

RELATIVELY DIVISIBLE AND RELATIVELY FLAT OBJECTS IN EXACT CATEGORIES

SEPTIMIU CRIVEI AND DERYA KESKİN TÜTÜNCÜ

ABSTRACT. We introduce and study relatively divisible and relatively flat objects in exact categories in the sense of Quillen. For every relative cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ in an exact category \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{A} coincides with the class of relatively flat objects of \mathcal{C} for some relative projectively generated exact structure, while \mathcal{B} coincides with the class of relatively divisible objects of \mathcal{C} for some relative injectively generated exact structure. We exhibit Galois connections between relative cotorsion pairs, relative projectively generated exact structures and relative injectively generated exact structures in additive categories. We establish closure properties and characterizations in terms of approximation theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many important characterizations of rings are of homological algebra nature. Some of the best known examples are the following ones: a ring R is semisimple if and only if every short exact sequence of right (or left) R -modules splits; a ring R is von Neumann regular if and only if every short exact sequence of right (or left) R -modules is pure; a ring R is right pure-semisimple if and only if every pure short exact sequence of right R -modules splits. These examples exhibit three classes of short exact sequences in a module category, namely split short exact sequences, pure short exact sequences and all short exact sequences. It has been noticed years ago that such classes of short exact sequences share some properties, that can be considered as axioms for a more general notion, called *exact structure* (Keller [19], Quillen [25]) or *proper class* (Buchsbaum [2]) on an additive category. It turns out that this context of exact structures on additive categories is a suitable one for developing homological algebra in categories more general than module categories or abelian categories. First, it encompasses non-abelian categories, which appear naturally in algebraic geometry (Rosenberg [27]), functional analysis (Frerick, Sieg [12]) etc. Secondly, they allow the use of relative homological algebra in abelian categories (Enochs, Jenda [10], Garkusha [14]).

As in the above examples, one may have many exact structures on the same category, and it is useful to find relationships between them as well as characterizations of objects of the category in terms of such exact structures defined on it. We mention a couple of other examples, out of many having the root in abelian group theory. Recall that a short exact sequence of right R -modules $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ is called *neat* if every simple right R -module is projective with respect to it, and *closed* if A is isomorphic to a complement (closed) submodule of B (Renault [26]). Then every closed short exact sequence of right R -modules is neat, while the converse holds if and only if R is a right C -ring in the sense of [26]. Also, a short exact sequence of right R -modules is called *finitely split* if every finitely generated right R -module is projective with respect to it (Azumaya [1]). Then every finitely split short exact sequence of right R -modules is pure, while the converse holds if and only if R is a right Noetherian ring [1, Proposition 6]. Further examples of classes of short exact sequences giving exact structures on module categories include *coneat* (Fuchs [13]), *s-pure* (I. Crivei, S. Crivei [6]) or *supplement* (Mermut [23]) short exact sequences.

Date: October 27, 2018.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 18E10, 18G50, 16D90.

Key words and phrases. Exact category, divisible object, flat object, cotorsion pair, Galois connection.

To each pair of exact structures \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} on an additive category \mathcal{C} there are some associated objects. An object X of \mathcal{C} is called \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible if every short exact sequence from \mathcal{D} (called \mathcal{D} -conflation) starting with X belongs to \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat if every \mathcal{D} -conflation ending with X belongs to \mathcal{E} . They are inspired by Sklyarenko's modules of flat type relative to a proper class [30], and have been reconsidered by Preisser Montaña [24, 15.4, 15.11] in abelian categories. One of the two exact structures \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} is often that given by the class of all short exact sequences in the category, but we point out that this class fails to form an exact structure unless the underlying category is not quasi-abelian (see Example 2.3). Examples of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible objects in suitable categories include: injective, pure-injective, absolutely pure (i.e., every short exact sequence starting with it is pure [21, 22]), finitely injective (i.e., every short exact sequence starting with it is finitely split [1]), finitely pure-injective (i.e., every pure short exact sequence starting with it is finitely split [1]), absolutely neat (i.e., every short exact sequence starting with it is neat [8]), absolutely coneat (i.e., every short exact sequence starting with it is coneat [4]), absolutely s -pure (i.e., every short exact sequence starting with it is s -pure [6]), weak injective (i.e., every short exact sequence starting with it is closed [35]) objects etc. Each of the above situations generates a corresponding notion of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat object, namely projective, pure-projective, flat, finitely projective [1], finitely pure-projective [1], neat-flat [5], coneat-flat [4], max-flat [33] and weak flat [36] object respectively.

The objective of the present paper is to give a unified treatment of relative divisibility and relative flatness in the natural setting of exact categories. Our main motivating examples come from module theory, but we also present some application to finitely accessible additive categories, which may not be abelian in general. We do not intend to give an exhaustive study of the concepts of relative divisibility and relative flatness, but rather to set the stage with some relevant properties and illustrations, and to leave the interested reader to deduce herself/himself the needed consequences. Most of the results will have two parts, one related to relative divisibility and one related to relative flatness, out of which we will only prove one, the other following in a dual manner.

Our paper is organized as follows. We recall in Section 2 the axioms of an exact structure on an additive category in the sense of Quillen, as refined by Keller. We also present some needed concepts, such as relative projectively and relative injectively generated exact structures, relative cotorsion pairs and approximation theory by relative covers and relative envelopes.

In Section 3 we show how the classes $Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$ and $Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$ of relatively divisible and relatively flat objects respectively allow some natural constructions of two Galois connections, generalizing the original work by Salce [29]. More precisely, let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} , and denote by $DCot(\mathcal{C})$ the class of \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pairs in \mathcal{C} . Also, denote by $DPEx(\mathcal{C})$ and $DIEx(\mathcal{C})$ the classes of \mathcal{D} -projectively and \mathcal{D} -injectively generated exact structures on \mathcal{C} respectively. Then we prove that there are a monotone Galois connection between $DPEx(\mathcal{C})$ and $DCot(\mathcal{C})$, and an antitone Galois connection between $DIEx(\mathcal{C})$ and $DCot(\mathcal{C})$. Moreover, we extend and dualize the notion of injectively generated Xu exact structure, and we show that the above Galois connections restrict to bijective correspondences between \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pairs in \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{D} -projectively generated Xu exact structures on \mathcal{C} , and \mathcal{D} -injectively generated Xu exact structures on \mathcal{C} .

Section 4 contains the main properties of relatively divisible and relatively flat objects in additive categories. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} . For a class \mathcal{A} of objects of \mathcal{C} , we define an object X of \mathcal{C} to be \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible if every \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \rightarrow A \rightarrow B$ is an \mathcal{E} -conflation, and \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -flat in a dual manner. We show several closure properties of the classes of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - $(-\mathcal{A})$ -divisible and \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - $(-\mathcal{A})$ -flat objects of \mathcal{C} . Their level of generality allows many useful consequences, such as the equivalence of the \mathcal{D} -resolving property of \mathcal{A} and the \mathcal{D} -coresolving property of \mathcal{B} for every \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{C} , provided \mathcal{C} has enough \mathcal{D} -injectives and enough \mathcal{D} -projectives. We also characterize \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - $(-\mathcal{A})$ -divisible and \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - $(-\mathcal{A})$ -flat objects of \mathcal{C} in terms of the existence of certain conflations involving them.

Applications of our results are included in a separate paper [9].

2. EXACT CATEGORIES

We shall use the following concept of exact category given by Quillen [25] (also see Buchsbaum [2]), as simplified by Keller [19].

Definition 2.1. An *exact category* is an additive category \mathcal{C} endowed with a distinguished class \mathcal{E} of short exact sequences (i.e. kernel-cokernel pairs) satisfying the axioms [E0], [E1], [E2] and [E2^{op}] below. Then \mathcal{E} is called an *exact structure* on \mathcal{C} . The short exact sequences in \mathcal{E} are called *\mathcal{E} -conflations* (or simply *conflations*), while kernels and cokernels appearing in such exact sequences are called *inflations* (denoted by \rightarrowtail) and *deflations* (denoted by \twoheadrightarrow) respectively.

[E0] The identity morphism $1_0 : 0 \rightarrow 0$ is a deflation.

