

Configurations in abelian categories. I.

Basic properties

Dominic Joyce
Lincoln College, Oxford

1 Introduction

This is the first of three papers [7, 8] developing the concept of *configuration* in an abelian category. Given an abelian category \mathcal{A} and a finite partially ordered set (poset) (I, \preceq) , we define an (I, \preceq) -*configuration* (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} to be a collection of objects $\sigma(J)$ and morphisms $\iota(J, K)$ or $\pi(J, K) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma(K)$ in \mathcal{A} satisfying certain axioms, where J, K are subsets of I .

Configurations are a tool for describing *how an object X in \mathcal{A} decomposes into subobjects*. They are especially useful for studying *stability conditions* on \mathcal{A} . Given a *slope function* Z on \mathcal{A} with *phase* θ , objects X in \mathcal{A} are called θ -*stable*, θ -*semistable* or θ -*unstable* depending on the θ -phases of subobjects $S \subset X$.

For some large classes of interesting abelian categories \mathcal{A} , such as the abelian category $\text{coh}(P)$ of *coherent sheaves* on a smooth complex projective variety P , or the abelian category $\text{mod-}A$ of representations of a finite-dimensional algebra A over \mathbb{C} , one can define *moduli spaces* $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(\kappa, \theta)$ of θ -*stable* objects in a fixed class $\kappa \in K_0(\mathcal{A})$, which in good cases are *complex quasi-projective varieties*.

As Z varies and crosses *real hypersurfaces* W in the space of slope functions, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(\kappa, \theta)$ changes. One goal of [7, 8] is to study this. Our key idea is that these transitions are best understood by introducing *moduli spaces* $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ of (I, \preceq) -*configurations* (σ, ι, π) , with $\sigma(\{i\})$ θ -stable for all $i \in I$. When I is one point $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ coincides with $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(\kappa, \theta)$.

As Z crosses W , the change in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ depends on $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(K, \trianglelefteq, \lambda, \theta)$ for finite posets (K, \trianglelefteq) more complicated than (I, \preceq) . Under some assumptions on \mathcal{A}, Z , in [7, 8] we define *systems of invariants* of \mathcal{A}, Z by taking weighted Euler characteristics of moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$, and determine *identities* the invariants satisfy, and their *transformation laws* as Z changes.

This is the start of a broader programme. In later papers [9] the author intends to extend the notion of configurations, and the corresponding moduli spaces and invariants, to *triangulated categories*. Then by applying them to *derived categories of coherent sheaves on Calabi–Yau manifolds*, we shall formulate some results and conjectures on *Homological Mirror Symmetry*, *branes in String Theory*, and II-stability .

This paper divides naturally into two parts. The first part §2–§6 introduces

configurations in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , and studies their basic properties. We motivate the definition by studying the set of *subobjects* $S \subset X$ of an object X with *nonisomorphic simple factors* in an abelian category \mathcal{A} of *finite length*. Then we discuss constructions of configurations.

The second part §7–§10 constructs and studies *generalized Hilbert schemes* $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ of (I, \preceq) -configurations in a \mathbb{C} -linear abelian category \mathcal{A} satisfying some assumptions. We show that these moduli spaces have the structure of *complex quasi-projective varieties*, and the natural maps between them are *morphisms of varieties*. We also prove some results on *Euler characteristics* and *constructible functions* on the moduli spaces, that will be needed in [7, 8].

We begin in §2 with an introduction to abelian categories, focussing on the notion of *subobject* $S \subset X$ of an object $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and the *Jordan–Hölder Theorem* for \mathcal{A} of *finite length*, which splits each $X \in \mathcal{A}$ into *simple factors* S_1, \dots, S_n .

Section 3 refines the Jordan–Hölder Theorem in the case when the simple factors S_1, \dots, S_n of $X \in \mathcal{A}$ are nonisomorphic. We find that the set of all *subobjects* of X may be classified using a *partial order* \preceq on $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, the indexing set for the simple factors of X . We also classify *quotient objects*, *factors* and *composition series* for X using (I, \preceq) .

Motivated by this, §4 defines the notion of (I, \preceq) -*configuration* (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} , and proves that it captures the properties of the set of all subobjects of $X \in \mathcal{A}$ when X has nonisomorphic simple factors $\{S^i : i \in I\}$. We also discuss the classes of the objects $\sigma(J)$ in the *Grothendieck group* $K_0(\mathcal{A})$, and an interpretation of configurations in terms of *flasque sheaves* on I .

Section 5 defines some elementary operations on configurations. Given an (I, \preceq) -configuration we can make *sub-* and *quotient* (K, \trianglelefteq) -*configurations*, where (K, \trianglelefteq) comes from (I, \preceq) with $K \subseteq I$ or using a surjective $\phi : I \rightarrow K$. We also construct new configurations by *substituting* one configuration into another.

Let \trianglelefteq, \leq be partial orders on a finite I , with \trianglelefteq stronger than \leq . Then each (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) has a quotient (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\iota}, \bar{\pi})$. We call (σ, ι, π) an (I, \preceq) -*improvement* of $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\iota}, \bar{\pi})$. We call $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\iota}, \bar{\pi})$ *best* if it has no strict improvements. Section 6 shows that improvements can be divided into a sequence of *steps*, classifies *one step improvements*, and gives a criterion for *best configurations* in terms of whether short exact sequences split.

Section 7 discusses *complex quasi-projective varieties*, the *Euler characteristic*, *constructible sets* and *constructible functions*. Section 8 sets out the assumptions that we need on an abelian category, which require the family $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X)$ of subobjects $S \subset X$ for $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[S] = \alpha$ in $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ to be a complex projective variety. Using *Quot-schemes* we show that these assumptions hold for coherent sheaves on a smooth complex projective variety, and also when \mathcal{A} has finite length and $\text{Hom}(X, Y), \text{Ext}^1(X, Y)$ are finite-dimensional over \mathbb{C} .

Section 9 defines *generalized Hilbert schemes*, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, and subspaces $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^b(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^b, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}^b(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ depending on a slope function Z with phase θ . Under the assumptions of §8 we show that $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ is a *complex quasi-projective variety*, and if Z is *permissible* the subspaces are *constructible sets*. We also prove some natural maps between moduli spaces are *morphisms of varieties*.

Finally, §10 proves some *counting results* for configurations using the Euler characteristic χ , which will be needed in [7, 8]. It would be convenient if every configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} had a unique *best improvement*. In general this is false, and the family \mathcal{F} of best improvements of (σ, ι, π) is a complicated constructible set in a complex quasi-projective variety. But we prove in §10.1 that $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = 1$, so that (σ, ι, π) has 1 best improvement ‘counted with χ ’.

Let Z be permissible with phase θ . An (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) is called θ -*(semi)stable* if $\sigma(\{i\})$ is θ -(semi)stable for all $i \in I$. In §10.2 we calculate the Euler characteristic of the union over all (I, \preceq) of the families of all *best θ -stable (I, \preceq) -configurations* (σ, ι, π) with $\sigma(I) = X$, for fixed $X \in \mathcal{A}$. In a similar way, in §10.3 we calculate the Euler characteristic of the family of all *best θ -stable refinements* of a fixed θ -semistable configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} . We express our results in terms of *constructible functions*.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Tom Bridgeland for some inspiring conversations, and helpful comments on early versions of this paper. I would also like to thank Richard Thomas, Paul Seidel, Frances Kirwan and Alastair King for useful conversations. I was supported by an EPSRC Advanced Research Fellowship whilst writing this paper.

2 Introduction to abelian categories

We now review material on abelian categories we shall need later. Some useful references are Popescu [16] and Gelfand and Manin [10, §II.5–§II.6].

2.1 Abelian categories

Here is the definition of abelian category, taken from [10, §II.5].

