

# THE PURITY OF A COMPLETION

by S. H. COX Jr.

(Received 13 March, 1975)

This note establishes two statements from R. M. Fossum's review [1] of a paper by E. A. Magarian [2]. Firstly, if  $A \rightarrow B$  is a pure homomorphism (of commutative rings) then  $A[[x_1, \dots, x_s]] \rightarrow B[[x_1, \dots, x_s]]$  is pure. Secondly, if  $R_n \rightarrow R$  is a directed family of pure homomorphisms then  $\cup R_n \rightarrow R$  is pure. A consequence is that if  $R_n \rightarrow R$  is a directed family of pure homomorphisms and if  $R$  is Noetherian, then  $\cup R_n[[x_1, \dots, x_s]]$  is Noetherian.

A homomorphism  $A \rightarrow B$  is said to be *pure* (respectively *n-pure*) if for every  $A$ -module  $M$  (respectively generated by  $n$  elements) the natural bimodule map  $M \rightarrow M \otimes B$  is injective. Clearly a morphism is pure if and only if it is  $n$ -pure for each  $n$ . The notion of  $n$ -pure is equivalent to what Gilmer and Mott [3] called condition  $\xi_n$ , namely each system of  $n$  linear equations over  $A$  which has a solution in  $B$  already has a solution in  $A$ . This equivalence is easily seen by observing that each of  $n$ -pure and  $\xi_n$  is equivalent to the condition that for each  $n$  and each submodule  $L$  of  $A^n$  the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L & \rightarrow & A^n \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ LB & \rightarrow & B^n \end{array}$$

be a pullback. Moreover, it is clear that it suffices to check that those diagrams with  $L$  finitely generated are pullbacks. Thus  $A \rightarrow B$  is  $n$ -pure if  $M \rightarrow M \otimes B$  is injective for each finitely presented  $A$ -module  $M$  generated by  $n$  elements. The condition that  $f: A \rightarrow B$  be 1-pure is equivalent to  $f^{-1}(f(I)B) = I$  for each ideal  $I$  of  $A$ . For this reason it is sometimes called (C) Here  $n$ -pure (or for  $n = 1$  *cyclic pure*) is used since most of the arguments are module-, rather than ideal-, theoretic. The corollary above generalizes a result from [2] where it is assumed that each of the homomorphisms  $R_n \rightarrow R$  admits an  $R_n$ -linear retraction  $R \rightarrow R_n$ . In that case for each  $R_n$ -module  $M$  there is a retraction of  $M \rightarrow M \otimes R$  induced by  $R \rightarrow R_n$ . Maps admitting retractions are always injective, hence  $M \rightarrow M \otimes R$  is injective for each  $M$  and therefore  $R_n \rightarrow R$  is pure. So the corollary above is a more general statement than [2, Theorem 2]. In the same paper Magarian proves that  $\cup R_n[[x]]$  is Noetherian (one variable) if  $R_n \rightarrow R$  is a directed family of cyclic pure homomorphisms. The technique suggested by Fossum in [1] cannot be modified to give an  $n$ -variable generalization of this last theorem; nor does an induction on the number of variables seem possible. The obstruction is that  $A \rightarrow B$  can be cyclic pure while  $A[[x]] \rightarrow B[[x]]$  is not. To see this one can replace by power series rings the polynomial rings in Enoch's construction [4] of a cyclic pure homomorphism  $A \rightarrow B$  such that

$$A[x_1, \dots, x_m] \rightarrow B[x_1, \dots, x_m]$$

is not cyclic pure. Then one obtains  $A \rightarrow B$  cyclic pure, but  $A[[x_1, \dots, x_m]] \rightarrow B[[x_1, \dots, x_m]]$  not cyclic pure. Finally by choosing  $m$  minimal and replacing  $A$  by  $A[[x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}]]$  we find that  $A \rightarrow B$  is cyclic pure but  $A[[x]] \rightarrow B[[x]]$  is not.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $u: A \rightarrow B$  be a unitary homomorphism of commutative rings and  $I$  a finitely generated ideal of  $A$ . Let  $\text{super } \wedge$  denote the  $I$ -adic completion functor. Suppose  $A$  and  $B$  are Hausdorff in the  $I$ -adic topologies. If  $u: A \rightarrow B$  is pure (respectively  $n$ -pure) then  $\hat{u}: \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{B}$  is pure (respectively  $n$ -pure). If  $A$  is a Zariski ring and if  $\hat{u}: \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{B}$  is pure (respectively  $n$ -pure) then  $u: A \rightarrow B$  is pure (respectively  $n$ -pure).*

