

# Finite Generation of Families of Structures Equipped with Compatible Group Actions

Charlotte Aten

University of Rochester

2022 June 23

# Introduction

- Background story 1: FI-module theory
- Background story 2: Bourbaki's structures
- Synergies and bimodules
- Isomorphism invariant polynomials

# Background story 1: FI-module theory

- Our first story is quite recent, taking place mostly during the 2010s.
- For some time there were known examples of phenomena called *representation stability* and *homological stability*.
- In both cases a naturally-constructed sequence of objects were known (either representations or spaces) and while their representations or homology groups continued to grow forever, their descriptions «stabilized» into a recognizable pattern.

# Background story 1: FI-module theory

- For example, it had been known for some time that when  $n \geq 2$  we have that

$$H^1(\mathrm{Conf}_n(\mathbb{C}); \mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C}^{\binom{n}{2}}.$$

- Since each of these cohomology groups is a  $\Sigma_n$ -module, we can decompose  $H^1(\mathrm{Conf}_n(\mathbb{C}); \mathbb{C})$  as a sum of irreducible representations.

# Background story 1: FI-module theory

- The significant observation here is that when  $n \geq 4$  we have that

$$H^1(\mathrm{Conf}_n(\mathbb{C}); \mathbb{C}) = V(0) \oplus V(1) \oplus V(2)$$

where the  $V(k)$  are representations induced from those corresponding to the partitions (0), (1), and (2).

# Background story 1: FI-module theory

- In 2013 Church and Farb proved that this stabilization in the names of the irreducible representations comprising  $H^i(\text{Conf}_n(\mathbb{C}); \mathbb{C})$  as a  $\Sigma_n$  representation occurs for each  $i$ .
- Church, Ellenberg, and Farb continued to develop the relevant theory over the next few years, which is the the theory of *FI-modules*.

# Background story 1: FI-module theory

- An *FI-module* is a functor from the category  $\mathbf{FI}$  of finite sets with injections as morphisms into a category  $\mathbf{Mod}(\mathbf{R})$  of modules over a commutative unital ring  $\mathbf{R}$ .
- In 2015 Church, Ellenberg, and Farb proved a Noetherianity result for FI-modules.

# Background story 1: FI-module theory

- This led to the 2019 work of Ramos and White on *FI-graphs*, which are functors from the category FI to the category **Grph** of graphs.
- They showed that for those FI-graphs  $G_\bullet$  they identified as *vertex-stable* the function

$$n \mapsto \dim_{\mathbb{R}}(H_i(\text{HoCo}(T, G_n); \mathbb{R}))$$

where  $T$  is a fixed graph and  $\text{HoCo}(T, G_n)$  is the Hom-complex of multi-homomorphisms of  $T$  into  $G_n$  eventually agrees with a polynomial of degree at most  $|V(T)| d(i+1)$  where  $d$  is the *stable degree* of the vertex-stable FI-graph  $G_\bullet$ .



# Background story 1: FI-module theory

For any fixed  $r$  the FI-graph  $KG_{\bullet,r}$  is vertex-stable.





## Background story 2: Bourbaki's structures

- Our second story takes place during the twentieth century.
- In writing the textbook series *les Éléments de mathématique*, Bourbaki had sought to lay out in the first text of the series, *Theory of Sets* a systematic description of mathematical structures as they would appear throughout the rest of the series.

## Background story 2: Bourbaki's structures

- Basically, they said that a *structure* was a set, say  $A$ , equipped with an indexed family  $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$  of *relations*  $f_i$  where each  $f_i$  was a subset of a set which could be constructed from  $A$  by taking Cartesian products and powersets finitely many times.
- For example, a relation on  $A$  might be a subset of

$$A \times \text{Sb}(\text{Sb}(A) \times A^{57}) \times \text{Sb}(\text{Sb}(\text{Sb}(A))).$$

## Background story 2: Bourbaki's structures

- Bourbaki defined what we would now call morphisms of these structures and proved several results about them, all of which we would now consider to belong to category theory.
- Once Eilenberg Mac Lane had established category theory Grothendieck and then Cartier were asked to produce a category theory component for the *Éléments*, although if either did their contribution never made it into the texts.