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{A} be a category. As a shorthand, write $X \in \mathcal{A}$ or $X \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$ when X is an object of \mathcal{A} , and $f \in \text{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ when f is a morphism of \mathcal{A} . When $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ write $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$ for the set of morphisms $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{A} . Write $\text{id}_X \in \text{Hom}(X, X)$ for the identity map $\text{id}_X : X \rightarrow X$.

We call \mathcal{A} an *additive category* if it has the properties:

- (i) $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$ is an *abelian group* for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, and composition of morphisms is *biadditive*.
- (ii) There exists a *zero object* $0 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\text{Hom}(0, 0) = 0$.
- (iii) For any $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $Z \in \mathcal{A}$ and morphisms $\iota_X : X \rightarrow Z$, $\iota_Y : Y \rightarrow Z$, $\pi_X : Z \rightarrow X$, $\pi_Y : Z \rightarrow Y$ with $\pi_X \circ \iota_X = \text{id}_X$, $\pi_Y \circ \iota_Y = \text{id}_Y$, $\iota_X \circ \pi_X + \iota_Y \circ \pi_Y = \text{id}_Z$ and $\pi_X \circ \iota_Y = \pi_Y \circ \iota_X = 0$. We write $Z = X \oplus Y$, the *direct sum* of X and Y . Any two such direct sums are canonically isomorphic.

Let \mathcal{A} be an additive category, and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ a morphism in \mathcal{A} . We call $k : K \rightarrow X$ a *kernel* of f if $f \circ k = 0$ and for any $k' : K' \rightarrow X$ with $f \circ k' = 0$

there exists a unique $h : K' \rightarrow K$ with $k' = k \circ h$. Similarly we call $c : Y \rightarrow C$ a *cokernel* of f if $c \circ f = 0$ and for any $c' : Y \rightarrow C'$ with $c' \circ f = 0$ there exists a unique $h : C \rightarrow C'$ with $c' = h \circ c$.

If a kernel or cokernel exists it is unique up to canonical isomorphism. Often we refer to K, C as the kernel or cokernel of f , taking k, c to be implicitly given. Define a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to be *injective* if it has kernel 0, and *surjective* if it has cokernel 0.

We call \mathcal{A} an *abelian category* if it satisfies (i)–(iii) above and:

- (iv) For any morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ there is a sequence $K \xrightarrow{k} X \xrightarrow{i} I \xrightarrow{j} Y \xrightarrow{c} C$ in \mathcal{A} such that $j \circ i = f$, and K is the kernel of f , and C the cokernel of f , and I is both the cokernel of k and the kernel of c .

We will often use the following properties of abelian categories:

- If $i \circ f = i \circ g$ and i is *injective*, then $f = g$ (i is *left cancellable*).
- If $f \circ \pi = g \circ \pi$ and π is *surjective*, then $f = g$ (π is *right cancellable*).
- If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is *injective* and *surjective*, then it is an *isomorphism*.

In an abelian category we can define *exact sequences* [10, §II.6].

Definition 2.2. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ a sequence in \mathcal{A} with $g \circ f = 0$. Let $k : K \rightarrow Y$ be the kernel of g and $c : Y \rightarrow C$ the cokernel of f . Then there exist unique morphisms $a : X \rightarrow K$ and $b : C \rightarrow Z$ with $f = k \circ a$ and $g = b \circ c$. We say that $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ is *exact at Y* if a is surjective, or equivalently if b is injective.

A complex in \mathcal{A} is called *exact* if it is exact at every term. A short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{A} is called *split* if there exists an isomorphism $h : X \oplus Z \rightarrow Y$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{\iota_X} & X \oplus Z & \xrightarrow{\pi_Z} & Z & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \text{id}_X \downarrow & & h \downarrow & & \text{id}_Z \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \longrightarrow & 0.
 \end{array} \tag{1}$$

The *Grothendieck group* $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ is the abelian group generated by $\text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$, with a relation $[Y] = [X] + [Z]$ for each short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{A} . Throughout the paper $K(\mathcal{A})$ will mean either $K_0(\mathcal{A})$, or the quotient of $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ by some fixed subgroup. In particular, in §2.5 we shall define the *numerical Grothendieck group* $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$ when \mathcal{A} is of *finite type* over a field \mathbb{K} , and we may take $K(\mathcal{A}) = K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$.

We write $[X] \in K(\mathcal{A})$ for the equivalence class of $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Note that for $K(\mathcal{A})$ to admit a *slope function* $Z : K(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, as in Definition 2.7 below, it is necessary that if $0 \not\cong X \in \mathcal{A}$ then $0 \neq [X] \in K(\mathcal{A})$, so we will often implicitly assume this property of $K(\mathcal{A})$.

2.2 Subobjects, quotient objects and factors

Subobjects of objects in \mathcal{A} are analogous to subgroups of an abelian group.

Definition 2.3. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. Two injective morphisms $i : S \rightarrow X$, $i' : S' \rightarrow X$ in \mathcal{A} are *equivalent* if there exists an isomorphism $h : S \rightarrow S'$ with $i = i' \circ h$. Then h is unique. A *subobject* of $X \in \mathcal{A}$ is an equivalence class of injective morphisms $i : S \rightarrow X$. Usually we refer to S as the subobject, taking both i and the equivalence class to be implicitly given, and write $S \subset X$ to mean S is a subobject of X . We write $0, X$ for the subobjects of X which are equivalence classes of $0 \rightarrow X$ and $\text{id}_X : X \rightarrow X$.

Similarly, surjective morphisms $\pi : X \rightarrow Q$, $\pi' : X \rightarrow Q'$ in \mathcal{A} are *equivalent* if there is an isomorphism $h : Q \rightarrow Q'$ with $\pi' = h \circ \pi$. A *quotient object* of $X \in \mathcal{A}$ is an equivalence class of surjective $\pi : X \rightarrow Q$. Usually we just refer to Q as the quotient object.

If $S, T \subset X$ are represented by $i : S \rightarrow X$ and $j : T \rightarrow X$, we write $S \subset T \subset X$ if there exists $a : S \rightarrow T$ with $i = j \circ a$. Then a is injective, and so fits into an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow S \xrightarrow{a} T \xrightarrow{b} F \rightarrow 0$ for b, F determined up to canonical isomorphism. We write $F = T/S$, and call F a *factor* of $X \in \mathcal{A}$. When $T = X$ and $j = \text{id}_X$, X/S is a *quotient object*.

We define operations $\cap, +$ on subobjects, following Popescu [16, §2.6]. The notation comes from the intersection and sum of *subgroups of abelian groups*.

Definition 2.4. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and suppose injective maps $i : S \rightarrow X$, $j : T \rightarrow X$ define subobjects S, T of X . Apply part (iv) of Definition 2.1 to $f = i \circ \pi_S + j \circ \pi_T : S \oplus T \rightarrow X$. This yields $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$ and morphisms $k : U \rightarrow S \oplus T$, $l : S \oplus T \rightarrow V$ and $e : V \rightarrow X$ such that $i \circ \pi_S + j \circ \pi_T = e \circ l$, and k is the kernel of $i \circ \pi_S + j \circ \pi_T$, and l is the cokernel of k , and e is the *image* (the kernel of the cokernel) of $i \circ \pi_S + j \circ \pi_T$.