*Proof.* Assume  $u: A \rightarrow B$  is  $n$ -pure. Let  $M$  be an  $A$ -module generated by  $n$  elements. Note that  $M$  and  $B \otimes M$  are complete and Hausdorff in the  $I$  and  $IB$ -adic topologies [5, p. 58]. Hence  $u_M: M \rightarrow M \otimes B$  is the inverse limit of the mappings  $u_r: M_r \rightarrow (M \otimes B)_r$ , where  $M_r = M \otimes A_r$ ,  $A_r = A/(I^r A) = A/I^r$ , [5, §2, no. 6]. However  $u_r$  is also obtained by tensoring  $A_r \rightarrow B_r$  with  $M_r$  over  $A_r$ . Also  $M_r$  is generated by  $n$  elements over  $A_r$ . Therefore, by the left exactness of inverse limit it suffices for the injectivity of  $u_M$  that  $A_r \rightarrow B_r$  be  $n$ -pure. This follows from the next proposition. The converse implication is valid for a Zariski ring  $A$  (i.e.  $A$  is Noetherian with Jacobson radical containing  $I$ ) because in this case  $A \rightarrow \hat{A}$  is faithfully flat [5, p. 72] thence pure. In effect the composite  $(A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \hat{B}) = (A \rightarrow \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{B})$  is pure so  $A \rightarrow B$  is pure.

**PROPOSITION 2.** *If  $A \rightarrow B$  is  $n$ -pure and if  $A \rightarrow C$  is either a surjection or a flat epimorphism of commutative rings then  $C \rightarrow C \otimes B$  is  $n$ -pure. If  $A \rightarrow B$  is pure and  $A \rightarrow C$  is any homomorphism, then  $C \rightarrow C \otimes B$  is pure.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $A \rightarrow C$  is a surjection. Given an  $n$ -generated  $C$ -module  $M$ ,  $M$  is also generated by  $n$  elements over  $A$ . Hence  $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B$  is injective. But  $M \otimes_A B = M \otimes_C C \otimes_A B$ . Now suppose  $A \rightarrow C$  is a flat epimorphism. Given a  $C$ -module  $M$  generated by  $m_1, \dots, m_n$  let  $L$  be the  $A$ -submodule of  $M$  generated by the  $m$ 's. Then, since  $L$  is  $n$ -generated,  $L \rightarrow L \otimes_A B$  is injective. Since  $C$  is  $A$ -flat  $L \otimes_A C \rightarrow L \otimes_A C \otimes_A B$  is injective. Since  $A \rightarrow C$  is a flat epimorphism the multiplication mapping  $L \otimes_A C \rightarrow M$  is an isomorphism. Hence  $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B = M \otimes_C C \otimes_A B$  is injective. The analog for pure is trivial since no cardinality problems arise.

**COROLLARY 3.** (Fossum [1]) *If  $A \rightarrow B$  is pure then  $A[[x_1, \dots, x_s]] \rightarrow B[[x_1, \dots, x_s]]$  is pure.*

*Proof.* Since  $A \rightarrow B$  is pure then by Proposition 2  $A[x_1, \dots, x_s] \rightarrow B[x_1, \dots, x_s]$  is pure. Then Theorem 1 applies with  $I$  taken to be the ideal generated by the  $x$ 's.

