

# THE GORENSTEIN VERSION OF LAZARD'S THEOREM IS FALSE

HENRIK HOLM AND PETER JØRGENSEN

ABSTRACT. This paper shows that the Gorenstein version of Lazard's Theorem is false. That is, there are Gorenstein flat modules which are not direct limits of finitely generated Gorenstein projective modules.

The proof is based on a theory of Gorenstein projective (pre)envelopes. For a commutative local noetherian ring  $R$  we show, among other things, that the finitely generated Gorenstein projective modules form an enveloping class in  $\text{mod } R$  if and only if  $R$  is Gorenstein or has the property that each finitely generated Gorenstein projective module is free.

This is analogous to a recent result on covers by Christensen, Piepmeyer, Striuli, and Takahashi, and their methods are an important input to our work.

## 0. INTRODUCTION

*Gorenstein homological algebra* was founded by Auslander and Bridger in [1]. Some of its main concepts are the so-called Gorenstein projective and Gorenstein flat modules; the latter were introduced in [8]. These modules inhabit a theory parallel to classical homological algebra. For instance, just as projective modules can be used to define projective dimension, so Gorenstein projective modules can be used to define Gorenstein projective dimension. A commutative noetherian local ring is Gorenstein if and only if all its modules have finite Gorenstein projective dimension. A good introduction to the subject is given in [3], although important advances have been made since that book was written.

*Lazard's Theorem* says that the closure under direct limits of the class of finitely generated projective modules is equal to the class of flat modules; see [11, thm. 1.2]. It is natural to ask if the Gorenstein

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13H10, 18G25.

*Key words and phrases.* Algebraic duality, closure under direct limits, covers, envelopes, Gorenstein flat modules, Gorenstein projective modules, precovers, preenvelopes, special precovers, special preenvelopes.

version of Lazard's Theorem is true. Namely, if  $\mathcal{G}$  denotes the class of finitely generated Gorenstein projective modules, is  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$  equal to the class of Gorenstein flat modules? In some cases the answer is yes, for instance over a ring which is Gorenstein in a suitable sense; this was proved by Enochs and Jenda in [7, thm. 10.3.8].

However, the main result of this paper is that, in general, the answer is no. Specifically, the Gorenstein version of Lazard's Theorem fails over the ring  $\mathbb{Q}[X, Y, Z]/(X^2, Y^2, Z^2, XY)$  by Example 2.8.

To give a more detailed explanation, let us work over a commutative local noetherian ring  $R$  and briefly recapitulate some definitions. The finitely generated Gorenstein projective modules are the kernels of differentials in exact complexes of finitely generated projective modules,

$$\cdots \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow P_{-1} \rightarrow \cdots,$$

which stay exact under the functor  $\text{Hom}(-, Q)$  when  $Q$  is a finitely generated projective module. The Gorenstein flat modules are the kernels of differentials in exact complexes of flat modules,

$$\cdots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow F_{-1} \rightarrow \cdots,$$

which stay exact under the functor  $I \otimes -$  when  $I$  is an injective module. Our main result is the following, where  $\mathcal{F}$  is the class of finitely generated free modules.

**Theorem A.** *If  $R$  has a dualizing complex, is henselian, not Gorenstein, and has  $\mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$  is strictly contained in the class of Gorenstein flat modules.*

This is proved in Theorem 2.7. Example 2.8 ensues since the ring  $\mathbb{Q}[X, Y, Z]/(X^2, Y^2, Z^2, XY)$  satisfies the conditions of the theorem.

The proof of Theorem A is based on a theory of  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelopes, the development of which takes up most of the paper.

The background is that the existence of  $\mathcal{G}$ -precovers has been considered at length. That is, if  $M$  is a finitely generated module, does there exist a homomorphism  $G \xrightarrow{\gamma} M$  with  $G$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that any other homomorphism  $G' \rightarrow M$  with  $G'$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  factors through  $\gamma$ ? A breakthrough was achieved recently in [5] by Christensen, Piepmeyer, Striuli, and Takahashi who proved, among other things, that if  $R$  is henselian, then  $\mathcal{G}$ -precovers exist for all finitely generated modules in precisely two cases: If  $R$  is Gorenstein, or if  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ .

We will consider the dual question: Existence of  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelopes. That is, if  $M$  is a finitely generated module, does there exist a homomorphism

$M \xrightarrow{\mu} G$  with  $G$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that any other homomorphism  $M \rightarrow G'$  with  $G'$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  factors through  $\mu$ ? Our most important result in this direction is Theorem 2.5, one aspect of which is the following precise analogue of the precovering case.

**Theorem B.** *If  $R$  is henselian then all finitely generated  $R$ -modules have  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelopes if and only if  $R$  is Gorenstein or  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ .*

Note that the methods and results of [5] are an important input to our proof.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 1 prepares the ground by examining the connections between  $\mathcal{G}$ -precovers and  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelopes which are induced by the algebraic duality functor  $(-)^* = \text{Hom}_R(-, R)$ . Section 2 proves Theorems A and B, among other things. Section 3 shows a method for constructing a Gorenstein flat module outside  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$ .