[E1] The composition of two deflations is again a deflation.

[E2] The pullback of a deflation along an arbitrary morphism exists and is again a deflation.

[E2^{op}] The pushout of an inflation along an arbitrary morphism exists and is again an inflation.

Remark 2.2. The duals of the axioms [E0], [E1] on inflations as well as both sides of Quillen's "obscure axiom" hold in any exact category [19]. The version of the latter for inflations states that if i, p are morphisms such that i has a cokernel and pi is an inflation, then i is an inflation.

Example 2.3. (1) Any additive category has a unique minimal exact structure, whose conflations are the split short exact sequences (e.g., see [3]).

(2) An additive category is called *quasi-abelian* if it is pre-abelian (i.e., it has kernels and cokernels), any pushout of a kernel along an arbitrary morphism is a kernel, and any pullback of a cokernel along an arbitrary morphism is a cokernel. Any quasi-abelian category, and in particular any abelian category, has a unique maximal exact structure, whose conflations are the kernel-cokernel pairs [28].

(3) An additive category is called *weakly idempotent complete* if every split monomorphism has a cokernel, or equivalently, every split epimorphism has a kernel (e.g., see [3]). A kernel (cokernel) in an additive category is called *semi-stable* if its pushout (pullback) along any morphism exists and is again a kernel (cokernel) (see [7, Definition 2.4]). Any weakly idempotent complete additive category has a unique maximal exact structure, whose conflations are the kernel-cokernel pairs consisting of a semi-stable kernel and a semi-stable cokernel [7, Theorem 3.5]. Note that every additive category has an idempotent-splitting (Karoubian) completion (see [18, p. 75]), which is weakly idempotent complete.

Definition 2.4. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{E} . An object X of \mathcal{C} is called *\mathcal{E} -injective* if every \mathcal{E} -conflation starting with X splits. Equivalently, X is \mathcal{E} -injective if and only if $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}^1(C, X) = 0$ for every object C of \mathcal{C} . The category \mathcal{C} is said to have enough *\mathcal{E} -injectives* if for every object X of \mathcal{C} there exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \rightarrowtail Y \twoheadrightarrow Z$ with Y \mathcal{E} -injective.

Dually, one defines *\mathcal{E} -projective* objects and categories having enough \mathcal{E} -projectives.

The reader is referred to [3, Section 11] for further properties of injective and projective objects in exact categories.

The following propositions can be easily deduced (also see [24, Section 4] and [31]). They provide ways to reflect exact structures via functors.

Proposition 2.5. Let $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ be a covariant (respectively contravariant) additive functor between additive categories \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' with exact structures \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' respectively. Then the class \mathcal{E}_F of \mathcal{D} -conflations $X \rightarrowtail Y \twoheadrightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{C} such that $F(X) \rightarrowtail F(Y) \twoheadrightarrow F(Z)$ (respectively $F(Z) \rightarrowtail F(Y) \twoheadrightarrow F(X)$) is a \mathcal{D}' -conflation in \mathcal{C}' defines an exact structure on \mathcal{C} .

Proposition 2.6. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} and Ab the category of abelian groups. For any object M of \mathcal{C} , consider the additive functors $H = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, -)$, $G = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, M) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$. For a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} , denote

$$\mathcal{E}_H^{\mathcal{M}} = \bigcap \{\mathcal{E}_H \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\} \text{ and } \mathcal{E}_G^{\mathcal{M}} = \bigcap \{\mathcal{E}_G \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{E}_H^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_G^{\mathcal{M}}$ are exact structures on \mathcal{C} , which are called the exact structures \mathcal{D} -projectively generated by \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{D} -injectively generated by \mathcal{M} respectively, and are also denoted by $\pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\iota_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{M})$ respectively.

When all kernel-cokernel pairs form an exact structure \mathcal{D} on an additive category \mathcal{C} , we omit \mathcal{D} in Proposition 2.6 and we talk about *projectively* and *injectively* generated exact structures.

We recall some categorical results on pushouts and pullbacks for easier reference.

Lemma 2.7. [3, Proposition 2.12] *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure.*

(1) *Consider the following diagram in \mathcal{C} , where the rows are conflations:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{i} & Y & \xrightarrow{d} & Z \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g & & \parallel \\ X' & \xrightarrow{i'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{d'} & Z \end{array}$$

Then the square $XY Y' X'$ is both a pushout and a pullback.

(2) *Consider the following diagram in \mathcal{C} , where the rows are conflations:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{i} & Y & \xrightarrow{d} & Z \\ \parallel & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow h \\ X & \xrightarrow{i'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{d'} & Z' \end{array}$$

Then the square $YZZ'Y'$ is both a pushout and a pullback.

Lemma 2.8. [20, Lemma 5.1] *Consider the following diagram in an arbitrary category \mathcal{C} :*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{i} & Y & \xrightarrow{d} & Z \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow h \\ X' & \xrightarrow{i'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{d'} & Z \end{array}$$

- (1) (i) *If the two squares are pushouts, then the rectangle is a pushout.*
(ii) *Assume that the left square is a pushout. Then the exterior rectangle is a pushout if and only if the right square is a pushout.*
- (2) (i) *If the two squares are pullbacks, then the rectangle is a pullback.*
(ii) *Assume that the right square is a pullback. Then the exterior rectangle is a pullback if and only if the left square is a pullback.*

Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} . One may construct the Yoneda bifunctor $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(-, -)$. For objects X and Z of \mathcal{C} , one has $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(Z, X) = 0$ if and only if every conflation $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{C} splits, that is, it is isomorphic to the canonical split exact sequence $X \rightarrow X \oplus Z \rightarrow Z$.

For a class \mathcal{A} of objects of \mathcal{C} , we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}} &= \{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(A, X) = 0 \text{ for every } A \in \mathcal{A}\}, \\ {}^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}}\mathcal{A} &= \{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(X, A) = 0 \text{ for every } A \in \mathcal{A}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The notion of cotorsion pair generalizes from abelian categories to exact categories in an obvious manner.

Definition 2.9. [15, 17] *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} . A \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair in \mathcal{C} is a pair of classes $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ of objects in \mathcal{C} such that $\mathcal{A}^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}} = \mathcal{B}$ and ${}^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}}\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$.*

Let \mathcal{A} be a class of objects of \mathcal{C} . The pair $({}^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}}\mathcal{A}, (\perp_{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{A})^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}})$ is a \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair in \mathcal{C} , called the \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair *generated* by \mathcal{A} . The pair $({}^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathcal{A}^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}}), \mathcal{A}^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}}})$ is a \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair in \mathcal{C} , called the \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair *cogenerated* by \mathcal{A} .

Definition 2.10. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} . A \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{C} is said to have:

- (1) *enough \mathcal{D} -injectives* if for every object X of \mathcal{C} there exists a \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \twoheadrightarrow B \rightarrow A$ for some objects $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.
- (2) *enough \mathcal{D} -projectives* if for every object Z of \mathcal{C} there exists a \mathcal{D} -conflation $B \twoheadrightarrow A \rightarrow Z$ for some objects $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

Also, $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is called \mathcal{D} -complete if $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ has enough \mathcal{D} -injectives and enough \mathcal{D} -projectives.

Remark 2.11. (1) An additive category \mathcal{C} with an exact structure \mathcal{D} has enough \mathcal{D} -injectives if the \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{C}, \text{Inj}(\mathcal{D}))$ has enough \mathcal{D} -injectives, where $\text{Inj}(\mathcal{D})$ denotes the class of \mathcal{D} -injective objects of \mathcal{C} . Dually, \mathcal{C} has enough \mathcal{D} -projectives if the \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\text{Proj}(\mathcal{D}), \mathcal{C})$ has enough \mathcal{D} -projectives, where $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{D})$ denotes the class of \mathcal{D} -projective objects of \mathcal{C} .

(2) Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} , and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ be a \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair in \mathcal{C} . Then both \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions [24, 15.3].

