

LINEAR RELATIONS OVER COMMUTATIVE RINGS

RAPHAEL BENNETT-TENNENHAUS

ABSTRACT. We consider the category of linear relations over an arbitrary commutative ring, and identify it as a subcategory of the category of Kronecker representations. We observe that this subcategory forms a definable torsion-free class in a canonical torsion pair whose torsion class consists of representations supported only at the tail vertex. In the complete local case we also generalise results used in the functorial filtrations method, known before only in case the ground ring is a field. In particular, our results strictly generalise what is usually called the ‘splitting lemma’ linear relations. Our generalisation of a ‘covering lemma’ involves the notion of a linearly compact module in the sense introduced by Zelinski.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background. In the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras, the notions of finite, tame and wild representation type play a central role. The representation type of a finite-dimension algebra over an algebraically closed field is: finite if there are finitely many pairwise non-isomorphic indecomposable modules; tame if said indecomposables in each dimension can be described by a finite number of one-parameter families; and wild if the problem of classifying said indecomposables contains the problem of finding a normal form of pairs of square matrices under simultaneous conjugation by a non-singular matrix. Drozd’s celebrated finite-tame-wild theorem gives a trichotomy: namely, that any finite-dimensional algebra over an algebraically closed field satisfies precisely one of the above notions of finite, tame, or wild representation type. A well-known theorem of Gabriel states that the representation type of a path algebra of a connected quiver is determined by the shape of the underlying graph of the quiver: said type is finite (respectively, tame) if and only if said graph is of Dynkin type A - D - E (respectively, \tilde{A} - \tilde{D} - \tilde{E}).

A prototypical example of a tame algebra is the path algebra of the Kronecker quiver, denoted $\mathcal{K} = t \rightrightarrows h$ in this article, for which finite-dimensional representations are defined by pairs of matrices of the same size. In what follows, generalisations of such representations will play an important role, due to their connection to the concept of a *linear relation*. Recalling that a relation C from a set V to a set W is a subset of the direct product $V \times W$, in case V and W are vector spaces over a common field one describes C as a linear relation provided it defines a subspace. In case $V = W$ the projections onto each component together define a representation $C \rightrightarrows V$ of \mathcal{K} , and in Theorem 1.3 we analyse closure conditions on the category of linear relations as a subcategory of the category of representations of \mathcal{K} .

Considering linear relations as modules over the path algebra of \mathcal{K} is not new, and served as a useful perspective in joint work with Crawley-Boevey [5] during an application of the so-called *functorial filtrations* classification method. This method has always relied on a careful analysis of linear relations defined by generators of the algebra, considered as subspaces of the underlying vector space of an arbitrary module. Especially useful in this analysis is to obtain a *covering* statement and a *splitting* statement; see for example [5, Lemma 3.1] and [5, Corollary 1.3] respectively. In the authors’ thesis [4] the functorial filtrations method was adapted to situations where the ground field is replaced by a complete noetherian local ring.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16D70, Secondary 18E40.

Key words and phrases. Definable category, linear relation, linearly compact module, torsion pair.

Covering, in the sense eluded to above, states that any fixed element of a module is the initial entry in a sequence of elements in which consecutive pairs lie in certain relations. Essential to this statement is the observation that, for a given sequence of relations each defined by the (inverse of the) graph of a homomorphism, the set of such initial terms is the intersection of such sets running over finite sequences. Said observation is straightforward when all modules involved are artinian, however, more generally, it is sufficient to impose certain compactness assumptions relating to work of Zelinsky [28]. These assumptions are automatic for modules that are complete in an adic topology, and the resulting covering statement makes up Theorem 1.1. *Splitting* states that, when the aforementioned pairs lie in a common relation, the subset of sequences that are eventually trivial has a complement which satisfies certain closure operations. In the adaptation of the functorial filtration method in [4], one observes that this splitting statement is both unnecessary for the purposes of classification, as well as being false when the local ring has a non-zero jacobson radical. However, the splitting result can be generalised to a result that is again sufficient for classification, and this generalisation makes up the statement of Theorem 1.2.

A main result in [5] was a description of the indecomposable Σ -*pure-injective* modules over a possibly infinite-dimensional string algebra. Prest [18] introduced the notion of a *definable category* which has been seen to be a natural context in which to consider pure-injectivity; see for example [19]. Definable subcategories of a module category are characterised by certain closure operations, and it follows from Theorem 1.3 that the category of linear relations is definable.

1.2. Main theorems. Let R be a commutative ring. For left R -modules L and M , an R -linear relation from an R -module L to an R -module M is a submodule C of $L \oplus M$. A prototypical example is $\text{graph}(\theta) := \{(\ell, \theta(\ell)) \mid \ell \in L\}$ for some $\theta \in \text{Hom}_R(L, M)$. The *inverse* of C is $C^{-1} = \{(m, \ell) \in M \oplus L : (\ell, m) \in C\}$. For any $\ell \in L$ we let $C\ell = \{m \in M : (\ell, m) \in C\}$. Theorem 1.1 below is essentially Theorem 5.15.

Theorem 1.1. *Let R be complete local noetherian. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ define an R -linear relation C_i by*

$$C_i = \text{graph}(\lambda_i) \text{ where } \lambda_i \in \text{Hom}_R(M_{i+1}, M_i), \quad \text{or,} \quad C_i^{-1} = \text{graph}(\lambda_i) \text{ where } \lambda_i \in \text{Hom}_R(M_i, M_{i+1}).$$

Then $N_\infty = \bigcap_{j \in \mathbb{N}} N_j$ where $N_j = \{m_0 \in M_0 \mid \exists (m_i) \in \prod_{i < j} M_i : m_i \in C_i m_{i+1} \forall i\}$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.

An R -linear relation from M to M is referred to as an R -linear relation *on* M , for which we define

$$\begin{aligned} C'' &= \{m \in M : \exists (m_n) \in M^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ with } m_{n+1} \in C m_n \text{ for all } n \text{ and } m = m_0\}, \\ (\dagger) \quad C' &= \{m \in M : \exists (m_n) \in M^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ with } m_{n+1} \in C m_n \text{ for all } n, m = m_0 \text{ and } m_n = 0 \text{ for } n \gg 0\}, \\ C^\sharp &= C'' \cap (C^{-1})'', \quad C^\flat = C'' \cap (C^{-1})' + (C^{-1})'' \cap C' \end{aligned}$$

all R -submodules of M . Theorem 1.2 below generalises [8, Lemma 4.6] and is essentially Theorem 4.12.

Theorem 1.2. *If R is local and C is an R -linear relation on an R -module M such that $\text{rad}(M) \subseteq (C^{-1})' + C'$ and such that C^\sharp/C^\flat is finitely generated, then there exists an $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -module U , free over R , and $\rho \in \text{Hom}_R(U, M)$ such that $C^\sharp = C^\flat + \text{im}(\rho)$, $\rho^{-1}(C^\flat) = \text{rad}(U)$ and $\rho(Tu) \in C\rho(u)$ for all $u \in U$.*

Let $R\mathcal{K}$ be the path algebra of the Kronecker quiver \mathcal{K} . Theorem 1.3 is essentially Theorem 3.21.

Theorem 1.3. *$R\text{-Rel}$ is equivalent to an R -linear subcategory $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{K})$ of $R\mathcal{K}\text{-Mod}$ containing the regular representation $R\mathcal{K}$ which is precovering and closed under extensions, limits, filtered colimits and coproducts. In particular, $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{K})$ is covering, enveloping and a definable subcategory of $R\mathcal{K}\text{-Mod}$ containing every flat $R\mathcal{K}$ -module, and, as a faithful torsion-free class, forms part of a TTF-triple.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

Setup 2.1. All subcategories we consider in what follows will be assumed to be full, unless stated otherwise. Throughout §2 we let R be a (unital) ring with jacobson radical J and \mathcal{C} be a subcategory of $R\text{-Mod}$.

We begin by recalling some notions generalising projective covers and injective envelopes.

Definition 2.2. A morphism $b \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ is said to be *left* (respectively, *right*) *minimal* provided the only endomorphisms $a \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}$ with $ab = b$ (respectively, $c \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}$ with $bc = b$) must be isomorphisms.

[10, §1, p. 190] (c.f. [21, §1, p. 900]) Let M be a left R -module. We say $x \in \text{Hom}_R(M, C)$ is a \mathcal{C} -preenvelope of M if $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and for any $y \in \text{Hom}_R(M, C')$ with $C' \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $y = zx$ for some $z \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(C, C')$. The notion of a \mathcal{C} -precover is defined dually. By a \mathcal{C} -envelope (respectively, \mathcal{C} -cover) we mean a left (respectively, right) minimal \mathcal{C} -preenvelope (respectively, \mathcal{C} -precover). We say that \mathcal{C} is *enveloping* (respectively, *covering*) finite provided that every R -module admits a \mathcal{C} -envelope (respectively, \mathcal{C} -cover).

When \mathcal{C} is closed under direct sums and summands, following [2, p. 81] one says \mathcal{C} is *covariantly* (respectively, *contravariantly*) finite provided that every R -module admits a \mathcal{C} -preenvelope (respectively, \mathcal{C} -precover). Thus when \mathcal{C} is enveloping (respectively, covering) this condition is automatic. For abelian categories, the notion of a torsion pair was introduced by Dickson [9].

Definition 2.3. [25, Chapter IV, §1] We call \mathcal{C} a *pretorsion* (respectively, *pretorsion-free*) class if it is closed under quotients and coproducts (respectively, subobjects and products).

[9, p. 224] By a *torsion theory* inside the abelian category $R\text{-Mod}$ we mean a pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ of subcategories of $R\text{-Mod}$ satisfying the following conditions for each left R -module M .

- (1) If $M \in \mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{F}$ then we must have $M = 0$.
- (2) If $M \in \mathcal{T}$ then so does any quotient of M , meaning that $N \in \mathcal{T}$ whenever $M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ is exact.
- (3) If $M \in \mathcal{F}$ then so does any submodule of M , meaning that $L \in \mathcal{F}$ whenever $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M$ is exact.
- (4) There exists an exact sequence $\xi_M: 0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ with $L \in \mathcal{T}$ and $N \in \mathcal{F}$.

[6, Definition 4.3] A torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in $R\text{-Mod}$ is said to be *faithful* when the R -module R lies in \mathcal{F}^1 .

[26] A torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in $R\text{-Mod}$ is said to *split* if, for every R -module M , the short exact sequence ξ_M from condition (4) above, splits.

[25] A torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in $R\text{-Mod}$ is said to be *hereditary* if \mathcal{T} is closed under submodules.

We recall why any torsion theory consists of a pretorsion class together with pretorsion-free class.

Theorem 2.4. [9, Theorem 2.3] *The following statements hold for any subcategories \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{T} of $R\text{-Mod}$.*

- (1) $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F})$ is a torsion theory if and only if \mathcal{C} is closed under quotients, coproducts and extensions.
- (2) $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C})$ is a torsion theory if and only if \mathcal{C} is closed under subobjects, products and extensions.
- (3) [9, Proposition 3.3] $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ is a torsion theory if and only if we have the following equalities

$$\{M: \text{Hom}_R(T, M) = 0 \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{T}\} = \mathcal{F}, \quad \{M: \text{Hom}_R(M, F) = 0 \text{ for all } F \in \mathcal{F}\} = \mathcal{T}.$$

Proposition 2.5 provides a well-known characterisation of hereditary torsion theories.

Proposition 2.5. *The following statements are equivalent for a torsion theory $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in $R\text{-Mod}$.*

- (1) $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ is a hereditary torsion theory.
- (2) [25, Proposition 3.2] \mathcal{F} is closed under injective envelopes.
- (3) [25, Proposition 3.7] $\mathcal{T} = \{M: \text{Hom}_R(M, I) = 0\}$ for some injective module I .

¹Equivalently, every projective R -module lies in \mathcal{F} .

Proposition 2.6 recalls work of Rada and Saorín in which torsion theory is translated to covering theory.

Proposition 2.6. [21, Proposition 4.1, Proposition 4.11] *The following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) \mathcal{C} is a pretorsion class if and only if every R -module has an injective \mathcal{C} -cover.
- (2) \mathcal{C} is a pretorsion-free class if and only if every R -module has a surjective \mathcal{C} -envelope.

In Definition 2.7 we recall the definition of a pure-injective module.

