

PRÜFER MODULES IN FILTRATION CATEGORIES OF SEMI-BRICKS

FRANK LUKAS

In memory of my teacher Otto Kerner

ABSTRACT. Let R be an associative unitary ring. A brick in the module category $R\text{-Mod}$ is a finitely generated module with a division ring as endomorphism ring. Two non-isomorphic bricks X, Y are said to be orthogonal if $\text{Hom}(X, Y) = \text{Hom}(Y, X) = 0$, and a class \mathcal{X} of pairwise orthogonal bricks is called a semi-brick. We consider the full subcategory $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ of modules with filtration in \mathcal{X} and show that this category is a wide category.

Let \mathcal{X}^\perp be the class of modules M with $\text{Ext}^1(X, M) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Then for each module $Y \in R\text{-Mod}$ there exists a \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope $Y_{\mathcal{X}^\perp}(\infty)$ which can be constructed as the direct limit of iterated universal short exact sequences.

Let now in addition the projective dimension of every $X \in \mathcal{X}$ be lower or equal 1. Then we call for $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ the \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope a Prüfer module since they share many properties with Prüfer groups and also with Prüfer modules over tame hereditary algebras. Their endomorphism rings are complete discrete valuation rings and every injective object in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of Prüfer modules.

We apply the toolset to tame hereditary algebras and give an alternative proof for the classification of divisible modules. For wild hereditary algebras we show that they have large classes of semi-bricks.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our motivation to analyse filtration categories of semi-bricks was to construct Prüfer modules over wild hereditary algebras. The starting point was the following observation : The module category of a tame hereditary algebra has a maximal class \mathcal{X} of semi-bricks, containing quasi-simple modules, and for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $\dim_k \text{Ext}(X, X) = 1$. The Prüfer modules, as defined by C. M. Ringel in [1] correspond to the bricks in \mathcal{X} and are the injective objects in the wide category of regular modules.

The module category of a wild hereditary algebra has large classes of semi-bricks (see 9.2). In contrast to the tame case, there exist semi-bricks \mathcal{X} with $\dim_k \text{Ext}(X, Y) \geq 2$ for $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}$. The category $\text{filt}(\mathcal{X})$ of modules having a \mathcal{X} -filtration of finite length is a wide category as C. M. Ringel proved in [2, 1.2]. In the first sections of this paper we show that also $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$, the subcategory of $R\text{-Mod}$ having a \mathcal{X} -filtration of, not necessarily finite length, is also a wide category. This was first proved by Claudius Heyer, who sent me his unpublished categorical proof. With his guidance I developed the algebraic proof as presented in the first sections. The proof works for all associative unitary rings as long as the bricks of the semi-brick are finitely generated. In the proof we exploit the fact that every module in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ has a canonical filtration which is strict for all homomorphisms in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. We call this filtration the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration and it is useful for the further investigations.

The next step was the construction of injective objects in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$, or more generally for a module $M \in R\text{-Mod}$ we want to construct the \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of M . We can construct an

Date: May 21, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 16G60.

Key words and phrases. Prüfer modules, wild hereditary algebras, Representation theory of algebras, infinite dimensional modules, filtration categories, semi-bricks.

\mathcal{X} -universal short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M_{\mathcal{X}}(2) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0$$

which has the property that every short exact sequence in $Ext(X, M)$ can be generated by pull-backs for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. We can iterate this construction and obtain a module $M_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$ as the direct limit of the ascending chain $M \subset M_{\mathcal{X}}(2) \subset M_{\mathcal{X}}(3) \subset \dots$. The module $M_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$ is the \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of M (see 6.2). For $M \in \mathcal{X}$ the \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of M is an injective object in $Filt(\mathcal{X})$. For a tame hereditary algebra and a quasi-simple module X the construction coincides with the construction of the Prüfer module \bar{X} as the direct limit of the irreducible monomorphisms starting from X , due to the fact that $\dim_k Ext(X, X) = 1$ and $Ext(X, Y) = 0$ for all quasi-simple modules Y that are not isomorphic to X . This construction works for all rings as long the bricks are finitely presented.

Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick without $Filt(\mathcal{X})$ -injective objects and $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for every $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Then we call a \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of a module $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ a Prüfer module. Every injective object in $Filt(\mathcal{X})$ is a direct sum of Prüfer modules (7.3). Similar to the tame case ([1, 4.4]), the endomorphism ring of a Prüfer module is a complete discrete valuation ring (7.6).

We use the toolset to give an alternative proof (8.2) for the classification of divisible modules over a tame hereditary algebra. In the tame case the \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of a preprojective module with defect -1 is the generic module Q for \mathcal{X} being a semi-brick containing all representatives of quasi-simple modules.

In the case of a wild hereditary algebra it is open whether a similar construction can be used to build generic modules.

2. PRELIMINARIES

By R we denote an associative unitary ring and $R\text{-Mod}$ ($R\text{-mod}$) denote the category of (finitely generated) left R -modules. For a class \mathcal{X} of modules in $R\text{-Mod}$ we denote by $Add(\mathcal{X})$ the class of modules which are isomorphic to a direct summand of direct sums of modules of \mathcal{X} and $Gen(\mathcal{X})$ should be the class of modules in $R\text{-Mod}$ which are generated by modules in $Add(\mathcal{X})$.

We write a concatenation of two homomorphisms $f \in Hom(X, Y)$, $g \in Hom(Y, Z)$ from left to right, so $f \circ g \in Hom(X, Z)$. A finitely generated module X which has a division ring as its endomorphism ring is called a brick. Two non-isomorphic bricks X, Y are said to be orthogonal if $Hom(X, Y) = Hom(Y, X) = 0$ and a class of pairwise orthogonal bricks is called a semi-brick.

In this paper we study filtration classes of semi-bricks. The definition of a filtration class is taken from [3].

Definition 2.1. Given a module M and an ordinal number μ , we call an ascending chain $M = (M_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ of submodules of M a **filtration of M** , if $M_0 = 0$, $M_\mu = M$, and $M_\nu = \bigcup_{\lambda < \nu} M_\lambda$ for every limit ordinal $\nu \leq \mu$. Furthermore, given a class of modules \mathcal{C} , we call M a **\mathcal{C} -filtration of M** , provided that each of the consecutive factors $M_{\lambda+1}/M_\lambda$ ($\lambda \leq \mu$) is isomorphic to a module from \mathcal{C} . A module M admitting a \mathcal{C} -filtration is said to be \mathcal{C} -filtered, and the class of all (finitely) \mathcal{C} -filtered modules is denoted by $Filt(\mathcal{C})$ ($filt(\mathcal{X})$).

For a class \mathcal{X} we denote by

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\perp\mathcal{X} &= \ker Ext^1(-, \mathcal{X}) = \{M \in R\text{-Mod} \mid Ext(M, X) = 0 \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{X}\} \\ \mathcal{X}^\perp &= \ker Ext^1(\mathcal{X}, -) = \{M \in R\text{-Mod} \mid Ext(X, M) = 0 \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{X}\} \end{aligned}$$

If the projective dimension of X is lower or equal 1 for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ the class \mathcal{X}^\perp is a torsion class. From [4, 6.2] we take over the Eklof-Lemma:

Lemma 2.2. *Let N be a module and M be a ${}^\perp N$ -filtered module. Then $M \in {}^\perp N$.*

Definition 2.3. For $M \neq 0$ we say that a module M is FP_m , provided that M has a projective resolution \mathcal{P} such that P_n is finitely generated for each $n \leq m$.

For the proof of the existence of \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelopes we use the following lemma from [4, 6.6]:

Lemma 2.4. Let R be a ring, $n \geq 0$ and M be a $(n + 1)$ -finitely presented module. Let $\{N_\alpha, f_{\beta, \alpha} | \alpha \leq \beta \in I\}$ be a direct system of modules. Then for all $i \leq n$

$$\text{Ext}^i(M, \varinjlim_{\alpha \in I} N_\alpha) \cong \varinjlim_{\alpha \in I} \text{Ext}^i(M, N_\alpha)$$

Also useful is the following lemma von M. Auslander ([4, 6.4]):

Lemma 2.5. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let M be a module. Assume M has a filtration of modules $X \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{proj.dim } X \leq n$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Then we have $\text{proj.dim } M \leq n$. is P_n -filtered. Then $M \in P_n$.

Given $U_i, V \in R - \text{Mod}$ for an index set I and $i \in I$ and $W \in R - \text{mod}$ we use the following isomorphisms

$$\text{Ext}(\bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i, V) \cong \prod_{i \in I} \text{Ext}(U_i, V), \quad \text{Ext}(W, \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i) \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Ext}(W, U_i)$$

For a module $M \in R - \text{Mod}$ we denote by $\text{proj.dim } M$ the projective dimension of M .

3. \mathcal{X} -SEMI-SIMPLE MODULES

For a semi-brick \mathcal{X} C. M. Ringel has shown in [2, 1.2] that $\text{filt}(\mathcal{X})$ is a wide category. In this and the next section we show that this is also the case for $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $M \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. We define the \mathcal{X} -socle of M as the submodule

$$\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M = \sum_{f \in \text{Hom}(X, M), X \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Im } f$$

If $M = \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M$ we call M a \mathcal{X} -semi-simple module.

In this section we will see that \mathcal{X} -semi-simple modules share many properties with k -vector spaces.

Proposition 3.2. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $M \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ with a filtration $(M_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$. Let I be the set of ordinal numbers λ with $M_\lambda \hookrightarrow M_{\lambda+1}$ is a split monomorphism. Then we have $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in I} M_{\lambda+1}/M_\lambda$.

Proof. For each $\lambda \in I$, the short exact sequence

$$(1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow M_{\lambda-1} \xrightarrow{\alpha} M_\lambda \xrightarrow{\beta} M_\lambda/M_{\lambda-1} \longrightarrow 0$$

splits by the definition of I . We choose a retraction $r_\lambda : M_\lambda/M_{\lambda-1} \rightarrow M_\lambda$ for each $\lambda \in I$, define $U_\lambda = r_\lambda(M_\lambda/M_{\lambda-1})$ and will prove that $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in I} U_\lambda$. Since we have $M_\lambda = U_\lambda \oplus M_{\lambda-1}$ and $\bigoplus_{\alpha < \lambda} U_\alpha \subset M_{\lambda-1}$, we have $\bigoplus_{\alpha < \lambda} U_\alpha \cap U_\lambda = 0$.