Definition 2.12. Let \mathcal{A} be a class of objects (always considered to be closed under isomorphisms) in a category \mathcal{C} . A morphism $f : A \rightarrow X$ in \mathcal{C} with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is called an \mathcal{A} -precover of X if every morphism $f' : A' \rightarrow X$ in \mathcal{C} with $A' \in \mathcal{A}$ factors through f . An \mathcal{A} -precover $f : A \rightarrow X$ of X is called an \mathcal{A} -cover if every endomorphism $g : A \rightarrow A$ with $fg = f$ is an automorphism. The class \mathcal{A} is called *(pre)covering* if every object X of \mathcal{C} has an \mathcal{A} -(pre)cover. The concepts of \mathcal{A} -(pre)envelope and *(pre)enveloping* class are defined dually.

Definition 2.13. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{A} a class of objects in \mathcal{C} .

An \mathcal{A} -precover relative to \mathcal{D} of an object $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is a \mathcal{D} -deflation $f : X \twoheadrightarrow C$ with $X \in \mathcal{A}$ such that every morphism $f' : X' \rightarrow C$ in \mathcal{C} with $X' \in \mathcal{A}$ factors through f . An \mathcal{A} -precover relative to \mathcal{D} of an object $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is called an \mathcal{A} -cover relative to \mathcal{D} of C if every endomorphism $g : X \rightarrow X$ with $fg = f$ is an automorphism. The class \mathcal{A} is called a \mathcal{D} -precovering class (\mathcal{D} -covering class) if every object $C \in \mathcal{C}$ has an \mathcal{A} -precover (\mathcal{A} -cover) relative to \mathcal{D} . The concepts of \mathcal{A} -(pre)envelope relative to \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D} -(pre)enveloping class are defined dually.

A \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{C} is called \mathcal{D} -perfect if \mathcal{A} is a \mathcal{D} -covering class and \mathcal{B} is a \mathcal{D} -enveloping class.

The following result is easily obtained from [24, Section 16], and shows how \mathcal{D} -enveloping and enveloping (\mathcal{D} -covering and covering) classes are related.

Proposition 2.14. [24, Propositions 16.3, 16.4] *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} , and let \mathcal{A} be a class of objects of \mathcal{C} .*

- (1) *Assume that \mathcal{D} is injectively generated. Then \mathcal{A} is a \mathcal{D} -enveloping class if and only if \mathcal{A} is an enveloping class and $\text{Inj}(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.*
- (2) *Assume that \mathcal{D} is projectively generated. Then \mathcal{A} is a \mathcal{D} -covering class if and only if \mathcal{A} is a covering class and $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.*

For an exhaustive account on exact categories, covers and envelopes we refer to [3, 34].

3. TWO GALOIS CONNECTIONS

The main concepts studied in the paper are those of relatively divisible and relatively flat objects. They are inspired by Sklyarenko's modules of flat type relative to a proper class [30]. Let us recall their definition [24, 15.4, 15.11], adapted in an obvious way to exact categories.

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} . An object X of \mathcal{C} is called:

- (1) \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible if every \mathcal{D} -inflation $X \twoheadrightarrow Y$ is an \mathcal{E} -inflation.
- (2) \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat if every \mathcal{D} -deflation $Y \twoheadrightarrow X$ is an \mathcal{E} -deflation.

We denote by $Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$ and $Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$ the classes of $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -divisible and $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -flat objects of \mathcal{C} respectively.

Remark 3.2. (1) Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} . For the exact structure \mathcal{E} consisting of all split exact sequences, $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -divisible and $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -flat objects coincide with \mathcal{D} -injective and \mathcal{D} -projective objects respectively.

(2) Let \mathcal{C} be a quasi-abelian category. Let \mathcal{D} be the exact structure on \mathcal{C} given by all kernel-cokernel pairs and \mathcal{E} an exact structure on \mathcal{C} . Then $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -divisible objects and $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -flat objects of \mathcal{C} are simply called \mathcal{E} -divisible and \mathcal{E} -flat respectively. We denote by $Div(\mathcal{E})$ and $Flat(\mathcal{E})$ the classes of \mathcal{E} -divisible and \mathcal{E} -flat objects of \mathcal{C} respectively.

In what follows we shall show that relatively divisible and relatively flat objects may be used for establishing Galois connections between the posets of relative cotorsion pairs, relative projectively generated exact structures and relative injectively generated exact structures. We extend and reformulate results from [24, Section 14] in terms of Galois connections.

We begin with the following proposition, which extends [24, 15.8, 15.15] from abelian categories to exact categories.

Proposition 3.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} .*

- (1) *Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated by a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} . Then an object X of \mathcal{C} is $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -divisible if and only if $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\mathcal{M}, X) = 0$.*
- (2) *Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -injectively generated by a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} . Then an object Z of \mathcal{C} is $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -flat if and only if $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(Z, \mathcal{M}) = 0$.*

Proof. (1) (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Assume that X is $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -divisible. Let $X \twoheadrightarrow Y \twoheadrightarrow M$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation with $M \in \mathcal{M}$. By hypothesis, it must be an \mathcal{E} -conflation. Since $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_H^M$, M is projective with respect to this \mathcal{E} -conflation, which implies its splitness. Hence $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\mathcal{M}, X) = 0$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Assume that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(\mathcal{M}, X) = 0$. Let $X \twoheadrightarrow Y \twoheadrightarrow Z$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation. Since this \mathcal{D} -conflation splits, every $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is projective with respect to the above \mathcal{D} -conflation. Then the \mathcal{D} -conflation must be an \mathcal{E} -conflation, because $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_H^M$. This shows that X is $\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}$ -divisible. \square

The next lemma can be immediately deduced from Proposition 3.3 (also, see [24, Lemmas 14.8, 14.9]).

Lemma 3.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} .*

- (1) *Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated. Then $({}^{\perp \mathcal{D}} Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}))^{\perp \mathcal{D}} = Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$.*
- (2) *Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -injectively generated. Then ${}^{\perp \mathcal{D}}(Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}))^{\perp \mathcal{D}} = Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$.*

Let us recall the concept of Galois connection between posets (e.g., see [11]).

Definition 3.5. Let (A, \leq) and (B, \leq) be posets.

- (1) A *monotone Galois connection* between (A, \leq) and (B, \leq) consists of a pair (α, β) of two order-preserving maps $\alpha : A \rightarrow B$ and $\beta : B \rightarrow A$ such that for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, we have $\alpha(a) \leq b$ if and only if $a \leq \beta(b)$. Equivalently, (α, β) is a monotone Galois connection if and only if for all $a \in A$, $a \leq \beta\alpha(a)$ and for all $b \in B$, $\alpha\beta(b) \leq b$. An element $a \in A$ (respectively $b \in B$) is called *Galois* with respect to (α, β) if $\beta\alpha(a) = a$ (respectively $\alpha\beta(b) = b$).
- (2) An *antitone Galois connection* between (A, \leq) and (B, \leq) is a monotone Galois connection between (A, \leq) and (B, \geq) .

Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} . The class $Ex(\mathcal{C})$ of exact structures on \mathcal{C} is partially ordered as follows: for every $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \in Ex(\mathcal{C})$, $\mathcal{E}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{E}_2$ if and only if every \mathcal{E}_2 -conflation is an \mathcal{E}_1 -conflation. This relation restricts to ones on the classes $DPEx(\mathcal{C})$ and $DIEx(\mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{D} -projectively and \mathcal{D} -injectively generated exact structures on \mathcal{C} . The class $DCot(\mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pairs in \mathcal{C} is partially ordered as follows: for every $(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_1), (\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{B}_2) \in DCot(\mathcal{C})$, $(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_1) \geq (\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{B}_2)$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_2 \supseteq \mathcal{A}_1$ if and only if $\mathcal{B}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{B}_2$ [16].

Following [24, Section 14] and the original work by Salce [29], we consider the following maps.

(1) Let $\Psi : DPEx(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow DCot(\mathcal{C})$ be defined by

$$\Psi(\mathcal{E}) = ({}^{\perp \mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}), Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})) = ({}^{\perp \mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}), ({}^{\perp \mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}))^{\perp \mathcal{D}})$$

(see Lemma 3.4) for every $\mathcal{E} \in DPEx(\mathcal{C})$, that is, the \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair generated by $Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$. Let $\tilde{\Psi} : DCot(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow DPEx(\mathcal{C})$ be defined by $\tilde{\Psi}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ for every $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in DCot(\mathcal{C})$, that is, the exact structure \mathcal{D} -projectively generated by \mathcal{A} .