Definition 2.7. Let M be an R -module and let I be a set. Let $\iota_I: \bigoplus_I M \rightarrow \prod_I M$ be the inclusion of the coproduct, into the product, of M indexed over I . The universal property of the coproduct defines an R -linear summation map $\sigma_I: \bigoplus_I M \rightarrow M$ that sends (m_i) to $\sum_i m_i$. Note σ_I makes sense since $m_i = 0$ for all but finitely many i . One says that M is *pure-injective* if, for any set I , there is a morphism $\tau_I: \prod_I M \rightarrow M$ such that $\tau_I \iota_I = \sigma_I$. One says that M is Σ -*pure-injective* if, for any set I , ι_I is a split monomorphism.

A module embedding $\theta: N \hookrightarrow M$ is said to be *pure* if $\mathbf{1}_L \otimes \theta$ is injective for any right R -module L .

Remark 2.8. Note that if M is Σ -pure-injective then one can see M is also pure-injective by setting $\tau_I := \sigma_I \pi_I$ in the notation of Definition 2.7, where $\pi_I \iota_I = \mathbf{1}_{\bigoplus_I M}$. Note also that Definition 2.7 is not the usual way to define pure-injective or Σ -pure-injective modules, however it is well-known to be equivalent; see, for example, the book by Jensen and Lenzing [15, Theorem 7.1(vi), Theorem 8.1(ii)]. In particular, note that a module N is pure-injective if and only if it is injective with respect to pure embeddings of the form $N \rightarrow M$.

Definable categories were introduced by Prest [18, §2.6] and characterised by Crawley-Boevey in [7, §2.3]. We use this characterisation as a basis for Definition 2.9.

Definition 2.9. We say \mathcal{C} is *definable* if it is closed under products, direct limits and pure submodules.

If \mathcal{C} is closed under directed colimits, then any module that has a \mathcal{C} -precover must also have a \mathcal{C} -cover; see for example [27, Theorem 2.2.12]. The category we are interested in is a torsion-free class, and with this in mind, we note a characterisation of definable torsion-free classes in $R\text{-Mod}$.

Theorem 2.10. [1, Theorem 2.7] *A torsion-free class \mathcal{F} in $R\text{-Mod}$ is definable if and only if every module has an \mathcal{F} -cover, in which case there is a pure injective module M such that every module in \mathcal{F} is a submodule of a direct product of copies of M .*

We recall some facts about morphisms between projective modules we use later. Recall that R is a *semilocal* ring provided R/J is an artinian ring, and hence a semisimple artinian ring.

Notation 2.11. We write $R\text{-Mod}$ for the category of left modules and $R\text{-Proj}$ for the subcategory of $R\text{-Mod}$ consisting of projective modules. For any object M of $R\text{-Mod}$ we write $\text{rad}(M)$ for the jacobson radical of M , meaning the intersection of the maximal submodules, or the sum of the superfluous submodules.

Hence for any object M in $R\text{-Mod}$, if R is semilocal or if M lies in $R\text{-Proj}$, then we have $\text{rad}(M) = JM$. See, for example, [16, Proposition 24.4, Theorem 24.7]. In particular, if L and M lie in $R\text{-Proj}$ and $g \in \text{Hom}_R(L, M)$ then the image of $JL = \text{rad}(L)$ under g lies in $JM = \text{rad}(M)$, and hence we define

$$\bar{g} \in \text{Hom}_R(L/\text{rad}(L), M/\text{rad}(M)), \quad \bar{g}(\ell + \text{rad}(L)) := g(\ell) + \text{rad}(M), \quad (\ell \in L).$$

We recall for context a well-known result about finitely generated projectives.

Lemma 2.12. [14, Lemma 2.1] *Let $g \in \text{Hom}_R(L, M)$ and assume the modules L and M are finitely generated and projective. If \bar{g} is an isomorphism then g is an isomorphism.*

For later use we recall a result due to Příhoda. To do so we use the terminology from [20, §2].

Definition 2.13. A *lift* of $h \in \text{Hom}_R(L/\text{rad}(L), M/\text{rad}(M))$ is a map $g \in \text{Hom}_R(L, M)$ with $\bar{g} = h$.

Theorem 2.14. [20, Theorem 2.3] *Let $L, M \in R\text{-Proj}$ and let $h \in \text{Hom}_R(L/\text{rad}(L), M/\text{rad}(M))$ be an isomorphism. Then there is an isomorphism $g \in \text{Hom}_R(L, M)$ which is a lift of h .*

We use the notion of a Morita context following the book by Bass [3, Chapters II and III].

Definition 2.15. A *Morita context* is a tuple $(R, S; N, L; \theta, \zeta)$ where R and S are rings, where ${}_R N_S, {}_S L_R$ are bimodules, where $\theta: N \otimes L \rightarrow R$ and $\zeta: L \otimes N \rightarrow S$ are bimodule homomorphisms and such that

$$\theta(n \otimes \ell)n' = n\zeta(\ell \otimes n'), \quad \ell\theta(n \otimes \ell') = \zeta(\ell \otimes n)\ell'$$

for each $\ell, \ell' \in L$ and $n, n' \in N$. It follows that there is a *ring of Morita context* denoted $[\begin{smallmatrix} R & N \\ L & S \end{smallmatrix}]$ whose ring multiplication is canonically defined by θ and ζ .

Remark 2.16. Given a Morita context $(R, S; N, L; \theta, \zeta)$ a left module over $[\begin{smallmatrix} R & N \\ L & S \end{smallmatrix}]$ is the same thing as a decorated column $[\begin{smallmatrix} M \\ K \end{smallmatrix}]_{\psi}^{\varphi}$ where M is a left R -module, K is a left S -module, and $\psi: L \otimes M \rightarrow K$ and $\varphi: N \otimes K \rightarrow M$ are left module homomorphisms such that, for each $k \in K, \ell \in L, m \in M$ and $n \in N$,

$$\theta(n \otimes \ell)m = \varphi(n \otimes \psi(\ell \otimes m)), \quad \zeta(\ell \otimes n)k = \psi(\ell \otimes \varphi(n \otimes k)).$$

Here the action of $[\begin{smallmatrix} R & N \\ L & S \end{smallmatrix}]$ is defined canonically by means of multiplying a length-2 column on the left. In case either of ψ or φ are 0 we omit the corresponding decoration.

Example 2.17. Given any rings R and S and any S - R -bimodule L there is a Morita context $(R, S; L, 0; 0, 0)$, and a left module over the ring $[\begin{smallmatrix} R & 0 \\ L & S \end{smallmatrix}]$ has the form $[\begin{smallmatrix} M \\ K \end{smallmatrix}]_{\psi}$ for a left R -module M , a left S -module K and a left S -module homomorphism $\psi: L \otimes M \rightarrow K$. That is, there is less to check when $N = 0$ in Remark 2.16.

In Theorem 2.19 we recall the form of flat and injective modules for triangular rings of Morita context. These results follow work of Fossum, Griffith and Reiten [11] and work of Haghany and Varadarajan [13]. See also work of Müller [17] and Stenström [24, Lemma, p. 163]. It is useful here to introduce notation for the tensor-hom adjunction.

Notation 2.18. Let R and S be rings, L be an S - R -bimodule, M be a left R -module and K be a left S -module. The image of the isomorphisms from the corresponding tensor-hom adjunction will be denoted

$$\text{Hom}_S(L \otimes M, K) \leftrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, \text{Hom}_S(L, K)), \quad \mu^{\circ} \leftrightarrow \mu^{\square}$$

meaning that, given either the left S -module homomorphism $\mu^{\circ}: L \otimes M \rightarrow K$ or the left R -module homomorphism $\mu^{\square}: M \rightarrow \text{Hom}_S(L, K)$, one defines the other map using the equation $\mu^{\circ}(\ell \otimes m) = (\mu^{\square}(m))(\ell)$.

Theorem 2.19. *Let R and S be rings, L be an S - R -bimodule, M be a left R -module, K be a left S -module, $\psi^{\circ}: L \otimes M \rightarrow K$ be a left S -module homomorphism. The following statements hold.*

- (1) [11, Proposition 1.14 (bis.)] (respectively, [13, Theorem 3.1]) *The left $[\begin{smallmatrix} R & 0 \\ L & S \end{smallmatrix}]$ -module $[\begin{smallmatrix} M \\ K \end{smallmatrix}]_{\psi^{\circ}}$ is flat (respectively, projective) if and only if M is a flat (respectively, projective) R -module, $\text{coker}(\psi^{\circ})$ is a flat (respectively, projective) S -module and ψ^{\square} is an injective function.*
- (2) [11, Corollary 1.6 (d)] *The left $[\begin{smallmatrix} R & 0 \\ L & S \end{smallmatrix}]$ -module $[\begin{smallmatrix} M \\ K \end{smallmatrix}]_{\psi^{\circ}}$ is injective if and only if K is an injective S -module, $\text{ker}(\psi^{\square})$ is an injective R -module and ψ^{\square} is a surjective function.*

We focus on representations of the Kronecker quiver over commutative rings. These will correspond to modules over a Morita context of the form $(R, R; R^2, 0; 0, 0)$ to which all of the observations so far apply. Also worth noting is the statement in Theorem 2.19 that ψ^{\square} is an injective function, a property which characterises objects in a subcategory we look at later.

Setup 2.20. For simplicity, from now on in §2 we assume the ring R is commutative.

Notation 2.21. Let \mathcal{Z} be the *Kronecker quiver*: two arrows a and b with the same tail t and same head h .

Write $R\mathcal{Z}$ for the *path algebra*, meaning the free left R -module $Re_t \oplus Re_h \oplus Ra \oplus Rb$ with multiplication

$$(r_t, r_h, r_a, r_b) \cdot (s_t, s_h, s_a, s_b) := (r_t s_t, r_h s_h, r_a s_t + r_h s_a, r_b s_t + r_h s_b), \quad (r_t, s_t, r_h, s_h, r_a, s_a, r_b, s_b \in R).$$

Here, as the notation indicates, we identify the paths in \mathcal{Z} as follows

$$e_t = (1, 0, 0, 0), \quad e_h = (0, 1, 0, 0), \quad a = (0, 0, 1, 0), \quad b = (0, 0, 0, 1).$$

Write $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ for the category of *representations*, whose objects are given by tuples $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ where M_t, M_h are left R -modules and $\mu_a, \mu_b \in \text{Hom}_R(M_t, M_h)$, and whose morphisms are defined by

$$\text{Hom}_{R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})}((L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b), (M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)) := \left\{ (f_t, f_h) \left| \begin{array}{l} f_x \in \text{Hom}_R(M_x, N_x) \text{ for } x = t, h, \\ \text{such that } f_h \lambda_c = \mu_c f_t \text{ for } c = a, b. \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Composing $(f_t, f_h): (L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b) \rightarrow (M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ with $(g_t, g_h): (M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b) \rightarrow (N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ is performed by setting $(g_t, g_h) \circ (f_t, f_h) := (g_t f_t, g_h f_h)$. The identity morphisms in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ with respect to this composition are defined by $\mathbf{1}_{(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)} := (\mathbf{1}_{M_t}, \mathbf{1}_{M_h})$.

Write $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ for the subcategory of $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ consisting of representations $(L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ such that the map $L_t \rightarrow L_h \oplus L_h$ given by $\ell \mapsto (\lambda_a(\ell), \lambda_b(\ell))$ is injective.

Remark 2.22. Considering \mathcal{Z} as a category, it follows that $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ is the category of functors of the form $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$. As is well-known, $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $R\mathcal{Z}\text{-Mod}$ are R -linear categories, and there is an R -linear equivalence $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow R\mathcal{Z}\text{-Mod}$ sending $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ to $M_t \oplus M_h$ with the $R\mathcal{Z}$ -action given by

$$(r_t, r_h, r_a, r_b) \cdot (m_t, m_h) := (r_t m_t, r_a \mu_a(m_t) + r_b \mu_b(m_t) + r_h m_h), \quad (m_t \in M_t, m_h \in M_h).$$

There is an R -algebra isomorphism between the path algebra and the lower-triangular ring of Morita context

$$R\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ R^2 & R \end{bmatrix}, \quad e_t \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ (0,0) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, e_h \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ (0,0) & 1 \end{pmatrix}, a \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ (1,0) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, b \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ (0,1) & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

See for example the work of Göbel and Simson [12, p. 215].

We note a technical observation. Although trivial, it will be useful to refer to later.

