

STRICT MITTAG-LEFFLER MODULES AND PURELY GENERATED CLASSES

PHILIPP ROTHMALER

To SK Jain

ABSTRACT. We study versions of strict Mittag-Leffler modules relativized to a class \mathcal{K} (of modules), that is, *strict* versions (in the technical sense of Raynaud and Gruson) of \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler modules, as investigated in the preceding paper, *Mittag-Leffler modules and definable subcategories*, in this very series.

Goodearl [Goo] noticed (in different terms) that a module is R_R -Mittag-Leffler if and only if the inclusion of any of its finitely generated submodules factors through a finitely presented module. (This can be found, among other more or less relative Mittag-Leffler properties, in the preceding paper [Rot4].) Raynaud and Gruson [RG] characterized *strict* Mittag-Leffler modules as those which can be mapped down to any finitely generated submodule in such a way that this map pointwise fixes the given finitely generated submodule and factors through a finitely presented module. There is a major difference here: in the strict version one must be able to map the *entire* module each time one examines a finitely generated submodule. What is in common though is a certain local behavior concerning finitely generated submodules or, one could say, finite subsets (the generator sets of them). One way of dealing with local behavior is to consider separation properties. Baer [Bae] introduced separable abelian groups as those in which every finite subset can be ‘separated’ by (is contained in) a direct summand which is completely decomposable, see [F]. Whatever these completely decomposable groups may be, inspired by Baer’s original investigations, a theory of separation has emerged that has taken other classes of groups as the pool from which to choose the separating direct summands, for instance free groups, see [EM].

For our purposes the most natural choice of separation module is the class R -mod of finitely presented modules, as in [GIRT] and here in Definition 4.1(3) and (5) (and thereafter). As was shown in [GIRT, Thm. 1], all strict Mittag-Leffler modules are so separable if and only if all pure-projective modules are direct sums of finitely presented modules—while, in general, a module is pure-projective if and only if it is a *direct summand* of a direct sum of finitely presented modules. This leads us to proving that, in general, a module is strict Mittag-Leffler if and only if it is a *direct summand* of a separable module, Corollary 6.19. And while this has been known in this form since [HT], we prove it for arbitrary relativizations in a rather general context, Corollary 6.8, as a consequence of a more general result, our first separation theorem 6.7. The other part of this theorem characterizes the (non-strict) relativized Mittag-Leffler modules in terms of another separability, that by pure submodules in place of direct summands. The unrelativized case of it says that

Date: published in Contemporary Mathematics, Volume **751**, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1090/conm/751/15085>.
 2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16D40, 16B70, 16D80, 16S90.

Supported in part by PSC CUNY Awards 64595-00 42 and 68835-00 46, BCCF Faculty Scholarship Support Grant (Spring Cycle 2018).

a module is Mittag-Leffler if and only if it is a direct summand of a pure separable module, i.e., of a module all of whose finite subsets can be contained in a pure submodule that is finitely presented, Corollary 6.19.

The second separation theorem 6.13 describes when the clause ‘direct summand’ is superfluous in Theorem 6.7. The most transparent form this assumes is in the classical, unrelativized case: all strict Mittag-Leffler modules are separable if and only if all Mittag-Leffler modules are pure separable—and this is the case precisely when also in the description of pure-projective modules ‘direct summand’ is superfluous, see Corollary 6.20.

What are all these relativizations and what the rather more general context? As for the context, the most satisfying results, in §6, have been achieved in purely generated classes, in particular, in purely resolving classes (cf. Definition 3.1), as developed in [HR]. Relativizations to classes of modules occurred very naturally in the study of Mittag-Leffler modules in the preceding paper [Rot4]. So it is only natural to ask what the corresponding relativizations should be in the strict case. Taking into account the description of (the unrestricted) strict Mittag-Leffler modules, given in [GIRT, Prop. 1], as those in which every tuple freely realizes a certain pp formula, the correct relativization, it seems, should be obtained by relativizing the scope of ‘freeness’ in the free realizations part of the definition, see Definitions 2.1(2) and 2.2. Another approach to achieve a similar goal can be found in [AH] in the shape of ‘stationary’ modules.

In the (non-strict) Mittag-Leffler case a fundamental feature was that the relativizations to a certain class depended only on the definable subcategory this class generates, which greatly simplifies many considerations and formulations. It also allowed for free transfer between formulations for classes \mathcal{K} of right modules and classes \mathcal{L} of left modules by simply applying elementary duality to the defining pairs of pp formulas, as was first done in [Her]. So, a module is \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler if and only if it is \mathcal{L} -atomic, whenever \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{L} generate elementarily dual definable subcategories, cf. [Rot4, Thm.3.1].

For the strict versions the situation is different, and I found no particular choice of module on the other side naturally lending itself to a similar transfer as in the non-strict case, which is why I mostly stay on the same side as the original module. This results in strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules having preference over strict \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler modules. Even more, I *define* the latter concept only for definable subcategories \mathcal{K} —namely, as the strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules for \mathcal{L} , the definable subcategory elementarily dual to \mathcal{K} , cf. Definition 2.2.

An actual example showing that the state of affairs is indeed different in the strict case was provided only by an anonymous referee, who pointed out the role of pure-injective modules for this study and how this could be used to obtain two classes of modules that generate the same definable subcategory, yet yield different notions of strict atomicity, see Remark 2.7 at the beginning of §2.3. More on this issue can be found in §5 and the final §7.

Some results seem new even in the classical situation of \mathcal{L} being the entire module category. For instance, the pp definability of finitely generated endosubmodules of any strict Mittag-Leffler module, Corollary 2.13, which had been previously known for pure-projective modules, cf. [P2, Cor. 2.1.27]. Another such result is the passage ‘from elements to tuples:’ in order for a module to be strict Mittag-Leffler it suffices that every *element* be a free realization of some (unary) pp formula, Corollary 3.7. This is done in the larger context of modules purely generated by a strict relatively atomic module, see Proposition 3.6.

In [HR] axiomatizations of purely generated classes by (usually infinitary) implications of pp formulas were found that provide a better handle on the problems arising with relativizations. They show that purely generated classes are F-classes in the sense of [PRZ]. In §3 we pick up this theory and specify it to fit purely resolving classes, cf. Lemma 3.11. The resulting more special axiomatization entails some downward Löwenheim-Skolem-like behavior, called self-separation, see §§5.2–5.4. A typical application of this is Theorem 5.12 showing that relative atomic modules in a purely resolving class are already (fully) Mittag-Leffler.

I would like to thank Ivo Herzog and Martin Ziegler for inspiring discussions. Further thanks are due to an anonymous referee for her or his contribution to §2.3 and other helpful comments improving the paper.

Preliminaries. The reader is assumed to be somewhat familiar with [Rot4]—its main techniques and definitions—in particular, with pp formulas and types, their finite generation and free realization, and definable subcategories and the like.

Throughout, \mathcal{K} denotes a nonempty class of right R -modules and \mathcal{L} a nonempty class of left R -modules. ‘Module’ means left R -module unless otherwise specified. $R\text{-Inj}$ stands for the class of injective (left) R -modules, \sharp for the class of absolutely pure modules (with subscript R to indicate the side when necessary), and \flat for that of flat modules (again, possibly, with a left or right subscript R).

Map means (*homo*)*morphism*, at least when it is between modules. (M, N) is a shorthand for $\text{Hom}(M, N)$, so (M, M) means $\text{End } M$.

We often identify a tuple with the (finite) set of its entries, which will be completely clear from the context. All tuples and formulas are assumed to be matching.

Herzog [Her, §4] discovered that the map that sends a pp pair φ/ψ to the pair $D\psi/D\varphi$ can be used to extend elementary duality from pp formulas to closed sets of the Ziegler spectrum (cf. [P2, Thm.5.4.1]) and hence to definable subcategories, and even to arbitrary theories of modules. Ever since we have the notion of *elementarily dual* definable subcategories that the reader is assumed to be acquainted with (cf. [P2, §3.4.2]). Recall from [Rot4, §2.5], that $D\mathcal{K}$ denotes the class of all character duals $(K, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ of $K \in \mathcal{K}$. The definable subcategory $\langle D\mathcal{K} \rangle$ turns out to be elementarily dual to $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$, see [Z-HZ], [PRZ] or simply [P2, Cor.3.4.17].

In [Rot4, Convention 2.7] it was stipulated that the classes \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{L} were *definably dual* in the sense that the definable subcategories they generate, $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$, are elementarily dual. While no such convention will be made now, as definable subcategories play a different role here, we will freely use definably dual classes in the sense just specified.

1. PURITY

1.1. Relativized purity. The first part of the following definition is discussed in great detail in [Rot4, §5.1]. The second is its natural dual, but seems not to have been discussed much. (A stronger version of it occurs in [Rot4, §5.4].)

Definition 1.1.

- (1) The map $f : A \longrightarrow B$ is an \mathcal{L} -pure monomorphism if for every tuple \bar{a} in A and every pp formula φ its image satisfies in B , there is a pp formula $\psi \leq_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$ it satisfies in A . A submodule A of a module B is *locally \mathcal{L} -pure* if the identical inclusion is.

- (2) The map $g : B \rightarrow C$ is an \mathcal{L} -pure epimorphism if for every tuple \bar{c} in C and every pp formula φ it satisfies, there is a g -preimage \bar{b} in B and a pp formula $\psi \leq_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$ it satisfies.

As the partial order does not change when passing from \mathcal{L} to the definable subcategory it generates, \mathcal{L} -pure and $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -pure are the same. Beware, \mathcal{L} -pure monomorphisms may not be monomorphisms. E.g., in the category of abelian groups the zero map on the group of two elements is an \mathcal{L} -pure monomorphism for \mathcal{L} , the class of torsionfree abelian groups.

Remark 1.2. If the source of any of these maps is in $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$, the two formulas are equivalent in that source, which yields the usual purity (where ψ can be taken to be φ). In particular,

- (a) \mathcal{L} -pure submodules that are in $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ are pure submodules,
- (b) \mathcal{L} -pure epimorphic images of modules in $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ are pure epimorphic images.

