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#### Abstract

Birge Huisgen-Zimmermann calls a finite dimensional algebra homologically tame provided the little and the big finitistic dimension are equal and finite. The question formulated in the title has been discussed by her in the paper "Representation-tame algebras need not be homologically tame", by looking for any $r \geq 1$ at a sequence of algebras $\Lambda_{m}$ with big finitistic dimension $r+m$. As we will show, also the little finitistic dimension of $\Lambda_{m}$ is $r+m$. It follows that contrary to her assertion, all the algebras $\Lambda_{m}$ are homologically tame.


Keywords Finitistic dimension • Special biserial algebras
Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) Primary 16E10 • Secondary 16G20, 16G60

Birge Huisgen-Zimmermann calls a finite dimensional algebra homologically tame provided the little and the big finitistic dimension are equal and finite. The question formulated in the title has been discussed by her in the paper [1], by looking for any $r \geq 1$ at a sequence of algebras $\Lambda_{m}$ with big finitistic dimension $r+m$. She presented a quite surprising infinite-dimensional $\Lambda_{m}$-module with projective dimension $r+m$, stressing that related finite-dimensional modules have infinite projective dimension. Nonetheless, as we will show, there do exist finite-dimensional $\Lambda_{m}$-modules with projective dimension $r+m$. Thus, also the little finitistic dimension of $\Lambda_{m}$ is $r+m$. It follows that contrary to her assertion, all the algebras $\Lambda_{m}$ are homologically tame.

Notation Let $k$ be a field and $r \geq 1$ a fixed natural number. We will deal with a sequence of finite-dimensional $k$-algebras $\Lambda_{m}$ with $m \geq 0$, with $\Lambda_{m}$ being a factor algebra of $\Lambda_{m+1}$ for all $m$ (thus, $\Lambda_{m}$-modules can be considered as $\Lambda_{m+1}$-modules) such that the projective $\Lambda_{m}$-modules are also projective as $\Lambda_{m+1}$-modules. The modules to be considered are (not necessarily finitely generated, left) $\Lambda_{m}$-modules for some $m$. Given any module $M$, we

[^0]denote by $P M$ a projective cover, by $\Omega M$ the first syzygy module and by pd $M$ the projective dimension of $M$. If $x$ is a vertex of a quiver $Q$, the corresponding simple representation will also be denoted by $x$.

Outline In Section 1, we recall the definition of the special biserial algebras $\Lambda_{m}$ considered in [1]. In Section 2, we exhibit for any $m$ a finite-dimensional $\Lambda_{m}$-module $Z_{m}$ of projective dimension $r+m$. Thus the little finitistic dimension fin. $\operatorname{dim} . \Lambda_{m}$ of $\Lambda_{m}$ is at least $r+m$. Section 3 presents a proof of the assertion in [1] that the big finitistic dimension Fin. dim. $\Lambda_{m}$ of $\Lambda_{m}$ is at most $r+m$. Combining these results, we get

$$
r+m \leq \text { fin. dim. } \Lambda_{m} \leq \text { Fin. dim. } \Lambda_{m} \leq r+m .
$$

It follows that both the little and the big finitistic dimension are equal to $r+m$.

## 1 The Algebras $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{m}}$

As we mentioned, we consider the algebras $\Lambda_{m}$ exhibited in [1]. This means, we deal with the following quiver with relations. The labels of the vertices are those used in [1], but we denote all arrows just by $\alpha$ or $\beta$, so that $\alpha \beta=0=\beta \alpha$ (and so that at any vertex, at most one $\alpha$-arrow and at most one $\beta$-arrow start, and similarly, at most one $\alpha$-arrow and at most one $\beta$-arrow end; finally, the arrow $a_{1} \rightarrow d_{0}$ is an $\alpha$-arrow). The $\alpha$-arrows are drawn as solid arrows, the $\beta$-arrows are the dashed ones.


The path starting at $d_{0}$ is an alternating $\beta-\alpha$-path of length $r$ with vertices $d_{0}, d_{1}, \ldots, d_{r}$. The $\alpha$-path of length 2 ending at $a_{m}$ with $m \geq 3$ starts in $b_{m+2}$. Similarly, the $\alpha$-path of length 2 ending at $b_{m}$ with $m \geq 2$ starts in $a_{m+2}$.

