

Dp-finite fields III: inflators and directories

Will Johnson

November 13, 2019

Abstract

We develop some tools for analyzing dp-finite fields, including a notion of an “inflator” which generalizes the notion of a valuation/specialization on a field. For any field K , let $\text{Sub}_K(K^n)$ denote the lattice of K -linear subspaces of K^n . An ordinary valuation on K with residue field k induces order-preserving dimension-preserving specialization maps from $\text{Sub}_K(K^n)$ to $\text{Sub}_k(k^n)$, satisfying certain compatibility across n . An r -inflator is a similar family of maps $\{\text{Sub}_K(K^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_k(k^{rn})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ scaling dimensions by r . We show that 1-inflators are equivalent to valuations, and that r -inflators naturally arise in fields of dp-rank r . This machinery was “behind the scenes” in §10 of [10]. We rework §10 of [10] using the machinery of r -inflators.

1 Introduction

This paper continues [10, 8], and is concerned with the problem of classifying fields of finite dp-rank. See [11] for background on dp-rank and [4] for background on the classification problem for NIP fields. “Dp-minimal” means dp-rank 1 and “dp-finite” means dp-rank n for some $n < \omega$.

In the present paper, we develop a set of algebraic tools for analyzing dp-finite fields. These tools—inflators and directories—were implicit in [10] §9-10; we will re-work §10 of [10] in the language of inflators. In a future paper [9], we will use inflators to carry out a detailed analysis of fields of dp-rank 2, yielding some new results.

1.1 Model-theoretic motivation

Dp-minimal fields were classified in [7]. Given an unstable dp-minimal field K , one embeds K into a monster model $\mathbb{K} \succeq K$, and uses this strategy:

1. Define a group of “ K -infinitesimals” $I_K \leq (\mathbb{K}, +)$.
2. Show that I_K is an ideal in a valuation ring \mathcal{O}_K on \mathbb{K} .
3. Show that \mathcal{O}_K is henselian.

4. Use canonical henselian valuations (specifically [6]) to find a henselian valuation \mathcal{O}' on \mathbb{K} with a controlled residue field.
5. Use the Ax-Kochen-Ershov principle to determine the complete theory of the original fields K and \mathbb{K} .

All these steps generalize to dp-finite fields, except Step 2. Step 1 was done in [10], Step 3 was done in [8], Step 4 was done by Halevi, Hasson, and Jahnke [4], and Step 5 was done by Sinclair [14].

The main gap is thus

Conjecture 1.1 (Valuation conjecture). *If K is an unstable dp-finite field embedded in a monster model $\mathbb{K} \succeq K$, then the group I_K of K -infinitesimals is an ideal in a valuation ring on \mathbb{K} .*

Here, I_K is the group of K -infinitesimals constructed in [10]. By later work (Lemma 5.8, Theorem 5.9 in [8], and Corollary 6.19 in [10]), we can characterize I_K as the smallest additive subgroup of \mathbb{K} that is type-definable over K and has full rank $\text{dp-rk}(I_K) = \text{dp-rk}(\mathbb{K})$.

If J is an additive subgroup of \mathbb{K} , the “stabilizer”

$$\text{Stab}(J) := \{a \in \mathbb{K} : a \cdot J \subseteq J\}$$

is always a subring of \mathbb{K} . The valuation conjecture says that $\text{Stab}(I_K)$ is a valuation ring. The focus of the present paper is on understanding the algebraic structure of rings $\text{Stab}(J)$ when J is a type-definable group in a dp-finite field.

It is worth noting two related conjectures:

Conjecture 1.2 (Shelah conjecture for dp-finite fields). *Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated, infinite, dp-finite field. Then \mathbb{K} admits a non-trivial henselian valuation ring.*

Conjecture 1.3 (Henselianity conjecture for dp-finite fields). *If (K, \mathcal{O}) is a dp-finite valued field, then \mathcal{O} is henselian.*

These two conjectures are much more likely than the valuation conjecture. Assuming the Shelah conjecture, the henselianity conjecture follows [5], and the full classification of dp-finite fields is known [4]. The valuation conjecture implies the Shelah and henselianity conjectures [8].

In the dp-minimal case, the valuation conjecture is true for a very simple reason. Let Λ^{00} be the poset of type-definable subgroups $G \leq (\mathbb{K}, +)$ such that $G = G^{00}$, ordered by inclusion. The K -infinitesimals I_K are an element of Λ^{00} .

If $\text{dp-rk}(\mathbb{K}) = 1$, then Λ^{00} is totally ordered. Therefore, for any $a \in \mathbb{K}^\times$,

$$a \cdot I_K \subseteq I_K \text{ or } I_K \subseteq a \cdot I_K.$$

Equivalently,

$$a \cdot I_K \subseteq I_K \text{ or } a^{-1} \cdot I_K \subseteq I_K.$$

In other words, $\text{Stab}(I_K)$ is a valuation ring (Conjecture 1.1).

If $\text{dp-rk}(K) = r > 1$, the structure of Λ^{00} is much less constrained, though we can still say the following:

- Λ^{00} is a bounded modular lattice.
- For $n > r$, there are no strict n -cubes in Λ^{00} .

Here, a “strict n -cube” in a modular lattice M means an unbounded sublattice¹ isomorphic to the boolean algebra of size 2^n . We say that a modular lattice M is *cube-bounded* if there is a uniform finite bound on the size of strict cubes in M .

Note that any two incomparable elements yield a strict 2-cube. Thus for $r = 1$, the second condition says that Λ^{00} is totally ordered. We can think of “cube-bounded” as the natural generalization of “totally ordered” to higher ranks.

Now, one would like to somehow deduce the valuation conjecture from cube-boundedness of Λ^{00} .

1.2 Multi-valuation rings, magic fields, and pedestals

For any small model $K_0 \preceq \mathbb{K}$, let Λ_{K_0} denote the lattice of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K} . If K_0 is a *magic subfield* (Definition 1.6), then $\Lambda_{K_0} \subseteq \Lambda^{00}$, and so Λ_{K_0} is cube-bounded. We preferentially work in Λ_{K_0} rather than Λ^{00} because the lattice operations are simpler; no $(-)^{00}$'s are involved.

Let r be maximal such that a strict r -cube exists in Λ_{K_0} . Say that A is a K_0 -*pedestal* if A is the base of a strict r -cube in Λ_{K_0} .

Say that a subring R of a field K is a *multi-valuation ring on K* if R is a finite intersection of valuation rings on K . Say that a subset $M \subseteq K$ is a *multi-valuation ideal on K* if M is an R -submodule of K for some multi-valuation ring R on K .

It turns out that pedestals can be used to verify the valuation conjecture:

Lemma (Pedestal criterion). *Let K be an unstable dp-finite field. Let $\mathbb{K} \succeq K$ be a monster model. Let $K_0 \succeq \mathbb{K}$ be a magic subfield. Let A be a K_0 -pedestal.*

1. *If A contains a non-zero multi-valuation ideal, then I_K is a valuation ideal.*
2. *If $\text{Stab}(A)$ contains a non-zero multi-valuation ideal, then I_K is a valuation ideal.*

This is essentially Theorem 8.11 in [8].²

1.3 Flattening and inflators

Let (M, \vee, \wedge, \perp) be a lower-bounded modular lattice. In §9.4 of [10], we defined a set of *quasi-atoms* in M , and a modular pregeometry on the quasi-atoms. Let M^b be the lattice of closed sets in this pregeometry. Then M^b is an atomic modular lattice. By Corollary 9.39.2 in [10],

¹“Unbounded sublattice” means a substructure of the unbounded lattice (M, \vee, \wedge) , rather than a substructure of the bounded lattice $(M, \vee, \wedge, \top, \perp)$.

²There is some subtlety in the second point when $A = 0$. See Lemma 11.5 for the details.

every element in M determines a closed set in the pregeometry, yielding an order-preserving map

$$f : M \rightarrow M^{\flat}.$$

We call M^{\flat} the *flattening of M* , and $f : M \rightarrow M^{\flat}$ the *flattening map*.

Now let \mathbb{K} be a dp-finite field. Fix a magic subfield K_0 , and suppress it from the notation. Let Λ_n be the lattice of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n . For any $A \in \Lambda_1$, we can build a family of maps

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_K(K^n) &\rightarrow \Lambda_n \rightarrow [A^n, \mathbb{K}^n] \rightarrow [A^n, \mathbb{K}^n]^{\flat} \\ V &\mapsto V \mapsto V + A^n \mapsto f(V + A^n). \end{aligned}$$

Here the notation $\text{Sub}_R(M)$ denotes the lattice of R -submodules of M , for any ring R and R -module M .

As predicted in Speculative Remark 10.10 of [10], there is a K_0 -algebra R and a semisimple R -module M such that

$$[A^n, \mathbb{K}^n]^{\flat} \cong \text{Sub}_R(M^n)$$

for each n . We get a family of maps

$$\varsigma_n : \text{Sub}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_R(M^n).$$

These maps satisfy the following properties, predicted in Speculative Remark 10.10 of [10]:

1. Each ς_n is order-preserving.
2. Each ς_n is $GL_n(K_0)$ -equivariant.
3. There is compatibility with \oplus :

$$\varsigma_{n+m}(V \oplus W) = \varsigma_n(V) \oplus \varsigma_m(W)$$

4. The map ς_n scales lengths by a fixed factor:

$$\ell_R(\varsigma_n(V)) = \ell_R(M) \cdot \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(V).$$

We call such a configuration an *inflator* on \mathbb{K} . If $d = \ell_R(M)$, we call this a *d -inflator*; a d -inflator inflates lengths by a factor of d :

$$\ell_R(\varsigma_n(V)) = d \cdot \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(V).$$

It is helpful to bundle the lattices $\text{Sub}_R(M^{\bullet})$ into a multi-sorted structure

$$\text{Dir}_R(M) := (\text{Sub}_R(M^1), \text{Sub}_R(M^2), \text{Sub}_R(M^3), \dots)$$

with the poset structure and $GL_n(K_0)$ -action on $\text{Sub}_R(M^n)$, and the connecting maps

$$\oplus : \text{Sub}_R(M^n) \times \text{Sub}_R(M^m) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_R(M^{n+m}).$$

We call such structures *directories*. Then conditions (1)-(3) say that ς_\bullet is a *morphism of directories*.

Inflators can be seen as generalized valuation data. In fact, if K is a valued field with valuation ring \mathcal{O} , maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} , and residue field k , then there is a 1-inflator

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_k(k) \\ \mathrm{Sub}_K(K^n) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Sub}_k(k^n) \\ V &\mapsto (V \cap \mathcal{O}^n + \mathfrak{m}^n)/\mathfrak{m}^n.\end{aligned}$$

Essentially all 1-inflators arise this way.

More generally, if $R = \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{O}_d$ is an intersection of d incomparable valuation rings on a field K , there is a natural d -inflator on K essentially given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_R(R/J) \\ \mathrm{Sub}_K(K^n) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Sub}_R(R^n/J^n) \\ V &\mapsto (V \cap R^n + J^n)/J^n,\end{aligned}$$

where J is the Jacobson radical $\mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{m}_d$ of R . These are the motivating examples of d -inflators. Thus the intuition is that any inflator should have something to do with a multi-valuation ring.

1.4 The fundamental ring

Fix a d -inflator $\varsigma : \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_S(M)$, where M is a semisimple S -module of length d . For any endomorphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}_S(M)$, let Θ_φ be the graph of φ :

$$\Theta_\varphi = \{(x, \varphi(x)) : x \in M\} \subseteq M^2.$$

Similarly, for $b \in K$ let Θ_b be the line with slope b :

$$\Theta_b = \{(x, bx) : x \in K\} \subseteq K^2.$$

It turns out that the set

$$\{(b, \varphi) : \varsigma_2(\Theta_b) = \Theta_\varphi\}$$

is the graph of a ring homomorphism

$$\widehat{\mathrm{res}} : R \rightarrow \mathrm{End}_S(M)$$

for some subring $R \subseteq K$. We call R the *fundamental ring* and $\widehat{\mathrm{res}}$ the *generalized residue map*.

For 1-inflators, R is the corresponding valuation ring and $\widehat{\mathrm{res}}$ is the usual residue map. Similarly, if ς is the n -inflator induced by a multi-valuation ring R , then the fundamental ring is R .

If \mathbb{K} is a saturated unstable dp-finite field, if A is a K_0 -pedestal, and if ς is the induced inflator, then the fundamental ring R_ς of ς turns out to be the stabilizer ring of A :

$$R_\varsigma = \text{Stab}(A) := \{x \in \mathbb{K} : x \cdot A \subseteq x\}.$$

In particular, if R_ς were a multi-valuation ring, the Valuation Conjecture would hold in \mathbb{K} , by the Pedestal Criterion of §1.2. We say that ς has *multi-valuation type* if its fundamental ring is a multi-valuation ring.

In fact, we only need $\text{Stab}(A)$ to contain a non-zero multi-valuation ideal on K . We say that ς is *weakly multi-valuation type* if R_ς contains a non-zero multi-valuation ideal on K .

1.5 Breaking and repairing

It would therefore be nice if every inflator was weakly multi-valuation type. Unfortunately, one can produce unwanted examples of inflators using the identity

$$\dim_K(V) + \dim_K(W) = \dim_K(V + W) + \dim_K(V \cap W).$$

For example, if (K, σ) is a difference field, there is a 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(K) \times \text{Dir}_K(K) \\ V &\mapsto (V + \sigma(V), V \cap \sigma(V)). \end{aligned}$$

The fundamental ring turns out to be the fixed field of σ , which usually contains no multi-valuation ideal on the big field K .

Fortunately, there is a way to “twist” or “mutate” inflators that seems to undo the corrupting influence of the $(V, W) \mapsto (V + W, V \cap W)$ map. If

$$\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_S(M)$$

is a d -inflator, and L is a 1-dimensional subspace of K^m , one can define a new inflator ς' by the formula

$$\varsigma'_n(V) = \varsigma_{nm}(V \otimes L).$$

We call ς' a *mutation* of ς . It turns out that $R_{\varsigma'} \supseteq R_\varsigma$. In fact,

$$R_\varsigma^\infty = \{R_{\varsigma'} : \varsigma' \text{ a mutation of } \varsigma\}$$

turns out to be a directed union, and R_ς^∞ is a multi-valuation ring on the field K .

In the case of inflators on dp-finite fields, this gives the construction of a weakly definable non-trivial multi-valuation ring. This was already proven in [10], Theorem 10.25, but the proof we give here is the original proof using inflators.

1.6 Directions for future work

One could be more optimistic, and conjecture the following:

Dream 1.1. *If ς is an inflator, then some mutation ς' of ς is weakly multi-valuation type.*

It turns out that Dream 1.1 implies the Valuation Conjecture 1.1. If ς comes from a pedestal A , and ς' is obtained from ς by mutation, then for some reason ς' also comes from a pedestal A' . So the Pedestal Criterion of §1.2 applies.

Unfortunately, Dream 1.1 is too optimistic, and there are examples where no mutation of ς is weakly multi-valuation type.

The inflators on dp-finite fields have an additional technical property called *malleability* (see Definition 5.31). Most of the bad examples of inflators fail to be malleable, so we could conjecture

Dream 1.2. *If ς is a malleable inflator, then some mutation ς' of ς is weakly multi-valuation type.*

This is probably still false, but much closer to the truth. In a future paper [9], we will investigate malleable 2-inflators and prove enough of a characterization to get the following description of infinitesimals:

Theorem 1.4 (to appear in [9]). *Let \mathbb{K} be an unstable dp-finite field of rank 2 and characteristic 0 in which the valuation conjecture fails— I_K is not a valuation ideal. Then there is a field $(L, \partial, \text{val})$ with a derivation and a valuation such that*

$$(\mathbb{K}, +, \cdot, I_K) \equiv (L, +, \cdot, J)$$

where $J = \{x \in L : \text{val}(x) > 0 < \text{val}(\partial x)\}$. Furthermore, the derivation and valuation on L satisfy some independence conditions—for example every set of the form

$$\{x \in L : \text{val}(a - x) > \gamma \text{ and } \text{val}(b - \partial x) \geq 0\}$$

is non-empty.

Using this, we show

Theorem 1.5 (to appear in [9]). *If K is an unstable dp-finite field of dp-rank 2 and characteristic 0, then K admits a unique definable V -topology. The canonical topology is also definable, and refines this V -topology.*

The hope is to generalize these results to higher ranks. If Theorem 1.5 were generalized to all ranks, it would imply the Shelah and henselianity conjectures, completing the classification.

1.7 Notation and conventions

Following [8] but not [10], the monster model will be denoted \mathbb{K} . We will always assume that \mathbb{K} is a field, and never assume that \mathbb{K} is a pure field. We will sometimes abuse terminology and use “saturated” to mean “sufficiently saturated and sufficiently strongly homogeneous,” rather than the official meaning of “saturated in the size of the model.”

If A is an additive subgroup of a field K , we will call the ring

$$\text{Stab}(A) = \{x \in K : x \cdot A \subseteq A\}$$

the “stabilizer” of A , for want of a better name. Sometimes the scare quotes will be omitted.

Rings are always unital but not always commutative. An R -module is always a left R -module; the category of R -modules is denoted $R\text{Mod}$, or $R\text{Vect}$ if R is a field. If K is a field, then $K\text{Vect}^f$ will denote the full subcategory of finite-dimensional K -vector spaces.

Lattices are not assumed to have top and bottom elements. A “bounded lattice” is a lattice with top and bottom elements. We use $\vee, \wedge, \perp, \top$ to denote the (bounded) lattice operations. A homomorphism of lattices need not preserve \top, \perp when they exist, but a bounded lattice homomorphism must preserve \top, \perp . A sublattice need not contain \top, \perp , but a bounded sublattice must.

A modular lattice is “atomic” if it is lower-bounded (\perp exists) and every element is a finite join of atoms. A modular lattice has “finite length” if there is a maximal chain of finite length. By Jordan-Hölder, this implies all maximal chains have finite length. A modular lattice is “semisimple” if it is an atomic modular lattice of finite length.

For objects in abelian categories, “semisimple” will always mean “semisimple of finite length,” i.e., a finite sum of simple objects, even in cases where the more general notion of semisimple would make sense. So an object A is semisimple if and only if the modular lattice of subobjects is semisimple.

A subquotient of an object in an abelian category is a quotient of a subobject, or equivalently, a subobject of a quotient. If A is an object in an abelian category, we let

- $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ denote the endomorphism ring of A
- $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ denote the modular lattice of subobjects of A .
- $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ denote the *directory* of A ; see Definition 2.1.

If \mathcal{C} is $R\text{Mod}$ or $K\text{Vect}$, we will shorten the subscript to R or K .

We adopt the following definition from [10], Definition 8.3:

Definition 1.6. Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated dp-finite field. A small submodel $K_0 \preceq \mathbb{K}$ is *magic* if for every type-definable subgroup $G \leq (\mathbb{K}^n, +)$, we have

$$K_0 \cdot G \subseteq G \implies G = G^{00}.$$

In other words, type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n are 00-connected.

By [10] (Theorem 8.4 and the proof of Corollary 8.7), all sufficiently large submodels of \mathbb{K} are magic. In particular, magic subfields exist.

We adopt the following changes in notation from [10], introduced in §8 of [8]:

- The lattice of type-definable K_0 -subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n is denoted Λ_n , not \mathcal{P}_n .
- We refer to the bases of maximal strict cubes in Λ_1 as K_0 -pedestals, rather than “special groups.”

Later we will give a more general notion of “pedestal” in an abstract setting; see Definition 8.2.

Following [8], a *multi-valuation ring* on a field K is a finite intersection of valuation rings on K . Multi-valuation rings are the same thing as Bezout domains with finitely many maximal ideals; see §6 in [8].

For most of the paper there will be a small but infinite field K_0 lurking in the background. All the fields will extend K_0 , all the rings will be K_0 -algebras, all the abelian categories will be K_0 -linear abelian categories, and all the additive subgroups of \mathbb{K} will be K_0 -linear subspaces. In the dp-finite setting, K_0 will generally be a magic subfield. In other cases one can usually take K_0 to be \mathbb{Q} of \mathbb{F}_p^{alg} . The field K_0 serves only one purpose, which is to provide a simple criterion for being a multi-valuation ring:

Lemma. *Fix q_1, \dots, q_n distinct elements of K_0 . Let K be a field extending K_0 and R be a K_0 -subalgebra of K . Then the following are equivalent:*

- R is an intersection of n valuation rings on K .
- For any $x \in K$, at least one of the following is in R :

$$x, \frac{1}{x - q_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{x - q_n}.$$

See Lemma 5.24. Note that for $n = 1$ and $q_1 = 0$, this generalizes the usual test for a valuation ring.

1.8 Outline

The paper is divided into three parts. Each part begins with a brief synopsis. Part I defines directories and inflators, and works through their basic algebraic theory. In particular, we see how inflators generalize valuations. Part II constructs inflators on dp-finite fields. A major theme is lifting the analysis of modular lattices in §9 in [10] to the more natural setting of abelian categories. Part III continues the algebraic investigation of inflators, showing how they naturally give rise to multi-valuation rings. As an application, this gives the construction of non-trivial multi-valuation rings on unstable dp-finite fields.

There are several appendices. The first two, Appendices A-B review the category theory of abelian categories and pro-objects. Appendix C double-checks some “obvious” statements

from Part I. Appendix D contains some further speculations on directories. This speculation is important for motivating directories, but not important for the main line of proofs. Finally, Appendix E is a remark on subadditive rank functions on abelian categories, which helps motivate the notion of “reduced rank.”

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank

- Martin Hils and Franziska Jahnke for the invitation to speak at the conference “Model Theory of Valued Fields and Applications.” This paper began as supplementary notes for the talk.
- Jan Dobrowolski, for some helpful discussions about groups of finite burden.
- Meng Chen, for hosting the author at Fudan University, where this research was carried out.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Award No. DMS-1803120. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Model-theoretic motivation	1
1.2	Multi-valuation rings, magic fields, and pedestals	3
1.3	Flattening and inflators	3
1.4	The fundamental ring	5
1.5	Breaking and repairing	6
1.6	Directions for future work	7
1.7	Notation and conventions	8
1.8	Outline	9
I	Directories and inflators	13
2	Directories	14
2.1	Neighborhoods	16
2.2	Semisimple directories	16
2.3	Morphisms of directories	17
2.4	Interval subdirectories	18
2.5	Products of directories	19
3	Directories from model theory	21
3.1	The definable case	22
3.2	The type-definable case	23
3.3	Serre quotients and 00-commensurability	23

4	Inflators: definition and examples	24
4.1	1-inflators from field embeddings	26
4.2	Inflators from restriction of scalars	26
4.3	1-inflators from valuations	26
4.4	Inflators from multivaluations	27
4.5	Unwanted examples	28
5	Algebraic properties of inflators	30
5.1	Basic techniques	30
5.2	The fundamental ring and ideal	32
5.3	Examples	35
5.4	1-inflators	38
5.5	Tame locus	41
5.6	Malleable d -inflators	45
II	Inflators on dp-finite fields	48
6	Cube-boundedness	49
6.1	Cube bounded lattices	49
6.2	Cube-bounded objects	51
6.3	Cube-bounded directories	53
6.4	Cube-boundedness in the model-theoretic case	54
7	Flattening	55
7.1	Flattening a lattice	56
7.2	Quasi-atoms as pro-objects	59
7.3	Flattening an abelian category	64
7.4	Flattening directories	67
7.5	Balanced objects	68
8	The pedestal machine	69
8.1	The cube-bounded configuration	70
8.2	The inflator	70
8.3	A special case	72
8.4	The ring and the ideal	73
8.5	Malleability	75
8.6	An example	76
9	Fields of finite burden	78
9.1	The NIP case	78
9.2	The general case	79

III	From inflators to multi-valuation rings	80
10	Mutation	81
10.1	The definition of mutation	81
10.2	Mutation and the fundamental ring	83
10.3	Iterated mutation	85
10.4	The limiting ring	86
10.5	Mutation and malleability	89
10.6	Mutation and pedestals	90
11	Application to fields of finite burden	94
12	Mutation examples	98
12.1	\mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C}	98
12.2	Another corrupted example	98
12.3	Endless mutation	100
IV	Appendices	103
A	Review of abelian categories	103
A.1	Additive and exact functors	105
A.2	Subobjects	106
A.3	Serre quotients	107
A.4	A criterion for recognizing abelian categories	110
B	Review of ind- and pro-objects	111
B.1	The category of ind-objects	111
B.2	The case of posets	112
B.3	The case of abelian categories	113
B.4	Pro-objects	115
C	Boring proofs	116
C.1	Semisimple directories	116
C.2	Examples of directory morphisms	118
C.3	The theorem on interval directories	120
C.4	The category \mathcal{H}	122
D	Further remarks on directories	126
D.1	Interpreting the endomorphism ring	126
D.2	Elementarity	128
D.3	An incomplete axiomatization	130
D.4	Another approach	131

Part I

Directories and inflators

Sections 2-5 work through the basic theory of directories and inflators.

Section 2 defines the category of directories. This category helps simplify the definition and construction of inflators. For example, we could define a d -inflator on a field K as a family of maps

$$\varsigma_n : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_R(M^n)$$

where R is a ring and M is a semisimple R -module of length d , satisfying the following conditions:

1. Each ς_n is order-preserving
2. ς_n is $GL_n(K_0)$ -equivariant
3. The ς_n are compatible with \oplus
4. Each ς_n scales lengths by a factor of d .

The first three conditions are meaningful in greater generality, and it is helpful to group them into the notion of a *morphism of directories*. The inflators we construct in Part II will be constructed as a composition of simpler directory morphisms, each satisfying conditions 1-3, but only the final composition will satisfy 4. Moreover, most of the directory morphisms we will use are generated out of a few simple examples in §2.3. Conditions 1-3 only need to be checked on these generating examples. Thus, the category of directories helps to suppress many of the boring details in proofs.

Also, the ring R and module M are not important; what we really care about is the collection of lattices

$$(\text{Sub}_R(M), \text{Sub}_R(M^2), \text{Sub}_R(M^n), \dots).$$

For example, in Part II we will construct an inflator

$$\varsigma_n : \text{Sub}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}^n) \rightarrow D_n$$

on dp-finite field \mathbb{K} . The codomain lattices D_n will be constructed abstractly. So the lattices are canonical, not the ring R and module M . The notion of *directory* focuses in on the important information.

In §3 we show that if \mathbb{K} is a saturated field, possibly with extra structure, then there are three natural directories:

- Δ_{\bullet} , where Δ_n is the lattice of definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n .

- Λ_\bullet , where Λ_n is the lattice of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n .
- Λ_\bullet^{00} , where Λ_n^{00} is the quotient of Λ_n by 00-commensurability.

These structures certainly feel like directories, but there are a few things to check. Section 3 is the only appearance of model theory in Part I.

In §4 we precisely define inflators, and give a few examples. Sections 4.1-4.4 cover the natural examples of inflators arising from valuation rings, field extensions, and multi-valuation rings. Section 4.5 goes through the unnatural examples of inflators that derail the analysis of dp-finite fields.

In §5 we begin to analyze inflators, a project which is continued in Part III. In §5.2-5.4 we show how to use the inflator axioms to construct the generalized residue map and fundamental ring, and we classify 1-inflators. In §5.5 we give a criterion for whether the fundamental ring is a multi-valuation ring. Lastly, §5.6 introduces the notion of “malleable” inflators. Malleability rules out most of the unwanted inflators of §4.5, but continues to hold for the inflators on dp-finite fields constructed in Part II. The hope, then, is to classify malleable inflators. Malleability will play a key role in the sequel [9].

2 Directories

Fix a small infinite field K_0 . See Appendix A for a review of abelian categories.

Definition 2.1. Let A be an object in a K_0 -linear abelian category \mathcal{C} . The *directory of A* is the multi-sorted structure

$$\text{Dir}(A) := (\text{Sub}(A), \text{Sub}(A^2), \text{Sub}(A^3), \dots)$$

with the following functions and relations:

- The lattice structure on each $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n)$.
- For any n, m , the map

$$\oplus : \text{Sub}(A^n) \times \text{Sub}(A^m) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^{n+m})$$

- For each n , the action of $GL_n(K_0)$ on $\text{Sub}(A^n)$.

We write $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ when we need to specify the category \mathcal{C} .

A *directory* is a structure isomorphic to $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ for some K_0 -linear abelian category \mathcal{C} and some $A \in \mathcal{C}$.

Perhaps this should be called a “ K_0 -linear directory.” But we will have no use for plain/ \mathbb{Z} -linear directories.

If D_\bullet is a directory, each D_n is a bounded modular lattice. There is a natural action of the n th symmetric group \mathcal{S}_n on D_n via permutation matrices in $GL_n(K_0)$.

Definition 2.2. Let d be a nonnegative integer. A directory $D_\bullet \cong \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ has length d if one of the following equivalent conditions holds:

- A has length d .
- D_1 is a modular lattice of length d .
- For every n , D_n is a modular lattice of length dn .

We say that D has *finite length* if D_\bullet has length d for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We let $\ell(D_\bullet)$ denote the length of D_\bullet , if it is finite.

Definition 2.3. A directory $D_\bullet \cong \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is *semisimple* if one of the following equivalent conditions holds:

- A is semisimple (of finite length)
- D_1 is an atomic modular lattice of finite length.
- For every n , D_n is an atomic modular lattice of finite length.

There are two intuitions for $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$. On one hand, the directory can be viewed as a generalization of the endomorphism K_0 -algebra $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$. One can interpret $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ in $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ by Proposition D.1 below. In the case of semisimple directories, the directory and endomorphism algebra appear to even be bi-interpretable—see Proposition D.2.

On the other hand, $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is also a generalization of the subobject lattice $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$. The subobject lattice $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is trivially interpretable in $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$, and most of the configurations that yield maps between subobject lattices yield maps between directories (see §2.3).

Remark 2.4. Very loosely, we can regard $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ as a version of $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ decorated with extra information which makes things like synthetic projective geometry work better. For example, for each n there is a correspondence

$$K \mapsto \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$$

from skew fields to $(n - 1)$ -dimensional projective spaces. For $n \geq 4$, this is a perfect correspondence. But for $n = 3$ the map is not onto, because of non-Desarguesian projective planes. For $n \leq 2$, the map is not injective, because projective lines are structureless. In contrast,

$$K \mapsto \text{Dir}_K(K)$$

is a perfect correspondence between skew fields and length-1 directories. (See §2.2.) The “extra structure” of $\text{Sub}_K(K^n)$ for $n > 1$ overcomes the problems of non-Desarguesian projective planes and structureless projective lines. The general form of synthetic projective geometry for directories is the statement that any directory (D_1, D_2, \dots) is isomorphic to $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ for some object A in an abelian category \mathcal{C} .

Of course we “cheated” and made this true by definition of “directory.” It would be better to define directories axiomatically as a collection of bounded modular lattices satisfying some axioms. See Appendix D for some speculation on what the axioms might be. Having a list of axioms would simplify life in the cases when we need to prove that a certain structure is a directory, as in §3 and §7.4 below.

2.1 Neighborhoods

If A is an object in an abelian category \mathcal{C} , we define the *neighborhood* of A to be the full subcategory of objects isomorphic to subquotients of finite powers of A . The neighborhood of A is in a sense the smallest abelian full subcategory $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ containing A and all its subobjects.

If \mathcal{C}' is the neighborhood of $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}'}(A) \cong \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$. In particular, the neighborhood of A determines the directory of A . The converse appears to be true: the directory of A seems to determine the neighborhood of A up to equivalence of categories. See §D.2.

2.2 Semisimple directories

For any (noncommutative) ring R , let $M_n(R)$ denote the ring of $n \times n$ matrices. Recall the Artin-Wedderburn theorem:

Theorem 2.5 (Artin-Wedderburn). *Let R be a ring. The following are equivalent:*

1. R is a semisimple ring, i.e., R is semisimple as an R -module.
2. R is a finite product

$$M_{n_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times M_{n_k}(D_k)$$

of matrix rings over division rings D_i .

The same circle of ideas which prove the Artin-Wedderburn theorem also prove the following proposition (see §C.1 for the proof):

Proposition 2.6. *Let A be a semisimple object in an abelian category \mathcal{C} .*

1. *The directory $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Dir}_R(R)$, where R is a semisimple ring, namely $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)^{\text{op}}$.*
2. *The directory $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Dir}_S(M)$, where S is a finite product $D_1 \times \cdots \times D_n$ of division rings, and M is a finitely-generated S -module.*

Conversely, if R is a semisimple ring and M is a finitely generated R -module, then M is a semisimple R -module. So we get the following characterization of semisimple directories:

Theorem 2.7. *Let D_{\bullet} be a directory. The following are equivalent:*

1. D_{\bullet} is a semisimple directory.
2. $D_{\bullet} \cong \text{Dir}_R(M)$ for some semisimple ring R and finitely generated R -module M .
3. $D_{\bullet} \cong \text{Dir}_R(R)$ for some semisimple ring R .
4. $D_{\bullet} \cong \text{Dir}_R(M)$ where R is a product of division algebras and M is a finitely generated R -module.

2.3 Morphisms of directories

Definition 2.8. . If D_\bullet and D'_\bullet are directories, a *morphism* from D_\bullet to D'_\bullet is a system of maps $f_n : D_n \rightarrow D'_n$ satisfying the following constraints:

1. For each n , the map f_n is order-preserving:

$$x \geq y \implies f_n(x) \geq f_n(y).$$

2. For each n , the map f_n is $GL_n(K_0)$ -equivariant.
3. The maps f_\bullet are compatible with \oplus :

$$f_{n+m}(x \oplus y) = f_n(x) \oplus f_m(y).$$

Note that we do not require f_n to preserve the lattice structure.

Example 2.9. For any morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} , there are pushforward and pullback morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} f^* : \text{Dir}(B) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}(A) \\ f_* : \text{Dir}(A) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}(B). \end{aligned}$$

defined by inverse and direct image along the componentwise maps $f^{\oplus n} : A^n \rightarrow B^n$. These are functorial in the obvious way:

$$\begin{aligned} (f \circ g)_* &= f_* \circ g_* \\ (f \circ g)^* &= g^* \circ f^*. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

1. If f is an isomorphism, then f_* and f^* are isomorphisms, and $(f^{-1})_* = f^*$.
2. If f is a monomorphism, each map $f_{*,n} : \text{Sub}(A^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(B^n)$ is injective, and $f^* \circ f_* = id$.
3. If f is an epimorphism, each map $f_n^* : \text{Sub}(B^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^n)$ is injective, and $f_* \circ f^* = id$.

(We verify that f^* and f_* are directory morphisms in Proposition C.4 below.)

Example 2.10. If $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ is a left-exact K_0 -linear functor, and $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then there is a morphism of directories

$$F_* : \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}'}(F(A)).$$

The map $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}'}(F(A)^n)$ is defined by sending a monomorphism

$$X \xrightarrow{i} A^n$$

to

$$F(X) \xrightarrow{F(i)} F(A^n) \cong F(A)^n.$$

This gives a well-defined map on subobjects.

(We verify that F_* is a directory morphism in Proposition C.5 below.)

Example 2.11. If $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ is a (K_0 -linear) equivalence of categories, then

$$F_* : \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}'}(F(A))$$

is an isomorphism of directories.

2.4 Interval subdirectories

Proposition 2.12. Let D_\bullet be a directory and $a \leq b$ be elements of D_1 . Let $D_n^{[a,b]}$ be the interval $[a^{\oplus n}, b^{\oplus n}]$ inside D_n .

1. $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ forms a substructure of D_\bullet , i.e., $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ is closed under \oplus, \vee, \wedge , and the $GL_\bullet(K_0)$ -action.
2. The substructure $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ is itself a directory.
3. The inclusion maps $i_n : D_n^{[a,b]} \xrightarrow{\subseteq} D_n$ form a directory morphism $i : D_\bullet^{[a,b]} \rightarrow D_\bullet$.
4. There is a directory morphism $r : D_\bullet \rightarrow D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ given by

$$r_n(x) = (x \vee a^{\oplus n}) \wedge b^{\oplus n} = (x \wedge b^{\oplus n}) \vee a^{\oplus n},$$

and r is a retract of i : $r \circ i$ is the identity map on $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$.

5. If $f : D' \rightarrow D$ is some directory morphism, then f factors through $D^{[a,b]} \rightarrow D$ if and only if $f_n(x) \in [a^{\oplus n}, b^{\oplus n}]$ for all n and all $x \in D'_n$.
6. If $D_\bullet = \text{Dir}(C)$ for some object C in an abelian category, and if a, b correspond to subobjects $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$, then $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ is isomorphic to $\text{Dir}(B/A)$ via the maps from the isomorphism theorems.

See §C.3 for the proof.

Definition 2.13. Let D_\bullet be a directory. An *interval subdirectory* is a directory of the form $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$. A morphism of directories is an *interval inclusion* or an *interval retract* if it is one of the maps

$$\begin{aligned} i : D_\bullet^{[a,b]} &\hookrightarrow D_\bullet \\ r : D_\bullet &\twoheadrightarrow D_\bullet^{[a,b]}, \end{aligned}$$

of Proposition 2.12, respectively.

Lemma 2.14. Let D_\bullet be a directory and a, b be two elements of D_1 . Then there is an isomorphism of directories $D^{[a \wedge b, a]} \rightarrow D^{[b, a \vee b]}$ given at each level by the usual isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} [a^n \wedge b^n, a^n] &\rightarrow [b^n, a^n \vee b^n] \\ x &\mapsto x \vee b^n. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We may assume $D_\bullet = \text{Dir}(C)$, and a, b correspond to subobjects $A, B \subseteq C$. By Proposition 2.12.6, the map in question is the isomorphism

$$\text{Dir}(C)^{[A \cap B, A]} \cong \text{Dir}(A/(A \cap B)) \cong \text{Dir}((A + B)/B) \cong \text{Dir}(C)^{[B, A+B]},$$

where the middle isomorphism $\text{Dir}(A/(A \cap B)) \cong \text{Dir}((A + B)/B)$ is induced by the standard isomorphism $A/(A \cap B) \cong (A + B)/B$. \square

2.5 Products of directories

If M and M' are two lattices, the product $M \times M'$ is naturally a lattice (as lattices are an algebraic theory), and the order on $M \times M'$ is determined as follows:

$$(a, a') \leq (b, b') \iff (a \leq b \text{ and } a' \leq b').$$

If $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'$ are two abelian categories, the product category $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}'$ is itself an abelian category ([12], Remark 8.3.6(i)). For any object $(A, A') \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}'$, one has

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}'}(A, A') = \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \times \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}'}(A'),$$

because a subobject of (A, A') is a pair (B, B') where B is a subobject of A and B' is a subobject of A' .

Lemma-Definition 2.15. *If D_\bullet and D'_\bullet are two directories, there is a product directory $(D \times D')_\bullet$ given by*

$$(D_1 \times D'_1, D_2 \times D'_2, \dots)$$

in which the structure maps are given componentwise; for example if $(V, V') \in D_n \times D'_n$ and $(W, W') \in D_m \times D'_m$, then

$$(V, V') \oplus (W, W') := (V \oplus W, V' \oplus W') \in D_{n+m} \times D'_{n+m}.$$

Furthermore, the two projections from $D \times D'$ to D and to D' are both morphisms of directories.