1.2. Local splitting. Recall Azumaya's notions, [Azu1], [Azu2]: a monomorphism $f : N \hookrightarrow M$ is called *locally split* if for every tuple \bar{n} in N there is a *local retract*, i.e., a homomorphism $g_{\bar{n}} : M \rightarrow N$ with $g_{\bar{n}}f(\bar{n}) = \bar{n}$. As usual, one calls a submodule N of a module M *locally split* if the identical embedding is locally split. (Notice, this makes f a monomorphism anyway.)

For completeness, let me mention that, dually, an epimorphism $g : N \rightarrow M$ is called *locally split* if for every tuple \bar{m} in M there is a *local section*, i.e., a homomorphism $h_{\bar{m}} : M \rightarrow N$ with $gh_{\bar{m}}(\bar{m}) = \bar{m}$. (Again, this makes g an epimorphism anyway.)

Remark 1.3. Clearly, in both definitions, the tuples \bar{n} and $f(\bar{n})$, respectively \bar{m} and $h_{\bar{m}}(\bar{m})$, have the same pp type. Hence locally split monomorphisms (resp., locally split epimorphisms) are pure.

It is not surprising that in order for a monomorphism to be locally split it suffices to check the definition on a generating subset:

Remark 1.4. Suppose N is generated by the set $C \subseteq N$ and $f : N \rightarrow M$ is a map such that every tuple \bar{c} in C has a local retract, i.e., a homomorphism $g_{\bar{c}} : M \rightarrow N$ with $g_{\bar{c}}f(\bar{c}) = \bar{c}$. Then f is a locally split monomorphism.

1.3. Relativized local splitting. Just as we were naturally led to weakenings of purity in [Rot3] and [Rot4], we are here led to weakenings of local splitting by the investigations of how much one can enlarge a class \mathcal{L} without disturbing the property of being strict \mathcal{L} -atomic (or strict \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler), see §2.3 below, the only section where this is used.

Definition 1.5. Suppose \mathcal{P} is a class of (left R -) modules.

A homomorphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ is *locally \mathcal{P} -split* if for every tuple \bar{a} from A and every tuple \bar{p} from some $P \in \mathcal{P}$, every map $g : (P, \bar{p}) \rightarrow (B, f(\bar{a}))$ factors through f so that \bar{p} goes to \bar{a} . More precisely, for every such $g : (P, \bar{p}) \rightarrow (B, f(\bar{a}))$ there is $h : (P, \bar{p}) \rightarrow (A, \bar{a})$ such that $g(\bar{p}) = fh(\bar{p})$.

A *locally \mathcal{P} -split source* of B is a module A for which there is such a locally \mathcal{P} -split homomorphism $f : A \rightarrow B$. A submodule A of a module B is *locally \mathcal{P} -split* if the identical inclusion is.

Remark 1.6. Just as R -Mod-purity was the usual purity, R -Mod-locally split submodules are the usual locally split submodules. Further, the $(R\text{-mod})$ -locally split submodules are precisely the pure submodules. Thus, so long as $R\text{-mod} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, all \mathcal{P} -locally split submodules are pure submodules.

2. STRICT MITTAG-LEFFLER AND ATOMIC MODULES

2.1. Free realizations of formulas.

Definition 2.1.

- (1) [Rot3, Def.2.2(1)] A *free realization* for \mathcal{L} of a pp formula φ , or an \mathcal{L} -*free realization* of φ , is a pointed module (M, \bar{m}) such that \bar{m} is a (matching) tuple satisfying φ in M and, whenever a tuple \bar{c} satisfies φ in a module $L \in \mathcal{L}$, then there is a map $M \rightarrow L$ sending \bar{m} to \bar{c} .¹
- (2) M is said to be a *strict \mathcal{L} -atomic* if every tuple in M freely realizes some pp formula for \mathcal{L} .
- (3) We omit the attribute \mathcal{L} if it is all of $R\text{-Mod}$.

Note that every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module is \mathcal{L} -atomic in the sense of [R] (or [Rot4])—as it should be. For, if (M, \bar{m}) freely realizes φ for \mathcal{L} and $\psi \in \text{pp}_M(\bar{m})$, then, in any $L \in \mathcal{L}$, if (L, \bar{a}) satisfies φ , there is a map $(M, \bar{m}) \rightarrow (L, \bar{a})$, hence (L, \bar{a}) satisfies also ψ . Consequently, φ \mathcal{L} -generates $\text{pp}_M(\bar{m})$. This property for every \bar{m} in M is what is called \mathcal{L} -atomicity. Now, the main theorem of [R] (or [Rot4]) says that in case the classes \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{L} are definably dual in the sense specified in the preliminaries above (which, recall, means that the definable subcategories they generate are elementarily dual in the sense of [Her]), the two properties, \mathcal{L} -atomicity and that of being \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler, are the same—and so we can take it as a definition of \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler. Similarly, [GIRT, Prop. 2.1] established that the two properties of strict atomicity (i.e., strict $R\text{-Mod}$ -atomicity in the sense just introduced) and of being strict Mittag-Leffler (in the sense of [RG]) are the same. So it seems only legitimate to extend this to arbitrary definable subcategories and make it a definition, redundant as it may seem.

Definition 2.2. Given a definable subcategory \mathcal{K} of right R -modules, a module is said to be a *strict \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler* if it is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic for \mathcal{L} , the definable subcategory of left modules elementarily dual to \mathcal{K} in the sense of Herzog (see Preliminaries).

We will still prefer the terms (strict) \mathcal{L} -atomic over their Mittag-Leffler version—for three reasons: first it allows us to stay on the same side of the ring, second, and more importantly, it makes available our main techniques involving pp formulas, third, and most importantly, it depends here on how we apply elementary duality to a class of modules, as the concepts may no longer be invariant under definable subcategories. At the same time though, we want to keep in mind their connotations ‘on the other side:’ as strict \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler modules—provided \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{L} are definable subcategories that are elementarily dual.

Remark 2.3. The strict Mittag-Leffler modules of [RG] are the strict \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler modules for $\mathcal{K} = \text{Mod-}R$ (i.e., the strictly \mathcal{L} -atomic modules for $\mathcal{L} = R\text{-Mod}$), [GIRT, Prop. 2.1], or, equivalently, [Azu2], the locally pure-projective modules, i.e., the modules such that every pure epimorphism onto them locally splits in the sense of §1.2.

It is not hard to see that within a definable subcategory \mathcal{D} , for a \mathcal{D} -atomic module to have the strict property it suffices to check it for single modules in \mathcal{D} one by one:

Lemma 2.4. *Let M be an \mathcal{L} -atomic module and $\mathcal{L}' = \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{L}_i \subseteq \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$.
If M is strict \mathcal{L}_i -atomic for every $i \in I$, then it is strict \mathcal{L}' -atomic.*

¹This differs from the definition made in [HR, §1.4] in that M is not required to be a member of \mathcal{L} . Both differ from Prest’s original definition in that the requirement on the underlying module of being finitely presented is also abandoned.

Proof. By hypothesis, every tuple \bar{a} in M satisfies a pp formula φ that \mathcal{L} -generates—hence also $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -generates—its type $\text{pp}_M(\bar{a})$, and there are φ_i in that type that \bar{a} freely realizes for \mathcal{L}_i , $i \in I$. As mentioned before, this implies that $\varphi_i \leq_{\mathcal{L}_i} \varphi$. But $\mathcal{L}_i \subseteq \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ implies also $\varphi \leq_{\mathcal{L}_i} \varphi_i$, which shows that we may take φ for all the φ_i . Consequently, (M, \bar{a}) freely realizes φ for \mathcal{L}' , as required. \square

2.2. Pure submodules of atomic modules. It is clear from the definition that the class of strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules is closed under arbitrary direct sum and pure submodules. Here is a refinement of the latter.

Lemma 2.5. *If $f : N \rightarrow M$ is an \mathcal{L} -pure monomorphism with M strict \mathcal{L} -atomic, then N is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic.*

In particular, \mathcal{L} -pure submodules of strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules are strict \mathcal{L} -atomic. (Without ‘strict’ this is [Rot4, Cor. 6.3].)

Proof. For notational simplicity, assume N is an \mathcal{L} -pure submodule of the strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module M and f is the identical inclusion. Let \bar{n} be a tuple in N . Then $(M, f(\bar{n}))$ freely realizes some formula φ for \mathcal{L} which is \mathcal{L} -equivalent to some ψ in $\text{pp}_N(\bar{n})$. To see that (N, \bar{n}) freely realizes ψ for \mathcal{L} , consider $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and a tuple \bar{c} therein that satisfies ψ . By \mathcal{L} -equivalence, it also satisfies φ , whence we have a map $(M, f(\bar{n})) \rightarrow (L, \bar{c})$. This yields the desired map $(N, \bar{n}) \rightarrow (L, \bar{c})$. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose $f : N \rightarrow M$ is an \mathcal{L} -pure monomorphism with M strict \mathcal{L} -atomic. If N is itself in \mathcal{L} , then f is a locally split (and hence pure²) monomorphism. If N is, in addition, finitely generated, f splits.*

In particular, \mathcal{L} -pure submodules of strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules that are themselves in \mathcal{L} are locally split (and hence pure) submodules. If they are, in addition, finitely generated, they are even direct summands.

Proof. Let \bar{n} be any tuple in N and let $(M, f(\bar{n}))$ \mathcal{L} -freely realize the pp formula φ . As $N \in \mathcal{L}$, by \mathcal{L} -purity, φ is contained in the type of \bar{n} in N , and so we have $(M, \bar{n}) \rightarrow (N, \bar{n})$, which is the desired local retract for \bar{n} . \square

2.3. Closure of the target class. First a crucial observation about pure-injectives provided by the referee, which culminates in an example showing that, in contrast to \mathcal{L} -atomicity (and \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler modules), which depends only on the definable subcategory \mathcal{L} (or \mathcal{K}) generates, strict \mathcal{L} -atomicity is, in general, different from $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomicity.

Remark 2.7.

- (a) If \mathcal{L} consists of pure-injective modules only, \mathcal{L} -atomic implies strict \mathcal{L} -atomic. For, if the pp type $\text{pp}_M(\bar{a})$ in M is \mathcal{L} -generated by φ which \bar{b} in $L \in \mathcal{L}$ satisfies, then $\text{pp}_M(\bar{a}) \subseteq \text{pp}_L(\bar{b})$, hence pure injectivity of L guarantees a map $(M, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (L, \bar{b})$, as desired (see e.g. [P2, Thm.4.3.9]).
- (b) If $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}' \subseteq \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ are such that $\mathcal{L}' \setminus \mathcal{L}$ consists of pure-injectives only, then every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module is strict \mathcal{L}' -atomic.