Define $a : U \rightarrow S$ by $a = k \circ \pi_S$, and $b : U \rightarrow T$ by $b = -k \circ \pi_T$ and $c : S \rightarrow V$ by $c = f \circ \iota_S$, and $d : T \rightarrow V$ by $d = f \circ \iota_T$. Then $k = \iota_S \circ a - \iota_T \circ b$, $l = c \circ \pi_S + d \circ \pi_T$, $i = e \circ c$ and $j = e \circ d$. Now $0 \rightarrow U \xrightarrow{k} S \oplus T \xrightarrow{l} V \rightarrow 0$ is exact. So $i \circ a = j \circ b$, and

$$0 \longrightarrow U \xrightarrow{\iota_S \circ a - \iota_T \circ b} S \oplus T \xrightarrow{c \circ \pi_S + d \circ \pi_T} V \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{is exact.} \quad (2)$$

As i, a are injective $i \circ a = j \circ b : U \rightarrow X$ is injective, and defines a *subobject* of X . Define $S \cap T$ to be this subobject. Similarly, $e : V \rightarrow X$ is injective, and so defines a subobject of X . Define $S + T$ to be this subobject. As U, V, a, \dots, e are unique up to canonical isomorphism, $S \cap T$ and $S + T$ depend only on the subobjects S, T of X . The morphisms a, b, c, d give inclusions of subobjects

$$S \cap T \subset S \subset S + T \subset X \quad \text{and} \quad S \cap T \subset T \subset S + T \subset X. \quad (3)$$

By Popescu [16, Prop. 2.6.4, p. 39] there are canonical isomorphisms

$$S/(S \cap T) \cong (S + T)/T \quad \text{and} \quad T/(S \cap T) \cong (S + T)/S. \quad (4)$$

These operations $\cap, +$ are *commutative* and *associative*. We can therefore form multiple sums and intersections. We shall write $\sum_{j \in J} T_j$ for the multiple sum $+$ of a finite set of subobjects $T_j \subset X$, in the obvious way.

2.3 The Jordan–Hölder Theorem

The *Jordan–Hölder Theorem* in group theory decomposes a (finite) group into simple factors, using chains of normal subgroups. We shall explain the analogue of this in an abelian category.

Definition 2.5. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. We call \mathcal{A} *artinian* if for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$, all descending chains of subobjects $\cdots \subset A_2 \subset A_1 \subset X$ stabilize, that is, $A_{n+1} = A_n$ for all $n \gg 0$. We call \mathcal{A} *noetherian* if for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$, all ascending chains of subobjects $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset \cdots \subset X$ stabilize, that is, $A_n = A_{n+1}$ for all $n \gg 0$. We call \mathcal{A} of *finite length* if it is both artinian and noetherian.

A nonzero object X in an abelian category \mathcal{A} is called *simple* if it has no nontrivial proper subobjects. That is, $X \not\cong 0$, and if $i : S \rightarrow X$ is injective then either $S \cong 0$ or i is an isomorphism.

Let $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and consider *filtrations* of subobjects

$$0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X \tag{5}$$

in \mathcal{A} . Such a filtration is called *without repetitions* if none of the inclusions $i_k : A_k \rightarrow A_{k+1}$ is an isomorphism. A *refinement* of (5) is any filtration obtained by inserting further terms. We allow (5) as a refinement of itself, i.e. by inserting no further terms. We call (5) a *composition series* for X if the factors $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ are simple objects in \mathcal{A} .

Here is the Jordan–Hölder Theorem in an abelian category, [19, Th. 2.1].

Theorem 2.6. *Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category of finite length. Then every filtration $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ without repetitions can be refined to a composition series for X . Suppose $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_m = X$ and $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ are two composition series for $X \in \mathcal{A}$, with simple factors $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ and $T_k = B_k/B_{k-1}$. Then $m = n$, and for some permutation σ of $1, \dots, n$ we have $S_k \cong T_{\sigma(k)}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$.*

2.4 Stability and Harder–Narasimhan filtrations

We now summarize the work of Rudakov [17] on *stability* in an abelian category, using the notation of Bridgeland [2, §2].

Definition 2.7. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and $K(\mathcal{A})$ be as in Definition 2.2. A *slope function* on \mathcal{A} is a group homomorphism $Z : K(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that for all $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{A}$, $Z([X])$ lies in the upper half-plane $H = \{r \exp(i\pi\theta) : r > 0, \theta \in (0, 1]\}$ in \mathbb{C} . Given a slope function Z on \mathcal{A} , the *phase* of $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{A}$ is

$$\theta([X]) = \frac{1}{\pi} \arg Z([X]) \in (0, 1]. \tag{6}$$

Then we say that a nonzero object X in \mathcal{A} is

- (i) θ -stable if for all $S \subset X$ with $S \not\cong 0$, X we have $\theta([S]) < \theta([X])$.
- (ii) θ -semistable if for all $S \subset X$ with $S \not\cong 0$ we have $\theta([S]) \leq \theta([X])$.
- (iii) θ -unstable if it is not θ -semistable.

Suppose $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence in \mathcal{A} with X, Y, Z nonzero. Then $[Y] = [X] + [Z]$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$, and exactly one of $\theta([X]) < \theta([Y]) < \theta([Z])$, or $\theta([X]) > \theta([Y]) > \theta([Z])$, or $\theta([X]) = \theta([Y]) = \theta([Z])$ holds. Therefore the condition $\theta([S]) < \theta([X])$ in (i) is equivalent to $\theta([X]) < \theta([X/S])$, and the condition $\theta([S]) \leq \theta([X])$ in (ii) is equivalent to $\theta([X]) \leq \theta([X/S])$.

Using θ we can weaken the ideas of *artinian* and *noetherian* in Definition 2.5.

Definition 2.8. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and Z a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ . We call \mathcal{A} θ -artinian if for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$, all descending chains of subobjects $\cdots \subset A_2 \subset A_1 \subset X$ with $\theta([A_{n+1}]) \geq \theta([A_n])$ for all n stabilize, that is, $A_{n+1} = A_n$ for all $n \gg 0$. We call \mathcal{A} θ -noetherian if for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$, all ascending chains of subobjects $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset \cdots \subset X$ with $\theta([A_n]) \leq \theta([A_{n+1}])$ for all n stabilize, that is, $A_n = A_{n+1}$ for all $n \gg 0$.

The next three theorems follow from Rudakov [17, Th.s 1, 2 & 3].

Theorem 2.9. Let Z be a slope function on an abelian category \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and suppose $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ are θ -semistable. If $\theta([X]) > \theta([Y])$ then $\text{Hom}(X, Y) = 0$. Suppose $\theta([X]) = \theta([Y])$ and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is nonzero. Then

- (a) If Y is θ -stable then f is surjective.
- (b) If X is θ -stable then f is injective.
- (c) If both X, Y are θ -stable then f is an isomorphism.

Theorem 2.10. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and Z a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and suppose \mathcal{A} is θ -artinian and θ -noetherian. Then each $X \in \mathcal{A}$ admits a unique filtration $0 = A_0 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ for $n \geq 0$, such that $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ is θ -semistable for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\theta([S_1]) > \theta([S_2]) > \cdots > \theta([S_n])$.

We call $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ in Theorem 2.10 a *Harder-Narasimhan filtration*, as it generalizes the filtrations constructed by Harder and Narasimhan [5] for vector bundles over algebraic curves. Here is an analogue of Theorem 2.6 for θ -semistable objects.

Theorem 2.11. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and Z a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and suppose \mathcal{A} is θ -artinian and θ -noetherian. Then each θ -semistable $X \in \mathcal{A}$ admits a filtration $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ for $n \geq 1$, such that $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ is θ -stable for $i = 1, \dots, n$, with $\theta([S_1]) = \cdots = \theta([S_n]) = \theta([X])$. Suppose $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_m = X$ and $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ are two such filtrations with θ -stable factors $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ and $T_k = B_k/B_{k-1}$. Then $m = n$, and for some permutation σ of $1, \dots, n$ we have $S_k \cong T_{\sigma(k)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

2.5 Ext groups and extensions

Finally we recall the properties of the *Ext groups* $\text{Ext}^n(X, Y)$ for X, Y objects in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , following [10, p. 166, 184-5] and [6, p. 233-240].