We prove by transfinite induction over λ that $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M_\lambda = \bigoplus_{\alpha \leq \lambda} U_\alpha$. For $\lambda = 1$ we have $M_1 = U_1 = \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M_1$. If λ is an ordinal number, we have to distinguish whether $M_{\lambda-1} \hookrightarrow M_\lambda$ splits or not. If $M_{\lambda-1} \hookrightarrow M_\lambda$ splits, we have $M_\lambda = M_{\lambda-1} \oplus U_\lambda$ with U_λ being isomorphic to a brick in \mathcal{X} and each $f : X \rightarrow M_{\lambda-1} \oplus U_\lambda$ can be written as (f_1, f_2) with $f_1 \in \text{Hom}(X, M_{\lambda-1})$ and $f_2 \in \text{Hom}(X, U_\lambda)$. The image of f_1 is in $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M_{\lambda-1} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \leq \lambda-1} U_\alpha$ which proves that $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M_\lambda = \bigoplus_{\alpha \leq \lambda} U_\alpha$.

If $M_{\lambda-1} \hookrightarrow M_\lambda$ does not split we show that $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M_\lambda = \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M_{\lambda-1}$. Suppose we have a homomorphism $f : X \rightarrow M_\lambda$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\text{Im } f \not\subseteq M_{\lambda-1}$. Then for the short exact sequence (1) we would have $f \circ \beta \neq 0$ and therefore $f \circ \beta$ would be an isomorphism and β a split epimorphism, a contradiction.

It remains the case that λ is a limit ordinal. Then we have $\text{soc}_X M_\lambda = \bigcup_{i < \lambda} \text{soc}_X M_i$ which shows the proposition. \square

The following lemma is the equivalent of Steinitz's theorem:

Lemma 3.3. *Let X be a semi-brick and $M \in \text{Filt}(X)$ with $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r X_i$ with $X_i \in X$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Let Y be a submodule of M which is isomorphic to an element of X and $\pi_r(Y) \neq 0$ for the natural projection $\pi_r : \bigoplus_{i=1}^r X_i \rightarrow X_r$. Then we have $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} X_i \oplus Y$.*

Proof. We first show that $Y \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} X_i = 0$. Let ϵ be the natural inclusion $Y \hookrightarrow M$ and $\pi_r : \bigoplus_{i=1}^r X_i \rightarrow X_r$ be the natural projection. Since $\pi_r(Y) \neq 0$ the homomorphism $\epsilon \circ \pi_r$ must be injective, thus $Y \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} X_i = 0$.

It remains to show that $M = Y + \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} X_i$. Let $\pi : M \rightarrow M / \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} X_i$ be the natural projection. Since $X_r \cong M / \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} X_i$ the non-zero homomorphism $\epsilon \circ \pi$ must be an epimorphism. This implies that $M = Y + \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} X_i$. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let X be a semi-brick, $U \in \text{Filt}(X)$ and $f : U \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} X_\alpha$ be a non-zero homomorphism with $X_\alpha \in X$ for $\alpha \in I$. Then $\text{Im } f$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of modules of X and there exists a subset $I' \subset I$ with $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} X_\alpha = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I'} X_\alpha \oplus \text{Im } f$.*

Proof. Let $(U_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ be an X -filtration of U . We define a partially ordered set \mathcal{P} as follows: The elements of \mathcal{P} are triples $(\lambda, (Y_j)_{j \in J_\lambda}, I_\lambda)$ of an ordinal $\lambda \leq \mu$, submodules Y_j of $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} X_\alpha$ which are isomorphic to an element of X for $j \in J_\lambda$, and a subset I_λ of I . Each triple should have the properties $f(U_\lambda) = \bigoplus_{j \in J_\lambda} Y_j$ and $f(U_\lambda) \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I_\lambda} X_\alpha = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} X_\alpha$. For two elements $P_1 = (\lambda_1, (Y_j)_{j \in J_{\lambda_1}}, I_{\lambda_1})$ and $P_2 = (\lambda_2, (Y_j)_{j \in J_{\lambda_2}}, I_{\lambda_2})$ of \mathcal{P} we define $P_1 \leq P_2$ if $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$, $J_{\lambda_1} \subset J_{\lambda_2}$ and $I_{\lambda_2} \subset I_{\lambda_1}$.

First we show that \mathcal{P} is not empty. Let $\lambda_0 \leq \mu$ be minimal with $f(U_{\lambda_0}) \neq 0$. The module $Y = f(U_{\lambda_0})$ is isomorphic to an element in X and a submodule of a finite direct sum of $\bigoplus_{j=1}^r X_{i_j}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\pi_r(Y) \neq 0$ for the natural projection $\pi_r : \bigoplus_{j=1}^r X_{i_j} \rightarrow X_{i_r}$. The triple $(\lambda_0, Y, I \setminus \{i_r\})$ is by 3.3 in \mathcal{P} .

Next, we show that every partially ordered chain $\mathcal{T} = (\lambda_t, (Y_j)_{j \in J_{\lambda_t}}, I_{\lambda_t})_{t \in T}$ in \mathcal{P} has an upper bound in \mathcal{P} . The triplet $(\lambda_s, J_{\lambda_s}, I_{\lambda_s})$ with

$$\lambda_s = \sup\{\lambda_t \mid t \in T\}, J_{\lambda_s} = \bigcup_{t \in T} J_{\lambda_t}, I_{\lambda_s} = \bigcap_{t \in T} I_{\lambda_t}$$

is an element of \mathcal{P} : We need to show that $f(U_{\lambda_s}) \bigoplus_{i \in I_{\lambda_s}} X_i = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$. Let $x \in \bigoplus_{i \in I_{\lambda_s}} X_i$ and $t_0 \in T$. Then x has a unique decomposition in $f(U_{\lambda_{t_0}}) \bigoplus_{i \in J_{t_0}} X_i$ and there exists a finite subset S of J_{t_0} with $x \in f(U_{\lambda_{t_0}}) \bigoplus_S X_i$. Since S is finite, there exists a $\lambda_1 \in T$ with $S \cap J_{\lambda_1} = S \cap J_{\lambda}$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$. But then we have $x \in f(U_{\lambda_s}) \bigoplus_{i \in I_{\lambda_s}} X_i$. This proves that every partially ordered subset in \mathcal{P} has an upper bound.

By Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal element $P_m = (\lambda_m, (Y_j)_{j \in J_{\lambda_m}}, I_{\lambda_m})$ in \mathcal{P} . We need to show that $f(U_{\lambda_m}) = f(U)$. Suppose there exists a minimal $\lambda_0 \leq \mu$ with $\lambda_m < \lambda_0$ and $f(U_{\lambda_0}) \not\subseteq f(U_{\lambda_m})$. With the natural projections π_1, π_2 we would get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_{\lambda_0} & \xrightarrow{f} & f(U_{\lambda_m}) \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I_{\lambda_m}} X_\alpha \\ \downarrow \pi_1 & & \downarrow \pi_2 \\ U_{\lambda_0} / U_{\lambda_0-1} & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I_{\lambda_m}} X_\alpha \end{array}$$

Let Y be the image of the injective function \bar{f} . Then we have $Y \subset f(U)$ and $Y \cap f(U_{\lambda_m}) = 0$. Let $i_0 \in I_{\lambda_m}$ with $\pi_{i_0}(Y) \neq 0$ for the natural projection $\pi_{i_0} : \bigoplus_{i \in I_{\lambda_m}} X_i \rightarrow X_{i_0}$. Since

Y is a subset of a finite direct sum of $\bigoplus_{i \in I_{\lambda_m}} X_i$ we could apply 3.3 and get that $P_{m'} = (\lambda_0, (Y_j)_{j \in J_{\lambda_t}} \cup \{Y\}, I_{\lambda_m} \setminus \{i_0\})$ is in \mathcal{P} but $\mathcal{P}_{m'} > \mathcal{P}_m$, a contradiction. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a homomorphism between two \mathcal{X} -semi-simple modules M and N . Then $\ker f$ and $\operatorname{coker} f$ are \mathcal{X} -semi-simple.*

Proof. By 3.4 we have $N \cong \operatorname{Im} f \oplus N'$ with a \mathcal{X} -semi-simple module N' . Thus $\operatorname{coker} f \cong N'$ is \mathcal{X} -semi-simple.

To see that the kernel of f is \mathcal{X} -semi-simple we consider the short exact sequence

$$(2) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \ker f \xrightarrow{\iota} M \xrightarrow{f} \operatorname{Im} f \longrightarrow 0$$

If this sequence splits let π be the projection from M onto $\ker f$ and ϵ the natural inclusion of $\ker f$ into M . We apply 3.4 on the map $\pi \circ \epsilon : M \rightarrow M$ and get the assertion.

It remains to show that the short exact sequence (2) splits. Let $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$. Using Lemma of Zorn it can be shown that there exists a subset I' of I maximal with the property that f restricted to $\bigoplus_{i \in I'} X_i$ is injective. Let $U = f(\bigoplus_{i \in I'} X_i)$ and assume that $U \subsetneq N$. By 3.4 there exists a submodule V of N such that $N = U \oplus V$. We denote by π the natural projection $U \oplus V \rightarrow V$. There exists a $i_0 \in I$ such that $f \circ \pi$ restricted to X_{i_0} is injective. The homomorphism f restricted to $\bigoplus_{i \in I \cup \{i_0\}} X_i$ would be injective, a contradiction to the maximality of I' . \square

4. $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ IS WIDE CATEGORY OF $R - \operatorname{Mod}$

The main theorem of this section is the following:

Theorem 4.1. *Let R be a unitary associative ring and \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick. Then the category $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ is wide.*

The proof of the theorem follows directly from the following statements of this sections:

Proposition 4.2. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $M \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ with a filtration $(M_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$. There exists a filtration $(N_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ of M and a $\lambda_0 \leq \mu$ with $N_{\lambda_0} = \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M$. In particular we have $M / \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. By 3.2 there is an isomorphism $\operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in I} M_{\lambda+1} / M_\lambda$. So we can choose submodules U_i of M for $i \in I$ with $\operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i$. Note that $M_\lambda \cap \bigoplus_{\alpha > \lambda} U_\alpha = 0$ for each $1 \leq \lambda \leq \mu$.

We define a new filtration $(V_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ of M with $V_\lambda = M_\lambda + \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M$. We have $V_0 = \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ and $V_\mu = M$. For a limit ordinal λ we have

$$V_\lambda = M_\lambda + \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} M_\alpha + \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} V_\alpha$$

By definition it could be that $V_\lambda = V_{\lambda+1}$. It remains to show for a ordinal number λ with $V_\lambda \neq V_{\lambda-1}$ that $V_{\lambda+1} / V_\lambda \in \mathcal{X}$. Note that the assumption $V_\lambda \neq V_{\lambda-1}$ implies $\lambda \notin I$:

$$\begin{aligned} V_\lambda / V_{\lambda-1} &= (M_\lambda + \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M) / (M_{\lambda-1} + \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M) \\ &= (M_\lambda \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} U_\alpha) / (M_{\lambda-1} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} U_\alpha) \\ &\cong M_\lambda / M_{\lambda-1} \in \mathcal{X} \end{aligned}$$

\square

Given a semi-brick \mathcal{X} , we can define the category $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ of modules $M \in A - \operatorname{Mod}$ that have an \mathcal{X} -filtration. This filtration is in general not uniquely determined. Using 4.2 we can define now a canonical filtration for every module in $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.