This follows from the implications $\text{strict } \mathcal{L}\text{-atomic} \implies \mathcal{L}\text{-atomic} \implies \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle\text{-atomic} \implies \mathcal{L}' \setminus \mathcal{L}\text{-atomic} \implies \text{strict } \mathcal{L}' \setminus \mathcal{L}\text{-atomic}$ (by (1)), which, together with strict \mathcal{L} -atomicity, yields strict \mathcal{L}' -atomicity by Lemma 2.4.

²It’s pure anyway, see Remark 1.2.

- (c) Let \mathcal{D} be a definable subcategory and \mathcal{L} be the class of all of pure-injectives in \mathcal{D} . If strict \mathcal{L} -atomic implies strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic, then \mathcal{D} -atomic implies strict \mathcal{D} -atomic.
 This follows from the implications \mathcal{D} -atomic $\implies \mathcal{L}$ -atomic \implies strict \mathcal{L} -atomic \implies strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic \iff strict \mathcal{D} -atomic, the second of which is (1); for the last notice $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle = \mathcal{D}$, for any module is in the same definable subcategories as its pure-injective hull.
- (d) Consequently, every definable subcategory \mathcal{D} with a \mathcal{D} -atomic member which is not strictly \mathcal{D} -atomic gives rise to a subclass \mathcal{L} (namely, the class of all pure-injective members of \mathcal{D}) such that strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomicity is stronger than strict \mathcal{L} -atomicity.
- (e) As a concrete example, take \mathcal{L} to be the class of all pure-injective abelian groups. The definable subcategory it generates is the category of all abelian groups. Since there are Mittag-Leffler abelian groups that are not strict Mittag-Leffler, e.g., Example 6.24 below, not every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic abelian group is strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic (= strict Mittag-Leffler).

The obstacle in extending strict \mathcal{L} -atomicity to strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomicity is the closure of \mathcal{L} under pure submodules (note, *every* module is pure in its pure-injective envelope). If we strengthen purity to a certain weak local splitting, however, we can prove this. Again, the additional clause about pure-injectives is due to the referee.

Proposition 2.8. *Suppose \mathcal{L} is any class of modules and \mathcal{P} is the class of strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules. Let \mathcal{L}' be the union of \mathcal{L} and the class of all pure-injectives in $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$, and let $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ be the closure of \mathcal{L}' under direct product, direct limit and local \mathcal{P} -split sources (in particular, under local \mathcal{P} -split submodules).*

Then every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module is strict $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ -atomic.

Proof. Suppose M is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic, hence, by (2) of the previous remark, also strict \mathcal{L}' -atomic. That this condition is preserved in direct products of the target modules follows easily from the fact that pp formulas are p-functors, i.e., commute with direct product. Namely, let $\overline{m} \in \varphi(M)$ freely realize a pp formula φ for \mathcal{L}' . If N is the product of some $L_i \in \mathcal{L}'$ and a tuple \overline{n} satisfies φ in N , then each coordinate of \overline{n} in L_i , call it \overline{l}_i , satisfies φ . So there are maps $f_i : (M, \overline{m}) \rightarrow (L_i, \overline{l}_i)$, whose product sends (M, \overline{m}) to (N, \overline{n}) , as desired.

To show that this condition is preserved in direct limits, suppose the L_i form a directed system with direct limit N and the tuple \overline{n} satisfies φ in N . This is possible only if φ was true along some tail of \overline{n} in the direct system. In particular, there is a preimage \overline{l}_i of \overline{n} , under a canonical map, which satisfies φ . By hypothesis, there is a map $(M, \overline{m}) \rightarrow (L_i, \overline{l}_i)$, which, composed with that canonical map, yields a map $(M, \overline{m}) \rightarrow (N, \overline{n})$, as desired.

Finally, suppose $f : N \rightarrow L$ is locally \mathcal{P} -split, $L \in \mathcal{L}'$, and (N, \overline{n}) satisfies φ . Being existential, φ is also satisfied in $(L, f(\overline{n}))$. By hypothesis on M , there is a map $(M, \overline{m}) \rightarrow (L, f(\overline{n}))$, which, by hypothesis on N , factors through f , and thus yields the desired map to (N, \overline{n}) . \square

A simple argument using $R\text{-mod} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ shows that $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ is closed under local \mathcal{P} -split sources. The other operations being part of the definition of definable subcategory, one infers that $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ is contained in the definable subcategory $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$. It might be short of being the whole thing by leaving out some pure submodules that are not locally \mathcal{P} -split. In fact, we have the following.

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose A is a pure submodule of some $L \in \mathcal{L}$ such that every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module is also strict A -atomic.*

Then A is locally \mathcal{P} -split in L (with \mathcal{P} , the class of strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules).

Proof. Suppose $A \subseteq L$ and g is a map from $P \in \mathcal{P}$ to L with $g(\bar{p}) = \bar{a}$ for given tuples \bar{a} in A and \bar{p} in P . As $P \in \mathcal{P}$, the tuple \bar{p} freely realizes some pp formula φ for \mathcal{L} in P . As g preserves pp formulas, \bar{a} satisfies φ in L , and, by purity, also in A .

Since P is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic, by hypothesis, it is also strict A -atomic, so (P, \bar{p}) must freely realize some pp formula ψ for A . Then $\varphi \leq_{\mathcal{L}} \psi$, and as A is in $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$, the tuple \bar{a} satisfies ψ in A , which yields the desired map $(P, \bar{p}) \longrightarrow (A, \bar{a})$. \square

We will return to this issue in §§5.2 and 7.

2.4. Countably generated atomic modules are strict. [Rot3, Prop. 2.4] says that every tuple in a countably generated \mathcal{L} -atomic module freely realizes some pp formula for \mathcal{L} . This is so basic a fact for this topic that we restate it as follows and make use of it without much mention.

Lemma 2.10 (The ‘Strict’ Lemma). [Rot3, Prop. 2.4]

Countably generated \mathcal{L} -atomic modules are strict \mathcal{L} -atomic. Consequently, countably generated strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules are strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic.

Proof. The first part of the statement is [Rot3, Prop. 2.4]. Invoking [Rot4, Cor. 3.6(a)] saying that \mathcal{L} -atomic is the same as $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic, the second follows at once. \square

2.5. Traces. The role of traces in this context has been made clear in [Z-H] and [Gar], see also [P2, Cor. 1.2.17]. Given a tuple \bar{m} in a module M , by the *trace* of \bar{m} in a module N we mean the set $(M, N)\bar{m} := \{h(\bar{m}) \mid h \in (M, N)\}$. By an \mathcal{L} -trace we mean a trace in a module from \mathcal{L} .

Lemma 2.11. *(M, \bar{m}) is a free realization for \mathcal{L} of the pp formula φ if and only if \bar{m} satisfies φ in M and φ defines all \mathcal{L} -traces of \bar{m} , i.e., $(M, L)\bar{m} = \varphi(L)$ for all $L \in \mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. As morphisms preserve pp formulas, $\bar{m} \in \varphi(M)$ implies $(M, F)\bar{m} \subseteq \varphi(F)$, for any module F . The inverse inclusion holds if and only if \bar{m} can be mapped to every element of $\varphi(F)$. \square

Note, if $M \in \mathcal{L}$ then \bar{m} is in its own \mathcal{L} -trace and therefore automatically satisfies any pp formula that defines all its \mathcal{L} -traces.

Proposition 2.12. *The following are equivalent for any (left R -) module M .*

- (i) *M is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic.*
- (ii) *Every tuple \bar{m} in M satisfies a pp formula that defines all traces of \bar{m} in modules from \mathcal{L} .*
- (iii) *Every tuple \bar{m} in M satisfies a pp formula φ that is freely realized in some module N with $\varphi(N) = (M, N)\bar{m}$.*

Proof. (i) and (ii) are equivalent by the lemma. Since every pp formula has a (total) free realization somewhere (in some module N , even a finitely presented one), (iii) is equivalent as well. \square

This allows us to extend a result known for pure-projective modules to strict Mittag-Leffler modules, cf. [P2, Cor. 2.1.27].

Corollary 2.13. *Every finitely generated endosubmodule of a strict Mittag-Leffler module is pp-definable.*

Proof. Let M be strict Mittag-Leffler, that is, strict $(R\text{-Mod-})$ atomic. An endosubmodule generated by elements $m_i \in M$ ($i \in I$) is the sum of all the traces $(\text{End } M)m_i = (M, M)m_i$. These being pp-definable, their sum is too (so long as I is finite). \square

Clearly, the same is true for finite sums of traces of k -tuples $(M, M)\overline{m}_i$, so that also finitely generated submodules of M^k —regarded as a module under the diagonal action of $\text{End } M$ again—are pp-definable (in M).

Remark 2.14. Every finitely generated endosubmodule of a module M is pp-definable if and only if M is strict M -atomic, for the finitely generated endosubmodules of M are precisely the traces under $\text{End } M = (M, M)$ of the generator tuples.

2.6. Strict ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic modules. Over left coherent rings, where ${}_R\flat$ and ${}_R\sharp$ form definable subcategories, [P2, Thm.3.4.24], which are elementarily dual, these are, by definition, the strict ${}_R\flat$ -Mittag-Leffler modules. However, we prefer to work with ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic modules, which make sense over any ring. (So does the duality of ${}_R\flat$ and ${}_R\sharp$, namely, Herzog showed that these classes are what we call definably dual, i.e., they generate elementarily dual subcategories [Her, §12], cf. [P2, Prop.3.4.26].)

It has been known since [Goo] that all modules are R_R -Mittag-Leffler (equivalently, ${}_R\flat$ -Mittag-Leffler, or ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic) if and only if R is left noetherian, cf. also [Rot4, Cor.4.3]. In our terminology, R is left noetherian if and only if every module is ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic. We are going to strengthen this by showing that then all modules are even strict ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic. First a general observation, whose original proof became obsolete with the referee's Remark 2.7(1) above.

Remark 2.15. R_R -Mittag-Leffler ($= {}_R\sharp$ -atomic) modules are strict R -Inj-atomic.