Definition 2.12. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. Then for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ there are abelian groups $\text{Ext}^n(X, Y)$ with the following properties:

- (i) $\text{Ext}^0(X, Y) = \text{Hom}(X, Y)$.
- (ii) There is a *multiplication* $\text{Ext}^m(X, Y) \times \text{Ext}^n(Y, Z) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^{m+n}(X, Z)$ for $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m, n \geq 0$, which is biadditive and associative.
- (iii) An *extension* of Z by X is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{\iota} Y \xrightarrow{\pi} Z \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{A} . Define $E(Z, X)$ to be the set of equivalence classes of such extensions, where two extensions are equivalent if there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{\iota} & Y & \xrightarrow{\pi} & Z & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \text{id}_X \downarrow & & f \downarrow & & \text{id}_Z \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{\iota'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{\pi'} & Z & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Then there is a natural 1-1 correspondence $E(Z, X) \cong \text{Ext}^1(Z, X)$, which identifies $0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{\iota_X} X \oplus Z \xrightarrow{\pi_Z} Z \rightarrow 0$ with $0 \in \text{Ext}(Z, X)$.

Let \mathbb{K} be a field. We call \mathcal{A} of *finite type over \mathbb{K}* if $\text{Ext}^m(X, Y)$ is a finite-dimensional vector space over \mathbb{K} for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m \geq 0$, and $\text{Ext}^m(X, Y) = 0$ for $m \gg 0$, and multiplication in (ii) is *bilinear*. If \mathcal{A} is of finite type over \mathbb{K} then one can define a bilinear form on the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{A})$, known as the *Euler form*, by

$$\chi([X], [Y]) = \sum_{m \geq 0} (-1)^m \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ext}^m(X, Y). \quad (7)$$

The *numerical Grothendieck group* $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$ is then defined to be

$$K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A}) = K_0(\mathcal{A}) / \{ \alpha \in K_0(\mathcal{A}) : \chi(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \text{ for all } \beta \in K_0(\mathcal{A}) \}.$$

It is a free abelian group, and the Euler form descends to a nondegenerate pairing $\chi : K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A}) \times K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, also known as the Euler form. If $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$ has finite rank then we call \mathcal{A} *numerically finite*. If P is a smooth projective variety over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} then the abelian category \mathcal{A} of coherent sheaves over P is of finite type over \mathbb{K} , and numerically finite.

3 Refining the Jordan–Hölder Theorem

We shall study the following situation.

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category of finite length, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Then X admits a *composition series* $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ by Theorem 2.6, and the *simple factors* $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$ of X are independent of choices, up to isomorphism and permutation of $1, \dots, n$. Suppose $S_k \not\cong S_l$ for $1 \leq k < l \leq n$. Then we say that X has *nonisomorphic simple factors*.

Let X have nonisomorphic simple factors, and let I be an *indexing set* for $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$, so that $|I| = n$, and write $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\} = \{S^i : i \in I\}$. Then Theorem 2.6 implies that for every composition series $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ for X with simple factors $T_k = B_k/B_{k-1}$, there exists a unique bijection $\phi : I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $S^i \cong T_{\phi(i)}$ for all $i \in I$.

Define a *partial order* \preceq on I by $i \preceq j$ for $i, j \in I$ if and only if $\phi(i) \leq \phi(j)$ for all bijections $\phi : I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ constructed from a composition series $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ for X as above. Then (I, \preceq) is a *partially ordered set*, or *poset* for short.

The point of this definition is to treat all the Jordan–Hölder composition series $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ for X on an *equal footing*. Now writing the simple factors of X as S_k for $k = 1, \dots, n$ gives them a preferred order S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n , and so favours one composition series over the rest. So instead we write the simple factors as S^i for $i \in I$, some arbitrary *indexing set*.

To make our notation easier to follow we shall generally use superscripts S^i when $i \in I$ and subscripts T_k when $k = 1, \dots, n$, and write elements of I as i, j , and elements of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ as k, l . Here is some more notation.

Definition 3.2. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset. Define $J \subseteq I$ to be

- (i) an *s-set* if $i \in I, j \in J$ and $i \preceq j$ implies $i \in J$,
- (ii) a *q-set* if $i \in I, j \in J$ and $j \preceq i$ implies $i \in J$, and
- (iii) an *f-set* if $i \in I$ and $h, j \in J$ and $h \preceq i \preceq j$ implies $i \in J$.

The motivation for this is that below s-sets will correspond to *subobjects* $S \subset X$, q-sets to *quotient objects* X/S , and f-sets to *factors* T/S for $S \subset T \subset X$.

Here are some properties of s-sets, q-sets and f-sets.

Proposition 3.3. *Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset. Then*

- (a) I and \emptyset are s-sets. If J, K are s-sets then $J \cap K$ and $J \cup K$ are s-sets.
- (b) J is an s-set if and only if $I \setminus J$ is a q-set.
- (c) If J is an s-set and K a q-set, then $J \cap K$ is an f-set. Every f-set is of this form.
- (d) If $J \subset K$ are s-sets then $K \setminus J$ is an f-set. Every f-set is of this form.
- (e) If J, K are f-sets then $J \cap K$ is an f-set, but $J \cup K$ may not be an f-set.

The proof is elementary, and left as an exercise. For the last part of (c), if $F \subseteq I$ is an f-set, define $J = \{i \in I : i \preceq j \text{ for some } j \in F\}$ and $K = \{i \in I : j \preceq i \text{ for some } j \in F\}$. It easily follows that J is an s-set, K a q-set, and $F = J \cap K$. Similarly, for the last part of (d), if $F \subseteq I$ is an f-set, define $K = \{i \in I : i \preceq j \text{ for some } j \in F\}$ and $J = K \setminus F$. It easily follows that $J \subset K$ are s-sets with $F = K \setminus J$.

Note that (a) and (b) imply that the collections of s-sets and q-sets are both *topologies* on I , but (e) shows that the f-sets may not be a topology on I . Also \preceq can be reconstructed from the set of s-sets on I , as $i \preceq j$ if and only if $i \in J$ for every s-set $J \subset I$ with $j \in J$. In the following series of results we establish 1-1 correspondences between *subobjects*, *quotient objects* and *factors* of X , and *s-sets*, *q-sets* and *f-sets* of I .

Lemma 3.4. *In the situation of Definition 3.1, suppose $S \subset X$ is a subobject. Then there exists a unique s-set $J \subseteq I$ such that the simple factors in any composition series for S are isomorphic to S^i for $i \in J$.*

Proof. Let $0 = B_0 \subset \cdots \subset B_l = S$ be a composition series for S , with simple factors $T_k = B_k/B_{k-1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, l$. Then $0 = B_0 \subset \cdots \subset B_l \subset X$ is a filtration of X without repetitions, and can be refined to a composition series by Theorem 2.6. As T_k is simple, no extra terms are inserted between B_{k-1} and B_k . Thus X has a composition series $0 = B_0 \subset \cdots \subset B_l \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$, with simple factors $T_k = B_k/B_{k-1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$.

By Definition 3.1 there is a unique bijection $\phi : I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $S^i \cong T_{\phi(i)}$ for all $i \in I$. Define $J = \phi^{-1}(\{1, \dots, l\})$. Then $J \subseteq I$, and the simple factors T_k of the composition series $0 = B_0 \subset \cdots \subset B_l = S$ are isomorphic to S^i for $i \in J$. Theorem 2.6 then implies that the simple factors in *any* composition series for S are isomorphic to S^i for $i \in J$.