Definition 4.3. For $M \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$, the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration $(V_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ of M is defined as follows: $V_0 = 0$ and if V_λ is defined then $V_{\lambda+1}$ is defined by the following pull-back

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & V_\lambda & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & M/V_\lambda & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V_\lambda & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda+1} & \longrightarrow & \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M/V_\lambda & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

If λ is a limit ordinal we define $V_\lambda = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} V_\alpha$.

We show now that the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration is strict for all homomorphisms in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. Then this is the finest filtration which is strict because we can apply a permutation of the \mathcal{X} -socle modules and get a different \mathcal{X} -filtration for the same module.

Proposition 4.4. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $M, N \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ with the \mathcal{X} -socle filtrations $(M_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ and $(N_\omega, \omega \leq \nu)$. Then for a homomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ we have $f(M_\lambda) \subset N_\lambda$ for $\lambda \leq \mu$. Here we define $N_\lambda = N$ in case $\lambda > \nu$.*

Proof. We prove the assertion by transfinite induction over $\lambda \leq \mu$. For $\lambda = 0$ there is nothing to prove. Assume now the assertion is true for an ordinal number $\lambda_0 \geq 0$. In the following diagram the image of the \mathcal{X} -socle of M/M_{λ_0} under f is in the \mathcal{X} -socle of N/N_{λ_0} and therefore is the image of M_{λ_0+1} a subset of N_{λ_0+1} .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda_0} & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda_0+1} & \longrightarrow & \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}}(M/M_{\lambda_0}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \iota & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda_0} & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & M/M_{\lambda_0} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \bar{f} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_{\lambda_0} & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & N/N_{\lambda_0} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

If λ_0 is a limit ordinal then $f(M_\alpha) \subset N_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \lambda_0$ implies $f(M_{\lambda_0}) = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda_0} f(M_\alpha) \subset \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda_0} N_\alpha = N_{\lambda_0}$. \square

Proposition 4.5. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick. The category $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ is an exact subcategory of $R\text{-Mod}$ and closed against kernels and images.*

Proof. We start to prove that $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ is exact and taken over the proof from [3, 3.2]. Let $M, N \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ with the \mathcal{X} -socle filtrations $(M_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ and $(N_\omega, \omega \leq \nu)$ and

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow 0$$

be an exact short exact sequence. For each N_ω with $\omega \leq \nu$, we can choose a subobject V_ω of Z such that $V_\omega/M \cong N_\omega$. We claim that $(Z_\Theta, \Theta \leq \mu + \nu)$ given by $Z_\Theta = M_\Theta$ whenever $\Theta \leq \mu$ and $Z_\Theta = V_\Theta$ whenever $\mu < \Theta \leq \mu + \nu$ is an $\text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$ -filtration of Z . It suffices to observe that $Z_{\mu+1}/Z_\mu = Z_{\mu+1}/M = V_1/M \cong N_1$ which lies in $\text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$.

Let now $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a homomorphism. We denote the restriction of f to the submodule M_λ of M by f_λ . Since 4.4 the image of f_λ is in the submodule N_λ of N . By the snake

lemma we have the following diagram

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker f_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & \ker f_{\lambda} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \ker \widehat{f}_{\lambda} & \xrightarrow{\beta} & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda}/M_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow f_{\lambda-1} & & \downarrow f_{\lambda} & & \downarrow \widehat{f}_{\lambda} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & N_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & N_{\lambda}/N_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \operatorname{coker} f_{\lambda-1} & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & \operatorname{coker} f_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{coker} \widehat{f}_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

We prove by induction over λ that all modules in the upper diagram are in $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. For $\lambda = 1$ we have to consider the homomorphism $f_1 : M_1 \rightarrow N_1$. The assertion follows directly from 3.5.

Now suppose the assertion is true for $\lambda \geq 1$. Since the modules $M_{\lambda}/M_{\lambda-1}$ and $N_{\lambda}/N_{\lambda-1}$ are in $\operatorname{Add}(\mathcal{X})$, 3.5 implies that the modules $\ker \widehat{f}_{\lambda}$ and $\operatorname{coker} \widehat{f}_{\lambda}$ are in $\operatorname{Add}(\mathcal{X})$, too. By induction assumption the modules $\ker f_{\lambda-1}$ and $\operatorname{coker} f_{\lambda-1}$ are in $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. The image of α is by 3.5 in $\operatorname{Add}(\mathcal{X})$ which implies $\ker f_{\lambda} \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. Also by induction assumption $\operatorname{coker} f_{\lambda-1}$ is in $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. The image of β is in the \mathcal{X} -socle of the cokernel which implies that $\operatorname{coker} f_{\lambda-1}/\operatorname{Im} \beta \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. Therefore $\operatorname{coker} f_{\lambda}$ is also in $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.

If λ is a limit ordinal then $\ker f_{\lambda} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \ker f_{\alpha}$. This shows that $\ker f \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.

To show that $\operatorname{Im} f \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ we show that $(f(M_{\lambda}), \lambda \leq \mu)$ is a $\operatorname{Add}(\mathcal{X})$ -filtration of $\operatorname{Im} f$. For $\lambda = 1$ we get from 3.4 that $f(M_1) \in \operatorname{Add}(\mathcal{X})$. Let now λ be an ordinal number. Then we consider the following diagram:

$$(4) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker f_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & \ker f_{\lambda} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \ker \widehat{f}_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & M_{\lambda}/M_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow f_{\lambda-1} & & \downarrow f_{\lambda} & & \downarrow \widehat{f}_{\lambda} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & f(M_{\lambda-1}) & \longrightarrow & f(M_{\lambda}) & \longrightarrow & f(M_{\lambda})/f(M_{\lambda-1}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Note that $\ker \widehat{f}_{\lambda} \in \operatorname{Add}(\mathcal{X})$ as the kernel is isomorphic to the image of α in the diagram (3). By 3.4 we see that $f(M_{\lambda})/f(M_{\lambda-1}) \in \operatorname{Add}(\mathcal{X})$. If λ is a limit ordinal then we have $f(M_{\lambda}) = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} f(M_{\alpha})$. This proves that $\operatorname{Im} f \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

With the next proposition we complete the proof that $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ is a wide category.

Proposition 4.6. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $M, N \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ with \mathcal{X} -socle filtrations $(M_{\lambda}, \lambda \leq \mu)$ and $(N_{\omega}, \omega \leq \nu)$ and let $f \in \operatorname{Hom}(M, N)$ be a homomorphism.*

- The sum and the intersection of two $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ -submodules of N are $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ -submodules.
- If N' is a $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ -submodule of N then $\operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} N' = \operatorname{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} N \cap N'$.
- $f(M)$ has the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration $(f(M) \cap N_{\lambda}, \lambda \leq \min\{\mu, \nu\})$.
- $\operatorname{coker} f \in \operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$

Proof. (a) Let U, V be $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ submodules of N . We denote by Σ the sum function in the following diagram

$$0 \longrightarrow U \cap V \longrightarrow U \oplus V \xrightarrow{\Sigma} U + V \longrightarrow 0$$

The module $U \oplus V$ is in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ and so by 4.5 is also the image $U + V$ of the homomorphism Σ . This implies by 4.5 that the kernel of Σ which is $U \cap V$ is in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.

(b) The inclusion $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} N' \subset \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} N \cap N'$ is trivial. For the opposite we use that by part (a) the module $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} N \cap N'$ is a $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ -module and by 3.4 \mathcal{X} -semi-simple.

(c) We prove the statement by transfinite induction over λ . For $\lambda = 1$, the statement follows from part (b), since $N_1 = \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} N$. Let $(V_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu_0)$ be the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration of $f(M)$. For an ordinal number λ we consider the following diagram:

$$(5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & f(M) & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & f(M)/V_{\lambda-1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \iota_{\lambda-1} & & \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \bar{\iota}_\lambda \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & N & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & N/N_{\lambda-1} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since $\pi_1 \circ \bar{\iota}_\lambda(V_\lambda) \subset \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} N/N_{\lambda-1}$ we have $V_\lambda \subset f(M) \cap N_\lambda$. For the opposite we use that the homomorphism $\bar{\iota}_\lambda$ in (5) is injective because by induction assumption we have $V_{\lambda-1} = f(M) \cap N_{\lambda-1}$. For the module $f(M) \cap N_\lambda$ we have $\pi_2(f(M) \cap N_\lambda) \subset \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} N/N_{\lambda-1}$ and because $\bar{\iota}_\lambda$ is injective $\pi_1(f(M) \cap N_\lambda) \subset \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} f(M)/V_{\lambda-1}$. This shows that we have $f(M) \cap N_\lambda \subset V_\lambda$.

(d) We have seen in the proof of part (c) that the function $\bar{\iota}_\lambda$ is injective. The snake lemma implies now that the following diagram is commutative

$$(6) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & f(M) & \longrightarrow & f(M)/V_{\lambda-1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \iota_{\lambda-1} & & \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \bar{\iota}_\lambda \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & N/N_{\lambda-1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } \iota_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } \iota & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } \bar{\iota}_\lambda \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

The short exact sequence at the bottom of (6) gives a $\text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$ -socle filtration of $\text{coker } \iota$ for the embedding $\iota : f(M) \hookrightarrow N$. \square

5. \mathcal{X} -UNIVERSAL SHORT EXACT SEQUENCES

For this and the following sections we assume that A is a right coherent ring.

Definition 5.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $Y \in A - \text{Mod}$. For $X \in \mathcal{X}$ the extension group $\text{Ext}(X, Y)$ has a structure as left $\text{End}(X)$ -module. We choose an $\text{End}(X)$ -vector space basis of ${}_{\text{End}(X)}\text{Ext}(X, Y)$, say

$$(0 \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow M_{X,i} \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0)_{i \in I_X}$$

and define the \mathcal{X} -universal short exact sequence starting at Y as the push-out in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} Y^{(I_X)} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}, i \in I_X} M_{X,i} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \Sigma & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Lemma 5.2. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $Y \in A - \text{Mod}$. Then for a short exact sequence

$$(7) \quad 0 \longrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\alpha} M \xrightarrow{\beta} \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0$$

there are equivalent:

- (i) The short exact sequence is \mathcal{X} -universal.