Proof. Write D_\bullet as $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ and D'_\bullet as $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}'}(A')$. Let A'' be the object (A, A') in the product category $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}'$. Then for any n ,

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}'}(A'') = \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \times \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}'}(A').$$

Then $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}'}(A'')$ is the desired product directory. The projections of $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}'}(A'')$ onto $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ and $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}'}(A')$ are induced by the (left-)exact projection functors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}' &\rightarrow \mathcal{C} \\ \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}' &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}'. \end{aligned}$$

as in Example 2.10. Therefore these projections are morphisms of directories. \square

Remark 2.16. If A, A' are two objects in an abelian category \mathcal{C} , the (left-)exact functor

$$\oplus : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

yields by Example 2.10 a morphism of directories

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A') &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A \oplus A') \\ (V, W) &\mapsto V \oplus W \end{aligned}$$

by Example 2.10.³ This morphism is rarely an isomorphism, unless every subobject of $A^n \oplus (A')^n$ happens to be of the form $V \oplus W$ for some $V \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n)$ and $W \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}((A')^n)$.⁴

Remark 2.17. If R_1, R_2 are two rings, the category $(R_1 \times R_2) \text{Mod}$ is equivalent to the product category $R_1 \text{Mod} \times R_2 \text{Mod}$. If M_i is an R_i -module for $i = 1, 2$, then

$$\text{Dir}_{R_1 \times R_2}(M_1 \times M_2) \cong \text{Dir}_{R_1}(M_1) \times \text{Dir}_{R_2}(M_2).$$

In particular,

$$\text{Dir}_{R_1 \times R_2}(R_1 \times R_2) \cong \text{Dir}_{R_1}(R_1) \times \text{Dir}_{R_2}(R_2).$$

Combined with Theorem 2.7, this implies that the semisimple directories are exactly those of the form

$$\text{Dir}_{k_1}(k_1^{d_1}) \times \cdots \times \text{Dir}_{k_n}(k_n^{d_n})$$

where k_1, \dots, k_n are division algebras over K_0 , and d_1, \dots, d_n are positive integers.

Usually, we aren't very interested in category-theoretic constructions in the category of directories. Nevertheless, the following fact will come in handy:

Proposition 2.18. *If D^1, D^2 are two directories, the product directory $D^1 \times D^2$ of Lemma-Definition 2.5 is the category-theoretic product in the category of directories.*

Proof. Let T be any directory. We must show bijectivity of the map

$$\text{Hom}(T, D^1 \times D^2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T, D^1) \times \text{Hom}(T, D^2)$$

induced by the projections $D^1 \times D^2 \rightarrow D^1, D^2$. Equivalently, if f^1, f^2 are two systems of maps

$$\begin{aligned} f_n^1 : T_n &\rightarrow D_n^1 \\ f_n^2 : T_n &\rightarrow D_n^2, \end{aligned}$$

and g is the induced system of maps

$$g_n : T_n \rightarrow D_n^1 \times D_n^2,$$

³Actually, the morphism is $(V, W) \mapsto (V \oplus W)^T$, where $(-)^T$ is the transpose map $A^n \oplus (A')^n \rightarrow (A \oplus A')^n$.

⁴This condition looks a lot like model-theoretic orthogonality. When A, A' are finite length, this condition should be equivalent to the condition that the simple factors of A are pairwise non-isomorphic to the simple factors of A' .

then we must show that

$$g_{\bullet} \in \text{Hom}(T, D^1 \times D^2) \iff (f_{\bullet}^1 \in \text{Hom}(T, D^1) \text{ and } f_{\bullet}^2 \in \text{Hom}(T, D^2)). \quad (1)$$

But (1) is somehow automatic, because...

- ... $D_n^1 \times D_n^2$ is the category-theoretic product of D_n^1 and D_n^2 in the category of posets.
- ... $D_n^1 \times D_n^2$ is the category-theoretic product of D_n^1 and D_n^2 in the category of sets with $GL_n(K_0)$ -actions.
- ... $D_{\bullet}^1 \times D_{\bullet}^2$ is the category-theoretic product of D_{\bullet}^1 and D_{\bullet}^2 in the category of multi-sorted structures (M_1, M_2, \dots) with operators $\oplus_{m,n} : M_m \times M_n \rightarrow M_{m+n}$.

So, somehow everything works because the structure on $D_{\bullet}^1 \times D_{\bullet}^2$ was defined componentwise. \square

3 Directories from model theory

Let \mathbb{K} be a field, possibly with extra structure, assumed to be very saturated and very homogeneous. Let K_0 be a small, infinite subfield. For each n , let

- Δ_n denote the lattice of definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n .
- Λ_n denote the lattice of type-definable⁵ K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n .
- Λ_n^{00} denote the quotient of Λ_n by the 00-commensurability relation:

$$G \approx H \iff (G/(G \cap H) \text{ and } H/(G \cap H) \text{ are bounded}).$$

Let Λ_{\bullet} be the multi-sorted structure

$$(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3, \dots)$$

with the following functions and relations:

- The lattice structure on each Λ_n
- For any n, m , the map

$$\oplus : \Lambda_n \times \Lambda_m \rightarrow \Lambda_{n+m}$$

⁵We mean “type-definable over a small set.” Unless we have an inaccessible cardinal on hand, there is some ambiguity in “small.” In what follows, it should suffice to fix a small cardinal $\kappa_0 \gg \aleph_0$ such that \mathbb{K} is κ -saturated for some $\kappa \gg \kappa_0$. Then we can take Λ to be the lattice of K_0 -linear subspaces that are type-definable over a small model of size less than κ_0 . The small cardinal κ_0 needs to be bigger than the size of the theory, and larger than the size of a magic subfield. Further properties, like being a regular cardinal or a limit cardinal, seem to be unnecessary.

- For each n , the action of $GL_n(K_0)$ on Λ_n .

Define the structures $\Lambda_\bullet^{00}, \Delta_\bullet$ similarly.

Theorem 3.1. *The structures $\Delta_\bullet, \Lambda_\bullet, \Lambda_\bullet^{00}$ are (K_0 -linear) directories.*

We give the proof over the next three sections §3.1-3.3. The cases of Δ_\bullet and Λ_\bullet are intuitively unsurprising, though there are some details to check. The case of Λ_\bullet^{00} is slightly more subtle.

Remark 3.2. One could define Δ_\bullet^{00} analogously, but it is always identical to Δ_\bullet . Indeed, if $G, H \in \Delta_n$ and $G \approx H$, then the groups $G/(G \cap H)$ and $H/(G \cap H)$ are bounded. They are also interpretable, so they are *finite*. They are also K_0 -vector spaces, and K_0 is infinite, so $G/(G \cap H)$ and $H/(G \cap H)$ are in fact *trivial*, implying $G = H$. Thus \approx is a trivial equivalence relation on Δ_n , and $\Delta_n^{00} = \Delta_n$.

Remark 3.3. If \mathbb{K} is NIP, we can alternatively view Λ_n^{00} as the set of $G \in \Lambda_n$ such that $G = G^{00}$. Note that Λ_n^{00} is not a sublattice of Λ_n —the lattice operations are

$$\begin{aligned} G \vee H &= G + H \\ G \wedge H &= (G \cap H)^{00}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.4. If \mathbb{K} is dp-finite and K_0 is a magic subfield, then the relation \approx on Λ_n is trivial, so $\Lambda_\bullet^{00} \cong \Lambda_\bullet$.

3.1 The definable case

Let \mathcal{D} be the abelian category of interpretable K_0 -vector spaces.⁶ We can view \mathbb{K} as an object in \mathcal{D} , and then there is an obvious isomorphism

$$\Delta_n \cong \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{K}^n)$$

for each n . Then Δ_\bullet is simply $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{K})$.

Remark 3.5. If R is a definable subring of \mathbb{K} containing K_0 , then there is a smaller directory Δ_\bullet^R , where Δ_n^R is the lattice of definable R -submodules of \mathbb{K}^n . This structure is a directory because it is the directory of \mathbb{K} in the category of definable R -modules.

⁶There’s an ambiguity here. The most general sort of interpretable K_0 -vector space would be a vector space $(V, +, \cdot)$ such that (1) the underlying set V is interpretable in \mathbb{K} , (2) the addition operation $V \times V \rightarrow V$ is definable, and (3) for each $a \in K_0$, the map $V \rightarrow V$ sending x to ax is definable. There is also a more restricted version where the map $x \mapsto ax$ is definable uniformly across a . The choice of \mathcal{D} ultimately doesn’t matter, since the “neighborhood” of \mathbb{K} in \mathcal{D} is the same in each case (see §2.1). If you’re unhappy with this state of affairs, you can also take the minimal necessary \mathcal{D} , which is defined similar to \mathcal{H} in the next section, but replacing “type-definable” with “definable.”

3.2 The type-definable case

For Λ_\bullet , we should be able to proceed analogously to Δ_\bullet , replacing the category of interpretable K_0 -vector spaces with the category of hyper-interpretable K_0 -vector spaces. It's not clear to me that this category is well-defined or well-behaved, so we instead build a minimal sufficient category \mathcal{H} . Morally, \mathcal{H} is the neighborhood of \mathbb{K} in the full category of hyper-interpretable K_0 -vector spaces.

We prove the following proposition and theorem in §C.4.

Proposition 3.6. *There is a K_0 -linear pre-additive category \mathcal{H} in which*

- *an object is a quotient A/B where $B, A \in \Lambda_n$ for some n , and $A \geq B$.*
- *a morphism from A/B to A'/B' is a K_0 -linear function $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ such that the set*

$$\{(x, y) \in A \times A' : y + B' = f(x + B)\}$$

is type-definable.

- *the composition of $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ and $g : A'/B' \rightarrow A''/B''$ is the usual composition $g \circ f$.*
- *the K_0 -vector space structure on $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}}(A/B, A'/B')$ is induced by the usual operations, i.e., induced as a subspace of $\text{Hom}_{K_0 \text{ Vect}}(A/B, A'/B')$.*

Theorem 3.7. *Let \mathcal{H} be the category of Proposition 3.6.*

- *\mathcal{H} is a K_0 -linear abelian category.*
- *The forgetful functor $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow K_0 \text{ Vect}$ is a K_0 -linear exact functor.*
- *Λ_\bullet is isomorphic to $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{K})$, and is therefore a directory.*

Remark 3.8. There is a K_0 -linear functor $\mathbb{K} \text{ Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ sending \mathbb{K}^n to the object $\mathbb{K}^n/0$ in \mathcal{H} . This functor is exact and faithful (see Remark A.1). The composition

$$\mathbb{K} \text{ Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \rightarrow K_0 \text{ Vect}$$

is equivalent to the forgetful functor $\mathbb{K} \text{ Vect}^f \rightarrow K_0 \text{ Vect}$. This configuration will be important in §8-9.

3.3 Serre quotients and 00-commensurability

In the category \mathcal{H} , the small/bounded objects form a Serre subcategory. We define \mathcal{H}^{00} to be the Serre quotient. (See §A.3 for a review of Serre subcategories and Serre quotients.)

Concretely, a morphism from X to Y in \mathcal{H}^{00} is an equivalence class of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces $\Gamma \subseteq X \times Y$ such that

- $\Gamma + (0 \times Y) \approx X \times Y$.
- $\Gamma \cap (0 \times Y) \approx 0 \times 0$.

where \approx denotes 00-commensurability. Two subspaces Γ and Γ' are regarded as equivalent if $\Gamma \approx \Gamma'$. These equivalence classes of relations are essentially the “endogenies” of ([13], §1.5) or the “quasi-homomorphisms” of ([3], §3). By analogy with abelian varieties, we call \mathcal{H}^{00} the *isogeny category*.

Proposition 3.9. \mathcal{H}^{00} is a well-defined K_0 -linear abelian category, and

$$\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{H}^{00}}(\mathbb{K}) \cong \Lambda_{\bullet}^{00}, \quad (2)$$

so Λ_{\bullet}^{00} is a directory.

This follows by basic facts about Serre quotients, discussed in §A.3. The identity (2) follows by Proposition A.5.

Remark 3.10. The localization functor $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{00}$ is exact, yielding a directory morphism

$$\Lambda_{\bullet} \rightarrow \Lambda_{\bullet}^{00}$$

The n th component of this morphism,

$$\Lambda_n \rightarrow \Lambda_n^{00},$$

is simply the quotient map.

Now assume \mathbb{K} is dp-finite. Recall Definition 1.6: a subfield K_0 is *magic* if it is large enough to ensure that type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n are 00-connected. These exist by [10], Corollary 8.7.

Assuming K_0 is magic, it follows that the localization map

$$\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{00}$$

is an equivalence of categories, because all non-trivial $A/B \in \mathcal{H}$ are unbounded⁷. In this case, $\Lambda_{\bullet} \cong \Lambda_{\bullet}^{00}$.

4 Inflators: definition and examples

Fix a small field K_0 . (Usually it will be \mathbb{Q} or a magic subfield of a field of finite dp-rank.)

⁷Because K_0 is magic, $A = A^{00}$ and $B = B^{00}$. If A/B is bounded, then $A^{00} = B^{00}$, implying $A = B$, implying A/B is trivial.

Definition 4.1. Let K/K_0 be a field. A d -inflator on K is a morphism of directories

$$\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow D_\bullet$$

to some semisimple directory D_\bullet of length d , satisfying the following additional axiom:

$$\ell(\varsigma_n(V)) = d \cdot \dim_K(V)$$

for any $V \subseteq K^n$. In other words, the maps ς_n scale lengths by a factor of d .

Explicitly, then, a d -inflator on K consists of a family of maps

$$\varsigma_n : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(B^n)$$

where B is a semisimple object of length d in a K_0 -linear abelian category, and the maps ς_n need to satisfy the identities⁸

$$\begin{aligned} V \subseteq W &\implies \varsigma_n(V) \subseteq \varsigma_n(W) \\ \varsigma_{n+m}(V \oplus W) &= \varsigma_n(V) \oplus \varsigma_m(W) \\ \ell(\varsigma_n(V)) &= d \cdot \dim_K(V) \\ \varsigma_n(\mu \cdot V) &= \mu \cdot \varsigma_n(V) \quad \text{for } \mu \in GL_n(K_0). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.2. Two d -inflators

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma &: \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow D_\bullet \\ \varsigma' &: \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow D'_\bullet \end{aligned}$$

are *equivalent* if there is an isomorphism of directories $f : D_\bullet \rightarrow D'_\bullet$ such that $\varsigma' = f \circ \varsigma$.

By Theorem 2.7, every d -inflator is equivalent to one of the form

$$\text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(A),$$

where R is a semisimple K_0 -algebra and A is a finitely-generated R -module. Moreover, we may assume either of the following (but not both):

- $A = R$.
- R is a finite product of division algebras over K_0 .

⁸Compare with Speculative Remark 10.10 in [10]. Inflators were called “ r -fold specializations” in introductory §1.2 of [10].

4.1 1-inflators from field embeddings

Let $K_0 \subseteq K_1 \subseteq K_2$ be a chain of field extensions. The inclusion of K_1 into K_2 induces a 1-inflator from $\text{Dir}_{K_1}(K_1)$ to $\text{Dir}_{K_2}(K_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_{K_1}(K_1^n) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_{K_2}(K_2^n) \\ V &\mapsto K_2 \otimes_{K_1} V. \end{aligned}$$

This is a directory morphism because it arises as in Example 2.10 from the left-exact K_0 -additive functor $K_2 \otimes_{K_1} -$ from $K_1 \text{ Vect}$ to $K_2 \text{ Vect}$.

More generally, if K_1, K_2 are two fields extending K_0 , any K_0 -linear embedding of K_1 into K_2 induces a 1-inflator from $\text{Dir}_{K_1}(K_1)$ to $\text{Dir}_{K_2}(K_2)$. Even more generally, we can allow K_2 to be a K_0 -division algebra.

4.2 Inflators from restriction of scalars

Let L/K be a finite field extension. The forgetful functor from $L \text{ Vect}$ to $K \text{ Vect}$ is exact, hence induces a morphism of directories

$$\text{Dir}_L(L) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(L).$$

This map clearly scales dimensions by a factor of $[L : K]$, yielding an $[L : K]$ -inflator on L .

4.3 1-inflators from valuations

Let $(K, \mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{m})$ be a valued field. Suppose K extends K_0 , and the valuation on K_0 is trivial, so that \mathcal{O} is a K_0 -algebra. Let k be the residue field.

Theorem 4.3. *The family of maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_n : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_k(k^n) \\ V &\mapsto (V \cap \mathcal{O}^n + \mathfrak{m}^n) / \mathfrak{m}^n \end{aligned}$$

is a 1-inflator from $\text{Dir}_K(K)$ to $\text{Dir}_k(k)$.

Proof. First we verify that ς is a morphism of directories. Indeed, it is the composition

$$\text{Dir}_K(K) \xrightarrow{i} \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{O}}(K) \xrightarrow{f} \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{g} \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{O}}(k),$$

where i is induced by the forgetful functor $K \text{ Vect} \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \text{ Mod}$, where f is pullback along the monomorphism $\mathcal{O} \hookrightarrow K$, and where g is pushforward along the epimorphism $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m} \cong k$. See Examples 2.9 and 2.10.

Next, we must show that

$$\dim_k(\varsigma_n(V)) = \dim_K(V) \tag{3}$$

for any subspace $V \subseteq K^n$. By the following lemma, we may change coordinates and assume $V = K^\ell \oplus 0^{n-\ell}$, in which case (3) is clear. \square

Lemma 4.4. *If $(K, \mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{m}, k)$ is a valued field and V is a subspace of K^n , then there is $\mu \in GL_n(\mathcal{O})$ such that $\mu \cdot V = K^\ell \oplus 0^{n-\ell}$ for some ℓ .*

Although this lemma is well-known⁹, we give a proof for completeness.

Proof. Let $r : \mathcal{O}^n \rightarrow k^n$ be the coordinatewise residue map. Let $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_\ell$ be elements of $V \cap \mathcal{O}^n$ such that $r(\vec{a}_1), \dots, r(\vec{a}_\ell)$ form a basis for the k -linear subspace $r(V \cap \mathcal{O}^n)$, the image of $V \cap \mathcal{O}^n$ under r . We may find $\vec{a}_{\ell+1}, \dots, \vec{a}_n \in \mathcal{O}^n$ such that $r(\vec{a}_1), \dots, r(\vec{a}_n)$ are a basis of k^n . Let ν be the matrix built out of $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_n$. Then ν is in $GL_n(\mathcal{O})$ because its determinant has nonzero residue, hence is invertible. Let $\mu = \nu^{-1}$. Replacing V with $\mu \cdot V$, we may assume that \vec{a}_i is the i th standard basis vector \vec{e}_i . For $1 \leq i \leq \ell$,

$$\vec{e}_i = \vec{a}_i \in V \cap \mathcal{O}^n \subseteq V,$$

so $K^\ell \oplus 0^{n-\ell} \subseteq V$. If V is strictly larger than $K^\ell \oplus 0^{n-\ell}$, we can find non-zero

$$\vec{x} \in V \cap (0^\ell \oplus K^{n-\ell}).$$

Rescaling \vec{x} by its coordinate of least valuation, we may assume $\vec{x} \in \mathcal{O}^n \setminus \mathfrak{m}^n$. Then $\vec{x} \in V \cap \mathcal{O}^n$. Also $r(\vec{x})$ is a non-zero element of $0^\ell \oplus k^{n-\ell}$, and therefore isn't in the span of the first ℓ standard basis vectors $r(\vec{a}_1), \dots, r(\vec{a}_\ell)$. But we chose the vectors $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_\ell$ to ensure that $r(\vec{a}_1), \dots, r(\vec{a}_\ell)$ span all of $r(V \cap \mathcal{O}^n)$. \square

Composing the 1-inflator of Theorem 4.3 with the 1-inflators from §4.1, we get a more general class of 1-inflators:

Theorem 4.5. *Let \mathcal{O} be a valuation K_0 -algebra, let L be a K_0 -division algebra, and f be a K_0 -linear embedding of the residue field of \mathcal{O} into L . Let $K = \text{Frac } \mathcal{O}$. Then there is a 1-inflator from $\text{Dir}_K(K)$ to $\text{Dir}_L(L)$ sending $V \subseteq K^n$ to*

$$L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m}} ((V \cap \mathcal{O}^n + \mathfrak{m}^n)/\mathfrak{m}^n)$$

In §5.4 we shall see that all 1-inflators have this form. Thus, a 1-inflator from K to L is equivalent to a valuation ring on K and an embedding of the residue field into L .

4.4 Inflators from multivaluations

Let K be a field extending K_0 . For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let

$$\zeta^i : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow D^i$$

be a d_i -inflator. Then the product map

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta : \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow (D^1 \times \dots \times D^n) \\ V &\mapsto (\zeta^1(V), \dots, \zeta^n(V)) \end{aligned}$$

of Proposition 2.18 is a $(d_1 + \dots + d_n)$ -inflator. The length equation is a consequence of the following trivial fact:

⁹It is the reason why Grassmannian varieties are proper.

Remark 4.6. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let M_i be a modular lattice of finite length and let x_i be an element of M_i . In the product lattice $\prod_{i=1}^n M_i$, the length of (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) over the bottom element is exactly

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{M_i}(x_i/\perp).$$

Example 4.7. If K is a field extending K_0 , and if $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n$ are valuation K_0 -algebras on K with residue fields k_1, \dots, k_n , then there is an n -inflator

$$\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Dir}_{k_i}(k_i)$$

sending V to $(\zeta^1(V), \dots, \zeta^n(V))$, where ζ^i is the 1-inflator coming from the i th valuation.

The original hope was that essentially *all* d -inflators would arise in this manner. In the next section, we will see that this is far from being the case.

4.5 Unwanted examples

Lemma 4.8. *If K is a field (extending K_0 as always), there is a length-preserving directory morphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau : \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \times \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \times \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \\ (V, W) &\mapsto (V + W, V \cap W). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \times \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \\ (V, W) &\mapsto V + W \end{aligned}$$

is a directory morphism, because it is the composition of the morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \times \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_K(K \oplus K) \\ (V, W) &\mapsto V \oplus W \end{aligned}$$

from Remark 2.16 with the morphism $\mathrm{Dir}_{K \oplus K}(K \oplus K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_K(K)$ obtained by pushforward along

$$\begin{aligned} K \oplus K &\rightarrow K \\ (x, y) &\mapsto x + y. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \times \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \\ (V, W) &\mapsto V \cap W \end{aligned}$$

is a directory morphism, because it is the composition of the morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K) \times \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(K \oplus K) \\ (V, W) &\mapsto V \oplus W \end{aligned}$$

from Remark 2.16 with the morphism $\text{Dir}_{K \oplus K}(K \oplus K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(K)$ obtained by pullback along the diagonal inclusion

$$\begin{aligned} K &\hookrightarrow K \oplus K \\ x &\mapsto (x, x). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.18, the product map τ is a morphism of directories. The map τ is obviously length-preserving (note Remark 4.6). \square

Using this, we can produce a number of perverse examples of 2-inflators. Some (but not all) of these examples will be ruled out by the ‘‘malleability’’ condition of §5.6.

Example 4.9. There is a 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \\ V &\mapsto (V + \bar{V}, V \cap \bar{V}), \end{aligned}$$

where \bar{V} denotes the complex conjugate of V .

Example 4.10. In fact, both $V + \bar{V}$ and $V \cap \bar{V}$ descend to \mathbb{R} , yielding a 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \\ V &\mapsto (V + \bar{V}, V \cap \bar{V}), \end{aligned}$$

Example 4.11. Let K be a field with two independent valuation rings $\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2$. Suppose both residue fields are isomorphic to some field k . Then there is a 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k) \times \text{Dir}_k(k) \\ V &\mapsto (\zeta^1(V) + \zeta^2(V), \zeta^1(V) \cap \zeta^2(V)) \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta^i : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k)$ is the 1-inflator induced by \mathcal{O}_i .

Example 4.12. Let

$$\dots, p_{-2}, p_{-1}, p_0, p_1, p_2, \dots$$

be some enumeration of $\{2, 3, 5, 7, 11, \dots\}$. Let

$$K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \sqrt{5}, \dots).$$

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\sigma_i : K \rightarrow K$ be the automorphism of K over \mathbb{Q} characterized by

$$\sigma_i(\sqrt{p_j}) = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{p_j} & j = i \\ \sqrt{p_j} & j \neq i \end{cases}$$

Extend σ_i to a map $K^n \rightarrow K^n$ by coordinatewise application. Let τ_i be the map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K) \times \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(K) \times \text{Dir}_K(K) \\ (V, W) &\mapsto (V + \sigma_i(W), V \cap \sigma_i(W)) \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$(V', W') = \tau_i(V, W) \implies \dim(V') + \dim(W') = \dim(V) + \dim(W).$$

For any integers $i \leq j$, there is a 2-inflator $\zeta^{i,j} : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{K \times K}(K, K)$ given by

$$\zeta^{i,j}(V) = (\tau_i \circ \tau_{i+1} \circ \cdots \circ \tau_j)(V, V)$$

Then we can define $\zeta : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{K \times K}(K, K)$ by

$$\zeta(V) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \zeta^{-j,j}(V)$$

The limit is well-defined because if V is defined over $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{p_i}, \sqrt{p_{i+1}}, \dots, \sqrt{p_j})$, then τ_k has no effect for $k < i$ or $k > j$.

One can generalize the examples of this section to d -inflators for $d > 2$, by using variants of τ , such as the map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K^d) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(W) \times \text{Dir}_K(K^d/W) \\ V &\mapsto (V \cap W^n, (V + W^n)/W^n) \end{aligned}$$

for any K -linear subspace $W \subseteq K^d$. (In the case of Lemma 4.8, W is the diagonal in K^2 .)

5 Algebraic properties of inflators

5.1 Basic techniques

Fix a d -inflator on K :

$$\zeta : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B),$$

where B is semisimple of length d .

We shall repeatedly use the following basic facts:

Lemma 5.1. $\zeta_n(0) = 0$ and $\zeta_n(K^n) = B^n$.

Proof. The map ζ_n must scale lengths by a factor of d , so

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\zeta_n(0)) &= 0 \\ \ell(\zeta_n(K^n)) &= nd. \end{aligned}$$

But $\ell(B^n) = nd$. The only subobject of B^n having length 0 is 0, and the only subobject having length nd is B^n . \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let V, W be subspaces of K^n .*

1. *If*

$$\ell(\varsigma_n(V) \cap \varsigma_n(W)) = d \cdot \dim(V \cap W)$$

then

$$\varsigma_n(V \cap W) = \varsigma_n(V) \cap \varsigma_n(W).$$

2. *Dually, if*

$$\ell(\varsigma_n(V) + \varsigma_n(W)) = d \cdot \dim(V + W)$$

then

$$\varsigma_n(V + W) = \varsigma_n(V) + \varsigma_n(W).$$

Proof. By order-preservation, the following holds in general:

$$\varsigma_n(V \cap W) \subseteq \varsigma_n(V) \cap \varsigma_n(W). \quad (4)$$

Suppose that

$$\ell(\varsigma_n(V) \cap \varsigma_n(W)) = d \cdot \dim(V \cap W)$$

holds. By the length-scaling law, it follows that

$$\ell(\varsigma_n(V) \cap \varsigma_n(W)) = \ell(\varsigma_n(V \cap W)).$$

Therefore, equality must hold in (4)—the two sides have the same length. This proves (1), and (2) is similar. \square

Lemma 5.2 can be re-stated as follows: Assume

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_n(V) &= V' \\ \varsigma_n(W) &= W'. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_n(V \cap W) &= V' \cap W' \\ \varsigma_n(V + W) &= V' + W', \end{aligned}$$

provided that the lengths and dimensions satisfy the expected requirements:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(V' \cap W') &\stackrel{?}{=} d \cdot \dim(V \cap W) \\ \ell(V' + W') &\stackrel{?}{=} d \cdot \dim(V + W). \end{aligned}$$

5.2 The fundamental ring and ideal

Fix some inflator $\varsigma : K \rightarrow \text{Dir}_C(B)$. For $\alpha \in K$ and $\varphi \in \text{End}_C(B)$, let

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_\alpha &= \{(x, \alpha x) : x \in K\} = K \cdot (1, \alpha) \\ \Theta_\varphi &= \{(y, \varphi(y)) : y \in B\}.\end{aligned}$$

Say that $\alpha \in K$ *specializes to* $\varphi \in \text{End}(B)$ if

$$\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha) = \Theta_\varphi.$$

Lemma 5.3. *If α specializes to φ and α' specializes to φ' , then $\alpha \cdot \alpha'$ specializes to $\varphi \circ \varphi'$.*

Proof. By compatibility with \oplus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma_3(\{(x, \alpha x, y) \mid x, y \in K\}) &= \{(x, \varphi x, y) \mid x, y \in B\} \\ \varsigma_3(\{(w, x, \alpha'x) \mid w, x \in K\}) &= \{(w, x, \varphi'x) \mid w, x \in B\}\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.2.1,

$$\varsigma_3(\{(x, \alpha x, \alpha'\alpha x) \mid x \in K\}) = \{(x, \varphi x, \varphi'\varphi x) \mid x \in B\}.$$

Meanwhile, by Lemma 5.1 and \oplus -compatibility,

$$\varsigma_3(\{(0, y, 0) \mid y \in K\}) = \varsigma_3(0 \oplus K \oplus 0) = \{(0, y, 0) \mid y \in B\}.$$

By Lemma 5.2.2, it follows that

$$\varsigma_3(\{(x, y, \alpha'\alpha x) \mid x, y \in K\}) = \{(x, y, \varphi'\varphi x) \mid x, y \in B\}.$$

By equivariance under $GL_3(K_0)$, we can permute the coordinates:

$$\varsigma_3(\{(x, \alpha'\alpha x, y) \mid x, y \in K\}) = \{(x, \varphi'\varphi x, y) \mid x, y \in B\}.$$

By \oplus -compatibility, this implies

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha'\alpha x) \mid x \in K\}) \oplus B = \{(x, \varphi'\varphi x) \mid x \in B\} \oplus B.$$

Therefore, the desired identity must hold:

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha'\alpha x) \mid x \in K\}) = \{(x, \varphi'\varphi x) \mid x \in B\}. \quad \square$$

Lemma 5.4. *If α specializes to φ and α' specializes to φ' , then $\alpha + \alpha'$ specializes to $\varphi + \varphi'$.*

Proof. Using a method similar to the proof of Lemma 5.3, we see that

$$\varsigma_3(\{(x, \alpha x, \alpha'x) \mid x \in K\}) = \{(x, \varphi x, \varphi'x) \mid x \in B\}.$$

By \oplus -compatibility,

$$\varsigma_4(\{(x, \alpha x, \alpha'x, 0) \mid x \in K\}) = \{(x, \varphi x, \varphi'x, 0) \mid x \in B\}.$$

By $GL_4(K_0)$ -equivariance,

$$\varsigma_4(\{(x, \alpha x, \alpha'x, \alpha x + \alpha'x) \mid x \in K\}) = \{(x, \varphi x, \varphi'x, \varphi x + \varphi'x) \mid x \in B\}.$$

Adding in $0 \oplus K \oplus K \oplus 0$, we see that

$$\varsigma_4(\{(x, y, z, \alpha x + \alpha'x) \mid x, y, z \in K\}) = \{(x, y, z, \varphi x + \varphi'x) \mid x, y, z \in B\}.$$

Permuting coordinates and splitting things off via \oplus -compatibility, we get the desired identity

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha x + \alpha'x) \mid x \in K\}) = \{(x, \varphi x + \varphi'x) \mid x \in B\}. \quad \square$$

Lemma 5.5. *If $\alpha \in K_0$, then α specializes to α (i.e., to α times id_B).*

Proof. By \oplus -compatibility,

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, 0) \mid x \in K\}) = \{(x, 0) \mid x \in B\}.$$

Applying the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, the $GL_2(K_0)$ -equivariance implies

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha x) \mid x \in K\}) = \{(x, \alpha x) \mid x \in B\}. \quad \square$$

Lemma 5.6. *If $\alpha \in K$ specializes to an automorphism $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(B)$, then α^{-1} specializes to φ^{-1} .*

Proof. This follows by $GL_2(K_0)$ -equivariance using the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \square$$

Putting together all the lemmas yields the

Proposition 5.7. *Let R be the set of $x \in K$ specializing to any endomorphism of B . Let I be the set of $x \in K$ specializing to 0. Let*

$$\widehat{\text{res}} : R \rightarrow \text{End}(B)$$

be the map sending x to φ if x specializes to φ .

1. R is a K_0 -subalgebra of K .

2. $\widehat{\text{res}} : R \rightarrow \text{End}(B)$ is a K_0 -algebra homomorphism.

3. I is the kernel of $\widehat{\text{res}}$, so I is an ideal in R .

4. I is contained in the Jacobson radical of R .

Proof. The only subtle point is the last one. By basic commutative algebra, it suffices to show that $1 + I \subseteq R^\times$, which follows from Lemma 5.6. \square

Note that the properties of R and I are analogous to the properties of the ring R_J and ideal I_J appearing in ([10], Proposition 10.15). In fact, the R_J and I_J of [10] are the fundamental ring and ideal of a specific inflator we will construct later in Theorem 9.3.

Definition 5.8. If ζ is a d -inflator, the *fundamental ring* and *fundamental ideal* of ζ are the ring R and ideal I appearing in Proposition 5.7. The natural map

$$\widehat{\text{res}} : R \rightarrow \text{End}(B)$$

is the *generalized residue map*; its kernel is I .

Lemma 5.9. Fix an inflator $K \rightarrow \text{Dir}_C(B)$. Let α be an element of K , and let $\Theta_\alpha = K \cdot (1, \alpha)$. The following are equivalent:

- $\alpha \in R$, i.e., $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha)$ is the graph of an endomorphism on B .
- $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha) + (0 \oplus B) = B \oplus B$, i.e., the projection of $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha)$ onto the first coordinate is onto.
- $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha) \cap (0 \oplus B) = 0 \oplus 0$, i.e., $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha)$ is the graph of a partial endomorphism.

Proof. The first condition is equivalent to the conjunction of the second and third conditions. By the length-scaling law, $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha)$ has half the length of $B \oplus B$. This ensures that the second and third conditions are, in fact, equivalent. \square

Lemma 5.10. Fix an inflator $K \rightarrow \text{Dir}_C(B)$. Let α be an element of K , and let $\Theta_\alpha = K \cdot (1, \alpha)$. The following are equivalent:

- $\alpha \in I$, i.e., $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha) = B \oplus 0$
- $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha) \supseteq B \oplus 0$.
- $\varsigma_2(\Theta_\alpha) \subseteq B \oplus 0$.

Proof. Similar to Lemma 5.9, but easier. \square

5.3 Examples

Example 5.11. Let $K \hookrightarrow L$ be a (K_0 -linear) embedding of K into a division ring L . As in §4.1, this gives a 1-inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_L(L^n) \\ V &\mapsto L \otimes_K V. \end{aligned}$$

If $a \in K$ and $\Theta_a = K \cdot (1, a)$, then $\varsigma(\Theta_a)$ is just $L \cdot (1, a)$. In particular, the fundamental ring of ς is all of K , and the generalized residue map is the embedding of K into L .

Example 5.12. Let $[L : K]$ be a finite field extension of degree d and let $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_L(L) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(L)$ be the restriction of scalars d -inflator, as in §4.2. For any $a \in L$, let $\Theta_a = L \cdot (1, a)$. Then $\varsigma(\Theta_a)$ is the graph of the K -linear map $L \rightarrow L$ induced by multiplication by a . Thus the fundamental ring of ς is all of L , and the generalized residue map is the obvious forgetful map $L \rightarrow \text{End}_K(L)$.

Example 5.13. Let \mathcal{O} be a valuation ring on a field K , and let

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k) \\ \varsigma_n(V) &= (V \cap \mathcal{O}^n + \mathfrak{m}^n) / \mathfrak{m}^n \end{aligned}$$

be the induced 1-inflator as in Theorem 4.3.

For $a \in K$, let $\Theta_a = K \cdot (1, a)$. Note that

$$\Theta_a \cap \mathcal{O}^2 = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O} \cdot (1, a) & a \in \mathcal{O} \\ \mathcal{O} \cdot (a^{-1}, 1) & a \notin \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

Then $\varsigma_2(\Theta_a)$ is the image of $\Theta_a \cap \mathcal{O}^2$ under the residue map $\mathcal{O}^2 \twoheadrightarrow k^2$, which is

$$\varsigma_2(\Theta_a) = \begin{cases} k \cdot (1, \text{res}(a)) & a \in \mathcal{O} \\ k \cdot (0, 1) & a \notin \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

It follows that \mathcal{O} is the fundamental ring of ς , \mathfrak{m} is the fundamental ideal, and the canonical map

$$\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \text{End}_k(k) = k$$

is the residue map.

Example 5.14. More generally, let $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_L(L)$ be a 1-inflator on K constructed from a valuation ring \mathcal{O} on K and an embedding of the residue field into a division ring L . Then the fundamental ring of ς is \mathcal{O} , the generalized residue map is the composition

$$\mathcal{O} \twoheadrightarrow k \hookrightarrow L,$$

and the fundamental ideal is \mathfrak{m} . We leave the details as an exercise to the reader.

Proposition 5.15. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\zeta^i : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(B_i)$ be a d_i -inflator. Let R_i and I_i be the fundamental ring and ideal of ζ^i . Let ζ be the product inflator of §4.4:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta : \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(B_i) \\ V &\mapsto (\zeta^1(V), \dots, \zeta^n(V)). \end{aligned}$$

Then the fundamental ring and ideal of ζ are exactly

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \bigcap_{i=1}^n R_i \\ I &= \bigcap_{i=1}^n I_i, \end{aligned}$$

and the canonical map

$$R/I \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(B_i)$$

is the product of the canonical maps for the ζ^i .

Proof. Note that for $a \in K$ and $\Theta_a = K \cdot (1, a)$, we have

$$\zeta(\Theta_a) = (\zeta^1(\Theta_a), \dots, \zeta^n(\Theta_a)).$$

By Lemma 5.9, $a \in R$ if and only if

$$\zeta(\Theta_a) \cap (0 \oplus (B_1, \dots, B_n)) = 0 \oplus 0,$$

i.e., if and only if

$$(\zeta^1(\Theta_a) \cap (0 \oplus B_1), \dots, \zeta^n(\Theta_a) \cap (0 \oplus B_n)) = (0 \oplus 0, \dots, 0 \oplus 0).$$

By Lemma 5.9 this holds if and only if $a \in R_i$ for all i . A similar argument using Lemma 5.10 shows $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n I_i$. Finally, if $a \in R$, and a specializes to $\varphi_i \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(B_i)$ for each i , then

$$\zeta^i(\Theta_a) = \Theta_{\varphi_i},$$

so

$$\zeta(\Theta_a) = (\Theta_{\varphi_1}, \dots, \Theta_{\varphi_n}).$$

But the right hand side is the graph of the endomorphism $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ in

$$\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_n}((B_1, \dots, B_n)) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}_1}(B_1) \times \dots \times \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}_n}(B_n). \quad \square$$

Example 5.16. Suppose $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n$ are valuation K_0 -algebras on a field K , and k_i is the residue field of \mathcal{O}_i . Let $\varsigma_i : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{k_i}(k_i)$ be the 1-inflator from \mathcal{O}_i , and let

$$\varsigma(V) = (\varsigma_1(V), \dots, \varsigma_n(V))$$

be the resulting n -inflator from $\text{Dir}_K(K)$ to $\prod_{i=1}^n \text{Dir}_{k_i}(k_i)$, as in Example 4.7. Then the fundamental ring of ς is $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}_i$, the fundamental ideal is $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i$, and the fundamental map

$$R/I \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \text{End}_{k_i}(k_i)$$

is the obvious map sending x to $(\text{res}_1(x), \dots, \text{res}_n(x))$.

Example 5.17. Consider the 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma : \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \\ V &\mapsto (V + \overline{V}, V \cap \overline{V}). \end{aligned}$$

of Example 4.10.

If $a \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\Theta_a = \mathbb{C} \cdot (1, a)$, then $\overline{\Theta}_a = \mathbb{C} \cdot (1, \overline{a})$, so

$$\varsigma(\Theta_a) = \begin{cases} (\mathbb{R} \cdot (1, \overline{a}), \mathbb{R} \cdot (1, \overline{a})) & a \in \mathbb{R} \\ (\mathbb{R}^2, 0) & a \notin \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

Let R and I be the fundamental ring and ideal of ς . By Lemmas 5.9 and 5.10,

$$\begin{aligned} a \in R &\iff \varsigma(\Theta_a) \cap (0 \oplus \mathbb{R}, 0 \oplus \mathbb{R}) = (0 \oplus 0, 0 \oplus 0) \\ &\iff a \in \mathbb{R} \\ a \in I &\iff \varsigma(\Theta_a) \subseteq (\mathbb{R} \oplus 0, \mathbb{R} \oplus 0) \\ &\iff a = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus $R = \mathbb{R}$ and $I = 0$.