There are the following additional relations: the square of any loop is zero, and we have $\alpha^{n}=\beta^{m}$, whenever this makes sense.

It is easily seen that $\mathrm{pd} d_{i}=r-i$ (in particular $\mathrm{pd} d_{0}=r$ ) and that $\mathrm{pd} u=\operatorname{pd} v=$ $\operatorname{pd} w=\operatorname{pd} c_{-1}=\operatorname{pd} b_{-1}=\infty$.

The algebra $\Lambda_{m}$ with $m \geq 0$ is given by the full subquiver with vertices $a_{i}, b_{i}, c_{i}$ where $i \leq m$ and all the vertices $u, v, w, d_{0}, \ldots, d_{r}$.

## 2 A Finite-Dimensional $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{m}}$-Module $\boldsymbol{Z}_{\boldsymbol{m}}$ of Projective Dimension $\boldsymbol{r}+\boldsymbol{m}$

We are going to exhibit a sequence of $\Lambda_{m}$-modules $Z_{m}$. All are direct sums of string modules.


For $Z_{m}$ with $m$ even, the southeast arrows are $\alpha$-arrows; for $m$ odd, the southeast arrows are $\beta$-arrows.

Proposition For $m \geq 0$, we have $\Omega Z_{m+1}=Z_{m}$, and $\operatorname{pd} Z_{m}=r+m$.

Proof The first assertion is easily verified. Since $\operatorname{pd} d_{0}=r$ and $\operatorname{pd} d_{1}=r-1$, the second assertion is an immediate consequence, using induction.

Remark The modules $Z_{m}$ with $m \geq 1$ are finite dimensional $\Lambda_{m}$-modules, but not $\Lambda_{m-1}$ modules. Since the projective dimension of any $Z_{m}$ is finite, the modules $Z_{m}$ with $m \geq 2$ are counter-examples to Claim 2 of [1].

## 3 The Big Finitistic Dimension of $\Lambda_{m}$

Let $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}$ be obtained from $\Lambda_{2}$ by deleting the vertices $a_{2}$ and $b_{2}$. We note the following: Let $M$ be a $\Lambda_{m}$-module. If $m=1$ or $m \geq 3$, then $\Omega M$ is a $\Lambda_{m-1}$-module. If $m=2$, then $\Omega M$ is a $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}$-module.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the set of the following 10 isomorphism classes of $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}$-modules; these are string modules $X$ with $X_{c_{2}} \neq 0$.










Lemma 1 The modules in $\mathcal{X}$ have infinite projective dimension.

Proof For the modules $X$ in the first row, $c_{-1}$ is a direct summand of $\Omega^{2} X$. For the modules $X$ in the second row, $v$ is a direct summand of $\Omega^{3} X$.

Lemma 2 Any $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}$-module is the direct sum of a $\Lambda_{1}$-module, of copies of $P\left(c_{2}\right)$, and of copies of modules in $\mathcal{X}$.

Proof Let $M$ be a $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}$-module without a direct summand of the form $P\left(c_{2}\right)$. Let $U$ be the subquiver of the quiver of $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}$ with vertices $d_{0}, a_{1}, a_{0}, c_{1}, c_{2}, b_{1}$.

Since $U$ is a Dynkin quiver, any representation of $U$ is a direct sum of finite-dimensional indecomposable representations. We decompose the restriction $M \mid U$ of $M$ to $U$ as follows: $M \mid U=X \oplus Y$, where $X$ is a direct sum of copies of modules in $\mathcal{X}$ and $Y_{c_{2}}=0$.

We claim that $X$ is a submodule of $M$. For the proof, we use that the maps $\alpha: X_{c_{2}} \rightarrow$ $X_{c_{1}}, \alpha: X_{c_{1}} \rightarrow X_{a_{0}}, \alpha: X_{a_{1}} \rightarrow X_{d_{0}}$, and $\beta: X_{c_{2}} \rightarrow X_{b_{1}}$ are surjective. Since $M$ has no direct summand of the form $P\left(c_{2}\right)$, we have $\alpha^{3} M_{c_{2}}=\beta^{2} M_{c_{2}}=0$, thus $\alpha X_{a_{0}}=0$ and $\beta X_{b_{1}}=0$. The relations $\alpha \beta=0=\beta \alpha$ show that also the subspaces $\beta X_{d_{0}}, \beta X_{a_{0}}, \beta X_{c_{1}}, \alpha X_{b_{1}}$ all are zero.