Lemma 2.23. *For any object $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ of $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ there is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} M_t & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & M_t^2 & \xrightarrow{\cong} & R^2 \otimes M_t \\ \mu^\square \downarrow & & \begin{pmatrix} \mu_a & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_b \end{pmatrix} \downarrow & \searrow^{(\mu_a \ \mu_b)} & \downarrow \mu^\circ \\ \text{Hom}_R(R^2, M_h) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & M_h^2 & \xrightarrow{\Sigma} & M_h \end{array} \quad (\dagger)$$

where Δ is the diagonal embedding, Σ is the summation projection and the isomorphisms are canonical. In particular, in terms of Remark 2.22, $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ corresponds to the left $\begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ R^2 & R \end{bmatrix}$ -module $\begin{bmatrix} M_t \\ M_h \end{bmatrix}_{\mu^\circ}$.

Proof. To begin we define the functions involved in the statement. The isomorphisms are defined and denoted

$\alpha: \text{Hom}_R(R^2, M_h) \rightarrow M_h^2$, $f \mapsto (f(1, 0), f(0, 1))$, $\beta: M_t^2 \rightarrow R^2 \otimes M_t$, $(m, m') \mapsto (1, 0) \otimes m + (0, 1) \otimes m'$ and $\Delta(m'') = (m'', m'')$ and $\Sigma(m, m') = m + m'$ for all $f \in \text{Hom}_R(R^2, M_h)$ and all $m, m', m'' \in M_t$. Now letting $\mu^\circ := (\mu_a \ \mu_b)\beta^{-1}$ in terms of Notation 2.18, we have

$$\mu^\square(m)(r, r') = \mu^\circ((r, r') \otimes m) = \mu^\circ((1, 0) \otimes rm + (0, 1) \otimes r'm) = \mu^\circ(\beta(rm, r'm)) = \mu_a(rm) + \mu_b(r'm)$$

for all $r, r' \in R$ and $m \in M_t$, and so $\alpha(\mu^\square(m)) = (\mu_a(m), \mu_b(m))$ for all such m , as required. \square

Lemma 2.24. For any object $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ of $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ the following statements hold.

- (1) $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ is flat (respectively, projective) if and only if M_t and $\text{coker}(\mu_a \ \mu_b)$ are flat (respectively, projective) over R and $(\mu_a \ \mu_b): M_t^2 \rightarrow M_h$ is injective, in which case so is $(\mu_a \ \mu_b): M_t \rightarrow M_h^2$.
- (2) $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ is injective if and only if M_h and $\ker(\mu_a \ \mu_b)$ are injective over R and $(\mu_a \ \mu_b): M_t \rightarrow M_h^2$ is surjective, in which case so is $(\mu_a \ \mu_b): M_t^2 \rightarrow M_h$.

Proof. Recall the diagram (\dagger) from Lemma 2.23, and that $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ corresponds to the left $\begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ R^2 & R \end{bmatrix}$ -module $\begin{bmatrix} M_t \\ M_h \end{bmatrix}_{\mu \circ}$. Furthermore, we can observe from (\dagger) that $\text{coker}(\mu_a \ \mu_b) \cong \text{coker}(\mu \circ)$ and that $\ker(\mu_a \ \mu_b) \cong \ker(\mu \square)$. Hence the stated characterisations of flatness (respectively, projectivity) and injectivity are, respectively, the direct translations of parts (1) and (2) of Theorem 2.19.

Additionally, assuming $(\mu_a \ \mu_b) = \Sigma \begin{pmatrix} \mu_a & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_b \end{pmatrix}$ is injective implies $\begin{pmatrix} \mu_a & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_b \end{pmatrix}$ is injective, and hence that $\begin{pmatrix} \mu_a \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \Delta$ is injective. Dually if $\begin{pmatrix} \mu_a \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is surjective then so is $(\mu_a \ \mu_b)$, as required. \square

Recall that a *topological ring* (respectively, module) is one with a topology for which multiplication (respectively, the action) and addition are continuous. For example, a filtration on R is a descending chain of ideals R_i ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) with $R_i R_j \subseteq R_{i+j}$. In the sequel we follow a book by Singh [23].

Definition 2.25. [23, §8.1] As is common, one can consider the *adic* filtration of R defined by the powers I^n of an ideal I . Likewise these powers define a filtration on a module M by means of the submodules $I^n M$.

Most of the facts that we will want concerning topological rings and modules are summarised in Remark 2.26. They will not be used until Section 5.

Remark 2.26. Note that filtered modules are topological modules, meaning that the binary operation of addition, and the unary operation of taking the additive inverse, are both continuous.

Let L and M be filtered modules. The following is standard; see for example [23, Lemma 8.2.1].

- (1) The sets $m + M_n$ with $m \in M$ and $n \geq 0$ are all clopen sets for the topology on M , and together define a fundamental system of neighbourhoods of x . In particular, $\{M_n \mid n \geq 0\}$ defines a fundamental system of neighborhoods of 0. This is a nice feature of filtered modules.
- (2) The topology on M is Hausdorff if and only if $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n = 0$. A sequence $(m_n \mid n \geq 0)$ of elements $m_n \in M$ is Cauchy if and only if, for each $n \geq 0$, there exists $d(n) \geq 0$ such that $m_{d+1} - m_d \in M_{d(n)}$ for all $d \geq n$. If M is Hausdorff, and if every Cauchy sequence converges, then the universal morphism from M to the inverse limit of M/M_n is an isomorphism.
- (3) Any submodule N of a filtered module M itself is filtered by the subspace topology, given by the filtration $\{N \cap M_n \mid n \geq 0\}$. Similarly M/N is filtered by $\{(N + M_n)/N \mid n \geq 0\}$.
- (4) An R -linear homomorphism $f: L \rightarrow M$ is continuous if and only if, for each $n \geq 0$, there exists $d(n) \geq 0$ such that $f(\ell) \in M_n$ for all $\ell \in L_{d(n)}$.
- (5) For a subset $S \subseteq M$ the closure of S is $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} (S + M_n)$; see [23, Exercise 8.4]. In particular, if $S = m + N$ for a submodule N with $M_n \subseteq N$ for $n \gg 0$, it follows that $m + N$ is closed.

By (5), for any $m \in M$ any element ℓ lying in the closure $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} (m + M_n)$ of $\{m\}$ satisfies $\ell - m \in \bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n$. Considering (1), this is consistent with the fact that singletons are closed in Hausdorff topological spaces.

A standard example that will be useful later is the adic filtration defined by the jacobson radical.

Example 2.27. Writing J for the jacobson radical of R , the adic filtration for J enjoys many properties. For example, if R is noetherian then $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} J^n M = 0$ for any finitely generated R -module M . This is a consequence of the Artin–Rees theorem; see for example [23, Corollary 8.1.4].

3. LINEAR RELATIONS AND KRONECKER REPRESENTATIONS

Setup 3.1. Throughout §3 we let R be a unital, associative and commutative ring.

Definition 3.2. For left R -modules L and M , an R -linear relation from L to M is an R -submodule C of the direct sum $L \oplus M$. An R -linear relation from M to M is referred to as an R -linear relation on M .

Notation 3.3. Let C be an R -linear relation from L to M . For any $\ell \in L$ and any subset $S \subseteq L$ let

$$C\ell := \{m \in M : (\ell, m) \in C\}, \quad CS := \bigcup_{\ell \in S} C\ell = \{m \in M : (\ell, m) \in C \text{ for some } \ell \in S\}.$$

Example 3.4. If $f: L \rightarrow M$ is an R -linear map then its *graph* is the R -linear relation $\{(\ell, f(\ell)) \mid \ell \in L\}$ from L to M . Conversely, if C is an R -linear relation from L to M such that $C0 = 0$, then the assignment $\ell \mapsto m$ if and only if $m \in C\ell$ gives a well-defined R -linear map $f: L \rightarrow M$, in which case C is the graph of f .

Example 3.4 defines the prototypical building block of the relations we have in mind.

Notation 3.5. Let C be an R -linear relation from L to M and D be an R -linear relation from M to N . The *composition* DC is the relation from L to N given by

$$DC := \{(\ell, n) \in L \oplus N : \text{there exists } m \in M \text{ with } (m, n) \in D, (\ell, m) \in C\}$$

Example 3.6. Combining Example 3.4 with Notation 3.5, if $f: L \rightarrow M$ and $g: M \rightarrow N$ are R -linear maps, and if C is the graph of f and if D is the graph of g , then DC is the graph of gf .

Notation 3.7. Let C be an R -linear relation from L to M . The *inverse* C^{-1} is the relation from M to L given by $C^{-1} := \{(m, \ell) \in M \oplus L : (\ell, m) \in C\}$.

Example 3.8. Let I be an ideal in R and let M be the quotient F/K of the free module $F = Rz_0 \oplus Rz_1$ by the submodule $K = Iz_1$, and for each $i = 0, 1$ let $\bar{z}_i = z_i + K$. Define the R -linear map $f: M \rightarrow M$ by $f(r\bar{z}_0 + s\bar{z}_1) = r\bar{z}_1$, and let C be the graph of f . Since $f^2 = 0$ it follows that $CC = M \oplus 0$

Let $D = C^{-1}C$ considered as an R -linear relation on M . By definition, if $r, r', s, s' \in R$ and

$$m = r\bar{z}_0 + s\bar{z}_1, \quad m' = r'\bar{z}_0 + s'\bar{z}_1$$

then $(m, m') \in D$ if and only if $f(m) = f(m')$ if and only if $(r - r')\bar{z}_1 = 0$ if and only if $r - r' \in I$. For example, if $I = R$ then $D = M \oplus M \cong R \oplus R$. For another example, if $I = 0$ then $K = 0$ and $D \cong R \oplus R \oplus R$.

Definition 3.9. The category $R\text{-Rel}$ of R -linear relations is defined as follows. The objects of $R\text{-Rel}$ are pairs (M, C) where C is a relation on a left R -module M . Given a pair $(L, B), (M, C)$ of such objects we let

$$\text{Hom}_{R\text{-Rel}}((L, B), (M, C)) := \{\langle f \rangle \mid f \in \text{Hom}_R(L, M) : (f(x), f(y)) \in C \text{ for all } (x, y) \in B\}.$$

We emphasise here that the brackets around $\langle f \rangle$ exist only to distinguish it from f . The composition of morphisms $\langle f \rangle: (L, B) \rightarrow (M, C)$ and $\langle g \rangle: (M, C) \rightarrow (N, D)$ is defined by $\langle g \rangle \circ \langle f \rangle := \langle gf \rangle$, which makes sense since for each $(x, y) \in B$ we have $(f(x), f(y)) \in C$ and hence $(g(f(x)), g(f(y))) \in D$. The identity morphisms in $R\text{-Rel}$ with respect to this composition are defined by $\mathbf{1}_{(M, C)} := \langle \mathbf{1}_M \rangle$.

Lemma 3.10. *There is a R -linear fully-faithful functor $\nabla_R: R\text{-Rel} \rightarrow R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. Define ∇_R on objects (M, C) by $(C, M; \alpha_{(M, C)}, \beta_{(M, C)})$ where $\alpha_{(M, C)}(x, y) = x$ and $\beta_{(M, C)}(x, y) = y$ for each $(x, y) \in C$. Let $\langle f \rangle \in \text{Hom}_{R\text{-Rel}}((L, B), (M, C))$ for some R -linear map $f: L \rightarrow M$ with $(f(x), f(y)) \in C$ for all $(x, y) \in B$. We now define the morphism

$$\nabla_R(\langle f \rangle) := (f_\Delta, f) \in \text{Hom}_{R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})}((B, L; \alpha_{(L, B)}, \beta_{(L, B)}), (C, M; \alpha_{(M, C)}, \beta_{(M, C)})).$$

Declare $f_\Delta: B \rightarrow C$ to be the R -linear map given by $(x, y) \mapsto (f(x), f(y))$. To see that $\nabla_R(\langle f \rangle)$ is a morphism in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$, consider that for each $(x, y) \in C$ we have

$$f(\alpha_{(L,B)}(x, y)) = f(x) = \alpha_{(M,C)}(f_\Delta(x, y)), \quad f(\beta_{(L,B)}(x, y)) = f(y) = \beta_{(M,C)}(f_\Delta(x, y)).$$

It is clear ∇_R respects composition and the identity morphisms. For any $r \in R$ we have $rf_\Delta = (rf)_\Delta$ since $r(f(x), f(y)) = ((rf)(x), (rf)(y))$ for all $(x, y) \in B$. Thus we have $r\nabla_R(\langle f \rangle) = \nabla_R(\langle rf \rangle)$ giving that ∇_R is R -linear. To see that ∇_R is full, for any morphism $(f_t, f_h): (B, L; \alpha_{(L,B)}, \beta_{(L,B)}) \rightarrow (C, M; \alpha_{(M,C)}, \beta_{(M,C)})$,

$$f_t(x, y) = (\alpha_{(M,C)}(f_t(x, y)), \beta_{(M,C)}(f_t(x, y))) = (f_h(\alpha_{(L,B)}(x, y)), f_h(\beta_{(L,B)}(x, y))) = (f_h(x), f_h(y)),$$

meaning that $(f_h)_\Delta = f_t$, and so $(f_t, f_h) = \nabla_R(\langle f_h \rangle)$. Since ∇_R is R -linear, it is straightforward to see that ∇_R is also faithful, since the zero morphism on $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ is given by $(0_{M_t}, 0_{M_h})$. \square

Notation 3.11. Write $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ for the subcategory of $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ consisting of objects $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ such that the morphism $(\mu_a, \mu_b): M_t \rightarrow M_h^2$ is injective, that is, such that $\ker(\mu_a) \cap \ker(\mu_b) = 0$.