(2) Let $\Phi : DIEx(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow DCot(\mathcal{C})$ be defined by

$$\Phi(\mathcal{E}) = (Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}), Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})^{\perp \mathcal{D}}) = ({}^{\perp \mathcal{D}}(Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})^{\perp \mathcal{D}}), Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})^{\perp \mathcal{D}})$$

(see Lemma 3.4) for every $\mathcal{E} \in DIEx(\mathcal{C})$, that is, the \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair cogenerated by $Flat(\mathcal{E})$. Let $\tilde{\Phi} : DCot(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow DIEx(\mathcal{C})$ be defined by $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \iota_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$ for every $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in DCot(\mathcal{C})$, that is, the exact structure \mathcal{D} -injectively generated by \mathcal{B} .

The following proposition offers one of the main motivations for studying relative divisibility and relative flatness. It is an immediate generalization of [24, 15.10, 15.17] from abelian categories to exact categories, and it will be frequently used in what follows, sometimes without explicit reference.

Proposition 3.6. *With the above notation:*

- (1) *The map Ψ is surjective. More precisely, for every \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{C} , $\mathcal{B} = Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$ for the \mathcal{D} -projectively generated exact structure $\mathcal{E} = \pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ on \mathcal{C} .*
- (2) *The map Φ is surjective. More precisely, for every \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{C} , $\mathcal{A} = Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$ for the \mathcal{D} -injectively generated exact structure $\mathcal{E} = \iota_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$ on \mathcal{C} .*

Theorem 3.7. *With the above notation:*

- (1) *The pair $(\Psi, \tilde{\Psi})$ is a monotone Galois connection between the posets $(DPEx(\mathcal{C}), \supseteq)$ and $(DCot(\mathcal{C}), \geq)$.*
- (2) *The pair $(\Phi, \tilde{\Phi})$ is an antitone Galois connection between the posets $(DIEx(\mathcal{C}), \supseteq)$ and $(DCot(\mathcal{C}), \geq)$.*

Proof. (1) One shows that Ψ and $\tilde{\Psi}$ are order-preserving maps between the posets $(DPEx(\mathcal{C}), \supseteq)$ and $(DCot(\mathcal{C}), \geq)$ as in [24, 14.10, 14.14]. Also, $\mathcal{E} \supseteq \tilde{\Psi}(\Psi(\mathcal{E}))$ for every $\mathcal{E} \in DPEx(\mathcal{C})$, and $\Psi(\tilde{\Psi}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})) \geq (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ (even equality) for every $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in DCot(\mathcal{C})$ as in [24, 14.15].

(2) One shows that Φ and $\tilde{\Phi}$ are order-reversing maps between the posets $(DIEx(\mathcal{C}), \supseteq)$ and $(DCot(\mathcal{C}), \geq)$ as in [24, 14.10, 14.14]. Also, $\mathcal{E} \supseteq \tilde{\Phi}(\Phi(\mathcal{E}))$ for every $\mathcal{E} \in DIEx(\mathcal{C})$, and $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \geq \Phi(\tilde{\Phi}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}))$ (even equality) for every $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in DCot(\mathcal{C})$ as in [24, 14.15]. \square

The following definition extends the notion of injectively generated Xu exact structure [24, 14.16] from abelian categories to exact categories, and also gives its dual.

Definition 3.8. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} .

- (1) A \mathcal{D} -projectively generated exact structure \mathcal{E} on \mathcal{C} is called a *Xu exact structure* if $Proj(\mathcal{E}) = {}^{\perp \mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$.
- (2) A \mathcal{D} -injectively generated exact structure \mathcal{E} on \mathcal{C} is called a *Xu exact structure* if $Inj(\mathcal{E}) = Flat(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})^{\perp \mathcal{D}}$.

Corollary 3.9. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category with an exact structure \mathcal{D} . Then there are bijective correspondences between:*

- (1) *\mathcal{D} -cotorsion pairs in \mathcal{C} .*
- (2) *\mathcal{D} -projectively generated Xu exact structures on \mathcal{C} .*
- (3) *\mathcal{D} -injectively generated Xu exact structures on \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. We shall use the following well-known result on Galois connections: if a pair (α, β) of maps $\alpha : A \rightarrow B$ and $\beta : B \rightarrow A$ is a monotone Galois connection between posets (A, \leq) and (B, \leq) , then α and β induce a bijective correspondence between the Galois elements of A and the Galois elements of B with respect to (α, β) .

By the proof of Theorem 3.7, every \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair in \mathcal{C} is a Galois element with respect to both Galois connections $(\Psi, \tilde{\Psi})$ and $(\Phi, \tilde{\Phi})$.

Let us show that the Galois elements of $DPEx(\mathcal{C})$ with respect to the Galois connection $(\Psi, \tilde{\Psi})$ are the \mathcal{D} -projectively generated Xu exact structures on \mathcal{C} . First, let \mathcal{E} be a Galois element of $DPEx(\mathcal{C})$ with respect to $(\Psi, \tilde{\Psi})$. Then $\Psi(\mathcal{E}) = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ for some \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{C} , and we have

$$\mathcal{E} = \tilde{\Psi}(\Psi(\mathcal{E})) = \tilde{\Psi}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}).$$

By Proposition 3.6, it follows that ${}^{\perp\mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E}) = {}^{\perp\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \subseteq Proj(\pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = Proj(\mathcal{E})$. On the other hand, we have $Proj(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq {}^{\perp\mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$, since \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated. Hence \mathcal{E} is a \mathcal{D} -projectively generated Xu exact structure on \mathcal{C} . Conversely, let \mathcal{E} be a \mathcal{D} -projectively generated Xu exact structure on \mathcal{C} . Then

$$\mathcal{E} = \pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(Proj(\mathcal{E})) = \pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}({}^{\perp\mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})) = \tilde{\Psi}(\Psi(\mathcal{E})),$$

hence \mathcal{E} is a Galois element of $DPEx(\mathcal{C})$ with respect to $(\Psi, \tilde{\Psi})$.

Similarly, one shows that the Galois elements of $DIEx(\mathcal{C})$ with respect to the Galois connection $(\Phi, \tilde{\Phi})$ are the \mathcal{D} -injectively generated Xu exact structures on \mathcal{C} . \square

We end this section with a characterization of injectively and projectively generated Xu exact structures, which generalizes [34, Theorem 3.5.1] from module categories to exact categories, and also gives its dual. The arguments of the implications (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) extend those of the Wakamatsu Lemmas [34, Lemmas 2.1.1 and 2.1.2].

Theorem 3.10. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} .*

- (1) *Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated and every object Z of \mathcal{C} has a $Proj(\mathcal{E})$ -cover $\mathcal{P}(Z) \twoheadrightarrow Z$ relative to \mathcal{D} . Then the following are equivalent:*
 - (i) *\mathcal{E} is a \mathcal{D} -projectively generated Xu exact structure on \mathcal{C} .*
 - (ii) *$Proj(\mathcal{E})$ is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions.*
 - (iii) *For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z) \twoheadrightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{C} , X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible.*
- (2) *Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -injectively generated and every object X of \mathcal{C} has an $Inj(\mathcal{E})$ -envelope $X \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{I}(X)$ relative to \mathcal{D} . Then the following are equivalent:*
 - (i) *\mathcal{E} is a \mathcal{D} -injectively generated Xu exact structure on \mathcal{C} .*
 - (ii) *$Inj(\mathcal{E})$ is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions.*
 - (iii) *For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{I}(X) \twoheadrightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{C} , Z is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat.*