Uniqueness of J is now clear, as a different J would give different simple factors for S . Suppose $j \in J$ and $i \in I \setminus J$. Then $1 \leq \phi(j) \leq l$ and $l+1 \leq \phi(i) \leq n$, so $\phi(j) < \phi(i)$, which implies that $i \not\preceq j$ by Definition 3.1. Hence if $j \in J$ and $i \in I$ with $i \preceq j$ then $i \in J$, and J is an s-set. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $S, T \subset X$ correspond to s-sets $J, K \subseteq I$, as in Lemma 3.4. Then $S \cap T$ corresponds to $J \cap K$, and $S + T$ corresponds to $J \cup K$.*

Proof. Let $S \cap T$ correspond to the s-set $L \subseteq I$, and $S + T$ to the s-set M . We must show $L = J \cap K$ and $M = J \cup K$. By Theorem 2.6 we may refine the filtration $0 \subset S \cap T \subset S$ to a composition series for S containing one for $S \cap T$. Thus the simple factors of S contain those of $S \cap T$, and $L \subseteq J$. Similarly $L \subseteq K$, so $L \subseteq J \cap K$, and $J \cup K \subseteq M$ as $S, T \subseteq S \cap T$.

Now the simple factors of $S/(S \cap T)$ are S^i for $i \in J \setminus L$, and the simple factors of $(S + T)/T$ are S^i for $i \in M \setminus K$. As $S/(S \cap T) \cong (S + T)/T$ by (4) we see that $J \setminus L = M \setminus K$. Together with $L \subseteq J \cap K$ and $J \cup K \subseteq M$ this implies that $L = J \cap K$ and $M = J \cup K$. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose $S, T \subset X$ correspond to s-sets $J, K \subseteq I$. Then $J \subseteq K$ if and only if $S \subset T \subset X$, and $J = K$ if and only if $S = T$.*

Proof. If $S \subset T \subset X$ we can refine $0 \subset S \subset T \subset X$ to a composition series $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ with $S = B_k$ and $T = B_l$ for $0 \leq k \leq l \leq n$. Let $T_m = B_m/B_{m-1}$. Then the simple factors of S are T_1, \dots, T_k and of T are T_1, \dots, T_l . Hence $J \subseteq K$, as $k \leq l$. This proves the first ‘if’.

Now suppose $S, T \subset X$ and $J \subseteq K$. Then $J \cap K = J$, so $S \cap T$ corresponds to the s-set J . But $S \cap T \subset S$, so $S/(S \cap T)$ has no simple factors, and $S = S \cap T$. Thus $S \subset T$, proving the first ‘only if’. The second part is immediate. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $j \in I$ and define $J^j = \{i \in I : i \preceq j\}$. Then J^j is an s-set, and there exists a subobject $D^j \subset X$ corresponding to J^j .*

Proof. Clearly J^j is an s-set. By Definition 3.1 each composition series $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ for X gives a bijection $\phi : I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_r be the distinct bijections $\phi : I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ realized by composition series for X . For each $k = 1, \dots, r$ choose a composition series $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ with bijection ϕ_k , and define C_k to be the subobject $B_{\phi_k(j)} \subset X$.

This defines subobjects $C_1, \dots, C_r \subset X$, where C_k corresponds to the s-set $\phi_k^{-1}(\{1, \dots, \phi_k(j)\}) \subseteq I$. Define $D^j = C_1 \cap C_2 \cap \cdots \cap C_r$. Then $S \subset X$, and Lemma 3.5 shows that D^j corresponds to the s-set

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^r \phi_k^{-1}(\{1, \dots, \phi_k(j)\}) = \bigcap_{k=1}^r \{i \in I : \phi_k(i) \leq \phi_k(j)\} = \\ \{i \in I : \phi_k(i) \leq \phi_k(j) \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, r\} = \{i \in I : i \preceq j\} = J^j,$$

by definition of \preceq . \square

We can now *classify subobjects* of X in terms of s-sets.

Proposition 3.8. *In the situation of Definitions 3.1 and 3.2, for each s-set $J \subseteq I$ there exists a unique subobject $S \subset X$ such that the simple factors in any composition series for S are isomorphic to S^i for $i \in J$. This defines a 1-1 correspondence between subobjects $S \subset X$ and s-sets $J \subseteq I$.*

Proof. For each $j \in J$ define J^j and D^j as in Lemma 3.7. Then $j \in J^j \subseteq J$, so $J = \bigcup_{j \in J} J^j$. Set $S = \sum_{j \in J} D^j$. Then $S \subset X$ corresponds to the s-set $\bigcup_{j \in J} J^j = J$ by Lemma 3.5. Uniqueness follows from Lemma 3.6. \square

In the same way we classify *quotient objects* of X in terms of q-sets.

Proposition 3.9. *In the situation of Definitions 3.1 and 3.2, for each q-set $K \subseteq I$ there exists a unique quotient object $Q = X/S$ of X such that the simple factors in any composition series for Q are isomorphic to S^i for $i \in K$. This defines a 1-1 correspondence between quotient objects and q-sets.*

Proof. Let $S \subset X$ correspond to an s-set $J \subseteq I$, and let $Q = X/S$ be the quotient object. If the simple factors of S are S^i for $i \in J$, then the simple factors of Q are S^i for $i \in K = I \setminus J$. But $K = I \setminus J$ is a q-set if and only if $J \subseteq I$ is an s-set. The result then follows from Proposition 3.8. \square

We can also classify *composition series* for X .

Proposition 3.10. *In the situation of Definition 3.1, for each bijection $\phi : I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ there exists a unique composition series $0 = B_0 \subset \dots \subset B_n = X$ with $S^i \cong B_{\phi(i)}/B_{\phi(i)-1}$ for all $i \in I$ if and only if $i \preceq j$ implies $\phi(i) \leq \phi(j)$.*

Proof. The ‘only if’ part follows from Definition 3.1. For the ‘if’ part, let $\phi : I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ be a bijection for which $i \preceq j$ implies that $\phi(i) \leq \phi(j)$. Then $\phi^{-1}(\{1, \dots, k\})$ is an s-set for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Let $B_k \subset X$ be the unique subobject corresponding to $\phi^{-1}(\{1, \dots, k\})$, which exists by Proposition 3.8. It easily follows that $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \dots \subset B_n = X$ is the unique composition series with $B_k/B_{k-1} \cong S^{\phi^{-1}(k)}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$, and the result follows. \square

This implies that composition series for X up to isomorphism are in 1-1 correspondence with *total orders* on I compatible with the partial order \preceq . In Definition 3.1 we defined the partial order \preceq on I to be the intersection of all the total orders on I coming from composition series for X . We now see that *every* total order on I compatible with \preceq comes from a composition series.

Recall that a *factor* of X is a quotient T/S for $S \subset T \subset X$. We classify the factors of X in terms of f-sets.

Proposition 3.11. *In the situation of Definitions 3.1 and 3.2, for each f-set $L \subseteq I$ there exists $U \in \mathcal{A}$, unique up to canonical isomorphism, such that*

- (a) *the simple factors in any composition series for U are isomorphic to S^i for $i \in L$, and*
- (b) *if $J \subset K$ are s-sets in I with $K \setminus J = L$, and $S \subset T$ are the corresponding subobjects of X , then there is a canonical isomorphism $U \cong T/S$.*

Proof. Let $L \subseteq I$ be an f-set, and define $K' = \{i \in I : i \preceq j \text{ for some } j \in L\}$ and $J' = K' \setminus L$. Then J', K' are s-sets with $J' \subseteq K'$ and $L = K' \setminus J'$, as in part (d) of Proposition 3.3. Let $S', T' \subset X$ be the unique subobjects corresponding to the s-sets J', K' , which exist by Proposition 3.8. Then $S' \subset T'$ by Lemma 3.6. Define U to be the quotient T'/S' , considered as an object of \mathcal{A} . This is well-defined up to canonical isomorphism in \mathcal{A} .