(ii) For $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is the connection homomorphism $\delta : \text{Hom}(X, \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)}) \rightarrow \text{Ext}(X, Y)$ an isomorphism.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): The surjectivity of the connection homomorphism follows directly from the construction. It remains to prove that δ is injective. Assume that a non-zero homomorphism $f \in \text{Hom}(X, \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)})$ is in the kernel of δ . The image of f is a subset of a finite direct sum, say $\text{Im } f \subset \bigoplus_{i=1}^s X_i$ and we have with the canonical projections $\pi_j : \bigoplus_{i=1}^s X_i \rightarrow X_j$ and the canonical inclusions $\epsilon_j : X_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^s X_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq s$ the following decomposition

$$f = f \circ \sum_{i=1}^s \pi_i \circ \epsilon_i = \sum_{i=1}^s (f \circ \pi_i) \circ \epsilon_i$$

Note that the homomorphism $\lambda_i = f \circ \pi_i$ is an endomorphism of X for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and not all λ_i are zero. If we denote the pull-back of the \mathcal{X} -universal short exact sequence starting at $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ along ϵ_i by E_i then we get $\sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i E_i = 0$, a contradiction to the linear independency of the basis elements of $\text{Ext}(X, Y)$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $\epsilon_{X,i} : X \rightarrow X^{(I_X)}$ be the natural embedding for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $i \in I_X$. Let $E_{X,i} = \delta(\epsilon_{X,i})$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $i \in I_X$. Since $(\epsilon_{X,i})_{i \in I_X}$ is a $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Hom}(X, \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)})$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and δ is an isomorphism the set $(E_{X,i})_{i \in I_X}$ is a $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Ext}(X, Y)$. Using the basis $(E_{X,i})_{X \in \mathcal{X}, i \in I_X}$ for the construction of the \mathcal{X} -universal short exact sequence results in (7). \square

D. Happel and L. Unger mentioned in [5, §1] that the universal sequence of $\text{Ext}(X, Y)$ is, up to equivalence, uniquely determined if X is a brick. They did not give a proof of this statement, therefore we add the following proposition:

Proposition 5.3. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $Y \in A - \text{Mod}$. Then all universal short exact sequences of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\alpha} Z \xrightarrow{\beta} \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0$$

are equivalent.

Proof. Given the following two universal short exact sequences

$$E : 0 \longrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\alpha} Z \xrightarrow{\beta} \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0$$

$$E' : 0 \longrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\alpha'} Z' \xrightarrow{\beta'} \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0$$

we have to show that there exist two isomorphisms $f \in \text{Hom}(Z', Z)$ and $g \in \text{End}(\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)})$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha'} & Z' & \xrightarrow{\beta'} & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Z & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Let

$$(E_{X,i} : 0 \longrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\alpha_{X,i}} Z_{X,i} \xrightarrow{\beta_{X,i}} X \longrightarrow 0)_{i \in I_X, X \in \mathcal{X}}$$

$$(E'_{X,i} : 0 \longrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\alpha'_{X,i}} Z'_{X,i} \xrightarrow{\beta'_{X,i}} X \longrightarrow 0)_{i \in I_X, X \in \mathcal{X}}$$

be the $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Ext}(X, Y)$ which has been chosen for the construction of the universal sequence E and E' .

For $X \in \mathcal{X}$ we apply $\text{Hom}(-, X)$ to the universal short exact sequence E . Since the

connection homomorphism δ is surjective, there exists $g_{X,i} \in \text{Hom}(X, \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)})$ for all $i \in I_X$ with $\delta(g_{X,i}) = E'_{X,i}$. We define $g_X \in \text{End}(X^{(I_X)})$ as $g_X = \bigoplus_{i \in I_X} g_{X,i}$. We claim that the endomorphism g_X is surjective: We show that for $i \in I_X$ the embedding $\epsilon_i : X \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)}$ can be written as a linear combination of finitely many $g_{X,j}$. Since $(E'_{X,i})_{i \in I_X}$ is an $\text{End}(X)$ -basis there is a linear combination for

$$\delta(\epsilon_i) = E_{X,i} = \sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j E'_{X,j} = \sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j \delta(g_{X,j}) = \delta\left(\sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j g_{X,j}\right)$$

By 5.2(b) the connection homomorphism δ is an isomorphism, thus we have $\epsilon_i = \sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j g_{X,j}$. This proves that G_X is surjective.

The homomorphism g_X is injective, otherwise a non-trivial linear combination $\sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j g_{X,j}$ would be zero, a contradiction to the injectivity of δ .

If for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ the function g_X is an isomorphism then the function $g = \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} g_X$ is also an isomorphism. The pull-back of E along g is the short exact sequence E' . \square

For a semi-brick \mathcal{X} and a module $Y \in A - \text{Mod}$ we define $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(0) = 0$, $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(1) = Y$ and recursively if $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ is defined for $r \geq 1$ we define $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$ as the middle term of the \mathcal{X} -universal short exact sequence starting at $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$. If we consider the monomorphisms $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$ as inclusions we define $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)$. Since 5.3 the definition of $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)$ and thus $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$ is unique defined up to equivalence.

The property stated in the next lemma results from the lineary independency of the short exact sequences used for the construction of the \mathcal{X} -universal sequence.

Lemma 5.4. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $f \in \text{Hom}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty))$. Then we have $\text{Im } f \subset Y$.*

Proof. For $r \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the following \mathcal{X} -universal short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \xrightarrow{\alpha} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1) \xrightarrow{\beta} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \longrightarrow 0$$

If for a $X \in \mathcal{X}$ there would exist a homomorphism $f : X \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$ with $f \circ \beta \neq 0$ then for the connection homomorphism $\delta : \text{Hom}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r))$ we would have $\delta(f) = 0$, a contradiction to 5.2. \square

We have shown that every module in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ has a \mathcal{X} -socle filtration. Given a sequence of submodules it would be useful to know if this sequence is already a \mathcal{X} -socle filtration of the direct limit of the sequence. The next proposition provides us with a criteria for this:

Proposition 5.5. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and M be a module in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $(V_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ be a $\text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$ -filtration of M . Then there are equivalent:*

- (i) *The filtration $(V_\lambda, \lambda \leq \mu)$ is the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration of M .*
- (ii) *For ordinal numbers $\lambda \geq 2$ and ordinals α with $0 \leq \alpha < \lambda$ we consider the following short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow V_{\lambda-1}/V_\alpha \xrightarrow{\epsilon} V_\lambda/V_\alpha \xrightarrow{\pi} V_\lambda/V_{\lambda-1} \longrightarrow 0$$

Then the connection homomorphism

$$\delta : \text{Hom}(X, V_\lambda/V_{\lambda-1}) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}(X, V_{\lambda-1}/V_\alpha)$$

is injective.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) Let λ be an ordinal number and $g \in \text{Hom}(X, V_\lambda/V_{\lambda-1})$ be a non-zero homomorphism. We have to show that the pull-back along g in the following diagram does

not split:

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda-1}/V_\alpha & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & V_\lambda/V_\alpha & \xrightarrow{\pi} & V_\lambda/V_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \uparrow f & & \uparrow g & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda-1}/V_\alpha & \xrightarrow{\epsilon'} & U & \xrightarrow{\pi'} & X & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

We use the fact that

$$\text{soc}_X M/V_\alpha = \text{soc}_X V_{\alpha+1}/V_\alpha = \text{soc}_X V_\lambda/V_\alpha$$

for all $0 \leq \alpha < \lambda \leq \mu$. If the lower sequence in (8) would split then there exists a retraction $r \in \text{Hom}(X, U)$ with $r \circ \pi' = \text{id}_X$. The function $r \circ f$ would be non-zero and do not map to the X -socle of V_λ/V_α , a contradiction.

(b) \Rightarrow (a) We have to show that $V_{\alpha+1}/V_\alpha = \text{soc}_X M/V_\alpha$ for all ordinals $\alpha \geq 0$. Since $V_{\alpha+1}/V_\alpha \in \text{Add}(X)$ we have $V_{\alpha+1}/V_\alpha \subset \text{soc}_X M/V_\alpha$. For the opposite we assume that there exists a non-zero function $g : X \rightarrow V_\lambda/V_\alpha$ for a $\lambda > \alpha + 1$. We can assume that λ is minimal with $\text{Im } g \subset V_\lambda$. We create the pull-back along $g \circ \pi$ as shown in the following diagram:

$$(9) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda-1}/V_\alpha & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & V_\lambda/V_\alpha & \xrightarrow{\pi} & V_\lambda/V_{\lambda-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \uparrow f & & \uparrow g \circ \pi & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda-1}/V_\alpha & \xrightarrow{\epsilon'} & U & \xrightarrow{\pi'} & X & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

The homomorphism $g \circ \pi$ is injective, so is f . We consider U as submodule of V_λ/V_α and get $g \circ \pi' = \text{id}_X$, a contradiction. \square

Proposition 5.6. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick such that $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and let $Y \in A\text{-Mod}$. Then for $r \geq 2$ the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration of $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y$ is $(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)/Y, 1 \leq i \leq r)$. In case $Y \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ the module $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ has the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration $(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i), 0 \leq i \leq r)$. The short exact sequences*

$$(10) \quad 0 \longrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i) \longrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i) \longrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \longrightarrow 0$$

are also \mathcal{X} -universal short exact sequences for $0 \leq i \leq r-1$.

Proof. We proof the assertion by complete induction over r . For $r = 2$ the assertion is trivial, so assume now that the assertion is true for $r \geq 2$. Let $\pi_i : Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i-1) \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)$ be the canonical projection for $2 \leq i \leq r-1$. Then we get the following commutative diagram by a sequence of push-out along π_i for $2 \leq i \leq r-1$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \\ \downarrow \pi_2 & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \downarrow \pi_{r-2} & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r-2) & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r-2) & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \\ \downarrow \pi_{r-1} & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r-1) & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r-1) & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \end{array}$$

We apply the functor $\text{Hom}(X, -)$ on the diagram above and get

$$(11) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} (X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y) & \longrightarrow & (X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) & \xrightarrow{\delta_1} & {}^1(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y) \\ \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow {}^1(X, \pi_2) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r-2)) & \longrightarrow & (X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{r-2}} & {}^1(X, Y_r/Y_{r-2}) \\ \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow {}^1(X, \pi_{r-1}) \\ (X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r-1)) & \longrightarrow & (X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{r-1}} & {}^1(X, Y_r/Y_{r-1}) \end{array}$$

The homomorphisms $\text{Ext}^1(X, \pi_i)$ are surjective for $1 \leq i \leq r-1$ because $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$. The concatenation ${}^1(X, \pi_1) \circ \dots \circ {}^1(X, \pi_{r-1})$ is the homomorphism $\text{Ext}(X, \beta)$ which we get if we apply the functor $\text{Hom}(X, -)$ to the following \mathcal{X} -universal short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r-1) \xrightarrow{\alpha} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \xrightarrow{\beta} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r-1) \longrightarrow 0$$

Since this sequence is \mathcal{X} -universal the homomorphism $\text{Ext}(X, \beta)$ is according to 5.2 an isomorphism thus the homomorphisms $\text{Ext}^1(X, \pi_i)$ are isomorphisms for $2 \leq i \leq r-1$. Also by 5.2 is δ_{r-1} an isomorphism which implies that δ_i must be isomorphisms for $0 \leq i \leq r-1$. The assertion for the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration follows now from 5.5. That the short exact sequences (10) are \mathcal{X} -universal follows from 5.2. \square

Remark 5.7. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick with $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Assume for $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $\text{Ext}(X, Y) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ with $X \not\cong Y$ and with $E = \text{End}(Y)$ we have $\dim_E \text{Ext}(Y, Y) = 1$. Then the modules $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are uni-serial modules in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ with the unique chain of submodules $0 \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}}(1) \subset \dots \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)$.