Proof. (1) (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Assume that (i) holds. Then $Proj(\mathcal{E}) = {}^{\perp\mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}\text{-}\mathcal{E})$ is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions, as a class of the above \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $\Psi(\mathcal{E})$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) Assume that (ii) holds. Consider a \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \xrightarrow{i} \mathcal{P}(Z) \xrightarrow{d} Z$. Since \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated, we have $\mathcal{E} = \pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}(Proj(\mathcal{E}))$. Then by Proposition 3.3, in order to show that X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible, it is enough to prove that $Ext_{\mathcal{D}}^1(M, X) = 0$ for every $M \in Proj(\mathcal{E})$. To this end, let $M \in Proj(\mathcal{E})$, and consider a \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} M$. Taking the pushout of

the morphisms i and f we may construct (see Lemma 2.7) the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{i} & \mathcal{P}(Z) & \xrightarrow{d} & Z \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow f' & & \parallel \\
 Y & \xrightarrow{i'} & V & \xrightarrow{d'} & Z \\
 \downarrow g & & \downarrow g' & & \\
 M & \xlongequal{\quad} & M & &
 \end{array}$$

in which the rows and the columns are \mathcal{D} -conflations. Since $Proj(\mathcal{E})$ is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions, we have $V \in Proj(\mathcal{E})$. Now the $Proj(\mathcal{E})$ -precover property of $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ yields a morphism $h : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z)$ such that $d' = dh$. Then $d = dhf'$, and the $Proj(\mathcal{E})$ -cover property of $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ implies that hf' is an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(Z)$. Denote $u = (hf')^{-1}hi' : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z)$. Then $uf = i$ and we may construct the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & M \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow u & & \downarrow v \\
 X & \xrightarrow{i} & \mathcal{P}(Z) & \xrightarrow{d} & Z
 \end{array}$$

The $Proj(\mathcal{E})$ -precover property of $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ yields a morphism $w : M \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z)$ such that $dw = v$. Then the \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} M$ splits by the Homotopy Lemma [32, 7.16]. Therefore, $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(M, X) = 0$ for every $M \in Proj(\mathcal{E})$, which shows that X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Assume that (iii) holds. Let $Z \in {}^{\perp \mathcal{D}}Div(\mathcal{D}-\mathcal{E})$. Consider the \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z) \rightarrow Z$. Then $X \in Div(\mathcal{D}-\mathcal{E})$, and so the \mathcal{D} -conflation splits. Hence $Z \in Proj(\mathcal{E})$, which shows that \mathcal{E} is a \mathcal{D} -projectively generated Xu exact structure. \square

4. PROPERTIES OF RELATIVELY DIVISIBLE AND RELATIVELY FLAT OBJECTS

We collect in the next proposition some first results on the classes of relatively divisible and relatively flat objects in exact categories. They are immediate generalizations of [24, 15.7 and 15.14]) from abelian categories to exact categories.

Proposition 4.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} .*

- (1)
 - (i) *The class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions and \mathcal{E} -inflations.*
 - (ii) *Assume that \mathcal{C} has products and \mathcal{E} is closed under products. Then the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under products.*
 - (iii) *Assume that \mathcal{C} has direct limits and \mathcal{E} is closed under direct limits. Let $(X_i, f_{ij})_I$ be a direct system of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} with direct limit $(\varinjlim X_i, f_i)$ such that each f_{ij} is a \mathcal{D} -inflation. Then $\varinjlim X_i$ is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. In particular, the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under coproducts.*
 - (iv) *Every object of \mathcal{C} is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible if and only if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$.*
 - (v) *Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated by a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} . Then every object of \mathcal{C} is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible if and only if every object of \mathcal{M} is \mathcal{D} -projective.*
- (2)
 - (i) *The class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions and \mathcal{E} -deflations.*
 - (ii) *Assume that \mathcal{C} has coproducts and \mathcal{E} is closed under coproducts. Then the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under coproducts.*
 - (iii) *Assume that \mathcal{C} has direct limits and \mathcal{E} is closed under direct limits. Then the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under direct limits.*
 - (iv) *Every object of \mathcal{C} is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat if and only if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$.*
 - (v) *Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -injectively generated by a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} . Then every object of \mathcal{C} is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat if and only if every object of \mathcal{M} is \mathcal{D} -injective.*

The following proposition is one of the key results on relatively divisible and relatively flat objects in exact categories, having a number of important consequences.

Proposition 4.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} . Consider the following commutative diagram in \mathcal{C} :*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{i} & Y & \xrightarrow{d} & Z & \xrightarrow{j} & U & \xrightarrow{p} & V \\ \parallel & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow h & & \parallel \\ X & \xrightarrow{i'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{d'} & Z' & \xrightarrow{j'} & U' & \xrightarrow{p'} & V \end{array}$$

where each row consists of two \mathcal{D} -conflations.

- (1) Assume that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(Z, X) = 0$ and Y' is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. Then Z' is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible.
- (2) Assume that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(V, Z') = 0$ and U is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat. Then Z is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat.

Proof. (1) Consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Y' \oplus Z & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & j \end{bmatrix}} & Y' \oplus U & \xrightarrow{[0 \ p]} & V \\ \downarrow [d' \ g] & & \downarrow [j' d' \ h] & & \parallel \\ Z' & \xrightarrow{j'} & U' & \xrightarrow{p'} & V \end{array}$$

where the rows are \mathcal{D} -conflations. Then the left square is a pushout by Lemma 2.7.

Since $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(Z, X) = 0$, there exists a morphism $\alpha : Z \rightarrow Y'$ such that $d'\alpha = g$. Consider the pushout of the morphisms $[1 \ \alpha] : Y' \oplus Z \rightarrow Y'$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & j \end{bmatrix} : Y' \oplus Z \rightarrow Y' \oplus U$, and denote by $[w_1 \ w_2] : Y' \oplus U \rightarrow W$ and $l : Y' \rightarrow W$ the resulting morphisms. Since $j' [d' \ g] = [j' d' \ h] \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & j \end{bmatrix}$, the pushout property implies the existence of a unique morphism $q : W \rightarrow U'$ such that $ql = j'd'$ and $q[w_1 \ w_2] = [j' d' \ h]$. Hence we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Y' \oplus Z & \xrightarrow{[1 \ \alpha]} & Y' & \xrightarrow{d'} & Z' \\ \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & j \end{bmatrix} & & \downarrow l & & \downarrow j' \\ Y' \oplus U & \xrightarrow{[w_1 \ w_2]} & W & \xrightarrow{q} & U' \end{array}$$

where the exterior rectangle is a pushout by the first part of the proof. Then the right square is a pushout by Lemma 2.8 and we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{i'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{d'} & Z' \\ \parallel & & \downarrow l & & \downarrow j' \\ X & \xrightarrow{w} & W & \xrightarrow{q} & U' \\ & & \downarrow v & & \downarrow p' \\ & & V & \xlongequal{\quad} & V \end{array}$$

where the rows and the columns are \mathcal{D} -conflations. Since Y' is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible, the first column is an \mathcal{E} -conflation. Then the last column is also an \mathcal{E} -conflation. Hence Z' is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} , and $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ a \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair. Assume that \mathcal{C} has enough \mathcal{D} -injectives and enough \mathcal{D} -projectives.*

- (1) Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated by a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} . Then the following are equivalent:
 - (i) For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \rightarrow Y' \rightarrow Z'$ in \mathcal{C} with $X \in \mathcal{B}$ and Y' \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible, Z' is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible.

- (ii) For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $Z \twoheadrightarrow U \twoheadrightarrow V$ in \mathcal{C} with $V \in \mathcal{M}$ and U \mathcal{D} -projective, $Z \in \mathcal{A}$.
- (2) Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -injectively generated by a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} . Then the following are equivalent:
- (i) For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $Z \twoheadrightarrow U \twoheadrightarrow V$ in \mathcal{C} with $V \in \mathcal{A}$ and U \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat, Z is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat.
- (ii) For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \twoheadrightarrow Y' \twoheadrightarrow Z'$ in \mathcal{C} with $X \in \mathcal{M}$ and Y' \mathcal{D} -injective, $Z' \in \mathcal{B}$.

