∞ -tilting theory

Leonid Positselski - University of Haifa

 $18^{\rm th}$ ICRA Conference, Prague

August 13-17, 2018

æ

Doubly infinite tilting theory

Doubly infinite tilting theory

or

Infinitely generated Wakamatsu tilting theory.

Doubly infinite tilting theory

or

Infinitely generated Wakamatsu tilting theory.

This means the theory of infinitely generated (co)tilting modules/objects

Doubly infinite tilting theory

or

Infinitely generated Wakamatsu tilting theory.

This means the theory of infinitely generated (co)tilting modules/objects of infinite projective and injective dimension

Doubly infinite tilting theory

or

Infinitely generated Wakamatsu tilting theory.

This means the theory of infinitely generated (co)tilting modules/objects of infinite projective and injective dimension (i. e., infinitely generated n-tilting theory

Doubly infinite tilting theory

or

Infinitely generated Wakamatsu tilting theory.

This means the theory of infinitely generated (co)tilting modules/objects of infinite projective and injective dimension (i. e., infinitely generated *n*-tilting theory for $n = \infty$).

Doubly infinite tilting theory

or

Infinitely generated Wakamatsu tilting theory.

This means the theory of infinitely generated (co)tilting modules/objects of infinite projective and injective dimension (i. e., infinitely generated *n*-tilting theory for $n = \infty$).

Joint work with Jan Št'ovíček:

L. Positselski, J. Št'ovíček. The tilting-cotilting correspondence. arXiv:1710.02230

L. Positselski, J. Št'ovíček. ∞ -tilting theory. arXiv:1711.06169

æ

< A > <

More than one would expect.

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto abelian$ category of R-modules R-Mod.

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto$ abelian category of R-modules R-Mod. Has a projective generator and an injective cogenerator.

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto$ abelian category of R-modules R-Mod. Has a projective generator and an injective cogenerator.

How does one produce abelian categories having only a projective generator,

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto$ abelian category of R-modules R-Mod. Has a projective generator and an injective cogenerator.

How does one produce abelian categories having only a projective generator, or only an injective cogenerator?

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto$ abelian category of R-modules R-Mod. Has a projective generator and an injective cogenerator.

How does one produce abelian categories having only a projective generator, or only an injective cogenerator?

Let C be an additive category and $M \in C$ an object.

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto$ abelian category of R-modules R-Mod. Has a projective generator and an injective cogenerator.

How does one produce abelian categories having only a projective generator, or only an injective cogenerator?

Let C be an additive category and $M \in C$ an object. How does one produce an abelian category out of this datum?

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto$ abelian category of R-modules R-Mod. Has a projective generator and an injective cogenerator.

How does one produce abelian categories having only a projective generator, or only an injective cogenerator?

Let C be an additive category and $M \in C$ an object. How does one produce an abelian category out of this datum?

Naïve approach: $(C, M) \mapsto S$ -Mod,

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto$ abelian category of R-modules R-Mod. Has a projective generator and an injective cogenerator.

How does one produce abelian categories having only a projective generator, or only an injective cogenerator?

Let C be an additive category and $M \in C$ an object. How does one produce an abelian category out of this datum?

Naïve approach: $(C, M) \mapsto S$ -Mod, where $S = End_C(M)^{op}$

More than one would expect.

Associative ring $R \mapsto$ abelian category of R-modules R-Mod. Has a projective generator and an injective cogenerator.

How does one produce abelian categories having only a projective generator, or only an injective cogenerator?

Let C be an additive category and $M \in C$ an object. How does one produce an abelian category out of this datum?

Naïve approach: $(C, M) \mapsto S$ -Mod, where $S = End_C(M)^{op}$

(The notation means: S acts in $M \in \mathbb{C}$ on the right, and we consider the category of left S-modules).

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Suppose coproducts exist in C,

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Suppose coproducts exist in C, and denote by $Add_C(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of coproducts of copies of M.

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Suppose coproducts exist in C, and denote by $Add_C(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of coproducts of copies of M.

 $\label{eq:claim: Claim: There exists a unique abelian category B with enough projectives$

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Suppose coproducts exist in C, and denote by $Add_C(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of coproducts of copies of M.

Claim: There exists a unique abelian category B with enough projectives such that $B_{proj} \simeq Add_C(M)$.

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Suppose coproducts exist in C, and denote by $Add_C(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of coproducts of copies of M.

Claim: There exists a unique abelian category B with enough projectives such that $B_{proj} \simeq Add_C(M)$.

Suppose products exist in C,

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Suppose coproducts exist in C, and denote by $Add_C(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of coproducts of copies of M.

Claim: There exists a unique abelian category B with enough projectives such that $B_{proj} \simeq Add_C(M)$.

Suppose products exist in C, and denote by $\operatorname{Prod}_{C}(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of products of copies of M.

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Suppose coproducts exist in C, and denote by $Add_C(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of coproducts of copies of M.

Claim: There exists a unique abelian category B with enough projectives such that $B_{proj} \simeq Add_C(M)$.

Suppose products exist in C, and denote by $\operatorname{Prod}_{C}(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of products of copies of M.

Claim*: There exists a unique abelian category \boldsymbol{A} with enough injectives

Two dual, less naïve approaches:

Suppose coproducts exist in C, and denote by $Add_C(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of coproducts of copies of M.

Claim: There exists a unique abelian category B with enough projectives such that $B_{proj} \simeq Add_C(M)$.

Suppose products exist in C, and denote by $\operatorname{Prod}_{C}(M) \subset C$ the full subcategory formed by the direct summands of products of copies of M.

Claim*: There exists a unique abelian category A with enough injectives such that $A_{inj} \simeq \operatorname{Prod}_{C}(M)$.

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$,

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let $\mathbb{T}:\operatorname{Sets}\longrightarrow\operatorname{Sets}$ be the functor

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let $\mathbb{T} : \text{Sets} \longrightarrow \text{Sets}$ be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$.

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let \mathbb{T} : Sets \longrightarrow Sets be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$. Then the functor \mathbb{T} is a monad on the category of sets.

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let \mathbb{T} : Sets \longrightarrow Sets be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$. Then the functor \mathbb{T} is a monad on the category of sets. One can construct B as the category of all algebras/modules over this monad.

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let \mathbb{T} : Sets \longrightarrow Sets be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$. Then the functor \mathbb{T} is a monad on the category of sets. One can construct B as the category of all algebras/modules over this monad.

Remark: Generally, the category of algebras/modules over a monad $\mathbb{T}\colon Sets \longrightarrow Sets$ is abelian
Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let \mathbb{T} : Sets \longrightarrow Sets be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$. Then the functor \mathbb{T} is a monad on the category of sets. One can construct B as the category of all algebras/modules over this monad.