Example 5.18. Let K, k be two fields extending K_0 . Suppose $\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2$ are two valuation K_0 -algebras on K and the two residue fields are both isomorphic to k . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k) \times \text{Dir}_k(k) \\ \varsigma(V) &= (\varsigma^1(V) + \varsigma^2(V), \varsigma^1(V) \cap \varsigma^2(V)) \end{aligned}$$

be the 2-inflator of Example 4.11, where ς^i is the inflator from the valuation ring \mathcal{O}_i .

Let us calculate the fundamental ring and ideal. If $a \in K$ and $\Theta_a = K \cdot (1, a)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma^1(\Theta_a) &= \begin{cases} k \cdot (1, \text{res}_1(a)) & a \in \mathcal{O}_1 \\ k \cdot (0, 1) & a \notin \mathcal{O}_1 \end{cases} \\ \varsigma^2(\Theta_a) &= \begin{cases} k \cdot (1, \text{res}_2(a)) & a \in \mathcal{O}_2 \\ k \cdot (0, 1) & a \notin \mathcal{O}_2 \end{cases} \\ \varsigma(\Theta_a) &= (\varsigma^1(\Theta_a) + \varsigma^2(\Theta_a), \varsigma^1(\Theta_a) \cap \varsigma^2(\Theta_a)) \end{aligned}$$

Now $\varsigma^1(\Theta_a) + \varsigma^2(\Theta_a)$ will be all of k^2 unless $\text{res}_1(a) = \text{res}_2(a)$ (including the possibility that $\text{res}_1(a) = \infty = \text{res}_2(a)$). Using this, one sees that the fundamental ring and ideal are

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \{x \in \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 : \text{res}_1(a) = \text{res}_2(a)\} \\ I &= \{x \in \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 : \text{res}_1(a) = \text{res}_2(a) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

In both Example 5.17 and 5.18, $\varsigma(\Theta_a)$ tends to be some fixed value not depending on a . In other words the maps

$$\varsigma_n : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathbb{C}}(B^n)$$

are a bit trivial for $n = 2$. This suggests that the inflators in question are degenerate without much interesting structure, at least compared to their unclobbered counterparts

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \\ V &\mapsto (V, \overline{V}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k) \times \text{Dir}_k(k) \\ V &\mapsto (\varsigma_1(V), \varsigma_2(V)) \end{aligned}$$

However, we will see in §12 that in both cases, the original unclobbered counterpart can be recovered from the clobbered version, by considering the maps ς_n for $n > 2$. The information is still there; it is merely hidden.

5.4 1-inflators

Proposition 5.19. *Let ς be a 1-inflator from K to $\text{Dir}(B)$. Then the fundamental ring \mathcal{O} is a valuation ring on K . The fundamental ideal I is the maximal ideal of \mathcal{O} . The induced map*

$$\mathcal{O}/I \rightarrow \text{End}(B)$$

is the inclusion of the residue field into a division ring.

Proof. The fact that ς is a 1-inflator implies that B is simple ($\ell(B) = 1$), so $\text{End}(B)$ is indeed a division ring. We may assume that the ambient abelian category is the category of D -modules, and $B = D$. For any $\alpha \in K$,

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha x) \mid x \in K\})$$

must be a 1-dimensional submodule of D^2 . This *must* have one of the following forms:

$$\begin{aligned} \{(x, x \cdot \beta) \mid x \in D\} \\ \{(x \cdot \beta, x) \mid x \in D\} \end{aligned}$$

for some $\beta \in D$. So, replacing α with α^{-1} if necessary, we get $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}$. Thus \mathcal{O} is a valuation ring. Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal.

By Proposition 5.7.4, we know $I \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$. Conversely, suppose $\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}$. Then $\alpha^{-1} \notin \mathcal{O}$. Therefore,

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha^{-1}x) \mid x \in K\})$$

is a 1-dimensional subspace of D^2 , *not* of the form

$$\{(x, x \cdot \beta) \mid x \in D\}.$$

There is only one such subspace, namely $0 \oplus D$. Therefore

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha^{-1}x) \mid x \in K\}) = 0 \oplus D.$$

Swapping the coordinates (using $GL_2(K_0)$ -equivariance), we see

$$\varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha x) \mid x \in K\}) = \varsigma_2(\{(\alpha^{-1}x, x) \mid x \in K\}) = D \oplus 0.$$

Thus α specializes to 0, meaning that $\alpha \in I$. Thus $\mathfrak{m} = I$.

Now \mathcal{O}/I is a field and $\mathcal{O}/I \hookrightarrow D$ is an injective ring homomorphism, because $I := \ker(\mathcal{O} \rightarrow D)$. So D is a division ring extending the residue field \mathcal{O}/I . \square

We can now classify 1-inflators:

Theorem 5.20. *Every 1-inflator $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_L(L)$ is of the form constructed in Theorem 4.5.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.19, there is a valuation ring \mathcal{O} on K and an embedding of the residue field $k = \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m}$ into L such that

- \mathcal{O} is the fundamental ring of ς
- \mathfrak{m} is the fundamental ideal
- The composition

$$\mathcal{O} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m} = k = k^{op} \hookrightarrow L^{op}$$

is the generalized residue map $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \text{End}_L(L) = L^{op}$.

By Theorem 4.5, this induces a 1-inflator $\varsigma' : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_L(L)$, arising as a composition

$$\text{Dir}_K(K) \xrightarrow{\varsigma''} \text{Dir}_k(k) \xrightarrow{L \otimes_k -} \text{Dir}_L(L)$$

where ς'' is the inflator

$$V \mapsto (V \cap \mathcal{O}^n + \mathfrak{m}^n)/\mathfrak{m}^n$$

of Theorem 4.3.

We claim that $\varsigma = \varsigma'$. Let V be a m -dimensional K -linear subspace of K^n . We will show $\varsigma_n(V) = \varsigma'_n(V)$. By Lemma 4.4, there are vectors $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_m \in V$ such that

- $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_m$ freely generate V as a K -vector space.

- $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_m$ freely generate $V \cap \mathcal{O}^n$ as an \mathcal{O} -module.
- The residues of $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_m$ freely generate the m -dimensional k -subspace

$$\zeta''(V) = (V \cap \mathcal{O}^n + \mathfrak{m}^n) / \mathfrak{m}^n \subseteq k^n.$$

Let ρ be the induced composition $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m} = k \hookrightarrow L$. Then $\rho(\vec{a}_1), \dots, \rho(\vec{a}_m)$ freely generate $\zeta'(V)$.

Let $\vec{a}_i = (a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,n})$. Let $b_{i,j} = \rho(a_{i,j})$. Because ρ is the generalized residue map from \mathcal{O} to $L^{op} = \text{End}_L(L)$,

$$\varsigma(\{(x, a_{i,j}x) : x \in K\}) = \{(x, xb_{i,j}) : x \in L\}$$

Inside $K^m \times K^{nm} \times K^n$, consider the following subspaces:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{i,j} &= \{(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) : y_{i,j} = a_{i,j}x_i\} \\ U_j &= \{(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) : z_j = y_{1,j} + \dots + y_{m,j}\} \\ M &= \{(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) : \vec{z} = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

By the techniques of §5.1-5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma(W_{i,j}) &= \{(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) : y_{i,j} = x_i b_{i,j}\} \\ \varsigma(U_j) &= \{(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) : z_j = y_{1,j} + \dots + y_{m,j}\} \\ \varsigma(M) &= \{(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) : \vec{z} = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the intersection of all the $W_{i,j}$ and U_j is the set of tuples $(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z})$ where

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i,j} &= a_{i,j}x_i \\ z_j &= y_{1,j} + \dots + y_{m,j} = a_{1,j}x_1 + \dots + a_{m,j}x_m. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.2.1,

$$\varsigma\left(\bigcap_{i,j} W_{i,j} \cap \bigcap_j U_j\right) = \bigcap_{i,j} \varsigma(W_{i,j}) \cap \bigcap_j \varsigma(U_j),$$

which is the set of tuples $(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) \in L^m \times L^{nm} \times L^n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i,j} &= x_i b_{i,j} \\ z_j &= x_1 b_{1,j} + \dots + x_m b_{m,j}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$M + \left(\bigcap_{i,j} W_{i,j} \cap \bigcap_j U_j\right)$$

is the set of $(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z})$ such that \vec{z} is in the span of $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_m$, i.e., $K^m \times K^{nm} \times V$. Similarly,

$$\varsigma(M) + \left(\bigcap_{i,j} \varsigma(W_{i,j}) \cap \bigcap_j \varsigma(U_j) \right)$$

is the set of $(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z})$ such that \vec{z} is in the L -module generated by $\vec{b}_1, \dots, \vec{b}_m$. We chose $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_m$ to ensure that this module is $\varsigma'(V)$. The identity

$$\varsigma(M) + \left(\bigcap_{i,j} \varsigma(W_{i,j}) \cap \bigcap_j \varsigma(U_j) \right) \subseteq \varsigma \left(M + \left(\bigcap_{i,j} W_{i,j} \cap \bigcap_j U_j \right) \right)$$

therefore says

$$L^n \times L^{nm} \times \varsigma'(V) \subseteq \varsigma(K^n \times K^{nm} \times V).$$

As in the proof of Lemma 5.2.2, equality holds, because both sides have the same dimension. Therefore $\varsigma(V) = \varsigma'(V)$ as desired. \square

Corollary 5.21. *A 1-inflator from $\text{Dir}_K(K)$ to $\text{Dir}_L(L)$ is equivalent to the following data:*

- *A valuation ring \mathcal{O} on K , with trivial valuation on K_0 .*
- *An embedding (over K_0) of the residue field of \mathcal{O} into L .*

Proof. Every such datum determines a 1-inflator (Theorem 4.5), every 1-inflator arises in this way (Theorem 5.20), and the data can be recovered from the 1-inflator (Example 5.14). \square

5.5 Tame locus

Fix a d -inflator $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}(B)$. Let R and I be the fundamental ring and ideal.

Lemma 5.22. *For any $\alpha \in K$, consider the set*

$$S_\alpha = \{\alpha\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha - q} \mid q \in K_0 \right\}.$$

Then one of two things happens:

- *No element of S_α is in R .*
- *Every element of S_α is in R , with at most d exceptions.*

Proof. First suppose that $\alpha \in R$, so α specializes to some $\varphi \in \text{End}(B)$. Then for any $q \in K_0$, the following identities hold

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha x) \mid x \in K\}) &= \{(x, \varphi x) \mid x \in B\} \\ \varsigma_2(\{(x, \alpha x - qx) \mid x \in K\}) &= \{(x, \varphi x - qx) \mid x \in B\} \\ \varsigma_2(\{((\alpha - q)x, x) \mid x \in K\}) &= \{((\varphi - q)x, x) \mid x \in B\} \end{aligned}$$

where each line follows from the preceding one by $GL_2(K_0)$ -equivariance. Let

$$B_q := \{((\varphi - q)x, x) \mid x \in B\}$$

Then $(\alpha - q)^{-1} \in R$ if and only if B_q is the graph of an endomorphism. By Lemma 5.9,

$$(\alpha - q)^{-1} \in R \iff B_q \cap (0 \oplus B) = 0 \oplus 0.$$

Thus $(\alpha - q)^{-1} \notin R$ if and only if there is a non-zero $x \in B$ annihilated by $\varphi - q$. For any q , let $V_q \subseteq B$ be the eigenspace $\ker(\varphi - q)$. We have seen

$$(\alpha - q)^{-1} \notin R \iff V_q \neq 0.$$

But as usual, the V_q are lattice-theoretically independent: if q_1, q_2, \dots is a sequence of distinct values in K_0 , then

$$V_{q_n} \cap \sum_{i < n} V_{q_i} = 0.$$

Otherwise, take n minimal for which this fails. Then there is an equation

$$t_1 + \dots + t_n = 0$$

where $t_i \in V_{q_i}$ and $t_n \neq 0$. By definition of V_q , we have

$$0 = \varphi(t_1 + \dots + t_n) = q_1 t_1 + \dots + q_n t_n.$$

Then

$$(q_1 - q_n)t_1 + (q_2 - q_n)t_2 + \dots + (q_{n-1} - q_n)t_{n-1} = 0,$$

contradicting the choice of n .

By independence of the V_q , it follows that at most d of the V_q can be non-trivial, so $(\alpha - q)^{-1} \in R$ for all but at most d values of $q \in K_0$.

We now turn to the general case. Let $PGL_2(K_0)$ be the group of fractional linear transformations over K_0 and let $Aff(K_0)$ be the subgroup of affine transformations. Both groups act on $K \cup \{\infty\}$. Note that $Aff(K_0)$ fixes R setwise, because R is a K_0 -algebra. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_q(x) &= \frac{1}{x - q} \\ \gamma_\infty(x) &= x \end{aligned}$$

for $q \in K_0$. Then $\{\gamma_q : q \in K_0 \cup \{\infty\}\}$ is a set of coset representatives for $Aff(K_0)$: every $\gamma \in PGL_2(K_0)$ can be uniquely written as

$$\tau \cdot \gamma_q$$

for some $\tau \in Aff(K_0)$ and $q \in K_0 \cup \{\infty\}$. Suppose that $\gamma_{q_0}(\alpha) \in R$ for at least one q_0 . By the first case we considered,

$$\gamma_q(\gamma_{q_0})(\alpha) \in R$$

for all $q \in K_0 \cup \{\infty\}$, with at most d exceptions. Now $\{\gamma_q \cdot \gamma_{q_0}\}$ is also a set of coset representatives. Therefore, there is a bijection and a map

$$\begin{aligned}\pi &: K_0 \cup \{\infty\} \xrightarrow{\sim} K_0 \cup \{\infty\} \\ \tau &: K_0 \cup \{\infty\} \rightarrow \text{Aff}(K_0)\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\gamma_q \cdot \gamma_{q_0} = \tau(q) \cdot \gamma_{\pi(q)}$$

for all $q \in K_0 \cup \{\infty\}$. As $\text{Aff}(K_0)$ preserves R , we see that

$$\gamma_q(\gamma_{q_0}(\alpha)) \in R \implies \gamma_{\pi(q)}(\alpha) \in R.$$

Thus

$$\gamma_{\pi(q)}(\alpha) \in R$$

for all q , with at most d exceptions. As π is a permutation, it follows that $\gamma_q(\alpha) \in R$ for all q , with at most d exceptions. This is the statement of the lemma. \square

Definition 5.23. We say that $\alpha \in K$ is *tame* if $\frac{1}{\alpha - q} \in R$ for almost all $q \in K_0$, and *wild* otherwise.

By the lemma, all elements of R are tame.

Lemma 5.24. *Let K be a field, K_0 be a subfield, and R be a K_0 -subalgebra. Let q_1, \dots, q_n be n distinct elements of K_0 . The following are equivalent:*

- R is an intersection of n or fewer valuation rings on K .
- For any $x \in K$, at least one of

$$x, \frac{1}{x - q_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{x - q_n}$$

is in R .

Proof. First suppose that $R = \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{O}_m$ for some $m \leq n$. Given $x \in K$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$, note that almost all of the values

$$x, \frac{1}{x - q_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{x - q_n}$$

are in \mathcal{O}_i , with at most one exception. Indeed,

- $x \notin \mathcal{O}_i \iff \text{res}_i(x) = \infty$.
- $\frac{1}{x - q_j} \notin \mathcal{O}_i \iff \text{res}_i(x) = q_j$.

As there are $n + 1$ total numbers, and at most n valuation rings, at least one number remains in all the \mathcal{O}_i , hence in R .

Conversely, suppose that for any $x \in K$, at least one of the numbers

$$x, \frac{1}{x - q_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{x - q_n}$$

is in R . (We repeat the arguments following [10], Claim 10.26.) Then first of all, any finitely-generated R -submodule of K is singly-generated. It suffices to consider $aR + bR$ for some $a, b \in K$. By the hypothesis (applied to $x = a/b$), at least one of the numbers

$$a/b, \frac{b}{a - q_1 b}, \dots, \frac{b}{a - q_n b}$$

lies in R . If $a/b \in R$, then $aR + bR = bR$. If $b/(a - q_i b) \in R$, then

$$aR + bR = (a - q_i b)R.$$

As in the proof of [8], Proposition 6.2, it follows that $\text{Frac}(R) = K$ and R is a Bezout domain. We claim that R has finitely many maximal ideals, in fact, no more than n maximal ideals. Otherwise, let $\mathfrak{m}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_n$ be $n + 1$ distinct maximal ideals. By the Chinese remainder theorem, find elements $a, b \in R$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a &\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_0} \\ b &\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_0} \\ a &\equiv q_i \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i} \\ b &\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Then a/b cannot be in R , or else

$$b \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_0} \implies a \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_0}.$$

Similarly, $b/(a - q_i b)$ cannot be in R or else

$$a - q_i b \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i} \implies b \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i}.$$

So this contradicts the hypothesis.

Therefore, R has at most n maximal ideals. By Proposition 6.9 in [8], R is a multi-valuation ring. By Corollary 6.7 in [8], R is an intersection of at most n valuation rings on K . \square

Proposition 5.25. *Let ς be a d -inflator on a field K , with fundamental ring R . The following are equivalent:*

- *The ring R is a multi-valuation ring.*

- The ring R is an intersection of d or fewer valuation rings.
- Every $\alpha \in K$ is tame.

Proof. Lemmas 5.22 and 5.24. □

Definition 5.26. A d -inflator is of *multi-valuation type* if the fundamental ring R is a multi-valuation ring. Equivalently, every $\alpha \in K$ is tame.

Definition 5.27. A d -inflator is *weakly of multi-valuation type* if the fundamental ring R contains a nonzero ideal of some multi-valuation ring.

Example 5.28. The multi-valuation inflators of Example 4.7 are of multi-valuation type, by Example 5.16.

5.6 Malleable d -inflators

Definition 5.29. Let $f : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'$ be an order-preserving $\{\perp, \top\}$ -preserving map between two finite-length modular lattices. Say that f has *atom-lifting* if for every atom $x' \in \mathcal{L}'$, there is an atom $x \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $f(x) \geq x'$.

Definition 5.30. Let $f : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'$ be an order-preserving map between two finite-length modular lattices. Say that f is *malleable* if for every interval $[x, y] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, the map

$$[x, y] \rightarrow [f(x), f(y)]$$

has atom-lifting.

Concretely, malleability of f means that for any $x, z \in \mathcal{L}$ and $y \in \mathcal{L}'$ such that

$$x \leq z$$

$$f(x) \leq y \leq f(z)$$

$$\ell(y) = 1 + \ell(f(x))$$

there exists $y' \in \mathcal{L}$ such that

$$x \leq y' \leq z$$

$$f(x) \leq y \leq f(y') \leq f(z)$$

$$\ell(y') = \ell(x) + 1.$$

Definition 5.31. We say that a morphism of directories $f : D_\bullet \rightarrow D'_\bullet$ is *malleable* if every n the map $f_n : D_n \rightarrow D'_n$ is malleable. We say that a d -inflator on K is *malleable* if the associated directory morphism $\text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow D_\bullet$ is malleable.

Proposition 5.32. *A 1-inflator is malleable if and only if it is (equivalent to) a 1-inflator*

$$\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_k(k)$$

induced as in Theorem 4.3 by a valuation K_0 -algebra $\mathcal{O} \subseteq K$ with residue field k .

Proof. First suppose that $\varsigma : \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_k(k)$ comes from a valuation ring \mathcal{O} . Then

$$\varsigma_n(V) = (V \cap \mathcal{O}^n + \mathfrak{m}^n)/\mathfrak{m}^n.$$

for any $n, V \in \mathrm{Sub}_K(K^n)$. Let $r : \mathcal{O}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^n/\mathfrak{m}^n$ be the coordinatewise residue map. Then $\varsigma_n(V)$ is the direct image $r(V \cap \mathcal{O}^n)$.

We check malleability. Suppose V, W are subspaces of K^n with $V \subseteq W$. Suppose X is a subspace of k^n with

$$r(V \cap \mathcal{O}^n) \subseteq X \subseteq r(W \cap \mathcal{O}^n),$$

and $\dim_k(X) = 1 + \dim_k(r(V \cap \mathcal{O}^n))$. Take $\vec{a} \in W \cap \mathcal{O}^n$ such that $r(\vec{a}) \in X \setminus r(V \cap \mathcal{O}^n)$. Then

$$X = k \cdot r(\vec{a}) + r(V \cap \mathcal{O}^n).$$

Let $V' = V + K \cdot \vec{a}$. Then $V \subseteq V' \subseteq W$ and $\dim(V') = \dim(V) + 1$. Also, $\vec{a} \in V' \cap \mathcal{O}^n$, and so

$$r(\vec{a}) \in r(V' \cap \mathcal{O}^n)$$

It follows that

$$r(V \cap \mathcal{O}^n) \subseteq X \subseteq r(V' \cap \mathcal{O}^n),$$

proving malleability.

Now suppose that ς is any 1-inflator on K . By Theorem 5.20, we may assume ς is a composition

$$\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_k(k) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_L(L)$$

where the first map arises from a valuation ring \mathcal{O} on K with residue field k , as in Theorem 4.3, and the second map arises from a field extension L/k . Specifically, the second map sends $V \in \mathrm{Sub}_k(k^n)$ to $L \otimes_k V \in \mathrm{Sub}_L(L^n)$.

Assume ς is malleable; we must show that $k = L$. If not, take $a \in L \setminus k$ and let

$$\Theta_a = L \cdot (1, a) = \{(x, xa) : x \in L\}.$$

Then

$$\varsigma(0 \oplus 0) = 0 \oplus 0 \subseteq \Theta_a \subseteq L \oplus L = \varsigma(K \oplus K)$$

By malleability, there is a 1-dimensional subspace $V \subseteq K^2$ such that

$$\Theta_a \subseteq \varsigma(V).$$

The right-hand side must have dimension equal to $1 \cdot \dim_K(V) = 1$, so equality must hold: $\Theta_a = \varsigma(V)$. However, $\varsigma(V)$ is of the form $L \otimes_k W$ for some subspace $W \subseteq k^2$. The subspace Θ_a does not have this form, by choice of a . This contradiction shows that $k = L$. Thus ς is a 1-inflator coming from a valuation as in Theorem 4.3. \square

Example 5.33. Consider the 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma &: \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \\ V &\mapsto (V + \overline{V}, V \cap \overline{V})\end{aligned}$$

from Example 4.9. Then ς is *not* malleable. Otherwise, from the chain

$$\varsigma_2(0^2) = (0^2, 0^2) \subseteq (0^2, \mathbb{C} \cdot (1, i)) \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^2, \mathbb{C}^2) = \varsigma_2(\mathbb{C}^2),$$

malleability implies the existence of a line $L \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$ such that

$$(0^2, \mathbb{C} \cdot (1, i)) \subseteq (L + \overline{L}, L \cap \overline{L}).$$

Then $(1, i) \in L \cap \overline{L}$, so \overline{L} contains both $(1, i)$ and $(1, -i)$, failing to be a line.

Example 5.34. Consider the 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma &: \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \\ V &\mapsto (V + \overline{V}, V \cap \overline{V})\end{aligned}$$

from Example 4.10. Then ς *is* malleable. First note that we can rewrite this example more accurately as

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma &: \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \\ V &\mapsto (\pi(V), V \cap \mathbb{R}^n)\end{aligned}$$

where $\pi : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the projection onto the real axis (the coordinatewise real part map). Now suppose that $V \subseteq W \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, and

$$(\pi(V), V \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq (H_1, H_2) \subseteq (\pi(W), W \cap \mathbb{R}^n),$$

where the length of (H_1, H_2) over $(\pi(V), V \cap \mathbb{R}^n)$ is 1. This length is exactly

$$\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(H_1/\pi(V)) + \dim_{\mathbb{R}}(H_2/(V \cap \mathbb{R}^n)),$$

so we are in one of two cases:

1. $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(H_1/\pi(V)) = 1$ and $H_2 = V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Take $\vec{a} \in H_1 \setminus \pi(V)$. The dimension of $H_1/\pi(V)$ ensures that $H_1 = \pi(V) + \mathbb{R} \cdot \vec{a}$. The fact that $H_1 \subseteq \pi(W)$ implies that $\vec{a} = \pi(\vec{b})$ for some $\vec{b} \in W$. Let $V' = V + \mathbb{C} \cdot \vec{b}$. Then

- $V \subseteq V' \subseteq W$, and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V') = 1 + \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V)$.
- $\pi(V') \supseteq \pi(V)$ and $\vec{a} \in \pi(V')$, so $\pi(V') \supseteq H_1$.

Then

$$(\pi(V), V \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq (H_1, H_2) = (H_1, V \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq (\pi(V'), V' \cap \mathbb{R}^n)$$

verifying malleability.

2. $H_1 = \pi(V)$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(H_2/(V \cap \mathbb{R}^n)) = 1$. Take $\vec{a} \in H_2 \setminus (V \cap \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $\vec{a} \in H_2 \subseteq W \cap \mathbb{R}^n$. Also $H_2 = V \cap \mathbb{R}^n + \mathbb{R} \cdot \vec{a}$. Let $V' = V + \mathbb{C} \cdot \vec{a}$. Then $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V') = 1 + \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V)$. We have $V' \subseteq W$, because $\vec{a} \in W$. Note that $V' \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ contains both $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ (trivially) and \vec{a} (because $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$). Thus $V' \cap \mathbb{R}^n$ must contain $V \cap \mathbb{R}^n + \mathbb{R} \cdot \vec{a} = H_2$, ensuring that

$$(\pi(V), V \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq (H_1, H_2) = (\pi(V), H_2) \subseteq (\pi(V'), V' \cap \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Part II

Inflators on dp-finite fields

In Part II, we carry out the main construction of inflators on dp-finite fields. Here is a brief synopsis.

Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated, unstable, dp-finite field. Let Λ_1 be the lattice of type-definable additive subgroups—or rather, type-definable K_0 -subspaces. If K_0 is a magic field, there is a uniform bound on the size of cubes in the lattice Λ_1 ; we say that Λ_1 is a *cube-bounded* modular lattice.

The notion of cube-boundedness naturally extends to directories and abelian categories: a directory D_{\bullet} is cube-bounded if every D_n is cube-bounded; an abelian category is cube-bounded if every subobject lattice is cube-bounded. In a dp-finite setting, the category \mathcal{H} of §3.2 and the directory Λ of §3 are both cube-bounded. For abelian categories, cube-boundedness is equivalent to the existence of a subadditive finite rank function on objects. Ultimately, the category \mathcal{H} is cube-bounded because of dp-rank.

In §9.4 of [10], we constructed a modular pregeometry on the “quasi-atoms” in any lower-bounded modular lattice (M, \vee, \wedge, \perp) . If M is a cube-bounded lattice, this pregeometry has finite rank. The lattice of closed sets is therefore a semisimple modular lattice M^{\flat} . We call M^{\flat} the *flattening* of M . There is an analogue of flattening for abelian categories and directories as well. In each case, flattening turns something cube-bounded into something semisimple. If $D_{\bullet} = (D_1, D_2, D_3, \dots)$ is a cube-bounded directory, we show that the levelwise flattenings $(D_1)^{\flat}, (D_2)^{\flat}, (D_3)^{\flat}, \dots$ naturally assemble into a semisimple directory

$$D_{\bullet}^{\flat} = (D_1^{\flat}, D_2^{\flat}, D_3^{\flat}, \dots).$$

Moreover, there is a “flattening map,” a directory morphism $D_{\bullet} \rightarrow D_{\bullet}^{\flat}$.

Applying this to the dp-finite field \mathbb{K} , for any type-definable subgroup $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ we get a composition

$$\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{K}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{K}/A) \rightarrow (\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{K}/A))^{\flat} \quad (5)$$

in which the maps are respectively induced by

1. The faithful functor $\mathbb{K} \mathrm{Vect}^f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}$.
2. Pushforward along $\mathbb{K} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{K}/A$.

3. Flattening.

For “suitable” A , the composition of (5) turns out to be an inflator, as predicted by Speculative Remark 10.10 in [10].

Let r be maximal such that a cube of size 2^r exists in Λ_1 . Then r is at most the dp-rank of \mathbb{K} . The “suitability” requirement on A is that A is a *pedestal*, i.e., the base of an r -cube in Λ_1 . The resulting inflator is an r -inflator. Moreover, this r -inflator knows something about A —the fundamental ring of the inflator is exactly

$$\text{Stab}(A) = \{x \in \mathbb{K} : x \cdot A \subseteq A\}.$$

The main construction actually works in greater generality than dp-finite fields. Abstractly, the only thing we need is a K_0 -linear functor from $K \text{Vect}^f$ to a cube-bounded K_0 -linear abelian category \mathcal{C} . For the dp-finite case, K is \mathbb{K} and \mathcal{C} is \mathcal{H} . But the machinery also applies when K is a field of finite burden, and \mathcal{C} is the isogeny category \mathcal{H}^{00} of §3.3.

Flattening turns out to be closely related to pro-categories. If M is a cube-bounded modular lattice, then $\text{Pro } M$ is also a modular lattice, and the pregeometry on quasi-atoms in M is equivalent to the geometry on atoms in $\text{Pro } M$. The flattening operation on a cube-bounded abelian category \mathcal{C} is essentially the socle functor on $\text{Pro } \mathcal{C}$.

Using pro-categories, the composition of (5) can be expressed less opaquely as

$$\text{Dir}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}) \hookrightarrow \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro } \mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{K}) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro } \mathcal{H}}(A^+/A)$$

where

- A^+/A is the socle of \mathbb{K}/A in the category $\text{Pro } \mathcal{H}$.
- The first map is induced by the faithful exact functor

$$\mathbb{K} \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \text{Pro } \mathcal{H}.$$

- The second map is the interval retract onto the subquotient A^+/A of \mathbb{K} .

We discuss cube-boundedness in §6, flattening in §7, the abstract form of the main construction in §8, and the dp-finite case in §9.

6 Cube-boundedness

6.1 Cube bounded lattices

Recall the notion of strict r -cubes and reduced rank (Definitions 9.13, 9.17 in [10]). A strict r -cube in a modular lattice M is an injective homomorphism of (unbounded) lattices from the powerset of r to M . The *base* of the cube is the image of \emptyset under this homomorphism. Equivalently, a strict r -cube is an (unbounded) sublattice isomorphic to the boolean algebra of size 2^r , and the base of the cube is the minimum element of the sublattice.

The reduced rank $\text{rk}_0(M)$ is the maximum r such that a strict r -cube exists in M , or ∞ if there is no maximum. If $a \geq b$ are elements of M , then $\text{rk}_0(a/b)$ is the reduced rank of the sublattice $[b, a] \subseteq M$.

Definition 6.1. A bounded modular lattice $(M, \vee, \wedge, \perp, \top)$ is *cube-bounded* if $\text{rk}_0(M) < \infty$, i.e., there is a uniform bound on the size of strict cubes in M .

Remark 6.2. A modular lattice of finite length is always cube-bounded, because a strict n -cube contains a chain of length n .

Cube-boundedness is equivalent to something like a uniform Baldwin-Saxl property:

Proposition 6.3. *Let M be a bounded modular lattice and $n > 1$ be an integer. The following are equivalent:*

1. *There is a strict n -cube in M .*
2. *There are $a_1, \dots, a_n \in M$ such that for every $1 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_n \neq a_1 \vee \dots \vee \widehat{a_i} \vee \dots \vee a_n$$

3. *There are $a_1, \dots, a_n \in M$ such that for every $1 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n \neq a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{a_i} \wedge \dots \wedge a_n$$

Proof. We give the implications (3) \implies (1) \implies (2); the reverse implications follow by duality. First suppose (3) holds. For each i , let

$$b_i = a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{a_i} \wedge \dots \wedge a_n.$$

and let $c = a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n$. Note that $b_i \geq c$ for each i . By assumption, $b_i > c$. We claim that the sequence b_1, \dots, b_n is independent over c (see [10], Definition 9.11.1). Indeed, for any k ,

$$c \leq (b_1 \vee \dots \vee b_{k-1}) \wedge b_k \leq a_k \wedge b_k = c,$$

because $b_i = b_i \wedge a_k \leq a_k$ for $i \neq k$. Thus $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ is an independent sequence over c . By Proposition 9.15 in [10], the b_i generate a strict n -cube in M .

Next suppose (1) holds. Then there is a strict n -cube $\{b_S\}_{S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}}$ in M . Let $a_i = b_{\{i\}}$. The map $S \mapsto b_S$ preserves \vee , so for any i ,

$$a_1 \vee \dots \vee \widehat{a_i} \vee \dots \vee a_n = b_{\{1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, n\}} < b_{\{1, \dots, n\}} = a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_n.$$

Therefore (2) holds. □

Proposition 6.4. *Let G be a definable abelian group with finite burden, and M be the lattice of type-definable subgroups of G , modulo 00-commensurability. Then M is cube-bounded; in fact $\text{rk}_0(M)$ is at most the burden of G .*

Proof. Let $n = \text{bdn}(G)$. By the proof of Proposition 4.5.2 in [2], one knows that if A_1, \dots, A_{n+1} are type-definable subgroups of G , then there is an i such that

$$A_1 \cap \dots \cap \widehat{A_i} \cap \dots \cap A_{n+1} \approx A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_{n+1}.$$

(Alternatively, the dual statement in terms of sums rather than intersections is essentially Lemma 2.6 in [3].) Then the desired bound $\text{rk}_0(M) < n + 1$ follows by Proposition 6.3. □

Lemma 6.5. *Let $R = \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{O}_n$ be an intersection of n pairwise incomparable valuation rings on a field K . Then $\text{Sub}_R(K)$ has reduced rank exactly n .*

Proof. First note that

$$\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{O}_n \neq \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \widehat{\mathcal{O}_i} \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{O}_n$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, by [8], Corollary 6.7. By the implication $(3 \implies 1)$ of Proposition 6.3, it follows that $\text{Sub}_R(K)$ has reduced rank at least n . Now suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\text{Sub}_R(K)$ has reduced rank greater than n . By the implication $(1 \implies 3)$ of Proposition 6.3, there are R -submodules $A_0, \dots, A_n \leq K$ such that

$$A_0 \cap \cdots \cap A_n \neq A_0 \cap \cdots \cap \widehat{A_j} \cap \cdots \cap A_n \quad (6)$$

for each $0 \leq j \leq n$. Let $\text{val}_i : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \Gamma_i$ be the valuation associated to \mathcal{O}_i . By Proposition 6.2.4 in [8], there exist cuts $\Xi_{i,j}$ in Γ_i for $0 \leq j \leq n$ such that

$$A_j = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{x \in \mathbb{K} : \text{val}_i(x) > \Gamma_{i,j}\}.$$

Then

$$\bigcap_{j=0}^n A_j = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \bigcap_{j=0}^n \{x \in \mathbb{K} : \text{val}_i(x) > \Gamma_{i,j}\} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{x \in \mathbb{K} : \text{val}_i(x) > \Gamma'_i\},$$

where

$$\Gamma'_i = \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} \Gamma_{i,j}.$$

Take $f : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $\Gamma'_i = \Gamma_{i,f(i)}$. Then

$$A_0 \cap \cdots \cap A_n = A_{f(1)} \cap \cdots \cap A_{f(n)},$$

contradicting (6), since f is not a surjection. □

6.2 Cube-bounded objects

Recall that in an abelian category, the subobject poset $\text{Sub}(A)$ is always a bounded modular lattice.

Definition 6.6. Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category.

1. If $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then the *reduced rank* of A is defined to be

$$\text{rk}_0(A) := \text{rk}_0(\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)),$$

which is possibly infinite.

2. If $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then A is *cube-bounded* if $\text{rk}_0(A) < \infty$, i.e., $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is a cube-bounded lattice.

3. \mathcal{C} itself is *cube-bounded* if every object $A \in \mathcal{C}$ is cube-bounded.

Remark 6.7. The reduced rank of A has a very concrete meaning: $\text{rk}_0(A) \geq r$ if and only if there are $C \leq B \leq A$ such that the subquotient B/C is a direct sum of r non-trivial objects.

Remark 6.8. By Remark 6.2, any object of finite length is cube-bounded.

Reduced rank behaves a bit like dp-rank:

Proposition 6.9. *Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category.*

1. If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is an epimorphism, then $\text{rk}_0(A) \geq \text{rk}_0(B)$.

2. If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a monomorphism, then $\text{rk}_0(A) \leq \text{rk}_0(B)$.

3. If

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence, then

$$\text{rk}_0(B) \leq \text{rk}_0(A) + \text{rk}_0(C).$$

Equality holds if the sequence splits.

4. $\text{rk}_0(A) = 0 \iff A \cong 0$.

Proof. First note that if $A \cong A'$, then $\text{Sub}(A) \cong \text{Sub}(A')$ so $\text{rk}_0(A) = \text{rk}_0(A')$. In other words, reduced rank is an isomorphism invariant.

Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence; view A as a subobject of B . We have isomorphisms

$$\text{Sub}(A) \cong [0, A] \subseteq \text{Sub}(B)$$

$$\text{Sub}(C) \cong [A, B] \subseteq \text{Sub}(B)$$

by the third isomorphism theorem. Now

$$\max(\text{rk}_0(A/0), \text{rk}_0(B/A)) \leq \text{rk}_0(B/0) \leq \text{rk}_0(A/0) + \text{rk}_0(B/A)$$

by [10], Proposition 9.28.1. This implies (1), (2), and the first half of (3). If the sequence splits, there is a subobject $A' \leq B$ complementary to $A \leq B$. Then

$$\text{rk}_0(B/0) = \text{rk}_0(A/0) + \text{rk}_0(A'/0)$$

by [10], Proposition 9.28.1. As $A' \cong C$, it follows that

$$\text{rk}_0(B) = \text{rk}_0(A) + \text{rk}_0(A') = \text{rk}_0(A) + \text{rk}_0(C).$$

Finally, part (4) is trivial: there is a 1-cube in a modular lattice if and only if the modular lattice contains more than one element, and $A \not\cong 0$ if and only if A has more than one subobject. \square

Corollary 6.10. *Given a short exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0,$$

in an abelian category \mathcal{C} , the following are equivalent:

- *B is cube-bounded.*
- *A and C are cube-bounded.*

Proof. This follows from the identity

$$\max(\mathrm{rk}_0(A), \mathrm{rk}_0(C)) \leq \mathrm{rk}_0(B) \leq \mathrm{rk}_0(A) + \mathrm{rk}_0(C). \quad \square$$

Corollary 6.11. *If A is a cube-bounded object in an abelian category \mathcal{C} , then the neighborhood of A is a cube-bounded abelian category (§2.1).*

Remark 6.12. An abelian category \mathcal{C} is cube-bounded if and only if it has a “rank” function from objects to \mathbb{N} satisfying certain axioms. See Appendix E.

The following variant of reduced rank will be important in §7.

Definition 6.13 (= [10], Definition 9.47). Let M be a bounded modular lattice. Then $\mathrm{rk}_\perp(M)$ is the maximum n such that a strict n -cube exists in M with base \perp . If no maximum exists, $\mathrm{rk}_\perp(M) = \infty$.

Definition 6.14. If A is an object in an abelian category, then $\mathrm{rk}_\perp(A) := \mathrm{rk}_\perp(\mathrm{Sub}(A))$.

Remark 6.15. Let A be an object in a cube-bounded abelian category.

1. $\mathrm{rk}_\perp(A)$ is the supremum over all n such that some subobject of A is a direct sum of n non-trivial objects. (Compare with Remark 6.7).
2. $\mathrm{rk}_\perp(A) \leq \mathrm{rk}_0(A) < \infty$.
3. If A is non-trivial, then $1 \leq \mathrm{rk}_\perp(A)$.

6.3 Cube-bounded directories

Definition 6.16. A directory $D_\bullet \cong \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is *cube-bounded* if it satisfies one of the following equivalent conditions:

- D_1 is a cube-bounded lattice.
- D_n is a cube-bounded lattice for all n .
- A is a cube-bounded object.
- The neighborhood of A in \mathcal{C} is a cube-bounded abelian category.