Lemma 3.12. $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is the essential image of the functor ∇_R from Lemma 3.10.

Proof. Suppose we are given an arbitrary isomorphism $(\theta_t, \theta_h): (L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b) \rightarrow (C, M; \alpha_{(M,C)}, \beta_{(M,C)})$. By Lemma 3.10, and since θ is a morphism in the category $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$, for each $\ell \in L_t$ we have

$$\theta_t(\ell) = (\alpha_{(M,C)}(\theta_t(\ell)), \beta_{(M,C)}(\theta_t(\ell))), \quad \alpha_{(M,C)}(\theta_t(\ell)) = \theta_h(\lambda_a(\ell)), \quad \beta_{(M,C)}(\theta_t(\ell)) = \theta_h(\lambda_b(\ell)).$$

Now suppose $\lambda_a(\ell) = 0$ and $\lambda_b(\ell) = 0$. Using the equations above this means that $\theta_t(\ell) = 0$, meaning that $\ell = 0$ since θ_t is injective. On the other hand, sending (x, y) to $(x, y) = (\alpha_{(M,C)}(x, y), \beta_{(M,C)}(x, y))$ clearly defines an injective map of the form $C \rightarrow M \oplus M$. \square

Lemma 3.13. The following statements hold for any sequence in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ of the form

$$(L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b) \xrightarrow{(f_t, f_h)} (M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b) \xrightarrow{(g_t, g_h)} (N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b) \quad (*)$$

(1) The sequence $(*)$ is exact if and only if the diagrams in $R\text{-Mod}$ below are exact sequences

$$L_t \xrightarrow{f_t} M_t \xrightarrow{g_t} N_t \quad L_h \xrightarrow{f_h} M_h \xrightarrow{g_h} N_h \quad (**)$$

(2) Assume that $(*)$ is exact and that f_h is injective. If $(L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ and $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ lie in the subcategory $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ then so too does $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$.

Proof. (1) is straightforward and well-known, see Remark 2.22. For (2) we fix $m \in M_t$ such that $\mu_a(m) = 0$ and $\mu_b(m) = 0$, and it remains to prove that $m = 0$. Since (g_t, g_h) is a morphism in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ we have $\eta_a(g_t(m)) = g_h(\mu_a(m)) = 0$ and similarly $\eta_b(g_t(m)) = 0$ and so, since $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ lies in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$, we have $g_t(m) = 0$. Since $(*)$ is exact, by (1) the sequences in $(**)$ are both exact, and so $m = f_t(\ell)$ for some $\ell \in L_t$. Since (f_t, f_h) is a morphism in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ we have $f_h(\lambda_a(\ell)) = \mu_a(m) = 0$ and so $\lambda_a(\ell) = 0$ since f_h is injective. Similarly $\lambda_b(\ell) = 0$. Since $(L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ lies in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ this means $\ell = 0$ and so $m = 0$. \square

In Remark 3.14 we see how the converse of Lemma 3.13(2) fails. This observation was inspired by the representation theory of the Kronecker quiver in the classical case where R is a field: the exact sequence we consider is an Auslander–Reiten sequence defined by the extension of the right-most preinjective module by the left-most preprojective module

Remark 3.14. Let $L_t = N_h = 0$, $L_h = M_t = M_h = N_t = R$ and $\mu_a = \mu_b = \mathbf{1}_R$. Then $(L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ and $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ lie in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$, but $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ does not lie in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$.

Lemma 3.15. *The category $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is closed under subobjects, extensions, limits and coproducts.*

Proof. We firstly prove that $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is closed under products. Let I be a set, $(M_t(i), M_h(i); \mu_a(i), \mu_b(i))$ be an object in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ for each $i \in I$ and $(P_t, P_h; \rho_a, \rho_b)$ be their product in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$. By definition,

$$P_t = \prod_{i \in I} M_t(i), \quad P_h = \prod_{i \in I} M_h(i), \quad \rho_c((m_i)) = (\mu_c(i)(m_i)) \quad (c = a, b)$$

where $m_i \in M_t(i)$ for each i . Now suppose $\rho_a((m_i)) = 0$ and $\rho_b((m_i)) = 0$. It follows that, for each i , we have $\mu_a(i)(m_i) = 0$ and $\mu_b(i)(m_i) = 0$, meaning that $m_i = 0$ since $(M_t(i), M_h(i); \mu_a(i), \mu_b(i))$ lies in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$. Thus $(P_t, P_h; \rho_a, \rho_b)$ lies in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$, and so $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is closed under products.

We secondly check that $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is closed under subobjects. To see this, let $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ be an object in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$, and let (g_t, g_h) be a monomorphism from an object $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ whose codomain is $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$. Taking $(L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b) = 0$ in Lemma 3.13 it follows immediately that $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ lies in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$, and so $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is closed under subobjects.

Since being closed under limits is equivalent to being closed under products and kernels, it follows immediately that $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is closed under limits. Likewise $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is closed under coproducts since they are subobjects of products. By Lemma 3.13(2), $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ is extension closed. \square

By Theorem 2.4(2), Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 3.15 it follows that every object in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ has an $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ -envelope defined by an epimorphism. We construct this explicitly in Proposition 3.16.

Proposition 3.16. *For any $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$, setting $K = \ker(\mu_a) \cap \ker(\mu_b)$ and*

$L_t = M_t/K, \quad L_h = M_h, \quad \lambda_a(m + K) = \mu_a(m), \quad \lambda_b(m + K) = \mu_b(m), \quad f_t(m) = m + K, \quad f_h(m') = m'$
for each $m \in M_t$ and $m' \in M_h$ defines an $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ -envelope $(f_t, f_h): (M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b) \rightarrow (L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b)$.

Proof. If $\lambda_a(m + K) = 0$ and $\lambda_b(m + K) = 0$ then $\mu_a(m) = 0$ and $\mu_b(m) = 0$, meaning $m \in K$ and so $m + K = 0$. Observe also that $\lambda_c f_t = f_h \mu_c$ for each $c = a, b$. Now let (g_t, g_h) be a morphism of representations of the form $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b) \rightarrow (N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ where $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ lies in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$. By definition, for any $m \in K$ this means $\eta_a(g_t(m)) = g_h(\mu_a(m)) = 0$ and similarly $\eta_b(g_t(m)) = 0$, and so $g_t(m) = 0$. Thus there is a well-defined morphism $k_t: L_t \rightarrow M_t$ such that $k_t f_t = g_t$. Setting $k_h = g_h$ then completes the construction of a morphism $(k_t, k_h): (L_t, L_h; \lambda_a, \lambda_b) \rightarrow (N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ such that $(k_t, k_h)(f_t, f_h) = (g_t, g_h)$.

This shows (f_t, f_h) is a $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ -preenvelope. Since f_t and f_h are both surjective, the pair (f_t, f_h) defines an epimorphism by Lemma 3.13, and so (f_t, f_h) is a $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ -envelope. \square

Lemma 3.17. *An object $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ lies in ${}^\perp R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ if and only if $M_h = 0$.*

Proof. Firstly suppose $M_h \neq 0$, and let $M := M_h$. Let $N_t = M^2$ and $N_h = M$. Define $\eta_a, \eta_b: N_t \rightarrow N_h$ by $\eta_a(m, m') = m$ and $\eta_b(m, m') = m'$ for each $m, m' \in M$. Hence if $\eta_a(m, m') = 0$ and $\eta_b(m, m') = 0$ then $(m, m') = (0, 0)$, meaning $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ lies in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$. Furthermore there is a morphism $(f_t, f_h): (M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b) \rightarrow (N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{Z})$ defined by setting $f_t(m, m') = (\mu_a(m), \mu_b(m))$ and $f_h = \mathbf{1}_M$. We have shown in this first case that $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ cannot lie in ${}^\perp R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$.

Secondly, suppose $M_h = 0$, and let (f_t, f_h) be an arbitrary morphism from $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ to an object $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$. Hence $f_h = 0$. Furthermore, if $m \in M_t$ then $\eta_a(f_t(m)) = f_h(\mu_a(m)) = 0$ and similarly $\eta_b(f_t(m)) = 0$, and since $(N_t, N_h; \eta_a, \eta_b)$ lies in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z})$ this means $f_t(m) = 0$, as required. \square

Combining Lemma 3.15 and Theorem 2.4 we have a torsion theory.

Proposition 3.18. *$({}^\perp R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z}), R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{Z}))$ is split if and only if R is a finite product of fields.*

Proof. Since R is assumed to be a commutative ring, we note that R is a finite product of fields if and only if it is a semisimple ring by the Wedderburn–Artin theorem. Given any object $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})$, by Lemma 3.15 and Proposition 3.16 there is a short exact sequence

$$\xi_{(M; \mu)}: 0 \longrightarrow (M'_t, 0; 0, 0) \xrightarrow{(\iota_t, 0)} (M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b) \xrightarrow{(\pi_t, \mathbf{1}_{M_h})} (M_t/M'_t, M_h; \bar{\mu}_a, \bar{\mu}_b) \longrightarrow 0$$

where $M'_t := \ker(\mu_a) \cap \ker(\mu_b)$, $\iota_t: M'_t \rightarrow M_t$ is the inclusion map, $\pi_t: M_t \rightarrow M_t/M'_t$ is the quotient map and, for each $x = a, b$, the map $\bar{\mu}_x: M_t/M'_t \rightarrow M_h$ sends $m + M'_t$ to $\mu_x(m)$. Recall that, by Lemma 3.13, that $\xi_{(M; \mu)}$ is a short exact sequence follows from the exactness of $\xi_M: 0 \rightarrow M'_t \rightarrow M_t \rightarrow M_t/M'_t \rightarrow 0$.

On the one hand, if R is semisimple then the short exact sequence ξ_M of R -modules splits, giving a retract $\rho_t: M_t \rightarrow M'_t$ of ι_t , and this defines a retract $(\rho_t, 0)$ of $(\iota_t, 0)$ in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})$.

On the other hand, any exact sequence $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ in $R\text{-Mod}$ is given by the kernel $L = \ker(\pi)$ of a surjective map $\pi: M \rightarrow N$, in which case there is an object $(M, N; \pi, \pi)$ in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})$. As above, assuming the corresponding exact sequence $\xi_{(M, N; \pi, \pi)}$ splits then so does $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$. Thus if any $\xi_{(M; \mu)}$ splits then R is semisimple, as required. \square

Colimits in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ are computed pointwise, since it is a category of functors with a cocomplete target; see Remark 2.22. Hence Lemma 3.19 follows from the fact that directed colimits: of exact sequences are exact; and commute with finite limits. Never-the-less, for accessibility we provide a detailed proof below.

Lemma 3.19. *$R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{A})$ is closed under directed colimits.*

Proof. Consider the colimit diagram associated with a directed system in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})$, given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & f_t^{ij} & & f_h^{ij} \\
 & & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowleft \\
 M_t^i & \xrightarrow{\mu_a^i} & M_h^i & \xrightarrow{\mu_a^j} & M_t^j & \xrightarrow{\mu_a^j} & M_h^j \\
 & \xrightarrow{\mu_b^i} & & & & \xrightarrow{\mu_b^j} & \\
 \varphi_t^i & \searrow & \varphi_t^j & \swarrow & \varphi_h^i & \swarrow & \varphi_h^j \\
 & & M_t & \xrightarrow{\mu_a} & M_h & & \\
 & & \xrightarrow{\mu_b} & & & &
 \end{array}$$

in $R\text{-Mod}$ where the equations below hold for all $c = a, b$ and all i, j running through some directed set I ,

$$\mu_c^j f_t^{ij} = f_h^{ij} \mu_c^i, \quad \mu_c \varphi_t^i = \varphi_h^i \mu_c^i, \quad \varphi_t^j f_t^{ij} = \varphi_t^i, \quad \varphi_h^j f_h^{ij} = \varphi_h^i.$$

In particular $(M_t, M_h; \mu_a, \mu_b)$ is the directed colimit in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{A})$. Hence $M_t \cong \bigoplus_i M_t^i/N_t$ and $M_h \cong \bigoplus_i M_h^i/N_h$ where (m^i) lies in N_t (respectively, N_h) precisely when there exists $k \in I$ with $m^i = 0$ for $i < k$ and $m^i = f_t^{ki}(m^k)$ (respectively, $m^i = f_h^{ki}(m^k)$) for $i \geq k$. Furthermore, by the functoriality (or rather, uniqueness) of colimits, we have $\mu_c((m^i) + N_t) = (\mu_c^i(m^i)) + N_h$ for each $c = a, b$.