We prove this by complete induction over i . For $i = 1$ this is given because Y is simple in \mathcal{X} . Assume $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)$ is uni-serial in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ for $i \geq 1$. Let $U \subsetneq Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)$ be a non-zero submodule in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. We get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1) & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)/Y \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & U & \longrightarrow & U/Y \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

By 5.6 we have $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)/Y \cong (Y_{\mathcal{X}}(2)/Y)_{\mathcal{X}}(i) \cong Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)$ thus by induction assumption U/Y must be a module in the unique chain $0 \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}}(1) \subset \dots \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)$. But then U is a module in the chain $0 \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}}(1) \subset \dots \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)$.

Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and \mathcal{X}' be a subset of \mathcal{X} . Within $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ the class $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X}')$ is a torsion class with the torsion functor $t_{\mathcal{X}'}$. We use this notation in the proof of the next proposition.

Theorem 5.8. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick, \mathcal{X}' be a subset of \mathcal{X} and $Y \in R\text{-Mod}$.

- (a) The module $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ can be considered in a canonical way as a submodule of $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$. For this we create the pull-back along the embedding $\epsilon : t_{\mathcal{X}'}C \rightarrow C$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha'} & Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r) & \xrightarrow{\beta'} & t_{\mathcal{X}'}C \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow \gamma & & \downarrow \epsilon \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & C \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

- The cokernel of $\gamma : Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r) \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ is an $t_{\mathcal{X}'}$ -torsionfree module in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.
- (b) If we have in addition $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for every $X \in \mathcal{X}$ then we have with $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{X})$ defined as the set of all finite sets of \mathcal{X} :

$$Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) = \bigcup_{X' \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{X})} Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$$

Proof. (a) We prove the assertion by complete induction over r . For $r = 2$ the assertion is trivial. We assume that the assertion has been proved for $r \geq 2$, and consider the following commutative diagram:

(1)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha'} & Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r) & \xrightarrow{\beta'} & t_{\mathcal{X}'}C \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow \gamma & & \downarrow \epsilon \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & C \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & F & \xlongequal{\quad} & F \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array}$$

For $X \in \mathcal{X}'$ we apply $\text{Hom}(X, -)$ to the sequence (1) and get

$$\dots \longrightarrow (X, F) \longrightarrow {}^1(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)) \xrightarrow{{}^1(X, \gamma)} {}^1(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) \longrightarrow \dots$$

By 4.6(d) we have $F \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. Additionally the module F is \mathcal{X}' -torsion free so we have $\text{Hom}(X, F) = 0$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}'$. We will define a $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Ext}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r))$ as follows:

- (i) For $X \in \mathcal{X}'$ let $(D_{X,i})_{i \in I'_X}$ be a $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Ext}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r))$ and $(E'_{X,i})_{i \in I'_X}$ be the image of the $\text{End}(X)$ -basis $(D_{X,i})_{i \in I'_X}$ under $\text{Ext}(X, \gamma)$. We complete the linear independent elements $(E'_{X,i})_{i \in I'_X}$ to a $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Ext}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r))$ by elements $(E''_{X,i})_{i \in I''_X}$.
- (ii) For $X \in \mathcal{X}/\mathcal{X}'$ let $(E_{X,i})_{i \in I_X}$ be a $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Ext}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r))$.

For $X \in \mathcal{X}'$ we define $I_X = I'_X \cup I''_X$ and write for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ the short exact sequences of the $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Ext}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r))$ in the form

$$(0 \longrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \longrightarrow Y_{X,i} \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0)_{i \in I_X}$$

With this we can write the construction of the universal short exact sequence as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)^{(I_X)} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}, i \in I_X} Y_{X,i} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \Sigma & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_n} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1) & \xrightarrow{\beta_n} & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)} \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

We prove now, that $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1) \subset t_{\mathcal{X}'}Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$. For this we use for $X \in \mathcal{X}'$ the basis elements $(E'_{X,i})_{i \in I'_X}$. Because they are in the image of $\text{Ext}(X, \gamma)$ we can derive them from $D_{X,i}$ by

a push-out along γ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 D_{X,i} : & 0 \longrightarrow & t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) & \longrightarrow & N_{X,i} & \longrightarrow & X \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \gamma & & \downarrow f_{X,i} & & \parallel \\
 E'_{X,i} : & 0 \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) & \longrightarrow & Y_{X,i} & \longrightarrow & X \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & F & \xlongequal{\quad} & F & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & &
 \end{array}$$

Since $X \in \mathcal{X}'$ the module $N_{X,i}$ is a \mathcal{X}' -torsion module. If we consider $f_{X,i}$ as an inclusion, we have $t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{X,i} = N_{X,i}$ because the cokernel F is \mathcal{X}' -torsion free. The monomorphism $f_{X,i} \in \text{Hom}(N_{X,i}, Y_{X,i})$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}'$ and $i \in I'_{\mathcal{X}}$ gives us a monomorphism $f \in \text{Hom}(\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}', i \in I'_{\mathcal{X}}} N_{X,i}, \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}, i \in I_{\mathcal{X}}} Y_{X,i})$. We get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r) & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}'} X^{(I'_{\mathcal{X}})} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \uparrow \Sigma' & & \uparrow & & \parallel \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)^{(I'_{\mathcal{X}})} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}', i \in I'_{\mathcal{X}}} N_{X,i} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}'} X^{(I'_{\mathcal{X}})} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)^{(I_{\mathcal{X}})} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}, i \in I_{\mathcal{X}}} Y_{X,i} & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{\mathcal{X}})} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \Sigma & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{\mathcal{X}})} \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

This gives a monomorphism from $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1)$ to $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$. Since $\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}', i \in I'_{\mathcal{X}}} N_{X,i}$ is \mathcal{X}' -torsion, $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1)$ is also \mathcal{X}' -torsion. So we have $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1) \subset t_{\mathcal{X}'} M_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$.

It remains to show that $t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1) \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1)$. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \xlongequal{\quad} t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) & & & & \\
 & & \downarrow \gamma & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{\mathcal{X}})} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \delta & & \downarrow \delta' & & \parallel \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & F & \xrightarrow{\alpha'} & N & \xrightarrow{\beta'} & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{\mathcal{X}})} \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

with the universal short exact sequence in the centre and a \mathcal{X}' -torsion-free module F .

We will show that for a module $G \in \text{filt}(\mathcal{X}')$ and a non-zero homomorphism $g : G \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$ we already have $\text{Im } g \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1)$. If $g \circ \delta' = 0$ then

$$\text{Im } g \subset t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) = Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r) \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r+1)$$

So assume we have a nonzero homomorphism $g \in \text{Hom}(G, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1))$ with the $g \circ \delta' \neq 0$. We can factorise $g \circ \delta'$ over $G' = G/\ker g \circ \delta'$ which is also a module in $\text{filt}(\mathcal{X}')$. The socle of G' is a direct sum of bricks from \mathcal{X}' , say $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}'} G' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r X_i$. Let $\epsilon : \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}'} G' \hookrightarrow G'$ be the inclusion. Then for $h = g \circ \delta' \circ \beta'$ is the homomorphism $\epsilon \circ h$ is injective, otherwise a simple torsion module X_i would map nonzero onto F . If $\epsilon \circ h$ is injective then h must also be injective, since $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}'} \ker h \subset \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}'} G'$. The image $\text{Im } h$ is a subset of the semi-simple module and therefore also semi-simple. Therefore we have $G' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r X_i$ and G' is a direct summand of $\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)}$. The sequence at the bottom splits.

We have seen in the first part that the sequences in $\text{Ext}(\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_X)}, Y(n))$ that splits under the push out along δ are in the image of $\text{Ext}(X, \gamma)$. But then we have $\text{Im } g \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(n+1)$.

(b) It is enough to show that there exists an epimorphism $f : \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)/Y$ for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with modules $M_i \in \text{filt}(\mathcal{X})$ and an index set I , because we have $f(M_i) \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X}')$ for $\mathcal{X}' \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{X})$.

We prove the assertion by complete induction over r . For $r = 2$ the assertion is true because $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(2)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a direct sum of elements of \mathcal{X} . Now suppose that the assertion has been proved for $r \geq 2$. Let $f : \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y$ be an epimorphism with finitely generated $M_i \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ for $i \in I$. With $K = \ker f$ we have the short exact sequence

$$(12) \quad 0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i \xrightarrow{f} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y \longrightarrow 0$$

Let the following sequence be a universal sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \longrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})} \longrightarrow 0$$

We apply the functor $\text{Hom}(\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})}, -)$ on 12 and get with $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$

$$\dots \longrightarrow \text{Ext}\left(\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})}, \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i\right) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}\left(\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})}, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)/Y\right) \longrightarrow 0$$

Therefore there must be a short exact sequence in $\text{Ext}(\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})}, \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i)$ such that we get the universal short exact sequence via push-out along f .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) & \longrightarrow & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

We consider the following pull-backs along the natural embedding $\epsilon_{X,i} : X \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})}$ for $i \in I_{X,r}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i & \longrightarrow & N_{X,i} & \longrightarrow & X \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \epsilon_{X,i} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{(I_{X,r})} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

The middle terms $N_{X,i}$ are generated by direct sums of finitely generated $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ -modules as the following shows

$$\text{Ext}\left(X, \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i\right) \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Ext}(X, M_i)$$

The direct sum $\bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}, i \in I_{X,n}} N_{X,i}$ generates N which generates $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$. \square

A useful proof strategy in the following for assertions about $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ for an infinite class \mathcal{X} will be that we first prove the assertion for $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ for a finite subset \mathcal{X}' of \mathcal{X} . Since 5.8(b) we can then lift the assertion to the semi-brick \mathcal{X} .