By Theorem 2.6 we may refine $0 \subset S' \subset T' \subset X$ to a composition series $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \dots \subset B_n = X$ with $S' = B_k$ and $T' = B_l$ for some $0 \leq k \leq l \leq n$. Let $T_m = B_m/B_{m-1}$. Then the simple factors of S' are T_1, \dots, T_k and of T' are T_1, \dots, T_l . Also $0 = (B_k/S') \subset \dots \subset (B_l/S') = U$ is a composition series for U . Thus the simple factors of U are T_{k+1}, \dots, T_l , that is, the simple factors in T' not appearing in S' . Hence the simple factors of U are S^i for $i \in K' \setminus J' = L$, and part (a) follows from Theorem 2.6.

Now let $J \subset K$ be s-sets in I with $K \setminus J = L$, and $S \subset T$ be the corresponding subobjects of X . Then it is easy to see that $J' \subseteq J$ and $K' \subseteq K$, and $J \cap K' = J'$, and $J \cup K' = K$. As $S \cap T'$ corresponds to the s-set $J \cap K'$ by Lemma 3.5, $J \cap K' = J'$ gives $S \cap T' = S'$ by Lemma 3.6. Since $S + T'$ corresponds to the s-set $J \cup K'$ by Lemma 3.5, $J \cup K' = K$ gives $S + T' = T$ by Lemma 3.6.

But (4) gives a canonical isomorphism $T'/(S \cap T') \cong (S + T')/S$, so that $U = T'/S' \cong T/S$, proving part (b). Note also that any U satisfying (a) and (b) must be canonically isomorphic to T'/S' by part (b), so U is unique up to canonical isomorphism. \square

4 Posets (I, \preceq) and (I, \preceq) -configurations in \mathcal{A}

Although a *subobject* of X is an equivalence class of injective $i : S \rightarrow X$, in §3 we for simplicity suppressed the morphisms i , and just wrote $S \subset X$. We shall now change our point of view, and investigate the natural morphisms between the factors T/S of X . Therefore we adopt some new notation, which stresses morphisms between objects. The following definition encodes the properties we expect of the factors of X , and their natural morphisms.

Definition 4.1. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, and use the notation of Definition 3.2. Define $\mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ to be the set of f-sets of I . Define $\mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ to be the subset of $(J, K) \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)} \times \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ such that $J \subseteq K$, and if $j \in J$ and $k \in K$ with $k \preceq j$, then $k \in J$. Define $\mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ to be the subset of $(J, K) \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)} \times \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ such that $K \subseteq J$, and if $j \in J$ and $k \in K$ with $k \preceq j$, then $j \in K$. It is easy to show that $\mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ have the following properties:

- (a) (J, K) lies in $\mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ if and only if $(K, K \setminus J)$ lies in $\mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$.
- (b) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $(J, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$.
- (c) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $(J, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$.
- (d) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$, $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $(J, J \cap L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$, $(J \cap L, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$.

Define an (I, \preceq) -*configuration* (σ, ι, π) in an abelian category \mathcal{A} to be maps $\sigma : \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)} \rightarrow \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$, $\iota : \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)} \rightarrow \text{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$, and $\pi : \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)} \rightarrow \text{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$, where

- (i) $\sigma(J)$ is an object in \mathcal{A} for $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$, with $\sigma(\emptyset) = 0$.
- (ii) $\iota(J, K) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma(K)$ is *injective* for $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and $\iota(J, J) = \text{id}_{\sigma(J)}$.
- (iii) $\pi(J, K) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma(K)$ is *surjective* for $(J, K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and $\pi(J, J) = \text{id}_{\sigma(J)}$.

These should satisfy the conditions:

- (A) Let $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and set $L = K \setminus J$. Then the following is exact in \mathcal{A} :

$$0 \longrightarrow \sigma(J) \xrightarrow{\iota(J, K)} \sigma(K) \xrightarrow{\pi(K, L)} \sigma(L) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (8)$$

- (B) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $\iota(J, L) = \iota(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K)$.
- (C) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $\pi(J, L) = \pi(K, L) \circ \pi(J, K)$.
- (D) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then

$$\pi(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K) = \iota(J \cap L, L) \circ \pi(J, J \cap L). \quad (9)$$

Note that (A)–(D) make sense because of properties (a)–(d), respectively.

The definition will be justified by what follows. Section 4.1 shows that the families of subobjects $S^J \subset X$ in §3 define an (I, \preceq) -configuration, up to canonical isomorphism.

4.1 Sets of subobjects and (I, \preceq) -configurations

We now show that Definition 4.1 captures the properties of the families of subobjects $S^J \subset X$ considered in §3.

Theorem 4.2. *Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, \mathcal{A} an abelian category, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Suppose that for each s-set $J \subseteq I$ we are given a subobject $S^J \subset X$, such that*

$$S^\emptyset = 0, \quad S^I = X, \quad S^A \cap S^B = S^{A \cap B} \quad \text{and} \quad S^A + S^B = S^{A \cup B} \quad (10)$$

for all s-sets $A, B \subseteq I$. Then there exists an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(I) = X$ such that $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow X$ represents $S^J \subset X$ for each s-set $J \subseteq I$. This (σ, ι, π) is unique up to canonical isomorphism in \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Throughout (i)–(iii) and (A)–(D) will refer to Definition 4.1. We divide the proof into the following seven steps:

- Step 1.** Define σ and ι on s-sets, and prove (B) for s-sets.
- Step 2.** For J, K s-sets with $J \cap K = \emptyset$, show $\sigma(J \cup K) \cong \sigma(J) \oplus \sigma(K)$.
- Step 3.** Define σ on f-sets and $\pi(J, L)$ for s-sets J .
- Step 4.** Complete the definitions of ι, π , and prove (A).
- Step 5.** Prove partial versions of (C), (D), mixing s-sets and f-sets.
- Step 6.** Prove (B), (C), and $\iota(J, J) = \pi(J, J) = \text{id}_{\sigma(J)}$ in (ii) and (iii).
- Step 7.** Prove (D).

Step 1. For each s-set $J \subseteq I$, choose $\sigma(J) \in \mathcal{A}$ and an injective morphism $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow X$ representing $S^J \subset X$. Then $\sigma(J)$ and $\iota(J, I)$ are unique up to canonical isomorphism. In particular, choose $\sigma(\emptyset) = 0$ as in (i), $\sigma(I) = X$, and $\iota(I, I) = \text{id}_X$. Suppose $J \subseteq K$ are s-sets. Then (10) implies that $S^J \subset S^K \subset X$. Hence there exists a unique, injective $\iota(J, K) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma(K)$ such that

$$\iota(J, I) = \iota(K, I) \circ \iota(J, K) \quad \text{for } J \subseteq K \text{ s-sets, as in (B).} \quad (11)$$

By uniqueness the two definitions of $\iota(J, I)$ coincide, and $\iota(J, J) = \text{id}_{\sigma(J)}$.

Suppose $J \subseteq K \subseteq L$ are s-sets. Applying (11) to $(K, L), (J, K), (J, L)$ gives

$$\iota(L, I) \circ \iota(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K) = \iota(K, I) \circ \iota(J, K) = \iota(J, I) = \iota(L, I) \circ \iota(J, L).$$

Since $\iota(L, I)$ is injective we can cancel it from both sides, so that

$$\iota(J, L) = \iota(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K), \quad \text{for } J \subseteq K \subseteq L \text{ s-sets, as in (B).} \quad (12)$$

Step 2. Let J, K be s-sets with $J \cap K = \emptyset$. We shall show that

$$\iota(J, J \cup K) \circ \pi_{\sigma(J)} + \iota(K, J \cup K) \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)} : \sigma(J) \oplus \sigma(K) \rightarrow \sigma(J \cup K) \quad (13)$$

is an *isomorphism*. Apply Definition 2.4 with $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow X$ in place of $i : S \rightarrow X$, and $\iota(K, I) : \sigma(K) \rightarrow X$ in place of $j : T \rightarrow X$. By (10) we may take $U = \sigma(I \cap J) = \sigma(\emptyset) = 0$, $V = \sigma(J \cup K)$ and $e = \iota(J \cup K, I)$. The definition gives $c : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma(J \cup K)$ with $\iota(J, I) = \iota(J \cup K, I) \circ c$, so $c = \iota(J, J \cup K)$ by (11) and injectivity of $\iota(J \cup K, I)$. Similarly $d = \iota(K, J \cup K)$. Thus (13) is the second map in (2). As $U = 0$, exactness implies (13) is an isomorphism.