Remark: Generally, the category of algebras/modules over a monad $\mathbb{T} \colon Sets \longrightarrow Sets$ is abelian if and only if it is additive.

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let \mathbb{T} : Sets \longrightarrow Sets be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$. Then the functor \mathbb{T} is a monad on the category of sets. One can construct B as the category of all algebras/modules over this monad.

Remark: Generally, the category of algebras/modules over a monad $\mathbb{T}\colon \operatorname{Sets} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Sets}$ is abelian if and only if it is additive. A monad \mathbb{T} is called additive

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let \mathbb{T} : Sets \longrightarrow Sets be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$. Then the functor \mathbb{T} is a monad on the category of sets. One can construct B as the category of all algebras/modules over this monad.

Remark: Generally, the category of algebras/modules over a monad $\mathbb{T} \colon \operatorname{Sets} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Sets}$ is abelian if and only if it is additive. A monad \mathbb{T} is called additive if this is the case.

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let \mathbb{T} : Sets \longrightarrow Sets be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$. Then the functor \mathbb{T} is a monad on the category of sets. One can construct B as the category of all algebras/modules over this monad.

Remark: Generally, the category of algebras/modules over a monad $\mathbb{T} \colon \text{Sets} \longrightarrow \text{Sets}$ is abelian if and only if it is additive. A monad \mathbb{T} is called additive if this is the case. Cocomplete abelian categories B with a fixed projective generator P

Construction 1: B is the category of all coherent (finitely presented) functors $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)^{\operatorname{op}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ab}$, which is abelian because $\operatorname{Add}_{\operatorname{C}}(M)$ has weak kernels.

Construction 2: Let \mathbb{T} : Sets \longrightarrow Sets be the functor taking a set X to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, M^{(X)})$. Then the functor \mathbb{T} is a monad on the category of sets. One can construct B as the category of all algebras/modules over this monad.

Remark: Generally, the category of algebras/modules over a monad $\mathbb{T} \colon \text{Sets} \longrightarrow \text{Sets}$ is abelian if and only if it is additive. A monad \mathbb{T} is called additive if this is the case. Cocomplete abelian categories B with a fixed projective generator P correspond bijectively to additive monads on the category of sets.

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring.

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

The topology on \mathfrak{S} :

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

The topology on \mathfrak{S} : a base of neighborhoods of zero is formed by the annihilators of finitely-generated submodules in M.

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

The topology on \mathfrak{S} : a base of neighborhoods of zero is formed by the annihilators of finitely-generated submodules in M.

 $B=\mathfrak{S}\text{-}{\rm Contra}$ is the category of left $\mathfrak{S}\text{-modules}$ endowed with the operations of infinite summation

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

The topology on \mathfrak{S} : a base of neighborhoods of zero is formed by the annihilators of finitely-generated submodules in M.

 $B = \mathfrak{S}$ -Contra is the category of left \mathfrak{S} -modules endowed with the operations of infinite summation with the coefficients — zero-converging families of elements in \mathfrak{S} .

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

The topology on \mathfrak{S} : a base of neighborhoods of zero is formed by the annihilators of finitely-generated submodules in M.

 $B = \mathfrak{S}$ -Contra is the category of left \mathfrak{S} -modules endowed with the operations of infinite summation with the coefficients — zero-converging families of elements in \mathfrak{S} .

Example 2. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $M = \mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]/\mathbb{Z}$.

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

The topology on \mathfrak{S} : a base of neighborhoods of zero is formed by the annihilators of finitely-generated submodules in M.

 $B = \mathfrak{S}$ -Contra is the category of left \mathfrak{S} -modules endowed with the operations of infinite summation with the coefficients — zero-converging families of elements in \mathfrak{S} .

Example 2. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $M = \mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]/\mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{Z}_p$ is the topological ring of *p*-adic integers.

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

The topology on \mathfrak{S} : a base of neighborhoods of zero is formed by the annihilators of finitely-generated submodules in M.

 $B = \mathfrak{S}$ -Contra is the category of left \mathfrak{S} -modules endowed with the operations of infinite summation with the coefficients — zero-converging families of elements in \mathfrak{S} .

Example 2. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $M = \mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]/\mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{Z}_p$ is the topological ring of *p*-adic integers.

 $B = \mathbb{Z}_{p}$ -Contra is equivalent to the full subcategory in Ab

Example 1. Let C = R-Mod, R an associative ring. Then B is the category of contramodules over the topological ring $\mathfrak{S} = \operatorname{End}_R(M)^{\operatorname{op}}$.

The topology on \mathfrak{S} : a base of neighborhoods of zero is formed by the annihilators of finitely-generated submodules in M.

 $B = \mathfrak{S}$ -Contra is the category of left \mathfrak{S} -modules endowed with the operations of infinite summation with the coefficients — zero-converging families of elements in \mathfrak{S} .

Example 2. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $M = \mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]/\mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{Z}_p$ is the topological ring of *p*-adic integers.

 $B = \mathbb{Z}_{p}$ -Contra is equivalent to the full subcategory in Ab consisting of all the abelian groups B such that $Hom_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}], B) = 0 = Ext_{\mathbb{Z}}^{1}(\mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}], B).$

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module.

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module. Then A is a Grothendieck abelian category.

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module. Then A is a Grothendieck abelian category.

[Herzog–Šťovíček, 2014.]

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module. Then A is a Grothendieck abelian category.

[Herzog–Šť'ovíček, 2014.]

Notation and terminology:

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module. Then A is a Grothendieck abelian category.

[Herzog–Šť'ovíček, 2014.]

Notation and terminology: $B = \sigma_M(C)$ and $A = \pi_M(C)$.

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module. Then A is a Grothendieck abelian category.

[Herzog–Šť'ovíček, 2014.]

Notation and terminology: $B = \sigma_M(C)$ and $A = \pi_M(C)$.

Assuming that $M \in C$ is a "tilting object" in one sense or another,

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module. Then A is a Grothendieck abelian category.

[Herzog–Šť'ovíček, 2014.]

Notation and terminology: $B = \sigma_M(C)$ and $A = \pi_M(C)$.

Assuming that $M \in C$ is a "tilting object" in one sense or another, one can call B the abelian category tilted from C at M.

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module. Then A is a Grothendieck abelian category.

[Herzog–Šť'ovíček, 2014.]

Notation and terminology: $B = \sigma_M(C)$ and $A = \pi_M(C)$.

Assuming that $M \in C$ is a "tilting object" in one sense or another, one can call B the abelian category tilted from C at M.

Assuming that $M \in C$ is a "cotilting object" in some sense,

Example 3. Let C = R-Mod, M a pure-injective R-module. Then A is a Grothendieck abelian category.