## 1. ALGEBRAIC DUALS OF PRECOVERS AND PREENVELOPES

The most important results of this section are Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 which show that algebraic duals of various types of  $\mathcal{G}$ -precovers give the corresponding types of  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelopes, and vice versa.

**Setup 1.1.** Throughout the paper,  $R$  is a commutative noetherian ring.

By  $\mathbf{mod} R$  is denoted the category of finitely generated  $R$ -modules. Recall that  $\mathcal{F}$  is the class of finitely generated free  $R$ -modules and  $\mathcal{G}$  is the class of finitely generated Gorenstein projective  $R$ -modules.

**Remark 1.2.** The following properties of  $\mathcal{G}$  will be used below.

- (i)  $\text{Ext}_R^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{G}, R) = 0$ .
- (ii)  $R$  is in  $\mathcal{G}$ .
- (iii) The class  $\mathcal{G}$  is closed under the algebraic duality functor  $(-)^* = \text{Hom}_R(-, R)$ .
- (iv) The biduality homomorphism  $G \xrightarrow{\delta_G} G^{**}$ , as defined in [3, (1.1.1)], is an isomorphism for each  $G$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ .
- (v) Each module in  $\mathcal{G}$  is isomorphic to a module  $G^*$  where  $G$  is in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Here (i) and (iv) are part of the definition of  $\mathcal{G}$ , see [3, def. (1.1.2)]. (ii) is by [3, rmk. (1.1.3)] and (iii) is by [3, obs. (1.1.7)]. (v) is immediate from (iii) and (iv).

**Lemma 1.3.** *If  $C$  is an  $R$ -module satisfying  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^1(C, R) = 0$ , then  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^1(G, C^*) \cong \mathrm{Ext}_R^1(C, G^*)$  for each  $G$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ .*

*Proof.* We have

$$\mathrm{H}^{<0}\mathrm{RHom}(C, R) = 0, \quad (1.a)$$

so  $\mathrm{RHom}(C, R)$  can be represented in the derived category  $\mathrm{D}(R)$  by a complex concentrated in non-negative cohomological degrees. Hence there is a canonical morphism in  $\mathrm{D}(R)$  from the zeroth cohomology  $\mathrm{H}^0\mathrm{RHom}(C, R) \cong C^*$  to  $\mathrm{RHom}(C, R)$ . Complete it to a distinguished triangle,

$$C^* \xrightarrow{\chi} \mathrm{RHom}(C, R) \rightarrow M \rightarrow, \quad (1.b)$$

and consider the long exact cohomology sequence which consists of pieces

$$\mathrm{H}^i(C^*) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^i\chi} \mathrm{H}^i\mathrm{RHom}(C, R) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^i M.$$

Since  $C^*$  is a module,  $\mathrm{H}^i(C^*) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ . Combined with equation (1.a), the long exact sequence hence implies  $\mathrm{H}^{\leq -2} M = 0$ .

Moreover,  $\mathrm{H}^0\chi$  is an isomorphism by the construction of  $\chi$ , and by assumption,  $\mathrm{H}^1\mathrm{RHom}(C, R) = \mathrm{Ext}_R^1(C, R) = 0$ . So in fact, the long exact sequence also implies  $\mathrm{H}^{-1} M = \mathrm{H}^0 M = \mathrm{H}^1 M = 0$ .

Consequently, the complex  $M$  admits an injective resolution of the form  $I = \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow I^2 \rightarrow I^3 \rightarrow \cdots$ , and in particular,

$$\mathrm{H}^{\leq 1}\mathrm{RHom}(G, M) \cong \mathrm{H}^{\leq 1}\mathrm{Hom}(G, I) = 0 \quad (1.c)$$

for each  $R$ -module  $G$ .

Now let  $G$  be in  $\mathcal{G}$ . It follows from Remark 1.2(i) that there is an isomorphism  $\mathrm{RHom}(G, R) \cong G^*$  in  $\mathrm{D}(R)$ , and hence by “swap”, [3, (A.4.22)], we get

$$\mathrm{RHom}(G, \mathrm{RHom}(C, R)) \cong \mathrm{RHom}(C, \mathrm{RHom}(G, R)) \cong \mathrm{RHom}(C, G^*).$$

Thus, by applying  $\mathrm{RHom}(G, -)$  to the distinguished triangle (1.b) we obtain

$$\mathrm{RHom}(G, C^*) \rightarrow \mathrm{RHom}(C, G^*) \rightarrow \mathrm{RHom}(G, M) \rightarrow .$$

Combining the long exact cohomology sequence of this with equation (1.c) proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.4.** *Let  $C$  be an  $R$ -module.*

- (i) *If  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^1(C, \mathcal{G}) = 0$  then  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^1(\mathcal{G}, C^*) = 0$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^1(C, R) = 0$  and  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^1(\mathcal{G}, C^*) = 0$ , then  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^1(C, \mathcal{G}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Combine Lemma 1.3 with Remark 1.2, parts (ii) and (iii), respectively, part (v).  $\square$