6. \mathcal{X}^\perp -ENVELOPES OF MODULES FOR A SEMI-BRICK \mathcal{X}

For a class \mathcal{C} of modules the following definitions for envelopes are generalizations of the concept of injective modules. We recall the definition of a \mathcal{C} -envelope which we take over from [4, 5.1, 5.12]:

Definition 6.1. Let \mathcal{C} be a class of modules. A map $f \in \text{Hom}(Y, \mathcal{C})$ with $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{C}$ is a **\mathcal{C} -preenvelope of Y** , provided for each homomorphism $f' : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ for a $\mathcal{C}' \in \mathcal{C}$ there is a homomorphism $g : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ such that $f' = g \circ f$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{C} \\ & \searrow f' & \downarrow g \\ & & \mathcal{C}' \end{array}$$

A \mathcal{C} -preenvelope f is called a **special \mathcal{C} -preenvelope**, provided that f is injective and $\text{coker } f \in {}^\perp \mathcal{C}$.

A \mathcal{C} -preenvelope f is a **\mathcal{C} -envelope of Y** provided that f is left minimal, that is, provided $f = f \circ g$ implies g is an automorphism for each $g \in \text{End}(\mathcal{C})$.

It is well known [4, 6.11] that for every module $M \in R\text{-Mod}$ and class of modules \mathcal{S} there exists a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow P \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow 0$$

with $P \in \mathcal{S}^\perp$ and $N \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. In particular is $M \rightarrow P$ a special \mathcal{S}^\perp -preenvelope M . For a semi-brick \mathcal{X} such that X is finitely presented for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ we get a \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope which comes with a concrete construction:

Proposition 6.2. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick such that all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ are finitely presented and let $Y \in R\text{-Mod}$.

- (a) The embedding $\alpha : Y \hookrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$ is a \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of Y with $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$ and $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/Y \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.
- (b) Let in addition $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for every $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $T_1 = R_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$, $T_2 = R_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/R$. Then $T = T_1 \oplus T_2$ is a tilting module with $\text{Hom}(T_2, T_1) = 0$.

Proof. (a) That $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/Y \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ can be immediately seen due to the construction of $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$. We first show that $\alpha : Y \hookrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$ is a \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of Y . Let $f : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ be a homomorphism for a $\mathcal{C}' \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$. We apply the functor $\text{Hom}(-, \mathcal{C})$ on the short exact sequence in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/Y \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & \searrow f & \downarrow g & & \\ & & & & \mathcal{C}' & & \end{array}$$

and get

$$\dots \longrightarrow (Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty), \mathcal{C}') \longrightarrow (Y, \mathcal{C}') \longrightarrow {}^1(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/Y, \mathcal{C}') \longrightarrow \dots$$

Since $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/Y \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{C}' \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$ we can apply 2.2 and get $\text{Ext}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/Y, \mathcal{C}') = 0$. Thus there exists a $g \in \text{Hom}((Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty), \mathcal{C}'))$ with $\alpha \circ g = f$.

Next we show that $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$. By 5.2 the connection homomorphisms $\delta_i : \text{Hom}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i-1)/Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i-1))$ is an isomorphism for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$. This implies that the homomorphism $\text{Ext}(X, \alpha_i) : \text{Ext}(X, Y_{i-1}) \rightarrow \text{Ext}(X, Y_i)$ is the zero map. We apply 2.4 and get

$$\text{Ext}(X, \varinjlim_{i \rightarrow \infty} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)) = \varinjlim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{Ext}(X, Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i)) = 0$$

To show that $\alpha : Y \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$ is a \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of Y assume that $\alpha = \alpha \circ h$ with $h \in \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty))$. We get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & \ker h & \xlongequal{\quad} & \ker h & \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/Y \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/Y \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & \text{coker } h & \xlongequal{\quad} & \text{coker } h
 \end{array}$$

By 4.5 and 4.6 $\ker h$ and $\text{coker } h$ are in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. If $\ker h$ would not be zero then we get a contradiction to 5.6. Therefore h must be injective. If $\text{coker } h$ would not be zero then the vertical sequence would split and we get $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) \cong Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) \oplus \text{coker } h$ and therefore again a contradiction to 5.6. This shows that h is surjective, thus an automorphism.

(b) It follows from 2.5 that $\text{proj.dim } T \leq 1$ and from 5.4 that $\text{Hom}(T_2, T_1) = 0$. It remains to show that $\text{Ext}(T, T^{(I)}) = 0$ for all index sets I . Since $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $R_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/R \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$ and therefore $\text{Ext}(X, T) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Since X is finitely generated we have $\text{Ext}(X, T^{(I)}) \cong \text{Ext}(X, T)^{(I)} = 0$. The module T is in the filtration class $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X}')$ for $\mathcal{X}' = \mathcal{X} \cup \{A\}$. The assertion follows now directly from 2.2. \square

Remark 6.3. In the proof of 6.2(a) we have only used the surjectivity of the connection homomorphism δ for the proof that $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$. If X is a set of finitely presented modules and $Y \in R\text{-Mod}$ we can construct a short exact sequence, starting at Y and ending with $\bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$ for $i \in I$ such that the connection homomorphism $\delta : \text{Hom}(X, \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i) \rightarrow \text{Ext}(X, Y)$ is surjective. For the construction we take a generator system of $\text{Ext}(Y, X)$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ instead of an $\text{End}(X)$ -basis of $\text{Ext}(X, Y)$.

By iterating this we would get a chain of submodules $Y = Y(1) \subset Y(2) \subset \dots$ with the direct limit $Y(\infty)$. Then we have $Y(\infty) \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$. If A is a hereditary k -algebra of infinite representation type and $\mathcal{X} = \{\tau^n P \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for a preprojective non-zero module P then it is easy to see that $A(\infty)$ is the Lukas tilting module. Let now A be a wild hereditary algebra and $\mathcal{X} = \{\tau^n R \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for a regular non-zero module R . Then the module $A(\infty)$ is a divisible module which is projective in the subcategory of divisible modules.

This shows that the construction is interesting not only for semi-bricks. However, in this paper we would like to keep our focus on semi-bricks.

7. PRÜFER MODULES

For a tame hereditary algebra the Prüfer modules, as defined in by C. M. Ringel in [1], are divisible modules, i.e. they are injective indecomposable objects in the filtration category of quasi-simple modules. We propose to use this homological property to generalise the definition of Prüfer modules.

To avoid that in the following definition also a finitely generated module would be called a Prüfer module we assume that the semi-brick \mathcal{X} does not contain an \mathcal{X} -injective object. In addition we assume in this section that for every $X \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$.

Example 7.1. We consider the category of abelian groups as module category over \mathbb{Z} and define the semi-brick $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \mid p \text{ primary number}\}$. We have $\dim_{\text{End}(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})} \text{Ext}(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}) = 1$ and $\text{Ext}(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}/p'\mathbb{Z})_E = 0$ for $p \neq p'$. A basis element is the canonical embedding

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow 0$$

The \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of \mathbb{Z}/p is the embedding $\mathbb{Z}/p \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{p^\infty}$ in the p -Prüfer group. Furthermore we have $\dim_{\text{End}(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})} \text{Ext}(\mathbb{Z}/p, \mathbb{Z}) = 1$ and therefore is the \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of \mathbb{Z} the embedding α of the following exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{p \text{ prim}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^\infty} \longrightarrow 0$$

By 5.7 the modules \mathbb{Z}_{p^∞} are uni-serial in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ for p prim and by 5.6(c) we have for $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}_{p^\infty}, \mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)) = 0$. Since \mathbb{Q} is also a \mathcal{X}^\perp -envelope of \mathbb{Z} we have $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty) \cong \mathbb{Q}$.

Definition 7.2. Let \mathcal{X} be semi-brick without an \mathcal{X} -injective object such that $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. We call an indecomposable module M in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ a **Prüfer module** in case M is injective in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$.

For a module $X \in \mathcal{X}$ we write \bar{X} instead of $X_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)$ in case there is no confusion about the underlying class \mathcal{X} of orthogonal bricks.

Theorem 7.3. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick without \mathcal{X} -injective objects and X finitely presented for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$ be an injective object in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$ for $i \in I$. Then we have $M \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} \bar{X}_i$.

Proof. Since M is injective in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ there exists a function f in the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & \bigoplus_{i \in I} \bar{X}_i \\ \downarrow \iota & \swarrow f & \\ M & & \end{array}$$

By 4.5 $\ker f$ is in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. If $\ker f$ would be non-zero the \mathcal{X} -socle of $\ker f$ would be a submodule of $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} \bigoplus_{i \in I} \bar{X}_i$ but f restricted to $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} \bigoplus_{i \in I} \bar{X}_i$ is injective. This shows that f must be injective.

By 4.6 the cokernel of f is in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. Since $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \bar{X}_i$ is \mathcal{X} -divisible we have $M \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} \bar{X}_i \oplus \text{coker } f$. In case $\text{coker } f$ would be non-zero the non-zero \mathcal{X} -socle of $\text{coker } f$ would be a subset of $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} M$, a contradiction. \square

A direct consequence of this theorem in combination 5.8(b) is the following:

Corollary 7.4. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick such that X is finitely presented and $\text{proj.dim } X \leq 1$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Then the \mathcal{X} -socle filtration of a module $M \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ is of finite or countable length.

Proof. Every module in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ has an \mathcal{X} -injective hull which is isomorphic to a direct sum of Prüfer modules. Since every Prüfer module has a countable \mathcal{X} -socle filtration, so does by 4.5(c) every submodule in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

Lemma 7.5. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $Y \in \mathcal{X}$. Then we have for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ $\text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) = Y$, especially the module $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ is indecomposable. The endomorphism ring of $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ is a discrete valuation ring with the maximal left-sided ideal $I = \{f \in \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) \mid f(Y) = 0\}$.

Proof. The fact that the \mathcal{X} -socle of $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ is simple follows directly from 5.6(a). It remains to prove that an endomorphism f with $f(Y) \neq 0$ is an automorphism. Since $Y = \text{soc}_{\mathcal{X}} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ and Y is a brick we have $f(Y) = Y$, hence f is not nilpotent.

Let \mathcal{X}' be a finite subset of \mathcal{X} with $Y \in \mathcal{X}'$. We apply 5.8(a) and get $t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r) = Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$. Since $f(t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) \subset t_{\mathcal{X}'} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ we have $f(Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)) \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$. Because $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ has a simple \mathcal{X} -socle the module $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ is an indecomposable finitely generated module. The endomorphism f restricted to $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ is not nilpotent, thus f restricted on $Y_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ is an automorphism. We get now the assertion from 5.8(b). \square

Theorem 7.6. Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick and $Y \in \mathcal{X}$. The endomorphism ring $\text{End}(\bar{Y})$ is a discrete valuation ring.