These are equivalent by Corollary 6.10. Note that for a directory D_\bullet ,

$$\text{semisimple} \implies \text{finite-length} \implies \text{cube-bounded}$$

6.4 Cube-boundedness in the model-theoretic case

Proposition 6.17. *Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated field of finite burden extending a small infinite field K_0 . Let the directories $\Lambda_\bullet, \Lambda_\bullet^{00}, \Delta_\bullet$ be as in §3. Let the categories $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}^{00}$ be as in §3.1-3.3.*

- *The categories \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{H}^{00} are cube-bounded.*
- *The directories Δ_\bullet and Λ_\bullet^{00} are cube-bounded; in fact*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}_0(\Delta_n) &\leq n \cdot \text{bdn}(\mathbb{K}) \\ \text{rk}_0(\Lambda_n^{00}) &\leq n \cdot \text{bdn}(\mathbb{K}). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose moreover that \mathbb{K} is NIP and K_0 is a magic subfield.

- *The category \mathcal{H} is cube-bounded.*
- *The directory Λ_\bullet is cube-bounded; in fact*

$$\text{rk}_0(\Lambda_n) \leq n \cdot \text{dp-rk}(\mathbb{K}).$$

Proof. We first consider the category \mathcal{D} . The objects of \mathcal{D} are interpretable groups, so each has a well-defined finite burden. (Finiteness follows by sub-multiplicativity of burden, Corollary 2.6 in [1].) Burden satisfies the following well-known properties:

1. If $A \twoheadrightarrow B$ is an epimorphism, then $\text{bdn}(A) \geq \text{bdn}(B)$.
2. If $A \hookrightarrow B$ is a monomorphism, then $\text{bdn}(A) \leq \text{bdn}(B)$.
3. $\text{bdn}(A \times B) \geq \text{bdn}(A) + \text{bdn}(B)$.
4. $\text{bdn}(A) > 0$ iff A is infinite. Since A is a K_0 -vector space and K_0 is infinite,

$$\text{bdn}(A) > 0 \iff A \not\cong 0.$$

Claim 6.18. For any $A \in \mathcal{D}$, $\text{bdn}(A) \geq \text{rk}_0(A)$.

Proof. If $\text{rk}_0(A) \geq n$, then there are subobjects $C \subseteq B \subseteq A$ and a direct sum decomposition

$$B/C \cong D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus D_n$$

with the $D_i \not\cong 0$. Then

$$\text{bdn}(A) \geq \text{bdn}(B) \geq \text{bdn}(B/C) = \text{bdn}(D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus D_n) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \text{bdn}(D_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n 1 = n.$$

Thus $\text{bdn}(A) \geq n$ for any $n \leq \text{rk}_0(A)$.

□_{Claim}

It follows that \mathcal{D} is a cube-bounded abelian category. Moreover, $\text{rk}_0(\mathbb{K}) \leq \text{bdn}(\mathbb{K})$. By Proposition 6.9.3,

$$\text{rk}_0(\Delta_n) = \text{rk}_0(\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{K}^n)) = \text{rk}_0(\mathbb{K}^n) \leq n \cdot \text{rk}_0(\mathbb{K}) \leq n \cdot \text{bdn}(\mathbb{K}).$$

Next consider the lattice Λ_1^{00} . The lattice Λ_1^{00} embeds into the lattice of type-definable subgroups of \mathbb{K} modulo 00-commensurability, so

$$\text{rk}_0(\Lambda_1^{00}) \leq \text{bdn}(\mathbb{K})$$

by Proposition 6.4. Using Proposition 3.9 to relate Λ_{\bullet}^{00} to \mathcal{H}^{00} , it follows that in the category \mathcal{H}^{00} ,

$$\text{rk}_0(\mathbb{K}) = \text{rk}_0(\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{H}^{00}}(\mathbb{K})) = \text{rk}_0(\Lambda_1^{00}) \leq \text{bdn}(\mathbb{K}).$$

By Proposition 6.9.3,

$$\text{rk}_0(\Lambda_n^{00}) = \text{rk}_0(\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{H}^{00}}(\mathbb{K}^n)) = \text{rk}_0(\mathbb{K}^n) \leq n \cdot \text{rk}_0(\mathbb{K}) \leq n \cdot \text{bdn}(\mathbb{K}).$$

By construction of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}^{00} , every object of \mathcal{H}^{00} is a subquotient of \mathbb{K}^n , so \mathcal{H}^{00} is cube-bounded by Proposition 6.9.1-2.

Lastly, if \mathbb{K} is NIP and K_0 is a magic subfield, then Λ_{\bullet} is isomorphic to Λ_{\bullet}^{00} and \mathcal{H} is equivalent to \mathcal{H}^{00} , by the discussion at the end of §3.3. In an NIP context, burden agrees with dp-rank. \square

Remark 6.19. There is something funny about the situation with \mathcal{D} in the finite burden case. By Proposition 6.9, there is a rank function $\text{rk}_0 : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ which satisfies the sub-additivity properties of dp-rank. For example, if

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence in \mathcal{D} , then

$$\text{rk}_0(B) \leq \text{rk}_0(A) + \text{rk}_0(C).$$

The analogous property for burden is unknown. So somehow we found a way to upgrade weakly sub-additive ranks into strongly sub-additive ranks.¹⁰ For a more general statement, see Appendix E.

7 Flattening

In this section, we carry out three parallel “flattening” constructions.

If M is a cube-bounded modular lattice, we will define a semisimple modular lattice M^b called the *flattening* of M , as well as a *flattening map* $M \rightarrow M^b$ that is surjective and preserves \wedge .

¹⁰On the other hand, the new rank is only defined on interpretable *abelian groups* or vector spaces, rather than on interpretable *sets*. Nothing miraculous is going on here.

If \mathcal{C} is a cube-bounded abelian category, we will define a semisimple abelian category \mathcal{C}^b , called the *flattening* of \mathcal{C} , as well as a *quasi-socle functor* $\text{qsoc} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^b$, that is essentially surjective and left-exact. The induced maps on subobject-lattices

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A))$$

are flattening maps on modular lattices.

If D_{\bullet} is a cube-bounded directory, we will define a semisimple directory D_{\bullet}^b , called the *flattening* of D_{\bullet} , as well as a directory morphism $D_{\bullet} \rightarrow D_{\bullet}^b$, called the *flattening map*. At each level, the map

$$D_n \rightarrow D_n^b$$

is a flattening map on modular lattices. One constructs D_{\bullet}^b by choosing an isomorphism $D_{\bullet} \cong \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$, and setting $D_{\bullet}^b = \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A))$.

For the case of lattices, flattening is essentially the “modular pregeometry on quasi-atoms” constructed in §9.4 of [10]. But we will see that the pro-construction in category theory gives a better way to understand flattening.

7.1 Flattening a lattice

Let (M, \wedge, \vee, \perp) be a modular lattice with minimum element \perp . Recall that a “quasi-atom” in M (Definition 9.32 in [10]) is an element $q > \perp$ such that the interval $(\perp, q]$ is closed under intersection (i.e., a sublattice). In §9.4 of [10], we constructed a (finitary) modular pregeometry on the set of quasi-atoms, characterized by the fact that a finite set $\{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ is independent in the pregeometry if and only if it is “lattice-theoretically independent.”

$$q_1 \wedge q_2 = \perp, (q_1 \vee q_2) \wedge q_3 = \perp, (q_1 \vee q_2 \vee q_3) \wedge q_4 = \perp, \dots$$

See Corollary 9.39 and Proposition 9.41 in [10] for details. For any $x \in M$, the set

$$V(x) = \{q \in M : q \text{ is a quasi-atom and } q \wedge x > \perp\}$$

is a closed set in this pregeometry ([10], Corollary 9.39). If the pregeometry has finite rank, then every closed set is of this form ([10], Proposition 9.45.2).

Proposition 7.1. *Let (M, \wedge, \vee, \perp) be a modular lattice with minimum element \perp . The following are equivalent:*

1. *There is no infinite sequence $a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots > \perp$ that is independent, in the sense that*

$$a_1 \wedge a_2 = \perp, (a_1 \vee a_2) \wedge a_3 = \perp, (a_1 \vee a_2 \vee a_3) \wedge a_4 = \perp, \dots$$

2. *For every $a > \perp$, there is a quasi-atom $q \leq a$, and the pregeometry on quasi-atoms has finite rank.*
3. *$\text{rk}_{\perp}(M) < \infty$, i.e., there is a finite bound on the length of independent sequence as in (1).*

Proof. We will prove $(1) \implies (2) \implies (3) \implies (1)$.

Assume (1) holds. The pregeometry on quasi-atoms certainly has finite rank; otherwise we could find an infinite independent set, which would yield an infinite independent sequence. Say that an element $a \in M$ is “bad” if $a > \perp$ but there is no quasi-atom $q \leq a$. Let $B \subseteq M$ be the set of bad elements. We claim B is empty. Note that if $a \in B$ then a is not a quasi-atom, so there exist $\perp < b, c \leq a$ such that $b \wedge c = \perp$. A fortiori, both b and c are bad. If B is non-empty, recursively build two sequences of bad elements

$$\begin{aligned} a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots \\ b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

where

- a_0 is some bad element.
- For each $i \geq 0$, we have $\perp < b_i, a_{i+1} \leq a_i$ and $b_i \wedge a_{i+1} = \perp$.

Then

$$a_0 \geq a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots$$

and $b_i \leq a_i$ for all i . Then for any $i < j$,

$$b_i \wedge (b_{i+1} \vee \dots \vee b_j) \leq b_i \wedge (a_{i+1} \vee \dots \vee a_j) = b_i \wedge a_{i+1} = \perp.$$

It follows that for any j , the sequence

$$b_j, b_{j-1}, \dots, b_1, b_0$$

is independent. By symmetry of independence ([10], Proposition 9.3), the sequence

$$b_0, b_1, \dots, b_j$$

is independent. This holds for all j , so the sequence of b_i 's is an infinite independent sequence, contradicting (1).

Next suppose (2) holds. Let n be the rank of the pregeometry on quasi-atoms. We claim that there is no independent sequence $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n+1} > \perp$. Otherwise, take q_i a quasi-atom below b_i . Then the sequence q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{n+1} is an independent sequence in the pregeometry, contradicting the choice of n . Thus $(2) \implies (3)$. Finally, the implication $(3) \implies (1)$ is trivial. \square

Cube-bounded lattice satisfy the equivalent conditions of Proposition 7.1. So do Noetherian modular lattices: if b_1, b_2, \dots were an infinite independent sequence of elements $b_i > \perp$, then for each n the initial subsequence b_1, \dots, b_n generates a strict n -cube (by [10], Proposition 9.15.3), and so

$$b_1 < b_1 \vee b_2 < b_1 \vee b_2 \vee b_3 < \dots < (b_1 \vee \dots \vee b_n).$$

Thus the sequence $b_1, b_1 \vee b_2, \dots$ is an infinite ascending sequence.

Definition 7.2. Let M be a bounded modular lattice with $\text{rk}_\perp(M) < \infty$. Let M^b be the lattice of closed sets in the pregeometry on quasi-atoms. The *standard flattening map* is the map

$$V : M \rightarrow M^b$$

sending x to the set $V(x)$ of quasi-atoms q with $q \wedge x > \perp$.

More generally, if (P, \leq) is a poset and $f : M \rightarrow P$ is a function, we say that f is a *flattening map* if it is isomorphic to V , i.e., there is a poset isomorphism $g : M^b \rightarrow P$ such that $f = g \circ V$.

The punchline of the next few sections is that if

$$D_\bullet = (D_1, D_2, \dots)$$

is a cube-bounded directory, then so is

$$D_\bullet^b = (D_1^b, D_2^b, \dots),$$

and there is a morphism of directories $D_\bullet \rightarrow D_\bullet^b$ whose n th component is the flattening map

$$D_n \rightarrow D_n^b.$$

Proposition 7.3. *Let M be a bounded modular lattice with $\text{rk}_\perp(M) < \infty$. Let $f : M \rightarrow M'$ be a flattening map.*

1. M' is a semisimple modular lattice of length equal to $\text{rk}_\perp(M)$.
2. f is surjective.
3. If $x \geq y$, then $f(x) \geq f(y)$.
4. $f(x \wedge y) = f(x) \wedge f(y)$.
5. $f(x \vee y) \geq f(x) \vee f(y)$.
6. $x > \perp \iff f(x) > \perp$.

Proof. By definition, we may assume $f = V$ and $M' = M^b$. Then M^b is a modular lattice because the pregeometry on quasi-atoms is modular ([10], Proposition 9.41), and the length of M^b is finite and equal to $\text{rk}_\perp(M)$ by [10], Remark 9.48.3. The map V is surjective because every closed set of M is of the form $V(x)$ ([10], Proposition 9.45.2). If $x \leq y$, then

$$V(x) = \{q : q \wedge x > \perp\} \subseteq V(y) = \{q : q \wedge y > \perp\}.$$

This implies the identities

$$\begin{aligned} V(x \wedge y) &\subseteq V(x) \cap V(y) \\ V(x \vee y) &\subseteq V(x) \vee V(y) \end{aligned}$$

where $V(x) \vee V(y)$ is the closed set generated by $V(x) \cup V(y)$. The reverse inclusion

$$V(x) \cap V(y) \subseteq V(x \wedge y)$$

is Lemma 9.37 in [10], or can be seen as follows: if $q \wedge x > \perp$ and $q \wedge y > \perp$, then the two elements $q \wedge x$ and $q \wedge y$ are non-trivial elements below q . As q is a quasi-atom, their meet $(q \wedge x) \wedge (q \wedge y)$ is also non-trivial, implying that $(x \wedge y) \wedge q > \perp$ and $q \in V(x \wedge y)$.

If $x = \perp$, then $x \wedge q = \perp$ for all q , so $V(x) = \emptyset$. Conversely, if $x > \perp$, then there is some quasi-atom $q \leq x$ by Proposition 7.1. Then $q \wedge x = q > \perp$, implying $q \in V(x)$ and $V(x) > \emptyset$. \square

7.2 Quasi-atoms as pro-objects

If \mathcal{C} is a category, then $\text{Pro } \mathcal{C}$ denotes the category of pro-objects. See Appendix B for a review of pro-objects and ind-objects. We will use the facts listed in §B.4.

Let M be a bounded lattice, viewed as a poset, viewed as a category. The category $\text{Pro } M$ is dual to the poset of filters, ordered by inclusion. Here, a *filter* is a subset $F \subseteq M$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \top &\in F \\ x, y \in F &\implies x \wedge y \in F \\ (x \in F \text{ and } y \geq x) &\implies y \in F \end{aligned}$$

The embedding of M into $\text{Pro } M$ sends an element $a \in M$ to the principal filter

$$\{x \in M : x \geq a\}.$$

Note that $\text{Pro } M$ is itself a (complete!) bounded lattice.

Lemma 7.4. *The embedding $M \hookrightarrow \text{Pro } M$ is a homomorphism of bounded lattices.*

Proof. If $a = \top$, then the principal filter generated by a is $\{\top\}$, which is clearly the minimum filter.

If $a = \perp$, then the principal filter generated by a is M , clearly the maximum filter.

If a, b are two elements, then

$$\{x \in M : x \geq a\} \cap \{x \in M : x \geq b\} = \{x \in M : x \geq (a \vee b)\}$$

So the embedding $M \hookrightarrow \text{Pro } M$ preserves \vee .

It remains to show that the filter generated by

$$\{x \in M : x \geq a\} \cup \{x \in M : x \geq b\}$$

is the filter generated by $a \wedge b$. In other words, we must show that the filter generated by $\{a, b\}$ is the filter generated by $\{a \wedge b\}$. From the definition of filter, it is clear that if F is a filter, then

$$F \supseteq \{a, b\} \iff F \supseteq \{a \wedge b\},$$

implying the desired statement. Thus the embedding $M \hookrightarrow \text{Pro } M$ preserves \wedge . \square

Proposition 7.5. *If M is a modular lattice, then $\text{Pro } M$ is a modular lattice.*

Proof. The dual of a modular lattice is a modular lattice, so it suffices to show that the lattice of filters is modular. If A, B are two filters on M , let $A + B$ denote the upwards closure of the set

$$S := \{a \wedge b : a \in A, b \in B\}$$

Then $A + B$ is a filter:

- As A, B are filters, $\top \in A, \top \in B$, and so $\top = \top \wedge \top \in S \subseteq A + B$.
- Suppose $x_1, x_2 \in A + B$. Then $x_i \geq a_i \wedge b_i$ for some $a_1, a_2 \in A$ and $b_1, b_2 \in B$. Then

$$x_1 \wedge x_2 \geq (a_1 \wedge b_1) \wedge (a_2 \wedge b_2) = (a_1 \wedge a_2) \wedge (b_1 \wedge b_2) \in S.$$

- $A + B$ is upwards-closed by fiat.

Also $A \cup B \subseteq A + B$, because of terms like $a \wedge \top$ and $\top \wedge b$. From all this, it follows that $A + B$ is exactly the filter generated by $A \cup B$.

To show modularity, suppose A, B, C are filters on M and $A \subseteq B$. We must show

$$(C + A) \cap B \stackrel{?}{\subseteq} (C \cap B) + A.$$

Suppose $x \in (C + A) \cap B$. Then $x \geq c \wedge a$ for some $c \in C$ and $a \in A$. Take $b = x \wedge a$. Then $x \geq b \leq a$, and so

$$(x \geq c \wedge a \text{ and } x \geq b) \implies x \geq (c \wedge a) \vee b \stackrel{!}{=} (c \vee b) \wedge a,$$

where $\stackrel{!}{=}$ is by modularity of M . Also $x \in B$ and $a \in A \subseteq B$, so $b = x \wedge a \in B$ because B is a filter. Then $c \vee b \in C \cap B$ and $a \in A$, so

$$x \geq (c \vee b) \wedge a \implies x \in (C \cap B) + A.$$

This proves that the lattice of filters on M is modular, which in turn implies $\text{Pro } M$ is modular. \square

Lemma 7.6. *If M is a modular lattice, the lattice $\text{Pro } M$ has enough atoms: if $x \in \text{Pro } M$ and $x > \perp$, there is an atom $a \in \text{Pro } M$ with $a \leq x$.*

Proof. A filter $F \subseteq M$ is proper if and only if $\perp \notin F$. By Zorn's lemma, every proper filter is contained in a maximal proper filter. \square

Lemma 7.7. *Let M be a bounded modular lattice with $\text{rk}_\perp(M) < \infty$, and Q be the set of quasi-atoms in M .*

1. If $q \in Q$, the set

$$F_q := \{x \in M : x \wedge q > \perp\} = \{x \in M : q \in V(x)\}$$

is a proper filter on M , containing q .

2. If $q \in Q$ and F' is a proper filter containing q , then $F' \subseteq F_q$. Therefore, F_q is a maximal proper filter.
3. Every maximal proper filter is of the form F_q for some $q \in Q$.

Proof. 1. F_q is clearly upwards-closed. We check that it is closed under intersection. Suppose $x \wedge q > \perp$ and $y \wedge q > \perp$. Then $\{x \wedge q, y \wedge q\}$ is a subset of $(\perp, q]$. By definition of quasi-atom, $(\perp, q]$ is closed under \wedge , and so

$$(x \wedge y) \wedge q = (x \wedge q) \wedge (y \wedge q) \in (\perp, q].$$

Therefore $x \wedge y \in F_q$. It is clear that $q \in F_q$ and $\perp \notin F_q$.

2. Suppose $q \in Q \cap F'$ but $F' \not\subseteq F_q$. Take $a \in F' \setminus F_q$. Then $a \wedge q = \perp$ by definition of F_q . On the other hand, F' contains a and q , so it must contain \perp , therefore failing to be a proper filter.
3. Let F be a maximal proper filter. The flattening map $V : M \rightarrow M^b$ is order-preserving, so the image $V(F)$ of F under this map is downwards directed. As M^b has finite length, it follows that $V(F)$ contains a minimum element. Thus, there is $a \in F$ such that $V(a) \subseteq V(x)$ for any $x \in F$. Properness of F implies $a > \perp$, which implies $V(a) \neq \emptyset$ by Proposition 7.3.6. Take q one of the quasi-atoms in the set $V(a)$. Then $q \in V(a) \subseteq V(x)$ for all $x \in F$, implying that $F \subseteq F_q$. \square

Lemma 7.8. *Let M be a modular lattice with $\text{rk}_\perp(M) < \infty$. Let $V : M \rightarrow M^b$ be the flattening map.*

1. For every $A \in M^b$, the set

$$F_A = \{x \in M : V(x) \geq A\}$$

is a filter on M .

2. The resulting map

$$A \mapsto F_A$$

is an order-reversing isomorphism (of posets) from M^b to its image, and satisfies the identity

$$F_{A \vee B} = F_A \cap F_B.$$

3. A filter $F \subseteq M$ is of the form F_A for some $A \in M^b$ if and only if F is a finite intersection of zero or more maximal proper filters.

Proof. For $A, A' \in M^b$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{A \vee A'} &= \{x \in M : V(x) \geq A \vee A'\} \\ &= \{x \in M : V(x) \geq A\} \cap \{x \in M : V(x) \geq A'\} = F_A \cap F_{A'}. \end{aligned}$$

If A is an atom in M^b , then A is the closure of $\{q\}$ for some quasi-atom $q \in M$, and

$$\begin{aligned} F_A &= \{x \in M : V(x) \supseteq A\} \\ &= \{x \in M : V(x) \supseteq \{q\}\} \\ &= \{x \in M : V(x) \ni q\} \\ &= \{x \in M : x \wedge q > \perp\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a filter by Lemma 7.7. In general, we can write $B = A_1 \vee \cdots \vee A_n$ where the A_i are atoms, and

$$F_B = \bigcap F_{A_i}.$$

Each F_{A_i} is a maximal proper filter, and every maximal proper filter is of the form F_A for some atom A , by Lemma 7.7. So as B ranges over M^b , F_B ranges over finite intersections of maximal proper filters, proving the first and third points.

It remains to show that $A \mapsto F_A$ is strictly order-reversing. For $A, A' \in M^b$, we have equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} F_{A'} \subseteq F_A &\iff \forall x \in M : (V(x) \geq A' \implies V(x) \geq A) \\ &\iff \forall B \in M^b : (B \geq A' \implies B \geq A) \\ &\iff A' \geq A, \end{aligned}$$

because $V : M \rightarrow M^b$ is surjective. □

Remark 7.9. Let M be a module over some ring. Recall that “semisimple” means “semisimple of finite length.” Let A, B be submodules of M . One has the following well-known facts:

- If A, B are both semisimple, then $A + B$ is semisimple.
- If $A \subseteq B$ and B is semisimple, then A is semisimple.

The proofs generalize to modular lattices. Let M be a bounded modular lattice. Let x, y be elements of M . The interval $[\perp, x]$ is a sublattice of M , which is semisimple if and only if x is a finite join of atoms.

- If $[\perp, x]$ and $[\perp, y]$ are semisimple, then so is $[\perp, x \vee y]$.
- If $x \leq y$ and $[\perp, y]$ is semisimple, then so is $[\perp, x]$.

Theorem 7.10. *Let M be a bounded modular lattice. Suppose $\text{rk}_\perp(M) < \infty$.*

1. *There is a unique maximum $s \in \text{Pro } M$ such that $[\perp, s] \subseteq \text{Pro } M$ is a semisimple sublattice of $\text{Pro } M$.*
2. *The composition*

$$M \hookrightarrow \text{Pro } M \xrightarrow{x \mapsto x \wedge s} [\perp, s]$$

is a flattening map.

3. In particular, the lattice $[\perp, s]$ is isomorphic to the lattice M^b of closed sets in the pregeometry on quasi-atoms in M .

4. In particular, equivalence classes of quasi-atoms in M correspond exactly to atoms in $\text{Pro } M$.

Proof. The lattice $\text{Pro } M$ is dual to the lattice of filters on M . By Lemma 7.8, there is therefore a map $g : M^b \rightarrow \text{Pro } M$ with the following properties:

- g is an isomorphism onto its image: for any $A, B \in M^b$,

$$A \subseteq B \iff g(A) \subseteq g(B)$$

- $g(A \vee B) = g(A) \vee g(B)$.
- An element $x \in \text{Pro } M$ is in the image of g if and only if x is a finite join of atoms, or equivalently, if and only if $[\perp, x]$ is a semisimple modular lattice.

As M^b has a maximal element, there is a maximal $s \in \text{Pro } M$ such that $[\perp, s]$ is semisimple. Then for any $x \in \text{Pro } M$, the following are equivalent:

- x is in the image of g
- $[\perp, x]$ is semisimple
- x is in $[\perp, s]$.

Therefore the image of g is $[\perp, s]$. Then g is an isomorphism of posets from M^b to $[\perp, s]$, hence an isomorphism of lattices, and $g \circ V : M \rightarrow [\perp, s]$ is a flattening map.

It remains to prove the formula

$$g(V(x)) \stackrel{?}{=} x \wedge s.$$

For any $A \in M^b$, $g(A)$ is dual to the filter

$$F_A = \{z \in M : V(z) \supseteq A\}$$

by definition of g . For any $x \in M$, the element $x \in \text{Pro } M$ is dual the principal filter

$$\{z \in M : z \geq x\}$$

generated by x . Therefore, for $x, y \in M$ we have an equivalence

$$\begin{aligned} x \geq g(V(y)) &\iff \{z \in M : z \geq x\} \subseteq \{z \in M : V(z) \supseteq V(y)\} \\ &\iff x \in \{z \in M : V(z) \supseteq V(y)\} \\ &\iff V(x) \supseteq V(y). \end{aligned}$$

As g is strictly order-preserving,

$$x \geq g(V(y)) \iff g(V(x)) \geq g(V(y)).$$

Now $g \circ V : M \rightarrow [\perp, s]$ is surjective (Proposition 7.3.2), so for any $x \in M$ and $w \in [\perp, s]$,

$$x \geq w \iff g(V(x)) \geq w.$$

Then for any $x \in M$ and $w \in [\perp, s]$,

$$x \wedge s \geq w \iff x \geq w \iff g(V(x)) \geq w,$$

implying that $x \wedge s = g(V(x))$. □

7.3 Flattening an abelian category

Fact 7.11. *Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be categories with finite limits, and $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a functor. Then F preserves finite limits if and only if for every $A \in \mathcal{D}$, the functor*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &\rightarrow \text{Set} \\ X &\mapsto \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(A, F(X)) \end{aligned}$$

preserves finite limits.

The following assumption will be in force for all of §7.3

Assumption 7.12. *\mathcal{C} is a small K_0 -linear abelian category that is cube-bounded, or satisfies the following weaker condition:*

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{C} : \text{rk}_{\perp}(A) < \infty.$$

For example, \mathcal{C} could be the category of modules over a Noetherian K_0 -algebra.

As discussed in Appendix B.4, the category $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ is naturally a K_0 -linear abelian category, and the embedding $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ is fully faithful and exact. Moreover, for any object $A \in \mathcal{C}$, there is an isomorphism

$$\text{Sub}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(A) \cong \text{Pro Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A).$$

By Theorem 7.10.1 in the previous section, if $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then the pro-object $A \in \text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ has a socle—a maximum semisimple¹¹ subobject. We define the *quasi-socle* $\text{qsoc}(A)$ to be the socle of A -as-a-pro-object.

¹¹As always, “semisimple” means “semisimple of finite length,” even though $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ might have a more general notion of semisimplicity.

Remark 7.13. If $B \subseteq A$ in \mathcal{C} , then

$$\text{qsoc}(B) = B \cap \text{qsoc}(A)$$

where the intersection is taken inside $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$. If A, B are arbitrary objects in \mathcal{C} , then

$$\text{qsoc}(A \oplus B) \cong \text{qsoc}(A) \oplus \text{qsoc}(B).$$

Both statements follow from general facts about socles.

Lemma 7.14. *(Under 7.12.) For every $A \in \mathcal{C}$, the induced map*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(\text{qsoc}(A)) \\ B &\mapsto \text{qsoc}(B) = B \cap \text{qsoc}(A) \end{aligned}$$

is a flattening map.

Proof. Theorem 7.10.2 and Remark 7.13. □

Theorem 7.15. *(Under 7.12.) Let \mathcal{C}^b be the full subcategory of $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ consisting of quasi-socles $\text{qsoc}(A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{C}$. Then*

1. \mathcal{C}^b is a small semisimple K_0 -linear abelian category.
2. The functor $\text{qsoc} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^b$ is left exact and essentially surjective.
3. For every $A \in \mathcal{C}$, the induced map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A)) \\ B &\mapsto \text{qsoc}(B) \end{aligned}$$

is a flattening map.

Proof. First note that for any $A \in \mathcal{C}$, the map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(\text{qsoc}(A)) \\ B &\mapsto \text{qsoc}(B) = B \cap \text{qsoc}(A) \end{aligned}$$

is a flattening map, by Lemma 7.14. As flattening maps are surjective (Proposition 7.3.2), it then follows that \mathcal{C}^b is closed under taking subobjects in $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$. It is also closed under direct sums, by Remark 7.13. Therefore \mathcal{C}^b is a semisimple abelian category, and

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A)) \cong \text{Sub}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(\text{qsoc}(A)).$$

So the natural map $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A))$ is a flattening map. The functor $\text{qsoc}(A)$ is essentially surjective by definition of \mathcal{C}^b . Note that for $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and $B \in \mathcal{C}^b$, there is a natural isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(B, \text{qsoc}(A)) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(B, \text{qsoc}(A)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(B, A).$$

By Fact 7.11, the (left-)exactness of the embedding $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ implies the left-exactness of $\text{qsoc} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^b$. □

We call \mathcal{C}^b the *flattening* of \mathcal{C} .

Remark 7.16. There is an alternative approach to construct \mathcal{C}^b , proceeding as follows: say that a monomorphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} is “dense” if the image $\text{im}(f)$ non-trivially intersects every non-trivial subobject of B . The class of dense monomorphisms turns out to admit a calculus of right fractions, and $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^b$ is the localization of \mathcal{C} obtained by inverting the dense monomorphisms. We prefer the approach using $\text{Pro } \mathcal{C}$ because it makes the calculations easier.

Proposition 7.17. *(Under 7.12.) If $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then the length of $\text{qsoc}(A)$ in \mathcal{C}^b is exactly $\text{rk}_\perp(A)$ in \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. There is a flattening map

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A)),$$

so by Proposition 7.3.1,

$$\text{rk}_\perp(A) := \text{rk}_\perp(\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)) = \ell(\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A))) =: \ell(\text{qsoc}(A)). \quad \square$$

Lemma 7.18 (Intersection lemma). *(Under 7.12.) If $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and B_1, B_2 are two subobjects, then*

$$\text{qsoc}(B_1) \cap \text{qsoc}(B_2) = \text{qsoc}(B_1 \cap B_2).$$

Consequently,

- The length of $\text{qsoc}(B_1) \cap \text{qsoc}(B_2)$ is $\text{rk}_\perp(B_1 \cap B_2)$.
- $\text{qsoc}(B_1) \cap \text{qsoc}(B_2) = 0 \iff B_1 \cap B_2 = 0$

Proof. This follows by properties of flattening maps, namely Proposition 7.3.4,6. □

Proposition 7.19. *Suppose every object of \mathcal{C} has finite length.*

1. For any $A \in \mathcal{C}$, the induced map

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \hookrightarrow \text{Sub}_{\text{Pro } \mathcal{C}}(A)$$

is an isomorphism of lattices.

2. The quasi-socle $\text{qsoc}(A)$ is the ordinary socle $\text{soc}(A)$. In particular, the pro-object $\text{qsoc}(A) \in \text{Pro } \mathcal{C}$ is an ordinary object in \mathcal{C} .
3. \mathcal{C}^b is equivalent to the category of semisimple objects in \mathcal{C} , and $\text{qsoc} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^b$ is equivalent to the ordinary socle functor.
4. In particular, if \mathcal{C} is a semisimple abelian category, then $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^b$ is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. If M is a modular lattice of finite length, every filter on M has a minimum element, hence is principal. Therefore the induced embedding $M \hookrightarrow \text{Pro } M$ is an isomorphism. As

$$\text{Sub}_{\text{Pro } \mathcal{C}}(A) \cong \text{Pro } \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A),$$

this proves the first point.

Then for any $A \in \mathcal{C}$, the sub-proobjects of A are the same thing as ordinary subobjects from \mathcal{C} . The quasi-socle is therefore the largest semisimple subobject of \mathcal{C} , which is the ordinary socle, proving the second point.

The essential image of the socle functor is exactly the category of semisimple objects in \mathcal{C} , because every semisimple object is its own socle. This proves the third point. The fourth point is then clear. \square

7.4 Flattening directories

Corollary 7.20. *Let D_{\bullet} be a cube-bounded directory. Then there is a directory D_{\bullet}^b and a morphism of directories $D_{\bullet} \rightarrow D_{\bullet}^b$ such that each map*

$$D_n \rightarrow D_n^b$$

is a flattening map. The resulting structure is unique up to isomorphism.

Proof. We may assume $D_{\bullet} = \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ for some object A in a K_0 -linear abelian category \mathcal{C} . Then A is a cube-bounded object in \mathcal{C} . Replacing \mathcal{C} with the neighborhood of A , we may assume \mathcal{C} is cube-bounded. Then we can construct $\text{qsoc} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^b$ as in Theorem 7.15. By Theorem 7.15.2, the functor qsoc is left-exact, hence induces a morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A)) \\ \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A)^n) \\ B &\mapsto \text{qsoc}(B) \end{aligned}$$

as in Example 2.10. Let D_{\bullet}^b denote $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A))$. By Theorem 7.15.3, the morphism $D_{\bullet} \rightarrow D_{\bullet}^b$ is a levelwise flattening map, proving existence.

Alternatively, we can form the composition

$$\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro } \mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(\text{qsoc}(A)),$$

where the first map is induced by the exact functor $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \text{Pro } \mathcal{C}$, and the second map is pullback along $\text{qsoc}(A) \hookrightarrow A$. This composition is a levelwise flattening map by Lemma 7.14.

For uniqueness, suppose that $D_{\bullet} \rightarrow D'_{\bullet}$ is some other directory morphism such that each map $D_n \rightarrow D'_n$ is a flattening map. Because flattening maps are unique up to isomorphism, we may move D'_{\bullet} by an isomorphism and arrange the following:

- D'_n and D_n^b have the same underlying poset

- The functions $D_n \rightarrow D'_n$ and $D_n \rightarrow D_n^b$ are the same underlying function.

After arranging this, we claim that $D'_\bullet = D_\bullet^b$. The underlying sets are the same, and we only need to check that the directory structures agree, specifically the \oplus operators and the $GL_n(K_0)$ -actions. The two maps

$$\begin{aligned} D_n &\twoheadrightarrow D'_n \\ D_n &\twoheadrightarrow D_n^b \end{aligned}$$

are surjective and $GL_n(K_0)$ -equivariant, so D'_n and D_n^b must have the same $GL_n(K_0)$ -action, namely, the action induced by the action on D_n . A similar argument shows that D_\bullet^b and D'_\bullet have the same \oplus operators. Thus $D_\bullet^b = D'_\bullet$. \square

Apparently, Corollary 7.20 also works if D_\bullet is a Noetherian directory, in the sense that the ascending chain condition holds in D_1 . (This implies the ascending chain condition in D_n for all n .)

We call the morphism $D_\bullet \rightarrow D_\bullet^b$ of Corollary 7.20 the *flattening morphism*.

Remark 7.21. From the proof of Corollary 7.20, we get two explicit descriptions of flattening. If $D_\bullet = \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$, the flattening D_\bullet^b can be described as the morphism

$$\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A))$$

induced by the left-exact functor $\text{qsoc}(A)$. It can also be described as the morphism

$$\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(\text{qsoc}(A))$$

where the first map is induced by the exact functor $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$, and the second map is intersection with $\text{qsoc}(A)$ (i.e., pullback along the monomorphism $\text{qsoc}(A) \hookrightarrow A$). These two descriptions are helpful when doing calculations.

7.5 Balanced objects

Let \mathcal{C} be a cube-bounded abelian category.

Remark 7.22. If $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then

$$\ell(\text{qsoc}(A)) = \text{rk}_\perp(A) \leq \text{rk}_0(A)$$

by Proposition 7.17 and Remark 6.15.2.

Definition 7.23. An object $A \in \mathcal{C}$ is *balanced* if

$$\ell(\text{qsoc}(A)) = \text{rk}_0(A).$$

Lemma 7.24. *Subobjects of balanced objects are balanced.*

Proof. Let $B \subseteq A$ with A balanced. As \mathcal{C}^b is a semisimple category, there is some $C' \subseteq \text{qsoc}(A)$ complementary to $\text{qsoc}(B) \subseteq \text{qsoc}(A)$. The induced map

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}(A))$$

is a flattening map, hence surjective, so we may take $C' = \text{qsoc}(C)$ for some $C \subseteq A$. Then

$$\text{qsoc}(C) \cap \text{qsoc}(B) = C' \cap \text{qsoc}(B) = 0.$$

By Intersection Lemma 7.18, $C \cap B = 0$. It follows that $C \oplus B \cong C + B \subseteq A$. Then

$$\text{rk}_0(C) + \text{rk}_0(B) = \text{rk}_0(C + B) \leq \text{rk}_0(A)$$

by Proposition 6.9.3. Note that

$$\ell(\text{qsoc}(C)) + \ell(\text{qsoc}(B)) = \ell(\text{qsoc}(A)).$$

because $\text{qsoc}(C)$ and $\text{qsoc}(B)$ are complementary inside $\text{qsoc}(A)$. Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\text{qsoc}(C)) &\leq \text{rk}_0(C) \\ \ell(\text{qsoc}(B)) &\leq \text{rk}_0(B) \end{aligned}$$

by Remark 7.22. By assumption, $\text{rk}_0(A) = \ell(\text{qsoc}(A))$. Putting everything together,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}_0(C) + \text{rk}_0(B) &\geq \ell(\text{qsoc}(C)) + \ell(\text{qsoc}(B)) \\ &= \ell(\text{qsoc}(A)) = \text{rk}_0(A) \\ &\geq \text{rk}_0(C) + \text{rk}_0(B). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore equality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\text{qsoc}(C)) &= \text{rk}_0(C) \\ \ell(\text{qsoc}(B)) &= \text{rk}_0(B). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 7.25. If A, B are balanced, then $A \oplus B$ is balanced. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\text{qsoc}(A \oplus B)) &= \ell(\text{qsoc}(A) \oplus \text{qsoc}(B)) = \ell(\text{qsoc}(A)) + \ell(\text{qsoc}(B)) \\ &= \text{rk}_0(A) + \text{rk}_0(B) = \text{rk}_0(A \oplus B). \end{aligned}$$

8 The pedestal machine

We give an abstract machine for generating inflators from cube-bounded lattices on fields.

8.1 The cube-bounded configuration

If K is a field, let $K \text{Vect}^f$ denote the category of finite-dimensional K -vector spaces. For §8.1-8.5 we assume the following:

Assumption 8.1 (Cube-bounded configuration). *We have the following configuration:*

1. A field K extending the small field K_0 .
2. A K_0 -linear abelian category \mathcal{C}
3. A K_0 -linear functor $F : K \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $F(K)$ is non-trivial but cube-bounded.

By Remark A.1, F is faithful, exact, and conservative. Abusing notation, we view $K \text{Vect}^f$ as a subcategory of \mathcal{C} , and suppress F .

The motivating example is where K is an infinite, saturated field of finite burden, \mathcal{C} is the category \mathcal{H}^{00} of §3.3, and F is the composition

$$K \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{00}.$$

If K is NIP and K_0 is a magic subfield, then the second map is an equivalence of categories, and we can take $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{H}$ instead. We give another example in §8.6.

Let $d = \text{rk}_0(K)$ (in the category \mathcal{C}). By assumption $d < \infty$.

Definition 8.2. A \mathcal{C} -subobject $A \subseteq K$ is a *pedestal* if $\text{rk}_\perp(K/A) = d$, i.e., A is the base of a strict d -cube in the lattice $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(K)$.