## Background story 2: Bourbaki's structures

- Discussions in «La Tribu» during the 1950s seem to indicate that Bourbaki felt much of the *Éléments* would have to be rewritten in order to accommodate the new notions from category theory.
- It appeared to be difficult to synthesize the structural and categorical viewpoints together, so the consensus became that this task was not worth the effort.

# Thesis results

- In my thesis I developed a more general theory which parallels that of FI-modules.
- Instead of a sequence of representations  $\{\mathbf{V}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of the symmetric groups  $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  indexed by the category FI of finite sets with inclusions as morphisms, we consider *synergies*, which are functors from an indexing (or shape) category  $\mathbf{S}$  to the category of groups.
- Building on this, a triad of results about finite generation of corresponding bimodules are proven.

# Thesis results

- I also present one possible categorification of Bourbaki's concept of structure here.
- The main result in this case is a generalization of a result of Hilbert on symmetric polynomials to the setting of finite structures.
- This generalization has the perhaps surprising implication that any first-order property of a finite structure  $\mathbf{A}$  can be checked by counting the number of embeddings of small substructures  $\mathbf{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{A}$ , where «small» is a function of the logical complexity of the first-order property.



# Thesis results

- As Bourbaki imagined, the setup for this is a little involved and is relegated to an appendix.
- That appendix also contains a Yoneda-style embedding theorem which shows that categories of structures built from a set  $A$  may always be viewed as having basic relations of the form  $A^n$  as in model theory.

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Synergy)

We refer to a functor  $\mathbf{G}: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{Grp}$  as a *synergy* of shape  $\mathbf{S}$  or as an  $\mathbf{S}$ -*synergy*.

- For  $s \in S$  we typically write  $\mathbf{G}_s$  rather than  $\mathbf{G}(s)$  and given a morphism  $f: s_1 \rightarrow s_2$  in  $\mathbf{S}$  we simply write  $\check{f}$  rather than  $\mathbf{G}(f)$ .

# Synergies and bimodules

- Many familiar families of groups form synergies.
- The symmetric and alternating groups both form synergies indexed by the natural numbers  $\mathbf{N}$ .
- The general linear groups  $\mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$  may be viewed as a synergy indexed by  $\mathbf{N}^2$  by taking

$$(\mathbf{GL}(\mathbb{F}))_{i,j} := \mathbf{GL}_{i+j}(\mathbb{F}).$$

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Unspooling of a synergy)

Given an  $\mathbf{S}$ -synergy  $\mathbf{G}$  the *unspooling* of  $\mathbf{G}$  is the category  $\mathcal{G}$  whose objects are the elements of  $S$ , whose morphism sets are

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}}(s_1, s_2) := \{ \sigma f \tau \mid \sigma, \tau \in G_{s_2} \text{ and } f: s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \},$$

whose composition map

$$\circ: \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}}(s_2, s_3) \times \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}}(s_1, s_2) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}}(s_1, s_3)$$

is given by

$$(\sigma_3 g \tau_3) \circ (\sigma_2 f \tau_2) = \sigma_3 \check{g}(\sigma_2)(g \circ f) \check{g}(\tau_2) \tau_3,$$

and whose identity morphisms are those of the form  $e_{l.e.}$

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Synergy bioobject)

Given a synergy  $\mathbf{G}$  and a category  $\mathcal{C}$  we refer to a functor  $\mathbf{V}: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  as a  $\mathbf{G}$ -*bioobject* in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

## Definition (Synergy bimodule category)

Given a commutative unital ring  $\mathbf{R}$  and a synergy  $\mathbf{G}$  we refer to  $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{Mod}(\mathbf{R})$  as the *category of  $\mathbf{G}$ -bimodules (over  $\mathbf{R}$ )*.