Let  $G \xrightarrow{\gamma} N$  be a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover. For the following theorem, recall that  $\gamma$  is called a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover if  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\mathcal{G}, \text{Ker } \gamma) = 0$ , and that  $\gamma$  is called a cover if each endomorphism  $G \xrightarrow{\varphi} G$  with  $\gamma\varphi = \gamma$  is an automorphism. Special  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelopes and  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelopes are defined dually.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let  $M$  be in  $\text{mod } R$ , let  $G$  be in  $\mathcal{G}$ , and let  $G \xrightarrow{\gamma} M^*$  be a homomorphism. Consider the composition*

$$M \xrightarrow{\delta_M} M^{**} \xrightarrow{\gamma^*} G^*$$

where  $\delta$  denotes the biduality homomorphism again. Then

- (i) *If  $\gamma$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover then  $\gamma^*\delta_M$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope.*
- (ii) *If  $\gamma$  is a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover then  $\gamma^*\delta_M$  is a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope.*
- (iii) *If  $\gamma$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -cover then  $\gamma^*\delta_M$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelope.*

*Proof.* There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & M^* \\ \delta_G \cong \downarrow & & \uparrow \delta_{M^*} \\ G^{**} & \xrightarrow{\gamma^{**}} & M^{***} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} (1) \quad \delta_{M^*}\gamma = \gamma^{**}\delta_G, \\ (2) \quad \gamma = (\delta_M)^*\gamma^{**}\delta_G. \end{array}$$

Here (1) just says that the biduality homomorphism is natural. By the proof of [3, prop. (1.1.9)] we have  $(\delta_M)^*\delta_{M^*} = 1_{M^*}$ , so  $\delta_{M^*}$  is (split) injective,  $(\delta_M)^*$  (split) surjective. Now (2) follows from  $\delta_{M^*}(\delta_M)^*\gamma^{**}\delta_G = \delta_{M^*}(\delta_M)^*\delta_{M^*}\gamma = \delta_{M^*}\gamma$  since  $\delta_{M^*}$  is injective.

(i). Suppose that  $\gamma$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover and let  $\tilde{G}$  be in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Remark 1.2(iv) and “swap” in the form [2, II. Exer. 4] give the following natural equivalences of functors,

$$\text{Hom}(-, \tilde{G}) \simeq \text{Hom}(-, \tilde{G}^{**}) \simeq \text{Hom}(\tilde{G}^*, (-)^*).$$

This gives the (top) two squares of the commutative diagram below, where we have abbreviated  $\text{Hom}(-, -)$  to  $(-, -)$ . The (bottom) commutative triangle comes from applying  $\text{Hom}(\tilde{G}^*, -)$  to part (2) from

the beginning of the proof.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
(G^*, \tilde{G}) & \xrightarrow{(\gamma^*, \tilde{G})} & (M^{**}, \tilde{G}) & \xrightarrow{(\delta_M, \tilde{G})} & (M, \tilde{G}) \\
\downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\
(\tilde{G}^*, G^{**}) & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{G}^*, \gamma^{**})} & (\tilde{G}^*, M^{***}) & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{G}^*, (\delta_M)^*)} & (\tilde{G}^*, M^*) \\
& \swarrow \cong & & \searrow & \\
& & (\tilde{G}^*, G) & & 
\end{array}$$

$(\tilde{G}^*, \delta_G)$   $\swarrow$   $(\tilde{G}^*, \gamma)$

Since  $\tilde{G}^*$  is in  $\mathcal{G}$  by Remark 1.2(iii), the map  $\text{Hom}(\tilde{G}^*, \gamma)$  is surjective, and the diagram implies that so is  $\text{Hom}(\delta_M, \tilde{G}) \circ \text{Hom}(\gamma^*, \tilde{G}) = \text{Hom}(\gamma^* \delta_M, \tilde{G})$ . Hence  $\gamma^* \delta_M$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope.

(ii). Suppose that  $\gamma$  is a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover; in particular we have  $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{G}, \text{Ker } \gamma) = 0$ . Part (i) says that  $\gamma^* \delta_M$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope, and it remains to show  $\text{Ext}^1(C, \mathcal{G}) = 0$  where  $C = \text{Coker}(\gamma^* \delta_M)$ . To prove this we use Lemma 1.4(ii). Thus we need to show that  $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{G}, C^*) = 0$  and  $\text{Ext}^1(C, R) = 0$ .

Applying  $(-)^*$  to the exact sequence  $M \xrightarrow{\gamma^* \delta_M} G^* \xrightarrow{\pi} C \longrightarrow 0$  gives the second exact row in

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & & & G & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & M^* \\
& & & & \delta_G \downarrow \cong & & \parallel \\
0 & \longrightarrow & C^* & \xrightarrow{\pi^*} & G^{**} & \xrightarrow{(\delta_M)^* \gamma^{**}} & M^*
\end{array}$$

where the square is commutative by part (2) at the beginning of the proof. It follows that  $C^* \cong \text{Ker } \gamma$ , and hence  $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{G}, C^*) = 0$ .