[Herzog–Šť'ovíček, 2014.]

Notation and terminology: $B = \sigma_M(C)$ and $A = \pi_M(C)$.

Assuming that $M \in C$ is a "tilting object" in one sense or another, one can call B the abelian category tilted from C at M.

Assuming that $M \in C$ is a "cotilting object" in some sense, one can call A the abelian category cotilted from C at M.

æ

Let A be an abelian category with products and an injective cogenerator $J \in A$.

Let A be an abelian category with products and an injective cogenerator $J \in A$. Then coproducts exist and are exact in A.

Let A be an abelian category with products and an injective cogenerator $J \in A$. Then coproducts exist and are exact in A.

An object $T \in A$ is called weakly tilting if $Ext_A^i(T, T^{(X)}) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let A be an abelian category with products and an injective cogenerator $J \in A$. Then coproducts exist and are exact in A.

An object $T \in A$ is called weakly tilting if $Ext_A^i(T, T^{(X)}) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $T \in A$ be a weakly tilting object.

Let A be an abelian category with products and an injective cogenerator $J \in A$. Then coproducts exist and are exact in A.

An object $T \in A$ is called weakly tilting if $Ext_A^i(T, T^{(X)}) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $T \in A$ be a weakly tilting object. The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ consists of all the objects $E \in A$ such that

Let A be an abelian category with products and an injective cogenerator $J \in A$. Then coproducts exist and are exact in A.

An object $T \in A$ is called weakly tilting if $Ext_A^i(T, T^{(X)}) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $T \in A$ be a weakly tilting object. The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ consists of all the objects $E \in A$ such that • $Ext_A^i(T, E) = 0$ for all i > 0;

Let A be an abelian category with products and an injective cogenerator $J \in A$. Then coproducts exist and are exact in A.

An object $T \in A$ is called weakly tilting if $Ext_A^i(T, T^{(X)}) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $T \in A$ be a weakly tilting object. The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ consists of all the objects $E \in A$ such that

- $Ext^{i}_{A}(T, E) = 0$ for all i > 0;
- there exists an exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow T^{(X_2)} \longrightarrow T^{(X_1)} \longrightarrow T^{(X_0)} \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow 0$$

in A,

Let A be an abelian category with products and an injective cogenerator $J \in A$. Then coproducts exist and are exact in A.

An object $T \in A$ is called weakly tilting if $\operatorname{Ext}_{A}^{i}(T, T^{(X)}) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $T \in A$ be a weakly tilting object. The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ consists of all the objects $E \in A$ such that

• $\operatorname{Ext}_{\operatorname{A}}^{i}(T, E) = 0$ for all i > 0;

• there exists an exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow T^{(X_2)} \longrightarrow T^{(X_1)} \longrightarrow T^{(X_0)} \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow 0$$

in A, which remains exact after applying the functor $\operatorname{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, -)$.

Lemma

æ

Lemma

The full subcategory $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{max}}(\mathsf{T}) \subset \mathrm{A}$ is closed under

Lemma

The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is closed under

• extensions,
Lemma

The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is closed under

- extensions,
- cokernels of monomorphisms,

Lemma

The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is closed under

- extensions,
- cokernels of monomorphisms,
- kernels of those epimorphisms that remain epimorphisms after applying Hom_A(T, -),

Lemma

The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is closed under

- extensions,
- cokernels of monomorphisms,
- kernels of those epimorphisms that remain epimorphisms after applying Hom_A(T, -),
- and direct summands.

Lemma

The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is closed under

- extensions,
- cokernels of monomorphisms,
- kernels of those epimorphisms that remain epimorphisms after applying Hom_A(T, -),
- and direct summands.

The object $T \in A$ is called ∞ -tilting (or Wakamatsu tilting)

Lemma

The full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is closed under

- extensions,
- cokernels of monomorphisms,
- kernels of those epimorphisms that remain epimorphisms after applying Hom_A(T, -),
- and direct summands.

The object $T \in A$ is called ∞ -tilting (or Wakamatsu tilting) if $A_{inj} \subset E_{max}(T)$.

The dual definition:

The dual definition:

Let B be an abelian category with coproducts and a projective generator $P \in B$.

The dual definition:

Let B be an abelian category with coproducts and a projective generator $P \in B$. Then products exist and are exact in B.

The dual definition:

Let B be an abelian category with coproducts and a projective generator $P \in B$. Then products exist and are exact in B.

An object $W \in B$ is called weakly cotilting if $\operatorname{Ext}_{B}^{i}(W^{X}, W) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

The dual definition:

Let B be an abelian category with coproducts and a projective generator $P \in B$. Then products exist and are exact in B.

An object $W \in B$ is called weakly cotilting if $\operatorname{Ext}_{B}^{i}(W^{X}, W) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $W \in B$ be a weakly cotilting object.

The dual definition:

Let B be an abelian category with coproducts and a projective generator $P \in B$. Then products exist and are exact in B.

An object $W \in B$ is called weakly cotilting if $\operatorname{Ext}_{B}^{i}(W^{X}, W) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $W \in B$ be a weakly cotilting object. The full subcategory $F_{\max}(W) \subset B$

The dual definition:

Let B be an abelian category with coproducts and a projective generator $P \in B$. Then products exist and are exact in B.

An object $W \in B$ is called weakly cotilting if $\operatorname{Ext}_{B}^{i}(W^{X}, W) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $W \in B$ be a weakly cotilting object. The full subcategory $F_{\max}(W) \subset B$ is constructed in the way dual to the above construction of the full subcategory $E_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \subset A$.

The dual definition:

Let B be an abelian category with coproducts and a projective generator $P \in B$. Then products exist and are exact in B.

An object $W \in B$ is called weakly cotilting if $\operatorname{Ext}_{B}^{i}(W^{X}, W) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $W \in B$ be a weakly cotilting object. The full subcategory $F_{\max}(W) \subset B$ is constructed in the way dual to the above construction of the full subcategory $E_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \subset A$.

The object $W \in B$ is called ∞ -cotilting (or Wakamatsu cotilting)

The dual definition:

Let B be an abelian category with coproducts and a projective generator $P \in B$. Then products exist and are exact in B.

An object $W \in B$ is called weakly cotilting if $\operatorname{Ext}_{B}^{i}(W^{X}, W) = 0$ for all sets X and i > 0.

Let $W \in B$ be a weakly cotilting object. The full subcategory $F_{\max}(W) \subset B$ is constructed in the way dual to the above construction of the full subcategory $E_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \subset A$.

The object $W \in B$ is called ∞ -cotilting (or Wakamatsu cotilting) if $B_{proj} \subset F_{max}(W)$.

