

# Strictly atomic modules in definable categories

Mike Prest

Department of Mathematics, University of Manchester, UK  
mprest@manchester.ac.uk

## Abstract

If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable category then it may contain no nonzero finitely presented modules but, by a result of Makkai, there is a  $\varinjlim$ -generating set of strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic modules. These modules share some key properties of finitely presented modules.

We consider these modules in general and then in the case that  $\mathcal{D}$  is the category of modules of some fixed irrational slope over a tubular algebra.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Mittag-Leffler and relatively atomic modules</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Strictly atomic modules</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1	Constructing strictly atomic models . . . . .	9
4.2	Strictly atomic generators . . . . .	13
4.3	The ring of definable scalars . . . . .	14
<b>5</b>	<b>Tilting and silting classes</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Modules of irrational slope</b>	<b>16</b>
6.1	Pp formulas near an irrational and definable closures . . . . .	18
6.2	Purity in $\mathcal{D}_r$ . . . . .	19
6.3	Non-pure morphisms in $\mathcal{D}_r$ . . . . .	20
<b>7</b>	<b>Background from Model Theory</b>	<b>25</b>

## 1 Introduction

Mittag-Leffler and strictly Mittag-Leffler modules were introduced in [26]. These modules are in some sense ‘small’: they include the finitely presented modules and pure-projective modules (direct summands of direct sums of finitely presented modules). For countably generated modules, the conditions of being Mittag-Leffler, strictly Mittag-Leffler and pure-projective are equivalent.

Definable categories include, but are much more general than, module categories. They are not in general locally finitely presented; indeed they may contain no finitely presented objects other than 0 ([23, 18.1.1]). They do, however, have enough relatively (to the definable category) Mittag-Leffler, even strictly Mittag-Leffler, objects; this is a result of Makkai [20]. Here we give a proof of existence which is more direct than in Makkai’s paper and we deduce various consequences. We also favour a different terminology, using ‘atomic’ in place of ‘Mittag-Leffler’ for the relative concepts - this term reflects the characterisation of Mittag-Leffler modules that every finite tuple of elements in such a module has finitely generated pp-type.

Early papers dealing with these modules include [6], where the strict Mittag-Leffler condition was shown to be equivalent to being locally pure-projective, and [29], where the model-theoretic characterisation of Mittag-Leffler modules in terms of pp-types was discovered and the basic results extended to definable categories. Makkai's work [20] was done in a very general context using category-theory-inspired model theory and here we connect it with the more algebraic line of development.

After introducing the concepts - we will use the terms (strictly)  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic for the relativisation of (strictly) Mittag-Leffler to a definable category  $\mathcal{D}$  - and basic results, we give a fairly short proof of existence of enough strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic objects in every definable category  $\mathcal{D}$ . In particular, if  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of a module category  $\text{Mod-}R$ , then every finitely presented  $R$ -module has a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope. Then we look at some immediate consequences, including the case that  $\mathcal{D} = \text{Gen}(T)$  for a silting  $R$ -module  $T$ .

All this is applied in the category  $\mathcal{D}_r$  of  $R$ -modules of some irrational slope  $r$  when  $R$  is a tubular algebra. Some information was obtained about these categories in [15] and here we take this further. Our eventual aim, still unrealised, is to describe the indecomposable pure-injective modules of slope  $r$  and hence to complete the description of the Ziegler spectrum which has been investigated in [15], [11] and [3], continuing the work in [27] and [28].

I would like to thank Amit Kuber, for reminding me about Makkai's paper and the strength of this result and for subsequent discussions, and Philipp Rothmaler for a conversation where we worked out the more direct proof, in the countable case, of Makkai's result and, of course, for originally noticing and developing the model-theoretic content and import of the Mittag-Leffler condition.

## 2 Background

Throughout we use the language of rings and modules but, in fact, for the general results we may take  $R$  to be any (skeletally) small preadditive category - a ring with many objects (a many-sorted ring in the terminology of model theory) - and so left and right  $R$ -modules will be additive functors (respectively covariant and contravariant) from  $R$  to the category  $\mathbf{Ab}$  of abelian groups. We write as if  $R$  is a normal, 1-sorted, ring but the proofs work in the more general context and we envisage that some applications will need that generality, though for this paper we don't need many-sorted rings.

We also make full use of concepts and results from the model theory of modules as well as algebraic methods. Indeed, from the start, we freely use the notions of pp formula and pp-type. There is a section at the end of the paper which gives a quick introduction/reminder of relevant definitions and concepts. There are many sources for more detail about the model theory used: here I tend to cite [23] as a fairly comprehensive secondary source but there are numerous (much) more concise introductions and summaries. In particular there is [31] which also includes a great deal of the algebraic background material from Sections 2 and 3, for which also see [1]. The "additive model theory" that we use is really a (highly-developed) part of regular (=pp-) model theory; see [8] for an introduction to this which is based on categorical model theory rather than classical model theory.

Most of the material from Section 3 and the beginning of Section 4 is already in the literature but I include it to keep the paper reasonably self-contained.

## 3 Mittag-Leffler and relatively atomic modules

Let  $R$  be a small preadditive category. An  $R$ -module  $M$  is **Mittag-Leffler**, or just **ML** ([26, §2]), if  $M$  is the direct limit of a directed system  $(\{M_i\}_i, \{f_{ij} : M_i \rightarrow M_j\}_{i < j})$  of finitely presented modules  $M_i$ , where the directed system satisfies the following equivalent conditions, with  $f_{i\infty} : M_i \rightarrow M$  denoting the limit maps:

- (i) for every  $i$  there is  $j \geq i$  such that, for any tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $M_i$ ,  $\text{pp}^M(f_{i\infty}\bar{a}) = \text{pp}^{M_j}(f_{ij}\bar{a})$  (it is enough to require this for a generating tuple for  $M_i$ );
- (ii) for every  $i$  there is  $j \geq i$  such that  $f_{ij}$  factors through each  $f_{ik}$  for all  $k \geq j$ ;

(iii) for every  $R$ -module  $N$ , the inverse system  $(\{(M_i, N)\}_i, \{(f_{ij}, N) : (M_j, N) \rightarrow (M_i, N)\}_{i \leq j})$  is Mittag-Leffler.

An inversely-directed system  $(\{L_i\}_i, \{g_{ji} : L_j \rightarrow L_i\}_{j \geq i})$  (of abelian groups say) is **Mittag-Leffler** if, for each  $i$ , the system of images  $(f_{ji}L_j)_{j \geq i}$  has the descending chain condition (that is, stabilises at some  $j \geq i$ ).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that  $M$  is a right  $R$ -module. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1)  $M$  is Mittag-Leffler.

(2) For every set  $\{L_i\}_{i \in I}$  of left  $R$ -modules, the canonical map  $M \otimes_R (\prod_{i \in I} L_i) \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} (M \otimes_R L_i)$  is monic.

(3) Every pp-type realised in  $M$  is finitely generated. That is, for any  $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  with the  $a_i \in M$ ,  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle$  for some pp formula  $\phi$ , where  $\langle \phi \rangle = \{\psi \text{ pp} : \phi \leq \psi\}$  denotes the pp-type generated by  $\phi$ .

It is this property (3) which we will use in what follows as the definition of the corresponding modules in the more general context of definable categories. That relativisation to definable categories  $\mathcal{D}$  is done in [29] (e.g. [29, 2.2]) and subsequent papers (e.g. [1], [13]). In the terminology of those references we would refer to our modules of interest as  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{d}}$ -Mittag-Leffler, where  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{d}}$  is the dual definable category (see [23, §3.4.2]) of  $\mathcal{D}$ . This would be slightly clumsy and, with possible extensions to non-additive situations in mind, worse since, in more general contexts, there seems not to be the nice, multiple-level, theory of duality that one has in the additive context. So we will follow [32] (and the earlier references [29], [18] and [31]) and take property (3) as the basis of our terminology.

We recall some properties of Mittag-Leffler modules and their relation to pure-projective modules.

**Theorem 3.2.** (1) *Every pure-projective  $R$ -module, in particular every finitely presented  $R$ -module, is ML.*

(2) *Every direct sum of ML modules is ML, as is every pure submodule, in particular every direct summand, of an ML module.*

(3) *Every countably generated ML module is pure-projective.*

(4) *A module  $M$  is ML iff every finite subset of  $M$  is contained in a pure-projective pure submodule of  $M$ , and this implies that every countable subset of  $M$  is contained in a pure-projective pure submodule of  $M$ .*

**Convention:** Throughout the paper  $\mathcal{D}$  will denote a definable subcategory which we will take to be definably embedded in (i.e. equivalent to a definable subcategory of)  $\text{Mod-}R$  for some small preadditive category  $R$ . All references to pp formulas and types may be taken to refer to the language for  $R$ -modules.

Recall that if  $\mathcal{D}$  is definably embedded in  $\text{Mod-}R$  (indeed, definably embedded into any definable category  $\mathcal{E}$ ) then purity in the larger category, restricted to  $\mathcal{D}$  coincides with the internally-defined purity in  $\mathcal{D}$ . The latter is defined as follows: an exact sequence is **pure** iff some ultrapower of it is split. This works because, given any definable category  $\mathcal{D}$ , there is some index set  $I$  and ultrafilter  $\mathcal{U}$  on that index set such that, if  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , then the ultrapower  $D^* = D^I/\mathcal{U}$  is pure-injective [24, 21.2]. That follows from a general model-theoretic result; see [24, §§20,21] for more detail.

It follows that the choice of definably-embedding category of modules makes no difference to the model theory on  $\mathcal{D}$  (only the language might change to an equivalent one).

**Definition 3.3.** *Given a definable category  $\mathcal{D}$ , we write  $\phi \leq_{\mathcal{D}} \psi$  if, for every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , we have  $\phi(D) \leq \psi(D)$ . If  $\phi$  is a pp formula, then we set  $\langle \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} = \{\psi \text{ pp} : \phi \leq_{\mathcal{D}} \psi\}$  to be the **pp-type generated by  $\phi$  in or modulo** (the theory of)  $\mathcal{D}$  and we will also say that  $p$  is  **$\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $\phi$** .*

That is,  $p$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $\phi$  if  $\phi \in p$  and if, in every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , every tuple which satisfies  $\phi$  also satisfies every formula in  $p$ . Thus  $p$  is the smallest pp-type of some tuple  $\bar{a}$  of elements from some  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  which contains  $\phi$ .

Recall [25, 3.5] that every definable subcategory  $\mathcal{D}$  of a module category  $\text{Mod-}R$  is **preenveloping** (as well as covering, e.g. [10, 2.4]), that is, given any  $M \in \text{Mod-}R$  there is a morphism  $f : M \rightarrow D_M \in \mathcal{D}$  - a  **$\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope** of  $M$  - such that, for every morphism  $g : M \rightarrow D \in \mathcal{D}$ , there is  $h : D_M \rightarrow D$  with  $hf = g$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{f} & D_M \\ & \searrow g & \vdots h \\ & & D \end{array}$$

However,  $h$  may well not be unique, and the choice of  $D_M$  is not unique in any sense though, see [19, 3.3], choosing such a weak reflection into  $\mathcal{D}$  can be made functorial.

Recall also that a  **$\mathcal{D}$ -envelope** of a module  $M$  is a  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope  $f : M \rightarrow D_M$  with the property that any endomorphism  $h : D_M \rightarrow D_M$  such that  $hf = f$  is an automorphism.

**Lemma 3.4.** *If  $A \in \text{mod-}R$  and  $\bar{a}$  is a tuple from  $A$  with  $\text{pp}^A(\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle$  and if  $f : A \rightarrow D \in \mathcal{D}$  is a  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope of  $A$ , then  $\text{pp}^D(f\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ .*

**Proof.** If  $D' \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \phi(D')$ , then there is ([23, 1.2.17]) a morphism  $A \rightarrow D'$  taking  $\bar{a}$  to  $\bar{b}$  and hence a morphism from  $D$  to  $D'$  taking  $f\bar{a}$  to  $\bar{b}$ , hence  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a}) \subseteq \text{pp}^{D'}(\bar{b})$ . That is,  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a})$  is the minimal pp-type realised in  $\mathcal{D}$  containing  $\phi$ , as claimed.  $\square$

There is  $\phi$  as in the statement of the lemma because every pp-type realised in  $A$  is finitely generated (by [23, 1.2.6]). Recall [23, §1.2.2] that every pp formula  $\phi$  has a **free realisation** in  $\text{Mod-}R$ , meaning a pair  $(A, \bar{a})$  with  $A$  finitely presented and  $\text{pp}^A(\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle$  (in the above definitions, we drop the subscript  $\mathcal{D}$  when  $\mathcal{D} = \text{Mod-}R$ ). Then [23, 1.2.17] if  $M \in \text{Mod-}R$  and  $\bar{b} \in \phi(M)$ , then there will be a morphism  $f : A \rightarrow M$  with  $f\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ . So 3.4 gives a weak relative version of this. But it turns out that there is a stronger existence result: see 4.9(b) below.

**Definition 3.5.** *Say that  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  is  **$\mathcal{D}$ -atomic**, if every pp-type realised in  $M$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -finitely generated.<sup>1</sup>*

This definition is made, and a number of properties developed, in [29] though there the term  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{d-ML}}$  is mostly used rather than  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.

**Lemma 3.6.** ([29, 2.4]) *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a definable category. Then the class of  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic modules is closed under pure submodules and arbitrary direct sums.*

**Proof.** Closure under pure submodules is immediate from the definition since pp-types are preserved under pure embeddings.

For closure under direct sums, since the definition is a condition on finite tuples of elements and pp-types are, as already remarked, unchanged in pure submodules (in particular, in direct summands), it is enough to prove the case where  $I$  is finite, indeed, the case where  $I = \{1, 2\}$ . Take  $\bar{a} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2) \in D_1 \oplus D_2$  with  $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ . Let  $\phi_1$  be a pp formula which  $\mathcal{D}$ -generates the pp-type of  $\bar{a}_1$  in  $D_1$  (equally of  $(\bar{a}_1, \bar{0})$  in  $D_1 \oplus D_2$ ), and similarly take  $\phi_2$  for  $\bar{a}_2$ . Then (by [23, 1.2.27]) the pp-type of  $\bar{a}$  in  $D_1 \oplus D_2$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by the pp formula  $\phi_1 + \phi_2$  (there is background on pp formulas in Section 7). That shows that  $D_1 + D_2$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.  $\square$

We say that  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  is  **$\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective** if every pure-epimorphism  $D \rightarrow M$  with  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  splits. We will see below (3.10) that this is equivalent to the property that morphisms from  $M$  lift over pure epimorphisms in  $\mathcal{D}$ . First we recall a characterisation of pure epimorphisms.

**Proposition 3.7.** (see [23, 2.1.14]) *A morphism  $f : N \rightarrow M$  is a pure epimorphism iff, for every tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$  and every pp formula  $\phi$  such that  $\bar{a} \in \phi(M)$ , there is  $\bar{b} \in \phi(N)$  with  $f\bar{b} = \bar{a}$ .*

<sup>1</sup>The term ‘‘pp-atomic’’ would be more accurate because ‘‘atomic’’ means in model theory that every realised *complete* type is finitely generated and here we mean that every realised *pp-type* is finitely generated. But, in the additive context, we mostly use pp-, also called ‘regular’, model theory.

For ease of reference, we note the closure of definable subcategories under pullbacks of pure epimorphisms and pushouts of pure monomorphisms.

**Lemma 3.8.** *If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$  and if the following diagram is a pullback with  $M, D, D'$  all in  $\mathcal{D}$  and with  $p$  a pure epimorphism, then  $X \in \mathcal{D}$ .*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & M \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ D & \xrightarrow{p} & D' \end{array}$$

**Proof.** Recall that  $X = \{(m, d) : fm = pd\} \leq M \oplus D$  and the morphisms from  $X$  are the restrictions of the projection maps. We show that  $X$  is pure in  $M \oplus D$ , from which the conclusion follows.

Suppose<sup>2</sup> that  $M \oplus D \models \phi((m, d))$ ; say  $M \models \theta((m, d), (\bar{n}, \bar{e}))$  where  $\phi$  is  $\exists \bar{y} \theta(x, \bar{y})$  with  $\theta$  quantifier-free,  $\bar{n}$  from  $M$  and  $\bar{e}$  from  $D$ . So  $M \models \theta(m, \bar{n})$ , hence  $D' \models \theta(fm, f\bar{n})$ ; also  $D \models \theta(d, \bar{e})$ , hence  $D' \models \theta(pd, p\bar{e})$ . Since  $fm = pd$ , this gives  $D' \models \theta(0, f\bar{n} - p\bar{e})$ . Since  $p$  is a pure epimorphism, there exists  $\bar{b}$  from  $D$  with  $D \models \theta(0, \bar{b})$  and  $p\bar{b} = f\bar{n} - p\bar{e}$ . That is,  $p(\bar{b} + \bar{e}) = f\bar{n}$ , and so  $(\bar{b} + \bar{e}, \bar{n})$  is in  $X$ .

Since  $D \models \theta(d, \bar{e})$  and  $D \models \theta(0, \bar{b})$  we deduce  $D \models \theta(d, \bar{b} + \bar{e})$ . Together with  $M \models \theta(m, \bar{n})$ , this gives  $M \oplus D \models \theta((m, d), (\bar{n}, \bar{b} + \bar{e}))$ . Therefore  $X \models \theta((m, d), (\bar{n}, \bar{b} + \bar{e}))$ , hence  $X \models \phi((m, d))$ , as required.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$  and if the following diagram is a pushout with  $M, D, D'$  all in  $\mathcal{D}$  and with  $i$  a pure monomorphism, then  $Y \in \mathcal{D}$ .*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D' & \xrightarrow{i} & D \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ M & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array}$$

**Proof.** The pushout is the factor of  $M \oplus D$  by the anti-diagonal image,  $(f, -i)D'$ , of  $D'$  but this is a pure submodule of  $M \oplus D$  because, if  $M \oplus D \models \phi((fd, -id))$  for some pp formula  $\phi$  and  $d \in D'$ , then  $D \models \phi(id)$ , so  $D' \models \phi(d)$  since  $D'$  is pure in  $D$ . But then  $(f, -i)D \models \phi((f, -i)d = fd, -id)$ , as required. Since definable categories are closed under pure-epimorphic images,  $Y = M \oplus D / (f, -i)D' \in \mathcal{D}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a definable category. Then  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective iff, given  $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $p : D \rightarrow D'$  a pure epimorphism, then there is a morphism  $g : M \rightarrow D$  with  $pg = f$ .*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & M & \\ g \swarrow \cdots & \downarrow f & \\ D & \xrightarrow{p} & D' \end{array}$$

**Proof.**  $(\Rightarrow)$  Form the pullback as in 4.17 and use that  $X$  as there is in  $\mathcal{D}$  to deduce that  $X \rightarrow M$  splits giving, composed with  $X \rightarrow D$ , the required morphism  $g$ .