**PROPOSITION 4.** *If  $R_t \rightarrow R$  is a directed family of pure (respectively  $n$ -pure) homomorphisms then  $\cup R_t \rightarrow R$  is pure (respectively  $n$ -pure).*

*Proof.* Let  $A = \cup R_t$  and let  $M$  be a finitely presented  $A$ -module generated by  $n$  elements. Choose a presentation  $A^m \xrightarrow{f} A^n \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  and matrix representing  $f$ . Define  $M_t = \text{coker}(R_t^m \rightarrow R_t^n)$  if the elements of the matrix of  $f$  are in  $R_t$  and  $M_t = 0$  otherwise. For each  $s \geq t$  let  $M_t \rightarrow M_s$  be the natural bimodule homomorphism obtained by extension of scalars  $R_t \rightarrow R_s$ . Then  $\varinjlim M_t = M$  and  $M_t$  is generated by  $n$  elements over  $R_t$ . Hence  $M_t \rightarrow M_t \otimes_{R_t} R$  is injective for each  $t$ ; the injectivity of  $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A R$  follows from the exactness of direct limits.

COROLLARY 5. (Fossum [1]) *If  $R_i \rightarrow R$  is a directed family of pure homomorphisms and if  $R$  is Noetherian then  $\cup R_i[[x_1, \dots, x_s]]$  is Noetherian.*

*Proof.* By the preceding results the union  $A$  of the  $R_i[[x_1, \dots, x_s]]$  is pure in  $R[[x_1, \dots, x_s]]$ . However if  $A \rightarrow R$  is cyclic pure and  $R$  Noetherian then  $A$  is Noetherian by [6, Theorem 4].

In [3] Gilmer and Mott and in [7] Gilmer study under what conditions a cyclic pure homomorphism is pure. The following provides a simple proof of one of the results from [3].

PROPOSITION 6. *Let  $A \rightarrow B$  be a cyclic pure homomorphism such that  $B$  is a torsionfree  $A$ -module and  $A$  is an integral domain. If  $M$  is a finitely presented  $A$ -module of projective dimension  $\leq 1$ , then  $M \rightarrow M \otimes B$  is injective.*

*Proof.* By hypothesis there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A^m \rightarrow A^n \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ . Given  $y$  in  $B^m$  such that  $u(y) = x$  and  $x$  in  $A^n$ , it must be shown that for some  $z$  in  $A^m$ ,  $u(z) = x$ . Since  $u$  is injective some  $m$  by  $m$  minor of  $u$  is not zero. Let  $S$  be the corresponding set of linear equations. By Cramer's Rule  $dy_i = d_i$  where  $d$  is the (nonzero) determinant of the coefficient matrix of  $S$  and  $d_i$  is the determinant obtained by replacing the  $i$ -th column of  $S$  by the appropriate entries of  $x$ . Now  $d, d_i$  are in  $A$  and so  $d_i$  is in  $A \cap dB = dA$ . Thus  $d_i = z_i d$  for  $z_i$  in  $A$ . Since  $d$  is a nonzero-divisor on  $B$  then  $y_i = z_i$ . So the original solution  $y$  actually lies in  $A^m$ . This establishes Proposition 6.

COROLLARY 7. (Gilmer and Mott [3]) *If  $A \rightarrow B$  is a cyclic pure homomorphism with  $B$   $A$ -torsionfree and if  $A$  is a Prüfer domain then  $A \rightarrow B$  is pure.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 6 since over a Prüfer domain each finitely presented module has projective dimension  $\leq 1$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. R. M. Fossum, Review number 290, *Math. Reviews* **48** (1974), 58–59.
2. E. A. Magarian, Direct limits of power series rings, *Math. Scand.* **31** (1972), 103–110.
3. R. Gilmer and J. Mott, Some results on contracted ideals, *Duke Math. J.* **37** (1970), 751–767.
4. E. E. Enoch, On absolutely pure modules, Preprint, University of Kentucky.
5. N. Bourbaki, *Algèbre Commutative* Chapitre 3 (Hermann, 1967).
6. R. Gilmer, Contracted ideals with respect to integral extensions, *Duke Math. J.* **34** (1967), 561–572.
7. R. Gilmer, Contracted ideals in Krull domains, *Duke Math. J.* **37** (1970), 769–774.

UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO  
RIO PIEDRAS  
PUERTO RICO 00931

Present address:  
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE  
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN  
TEXAS 78712