æ

< 一 → <

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete.

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category ${\rm A}$ is assumed to have an injective cogenerator,

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

Theorem

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

Theorem

There is a one-to-one correspondence

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

Theorem

There is a one-to-one correspondence between abelian categories A with an injective cogenerator J

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

Theorem

There is a one-to-one correspondence between abelian categories A with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$,

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

Theorem

There is a one-to-one correspondence between abelian categories A with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$, and abelian categories B with a projective generator P

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

Theorem

There is a one-to-one correspondence between abelian categories A with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$, and abelian categories B with a projective generator P and an ∞ -cotilting object $W \in B$.

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

Theorem

There is a one-to-one correspondence between abelian categories A with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$, and abelian categories B with a projective generator P and an ∞ -cotilting object $W \in B$. The correspondence assigns to a category A the category $B = \sigma_T(A)$,

From now on, all our abelian categories will be complete and cocomplete. The abelian category A is assumed to have an injective cogenerator, and the abelian category B is assumed to have a projective generator.

Theorem

There is a one-to-one correspondence between abelian categories A with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$, and abelian categories B with a projective generator P and an ∞ -cotilting object $W \in B$. The correspondence assigns to a category A the category $B = \sigma_T(A)$, and to a category B the category $A = \pi_W(B)$.

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Put $B = \sigma_T(A)$, so $Add_A(T) \simeq B_{proj}$.

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Put $B = \sigma_T(A)$, so $Add_A(T) \simeq B_{proj}$. Let $P \in B_{proj}$ be the object corresponding to $T \in Add(T)$;

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Put $B = \sigma_T(A)$, so $Add_A(T) \simeq B_{proj}$. Let $P \in B_{proj}$ be the object corresponding to $T \in Add(T)$; then P is a projective generator of the abelian category B.

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Put $B = \sigma_T(A)$, so $Add_A(T) \simeq B_{proj}$. Let $P \in B_{proj}$ be the object corresponding to $T \in Add(T)$; then P is a projective generator of the abelian category B.

The embedding functor $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{proj}} \simeq \mathrm{Add}_{\mathrm{A}}(\mathcal{T}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{A}$

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Put $B = \sigma_T(A)$, so $Add_A(T) \simeq B_{proj}$. Let $P \in B_{proj}$ be the object corresponding to $T \in Add(T)$; then P is a projective generator of the abelian category B.

The embedding functor $B_{proj} \simeq Add_A(\mathcal{T}) \longrightarrow A$ can be uniquely extended to a right exact functor $\Phi \colon B \longrightarrow A$.

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Put $B = \sigma_T(A)$, so $Add_A(T) \simeq B_{proj}$. Let $P \in B_{proj}$ be the object corresponding to $T \in Add(T)$; then P is a projective generator of the abelian category B.

The embedding functor $B_{proj} \simeq Add_A(\mathcal{T}) \longrightarrow A$ can be uniquely extended to a right exact functor $\Phi \colon B \longrightarrow A$.

The embedding functor $\operatorname{Add}_A(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{B}_{\operatorname{proj}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{B}$

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Put $B = \sigma_T(A)$, so $Add_A(T) \simeq B_{proj}$. Let $P \in B_{proj}$ be the object corresponding to $T \in Add(T)$; then P is a projective generator of the abelian category B.

The embedding functor $B_{proj} \simeq Add_A(\mathcal{T}) \longrightarrow A$ can be uniquely extended to a right exact functor $\Phi \colon B \longrightarrow A$.

The embedding functor $\operatorname{Add}_A(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{B}_{\operatorname{proj}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{B}$ can be extended to a left exact functor $\Psi \colon A \longrightarrow \operatorname{B}$ right adjoint to Φ .

Let A be an abelian category with an injective cogenerator J and an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

Put $B = \sigma_T(A)$, so $Add_A(T) \simeq B_{proj}$. Let $P \in B_{proj}$ be the object corresponding to $T \in Add(T)$; then P is a projective generator of the abelian category B.

The embedding functor $B_{proj} \simeq Add_A(\mathcal{T}) \longrightarrow A$ can be uniquely extended to a right exact functor $\Phi \colon B \longrightarrow A$.

The embedding functor $\operatorname{Add}_A(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{B}_{\operatorname{proj}} \longrightarrow \operatorname{B}$ can be extended to a left exact functor $\Psi \colon A \longrightarrow \operatorname{B}$ right adjoint to Φ .

Set
$$W = \Psi(J) \in B$$
.

The functors Φ and Ψ restrict to an equivalence of exact categories
The functors Φ and Ψ restrict to an equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi: \operatorname{E}_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{F}_{\max}(\mathcal{W}): \Phi.$

The functors Φ and Ψ restrict to an equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi: \operatorname{E}_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{F}_{\max}(\mathcal{W}): \Phi.$

If the projective dimension $pd_A(T)$

The functors Φ and Ψ restrict to an equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi: \operatorname{E}_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{F}_{\max}(\mathcal{W}): \Phi.$

If the projective dimension $pd_A(T)$ and the injective dimension $id_B(W)$ are both finite,

The functors Φ and Ψ restrict to an equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi: \operatorname{E}_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{F}_{\max}(\mathcal{W}): \Phi.$

If the projective dimension $pd_A(T)$ and the injective dimension $id_B(W)$ are both finite, then they agree, $pd_A(T) = n = id_B(W)$.

The functors Φ and Ψ restrict to an equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi: \operatorname{E}_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{F}_{\max}(\mathcal{W}): \Phi.$

If the projective dimension $pd_A(T)$ and the injective dimension $id_B(W)$ are both finite, then they agree, $pd_A(T) = n = id_B(W)$.

In this case, the object $T \in A$ is called *n*-tilting,

The functors Φ and Ψ restrict to an equivalence of exact categories

$$\Psi: \operatorname{E}_{\max}(\mathcal{T}) \simeq \operatorname{F}_{\max}(\mathcal{W}): \Phi.$$

If the projective dimension $pd_A(T)$ and the injective dimension $id_B(W)$ are both finite, then they agree, $pd_A(T) = n = id_B(W)$.

In this case, the object $T \in A$ is called *n*-tilting, and the object $W \in B$ is called *n*-cotilting.