Remark 8.3. If A is a pedestal, then

$$\ell(\text{qsoc}(K/A)) = \text{rk}_\perp(K/A) = d = \text{rk}_0(K) \geq \text{rk}_0(K/A) \geq \text{rk}_\perp(K/A),$$

so K/A is *balanced* (Definition 7.23).

8.2 The inflator

Continue Assumption 8.1.

Lemma 8.4 (\approx Lemma 10.9 in [10]). *Let $d = \text{rk}_0(K)$ and $A \subseteq K$ be a pedestal. Then for any $V \in \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$, we have*

$$\ell(\text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n)) = \text{rk}_\perp((V + A^n)/A^n) = \text{rk}_0((V + A^n)/A^n) = d \cdot \dim_K(V).$$

Proof. The first equality is Proposition 7.17. The second holds by Lemma 7.24 because $(V + A^n)/A^n$ is isomorphic to a subobject of K^n/A^n , which is balanced by Remark 7.25. It remains to show the third equality. Let $W \in \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$ be a complementary subspace, so

$$\begin{aligned} V + W &= K^n \\ V \cap W &= \{0\} \\ \dim(V) + \dim(W) &= n. \end{aligned}$$

The isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} V &\cong K^{\dim V} \\ W &\cong K^{\dim W} \end{aligned}$$

imply that in \mathcal{C} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{rk}_0(V) &= d \cdot \dim(V) \\ \mathrm{rk}_0(W) &= d \cdot \dim(W). \end{aligned}$$

The surjection $V \rightarrow (V + A^n)/A^n$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{rk}_0((V + A^n)/A^n) &\leq d \cdot \dim(V) \\ \mathrm{rk}_0((W + A^n)/A^n) &\leq d \cdot \dim(W). \end{aligned}$$

Now K^n/A^n is the join of the subobjects $(V + A^n)/A^n$ and $(W + A^n)/A^n$, so

$$\mathrm{rk}_0(K^n/A^n) \leq \mathrm{rk}_0((V + A^n)/A^n) + \mathrm{rk}_0((W + A^n)/A^n).$$

Assembling all the inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} dn &= n \cdot \mathrm{rk}_0(K/A) = \mathrm{rk}_0(K^n/A^n) \\ &\leq \mathrm{rk}_0((V + A^n)/A^n) + \mathrm{rk}_0((W + A^n)/A^n) \\ &\leq d \cdot \dim(V) + d \cdot \dim(W) = dn. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore all the inequalities are equalities and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{rk}_0((V + A^n)/A^n) &= d \cdot \dim(V) \\ \mathrm{rk}_0((W + A^n)/A^n) &= d \cdot \dim(W). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Theorem 8.5 (Pedestal machine). *Under Assumption 8.1, if $d = \mathrm{rk}_0(K)$ and $A \in \mathrm{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(K)$ is a pedestal, then the following composition is a d -inflator on K :*

$$\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Dir}_{K \mathrm{Vect}^f}(K) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K/A) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K/A)^{\flat}$$

where the second map comes from the exact functor $K \mathrm{Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, the third map comes from the pushforward along $K \rightarrow K/A$, and the final map is the flattening map of Corollary 7.20.

Proof. By Remark 7.21, we can identify $\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K/A)^{\flat}$ with $\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}^{\flat}}(\mathrm{qsoc}(K/A))$, and the directory morphism in question is simply the map

$$V \mapsto (V + A^n)/A^n \mapsto \mathrm{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n).$$

Lemma 8.4 ensures that this is a d -inflator. □

Proposition 8.6. *Under Assumption 8.1, the d -inflator of Theorem 8.5 can also be described as*

$$\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(A^+/A),$$

where

- A^+ is the pro-subobject of K such that A^+/A is the socle of K/A .
- the first map is induced by the exact functor $K \mathrm{Vect}^f \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}$.
- the second map is an interval retract onto the interval $[A, A^+]$, as in Definition 2.13.

Proof. By Remark 7.21, we can identify $\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K/A)^b$ with $\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(\mathrm{qsoc}(K/A)) = \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(A^+/A)$, and the map in question is

$$V \mapsto (V + A^n)/A^n \cap (A^+)^n/A^n.$$

The notation is unambiguous because the embedding $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ is an exact functor which preserves everything. In other words, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K/A) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(K) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(K/A). \end{array}$$

So the map in question is the composition

$$\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{K \mathrm{Vect}^f}(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(K/A) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(A^+/A).$$

The composition of the final two maps is the interval retract. □

8.3 A special case

Continue Assumption 8.1.

Lemma 8.7. *If M is a modular lattice of finite length, then $M \cong \mathrm{Pro} M$.*

Proof. Every filter has a minimum element, and is therefore principal. □

Corollary 8.8. *If A is an object of finite length in an abelian category \mathcal{C} , then*

$$\mathrm{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sub}_{\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(A)$$

is an isomorphism. In particular, A has the same length in \mathcal{C} and $\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}$, and A is semisimple in \mathcal{C} if and only if A is semisimple in $\mathrm{Pro}\mathcal{C}$.

Proposition 8.9. *Under Assumption 8.1, suppose there are subobjects $A \leq A^+ \leq K$ such that A^+/A is semisimple of length $d = \text{rk}_0(K)$. Then A is a pedestal and the associated d -inflator is isomorphic to*

$$\text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^+/A),$$

where the first map is induced by the inclusion $K \text{Vect}^f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and the second map is the interval retract

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(K^n) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}((A^+/A)^n) \\ V &\mapsto (V \cap (A^+)^n + A^n)/A^n. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. In the category $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$, we see that A^+/A is semisimple. Therefore,

$$A^+/A \subseteq \text{qsoc}(K/A),$$

and then $\text{rk}_{\perp}(K/A) = \ell(\text{qsoc}(K/A)) \geq \ell(A^+/A) = d$, showing that A is a pedestal. Equality holds, so $A^+/A = \text{qsoc}(K/A)$. Then the induced d -inflator is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_K(K^n) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}((A^+/A)^n) \\ V &\mapsto (V \cap (A^+)^n + A^n)/A^n. \end{aligned}$$

Since A^+ comes from \mathcal{C} , this map factors through the natural map

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}((A^+/A)^n) \hookrightarrow \text{Sub}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}((A^+/A)^n),$$

which is an isomorphism by Corollary 8.8. □

8.4 The ring and the ideal

Continue Assumption 8.1.

Note that there is an action of $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(K)$ on $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(K)$, by direct images. Via the embedding $K = \text{End}_K(K) \hookrightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(K)$, we get an action of the monoid (K, \cdot) on the poset $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(K)$.

In the concrete cases of interest, $a \in K$ sends a type-definable subgroup $A \subseteq K$ to its rescaling $a \cdot A$.

Proposition 8.10. *Under Assumption 8.1, let A be a pedestal and let ς be the d -inflator of Theorem 8.5. Then the fundamental ring is the “stabilizer”*

$$R = \{x \in K : xA \subseteq A\}$$

and the fundamental ideal is

$$I = \{x \in R : \text{rk}_0(A/xA) = d\}.$$

Proof. Let b be an element of K and let $\Theta_b = K \cdot (1, b)$. Then $\varsigma_2(\Theta_b)$ is exactly

$$\text{qsoc}((\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2).$$

By Lemma 5.9, Intersection Lemma 7.18, and modularity of subobject lattices,

$$\begin{aligned} b \in R &\iff \text{qsoc}((\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2) \cap (0 \oplus \text{qsoc}(K/A)) = 0 \\ &\iff \text{qsoc}((\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2) \cap \text{qsoc}((A \oplus K)/A^2) = 0 \\ &\iff (\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2 \cap (A \oplus K)/A^2 = 0 \\ &\iff (\Theta_b + A^2) \cap (A \oplus K) = A^2 \\ &\iff (\Theta_b \cap (A \oplus K)) + A^2 = A^2 \\ &\iff \Theta_b \cap (A \oplus K) \subseteq A^2. \end{aligned}$$

The final condition is equivalent to $bA \subseteq A$. Next suppose $b \in R$, so $bA \subseteq A$. By Lemma 5.10, the Intersection Lemma 7.18, and modularity of subobject lattices,

$$\begin{aligned} b \in I &\iff \text{qsoc}((\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2) \supseteq (\text{qsoc}(K/A) \oplus 0) \\ &\iff \ell(\text{qsoc}((\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2) \cap (\text{qsoc}(K/A) \oplus 0)) \geq \ell(\text{qsoc}(K/A)) \\ &\iff \ell(\text{qsoc}((\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2) \cap (\text{qsoc}(K/A) \oplus 0)) \geq d \\ &\iff \ell(\text{qsoc}((\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2) \cap \text{qsoc}((K \oplus A)/A^2)) \geq d \\ &\iff \text{rk}_\perp((\Theta_b + A^2)/A^2 \cap (K \oplus A)/A^2) \geq d \\ &\iff \text{rk}_\perp(((\Theta_b + A^2) \cap (K \oplus A))/A^2) \geq d \\ &\iff \text{rk}_\perp((\Theta_b \cap (K \oplus A) + A^2)/A^2) \geq d \end{aligned}$$

By a diagram chase,

$$(\Theta_b \cap (K \oplus A) + A^2)/A^2 \cong (\Theta_b \cap (K \oplus A))/(\Theta_b \cap A^2) \cong b^{-1}A/A.$$

But $b^{-1}A/A$ is a subobject of the balanced object K/A , so by Lemma 7.24,

$$\text{rk}_\perp(b^{-1}A/A) = \text{rk}_0(b^{-1}A/A).$$

Thus

$$b \in I \iff \text{rk}_\perp(b^{-1}A/A) \geq d \iff \text{rk}_0(b^{-1}A/A) \geq d \iff \text{rk}_0(A/bA) \geq d. \quad \square$$

Warning. In the \mathcal{H}^{00} case, the notation must be understood modulo commensurability. For example, the fundamental ring is the set of $x \in K$ such that xA is below A in the lattice Λ^{00} , i.e., $xA \cap A$ has bounded index in xA .

In the good case of dp-finite fields, the ring and ideal appearing in Proposition 8.10 are the same ring and ideal appearing in [10], Proposition 10.15.

8.5 Malleability

To obtain malleability from the pedestal machine, we need an additional assumption:

Assumption 8.11 (Special cube-bounded configuration). *Assumption 8.1 holds, and there is a faithful exact K_0 -linear functor $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow K_0 \text{Vect}$ such that the composition*

$$K \text{Vect}^f \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{G} K_0 \text{Vect}$$

is isomorphic to the forgetful functor $K \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow K_0 \text{Vect}$.

For example, Assumption 8.11 holds for

$$F : \mathbb{K} \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{00}$$

when \mathbb{K} is NIP and K_0 is a magic subfield. In this case, $\mathcal{H}^{00} = \mathcal{H}$ and we can take G to be the natural forgetful functor to $K_0 \text{Vect}$.

Proposition 8.12. *Under Assumption 8.11, the d -inflator of Theorem 8.5 is malleable.*

Proof. The faithful exact functors F and G allow us to view objects of $\mathbb{K} \text{Vect}^f$ and \mathcal{C} as K_0 -vector spaces with extra structure. (On the other hand, \mathcal{C}^b is still opaque.) We can then suppress F and G from the notation. The fact that $G \circ F$ is the usual forgetful functor $\mathbb{K} \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow K_0 \text{Vect}$ ensures that this is notationally safe.

Let $B = \text{qsoc}(K/A)$, so that the d -inflator is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(B) \\ V &\mapsto \text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $V \subseteq W \subseteq K^n$ and L is a subobject of B^n such that

$$\text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n) \subseteq L \subseteq \text{qsoc}((W + A^n)/A^n)$$

with the length of $L/\text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n)$ equal to 1. We must find a K -linear subspace $V' \subseteq W$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} V &\subseteq V' \\ L &\subseteq \text{qsoc}((V' + A^n)/A^n) \\ \dim_K(V') &\leq \dim_K(V) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Because \mathcal{C}^b is a semisimple category, we can find a subobject S of L complementary to $\text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n)$. Then S has length 1, and L is generated by $\text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n)$ and S . Now the map

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}((W + A^n)/A^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}^b}(\text{qsoc}((W + A^n)/A^n))$$

is a flattening map (Theorem 7.15.3) and flattening maps are surjective (Proposition 7.3,2), so there is a \mathcal{C} -subobject Q of $W + A^n$ such that

$$A^n \subseteq Q \subseteq W + A^n$$

and $\text{qsoc}(Q/A^n) = S$. Then $\ell(\text{qsoc}(Q/A^n)) = 1$, so $Q/A^n \neq 0$. Take $x_0 \in Q \setminus A^n$. We can write x_0 as $x_1 + x_2$, where $x_1 \in W$ and $x_2 \in A^n$. Then $x_1 \in W$ and $x_1 \in Q \setminus A^n$. Let V' be the K -linear subspace of W generated by V and x_1 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &\in V' + A^n \\ x_1 &\in Q \\ x_1 &\notin A^n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(V' + A^n)/A^n$ and Q/A^n have non-trivial intersection. By the Intersection Lemma 7.18,

$$\text{qsoc}((V' + A^n)/A^n) \cap \text{qsoc}(Q/A^n) \neq 0.$$

But $\text{qsoc}(Q/A^n)$ has length 1, so this in fact implies

$$\text{qsoc}((V' + A^n)/A^n) \supseteq \text{qsoc}(Q/A^n) = S.$$

Also $V' \supseteq V$, so

$$\text{qsoc}((V' + A^n)/A^n) \supseteq \text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n) + S = L.$$

Thus V' has all the desired properties. □

8.6 An example

Let K be a field, K_0 be a subfield, and let $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n$ be pairwise incomparable valuation rings on K , with $K_0 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_i$. Let R be the multivaluation ring $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{O}_n$; this is a K_0 -subalgebra of K . Let \mathcal{C} be the category $R\text{Mod}$, and let

$$K \text{Vect}^f \xrightarrow{F} R\text{Mod} \xrightarrow{G} K_0 \text{Mod}$$

be the forgetful functors. Then we are in the Special Cube-bounded Configuration of Assumption 8.11. Indeed, the reduced rank d of $K \in R\text{Mod}$ is exactly n , by Lemma 6.5.

For each i , let \mathfrak{m}_i be the maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_i , and let J be the intersection

$$J = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{m}_n.$$

By [8], Proposition 6.2, R has exactly n distinct maximal ideals $M_i = R \cap \mathfrak{m}_i$, the quotients R/M_i are isomorphic to $k_i := \mathcal{O}_i/\mathfrak{m}_i$, and $J = M_1 \cap \dots \cap M_n$ is the Jacobson radical of R . The quotient R/J is isomorphic to $k_1 \times \dots \times k_n$. By Propositions 8.9, 8.12, we see that J is a pedestal, and there is a malleable n -inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(R/J) \\ V &\mapsto (V \cap R^n + J^n)/J^n. \end{aligned}$$

If $n = 1$ and R is a valuation ring, this is the 1-inflator of Theorem 4.3. If $n > 1$, note that

$$\mathrm{Dir}_R(R/J) = \mathrm{Dir}_{R/J}(R/J) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Dir}_{k_i}(k_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Dir}_R(k_i)$$

by Remark 2.17 and the isomorphism $R/J \cong k_1 \times \cdots \times k_n$. The i th projection map $\mathrm{Dir}_R(R/J) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_R(k_i)$ can be described in several ways; one of them is that it is the pushforward along the quotient map $R/J \rightarrow R/M_i$. Thus the composition

$$\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_R(R/J) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_R(k_i)$$

is given by

$$V \mapsto (V \cap R^n + M_i^n)/M_i^n.$$

Let f be the R -module morphism from R/M_i to $\mathcal{O}_i/\mathfrak{m}_i$ induced by the inclusion. By Proposition 6.2.6 in [8], f is an isomorphism. Let $f^{\oplus n} : (R/M_i)^n \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_i/\mathfrak{m}_i)^n$ be defined componentwise.

Claim 8.13. For any subspace $V \leq K^n$, the direct image of

$$(V \cap R^n + M_i^n)/M_i^n$$

under $f^{\oplus n}$ is contained in

$$(V \cap \mathcal{O}_i^n + \mathfrak{m}_i^n)/\mathfrak{m}_i^n.$$

Proof. First, note that for any $M_i^n \leq X \leq R^n$, the direct image of X/M_i^n under $f^{\oplus n}$ is exactly $(X + \mathfrak{m}_i^n)/\mathfrak{m}_i^n$, because the composition

$$R^n \rightarrow R^n/M_i^n \xrightarrow{f^{\oplus n}} \mathcal{O}_i^n/\mathfrak{m}_i^n$$

is the same as the composition $R^n \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_i^n \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_i^n/\mathfrak{m}_i^n$, by definition of f . In particular, the direct image along $f^{\oplus n}$ sends

$$(V \cap R^n + M_i^n)/M_i^n \mapsto ((V \cap R^n + M_i^n) + \mathfrak{m}_i^n)/\mathfrak{m}_i^n$$

Then it remains to show that for any $V \leq K^n$,

$$(V \cap R^n + M_i^n) + \mathfrak{m}_i^n \subseteq V \cap \mathcal{O}_i^n + \mathfrak{m}_i^n.$$

This is clear, since $M_i \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_i$ and $R \subseteq \mathcal{O}_i$. □

But then for any V ,

$$\begin{aligned} n \cdot \dim_K(V) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \dim_{k_i}((V \cap R^n + M_i^n)/M_i^n) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \dim_{k_i}((V \cap \mathcal{O}_i^n + \mathfrak{m}_i^n)/\mathfrak{m}_i^n) \stackrel{*}{=} n \cdot \dim_K(V), \end{aligned}$$

where the starred equality holds by Theorem 4.3. So equality holds in Claim 8.13. Thus the n -inflator derived from J is exactly the multi-valuation n -inflator of Example 4.7.

9 Fields of finite burden

Fix a saturated field $(\mathbb{K}, +, \cdot, 0, 1, \dots)$ of finite burden, as well as a small subfield K_0 . Recall from §3 the lattice $\Lambda = \Lambda_1$ of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K} , and the lattice $\Lambda^{00} = \Lambda_1^{00}$ obtained by quotienting out by 00-commensurability. By Proposition 6.17, the lattice Λ^{00} is cube-bounded.

Definition 9.1. Let r be the reduced rank of Λ^{00} . A K_0 -pedestal is a group $A \in \Lambda$ whose image in Λ^{00} is the base of a strict r -cube in Λ^{00} .

By Proposition 6.4, $r \leq \text{dp-rk}(\mathbb{K})$.

Remark 9.2. If \mathbb{K} is NIP and K_0 is a magic subfield, then $\Lambda = \Lambda^{00}$, and so

- Λ is a cube-bounded lattice of reduced rank r .
- A K_0 -pedestal is a group $A \in \Lambda$ that is the base of a strict r -cube in Λ .

Thus this definition of “ K_0 -pedestal” generalizes Definition 8.4 in [8].

9.1 The NIP case

Recall the categories \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}^{00} of §3.2-3.3.

Theorem 9.3. *Suppose \mathbb{K} is NIP, K_0 is a magic subfield, and A is a K_0 -pedestal. Then there is a malleable r -inflator*

$$\varsigma : \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{H}^b}(\text{qsoc}(\mathbb{K}/A))$$

given by

$$\varsigma_n(V) = \text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n) \subseteq \text{qsoc}(\mathbb{K}^n/A^n) \cong \text{qsoc}(\mathbb{K}/A)^n,$$

where $\text{qsoc} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^b$ is the quasi-socle functor of Theorem 7.15. The fundamental ring and ideal of ς (see Proposition 5.7) are

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \{x \in \mathbb{K} : x \cdot A \subseteq A\} \\ I &= \{x \in R : \text{rk}_0(A/x \cdot A) = r\}, \end{aligned}$$

where r is $\text{rk}_0(\mathbb{K})$ (in the category \mathcal{H}), or equivalently $\text{rk}_0(\Lambda)$.

Proof. Note that

$$\mathbb{K} \text{Vect}^f \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{G} K_0 \text{Vect}$$

is an instance of the Special Cube-bounded Configuration of Assumption 8.11, by Proposition 6.17. Then everything follows from Theorem 8.5, Proposition 8.10, and Proposition 8.12. \square

Remark 9.4. Theorem 9.3 verifies the structure predicted in [10], Speculative Remark 10.10.

Remark 9.5. The ring R and ideal I appearing in Theorem 9.3 are the same ring and ideal appearing in Proposition 10.15 in [10].

Remark 9.6. Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated unstable dp-finite field. In [8], we defined a notion of \mathbb{K} having “valuation type,” meaning that the canonical topology is a V-topology. We showed that if all dp-finite fields are either stable or valuation type, then the expected Shelah and henselianity conjectures hold, implying the expected classification of dp-finite fields.

Inflators give a way to detect multi-valuation type: let K_0 be a magic subfield and A be a K_0 -pedestal. Let ς be the induced inflator. If ς is weakly of multi-valuation type (Definition 5.27), then there is a multi-valuation ring R' on \mathbb{K} and a non-trivial R' -submodule $M \leq \mathbb{K}$ such that

$$x \in M, y \in A \implies x \cdot y \in A.$$

Assuming $A \neq 0$, this implies that A itself contains a non-trivial R' -submodule of \mathbb{K} . By Theorem 8.11 in [8], this implies that \mathbb{K} has valuation type. The degenerate case where $A = 0$ works as well; see Lemma 11.5 below.

The original hope for inflators was that every inflator would be weakly of multi-valuation type, completing the proof. The examples of §4.5 show that this fails to hold, in general. The remaining sections §10-12 show how we can partially fix the problem, by changing A to a new pedestal A' whose inflator is closer to being weakly multi-valuation type. This strategy successfully yields a valuation ring, but fails to prove the valuation conjecture (Conjecture 1.1).

9.2 The general case

In the general finite burden case, we apparently lose malleability, and need to consider everything up to 00-commensurability:

Theorem 9.7. *Suppose \mathbb{K} has finite burden, K_0 is a small subfield, and A is a K_0 -pedestal. Then there is an r -inflator*

$$\varsigma : \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{(\mathcal{H}^{00})^b}(\text{qsoc}(\mathbb{K}/A))$$

given by

$$\varsigma_n(V) = \text{qsoc}((V + A^n)/A^n) \subseteq \text{qsoc}(\mathbb{K}^n/A^n) \cong \text{qsoc}(\mathbb{K}/A)^n$$

where $\text{qsoc} : \mathcal{H}^{00} \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}^{00})^b$ is the quasi-socle functor of Theorem 7.15. The fundamental ring and ideal of ς are

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \{x \in \mathbb{K} : x \cdot A \leq A\} \\ I &= \{x \in R : \text{rk}_0(A/x \cdot A) = r\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the \leq and rk_0 are in the lattice Λ^{00} modulo commensurability.

For instance, R should be understood as

$$\{x \in \mathbb{K} : (x \cdot A)/((x \cdot A) \cap A) \text{ is bounded.}\}$$

Combining Theorem 9.7 with earlier Proposition 5.19 gives an extremely roundabout proof of the following (easy) fact:

Corollary 9.8. *If \mathbb{K} has burden 1 and A is a type-definable K_0 -linear subspace of \mathbb{K} , then*

$$\{\alpha \in \mathbb{K} \mid \alpha A \leq A\}$$

is a valuation ring on \mathbb{K} , where $A \leq B$ means “ $A \cap B$ has bounded index in A .”

Of course this is true more generally without the K_0 -linearity assumption, for the simple reason that the lattice (modulo commensurability) is totally ordered. So for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}^\times$, either

$$\alpha A \leq A \text{ or } \alpha A \geq A,$$

and so

$$\alpha A \leq A \text{ or } \alpha^{-1} A \leq A.$$

Part III

From inflators to multi-valuation rings

We rework §10.3 of [10] in the language of inflators, culminating in the construction of weakly definable valuation rings on unstable dp-finite fields (Theorem 10.28 of [10]). This is part of a more general construction of multi-valuation rings from inflators.

Let ς be an r -inflator on K , with fundamental ring R . In §5.5 we defined a notion of *tame* and *wild* elements of K , and showed that R is a multi-valuation ring when every element is tame. It turns out that for any $a \in K$, we can twist or “mutate” ς and obtain a new r -inflator ς' whose fundamental ring and tame locus are larger than those of ς —and specifically a is now tame.

The rough idea of mutation is as follows: given a line $L \leq K^m$ and an r -inflator

$$\varsigma_n : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_S(M^n),$$

we define a new r -inflator ς'_\bullet by the formula

$$\varsigma'_n(V) = \varsigma'_{mn}(V \otimes L),$$

where we view \otimes as a map

$$\otimes : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) \times \text{Sub}_K(K^m) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_K(K^{mn}).$$

When trying to make a wild element $a \in K$ become tame, we mutate along the line $K \cdot (1, a, a^2, \dots, a^{r-1})$. This approach works because of a simple argument using Vandermonde matrices.

Now, if ς is an inflator, we define the *limiting ring* of ς to be the union

$$R_\varsigma^\infty := \bigcup \{R_{\varsigma'} : \varsigma' \text{ a mutation of } \varsigma\},$$

i.e., the union of the fundamental rings of the mutations of ς . The union turns out to be directed, so this is indeed a ring. Because we can make any element tame via mutation, the ring R_ς^∞ turns out to be a multi-valuation ring. Because ς is a trivial mutation of itself, $R_\varsigma^\infty \supseteq R_\varsigma$.

One can also define the *limiting ideal* of ς to be the union

$$I_\varsigma^\infty := \bigcup \{I_{\varsigma'} : \varsigma' \text{ a mutation of } \varsigma\}.$$

Again, the union is directed, implying that I_ς^∞ is an ideal in R_ς^∞ , contained in the Jacobson radical of R_ς^∞ . (Compare with Proposition 5.7.) Moreover, $I_\varsigma^\infty \supseteq I_\varsigma$.

The upshot is that if I_ς is non-zero, then R_ς^∞ is a multi-valuation ring with a non-zero Jacobson radical; therefore R_ς^∞ is a non-trivial multi-valuation ring determining finitely many non-trivial valuation rings.

If ς is one of the inflators on unstable dp-finite fields constructed via Theorem 9.3, then I_ς is non-trivial, and this gives non-trivial weakly definable valuation rings. This is essentially the same construction of weakly definable valuation rings as in Theorem 10.28 in [10].

Section 10 works through the construction of multi-valuation rings from inflators. Section §10.1 defines mutation, §10.2 shows that mutation increases the fundamental ring and ideal, §10.3 shows that mutation is transitive (a mutation of a mutation is a mutation), and §10.4 shows that mutation can make any element tame (implying that the limiting ring is a multi-valuation ring). The additional sections §10.5-10.6 show that mutation preserves malleability and the property “comes from a pedestal via the main construction.”

In §11, we apply these facts to fields of finite dp-rank and finite burden. For unstable dp-finite fields we recover the construction of non-trivial valuation rings. For fields of finite burden, we recover non-trivial valuation rings only when the lattice of type-definable subgroups is sufficiently rich. We also discuss the strategy of attacking Valuation Conjecture 1.1 by trying to show that malleable inflators can be mutated to have weakly multi-valuation type.

Finally, §12 works through examples of mutation in some of the inflators from Part I. We see that mutation helps undo the destruction wrought by the map

$$(V, W) \mapsto (V + W, V \cap W).$$

10 Mutation

10.1 The definition of mutation

Let K be a field. For any line $L = K \cdot (a_1, \dots, a_m) \leq K^m$, let $\xi_n^L : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_K(K^{mn})$ be the map

$$\xi_n^L(V) = \{(a_1 \vec{x}, \dots, a_m \vec{x})^T : \vec{x} \in V\}$$

where $(-)^T$ denotes transpose:

$$(x_{1,1}, x_{1,2}, \dots, x_{1,n}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{m,n})^T = (x_{1,1}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{m,1}, x_{1,2}, \dots, x_{m,n}).$$

Note that $\xi_n^L(V)$ can be thought of as $V \otimes L \leq K^n \otimes K^m$. In particular, $\xi_n^L(-)$ depends only on L , and not on \vec{a} .

By inspection, the maps $\xi_n^L : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_K(K^{mn})$ satisfy the following properties:

$$V \subseteq W \implies \xi_n^L(V) \subseteq \xi_n^L(W) \quad (7)$$

$$\xi_{\ell+n}^L(V \oplus W) = \xi_\ell^L(V) \oplus \xi_n^L(W) \quad (8)$$

$$\xi_n^L(\mu \cdot V) = (\mu \otimes I_m) \cdot \xi_n^L(V) \quad \text{for } \mu \in GL_n(K) \quad (9)$$

$$\dim_K(\xi_n^L(V)) = \dim_K(V). \quad (10)$$

In fact, ξ_\bullet^L is essentially the directory morphism

$$\text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(K^m)$$

obtained by pushforward along the morphism

$$\begin{aligned} K &\rightarrow K^m \\ x &\mapsto (a_1x, \dots, a_mx). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 10.1. *Let $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M)$ be a $(K_0$ -linear) d -inflator, where R is a semisimple K_0 -algebra and M is an R -module of length d . Let $L = K \cdot (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ be a line in K^m . Let $M' = \varsigma_m(L)$; so M' is a submodule of M^m . For $V \in \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$, define*

$$\varsigma'_n(V) = \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(V)).$$

Then $\varsigma'_n(V)$ is an R -submodule of $(M')^n$ for each n , and the family ς'_\bullet forms a d -inflator

$$\varsigma'_\bullet : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M').$$

Proof. Let V be a subspace of K^n . By (8),

$$\xi_n^L(K^n) = \xi_n^L(K^{\oplus n}) = (\xi_1^L(K))^{\oplus n}.$$

Now $\xi_1^L(K)$ is $L \leq K^m$, so

$$\xi_n^L(K^n) = L^n \leq (K^m)^n.$$

By (7),

$$V \leq K^n \implies \xi_n^L(V) \leq \xi_n^L(K^n).$$

Thus $\xi_n^L(V) \leq \xi_n^L(K^n) = L^n$. Because ς is a directory morphism,

$$\varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(V)) \subseteq \varsigma_{mn}(L^n) = \varsigma_{mn}(L^{\oplus n}) = (\varsigma_m(L))^{\oplus n} = (M')^n.$$

This shows that $\varsigma'_n(V) \in \text{Sub}_R((M')^n)$ for each n . Next, we verify that the ς'_\bullet maps constitute a morphism of directories:

1. The map ς'_n is order-preserving: it is the composition of ς_{mn} , which is order preserving because ς_\bullet is a directory morphism, and ξ_n^L , which is order-preserving by (7).
2. The maps ς'_\bullet are compatible with \oplus : this follows from the analogous properties of ς_\bullet (it is a directory morphism) and ξ_n^L (Equation (8) above):

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma'_{\ell+n}(V \oplus W) &= \varsigma_{m\ell+mn}(\xi_{\ell+n}^L(V \oplus W)) = \varsigma_{m\ell+mn}(\xi_\ell^L(V) \oplus \xi_n^L(W)) \\ &= \varsigma_{m\ell}(\xi_\ell^L(V)) \oplus \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(W)) = \varsigma'_\ell(V) \oplus \varsigma'_n(W).\end{aligned}$$

3. The map ς'_n is compatible with the action of $GL_n(K_0)$. This one is the most complicated. Given $V \in \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$ and $\mu \in GL_n(K_0)$, note

$$\varsigma'_n(\mu \cdot V) = \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(\mu \cdot V))$$

By (9) and the fact that ς_\bullet is a directory morphism,

$$\varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(\mu \cdot V)) = \varsigma_{mn}((\mu \otimes I_m) \cdot \xi_n^L(V)) = (\mu \otimes I_m) \cdot \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(V)) \in \text{Sub}_R(M^{mn})$$

Now the subtle point is that the action of $(\mu \otimes I_m)$ on M^{mn} is the same as the action of μ on $(M^m)^n$, which restricts to the action of μ on $(M')^n$. Thus

$$\varsigma'_n(\mu \cdot V) = (\mu \otimes I_m) \cdot \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(V)) = \mu \cdot \varsigma'_n(V).$$

Thus ς'_\bullet is a valid directory morphism.

Next, we verify that ς'_\bullet is a d -inflator. First of all,

$$\ell_R(M') = \ell_R(\varsigma_m(L)) = d \cdot \dim_K(L) = d.$$

Finally, for any $V \in \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$,

$$\ell_R(\varsigma'_n(V)) = \ell_R(\varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(V))) = d \cdot \dim_K(\xi_n^L(V)) = d \cdot \dim_K(V),$$

using Equation (10) above. □

Definition 10.2. If $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M)$ is a d -inflator and $L \leq K^m$ is a one-dimensional subspace, the *mutation of ς along L* is the d -inflator $\varsigma' : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M')$ constructed as in Theorem 10.1.

10.2 Mutation and the fundamental ring

Recall the notion of “ $b \in K$ specializes to $\varphi \in \text{End}_R(M)$ ” of §5.2.

Lemma 10.3. *Let $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M)$ be a d -inflator, let $L = K \cdot (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ be a line in K^m , and let $\varsigma' : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M')$ be the mutation, where $M' = \varsigma_m(L)$.*

If $b \in K$ specializes (with respect to ς) to an endomorphism $\varphi \in \text{End}_R(M)$, then the map

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^{\oplus m} &\in \text{End}_R(M^m) \\ \varphi^{\oplus m}(x_1, \dots, x_m) &= (\varphi(x_1), \dots, \varphi(x_m))\end{aligned}$$

maps M' into M' , and therefore induces an endomorphism $\varphi' \in \text{End}_R(M')$. The element b specializes (with respect to ς') to φ' .

Proof. Let $\Theta_b = K \cdot (1, b)$. By definition of “specializes to,”

$$\varsigma_2(\Theta_b) = \{(x, \varphi(x)) : x \in M\} \leq M^2.$$

Because ς_\bullet is compatible with \oplus ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_b^{\oplus m} &= \{(x_1, bx_1, x_2, bx_2, \dots, x_m, bx_m) : \vec{x} \in K^m\} \\ \varsigma_{2m}(\Theta_b^{\oplus m}) &= \{(x_1, \varphi(x_1), x_2, \varphi(x_2), \dots, x_m, \varphi(x_m)) : \vec{x} \in M^m\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the subspace

$$V = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, bx_1, bx_2, \dots, bx_m) : \vec{x} \in K^m\} \leq K^{2m}.$$

Because ς_{2m} preserves permutations,

$$\varsigma_{2m}(V) = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, \varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2), \dots, \varphi(x_m)) : \vec{x} \in M^m\} = \{(\vec{x}, \varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x})) : \vec{x} \in M^m\}.$$

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \{(a_1x, a_2x, \dots, a_mx) : x \in K\} \\ \varsigma_m(L) &=: M'. \end{aligned}$$

By compatibility with \oplus ,

$$\begin{aligned} L \oplus L &= \{(a_1x, a_2x, \dots, a_mx, a_1y, a_2y, \dots, a_my) : x, y \in K\} \\ \varsigma_{2m}(L \oplus L) &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m) : \vec{x}, \vec{y} \in M'\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now $\varsigma_{2m}(-)$ is order-preserving, so

$$\varsigma_{2m}(V \cap (L \oplus L)) \subseteq \varsigma_{2m}(V) \cap \varsigma_{2m}(L \oplus L).$$

By the above identifications of $V, L \oplus L, \varsigma_{2m}(V)$, and $\varsigma_{2m}(L \oplus L)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V \cap (L \oplus L) &= \{(a_1x, a_2x, \dots, a_mx, a_1bx, a_2bx, \dots, a_mbx) : x \in K\} \\ \varsigma_{2m}(V) \cap \varsigma_{2m}(L \oplus L) &= \{(\vec{x}, \varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x})) : \vec{x} \in M', \varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x}) \in M'\}. \end{aligned}$$

The dimension of $V \cap (L \oplus L)$ as a K -vector space is 1. By the length-scaling law,

$$\ell_R(\varsigma_{2m}(V \cap (L \oplus L))) = d \cdot \dim_K(V \cap (L \oplus L)) = d.$$

On the other hand

$$\ell_R(\{(\vec{x}, \varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x})) : \vec{x} \in M', \varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x}) \in M'\}) \leq \ell_R(M') = d,$$

with equality only if

$$\vec{x} \in M' \implies \varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x}) \in M'.$$

Therefore, equality holds, $\varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x})$ maps M' into M' , and

$$\varsigma_{2m}(V \cap (L \oplus L)) = \varsigma_{2m}(V) \cap \varsigma_{2m}(L \oplus L) = \{(\vec{x}, \varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x})) : \vec{x} \in M'\}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_2^L(\Theta_b) &= \{(a_1\vec{x}, \dots, a_m\vec{x})^T : \vec{x} \in \Theta_b\} \\ &= \{(a_1x, a_1bx, a_2x, a_2bx, \dots, a_mx, a_mbx)^T : x \in K\} \\ &= \{(a_1x, a_2x, \dots, a_mx, a_1bx, a_2bx, \dots, a_mbx) : x \in K\} \\ &= V \cap (L \oplus L). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\varsigma_2'(\Theta_b) = \varsigma_{2m}(\xi_2^L(\Theta_B)) = \varsigma_{2m}(V \cap (L \oplus L)) = \{(\vec{x}, \varphi^{\oplus m}(\vec{x})) : \vec{x} \in M'\}.$$

So b specializes (with respect to ς') to the endomorphism of M' induced by $\varphi^{\oplus m}$. \square

Proposition 10.4 (\approx Lemma 10.20 in [10]). *Let ς be a d -inflator on K , let $L = K \cdot (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ be a line in K^m , and let ς' be the mutation of ς along L . Let R, R' be the fundamental rings of ς, ς' , and let I, I' be the fundamental ideals of ς, ς' . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} R &\subseteq R' \\ I &\subseteq I'. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. If $b \in R$, then by definition b specializes (with respect to ς) to some $\varphi \in \text{End}_R(M)$. By Lemma 10.3, b specializes (with respect to ς') to some endomorphism $\varphi' \in \text{End}_R(M')$. Thus $b \in R \implies b \in R'$. Moreover, φ' is given by the restriction to M' of $\varphi^{\oplus m} : M^m \rightarrow M^m$. Thus, if $\varphi = 0$, then $\varphi' = 0$. In other words, $b \in I \implies b \in I'$. \square

10.3 Iterated mutation

Proposition 10.5. *Suppose*

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma &: \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M) \\ \varsigma' &: \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M') \\ \varsigma'' &: \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M'') \end{aligned}$$

are three d -inflators on K . Suppose ς' is the mutation of ς along a line $L_1 \leq K^{m_1}$. Suppose ς'' is the mutation of ς' along a line $L_2 \leq K^{m_2}$. Then ς'' is isomorphic to the mutation of ς along the line $L_2 \otimes L_1 \leq K^{m_1 m_2}$.