We now assume $(M_t^i, M_h^i; \mu_a^i, \mu_b^i)$ defines an object in $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{A})$, meaning $\ker(\mu_a^i) \cap \ker(\mu_b^i) = 0$, for each i . From here, to complete the proof it suffices to prove that $(m^i) \in N_t$ assuming $(m^i) \in \ker(\mu_a) \cap \ker(\mu_b)$. The assumption gives integers $k(a), k(b) \in I$ such that, for each $c = a, b$, we have $\mu_c^i(m^i) = 0$ for $i < k(c)$ and $\mu_c^i(m^i) = f_t^{k(c)i}(\mu_c^{k(c)}(m^{k(c)}))$ for $i \geq k_c$. Without loss of generality, $k(a) \geq k(b)$. From here we claim

- (1) $m^i = 0$ if $i < k(b)$, (2) $m^i = f_t^{k(b)i}(m^{k(b)})$ if $k(b) \leq i < k(a)$, (3) $m^i = f_t^{k(a)i}(m^{k(a)})$ if $k(a) \leq i$.

If we show claims (1), (2) and (3) hold then it follows that $(m^i) = (m_b^i) + (m_a^i)$ where $(m_b^i), (m_a^i) \in \bigoplus_i M_t^i$ are defined by $m_b^i := 0$ for $i < k(b)$, $m_b^i := f_t^{k(b)i}(m^{k(b)})$ for $i \geq k(b)$, $m_a^i := 0$ for $i < k(a)$ and $m_a^i := f_t^{k(a)i}(m^{k(a)} - f_t^{k(b)k(a)}(m^{k(b)}))$ for $i \geq k(a)$. Thus to complete the proof we just check (1), (2) and (3).

For each equation it is necessary and sufficient to prove that the difference of the given expressions lies in $\ker(\mu_a^i) \cap \ker(\mu_b^i) = 0$. Recall, for each $c = a, b$, that $m^i - f_t^{k(c)i}(m^{k(c)}) \in \ker(\mu_c^i)$ for $k(c) \leq i$.

(1) If $i < k(b)$ then also $i < k(a)$ and so $\mu_b^i(m^i) = 0 = \mu_b^i(m^i)$.

(2) If $i < k(a)$ then $m^i \in \ker(\mu_a^i)$ and also $\mu_a^i f_t^{k(b)i} = f_h^{k(b)i} \mu_a^{k(b)}$ and so $f_t^{k(b)i}(m^{k(b)}) \in \ker(\mu_a^i)$.

(3) Note that $m^i - f_t^{k(a)i}(m^{k(a)}) = x + f_t^{k(a)i}(y)$ where $x = m^i - f_t^{k(b)i}(m^{k(b)})$ and $y = f_t^{k(b)k(a)} m^{k(b)} - m^{k(a)}$, and when $k(b) \leq k(a) \leq i$ we have $x \in \ker(\mu_b^i)$, $\mu_b^i f_t^{k(a)i} = f_h^{k(a)i} \mu_b^{k(a)}$ and $y \in \ker(\mu_b^{k(a)})$ since $k(b) \leq k(a)$. \square

Remark 3.20. By Remark 3.14 we have that $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$ is never closed under quotients, and by Proposition 2.6(2) this means that defining monomorphic $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$ -covers of arbitrary objects in $R\text{-Rep}(\mathcal{X})$ is impossible. Never-the-less, as we shall see in Theorem 3.21, $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$ is still covering.

Theorem 3.21. *As an R -linear subcategory of $R\mathcal{X}\text{-Mod}$, $R\text{-Rel}$ is: covering and enveloping; closed under extensions, limits, filtered colimits and coproducts; and a definable functorially finite subcategory of $R\mathcal{X}\text{-Mod}$ containing every flat $R\mathcal{X}$ -module such that*

$$R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})^\perp = e_t R\mathcal{X} e_t\text{-Mod}, \quad e_t R\mathcal{X} e_t\text{-Mod}^\perp = e_h R\mathcal{X} e_h\text{-Mod}.$$

In particular, $R\text{-Rel}$ is the torsion-free class in a faithful hereditary torsion theory.

Proof. By Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 3.12 we have an R -linear equivalence between $R\text{-Rel}$ and $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$. By Lemma 3.15 the category $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under subobjects, extensions, limits and coproducts. By Theorem 2.4(2) this means $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$ is a torsion-free class. By Proposition 2.6 this means $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$ is enveloping. By Lemma 3.19 $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under directed colimits, and hence definable since it is closed under (pure) subobjects and (discrete) limits; see Definition 2.9. By Theorem 2.10 this means $R\text{-Rel}(\mathcal{X})$ is covering. By Lemma 2.24 this torsion-free class contains every projective $R\mathcal{X}$ -module, and so it is faithful. By Theorem 2.4(3) and Lemma 3.17 the corresponding torsion class is precisely $e_t R\mathcal{X} e_t\text{-Mod}$, and since this is closed under submodules, the corresponding torsion theory is hereditary. \square

4. REDUCTIONS OF RELATIONS OVER LOCAL RINGS

Setup 4.1. In §4 we assume (R, J, S) is *local*, meaning (as usual) that R is a local noetherian ring where J denotes the unique maximal ideal and S denotes the residue field.

Notation 4.2. For any object (M, C) of $R\text{-Rel}$ define the R -submodules C' and C'' of M by

$$\begin{aligned} C'' &= \{m \in M : \exists (m_n) \in M^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ with } m_{n+1} \in C m_n \text{ for all } n \text{ and } m = m_0\}, \\ C' &= \{m \in M : \exists (m_n) \in M^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ with } m_{n+1} \in C m_n \text{ for all } n, m = m_0 \text{ and } m_n = 0 \text{ for } n \gg 0\}, \\ C^\sharp &= C'' \cap (C^{-1})'', \quad C^\flat = C''' \cap (C^{-1})' + (C^{-1})'' \cap C'. \end{aligned}$$

Example 4.3. Recall Example 3.4. When C is the graph of a map f then CS is the image of S under f . Momentarily consider the case where R is the field S and (C, M) is an S -linear relation. Then the subspace C' is equal to the *stable kernel* $\bigcup_{n>0} C^n 0$, and C'' is a subspace of the *stable image* $\bigcap_{n>0} C^n V$, as defined by Ringel [22, §2]. Furthermore if $\dim_k(M) < \infty$ then C''' is equal to the stable image; see [8, Lemma 4.2].

We unpack Notation 4.2 a little.

Remark 4.4. Let $m \in C^\sharp$ and so in particular $m \in C''$ giving a sequence $(m_n) \in M^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $m_{n+1} \in C m_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m = m_0$. Hence for any $r \in R$ the diagonal R -linear action on $M \oplus M$ gives $(r m_n, r m_{n+1}) = r(m_n, m_{n+1}) \in C$, and so $C' \subseteq C''$ are both R -submodule of M by restriction.

Since $m \in (C^{-1})''$ we also similarly have a sequence $(m'_n) \in M^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $m'_{n+1} \in C^{-1} m'_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m = m'_0$. Now let $m_{-n} := m'_n$ meaning $m_{n+1} \in C m_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In other words C^\sharp is the set of elements

m_0 arising in the middle term of a sequence $(m_n) \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $m_{n+1} \in Cm_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Similarly C^b consists of the sums $m_0^+ + m_0^-$ of the middle terms of sequences (m_n^{\pm}) where $m_n^{\pm} = 0$ for $\pm n \gg 0$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let (M, C) be an object in $R\text{-Rel}$ and let I be an ideal in R . If $IM \subseteq (C^{-1})' + C'$ then $C^{\sharp} \cap IM \subseteq C^b$ and, in particular, the quotient C^{\sharp}/C^b is an R/I -module.*

Proof. We claim that $IM \cap C^{\sharp} \subseteq C^b$. Let $z \in IM \cap C^{\sharp}$ and so there exist $x \in (C^{-1})'$ and $y \in C'$ such that $z = x + y$. In particular $x = z - y \in C''$ and similarly $y \in (C^{-1})''$ which altogether shows that $z \in C^b$ giving the claim. In particular $IC^{\sharp} \subseteq C^b$ and so the R -module C^{\sharp}/C^b is annihilated by I . \square

The following result from [8] was written only in the context where R is a field. The proof does not make use of this assumption, and generalises with no complication. For completeness we expose this fact.

Lemma 4.6. [8, Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5] *For any object (M, C) of $R\text{-Rel}$ we have*

$$C^{\sharp} \subseteq CC^{\sharp}, \quad C^b = C^{\sharp} \cap CC^b, \quad C^{\sharp} \subseteq C^{-1}C^{\sharp}, \quad C^b = C^{\sharp} \cap C^{-1}C^b.$$

Consequently there is an R -module automorphism θ on C^{\sharp}/C^b defined by

$$\theta(m + C^b) = m' + C^b \text{ if and only if } m' \in C^{\sharp} \cap (C^b + Cm).$$

Proof. In what remains in the proof we use the notation from Remark 4.4 without further reference.

Firstly, setting $\ell_n := m_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ gives $\ell_{n+1} = m_{n+2} \in Cm_{n+1} = C\ell_n$ and so $m_1 \in C^{\sharp}$ meaning $m = m_0 \in Cm_1 \subseteq CC^{\sharp}$ giving $C^{\sharp} \subseteq CC^{\sharp}$. Using that $C^{\sharp} = (C^{-1})^{\sharp}$ gives $C^{\sharp} \subseteq C^{-1}C^{\sharp}$.

Secondly, suppose we also have $m_0 = m_0^+ + m_0^-$ where $m_n^{\pm} = 0$ for $\pm n \gg 0$. In this situation we likewise write $\ell_n^{\pm} = m_{n+1}^{\pm}$ for all n , meaning in particular that $\ell_n^{\pm} = 0$ for $\pm(n+1) \gg 0$, and so for $\pm n \gg 0$. It follows that $\ell_0^{\pm} \in C((C^{\mp 1})' \cap (C^{\pm 1})'')$ and so $\ell_0 \in CC^b$ since C^b is an R -submodule, and so an additive subgroup.

This argument shows that $C^b \subseteq C^{\sharp} \cap CC^b$ and for the converse we assume $k \in C^{\sharp} \cap CC^b$ and suppose $k \in Cm$ for $m \in C^b$ as above. We now have $m_{-1}^{\pm} \in Cm_0^{\pm}$, and taking the sum gives $m' \in Cm$ where $m' := m_{-1}^+ + m_{-1}^-$, which taking the difference with k gives $k - m' \in C0$ as above we have $m' \in C^b$ and so in particular $k - m' \in (C^{-1})'' \cap C' \subseteq C^b$ as required for the equality $C^b = C^{\sharp} \cap CC^b$. As above, using that $C^{\sharp} = (C^{-1})^{\sharp}$ and that $C^b = (C^{-1})^b$ gives $C^b = C^{\sharp} \cap C^{-1}C^b$.

We now prove that the given formula defines an R -module automorphism. We claim that the formula ensures θ is well-defined. So let $m + C^b = \ell + C^b$ for some $m, \ell \in C^{\sharp}$ and suppose $m' \in C^{\sharp} \cap (C^b + Cm)$ and $\ell' \in C^{\sharp} \cap (C^b + C\ell)$. Hence there exist $k, j \in C^b$ such that $(m, m' - k), (\ell, \ell' - j) \in C$. This gives $C^{\sharp} \ni \ell' - m' + j - k \in C(\ell - m) \in CC^b$ and so $\ell' - m' \in C^b$ by the equality $C^b = C^{\sharp} \cap CC^b$ giving the claim.

To see that θ is surjective, if $m' \in C^{\sharp} \subseteq CC^{\sharp}$ we have $m' \in Cm$ for $m \in C^{\sharp}$ and so $\theta(m + C^b) = m' + C^b$.