- A symmetric synergy bimodule is an FI-module with a compatible action of the symmetric groups on the right.

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Regular synergy bimodule)

Given an  $\mathbf{S}$ -synergy  $\mathbf{G}$ , a unital commutative ring  $\mathbf{R}$ , and an  $\mathbf{S}$ -set  $\Psi$  we define the *regular  $\mathbf{G}$ -bimodule*

$$\mathbf{RG}[\Psi]: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(\mathbf{R})$$

by

$$(\mathbf{RG}[\Psi])_s := \mathbf{R}[\{ \sigma\psi \mid \psi \in \Psi_s \text{ and } \sigma \in G_s \}]$$

and

$$\overline{\sigma_2 f \tau_2}(\sigma_1 \psi) := \sigma_2 \check{f}(\sigma_1) \tau_2 \check{f}(\psi).$$

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Finitely generated synergy bimodule)

We say that a  $\mathbf{G}$ -bimodule  $\mathbf{V}: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(\mathbf{R})$  is *finitely generated* when there exists an epimorphism  $\mathbf{Fr}(\Psi) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{V}$  where  $\Psi$  is finite.

- A finitely generated synergy bimodule is thus determined by elements lying in a certain collection of modules  $\mathbf{V}_s$ .

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Augmentation ideal)

Given a  $\mathbf{G}$ -bimodule  $\mathbf{V}: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(\mathbf{R})$  the *augmentation ideal*  $\Theta\mathbf{V}: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(\mathbf{R})$  is the sub- $\mathbf{G}$ -bimodule of  $\mathbf{V}$  with  $(\Theta\mathbf{V})_s$  defined to be the sub- $\mathbf{R}$ -module of  $\mathbf{V}_s$  generated by

$$\{v - \bar{\sigma}v\bar{\tau} \mid v \in V_s, \sigma, \tau \in G_s\}.$$



# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Escalation)

Given a category  $\mathbf{S}$  and an endofunctor  $\overset{\circ}{\xi}: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$  we refer to a natural transformation  $\xi: \text{id}_{\mathbf{S}} \rightarrow \overset{\circ}{\xi}$  as an *escalation* of  $\mathbf{S}$ .

- Escalations of a poset are isotone maps.
- Escalations of a group are inner automorphisms. (Compare with the work of Cohen et al.)
- The escalations of a category always form a monoid under horizontal composition.

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Escalation ring)

Given a category  $\mathbf{S}$  and a unital commutative ring  $\mathbf{R}$  we denote by  $\mathbf{R} \mathbf{Esc}(\mathbf{S})$  the *escalation ring (of  $\mathbf{S}$  over  $\mathbf{R}$ )*, which is the monoid ring of  $\mathbf{Esc}(\mathbf{S})$  over  $\mathbf{R}$ .

## Definition (Ring of a set of escalations)

Given a category  $\mathbf{S}$  and some  $\Xi \subset \mathbf{Esc}(\mathbf{S})$  we denote by  $\mathbf{R}\{\Xi\}$  the subring of  $\mathbf{R} \mathbf{Esc}(\mathbf{S})$  generated by  $R \cup \Xi$ .

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Coinvariants module)

Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be an  $\mathbf{S}$ -synergy which has a generating set  $\Xi$  and let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a unital commutative ring. Given a  $\mathbf{G}$ -bimodule  $\mathbf{V}: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(\mathbf{R})$  the  $\Xi$ -*coinvariants module*  $\Phi\mathbf{V}$  is an  $\mathbf{S}$ -graded  $\mathbf{R}\{\Xi\}$ -module whose  $s^{\text{th}}$  component is

$$(\Phi\mathbf{V})_s := \mathbf{V}_s / (\Theta\mathbf{V})_s$$

and for which  $\xi \in \Xi$  acts as a map

$$\dot{\xi}_s: (\Phi\mathbf{V})_s \rightarrow (\Phi\mathbf{V})_{\dot{\xi}(s)}$$

which is given by

$$\dot{\xi}_s(v / (\Theta\mathbf{V})_s) := \bar{\xi}_s(v) / (\Theta\mathbf{V})_{\dot{\xi}(s)}.$$