æ

< 🗇 > <

An ∞ -tilting pair (T, E) in A

æ

▶ ∢ ⊒ ▶

An ∞ -tilting pair (T, E) in A consists of an object $T \in A$ and a full subcategory $E \subset A$ such that

• $A_{inj} \subset E;$

- $A_{inj} \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Add}_A(T) \subset E;$

- $A_{inj} \subset E$;
- $\operatorname{Add}_A(T) \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Ext}_{\operatorname{A}}^{i}(T, E) = 0$ for all $E \in \operatorname{E}$ and i > 0;

- $A_{inj} \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Add}_{A}(T) \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Ext}_{\operatorname{A}}^{i}(T, E) = 0$ for all $E \in \operatorname{E}$ and i > 0;
- $\bullet~E$ is closed under the cokernels of monomorphisms and extensions in A;

- $A_{inj} \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Add}_{A}(T) \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Ext}_{\operatorname{A}}^{i}(T, E) = 0$ for all $E \in \operatorname{E}$ and i > 0;
- $\bullet~E$ is closed under the cokernels of monomorphisms and extensions in A;
- every Add_A(*T*)-precover of an object of E is an epimorphism in A with the kernel belonging to E.

An ∞ -tilting pair (T, E) in A consists of an object $T \in A$ and a full subcategory $E \subset A$ such that

- $A_{inj} \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Add}_{A}(T) \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Ext}_{A}^{i}(T, E) = 0$ for all $E \in E$ and i > 0;
- $\bullet~E$ is closed under the cokernels of monomorphisms and extensions in A;
- every Add_A(*T*)-precover of an object of E is an epimorphism in A with the kernel belonging to E.

An object $T \in A$ is ∞ -tilting if and only if it is a part of some ∞ -tilting pair (T, E) in A.

An ∞ -tilting pair (T, E) in A consists of an object $T \in A$ and a full subcategory $E \subset A$ such that

- $A_{inj} \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Add}_A(T) \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Ext}_{A}^{i}(T, E) = 0$ for all $E \in E$ and i > 0;
- $\bullet~E$ is closed under the cokernels of monomorphisms and extensions in A;
- every Add_A(*T*)-precover of an object of E is an epimorphism in A with the kernel belonging to E.

An object $T \in A$ is ∞ -tilting if and only if it is a part of some ∞ -tilting pair (T, E) in A.

In this case, all such $\infty\text{-tilting pairs}$ (T, E) with the fixed object T form a complete lattice

An ∞ -tilting pair (T, E) in A consists of an object $T \in A$ and a full subcategory $E \subset A$ such that

- $A_{inj} \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Add}_{A}(T) \subset E;$
- $\operatorname{Ext}_{A}^{i}(T, E) = 0$ for all $E \in E$ and i > 0;
- $\bullet~E$ is closed under the cokernels of monomorphisms and extensions in A;
- every Add_A(*T*)-precover of an object of E is an epimorphism in A with the kernel belonging to E.

An object $T \in A$ is ∞ -tilting if and only if it is a part of some ∞ -tilting pair (T, E) in A.

In this case, all such ∞ -tilting pairs (T, E) with the fixed object T form a complete lattice with respect to inclusion of the full subcategories $E \subset A$.

In particular, $(T, E_{max}(T))$,

In particular, $(T, E_{max}(T))$, with the full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ constructed above,

In particular, $(T, E_{max}(T))$, with the full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ constructed above, is the maximal ∞ -tilting pair for an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

In particular, $(T, E_{\max}(T))$, with the full subcategory $E_{\max}(T) \subset A$ constructed above, is the maximal ∞ -tilting pair for an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

There is also the minimal ∞ -tilting pair $(T, E_{\min}(T))$.

In particular, $(T, E_{max}(T))$, with the full subcategory $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ constructed above, is the maximal ∞ -tilting pair for an ∞ -tilting object $T \in A$.

There is also the minimal ∞ -tilting pair $(T, E_{\min}(T))$.

This means that, for any ∞ -tilting pair (\mathcal{T}, E), one has $E_{\min}(\mathcal{T}) \subset E \subset E_{\max}(\mathcal{T})$.

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B is dual to that of an ∞ -tilting pair.

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B is dual to that of an ∞ -tilting pair.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between ∞ -tilting pairs (T, E) in abelian categories A and ∞ -cotilting pairs (W, F) in abelian categories B

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B is dual to that of an ∞ -tilting pair.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between ∞ -tilting pairs (T, E) in abelian categories A and ∞ -cotilting pairs (W, F) in abelian categories B provided by the rules

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B is dual to that of an ∞ -tilting pair.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between ∞ -tilting pairs (T, E) in abelian categories A and ∞ -cotilting pairs (W, F) in abelian categories B provided by the rules

•
$$B = \sigma_T(A)$$
,

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B is dual to that of an ∞ -tilting pair.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between ∞ -tilting pairs (T, E) in abelian categories A and ∞ -cotilting pairs (W, F) in abelian categories B provided by the rules

• $B = \sigma_T(A)$, and conversely, $A = \pi_W(B)$;

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B is dual to that of an ∞ -tilting pair.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between ∞ -tilting pairs (T, E) in abelian categories A and ∞ -cotilting pairs (W, F) in abelian categories B provided by the rules

•
$$B = \sigma_T(A)$$
, and conversely, $A = \pi_W(B)$;

•
$$P = \Psi(T)$$
 and $W = \Psi(J)$,

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B is dual to that of an ∞ -tilting pair.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between ∞ -tilting pairs (T, E) in abelian categories A and ∞ -cotilting pairs (W, F) in abelian categories B provided by the rules

•
$$B = \sigma_T(A)$$
, and conversely, $A = \pi_W(B)$;

•
$$P = \Psi(T)$$
 and $W = \Psi(J)$, and conversely,
 $J = \Phi(W)$ and $T = \Phi(P)$;

The definition of an ∞ -cotilting pair (W, F) in B is dual to that of an ∞ -tilting pair.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between ∞ -tilting pairs $(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{E})$ in abelian categories A and ∞ -cotilting pairs (W, \mathbf{F}) in abelian categories B provided by the rules

•
$$B = \sigma_T(A)$$
, and conversely, $A = \pi_W(B)$;

•
$$P = \Psi(T)$$
 and $W = \Psi(J)$, and conversely,
 $J = \Phi(W)$ and $T = \Phi(P)$;

•
$$F = \Psi(E)$$
, and conversely, $E = \Phi(F)$.