Step 3. Let $L \subseteq I$ be an f-set which is not an s-set or a q-set, and define $J' = \{i \in I \setminus L : l \not\leq i \text{ for all } l \in L\}$ and $K' = J' \cup L$. Then $J' \subset K'$ are s-sets with $L = K' \setminus J'$. Choose $\sigma(L) \in \mathcal{A}$ and a surjective $\pi(K', L) : \sigma(K') \rightarrow \sigma(L)$ which is a *cokernel* for $\iota(J', K') : \sigma(J') \rightarrow \sigma(K')$. Then $\sigma(L)$, $\pi(K', L)$ are unique up to canonical isomorphism.

If L is an s-set then J', L are s-sets with $J' \cap L = \emptyset$, and Step 2 shows that $\sigma(K') \cong \sigma(J') \oplus \sigma(L)$, and we take $\pi(K', L)$ to be the natural projection with $\pi(K', L) \circ \iota(L, K') = \text{id}_{\sigma(L)}$.

Now let $J \subset K$ be s-sets in I with $K \setminus J = L$. Then $J \subseteq J'$ and $K \subseteq K'$, as J', K' are defined to be as large as possible, and $J' \cap K = J$, $J' \cup K' = K'$. Let $c : \sigma(K) \rightarrow C$ be a cokernel for $\iota(J, K)$, and consider the commutative diagram with rows short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma(J) & \xrightarrow{\iota(J,K)} & \sigma(K) & \xrightarrow{c} & C \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \iota(J,J') & & \downarrow \iota(K,K') & & \downarrow h \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma(J') & \xrightarrow{\iota(J',K')} & \sigma(K') & \xrightarrow{\pi(K',L)} & \sigma(L) \longrightarrow 0, \end{array} \quad (14)$$

where h is not yet constructed. The first square of (14) commutes by (12), so

$$0 = \pi(K', L) \circ \iota(J', K') \circ \iota(J, J') = \pi(K', L) \circ \iota(K, K') \circ \iota(J, K).$$

But c is the cokernel of $\iota(J, K)$, so there exists a unique $h : C \rightarrow \sigma(L)$ such that $h \circ c = \pi(K', L) \circ \iota(K, K')$, that is, the second square in (14) commutes.

As $S^J = S^{J'} \cap S^K$ and $S^{K'} = S^{J'} + S^K$ by (10), equation (2) implies that

$$0 \longrightarrow \sigma(J) \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} \iota_{\sigma(J')} \circ \iota(J, J') - \\ \iota_{\sigma(K)} \circ \iota(J, K) \end{smallmatrix}} \sigma(J') \oplus \sigma(K) \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} \iota(J', K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(J')} + \\ \iota(K, K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)} \end{smallmatrix}} \sigma(K') \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. As the composition of the first map with $c \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)}$ is zero we see that

$$c \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)} = l \circ (\iota(J', K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(J')} + \iota(K, K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)})$$

for some unique $l : \sigma(K') \rightarrow C$, by definition of cokernel. Composing with $\iota_{\sigma(J')}$ gives $l \circ \iota(J', K') = 0$, so $l = m \circ \pi(K', L)$ for some unique $m : \sigma(L) \rightarrow C$, by exactness of the bottom line of (14).

Then $m \circ h \circ c = m \circ \pi(K', L) \circ \iota(K, K') = l \circ \iota(K, K') = c = \text{id}_C \circ c$, so as c is surjective we have $m \circ h = \text{id}_C$. Also $\pi(K', L) = h \circ l$, since

$$\begin{aligned} h \circ l \circ (\iota(J', K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(J')} + \iota(K, K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)}) &= h \circ c \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)} = \\ \pi(K', L) \circ \iota(K, K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)} &= \pi(K', L) \circ (\iota(J', K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(J')} + \iota(K, K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)}), \end{aligned}$$

and $\iota(J', K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(J')} + \iota(K, K') \circ \pi_{\sigma(K)}$ is surjective. Hence $h \circ m \circ \pi(K', L) = h \circ l = \pi(K', L) = \text{id}_{\sigma(L)} \circ \pi(K', L)$, and $h \circ m = \text{id}_{\sigma(L)}$ as $\pi(K', L)$ is surjective. Thus $m = h^{-1}$, and h is an *isomorphism*.

Define $\pi(K, L) = \pi(K', L) \circ \iota(K, K')$, so that $\pi(K, L) = h \circ c$ as (14) is commutative. As h is an isomorphism and c is a cokernel for $\iota(J, K)$, we see that $\pi(K, L) : \sigma(K) \rightarrow \sigma(L)$ is a *cokernel* for $\iota(J, K) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma(K)$. Hence $\pi(K, L)$ is *surjective*, and (8) is exact when $J \subseteq K$ are s-sets.

Suppose now that J, K are s-sets and L is an f-set with $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \subseteq)}$ and $(J, L), (K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \subseteq)}$. Define K' using L as above. Then $J \subseteq K \subseteq K'$ and

$$\pi(J, L) = \pi(K', L) \circ \iota(J, K') = \pi(K', L) \circ \iota(K, K') \circ \iota(J, K) = \pi(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K),$$

by (12) and the definitions of $\pi(J, L), \pi(K, L)$. Hence

$$\pi(J, L) = \pi(K, L) \circ \iota(K, J) \quad \text{when } J, K \text{ are s-sets.} \quad (15)$$

Step 4. Let $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \subseteq)}$, and define $A' = \{i \in I \setminus K : k \not\leq i \text{ for all } k \in K\}$, $B' = A' \cup J$ and $C' = A' \cup K$. Then $A' \subseteq B' \subseteq C'$ are s-sets with $J = B' \setminus A'$, $K = C' \setminus A'$, and $K \setminus J = C' \setminus B'$, and they are the *largest* s-sets with this property. Consider the commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & 0 & & 0 & \\ & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma(A') & \xrightarrow{\iota(A', B')} & \sigma(B') & \xrightarrow{\pi(B', J)} & \sigma(J) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \text{id}_{\sigma(A')} \parallel & & \downarrow \iota(B', C') & & \downarrow \iota(J, K) \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma(A') & \xrightarrow{\iota(A', C')} & \sigma(C') & \xrightarrow{\pi(C', K)} & \sigma(K) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow \pi(C', K \setminus J) & & \downarrow \pi(K, K \setminus J) \\ & & & & \sigma(K \setminus J) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\sigma(K \setminus J)}} & \sigma(K \setminus J) \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & & & 0 & & 0. \end{array} \quad (16)$$

Here solid arrows ' \rightarrow ' have already been defined, and dashed arrows ' \dashrightarrow ' remain to be constructed. The left hand square commutes by (12).

Now $\pi(C', K \setminus J) \circ \iota(A', C') = \pi(C', K \setminus J) \circ \iota(B', C') \circ \iota(A', B') = 0$ as the middle column is exact. Since $\pi(C', K)$ is the cokernel of $\iota(A', C')$, there exists a unique $\pi(K, K \setminus J) : \sigma(K) \rightarrow \sigma(K \setminus J)$ with $\pi(K, K \setminus J) \circ \pi(C', K) = \pi(C', K \setminus J)$.

As $\pi(C', K \setminus J)$ is surjective, $\pi(K, K \setminus J)$ is *surjective*, as in (iii). Thus in (16) the lower dashed arrow exists, and the lower square commutes.