The other direction follows by applying the property with  $f = 1_M$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.11.** ([29, 3.9, 3.12]) *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a definable category.*

- (1) *Every  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective module is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.*
- (2) *Every countably generated  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic module is  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective.*
- (3) *A module  $M$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic iff every finite subset of  $M$  is contained in a pure-projective pure submodule of  $M$ , and this implies that every countable subset of  $M$  is contained in a  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective pure submodule of  $M$ .*

**Proof.** The proofs are as in the non-relative case but we include proofs of (1) and (2) since they illustrate some of the techniques we use in the paper.

<sup>2</sup>To check purity it is enough to consider pp formulas in one free variable, see [23, 2.1.6]; or just put a bar over  $m, d$ , etc.

(1) Suppose that  $M$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective. Recall (e.g. [23, 2.1.25]) that every module is a pure epimorphic image of a direct sum of finitely presented modules: say  $p : \bigoplus_i A_i \rightarrow M$  is a pure epimorphism with each  $A_i$  finitely presented; set  $p_i : A_i \rightarrow M$  be the  $i$ th component of  $p$ . For each  $i$  choose a  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope  $g_i : A \rightarrow D_i \in \mathcal{D}$  and a factorisation  $f_i g_i = p_i$  of  $p_i$ . Set  $g = (g_i)_i$ . The morphism  $f = (f_i) : D = \bigoplus_i D_i \rightarrow M$  is, applying 3.7, a pure epimorphism, hence splits; let  $h : M \rightarrow D$  be a splitting of  $f$ .

Given  $\bar{c}$  from  $M$ , choose  $\bar{a}$  from  $\bigoplus_i A_i$  with  $g\bar{a} = h\bar{c}$ , so  $fg\bar{a} = \bar{c}$ . By 3.4,  $\text{pp}^D(f\bar{a})$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by any pp formula  $\phi$  which generates  $\text{pp}^A(\bar{a})$  and, since  $M$  is a direct summand of  $D$ ,  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{c}) = \text{pp}^D(h\bar{c})$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -finitely generated by  $\phi$ , as required.

(2) Suppose that  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, \dots$  is an enumeration of a countable set of generators for the  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic module  $M$  and suppose that  $\pi : D \rightarrow M$  is a pure epimorphism. Suppose that  $\phi_1 = \phi(x_1)$   $\mathcal{D}$ -generates  $\text{pp}^M(a_1)$ . By assumption and 3.7 there is  $c_1 \in \phi_1(D)$  with  $\pi c_1 = a_1$ . Note that, since morphisms are non-decreasing on pp-types,  $\text{pp}^D(c_1)$  is therefore  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $\phi_1$ .

Choose  $\phi_2 = \phi_2(x_1, x_2)$  which  $\mathcal{D}$ -generates  $\text{pp}^M(a_1, a_2)$ . Then  $\exists x_2 \phi_2(x_1, x_2) \in \text{pp}^M(x_1) = \text{pp}^D(c_1)$ , so there is  $c'_2 \in D$  with  $(c_1, c'_2) \in \phi_2(D)$ . Now,  $\text{pp}^D(c_1, c'_2)$  might strictly contain  $\langle \phi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$  but, since  $\pi$  is a pure epimorphism, there is, as above, some  $(b_1, b_2) \in \phi_2(D)$  with  $\pi b_1 = a_1$  and  $\pi b_2 = a_2$ . Then we have  $D \models \phi_2(c_1 - b_1, c'_2 - b_2)$  and also  $c_1 - b_1 \in \ker(\pi)$ . Since  $\ker(\pi)$  is pure in  $D$ , there is  $d_2 \in \ker(\pi)$  with  $D \models \phi_2(c_1 - b_1, d_2)$ . Combining with  $\phi_2(b_1, b_2)$  gives  $D \models \phi_2(c_1, b_2 + d_2)$ ; set  $c_2 = b_2 + d_2$ . Noting that  $\pi : (c_1, c_2) \mapsto (a_1, a_2)$ , we conclude that  $\text{pp}^D(c_1, c_2) = \langle \phi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} = \text{pp}^M(a_1, a_2)$ .

We continue in this way, to obtain  $c_1, c_2, \dots \in N$  with the same pp-type as  $a_1, a_2, \dots$ . In particular we have a well-defined map  $f : M \rightarrow D$ , defined by  $f a_i = c_i$ , splitting  $\pi$ , as required.  $\square$

*Remark 3.12.* It is shown in [18, 3.1] that a pp-constructible module is pure-projective, where a module  $M$  is **pp-constructible** if it is the union  $M = \bigcup_{i < \alpha} A_i$  of subsets where, for each  $i \geq -1$ ,  $A_{i+1}$  is the union of  $A_i$  (take  $A_{-1} = \emptyset$ ) and (the entries of) some finite tuple  $\bar{a}_i$  of elements of  $M$  such that the pp-type,  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}_i/A_i)$ , of  $\bar{a}_i$  in  $M$  over  $A_i$  is finitely generated. Again, this - both definition and result - can be relativised to a definable category  $\mathcal{D}$  by taking  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  and requiring the pp-types  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}_i/A_i)$  to be  $\mathcal{D}$ -finitely generated.

To continue with some degree of self-containedness, we now give a proof (essentially that of Rothmaler [29, 2.2]) of the relative version of 3.1 (at least, of the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) there).

We recall Herzog's criterion for a tensor to be 0.

**Theorem 3.13.** (see [23, 1.3.7]) *If  $\bar{a}$  is a tuple of elements from a right  $R$ -module  $M$  and  $\bar{l}$  is a tuple of the same length from a left  $R$ -module  $L$ , then  $\bar{a} \otimes \bar{l} = 0$  (that is,  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes_R l_i = 0$ ) iff there is a pp formula  $\phi(\bar{x})$  for right  $R$ -modules such that  $M \models \phi(\bar{a})$  and  $L \models D\phi(\bar{l})$ .*

Recall that  $\mathcal{D}^d$  denotes the elementary dual definable category of  $\mathcal{D}$  (see Section 7); if  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$ , then  $\mathcal{D}^d$  is a definable subcategory of  $R\text{-Mod}$ .

**Theorem 3.14.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$  and that  $M \in \text{Mod-}R$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *for all sets  $L_i \in \mathcal{D}^d$  ( $i \in I$ ) the canonical morphism  $t : M \otimes_R \prod_i L_i \rightarrow \prod_i M \otimes_R L_i$  is monic;*

(ii) *every pp-type realised in  $M$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -finitely generated; that is, for every finite tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$ , there is a pp formula  $\phi \in \text{pp}^M(\bar{a})$  such that, for every  $\psi \in \text{pp}^M(\bar{a})$ , we have  $\phi \leq_{\mathcal{D}} \psi$ .*

**Proof.** (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Given a set  $(L_i)_i$  of modules in  $\mathcal{D}^d$ , suppose that we have a tuple  $\bar{q} = (\bar{q}_i)_i \in \prod_i L_i$  and matching tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$  such that  $t(\bar{a} \otimes \bar{q}) = 0$ . That is  $\bar{a} \otimes \bar{q}_i = 0$  for all  $i$ . Then, by Herzog's criterion 3.13 there, for each  $i$ , is a pp formula  $\psi_i$  such that  $M \models \psi_i(\bar{a})$  and  $L_i \models D\psi_i(\bar{q}_i)$ .

Let  $\phi$  be a pp formula which generates, with respect to  $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$ , the pp-type of  $\bar{a}$  in  $M$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}$  models that  $\phi \leq \psi_i$ . Hence, by elementary duality [23, 3.4.18],  $\mathcal{D}^d$  models that  $D\psi_i \leq D\phi$ . Hence  $L_i \models D\phi(\bar{q}_i)$ . That is true for every  $i$ , so  $\prod_i L_i \models D\phi(\bar{q})$ . So, again by Herzog's Criterion and since  $M \models \phi(\bar{a})$ , we have  $\bar{a} \otimes \bar{q} = 0$  in  $M \otimes \prod L_i$ , and so  $t$  is monic as claimed.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) The above proof essentially reverses. Given  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$ , for each  $\psi_i \in \text{pp}^M(\bar{a})$  choose  $L_i \in \mathcal{D}^d$  to contain a tuple  $\bar{q}_i$  such that  $\text{pp}^{L_i}(\bar{q}_i)$  is generated, modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}^d$ , by  $D\psi_i$  - for instance, take  $L_i$  to be a  $\mathcal{D}^d$ -preenvelope of a free realisation of  $D\psi_i$  in  $R\text{-Mod}$  (by 3.4 this will have the required property). Since  $M \models \psi_i(\bar{a})$  and  $L_i \models D\psi_i(\bar{q}_i)$ , we have  $\bar{a} \otimes \bar{q}_i = 0$  in  $M \otimes L_i$ .

By assumption, it follows that  $\bar{a} \otimes \bar{q} = 0$  in  $M \otimes \prod_i L_i$  where  $\bar{q} = (\bar{q}_i)_i$ . So there is a pp formula  $\phi$  such that  $M \models \phi(\bar{a})$  and  $L_i \models D\phi(\bar{q}_i)$  for all  $i$ . By choice of  $L_i$  and  $\bar{q}_i$ ,  $\mathcal{D}^d$  models  $D\psi_i \leq D\phi$ , hence  $\mathcal{D}$  models  $\phi \leq \psi_i$ . That is so for every  $i$ ; that is, every pp formula in the pp-type of  $\bar{a}$  in  $M$  is a consequence of  $\phi$  modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}$ , that is with respect to  $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$ , as required.  $\square$

## 4 Strictly atomic modules

A right module  $M$  is said to be **strictly Mittag-Leffler** if, for every tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$ , there is a finitely presented module  $A$  and a pair,  $f : M \rightarrow A$ ,  $g : A \rightarrow M$ , of morphisms such that  $gf\bar{a} = \bar{a}$ . It follows that there is a pp formula  $\phi$  such that the pp-type,  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a})$  of  $\bar{a}$  in  $M$  is generated by  $\phi$  and that  $(A, f\bar{a})$  is a free realisation of  $\phi$ . Thus we obtain the following characterisation.

**Lemma 4.1.** *A module  $M$  is strictly Mittag-Leffler iff  $M$  is Mittag-leffler and if, for every tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$  and pp formula  $\phi$  such that  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle$ , if  $N$  is any module and  $\bar{b} \in \phi(N)$ , then there is a morphism  $f : M \rightarrow N$  with  $f\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ .*

**Proof.** For ( $\Rightarrow$ ), take  $A$  in the definition to be a free realisation of  $\phi$ , noting that there will then be a morphism from  $M$  to  $A$  and another from  $A$  to  $N$ . For the other direction, again take  $A$  to be a free realisation of  $\phi$ .  $\square$

Definable categories do not, in general, have enough finitely presented objects (those which do are exactly the finitely presentable categories with products), indeed they may have 0 as the only finitely presented object [23, 18.1.1] but the property above - which, [23, 1.2.7], is a property of finitely presented modules - does generalise. Indeed, it will be the strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic modules, defined below, that are the next best thing to finitely presented objects in definable categories. Makkai [20, 4.4] proved that there is a  $\varinjlim$ -generating set of these in every definable category. In fact, his result is more general in two directions: it includes infinitary versions (which allow infinitary pp formulas and infinite tuples of elements) and his results apply in general categories of models of regular theories. We will come back to his result but now we consider the following concept equivalent to being strictly ML.

An epimorphism  $f : N \rightarrow M$  is **locally split** if, for every tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$  there is a 'local section', that is a morphism  $g : M \rightarrow N$  such that  $gf\bar{a} = \bar{a}$ . A module is **locally pure-projective** [6] if every pure epimorphism to it locally splits.

**Proposition 4.2.** *([6, Thm. 5]) A module is strictly Mittag-Leffler iff it is locally pure-projective.*

**Definition 4.3.** *Given a definable category  $\mathcal{D}$ , we say that a module  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  is **strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic** if it is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic and if, for every tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$ , with pp-type  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by, say,  $\phi$ , and for every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \phi(D)$ , there is a morphism  $f : M \rightarrow D$  with  $f\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ . Say that  $M$  is **locally  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective** if every pure epimorphism  $D \rightarrow M$  with  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  locally splits.*

Note that [16], [32] consider more general relative notions of strictly ML.

We will show (4.20 below) that the strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic objects are exactly the locally  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projectives.

In [20] Makkai uses the term **principal prime** or **pp** object of  $\mathcal{D}$  for what we have termed strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.

**Lemma 4.4.** ([32, 2.5]) *Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable category. Every pure submodule of a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic module is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic and every direct sum of strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic modules is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.*

**Proof.** If  $N$  is pure in the strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic module  $M$  then, by 3.6,  $N$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic. Also since  $N$  is pure in  $M$ , given any tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $N$ , we have  $\text{pp}^N(\bar{a}) = \text{pp}^M(\bar{a})$ , so  $\text{pp}^N(\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$  for some pp  $\phi$ . Now, if  $\bar{b} \in \phi(D)$  for some  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  then, since  $M$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, there is a morphism  $f : M \rightarrow D$  with  $f\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ . The restriction of  $f$  to  $N$  verifies that  $N$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.

For the second statement, as in 3.6 it is enough to show that the direct sum of two strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic modules is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.

So suppose that  $D_1, D_2$  are strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic. From 3.6 we have that  $D_1 \oplus D_2$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic. Suppose that  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , and that  $\bar{b} \in (\phi_1 + \phi_2)(D)$ . Then there are  $\bar{b}_1 \in \phi_1(D)$  and  $\bar{b}_2 \in \phi_2(D)$  with  $\bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2 = \bar{b}$ . Since  $D_i$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, there are  $f_i : D_i \rightarrow D$  with  $f_i\bar{a}_i = \bar{b}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ ; these combine to give  $f = (f_1, f_2) : D_1 \oplus D_2 \rightarrow D$  with  $f\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ , as required.  $\square$

We note next that there is a purely category-theoretic characterisation of strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic modules. Since definable categories have products and directed colimits they have reduced products (in particular ultraproducts).

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a definable category. A module  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic iff there is an index set  $\Lambda$  and filter  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $I$  such that, whenever  $\pi : P \rightarrow M$  is a pure epimorphism with  $P \in \mathcal{D}$ , there are morphisms  $f_\lambda : M \rightarrow P$  ( $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ) such that, if  $\pi^* = \pi^\Lambda/\mathcal{F} : P^* = P^\Lambda/\mathcal{F} \rightarrow M^* = M^\Lambda/\mathcal{F}$  denotes the corresponding reduced product, the morphism  $f : M^* \rightarrow P^*$  which is  $(f_\lambda)_\lambda/\mathcal{F}$  satisfies  $\pi^*f\Delta_M = \Delta_M$ , where  $\Delta_M : M \rightarrow M^*$  is the diagonal embedding.*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $M$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.

Let  $\Lambda$  be the set of finite subsets, which we write as tuples, of  $M$ . Consider the filter-base consisting of the sets of the form  $\langle \bar{a} \rangle = \{\bar{b} : \bar{a} \subseteq \bar{b}\}$  and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be any filter containing this filter-base. Denote by  $\Delta_P : P \rightarrow P^*$  and  $\Delta_M : M \rightarrow M^*$  the canonical (pure) embeddings into the corresponding reduced products.

Now, given any pure epimorphism  $\pi : P \rightarrow M$  with  $P \in \mathcal{D}$ , choose, for each  $\bar{a} \in \Lambda$ , some local splitting  $f_{\bar{a}} : M \rightarrow P$  such that  $\pi f_{\bar{a}}(\bar{a}) = \bar{a}$ .

Form the ultraproduct  $\pi^* : P^* \rightarrow M^*$  where  $(-)^* = (-)^\Lambda/\mathcal{F}$  and define  $f : M^* \rightarrow P^*$  by  $c = (c_{\bar{a}})_{\bar{a}}/\mathcal{F} \mapsto (d_{\bar{a}})_{\bar{a}}/\mathcal{F}$  where  $d_{\bar{a}} = f_{\bar{a}}(c_{\bar{a}})$  if  $c_{\bar{a}} \in \bar{a}$  and  $d_{\bar{a}} = 0$  otherwise.

Note that  $f$  is well-defined since, if  $(c_{\bar{a}})_{\bar{a}}/\mathcal{F} = (b_{\bar{a}})_{\bar{a}}/\mathcal{F}$  then  $\{\bar{a} : c_{\bar{a}} = b_{\bar{a}}\} \in \mathcal{F}$  and hence  $\{\bar{a} : f_{\bar{a}}c_{\bar{a}} = f_{\bar{a}}b_{\bar{a}}\} \supseteq \{\bar{a} : c_{\bar{a}} = b_{\bar{a}}\}$ , so is in  $\mathcal{F}$ , as required.

We show that  $\pi^*f\Delta_M = \Delta_M$ . So take  $c \in M$ . Then  $\pi^*f\Delta_M(c) = (\pi f_{\bar{a}}(c))_{\bar{a}}/\mathcal{F}$ . By choice of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we have  $\langle c \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$  and, if  $\bar{a} \in \langle c \rangle$ , that is, if  $c \in \bar{a}$ , then  $\pi f_{\bar{a}}(c) = c$ . Therefore  $\pi^*f\Delta_M = \Delta_M$ , as required.