æ

▲御▶ ▲ 陸▶ ▲ 陸▶

The equivalence of derived categories $D(E) \simeq D(F)$

The equivalence of derived categories $D(E)\simeq D(F)$ induced by the equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi\colon \mathrm{E}\,\simeq\,\mathrm{F}:\!\Phi$

The equivalence of derived categories $D(E)\simeq D(F)$ induced by the equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi\colon \mathrm{E}\simeq\mathrm{F}:\!\Phi$

can be thought of as an equivalence of exotic derived categories of the abelian categories ${\rm A}$ and ${\rm B}.$
The equivalence of derived categories $D(E)\simeq D(F)$ induced by the equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi\colon \mathrm{E}\simeq\mathrm{F}:\Phi$

can be thought of as an equivalence of exotic derived categories of the abelian categories ${\rm A}$ and ${\rm B}.$

When T is *n*-tilting and W is *n*-cotilting, one has

The equivalence of derived categories $D(E)\simeq D(F)$ induced by the equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi \colon \mathrm{E} \simeq \mathrm{F} : \Phi$

can be thought of as an equivalence of exotic derived categories of the abelian categories ${\rm A}$ and ${\rm B}.$

When T is *n*-tilting and W is *n*-cotilting, one has

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) \simeq D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

The equivalence of derived categories $D(E)\simeq D(F)$ induced by the equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi \colon \mathrm{E} \simeq \mathrm{F} : \Phi$

can be thought of as an equivalence of exotic derived categories of the abelian categories ${\rm A}$ and ${\rm B}.$

When T is *n*-tilting and W is *n*-cotilting, one has

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) \simeq D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

In the ∞ -tilting (Wakamatsu) situation,

The equivalence of derived categories $D(E)\simeq D(F)$ induced by the equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi\colon \mathrm{E}\simeq\mathrm{F}:\!\Phi$

can be thought of as an equivalence of exotic derived categories of the abelian categories ${\rm A}$ and ${\rm B}.$

When T is *n*-tilting and W is *n*-cotilting, one has

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) \simeq D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

In the $\infty\text{-tilting}$ (Wakamatsu) situation, it helps to assume that E is closed under coproducts in A

The equivalence of derived categories $D(E)\simeq D(F)$ induced by the equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi\colon \mathrm{E}\simeq\mathrm{F}:\!\Phi$

can be thought of as an equivalence of exotic derived categories of the abelian categories ${\rm A}$ and ${\rm B}.$

When T is *n*-tilting and W is *n*-cotilting, one has

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) \simeq D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

In the $\infty\text{-tilting}$ (Wakamatsu) situation, it helps to assume that E is closed under coproducts in A and F is closed under products in B.

The equivalence of derived categories $D(E)\simeq D(F)$ induced by the equivalence of exact categories

 $\Psi\colon \mathrm{E}\simeq\mathrm{F}:\!\Phi$

can be thought of as an equivalence of exotic derived categories of the abelian categories ${\rm A}$ and ${\rm B}.$

When T is *n*-tilting and W is *n*-cotilting, one has

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) \simeq D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

In the ∞ -tilting (Wakamatsu) situation, it helps to assume that E is closed under coproducts in A and F is closed under products in B. But we start without this assumption.

æ

▲ 御 ▶ ▲ 臣

Let $D^{\geqslant 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory

Let $D^{\geq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes $0 \longrightarrow E^0 \longrightarrow E^1 \longrightarrow \cdots$ with $E^i \in E$.

Let $D^{\geq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes $0 \longrightarrow E^0 \longrightarrow E^1 \longrightarrow \cdots$ with $E^i \in E$.

Let $D_A^{\leqslant 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory

Let $D^{\geq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes $0 \longrightarrow E^0 \longrightarrow E^1 \longrightarrow \cdots$ with $E^i \in E$.

Let $D_A^{\leq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes E^{\bullet} with $E^i \in E$ such that $H_A^i(E^{\bullet}) = 0$ for i > 0.

Let $D^{\geq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes $0 \longrightarrow E^0 \longrightarrow E^1 \longrightarrow \cdots$ with $E^i \in E$.

Let $D_A^{\leqslant 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes E^{\bullet} with $E^i \in E$ such that $H_A^i(E^{\bullet}) = 0$ for i > 0. Then $(D_A^{\leqslant 0}(E), D^{\geqslant 0}(E))$ is a t-structure on D(E)

Let $D^{\geq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes $0 \longrightarrow E^0 \longrightarrow E^1 \longrightarrow \cdots$ with $E^i \in E$.

Let $D_A^{\leqslant 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes E^{\bullet} with $E^i \in E$ such that $H_A^i(E^{\bullet}) = 0$ for i > 0.

Then $(D_A^{\leq 0}(E), D^{\geq 0}(E))$ is a t-structure on D(E) with the heart A.

Let $D^{\geq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes $0 \longrightarrow E^0 \longrightarrow E^1 \longrightarrow \cdots$ with $E^i \in E$.

Let $D_A^{\leq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes E^{\bullet} with $E^i \in E$ such that $H_A^i(E^{\bullet}) = 0$ for i > 0.

Then $(D_A^{\leq 0}(E), D^{\geq 0}(E))$ is a t-structure on D(E) with the heart A.

Dually one constructs the t-structure $(D^{\leq 0}(F), D_B^{\geq 0}(F))$ on D(F) with the heart B.

Let $D^{\geq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes $0 \longrightarrow E^0 \longrightarrow E^1 \longrightarrow \cdots$ with $E^i \in E$.

Let $D_A^{\leq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes E^{\bullet} with $E^i \in E$ such that $H_A^i(E^{\bullet}) = 0$ for i > 0. Then $(D_A^{\leq 0}(E), D^{\geq 0}(E))$ is a t-structure on D(E) with the heart A.

Dually one constructs the t-structure $(D^{\leq 0}(F), D_B^{\geq 0}(F))$ on D(F) with the heart B.

Thus we have two t-structures on the triangulated category $D(\mathrm{E})=D(\mathrm{F})$

Let $D^{\geq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes $0 \longrightarrow E^0 \longrightarrow E^1 \longrightarrow \cdots$ with $E^i \in E$.

Let $D_A^{\leq 0}(E) \subset D(E)$ be the full subcategory consisting of all the complexes E^{\bullet} with $E^i \in E$ such that $H_A^i(E^{\bullet}) = 0$ for i > 0. Then $(D_A^{\leq 0}(E), D^{\geq 0}(E))$ is a t-structure on D(E) with the heart A.

Dually one constructs the t-structure $(D^{\leq 0}(F), D_B^{\geq 0}(F))$ on D(F) with the heart B.

Thus we have two t-structures on the triangulated category D(E) = D(F) with the hearts A and B.

æ

э

< □ > <

Let ${\rm E}$ be an exact category with exact coproducts.

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{\rm co}(E)$

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{co}(E)$ is the triangulated quotient category

 $D^{co}(E) = Hot(E) / Acycl^{co}(E),$

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{co}(E)$ is the triangulated quotient category

 $D^{co}(E) = Hot(E) / Acycl^{co}(E),$

where $Acycl^{co}(E)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in Hot(E) containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in E

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{co}(E)$ is the triangulated quotient category

 $D^{co}(E) = Hot(E) / Acycl^{co}(E),$

where $Acycl^{co}(E)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in Hot(E) containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in E and closed under coproducts.