Proposition 2.16. *A ring R is left noetherian if and only if every module is strict ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic. In particular, every abelian group has this property.*

Proof. In the noetherian case, ${}_R\sharp = R\text{-Inj}$, so the implication from left to right follows from the remark (and the fact that then every module is ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic). As mentioned, for the converse it suffices to have all modules (plain) ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic ($= R_R$ -Mittag-Leffler). \square

Example 2.17. By [AF, Prop. 7], an abelian group M is Mittag-Leffler iff it has trivial first Ulm group (i.e., the intersection of all nM is 0) and M/tM is Mittag-Leffler. Hence no divisible group is Mittag-Leffler. But all of them are strict ${}_R\sharp$ -atomic.

2.7. Strict ${}_R\flat$ -atomic modules. Dually to what was said at the beginning of the previous section, now it is the right coherent rings over which these are the strict \sharp_R -Mittag-Leffler modules. But again, we wish to work with arbitrary rings and stick to strict ${}_R\flat$ -atomic modules instead.

Example 2.18. (Of strict ${}_R\flat$ -atomic abelian groups that are not Mittag-Leffler.) By [Rot3, Prop. 5.1], every torsion abelian group is ${}_R\flat$ -atomic—in fact, by [Rot3, Thm. 6.8 or Cor. 6.12], every group M with $M/t(M)$ Mittag-Leffler is. Hence every countable such group is even strict ${}_R\flat$ -atomic, cf. Lemma 2.10. Now one gets a host of such groups which are not Mittag-Leffler from [AF, Prop. 7], see the previous Example. Namely, take any countable torsion group with non-trivial first Ulm group, like the Prüfer groups.

In contrast, flat strict ${}_R\flat$ -atomic modules turn out to be always strict atomic (i.e., strict Mittag-Leffler), as will be shown in Corollary 3.5 below. More will be said in the introduction to §6.6 as a consequence of some separation results for purely generated classes.

3. PURE GENERATION

Definition 3.1. [HR, §2]

- (1) A module is *purely generated* by a class \mathcal{B} if it is a pure epimorphic image of a direct sum of modules from \mathcal{B} . A class is *purely generated by \mathcal{B}* if every module in it is. The class of *all* modules purely generated by \mathcal{B} is denoted $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$.
- (2) Following [HR, §2], we let $\mathcal{C} = \text{Add}\mathcal{B}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be the class of all pure epimorphic images of modules from \mathcal{C} (equivalently, from $\oplus\mathcal{B}$). So $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is a shorthand for $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$.
- (3) [HR, Rem. 2.4(a)]. A class is *purely resolving* if it is purely generated by pure-projective modules.
- (4) For the ease of exposition, we always assume \mathcal{B} to be closed under finite direct sum.

Note, a class is pure resolving whenever it is purely generated by *locally* pure-projective modules, [HR, Cor. 2.5], which means we may allow \mathcal{B} to consist of strict Mittag-Leffler modules and still have $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ purely resolving.

3.1. Basic properties.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose M is a pure-epimorphic image of a strict \mathcal{G} -atomic module $L \in \mathcal{L}$.*

If a tuple \bar{m} in M freely realizes some pp formula for \mathcal{L} , then it freely realizes also some (possibly different) pp formula for \mathcal{G} .

Consequently, if M is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic, it is also strict \mathcal{G} -atomic.

Proof. Consider a pure epimorphism $h : L \rightarrow M$. Let \bar{m} (in M) freely realizes a pp formula φ for \mathcal{L} and choose a preimage $\bar{l} \in \varphi(L)$ of \bar{m} by purity. By hypothesis on φ , there is a map $f : (M, \bar{m}) \rightarrow (L, \bar{l})$. Being strict \mathcal{G} -atomic, (L, \bar{l}) freely realizes a pp formula ψ for \mathcal{G} . Application of h shows that (M, \bar{m}) also satisfies ψ . To see that it does so freely for \mathcal{G} , let $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and \bar{g} be a tuple that satisfies ψ in G . Then there is a map $(L, \bar{l}) \rightarrow (G, \bar{g})$. Composed with f , this yields the desired map $(M, \bar{m}) \rightarrow (G, \bar{g})$. \square

Corollary 3.3. *Let \mathcal{L} be a class of strict \mathcal{G} -atomic modules and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ a class purely generated by \mathcal{L} , [HR, §2].*

Then every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic member of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is strict \mathcal{G} -atomic.

Special cases are:

Corollary 3.4. *If \mathcal{L} is a purely resolving class, then every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic member of \mathcal{L} is strict atomic, i.e., strict Mittag-Leffler.* \square

Corollary 3.5. *Every flat strict ${}_R\mathbf{b}$ -atomic module is strict atomic, hence strict Mittag-Leffler.*

Proof. The class ${}_R\mathbf{b}$ of flat modules is purely resolving, in fact, purely generated by the finitely generated projectives, cf. [HR, before Thm.2.1]. Now the previous corollary applies. \square

Compare this to [Rot3, Thm. 3.10], which says the same without ‘strict.’

3.2. From elements to tuples. It is always desirable to reduce a condition on tuples to the same condition on just elements.

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose M is a pure-epimorphic image of a strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in \mathcal{L} . Then the following are equivalent.*

- (i) *M is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic.*

(ii) *Every element in M freely realizes a certain pp formula for \mathcal{L} .*

Proof. We prove the nontrivial direction by induction on the length of the tuple. Suppose \bar{m}_0 is a tuple in M \mathcal{L} -freely realizing a pp formula φ_0 and $m \in M$. We are going to find a pp formula φ that the concatenated tuple (\bar{m}_0, m) freely realizes for \mathcal{L} (in M).

By hypothesis, there is a pure epimorphism g from a strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module $L \in \mathcal{L}$ onto M . Using purity of g , choose a preimage \bar{b}_0 of \bar{m}_0 in L satisfying φ_0 . By choice of φ_0 , there's a map $f_0 : (M, \bar{m}_0) \rightarrow (L, \bar{b}_0)$. Note, $gf_0(\bar{m}_0) = \bar{m}_0$.

By (ii), there is a pp formula φ' that the element $m' := m - gf_0(m)$ freely realizes for \mathcal{L} in M , and, by purity of g again, a preimage b' in L realizing it. Then there is a map $f' : (M, m') \rightarrow (L, b')$. Again, $gf'(m') = m'$.

Let f be the map $f' + f_0 - f'gf_0$. An easy calculation shows that $f(\bar{m}_0) = \bar{b}_0$ and $f(m) = f'(m') + f_0(m)$, and another one that therefore gf fixes both \bar{m}_0 and m . Thus (\bar{m}_0, m) and $f(\bar{m}_0, m)$ have the same pp type (in M and L , resp.).

It remains to note that, by choice of L , the latter type is generated by a single pp formula, say $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}_0, x)$, that $(L, \bar{b}_0, f(m))$ freely realizes for \mathcal{L} . Composing with the map f , we finally conclude that (M, \bar{m}_0, m) freely realizes that same φ for \mathcal{L} , as desired. \square

Warfield showed every module is a pure-epimorphic image of a pure-projective module (one can, in fact, take a direct sum of finitely presented modules), [W, 33.5]. Hence the lemma holds for $\mathcal{L} = R\text{-Mod}$.

Corollary 3.7. *A module is strict Mittag-Leffler if and only if every element freely realizes some (unary) pp formula.* \square

3.3. Axiomatizability. Consider *F-classes* as introduced in [PRZ], which are classes of modules that can be axiomatized by *F-sentences*, i.e., implications of the form $\varphi \rightarrow \bigvee \varphi_i$, where φ and the φ_i are pp formulas. Here the conclusio is allowed to be an infinitary disjunction, but such that the φ_i are closed under finite sum so that this implication is equivalent to the implication $\varphi \rightarrow \sum \varphi_i$, cf. [HR, §2]. The ‘F’ comes from flat, for the class of flat modules is an F-class, see next section.

[HR, Thm. 2.1] exhibits an axiomatization of purely resolving classes by F-sentences. To describe the specific axioms, consider such a class, $\tilde{C} = \text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$. Let $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}$ stand for the set of pp formulas that are freely realized (for *all* of $R\text{-Mod}$) by a tuple in some module from \mathcal{B} . Given a pp formula φ , let $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi$ be the set of all formulas (of same arity) in $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}$ that are below φ , i.e., $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi = \{\theta \in \text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}} \mid \theta \leq \varphi\}$. The axioms for \tilde{C} are now all F-sentences of the form $\varphi \rightarrow \bigvee \text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi$, where φ runs over all pp formulas (it suffices to consider 1-place pp formulas).

The overall assumption that \mathcal{B} be closed under finite direct sum guarantees that $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}$ (hence also $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi$) is closed under (finite) sums of pp formulas, so that the disjunction in the conclusio can, again, be replaced by the sum. In other words, the above axiom is equivalent to $\varphi \rightarrow \sum \text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi$.

Remark 3.8. One can generalize this axiomatization result to classes that are purely generated by relativized strict atomic modules, however those will no longer have the special features singled out in the next section.

3.4. Special F-classes. In general, one may take $\varphi_i \wedge \varphi$ in the conclusio of an F-sentence, to ensure that the implication's converse is automatically true: then the implication $\varphi \rightarrow \bigvee \varphi_i$ entails the equivalence of φ and $\bigvee \varphi_i$.

(Beware, this may lead outside the realm of a specific shape of formula. For instance, the conjunction of a formula from $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}$ with an arbitrary pp formula φ may no longer be

in $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}$. This is the reason, why, in §3.3, we worked with $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi$ instead, cf. the proof of Lemma 3.11 below.)

We will see shortly that ${}_R\mathfrak{b}$ is so axiomatized. But the axioms for the class of flat modules have yet another special feature. Given another such axiom, $\psi \longrightarrow \bigvee \psi_i$ with $\psi_i \leq \psi$, if every disjunct φ_i of φ is equivalent to one of the ψ_i , then $\varphi \longrightarrow \bigvee \varphi_i$ implies $\varphi \longrightarrow \psi$. Plainly speaking, one disjunction (trivially) implies another disjunction provided all disjuncts of the former are disjuncts of the latter. The special feature we are after now is when this is the only way that the former disjunction can imply the latter. Here is the precise definition.