For the converse, if  $M$  satisfies this condition, then let  $\pi : P \rightarrow M$  be a pure epimorphism and let  $f_\lambda : M \rightarrow P$  ( $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ) be morphisms as described. Let  $\bar{a}$  be a finite subset of  $M$ . By assumption there is  $f : M^* \rightarrow P^*$  with  $(\pi^*f)(\bar{a})_\lambda/\mathcal{F} = (\bar{a})_\lambda/\mathcal{F}$ . In particular there is some (indeed there are many)  $\lambda$  with  $\pi f_\lambda\bar{a} = \bar{a}$ , showing that  $M$  is locally  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective hence strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.  $\square$

We denote by  $(-)^*$  the hom-dual of a module taken with respect to an injective cogenerator for the category of modules over some chosen subring of its endomorphism ring; we will suppose where needed that the injective cogenerator is minimal or at least that each of its indecomposable direct summands is the injective hull of a simple module. So  $M^*$  could be  $\text{Hom}_k(M, k)$  if  $k$  is a field and  $R$  is a  $k$ -algebra, it could be  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$  or  $\text{Hom}_S(M, E)$  where  $S = \text{End}(M_R)$  and  $E$  is a minimal injective cogenerator of  $S$ -Mod.

A pp-type  $p$  is said to be **neg-isolated** by a pp formula  $\phi$  if it is maximal (among pp-types) with respect to not containing  $\phi$ . Any such pp-type is irreducible, so is realised in an indecomposable pure-injective. The same is true for the relativised notion, see Section 7.



**Theorem 4.6.** *If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$  and  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, then every indecomposable direct summand of its dual  $M^*$  is neg-isolated with respect to the theory of  $M^*$ .*

**Proof.** We use that  $M^* \models \phi(f)$  iff  $D\phi(M) \leq \ker(f)$  (see [23, 1.3.12]).

Suppose that  $p$  is irreducible so, see Section 7, the hull of  $f$  in  $M^*$  is a typical indecomposable summand of  $M^*$ . We show that  $M/\ker(f)$  is a uniform  $S$ -module.

Suppose that  $a, b \in M \setminus \ker(f)$ . Since  $M$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, there is a pp formula  $\psi_1$  such that  $\text{pp}^M(a) = \langle \psi_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ ; since  $a \notin \ker(f)$ ,  $D\psi_1 \notin p$ . Similarly, there is a pp formula  $\psi_2$  such that  $\text{pp}^M(b)$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $\psi_2$  and so with  $D\psi_2 \notin p$ . Since  $p$  is irreducible there is, see [23, §4.3.6], a pp formula  $\phi \in p$  such that  $(\phi \wedge D\psi_1) + (\phi + D\psi_2) \notin p$  and hence the solution set in  $M$  of the dual pp formula  $(D\phi + \psi_1) \wedge (D\phi + \psi_2)$  is not contained in  $\ker(f)$ . Therefore, since  $D\phi(M) \leq \ker(f)$ , we have that  $f\psi_1(M) \cap f\psi_2(M) \neq 0$ .

Since  $M$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic we have  $\psi_1(M) = Sa$ , where  $S = \text{End}(M)$  and  $\psi_2(M) = Sb$ . So we have that the images of  $Sa$  and  $Sb$  under  $f$  have non-zero intersection, showing that  $M/\ker(f)$  is indeed a uniform  $S$ -module.

Therefore  $M/\ker(f)$  is contained in an indecomposable direct summand  $E'$  of  $E$ . By choice of  $E$ ,  $E'$  has a non-zero simple submodule, which necessarily lies in the image of  $f$ , so let  $a \in M$  be such that  $fa$  generates that simple module. By assumption, there is a pp formula  $\psi$  which  $\mathcal{D}$ -generates  $\text{pp}^M(a)$ . We claim that  $p$  is neg-isolated, for the theory of  $M^*$ , by  $D\psi$ . To see that, suppose that  $q$  is a pp-type for that theory, strictly containing  $p$ ; say  $\eta \in q \setminus p$ . Then  $D\eta(M)$  is not contained in  $\ker(f)$  and so  $a \in D\eta(M)$  (since  $Sa + \ker(f)$  is the unique smallest  $S$ -submodule of  $M$  strictly containing  $\ker(f)$ ). So  $\psi(M) \leq D\eta(M) + D\phi(M)$  for some  $\phi \in p$ . Hence, by elementary duality,  $\eta(M^*) \cap \phi(M^*) \leq D\psi(M^*)$ , showing that  $D\psi \in q$ , as required.  $\square$

Note the special case  $\mathcal{D} = \text{Mod-}R$ .

**Corollary 4.7.** *If  $A$  is a finitely presented  $R$ -module then every indecomposable direct summand of its dual  $A^*$  (with respect to any suitable duality) is  $\mathcal{D}$ -neg-isolated where  $\mathcal{D}$  is the definable category generated by  $A^*$ .*

We already know, by [21, 3.5], that any (nonzero) dual module  $M^*$  has ‘enough’ neg-isolated, in particular indecomposable, direct summands. The result above says that, for a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic module, every indecomposable direct summand is neg-isolated. There can, however, be superdecomposable direct summands (nonzero direct summands with no indecomposable direct summand), as the following example illustrates.

*Example 4.8.* Let  $R$  be a simple, non-artinian, von Neumann regular ring; the last condition implies that the pure-injectives are exactly the injectives. The module (left or right)  $R$  has no uniform submodules (see [23, 7.3.19]) so its injective hull is superdecomposable. The left module  ${}_R R$  is strictly atomic for the whole category  $R\text{-Mod}$  so, noting that  $\text{End}({}_R R) = R$ , consider the right module  $({}_R R)^* = \text{Hom}({}_R R, E({}_R R))$ . The embedding  $f : {}_R R \rightarrow E({}_R R)$  is in this dual module and it generates a copy of  ${}_R R$ . Thus  ${}_R R$  embeds, purely since  $R$  is regular, in  $({}_R R)^*$ , hence the superdecomposable (pure-)injective  $E({}_R R)$  is a direct summand of  $({}_R R)^*$ , as required.

## 4.1 Constructing strictly atomic models

Makkai [20] proves a remarkably strong result, a special case of which we state now. In fact, this statement reflects some of his proof, not simply his formally-stated conclusion(s).

**Theorem 4.9.** ([20, §4, esp. 4.4])

(a) *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a definable category. Then there is a  $\varinjlim$ -generating set of strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic modules in  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

(b) *Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$  and let  $A \in \text{mod-}R$  be any finitely presented  $R$ -module. Then there is a  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope  $A \rightarrow D_A$  where  $D_A$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.*

*Remarks 4.10.* In part (a) it is the existence of enough strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic models which is the point. That one can take a set of them to  $\varinjlim$ -generate is direct from the Downwards Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem; or one can use those appearing in part (b).

We noted earlier that, if  $A$  is in  $\text{mod-}R$ , if  $\bar{a}$  is a tuple from  $A$ , and if  $f : A \rightarrow D_A \in \mathcal{D}$  is any  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope then the pp-type of  $f\bar{a}$  in  $D_A$  will be  $\mathcal{D}$ -finitely generated, indeed, 3.4, will be generated by any pp formula which generates the pp-type of  $\bar{a}$  in  $A$ . If  $\bar{a}$  generates  $A$ , we can take this pp formula to be quantifier-free (specifying finitely many relations which define the module  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i R$ ). Clearly these  $D_A$ , as  $A$  ranges over finitely presented  $R$ -modules, form a  $\varinjlim$ -generating subset of  $\mathcal{D}$ . And  $D_R$  is even a generator in the sense that every  $\bar{D} \in \mathcal{D}$  is an epimorphic image of a coproduct of copies of  $D_R$ . But, though the pp-type of  $\bar{a}$  in  $D_A$  is finitely generated, there is no reason in general to suppose that *every* tuple in  $D_A$  has finitely generated pp-type - i.e. that  $D_A$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, let alone strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic. Makkai shows that there is, nevertheless, some choice of  $A \rightarrow D_A$  such that  $D_A$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.

Makkai's construction/proof in [20] is a Henkin-style construction and is done in great generality. It is perhaps not easy to extract its core from the surrounding details but we give what we hope is a more conceptual proof here which makes the relation between the inputs and outputs of the construction clearer. This proof (the countable case) was found in discussion with Philipp Rothmaler. Let us begin.

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$ .

Recall that a **pp-pair** - denoted  $\phi/\psi$  - is a pair  $\phi(\bar{x}) \geq \psi(\bar{x})$  of pp formulas, where the inequality means that  $\phi(M) \geq \psi(M)$  for all modules  $M$ . Recall also that every definable category is determined by the set of pp-pairs which are closed on it, where we say that a pp-pair  $\phi \geq \psi$  is **closed** on  $M$  if  $\phi(M) = \psi(M)$  and is **closed** on  $\mathcal{D}$  if it is closed on  $M$  for all  $M \in \mathcal{D}$ .

For  $\phi$  a pp formula, set  $\phi_{\downarrow \mathcal{D}} = \{\psi : \phi \geq \psi \text{ and } \phi/\psi \text{ is closed in } \mathcal{D}\}$  - a subset of  $\langle \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ .

**First we deal with the case where the ring  $R$  is countable;** this implies that there are just countably many (pp) formulas. The general case will be done after this.

**Theorem 4.11.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of the module category  $\text{Mod-}R$  where  $R$  is countable. Let  $A$  be a finitely presented  $R$ -module. Then there is a  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope  $A \rightarrow D_A$  where  $D_A$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.*

**Proof.** The construction of  $D_A$  is an inductive one; set  $B_0 = A$ .

Say  $A$  is generated by  $\bar{a} = \bar{a}_0$  with pp-type generated by the (quantifier-free) formula  $\theta(\bar{x}_1)$ . Set  $\theta_0 = \theta$ .

Enumerate:  $(\theta_0)_{\downarrow \mathcal{D}} = \{\phi_{1j} : j \geq 1\}$ .

Let  $\bar{a}_1$  in  $B_1$  be a free realisation of  $\phi_{11}$  so, by [23, 1.2.17], we have  $f_0 : A \rightarrow B_1$  with  $f_0\bar{a}_0 = \bar{a}_1$ . Take  $\bar{b}_1 = \bar{a}_1\bar{b}'_1$  generating  $B_1$ , with pp-type generated by  $\theta_1 = \theta_1(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}'_1)$ ; set  $\bar{x}_2 = \bar{x}_1\bar{x}'_1$  - the concatenation of  $\bar{x}_1$  and  $\bar{x}'_1$ .

Enumerate:  $(\theta_1)_{\downarrow \mathcal{D}} = \{\phi_{2j} : j \geq 1\}$ .

Let  $\bar{a}_2$  in  $B_2$  be a free realisation of  $\phi_{12}(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \phi_{21}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}'_1)$  and choose a morphism  $f_1 : B_1 \rightarrow B_2$  taking  $\bar{b}_1$  to  $\bar{a}_2$ .

Continue inductively: having produced a free realisation  $(B_n, \bar{a}_n)$  of  $\phi_{1n}(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \phi_{2,n-1}(\bar{x}_2) \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{n1}(\bar{x}_n)$ , and a morphism  $f_{n-1} : B_{n-1} \rightarrow B_n$  taking  $\bar{b}_{n-1}$  to  $\bar{a}_n$ , choose a generating tuple  $\bar{b}_n = \bar{a}_n\bar{b}'_n$  for  $B_n$ , with pp-type generated by  $\theta_n = \theta_n(\bar{x}_{n+1}) = \theta_n(\bar{x}_n, \bar{x}'_n)$ .

Then enumerate  $(\theta_n)_{\downarrow \mathcal{D}} = \{\phi_{n+1,j} : j \geq 1\}$  and continue by choosing a free realisation  $(B_{n+1}, \bar{a}_{n+1})$  of  $\phi_{1,n+1}(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \phi_{2,n}(\bar{x}_2) \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{n+1,1}(\bar{x}_{n+1})$ , and a morphism  $f_n : B_n \rightarrow B_{n+1}$  taking  $\bar{b}_n$  to  $\bar{a}_{n+1}$ .

Having continued the construction inductively, set  $D_A = \varinjlim ((B_n)_n, (f_n : B_n \rightarrow B_{n+1})_n)$ , with  $f_{n\infty} : B_n \rightarrow D_A$  the limit maps.

We **claim** that  $D_A$  is in  $\mathcal{D}$ , is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic and the pp-type of  $f_{0\infty}(\bar{a})$  in  $D_A$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $\theta$ .

Before going on to prove our claims, we note some points about the construction:

- for each  $n$  and  $m \geq n$ ,  $f_{nm}\bar{b}_n$  is an initial segment of  $\bar{b}_m$ , where  $f_{nm}$  denotes the composition  $f_{m-1,m} \cdots f_{n,n+1}$ ;
  - for each  $n$ , the formula  $\theta_n$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -equivalent to each  $\phi_{n+1,j}$  where, recall, we say that two formulas are  **$\mathcal{D}$ -equivalent** if they have the same solution set in each  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ ;
- and a lemma:

**Lemma 4.12.** *Given any  $B_n$  and morphism  $g : B_n \rightarrow D \in \mathcal{D}$ , there is a factorisation through  $f_n : B_n \rightarrow B_{n+1}$ , and hence, by induction, through any  $f_{nm} : B_n \rightarrow B_m$ .*

**Proof.** of Lemma: Since  $\bar{a}_{n+1} = f_n \bar{b}_n$  is a free realisation of  $\phi_{1,n+1}(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \phi_{2,n}(\bar{x}_2) \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{n+1,1}(\bar{x}_{n+1})$ , it will be sufficient to show that  $g\bar{b}_n$  satisfies each of the formulas  $\phi_{i,n+2-i}(\bar{x}_i)$ . But, for  $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ ,  $\phi_{i,n+2-i}(\bar{x}_i) \in (\theta_{i-1})_{\downarrow \mathcal{D}}$  and  $\bar{b}_{i-1}$  satisfies  $\theta_{i-1}$ , hence so does  $gf_{i-1,n}\bar{b}_{i-1}$ , which is the initial segment of  $g\bar{b}_n$  from which we deduce that  $g\bar{b}_n$  satisfies  $\phi_{i,n+2-i}(\bar{x}_i)$ .  $\square$  of Lemma.

**Corollary 4.13.** *of Lemma: If  $\psi$  generates the pp-type of  $f_{nm}(\bar{b}_n)$  in  $B_m$ , then  $\psi \in (\theta_n)_{\mathcal{D}}$ .*

**Proof.** of Corollary: Suppose that  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\bar{d} \in \theta_n(D)$ . So there is  $g : B_n \rightarrow D$  taking  $\bar{b}_n$  to  $\bar{d}$ . By the Lemma, this extends to a morphism from  $B_m$  to  $D$ . So  $\bar{d} \in \psi(D)$ , as required.  $\square$  of Corollary

Now the proofs of the claims:

1)  $D_A \in \mathcal{D}$ : Suppose  $\phi/\psi$  is closed on  $\mathcal{D}$  and take  $\bar{d} \in \phi(D_A)$ . Note that  $\bar{d} = f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n \cdot \bar{r}$  for some  $n$  and matrix  $\bar{r}$  over  $R$ .<sup>3</sup> Since pp formulas commute with directed colimits [23, 1.2.31], we may take  $n$  to be such that  $\bar{b}_n \cdot \bar{r} \in \phi(\bar{x}_n \cdot \bar{r})(B_n)$ .<sup>4</sup> Therefore  $\psi(\bar{x}_n \cdot \bar{r}) \in (\theta_n(\bar{x}_n))_{\mathcal{D}}$ , so is  $\phi_{n+1,j}$  for some  $j$ . By construction, there is  $m \geq n$  (indeed  $m = n + j$  works) such that  $f_{nm}\bar{b}_n \cdot \bar{r} \in \psi(\bar{x}_n \cdot \bar{r})(B_m)$ . Since  $\bar{d} = f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n \cdot \bar{r} = f_{m\infty}f_{nm}\bar{b}_n \cdot \bar{r}$ , we deduce that  $\bar{d} \in \psi(D_A)$ .

Thus every pp-pair closed on  $\mathcal{D}$  is closed in  $D_A$ , hence, by definition of definable categories (see Section 7)  $D_A \in \mathcal{D}$ .

2)  $D_A$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic: Suppose  $\bar{d}$  is from  $D_A$ , say  $\bar{d} = f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n \cdot \bar{r}$  as above. It is sufficient to take  $\bar{d} = f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n$  since, if the pp-type of the latter in  $D_A$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by a pp formula  $\theta$ , then that of  $f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n \cdot \bar{r}$  will be  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $\exists \bar{y}(\theta(\bar{y}) \wedge \bar{x} = \bar{y} \cdot \bar{r})$ . We claim that, in fact, the pp-type of  $f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n$  in  $D_A$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $\theta_n$ . Since  $\theta_n \in \text{pp}^{B_n}(\bar{b}_n)$  certainly  $\theta_n \in \text{pp}^{D_A}(f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n)$ . In the other direction, we have that  $\text{pp}^{D_A}(f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n) = \bigcup_{m \geq n} \text{pp}^{B_m}(f_{nm}\bar{b}_n)$  (by [23, 1.2.31] again). By 4.13, each  $\text{pp}^{B_m}(f_{nm}\bar{b}_n)$  is a subset of  $\langle \theta_n \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ , and so we have that  $\text{pp}^{D_A}(f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n) \subseteq \langle \theta_n \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ , as required.

In particular, if we start with a pp formula  $\phi$  and take a free realisation  $(A, \bar{a}')$  of  $\phi$  as the starting point of the construction, if we choose a generating tuple  $\bar{a}_0 = \bar{a}' \bar{b}'_0$ , then continue and build  $D_A$  as before, then the pp-type of the image of  $\bar{a}_0$  in  $D_A$  will be  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $\phi$ . We state this for easy reference.

**Corollary 4.14.** *If  $A$  is finitely presented and we construct  $D_A$  as above, then for every  $\bar{a}$  from  $A$ , if  $\phi$  is such that  $\langle \phi \rangle = \text{pp}^A(\bar{a})$ , then  $\text{pp}^{D_A}(f_{0\infty}\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ .*

3)  $D_A$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic: Since any tuple from  $D_A$  has the form  $f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n \cdot \bar{r}$ , it is enough to consider tuples of the form  $f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n$ . Suppose, then, that  $\bar{d}$  is a tuple from  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $\text{pp}^{D_A}(f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n) \subseteq \text{pp}^D(\bar{d})$ . We must produce a morphism from  $D_A$  to  $D$  extending the partial map which takes  $f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n$  to  $\bar{d}$ . It will be sufficient, by

<sup>3</sup>If  $d$  is a single element, this means just  $d = \sum_i f_{n\infty}(b_i)r_i$ , that is,  $\bar{r}$  is a tuple; if  $\bar{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_k)$  then  $\bar{r}$  is a matrix with  $k$  columns.