To prove  $\text{Ext}^1(C, R) = 0$ , we will argue that each short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow E \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$  splits. Consider the diagram with exact rows,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
M & \xrightarrow{\gamma^* \delta_M} & G^* & \xrightarrow{\pi} & C & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\vdots & \searrow \varphi & \vdots & & \parallel & & \\
\mu \downarrow & & \nu \downarrow & \swarrow \chi & & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & R & \xrightarrow{\rho} & E & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & C \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

By Remark 1.2, (i) and (iii), we have  $\text{Ext}^1(G^*, R) = 0$ , so the functor  $\text{Hom}(G^*, -)$  preserves the exactness of the bottom row. In particular,

there exists  $G^* \xrightarrow{\nu} E$  with  $\varepsilon\nu = \pi$ . By the universal property of the kernel of  $\varepsilon$ , there exists a (unique)  $M \xrightarrow{\mu} R$  with  $\rho\mu = \nu\gamma^*\delta_M$ .

Since  $\gamma^*\delta_M$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope and since  $R$  is in  $\mathcal{G}$  by Remark 1.2(ii), there exists  $G^* \xrightarrow{\varphi} R$  satisfying  $\varphi\gamma^*\delta_M = \mu$ . It follows that

$$(\nu - \rho\varphi)\gamma^*\delta_M = \nu\gamma^*\delta_M - \rho\varphi\gamma^*\delta_M = \nu\gamma^*\delta_M - \rho\mu = 0,$$

so by the universal property of the cokernel of  $\gamma^*\delta_M$ , there exists a (unique)  $C \xrightarrow{\chi} E$  with  $\chi\pi = \nu - \rho\varphi$ . Consequently,

$$\varepsilon\chi\pi = \varepsilon(\nu - \rho\varphi) = \varepsilon\nu - \varepsilon\rho\varphi = \pi - 0 = \text{id}_C \pi,$$

and since  $\pi$  is surjective we get  $\varepsilon\chi = \text{id}_C$ . This proves that  $\varepsilon$  is a split epimorphism as desired.

(iii). Suppose that  $\gamma$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -cover. Part (i) says that  $\gamma^*\delta_M$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope, and it remains to show that each endomorphism  $G^* \xrightarrow{\varphi} G^*$  with

$$\varphi\gamma^*\delta_M = \gamma^*\delta_M \tag{1.d}$$

is an automorphism. However, such an endomorphism has

$$\gamma\delta_G^{-1}\varphi^* = (\delta_M)^*\gamma^{**}\varphi^* = (\delta_M)^*\gamma^{**} = \gamma\delta_G^{-1}$$

where the first and third = are by part (2) at the beginning of the proof while the second = is  $(-)^*$  of equation (1.d). Hence  $\gamma(\delta_G^{-1}\varphi^*\delta_G) = \gamma$ , and since  $\gamma$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -cover and  $\delta_G^{-1}\varphi^*\delta_G$  is an endomorphism of  $G$ , it follows that  $\delta_G^{-1}\varphi^*\delta_G$  is an automorphism.

Therefore  $\varphi^*$ , and hence also  $\varphi^{**}$ , is an automorphism. Applying Remark 1.2, (iii) and (iv), and naturality of the biduality homomorphism gives  $\varphi = \delta_{G^*}^{-1}\varphi^{**}\delta_{G^*}$  whence  $\varphi$  is an automorphism as desired.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $M$  be in  $\text{mod } R$ , let  $G$  be in  $\mathcal{G}$ , and let  $M \xrightarrow{\mu} G$  be a homomorphism. Consider the algebraic dual  $G^* \xrightarrow{\mu^*} M^*$ . Then*

- (i) *If  $\mu$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope then  $\mu^*$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover.*
- (ii) *If  $\mu$  is a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope then  $\mu^*$  is a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover.*
- (iii) *If  $\mu$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelope then  $\mu^*$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -cover.*

*Proof.* (i). We have  $\text{Hom}(G, \mu^*) \cong \text{Hom}(\mu, G^*)$  by “swap”, [2, II. Exer. 4], and combined with Remark 1.2(iii) this implies the claim.

(ii). Suppose that  $\mu$  is a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope; in particular we have  $\text{Ext}^1(\text{Coker } \mu, \mathcal{G}) = 0$ . Part (i) says that  $\mu^*$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover, and it remains to show  $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{G}, \text{Ker}(\mu^*)) = 0$ . But this follows from Lemma 1.4(i) because  $\text{Ker}(\mu^*) \cong (\text{Coker } \mu)^*$ .

(iii). Suppose that  $\mu$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelope. Part (i) says that  $\mu^*$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -pre-cover, and it remains to show that each  $G^* \xrightarrow{\varphi} G^*$  with  $\mu^*\varphi = \mu^*$  is an automorphism.

The biduality homomorphism is natural so  $\delta_G\mu = \mu^{**}\delta_M$ , and since  $\delta_G$  is an isomorphism by Remark 1.2(iv), it follows that  $\mu = \delta_G^{-1}\mu^{**}\delta_M$ . Applying  $(-)^*$  to  $\mu^*\varphi = \mu^*$  gives  $\varphi^*\mu^{**} = \mu^{**}$ . Combining these gives

$$(\delta_G^{-1}\varphi^*\delta_G)\mu = (\delta_G^{-1}\varphi^*\delta_G)(\delta_G^{-1}\mu^{**}\delta_M) = \delta_G^{-1}\varphi^*\mu^{**}\delta_M = \delta_G^{-1}\mu^{**}\delta_M = \mu.$$

Since  $\mu$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelope and  $\delta_G^{-1}\varphi^*\delta_G$  is an endomorphism of  $G$ , it follows that  $\delta_G^{-1}\varphi^*\delta_G$  is an automorphism.