Proof. Recall that we can think of $\xi_n^L(V)$ as $V \otimes L$. Therefore, for $V \in \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$,

$$\varsigma_n''(V) = \varsigma_{m_2 n}'(V \otimes L_2) = \varsigma_{m_1 m_2 n}(V \otimes L_2 \otimes L_1).$$

Also,

$$M'' = \varsigma_1''(K) = \varsigma_{m_1 m_2}(K \otimes L_2 \otimes L_1) = \varsigma_{m_1 m_2}(L_2 \otimes L_1),$$

so M'' is the expected submodule of $M^{m_1 m_2}$. \square

Lemma 10.6. *Let L_1, L_2 be two lines in K^m . Suppose $L_2 = \mu \cdot L_1$ for some $\mu \in GL_m(K_0)$. Let ς be a d -inflator on K , and let ς', ς'' be the mutations of ς along L_1 and L_2 , respectively. Then ς' is equivalent to ς'' .*

Proof. Let $\text{Dir}_R(M)$ be the target of ς . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma'_n(V) &= \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^{L_1}(V)) \in \text{Sub}_R((M')^n) \\ \varsigma''_n(V) &= \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^{L_2}(V)) \in \text{Sub}_R((M'')^n)\end{aligned}$$

where $M' = \varsigma_m(L_1)$ and $M'' = \varsigma_m(L_2)$. Then

$$M'' = \varsigma_m(L_2) = \varsigma_m(\mu \cdot L_1) = \mu \cdot \varsigma_m(L_1).$$

So $\mu : M' \rightarrow M''$ induces an isomorphism from M' to M'' . This in turn induces an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Dir}_R(M') &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M'') \\ \text{Sub}_R((M')^n) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_R((M'')^n) \\ V &\mapsto (I_n \otimes \mu) \cdot V.\end{aligned}$$

Now for any $V \in \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(I_n \otimes \mu) \cdot \varsigma'_n(V) &= (I_n \otimes \mu) \cdot \varsigma_{mn}(V \otimes L_1) \\ &= \varsigma_{mn}((I_n \otimes \mu) \cdot (V \otimes L_1)) \\ &= \varsigma_{mn}(V \otimes (\mu \cdot L_1)) \\ &= \varsigma_{mn}(V \otimes L_2) = \varsigma''_n(V).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\text{Dir}_K(K) & \xrightarrow{\varsigma'} & \text{Dir}_R(M') \\ & \searrow \varsigma'' & \downarrow \\ & & \text{Dir}_R(M'')\end{array}$$

and the vertical map on the right is an isomorphism. \square

Remark 10.7. If L_1 is a line in K^{m_1} and L_2 is a line in K^{m_2} , then the two lines $L_1 \otimes L_2$ and $L_2 \otimes L_1$ in $K^{m_1 m_2}$ are related by a permutation matrix, so they induce equivalent mutations. Therefore, up to equivalence, mutating along L_1 commutes with mutating along L_2 .

10.4 The limiting ring

Proposition 10.8. *Let ς be a d -inflator on K . For any m and any line $L \leq K^m$, let ς^L denote the mutation of ς along L . Let R_L and I_L denote the fundamental ring and ideal of*

ς^L . Then the following are directed unions:

$$R_\infty = \bigcup_L R_L$$

$$I_\infty = \bigcup_L I_L.$$

Therefore R_∞ is a subring of K and I_∞ is an ideal in R_∞ . Furthermore, $1 + I_\infty \subseteq R_\infty^\times$, so I_∞ is in the Jacobson radical of R_∞ .

Proof. The unions are directed by Proposition 10.4, Proposition 10.5, and Remark 10.7. The remaining properties follow by Proposition 5.7. \square

Definition 10.9. The *limiting ring* and *limiting ideal* of a d -inflator ς are the ring R_∞ and ideal I_∞ of Proposition 10.8.

Since ς is a trivial mutation of itself (along the line $K^1 \leq K^1$), one has

$$R_\infty \supseteq R$$

$$I_\infty \supseteq I$$

where R, I are the fundamental ring and ideal of ς .

Lemma 10.10. Let $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M)$ be a d -inflator on K . Let a be an element of K and q be an element of K_0 such that $a \neq q$. Let ς' be the mutation of ς along the line $K \cdot (1, a, \dots, a^{d-1})$, and let R' be the fundamental ring. If $1/(a - q) \notin R'$, then there is non-zero $\epsilon \in M$ such that

$$(\epsilon, q\epsilon, \dots, q^d\epsilon) \in \varsigma_{d+1}(\{(x, ax, a^2x, \dots, a^d x) : x \in K\}).$$

Proof. Let $M' = \varsigma_d(K \cdot (1, a, \dots, a^{d-1}))$, so that $\text{Dir}_R(M')$ is the codomain of ς' .

Let $\Theta = K \cdot (1, 1/(a - q)) = K \cdot (a - q, 1)$. By definition of R' and by Lemma 5.9,

$$1/(a - q) \notin R' \implies \varsigma'_2(\Theta) \cap (0 \oplus M) > 0 \oplus 0.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma'_2(\Theta) = \varsigma_{2d}(\{ & ((a - q)x, (a - q)ax, (a - q)a^2x, \dots, (a - q)a^{d-1}x; \\ & x, ax, \dots, a^{d-1}x) : x \in K \}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $N = \{(x, ax, a^2x, \dots, a^d x) : x \in K\}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{((a - q)x, (a - q)ax, \dots, (a - q)a^{d-1}x; x, ax, \dots, a^{d-1}x) : x \in K\} \\ = & \{(x_1 - qx_0, x_2 - qx_1, \dots, x_d - qx_{d-1}; x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) : (x_0, \dots, x_d) \in N\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the techniques of §5.1-5.2,

$$\zeta'_2(\Theta) = \{(x_1 - qx_0, x_2 - qx_1, \dots, x_d - qx_{d-1}; \\ x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) : (x_0, \dots, x_d) \in \varsigma_{d+1}(N)\}.$$

So the assumption that $\zeta'_2(\Theta) \cap (0 \oplus M)$ is non-trivial implies that there are $(x_0, \dots, x_d) \in \varsigma_{d+1}(N)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall i : x_{i+1} &= qx_i \\ \exists i : x_i &\neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Evidently, then $x_i = q^i \epsilon$ for some non-zero $\epsilon \in M$. Then

$$(\epsilon, q\epsilon, q^2\epsilon, \dots, q^d\epsilon) \in \varsigma_{d+1}(N). \quad \square$$

Lemma 10.11 (\approx Lemma 10.21 in [10]). *Let $\varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M)$ be a d -inflator on K . Let a be an element of K . Let ζ' be the mutation of ς along the line $K \cdot (1, a, a^2, \dots, a^{d-1})$. Then a is tame with respect to ζ' , i.e., $1/(a - q)$ is in the fundamental ring of ζ' for almost all $q \in K_0$.*

Proof. Choose q_0, q_1, \dots, q_d distinct elements of K_0 . If $1/(a - q_i)$ is not in the fundamental ring of ζ' for each i , then by Lemma 10.10, there exist $\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_d \in M$, all non-zero, such that for each i ,

$$(\epsilon_i, q_i\epsilon_i, q_i^2\epsilon_i, \dots, q_i^d\epsilon_i) \in \varsigma_{d+1}(K \cdot (1, a, \dots, a^d)).$$

By invertibility of Vandermonde matrices, there is a matrix $\mu \in GL_{d+1}(K_0)$ such that

$$\mu \cdot (1, q_i, \dots, q_i^d) = \vec{u}_i,$$

where \vec{u}_i is the i th standard basis vector. Then

$$\epsilon_i \vec{u}_i \in \mu \cdot \varsigma_{d+1}(K \cdot (1, a, \dots, a^d))$$

for each i . But the right side is an R -module of length $d \cdot \dim_K(K \cdot (1, a, \dots, a^d)) = d$. The elements on the left side generate an R -module

$$(R\epsilon_0) \oplus (R\epsilon_1) \oplus \dots \oplus (R\epsilon_d) \leq M^{d+1}$$

of length at least $d + 1$, a contradiction. □

Theorem 10.12 (\approx Theorem 10.25 in [10]). *If ς is a d -inflator of K , the limiting ring R_∞ is a multi-valuation ring. In fact, it is an intersection of at most d valuation rings. If the fundamental ideal of ς is non-trivial, then R_∞ is a non-trivial multi-valuation ring, i.e., R_∞ is a proper subring of K .*

Proof. Fix q_1, q_2, \dots, q_d distinct elements of K_0 . For any $a \in K$, there is a mutation ζ' , namely the mutation along $K \cdot (1, a, a^2, \dots, a^{d-1})$, such that a is tame with respect to ζ' . By Lemma 5.22, one of the elements

$$x, \frac{1}{x - q_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{x - q_d}$$

is in the fundamental ring $R_{\zeta'}$ of ζ' , and therefore in the limiting ring R_{ζ}^{∞} of ζ . By Lemma 5.24, $R^{\infty} = R_{\zeta}^{\infty}$ is a multi-valuation ring, an intersection of at most d valuation rings on K .

Now if the fundamental ideal I_{ζ} is non-trivial, then the limiting ideal I_{ζ}^{∞} is non-trivial. By Proposition 10.8, R^{∞} has a non-trivial Jacobson radical. The Jacobson radical of a field is trivial, so R^{∞} must be a non-trivial multi-valuation ring. \square

10.5 Mutation and malleability

The following fact isn't strictly necessary for the applications we have in mind,¹² but it's nice to know conceptually.

Proposition 10.13. *Let ζ be a malleable d -inflater and ζ' be a mutation. Then ζ' is malleable.*

Proof. Let ζ be a morphism from $\text{Dir}_K(K)$ to $\text{Dir}_R(M)$ and let $\zeta' : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_R(M')$ be the mutation along a line $L \leq K^m$, where $M' = \varsigma_m(L) \leq M^m$.

Let X, Z be subspaces of K^n with $X \subseteq Z$. Let Y be a submodule of $(M')^n$ such that

$$\varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(X)) = \varsigma'_n(X) \subseteq Y \subseteq \varsigma'_n(Z) = \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(Z)).$$

$$\ell_R(Y) = \ell_R(\varsigma'_n(X)) + 1 = \ell_R(\varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(X))) + 1.$$

By malleability of the map $\varsigma_{mn} : \text{Sub}_K(K^{mn}) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_R((M^m)^n)$, there is a subspace $Y' \leq K^{mn}$ such that

$$\xi_n^L(X) \leq Y' \leq \xi_n^L(Z)$$

$$Y \leq \varsigma_{mn}(Y')$$

$$\dim_K(Y') = \dim_K(\xi_n^L(X)) + 1.$$

By Lemma 10.14 below, the map $\xi_n^L(-)$ induces an isomorphism from the interval $[X, Z] \subseteq \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$ to the interval $[\xi_n^L(X), \xi_n^L(Z)] \subseteq \text{Sub}_K(K^{mn})$. Therefore $Y' = \xi_n^L(Y'')$ for a unique subspace $Y'' \leq K^n$ such that

$$X \leq Y'' \leq Z.$$

Moreover, $\xi_n^L(-)$ preserves dimensions, by Equation (10) in §10.1. Thus

$$\dim_K(Y'') = \dim_K(\xi_n^L(Y')) = \dim_K(\xi_n^L(X)) + 1 = \dim_K(X) + 1.$$

¹²Because of Proposition 8.12 above and Proposition 10.15 below.

So we have found Y'' between X and Z such that $\dim_K(Y''/X) = 1$ and

$$Y \leq \varsigma_{mn}(Y') = \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(Y'')) = \zeta'_n(Y'').$$

This is the exact configuration required by malleability. \square

Lemma 10.14. *For any n , for any line L , for any subspaces $X, Z \in \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$ with $X \leq Z$, the map $\xi_n^L(-)$ induces an isomorphism from the interval*

$$[X, Z] \subseteq \text{Sub}_K(K^n)$$

to the interval

$$[\xi_n^L(X), \xi_n^L(Z)] \subseteq \text{Sub}_K(K^{mn}).$$

Proof. Let $L = K \cdot (a_1, \dots, a_m)$. Recall that $\xi_n^L(-)$ is given by

$$\xi_n^L(V) = \{(a_1\vec{x}, \dots, a_m\vec{x})^T : \vec{x} \in V\}.$$

Choose some $\mu \in GL_m(K)$ such that $\mu \cdot (a_1, \dots, a_m) = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$. Let $\tau \in GL_{mn}(K)$ be the permutation matrix inducing the transpose operation

$$\tau \cdot (a_{1,1}, a_{1,2}, \dots, a_{1,n}, a_{2,1}, \dots, a_{m,n}) = (a_{1,1}, a_{2,1}, \dots, a_{m,1}, a_{1,2}, \dots, a_{m,n}).$$

Then $(\mu \otimes I_n) \cdot \tau$ is an invertible matrix in $GL_{mn}(K)$, inducing an automorphism of the K -vector space K^{mn} . This automorphism sends

$$(a_1\vec{x}, a_2\vec{x}, \dots, a_m\vec{x})^T \mapsto (\vec{x}, \underbrace{\vec{0}, \dots, \vec{0}}_{m-1 \text{ times}}).$$

The automorphism of K^{mn} induces an automorphism of the lattice $\text{Sub}_K(K^{mn})$. This automorphism sends

$$\xi_n^L(V) \mapsto V \oplus 0^{mn-n}.$$

Now the map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sub}_K(K^n) &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_K(K^{mn}) \\ V &\mapsto V \oplus 0^{mn-n} \end{aligned}$$

clearly has the property of mapping intervals isomorphically onto intervals. \square

10.6 Mutation and pedestals

Suppose we are in the Cube-bounded Configuration of Assumption 8.1, so

- There is a faithful exact embedding of $K \text{Vect}^f$ into an abelian category \mathcal{C} .
- In the category \mathcal{C} , the object K is cube-bounded, of reduced rank d .

Recall that a *pedestal* is a subobject $A \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(K)$ such that

$$\text{rk}_{\perp}(K/A) = \text{rk}_0(K) = d,$$

where the ranks are calculated in \mathcal{C} . By the pedestal machine (Theorem 8.5 and Proposition 8.6), any pedestal A determines a d -inflator ς :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(B/A) \\ V &\mapsto (V + A^n)/A^n \cap B^n/A^n = (V \cap B^n + A^n)/A^n, \end{aligned}$$

where B/A is the socle of K/A in the category $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$.

Proposition 10.15 (\approx Lemma 10.20 in [10]). *Let $A \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(K)$ be a pedestal, let $L = K \cdot (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ be a line in K^m . Then*

$$A' = a_1^{-1}A \cap a_2^{-1}A \cap \dots \cap a_m^{-1}A$$

is a pedestal. Moreover, if ς, ς' are the d -inflators obtained from A and A' , then ς' is the mutation of ς along the line L .

Proof. Let $\eta : K \rightarrow K^m$ be the map $x \mapsto (a_1x, a_2x, \dots, a_mx)$. Let $\xi^L : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_K(K^m)$ be pushforward along η . For each n , the map $\eta^{\oplus n} : K^n \rightarrow K^{mn}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) &\mapsto (a_1x_1, a_2x_1, \dots, a_mx_1, a_1x_2, a_2x_2, \dots, a_mx_2, a_1x_3, \dots, a_mx_n) \\ &= (a_1x_1, a_1x_2, \dots, a_1x_n, a_2x_1, \dots, a_mx_n)^T \\ &= (a_1\vec{x}, a_2\vec{x}, \dots, a_m\vec{x})^T. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\xi_n^L : \text{Sub}_K(K^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_K(K^{mn})$ agrees with our earlier notation(!)

We can also view η as a morphism in $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$, because of the faithful exact embeddings $K \text{Vect}^f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$. Let

$$\hat{\xi}^L : \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(K^m)$$

be pushforward along η in the category $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$. Let B be the $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ -subobject of K such that B/A is the socle of K/A . Also let B', A' be the pullbacks of B^m and A^m along $\eta : K \rightarrow K^m$. Thus B' is a $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ -subobject of K , and A' is a \mathcal{C} -subobject of K . In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= a_1^{-1}A \cap \dots \cap a_m^{-1}A \\ B' &= a_1^{-1}B \cap \dots \cap a_m^{-1}B, \end{aligned}$$

so A' agrees with the A' in the statement of the proposition. The map η induces a monomorphism

$$\iota : B'/A' \hookrightarrow B/A$$

in the category $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$. Let ι_* denote pushforward along this map.

There is a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) & \xrightarrow{\xi^L} & \mathrm{Dir}_K(K^m) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(K) & \xrightarrow{\xi^L} & \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(K^m) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(B'/A') & \xrightarrow{\iota_*} & \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(B^m/A^m).
\end{array} \tag{11}$$

in which the \rightarrow maps are interval retracts. The bottom square commutes by Lemma 10.16 below, and the top square commutes because the embedding $K \mathrm{Vect}^f \hookrightarrow \mathrm{ProC}$ is exact (or because η is a monomorphism).

Let $\rho : \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(B^m/A^m)$ be the composition of the maps in the diagram. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_n(V) &= \iota_{*,n}((V \cap (B')^n + (A')^n)/(A')^n) \\
\rho_n(V) &= (\xi_n^L(V) \cap B^{mn} + A^{mn})/A^{mn} = \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(V)).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $Q = \varsigma_m(L)$. Then Q is a semisimple subobject of B^m/A^m of length $d \cdot \dim_K(L) = d$. Let

$$\zeta'' : \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(Q)$$

be the mutation of ζ along L . Then

$$\zeta_n''(V) = \varsigma_{mn}(\xi_n^L(V)) = \rho_n(V).$$

So ζ'' and ρ are identical except for their codomain.

Let ζ' be the composition of the left vertical maps in (11)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(K) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(B'/A') \\
V &\mapsto (V \cap (B')^n + (A')^n)/(A')^n.
\end{aligned}$$

By the commutative diagram, $\rho = \iota_* \circ \zeta'$. Then for any $V \in \mathrm{Sub}_K(K^n)$,

$$\iota_{*,n}(\zeta_n'(V)) = \rho_n(V) = \zeta_n''(V). \tag{12}$$

Taking $n = 1$ and $V = K$,

$$\iota_*(B'/A') = \iota_*((K \cap B' + A')/A') = \iota_*(\zeta_1'(K)) = \zeta_1''(K).$$

Because $\zeta'' : \mathrm{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Dir}_{\mathrm{ProC}}(Q)$ is an inflator,

$$\iota_*(B'/A') = \zeta_1''(K) = Q.$$

Therefore the image of the monomorphism

$$\iota : B'/A' \rightarrow B/A$$

is exactly Q , and ι is an isomorphism from B'/A' to Q . Then (12) gives a commutative diagram in which the bottom map is an isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Dir}_K(K) & & \\ \zeta' \downarrow & \searrow \zeta'' & \\ \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(B'/A') & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Dir}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(Q) \end{array}$$

Therefore ζ' is a d -inflator equivalent to ζ'' . Also, B'/A' is a semisimple object of length d (because of the isomorphism to Q). Since A' is a \mathcal{C} -subobject of K , not merely a $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ -subobject, the pro-object K/A' has a socle B''/A' . Semisimplicity of B'/A' implies $B' \subseteq B''$. Then

$$d = \ell(B'/A') \leq \ell(B''/A') = \ell(\text{qsoc}(K/A')) = \text{rk}_\perp(K/A') \leq \text{rk}_0(K/A') \leq \text{rk}_0(K) = d.$$

Therefore equality holds, forcing $B' = B''$ and $\text{rk}_\perp(K/A') = d$. It follows that A' is a pedestal. Moreover, $B'/A' = \text{qsoc}(K/A')$, and so ζ' is the d -inflator associated to A' :

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta'_n(V) &= (V \cap (B')^n + (A')^n)/(A')^n = (V + (A')^n)/(A')^n \cap (B')^n/(A')^n \\ &= \text{qsoc}((V + (A')^n)/(A')^n). \end{aligned}$$

We have shown that ζ' (the inflator derived from A') is equivalent to ζ'' (the mutation along L). \square

Lemma 10.16. *Let M be an object in an abelian category \mathcal{C} . Let $A \leq B \leq M$ be subobjects. Let $f : N \hookrightarrow M$ be a monomorphism. Let $A' = f^{-1}(A)$ and $B' = f^{-1}(B)$. Let $f' : A'/B' \rightarrow A/B$ be the monomorphism induced by f . Then the diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(N) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(M) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B'/A') & \xrightarrow{f'_*} & \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B/A) \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are interval retracts and the horizontal maps are pushforwards.

Proof. Without loss of generality $N \subseteq M$, so $A' = A \cap N$ and $B' = B \cap N$. Consider the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(N) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(M) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B') & \xrightarrow{f'_*} & \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B) \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are interval retracts onto $[0, B'] \subseteq \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$ and $[0, B] \subseteq \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(M)$, and the bottom map is induced by the inclusion $B' = B \cap N \hookrightarrow B$. Then the square commutes, because the upper right path sends $X \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(N^n)$ like so:

$$X \mapsto X \mapsto X \cap B^n;$$

the bottom left path sends X like so:

$$X \mapsto X \cap (B')^n \mapsto X \cap (B')^n;$$

and $X \cap (B')^n = X \cap B^n \cap N^n = X \cap B^n$ for $X \subseteq N^n$.

Also, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B') & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B'/A') & \xrightarrow{f'_*} & \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B/A) \end{array}$$

commutes, because the maps are the pushforwards along the following commuting diagram in \mathcal{C} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B \cap N & \longrightarrow & B \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (B \cap N)/(A \cap N) & \longrightarrow & B/A. \end{array}$$

Glueing the two squares together gives the desired commuting square of directories. \square

11 Application to fields of finite burden

Theorem 11.1 (= Theorem 10.28 in [10]). *Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated unstable dp-finite field. Then \mathbb{K} admits a non-trivial $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{K}/S)$ -invariant valuation ring, for some small subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{K}$.*

Proof. Fix a magic subfield $K_0 \preceq \mathbb{K}$. Let $\Lambda = \Lambda_1$ be the lattice of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K} . By Proposition 10.4.1 in [10], we can find a non-zero pedestal $A \in \Lambda$.¹³ Let K be a small model containing K_0 and type-defining A . Let ς be the d -inflator derived from A . Let R, I be the fundamental ring and ideal of ς . By Theorem 9.3,

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \{b \in \mathbb{K} : b \cdot A \subseteq A\} \\ I &= \{b \in R : \text{rk}_0(A/b \cdot A) = d\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 10.15.5 in [10], $I \neq 0$; in fact I contains the K -infinitesimals I_K . Let R_∞ be the limiting ring of ς . By Theorem 10.12, R_∞ is a non-trivial multi-valuation ring. The ring

¹³The point is that (1) pedestals certainly exist, (2) $\text{rk}_\perp(\Lambda) = 1$ because the groups of infinitesimals I_K are co-initial among nonzero elements of Λ , (3) therefore 0 cannot be a pedestal unless $\text{rk}_0(\Lambda) = 1$, (4) if $\text{rk}_0(\Lambda) = 1$, then Λ is totally ordered and every group is a pedestal.

R_∞ is $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{K}/K)$ -invariant by construction. The ring R_∞ can be written as an intersection of incomparable valuation rings in a unique way, by Corollary 6.7 in [8]:

$$R_\infty = \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{O}_n.$$

Non-triviality of R_∞ implies non-triviality of the \mathcal{O}_i . The group $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{K}/K)$ might permute the \mathcal{O}_i , but there is a finite set S_0 such that $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{K}/S_0K)$ fixes each \mathcal{O}_i . Then each \mathcal{O}_i is a non-trivial $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{K}/S)$ -invariant valuation ring, for $S = S_0 \cup K$. \square

For general fields of finite burden, we can prove some weaker statements:

Theorem 11.2. *Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated field of finite burden. Let K_0 be a small infinite subfield. Let Λ be the lattice of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K} , and let Λ^{00} be the quotient modulo 00-commensurability. Suppose there is some $G \in \Lambda$ and non-zero $\epsilon \in \mathbb{K}$ such that in the lattice Λ^{00} ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \cdot G &\leq G \\ \text{rk}_0(G/\epsilon \cdot G) &= \text{rk}_0(\Lambda^{00}). \end{aligned}$$

Then \mathbb{K} admits a non-trivial $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{K}/S)$ -invariant valuation ring for some small set $S \subseteq \mathbb{K}$.

Proof. Let $d = \text{rk}_0(\Lambda^{00})$. Take a strict d -cube in the interval $[\epsilon \cdot G, G] \subseteq \Lambda^{00}$. Let $H \in \Lambda$ represent the base of the cube. Then H is a pedestal in Λ^{00} . Moreover,

$$\epsilon \cdot G \leq H \leq G,$$

and so

$$\epsilon \cdot H \leq \epsilon \cdot G \leq H \leq G \leq \epsilon^{-1} \cdot H.$$

By choice of H , there is a strict d -cube in the interval $[H, G] \subseteq [H, \epsilon^{-1} \cdot H]$. There is an isomorphism of intervals

$$[H, \epsilon^{-1} \cdot H] \cong [\epsilon \cdot H, H].$$

Therefore $\text{rk}_0(H/\epsilon \cdot H) = d = \text{rk}_0(\Lambda^{00})$.

Replacing G with H , we may assume that G is a pedestal. Let ς be the associated d -inflator. Let R, I be the fundamental ring and ideal, and R_∞, I_∞ be the limiting ring and ideal. By Theorem 9.7

$$\text{rk}_0(H/\epsilon \cdot H) = \text{rk}_0(\Lambda^{00}) \implies \epsilon \in I,$$

so I is non-trivial. By Theorem 10.12, R_∞ is a non-trivial multi-valuation ring. Proceed as in the proof of Theorem 11.1. \square

Theorem 11.3. *Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated field of finite burden. Let K_0 be a small infinite subfield. Let Δ be the lattice of definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K} . Let G be an element of Δ . Suppose that $\epsilon \cdot G \subseteq G$ for some non-zero $\epsilon \in \mathbb{K}$, and moreover*

$$\text{rk}_0(G/\epsilon \cdot G) = \text{rk}_0(\Delta)$$

in the lattice Δ . Then \mathbb{K} admits a non-trivial $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{K}/S)$ -invariant valuation ring for some small set $S \subseteq \mathbb{K}$.

Proof. Similar to Theorem 11.2. □

Remark 11.4. In Theorem 11.3, it may be possible to show that the invariant valuation rings are, in fact *definable*.

We are also interested in the question of whether mutation terminates in finitely many steps. Recall from ([8], Theorem 8.11) that a dp-finite field \mathbb{K} has *valuation type* if it satisfies the following equivalent conditions:

- The canonical topology on \mathbb{K} is a V-topology.
- For any small $K \preceq \mathbb{K}$, the K -infinitesimals I_K are the maximal ideal of a valuation ring \mathcal{O}_K on \mathbb{K} .
- For some small $K \preceq \mathbb{K}$, the K -infinitesimals I_K contain a non-zero ideal of a multi-valuation ring on \mathbb{K} .
- Some “bounded” group $J \subseteq (\mathbb{K}, +)$ contains a non-zero ideal of a multi-valuation ring on \mathbb{K} .

In [8], we showed how to complete the classification of dp-finite fields assuming the (unlikely) conjecture that unstable dp-finite fields have valuation type.

Lemma 11.5 (Pedestal criterion). *Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated dp-finite field. Let K_0 be a magic subfield. Let A be a K_0 -pedestal.*

1. *If A contains a non-zero multi-valuation ideal, then \mathbb{K} has valuation type.*
2. *If $\text{Stab}(A) := \{x \in \mathbb{K} : x \cdot A \subseteq A\}$ contains a non-zero multi-valuation ideal, then \mathbb{K} has valuation type.*

Proof. The first point holds because K_0 -pedestals are bounded (Remark 8.6 in [8]). For the second point, suppose R is a multi-valuation ring on K , M is a non-zero R -submodule of K , and $\text{Stab}(A) \supseteq M$. There are two cases. If $A \neq 0$, take a non-zero $a_0 \in A$. Then

$$M \cdot a_0 \subseteq \text{Stab}(A) \cdot A \subseteq A,$$

so A contains the non-zero R -submodule $M \cdot a_0$. Therefore \mathbb{K} has valuation type by the first point.

Otherwise, $A = 0$. Let Λ be the lattice of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K} , and let $d = \text{rk}_0(\Lambda)$. By definition of pedestal, $d = \text{rk}_\perp([A, \mathbb{K}])$. But $A = 0$, so the interval $[A, \mathbb{K}]$ is all of Λ . Then $d = \text{rk}_\perp(\Lambda)$. By Proposition 10.1.6 in [10], $\text{rk}_\perp(\Lambda) = 1$. Thus $d = 1$ and Λ is totally ordered. Therefore every element of Λ is a pedestal other than \mathbb{K} . In particular, I_{K_0} is a pedestal. If ζ is the 1-inflator derived from I_{K_0} , then $\text{Stab}(I_{K_0}) = R_\zeta$ and R_ζ is a valuation ring, by Theorem 9.3 and Proposition 5.19. Therefore $\text{Stab}(I_{K_0})$ contains a non-zero multi-valuation ideal. Replacing A with I_{K_0} , we reduce to the $A \neq 0$ case. □

Theorem 11.6. *Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated dp-finite field. Let K_0 be a magic subfield. At least one of the following holds:*

1. \mathbb{K} is stable.
2. \mathbb{K} has valuation type.
3. There is a K_0 -pedestal A such that the associated inflator ς has the following properties:
 - ς is malleable
 - ς is not weakly multi-valuation type (Definition 5.27).
 - Every mutation of ς is malleable
 - No mutation of ς is weakly multi-valuation type.

Moreover, all K_0 -pedestals A have this property.

Proof. Suppose \mathbb{K} is unstable and not of valuation type. Let d be the reduced rank of the lattice Λ of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K} . If A is a pedestal and ς is the associated d -inflator, then

$$\text{Stab}(A) = R_\varsigma.$$

By the Pedestal Criterion (Lemma 11.5), it follows that R_ς is *not* weakly multi-valuation type. Meanwhile, ς is malleable by Theorem 9.3.

If ς' is any mutation of ς , then ς' comes from a pedestal A' , by Proposition 10.15. Therefore ς' continues to be malleable and continues to fail to be weakly multi-valuation type. \square

Definition 11.7. An inflator ς on a field K is *wicked* if ς is malleable and no mutation of ς is weakly multi-valuation type.

By Propositions 10.5 and 10.13, any mutation of a wicked inflator is wicked. Theorem 11.6 arguably reduces the analysis of dp-finite fields to the algebraic analysis of wicked inflators. In a subsequent paper, we will demonstrate this idea by analyzing wicked 2-inflators on fields of characteristic 0. While we do not obtain a proof of the Shelah or henselianity conjectures for fields of rank 2, we do prove the following useful facts:

Theorem 11.8 (to appear in [9]). *Let \mathbb{K} be a saturated unstable dp-finite field of characteristic 0.*

- *The canonical topology on \mathbb{K} is definable.*
- *There is a unique definable V -topology on \mathbb{K} .*

If the second point could be generalized to higher ranks, the Shelah and henselianity conjectures for dp-finite fields would follow.

12 Mutation examples

12.1 \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C}

Consider the 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma : \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \\ V &\mapsto (V + \overline{V}, V \cap \overline{V}). \end{aligned}$$

of Example 4.10. In Example 5.17, we saw that the fundamental ring and ideal are $R = \mathbb{R}$ and $I = 0$. Note that \mathbb{R} is *not* a multi-valuation ring on \mathbb{C} , by Proposition 6.2.3 in [8].

Let ς' be the mutation along $\mathbb{C} \cdot (1, i)$. Then for any subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, we have

$$\varsigma'(V) = \varsigma(\{(\vec{x}, i\vec{x})^T : \vec{x} \in V\}).$$

The first component of $\varsigma'(V)$ is

$$W_1 := \{(\vec{x}, i\vec{x})^T : \vec{x} \in V\} + \{(\vec{y}, -i\vec{y})^T : \vec{y} \in \overline{V}\}$$

Thus $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})^T \in W_1$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{x} &= \frac{1}{2}(\vec{a} - i\vec{b}) \in V \\ \vec{y} &= \frac{1}{2}(\vec{a} + i\vec{b}) \in \overline{V}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, these are equivalent, and so the first component is essentially the image of V under the forgetful functor $\text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{C})$. On the other hand, the second component of $\varsigma'(V)$ is

$$W_2 := \{(\vec{x}, i\vec{x})^T : \vec{x} \in V\} \cap \{(\vec{y}, -i\vec{y})^T : \vec{y} \in \overline{V}\}$$

This vanishes, since $\vec{x} = \vec{y}$ and $i\vec{x} = -i\vec{y}$ together imply $\vec{x} = \vec{y} = 0$.

So ς' is equivalent to the forgetful 2-inflator

$$\text{Dir}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{C}).$$

The new fundamental ring and ideal are \mathbb{C} and 0.

12.2 Another corrupted example

Let K be a field with two independent valuations, both of which have residue field k , as in Examples 4.11, 5.18. Let ς be the 2-inflator

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma : \text{Dir}_K(K) &\rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k) \times \text{Dir}_k(k) \\ \varsigma(V) &= (\varsigma^1(V) + \varsigma^2(V), \varsigma^1(V) \cap \varsigma^2(V)) \end{aligned}$$

be the 2-inflator of Example 4.11, where ζ^i is the 1-inflator from the i th valuation.

In Example 5.18, we saw that the fundamental ring and ideal are exactly

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \{x \in \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 : \text{res}_1(a) = \text{res}_2(a)\} \\ I &= \{x \in \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 : \text{res}_1(a) = \text{res}_2(a) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The ring R is *not* a multi-valuation ring on K . Indeed, if we choose $a \in K$ such that $\text{res}_1(a) = 1$ and $\text{res}_2(a) = 2$, then one can check directly that none of the elements $a, 1/(a-q)$ are in R , for any $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. So the criterion of Lemma 5.24 fails to hold.

Fix such an a and mutate along the line $\Theta_a = K \cdot (1, a) \subseteq K^2$. This yields a new mutation $\zeta' : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(B_1) \times \text{Dir}_k(B_2)$, where

$$(B_1, B_2) = \zeta(\Theta_a) = (k^2, 0).$$

Thus $B_2 = 0$, and what we really have is a map

$$\zeta' : \text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k^2).$$

The map is given by

$$V \mapsto \zeta(V \otimes \Theta_a) = \zeta^1(V \otimes \Theta_a) + \zeta^2(V \otimes \Theta_a).$$

since the second component of $\zeta(V \otimes \Theta_a)$ vanishes. Now for $j = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta^j(V \otimes \Theta_a) &= \zeta^j(\{(x_1, ax_1, x_2, ax_2, \dots, x_n, ax_n) : (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in V\}) \\ &= \{(y_1, jy_1, y_2, jy_2, \dots, y_n, jy_n) : (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \zeta^j(V)\} \end{aligned}$$

since a specializes to j under ζ^j . Thus,

$$\zeta'(V) = \{(y_1 + z_1, y_1 + 2z_1, y_2 + z_2, y_2 + 2z_2, \dots, y_n + z_n, y_n + 2z_n) : \vec{y} \in \zeta^1(V), \vec{z} \in \zeta^2(V)\}.$$

After changing coordinates on k^2 , this is just

$$V \mapsto \{(y_1, z_1, y_2, z_2, \dots, y_n, z_n) : \vec{y} \in \zeta^1(V), \vec{z} \in \zeta^2(V)\}.$$

This is the composition

$$\text{Dir}_K(K) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k) \times \text{Dir}_k(k) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_k(k^2)$$

where the first map is the product of ζ^1 and ζ^2 , and the second map is the map

$$(V, W) \mapsto V \oplus W$$

from Remark 2.16.

In particular, the fundamental ring and ideal are $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2$ and $\mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \mathfrak{m}_2$. So again we see that mutation has more or less undone the corrupting influence of the map

$$(V, W) \rightarrow (V + W, V \cap W).$$

12.3 Endless mutation

We give an example (promised in [10], Speculative Remark 10.10.5) of an inflator which fails to have multi-valuation type after any finite amount of mutation.

Let Γ be the ordered abelian group $\mathbb{Z}[1/3]$ (the ring generated by $1/3$, with the order coming from the embedding into \mathbb{Q} or \mathbb{R}). Note that $(\Gamma, \leq, +)$ is dp-minimal, and $\Gamma/2\Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

Let K be the Hahn field $\mathbb{C}((t^\Gamma))$. It is dp-minimal as a pure field (by Theorem 1.1 in [7]). Moreover, the valuation is definable from the pure field structure.¹⁴

Let F be the subfield $\mathbb{C}((t^{2\Gamma}))$ inside K . Then $[K : F] = 2$, and F is also dp-minimal. The expansion of K by a predicate for F has dp-rank 2, because of the bi-interpretation with the pure field F .

The set $\{1, t\}$ is an F -linear basis of K . So K is an internal direct sum of F and $F \cdot t$. Let $g, h : K \rightarrow K$ be the projections onto F and $F \cdot t$. Then for any Hahn series $x \in K$,

- $g(x)$ is the “even component” of x —the terms with even exponents
- $h(x)$ is the “odd component” of x —the terms with odd exponents.

The functions g and h are definable in the rank-2 structure (K, F) . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} g(xy) &= g(x)g(y) + h(x)h(y) \\ h(xy) &= g(x)h(y) + h(x)g(y) \\ \text{val}(x) &= \min(\text{val}(g(x)), \text{val}(h(x))). \end{aligned}$$

Let $K_0 = \mathbb{Q}$. Let R be the following definable \mathbb{Q} -linear subspace of K :

$$R = \{x \in K : \text{val}(g(x)) \geq 0, \text{val}(h(x)) \geq 2\}.$$

Then R is a pedestal in the definable picture Δ_\bullet , because it is the intersection of the following two incomparable elements of Δ_1 :

$$\{x \in K : \text{val}(g(x)) \geq 0\} \cap \{x \in K : \text{val}(h(x)) \geq 2\}.$$

Claim 12.1. R is a unital ring, and

$$R = \text{Stab}(R) = \{x \in K : x \cdot R \subseteq R\}.$$

Proof. If $x, y \in R$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}(g(xy)) &= \text{val}(g(x)g(y) + h(x)h(y)) \\ &\geq \min(\text{val}(g(x)) + \text{val}(g(y)), \text{val}(h(x)) + \text{val}(h(y))) \\ &\geq \min(0 + 0, 2 + 2) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

¹⁴If $x \in K$ then \sqrt{x} exists if and only if $\text{val}(x) \in 2\Gamma$. (This can be seen using henselianity and the fact that the residue field \mathbb{C} is algebraically closed.) For any non-square $a \in K$, let B_a be the definable set of $x \in K$ such that $\sqrt{1 + x^2/a}$ exists. Then $B_a = \{x \in K : \text{val}(x) > \text{val}(a)/2\}$. The “stabilizer” $\{y \in K : y \cdot B_a \subseteq B_a\}$ is exactly the valuation ring, independent of the choice of a .

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}(h(xy)) &= \text{val}(g(x)h(y) + h(x)g(y)) \\ &\geq \min(\text{val}(g(x)) + \text{val}(h(y)), \text{val}(h(x)) + \text{val}(g(y))) \\ &\geq \min(0 + 2, 2 + 0) = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $x, y \in R$, proving that R is a ring. Also $1 \in R$ because $\text{val}(g(1)) = 0 \geq 0$ and $\text{val}(h(1)) = +\infty > 2$. So R is a unital ring. Then $R \subseteq \text{Stab}(R)$. On the other hand, if $a \in \text{Stab}(R)$ then $1 \in R \implies a \cdot 1 \in R$, so $\text{Stab}(R) \subseteq R$. \square

Let ς be the inflator associated to R by the pedestal machine (Theorem 8.5), using the definable picture $K \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, rather than the usual type-definable picture $K \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 8.10 and Claim 12.1, the fundamental ring is R .

Lemma 12.2. *The integral closure of R is the valuation ring $\mathcal{O} := \{x \in K : \text{val}(x) \geq 0\}$.*

Proof. We first observe that $\text{Frac}(R) = K$, so there is no ambiguity in the integral closure. Indeed, given any element $x \in K^\times$, choose $y \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $\text{val}(y) > 2$ and $\text{val}(yx) > 2$. Then y and yx are both in R , because of the general identity

$$\text{val}(z) = \min(\text{val}(g(z)), \text{val}(h(z))). \quad (13)$$

Thus $x \in \text{Frac}(R)$.

Let R' be the integral closure of R . As \mathcal{O} is integrally closed and contains R , we must have $\mathcal{O} \supseteq R'$. Conversely, suppose $x \in \mathcal{O}$. We claim $x \in R'$. By the identity (13), both $g(x)$ and $h(x)$ are in \mathcal{O} . Now $g(x) \in F$ and h vanishes on F , so $h(g(x)) = 0$. Then

$$g(x) \in \mathcal{O} \implies g(x) \in R \implies g(x) \in R'.$$

On the other hand, $h(x)^2$ is also in F , so $h(h(x)^2) = 0$ and similarly

$$h(x) \in \mathcal{O} \implies h(x)^2 \in \mathcal{O} \implies h(x)^2 \in R \implies h(x) \in R'.$$

Then the fact that both $g(x)$ and $h(x)$ are in R' implies that their sum $g(x) + h(x) = x$ is in R' . This shows $\mathcal{O} \subseteq R'$, so $\mathcal{O} = R'$. \square

Proposition 12.3. *If L is any line in K^m , then the mutation of ς along L fails to be of multi-valuation type.*

Proof. Without loss of generality $L = K \cdot (1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_m)$, where the a_i are in \mathcal{O} . Let ς' be the mutation of ς along L , and let R' be the fundamental ring. We will show that R' is not a multi-valuation ring. By Proposition 10.4, $R' \supseteq R$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that R' is a multi-valuation ring. Then R' is integrally closed, hence contains the valuation ring \mathcal{O} , by Lemma 12.2.