<sup>4</sup>Here  $\phi$  is a formula with  $k$  free variables and  $\phi(\bar{x}_n \cdot \bar{r})$  is the pp formula where the  $t$ -th free variable is replaced by  $\sum_i x_i r_{it}$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, k$ .

construction of  $D_A$ , to extend inductively, so coherently, to each  $B_m$ ,  $m \geq n$ , the morphism  $g_n : B_n \rightarrow D$  defined by  $\bar{b}_n \mapsto f_{n\infty}\bar{b}_n \mapsto \bar{d}$ .

But that is exactly what 4.12 above gives us.  $\square$

Remark: Of course, the same applies to each  $B_n$  in the construction (just take  $B_n$  as the starting point).

**Corollary 4.15.** (cf. [29, 3.13]) *If  $D_A$  is constructed as above then  $D_A$  is a union of submodules  $B'_n (= f_{n\infty}B_n)$  such that, if  $\bar{b}'_n$  is a finite generating tuple for  $B'_n$  and if  $\theta'_n$  is a quantifier-free formula generating  $\text{pp}^{B'_n}(\bar{b}'_n)$ , then  $\text{pp}^{D_A}(\bar{b}'_n)$  is  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -generated by  $\theta'_n$ .*

**Corollary 4.16.** *If  $M$  is a pure-projective  $R$ -module and  $\mathcal{D}$  a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$ , then  $M$  has a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope.*

**Proof.** If, for  $i \in I$ ,  $A_i$  is finitely presented and  $f_i : A_i \rightarrow D_i$  is a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope, then  $\bigoplus_i f_i$  is clearly (reduce to the finite case) a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope for  $\bigoplus_i A_i$ , and hence for any direct summand of  $\bigoplus_i A_i$ .  $\square$

In order to obtain the same results for the general case we must express  $D_A$  as the limit of a directed system, rather than just a chain, of finitely presented modules.

**Now we treat the general case** though we have not as yet seen how to present a clear proof along these lines. So, at least in this version of this paper, we just indicate what seems to be needed. The idea is not really different but the arrangement has to change. We have to freely realise consequences, modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}$ , of pp-formulas (if we freely realise  $\phi$  we must also freely realise every formula in  $(\phi)_{\downarrow\mathcal{D}}$ ) but we also have to combine these (so if we freely realise  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  we must freely realise  $\phi \wedge \psi$  and hence also the consequences of this modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}$ ). The latter can be done using repeated pushouts / coequalisers of amalgamation diagrams.

Set  $\kappa = |R| + \aleph_0$ , so any set of pp formulas of the language for  $R$ -modules may be labelled by ordinals  $\alpha < \kappa$ .

We start with a finitely presented module  $A = \langle \bar{a} = \bar{a}_\emptyset \rangle$  and take  $\theta_\emptyset(\bar{x})$  which generates  $\text{pp}^A(\bar{a}_\emptyset)$ . We also set  $B_\emptyset = A$ .

Set  $(\theta_\emptyset)_{\downarrow\mathcal{D}} = \{\phi_{\alpha_1} : \alpha_1 < \kappa\}$ .

For each  $\alpha_1 < \kappa$ , choose a free realisation,  $\bar{a}_{\alpha_1}$  in  $B_{\alpha_1}$ , of  $\phi_{\alpha_1}$ , and a morphism  $f_{\emptyset\alpha_1} : B_\emptyset \rightarrow B_{\alpha_1}$  with  $f_{\emptyset\alpha_1}\bar{a}_\emptyset = \bar{a}_{\alpha_1}$ . Then take a generating tuple  $\bar{b}_{\alpha_1} = \bar{a}_{\alpha_1}\bar{b}'_{\alpha_1}$  for  $B_{\alpha_1}$ , and take  $\theta_{\alpha_1}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_{\alpha_1}) = \theta_{\alpha_1}(\bar{x}_{\alpha_1})$  to generate its pp-type.

Set  $(\theta_{\alpha_1})_{\mathcal{D}} = \{\phi_{\alpha_1\alpha_2} : \alpha_2 < \kappa\}$ .

For each  $\alpha_2 < \kappa$ , choose a free realisation,  $\bar{a}_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$  in  $B_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$ , of  $\phi_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$ , and a morphism  $f_{\alpha_1\alpha_2} : B_{\alpha_1} \rightarrow B_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$  with  $f_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}\bar{a}_{\alpha_1} = \bar{a}_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$ .

Inductively, for each sequence  $\alpha_1\alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n$  in  $\kappa^n$ , suppose that we have a free realisation  $\bar{a}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$  in  $B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$ , of  $\phi_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} = \phi_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}(\bar{x}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n-1}})$ , and a morphism  $f_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} : B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n-1}} \rightarrow B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$  with  $f_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}\bar{a}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n-1}} = \bar{a}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$ .

The inductive step is to choose a generating tuple  $\bar{b}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} = \bar{a}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}\bar{b}'_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$  for  $B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$ , with pp-type generated by, say,  $\theta_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}(\bar{x}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n-1}}, \bar{y}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}) = \theta_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}(\bar{x}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n})$  to generate its pp-type.

Set  $(\theta_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n})_{\downarrow\mathcal{D}} = \{\phi_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n \alpha_{n+1}} : \alpha_{n+1} < \kappa\}$  and, then, for each  $\alpha_{n+1}$ , choose a free realisation  $\bar{a}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n+1}}$  in  $B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n+1}}$ , of  $\phi_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n+1}} = \phi_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n+1}}(\bar{x}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n})$ , and a morphism  $f_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n+1}} : B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \rightarrow B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n+1}}$  with  $f_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n+1}}\bar{a}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} = \bar{a}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n+1}}$ .

Having defined all this inductively, consider the diagram consisting of the  $B_\eta$ , with  $\eta \in \kappa^{<\omega} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \kappa^n$  or  $= \emptyset$  and the  $f_{\emptyset\alpha_1} : B_\emptyset \rightarrow B_{\alpha_1}$  and the  $f_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} : B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{n-1}} \rightarrow B_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$ . This is not a directed diagram (so [23, 1.2.31] is not available if we just take the colimit of the diagram), therefore we close it under ‘‘finite pushouts’’ (that is, coequalisers of finitely many morphisms with a common domain). That is, for each  $B_\eta$  and finitely many extensions  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k$  of  $\eta$ , with corresponding maps  $f_{\eta, \zeta_j} : B_\eta \rightarrow B_{\zeta_j}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$  (compositions of morphisms of the form  $f_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$ ), we form the coequaliser of these  $k$  morphisms. We add to the

original diagram all the modules and morphisms produced in this way. The resulting diagram is directed - to see an upper bound for two (new) modules in the new system of modules and morphisms, take the union of the two sets of data used to produce those modules and form the pushout from that data, using as base of the pushout the largest common initial segment of the bases of those two systems. But we must now add consequences modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}$ , ensuring that if we have a free realisation of  $\phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_k$  then we also have free realisations of formulas in  $(\phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_k)_{\downarrow \mathcal{D}}$ . Since implication modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}$  is transitive, there is no need to repeat the process of combining these and hence no need to add more modules, so the processes can stop at this stage. From this, we obtain a directed diagram and then define  $D_A$  to be the colimit of this directed diagram. By construction, in  $D_A$  the image of  $\bar{a}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$  is equal to that of  $\bar{a}_\sigma$  for any initial segment of  $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$  including  $\emptyset$ .

The arguments of the countable case will then apply to give that  $D_A \in \mathcal{D}$ , and that  $D_A$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.

## 4.2 Strictly atomic generators

The existence of “enough” strictly atomic models gives us the first result.

**Lemma 4.17.** *If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable category and  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  then there is a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  and a pure epimorphism  $M \rightarrow D$ .*

**Proof.** There is a pure epimorphism  $f : P \rightarrow D$  where  $P = \bigoplus_i A_i$  is a direct sum of finitely presented  $R$ -modules, see [23, 2.1.25]. Each component map from some  $A_i$  to  $D$  factors through  $A_i \rightarrow D_{A_i}$  where  $D_{A_i}$  is a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope of  $A_i$ . Take  $M$  to be the, strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic by 4.4, direct sum of these modules  $D_{A_i}$ ; it is directly checked that the corresponding map  $M \rightarrow D$  is a pure epimorphism.  $\square$

Since every definable category  $\mathcal{D}$  is closed under pure subobjects and since a pure subobject of a strictly atomic object is strictly atomic (4.4), we deduce that every object of  $\mathcal{D}$  has a pure presentation by strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic objects.

**Corollary 4.18.** *If  $\mathcal{D}$  is definable and  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  then there is a pure-exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_0 \rightarrow D \rightarrow 0$  with  $M_0, M_1$  strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.*

*Remark 4.19.* It follows from 4.17 and [32, 3.6] that, in the definition of strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, it is enough to require the “free realisation” property for single elements (it then follows for finite tuples).

We may also deduce the following.

**Corollary 4.20.** *If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory then  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic iff  $M$  is locally  $\mathcal{D}$ -pure-projective.*

**Proof.** ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose that  $M$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic and  $f : D \rightarrow M$  is a pure epimorphism in  $\mathcal{D}$ . If  $\bar{a}$  is a finite tuple from  $M$ , let  $\phi$  pp be such that  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ . By 3.7, there is  $\bar{d}$  from  $D$  with  $f\bar{d} = \bar{a}$  and  $\bar{d} \in \phi(D)$ . Since  $M$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, there is  $g : M \rightarrow D$  with  $g\bar{a} = \bar{d}$ , as required.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) By 4.17 there is a pure epimorphism  $f : D' = \bigoplus_i D_i \rightarrow M$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  with each  $D_i$  strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic. Now suppose that  $\bar{a}$  is from  $M$ . By assumption, there is  $g : M \rightarrow D'$  such that  $fg\bar{a} = \bar{a}$  and hence with  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}) = \text{pp}^{D'}(g\bar{a})$ . Since  $D'$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, the latter is  $\mathcal{D}$ -finitely generated, by  $\phi$  say. Thus  $M$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.

Now suppose that  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \phi(D)$ . By 4.4,  $D'$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, so there is  $h : D' \rightarrow M$  with  $h.g\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ . Thus we obtain the morphism  $hg : M \rightarrow D$  with  $hg\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ , and so see that  $M$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.  $\square$

Note the following.

**Lemma 4.21.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$  and  $A \in \text{mod-}R$ . If  $A$  has a  $\mathcal{D}$ -envelope,  $f : A \rightarrow D$ , then  $D$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic (and hence may be taken to be  $D_A$ ).*

**Proof.** Choose some strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic preenvelope  $A \rightarrow D_A$ . Since each of  $D$ ,  $D_A$  is a  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope of  $A$ , there are morphisms  $g : D \rightarrow D_A$  and  $h : D_A \rightarrow D$  such that  $hgf = f$ . Then  $hg$  is an automorphism of  $D$  and hence  $D$  is a direct summand of  $D_A$  so, 4.4, is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.  $\square$

If  $M$  is a module,  $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  an  $n$ -tuple of elements from  $M$  and  $b \in M$ , then we say that  $b$  is **definable** by a pp formula (in  $M$ ) over  $\bar{a}$  if there is a pp formula  $\psi(\bar{x}, y)$  with  $M \models \psi(\bar{a}, b)$  and with  $b$  the unique solution in  $M$  to  $\psi(\bar{a}, y)$ , equivalently with  $\psi(\bar{0}, M) = 0$  (see Section 7).

One might ask whether, given  $A \in \text{mod-}R$ , one may choose a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $A \rightarrow D_A$  such that every element of  $D_A$  is definable over the image of  $A$ . The example  $R = \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $A = \mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  the class of injective  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules shows that in general the answer is negative, since  $D_A$  clearly is  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^\infty}$  which has many automorphisms which fix its submodule  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . Here is another example, this time with  $A = R$ .

*Example 4.22.* Take  $k$  any field,  $R = k[X, Y]/(X, Y)^2$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  the definable subcategory generated by the injective hull  $E(k)$  of the unique simple module  $k$  (so  $\mathcal{D} = \text{Inj-}R$ ). The  $\mathcal{D}$ -envelope of  $R$ , which is the minimal choice of  $D_A$ , is  $E(R) = E(k) \oplus E(k)$ . Let  $a$  denote the image of  $1_R$  in  $E(R)$  and consider any element  $b \in E(R)$  such that  $bY = aX$ . The pp-type of  $b$  is generated, module the theory of (injective)  $R$ -modules, by the formula  $yX = 0 (\wedge \exists y yY = xX)$  but this is also satisfied by, for instance, any element of the form  $b + c$  where  $c$  is in the socle of  $E(R)$ . (Put more algebraically, there are non-identity automorphisms of  $E(R)$  which fix  $a$ .)

### 4.3 The ring of definable scalars

If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$ , then the **ring  $R_{\mathcal{D}}$  of definable scalars** of  $\mathcal{D}$  is the set of pp-definable maps on  $\mathcal{D}$  (see Section 7); if  $\mathcal{D} = \langle M \rangle$ , we also write  $R_M$  for  $R_{\mathcal{D}}$ .

**Lemma 4.23.** *If  $R \xrightarrow{f} D_R$  is any  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope of  $R$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ , then  $D_R$  is cyclic, generated by  $a = f1$ , over its endomorphism ring.*

**Proof.** If  $b \in D_R$  and  $g : R \rightarrow D_R$  is defined by  $1 \mapsto b$ , then the preenveloping property gives us an endomorphism of  $D_R$  as shown in the diagram and as required.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{a} & D_R & \square \\ & \searrow g & \downarrow & \\ & & D_R & \end{array}$$

**Lemma 4.24.** *If  $R \xrightarrow{f} D_R$  with  $a = f1$  is any  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic preenvelope of  $R$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  and if  $R'$  is the ring of definable scalars of  $D_R$ , then  $aR'$  is the submodule consisting of those elements which are definable in  $D_R$  by a pp formula over  $a$ :*

$$aR' = \{b \in D_R : \phi(0, D_R) = 0 \text{ where } \langle \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} = \text{pp}^{D_R}(a, b)\}.$$

**Proof.** Certainly any element in  $aR'$  is definable over  $a$ .

If  $\phi$   $\mathcal{D}$ -generates the pp-type of  $(a, b)$  then since, for every  $c \in D_R$  there is an endomorphism  $f$  of  $D_R$  taking  $a$  to  $c$ , and hence with  $\phi(c, fb)$ , we see that  $\phi$  defines a total relation on  $D_R$ . Therefore  $\phi$  defines a scalar iff it is functional, that is, iff  $\phi(0, D_R) = 0$ , giving the second statement.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.25.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$  and that  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic and is finitely generated over its endomorphism ring. Set  $R_M$  to be the ring of definable scalars of  $M$ . Then  $R_M = \text{Biend}(M_R)$  - the biendomorphism ring  $\text{End}_{\text{End}(M_R)}(M)$  of  $M_R$ .*

**Proof.** The proof of [23, 6.1.19] works in this situation; we essentially repeat it here.

Let  $g \in \text{Biend}(M_R)$ : it must be shown that the action of  $g$  on  $M$  is pp-definable in  $M_R$ . Set  $S = \text{End}(M_R)$  and suppose that  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in M$  are such that  ${}_S M = \sum_1^k S a_i$ . Then  $g$  is determined by its action on  $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$ , so consider  $\bar{a}g$ . Since  $M$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, the pp-type of  $(\bar{a}, \bar{a}g)$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -finitely generated, by, say,  $\phi$ .

Consider the pp formula  $\rho(u, v)$  which is

$$\exists x_1, \dots, x_k \exists y_1, \dots, y_k \left( u = \sum_1^k x_i \wedge v = \sum_1^k y_i \wedge \bar{\phi}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \right)$$

where  $\bar{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k)$  is  $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k \phi_i(x_i, y_i)$  where  $\phi_i(x_i, y_i)$  is

$$\exists z_{i1}, \dots, \hat{z}_{ii}, \dots, z_{ik}, w_{i1}, \dots, \hat{w}_{ii}, \dots, w_{ik} \phi(z_{i1}, \dots, x_i, \dots, z_{ik}, w_{i1}, \dots, y_i, \dots, w_{ik}).$$

It follows directly, from the strong  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic condition and choice of  $\phi$ , that  $M \models \phi_i(c, d)$  iff there is  $s \in S$  with  $sa_i = c$  and  $sa_i g = d$  (the formula  $\phi_i(c, d)$  says that  $c, d$  are the  $i$ -th components of tuples satisfying  $\phi$ ; note that such tuples are exactly the images of  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{a}g$  under (the same) endomorphisms). In particular, for each  $i$  and  $s$ , we have  $M \models \phi_i(sa_i, sa_i g)$ . We claim that  $\rho$  defines the action of  $g$  in  $M$ .

First,  $\rho(u, v)$  defines a total relation from  $u$  to  $v$ : given  $c \in M$  we have  $c = \sum_1^k s_i a_i$  for some  $s_i \in S$ , hence  $cg = \sum_1^k s_i a_i g$ . As commented above,  $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k \phi_i(s_i a_i, s_i a_i g)$ , holds. Therefore  $(c, cg) \in \rho(M)$ .