Definition 3.9.

- (1) An F-sentence $\varphi \longrightarrow \bigvee \varphi_i$ is in *standard form* if $\varphi_i \leq \varphi$ for every i .
- (2) Given F-sentences in standard form, $\varphi \longrightarrow \bigvee \varphi_i$ and $\psi \longrightarrow \bigvee \psi_j$, we say φ *trivially implies* ψ (in \mathcal{F}) if every disjunct φ_i (of φ) (logically) implies some disjunct ψ_j (of ψ), i.e., for all i there is a j with $\varphi_i \leq \psi_j$.
- (3) An F-class \mathcal{F} is *special* if it has a set of F-axioms $\varphi \longrightarrow \bigvee \varphi_i$ in standard form, one for each pp formula φ (this is important!), and such that for every two axioms $\varphi \longrightarrow \bigvee \varphi_i$ and $\psi \longrightarrow \bigvee \psi_j$ from that set, we have $\varphi \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \psi$ (if and) only if φ trivially implies ψ .

The standard form of $\varphi \longrightarrow \bigvee \varphi_i$ guarantees that φ is \mathcal{F} -equivalent to the disjunction of the φ_i , and similarly for ψ . Hence, if every disjunct of φ implies some disjunct ψ_j in the above φ and ψ , then φ does imply ψ in \mathcal{F} (trivially), thus justifying the terminology.

Remark 3.10. ${}_R\mathfrak{b}$ is a special F-class. This follows from [Zim1], see [P2, Thm. 2.3.9] or the explicit axioms in [PRZ] or [Rot3, Fact 1.3], which are in standard form—each disjunct of the conclusio implies the premise.

Is the class of torsion-free modules a special F-class? It is an F-class, cf. [Rot3]. However, one has F-axioms only for annihilation formulas φ , so not *every* pp formula may end up being equivalent to such a disjunction. I have no counterexample at hand, but certainly the proof below breaks down when not *every* pp formula occurs as a premise.

Lemma 3.11. *Purely resolving classes are special F-classes.*

Proof. As all formulas in $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi$ are below φ , the axioms given in the previous sections are in standard form.

To verify that they are special in the sense of the above definition, consider two axioms $\varphi \longrightarrow \bigvee \text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi$ and $\psi \longrightarrow \bigvee \text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\psi$ with $\varphi \leq_{\tilde{C}} \psi$. All we need is $\text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi \subseteq \text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}\psi$.

So let $\theta \in \text{ppf}_{\mathcal{B}}$ be below φ . To show that it is also below ψ , let (M, \overline{m}) realize θ . Pick a free realization (B, \overline{b}) of θ with $B \in \mathcal{B}$, send it to (M, \overline{m}) and observe that it remains to see that ψ is already satisfied in (B, \overline{b}) . But this follows from $B \in \mathcal{B} \subseteq \tilde{C}$ and the assumption $\varphi \leq_{\tilde{C}} \psi$. \square

This will be used in §6.4.

4. SEPARATION

Reinhold Baer introduced separability in abelian groups—of finite subsets by direct summands that are completely decomposable, see [F].

4.1. Separabilities. We distinguish several types of separation—according to three different coordinates, cardinality of sets to be separated, the form of separation, and the kind of submodules to perform the separation. In Baer’s original separation, the second coordinate, the form of separation, was by direct summand, which is what one usually sees in the literature in the various types, see [EM]. This can be relaxed to Azumaya’s locally split,³ or to pure submodules, called *local separation* and *pure separation*, respectively. On top of that, we will have an entire family of relativized pure separabilities.

Generalizing e.g. [GIRT, §4], we make the following, essentially three, definitions.

Definition 4.1. Let κ be an infinite regular cardinal and \mathcal{S} a class of modules.

- (1) A module M is κ -separable by (modules from) \mathcal{S} , or (κ, \mathcal{S}) -separable for short, if every subset of M of cardinality $< \kappa$ is contained in a submodule from \mathcal{S} that is a direct summand of M .
- (2) We say *locally* (resp., \mathcal{L} -pure) κ -separable by (modules from) \mathcal{S} , or *locally* (resp., \mathcal{L} -pure) (κ, \mathcal{S}) -separable, if ‘direct summand’ is replaced by ‘locally split submodule’ (resp., by ‘ \mathcal{L} -pure submodule’).
- (3) If $\kappa = \aleph_0$, we simply omit it or say *finite separability* (for whichever version of separability at hand).
- (4) If $\kappa = \aleph_1$, we speak of *countable separability*.
- (5) We omit the reference to the class \mathcal{S} when it is $R\text{-mod}$.

By these conventions, *local separability by \mathcal{S}* , or *local \mathcal{S} -separability*, is local (\aleph_0, \mathcal{S}) -separability, while *\mathcal{L} -pure separability by \mathcal{S}* , or *\mathcal{L} -pure \mathcal{S} -separability*, is \mathcal{L} -pure (\aleph_0, \mathcal{S}) -separability. And, for instance, a *separable module* is one all of whose finite subsets are contained in a finitely presented direct summand—beware, this is often handled differently in the literature, cf. [EM] and [F].

Remark 4.2.

- (a) Bear’s original separability is (finite) separability—by completely decomposable submodules, cf. [F].
- (b) Clearly, any of the κ -separabilities entail the corresponding λ -separability for every $\lambda \leq \kappa$.
- (c) Clearly, direct summand \implies locally split submodule \implies pure submodule $\implies \mathcal{L}$ -pure submodule, hence
separable \implies locally separable \implies pure separable $\implies \mathcal{L}$ -pure separable.

Our interest in separation lies in the following facts, which we single out for reference.

Lemma 4.3.

- (1) If M is \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{L} -atomic modules, M is \mathcal{L} -atomic (hence $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic).
- (2) If M is locally separable by strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules, M is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic.
- (3) If M is locally separable by countably generated strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules, M is strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic.

Proof. (1) By definition $N \subseteq M$ is \mathcal{L} -pure iff the pp types of all tuples in N are \mathcal{L} -equivalent, whether taken in N or in M , which is, by the Main Theorem of [R] or [Rot4] all we need.

(2) First separate a given tuple in M by a locally split submodule N that is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic. Inside N , that tuple \mathcal{L} -freely realizes a certain pp formula φ . The same formula generates the tuple’s pp type in M , for locally split submodules are pure. To see that this

³also to his finitely split submodules,

tuple freely realizes φ also in M , simply combine the tuple's local retract from M to N by any of the 'free' maps from N to a realization of φ in any other module from \mathcal{L} .

(3) Apply the (stronger half of the) 'Strict' Lemma and (2) above. \square

The question of a converse arises at once. This will be addressed in §6, especially in Theorem 6.7. We conclude this section with some general observations.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ and M a strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module.*

- (1) *The following are equivalent for any infinite cardinal κ .*
 - (i) *M is \mathcal{L} -pure κ -separable by \mathcal{B} .*
 - (ii) *M is pure κ -separable by \mathcal{B} .*
 - (iii) *M is locally κ -separable by \mathcal{B} .*
- (2) *If all members of \mathcal{B} are finitely generated, M is κ -separable by \mathcal{B} in that case.*

Proof. As $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, for submodules that are in \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{L} -purity is the same as purity, Rem.1.2. So the first two conditions are equivalent (and this does not require atomicity of M). To see they imply the third, and for (2), refer to Lemma 2.6. \square

4.2. Separation and definable subcategories. Next we show that in the situation of the previous lemma, M belongs to the definable subcategory generated by \mathcal{L} .

Lemma 4.5.

- (1) *If M is \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{L} (hence pure separable by \mathcal{L}), then $M \in \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$.*
- (2) *Suppose \mathcal{L} is axiomatizable by implications of the form $\Phi \longrightarrow \Psi$, where Φ is a possibly infinite conjunction of possibly infinite disjunctions of pp formulas and Ψ a possibly infinite disjunction of possibly infinite conjunctions of existential formulas, all in the same finitely many variables.*
If M is \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{L} (hence pure separable by \mathcal{L}), then M satisfies all those implications that are true in \mathcal{L} .

Proof. (1) is the special case of (2) where both Φ and Ψ are single pp formulas. To prove (2) consider one such implication $\Phi \longrightarrow \Psi$ and assume the tuple \overline{m} satisfies the antecedent Φ . We may \mathcal{L} -pure separate it by some $L \in \mathcal{L}$, which is actually pure in M , Remark 1.2.

Now \overline{m} satisfies all conjuncts of Φ and hence one disjunct for each of these in M . Being pp, these latter are, by purity, satisfied by \overline{m} in L as well. It is easy to see that \overline{m} satisfies all of Φ in L . But being in \mathcal{L} , L satisfies the implication, hence \overline{m} satisfies Ψ in L . Being existential, Ψ it is also true of that very tuple in the original M , as desired. \square

5. COUNTABLE SELF-SEPARATION

5.1. A general fact. As shown in [Rot3, Prop. 3.5] or [Rot4, Cor. 6.5], a module is \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler if and only if each of its countable subsets is contained in a countably generated \mathcal{L} -pure submodule that is \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler (where \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{L} are assumed to be mutually dual). Because of the stronger half of the 'Strict' Lemma 2.10, we can say that \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler modules are countably \mathcal{L} -pure separable by strict $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$ -Mittag-Leffler modules. (The easy direction also follows from Lemma 4.3.) This fundamental separation result characterizing \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler modules we now formulate as follows.

Fact 5.1. *A module is \mathcal{L} -atomic if and only if it is countably \mathcal{L} -pure separable by countably generated strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules (even strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic modules).*

5.2. Countable self-separation. A principal deficiency in the above general fact is that one has no reason to expect the strict \mathcal{L} -atomic separating submodules to be themselves in \mathcal{L} , even if the original module was. The Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem of first-order model theory springs to mind as a remedy, and we are going to pursue this in §5.3. In order to avoid repeating a mouthful let us make a definition.

Definition 5.2. We call a class \mathcal{L} (countably) *self-separating* if every \mathcal{L} -atomic module in \mathcal{L} is countably \mathcal{L} -pure separable by countably generated (strict) \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in \mathcal{L} .

Lemma 5.3. Suppose \mathcal{L} is self-separating.