To see that θ is injective, note that if $m' \in C^b \cap (C^b + Cm)$ then $m \in C^{-1}C^b$ giving $m \in C^{\sharp} \cap C^{-1}C^b = C^b$.

Finally let $r \in R$. Then if $m' \in C^{\sharp} \cap (C^b + Cm)$, say $m' = k + \ell$ for $k \in C^b$ and $\ell \in Cm$, then $rk \in C^b$ by Remark 4.4 and also $(rm, r\ell) \in C$ giving $rm' \in C^{\sharp} \cap (C^b + C(rm))$, meaning that θ is R -linear. \square

From Lemma 4.6 one has that C^{\sharp}/C^b has the structure of an $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -module.

Definition 4.7. [4, Definition 1.4.32] A *reduction* of an object (M, C) of $R\text{-Rel}$ is a pair $(U | \rho)$ where U is an $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -module which is free as an R -module, and $\rho: U \rightarrow M$ is an R -linear map such that

$$C^{\sharp} = C^b + \text{im}(\rho), \quad \rho(Tu) \in C\rho(u) \quad (u \in U).$$

We say a reduction $(U | \rho)$ of C *meets in J* if $\{u \in U: \rho(u) \in C^b\} = JU$.

Theorem 4.12 provides sufficient conditions for the existence of a reduction. Before stating and proving this result we note consequences of the definition of a reduction in Lemma 4.8.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $(U \mid \rho)$ be a reduction of an object (M, C) in $R\text{-Rel}$ that meets in J . Then*

$$0 \longrightarrow JU \xrightarrow{\subseteq} U \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}} C^\sharp/C^b \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence of $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -modules where $\bar{\rho}(u) \mapsto \rho(u) + C^b$ for each $u \in U$.

Proof. Since $\rho(u) \in \text{im}(\rho) \subseteq C^\sharp$ the map $\bar{\rho}$ is well-defined. Since C^\sharp is an R -submodule of M , it is R -linear. Since $0 \in C^b$ and $\rho(Tu) \in C\rho(u)$ it also follows that $\rho(Tu) \in C^\sharp \cap (C^b + C\rho(u))$ and so $\theta(\rho(u) + C^b) = \rho(Tu) + C^b$ in the notation from Lemma 4.6. In other words, $\bar{\rho}$ is an $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -module homomorphism. Furthermore, from the assumption that $C^\sharp = \text{im}(\rho) + C^b$ it follows that $\bar{\rho}$ is surjective. By construction we have $\ker(\bar{\rho}) = \{u \in U : \rho(u) \in C^b\}$, and so to say this submodule is JU is to say $(U \mid \rho)$ meets in J . \square

Proposition 4.9. *Let R be a field and (M, C) lie in $R\text{-Rel}$. The following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a reduction of (M, C) that meets in $J = 0$.*
- (2) *We have $C^\sharp = C^b \oplus V$ for an $S[T, T^{-1}]$ -module V with $Tw = v$ if and only if $v \in Cw$ for $v, w \in V$.*

Proof. (1 \Rightarrow 2) Let $(U \mid \rho)$ be a reduction of (M, C) that meets in 0 and let $V = \text{im}(\rho)$. By Definition 4.7 we have $C^\sharp = C^b + V$. If $v \in C^b \cap V$ then $v = \rho(u)$ for some $u \in U$, meaning $\rho(u) \in C^b$ and so $u = 0$ since $(U \mid \rho)$ meets in 0. Thus $C^\sharp = C^b \oplus V$ and so $V \cong C^\sharp/C^b$ as S -vector spaces. By Lemma 4.8 there is an $S[T, T^{-1}]$ -module isomorphism $\sigma = (\bar{\rho})^{-1}$ of the form $C^\sharp/C^b \rightarrow U$ and so V is an $S[T, T^{-1}]$ -module by setting $Tw = v$ if and only if $T\sigma(w + C^b) = \sigma(v + C^b)$.

Let $v, w \in V$ say where $v = \rho(u)$ and $w = \rho(u')$ for some $u, u' \in U$. By Definition 4.7 we have $\rho(Tu') \in Cw$. By Lemma 4.8 we have $\sigma(w + C^b) = u'$ and similarly $\sigma(v + C^b) = u$. Thus $Tw = v$ if and only if $Tu' = u$ in which case $\rho(u) \in C\rho(u')$ by Definition 4.7, and this means $v \in Cw$. Conversely $v \in Cw \subseteq C^\sharp \cap (C^b + Cw)$ implies $\theta(w + C^b) = v + C^b$ meaning $Tu' = u$.

(2 \Rightarrow 1) The pair $(V \mid \mathbf{1}_V)$ is a reduction of (M, C) that meets in 0. To see this, note that

$$C^\sharp = C^b + \text{im}(\mathbf{1}_V), \quad \{u \in V : \mathbf{1}_V(u) \in C^b\} = V \cap C^b = 0 = JV,$$

and that $u \in V$ implies $Tu \in Cu$ by taking $w = u$ and $v = Tu$ in our assumption. \square

Remark 4.10. Another interpretation of Proposition 4.9 is that, in case R is a field, the existence of a reduction of an object (M, C) in $R\text{-Rel}$ is equivalent to saying that C is *split* in the sense of [8, p. 9].

For the proof of Theorem 4.12, in Lemma 4.11 we observe how one of the hypothesis yields an isomorphism consistent with the conclusion of Lemma 4.8.

Lemma 4.11. *If (M, C) is an object (M, C) of $R\text{-Rel}$ such that $JM \subseteq (C^{-1})' + C'$ then there is an $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -module U which is free over R such that $U/JU \cong C^\sharp/C^b$ as $S[T, T^{-1}]$ -modules.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.5 the quotient C^\sharp/C^b is a vector space over the field $S = R/J$. Let $U = R^{(\kappa)} = \bigoplus R$ where κ is the cardinality of an S -basis of C^\sharp/C^b . By [16, Proposition 24.6(3)] we have $\text{rad}(U) = J^{(\kappa)}$ and so there is an S -module isomorphism $\alpha : U/\text{rad}(U) \rightarrow C^\sharp/C^b$ given by a bijection on S -bases, and recall that by Lemma 4.6 there is an R -module automorphism θ of C^\sharp/C^b which is of course S -linear. Let $\tau := \alpha^{-1}\theta\alpha$. By construction we have that $U/\text{rad}(U)$ is an $S[T, T^{-1}]$ -module and that α is an $S[T, T^{-1}]$ -module isomorphism since $\alpha\tau = \theta\alpha$. Since U is free over R , it is projective over R , and since τ is an automorphism of $U/\text{rad}(U)$, altogether by Theorem 2.14 there is an automorphism σ of U with $\bar{\sigma} = \tau$. Hence U is an $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -module. \square

Theorem 4.12. *If (M, C) is an object of $R\text{-Rel}$ such that $JM \subseteq (C^{-1})' + C'$ and C^\sharp/C^b is finitely generated as an R -module, then there exists a reduction $(U \mid \rho)$ of (M, C) .*

Proof. By assumption and by Lemma 4.5 the quotient C^\sharp/C^b is a finite-dimensional vector space over $S = R/J$, for which we choose a finite S -basis $(m_\omega + C^b \mid \omega \in \Omega)$. By Lemma 4.11 there is an $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -module U , free over R , and there is an $S[T, T^{-1}]$ -module isomorphism $\alpha: U/\text{rad}(U) \rightarrow C^\sharp/C^b$.

In particular, for each $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda} m_\lambda + C^b &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda} \alpha(b_\lambda + \text{rad}(U)) = \alpha(\sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda} b_\lambda + \text{rad}(U)) \\ &= \alpha(T(b_\omega) + \text{rad}(U)) = \alpha(\overline{T}(b_\omega + \text{rad}(U))) = \theta(\alpha(b_\omega + \text{rad}(U))) = \theta(m_\omega + C^b) \end{aligned}$$

where $r_{\omega\lambda} \in R$ are chosen such that $T(b_\omega) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda} b_\lambda$.

So far note that U has been given the structure of an $R[T, T^{-1}]$ -module. For each $\lambda, \omega \in \Omega$ let $\delta_{\lambda\omega} = 1$ if $\lambda = \omega$, and let $\delta_{\lambda\omega} = 0$ if $\lambda \neq \omega$. For each $\lambda \in \Omega$ define the elements $q_{\lambda\gamma} \in R$ ($\gamma \in \Omega$) such that $T^{-1}(b_\lambda) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega} q_{\lambda\gamma} b_\gamma$. By construction we have $\sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda} q_{\lambda\gamma} = \delta_{\omega\gamma} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} q_{\omega\lambda} r_{\lambda\gamma}$.

For each $\omega, \lambda \in \Omega$ and each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we now define elements $r_{\omega\lambda}^{n \rightarrow}, r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n} \in R$ as follows. Let $r_{\omega\lambda}^{0 \rightarrow} := q_{\omega\lambda}$, $r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow 1} := -\delta_{\omega\lambda}$, $r_{\omega\lambda}^{n \rightarrow} := 0$ for $n > 0$ and $r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n} := 0$ for $n \leq 0$. If $n \leq 0$ and $r_{\gamma\lambda}^{n \rightarrow}$ is defined for each $\gamma \in \Omega$, let $r_{\omega\lambda}^{n-1 \rightarrow} := \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega} q_{\omega\gamma} r_{\gamma\lambda}^{n \rightarrow}$. If $n > 0$ and $r_{\omega\gamma}^{\leftarrow n}$ is defined for each $\gamma \in \Omega$, let $r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n+1} := \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega} r_{\omega\gamma} r_{\gamma\lambda}^{\leftarrow n}$.

Recall, from Lemma 4.6, that for each $\omega \in \Omega$, one has that

$$T(b_\omega) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda} b_\lambda \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda} m_\lambda \in C^\sharp \cap (C^b + Cm_\omega).$$

Hence for each $\omega \in \Omega$ there are elements $\ell_\omega \in C^b$ and $p_\omega \in Cm_\omega$ such that $p_\omega = \ell_\omega + \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda} m_\lambda$. Fix $\omega \in \Omega$. Since $\ell_\omega \in C^b$ there exists $\ell_\omega^{\rightarrow} \in C' \cap (C^{-1})''$ and $\ell_\omega^{\leftarrow} \in C'' \cap (C^{-1})'$ such that $\ell_\omega = \ell_\omega^{\leftarrow} + \ell_\omega^{\rightarrow}$. The notation from Remark 4.4 gives $d_{\rightarrow}(\omega), d_{\leftarrow}(\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\ell_\omega^{n \rightarrow}, \ell_\omega^{\leftarrow n} \in M$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_\omega^{0 \rightarrow} &= \ell_\omega^{\rightarrow}, \quad \ell_\omega^{n \rightarrow} \in C\ell_\omega^{n+1 \rightarrow} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \ell_\omega^{n \rightarrow} = 0 \text{ for all } n < d_{\rightarrow}(\omega), \\ \ell_\omega^{\leftarrow 0} &= \ell_\omega^{\leftarrow}, \quad \ell_\omega^{n \leftarrow} \in C\ell_\omega^{n+1 \leftarrow} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \ell_\omega^{n \leftarrow} = 0 \text{ for all } n > d_{\leftarrow}(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and each $\omega \in \Omega$ define $h_\omega^{\leftarrow n} := \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n} \ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n}$ and $h_\omega^{n \rightarrow} := \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{n \rightarrow} \ell_\lambda^{n \rightarrow}$.