By Proposition 10.15, ς' is the 2-inflator obtained from the pedestal

$$A' = R \cap a_2^{-1}R \cap \dots \cap a_m^{-1}R.$$

By Proposition 8.10,

$$R' = \{x \in K : xA' \subseteq A'\}.$$

By the assumption that R' is integrally closed, it follows that $R' \supseteq \mathcal{O}$ and so

$$\mathcal{O} \cdot A' \subseteq A' \tag{14}$$

Note that $x \in K$ belongs to A' if and only if all of the following are true:

1. $\text{val}(g(x)) \geq 0$
2. $\text{val}(h(x)) \geq 2$
3. For every $2 \leq i \leq m$,

$$\text{val}(g(a_i x)) \equiv \text{val}(g(a_i)g(x) + h(a_i)h(x)) \stackrel{?}{\geq} 0$$

4. For every $2 \leq i \leq m$,

$$\text{val}(h(a_i x)) \equiv \text{val}(g(a_i)h(x) + h(a_i)g(x)) \stackrel{?}{\geq} 2.$$

We may drop (3) since it follows from the others—recall that the a_i are in \mathcal{O} , so $\text{val}(g(a_i)) \geq 0$ and $\text{val}(h(a_i)) \geq 0$. Assuming (2), the term $g(a_i)h(x)$ in (4) always has valuation at least 2, hence is irrelevant. So we see that $x \in A'$ if and only if the following conditions hold

1. $\text{val}(g(x)) \geq 0$
2. $\text{val}(h(x)) \geq 2$.
3. For every $2 \leq i \leq m$,

$$\text{val}(h(a_i)g(x)) \geq 2.$$

Thus

$$A' = \{x \in K : \text{val}(g(x)) \geq \gamma \text{ and } \text{val}(h(x)) \geq 2\},$$

where γ is the maximum of the set

$$\{0\} \cup \{2 - \text{val}(h(a_i)) : 2 \leq i \leq m\}.$$

Note that $\text{val}(h(a_i)) > 0$, because $a_i \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\text{val}(h(a_i))$ is odd. Thus $\gamma < 2$.

Because the value group Γ is dense, we may find $x \in F$ and $y \in tF$ such that

$$\gamma < \text{val}(x) < \text{val}(y) < 2.$$

Then $x \in A'$, $y \notin A'$ and $y/x \in \mathcal{O}$, contradicting (14). □

Proposition 12.3 says that no amount of mutation will convert ς into a 2-inflator of multi-valuation type.

On the other hand, ς is *already* of weak multi-valuation type, because for $x \in K$,

$$\text{val}(x) > 2 \iff \min(\text{val}(g(x)), \text{val}(h(x))) > 2 \implies x \in R,$$

and so R contains a valuation ideal.

Remark 12.4. I believe the 2-inflator of Example 4.12 also has “endless mutation,” in the sense that no mutation is of multi-valuation type. The problem is that any line L in K^m only involves finitely many \sqrt{p} , and therefore fails to undo the twisting by τ_i for $|i| \gg 0$. Unlike the example of this section, Example 4.12 fails to be malleable.

Part IV

Appendices

A Review of abelian categories

For a textbook account of abelian categories, see Chapter 8 of [12].


A *pre-additive category* is a category with the extra structure of an abelian group on each hom-set $\text{Hom}(A, B)$, such that for any objects A, B, C the composition operation

$$\text{Hom}(A, B) \times \text{Hom}(B, C) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(A, C)$$


is bilinear. If K is a field, a K -linear pre-additive category is defined the same way, using K -vector spaces rather than abelian groups. Note that a K -linear pre-additive category is a pre-additive category with extra structure, and a pre-additive category is a category with extra structure.

Let \mathcal{C} be a pre-additive category. If A, B are two objects in \mathcal{C} , there is a correspondence between the following three types of data:


1. Product diagrams



2. Co-product diagrams



3. Diagrams of the form



such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi_A \circ \iota_A &= id_A \\
 \pi_A \circ \iota_B &= 0 \in \text{Hom}(B, A) \\
 \pi_B \circ \iota_A &= 0 \in \text{Hom}(A, B) \\
 \pi_B \circ \iota_B &= id_B.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus binary products are equivalent to binary coproducts. The configurations of (3) are sometimes called “biproducts.”

More generally, n -ary products are equivalent to n -ary coproducts for any finite $n \geq 0$. A pre-additive category \mathcal{C} is *additive* if all finite products/coproducts exist. The existence of 0-ary and 2-ary products/coproducts is sufficient.¹⁵

If \mathcal{C} is an additive category, the pre-additive category structure is determined by the underlying pure category structure ([12], Theorem 8.2.14). The analogue for K -linear additive categories fails.

If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a map in a pre-additive category, a *kernel* of f is an equalizer of f and the zero morphism $0 \in \text{Hom}(A, B)$. Cokernels are defined similarly. An equalizer of two parallel maps $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to a kernel of $f - g$. Thus, a pre-additive category has all equalizers if and only if it has all kernels. The same holds for coequalizers and cokernels.

A pre-additive category \mathcal{C} is *pre-abelian* if it has all finite limits. Equivalently, \mathcal{C} is preabelian if \mathcal{C} is additive and has all kernels and cokernels.

If \mathcal{C} is pre-abelian, one defines the *image* of any morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ to be the kernel of the cokernel of f . The *coimage* is defined dually as the cokernel of the kernel. There is a natural factorization of f into

$$A \rightarrow \text{coim}(f) \rightarrow \text{im}(f) \rightarrow B.$$

One says that \mathcal{C} is *abelian* if the natural map $\text{coim}(f) \rightarrow \text{im}(f)$ is an isomorphism for every f .

For \mathcal{C} pre-abelian, it turns out that \mathcal{C} is abelian if and only if every monomorphism is a kernel and every epimorphism is a cokernel.

The standard example of an abelian category is the category $R\text{Mod}$ of (left) R -modules for any ring R , possibly noncommutative. For $R = \mathbb{Z}$, this is the category Ab of abelian groups. For $R = K$, this is the category $K\text{Vect}$ of K -vector spaces.

¹⁵For $n = 0$, a nullary product is a terminal object, and a nullary coproduct is an initial object.

The category of free \mathbb{Z} -modules of finite rank is an example of a pre-abelian category that fails to be abelian. Kernels exist because submodules of free \mathbb{Z} -modules are free. Cokernels exist because the category is self-dual. On the other hand, the coimage/image factorization of the inclusion $2\mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ turns out to be

$$2\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{=} 2\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\neq} \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{=} \mathbb{Z}.$$

A.1 Additive and exact functors

If \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} are two pre-additive categories, a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is *additive* if the induced map on Hom-sets

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(F(A), F(B))$$

is a group homomorphism. If \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} are K -linear pre-additive categories, one can analogously say that F is a K -linear functor if the map on Hom-sets is K -linear.

If $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is an additive functor between *additive* categories, then F preserves finite products/coproducts. The analogue for K -linear functors holds a fortiori. Conversely, if $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a product-preserving functor between two additive categories, then F is additive. The analogue for K -linear functors fails, since being K -linear is a strictly stronger condition than being \mathbb{Z} -linear.

Let $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be an additive functor between abelian categories. One says that F is *left exact* if it satisfies the following equivalent conditions:

- F preserves kernels
- F preserves finite limits

Dually, one says that F is *right exact* if it satisfies the following equivalent conditions:

- F preserves cokernels
- F preserves finite colimits

Finally, one says that F is *exact* if it satisfies the following equivalent conditions:

- F is left exact and right exact
- F preserves exact sequences
- F preserves short exact sequences.

If \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} are general categories, a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is said to be

- *faithful* if for any $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, the map

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(F(A), F(B)) \tag{15}$$

is injective.

- *fully faithful* if for any $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, the map (15) is bijective.
- *conservative* if for any $f : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} , f is an isomorphism if and only if $F(f)$ is an isomorphism.

If \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} are abelian categories, and F is an exact functor, then the following are equivalent, by ([12], Exercise 8.25).

- F is faithful.
- For every $A \in \mathcal{C}$, $A = 0$ if and only if $F(A) = 0$.
- F is conservative.

Remark A.1. Let $K \text{Vect}^f$ be the category of finite-dimensional K -vector spaces. If $F : K \text{Vect}^f \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is an additive functor, then

1. F is automatically exact, because every short exact sequence in $K \text{Vect}^f$ splits.
2. If $F(K) = 0$, then $F(X) = 0$ for all $X \in K \text{Vect}^f$, because $X \cong K^{\dim(X)}$.
3. If $F(K) \neq 0$, then F is conservative and faithful.

Fact A.2 (Mitchell embedding theorem). *Every K -linear abelian category admits a fully faithful exact K -linear functor to a category $R \text{Mod}$ of R -modules, for some K -algebra R .*

See Theorem 9.6.10 in [12] for a proof.

A.2 Subobjects

If A is an object in an arbitrary category \mathcal{C} , a “subobject” of A is an equivalence class of monomorphisms $X \hookrightarrow A$. There is a partial order on subobjects, induced by the “factors-through” preorder on monomorphisms. In the concrete setting of $R \text{Mod}$, subobjects correspond exactly to R -submodules.

In an abelian category, the subobject poset $\text{Sub}(A)$ is always a bounded modular lattice, with the bounded lattice operations given as follows:

- The intersection of $X \hookrightarrow A$ and $Y \hookrightarrow A$ is the pullback $X \times_A Y \hookrightarrow A$.
- The join of $X \hookrightarrow A$ and $Y \hookrightarrow A$ is the image of $X \oplus Y \rightarrow A$.
- The bottom element is the zero monomorphism $0 \hookrightarrow A$.
- The top element is the identity $id_A : A \rightarrow A$.

The fact that these operations satisfy the axioms of bounded modular lattices can be checked using the Mitchell embedding theorem to reduce to the case of $R\text{Mod}$.

Because the subobject lattice $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is modular, it makes sense to talk about the length of A , and to talk about A having “finite-length.”

Also, if $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow R\text{Mod}$ is a Mitchell embedding, or even a faithful exact functor, then there is an embedding of bounded lattices

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \hookrightarrow \text{Sub}_R(F(A)) \tag{16}$$

for any $A \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus, one can view a subobject of A as an R -submodule of $F(A)$. In general, the map (16) is not surjective, so not all R -submodules of $F(A)$ correspond to subobjects of A .¹⁶

A.3 Serre quotients

Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category. A *Serre subcategory* is a full subcategory $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ containing 0, such that for any short exact sequence,

$$0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$$

in \mathcal{C} , the following holds:

$$Y \in \mathcal{S} \iff (X \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } Z \in \mathcal{S}).$$

This implies:

- If $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, then $X \oplus Y \in \mathcal{S}$
- If X is a subobject or quotient object of Y , then $Y \in \mathcal{S} \implies X \in \mathcal{S}$.
- If $X \cong Y$, then $X \in \mathcal{S} \iff Y \in \mathcal{S}$.

If \mathcal{S} is a Serre subcategory, let $W_{\mathcal{S}}$ be the set of morphisms $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{C} such that the kernel and cokernel are both in \mathcal{S} . The class $W_{\mathcal{S}}$ has a calculus of left fractions and right fractions ([12], Exercise 8.12). The *Serre quotient* is the localization

$$\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{C}[W_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1}].$$

See §7.1 of [12] for information on localization. (There, a calculus of fractions is called a multiplicative system.)

¹⁶If the map were always surjective, it would always be an isomorphism of lattices. This would force $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ to be a complete lattice. However, this cannot hold in general, essentially because the class of abelian categories is an elementary class, and the class of complete lattices is not. For example, in the category of finite abelian groups, for each n we can find an object A_n (namely $\mathbb{Z}/2^{n-1}\mathbb{Z}$) whose subobject lattice is the totally ordered set of size n . In an elementary extension, we can find an object A for which $\text{Sub}(A)$ is a pseudo-finite total order. Pseudo-finite total orders are *never* complete lattices.

By Exercises 8.11-8.12 in [12], the Serre quotient \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} is itself an abelian category, and the localization functor

$$\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S}$$

is exact. If $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$, then the morphisms $X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} can be represented by diagrams

$$X \longleftarrow X' \longrightarrow Y$$

where $X' \rightarrow X$ is in $W_{\mathcal{S}}$, or alternatively by diagrams

$$X \longrightarrow Y' \longleftarrow Y,$$

where $Y \rightarrow Y'$ is in $W_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Lemma A.3. *If A is an object in \mathcal{C} , then $A \cong 0$ holds in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} if and only if $A \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. The following statements are equivalent:

1. $A \cong 0$ in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S}
2. There is an object $B \in \mathcal{C}$ such that the zero morphism $0_{A,B} : A \rightarrow B$ is in $W_{\mathcal{S}}$.
3. There is an object $B \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $A, B \in \mathcal{S}$.
4. $A \in \mathcal{S}$.

The equivalence (1) \iff (2) holds by the calculus of fractions; see Exercise 7.3 in [12]. The equivalence (2) \iff (3) is by definition of $W_{\mathcal{S}}$. The equivalence (3) \iff (4) is trivial. \square

Lemma A.4. *Let A, B be objects of \mathcal{C} and $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a morphism in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} .*

1. *There is an isomorphism $B \cong B'$ in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} such that $A \rightarrow B'$ lifts to a morphism in \mathcal{C} .*
2. *If f is a monomorphism in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} , there is an isomorphism $A' \cong A$ in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} such that $A' \rightarrow B$ lifts to a monomorphism in \mathcal{C} .*

The dual statements hold as well.

Proof. The first point holds by the calculus of fractions. Now suppose f is a monomorphism. Then f is the kernel of some morphism $g : B \rightarrow C$ in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} , because the Serre quotient \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} is an abelian category. By the first point, we can change the object C by an isomorphism and arrange g to lift to a morphism \tilde{g} in the category \mathcal{C} . Take an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A' \rightarrow B \xrightarrow{\tilde{g}} C$$

in the category \mathcal{C} . By exactness of the localization functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S}$, this induces an exact sequence in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} . In the category \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} , the two monomorphisms $A \rightarrow B$ and $A' \rightarrow B$ are both kernels of $g : B \rightarrow C$, so they must be isomorphic to each other. \square

Proposition A.5. *Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category, \mathcal{S} be a Serre subcategory, and A be an object in \mathcal{C} . The exact localization functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S}$ induces a lattice homomorphism*

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S}}(A).$$

This lattice homomorphism is onto. Two subobjects $X_1, X_2 \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ map to the same subobject in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} X_1/(X_1 \cap X_2) &\in \mathcal{S} \\ X_2/(X_1 \cap X_2) &\in \mathcal{S}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The map is onto by Lemma A.4. Since the localization functor is exact, it preserves constructs like $X_1/(X_1 \cap X_2)$. Therefore, X_1 and X_2 map to the same subobject in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} if and only if the identities

$$\begin{aligned} X_1/(X_1 \cap X_2) &\cong 0 \\ X_2/(X_1 \cap X_2) &\cong 0 \end{aligned}$$

hold in the Serre quotient \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} . By Lemma A.3, this is equivalent to the stated conditions on X_1, X_2 . \square

This gives another way to think about the Serre quotient. The Serre quotient \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} has the same underlying objects as \mathcal{C} , but the morphisms from A to B correspond to subobjects $\Gamma \subseteq A \oplus B$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma + (0 \oplus B) &\approx A \oplus B \\ \Gamma \cap (0 \oplus B) &\approx 0 \oplus 0, \end{aligned}$$

where \approx denotes commensurability modulo \mathcal{S} .

As an example, let M be some model-theoretic structure and let \mathcal{C} be the category of interpretable abelian groups in the structure M . Then \mathcal{C} is an abelian category. Let \mathcal{S} be the subcategory of finite interpretable abelian groups. Then \mathcal{S} is a Serre subcategory, because in a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0,$$

Z is finite if and only if X and Y are both finite. Therefore we can form the Serre quotient. If $X \in \mathcal{C}$, then the subobject lattice of X in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} is the lattice of definable subgroups, modulo commensurability.

If M is a structure in which G^0 always exists, then we can give a more explicit description of the Serre quotient \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} :

- Objects are interpretable abelian groups $(G, +)$ such that $G = G^0$.
- The subobject lattice of G is the lattice of connected subgroups.

- A morphism from G to H is a connected subgroup $\Gamma \subseteq G \oplus H$ such that $\Gamma + (0 \oplus H) = G \oplus H$ (i.e., Γ projects onto G) and such that $(\Gamma \cap (0 \oplus H))^0 = 0 \oplus 0$, (i.e., $\Gamma \cap (0 \oplus H)$ is finite).

So a morphism from G to H is an “endogeny” or “quasi-homomorphism” from G to H , in the sense of ([13], §1.5) or ([3], §3). The category \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{S} is similar to the isogeny category of abelian varieties.

A.4 A criterion for recognizing abelian categories

Lemma A.6. *Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be additive categories, with \mathcal{D} abelian. Let $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a faithful additive functor. Suppose the following conditions hold:*

1. *For every $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{C} , there is $e : W \rightarrow X$ in \mathcal{C} such that the diagram*

$$0 \rightarrow F(W) \rightarrow F(X) \rightarrow F(Y)$$

is exact in \mathcal{D} .

2. *For every $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{C} , there is $g : X \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{C} such that the diagram*

$$F(X) \rightarrow F(Y) \rightarrow F(Z) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact in \mathcal{D} .

3. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : X' \rightarrow Y$ be morphisms in \mathcal{C} . Suppose $F(g) : F(X') \rightarrow F(Y)$ is a monomorphism in \mathcal{D} and $F(f) : F(X) \rightarrow F(Y)$ factors through $F(g)$. Then f factors through g .*
4. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : X \rightarrow Y'$ be morphisms in \mathcal{C} . Suppose $F(g) : F(X) \rightarrow F(Y')$ is an epimorphism in \mathcal{D} and $F(f) : F(X) \rightarrow F(Y)$ factors through $F(g)$. Then f factors through g .*

Then \mathcal{C} is abelian and F is an exact functor.

Proof. Because F is faithful, F reflects monomorphisms. Indeed, suppose $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism in \mathcal{C} , $F(f)$ is a monomorphism, and $g_1, g_2 : W \rightarrow X$ are parallel morphisms such that $f \circ g_1 = f \circ g_2$. Then $F(f) \circ F(g_1) = F(f) \circ F(g_2)$. As $F(f)$ is a monomorphism, $F(g_1) = F(g_2)$. Then $g_1 = g_2$ because F is faithful. A similar argument shows that F reflects epimorphisms.

We claim that \mathcal{C} has kernels and F preserves them. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism, and let $e : W \rightarrow X$ be as in (1). Then $F(f) \circ F(e) = 0$, so $f \circ e = 0$ by faithfulness of F . We claim that e is the kernel of f . Let $e' : W' \rightarrow X$ be some morphism in \mathcal{C} such that $f \circ e' = 0$. Then $F(f) \circ F(e') = 0$. As $F(e)$ is the kernel of $F(f)$, we see that $F(e') : F(W') \rightarrow F(X)$ factors through the monomorphism $F(e) : F(W) \hookrightarrow F(X)$. By (3), we see that e' factors through e . Because F reflects monomorphisms, e is a monomorphism, and so the factorization of e'

through e is unique. This proves that e is the kernel of f . Therefore \mathcal{C} has kernels and F preserves them. By duality, \mathcal{C} has cokernels and F preserves them.

Therefore, \mathcal{C} is pre-abelian, and if \mathcal{C} is abelian, then F is exact.

Next we claim that F is conservative (i.e., F reflects isomorphisms). Indeed, suppose $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is such that $F(f) : F(X) \rightarrow F(Y)$ is an isomorphism. Note that $id_{F(Y)} = F(id_Y)$ factors through the monomorphism $F(f)$. By (3), id_Y factors through f , i.e.,

$$id_Y = f \circ g$$

for some morphism $g : Y \rightarrow X$. Similarly,

$$id_X = h \circ f$$

for some morphism $h : Y \rightarrow X$. Then f has a two-sided inverse given by

$$h = h \circ id_Y = h \circ f \circ g = id_X \circ g = g.$$

So f is an isomorphism. This shows that F reflects isomorphisms.

Finally, let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be any morphism. As \mathcal{C} is pre-abelian, there is the usual coimage/image factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \ker(f) & \longrightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{\hspace{2cm}} & Y & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{coker}(f). \\ & & & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & & \operatorname{coim}(f) & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{im}(f) & \end{array}$$

Because F preserves kernels and cokernels, the diagram obtained by applying F is also a coimage/image factorization. In particular, $F(\operatorname{coim}(f))$ is the coimage and $F(\operatorname{im}(f))$ is the image of $F(f) : F(X) \rightarrow F(Y)$. As \mathcal{D} is abelian, the morphism $F(\operatorname{coim}(f)) \rightarrow F(\operatorname{im}(f))$ is an isomorphism. As F is conservative, it follows that $\operatorname{coim}(f) \rightarrow \operatorname{im}(f)$ is an isomorphism, which is exactly what it means for \mathcal{C} to be an abelian category. \square

B Review of ind- and pro-objects

For a textbook account of ind-objects and pro-objects, see Chapter 6 and Section 8.6 of [12].

B.1 The category of ind-objects

Let \mathcal{C} be a small category. The Yoneda lemma gives a fully faithful embedding of \mathcal{C} into the functor category $\operatorname{Fun}(\mathcal{C}^{op}, \operatorname{Set})$. For $A \in \mathcal{C}$, let h_A be the corresponding representable functor

$$h_A(B) := \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(B, A).$$

The category $\operatorname{Fun}(\mathcal{C}^{op}, \operatorname{Set})$ has all small limits and colimits; they are constructed pointwise. If $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a filtered diagram of objects in A , one defines

$$\varinjlim_{i \in I} A_i := \varinjlim_{i \in I} h_{A_i}.$$

One defines the *indization* $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ to be the full subcategory of $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}^{op}, \text{Set})$ consisting of the objects of the form

$$\overrightarrow{\lim}_{i \in I} A_i.$$

Objects of $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ are called *ind-objects*. There is a fully faithful embedding $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ sending A to its representable functor h_A .

From the Yoneda lemma, one gets the usual formula

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}} \left(\overrightarrow{\lim}_{j \in J} B_j, \overrightarrow{\lim}_{i \in I} A_i \right) = \overleftarrow{\lim}_{j \in J} \overrightarrow{\lim}_{i \in I} \text{Hom}(B_j, A_i). \quad (17)$$

So one can alternatively define $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ as the category of formal colimits $\overrightarrow{\lim}_{i \in I} A_i$ with morphisms given by (17). The downside of this alternative approach is that it now takes some work to define composition and verify associativity.

B.2 The case of posets

If P is a poset, say that a subset $I \subseteq P$ is an *ideal* if the following conditions hold:

- I is downwards-closed, i.e.,

$$(x \in I \text{ and } y \leq x) \implies y \in I.$$

- I is upwards-directed, i.e.,

$$\forall x, y \in I \exists z \in I : x, y \leq z.$$

- I is non-empty.

Any object $x \in P$ determines a principal ideal

$$(x) = \{y \in P : y \leq x\}.$$

Proposition B.1. *If P is a poset, then $\text{Ind } P$ is (isomorphic to) the poset of ideals in P , ordered by inclusion. The map $P \rightarrow \text{Ind } P$ is the map $x \rightarrow (x)$.*

Proof. By formula (17), every Hom-set in $\text{Ind } P$ has at most one element, and so $\text{Ind } P$ is equivalent to a poset. Let $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{y_j\}_{j \in J}$ be two filtered diagrams in P . These determine ind-objects

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \overrightarrow{\lim}_{i \in I} x_i \in \text{Ind } P \\ y &= \overrightarrow{\lim}_{j \in J} y_j \in \text{Ind } P \end{aligned}$$

as well as ideals

$$\begin{aligned} E_x &= \{z \in P \mid \exists i \in I : z \leq x_i\} \\ E_y &= \{z \in P \mid \exists j \in J : z \leq x_j\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now one has equivalences

$$x \leq y \iff (\forall i \in I \exists j \in J : x_i \leq y_j) \iff E_x \subseteq E_y,$$

where the first equivalence is a disguised form of (17), and the second equivalence is easy. Thus $\text{Ind } P$ embeds into the poset of ideals via the map $x \mapsto E_x$. But the map is onto, because any ideal $I \subseteq P$ determines a filtered diagram $\{i\}_{i \in I}$, mapping to I under the embedding.

Finally, if $x \in P$, then the ind-object x is represented by the filtered diagram $\{x\}_{i \in 1}$, where 1 is the terminal category. The corresponding ideal is the principal ideal generated by x . \square

B.3 The case of abelian categories

See §8.6 of [12] for a textbook account of indization of abelian categories.

Let \mathcal{C} be a small abelian category. Then

- $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ is abelian.
- The embedding $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ is additive, fully faithful, and exact.
- The category $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ has directed limits (i.e., filtered colimits), and they are exact.

See Theorem 8.6.5 in [12]. The analogous facts hold for k -linear abelian categories. In particular, if \mathcal{C} is a k -linear abelian category, then $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ naturally has the structure of a k -linear category.

We also need some facts about subobject lattices in $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$.

Lemma B.2. *Let Y be an object in a small abelian category \mathcal{C} . If $\{f_i : X_i \hookrightarrow Y\}$ is a filtered diagram of monomorphisms in \mathcal{C} , then*

$$\text{“}\lim_{\rightarrow, i \in I} \text{”} X_i \rightarrow Y$$

is a monomorphism in $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$. Up to isomorphism over Y , all $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ -monomorphisms into Y arise this way.

Proof. Because the embedding $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ is exact, each morphism $X_i \rightarrow Y$ is a monomorphism in $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$. Filtered colimits are exact in $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$, so the filtered colimit of all these monomorphisms is a monomorphism.¹⁷

¹⁷Note that in the category $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$, the formal filtered colimit “ $\lim_{\rightarrow, i \in I}$ ” X_i is the actual filtered colimit. This is because $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ gets its filtered colimits from the larger category $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}^{op}, \text{Set})$.

Now let

$$f : \varinjlim_{i \in I} X_i \hookrightarrow Y$$

be some arbitrary monomorphism in $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$. This map arises as the filtered colimit of a filtered diagram $\{f_i : X_i \rightarrow Y\}_{i \in I}$ of morphisms in \mathcal{C} , but the f_i are not guaranteed to be monic. Nevertheless, we can form a filtered family of diagrams of the form

$$X_i \rightarrow \text{im}(f_i) \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \text{coker}(f_i).$$

This induces a diagram

$$\varinjlim_{i \in I} X_i \rightarrow \varinjlim_{i \in I} \text{im}(f_i) \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \varinjlim_{i \in I} \text{coker}(f_i).$$

Because filtered colimits in $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ are exact, we see that

$$\varinjlim_{i \in I} \text{coker}(f_i) \cong \text{coker}(f),$$

and then

$$\varinjlim_{i \in I} \text{im}(f_i) \cong \ker(\text{coker}(f)).$$

Because f is monic, it follows that f is isomorphic to the monomorphism

$$\varinjlim_{i \in I} \text{im}(f_i) \hookrightarrow Y,$$

which has the desired form. □

Proposition B.3. *If \mathcal{C} is an abelian category and $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then the natural map*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Ind Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}}(A) \\ & \left(\varinjlim_{i \in I} (X_i \hookrightarrow A) \right) \mapsto \left(\left(\varinjlim_{i \in I} X_i \right) \hookrightarrow A \right) \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism of lattices.

Proof. By Lemma B.2, the map is onto. It remains to check that it is strictly order-preserving. Let $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{Y_j\}_{j \in J}$ be two directed diagrams of \mathcal{C} -subobjects of A . Let

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \varinjlim_{i \in I} X_i \\ Y &= \varinjlim_{j \in J} Y_j \end{aligned}$$

be the corresponding $\text{Ind } \mathcal{C}$ -subobjects of A .

Claim B.4. For each i , $X_i \subseteq Y$ if and only if there is some j such that $X_i \subseteq Y_j$.

Proof. There is a natural morphism $Y_j \rightarrow Y$. As Y_j, Y are both subobjects of A , it follows that $Y_j \subseteq Y$. If $X_i \subseteq Y_j$, then $X_i \subseteq Y$.

Conversely, suppose $X_i \subseteq Y$. Then the inclusion $X_i \rightarrow Y$ factors through some $Y_j \rightarrow Y$, by Formula (17). Then $X_i \subseteq Y_j$. □_{Claim}

Claim B.5. $X \subseteq Y$ if and only if $X_i \subseteq Y$ for all i .

Proof. Note $X_i \subseteq X$ because of the morphism $X_i \rightarrow X$ over A . Thus $X \subseteq Y$ clearly implies $X_i \subseteq Y$ for all i . Conversely, suppose $X_i \subseteq Y$ for all i . For any arrow $i \rightarrow i'$ in the category I , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_i & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \\ X_{i'} & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array}$$

commutes, because the same diagram commutes when Y is replaced with A , and the map $Y \rightarrow A$ is a monomorphism. Therefore the maps $X_i \rightarrow Y$ assemble into a morphism

$$X = \varinjlim_{i \in I} X_i \rightarrow Y$$

whose composition with $Y \rightarrow A$ is the given morphism $X \rightarrow A$. Therefore $X \subseteq Y$. □_{Claim}

By the two claims, we see that

$$X \subseteq Y \iff (\forall i \exists j : X_i \subseteq Y_j).$$

As in the proof of Proposition B.1, the right hand side corresponds to

$$\varinjlim_{i \in I} (X_i \hookrightarrow A) \leq \varinjlim_{j \in J} (Y_j \hookrightarrow A)$$

in the poset $\text{Ind Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$. □

B.4 Pro-objects

If \mathcal{C} is any category, the category $\text{Pro } \mathcal{C}$ of pro-objects is defined as $(\text{Ind}(\mathcal{C}^{op}))^{op}$. Objects of $\text{Pro } \mathcal{C}$ can be thought of as formal inverse limits

$$\varprojlim_{i \in I} A_i.$$

If M is a bounded lattice, then $\text{Pro } M$ is dual to the lattice of filters on M , where a *filter* is a subset $F \subseteq M$ such that

- $\top \in F$
- If $x, y \in F$, then $x \wedge y \in F$

- If $x \in F$ and $y \in M$, then $x \vee y \in F$.

If \mathcal{C} is an abelian category, then $\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ is an abelian category. The inclusion $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \text{Pro}\mathcal{C}$ is fully faithful and exact. If $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\text{ProSub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \cong \text{Sub}_{\text{Pro}\mathcal{C}}(A).$$

C Boring proofs

We give the proofs of several statements from §2-3 that sound obvious, but perhaps aren't.

C.1 Semisimple directories

For completeness, we should give a proof of Proposition 2.6. Recall Schur's lemma:

Lemma C.1 (Schur). *Let A, B be simple objects in an abelian category \mathcal{C} . Every morphism from A to B is either zero or an isomorphism. Therefore,*

- If A, B are non-isomorphic, $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B) = 0$.
- $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, A)$ is a division ring.

We will also use Morita equivalence—the fact that the category of $M_n(R)$ -modules is equivalent to the category of R -modules via an equivalence sending $M_n(R)$ to R^n .

Recall the notion of “neighborhood” from §2.1.

Proposition C.2. *If A is a semisimple object in an abelian category \mathcal{C} , then there is a ring R such that*

1. R is a finite product of division rings $D_1 \times \cdots \times D_k$
2. The neighborhood of A in \mathcal{C} is equivalent to the category of finitely generated R -modules, or equivalently, the neighborhood of R in $R\text{Mod}$.

Proof. For any noncommutative ring R , let $\text{Mat}(R)$ denote the category in which

- objects are nonnegative integers
- morphisms from n to m are $m \times n$ matrices
- composition is matrix multiplication.

Equivalently, $\text{Mat}(R)$ is the category of free R^{op} -modules of finite rank. More generally, if A is any object in an abelian category, then $\text{Mat}(\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)^{op})$ is equivalent to the full category $\{0, A, A^2, A^3, \dots\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.

Write $A \cong A_1^{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_k^{n_k}$ for some pairwise non-isomorphic simple $A_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n_k > 0$. Let D_i be the division ring $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A_i)^{op}$. There is a natural functor

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mat}(D_1) \times \cdots \times \text{Mat}(D_k) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C} \\ (j_1, \dots, j_k) &\mapsto A_1^{j_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_k^{j_k} \end{aligned}$$

This functor is fully faithful by Schur's lemma, and the essential image is the neighborhood of A . So the neighborhood of A in \mathcal{C} is equivalent to the category $\text{Mat}(D_1) \times \cdots \times \text{Mat}(D_k)$.

Now let $R = D_1 \times \cdots \times D_k$. In the category $R\text{Mod}$, the object R decomposes as an internal direct sum $D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus D_k$, where $\text{End}_R(D_k) \cong D_k^{op}$. Replacing \mathcal{C} with $R\text{Mod}$ in the above argument, we see that the neighborhood of R in $R\text{Mod}$ is equivalent to $\text{Mat}(D_1) \times \cdots \times \text{Mat}(D_k)$. Thus the neighborhood of R in $R\text{Mod}$ is also equivalent to the neighborhood of A in \mathcal{C} . \square

The following variant holds as well:

Proposition C.3. *If A is a semisimple object in an abelian category \mathcal{C} , and $R = \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)^{op}$, then*

1. *R is a finite product of matrix algebras over division rings.*
2. *The neighborhood of A in \mathcal{C} is equivalent to the neighborhood of R in $R\text{Mod}$, and the equivalence sends A to R .*

Proof. By Proposition C.2 there is $R_0 = D_1 \times \cdots \times D_k$ such that the neighborhood of A in \mathcal{C} is equivalent to the neighborhood of R_0 in $R_0\text{Mod}$. Let $M \in R_0\text{Mod}$ be the object corresponding to A under this equivalence. Write M as $D_1^{n_1} \times \cdots \times D_k^{n_k}$. For each k , there is a Morita equivalence from the category of $M_{n_k}(D_k)$ -modules to the category of D_k -modules. This equivalence sends $M_{n_k}(D_k)$ to $D_k^{n_k}$. Let $R = M_{n_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times M_{n_k}(D_k)$. The Morita equivalences assemble to an equivalence

$$R\text{Mod} = (M_{n_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times M_{n_k}(D_k))\text{Mod} \xrightarrow{\sim} (D_1 \times \cdots \times D_k)\text{Mod} = R_0\text{Mod}$$

under which R maps to $D_1^{n_1} \times \cdots \times D_k^{n_k} = M$. Thus the neighborhood of M in $R_0\text{Mod}$ is equivalent to the neighborhood of R in $R\text{Mod}$, via an equivalence sending M to R_0 .

Chaining things together, there is an equivalence from the neighborhood of A in \mathcal{C} to the neighborhood of R in $R\text{Mod}$, and this equivalence sends A to R . It follows that $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) = \text{End}_R(R) = R^{op}$. \square

Now Proposition 2.6 follows from Propositions C.2 and C.3, because $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ is determined by the neighborhood of A in \mathcal{C} . Also, Proposition C.3 implies the harder (1) \implies (2) direction of the Artin-Wedderburn theorem (Theorem 2.5).¹⁸ This is essentially the standard proof of the Artin-Wedderburn theorem.

¹⁸The easier (2) \implies (1) direction follows by Morita equivalence, I suppose.

C.2 Examples of directory morphisms

The next two propositions verify the (intuitively obvious) fact that Examples 2.9-2.10 are valid.

Proposition C.4. *If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a morphism in an abelian category \mathcal{C} , then the pushforward and pullback maps*

$$\begin{aligned} f_* &: \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B) \\ f^* &: \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(B) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \end{aligned}$$

of Example 2.9 are directory morphisms.

Proof. It is trivial that f^* and f_* are levelwise order-preserving. For $GL_n(K_0)$ -equivariance, let μ be an invertible $n \times n$ matrix over K_0 . Then there is a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^n & \xrightarrow{f^{\oplus n}} & B^n \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A^n & \xrightarrow{f^{\oplus n}} & B^n \end{array}$$

in which the vertical maps are isomorphisms induced by μ . Given a subobject $X \leq A^n$, the two ways of pushing forward to the bottom left corner are equal, which shows that

$$(f^{\oplus n})_*(\mu \cdot X) = \mu \cdot (f^{\oplus n})_*(X).$$

A similar argument using μ^{-1} instead of μ , and pullbacks instead of pushforwards, shows that

$$(f^{\oplus n})^*(\mu \cdot X) = \mu \cdot (f^{\oplus n})^*(X).$$

Finally, for \oplus -compatibility, note that for $X \leq A^n$ and $Y \leq A^m$,

$$(f^{\oplus(n+m)})_*(X \oplus Y) = (f^{\oplus n})_*(X) \oplus (f^{\oplus m})_*(Y)$$

because, choosing a Mitchell embedding, both sides are

$$\{(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n), f(y_1), \dots, f(y_m)) : \vec{x} \in X, \vec{y} \in Y\}.$$

Similarly, for $X \leq B^n$ and $Y \leq B^m$,

$$(f^{\oplus(n+m)})^*(X \oplus Y) = (f^{\oplus n})^*(X) \oplus (f^{\oplus m})^*(Y)$$

because, choosing a Mitchell embedding, both sides are

$$\{(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \in A^n \times A^m : (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n)) \in X \text{ and } (f(y_1), \dots, f(y_m)) \in Y\} \quad \square$$

Proposition C.5. *If $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ is a left-exact functor and $A \in \mathcal{C}$, then the map*

$$F_* : \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}'}(F(A))$$

of Example 2.10 is a directory morphism.

Proof. Fix Mitchell embeddings of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' , so that we can identify subobjects of A with literal subgroups of A . Then the map from $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n)$ to $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}'}(F(A)^n)$ is the map sending a subobject $X \subseteq A^n$ to the image of $F(X) \rightarrow F(A)^n$.

The map is order-preserving: suppose $X \subseteq Y \subseteq A^n$. Then $F(X) \rightarrow F(A)^n$ factors through $F(Y) \rightarrow F(A)^n$, so $F_*(X) \leq F_*(Y)$.

The map is $GL_n(K_0)$ -equivariant: suppose $X \subseteq A^n$ and μ is an invertible $n \times n$ matrix over K_0 . Since F is K_0 -linear, the image of

$$A^n \xrightarrow{\mu} A^n$$

under F is

$$F(A)^n \xrightarrow{\mu} F(A)^n.$$

Now $\mu \cdot X$ is the image of the composition

$$X \xrightarrow{\subseteq} A^n \xrightarrow{\mu} A^n,$$

and so $F_*(\mu \cdot X)$ is the image of

$$F(X) \rightarrow F(A)^n \xrightarrow{\mu} F(A)^n$$

The first map is essentially the inclusion of $F_*(X)$ into $F(A)^n$, showing that $F_*(\mu \cdot X) = \mu \cdot F_*(X)$.