- (1) Every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in \mathcal{L} is countably locally separable by countably generated (strict) \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in \mathcal{L} , hence by strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic submodules in \mathcal{L} .
- (2) Every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in \mathcal{L} is strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic.

Proof. For (1) use the ‘Strict’ Lemma 2.10 and Lemma 4.4(1). For (2) use (1) and Lemma 4.3(3). \square

5.3. Elementary classes. Recall that a class axiomatized by finitary first-order axioms is called *elementary*.

Lemma 5.4. Suppose \mathcal{L} is an elementary class and $\kappa = \max(|R|, \aleph_0)$. Let \mathcal{B} be the class of strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in \mathcal{L} of power $\leq \kappa$.

- (1) Every \mathcal{L} -atomic module in \mathcal{L} is pure κ^+ -separable by \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in \mathcal{L} of power κ .
- (2) Every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in \mathcal{L} is locally κ^+ -separable by \mathcal{B} .

Proof. By the Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, every subset of a module M of power at most κ is contained in an elementary substructure N of M of power κ . Then N is in \mathcal{L} and a pure submodule of M , hence \mathcal{L} -atomic. This proves (1). For (2) apply Lemma 2.5 to see that N is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic and thus in \mathcal{B} . In that case, Lemma 2.6 yields that N is locally split in M . \square

Proposition 5.5. Suppose \mathcal{L} is an elementary class and R is countable.

A module in \mathcal{L} is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic if and only if it is locally countably separable by countable strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in \mathcal{L} .

In particular, elementary classes over countable rings are self-separating.

Proof. One direction follows from the lemma (for $\kappa = \aleph_0$) and the ‘Strict’ Lemma 2.10. The other is immediate from (2) of Lemma 4.3. \square

This can be slightly strengthened if the axiomatization of \mathcal{L} is of a specific kind.

Corollary 5.6. Suppose R is countable and \mathcal{L} is axiomatizable by implications as in Lemma 4.5 (2), but finitary (so that Löwenheim-Skolem applies).

A module is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic and in \mathcal{L} if and only if it is locally countably separable by countable strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in \mathcal{L} .

Proof. All that’s missing in the proposition is that if M is so separable, it has to be in \mathcal{L} . But this follows from Lemma 4.5 (2). \square

For definable subcategories this can be reformulated as follows.

Corollary 5.7. *Suppose R is countable, \mathcal{L} is a definable subcategory (i.e., $\mathcal{L} = \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$) and \mathcal{K} is its elementary dual.*

A module M is strict \mathcal{L} -atomic (= strict \mathcal{K} -Mittag-Leffler) and a member of \mathcal{L} if and only if it is countably locally separable by countably generated strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules that are members of \mathcal{L} . \square

Question 5.8. Is this true over uncountable rings?

5.4. Special F-classes. For \mathcal{L} , the class ${}_R\langle b \rangle$ of *quasi-flat* modules, the previous proposition implies that, over a countable ring, a quasi-flat module is strict ${}_R\langle b \rangle$ -atomic if and only if it is countably separable by countably generated strict ${}_R\langle b \rangle$ -atomic modules. However, we can drop the countability assumption on R in this case, as follows from [Rot3, Prop.3.7] and get a better separation result at the same time—namely by flats rather than quasi-flats. Analyzing that proof, we have arrived at the following abstract version that tells the gist of it. We will work in special F-class as introduced in §3.4 with terminology and notation from Definition 3.1. This is the abstract version of [Rot3, Prop.3.7]:

Proposition 5.9. *Every special F-class is (countably) self-separating.*

Proof. Referring to the proof of [Rot3, Prop. 3.7], we start also here by modifying the \mathcal{F} -generator φ of the type $\text{pp}_M(a)$ from the proof of [Rot3, Prop. 3.5] (= Fact 5.1) by a disjunct $\varphi_{i_a} \in \text{pp}_M(a)$ of the conclusio, which too is an \mathcal{F} -generator of $\text{pp}_M(a)$. Taking witnesses for φ_{i_a} in each of the countable steps and then closing off by the countably generated submodule N of M , we see, as in [Rot3, Prop. 3.7], that N is \mathcal{F} -atomic and \mathcal{F} -pure in M . It remains to verify that $N \in \mathcal{F}$, for which we will verify the axioms.

Let $\psi \rightarrow \bigvee \psi_j$ be one of them. Suppose $a \in N$ satisfies ψ . We have to show, a also satisfies one of the ψ_j in N .

As $\psi \in \text{pp}_M(a)$, we have $\varphi \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \psi$ (even $\varphi_{i_a} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \psi$). Since \mathcal{F} is special, this can happen only if every disjunct φ_i of φ implies some disjunct of ψ . In particular, φ_{i_a} does, which shows that a satisfies some disjunct of ψ , as desired. \square

Corollary 5.10. *Every purely resolving class is (countably) self-separating.*

Proof. Use Lemma 3.11. \square

Corollary 5.11. [Rot3, Prop. 3.7] *Every flat ${}_R b$ -atomic module is countably ${}_R b$ -pure separable by countably generated flat (strict) ${}_R b$ -atomic modules.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.5, ${}_R b$ is purely resolving. \square

5.5. Relative Mittag-Leffler modules in purely resolving classes. Recall from Corollary 3.4: strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules are strict atomic—i.e., strict Mittag-Leffler—provided they are members of \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L} is purely resolving. We are going to show the same for the non-strict version.

Theorem 5.12. *Suppose \mathcal{L} is purely resolving.*

\mathcal{L} -atomic modules in \mathcal{L} are Mittag-Leffler.

Proof. Let M be \mathcal{L} -atomic. By Corollary 5.10, M is countably \mathcal{L} -pure separable by strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in \mathcal{L} . As these are strict atomic and \mathcal{L} -purity is just purity by Remark 1.2, the module M is pure separable by atomic modules, hence atomic itself, which means Mittag-Leffler. \square

Corollary 5.13. [Rot3, Thm. 3.10] *Flat b -atomic modules are Mittag-Leffler.* \square

6. FINITE SEPARATION IN PURELY GENERATED CLASSES

6.1. The first separation theorem.

Definition 6.1.

- (1) A *separation pair* is an ordered pair $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ of classes of modules, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, where \mathcal{L} is closed under direct sum and \mathcal{L} -pure epimorphic images and \mathcal{B} is a *small*⁴ class of strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules closed under finite direct sum.
- (2) A *\mathcal{B} -free module* is simply a direct sum of modules from \mathcal{B} . The class of all of them is denoted $\oplus \mathcal{B}$.
- (3) A *large \mathcal{B} -free module* is a direct sum of direct powers of infinitely many copies of each isomorphism type of modules from \mathcal{B} , i.e., a module of the form $\oplus_{B \in \mathcal{B}^*} B^{(\kappa_B)}$ with all κ_B infinite, where \mathcal{B}^* is any transversal in \mathcal{B}/\cong .
- (4) We denote by P^* the large \mathcal{B} -free module $\oplus_{B \in \mathcal{B}^*} B^{(\omega)}$.

Notation 6.2. Throughout this subsection, $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a separation pair. Following [HR, §2], we let $C = \text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ and \tilde{C} be the class of all pure epimorphic images of modules from C (equivalently, from $\oplus \mathcal{B}$), i.e., the class purely generated by \mathcal{B} , which is therefore also denoted $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$.

Remark 6.3.

- (a) As \mathcal{B} is closed under finite direct sum, \mathcal{B} -free modules are (finitely) \mathcal{B} -separable.
- (b) Relaxing pure generation to \mathcal{L} -pure generation would not gain one anything, for $C \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, and \mathcal{L} -pure epimorphisms emanating from modules in \mathcal{L} are pure epimorphisms.

Lemma 6.4. [Rot3, Prop.2.5]. *Every countably generated (strict) \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$ is contained in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$, i.e., a direct summand of a \mathcal{B} -free module (which can be taken to be large) and thus a direct summand of a module (finitely) separable by \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Being in $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$, the module N is a pure epimorphic image of a \mathcal{B} -free module P . But pure epimorphisms emanating from \mathcal{L} —this is where $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is needed—onto countably generated \mathcal{L} -atomic modules split by [Rot3, Prop.2.5]. \square

Lemma 6.5 (Eilenberg’s Trick). *For every \mathcal{L} -atomic module $N \in \text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$ there is a large \mathcal{B} -free module P such that $N \oplus P \cong P$.*

If N is, in addition, countably generated, then $N \oplus P^ \cong P^*$.*

Proof. By the previous lemma, we have $P = N \oplus M$ for some M . Now comes Eilenberg’s trick: as $P^{(\omega)} \cong P$ we may rewrite P as $(N \oplus M)^{(\omega)} \cong N \oplus (M \oplus N)^{(\omega)} \cong N \oplus P$. In case N is countably generated, $P = P^*$ works. \square

Lemma 6.6 (The Separation Lemma). *If M is an \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$, then $M \oplus P^*$ is \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Consider a finite subset (a tuple) of $M \oplus P^*$ and denote its projections onto M and P^* by \overline{m} and \overline{p} , respectively. As P^* is separable by modules from \mathcal{B} , the tuple \overline{p} is contained in a direct summand $B \in \mathcal{B}$ of P^* . By the basic properties of P^* , we can split it into $P_0^* \oplus B$, where $P_0^* \cong P^*$, and then write $M \oplus P^* = M \oplus P_0^* \oplus B$. It remains to \mathcal{L} -pure-separate \overline{m} in $M \oplus P_0^* \cong M \oplus P^*$ by a module from \mathcal{B} .

By hypothesis, we can \mathcal{L} -pure separate \overline{m} in M by a countably generated \mathcal{L} -atomic module $N \in \text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$, an \mathcal{L} -pure submodule of M .

⁴I.e., containing only a set of distinct isomorphism types, in other words, \mathcal{B}/\cong is a set.

Then $N \oplus P^*$ is an \mathcal{L} -pure submodule of $M \oplus P^*$ containing \overline{m} , and it therefore suffices to \mathcal{L} -pure-separate \overline{m} by a module from \mathcal{B} in $N \oplus P^*$. Now Eilenberg's trick shows us that $N \oplus P^*$ is isomorphic to P^* and thus (even) separable by \mathcal{B} . \square

Theorem 6.7. *Suppose $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a separation pair:*

- (1) *Every \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ is a direct summand of a module that is (finitely) \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{B} (and conversely).*
- (2) *Every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ is a direct summand of a module that is locally separable by \mathcal{B} (and conversely).*

Proof. The direction from left to right in (1) follows from the Separation Lemma. Namely, if M is \mathcal{L} -atomic, $M \oplus P^*$ is \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{B} . For (2), notice that then $M \oplus P^*$ is even strict \mathcal{L} -atomic, hence even locally \mathcal{B} -separable by Lemma 4.4.