The argument used at the end of the proof of Theorem 1.5 now shows that  $\varphi$  is an automorphism as desired.  $\square$

## 2. EXISTENCE OF PREENVELOPES AND LAZARD'S THEOREM

This section proves Theorems A and B of the introduction; see Theorems 2.7 and 2.5.

**Setup 2.1.** In this section, the commutative noetherian ring  $R$  is assumed to be local with residue class field  $k$ . We write  $d = \text{depth } R$ .

In the following lemma, the case  $d = 0$  is trivial,  $d = 1$  is closely inspired by a proof of Takahashi, and  $d \geq 2$  is classical. Recall that  $\Omega^d(k)$  denotes the  $d$ th syzygy in a minimal free resolution of  $k$  over  $R$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *There exists an  $M$  in  $\text{mod } R$  such that  $\Omega^d(k)$  is isomorphic to a direct summand of  $M^*$ .*

*Proof.*  $d = 0$ . We can use  $M = k$  since  $\Omega^d(k) = \Omega^0(k) = k$  and since  $M^* = \text{Hom}(k, R) \cong k^e$  with  $e \neq 0$  because  $d = 0$ .

$d = 1$ . We will show that  $M = \Omega^d(k)^*$  works here; in fact, we will show that the biduality homomorphism for  $\Omega^d(k)$  is an isomorphism so  $\Omega^d(k) \cong \Omega^d(k)^{**} = M^*$ .

There is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{m} \xrightarrow{\mu} R \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0 \tag{2.a}$$

where  $\mathfrak{m}$  is the maximal ideal of  $R$  and  $\mu$  is the inclusion, so  $\Omega^d(k) = \Omega^1(k) = \mathfrak{m}$ .

If  $R$  is regular then  $k$  has projective dimension 1 by the Auslander-Buchsbaum formula, so (2.a) shows that  $\mathfrak{m}$  is projective whence the biduality homomorphism  $\delta_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is an isomorphism as desired.



Assume that  $R$  is not regular. For reasons of clarity, we start by reproducing, in our notation, part of Takahashi's proof of [15, thm. 2.8]. Applying  $(-)^*$  and its derived functors to the short exact sequence (2.a) gives a long exact sequence containing

$$0 \rightarrow R^* \xrightarrow{\mu^*} \mathfrak{m}^* \rightarrow k^e \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.b)$$

where we have written  $k^e$  instead of  $\text{Ext}^1(k, R)$ , and where  $e \neq 0$  since  $d = 1$ . Applying  $(-)^*$  again gives a left exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow (k^e)^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}^{**} \xrightarrow{\mu^{**}} R^{**}$ ; here  $(k^e)^* = 0$  because  $d = 1$ , so  $\mu^{**}$  is injective.

Consider the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{m} & \xrightarrow{\mu} & R \\ \delta_{\mathfrak{m}} \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow \delta_R \\ \mathfrak{m}^{**} & \xrightarrow{\mu^{**}} & R^{**} \end{array}$$

where  $\delta_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is injective because  $\delta_R \mu$  is injective. There are inclusions

$$\text{Im}(\mu^{**} \delta_{\mathfrak{m}}) \subseteq \text{Im}(\mu^{**}) \subseteq R^{**}. \quad (2.c)$$

We have  $R^{**}/\text{Im}(\mu^{**} \delta_{\mathfrak{m}}) = R^{**}/\text{Im}(\delta_R \mu) \cong R/\text{Im}(\mu) \cong k$  where the first  $\cong$  is because  $\delta_R$  is an isomorphism. This quotient is simple so one of the inclusions (2.c) must be an equality; this means that either  $\mu^{**}$  or  $\delta_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is an isomorphism. Suppose that  $\mu^{**}$  is an isomorphism; we will prove a contradiction whence  $\delta_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is an isomorphism as desired.

To get the contradiction, we now depart from Takahashi's proof. Since  $\mu^{**}$  is an isomorphism, so is  $R^{***} \xrightarrow{\mu^{***}} \mathfrak{m}^{***}$ , and so  $\mathfrak{m}^{***} \cong R$ . But  $(\delta_{\mathfrak{m}})^* \delta_{\mathfrak{m}^*} = \text{id}_{\mathfrak{m}^*}$  by the proof of [3, prop. (1.1.9)], so  $\mathfrak{m}^* \xrightarrow{\delta_{\mathfrak{m}^*}} \mathfrak{m}^{***}$  is a split monomorphism. It follows that  $\mathfrak{m}^*$  is a direct summand of  $R$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}^*$  is projective. Hence the exact sequence (2.b) gives a projective resolution of  $k^e$ , and since  $e \neq 0$  it follows that  $\text{gldim } R \leq 1$  contradicting that  $R$  is not regular.