Proof. To see that $\text{End}(Y_{\bar{Y}})$ is a complete discrete valuation ring we define a ring epimorphism $\Psi_i : \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)) \rightarrow \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i))$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows: Let $\epsilon : Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i) \hookrightarrow Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)$ be the inclusion. Then, for $f \in \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1))$, we define the homomorphism $\Psi_i(f) = \epsilon \circ f$. The function Ψ_i is surjective: Let $g \in \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{S}}(i))$ and $\epsilon' : Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i) \rightarrow \bar{Y}$ be the natural embedding. Then in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1) \\ \downarrow g \circ \epsilon' & \nearrow \hat{f} & \\ \bar{Y} & & \end{array}$$

there exists a homomorphism \hat{g} because \bar{Y} is injective and $\text{coker } \epsilon \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$. Since $\hat{f}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)) \subset Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)$ we can consider \hat{g} as an endomorphism of $Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i+1)$, which then has the property $\Psi_i(\hat{g}) = g$.

The endomorphism ring of \bar{Y} is isomorphic to the inverse limit of the following ring epimorphisms

$$\dots \longrightarrow \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(4)) \xrightarrow{\Psi_3} \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(3)) \xrightarrow{\Psi_2} \text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(2)) \xrightarrow{\Psi_1} \text{End}(Y) \longrightarrow 0$$

The rings $\text{End}(Y_{\mathcal{X}}(i))$ are by 7.5 discrete valuation rings, so the inverse limit is a complete discrete valuation ring. \square

8. CLASSIFICATION OF DIVISIBLE MODULES OVER TAME HEREDITARY ALGEBRA

In this section, A should always denote a tame hereditary algebra over a field k . The aim of this section is to demonstrate how useful the filtration $(P_{\mathcal{X}}(r), r \in \mathcal{N})$ is for a preprojective module P . We will use this tool to give an alternative proof to the statements in [1] for the classification of divisible modules. Here a module $M \in A\text{-Mod}$ is called divisible if we have $\text{Ext}(R, M) = 0$ for all regular modules $R \in A\text{-mod}$ or equivalently $\text{Ext}(S, M) = 0$ for all quasi-simple modules S .

We use from [1, 3.7] that the functor \mathcal{I} which is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}(M) = \sum_{f \in \text{Hom}(I, M), I \text{ preinjective}} \text{Im } f$$

splits. Therefore we can restrict to divisible modules M with $\text{Hom}(I, M) = 0$ for all preinjective modules I .

In the next proposition we make use of the defect function which is a linear form $\delta : \mathbb{R}^{n(A)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that should be normalised so that $\delta(P_i) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for the indecomposable projective modules P_i for $1 \leq i \leq n(A)$ and at least for one P_i we have $\delta(P_i) = -1$. We have $\delta(\underline{\dim} X) < 0 (> 0)$ if X is preprojective, (preinjective) and $\delta(\underline{\dim} X) = 0$ if X is a regular module.

Proposition 8.1. *Let \mathcal{X} be a semi-brick with the following property: Each $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is quasi-simple and with X are also $\tau^r X \in \mathcal{X}$ for $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Let further P a preprojective module with defect -1 :*

- (a) *In case \mathcal{X} is a finite set, $P_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ is an indecomposable preprojective module with $\delta(P_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) = -1$*
- (b) *The endomorphism ring of $P_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ is a division ring.*
- (c) *Every nonzero homomorphism $g \in \text{End}(P_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty))$ is injective.*

Proof. (a) The assertion is proved by complete induction over r . For $r = 1$, the assertion is true by assumption. Assuming that the assertion is proved for $r \geq 1$ and let the following short exact sequence be \mathcal{X} -universal:

$$(13) \quad 0 \longrightarrow P_{\mathcal{X}}(r) \longrightarrow P_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X^{d_{X,r}} \longrightarrow 0$$

The module $P_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$ is a finitely generated module and by 5.6(c) we have $\text{Hom}(X, P_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)) = 0$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$, thus $P_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$ is a preprojective module. Applying the defect function to (13) shows that $\delta(P_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)) = -1$, which implies that $P_{\mathcal{X}}(r+1)$ is an indecomposable module.

(b) For a non-zero $f \in \text{End}(P_{\mathcal{X}}(r))$ we have $f(P) \neq 0$ since $\text{Hom}(X, P_{\mathcal{X}}(r)) = 0$. Restricting f to $t_{\mathcal{X}'}P_{\mathcal{X}}(r)$ for a finite subset \mathcal{X}' of \mathcal{X} gives an endomorphism $f_{\mathcal{X}'} \in \text{End}(t_{\mathcal{X}'}P_{\mathcal{X}}(r))$. This must be an automorphism because $t_{\mathcal{X}'}P_{\mathcal{X}}(r) = P_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ is an indecomposable preprojective module by part (a). The assertion now follows from 5.8(b).

(c) We have $g(P) \neq 0$ otherwise we could factorise g over the $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ -module $P_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)/P$. This gives a contradiction $\text{Hom}(X, P_{\mathcal{X}}(\infty)) \neq 0$ for at least one $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

For a finite subset \mathcal{X}' of \mathcal{X} and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ the function g restricted to $P_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ would be a nonzero function from $P_{\mathcal{X}'}(r)$ to a module $P_{\mathcal{X}'}(s)$ for a $s \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. Since by part (a) both modules have defect -1 , the restriction of g must therefore be injective. Again, the assertion follows from 5.8(b). \square

Theorem 8.2. *Let \mathcal{S} be a class containing a representative of the isomorphism class of every quasi-simple module and P be a preprojective module with defect -1 . Then we have for the module $Q = P_{\mathcal{S}}$ and the right perpendicular category $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$ of $(\oplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{S})$:*

- (a) Q is a simple object in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$, in particular $\text{End}(P_{\mathcal{S}})$ is a division ring.
- (b) Every module $M \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is isomorphic to $Q^{(I)}$ for an index set I .
- (c) Let $M \in A\text{-Mod}$ be a divisible module. Then there exists cardinal numbers I_S for $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and I with $M \cong \bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{S}^{(I_S)} \oplus Q^{(I)}$.

Proof. (a) Let U be a nonzero submodule of Q , which is an object in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$. We will show that for any finite subset $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$ the modules $P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r) \subset U$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$. The assertion then follows from 5.8(b).

For a finite set $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$ we have the following short exact sequence

$$(14) \quad 0 \longrightarrow U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r) \longrightarrow P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r) \longrightarrow P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)/U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r) \longrightarrow 0$$

We can assume that $U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r) \neq 0$, otherwise we can extend \mathcal{S}' by a finite number of elements of \mathcal{S} or increase r . We have

$$P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)/(U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)) \cong (P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r) + U)/U \subset P_{\mathcal{S}}(\infty)/U$$

Since the modules U and $P_{\mathcal{S}}$ are in the abelian category $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$, the factor module $P_{\mathcal{S}}/U$ is also in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$, which implies $\text{Hom}(S, P_{\mathcal{S}}(\infty)/U) = 0$ for all modules $S \in \mathcal{S}$. But then the submodule $P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)/(U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r))$ must be preprojective. We apply the defect function δ to the sequence (14) and get

$$\delta(P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)) = \delta(U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)) + \delta(P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)/(U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)))$$

According to 8.1(a) the module $P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)$ is a preprojective module with $\delta(P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)) = -1$. The module $U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)$ is a nonzero preprojective module, so $\delta(U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)) \leq -1$. This implies that the module $P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r)/(U \cap P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r))$ must be zero, so $P_{\mathcal{S}'}(r) \subset U$.

(b) Without loss of generality we can assume that P is a projective module with $\delta(P) = -1$. The module Q is a partial tilting module, so $\text{Gen}(Q)$ is a torsion class. Let t_Q be the torsion functor. For $M \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$ we consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow t_Q M \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M/t_Q M \longrightarrow 0$$

For the module $M/t_Q M$ we have $\text{Hom}(Q, M/t_Q M) = 0$, which implies $\text{Hom}(P, M/t_Q M) = 0$ due to the divisibility of M . But then $M/t_Q M$ has a structure over the algebra A/P , which is an algebra of finite representation type. This implies that $M/t_Q M$ is a direct sum of finite dimensional modules. So $M/t_Q M = 0$ and M is a semi-simple module and therefore the direct sum of copies of Q .

(c) The partial tilting module $\bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{S}$ generates a torsion class with torsion functor t . The module M/tM in the short exact sequence

$$(15) \quad 0 \longrightarrow tM \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M/tM \longrightarrow 0$$

is a module in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and thus by part (b) isomorph to Q^I for a cardinal number I . The module tM is a divisible module in $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{S})$ and by 7.3 isomorph to $\bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{S}^{(I_S)}$ for cardinal numbers I_S for $S \in \mathcal{S}$. It remains to show that (15) splits.

Note that for X finitely generated and preprojective or regular we have

$$\text{Ext}(X, \bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{S}^{(I_S)}) \cong \bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \text{Ext}(X, \bar{S}) = 0$$

By 2.2 we have therefore $\text{Ext}(Q, \bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{S}^{(I_S)}) = 0$ and therefore

$$\text{Ext}(Q^{(I)}, \bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{S}^{(I_S)}) \cong \prod_{i \in I} \text{Ext}(Q, \bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{S}^{(I_S)}) = 0$$

□

9. SEMI-BRICKS OVER WILD HEREDITARY ALGEBRAS

The aim of this appendix is to show that the module category of a wild hereditary algebra has large classes \mathcal{X} of pairwise orthogonal bricks with self-extensions. We use elementary modules for the proof. A module X is called elementary if X is a regular module with the property that for every non-zero regular submodule U of X the cokernel cannot be a non-zero regular module. In [6, 1.4] it was shown that elementary modules X, Y which are not isomorphic but have the same dimension vector must be orthogonal bricks. The following example shows that wild hereditary path algebras with two vertices have an infinite class of orthogonal bricks.

Example 9.1. Let A be the path algebra of the quiver $K_r = 1 \begin{array}{c} \longleftarrow \\ \text{---} \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} 2$ for $r \geq 3$. All indecomposable modules with dimension vector $(1, 1)$ are elementary (see [7] for $r = 3$ and [8] for $r \geq 4$) and, for an algebraically closed field K there are infinitely many pairwise non-isomorphic indecomposable modules with dimension vector $(1, 1)$. For two dimension vectors $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$ we have the bilinear form

$$\langle x, y \rangle = x_1 y_2 + x_2 y_1 - r x_1 y_1$$

and therefore for a brick X with $\underline{\dim} X = (1, 1)$

$$\langle \underline{\dim} X, \underline{\dim} X \rangle = 2 - r = 1 - \dim_K \text{Ext}(X, X)$$

which implies $\dim_K \text{Ext}(X, X) = r - 1$ and $\dim_K \text{Ext}(X, Y) = r - 2$ for two indecomposable non-isomorphic modules X, Y with dimension vector $(1, 1)$.