It remains to show that  $\rho$  is functional, so suppose  $(0, d) \in \rho(M)$ . Then there are  $c_i, d_i \in M$  such that  $0 = \sum_1^k c_i$ ,  $d = \sum_1^k d_i$  and such that  $M \models \phi_i(c_i, d_i)$  for each  $i$ . As commented above, it follows that there are  $s_i \in S$  with  $s_i a_i = c_i$  and  $s_i a_i g = d_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . So  $d = \sum d_i = \sum s_i a_i g = (\sum s_i a_i)g$  and  $0 = \sum c_i = \sum s_i a_i$ , from which we deduce  $d = 0$ , as required.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.26.** *Suppose that  $R \rightarrow D_R$  is a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $\mathcal{D}$ -envelope of  $R$ . If the definable category generated by  $D_R$  is all of  $\mathcal{D}$  then  $R_{\mathcal{D}} = R_{D_R} = \text{Biend}(D_R)$ .*

**Proof.** This is immediate from the previous two results but here is a simpler proof for this special case.

Every definable scalar of  $M$  is a biendomorphism so, for the converse, take  $\alpha \in \text{Biend}(M)$  and set  $b = \alpha a$ , where  $a$  is the image of  $1_R$  in  $D_R$ . Choose a generator  $\rho$  for  $\text{pp}^{D_R}(a, b)$ ; we claim that  $\rho$  defines a scalar on  $D_R$ . Since  $D_R$  is generated by  $a$  as an  $\text{End}(D_R)$ -module,  $\rho$  is total on  $D_R$ . Also, if we have  $\rho(0, d)$  for some  $d \in D_R$ , then there is an endomorphism  $f$  of  $D_R$  with  $fa = 0$  and  $fb = d$ . But then  $d = fb = f(\alpha a) = (fa)\alpha = 0$ , as required.  $\square$

## 5 Tilting and silting classes

Recall that an  $R$ -module  $T$  is **tilting** if  $\text{Gen}(T) = T^{\perp 1}$  where  $T^{\perp 1} = \{M : \text{Ext}^1(T, M) = 0\}$ , equivalently if  $\text{pdim}(T) \leq 1$ , if  $\text{Ext}^1(T, T^{(\kappa)}) = 0$  for any  $\kappa$  and if there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$ . If so, then  $R \rightarrow T_0$  is a  $\text{Gen}(T)$ -preenvelope of  $R$ . Also, if  $T$  is tilting, then  $\text{Gen}(T) = \text{Pres}(T)$ , that is, for any  $M \in \text{Gen}(T)$ , there is an exact sequence  $T_1 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  with  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$ .

More generally an  $R$ -module  $T$  is **silting** if  $T$  is a tilting  $R/\text{ann}(T)$ -module, in which case the **silting class**  $\text{Gen}(T)$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R/\text{ann}(T)$  and hence (since ‘‘definable subcategory of’’ is transitive) of  $\text{Mod-}R$ . Furthermore, the elementary dual definable category of  $\text{Gen}(T)$  is that,  $\text{Cogen}(T^*)$ , cogenerated by the dual cosilting module  $T^*$ . For all this see, for instance, [9], [5], [4].

Also ([1, 9.8]), if  $T$  is tilting, then  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq \text{Cogen}(T^*)\text{-ML}$ , that is, every module in  $\text{Add}(T)$  is  $\text{Gen}(T)$ -atomic. In fact, we have the following.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Suppose that  $T$  is a silting module in  $\text{Mod-}R$  and let  $\mathcal{D} = \text{Gen}(T)$  be the (definable) silting class generated by  $T$ . Then  $T$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic and, for*

some  $n$ ,  $R \rightarrow T^n$  is a  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope for  $R$ . The same is true for  $\mathcal{D} = \langle T \rangle$ , the definable category generated by  $T$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be either  $\text{Gen}(T)$  or  $\langle T \rangle$ . By 4.17 there is a pure epimorphism  $p : D \rightarrow T$  with  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, so we get an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K = \ker(p) \rightarrow D \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0$  with  $K \in \mathcal{D}$ . Now,  $T$  is Ext-projective in  $\mathcal{D}$  ([5, 2.1]), so  $T$  is a direct summand of  $D$  hence, by 4.4,  $T$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic, as claimed.

Let  $R \rightarrow D_R$  be a strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope of  $R$ . Since  $D_R \in \mathcal{D} \subseteq \text{Gen}(T)$ , there is an epimorphism  $g : T^{(\kappa)} \rightarrow D_R$ . Let  $a$  be the image of 1 in  $D_R$ . Since  $D_R$  is locally  $\mathcal{D}$ -projective, 4.20, there is  $h : D_R \rightarrow T^{(\kappa)}$  with  $gha = a$  and hence such that the pp-type of  $ha$  in  $T^{(\kappa)}$ , and hence in  $T^n$  for some  $n$ , is  $\mathcal{D}$ -generated by  $x = x$ . Therefore the composition  $R \rightarrow D_R \xrightarrow{h} T^{(\kappa)} \xrightarrow{\pi} T^n$  is a  $\mathcal{D}$ -preenvelope of  $R$ .  $\square$

By 4.4 we deduce the following.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Suppose that  $T$  is a silting module in  $\text{Mod-}R$  and let  $\mathcal{D} = \text{Gen}(T)$  be the (definable) silting class generated by  $T$  or  $\mathcal{D} = \langle T \rangle$  the definable subcategory generated by  $T$ . Then every module in  $\text{Add}(T)$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}$ -atomic.*

The converse is far from true (take  $T = R$ ; in general not every finitely presented  $R$ -module is projective). But in 6.13 we see a special case where every strictly  $\text{Gen}(T)$ -atomic module is pure in a direct sum of copies of  $T$ .

The next result now follows from 4.6.

**Corollary 5.3.** *Suppose that  $T$  is a silting module in  $\text{Mod-}R$  and, choosing a suitable duality, let  $T^*$  be the dual cosilting module. Then every indecomposable pure-injective direct summand of  $T^*$  is neg-isolated with respect to the definable class  $\langle T \rangle \subseteq \text{cogen}(T^*)$  generated by  $T^*$ .*

Since, [5, 1.2], any tilting, hence any silting, module  $T$  is finitely generated over its endomorphism ring, 4.25 applies to  $T$ .

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $T$  be a silting  $R$ -module and set  $R_T$  to be its ring of definable scalars. Then  $R_T = \text{Biend}(T_R)$  (as  $R$ -algebras).*

If  $T$  is a tilting module, then ([5, 2.1]) every module  $M$  has a **special**  $\text{Gen}(T)$ -preenvelope, that is, there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{i} T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $i$  a  $\text{Gen}(T)$ -preenvelope of  $M$  and  $T_1 \in {}^{\perp 1}\text{Gen}(T)$ , that is  $\text{Ext}^1(T_1, \text{Gen}(T)) = 0$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *Suppose that  $T$  is a tilting  $R$ -module and  $M \in \text{Mod-}R$  is such that  $\text{Ext}^1(M, \text{Gen}(T)) = 0$ . Then there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{i} T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Gen}(T)$ ,  $i$  a  $\text{Gen}(T)$ -preenvelope of  $M$  and  $\text{Ext}^1(T_0, \text{Gen}(T)) = 0 = \text{Ext}^1(T_1, \text{Gen}(T))$ . It follows that  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$*

*Furthermore, in the case  $M = R$ ,  $T_0 \oplus T_1$  is a tilting module equivalent to  $T$ .*

**Proof.** The first statement follows from the proof of [5, 1.2], alternatively see (the proof of) [12, 13.18]. The fact that  $\text{Gen}(T) \cap {}^{\perp 1}\text{Gen}(T) = \text{Add}(T)$  is [12, 13.10(c)]. The last comment is [12, 13.19].  $\square$

In the next section we focus on a special case of a tilting class. For the general case, especially the comparison of atomicity between  $\text{Gen}(T)$  and  $\langle T \rangle$ , the wider relative-ML notions of [32] would be required.

## 6 Modules of irrational slope

We suppose throughout this and the following sections that  $R$  is a tubular algebra. For these algebras and their modules, see [27, Chpt. 5] or any of the references cited below. Our eventual aim is to complete the description of the Ziegler spectrum  $\mathbb{Z}\text{g}_R$  of  $R$  which was begun in [14], [15] and continued in [11]. The task which remains is to describe the modules of irrational slope. Here we make a little progress in this direction.



We refer to [15], [28] for what we need on the modules and morphisms between them, and to [3] for tilting and cotilting modules over these algebras. We do recall that any indecomposable module (finite- or infinite-dimensional) has a well-defined *slope*, which is a real number or  $\infty$  and that there is only the zero morphism from a module of slope  $r$  to a module of slope  $s < r$ . This is extended by saying that a module  $M$  is **supported** on an interval  $I$  in the extended real line if  $M$  is a directed sum of finitely generated submodules whose indecomposable summands have slope in  $I$ .

Let  $r$  be a positive irrational. Denote by  $\mathbf{p}_r$  the finite-dimensional indecomposable modules of slope  $< r$  and by  $\mathbf{q}_r$  those of slope  $> r$ . We will also use these notations for their add-closures. Let  $\mathcal{B}_r = \mathbf{q}_r^{\perp_0}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_r = {}^{\perp_0}\mathbf{p}_r$  and set  $\mathcal{D}_r = \mathcal{B}_r \cap \mathcal{C}_r$ . This is the category of modules of slope  $r$  and it is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$ . It is closed under extensions: if  $0 \rightarrow D \rightarrow X \rightarrow D' \rightarrow 0$  is an exact sequence with  $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_r$ , then we have  $(\mathbf{q}_r, X) = 0 = (X, \mathbf{p}_r)$  and hence  $X \in \mathcal{D}_r$ . In fact, we will see 6.9 below, that every exact sequence in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  is pure-exact.

*Remark 6.1.* Every exact sequence being pure-exact is a property of the category of modules over a von Neumann regular ring but  $\mathcal{D}_r$  is not an abelian category: there are epimorphisms between modules in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  whose kernel is not in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  (and which are not the cokernel of any kernel in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ ); similarly for some monomorphisms in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ . Just taking  $\mathcal{D}_r$  with the pure morphisms seems not to give a nice category. But we do say something, see 6.14 and 6.15, about the non-pure morphisms in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ .

Recall [3, 6.4] that there is a unique to Add-equivalence tilting module  $T$  in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  and a unique to Prod-equivalence cotilting module  $C$  in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  and so ([5], [3])  $\mathcal{C}_r = \text{Gen}(T) = \text{Pres}(T)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_r = \text{Cogen}(C) = \text{Copres}(W)$ , hence  $\mathcal{D}_r = \text{Gen}(T) \cap \text{Copres}(C)$ . Recall [5] that the partial tilting modules - the modules  $T' \in \text{Add}(T)$  - are Ext-projectives in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , meaning that  $\text{Ext}^1(T', \mathcal{D}_r) = 0$  and hence that any exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow D' \rightarrow D \rightarrow T' \rightarrow 0$  with  $D', D \in \mathcal{D}_r$  splits. Dually, the partial cotilting modules - the modules  $C' \in \text{Cogen}(C)$  - are Ext-injectives in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ :  $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{D}_r, C') = 0$  and every exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow C' \rightarrow D \rightarrow D'' \rightarrow 0$  with  $D, D'' \in \mathcal{D}_r$  splits. If  $T$  is a tilting module, then  $T^* = \text{Hom}_k(T, k)$  is, [2, 3.4], a cotilting module for the dual definable category  $(\mathcal{D}_r)^d$ , which is (the duality takes an irrational cut on indecomposable right modules to an irrational cut on indecomposable left modules) the category of left  $R$ -modules of some irrational slope  $r^*$ . So, by left/right symmetry, the cotilting module  $C$  for  $\mathcal{D}_r$  may be taken to be the dual (in this sense) module for some tilting left  $R$ -module which belongs to the category of left modules of slope  $r^*$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $T$  be a tilting module of irrational slope  $r$ . For every  $M \in \text{Mod-}R$  supported on  $(-\infty, r)$  there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{i} T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$  and  $i$  a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope of  $M$ .*

**Proof.** For every finite-dimensional module  $A$  with slope  $< r$ , we have  $\text{Ext}^1(A, \mathcal{D}_r) = 0$  so, since  $M$  is a directed union of such finite-dimensional modules, hence is filtered by such finite-dimensional modules, it follows by Eklof's Lemma (see [12, 6.2]) that  $\text{Ext}^1(M, \mathcal{D}_r) = 0$ . So 5.5 applies.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.3.** *Let  $T$  be a tilting module of irrational slope  $r$  and let  $T^*$  be its dual, cotilting module, of irrational slope  $r^*$ . Then every indecomposable direct summand of  $T^*$  is neg-isolated with respect to  $\mathcal{D}_{r^*}$ .*

**Proof.** This is by 5.3 and since the definable subcategory generated by  $T^*$  is, [15, 8.5], all of  $\mathcal{D}_{r^*}$ .  $\square$

We know [15, 7.4, 7.5], at least if  $R$  is countable, that there are superdecomposable pure-injectives in  $\mathcal{D}_{r^*}$  so it *might* be that  $T^*$  has superdecomposable direct summands.

Reversing the roles of  $r$  and  $r^*$ , we deduce the following (which is already known by other arguments).

**Corollary 6.4.** *If  $r$  is an irrational then there is a cotilting module of slope  $r$  all of whose indecomposable direct summands are neg-isolated in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ .*

Indeed, applying [21, 3.5], there is such a cotilting module with no superdecomposable direct summand, hence which is the pure-injective hull of a direct sum of neg-isolated (in particular, indecomposable) pure-injectives.

## 6.1 Pp formulas near an irrational and definable closures

We recall the following result of Harland [14], see [15, 3.2]. In fact, the result in [15] is for formulas in one free variable/single elements, but the proof works just as well for finite tuples (the change is essentially notational).

**Theorem 6.5.** *Let  $r$  be a positive irrational and  $\phi(\bar{x})$  be a pp formula for  $R$ -modules. Then there is a pp formula  $\phi'$ , a free realisation  $(C', \bar{c}')$  of  $\phi'$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that:*

- (1)  $C' \in \text{add}(\mathbf{p}_{r-\epsilon})$ ;
- (2)  $C'/\langle \bar{c}' \rangle \in \text{add}(\mathbf{q}_{r+\epsilon})$ ;
- (3)  $\phi(X) = \phi'(X)$  for every  $X$  supported on  $(r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon)$
- (4) each morphism  $C' \rightarrow X$  with  $X$  supported on  $(r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon)$  is determined by  $f\bar{c}'$
- (5) we may choose the formula  $\phi'(\bar{x})$ , say  $\exists \bar{y} \theta'(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  with  $\theta'$  quantifier-free, such that there is a unique tuple  $\bar{d}'$  from  $C'$  such that  $C' \models \theta(\bar{c}', \bar{d}')$ ;
- (6) with  $\phi'$ , being  $\exists \bar{y} \theta'(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , chosen as in (5) above, if  $X$  is supported on  $(r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon)$  and  $\bar{a} \in \phi(X) = \phi'(X)$ , then there is a unique tuple  $\bar{b}$  from  $X$  with  $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \in \theta'(X)$ .

**Proof.** (1)-(3) We just follow through the proof of [15, 3.2], checking that it works for  $n$ -tuples in place of elements.

(4) Suppose that  $f, g : C' \rightarrow X$  are such that  $f\bar{c}' = g\bar{c}'$ . Then  $f - g$  factors through  $C'/\langle \bar{c}' \rangle$  which is supported on  $[r + \epsilon, \infty)$ , hence  $f - g = 0$ .

(5) Having made an initial choice of  $\phi'$  being, say,  $\exists \bar{y} \theta''(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , choose  $\bar{d}'$  from  $C'$  such that  $C' \models \theta(\bar{c}', \bar{d}')$ , then just replace  $\theta''$  by a pp formula  $\theta'$  which generates the pp-type of  $\bar{c}'\bar{d}'$  in  $C'$  (using that the pp-type of any finite tuple in a finitely presented module is finitely generated).

Then, if there were another witness in  $C'$  to the existential quantifiers in  $\exists \bar{y} \theta'(\bar{c}', \bar{y})$ , say  $C' \models \theta(\bar{c}', \bar{e})$ , there would be  $f : C' \rightarrow C'$  with  $f\bar{c}' = \bar{c}'$  and  $f\bar{d}' = \bar{e}$ . But then  $1 - f : C' \rightarrow C'$  would factor through  $C'/\langle \bar{c}' \rangle$ , a contradiction as above.

(6) We have that if  $X \models \theta'(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$  and  $X \models \theta'(\bar{a}, \bar{b}')$ , then there are morphisms  $f, f' : C' \rightarrow X$  with  $f : \bar{c}'\bar{d}' \mapsto \bar{a}\bar{b}$  (where  $\bar{d}'$  is as in part 5) and  $f' : \bar{c}'\bar{d}' \mapsto \bar{a}\bar{b}'$ . Then  $f - f'$  factors through  $C'/\langle \bar{c}' \rangle$  and so, as before, must be the zero map and  $\bar{b} = \bar{b}'$ , as claimed.  $\square$

Note that (6) says that, given a pp formula, there is a pp formula to which it is equivalent on every module supported near  $r$  and which has unique witnesses to its existential quantifiers.

We now show that the pp-type of any tuple  $\bar{a}$  from a module  $D$  of irrational slope  $r$  is determined, within the category  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , by its pp-type in its definable closure,  $\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a})$ , in  $D$ .

Recall (see Section 7) that the **definable closure**,  $\text{dcl}^D(A)$  or  $\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a})$  of a subset  $A$  of, or tuple  $\bar{a}$  in,  $D$  means the set of elements  $b \in D$  which are pp-definable in  $D$  over  $\bar{a}$ . This is a submodule of  $D$ . Also, just from the definition of definable closure and the fact that morphisms preserve pp formulas, if  $f, g : D \rightarrow D' \in \mathcal{D}_r$  agree on  $\bar{a}$ , then they agree on  $\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a})$ .

**Corollary 6.6.** *If  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$  and  $\bar{a}$  is from  $D$ , then  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a})$  is generated, modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$  by  $\text{pp}^{\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a})}(\bar{a})$ . That is,  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a}) =_{\mathcal{D}_r} \text{pp}^{\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a})}(\bar{a})$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $D \models \phi(\bar{a})$ . Choose  $\phi'$  as in 6.5(5); say  $\phi'(\bar{x})$  is  $\exists \bar{z} \theta(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$ . So  $D \models \phi'(\bar{a})$ ; say  $D \models \theta(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ . By 6.5(6),  $\bar{b}$  is the unique solution to  $\theta(\bar{a}, \bar{z})$  in  $D$ , so each component of the tuple  $\bar{b}$  is definable in  $D$  over  $\bar{a}$ . Hence  $\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a}) \models \phi'(\bar{a})$  and so  $\phi' \in \text{pp}^{\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a})}(\bar{a})$ . But  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  are equivalent modulo theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , as required.  $\square$

Note, see the example below, that this does *not* imply that the inclusion of  $\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a})$  in  $D$  is pure, nor that  $\text{dcl}^D(\bar{a})$  is in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ . That is, if  $\bar{a}$  satisfies some pp

formula  $\phi$  in  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$ , it need not be the case that there will be witnesses to the existential quantifiers of  $\phi$  which are definable over  $\bar{a}$ ; rather, there is some pp formula  $\phi'$  with  $\phi'(D) = \phi(D)$  for which there are definable-over- $\bar{a}$  witnesses to any existential quantifiers that  $\phi'$  may have.