$d \geq 2$ . Here we have  $\Omega^d(k) = \Omega^2(\Omega^{d-2}(k))$ , so it is enough to show that a second syzygy of a finitely generated module is a direct summand of some  $M^*$ . In fact, such a second syzygy  $\Omega^2$  is isomorphic to an  $M^*$ . Namely,  $\Omega^2$  sits in a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \Omega^2 \rightarrow P \xrightarrow{\pi} Q$  where  $P$  and  $Q$  are finitely generated projective modules. Consider the right-exact sequence  $Q^* \xrightarrow{\pi^*} P^* \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  and apply  $(-)^*$  to get a left-exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M^* \rightarrow P^{**} \xrightarrow{\pi^{**}} Q^{**}$ . Since  $\pi^{**}$  is isomorphic to  $\pi$ , we get  $\Omega^2 \cong M^*$ .  $\square$

The following lemma is implicitly in [5], but it is handy to make it explicit for reference. Recall from [5, defs. (2.1)] that if  $\mathcal{B}$  is a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{mod} R$ , then a  $\mathcal{B}$ -approximation of an  $M$  in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  is a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow B \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  where  $B$  is in  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{B}, K) = 0$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Consider a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover and complete it with its kernel. The resulting short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow G \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -approximation of  $M$ .*

*Proof.* We know  $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{G}, K) = 0$ . By [3, cor. (4.3.5)(a)] each  $G$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  sits in a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow G' \rightarrow P \rightarrow G \rightarrow 0$  where  $P$  is a finitely generated projective module and  $G'$  is in  $\mathcal{G}$ , and it follows by an easy induction that  $\mathrm{Ext}^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{G}, K) = 0$  as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** Let us give a brief summary of part of [5].

Recall from [5, (1.1)] that if  $\mathcal{B}$  is a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{mod} R$ , then  $\langle \mathcal{B} \rangle$  denotes the closure under direct summands and extensions. The class of finitely generated Gorenstein projective modules  $\mathcal{G}$  is a so-called reflexive subcategory of  $\mathbf{mod} R$  by [5, def. (2.6)]. It follows from [5, prop. (2.10)] that  $\langle \widehat{R} \otimes_R \mathcal{G} \rangle$  is a reflexive subcategory of  $\mathbf{mod} \widehat{R}$ .

Now suppose that there is an  $\langle \widehat{R} \otimes_R \mathcal{G} \rangle$ -cover of  $\Omega_{\widehat{R}}^d(k)$ . The cover is an  $\langle \widehat{R} \otimes_R \mathcal{G} \rangle$ -approximation by [5, (2.2)(b)]. But when such an approximation exists, the proof of [5, thm. (3.4)] gives that either,  $\widehat{R}$  is Gorenstein, or  $\langle \widehat{R} \otimes_R \mathcal{G} \rangle$  consists of free  $\widehat{R}$ -modules.

An important input to the proof of the next theorem are the methods and results developed by Christensen, Piepmeyer, Striuli, and Takahashi in [5].

**Theorem 2.5.** *The following three conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) *Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelope.*
- (ii) *Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope.*
- (iii)  *$R$  is Gorenstein or  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ .*

*They imply the following condition.*

- (iv) *Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope.*

*Moreover, if  $R$  is henselian then (iv) implies (i), (ii), and (iii).*

*Proof.* (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Holds by Wakamatsu's Lemma, [17, lem. 2.1.2].

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). By Lemma 2.2 the module  $\Omega_R^d(k)$  is a direct summand in a module of the form  $M^*$  where  $M$  is in  $\mathbf{mod} R$ . If (ii) holds then  $M$  has a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope, and by Theorem 1.6(ii) it follows that  $M^*$  has a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover. Completing with the kernel gives a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow G \rightarrow M^* \rightarrow 0$  which is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -approximation of  $M^*$  by Lemma 2.3.

Tensoring the sequence with  $\widehat{R}$  gives an  $\langle \widehat{R} \otimes_R \mathcal{G} \rangle$ -approximation of  $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M^*$  by [5, prop. 2.4]. In particular, there is an  $\langle \widehat{R} \otimes_R \mathcal{G} \rangle$ -precover of  $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M^*$ , and the same must hold for its direct summand  $\widehat{R} \otimes_R \Omega_R^d(k) \cong \Omega_{\widehat{R}}^d(k)$ . Hence there is an  $\langle \widehat{R} \otimes_R \mathcal{G} \rangle$ -cover of  $\Omega_{\widehat{R}}^d(k)$  by [14, cor. 2.5].

But now the results of [5] imply that either,  $\widehat{R}$  is Gorenstein, or  $\langle \widehat{R} \otimes_R \mathcal{G} \rangle$  consists of free  $\widehat{R}$ -modules; see Remark 2.4. In the former case,  $R$  is Gorenstein by [13, thm. 18.3]. In the latter case, in particular,  $\widehat{R} \otimes_R G$  is a free  $\widehat{R}$ -module whenever  $G$  is in  $\mathcal{G}$ . But then  $G$  is a free  $R$ -module whence  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ ; cf. [13, cor. p. 53, exer. 7.1, and (3), p. 63].

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). First, suppose that  $R$  is Gorenstein. Then each finitely generated  $R$ -module has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -cover by unpublished work of Auslander; see [9, thm. 5.5]. Existence of  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelopes now follows from Theorem 1.5(iii).