Proof. (1) (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let $Z \xrightarrow{j} U \xrightarrow{p} V$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation with $V \in \mathcal{M}$ and U \mathcal{D} -projective. Let $X \xrightarrow{i} Y \xrightarrow{d} Z$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation with $X \in \mathcal{B}$. Consider a \mathcal{D} -inflation $f : Y \rightarrow Y'$ for some \mathcal{D} -injective object Y' of \mathcal{C} , and denote by $i' = fi : X \rightarrow Y'$ the composed \mathcal{D} -inflation and by $d' : Y' \rightarrow Z'$ its cokernel. Then there is a morphism $g : Z \rightarrow Z'$ such that $gd = d'f$. Now consider the pushout of the \mathcal{D} -inflation j and the morphism g to obtain the commutative diagram from Proposition 4.2. By hypothesis, Z' is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible, hence we have $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(V, Z') = 0$ by Proposition 3.3. Since U is \mathcal{D} -projective, we have $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(U, X) = 0$. It follows that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(Z, X) = 0$ by Proposition 4.2. Hence $Z \in \mathcal{A}$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Let $X \xrightarrow{i'} Y' \xrightarrow{d'} Z'$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation with $X \in \mathcal{B}$ and Y' \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. Let $Z' \xrightarrow{j'} U' \xrightarrow{p'} V$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation with $V \in \mathcal{M}$. Consider a \mathcal{D} -deflation $h : U' \rightarrow U$ for some \mathcal{D} -projective object U of \mathcal{C} , and denote by $p = p'h : U' \rightarrow V$ the composed \mathcal{D} -deflation and by $j : Z \rightarrow U$ its kernel. Then there is a morphism $g : Z \rightarrow Z'$ such that $j'g = hj$. Now consider the pullback of the \mathcal{D} -deflation d' and the morphism g to obtain the commutative diagram from Proposition 4.2. Since $Z \in \mathcal{A}$ and $X \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(Z, X) = 0$. Then Z' is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible by Proposition 4.2. \square

Corollary 4.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} . Assume that \mathcal{C} has enough \mathcal{D} -injectives and enough \mathcal{D} -projectives.*

- (1) Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated by a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} . Then the following are equivalent:
- (i) The class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under \mathcal{D} -deflations.
- (ii) For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $Z \twoheadrightarrow U \twoheadrightarrow V$ with $V \in \mathcal{M}$ and U \mathcal{D} -projective, Z is \mathcal{D} -projective.
- (2) Assume that \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -injectively generated by a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} . Then the following are equivalent:
- (i) The class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under \mathcal{D} -inflations.
- (ii) For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \twoheadrightarrow Y' \twoheadrightarrow Z'$ with $X \in \mathcal{M}$ and Y' \mathcal{D} -injective, Z' is \mathcal{D} -injective.

Proof. Use Theorem 4.3 for the \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, where \mathcal{A} is the class of \mathcal{D} -projective objects and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$ for (1), and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C}$ and \mathcal{B} is the class of \mathcal{D} -injective objects for (2). \square

Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category and \mathcal{D} an exact structure on \mathcal{C} . Generalizing the corresponding notions from module categories, a class \mathcal{M} of objects of \mathcal{C} is called \mathcal{D} -*resolving* (respectively \mathcal{D} -*coresolving*) if it contains all \mathcal{D} -projective objects (\mathcal{D} -injective objects), it is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions and for every \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \twoheadrightarrow Y \twoheadrightarrow Z$ with $Y, Z \in \mathcal{M}$ ($X, Y \in \mathcal{M}$) one has $X \in \mathcal{M}$ ($Z \in \mathcal{M}$).

Corollary 4.5. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, \mathcal{D} an exact structures on \mathcal{C} , and $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ a \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair. Assume that \mathcal{C} has enough \mathcal{D} -injectives and enough \mathcal{D} -projectives. View \mathcal{B} as the class of relatively divisible objects of \mathcal{C} for some exact structure \mathcal{D} -projectively generated by a class of objects \mathcal{N} , and \mathcal{A} as the class of relatively flat objects of \mathcal{C} for some exact structure \mathcal{D} -injectively generated by a class of objects \mathcal{M} . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathcal{B} is \mathcal{D} -coresolving.
- (ii) For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $Z \twoheadrightarrow U \twoheadrightarrow V$ in \mathcal{C} with $V \in \mathcal{N}$ and U \mathcal{D} -projective, $Z \in \mathcal{A}$.

(iii) \mathcal{A} is \mathcal{D} -resolving.

(iv) For every \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \rightarrow Y' \rightarrow Z'$ in \mathcal{C} with $X \in \mathcal{M}$ and Y' \mathcal{D} -injective, $Z' \in \mathcal{B}$.

Proof. Note that \mathcal{A} contains all \mathcal{D} -projective objects, \mathcal{B} contains all \mathcal{D} -injective objects, and both \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions.

The implications (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) and (iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv) follow by Theorem 4.3.

(i) \Rightarrow (iii) Assume that \mathcal{B} is \mathcal{D} -coresolving. Let $Z \xrightarrow{j} U \xrightarrow{p} V$ with $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $X \xrightarrow{i} Y \xrightarrow{d} Z$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation with $X \in \mathcal{B}$. Consider a \mathcal{D} -inflation $f : Y \rightarrow Y'$ for some \mathcal{D} -injective object Y' of \mathcal{C} , and denote by $i' = fi : X \rightarrow Y'$ the composed \mathcal{D} -inflation and by $d' : Y' \rightarrow Z'$ its cokernel. Then there is a morphism $g : Z \rightarrow Z'$ such that $gd = d'f$. Now consider the pushout of the \mathcal{D} -inflation j and the morphism g to obtain the commutative diagram from Proposition 4.2. Since $X, Y' \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $Z' \in \mathcal{B}$, and so $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(V, Z') = 0$. Since $U \in \mathcal{A}$, it follows that $Z \in \mathcal{A}$ by Proposition 4.2. Hence \mathcal{A} is \mathcal{D} -resolving.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) This is dual to (i) \Rightarrow (iii). \square

In what follows we establish some further characterizations of relatively divisible and relatively flat objects in exact categories.

Proposition 4.6. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} .*

(1) *Assume that \mathcal{C} has enough \mathcal{D} -injectives. Then the following are equivalent for an object X of \mathcal{C} :*

(i) X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible.

(ii) There exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$, where Y is \mathcal{D} -injective.

(iii) There exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$, where Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible.

If \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -injectively generated by a class of objects \mathcal{M} , then they are also equivalent to:

(iv) For every object $M \in \mathcal{M}$, every morphism $X \rightarrow M$ factors through a \mathcal{D} -injective object.

(2) *Assume that \mathcal{C} has enough \mathcal{D} -projectives. Then the following are equivalent for an object Z of \mathcal{C} :*

(i) Z is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat.

(ii) There exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$, where Y is \mathcal{D} -projective.

(iii) There exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$, where Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat.

If \mathcal{E} is \mathcal{D} -projectively generated by a class of objects \mathcal{M} , then they are also equivalent to:

(iv) For every object $M \in \mathcal{M}$, every morphism $M \rightarrow Z$ factors through a \mathcal{D} -projective object.

Proof. (1) (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Assume that X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. Let $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow M$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation with Y \mathcal{D} -injective. By hypothesis, it must be an \mathcal{E} -conflation.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) This is clear.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Assume that there exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \xrightarrow{\beta} Y \rightarrow Z$, where Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. Let $\alpha : X \rightarrow X'$ be a \mathcal{D} -inflation. Now consider the pushout of α and β to obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\beta} & Y & \twoheadrightarrow & Z \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \gamma & & \parallel \\ X' & \xrightarrow{\delta} & Y' & \twoheadrightarrow & Z \end{array}$$

where the last row is an \mathcal{E} -conflation. Then the \mathcal{D} -inflation $\gamma : Y \rightarrow Y'$ is an \mathcal{E} -inflation, because Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. It follows that $\delta\alpha = \gamma\beta$ is an \mathcal{E} -inflation, hence α must be an \mathcal{E} -inflation. Therefore, X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible.

(i) \Rightarrow (iv) Assume that X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and consider a morphism $f : X \rightarrow M$. There is a \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$ for some \mathcal{D} -injective object Y . This must be an \mathcal{E} -conflation, because X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible. But $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_G^M$, hence M is injective with respect to \mathcal{E} -conflations. Then f factors through the \mathcal{D} -injective object Y .