# Synergies and bimodules

## Definition (Noetherian category)

Given a category  $\mathbf{S}$  which is finitely generated by  $(\Xi, B)$  and a unital commutative ring  $\mathbf{R}$  we say that  $\mathbf{S}$  is  $(\mathbf{R}, \Xi)$ -Noetherian (or Noetherian (over  $\mathbf{R}$  with respect to  $\Xi$ )) when  $\mathbf{R}\{\Xi\}$  is a Noetherian ring.

# Synergies and bimodules

## Proposition (A. 2022)

*If  $\mathbf{G}$  is a synergy then for any finite  $\mathbf{S}$ -set  $\Psi$  we have that  $\mathbf{RG}[\Psi]$  is finitely generated. If  $\mathbf{G}$  is NFG by  $(\Omega, \Omega', B)$  and  $\Psi$  is finite with finite generating set  $\Psi'$  whose associated base is  $B$  then  $\Theta\mathbf{G}[\Psi]$  is finitely generated.*

- We get a relatively explicit bound on the size of a finite generating set for  $\Theta\mathbf{G}[\Psi]$  since we have that

$$|\Psi^\Omega| \leq |(\Psi')^{\Omega'}| \leq 2 \sum_{s \in B} |\Psi' \cap \Psi_s| |\Omega' \cap \Omega_s|.$$

# Synergies and bimodules

## Theorem (A. 2022)

Suppose that  $\mathbf{G}$  is an  $\mathbf{S}$ -synergy and that  $\mathbf{V}: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(\mathbf{R})$  is a  $\mathbf{G}$ -bimodule with  $\mathbf{W} \leq \mathbf{V}$ . If

- 1  $\Theta\mathbf{W}$  is finitely generated with witness  $q_\Theta: \mathbf{Fr}(\Psi_\Theta) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{V}$  where  $\Psi_\Theta$  is finite with finite generating set  $\Psi'_\Theta$  whose associated base is  $B_\Theta$ ,
- 2  $\mathbb{Q} \leq \mathbf{R}$ ,
- 3 all the groups  $\mathbf{G}_s$  are torsion,
- 4  $\mathbf{S}$  is  $(\mathbf{R}, \Xi)$ -Noetherian,
- 5  $\mathbf{V}$  is finitely generated with witness  $q: \mathbf{Fr}(\Psi) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{V}$  where  $\Psi$  is finite with finite generating set  $\Psi'$  whose associated base is  $B$ ,
- 6  $\mathbf{S}$  is generated by  $(\Xi, B)$

then  $\mathbf{W}$  is finitely generated.

# Synergies and bimodules

Theorem (A. 2022)

*Sub- $\Sigma$ -bimodules of  $\mathbb{C}\Sigma[1]$  are finitely generated.*

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

- A *finite structure* is a pair  $\mathbf{A} := (A, \{f_i\}_{i \in I})$  where  $A$  is a finite set and the  $f_i$  form an  $I$ -indexed sequence of relations  $f_i \subset A^{\rho(i)}$  where the function  $\rho: I \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is the *signature* of  $\mathbf{A}$ .
- We denote by  $\mathbf{Struct}^\rho$  the evident category and by  $\mathbf{Struct}_A^\rho$  the collection of all structures of the same signature on the set  $A$ , which we call a *kinship class*.
- The class  $\mathbf{Struct}^\rho$  of all structures with signature  $\rho$  is likewise called a *similarity class*.



# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

## Definition (Substructure)

Given a structure  $\mathbf{A}$  of signature  $\rho$  we refer to a subobject of  $\mathbf{A}$  in  $\mathbf{Struct}^\rho$  as a *substructure* of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

## Definition (Finite signature)

We say that a signature  $\rho: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{Fun}(\mathbf{Set}, \mathbf{Set})$  is *finite* when  $\mathcal{I}$  has finitely many objects and finitely many morphisms and for each  $N \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{I})$  and each finite set  $A$  we have that  $\rho_A(N)$  is finite.

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

## Definition (Finite kinship class)

When  $\rho$  is a finite signature and  $A$  is a finite set we say that  $\text{Struct}_A^\rho$  is a *finite kinship class*.

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

- Given a set of variables  $X$  the symmetric group  $\Sigma_X$  of permutations of  $X$  acts on the corresponding polynomial algebra  $\mathbf{R}[X]$  for some unital commutative ring  $\mathbf{R}$ .
- The polynomials invariant under this action are the *symmetric polynomials*, which themselves form an  $\mathbf{R}$ -algebra.
- A classical result of Hilbert is that certain very simple *elementary symmetric polynomials* generate this algebra of all symmetric polynomials.

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

## Definition (Monomial $y_{\mathbf{A}}$ )

Given a finite signature  $\rho$  on an index category  $\mathcal{I}$ , a finite set  $A$ , and a structure  $\mathbf{A} := (A, F) \in \text{Struct}_A^\rho$  we define

$$y_{\mathbf{A}} := \prod_{N \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{I})} \prod_{a \in F(N)} x_{N,a}.$$

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

## Definition $((\rho, A)$ polynomial algebra)

Given a commutative ring  $\mathbf{R}$ , a finite signature  $\rho$ , and a finite set  $A$  we define the  $(\rho, A)$  *polynomial algebra* over  $\mathbf{R}$  to be the subalgebra of  $\mathbf{R}[X_A^\rho]$  which is generated by  $Y_A^\rho$ . We denote this algebra by  $\mathbf{Pol}_A^\rho(\mathbf{R})$  and its universe by  $\text{Pol}_A^\rho(\mathbf{R})$ .

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

## Definition (Action $v$ )

We define a group action  $v: \Sigma_A \rightarrow \mathbf{Aut}(\mathbf{R}[X_A^\rho])$  by setting  $(v(\sigma))(x_{N,a}) := x_{N,(\rho_\sigma(N))(a)}$  and extending.

## Definition (Symmetric polynomial)

A polynomial  $p \in \text{Pol}_A^\rho(\mathbf{R})$  is called *symmetric* when for every  $\sigma \in \Sigma_A$  we have that  $(v(\sigma))(p) = p$ .

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

## Definition (Action $\zeta$ )

We define a group action  $\zeta: \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_{\text{Struct}_A^\rho}$  by

$$(\zeta(\sigma))(A, F) := (A, \rho_\sigma \circ F).$$



# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

## Definition (Isomorphism classes of structures)

We define

$$\text{IsoStr}_A^\rho := \{ \text{Orb}_\zeta(\mathbf{A}) \mid \mathbf{A} \in \text{Struct}_A^\rho \}.$$

## Definition (Elementary symmetric polynomial)

Given a finite signature  $\rho$ , a finite set  $A$ , and an isomorphism class  $\psi \in \text{IsoStr}_A^\rho$  we define the *elementary symmetric polynomial* of  $\psi$  to be

$$s_\psi := \sum_{\mathbf{A} \in \psi} y_{\mathbf{A}}.$$

- The elementary symmetric polynomials are symmetric polynomials.

# Isomorphism invariant polynomials

Theorem (A. 2022)

*Given a polynomial  $f \in \text{SymPol}_A^\rho(\mathbf{R})$  of degree  $d$  there exists a polynomial  $g \in R[Z_A^\rho]$  of weight at most  $d$  such that  $f = g|_{Z_A^\rho = S_A^\rho}$ .*

Thank you!