Secondly, suppose  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ . Then each finitely generated  $R$ -module has an  $\mathcal{F}$ -envelope by [16, Prop. 2.3(3)], which does not need that paper's assumption that the ring is henselian.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (iv). Trivial.

Now assume that  $R$  is henselian.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Suppose that (iv) holds. Then Theorem 1.6(i) implies that each  $R$ -module of the form  $M^*$  with  $M$  in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover. Since  $R$  is henselian, each  $M^*$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -cover by [14, cor. 2.5], and so each  $M$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelope by Theorem 1.5(iii).  $\square$

**Remark 2.6.** As a consequence, the following conditions are equivalent.

- (i) Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -cover.
- (ii) Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover.
- (iii) Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -envelope.
- (iv) Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a special  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope.
- (v)  $R$  is Gorenstein or  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ .

Namely, (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) is by Wakamatsu's Lemma, [17, lem. 2.1.1]. (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv) follows from Theorem 1.5(ii). Conditions (iii), (iv), and (v) are equivalent by Theorem 2.5. And (v) $\Rightarrow$ (i) follows from unpublished work by Auslander; see [9, thm. 5.5].

Note that the equivalence of (i), (ii), and (v) was first established in [5], and that our proof depends on that paper.

Now assume that  $R$  is henselian. Combining with a result of Crawley-Boevey shows that the following conditions are also equivalent, where  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$  denotes the closure of  $\mathcal{G}$  under direct limits.

- (i) Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover.
- (ii) Each module in  $\mathbf{mod} R$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope.
- (iii)  $R$  is Gorenstein or  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ .
- (iv)  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$  is closed under set indexed direct products.

Namely, (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) holds by [5, (2.8) and thm. (3.4)]. (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) follows from unpublished work by Auslander as above; see [9, thm. 5.5]. (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) is by Theorem 2.5. And (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iv) holds by [6, (4.2)].

**Theorem 2.7.** *If  $R$  has a dualizing complex, is henselian, not Gorenstein, and has  $\mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$  is strictly contained in the class of Gorenstein flat modules.*

*Proof.* Each module in  $\mathcal{G}$  is Gorenstein flat, cf. [3, Thm. (5.1.11)], and the class of Gorenstein flat modules is closed under direct limits by [10], so  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$  is contained in the class of Gorenstein flat modules.

The class of Gorenstein flat modules is closed under set indexed products by [4, thm. 5.7]. On the other hand, by the last four conditions of Remark 2.6, the assumptions on  $R$  imply that  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$  is not closed under set indexed products.  $\square$

**Example 2.8.** It is easy to find rings of the type required by Theorem 2.7. Consider the ring  $S = \mathbb{Q}[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2, XY)$  which is artinian and local, but not Gorenstein. We claim that the ring of dual numbers over  $S$ ,

$$T = S[Z]/(Z^2) \cong \mathbb{Q}[X, Y, Z]/(X^2, Y^2, Z^2, XY),$$

can be used in Theorem 2.7.

Namely,  $T$  inherits the properties of being artinian and local, but not Gorenstein. Since  $T$  is artinian, it is complete and in particular henselian, and has a dualizing complex. Finally, let  $z$  be the image

of  $Z$  in  $T$ . Then the complete projective resolution

$$\cdots \rightarrow T \xrightarrow{z_i} T \xrightarrow{z_i} T \rightarrow \cdots$$

shows that the non-projective module  $T/(z) \cong S$  is Gorenstein projective, so  $\mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{F}$ .

### 3. A SPECIAL GORENSTEIN FLAT MODULE

This short section shows a method for constructing a Gorenstein flat module outside  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$ .

**Construction 3.1.** Let  $\{G_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a set of representatives of the isomorphism classes of indecomposable modules in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $M$  be in  $\mathbf{mod} R$ . For each  $i$  in  $I$ , view  $H(i) = \text{Hom}_R(M, G_i)$  as a set and consider the direct product  $G_i^{H(i)}$  indexed by that set. Define

$$\Lambda(M) = \prod_{i \in I} G_i^{H(i)}.$$

**Proposition 3.2.** *Assume that  $R$  has a dualizing complex. Let  $M$  be in  $\mathbf{mod} R$ . Then*

- (i)  $\Lambda(M)$  is Gorenstein flat.
- (ii) If  $\Lambda(M)$  belongs to  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$ , then  $M$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope.

*Proof.* (i). As in the proof of Theorem 2.7, the modules in  $\mathcal{G}$  are Gorenstein flat and the class of Gorenstein flat modules is closed under set indexed products.

(ii). For each  $i$  in  $I$ , consider the homomorphism

$$M \xrightarrow{\mu_i} G_i^{H(i)}, \quad m \mapsto (h(m))_{h \in H(i)}.$$

Let  $\Lambda(M) \xrightarrow{\pi_i} G_i^{H(i)}$  be the  $i$ 'th projection, and let  $M \xrightarrow{\mu} \Lambda(M)$  be the unique homomorphism which satisfies  $\pi_i \mu = \mu_i$  for each  $i$  in  $I$ . Then each homomorphism  $M \xrightarrow{\eta} G$  with  $G$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  factors through  $\mu$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \Lambda(M). \\ \eta \downarrow & \swarrow \lambda & \\ & & G \end{array}$$

Namely, we may assume  $G = G_i$  for some  $i$ , since each  $G$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of modules from the set  $\{G_i\}_{i \in I}$ . But then  $\eta$  is an element of  $H(i)$ , and we can let  $\lambda$  equal the composition of the projections  $\Lambda(M) \xrightarrow{\pi_i} G_i^{H(i)} \rightarrow G_i$  where the second one is onto the  $\eta$ th copy of  $G_i$ .