(iv) \Rightarrow (ii) Assume that (iv) holds. There is a \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} Y \rightarrow Z$ for some \mathcal{D} -injective object Y . Let $f : X \rightarrow M$ be a morphism in \mathcal{C} with $M \in \mathcal{M}$. By hypothesis, f factors through a \mathcal{D} -injective object Y' , hence there exist morphisms $g : Y' \rightarrow M$ and $h : X \rightarrow Y'$ such that $f = gh$. By the \mathcal{D} -injectivity of Y' , there exists a morphism $\beta : Y \rightarrow Y'$ such that $\beta\alpha = h$. Then $g\beta\alpha = f$, hence M is injective with respect to the \mathcal{D} -conflation. But $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_G^{\mathcal{M}}$, hence the initial \mathcal{D} -conflation must be an \mathcal{E} -conflation, which concludes the proof. \square

Relative divisibility and relative flatness may be further generalized with respect to some class of objects. These new notions are motivated by some subsequent applications to finitely accessible additive categories.

Definition 4.7. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{A} a class of objects in \mathcal{C} . An object X of \mathcal{C} is called:

- (1) \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible if every \mathcal{D} -inflation $X \rightarrow A$ with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is an \mathcal{E} -inflation.
- (2) \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -flat if every \mathcal{D} -deflation $A \rightarrow X$ with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is an \mathcal{E} -deflation.

Some closure properties of relatively divisible and relatively flat objects in exact categories from Proposition 4.1 can be generalized with respect to a class of objects as follows.

Proposition 4.8. Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be exact structures on \mathcal{C} , and \mathcal{A} a class of objects in \mathcal{C} .

- (1)
 - (i) Assume that \mathcal{A} is closed under \mathcal{E} -deflations. Then the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions.
 - (ii) Assume that \mathcal{C} has products and \mathcal{E} is closed under products. Then the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under products.
 - (iii) Assume that \mathcal{C} has direct limits and \mathcal{E} is closed under direct limits. Let $(X_i, f_{ij})_I$ be a direct system of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} with direct limit $(\varinjlim X_i, f_i)$ such that each f_{ij} is a \mathcal{D} -inflation. Then $\varinjlim X_i$ is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible. In particular, the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under coproducts.
- (2)
 - (i) Assume that \mathcal{A} is closed under \mathcal{E} -inflations. Then the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -flat objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions.
 - (ii) Assume that \mathcal{C} has coproducts and \mathcal{E} is closed under coproducts. Then the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -flat objects of \mathcal{C} is closed under coproducts.

Proof. (1) (i) Let $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation in \mathcal{C} such that X and Z are \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible. Let $j : Y \rightarrow A$ be a \mathcal{D} -inflation with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and consider the pushout of g and j . Then we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow j & & \downarrow j' \\
 X & \xrightarrow{f'} & A & \xrightarrow{g'} & A' \\
 & & \downarrow p & & \downarrow p' \\
 & & C & \xlongequal{\quad} & C
 \end{array}$$

where the rows and columns are \mathcal{D} -conflations. Since X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible, g' is an \mathcal{E} -deflation. Then we have $A' \in \mathcal{A}$, because \mathcal{A} is closed under \mathcal{E} -deflations by hypothesis. Since Z is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible, it follows that p' is an \mathcal{E} -deflation. Then $p = p'g'$ is an \mathcal{E} -deflation, and so Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible.

(ii) Let $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} and $X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$. Let $f : X \rightarrow A$ be a \mathcal{D} -inflation with $A \in \mathcal{A}$. For every $k \in I$ denote $X'_k = \prod_{i \in I, i \neq k} X_i$ and consider the canonical split monomorphism $\alpha_k : X_k \rightarrow X$. Then $\alpha'_k = f\alpha_k$ is a \mathcal{D} -inflation and we obtain a

pullback-pushout commutative diagram of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
X_k & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_k & & \\
\alpha_k \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha'_k & & \\
X & \xrightarrow{f} & A & \xrightarrow{g} & Z \\
\beta_k \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta'_k & & \parallel \\
X'_k & \xrightarrow{f'_k} & Y_k & \xrightarrow{g'_k} & Z
\end{array}$$

Since X_k is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible, it follows that the second column is an \mathcal{E} -conflation. Then the induced morphism $\prod_{k \in I} \alpha'_k : \prod_{k \in I} X_k \rightarrow A^I$ is an \mathcal{E} -inflation. But $\prod_{k \in I} \alpha'_k$ is the composition of morphisms $X = \prod_{k \in I} X_k \xrightarrow{f} A \xrightarrow{j} A^I$, where j is the canonical monomorphism. Then $f : X \rightarrow A$ is an \mathcal{E} -inflation. Therefore, X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible.

(iii) Denote $X = \varinjlim X_i$. Note that, since each f_{ij} is a \mathcal{D} -inflation, so is each canonical morphism $f_i : X_i \rightarrow X$. Let $X \xrightarrow{u} A \xrightarrow{v} Z$ be a \mathcal{D} -conflation in \mathcal{C} with $A \in \mathcal{A}$. For every $i \in I$, $u_i = u f_i$ is a \mathcal{D} -inflation and we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
X_i & \xrightarrow{u_i} & A & \xrightarrow{v_i} & Z_i \\
f_i \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow \\
X & \xrightarrow{u} & A & \xrightarrow{v} & Z
\end{array}$$

Since X_i is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible, the upper row is an \mathcal{E} -conflation. Now take the direct limit of the \mathcal{E} -conflations $X_i \xrightarrow{u_i} A \xrightarrow{v_i} Z$ for $i \in I$ and use the closure of \mathcal{E} under direct limits in order to deduce that $X \xrightarrow{u} A \xrightarrow{v} Z$ is an \mathcal{E} -conflation. This shows that $X = \varinjlim X_i$ is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible. \square

Theorem 4.9. *Let \mathcal{C} be an additive category, \mathcal{D} an exact structure on \mathcal{C} , and $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ a \mathcal{D} -perfect \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair in \mathcal{C} .*

- (1) *Consider an exact structure \mathcal{E} on \mathcal{C} such that \mathcal{A} coincides with the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat objects of \mathcal{C} and assume that $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Then the following are equivalent for an object X of \mathcal{C} :*
 - (i) *X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible.*
 - (ii) *The \mathcal{B} -envelope of X relative to \mathcal{D} is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible.*
 - (iii) *There exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \rightarrow B \rightarrow A$, where $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible.*
 - (iv) *There exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow A$, where $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible.*
- (2) *Consider an exact structure \mathcal{E} on \mathcal{C} such that \mathcal{B} coincides with the class of \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -divisible objects of \mathcal{C} and assume that $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Then the following are equivalent for an object Z of \mathcal{C} :*
 - (i) *Z is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{B} -flat.*
 - (ii) *The \mathcal{A} -cover of Z relative to \mathcal{D} is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{B} -flat.*
 - (iii) *There exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $B \rightarrow A \rightarrow Z$, where $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{B} -flat and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.*
 - (iv) *There exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $B \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$, where Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{B} -flat and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. (1) The existence of the required exact structure \mathcal{E} on \mathcal{C} follows by Proposition 3.6.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii) Assume that X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible. Consider the \mathcal{B} -envelope $X \rightarrow B(X)$ of X relative to \mathcal{D} , which does exist and is a \mathcal{D} -inflation, because the \mathcal{D} -cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is \mathcal{D} -perfect. Let $B(X) \rightarrow A$ be a \mathcal{D} -inflation with $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Consider the \mathcal{B} -envelope $A \rightarrow B(A)$ of A relative to \mathcal{D} and the induced composition $X \rightarrow B(X) \rightarrow A \rightarrow B(A)$ of morphisms, which we denote by α . Then $\alpha : X \rightarrow B(A)$ is a \mathcal{D} -inflation, as a composition of \mathcal{D} -inflations. Consider the induced \mathcal{D} -conflations $A \rightarrow B(A) \rightarrow A'$ and $X \rightarrow B(A) \rightarrow Z$. Since $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$ and \mathcal{A} is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions, we have $B(A) \in \mathcal{A}$. Since X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible, it follows that $\alpha : X \rightarrow B(A)$ is