The converses follow from Lemma 4.3 (together with Lemma 2.5). \square

See Corollary 6.19 for the case of the classical separation pair $(R\text{-Mod}, R\text{-mod})$.

Corollary 6.8. *Suppose $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a separation pair with all modules in \mathcal{B} finitely generated.*

Then every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ is a direct summand of a (finitely) \mathcal{B} -separable module (and conversely).

Proof. Employ Lemma 4.4(2). \square

Remark 6.9.

- (a) One may be tempted to think that the following is true even without $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$:
 \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ are direct summands of modules that are (finitely) \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{B} . However, the entire series of lemmas leading to the theorem is based on the first one, Lemma 6.4, which does need it.
- (b) The converses of the theorem are true only within $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$, for the separabilities in question only imply inclusion in \mathcal{L} , not necessarily in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$.
- (c) Remember also, that $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, so the theorems are only about \mathcal{L} -atomic modules belonging to \mathcal{L} (even $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$, which may be less).

6.2. Finite separation and direct sum decomposition. Baer made exactly the following argument—in his special case.

Lemma 6.10. [Baer's Lemma] *Let \mathcal{G} be a class of modules closed under direct summand and such that every module in \mathcal{G} is (finitely) \mathcal{B} -separable.*

- (1) *Every module in \mathcal{G} is countably locally separable by (countable) direct sums of modules from \mathcal{B} .*
- (2) *Countably generated modules from \mathcal{G} are direct sums of modules from \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Let C be a countable subset in $G \in \mathcal{G}$. (1) List the set C as c_i ($i < \omega$). Set $G_0 = G$ and $b_0 = c_0$. As G_0 is \mathcal{B} -separable, b_0 is contained in a direct summand $B_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ of G_0 . Write $G_0 = B_0 \oplus G_1$ and $c_1 = a_1 + b_1$ accordingly. Since G_1 is again in \mathcal{G} , hence \mathcal{B} -separable, b_1 is contained in a direct summand $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ of G_1 . Successively we decompose G into $\oplus_{i < n} B_i \oplus G_n$ where each B_i is in \mathcal{B} and so that the sum of the first n summands B_i contains the first n elements of C . Eventually, C is contained in the direct sum $B_\omega := \oplus_{n < \omega} B_n$. And while B_ω may not be a direct summand of G , it certainly is a locally split submodule.

- (2) If C happens to generate all of G , then inevitably, $G = B_\omega$. \square

Applying this to $\mathcal{G} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{B})$, the situation considerably simplifies when all the generating modules are countably generated, cf. [GIRT, Lemma 7].

Corollary 6.11. *Suppose \mathcal{B} is a class of countably generated modules closed under finite direct sum.*

The following assertions are equivalent.

- (i) *Every module in $\text{Add}(\mathcal{B})$ is (finitely) \mathcal{B} -separable.*
- (ii) *Every module in $\text{Add}(\mathcal{B})$ is a direct sum of modules from \mathcal{B} , i.e., $\text{Add}(\mathcal{B}) = \oplus \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. If \mathcal{B} is closed under finite direct sum, all modules in $\oplus \mathcal{B}$ are \mathcal{B} -separable. This yields the easy direction. For the nontrivial direction, note that by Kaplansky's Theorem—which applies due to the hypothesis made on \mathcal{B} —every module in $\text{Add}(\mathcal{B})$ decomposes into a direct sum of countably generated modules in $\text{Add}(\mathcal{B})$. \square

6.3. Back to countable self-separation. Applying Baer's Lemma to the class of all strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ allows one to considerably strengthen the fundamental countable separation of Fact 5.1 as follows. (Note, from Fact 5.1 alone we would not know if the separating module from \mathcal{L} was in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$, let alone that it was \mathcal{B} -separable.)

Corollary 6.12. *Suppose $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a separation pair and every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ is \mathcal{B} -separable. (This is the case, for instance, if (iii) of 6.13 holds and \mathcal{B} consists of finitely generated modules only.)*

- (1) *Then all strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ are countably locally separable by countable direct sums of modules in \mathcal{B} .*
- (2) *In particular, all strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ are countably locally \mathcal{L} -separable.*

6.4. The second separation theorem: when everything is 'basic'. By 'basic' we mean that direct summands can be avoided. For instance, we wish to investigate when $\text{Add } \mathcal{B} = \oplus \mathcal{B}$ and what the effect of that is on the conclusions of Theorem 6.7. In particular, we are interested to see in which cases those will be 'basic' too.

Theorem 6.13. *Suppose $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a separation pair.*

- (1) *The following are equivalent.*
 - (i) *Every module in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ is \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{B} .*
 - (ii) *Every module in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ is locally separable by \mathcal{B} .*
 - (iii) *Every (countably generated) strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is locally separable by \mathcal{B} .*
- (2) *The next statement implies the above ones. It is equivalent to them, provided $\mathcal{L} = \tilde{\mathcal{C}} (= \text{PGen}\mathcal{B})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is self-separating.*
 - (iv) *Every $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -atomic module in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -pure separable by \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. (iv) \Rightarrow (iii) follows from Lemma 4.4, while (ii) is a special case of (iii), for every module in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ is strict $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -atomic and $\text{Add } \mathcal{B} \subseteq \text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$. And (i) and (ii) are equivalent by Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4. We are left with (ii) \Rightarrow (iv), the only implication where we seem to have to invoke the extra hypotheses of \mathcal{L} being self-separating and of it being equal to $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$.

For this, first note that (ii) implies, together with Lemma 6.4, the countably generated part of (iii). Now consider a tuple \overline{m} in a $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -atomic module $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. By hypothesis, \overline{m} is contained in a countably generated $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -pure submodule $N \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of M that is strict $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -atomic, hence, by what has just been said, locally \mathcal{B} -separable. Consequently, \overline{m} is contained in a $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -pure submodule $B \in \mathcal{B}$ of M , as desired. \square

Remark 6.14. Finite self-separability of \mathcal{L} suffices in (iv).

Corollary 5.10 now yields

Corollary 6.15. *Statements (i) through (iv) of the theorem are equivalent for any purely resolving class $\mathcal{L} = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. (But note Theorem 5.12.)* \square

When all members of \mathcal{B} are countably generated, Kaplansky's Theorem allows for a slightly different and stronger version of the previous theorem.

Theorem 6.16. *Suppose $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a separation pair with all modules in \mathcal{B} countably generated.*

- (1) *The following are equivalent.*
 - (i) *Every module in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ is separable by \mathcal{B} .*
 - (ii) *Every module in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ is countably locally separable by $\oplus \mathcal{B}$.*
 - (iii) *$\text{Add } \mathcal{B} = \oplus \mathcal{B}$.*
 - (iv) *Every countably generated (strict) \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$ is in $\oplus \mathcal{B}$.*
 - (v) *Every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$ is countably locally separable by $\oplus \mathcal{B}$.*
- (2) *The following statement implies the previous ones. It is equivalent to them, provided $\mathcal{L} = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ ($= \text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$) and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is self-separating.*
 - (vi) *Every $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -atomic module in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is countably $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -pure separable by $\oplus \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is Baer's Lemma 6.10.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): first note that (ii) implies that *countably generated* modules in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ are in $\oplus \mathcal{B}$. To see the same for *all* modules in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$, apply Kaplansky's Theorem, which shows that every module in $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ is a direct sum of countably generated modules from $\text{Add } \mathcal{B}$ (here the countable generation of all members of \mathcal{B} is used).

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv) follows from Lemma 6.4, (iv) \Rightarrow (vi) from the basic Fact 5.1, and (vi) \Rightarrow (v) from Lemma 4.4, while (v) \Rightarrow (iv) is trivial.

Finally, (iv) \Rightarrow (iii) is by Kaplansky's Theorem again. \square

Remark 6.17. (iv) above implies (iv)': every countably generated (strict) \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$ is separable by \mathcal{B} .

(v) above implies (v)': every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$ is locally separable by \mathcal{B} .

(vi) above implies (vi)': every \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen } \mathcal{B}$ is \mathcal{L} -pure separable by \mathcal{B} .

Note, (v)' and (vi)' are equivalent.

Corollary 6.18. *If all modules in \mathcal{B} are finitely generated, one may replace (in Theorem 6.16),*

in (v): 'countably locally separable by $\oplus \mathcal{B}$ ' by '(finitely) separable by \mathcal{B} ,'

in (vi): 'countably $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -pure separable by $\oplus \mathcal{B}$ ' by '(finitely) $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ -pure separable by \mathcal{B} .'

Proof. Only (v) and (vi) differ from the corresponding statements in the theorem. In fact, they are (v)' and (vi)' from the remark above, which are equivalent to each other and definitely follow from (v) and (vi) in the theorem. But now that \mathcal{B} consists entirely of finitely generated modules, (v)' becomes (v) here. Finally, (i) is a special case of (v), so the circle is completed. \square

6.5. The classical case. Here we draw the conclusions of the above theorems for the classical case when $\mathcal{K} = \text{Mod-}R = \langle \text{mod-}R \rangle$ and $\mathcal{L} = R\text{-Mod} = \langle R\text{-mod} \rangle$. This corresponds to the separation pair $(R\text{-Mod}, R\text{-mod})$, or the purely resolving class $R\text{-Mod}$. (Remember, (strict) Mittag-Leffler is the same as (strict) atomic.)

Recall our convention: ‘separable’ means ‘separable by $R\text{-mod}$ ’ here (i.e., separable by finitely presented modules).

Corollary 6.19.