Now,  $M$  is finitely presented, so if  $\Lambda(M)$  belongs to  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$  then [12, prop. 2.1] says that  $\mu$  can be factored as  $M \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{G} \rightarrow \Lambda(M)$  with  $\tilde{G}$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Since each homomorphism  $M \xrightarrow{\eta} G$  factors through  $\mu$  by the above, it also factors through  $\tilde{\mu}$  which is hence a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope of  $M$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.3.** Consider the ring  $T$  from Example 2.8 again. Its residue class field is  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}^* \cong \mathbb{Q}^2$ . If  $\mathbb{Q}$  had a  $\mathcal{G}$ -preenvelope, then  $\mathbb{Q}^2$  would have a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover by Theorem 1.6(i), and then  $\mathbb{Q}$  would have a  $\mathcal{G}$ -precover. But this is false by [5, (2.8) and thm. (3.4)].

Hence by Proposition 3.2, the  $T$ -module  $\Lambda(\mathbb{Q})$  is Gorenstein flat, but not in  $\varinjlim \mathcal{G}$ . It is easy to see that  $\Lambda(\mathbb{Q})$  is the direct product of a family which contains, for each isomorphism class of indecomposable modules in  $\mathcal{G}$ , countably many copies of a representative of that isomorphism class.

Note that there is a similar, slightly more complicated construction where  $H(i)$  is a set of generators of the  $R$ -module  $\text{Hom}_R(M, G_i)$ . The resulting  $\Lambda(\mathbb{Q})$  can be described as in the previous paragraph, but replacing “countably” with “finitely”.

*Acknowledgement.* We thank Lars Winther Christensen for comments to a preliminary version.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Auslander and M. Bridger, “Stable module theory”, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., no. 94, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1969.
- [2] H. Cartan and S. Eilenberg, “Homological algebra”, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1956. Reprinted in Princeton Landmarks Math., Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1999.
- [3] L. W. Christensen, “Gorenstein dimensions”, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 1747, Springer, Berlin, 2000.
- [4] L. W. Christensen, A. Frankild, and H. Holm, *On Gorenstein projective, injective and flat dimensions — a functorial description with applications*, J. Algebra **302** (2006), 231–279.
- [5] L. W. Christensen, G. Piepmeyer, J. Striuli, and R. Takahashi, *Finite Gorenstein representation type implies simple singularity*, Adv. Math. **218** (2008), 1012–1026.
- [6] W. Crawley-Boevey, *Locally finitely presented additive categories*, Comm. Algebra **22** (1994), 1641–1674.
- [7] E. E. Enochs and O. M. G. Jenda, “Relative homological algebra”, de Gruyter Exp. Math., Vol. 30, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2000.
- [8] E. E. Enochs, O. M. G. Jenda, and B. Torrecillas, *Gorenstein flat modules*, Nanjing Daxue Xuebao Shuxue Bannian Kan **10** (1993), 1–9.

- [9] E. E. Enochs, O. M. G. Jenda, and J. Xu, *A generalization of Auslander's last theorem*, *Algebr. Represent. Theory* **2** (1999), 259–268.
- [10] E. E. Enochs and J. A. López-Ramos, *Kaplansky classes*, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **107** (2002), 67–79.
- [11] D. Lazard, *Autour de la platitude*, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **97** (1969), 81–128.
- [12] H. Lenzing, *Homological transfer from finitely presented to infinite modules*, pp. 734–761 in “Abelian group theory” (proceedings of the conference in Hawaii, 1983), *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Vol. 1006, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [13] H. Matsumura, “Commutative ring theory”, *Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math.*, Vol. 8, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [14] R. Takahashi, *On the category of modules of Gorenstein dimension zero*, *Math. Z.* **251** (2005), 249–256.
- [15] R. Takahashi, *On the category of modules of Gorenstein dimension zero II*, *J. Algebra* **278** (2004), 402–410.
- [16] R. Takahashi, *Remarks on modules approximated by  $G$ -projective modules*, *J. Algebra* **301** (2006), 748–780.
- [17] J. Xu, “Flat covers of modules”, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Vol. 1634, Springer, Berlin, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF BASIC SCIENCES AND ENVIRONMENT, FACULTY OF LIFE SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN, THORVALDSSENSVEJ 40, 6TH FLOOR, 1871 FREDERIKSBERG C, DENMARK

*E-mail address:* `hholm@life.ku.dk`

*URL:* `http://www.dina.kvl.dk/~hholm/`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY, NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE NE1 7RU, UNITED KINGDOM

*E-mail address:* `peter.jorgensen@ncl.ac.uk`

*URL:* `http://www.staff.ncl.ac.uk/peter.jorgensen`