an \mathcal{E} -inflation. Then $Z \in \mathcal{A}$, because \mathcal{A} is closed under \mathcal{E} -deflations by Propositions 4.1 and 3.6. We have the following induced commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{\beta} & B(X) & & \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow \gamma & & \\
 X & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & B(A) & \twoheadrightarrow & Z \\
 \downarrow \beta & \swarrow \delta & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 B(X) & \longrightarrow & Y & \twoheadrightarrow & Z
 \end{array}$$

where the lower \mathcal{D} -conflation is obtained by taking the pushout of α and β . The morphism $\gamma : B(X) \rightarrow B(A)$ such that $\gamma\beta = \alpha$ does exist because $B(X)$ is a \mathcal{B} -preenvelope of X (relative to \mathcal{D}). Since $Z \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B(X) \in \mathcal{B}$, it follows that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}}^1(Z, B(X)) = 0$, hence the lower \mathcal{D} -conflation splits. By the Homotopy Lemma [32, 7.16] there exists the required morphism $\delta : B(A) \rightarrow B(X)$ such that $\delta\alpha = \beta$. Then $\delta\gamma\beta = \beta$, whence it follows that $\delta\gamma$ is an automorphism, using the \mathcal{B} -envelope (relative to \mathcal{D}) condition for $B(X)$. Hence $\gamma : B(X) \rightarrow B(A)$ is a split monomorphism, which implies that $B(X) \twoheadrightarrow A$ is a split monomorphism, and so it is an \mathcal{E} -inflation. Therefore, $B(X)$ is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) By hypothesis, there is a \mathcal{D} -conflation $X \twoheadrightarrow B(X) \twoheadrightarrow A$, where $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B(X)$ is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible. Since every object of \mathcal{A} is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -flat, the \mathcal{D} -conflation is also an \mathcal{E} -conflation.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv) This is clear.

(iv) \Rightarrow (i) Assume that there exists an \mathcal{E} -conflation $X \xrightarrow{\beta} Y \twoheadrightarrow A$, where $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible. Let $\alpha : X \twoheadrightarrow A'$ be a \mathcal{D} -inflation with $A' \in \mathcal{A}$. Now consider the pushout of α and β to obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{\beta} & Y & \twoheadrightarrow & A \\
 \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \gamma & & \parallel \\
 A' & \xrightarrow{\delta} & Y' & \twoheadrightarrow & A
 \end{array}$$

where the last row is an \mathcal{E} -conflation. Since $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ and \mathcal{A} is closed under \mathcal{D} -extensions, we have $Y' \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the \mathcal{D} -inflation $\gamma : Y \rightarrow Y'$ is an \mathcal{E} -inflation, because Y is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible. It follows that $\delta\alpha = \gamma\beta$ is an \mathcal{E} -inflation, hence α must be an \mathcal{E} -inflation. Therefore, X is \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} - \mathcal{A} -divisible. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Azumaya, *Finite splitness and finite projectivity*, J. Algebra **106** (1987), 114–134.
- [2] D. Buchsbaum, *A note on homology in categories*, Ann. of Math. **69** (1959), 66–74.
- [3] T. Bühler, *Exact categories*, Expo. Math. **28** (2010), 1–69.
- [4] E. Büyükaşık and Y. Durğun, *Coneat submodules and coneat-flat modules*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **51** (2014), 1305–1319.
- [5] E. Büyükaşık and Y. Durğun, *Neat-flat modules*, Comm. Algebra **44** (2016), 416–428.
- [6] I. Crivei and S. Crivei, *Absolutely s-pure modules*, Automat. Comput. Appl. Math. **6** (1998), 25–30.
- [7] S. Crivei, *Maximal exact structures on additive categories revisited*, Math. Nachr. **285** (2012), 440–446.
- [8] S. Crivei, *Neat and coneat submodules of modules over commutative rings*, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. **89** (2014), 343–352.
- [9] S. Crivei and D. Keskin Tütüncü, *Relatively divisible and relatively flat objects in exact categories: Applications*, preprint 2018.
- [10] E.E. Enochs and O.M.G. Jenda, *Relative homological algebra*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 2000.
- [11] M. Erné, J. Kosłowski, A. Melton and G.E. Strecker, *A primer on Galois connections*. In: Proceedings of the 1991 Summer Conference on General Topology and Applications in Honor of Mary Ellen Rudin and Her Work, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, **704**, 1993, pp. 103–125.
- [12] L. Frerick and D. Sieg, *Exact categories in functional analysis*, preprint 2010, www.mathematik.uni-trier.de:8080/abteilung/analysis/HomAlg.pdf.
- [13] L. Fuchs, *Neat submodules over integral domains*, Period. Math. Hungar. **64** (2012), 131–143.

- [14] G. Garkusha, *Relative homological algebra for the proper class $\omega_f^\#$* , Comm. Algebra **32** (2004), 4043–4072.
- [15] J. Gillespie, *Model structures on exact categories*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **215** (2011), 2892–2902.
- [16] R. Göbel, S. Shelah and S.L. Wallutis, *On the lattice of cotorsion theories*, J. Algebra **238** (2001), 292–313.
- [17] M. Hovey, *Cotorsion pairs, model category structures, and representation theory*, Math. Z. **241** (2002), 553–592.
- [18] M. Karoubi, *Algèbres de Clifford et K-théorie*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **1** (1968), 161–270.
- [19] B. Keller, *Chain complexes and stable categories*, Manuscripta Math. **67** (1990), 379–417.
- [20] G.M. Kelly, *Monomorphisms, epimorphisms and pull-backs*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. **9** (1969), 124–142.
- [21] B.H. Maddox, *Absolutely pure modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (1967), 155–158.
- [22] C. Megibben, *Absolutely pure modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **26** (1970), 561–566.
- [23] E. Mermut, *Homological approach to complements and supplements*, Ph.D. Thesis, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, 2004.
- [24] C.F. Preisser Montaño, *Proper classes of short exact sequences and structure theory of modules*, Ph.D. Thesis, Heinrich-Heine University, Düsseldorf, 2010.
- [25] D. Quillen, *Higher algebraic K-theory. I*, Algebraic K-theory, I: Higher K-theories (Proc. Conf., Battelle Memorial Inst., Seattle, Wash., 1972), Springer, Berlin, 1973, pp. 85–147. Lecture Notes in Math. **341**.
- [26] G. Renault, *Étude de certains anneaux A liés aux sous-modules compléments d'un A -module*, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris **259** (1964), 4203–4205.
- [27] A. Rosenberg, *Homological algebra of non-commutative spaces, I*, preprint Max Planck, Bonn: MPIM2008-91, <http://www.mpim-bonn.mpg.de/preprints>.
- [28] W. Rump, *Almost abelian categories*, Cah. Topologie Géom. Différ. Catégoriques **42** (2001), 163–225.
- [29] L. Salce, *Cotorsion theories for abelian groups*, Symposia Math. **23** (1979), 11–32.
- [30] E.G. Sklyarenko, *Relative homological algebra in categories of modules*, Russian Math. Surveys **33** (1978), 97–137.
- [31] B. Stenström, *Pure submodules*, Ark. Math. **10** (1967), 159–171.
- [32] R. Wisbauer, *Foundations of module and ring theory*, Gordon and Breach, Reading, 1991.
- [33] Y. Xiang, *Max-injective, max-flat modules and max-coherent rings*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. **47** (2010), 611–622.
- [34] J. Xu, *Flat covers of modules*, Lecture Notes in Math. **1634**, Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [35] H. Zöschinger, *Schwach-injektive Moduln*, Period. Math. Hungar. **52** (2006), 105–128.
- [36] H. Zöschinger, *Schwach-flache Moduln*, Comm. Algebra **41** (2013), 4393–4407.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, BABEŞ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY, 400084 CLUJ-NAPOCA, ROMANIA

E-mail address: `crivei@math.ubbcluj.ro`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY, 06800 ANKARA, TURKEY

E-mail address: `keskin@hacettepe.edu.tr`