- (1) *Every pure-projective R -module is a direct summand of a direct sum of finitely presented modules.* (This well-known fact is included only to draw the analogy in the next corollaries.)
- (2) [HT, Lemma 3.6(ii)] *Every strict Mittag-Leffler module is a direct summand of a separable module.*
- (3) *Every Mittag-Leffler module is a direct summand of a pure separable module.*

Proof. Apply Corollary 6.8 and Theorem 6.7(1), resp., with $\mathcal{B} = R\text{-mod}$, $\mathcal{L} = R\text{-Mod}$. Recall, strict atomic = strict Mittag-Leffler and atomic = Mittag-Leffler. \square

The first two statements in the next corollary were proved to be equivalent in [GIRT, Thm. 4.2]. It says that if ‘direct summand’ can be omitted in any of the three statements of Corollary 6.19, it can be omitted in the other two.

Corollary 6.20. *The following are equivalent.*

- (i) *Every pure-projective R -module is a direct sum of finitely presented modules.*
- (ii) *Every strict Mittag-Leffler module is separable.*
- (iii) *Every Mittag-Leffler module is pure separable.*

Proof. Take $\mathcal{B} = R\text{-mod}$ and $\mathcal{L} = R\text{-Mod}$ in Corollary 6.18. \square

This is the case over $R = \mathbb{Z}$ (that is, for abelian groups), over Krull-Schmidt rings, over rings that are one-sided noetherian and two-sided serial, as well as over (two-sided) hereditary noetherian rings, cf. [GIRT] or [PR] for references.

6.6. The flat case. Corollary 6.8 now reads: Every flat strict \mathfrak{b} -atomic module is a direct summand of a \mathcal{B} -separable module (and conversely), where we can take $\mathcal{B} = R\text{-proj}$, the finitely generated projectives, or $\mathcal{B} = R\text{-free}$, the free modules (of finite rank). However, we know from Corollary 3.5 already that flat strict \mathfrak{b} -atomic are even strict Mittag-Leffler, and similarly, flat \mathfrak{b} -atomic (= \sharp_R -Mittag-Leffler) modules are Mittag-Leffler, see [Rot3, Thm. 3.10].

Corollary 6.21.

- (1) *Flat strict Mittag-Leffler modules are direct summands of R -free-separable modules.*
- (2) *Flat Mittag-Leffler modules are direct summands of modules that are \mathfrak{b} -pure R -free-separable.*

When we apply Theorem 6.13 in the shape of Corollary 6.18 to this situation, we get two different results, one for $\mathcal{B} = R\text{-free}$, one for $\mathcal{B} = R\text{-proj}$. Only the last condition in either one is new though, the other two had been achieved already in [GIRT, Thms. 5.1 and 5.3].

Corollary 6.22. *The following are equivalent.*

- (i) *Every projective R -module is free.*
- (ii) *Every flat strict Mittag-Leffler module is R -free-separable.*
- (iii) *Every flat Mittag-Leffler module is \mathfrak{b} -pure R -free-separable.*

Corollary 6.23. *The following are equivalent.*

- (i) Every projective R -module is a direct sum of finitely generated projective modules.
- (ii) Every flat strict Mittag-Leffler module is R -proj-separable.
- (iii) Every flat Mittag-Leffler module is \flat -pure R -proj-separable.

In [GIRT, §5] one may find lists of rings over which either of these cases take place. For instance, the case of Cor.6.22 takes place over the integers. So, a torsionfree (=flat) abelian group is strict Mittag-Leffler iff it is R -free-separable (such groups are simply called ‘separable’ in [EM, Def.2.4 and after]). Correspondingly, [AF, Prop. 7] implies that a torsionfree abelian group is Mittag-Leffler iff it is \aleph_1 -free, which is to say that every countable subgroup is free.

Example 6.24. [EM, Exercise IV.11] says that $\mathbb{Z}^{<\aleph_1}$, the subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^{\aleph_1} of all elements with countable support, is \aleph_1 -free, but not separable (not even torsionless). Thus this group is Mittag-Leffler, but not strict Mittag-Leffler.

7. WHEN STRICT \mathcal{L} -ATOMIC MODULES ARE STRICT $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -ATOMIC

Recall from the referee’s Remark 2.7 that there are strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules which are not strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic. I conclude with a proof that in the context of the previous section, the opposite is the case.

Proposition 7.1. *Suppose $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a separation pair such that all modules in \mathcal{B} are strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic (e.g., when all modules in \mathcal{B} are countably generated).*

Every strict \mathcal{L} -atomic module in $\text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ is strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic.

Proof. Recall from the ‘Strict’ Lemma 2.10 that countably generated strict \mathcal{L} -atomic modules are strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic (which explains the parenthetical clause).

Let now $M \in \text{PGen}\mathcal{B}$ be strict \mathcal{L} -atomic. By Theorem 6.7(2), M is a direct summand of a module that is locally separable by \mathcal{B} . By hypothesis and Lemma 4.3 (2)—applied to $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ rather than \mathcal{L} , the module M is a direct summand of a strict $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic module, hence itself $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ -atomic. \square

Corollary 7.2. *Strict ${}_R\flat$ -atomic modules are strict $\langle {}_R\flat \rangle$ -atomic, i.e., strict $\langle \sharp_R \rangle$ -Mittag-Leffler.*

REFERENCES

- AH. Angeleri-Hügel, L. and Herbera, D., Mittag-Leffler conditions on modules, *Indiana Math. J.* **57** (2008), 2459–2517.
- Azu1. Azumaya, G. (1990) Locally split submodules and modules with perfect endomorphism rings. In: Jain S.K., Lpez-Permouth S.R. (eds) *Non-Commutative Ring Theory*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol 1448. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Azu2. Azumaya, G., Locally Pure-Projective Modules, *Contemporary Math.* **124** (1992) 17–22.
- AF. Azumaya, G. and Facchini, A., Rings of Pure Global Dimension Zero and Mittag-Leffler Modules, *J. Pure and Appl. Alg.* **62** (1989) 109–122.
- Bae. Baer, R., Abelian groups without elements of finite order, *Duke Math. J.* **3** (1937) 68–122.
- EM. Eklof, P. and Mekler, A., *Almost free modules*, 2nd ed., North Holland 2002.
- Fac. Facchini, A., Mittag-Leffler Modules, Reduced Products, and Direct Products, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **85** (1991) 119–132.
- FA. A. Facchini, *Module Theory: Endomorphism Rings and Direct Sum Decompositions in Some Classes of Modules*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 167, Birkhäuser 1998.
- F. Fuchs, L., *Abelian Groups*, Springer 2015.
- Gar. Garfinkel, G.S., Universally torsionless and trace modules, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **215** (1976) 119–144.
- Goo. Goodearl, K. R., Distributing tensor product over direct product, *Pacific J. Math.* **43** (1972) 107–110.
- GJ. Gruson, L. and Jensen C.U., Modules algébriquement compact et foncteurs $\lim(i)$, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **276** (1973), 1651–1653.

- GIRT. Guil Asensio, P.A., Izurdiaga, M.C., Rothmaler, Ph., and Torrecillas, B., Strict Mittag-Leffler Modules, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* **57**(6) (2011) 566-570.
- HT. Herbera, D. and Trlifaj, J., Almost free modules and Mittag-Leffler conditions, *Adv. Math.* **229** (2012), 34363467.
- Her. Herzog, I., Elementary duality of modules, *Trans. A.M.S.* **340**(1) (1993) 37-69.
- HR. Herzog, I. and Rothmaler, Ph., When cotorsion modules are pure injective, *J. Math. Logic*, **9** (1) (2009) 63-102.
- H. Hodges, W., *Model Theory*, Encyclopedia of Math. and its Applications, vol. 42, Cambridge University Press 1993.
- P1. Prest, M., *Model Theory and Modules*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series, vol. 130, Cambridge University Press 1987.
- P2. Prest, M., *Purity, Spectra and Localisation*, Encyclopedia of Math. and its Applications, vol. 121, Cambridge University Press 2009.
- PRZ. Prest, M., Rothmaler, Ph., and Ziegler, M., Extensions of elementary duality, *J. Pure and Appl. Algebra* **93** (1994) 33-56.
- PR. Puninski, G. and Rothmaler, Ph., Pure-projective modules, *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **71** (2005) 304-320.
- RG. Raynaud, M. and Gruson, L., Critères de platitude et de projectivité, Seconde partie, *Invent. Math.* **13** (1971) 52-89.
- R. Rothmaler, Ph., *Mittag-Leffler modules and positive atomicity*, Habilitationsschrift, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel 1994.
- Rot1. Rothmaler, Ph., Mittag-Leffler Modules, *Proc. of Conf. on Model Theory and Algebra, Florence 1995*, *Ann. of Pure and Appl. Logic* **88** (1997) 227-239.
- Rot2. Rothmaler, Ph., Purity in model theory, *Proc. of Conf. on Model Theory and Algebra, Essen/Dresden, 1994/95*, M. Droste and R. Göbel eds., *Algebra, Logic and Application Series*, vol. 9, Gordon & Breach 1997, 445-469.
- Rot3. Rothmaler, Ph., Torsion-free, Divisible, and Mittag-Leffler Modules, *Communications in Algebra*, **43**:8 (2015), 3342-3364.
- Rot4. Rothmaler, Ph., Mittag-Leffler modules and definable subcategories, *Proc. of Int. Conf. Model Theory of Modules, Algebras and Categories, Erice, Sicily, Italy, 2017*, A. Facchini, L. Gregory, S. L'Innocente, M. Tressl eds., *Contemporary Mathematics*, Vol. **730**, 2019 (CONM14716), 171-196.
- W. Wisbauer R., *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*, *Algebra, Logic and Application Series*, vol. 3, Gordon and Breach, Philadelphia 1991.
- Zie. Ziegler, M., Model theory of modules, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **26** (1984) 149-213.
- Zim1. Zimmermann, W., Rein injektive direkte Summen von Moduln, *Comm. Alg.* **5**(10) (1977) 1083-1117.
- Zim2. Zimmermann, W., On locally pure-injective modules, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **166** (2002) 337-357.
- Z-H. Zimmermann-Huisgen, B., Pure Submodules of Direct Products of Free Modules, *Math. Ann.* **224** (1976) 233-245.
- Z-HZ. Zimmermann-Huisgen, B. and Zimmermann, W., On the sparsity of rings of pure global dimension zero, *Trans. A.M.S.* **320**(2) (1990) 695-711.

CUNY, THE GRADUATE CENTER, 365 FIFTH AVENUE, ROOM 4208, NY, NY 10016

E-mail address: philipp.rothmaler@bcc.cuny.edu