If $n < 0$ then $n+1 \leq 0$ and hence $r_{\omega\lambda}^{n \rightarrow} = r_{\omega\lambda}^{n+1 \rightarrow} = \sum_{\zeta \in \Omega} q_{\omega\zeta} r_{\zeta\lambda}^{n+1 \rightarrow}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} h_\omega^{n \rightarrow} &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{n \rightarrow} \ell_\lambda^{n \rightarrow} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} \sum_{\zeta \in \Omega} q_{\omega\zeta} r_{\zeta\lambda}^{n+1 \rightarrow} \ell_\lambda^{n \rightarrow} \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} \sum_{\zeta \in \Omega} (\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} q_{\omega\zeta}) r_{\zeta\lambda}^{n+1 \rightarrow} \ell_\lambda^{n \rightarrow} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} \sum_{\zeta \in \Omega} \delta_{\gamma\zeta} r_{\zeta\lambda}^{n+1 \rightarrow} \ell_\lambda^{n \rightarrow} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\lambda}^{n+1 \rightarrow} \ell_\lambda^{n \rightarrow}. \end{aligned} \quad (*)$$

If $n = 0$ then $r_{\omega\lambda}^{0 \rightarrow} = q_{\omega\lambda}$ and so $\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} q_{\omega\lambda} = \delta_{\gamma\lambda}$ which gives

$$\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} h_\omega^{0 \rightarrow} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{0 \rightarrow} \ell_\lambda^{0 \rightarrow} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} (\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} q_{\omega\lambda}) \ell_\lambda^{0 \rightarrow} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} \delta_{\gamma\lambda} \ell_\lambda^{0 \rightarrow} = \ell_\gamma^{0 \rightarrow}. \quad (**)$$

If $n > 0$ then $n+1 > 0$ and hence $r_{\gamma\lambda}^{\leftarrow n+1} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n}$ and therefore

$$\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} h_\omega^{\leftarrow n} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n} \ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} (\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n}) \ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\lambda}^{\leftarrow n+1} \ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n}. \quad (***)$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and each $\gamma \in \Omega$ define $k_\gamma^{\leftarrow n} := \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\lambda}^{\leftarrow n+1} \ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n}$ and $k_\gamma^{n \rightarrow} := \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\lambda}^{n+1 \rightarrow} \ell_\lambda^{n \rightarrow}$. So,

$$(h_\omega^{\leftarrow n}, k_\omega^{\leftarrow n-1}) = (\sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n} \ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n}, \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n+1} \ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n-1}) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega} r_{\omega\lambda}^{\leftarrow n} (\ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n}, \ell_\lambda^{\leftarrow n-1}) \in C.$$

Similarly, since $(\ell_\omega^{n \rightarrow}, \ell_\omega^{n-1 \rightarrow}) \in C$, we have $(h_\omega^{n \rightarrow}, k_\omega^{n-1 \rightarrow}) \in C$. By (**) we have

$$k_\gamma^0 - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} h_\omega^0 = k_\gamma^{\leftarrow 0} - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} h_\omega^{0 \rightarrow} = -\ell_\gamma^{\leftarrow 0} - \ell_\gamma^{0 \rightarrow} = -\ell_\gamma.$$

When $n \neq 0$ we have $k_\gamma^n = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} h_\omega^n$ by combining (*) and (**). Using that Ω is finite, we can define $d := 1 + \max\{|d_{\rightarrow}(\omega)|, |d_{\leftarrow}(\omega)| : \omega \in \Omega\}$, and it follows that $h_\omega^n = k_\omega^n = 0$ whenever $|n| > d$, by construction.

Now let $z_\omega := m_\omega + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} h_\omega^n$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} z_\omega &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} m_\omega + \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} r_{\gamma\omega} h_\omega^n = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_{\gamma\omega} m_\omega + \ell_\gamma + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} k_\gamma^n \\ &= p_\gamma + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} k_\gamma^n \in C(m_\gamma + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} h_\gamma^n) = Cz_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Define the required morphism $\rho: U \rightarrow M$ by extending the assignment $b_\omega \mapsto z_\omega$ linearly over R , where $(b_\omega \mid \omega \in \Omega)$ is an R -basis for U . By construction we have that $\rho(Tu) \in C\rho(u)$ for any $u \in U$.

Since the elements $(m_\omega + C^b)$ span the S -vector space C^\sharp/C^b it follows that $C^\sharp = C^b + \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} Rm_\omega$ and so $C^\sharp \subseteq C^b + \text{im}(\rho)$ and $\text{im}(\rho) \subseteq C^\sharp$ giving $C^\sharp = C^b + \text{im}(\rho)$. If $u \in JU$ then $\rho(u) \in C^\sharp \cap JM$ which lies in C^b by Lemma 4.5. Conversely assume $u \in U$ satisfies $\rho(u) \in C^b$ and write $u = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_\omega b_\omega$ for some $r_\omega \in R$. Since the elements $m_\omega + C^b = z_\omega + C^b$ with $\omega \in \Omega$ are linearly independent over S , the expression

$$0 = \rho(u) + C^b = \rho(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_\omega b_\omega) + C^b = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} r_\omega z_\omega + C^b = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} (r_\omega + J)(z_\omega + C^b)$$

gives $r_\omega \in J$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, and hence $u \in JU$, as required. \square

Example 4.13. We make Example 3.8 more concrete. Here we were considering an R -linear relation of the form $D = C^{-1}C$ where C is the R -linear relation given by a graph. It follows that $D = D^{-1}$ and so $D^\sharp = D''$ and $D^b = D'$ by Notation 4.2. Let R be a discrete valuation ring with uniformizer π , and so $J = R\pi$. As before we write M for the quotient F/K of the free module $F = Rz_0 \oplus Rz_1$ by the submodule $K = R\pi z_1$, and we write $\bar{z}_i = z_i + K$. Hence $M \cong R \oplus R/J$ as R -modules. Recall the R -linear relation on M given by

$$D = \{(r\bar{z}_0 + s\bar{z}_1, r'\bar{z}_0 + s'\bar{z}_1) : r, r', s, s' \in R \text{ and } r - r' \in J\}.$$

It follows that $D'' = M$ and that $r\bar{z}_0 + s\bar{z}_1 \in D'$ if and only if $\pi \mid r$, meaning $D' = J\bar{z}_0 \oplus (R/J)\bar{z}_1$. Note that $JM = J\bar{z}_0 \subseteq D' = D' + (D^{-1})'$ and $D''/D' \cong R/J$ has finite dimension over $S = R/J$. Thus by Theorem 4.12 there is a reduction $(U \mid \rho)$ of (M, C) that meets in J . We claim that Proposition 4.9 fails in case R is artinian but not a field. For then $J^n = 0$ for some minimal $n > 1$, and it follows that

$$D^\sharp = D'' = M \cong R \oplus R/J, \quad D^b \oplus D^\sharp/D^b = D' \oplus D^\sharp/D^b \cong J \oplus R/J \oplus R/J$$

which gives $D^\sharp \not\cong D^b \oplus D''/D'$ since the right-hand side is annihilated by J^{n-1} but the left-hand side is not.

Remark 4.14. By Example 4.13 and Remark 4.10 it follows that Theorem 4.12 is a strict generalisation of [8, Lemma 4.6] in both statement and proof.

5. COVERING AND LINEAR COMPACTNESS

Setup 5.1. In §5 we continue, as we have throughout the article so far, to assume R is a commutative ring.

Notation 5.2. Let $f: L \rightarrow M$ be an R -linear map, $m \in M$ and $S \subseteq L$ and $T \subseteq M$ be subsets. Now set

$$f(S) := \{f(\ell) \mid \ell \in S\}, \quad f^{-1}(T) := \{\ell \in L \mid f(\ell) \in T\}, \quad f^{-1}(m) := f^{-1}(\{m\}).$$

If S (respectively, T) is a submodule then so is $f(S)$ (respectively, $f^{-1}(T)$). Note $\ker(f) = f^{-1}(0)$.

Definition 5.3. In what follows we write \mathbb{A}_∞ for the infinite Dynkin diagram depicted as follows

$$0 \text{ --- } 1 \text{ --- } 2 \text{ --- } \dots \text{ --- } n-1 \text{ --- } n \text{ --- } n+1 \text{ --- } \dots$$

An \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation is a functor $(M(i); \delta_i; \mu_i)$ from a quiver with graph \mathbb{A}_∞ to $R\text{-Mod}$, so a diagram

$$M(0) \xrightarrow{\mu_0} M(1) \xrightarrow{\mu_1} M(2) \text{ --- } \dots \text{ --- } M(n-1) \xrightarrow{\mu_n} M(n) \text{ --- } \dots$$

in $R\text{-Mod}$, where: each $M(i)$ is an R -module; each edge is orientated by a choice of $\delta_i = \pm$ with $+$ or $-$ corresponding to left or right respectively; and each μ_i is an R -module homomorphism of the form

$$M(i-1) \xleftarrow{\mu_i} M(i) \text{ when } \delta_i = +, \quad M(i-1) \xrightarrow{\mu_i} M(i) \text{ when } \delta_i = -.$$

Notation 5.4. Given an \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation $(M(i); \delta_i; \mu_i)$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\delta_i = \pm$ we define C_i^\pm to be the graph of μ_i . So, depending on δ_i , by definition we have

$$C_i = \{(m, \mu_i(m)) \mid m \in M(i)\} \text{ when } \delta_i = +, \quad C_i = \{(\mu_i(m'), m') \mid m' \in M(i-1)\} \text{ when } \delta_i = -.$$

Finally, for each $n \geq 0$ we let $C_{\leq n} := C_1 \dots C_n$, defined by composing relations; see Notation 3.5.

In Example 5.5 we unpack Definition 5.3 with an alternating orientation to decode the notation.

Example 5.5. Let $\delta_i = (-1)^{i+1}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. That is, consider an \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation of the form

$$M(0) \xrightarrow{\mu_0} M(1) \xleftarrow{\mu_1} M(2) \xrightarrow{\mu_2} M(3) \xleftarrow{\mu_3} M(4) \xrightarrow{\mu_4} M(5) \xleftarrow{\mu_5} M(6) \xrightarrow{\mu_6} \dots$$

Combining with Notation 3.3 we have, for example, for any subset $S \subseteq M(5)$, that

$$C_{\leq 5}S = C_1C_2C_3C_4C_5S = \left\{ m \in M(0) \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{there exists } m' \in M(2), m'' \in M(4) \text{ such that} \\ \mu_0(m) = \mu_1(m'), \mu_2(m') = \mu_3(m''), \mu_4(m'') \in S \end{array} \right\}$$

Proposition 5.6. Let $\delta_i = \pm$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, S be an index set, $(M^s(i); \delta_i; \mu_i^s)$ be an \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation with associated relations C_i^s for each $s \in S$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The following statements hold.

- (1) The product and coproduct give \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representations $(M^\Pi(i); \delta_i; \mu_i^\Pi)$, $(M^\oplus(i); \delta_i; \mu_i^\oplus)$ respectively.
- (2) For the relations C_i^Π associated to $(M^\Pi(i); \delta_i; \mu_i^\Pi)$ we have $C_{\leq n}^\Pi M^\Pi(n) = \prod_{s \in S} C_{\leq n}^s M^s(n)$.
- (3) For the relations C_i^\oplus associated to $(M^\oplus(i); \delta_i; \mu_i^\oplus)$ we have $C_{\leq n}^\oplus M^\oplus(n) = \bigoplus_{s \in S} C_{\leq n}^s M^s(n)$.

Proof. (1) Let $M^\Pi(i) = \prod_{s \in S} M^s(i)$, $M^\oplus(i) = \bigoplus_{s \in S} M^s(i)$, $\mu_i^\Pi((m^s)) = (\mu_i^s(m^s))$ and $\mu_i^\oplus((\ell^s)) = (\mu_i^s(\ell^s))$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\ell^s, m^s \in M^s(i)$ where $\ell^s = 0$ for all but finitely many s .

(2) Let $(m_0^s) \in C_{\leq n}^\Pi M^\Pi(n)$, meaning there are elements $(m_i^s) \in M^\Pi(i)$ such that $(m_{i-1}^s) \in C_i^\Pi(m_i^s)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. For each i and s write $\pi_i^s: M^\Pi(i) \rightarrow M^s(i)$ for the canonical projection. If $\delta_i = +$ we have

$$m_{i-1}^s = \pi_i^s((m_{i-1}^s)) = \pi_i^s(\mu_i^\Pi((m^s))) = \pi_i^s((\mu_i^s(m^s))) = \mu_i^s(m_i^s),$$

and, similarly, if $\delta_i = -$ then $m_i^s = \mu_{i-1}^s(m_{i-1}^s)$ for any s and i with $1 \leq i \leq n$. Thus $m_0^s \in C_{\leq n}^s M^s(n)$.

Conversely, if $m_0^s \in C_{\leq n}^s M^s(n)$ for each s one can use a similar argument to prove $(m_0^s) \in C_{\leq n}^\Pi M^\Pi(n)$.

(3) The argument in (2) holds when, for each i , we have $m_i^s = 0$ for all but finitely many s . \square

Setup 5.7. For what remains in §5 we will assume R as an \mathbb{N} -filtered ring, and write $\{R_n \mid n \geq 0\}$ for the corresponding filtration of ideals. We will considered filtered R -modules M , equipped with a filtration of submodules denoted $\{M_n \mid n \geq 0\}$ with respect to $\{R_n \mid n \geq 0\}$.

We will follow the article of Zelinsky [28].