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{co}(E)$ is the triangulated quotient category

 $D^{co}(E) = Hot(E) / Acycl^{co}(E),$

where $Acycl^{co}(E)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in Hot(E) containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in E and closed under coproducts.

Let ${\rm F}$ be an exact category with exact products.

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{co}(E)$ is the triangulated quotient category

 $D^{co}(E) = Hot(E) / Acycl^{co}(E),$

where $Acycl^{co}(E)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in Hot(E) containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in E and closed under coproducts.

Let F be an exact category with exact products. Then the contraderived category $D^{\rm ctr}(F)$

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{co}(E)$ is the triangulated quotient category

 $D^{co}(E) = Hot(E) / Acycl^{co}(E),$

where $Acycl^{co}(E)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in Hot(E) containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in E and closed under coproducts.

Let F be an exact category with exact products. Then the contraderived category $D^{\rm ctr}(F)$ is the triangulated quotient category

$$D^{ctr}(F) = Hot(F) / Acycl^{ctr}(F),$$

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{co}(E)$ is the triangulated quotient category

 $D^{co}(E) = Hot(E) / Acycl^{co}(E),$

where $Acycl^{co}(E)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in Hot(E) containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in E and closed under coproducts.

Let F be an exact category with exact products. Then the contraderived category $D^{\rm ctr}(F)$ is the triangulated quotient category

$$D^{ctr}(F) = Hot(F) / Acycl^{ctr}(F),$$

where ${\rm Acycl}^{\rm ctr}(F)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in ${\rm Hot}(F)$ containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in F

Let E be an exact category with exact coproducts. Then the coderived category $D^{co}(E)$ is the triangulated quotient category

 $D^{co}(E) = Hot(E) / Acycl^{co}(E),$

where $Acycl^{co}(E)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in Hot(E) containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in E and closed under coproducts.

Let F be an exact category with exact products. Then the contraderived category $D^{\rm ctr}(F)$ is the triangulated quotient category

$$D^{ctr}(F) = Hot(F) / Acycl^{ctr}(F),$$

where $Acycl^{ctr}(F)$ is the minimal triangulated subcategory in Hot(F) containing the totalizations of short exact sequences of complexes in F and closed under products.

Let (T, E) be a tilting pair in an abelian category A

Let (T, E) be a tilting pair in an abelian category A and (W, F) be the corresponding cotilting pair in an abelian category B.

Let (T, E) be a tilting pair in an abelian category A and (W, F) be the corresponding cotilting pair in an abelian category B.

Suppose E is closed under coproducts in A and F is closed under products in $B. \label{eq:suppose}$

Let (T, E) be a tilting pair in an abelian category A and (W, F) be the corresponding cotilting pair in an abelian category B.

Suppose E is closed under coproducts in A and F is closed under products in B.

Then the embedding functors $E \longrightarrow A$ and $F \longrightarrow B$

Let (T, E) be a tilting pair in an abelian category A and (W, F) be the corresponding cotilting pair in an abelian category B.

Suppose E is closed under coproducts in A and F is closed under products in B.

Then the embedding functors $E \longrightarrow A$ and $F \longrightarrow B$ induce triangulated equivalences

Let (T, E) be a tilting pair in an abelian category A and (W, F) be the corresponding cotilting pair in an abelian category B.

Suppose E is closed under coproducts in A and F is closed under products in B.

Then the embedding functors $E \longrightarrow A$ and $F \longrightarrow B$ induce triangulated equivalences

 $D^{co}(E) \simeq D^{co}(A)$ and $D^{ctr}(F) \simeq D^{ctr}(B)$

Let (T, E) be a tilting pair in an abelian category A and (W, F) be the corresponding cotilting pair in an abelian category B.

Suppose E is closed under coproducts in A and F is closed under products in B.

Then the embedding functors $E \longrightarrow A$ and $F \longrightarrow B$ induce triangulated equivalences

 $D^{co}(E) \simeq D^{co}(A)$ and $D^{ctr}(F) \simeq D^{ctr}(B)$

(since E is coresolving & closed under coproducts in A,

Let (T, E) be a tilting pair in an abelian category A and (W, F) be the corresponding cotilting pair in an abelian category B.

Suppose E is closed under coproducts in A and F is closed under products in $B. \label{eq:suppose}$

Then the embedding functors $E \longrightarrow A$ and $F \longrightarrow B$ induce triangulated equivalences

 $D^{co}(E) \simeq D^{co}(A)$ and $D^{ctr}(F) \simeq D^{ctr}(B)$

(since E is coresolving & closed under coproducts in A, and F is resolving & closed under products in B).

Hence the commutative diagram of triangulated functors
Hence the commutative diagram of triangulated functors (in fact, Verdier quotient functors)

Hence the commutative diagram of triangulated functors (in fact, Verdier quotient functors) and a triangulated equivalence

Hence the commutative diagram of triangulated functors (in fact, Verdier quotient functors) and a triangulated equivalence



So, generally speaking, there is a derived equivalence between \boldsymbol{A} and \boldsymbol{B} on some intermediate level

So, generally speaking, there is a derived equivalence between $\rm A$ and $\rm B$ on some intermediate level between the co/contraderived and the conventional derived categories.

So, generally speaking, there is a derived equivalence between $\rm A$ and $\rm B$ on some intermediate level between the co/contraderived and the conventional derived categories.

There may be many (co)tilting pairs for a given (co)tilting object in an abelian category.

So, generally speaking, there is a derived equivalence between $\rm A$ and $\rm B$ on some intermediate level between the co/contraderived and the conventional derived categories.

There may be many (co)tilting pairs for a given (co)tilting object in an abelian category. When the exact subcategory $E\subset A$ or $F\subset B$ is enlarged,

So, generally speaking, there is a derived equivalence between $\rm A$ and $\rm B$ on some intermediate level between the co/contraderived and the conventional derived categories.

There may be many (co)tilting pairs for a given (co)tilting object in an abelian category. When the exact subcategory $E\subset A$ or $F\subset B$ is enlarged, the derived category D(E) or D(F) gets deflated

So, generally speaking, there is a derived equivalence between A and B on some intermediate level between the co/contraderived and the conventional derived categories.

There may be many (co)tilting pairs for a given (co)tilting object in an abelian category. When the exact subcategory $E \subset A$ or $F \subset B$ is enlarged, the derived category D(E) or D(F) gets deflated (comes closer to the conventional derived category).

So, generally speaking, there is a derived equivalence between A and B on some intermediate level between the co/contraderived and the conventional derived categories.