Let $M^{\prime}$ be defined by $M^{\prime} \mid U=Y$ and $M_{x}^{\prime}=M_{x}$ for those vertices $x$ in the quiver of $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}$ which do not belong to $U$. Clearly, $M^{\prime}$ is a submodule of $M$ and we have $M=X \oplus M^{\prime}$. By construction, $M_{c_{2}}^{\prime}=0$, thus $M^{\prime}$ is a $\Lambda_{1}$-module.

Corollary If $M$ is a $\Lambda_{2}$-module of finite projective dimension, then $\Omega M$ is a $\Lambda_{1}$-module.

Proof The syzygy-module $\Omega M$ is a $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}$-module of finite projective dimension, thus according to Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 a $\Lambda_{1}$-module.

Proposition Any $\Lambda_{m}$-module of finite projective dimension has projective dimension at most $r+m$.

Proof Let $M$ be a $\Lambda_{m}$-module of finite projective dimension.
First, let $m=0$. The algebra $\Lambda_{0}$ is the product of an algebra of global dimension $r$ (with vertices $d_{0}, \ldots, d_{r}$ ) and an algebra (with vertices $a_{0}, c_{0}, b_{0}, u, v, w, b_{-1}, c_{-1}$ ) whose non-projective modules have infinite projective dimension. Thus pd $M \leq r$.

Now, let $m \geq 1$. Then $\Omega M$ is a $\Lambda_{m-1}$-module of finite projective dimension. By induction $\operatorname{pd} \Omega M \leq r+m-1$, thus pd $M \leq r+m$.

## 4 Direct Limits

The abstract of [1] claims that there exist infinite dimensional $\Lambda$-modules of finite projective dimension which are not direct limits of finitely generated representations of finite projective dimension. Apparently, the author refers to the $\Lambda_{m}$-modules labelled $M_{m}$ which are presented in Claim 4 of [1] (these are the only infinite dimensional $\Lambda$-modules exhibited in the paper; they are used in order to show that Fin. $\operatorname{dim} . \Lambda_{m} \geq r+m$ ). Indeed, these modules $M_{m}$ have finite projective dimension, namely $\operatorname{pd} M_{m}=r+m$. However, the modules $M_{m}$ are direct limits of finitely generated modules of finite projective dimension, as we will show.

For $m \geq 0$ and $t \geq 1$, let us introduce a $\Lambda_{m}$-module $Z_{m}[t]$ such that $Z_{m}[1]=Z_{m}$, with a submodule $U_{m t} \subset Z_{m}[t]$, as well as a map $\phi_{m t}: Z_{m}[t] \rightarrow Z_{m}[t+1]$ with kernel $U_{m t}$. Below, we display the modules $Z_{m}[t]$ with $t=3$. The submodule $U_{m t}$ is the zero module in case $m \geq 3$, and is the shaded part in case $m \leq 2$. The module $X=Z_{m}[t] / U_{m t}$ has a filtration $0 \subseteq X_{0} \subset X_{1} \subset \cdots \subset X_{t} \subseteq Z_{m}[t] / U_{m t}$ with isomorphic subfactors $X_{s} / X_{s-1}$ for $1 \leq s \leq t$. In our display, we enclose the subfactors $X_{s} / X_{s-1}$ with $1 \leq s \leq 3$ by dotted lines.


The map $\phi_{m t}$ is given by the obvious embedding of $Z_{m}[t] / U_{m t}$ into $Z_{m}[t+1]$ and we define $M_{m}=\lim _{t}\left(Z_{m}[t], \phi_{m t}\right)$. For $m \geq 1$, the modules $M_{m}$ are those presented in [1], Claim 4. As in Section 2, one easily checks that $\Omega\left(Z_{m+1}[t]\right)=Z_{m}[t]$ for any $m \geq 0$ and $t \geq 1$, so that $\operatorname{pd} Z_{m}[t]=r+m$. Also, $\Omega M_{m+1}=M_{m}$, and therefore pd $M_{m}=r+m$.

Remark For $m \geq 3$, the module $M_{m}$ is just a Prüfer module for its support algebra (which is hereditary).

## Appendix: The shape of the Indecomposable Projective $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{5}}$-Modules

These graphical displays can be found in [1]. But the referee has suggested to provide the pictures also here.
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