In particular, consider the case  $M = R$  and a corresponding exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{f} T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$  as in 6.2. Set  $a = f1$ . Then the pp-type of  $a$  in  $T_0$  is equivalent (3.4), modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$  to the formula  $x = x$  which generates  $\text{pp}^R(1)$ . Thus every formula  $\phi$  such that  $T_0 \models \phi(a)$  is equivalent, modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , to  $x = x$ . But certainly there will be such formulas which are not quantifier-free and which are not themselves witnessed in the definable closure (which by 6.7 below is  $aR$ ) of  $a$  in  $T_0$  - rather each is  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -equivalent to a formula  $(x = x)$  which is so witnessed.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Suppose that the module  $M$  is supported on  $(-\infty, r - \eta)$  for some  $\eta > 0$  and take an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow T_0 \xrightarrow{p} T_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $T_0, T_1$  both of slope  $r$ . Then  $\text{dcl}^{T_0}(M) = M$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $b \in \text{dcl}^{T_0}(M)$ , say  $T_0 \models \rho(\bar{a}, b)$  for some pp formula  $\rho$  with  $\rho(\bar{0}, T_0) = 0$  and with  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$ . Then  $T_1 \models \rho(\bar{0}, pb)$  and so, since  $T_1$  and  $T_0$  generate the same definable category - see 6.8 - (and  $T_1 \neq 0$ ), we deduce that  $pb = 0$  and  $b \in M$ , as claimed.  $\square$

## 6.2 Purity in $\mathcal{D}_r$

We continue to use the fact, below, that the category  $\mathcal{D}_r$  has no non-zero proper definable subcategory.

**Theorem 6.8.** *([15, 8.5]) If  $M, N \in \mathcal{D}_r$  are nonzero, then  $M$  and  $N$  are elementarily equivalent, in particular they open the same pp-pairs. Hence, if  $M \in \mathcal{D}_r$  is nonzero, then the definable subcategory  $\langle M \rangle$  of  $\text{Mod-}R$  generated by  $M$  is  $\mathcal{D}_r$ .*

**Proposition 6.9.** *Every exact sequence in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  is pure-exact.*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $0 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow 0$  is an exact sequence in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ . Express  $M''$  as a direct limit  $\varinjlim_{\lambda} A_{\lambda}$  of finite-dimensional modules. Each  $A_{\lambda}$  is in  $\mathfrak{p}_r$ , so  $\text{Ext}^1(A_{\lambda}, M') = 0$  and hence each pullback sequence below is split.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M' & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & M'' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M' & \longrightarrow & X_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & A_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

These fit together ( $X_{\lambda}$  is just the full inverse image of  $A_{\lambda}$  in  $M$ ) into a directed system of split exact sequences, with limit the original exact sequence which is, therefore, pure-exact.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.10.** *If  $M' \xrightarrow{f} M$  with  $M, M'$  both in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  then  $\text{im}(f) \in \mathcal{D}_r$ .*

**Proof.** Since  $M'' = \text{im}(f)$  embeds in  $M$ ,  $(\mathfrak{q}_r, M'') = 0$ . Since  $M''$  is an epimorphic image of  $M'$ ,  $(M'', \mathfrak{p}_r) = 0$ , so  $M'' \in \mathcal{B}_r \cap \mathcal{C}_r = \mathcal{D}_r$ , as required.  $\square$

The category  $\mathcal{D}_r$  is not, however, closed in  $\text{Mod-}R$  under kernels and cokernels. Indeed, as we have seen in 6.2, for any finite-dimensional module  $A$  of slope  $< r$  there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T_0 \xrightarrow{f} T_1 \rightarrow 0$  where  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_r$ . Dually, any finite-dimensional module of slope  $> r$  is the cokernel of a morphism  $g : C_0 \rightarrow C_1$  in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  with  $C_0, C_1 \in \text{Prod}(C)$ . In Section 6.3 will see more precisely what are the non-pure monomorphisms.

**Lemma 6.11.** *([3, proof of 6.4]) For every  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$  there is an exact sequence*

$$T_1 \xrightarrow{f} T_0 \xrightarrow{p} D \rightarrow 0$$

*with  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$ ,  $p$  a pure epimorphism and the inclusion  $\text{im}(f) \rightarrow T_0$  a pure monomorphism; and there is an exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow D \xrightarrow{i} C_0 \xrightarrow{g} C_1$$

with  $C_0, C_1 \in \text{Prod}(C)$ ,  $i$  a pure monomorphism and  $C_0 \rightarrow C_0/D$  a pure epimorphism.

**Proof.** Since  $\mathcal{D}_r = \text{Pres}(T)$ , there is an exact sequence  $T_1 \xrightarrow{f} T_0 \rightarrow D \rightarrow 0$  with  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$ . By 6.10,  $\text{im}(f) \in \mathcal{D}$  so we have an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \text{im}(f) \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow D \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  which, by 6.9, is pure-exact.

For the second statement, since  $\mathcal{D}_r = \text{Copres}(C)$ , we have an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow D \xrightarrow{i} C_0 \rightarrow C_1$  with  $C_0, C_1 \in \text{Copres}(C)$ . Since  $C_0/\text{im}(i) \in \mathcal{D}$ , we have, by 6.9, that the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow D \rightarrow C_0 \rightarrow C_0/D \rightarrow 0$  is pure.  $\square$

Recall, 5.1, that every tilting module  $T$  for  $\mathcal{D}_r$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic and some finite power of it is a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope for  $R$ .

**Proposition 6.12.** *Let  $A \in \text{mod-}R$ . Then there is a morphism  $A \rightarrow T$  for some tilting module  $T$  for  $\mathcal{D}_r$  such that this is a strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic,  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope for  $A$ .*

**Proof.** Choose, by 4.9, some strictly atomic  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope  $f : A \rightarrow D_A$  for  $A$ . There is, by 6.11, a pure epimorphism  $p : T \rightarrow D_A$  for some tilting module  $T$  for  $\mathcal{D}_r$ . Suppose that  $\bar{a}$  is a generating tuple for  $A$ , and let  $\phi$  be such that  $\text{pp}^A(\bar{a}) = \langle \phi \rangle$ . Since  $p$  is a pure epimorphism there is a tuple  $\bar{b} \in \phi(T)$  with  $p\bar{b} = f\bar{a}$  hence, by 3.4, with  $\text{pp}^T(\bar{b}) = \text{pp}^{D_A}(f\bar{a})$  being  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -generated by  $\phi$ . Therefore, by 5.1, the morphism  $A \rightarrow T$  given by  $\bar{a} \mapsto \bar{b}$  is a strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic,  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope for  $A$ .  $\square$

For a module  $M$ , set  $\text{Add}^+(M)$  to be the class of pure submodules of direct sums of copies of  $M$ .

**Corollary 6.13.** *Let  $T$  be a tilting module for  $\mathcal{D}_r$ . Then every strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic module is a pure submodule of a direct sum of copies of  $T$ . So the strictly atomic  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -modules are exactly the modules in  $\text{Add}^+(T)$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic. Let  $\bar{a}$  be a tuple from  $D$ , so  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a})$  is generated, modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$  by a pp formula,  $\phi$ , say. Let  $(C_\phi, \bar{c}_\phi)$  be a free realisation of  $\phi$ . By 6.12 there is a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope  $f_\phi : C_\phi \rightarrow T_\phi$  with  $T$  in  $\text{Add}(T)$ . By assumption, there is a morphism  $g_\phi : D \rightarrow T_\phi$  taking  $\bar{a}$  to  $f_\phi \bar{c}_\phi$ . Take the direct sum of all these morphisms  $g_\phi$  as  $\bar{a}$  ranges over finite tuples in  $D$ . Then this morphism is pp-type-preserving, hence a pure embedding, as required.  $\square$

### 6.3 Non-pure morphisms in $\mathcal{D}_r$

The next result and its extension that follows in some sense explain the non-pure embeddings in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ .

**Proposition 6.14.** *Suppose that  $A = \bar{a}R$  is a finitely generated submodule of  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$ . Then  $D/A \in \mathcal{D}_r$  iff  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a}) = \langle \theta_{\bar{a}} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ , where  $\theta_{\bar{a}}$ , which we may take to be quantifier-free, is such that  $\text{pp}^A(\bar{a}) = \langle \theta_{\bar{a}} \rangle$ .*

**Proof.** ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose that  $\phi \in \text{pp}^D(\bar{a})$ , that is  $\phi$  is pp and  $\bar{a} \in \phi(D)$ . If  $(C_\phi, \bar{c})$  is a free realisation of  $\phi$  then there is a morphism  $C_\phi \rightarrow D$  taking  $\bar{c}$  to  $\bar{a}$ , so we may assume that  $C_\phi \in \mathbf{p}_r$ . By 6.5 there is  $\phi' \geq \phi$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  and a free realisation  $(C_{\phi'}, \bar{c}')$  of  $\phi'$  such that  $C_{\phi'} \in \mathbf{p}_r$ ,  $C_{\phi'}/\langle \bar{c}' \rangle \in \mathbf{q}_r$  and  $\phi' \equiv \phi$  on  $(r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon)$ . In particular  $\phi' \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} \phi$ .

Also, since there will therefore be a morphism  $f : C_{\phi'} \rightarrow D$  with  $\bar{c}' \mapsto \bar{a}$ , there is an induced morphism  $C_{\phi'}/\langle \bar{c}' \rangle \rightarrow D/A$ . We are assuming that  $D/A$  has slope  $r$ , so this must be the zero map and hence  $\text{im}(f) = A$ . Thus we have a morphism  $C_{\phi'} \rightarrow A$  with  $\bar{c}' \mapsto \bar{a}$  and we deduce that  $\bar{a} \in \phi'(A)$ . Since  $\bar{a} \in A$  freely realises  $\theta_{\bar{a}}$ , we deduce that  $\phi' \geq \theta_{\bar{a}}$ .

So, since  $\phi' \equiv \phi$  on  $\mathcal{D}_r$  (in fact, on a neighbourhood of  $r$ ), we have  $\phi \geq_{\mathcal{D}} \theta_{\bar{a}}$  and hence  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a}) = \langle \theta_{\bar{a}} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) For the converse, we have by 6.2 that there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{i} L_0 \xrightarrow{p} L_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $L_0$  a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope of  $A$  and  $L_1 \in \mathcal{D}_r$ . So there is  $f : L_0 \rightarrow D$

with  $A \xrightarrow{i} L_0 \xrightarrow{f} D$  equal to the inclusion  $A \leq D$ . By assumption and 3.4 we have  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a}) = \text{pp}^{L_0}(i\bar{a})$ . We use this to show that if  $\phi/\psi$  is a pp-pair closed on  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , then  $\phi/\psi$  is closed on  $D/A$ , and hence  $D/A \in \mathcal{D}_r$ .

So suppose that  $D/A \models \phi(\bar{c}')$  where  $\phi(\bar{x})$  is  $\exists \bar{y} \theta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  where  $\theta$  is

$$\bigwedge_j \sum_i x_i r_{ij} + \sum_k y_k s_{kj} = 0,$$

say  $D/A \models \theta(\bar{c}', \bar{d}')$  for some  $\bar{d}'$  in  $D/A$ . So we have

$$\bigwedge_j \sum_i c'_i r_{ij} + \sum_k d'_k s_{kj} = 0.$$

Choose inverse images  $c_i$  of  $c'_i$  and  $d_j$  of  $d'_j$  and also choose  $a_j \in iA$  such that

$$\bigwedge_j \sum_i c_i r_{ij} + \sum_k d_k s_{kj} = f a_j.$$

Therefore

$$D \models \exists \bar{x} \bar{y} \bigwedge_j \sum_i x_i r_{ij} + \sum_k y_k s_{kj} = f a_j$$

and so the formula

$$\exists \bar{x} \bar{y} \bigwedge_j \sum_i x_i r_{ij} + \sum_k y_k s_{kj} = z_j$$

is in  $\text{pp}^D(f\bar{a}) = \text{pp}^{L_0}(i\bar{a})$ . Therefore

$$L_0 \models \bigwedge_j \sum_i m_i r_{ij} + \sum_k n_k s_{kj} = a_j$$

for some  $m_i, n_j \in L_0$  and hence

$$L_1 \models \phi(p\bar{m}).$$

Note that

$$D \models \bigwedge_j \sum_i f m_i r_{ij} + \sum_k f n_k s_{kj} = f a_j$$

follows and hence

$$D \models \bigwedge_j \sum_i (c_i - f m_i) r_{ij} + \sum_k (d_k - f n_k) s_{kj} = 0,$$

that is,  $D \models \theta(\bar{c} - f\bar{m}, \bar{d} - f\bar{n})$  and hence  $D \models \phi(\bar{c} - f\bar{m})$ . We are assuming  $\phi/\psi$  to be closed on  $D$  and therefore  $D \models \psi(\bar{c} - f\bar{m})$  and so  $D/A \models \psi(\bar{c}' - \pi f\bar{m})$  where  $\pi : D \rightarrow D/A$  is the projection.

We know that  $\phi/\psi$  is also closed on  $L_1$  where  $\psi(\bar{x})$  is, say,  $\exists \bar{u} \theta'(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$  where  $\theta'$  is  $\bigwedge_t \sum_i x_i r'_{it} + \sum_l u_l s'_{lt} = 0$ . Therefore (using  $u$  to denote elements as well as variables)

$$L_1 \models \bigwedge_t \sum_i p m_i r'_{it} + \sum_l u'_l s'_{lt} = 0.$$

So there are  $u_l$  with  $p u_l = u'_l$  and there are  $a'_t \in iA$  such that

$$L_0 \models \bigwedge_t \sum_i m_i r'_{it} + \sum_l u_l s'_{lt} = a'_t$$

and hence such that

$$D \models \bigwedge_t \sum_i f m_i r'_{it} + \sum_l f u_l s'_{lt} = f a'_t.$$

We deduce that

$$D/A \models \bigwedge_t \sum_i \pi f m_i r'_{it} + \sum_l \pi f u_l s'_{lt} = 0,$$

that is  $D/A \models \theta'(\pi f\bar{m}, \pi f\bar{u})$ , hence  $D/A \models \psi(f\bar{m})$ . Combined with the conclusion of the previous paragraph, this gives  $D/A \models \psi(\bar{c}')$ , as required.  $\square$

That is, if a finitely generated submodule  $A$  of  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$  has its pp-type in  $D$  being the minimal possible - that is,  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -generated by its isomorphism type - then  $D/A \in \mathcal{D}_r$ . We state this formally below (6.17). Thus we have a source of morphisms in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  with kernel not in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ .

We have the following extension of 6.14 which identifies the kernels of morphisms in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  as the definably closed subsets of modules in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ .

**Theorem 6.15.** *Suppose that  $K \subseteq D \in \mathcal{D}_r$ . Then  $D/K \in \mathcal{D}_r$  iff  $K$  is definably closed in  $D$ .*

**Proof.** Set  $\pi : D \rightarrow D/K$  to be the projection map.

( $\Rightarrow$ ) We have seen this argument already: suppose that  $b \in \text{dcl}^D(K)$ ; say  $D \models \rho(\bar{a}, b)$  with  $\bar{a}$  from  $K$ ,  $\rho$  pp and  $\rho(\bar{0}, D) = 0$ , hence also  $\rho(\bar{0}, D/K) = 0$  by assumption and 6.8. Then  $D/K \models \rho(\bar{0}, \pi b)$ , so  $\pi b = 0$  and  $b \in K$ , as required.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) The argument is a modification of that for 6.14.

Suppose that the pp-pair  $\phi/\psi$  is closed on  $\mathcal{D}_r$ ; we show that  $\phi/\psi$  is closed on  $D/K$ , which will be enough.

So suppose that  $D/K \models \phi(\bar{c}')$  where  $\phi(\bar{x})$  is  $\exists \bar{y} \theta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  with  $\theta$  being

$$\bigwedge_j \sum_i x_i r_{ij} + \sum_k y_k s_{kj} = 0,$$

say  $D/K \models \theta(\bar{c}', \bar{d}')$  for some  $\bar{d}'$  in  $D/K$ . So we have

$$\bigwedge_j \sum_i c'_i r_{ij} + \sum_k d'_k s_{kj} = 0.$$

Choose inverse images  $c_i$  of  $c'_i$  and  $d_j$  of  $d'_j$  and also choose  $a_j \in K$  such that

$$D \models \bigwedge_j \sum_i c_i r_{ij} + \sum_k d_k s_{kj} = a_j.$$

Therefore

$$D \models \exists \bar{x} \bar{y} \bigwedge_j \sum_i x_i r_{ij} + \sum_k y_k s_{kj} = a_j$$

and so the formula  $\tau(\bar{v})$  which is

$$\exists \bar{x} \bar{y} \bigwedge_j \sum_i x_i r_{ij} + \sum_k y_k s_{kj} = v_j$$

is in  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a})$ . By 6.6 there is a pp formula  $\exists \bar{z} \theta_0(\bar{z}, \bar{v}) \in \text{pp}^K(\bar{a})$  such that  $\exists \bar{z} \theta_0(\bar{z}, \bar{v}) \leq_{\mathcal{D}_r} \tau(\bar{v})$ . Say we have  $\theta_0(\bar{\kappa}, \bar{a})$  with  $\kappa$  from  $K$ . Set  $K_0 = \langle \bar{a}, \bar{\kappa} \rangle$  to be the module generated by the entries of these tuples. Note that  $K_0 \models \theta_0(\bar{\kappa}, \bar{a})$ .

There is, since  $K_0$  is finitely generated and is a submodule of  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$ , an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K'_0 \rightarrow L_0 \rightarrow L_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $K'_0$  a copy of  $K_0$ ,  $L_0$  a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope of  $K'_0$  and  $L_1 \in \mathcal{D}_r$ . So there is  $f : L_0 \rightarrow D$  which restricts to an isomorphism on  $K'_0 \simeq K_0$ .