There may be many (co)tilting pairs for a given (co)tilting object in an abelian category. When the exact subcategory $E \subset A$ or $F \subset B$ is enlarged, the derived category D(E) or D(F) gets deflated (comes closer to the conventional derived category).

In other words, the larger the exact subcategory ${\rm E}$ or ${\rm F}$,

So, generally speaking, there is a derived equivalence between A and B on some intermediate level between the co/contraderived and the conventional derived categories.

There may be many (co)tilting pairs for a given (co)tilting object in an abelian category. When the exact subcategory $E \subset A$ or $F \subset B$ is enlarged, the derived category D(E) or D(F) gets deflated (comes closer to the conventional derived category).

In other words, the larger the exact subcategory E or F, the smaller the derived category D(E) or D(F).

æ

'문▶' ★ 문≯

Let \boldsymbol{A} be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category,

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A.

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A. $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is the full subcategory of Gorenstein injective objects.

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A. $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is the full subcategory of Gorenstein injective objects.

Set $B = \sigma_T(A)$.

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A. $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is the full subcategory of Gorenstein injective objects.

Set $B = \sigma_T(A)$. Then A_{inj} is closed under coproducts in A,

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A. $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is the full subcategory of Gorenstein injective objects.

Set $B = \sigma_T(A)$. Then A_{inj} is closed under coproducts in A, and B_{proj} is closed under products in B.

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A. $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is the full subcategory of Gorenstein injective objects.

Set $B=\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}(A).$ Then A_{inj} is closed under coproducts in A, and B_{proj} is closed under products in B. The additive categories A_{inj} and B_{proj} are equivalent.

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A. $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is the full subcategory of Gorenstein injective objects.

Set $B=\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}(A).$ Then A_{inj} is closed under coproducts in A, and B_{proj} is closed under products in B. The additive categories A_{inj} and B_{proj} are equivalent.

$$(T = J, E = A_{inj})$$
 is a minimal ∞ -tilting pair in A.

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A. $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is the full subcategory of Gorenstein injective objects.

Set $B=\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}(A)$. Then A_{inj} is closed under coproducts in A, and B_{proj} is closed under products in B. The additive categories A_{inj} and B_{proj} are equivalent.

 $(T = J, E = A_{inj})$ is a minimal ∞ -tilting pair in A. $(W = P, F = B_{proj})$ is the corresponding minimal ∞ -cotilting pair in B.

Let A be a locally Noetherian Grothendieck abelian category, and let $J \in A$ be an injective object such that $Add_A(J) = A_{inj}$.

Then T = J is an ∞ -tilting object in A. $E_{max}(T) \subset A$ is the full subcategory of Gorenstein injective objects.

Set $B=\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}(A).$ Then A_{inj} is closed under coproducts in A, and B_{proj} is closed under products in B. The additive categories A_{inj} and B_{proj} are equivalent.

 $(T = J, E = A_{inj})$ is a minimal ∞ -tilting pair in A. $(W = P, F = B_{proj})$ is the corresponding minimal ∞ -cotilting pair in B.

The related derived equivalence is

$$\mathrm{D^{co}}(\mathrm{A})\simeq\mathrm{Hot}(\mathrm{A_{inj}})=\mathrm{Hot}(\mathrm{B_{proj}})\simeq\mathrm{D^{ctr}}(\mathrm{B}).$$

æ

< □ > <

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category \boldsymbol{A} is n-Gorenstein

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting.

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting. (Equivalently, all injective objects in A have projective dimension $\leq n$

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting. (Equivalently, all injective objects in A have projective dimension $\leq n$ and A has a generator of finite injective dimension.)

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting. (Equivalently, all injective objects in A have projective dimension $\leq n$ and A has a generator of finite injective dimension.)

Suppose A is n-Gorenstein.

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting. (Equivalently, all injective objects in A have projective dimension $\leq n$ and A has a generator of finite injective dimension.)

Suppose A is n-Gorenstein. Then there are triangulated equivalences

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting. (Equivalently, all injective objects in A have projective dimension $\leq n$ and A has a generator of finite injective dimension.)

Suppose A is n-Gorenstein. Then there are triangulated equivalences

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) = D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting. (Equivalently, all injective objects in A have projective dimension $\leq n$ and A has a generator of finite injective dimension.)

Suppose A is n-Gorenstein. Then there are triangulated equivalences

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) = D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

Furthermore,

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting. (Equivalently, all injective objects in A have projective dimension $\leq n$ and A has a generator of finite injective dimension.)

Suppose A is n-Gorenstein. Then there are triangulated equivalences

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) = D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

Furthermore, there is a commutative diagram of triangulated equivalences and Verdier quotient functors

Let us say that a locally Noetherian Grothendieck category A is *n*-Gorenstein if the object T = J as above is *n*-tilting. (Equivalently, all injective objects in A have projective dimension $\leq n$ and A has a generator of finite injective dimension.)

Suppose A is n-Gorenstein. Then there are triangulated equivalences

$$D(A) \simeq D(E_{max}) = D(F_{max}) \simeq D(B).$$

Furthermore, there is a commutative diagram of triangulated equivalences and Verdier quotient functors

$$D(E_{min}) = D^{co}(A) = D^{ctr}(B) = D(F_{min})$$

$$\downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow$$

$$D(E_{max}) = D(A) = D(B) = D(F_{max})$$

- L. Angeleri Hügel, D. Herbera, J. Trlifaj. Tilting modules and Gorenstein rings. *Forum Math.* **18**, #2, p. 211–229, 2006.
- S. Bazzoni, F. Mantese, A. Tonolo. Derived equivalence induced by infinitely generated *n*-tilting modules. *Proceedings* of the Amer. Math. Soc. **139**, #12, p. 4225–4234, 2011.
- L. Fiorot, F. Mattiello, M. Saorín. Derived equivalence induced by nonclassical tilting objects. *Proceedings of the Amer. Math. Soc.* **145**, #4, p. 1505–1514, 2017.
- F. Mantese, I. Reiten. Wakamatsu tilting modules. *Journ. of Algebra* **278**, #2, p. 532–552, 2004.
- L. Positselski, J. Rosický. Covers, envelopes, and cotorsion theories in locally presentable abelian categories and contramodule categories. *Journ. of Algebra* **483**, p. 83–128, 2017.
- J. Št'ovíček. Derived equivalences induced by big cotilting modules. *Advances in Math.* **263**, p. 45–87, 2014.

- T. Wakamatsu. On modules with trivial self-extensions. *Journ.* of Algebra **114**, #1, p. 106–114, 1988.
- T. Wakamatsu. Stable equivalence for self-injective algebras and a generalization of tilting modules. *Journ. of Algebra* **134**, #2, p. 298–325, 1990.