The map is compatible with \oplus : suppose $X \subseteq A^n$ and $Y \subseteq A^m$. Apply F to the commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \longrightarrow & X \oplus Y & \longleftarrow & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A^n & \longrightarrow & A^{n+m} & \longleftarrow & A^m. \end{array}$$

This yields the following diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F(X) & \longrightarrow & F(X \oplus Y) & \longleftarrow & F(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F(A)^n & \longrightarrow & F(A)^{n+m} & \longleftarrow & F(A)^m. \end{array}$$

The images of the vertical maps are $F_*(X)$, $F_*(X \oplus Y)$, $F_*(Y)$, respectively. Moreover, the vertical maps are inclusions, by left-exactness. Changing the top row by an isomorphism, we get a diagram in which all the vertical maps are inclusions:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F_*(X) & \longrightarrow & F_*(X \oplus Y) & \longleftarrow & F_*(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F(A)^n & \longrightarrow & F(A)^{n+m} & \longleftarrow & F(A)^m. \end{array}$$

The top row is a coproduct diagram, because F preserves coproducts. Therefore $F_*(X \oplus Y) = F_*(X) \oplus F_*(Y)$. \square

C.3 The theorem on interval directories

Proposition C.6 (= Proposition 2.12). *Let D_\bullet be a directory and $a \leq b$ be elements of D_1 . Let $D_n^{[a,b]}$ be the interval $[a^{\oplus n}, b^{\oplus n}]$ inside D_n .*

1. $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ forms a substructure of D_\bullet , i.e., $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ is closed under \oplus, \vee, \wedge , and the $GL_\bullet(K_0)$ -action.
2. The substructure $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ is itself a directory.
3. The inclusion maps $i_n : D_n^{[a,b]} \xrightarrow{\subseteq} D_n$ form a directory morphism $i : D_\bullet^{[a,b]} \rightarrow D_\bullet$.
4. There is a directory morphism $r : D_\bullet \rightarrow D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ given by

$$r_n(x) = (x \vee a^{\oplus n}) \wedge b^{\oplus n} = (x \wedge b^{\oplus n}) \vee a^{\oplus n},$$

and r is a retract of i : $r \circ i$ is the identity map on $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$.

5. If $f : D' \rightarrow D$ is some directory morphism, then f factors through $D^{[a,b]} \rightarrow D$ if and only if $f_n(x) \in [a^{\oplus n}, b^{\oplus n}]$ for all n and all $x \in D'_n$.
6. If $D_\bullet = \text{Dir}(C)$ for some object C in an abelian category, and if a, b correspond to subobjects $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$, then $D_\bullet^{[a,b]}$ is isomorphic to $\text{Dir}(B/A)$ via the maps from the isomorphism theorems.

Proof. Changing everything by an isomorphism, we may assume we are in the setting of (6). Let $f : B \hookrightarrow C$ be the inclusion and $g : B \twoheadrightarrow B/A$ be the quotient map. By Example 2.9, we get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Dir}(B/A) & \xrightarrow{g^*} & \text{Dir}(B) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \text{Dir}(C) \\ \text{id} \downarrow & & \text{id} \downarrow & \swarrow f^* & \\ \text{Dir}(B/A) & \xleftarrow{g_*} & \text{Dir}(B) & & \end{array} \quad (18)$$

Thus $r^0 := g_* \circ f^*$ is a retract of $i^0 := f_* \circ g^*$.

At level n , the resulting diagram of functions is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Sub}(B^n/A^n) & \xrightarrow{g^*} & \text{Sub}(B^n) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \text{Sub}(C^n) \\ \text{id} \downarrow & & \text{id} \downarrow & \swarrow f^* & \\ \text{Sub}(B^n/A^n) & \xleftarrow{g_*} & \text{Sub}(B^n) & & \end{array}$$

By the isomorphism theorems, this diagram is isomorphic to

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 [a^{\oplus n}, b^{\oplus n}] & \longrightarrow & [\perp, b^{\oplus n}] & \longrightarrow & \text{Sub}(C^n) \\
 \text{id} \downarrow & & \text{id} \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
 [a^{\oplus n}, b^{\oplus n}] & \longleftarrow & [\perp, b^{\oplus n}] & &
 \end{array} \tag{19}$$

where all the intervals are in $\text{Sub}(C^n)$, the rightward maps are inclusions, and the leftward maps are $- \wedge b^{\oplus n}$ and $- \vee a^{\oplus n}$.

Therefore, there is *some* choice of directory structures on $D_{\bullet}^{[a,b]}$ and $D_{\bullet}^{[\perp,b]}$ such that the maps of (19) assemble into directory morphisms forming a diagram isomorphic to (18):

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 D_{\bullet}^{[a,b]} & \longrightarrow & D_{\bullet}^{[\perp,b]} & \longrightarrow & \text{Dir}(C) \\
 \text{id} \downarrow & & \text{id} \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
 D_{\bullet}^{[a,b]} & \longleftarrow & D_{\bullet}^{[\perp,b]} & &
 \end{array}$$

Dropping the middle column, we get

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 D_{\bullet}^{[a,b]} & \xrightarrow{i} & \text{Dir}(C) \\
 \text{id} \downarrow & \swarrow r & \\
 D_{\bullet}^{[a,b]} & &
 \end{array} \tag{20}$$

where i is the inclusion and r is the map

$$x \mapsto (x \wedge b^{\oplus n}) \vee a^{\oplus n}$$

The diagram (20) ensures that $D_{\bullet}^{[a,b]}$ is an induced substructure of $\text{Dir}(C) = D_{\bullet}$, at least for the following parts of the structure:

- The \oplus operator
- The $GL_n(K_0)$ -action
- The partial order \leq .

As for \vee and \wedge , it is a general fact that any interval $[c, d]$ in a lattice L is naturally a sublattice of L .

This proves all the points but (5). Let $f : D'_{\bullet} \rightarrow D_{\bullet}$ be a directory morphism. If f factors through the inclusion $i : D_{\bullet}^{[a,b]} \hookrightarrow D_{\bullet}$, then clearly $f_n(x) \in D_n^{[a,b]} = [a^{\oplus n}, b^{\oplus n}]$ for all $x \in D'_n$. Conversely, if $f_n(x) \in D_n^{[a,b]}$ for all x , then $f = i \circ r \circ f$, so f factors through i . \square

C.4 The category \mathcal{H}

As in §3.2, let \mathbb{K} be a monster model of a field, possibly with extra structure. Let K_0 be a small infinite subfield. Let Λ_n be the lattice of type-definable K_0 -linear subspaces of \mathbb{K} .

Proposition C.7 (= Proposition 3.6). *There is a K_0 -linear pre-additive category \mathcal{H} in which*

- *an object is a quotient A/B where $B \leq A \in \Lambda_n$ for some n .*
- *a morphism from A/B to A'/B' is a K_0 -linear function $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ such that the set*

$$\{(x, y) \in A \times A' : y + B' = f(x + B)\}$$

is type-definable.

- *the composition of $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ and $g : A'/B' \rightarrow A''/B''$ is the usual composition $g \circ f$.*
- *the K_0 -vector space structure on $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}}(A/B, A'/B')$ is induced by the usual operations, i.e., induced as a subspace of $\text{Hom}_{K_0 \text{ Vect}}(A/B, A'/B')$.*

Proof. If $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ is a function, we call the set

$$T_f = \{(x, y) \in A \times A' : y + B' = f(x + B)\}$$

the *trace* of f . We call f an \mathcal{H} -*morphism* if f is K_0 -linear and the trace of f is type-definable.

We must check that all the operations on morphisms are well-defined:

1. The identity map on A/B is an \mathcal{H} -morphism. Its trace is the type-definable set

$$\{(x, y) \in A \times A : x - y \in B\}.$$

2. The zero morphism on A/B is an \mathcal{H} -morphism. Its trace is the type-definable set $A \times B$.
3. If $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ and $g : A'/B' \rightarrow A''/B''$ are \mathcal{H} -morphisms, then so is the composition $g \circ f$. Indeed, the trace of $g \circ f$ is the type-definable set

$$\{(x, z) \in A \times A'' \mid \exists y \in A' : ((x, y) \in T_f \text{ and } (y, z) \in T_g)\}.$$

4. If $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ and $g : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ are parallel \mathcal{H} -morphisms, the sum $f + g$ is an \mathcal{H} -morphism. Indeed, its trace is the type-definable set

$$\{(x, y) \in A \times A' \mid \exists w \in A' : ((x, w) \in T_f \text{ and } (x, y - w) \in T_g)\}.$$

5. If $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ is an \mathcal{H} -morphism and $\alpha \in K_0$, the product $\alpha \circ f$ is an \mathcal{H} -morphism. Indeed, the trace is the type-definable set

$$\{(x, y) \in A \times A' : (x, \alpha^{-1} \cdot y) \in T_f\}.$$

The associative, distributive, etc. laws are trivial, because they hold in $K_0 \text{Vect}$. This shows that \mathcal{H} is a K_0 -linear pre-additive category. \square

Lemma C.8. *The category \mathcal{H} is additive, i.e., finite products and coproducts exist.*

Proof. If A is any element of Λ_1 , such as $A = 0$, then the object A/A has the property that its identity and zero endomorphisms are equal. Thus \mathcal{H} has a zero object. It remains to verify that binary products/coproducts exist. (Since we are in a pre-additive category, they are equivalent.) Let A/B and A'/B' be two objects in \mathcal{H} , with $A, B \in \Lambda_n$ and $A', B' \in \Lambda_m$. Then $A \times A'$ and $B \times B'$ are two objects in Λ_{n+m} , and $A \times A' \geq B \times B'$. Therefore $(A \times A')/(B \times B')$ is an object of \mathcal{H} . It remains to produce a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A/B & & A/B \\
 & \searrow^{\iota_1} & \nearrow^{\pi_1} \\
 & (A \times A')/(B \times B') & \\
 & \nearrow_{\iota_2} & \searrow_{\pi_2} \\
 A'/B' & & A'/B'
 \end{array}$$

in \mathcal{H} such that the composition $\pi_j \circ \iota_i$ is the identity for $i = j$ and the zero morphism for $i \neq j$. Note that $(A \times A')/(B \times B')$ is isomorphic as a K_0 -vector space to $(A/B) \times (A'/B')$. We take ι_1, ι_2 to be the obvious inclusions and π_1, π_2 to be the obvious projections.

It remains to show that $\iota_1, \iota_2, \pi_1, \pi_2$ are \mathcal{H} -morphisms. Note that for $x \in A$ and $(y, z) \in A \times A'$,

$$\iota_1(x + B) = (y, z) + (B \times B') \iff (x, 0) + (B \times B') = (y, z) + (B \times B')$$

Thus the trace of ι_1 is exactly

$$\{(x, y, z) \in A \times A \times A' : x - y \in B \text{ and } z \in B'\},$$

which is type-definable. So ι_1 is an \mathcal{H} -morphism, and ι_2 is too, by symmetry. Similarly, for $(x, y) \in A \times A'$ and $z \in A$,

$$\pi_1((x, y) + (B \times B')) = z + B \iff x + B = z + B,$$

and so the trace of π_1 is exactly

$$\{(x, y, z) \in A \times A' \times A : x - z \in B\}.$$

Thus π_1 is an \mathcal{H} -morphism, and so is π_2 . This shows that the diagram exists and $(A \times A')/(B \times B')$ is truly the biproduct of A/B and A'/B' . \square

Lemma C.9. *Let $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ be an \mathcal{H} -morphism. Let A'' be the kernel of the composition*

$$A \rightarrow A/B \xrightarrow{f} A'/B'$$

Then A'' is type-definable, A''/B is an object in \mathcal{H} , the natural inclusion $A''/B \hookrightarrow A/B$ is an \mathcal{H} -morphism, and the diagram

$$0 \rightarrow A''/B \rightarrow A/B \xrightarrow{f} A'/B'$$

is exact in the category of K_0 -vector spaces.

Proof. The group A'' is type-definable because it is exactly

$$\{x \in A \mid \exists y \in B' : (x, y) \in T_f\}.$$

The group A'' contains B because B is in the kernel of $A \rightarrow A/B$. Therefore A''/B is an object in \mathcal{H} . The inclusion $A''/B \hookrightarrow A/B$ is an \mathcal{H} -morphism because its trace is the type-definable set

$$\{(x, y) \in A'' \times A : x - y \in B\}.$$

Finally, the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A''/B \rightarrow A/B \xrightarrow{f} A'/B'$$

is exact in the category of K_0 -vector spaces by a trivial diagram chase. \square

Lemma C.10. *Let $f : A/B \rightarrow A''/B''$ and $g : A'/B' \rightarrow A''/B''$ be \mathcal{H} -morphisms, such that g is injective and f factors through g set-theoretically. Let $h : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ be the unique K_0 -linear map such that $f = g \circ h$. Then h is an \mathcal{H} -morphism.*

Proof. The trace of h is the type-definable set

$$\{(x, y) \in A \times A' \mid \exists z \in A'' : ((x, z) \in T_f \text{ and } (y, z) \in T_g)\}. \quad \square$$

Lemma C.11. *Let $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ be an \mathcal{H} -morphism. Then there is a type-definable B'' such that $B'' \subseteq A'$, $B'' \supseteq B'$, the image of f is B''/B' , the quotient map $A'/B' \rightarrow A'/B''$ is an \mathcal{H} -morphism, and the diagram*

$$A/B \xrightarrow{f} A'/B' \rightarrow A'/B'' \rightarrow 0$$

is exact in the category of K_0 -vector spaces.

Proof. Let B'' be the type-definable set

$$B'' = \{y \in A' \mid \exists x \in A : (x, y) \in T_f\}.$$

Then B'' is certainly a type-definable subgroup of A' , containing B' (take $x = 0 \in A$). It is clear that B''/B' is the image of $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$. A trivial diagram chase shows that

$$A/B \rightarrow A'/B' \rightarrow A'/B'' \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Lastly, the quotient map $A'/B' \rightarrow A'/B''$ is an \mathcal{H} -morphism because its trace is exactly the type-definable set.

$$\{(x, y) \in A' \times A' : x - y \in B''\} \quad \square$$

Lemma C.12. *Let $f : A/B \rightarrow A'/B'$ be a surjective \mathcal{H} -morphism. Let $g : A/B \rightarrow A''/B''$ be another \mathcal{H} -morphism such that $g = h \circ f$ for some K_0 -linear $h : A'/B' \rightarrow A''/B''$. Then h is an \mathcal{H} -morphism.*

Proof. By surjectivity of f , the trace of h is exactly the type-definable set

$$\{(y, z) \in A' \times A'' \mid \exists x \in A : ((x, y) \in T_f \text{ and } (x, z) \in T_g)\}. \quad \square$$

Proposition C.13. *The category \mathcal{H} is abelian and the forgetful functor $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow K_0 \text{Vect}$ is exact.*

Proof. We use the criterion of Lemma A.6. The previous four lemmas verify all the necessary conditions. \square

Lemma C.14. *Let A/B be an object in \mathcal{H} , with $A, B \in \Lambda_n$. Suppose $A' \in [B, A] \subseteq \Lambda_n$. Then A'/B is an object in \mathcal{H} , and the inclusion $A'/B \hookrightarrow A/B$ is a monomorphism in \mathcal{H} . The induced map*

$$\begin{aligned} [B, A] &\rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{H}}(A/B) \\ A' &\mapsto A'/B \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism of lattices.

Proof. It is trivial that A'/B is an object of \mathcal{H} . The inclusion $A'/B \hookrightarrow A/B$ is an \mathcal{H} -morphism because its trace is the type-definable set

$$\{(x, y) \in A' \times A : x - y \in B\}.$$

The inclusion is an \mathcal{H} -monomorphism because the forgetful functor $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow K_0 \text{Vect}$ reflects monomorphisms, by virtue of being faithful. Thus A'/B yields a subobject of A/B .

We claim that all subobjects of A/B arise this way. Because \mathcal{H} is abelian, every subobject of A/B arises as the kernel of some morphism $A/B \rightarrow A''/B''$. In Lemma C.9 we found $A' \in [A, B]$ such that the diagram

$$0 \rightarrow A'/B \rightarrow A/B \rightarrow A''/B''$$

becomes exact after applying the forgetful functor. But the forgetful functor is faithful and exact, so the diagram is *already* exact in \mathcal{H} . Therefore the subobject in question is represented by A'/B . Thus every \mathcal{H} -subobject of A/B has the form A'/B , and the map $[B, A] \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{H}}(A/B)$ is onto.

It remains to show that $[B, A] \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{H}}(A/B)$ is strictly order-preserving. Because the forgetful functor is faithful and exact, the induced map $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{H}}(A/B) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{K_0 \text{Vect}}(A/B)$ is strictly order-preserving. Therefore it suffices to show that for $A', A'' \in [B, A]$,

$$A' \subseteq A'' \iff A'/B \subseteq A''/B.$$

This is trivial. \square

We put everything together into the following theorem

Theorem C.15 (= Theorem 3.7). *Let \mathcal{H} be the category of Proposition C.7.*

- \mathcal{H} is a K_0 -linear abelian category.
- The forgetful functor $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow K_0 \text{Vect}$ is a K_0 -linear exact functor.
- Λ_\bullet is isomorphic to $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{K})$, and is therefore a directory.

Remark C.16. The technique used to prove Theorem C.15 probably generalizes to prove the following:

Proposition(?) C.17. *Let R be a K_0 -algebra and M be an R -module. For every n , let D_n be some bounded sublattice of $\text{Sub}_M(R)$. Suppose that for any $m \times n$ matrix μ with coefficients from K_0 , the structure Λ_\bullet is closed under pushforward and pullback along the map $M^n \rightarrow M^m$ induced by μ :*

$$\begin{aligned} A \in D_n &\implies \{\mu \cdot \vec{x} : \vec{x} \in A\} \in D_m \\ A \in D_m &\implies \{\vec{x} \in M^n : \mu \cdot \vec{x} \in A\} \in D_n. \end{aligned}$$

Then D_\bullet is a substructure of $\text{Dir}_R(M)$, and D_\bullet is a directory.

D Further remarks on directories

We discuss

- How $\text{End}(A)$ is uniformly interpretable in $\text{Dir}(A)$.
- How $\text{Dir}(A)$ is uniformly interpretable in $\text{End}(A)$ when A is semisimple.
- Why the class of directories is probably an elementary class.

The first two points yield the intuition that $\text{Dir}(A)$ is somehow a “generalized endomorphism ring.”

D.1 Interpreting the endomorphism ring

Let A be an object in a K_0 -linear abelian category.

Proposition D.1. *The structure $\text{Dir}(A)$ determines the K_0 -algebra $\text{End}(A)$. In fact, $\text{End}(A)$ is interpretable in $\text{Dir}(A)$.*

Proof. Let $\text{Dir}(A) = (D_1, D_2, \dots)$ be given as an abstract structure. Let \perp_n and \top_n denote the bottom and top elements of D_n . (So $\perp_n = 0$ and $\top_n = A^n$.) Set

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \top_1 \oplus \perp_1 \in D_2 \\ Y &= \perp_1 \oplus \top_1 \in D_2. \end{aligned}$$

(So $X = A \oplus 0$ and $Y = 0 \oplus A$.) Set

$$R = \{\Gamma \in D_2 \mid \Gamma \wedge Y = \perp_2, \Gamma \vee Y = \top_2\}.$$

(So R is the set of graphs of endomorphisms on A .) Given $\Gamma, \Gamma' \in R$, define $f(\Gamma, \Gamma') \in D_3$ by

$$f(\Gamma, \Gamma') = (\top_1 \oplus \Gamma') \wedge (\Gamma \oplus \top_1)$$

(So

$$f(\Gamma, \Gamma') = \{(x, \varphi(x), \varphi'(\varphi(x))) \mid x \in A\}$$

where Γ and Γ' are the graphs of $\varphi, \varphi' \in \text{End}(A)$, respectively.) Let $\nu \in GL_3(K_0)$ be the matrix swapping the second and third coordinates:

$$\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Define $\Gamma' \circ \Gamma$ to be the unique $\Gamma'' \in R$ such that

$$\nu \cdot (\Gamma'' \oplus \top_1) = f(\Gamma, \Gamma') \vee (\perp_1 \oplus \top_1 \oplus \perp_1),$$

(So Γ'' is the graph of $\varphi' \circ \varphi$.) If $\Gamma, \Gamma' \in R$, let

$$g(\Gamma, \Gamma') := (\Gamma \oplus \top_1) \wedge (\nu \cdot (\Gamma' \oplus \top_1)),$$

where ν is the matrix swapping second and third coordinates, as above. (So

$$g(\Gamma, \Gamma') = \{(x, \varphi(x), \varphi'(x)) \mid x \in A\}.$$

where Γ, Γ' are the graphs of φ, φ' , respectively.) Let $\rho \in GL_3(K_0)$ be the matrix sending $(x, y, z) \mapsto (x, y + z, z)$. Let

$$h(\Gamma, \Gamma') = (\rho \cdot g(\Gamma, \Gamma')) \vee (\perp_2 \oplus \top_1).$$

(So

$$h(\Gamma, \Gamma') = \{(x, \varphi(x) + \varphi'(x), y) \mid x, y \in A\}.$$

holds.) Let $\Gamma + \Gamma'$ be the unique $\Gamma'' \in R$ such that

$$\Gamma'' \oplus \top_1 = h(\Gamma, \Gamma').$$

(So Γ'' is the graph of $\varphi + \varphi' \in \text{End}(A)$.) Finally, if $\alpha \in K_0$, define $\iota_\alpha \in R$ to be

$$\lambda_\alpha \cdot (\top_1 \oplus \perp_1),$$

where $\lambda_\alpha \in GL_2(K_0)$ sends $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + \alpha x)$. (So ι_α is

$$\iota_\alpha = \{(x, \alpha x) \mid x \in A\},$$

the graph of α times the identity endomorphism $id_A \in \text{End}(A)$.)

Thus, we have recovered the set $\text{End}(A)$, the ring structure on $\text{End}(A)$, and the K_0 -algebra structure map $K_0 \rightarrow \text{End}(A)$, using only the pure directory structure. \square

For semisimple directories, this is in fact a bi-interpretation:

Proposition(?) D.2. *If A is semisimple, then $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ and $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ are bi-interpretable.*

Proof sketch. We interpret $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n)$ as the matrix ring over $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$. The following claim shows that $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n)$ interprets $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n)$.

Claim D.3. If $B \in \mathcal{C}$ is semisimple, then $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(B)$ is interpretable in $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(B)$.

Proof. Let I be the set of idempotent elements in $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(B)$. Note that for $u_1, u_2 \in I$, we have

$$u_2 \circ u_1 = u_1 \iff \text{im}(u_1) \subseteq \text{im}(u_2).$$

The \implies direction is straightforward. Conversely, if $\text{im}(u_1) \subseteq \text{im}(u_2)$, then for any $x \in B$,

$$u_1(x) \in \text{im}(u_1) \subseteq \text{im}(u_2),$$

so that $u_1(x) = u_2(u_1(x))$.

Furthermore, every subobject of B is of the form $\text{im}(u)$ for some $u \in I$, by semisimplicity. Therefore the relation

$$u_1 \leq u_2 \iff u_2 \circ u_1 = u_1$$

defines a pre-order on I and the induced poset is $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(B)$. \square Claim

Thus we can interpret the lattice $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}(A^n)$ in $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$. We leave the remaining details as an exercise to the reader. \square

D.2 Elementarity

Let A be an object in a K_0 -linear abelian category \mathcal{C} , and let \mathcal{C}' be the neighborhood of A , i.e., the category of subquotients of finite powers of A . It appears that \mathcal{C}' is determined up to equivalence by $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$, using the methods of Proposition D.1.

More precisely, for every n let \mathcal{C}'_n be the category whose

- *objects* are triples (X, Y, m) where $m \leq n$, where $X, Y \in \text{Sub}(A^m)$, and $X \geq Y$.
- *morphisms* from (X, Y, m) to (X', Y', m') are \mathcal{C} -morphisms from X/Y to X'/Y' .

Then \mathcal{C}'_n is equivalent to the full subcategory of \mathcal{C} consisting of the subquotients of A^n . Moreover, \mathcal{C}'_m is a full subcategory of \mathcal{C}'_n for $m \leq n$ and \mathcal{C}' is equivalent to the direct limit

$$\varinjlim_n \mathcal{C}'_n.$$

Now, using the techniques of Proposition D.1, each \mathcal{C}'_n should be interpretable in $\text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$ —uniformly across all \mathcal{C} and A . Up to equivalence, \mathcal{C}' is thus “ind-interpretable.”

Assuming things work out, we provisionally make the following definition:

Definition D.4. If D_{\bullet} is an abstract directory, the *neighborhood of D_{\bullet}* is the neighborhood of $A \in \mathcal{C}$, for any abelian category \mathcal{C} and object $A \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $D_{\bullet} \cong \text{Dir}_{\mathcal{C}}(A)$.

This should be well-defined up to equivalence, and comes with a canonical object A whose directory is D_{\bullet} .

Another likely consequence is

Proposition(?) D.5. *The class of directories is elementary.*

Proof sketch. Let (D_1, D_2, \dots) be a multi-sorted structure of the appropriate signature. Roughly speaking, we can assert that D_{\bullet} is a directory by interpreting the neighborhood and asserting that the neighborhood is a K_0 -linear abelian category.

Unfortunately, one needs a more intricate argument, because the neighborhood is merely ind-interpretable, rather than fully interpretable. One approach is to replace the category \mathcal{C}' with the multi-sorted structure $(\mathcal{C}'_1, \mathcal{C}'_2, \dots)$, and write down axioms ensuring that

$$\varinjlim_n \mathcal{C}'_n$$

is a K_0 -linear abelian category. One needs axioms like the following:

- Each \mathcal{C}'_n is a K_0 -linear pre-additive category.
- Each inclusion functor $\mathcal{C}'_n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_{n+1}$ is fully faithful, K_0 -linear, and injective on objects.
- If $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}'_n$, then $X \oplus Y$ exists in \mathcal{C}'_{2n} .
- If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism in \mathcal{C}'_n , then $\ker(f)$ and $\text{coker}(f)$ exist in \mathcal{C}'_n .
- The inclusion functors preserve kernels and cokernels.
- If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism in \mathcal{C}'_n , then the canonical map from $\text{coker}(\ker(f))$ to $\ker(\text{coker}(f))$ is an isomorphism.

One should also add a constant for the element $A = (A, 0, 1) \in \mathcal{C}'_1$. Call such a structure a “gadget.” Then

- The class of gadgets should be elementary.

- There should be a uniform way to interpret gadgets in directories, using the techniques of Proposition D.1.
- Given a gadget $(\mathcal{C}'_1, \mathcal{C}'_2, \dots)$ with selected object $A \in \mathcal{C}'_1$, the directory

$$\text{Dir}_{\varinjlim_n} c'_n(A)$$

should be interpretable in a straightforward, uniform fashion.

- These should combine to show that every directory is bi-interpretable with a gadget¹⁹ in a uniform fashion.

Finally, one can assert that a general structure D_\bullet is a directory by attempting to interpret the resulting gadget and the resulting directory. As long as the resulting gadget satisfies the gadget axioms, and as long as the resulting directory D'_\bullet is isomorphic to D_\bullet in the expected way, we can conclude that D_\bullet is a directory. \square

D.3 An incomplete axiomatization

It would be nice to have a more explicit and concise set of axioms for directories, however. One candidate list is the following:

- Each D_i should be a bounded modular lattice.
- The \oplus operation should be associative.
- The map $D_n \times D_m \rightarrow D_{n+m}$ should be an injective morphism of bounded lattices.
- For any n, m , the map

$$\begin{aligned} D_n &\rightarrow D_m \\ V &\mapsto V \oplus 0^m \end{aligned}$$

should be an isomorphism from D_n onto an interval in D_m .

- The $GL_n(K_0)$ -action should preserve the lattice structure.
- If $\mu_1 \in GL_n(K_0)$ and $\mu_2 \in GL_m(K_0)$ and μ_3 is the block matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

then the identity should hold:

$$(\mu_1 \cdot X) \oplus (\mu_2 \cdot Y) = \mu_3 \cdot (X \oplus Y)$$

¹⁹But not vice versa.

- If $X \in D_n, Y \in D_m$ and τ is the block matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_m \\ I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

then the identity should hold:

$$\tau \cdot (X \oplus Y) = Y \oplus X.$$

Unfortunately, this list is incomplete. One can show (again using the methods of Proposition D.1) that the $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ action is determined by the action of the symmetric group \mathcal{S}_n . Given a genuine directory $D_\bullet = (D_1, D_2, \dots)$, we can create another structure D'_\bullet in which the $GL_n(K_0)$ -action is twisted by the automorphism

$$\mu \mapsto (\mu^{-1})^T.$$

This automorphism fixes permutation matrices, but is non-trivial for $n > 1$. We can find a directory D_\bullet for which the $GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action on D_2 is faithful. The resulting twisted structure D'_\bullet seems to satisfy the axioms listed above. But D'_\bullet cannot be a directory, because

- D'_\bullet and D_\bullet have the same \oplus -structure, lattice structure, and \mathcal{S}_n -action.
- D'_\bullet and D_\bullet have distinct $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ -actions.
- For genuine directories, the $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ -action is determined by the \oplus -structure, lattice structure, and \mathcal{S}_n -action.

D.4 Another approach

If A is an object in a K_0 -linear abelian category, define $\text{Dir}^+(A)$ to be

$$(\text{Sub}(A), \text{Sub}(A^2), \text{Sub}(A^3), \dots)$$

with the following structure:

- For each n , the bounded lattice structure on $\text{Sub}(A^n)$.
- For any $m \times n$ matrix μ over K_0 , the pullback and pushforward maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^* &: \text{Sub}(A^m) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^n) \\ \mu_* &: \text{Sub}(A^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^m) \end{aligned}$$

along the morphism $A^n \rightarrow A^m$ induced by μ .

Restricting μ to invertible matrices, one recovers the $GL_n(K_0)$ -action. The \oplus operation

$$\oplus : \text{Sub}(A^n) \times \text{Sub}(A^m) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^{n+m})$$

is determined as well:

$$V \oplus W = (\pi_1^* V) \wedge (\pi_2^* W),$$

where π_1, π_2 are the matrices corresponding to the coordinate projections

$$\begin{aligned} K_0^{n+m} &\rightarrow K_0^n \\ K_0^{n+m} &\rightarrow K_0^m. \end{aligned}$$

So $\text{Dir}(A)$ is interpretable in $\text{Dir}^+(A)$. Conversely, $\text{Dir}^+(A)$ is interpretable in $\text{Dir}(A)$ as follows:

1. Let μ be a given $m \times n$ matrix over K_0 .
2. Let μ' be the invertible block triangular matrix

$$\mu' = \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mu \\ 0 & I_n \end{pmatrix}$$

3. Let f and f' be the morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} f &: A^n \rightarrow A^m \\ f' &: A^{m+n} \rightarrow A^{m+n} \end{aligned}$$

induced by μ, μ' . Then

$$f'(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = (\vec{x} + f(\vec{y}), \vec{y})$$

for $\vec{x} \in A^m$ and $\vec{y} \in A^n$.

4. Let X be a given subobject of A^n . Then

$$\mu' \cdot (0^m \oplus X) = f'_*(0^m \oplus X) = \{(f(\vec{y}), \vec{y}) : \vec{y} \in X\}$$

$$(\mu' \cdot (0^m \oplus X)) \vee (0^m \oplus X) = \{(f(\vec{y}), \vec{z}) : \vec{y}, \vec{z} \in X\} = f_*(X) \oplus A^n.$$

Then $f_*(X)$ is the unique $Y \in \text{Sub}(A^m)$ such that

$$(\mu' \cdot (0^m \oplus X)) \vee (0^m \oplus X) = Y \oplus A^n.$$

This shows that $f_* : \text{Sub}(A^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^m)$ is interpretable in $\text{Dir}(A)$. Then $f^* : \text{Sub}(A^m) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^n)$ is also interpretable, because it is characterized by the Galois connection with f_* :

$$\forall X \in \text{Sub}(A^n), Y \in \text{Sub}(A^m) : (f_*(X) \leq Y \iff X \leq f^*(Y).)$$

Thus $\text{Dir}(A)$ and $\text{Dir}^+(A)$ are bi-interpretable. Say that a structure D_\bullet is an *extended directory* if it is isomorphic to one of the form $\text{Dir}_\mathcal{C}^+(A)$. Extended directories are equivalent to directories. We opted to use directories rather than extended directories because most of the directory morphisms we are interested in fail to preserve the extended directory structure.

Example D.6. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a morphism. Consider the commutative diagram, in which the horizontal maps are the projections onto the first coordinate, induced by the 1×2 matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^2 & \xrightarrow{\pi_A} & A \\ f^{\oplus 2} \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ B^2 & \xrightarrow{\pi_B} & B. \end{array}$$

Then for general $X \in \text{Sub}(A)$,

$$\pi_B^* f_* X \neq f_*^{\oplus 2} \pi_A^* X.$$

Therefore the pushforward map $f_* : \text{Dir}^+(A) \rightarrow \text{Dir}^+(B)$ does not preserve the added structure of $\text{Dir}^+(-)$.

On the other hand, the class of extended directories appears to be closed under the following:

1. Ultraproducts, because extended directories are the image of an elementary class (pointed abelian categories) under an interpretation.
2. Substructures, by Proposition C.17 and Mitchell embedding
3. Quotients, by a Serre quotient construction similar to §3.3.
4. Products, by §2.5, which should generalize to infinite products. An infinite product of abelian categories is an abelian category, by Remark 8.3.6(i) in [12].

If points (2-4) hold, then the class of extended directories is cut out by a universal equational theory. If points (1-2) hold, the class is cut out by a universal theory. Either way, the classes of extended directories and plain directories would therefore be elementary.

Here is a candidate axiomatization for extended directories:

Conjecture D.7. Let D_\bullet be a structure (D_0, D_1, D_2, \dots) with a poset structure on each D_i , and connecting maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^* &: \text{Sub}(A^m) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^n) \\ \mu_* &: \text{Sub}(A^n) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A^m) \end{aligned}$$

for every $m \times n$ matrix over K_0 . Suppose the following axioms hold:

1. Each D_n is a bounded modular lattice.
2. D_0 is the trivial one-element modular lattice.

3. The maps μ^* and μ_* are order-preserving:

$$\begin{aligned} x \leq y &\implies \mu^*(x) \leq \mu^*(y) \\ x \leq y &\implies \mu_*(x) \leq \mu_*(y). \end{aligned}$$

4. The maps μ^* and μ_* depend functorially on μ :

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu \cdot \nu)^* &= \mu^* \circ \nu^* \\ (\mu \cdot \nu)_* &= \nu_* \circ \mu_* \\ (I_n)^* &= id_{D_n} \\ (I_n)_* &= id_{D_n}. \end{aligned}$$

5. The maps μ^* and μ_* have a Galois connection:

$$\mu_*(x) \leq y \iff x \leq \mu^*(y).$$

Then D is an extended directory, i.e., $D \cong \text{Dir}^+(A)$ for some object A in a K_0 -linear abelian category.

If this conjecture is true, one could view a directory as a functor from $K_0 \text{Vect}^f$ to a category of bounded modular lattices with Galois connections as morphisms.

On the other hand, Axiom 2 feels out of place, and suggests that we need some additional axioms for compatibility with \oplus .

E A note on ranks in abelian categories

Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category. Let $\text{rk} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be a function assigning each object in \mathcal{C} a non-negative integer rank. Say that rk is a *weak rank* if the following conditions hold:

1. If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is an epimorphism, then $\text{rk}(A) \geq \text{rk}(B)$.
2. If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a monomorphism, then $\text{rk}(A) \leq \text{rk}(B)$.
3. $\text{rk}(A \oplus B) \geq \text{rk}(A) + \text{rk}(B)$.
4. $\text{rk}(A) = 0 \iff A \cong 0$.

Say that rk is a *strong rank* if the following additional condition holds: for any short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$$

we have

$$\text{rk}(B) \leq \text{rk}(A) + \text{rk}(C).$$

A rank function $\text{rk}(-)$ is a strong rank if and only if it satisfies the properties of Proposition 6.9. In particular, reduced rank is a strong rank in a cube-bounded category.

Proposition E.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category and $\text{rk} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be a weak rank. Then \mathcal{C} is cube-bounded and*

$$\text{rk}_0(A) \leq \text{rk}(A)$$

for any A .

Proof. Same as Claim 6.18 in the proof of Proposition 6.17. \square

With Proposition 6.9, this implies the following result, which explains the name “reduced rank:”

Proposition E.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category. The following are equivalent:*

1. \mathcal{C} is cube-bounded (Definition 6.6).
2. \mathcal{C} admits a weak rank.
3. \mathcal{C} admits a strong rank.

If the equivalent conditions hold, then $\text{rk}_0(-)$ is the smallest weak rank and the smallest strong rank.

In particular, there is some way to upgrade weak ranks (like burden) into strong ranks (like dp-rank, reduced rank).

Here is a more general statement in this direction:

Proposition E.3. *Let $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$ be the extended natural numbers $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category. Let $\star : \overline{\mathbb{N}} \times \overline{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ be a function such that*

$$0 \star 0 = 0$$

$$x, y < \infty \implies x \star y < \infty.$$

Let $\text{rk} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ be a function assigning each object $A \in \mathcal{C}$ a rank $\text{rk}(A) \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$, satisfying the following properties:

1. *Given a short exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0,$$

we have

$$\max(\text{rk}(A), \text{rk}(C)) \leq \text{rk}(B) \leq \text{rk}(A) \star \text{rk}(B).$$

2. *For any A, B ,*

$$\text{rk}(A \oplus B) \geq \text{rk}(A) + \text{rk}(B).$$

Then there is another rank $\text{rk}' : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the same properties with $+$ instead of \star ; moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}'(A) = 0 &\iff \text{rk}(A) = 0 \\ \text{rk}'(A) = \infty &\iff \text{rk}(A) = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{C}' be the (Serre) subcategory of objects of finite rank. Let \mathcal{C}'' be the Serre subcategory of objects of rank 0. Then rk induces a weak rank on the Serre quotient $\mathcal{C}'/\mathcal{C}''$. Therefore $\mathcal{C}'/\mathcal{C}''$ has a strong rank, which pulls back to an \mathbb{N} -valued rank on \mathcal{C}' having the desired properties. This extends to an $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$ -valued rank on \mathcal{C} by setting rank to ∞ outside of \mathcal{C}' . \square

For example, if \mathcal{D} is the category of interpretable abelian groups in some structure, then $\text{bdn} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the assumptions, with

$$x \star y := x + y + xy,$$

by the sub-multiplicativity of burden proven in ([1], Corollary 2.6).

Therefore there is a rank $\text{rk} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ with all the good sub-additivity properties of dp-rank, such that

$$\text{rk}(A) < \infty \iff (\text{bdn}(A) \text{ is finite.})$$

References

- [1] Artem Chernikov. Theories without the tree property of the second kind. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 165(2):695–723, February 2014.
- [2] Artem Chernikov, Itay Kaplan, and Pierre Simon. Groups and fields with NTP_2 . *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 143:395–406, 2015.
- [3] Jan Dobrowolski and Frank O. Wagner. On omega-categorical groups and rings of finite burden. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 2019.
- [4] Yatir Halevi, Assaf Hasson, and Franziska Jahnke. A conjectural classification of strongly dependent fields. arXiv:1805.03814v2 [math.LO], 2018.
- [5] Yatir Halevi, Assaf Hasson, and Franziska Jahnke. Definable V-topologies, henselianity and NIP. arXiv:1901.05920v2 [math.LO], 2019.
- [6] Franziska Jahnke and Jochen Koenigsmann. Uniformly defining p-henselian valuations. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 166(7-8):741–754, July-August 2015.
- [7] Will Johnson. On dp-minimal fields. arXiv:1507.02745v1 [math.LO], July 2015.
- [8] Will Johnson. Dp-finite fields II: the canonical topology and its relation to henselianity. arXiv:1910.05932v2 [math.LO], October 2019.
- [9] Will Johnson. Dp-finite fields IV. In preparation, 2019.
- [10] Will Johnson. Partial results on dp-finite fields. arXiv:1903.11322v1 [math.LO], March 2019.

- [11] Itay Kaplan, Alf Onshuus, and Alexander Usvyatsov. Additivity of the dp-rank. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 365(11):5783–5804, November 2013.
- [12] Masaki Kashiwara and Pierre Schapira. *Categories and Sheaves*. Number 332 in Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, 2006.
- [13] Bruno Poizat. *Stable Groups*. Number 87 in Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 1987.
- [14] Peter Sinclair. *Relationships between model theory and valuations on fields*. PhD thesis, McMaster University, 2018.