Since  $K_0 \models \theta_0(\bar{\kappa}, \bar{a})$ , we have  $K'_0 \models \exists \bar{z} \theta_0(\bar{z}, \bar{a}_0)$ , where we write  $\bar{a}_0$  for the copy of  $\bar{a}$  in  $K'_0$ . Therefore  $\exists \bar{z} \theta_0(\bar{z}, \bar{v}) \in \text{pp}^{L_0}(\bar{a}_0)$  (we identify  $K'_0$  with its image in  $L_0$ ) and so, by choice of  $\theta_0$ , we have  $L_0 \models \tau(\bar{a}_0)$ . Say

$$L_0 \models \bigwedge_j \sum_i m_i r_{ij} + \sum_k n_k s_{kj} = a_{0j}$$

for some  $m_i, n_j \in L_0$  and hence

$$L_1 \models \phi(p\bar{m}).$$

Note that

$$D \models \bigwedge_j \sum_i f m_i r_{ij} + \sum_k f n_k s_{kj} = f a_{0j} = a_j$$

and hence

$$D \models \bigwedge_j \sum_i (c_i - fm_i)r_{ij} + \sum_k (d_k - fn_k)s_{kj} = 0,$$

that is,  $D \models \theta(\bar{c} - f\bar{m}, \bar{d} - f\bar{n})$  and hence  $D \models \phi(\bar{c} - f\bar{m})$ . We are assuming  $\phi/\psi$  to be closed on  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , so  $D \models \psi(\bar{c} - f\bar{m})$  and therefore  $D/K \models \psi(\bar{c}' - \pi f\bar{m})$ .

We know that  $\phi/\psi$  is also closed on  $L_1$  where  $\psi(\bar{x})$  is, say,  $\exists \bar{u} \theta'(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$  where  $\theta'$  is  $\bigwedge_t \sum_i x_i r'_{it} + \sum_l u_l s'_{lt} = 0$ . Therefore (using  $u$  to denote elements as well as variables)

$$L_1 \models \bigwedge_t \sum_i pm_i r'_{it} + \sum_l u'_l s'_{lt} = 0.$$

So there are  $u_l$  with  $pu_l = u'_l$  and there are  $\kappa'_t \in K'_0$  such that

$$L_0 \models \bigwedge_t \sum_i m_i r'_{it} + \sum_l u_l s'_{lt} = \kappa'_t$$

and hence such that

$$D \models \bigwedge_t \sum_i fm_i r'_{it} + \sum_l fu_l s'_{lt} = f\kappa'_t.$$

Note that  $f\kappa'_t \in K_0 \leq K$ . We deduce that

$$D/K \models \bigwedge_t \sum_i \pi fm_i r'_{it} + \sum_l \pi fu_l s'_{lt} = 0,$$

that is  $D/K \models \theta'(\pi f\bar{m}, \pi f\bar{u})$ , hence  $D/K \models \psi(f\bar{m})$ . Combined with the conclusion of the previous paragraph, this gives  $D/K \models \psi(\bar{c}')$ , as required.  $\square$

This lets us say precisely how the morphisms in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  with kernel not in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  are associated with minimal pp-types in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ .

**Corollary 6.16.** *Suppose  $f : D \rightarrow D'$  with  $D, D'$  in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  and  $K = \ker(f)$  supported on  $(-\infty, r - \eta)$  for some  $\eta > 0$ , in particular,  $K \notin \mathcal{D}_r$ . Then for every finite tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $K$ ,  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a}) = \langle \text{pp}^K(\bar{a}) \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_r}$ . That is,  $\text{pp}^D(K)$  is the minimal pp-type modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$  extending the isomorphism type of  $K$ .*

**Proof.** This follows directly from 6.15 and 6.6 (the latter is stated for finitely generated modules but the general case is an immediate consequence of that). But the proof direct from 6.5 is quick, so we also give this.

Take any tuple  $\bar{a}$  from  $K$  and suppose that  $\phi$  is a pp formula such that  $D \models \phi(\bar{a})$ . By 6.5 there is a pp formula  $\phi'$  equivalent to  $\phi$  at (and near)  $r$  and with a free realisation  $(C, \bar{c})$  such that  $C/\langle \bar{c} \rangle \in \mathbf{q}_r$ .

Then we have a morphism  $f : C \rightarrow D$  with  $f\bar{c} = \bar{a}$  and hence an induced morphism  $C/\langle \bar{c} \rangle \rightarrow D'$  which, since the slope of  $C/\langle \bar{c} \rangle$  is greater than  $r$ , must be 0. Hence  $fC \leq K$ . But then  $K \models \phi'(\bar{a})$  and so, since  $\phi$  is equivalent to  $\phi'$  near  $r$ ,  $\phi$  is in the  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -closure of  $\text{pp}^K(\bar{a})$ , as required.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.17.** *Suppose that  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow D \rightarrow D'$  is an exact sequence with  $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_r$  and  $A$  finite-dimensional, generated by the tuple  $\bar{a}$ . Then  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{a})$  is generated, modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , by any quantifier-free formula which generates the defining linear relations on  $\bar{a}$ . In particular it is the minimal pp-type of any tuple from a module in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  with the same isomorphism type as  $\bar{a}$ .*

We look at the following case more closely

**Proposition 6.18.** *Suppose that  $A \in \text{mod-}R$  and  $A \rightarrow D_A$  is a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -preenvelope. Then  $D_A/A \in \mathcal{D}_r$  and  $D_A/A$  is  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic. If  $D_A$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic, so is  $D_A/A$ .*

**Proof.** The fact that  $D_A/A \in \mathcal{D}_r$  is by 3.4 and 6.14. Let  $\bar{b}$  be from  $D_A$  and choose  $\phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  which generates  $\text{pp}^{D_A}(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$  where  $\bar{a}$  is a chosen finite generating tuple for  $A$ . We claim that  $\phi(\bar{0}, \bar{y})$  generates  $\text{pp}^{D_A/A}(\pi\bar{b})$ , where  $\pi : D_A \rightarrow D_A/A$  is the quotient map.

Certainly that formula is in  $\text{pp}^{D_A/A}(\pi\bar{b})$ , so suppose that  $D_A/A \models \psi(\pi\bar{b})$ , say  $\psi$  is  $\exists \bar{z} \bigwedge_j \sum y_i r_{ij} + \sum_k z_k s_{kj} = 0$ , so  $D_A \models \bigwedge_j \sum b_i r_{ij} + \sum c_k s_{kj} = a'_j$  for some  $c_k \in D_A$  and  $a'_j \in A$ . Then  $\exists \bar{z} \bigwedge_j \sum_i y_i r_{ij} + \sum_k z_k s_{kj} = x'_j$  is a consequence (modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$ ) of  $\phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  where  $x'_j$  is being used for the linear combination of the variables  $\bar{x}$  that corresponds to  $a'_j$  written as a specific linear combination of the entries of  $\bar{a}$ . Since  $D_A/A \models \phi(\bar{0}, \pi\bar{b})$  we deduce  $D_A/A \models \exists \bar{z} \bigwedge_j \sum_i \pi b_i r_{ij} + \sum_k z_k s_{kj} = 0$ , that is,  $D_A/A \models \psi(\pi\bar{b})$ , as claimed.

So every pp-type realised in  $D_A/A$  is finitely generated modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$ ; that is,  $D_A/A$  is  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic. Suppose that  $D_A$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic and, continuing the notation as above, take a finite tuple  $\pi\bar{b}$  from  $D_A/A$  and a generator  $\phi(\bar{0}, \bar{x})$  for the pp-type of  $\pi\bar{b}$  in  $D_A/A$  constructed as above. Suppose that  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$  and  $D \models \phi(\bar{0}, \bar{a})$ . Then, by choice of  $\phi$  and since  $D_A$  is strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic, there is a morphism  $D_A \rightarrow D$  with  $\bar{a} \mapsto \bar{0}$  and  $\bar{b} \mapsto \bar{a}$ , so this morphism factors through  $\pi$ , giving a morphism  $D_A/A \rightarrow D$  with  $\pi\bar{b} \mapsto \bar{a}$ , as required.  $\square$

Here's a little more about morphisms of  $\mathcal{D}_r$  with kernel  $R$ . Take (6.2) an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{i} T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $i$  a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -precover and  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$ ; set  $a = i(1)$ . Consider a pure-injective hull  $i' : T_0 \rightarrow H(T_0) \in \mathcal{D}_r$ . Then  $\text{pp}^{H(T_0)}(i'a) = \text{pp}^{T_0}(a) = \langle x = x \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_r}$  is the generic pp-type (that is, the smallest pp-type, being generated by " $x = x$ "), write this as  $p_0$ , in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ . We also have ([3, proof of 6.4]) an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{j} C_0 \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $C_0, C_1 \in \text{Prod}(C)$ ; in particular these are pure-injective. Since  $j$  is the kernel of a morphism in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , we have by 6.15 that  $jR$  is definably closed in  $C_0$ . Then 6.6 implies that  $\text{pp}^{C_0}(j(1)) = p_0$  and so  $H(T_0)$  is a direct summand of  $C_0$ . Therefore we can replace this exact sequence with  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow H(T_0) \rightarrow H(T_0)/R \rightarrow 0$ , deducing in particular, that  $H(T_0)/R$  is pure-injective. Next consider the diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & R & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & T_1 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow i' & & \downarrow f & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & R & \longrightarrow & H(T_0) & \longrightarrow & H(T_0)/R & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

$i'$  is a pure embedding, so is its pushout  $f$ , so  $H(T_1)$  is a direct summand of  $H(T_0)/R$ . Therefore we have shown the following.

**Proposition 6.19.** *If  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$  is a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -precovering sequence with  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$ , then we obtain an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow H(T_0) \rightarrow H(T_0)/R \rightarrow 0$  with  $H(T_0), H(T_0)/R$  in  $\text{Prod}(C)$ , and the induced inclusion of  $H(T_1)$  in  $H(T_0)/R$  is split.*

The modules  $H(T_0)$  and  $H(T_1)$ , although in  $\text{Prod}(C)$ , certainly are not cotilting modules since, according to next result, they have no neg-isolated direct summands.

**Proposition 6.20.** *If  $T$  is a strictly  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic module then the pure-injective hull  $H(T)$  of  $T$  has no neg-isolated direct summand.*

**Proof.** We need rather more model theory/functor category theory for this. We use the embedding  $M \mapsto M \otimes -$  of  $\text{Mod-}R$  into the functor category  $(R\text{-mod}, \mathbf{Ab})$  followed by Gabriel localisation at the torsion theory which is generated by the finitely presented functors which are 0 on the dual definable category  $\mathcal{D}_r^d$ . In  $(R\text{-mod}, \mathbf{Ab})$ ,  $H(T) \otimes -$  is the injective hull of  $T \otimes -$  and is torsionfree for that torsion theory. Working in the localised category (see [23, §12.5, 12.5.6 especially]), if  $H(T)$  has a neg-isolated direct summand, say the hull  $H(p)$  of a pp-type  $p$  neg-isolated by a pp formula  $\psi$ , then  $H(T) \otimes -$  has a simple subobject, namely, the localisation of the functor  $F_{D\psi/Dp}$ , and hence so does its essential subobject  $T \otimes -$ . Therefore,  $T$  realises a neg-isolated type - for we have a nonzero morphism  $F_{D\psi/Dp} \rightarrow T \otimes -$  and so, by [23, 12.2.4], there is  $a \in T$  with  $\text{pp}^T(a) = p$ . But every pp-type realised in  $T$  is finitely generated, so  $p = \langle \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_r}$  for some pp formula  $\phi$ . But then  $\phi/\psi$  is a minimal pair in the ordering  $\leq_{\mathcal{D}_r}$ , meaning there is no point in the ordering strictly between them. But that contradicts [15, 6.1, 7.3], as required. (In terms of the functor category, the localisation of the object  $F_{D\psi}/F_{D\phi}$  is equal to the localisation of  $F_{D\psi}/F_{Dp}$ , which shows that that simple object is finitely presented in the localised functor category, contradicting the result in [15].)  $\square$



**Question:** Are there any nonzero finitely presented objects in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ ?

We can say this much:

**Proposition 6.21.** *If  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$  is finitely presented in  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , then  $D$  is  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic. Indeed, every finite tuple of  $D$  can be extended to a finite tuple whose pp-type is  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -generated by its quantifier-free type (cf. [29, 3.13]).*

**Proof.** Write  $D = \varinjlim A$  as the direct limit of its finitely generated submodules. For each finitely generated submodule  $A$  of  $D$ , choose a  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -atomic,  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -precover  $A \rightarrow D_A$  of  $A$ . By [19, 3.3] these may be chosen in a functorial way, so that, corresponding to an inclusion  $A \leq B$  of finitely generated submodules of  $D$ , we have a morphism  $D_A \rightarrow D_B$  and these morphisms give a directed system, with  $\varinjlim D_A = D_1$  say. Since  $D = \varinjlim A$  there is an induced morphism  $f : D \rightarrow D_1$  (indeed, this also is functorial, as stated in [19, 3.3]).

Since  $D$  is finitely presented, there is  $A \leq D$  finitely generated and a morphism  $h : D \rightarrow D_A$  such that  $f = g_{A\infty}h$  where  $g_{A\infty} : D_A \rightarrow D_1$  is the limit map. Let  $\bar{b}$  be any tuple from  $D$  and, without loss of generality, assume that it contains a generating tuple for  $A$ . Set  $B$  to be the submodule of  $D$  generated by  $\bar{b}$ . Then we have  $\text{pp}^B(\bar{b}) \leq \text{pp}^D(\bar{b}) \leq \text{pp}^{D_A}(\bar{b}) \leq \text{pp}^{D_B}(\bar{b})$ . The last pp-type is  $\mathcal{D}_r$ -finitely generated, being equivalent, modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , to the first pp-type and hence is generated by any pp formula which generates the first pp-type. Hence  $\text{pp}^D(\bar{b})$  is generated, modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , by (any quantifier-free pp formula which generates)  $\text{pp}^B(\bar{b})$ .  $\square$

## 7 Background from Model Theory

This consists of brief explanations; for more information and detail there are various references, including [22], [23] and the introductions to [29], [31].

**Pp formulas** A **pp formula**  $\phi$  is (one which is equivalent to) an existentially quantified system of  $R$ -linear equations, that is, has the form

$$\exists \bar{y} \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n x_i r_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^t y_k s_{kj} = 0.$$

Here the  $r_{ij}$  and  $s_{kj}$  are elements of  $R$  (strictly function symbols standing for multiplication by those elements) and  $\bigwedge$  is to  $\wedge$  (“and”) as  $\sum$  is to  $+$ ; so this is a system of  $m$   $R$ -linear equations. The variables  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  are the **free** variables of  $\phi$  (they are ‘free’ to be substituted with values from some module) and the  $y_k$  are the existentially quantified variables. We may display the free variables of  $\phi$ , writing  $\phi(\bar{x})$  or  $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .

A **quantifier-free** pp formula is one (equivalent to one) with no existential quantifiers. For instance  $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n x_i r_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^t y_k s_{kj} = 0$  is a quantifier-free formula, with free variables the  $x_i$  and the  $y_k$ .

**Solution sets of pp formulas** If  $\phi = \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is a pp formula as above then, in any module  $M$ , we have its solution set:

$$\phi(M) = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in M^n : \exists b_1, \dots, b_t \in M \text{ such that } \sum_{i=1}^n a_i r_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^t b_k s_{kj} = 0, j = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

This is a projection, to the first  $n$  coordinates in  $M^{n+t}$  of the solution set of the quantifier-free formula  $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n x_i r_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^t y_k s_{kj} = 0$ . Since the solution set to the latter is a subgroup of  $M^{n+t}$ , its projection  $\phi(M)$  is a subgroup of  $M^n$ . (In fact, it is easy to see that both are  $\text{End}(M)$ -submodules, under the diagonal action of that ring on powers of  $M$ .) We say that  $\phi(M)$  is a subgroup of  $M^n$  **pp-definable** in  $M$  or, more briefly though possibly less accurately, a **pp-definable subgroup** of  $M$ .

If  $\bar{a} \in \phi(M)$  then we write  $M \models \phi(\bar{a})$  - this is the more usual notation in model theory and is read as “ $\bar{a}$  satisfies  $\phi$  in  $M$ ” or “ $M$  models  $\phi(\bar{a})$ ” or “ $\phi(\bar{a})$  is true in  $M$ ”.

Since pp formulas define subgroups, we have that  $M \models \phi(\bar{a})$  and  $M \models \phi(\bar{b})$  together imply  $M \models \phi(\bar{a} - \bar{b})$ .

**The (pre-)ordering on, and equivalence of, pp formulas** We write  $\psi \leq \phi$  if, for every module  $M$ ,  $\psi(M) \leq \phi(M)$ . We will make this comparison only when  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  have the same free variables (so that  $\psi(M)$  and  $\phi(M)$  may be compared as subsets of the same power of  $M$ ). This is a preordering, and **equivalence** of formulas means equivalence with respect to this. More generally, we say that  $\phi$  is **equivalent** to  $\psi$  **in**  $M$  if  $\phi(M) = \psi(M)$ , that is if  $M \models \phi(\bar{a})$  iff  $M \models \psi(\bar{a})$ . So two pp formulas are equivalent iff this holds for every  $M$  (in fact, to test the ordering and equivalence it is enough to check just on finitely presented modules [23, 1.2.23]). Thus we use “=” not to mean that the formulas are identical but rather to mean that they have the same solution set.

**Lattices of pp formulas** For each  $n$  the resulting ordered set of (equivalence classes of) pp formulas in (a specified list of)  $n$  free variables is a modular lattice, written  $\text{pp}_R^n$ , the point being that each of the intersection and sum of  $\phi(M), \psi(M) \leq M^n$  is the solution set of a pp formula; these formulas are respectively written  $\phi \wedge \psi$  and  $\phi + \psi$  and are entirely independent of  $M$ .

So, for every module  $M$ , we have the evaluation map  $\text{pp}_R^n \rightarrow \text{pp}^n(M)$  where the latter is the set, indeed modular lattice, of subgroups of  $M^n$  pp-definable in  $M$ . The kernel of this lattice homomorphism consists of the pairs  $(\phi, \psi)$  such that  $\phi(M) = \psi(M)$ : we say that such a pair is **closed on**  $M$ . Otherwise the pair is **open on**  $M$ . Sometimes this terminology is restricted to **pp-pairs** meaning pairs of pp formulas which are comparable in the ordering on  $\text{pp}_R^n$ .