Proposition 9.2. *Let A be a wild hereditary algebra. Then there exists an infinite class \mathcal{X} of pairwise orthogonal bricks with self-extensions in $A - \text{mod}$ with $\dim_K \text{Ext}(X, X) \geq 2$ and $\text{Ext}(X, Y) \neq 0$ for $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. We prove the assertion by complete induction over $n(A)$, the number of vertices of the quiver. For $n = 2$, we have seen in example 9.1 that every path algebra K_r of the quiver $1 \begin{array}{c} \longleftarrow \\ \text{---} \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} 2$ for $r \geq 3$ has a class \mathcal{X} of infinitely many elementary modules with dimension vector $(1, 1)$. These modules are pairwise orthogonal and we have $\dim_K \text{Ext}(X, X) = \dim_K \text{Ext}(X, Y) + 1 = r - 2$ for $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $X \neq Y$. We use this class \mathcal{X} to construct classes \mathcal{X}_s of pairwise orthogonal bricks with $\dim_K \text{Ext}(X, X) = \dim_K \text{Ext}(X, Y) + 1 \geq s$ for $s \in \mathbb{N}$ by the following construction.

Now suppose that the statement is true for all algebras A with $n(A) \leq n$ for $n \geq 2$. Let A be a wild hereditary algebra with $n(A) = n + 1$. Then A dominates infinitely many wild hereditary algebras B with $n(B) \leq n$ (see [9, Theorem 3]). In $B - \text{mod}$ there exists for each

$s \in \mathbb{N}$ a class \mathcal{X}_s of orthogonal bricks with the required property. This class \mathcal{X}_s , considered as a class of A -modules, shows the assertion. \square

In the previous sections we saw that bricks X with $\dim_k \text{Ext}(X, X) = 1$ have the same properties as quasi-simple modules over a tame hereditary algebra. In this section we will show that these bricks have their origin in a fully exact embedding of the regular modules of a tame hereditary algebra. First we recall the definition of the domination graph Δ of wild quiver algebras:

Definition 9.3. The vertices of the **domination graph** Δ of wild quiver algebras are the classes $[A]$ of connected wild quiver algebras with respect to concealed equivalence, i.e. $[A] = [B]$ if there is a preprojective tilting module T in $A\text{-mod}$ with $\text{End}(T) \cong B$. There is an arrow $[A] \rightarrow [B]$ if there are $A' \in [A]$, $B' \in [B]$ and a quasi-simple stone $X \in A'\text{-mod}$ such that $X^\perp \cong B'\text{-mod}$. We say in this case that $[A]$ **strictly dominates** $[B]$ over X . If there is an oriented path Δ from $[A]$ to $[B]$, we say that $[A]$ dominates $[B]$.

Proposition 9.4. *Let X be a brick with $\dim_k \text{Ext}(X, X) = 1$. Then X is an element of a full exact abelian subcategory \mathcal{C} of $A\text{-mod}$ which is equivalent to the full subcategory of regular modules of $B\text{-mod}$ for a tame hereditary algebra B . The algebra B is a subalgebra of A or a subalgebra of an algebra which is dominated by A .*

Proof. First, we show that it is sufficient to prove that X is not τ -sincere, or that X is part of a right perpendicular category D^\perp for a quasi-simple stone D . This we can see by complete induction over $n(A)$ the number of simple modules of A .

For $n(A) = 2$ we have to consider the algebras K_r , which are the path algebras of the quiver $1 \begin{array}{c} \longleftarrow \\ \vdots \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} 2$ for $r \geq 3$. The algebras K_r for $r \geq 3$ do not have a tame hereditary subalgebra, nor they have regular stones. So the algebra has no bricks X with $\dim_k \text{Ext}(X, X) = 1$ and nothing needs to be proved.

Now let A be a wild hereditary algebra with $n(A) \geq 3$ and X be a brick with $\dim_k \text{Ext}(X, X) = 1$. Then X is not τ -sincere or $X \in D^\perp$ for a quasi-simple stone D . If X is not τ -sincere there exists a $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\tau^z X$ is not sincere, so $\tau^z X \in C\text{-mod}$ for a full subalgebra C of A with $n(C) < n(A)$. By the induction assumption, there exists a subcategory \mathcal{C} of $C\text{-mod}$ with ${}_A X \in \mathcal{C}$ and \mathcal{C} is equivalent to the subcategory of regular modules of a tame algebra B . Since the modules in \mathcal{C} are regular B -modules they are also regular in $A\text{-mod}$ and therefore \mathcal{C} is equivalent to $\tau^{-z}(\mathcal{C})$. In the case $X \in D^\perp$ the argument is analogous.

We now prove that X is not τ -sincere or an element of a right perpendicular category D^\perp for a quasi-simple module D . Without loss of generality we can assume that $\dim_k X = \min\{\dim_k Y \mid Y \in \mathcal{O}(X)\}$. Let $f \in \text{Hom}(X, \tau X)$ be a nonzero homomorphism. Then f cannot be surjective because $\dim_k X \leq \dim_k \tau X$. We need to distinguish whether f is injective or not. Suppose first that f is injective, then we have a short exact sequence

$$(16) \quad 0 \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \tau X \xrightarrow{\beta} Q \longrightarrow 0$$

with $Q = \tau X/X$. We apply the functor $\text{Hom}(-, \tau X)$ to 16 and get

$$0 \rightarrow (Q, \tau X) \rightarrow (\tau X, \tau X) \rightarrow (X, \tau X) \rightarrow {}^1(Q, \tau X) \rightarrow {}^1(\tau X, \tau X) \rightarrow {}^1(X, \tau X) \rightarrow 0$$

We have $\text{Hom}(Q, \tau X) = 0$ because a nonzero homomorphism $g \in \text{Hom}(Q, \tau X)$ would imply that $\alpha \circ g \in \text{End}(\tau X)$ is nonzero and an isomorphism because τX is a brick. But then we have the contradiction that β is injective.

Because of

$$\text{Hom}(\tau X, \tau X) \cong \text{Hom}(X, \tau X) \cong k \cong \text{Ext}(\tau X, \tau X) \cong \text{Ext}(X, \tau X) \cong k$$

we have $\text{Ext}(Q, \tau X) = 0$. But this means that $\text{Hom}(\tau X, \tau Q) \cong \text{DExt}(Q, \tau X) = 0$, which would imply that X is not τ -sincere if Q had a nonzero preinjective direct summand. Note that Q must have at least one non-zero preinjective direct summand, otherwise the functor τ^{-r} would remain left exact for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and we would get monomorphisms

$\tau^{-r}X \rightarrow \tau^{-r+1}X$ and hence the contradiction $\dim_k \tau^{-r}X > \dim_k \tau^{-r+1}X$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now suppose that f is not injective. With $V = \text{Im} f$ and $C = \tau X/V$ we have the short exact sequence

$$(17) \quad 0 \longrightarrow V \xrightarrow{\alpha} \tau X \xrightarrow{\beta} C \longrightarrow 0$$

We have $\text{Hom}(C, \tau X) = 0$ because with a non-zero homomorphism $g \in \text{Hom}(C, \tau X)$ we could get a nonzero homomorphism $\beta \circ g \in \text{End}(\tau X)$, which must be an isomorphism because τX is a brick. This would lead to the contradiction that β is injective. We apply the functor $\text{Hom}(-, \tau X)$ on 17 and get

$$0 \rightarrow (C, \tau X) \rightarrow (\tau X, \tau X) \rightarrow (V, \tau X) \rightarrow {}^1(C, \tau X) \rightarrow {}^1(\tau X, \tau X) \rightarrow {}^1(V, \tau X) \rightarrow 0$$

We have $\text{Hom}(C, \tau X) = 0$ and $\text{Hom}(\tau X, \tau X) \cong \text{Hom}(V, \tau X) \cong K$ which together with $\text{Ext}(\tau X, \tau X) \cong \text{Ext}(V, \tau X) \cong K$ implies $\text{Ext}(C, \tau X) = 0$.

So far we have $\text{Hom}(C, \tau X) = \text{Ext}(C, \tau X) = 0$ and therefore $\tau X \in C^\perp$. To see that $\text{Ext}(C, C) = 0$ we apply $\text{Hom}(C, -)$ on 17 and get

$$\dots \longrightarrow \text{Ext}(C, \tau X) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}(C, C) \longrightarrow 0$$

which implies $\text{Ext}(C, C) = 0$ since $\text{Ext}(C, \tau X) = 0$.

In case C has a preinjective direct summand then X is not τ -sincere due to $\text{Hom}(X, C) \cong \text{DExt}(\tau^-C, X) \cong \text{DExt}(C, \tau X) = 0$. In case not, C has an indecomposable regular direct summand $D[n]$ for a quasi-simple module D and of quasi-rank $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We have $\tau X \in D[n]^\perp$ and it is easy to see that then $\tau X \in D^\perp$, which proves the assertion. \square

Corollary 9.5. *Let A be a wild hereditary algebra A with two simple modules. Then A has no bricks X with $\dim_k \text{Ext}(X, X) = 1$. If A is a wild hereditary algebra with three simple modules then all bricks X with $\dim_k \text{Ext}(X, X) = 1$ are not τ -sincere.*

REFERENCES

- [1] C. M. Ringel, Infinite dimensional representations of finite dimensional hereditary algebras, in: Symposia mathematica, Vol. 23, 1979.
- [2] C. M. Ringel, Representations of k -species and bimodules, Journal of algebra 41 (2) (1976).
- [3] L. A. Hügel, F. Marks, J. Vitória, A characterisation of τ -tilting finite algebras, in: Model theory of modules, algebras and categories, Vol. 730, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 2019, pp. 75–89.
- [4] R. Göbel, J. Trlifaj, Approximations and endomorphism algebras of modules, in: Approximations and Endomorphism Algebras of Modules, de Gruyter, 2012.
- [5] D. Happel, L. Unger, Almost complete tilting modules, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 107 (3) (1989) 603–610.
- [6] O. Kerner, F. Lukas, Elementary modules, Mathematische Zeitschrift 223 (1996) 421–434.
- [7] C. M. Ringel, The elementary 3-kronecker modules, arXiv: Representation Theory (2016). URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119319556>
- [8] D. Bissinger, Shift orbits for elementary representations of kronecker quivers (2024). arXiv:2403.01824.
- [9] S. Lache, Coxeter polynomials and domination of wild quiver algebras, Communications in Algebra 26 (1) (1998) 49–61.