Definition 5.8. [28, §1, p. 80, Definition] By a *linear variety* in a filtered module M we mean a coset of a submodule, that is, a subset of the form $m + N$ where N is a submodule of M .

A collection $\{m_a + N_a \mid a \in A\}$ of linear varieties is said to have the *finite intersection property* provided $\bigcap_{b \in B} m_b + N_b$ for any finite subset B of the indexing set A . We then say that M is *linearly compact* if any collection of closed linear varieties with the finite intersection property has a non-empty intersection.

We will be interested in linear compact modules, and hence closed linear varieties.

Remark 5.9. Recall that if L and N are submodules of M and if $m', m'' \in M$ then either $(m' + N) \cap (m'' + L) = \emptyset$, or this intersection contains an element m in which case $(m' + N) \cap (m'' + L) = m + N \cap L$. In a topological space the finite intersection of closed subsets is closed. Thus, the intersection of finitely many closed linear varieties is closed, and this intersection is a linear variety in case it is non-empty.

Following results from [28] we begin with some remarks on linear varieties and linearly compact modules. Recall from Remark 2.26(3) that submodules and quotients of filtered modules have induced filtrations.

Lemma 5.10. *The following statements hold a continuous R -linear map $f: L \rightarrow M$ of filtered modules.*

- (1) *Let $m \in M$. If $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n = 0$ then $f^{-1}(m)$ is closed. If $f^{-1}(m) \neq \emptyset$ then $f^{-1}(m)$ is a linear variety.*
- (2) *If L and M are linearly compact then $f(N)$ is closed in M for any closed submodule N of L .*

Proof. (1) By Remark 2.26(2) the topology on M is Hausdorff, and so singletons are closed. Hence, by assuming f is continuous, the preimage $f^{-1}(m)$ of the closed set $\{m\}$ is closed. Now suppose $f^{-1}(m) \neq \emptyset$ and so there is some $\ell \in f^{-1}(m)$ meaning that $\ell \in L$ and $f(\ell) = m$. Let $K = f^{-1}(0)$, the kernel of f , which is a submodule of L . We claim $f^{-1}(m) = \ell + K$. Clearly $f^{-1}(m) \supseteq \ell + K$. Now for any $\ell' \in f^{-1}(m)$ we have $\ell' = \ell + \ell' - \ell$ where $\ell' - \ell \in K$ $f(\ell') = m = f(\ell)$, giving the reverse inclusion.

(2) By [28, Proposition 3] we have that N is linearly compact, since it is closed inside the linearly compact module L . By [28, Proposition 2] this means the image $f(N)$ of N under f is again linearly compact. Recall from Remark 2.26(1) that the submodules M_n define a fundamental system of neighbourhoods of $0 \in M$. By [28, Proposition 7] we have that $f(N)$ is closed inside M since it is a linearly compact submodule of M . \square

Remark 5.11. We note how the conclusion of Lemma 5.10 holds if one swaps the graph of f with the inverse relation. Let $f: L \rightarrow M$ be a continuous R -module homomorphism. For any $\ell \in L$ we have $\{f(\ell)\} = f(\ell) + 0$. Clearly this singleton is a non-empty linear variety, which closed in M if $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n = 0$, since then M is Hausdorff by Remark 2.26(2). Also, if N is a closed submodule of M then the preimage $f^{-1}(N)$ is a submodule since f is R -linear, and closed since f is continuous.

Definition 5.12. We say that an \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation $(M(i); \delta_i; \mu_i)$ is *compact-continuous-Hausdorff* if each $M(i)$ is filtered and linearly compact, $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n(i) = 0$ and each μ_i is continuous.

Lemma 5.13. *Let $(M(i); \delta_i; \mu_i)$ be a compact-continuous-Hausdorff \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation and let $i \in \mathbb{N}$.*

- (1) *If $m \in M(i+1)$ then $C_i m$ is closed in $M(i)$ and $C_i m$ is a linear variety if it is non-empty.*
- (2) *If N is a closed submodule of $M(i+1)$ then $C_i N$ is a closed submodule of $M(i)$.*

Proof. Combine Lemma 5.10, Remark 5.11 and Definition 5.3. \square

In Lemma 5.14 we observe an infinite version of the phenomena discussed in Example 5.5.

Lemma 5.14. *Let $(M(i); \delta_i; \mu_i)$ be a compact-continuous-Hausdorff \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation. Then*

$$\bigcap_{n \geq 0} C_{\leq n} M(n) = \left\{ m \in M(0) \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{there exists } (m_i) \in \prod_{i \geq 0} M(i) \text{ such that} \\ m = m_0 \text{ and } (m_i, m_{i-1}) \in C_i \text{ for } i > 0 \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Proof. Given m in the righthand-side with $(m_i) \in \prod_{i \geq 0} M(i)$ such that $m_{i-1} \in C_i m_i$ for each i , for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the following string of containments proving m lies in the lefthand-side

$$m = m_0 \in C_1 m_1 \subseteq C_1 C_2 m_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq C_1 \cdots C_{n-1} m_{n-1} \subseteq C_1 \cdots C_n m_n \subseteq C_1 \cdots C_n M(n) = C_{\leq n} M(n)$$

It remains to show the lefthand-side is contained in the righthand-side of the required equality. Let

$$L(j, n) := C_{j+1} \cdots C_n M(n) \quad (n > j), \quad N(j) := C_j^{-1} m_{j-1} \cap \bigcap_{n > j} L(j, n) \quad (j > 0).$$

Let $N(0) := \bigcap_{n > 0} L(0, n)$ and note that $L(0, n) = C_{\leq n} M(n)$. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ note that $L(j, n)$ and $N(j)$ are subsets of $M(j)$ and that $L(j, n)$ is an R -submodule. Starting from setting $m_0 := m \in N(0)$, we shall construct $(m_i) \in \prod_{i \geq 0} N(i)$ iteratively. So let $j > 0$ and assume $m_i \in N(i)$ has been defined for $i = 0, \dots, j-1$. We require $m_j \in N(j)$. It remains to prove that $N(j) \neq \emptyset$.

By Lemma 5.13 we have that $N(j)$ is an intersection of closed linear varieties. Since $M(j)$ is linearly compact, it suffices to prove that these linear varieties have the finite intersection property. Let S be a finite non-empty subset of integers $n > j$ and let $d := \max S$. The intersection of the linear varieties $L(j-1, n)$ with $n \in S$ is $\bigcap_{n \in S} L(j-1, n) = L(j-1, d) \ni 0$, and so it suffices to prove that $C_j^{-1}m_{j-1} \cap L(j, d) \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, $m_{j-1} \in C_j L(j, d)$ and so there is some $m' \in L(j, d)$ such that $m_{j-1} \in C_j m'$ as required. \square

Theorem 5.15. *Let R be a J -adically complete noetherian semilocal² ring. Let $(M(i); \delta_i; \mu_i)$ be an \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation where each $M(i)$ is a finitely generated R -module. Then we have*

$$\bigcap_{m \geq 0} C_{\leq n} M(n) = \{m_0 \in M(0) \mid \exists (m_i) \in \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} M(i) : (m_i, m_{i+1}) \in C_i \text{ for each } i\}.$$

Proof. We begin by noting some standard examples of linearly compact modules.

- (1) By [28, Proposition 5], if M is a filtered module with the descending chain condition on closed submodules, then M is linearly compact. Hence artinian modules are linearly compact.
- (2) The inverse limit M' of a directed system $f_{ij}: M_i \rightarrow M_j$ of filtered modules M_i is again filtered; see for example [23, §8.2.2]. Furthermore, if each M_i is linearly compact then M' is also linearly compact; see for example [28, Proposition 4]. For example, as noted in [28, Proposition 1], any product of linearly compact modules is again linearly compact.
- (3) Since R is noetherian and semilocal we have that R/J^n has finite-length for each $n > 0$; see for example [23, Exercise 7.16]. Since R is J -adically complete, as an R -module it is linearly compact by (1) and (2), and any finitely generated R -module is linearly compact by (2) and [28, Proposition 2].

In any adic topology, every module homomorphism is continuous; see for example [23, Lemma 8.2.1(7)]. Hence in this setting, by (3), for an \mathbb{A}_∞ - R -representation $(M(i); \delta_i; \mu_i)$ to be compact-continuous-Hausdorff it is sufficient that each $M(i)$ is a finitely generated R -module. Thus the claim follows from Lemma 5.14. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB-TRR 358/1 2023- 491392403). The author is grateful for this support. The author is also grateful to Francesca Fedele and Rosie Laking for helpful and encouraging conversations.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Angeleri Hügel and F. Sentieri. Wide coreflective subcategories and torsion pairs. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2304.00845, Apr. 2023.
- [2] M. Auslander and S. O. Smalø. Preprojective modules over Artin algebras. *J. Algebra*, 66(1):61–122, 1980.
- [3] H. Bass. *Algebraic K-theory*. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1968.
- [4] R. Bennett-Tennenhaus. *Functorial filtrations for semiperfect generalisations of gentle algebras*. PhD thesis, University of Leeds, <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/19607/>, 2018.
- [5] R. Bennett-Tennenhaus and W. Crawley-Boevey. Σ -pure-injective modules for string algebras and linear relations. *J. Algebra*, 513:177–189, 2018.
- [6] R. Colpi and K. R. Fuller. Tilting objects in abelian categories and quasitilted rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(2):741–765, 2007.
- [7] W. Crawley-Boevey. Infinite-dimensional modules in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras. In *Algebras and modules, I (Trondheim, 1996)*, volume 23 of *CMS Conf. Proc.*, pages 29–54. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998.
- [8] W. Crawley-Boevey. Classification of modules for infinite-dimensional string algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 370(5):3289–3313, 2018.
- [9] S. E. Dickson. A torsion theory for Abelian categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 121:223–235, 1966.
- [10] E. E. Enochs. Injective and flat covers, envelopes and resolvents. *Israel J. Math.*, 39(3):189–209, 1981.

²This means that $S = R/J$ is a semisimple ring. Since R is commutative, this is equivalent to requiring that R has finitely many maximal ideals, or to requiring that S is a finite product of fields.

- [11] R. Fossum, P. Griffith, and I. Reiten. Trivial extensions of abelian categories and applications to rings: an expository account. In *Ring theory (Proc. Conf., Park City, Utah, 1971)*, pages 125–151. Academic Press, New York-London, 1972.
- [12] R. Göbel and D. Simson. Embeddings of Kronecker modules into the category of prinjective modules and the endomorphism ring problem. *Colloq. Math.*, 75(2):213–244, 1998.
- [13] A. Haghany and K. Varadarajan. Study of modules over formal triangular matrix rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 147(1):41–58, 2000.
- [14] D. Herbera and P. Příhoda. Infinitely generated projective modules over pullbacks of rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 366(3):1433–1454, 2014.
- [15] C. Jensen and H. Lenzing. *Model-theoretic algebra with particular emphasis on fields, rings, modules*, volume 2 of *Algebra, Logic and Applications*. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1989.
- [16] T. Lam. *A first course in noncommutative rings*, volume 131 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [17] M. Müller. Rings of quotients of generalized matrix rings. *Comm. Algebra*, 15(10):1991–2015, 1987.
- [18] M. Prest. *Model theory and modules*, volume 130 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- [19] M. Prest. Definable categories and monoidal categories. In *Functor categories, model theory, algebraic analysis and constructive methods*, volume 450 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 197–222. Springer, Cham, [2024] ©2024.
- [20] P. Příhoda. Projective modules are determined by their radical factors. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 210(3):827–835, 2007.
- [21] J. Rada and M. Saorin. Rings characterized by (pre)envelopes and (pre)covers of their modules. *Comm. Algebra*, 26(3):899–912, 1998.
- [22] C. M. Ringel. The indecomposable representations of the dihedral 2-groups. *Math. Ann.*, 214:19–34, 1975.
- [23] B. Singh. *Basic commutative algebra*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2011.
- [24] B. Stenström. The maximal ring of quotients of a triangular matrix ring. *Math. Scand.*, 34:162–166, 1974.
- [25] B. Stenström. *Rings of quotients*, volume Band 217 of *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975. An introduction to methods of ring theory.
- [26] M. L. Teply. Homological dimension and splitting torsion theories. *Pacific J. Math.*, 34:193–205, 1970.
- [27] J. Xu. *Flat covers of modules*, volume 1634 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [28] D. Zelinsky. Linearly compact modules and rings. *Amer. J. Math.*, 75:79–90, 1953.

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT BIELEFELD, 33501 BIELEFELD, GERMANY
 Email address: raphaelbennetttennenhaus@gmail.com