We write  $\psi \leq_M \phi$  and  $\psi =_M \phi$  for the (pre)ordering and equivalence of pp formulas when evaluated on  $M$ .

**Definable subcategories** Given any set  $\Phi$  of pp-pairs, the corresponding **definable subcategory** of  $\text{Mod-}R$  is the full subcategory on

$$\{M \in \text{Mod-}R : \phi(M) = \psi(M) \forall (\phi, \psi) \in \Phi\}.$$

Thus a definable subcategory is one with membership determined by closure of a certain set of pp-pairs.

The definable subcategories of  $\text{Mod-}R$  are characterised algebraically as being those closed under direct products, direct limits and pure submodules ([23, 3.4.7]). They also are closed under pure epimorphisms and pure-injective hulls ([23, 3.4.8]). A **definable category** is one which is equivalent to a definable subcategory of some module category  $\text{Mod-}R$  (we allow  $R$  to be a ring with many objects, that is a skeletally small preadditive category).

If  $M$  is a module then we denote by  $\langle M \rangle$  the definable subcategory **generated** by  $M$  - the smallest definable subcategory (of the ambient module category) containing  $M$ :

$$\langle M \rangle = \{N \in \text{Mod-}R : \phi(M) = \psi(M) \implies \phi(N) = \psi(N) \forall \phi, \psi \text{ pp}\}.$$

That is,  $\langle M \rangle$  consists of the class of modules  $N$  such that every pp-pair closed on  $M$  is closed on  $N$ . Similar notation is used for the definable subcategory generated by a class of modules. Every definable subcategory is generated (by no means unique)  $M$ .

**The functor category of a definable category** If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable category, then the functors from  $\mathcal{D}$  to the category, **Ab**, of abelian groups which commute with direct products and directed colimits are precisely those given by pp-pairs: those of the form  $D \mapsto \phi(D)/\psi(D)$ , for  $\phi \geq \psi$  a pp-pair, see [23, 18.1.19] (and the

main result of [20] specialises to almost this). This category is also equivalent to the localisation of the functor category  $(\text{mod-}R, \mathbf{Ab})^{\text{fp}}$  - the finitely presented functors on finitely presented modules - by the Serre subcategory consisting of those finitely presented functors which are 0 on  $\mathcal{D}$ . Indeed, the finitely presented functors just being the pp-pairs, these are exactly all the pp-pairs which are closed on, hence which together define,  $\mathcal{D}$ . See [23, 12.3.19, 12.3.20].

**Pp formulas relative to a definable subcategory** If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory, then we write  $\psi \leq_{\mathcal{D}} \phi$  if  $\psi(M) \leq \phi(M)$  for every  $M \in \mathcal{D}$ , and  $\psi =_{\mathcal{D}} \phi$  if  $\psi(M) = \phi(M)$  for every  $M \in \mathcal{D}$ . If  $\mathcal{D} = \langle M \rangle$ , then these are the same as  $\leq_M$  and  $=_M$ . We might sometimes write  $\mathcal{D} \models \psi \leq \phi$ , meaning  $\psi \leq_{\mathcal{D}} \phi$  and say “ $\mathcal{D}$  models  $\psi \leq \phi$ ”; equivalently,  $\mathcal{D} \models \forall \bar{x} (\phi(\bar{x}) \rightarrow \psi(\bar{x}))$ ; equivalently  $\psi \wedge \phi =_{\mathcal{D}} \phi$ .

The relation  $=_{\mathcal{D}}$  of  $\mathcal{D}$ -equivalence between pp formulas in a given set of, say  $n$ , free variables is a congruence on the lattice  $\text{pp}_R^n$  of pp formulas in those  $n$  free variables and so there is induced a surjective lattice homomorphism to the lattice  $\text{pp}_{\mathcal{D}}^n$  of equivalent-on- $\mathcal{D}$  classes of pp formulas (which can be identified with  $\text{pp}^n(M)$  if  $\langle M \rangle = \mathcal{D}$ ).

**Elementary duality of pp formulas** If  $\phi(\bar{x})$  is a pp formula for right  $R$ -modules then there is a well-defined (up to equivalence of pp formulas on left  $R$ -modules) **(elementary) dual** pp formula  $D\phi(\bar{x})$  for left  $R$ -modules (in the same number of free variables<sup>5</sup>) For instance the dual of an annihilation formula  $xr = 0$  is the corresponding divisibility formula  $r|x$ , that is  $\exists z(rz = x)$ , and *vice versa*. This is a duality between the lattices  $\text{pp}_R^n$  and  $\text{pp}_{R^{\text{op}}}^n$ :  $D(\phi \wedge \psi) = D\phi + D\psi$ ;  $D(\phi + \psi) = D\phi \wedge D\psi$ ;  $D^2\phi = \phi$ .

**Dual definable categories** If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$ , determined by closure of some set  $\Phi$  of pp-pairs, then the **(elementary) dual definable category**  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{d}}$  is the subcategory of  $R\text{-Mod}$  defined by the set of dual pairs - the collection of  $(D\phi, D\psi)$  such that  $(\psi, \phi) \in \Phi$ .

In particular,  $\psi \leq_{\mathcal{D}} \phi$  iff  $D\phi \leq_{\mathcal{D}^{\text{d}}} D\psi$ .

We have  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{d}})^{\text{d}} = \mathcal{D}$ . Also  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  iff  $M^* \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{d}}$  where  $*$  denotes any duality of the sort seen earlier in this paper. Also, the pure-injectives in  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{d}}$  are the direct summands of modules of the form  $M^*$  with  $M \in \mathcal{D}$ .

**Pp-types** The **pp-type** of an element  $a$  in a module  $M$  is the set of all pp formulas that it satisfies in  $M$ ; similarly for  $n$ -tuples:  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}) = \{\phi(\bar{x}) : M \models \phi(\bar{a})\}$ . We say that  $\bar{a}$  is a **realisation** of that pp-type **in**  $M$ . Every set  $p$  of pp formulas which is a filter, that is, upwards-closed (if  $\phi \leq \psi$  and  $\phi \in p$  then  $\psi \in p$ ) and closed under intersection/conjunction ( $\phi, \psi \in p$  implies  $\phi \wedge \psi \in p$ ) occurs in this way, so we refer to such a set as a **pp-type**.

When we work in a definable subcategory  $\mathcal{D}$ , then pp-types realised in modules in  $\mathcal{D}$  will be closed under the equivalence relation  $=_{\mathcal{D}}$ , and every filter of pp formulas which is closed under this relation will be realised in some module in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

A pp-type  $p$  is **finitely generated** if there is a pp formula  $\phi \in p$  such that  $p = \{\psi : \phi \leq \psi\}$ ; we write  $p = \langle \phi \rangle$ . If  $A$  is finitely presented and  $\bar{a}$  is from  $A$ , then  $\text{pp}^A(\bar{a})$  is finitely generated, [23, 1.2.6].

**Morphisms** Morphisms preserve pp formulas: if  $f : M \rightarrow N$  and  $M \models \phi(\bar{a})$ , then  $N \models \phi(f\bar{a})$ . Thus morphisms are non-decreasing on pp-types:  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}) \subseteq \text{pp}^N(f\bar{a})$  if  $f$  is as above. And  $f$  is a pure monomorphism iff  $\text{pp}^M(\bar{a}) = \text{pp}^N(f\bar{a})$  for every  $\bar{a}$  from  $M$ .

---

<sup>5</sup>Free variables are just place-holders so it doesn't matter whether or not we use the same free variables in the dual formula.

**Free realisations of pp formulas** A **free realisation** of a pp formula  $\phi$  in  $n$  free variables is a finitely presented module  $C$  and an  $n$ -tuple  $\bar{c}$  from  $C$  such that  $\text{pp}^C(\bar{c}) = \langle \phi \rangle$ . It follows that, if  $M$  is any module and  $\bar{a} \in \phi(M)$ , then there is a morphism  $f : C \rightarrow M$  such that  $f\bar{c} = \bar{a}$  [23, 1.2.7].

Every pp formula has a free realisation [23, 1.2.14].

**Irreducible pp-types** A nonzero pp-type  $p$  is **irreducible** (or **indecomposable**) if it is realised in an indecomposable pure-injective module. That module, the **hull**, denoted  $H(p)$ , of  $p$ , is unique to isomorphism (over any realisation of  $p$ ). Ziegler's criterion, see [23, 4.3.49], is an often checkable criterion for this: it says that  $p$  is irreducible iff, for every  $\psi_1, \psi_2$  not in  $p$ , there is  $\phi \in p$  such that  $(\psi_1 \wedge \phi) + (\psi_2 \wedge \phi) \notin p$ .

**Neg-isolated pp-types** A pp-type  $p$  is said to be **neg-isolated** by a pp formula  $\phi$  if it is maximal (among pp-types) with respect to not containing  $\phi$ . Any such pp-type is [23, §5.3.5, 4.3.52] irreducible, so is realised in an indecomposable pure-injective. An indecomposable pure-injective  $N$  is said to be **neg-isolated** if it is the hull of a neg-isolated pp-type and, in that case, every non-zero pp-type realised in it is neg-isolated, see [23, 5.3.46]. In fact neg-isolation of  $N$  is equivalent, see [23, 5.3.47], to the functor  $N \otimes -$  being the injective hull of a simple object in the functor category  $(R\text{-mod}, \mathbf{Ab})$ .

All these notions relativise to any definable category  $\mathcal{D}$ , see [23, §5.3.5]. In particular  $N$  is **neg-isolated** in  $\mathcal{D}$ , or with respect to  $\mathcal{D}$ , if it is the hull of some pp-type  $p$  such that there is a pp formula  $\psi$  such that  $p$  is maximal among pp-types realised in modules in  $\mathcal{D}$  with respect to not containing  $\psi$ . Also, the relevant functor categories are those associated to  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^d$  (Gabriel localisations of the functor categories associated to the whole module category).

**Elementary cogenerators** An **elementary cogenerator** for a definable category  $\mathcal{D}$  is a pure-injective  $N \in \mathcal{D}$  such that every object of  $\mathcal{D}$  is a pure submodule of a direct product of copies of  $N$ . Every definable category has an elementary cogenerator [23, 5.3.52] and, for  $N$  to be an elementary cogenerator, it is necessary and sufficient that every neg-isolated pure-injective in  $\mathcal{D}$  be a direct summand of  $N$  ([23, 5.3.50]). It is equivalent that (the localisation of)  $N \otimes -$  be an injective cogenerator of the relevant functor category ([23, 12.5.7]), namely the Gabriel localisation of  $(R\text{-mod}, \mathbf{Ab})$  at the hereditary, finite-type torsion theory corresponding to the dual definable category  $\mathcal{D}^d$  (see [23, §12.3]).

(We have to involve modules on the other side because we are using the functor which makes a right module  $M$  into a functor  $M \otimes -$  on left modules, see [23, §12.1].)

**Rings of definable scalars** Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a definable subcategory. If  $\rho(x, y)$  is a pp formula with 2 free variables such that, on every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  the solution set  $\rho(D)$  in  $D$  is the graph of a function, necessarily additive, on  $D$ , then we say that  $\rho$  is a **definable scalar** on  $\mathcal{D}$  (more precisely,  $\rho$  defines a scalar on every module in  $\mathcal{D}$ ). Of course, if two pp formulas are equivalent on  $\mathcal{D}$ , then they define the same scalar on  $\mathcal{D}$ . The set of maps so defined is the **ring of definable scalars** for  $\mathcal{D}$ , denoted  $R_{\mathcal{D}}$ . For instance, multiplication by any  $r \in R$  is such, being given by the formula  $x - yr = 0$ , and this gives a (canonical) ring homomorphism  $R \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{D}}$ .

It is easy to see that sums and compositions of pp-definable maps on  $\mathcal{D}$  are pp-definable, so  $R_{\mathcal{D}}$  is indeed a ring. If  $M$  is any module, then any pp-definable map on  $M$  extends to a pp-definable map (given by the same pp formula) on the definable category  $\mathcal{D} = \langle M \rangle$  generated by  $M$  and we also write  $R_M$  for  $R_{\mathcal{D}}$ .

For more details see [23, Chpt. 6, §12.8].

Every universal localisation  $R \rightarrow R'$  occurs this way (as the ring of definable scalars for  $\text{Mod-}R'$  canonically embedded as a definable subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}R$ ) and any ring of definable scalars  $R \rightarrow R'$  can be seen as a localisation of  $R$  at the level of functor categories ([23, 12.8.2] makes this precise).

**Definable closures** If  $M$  is an  $R$ -module,  $A \subseteq M$  and  $b \in M$ , we say that  $b$  is **definable over  $A$**  in  $M$  if there is  $\bar{a}$  from  $A$  and a formula  $\chi(\bar{x}, y)$  in the language of  $R$ -modules such that  $M \models \chi(\bar{a}, b)$  and  $b$  is the only solution to  $\chi(\bar{a}, y)$  in  $M$ . In the context,  $\mathcal{D}_r$ , that we consider, it is the case that every module  $D \in \mathcal{D}_r$  is elementarily equivalent to  $D \oplus D$  ([15, 8.5]) and then it follows by [7, 2.1] that a defining formula may be taken to be pp. If  $A \subseteq M$  is any subset, then the **definable closure**,  $\text{dcl}^M(A)$ , of  $A$  in  $M$  is the set of all elements in  $M$  which are definable over  $A$ . This will be a submodule of  $M$  since an  $R$ -linear combination of elements clearly is definable over those elements.

## References

- [1] L. Angeleri Hügel and D. Herbera, Mittag-Leffler conditions on modules, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 57(5) (2008), 2459-2517.
- [2] L. Angeleri Hügel and M. Hrbek, Silting modules over commutative rings, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, 2017(13) (2016), 4131-4151.
- [3] L. Angeleri Hügel and D. Kussin, Tilting and cotilting modules over concealed canonical algebras, *Math. Z.*, 284(2017), 821-850.
- [4] L. Angeleri Hügel, F. Marks and J. Vitória, Silting modules, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, 2016(4), 1251-1284.
- [5] L. Angeleri Hügel, A. Tonolo and J. Trlifaj, Tilting preenvelopes and cotilting precovers, *Algebra Represent. Theory*, 4(2) (2001), 155-170.
- [6] G. Azumaya, Locally pure-projective modules, *Contemp. Math.*, 124(1992), 17-22.
- [7] K. Burke and M. Prest, Rings of definable scalars and biendomorphism rings, pp. 188-201 *in* *Model Theory of Groups and Automorphism Groups*, London Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser., Vol. 244, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [8] C. Butz, Regular categories & regular logic, *BRICS Lecture Series LS-98-2* 1998.
- [9] R. Colpi and K. R. Fuller, Tilting objects in abelian categories and quasitilted rings, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(2) (2007), 741-765.
- [10] S. Crivei, M. Prest and B. Torrecillas, Covers in finitely accessible categories, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 138 (2010), 1213-1221.
- [11] L. Gregory, Decidability of theories of modules over tubular algebras, *arXiv:1603.03284*
- [12] R.. Göbel and J. Trlifaj, *Approximations and Endomorphism Algebras of Modules*, 2nd Edition, De Gruyter, 2012.
- [13] P. A. Guil Asensio, M. C. Izurdiaga, P. Rothmaler and B. Torrecillas, Strict Mittag-Leffler modules, *Math. Log. Quart.*, 57(6), 566-570, 2011.
- [14] R. Harland, *Pure-injective Modules over Tubular Algebras and String Algebras*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Manchester, 2011, *available at* <https://personalpages.manchester.ac.uk/staff/mike.prest/publications.html>
- [15] R. Harland and M. Prest, Modules with irrational slope over tubular algebras, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 110(3) (2015), 695-720.
- [16] I. Herzog and Ph. Rothmaler, When cotorsion modules are pure injective, *J. Math. Logic*, 9(1) (2009), 63-102.
- [17] A. Kuber and J. Rosický, Definable categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 222(5) (2018), 1006-1025.
- [18] T. G. Kucera and Ph. Rothmaler, Pure-projective modules and positive constructibility, *J. Symbolic Logic*, 65(1) (2000), 103-110.
- [19] S. Lack and G. Tendas, Enriched regular theories, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 224(6) (2020), 1-29.

- [20] M. Makkai, A theorem on Barr-exact categories with an infinitary generalization, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 47 (1990), 225-268.
- [21] A. R. Mehdi and M. Prest, Almost dual pairs and definable classes of modules. *Comm. Algebra*, 43(4) (2015), 1387–1397.
- [22] M. Prest, *Model Theory and Modules*, London Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser., Vol. 130, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- [23] M. Prest, Purity, Spectra and Localisation, *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, Vol. 121, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [24] M. Prest, Definable additive categories: purity and model theory, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 210/No. 987, 2011.
- [25] J. Rada and M. Saorín, Rings characterized by (pre)envelopes and (pre)covers of their modules, *Comm. Algebra*, 26(3) (1998), 899-912.
- [26] M. Raynaud and L. Gruson, Critères de platitude et de projectivité, Seconde partie, *Invent. Math.*, 13(1-2) (1971), 52-89.
- [27] C. M. Ringel, *Tame Algebras and Integral Quadratic Forms*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1099, Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [28] I. Reiten and C. M. Ringel, Infinite dimensional representations of canonical algebras, *Canad. J. Math.*, 58(1) (2006), 180-224.
- [29] Ph. Rothmaler, *Mittag-Leffler Modules and Positive Atomicity*, Habilitationsschrift, Universität Kiel, 1994.
- [30] Ph. Rothmaler, Mittag-Leffler Modules, *Ann. Pure Applied Logic*, 88(2-3) (1997), 227-239.
- [31] Ph. Rothmaler, Mittag-Leffler modules and definable subcategories, pp. 171-196 *in* *Contemp. Math.*, 710, Amer. Math. Soc., 2019.
- [32] Ph. Rothmaler, Strict Mittag-Leffler modules and purely generated classes, pp. 303-327 *in* *Categorical, Homological and Combinatorial Methods in Algebras*, *Contemp. Math.*, 751, Amer. Math. Soc., 2020.