Suppose $f : D \rightarrow \sigma(B')$ is a morphism with $\pi(C', K) \circ \iota(B', C') \circ f = 0$. Then there exists a unique $h : D \rightarrow \sigma(A')$ with $\iota(A', C') \circ h = \iota(B', C') \circ f$, as $\iota(A', C')$ is the kernel of $\pi(C', K)$. But then $\iota(B', C') \circ \iota(A', B') \circ h = \iota(B', C') \circ f$, so $\iota(A', B') \circ h = f$ as $\iota(B', C')$ is injective. This implies that $\iota(A', B')$ is the *kernel* of $\pi(C', K) \circ \iota(B', C') : \sigma(B') \rightarrow \sigma(K)$.

Suppose $f : \sigma(K) \rightarrow D$ is a morphism with $f \circ \pi(C', K) \circ \iota(B', C') = 0$. Then there exists a unique $h : \sigma(K \setminus J) \rightarrow D$ with $h \circ \pi(C', K \setminus J) = f \circ \pi(C', K)$, as $\pi(C', K \setminus J)$ is the cokernel of $\iota(B', C')$. But then $h \circ \pi(K, K \setminus J) \circ \pi(C', K) = f \circ \pi(C', K)$, so $h \circ \pi(K, K \setminus J) = f$ as $\pi(C', K)$ is surjective. This implies that $\pi(K, K \setminus J)$ is the *cokernel* of $\pi(C', K) \circ \iota(B', C') : \sigma(B') \rightarrow \sigma(K)$.

Now apply part (iv) of Definition 2.1 to the morphism $\pi(C', K) \circ \iota(B', C') : \sigma(B') \rightarrow \sigma(K)$. As this morphism has kernel $\iota(A', B')$ and cokernel $\pi(K, K \setminus J)$, and $\pi(B', J)$ is the cokernel of $\iota(A', B')$, this gives existence of a unique $\iota(J, K) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma(K)$ with $\iota(J, K) \circ \pi(B', J) = \pi(C', K) \circ \iota(B', C')$, such that $\iota(J, K)$ is the kernel of $\pi(K, K \setminus J)$. This implies that $\iota(J, K)$ is *injective*, as in (ii), and in (16) the upper dashed arrow exists, and the upper right square commutes, and the right hand column is exact, which proves (A).

We should also check that if J, K are s-sets, the definition above gives the same answer for $\iota(J, K)$ as Step 1, and for $\pi(K, K \setminus J)$ as Step 3. If J, K are s-sets then A', J, K are s-sets with $A' \cap J = A' \cap K = \emptyset$, so Step 2 gives $\sigma(B') \cong \sigma(A') \oplus \sigma(J)$ and $\sigma(C') \cong \sigma(A') \oplus \sigma(K)$. Substituting these into (16), we find the definitions are consistent.

Step 5. Let C be an s-set and D, E f-sets with $(C, D), (C, E), (D, E) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$, so that $C \supseteq D \supseteq E$. Apply Step 4 with $J = D \setminus E$ and $K = D$. This gives C' which is the largest s-set with $(C', D) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$, so $C \subseteq C'$. Therefore

$$\pi(C, E) = \pi(C', E) \circ \iota(C, C') = \pi(D, E) \circ \pi(C', D) \circ \iota(C', C) = \pi(D, E) \circ \pi(C, D),$$

using (15) for the first and third steps, and commutativity of the bottom square in (16) for the second. Hence

$$\pi(C, E) = \pi(D, E) \circ \pi(C, D) \quad \text{for } C \text{ an s-set, as in (C)}. \quad (17)$$

Suppose J, K are s-sets and L an f-set with $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$. Then $J \cap L$ is an s-set with $(J, J \cap L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(J \cap L, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$. As in Step 4 with J, K replaced by $J \cap L, L$, define $A' = \{i \in I \setminus L : l \not\preceq i \text{ for all } l \in L\}$, $B' = A' \cup (J \cap L)$ and $C' = A' \cup L$. Then $J \subseteq B'$ and $K \subseteq C'$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(J \cap L, L) \circ \pi(J, J \cap L) &= \iota(J \cap L, L) \circ \pi(B', J \cap L) \circ \iota(J, B') = \\ \pi(C', L) \circ \iota(B', C') \circ \iota(J, B') &= \pi(C', L) \circ \iota(B, C') = \\ \pi(C', L) \circ \iota(K, C') \circ \iota(J, K) &= \pi(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K), \end{aligned}$$

using (15) at the first and fifth steps, commutativity of the upper right square in (16) at the second, and (12) at the third and fourth. This proves

$$\pi(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K) = \iota(J \cap L, L) \circ \pi(J, J \cap L) \quad \text{for } J, K \text{ s-sets, as in (D)}. \quad (18)$$

Step 6. Suppose $(J, K), (K, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and define $D = \{i \in I : i \preceq l \text{ for some } l \in L\}$, $A = D \setminus L$, $B = A \cup J$, and $C = A \cup K$. Then $A \subseteq B \subseteq C \subseteq D$ are s-sets, with $J = B \setminus A$, $K = C \setminus A$, and $L = D \setminus A$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K) \circ \pi(B, J) &= \iota(K, L) \circ \pi(C, K) \circ \iota(B, C) = \\ \pi(D, L) \circ \iota(C, D) \circ \iota(B, C) &= \pi(D, L) \circ \iota(B, D) = \iota(J, L) \circ \pi(B, J), \end{aligned}$$

using (18) at the first, second and fourth steps with $J = B \cap K$, $K = C \cap L$ and $J = B \cap L$ respectively, and (12) at the third. As $\pi(B, J)$ is surjective this implies that $\iota(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K) = \iota(J, L)$, proving (B).

Similarly, suppose $(J, K), (K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and define $D = \{i \in I : i \preceq j \text{ for some } j \in J\}$, $A = D \setminus J$, $B = D \setminus K$, and $C = D \setminus L$. Then $A \subseteq B \subseteq C \subseteq D$ are s-sets, with $J = D \setminus A$, $K = D \setminus B$, and $L = D \setminus C$. Therefore

$$\pi(J, L) \circ \pi(D, J) = \pi(D, L) = \pi(K, L) \circ \pi(D, K) = \pi(K, L) \circ \pi(J, K) \circ \pi(D, J),$$

using (17) three times. As $\pi(D, J)$ is surjective, this proves (C). Applying (B), (C) with $J = K = L$ gives $\iota(J, J) = \pi(J, J) = \text{id}_{\sigma(J)}$, as in (ii) and (iii).

Step 7. Suppose $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and define $C = \{i \in I : i \preceq k \text{ for some } k \in K\}$, $A = C \setminus K$ and $B = A \cup J$. Then $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ are s-sets, with $J = B \setminus A$ and $K = C \setminus A$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K) \circ \pi(B, J) &= \pi(K, L) \circ \pi(C, K) \circ \iota(B, C) = \pi(C, L) \circ \iota(B, C) = \\ \iota(J \cap L, L) \circ \pi(B, J \cap L) &= \iota(J \cap L, L) \circ \pi(J, J \cap L) \circ \pi(B, J), \end{aligned}$$

using (18) at the first and third steps with $J = B \cap K$, $B \cap L = J \cap L$ respectively, and (C) at the second and fourth. As $\pi(B, J)$ is surjective this proves (D).

Hence (σ, ι, π) is an (I, \preceq) -configuration, in the sense of Definition 4.1. It remains only to show that (σ, ι, π) is *unique up to canonical isomorphism* in \mathcal{A} . At each stage in the construction the objects and morphisms were determined either uniquely up to canonical isomorphism, or uniquely. Thus, if (σ, ι, π) , (σ', ι', π') both satisfy the conditions of the theorem, one can go through the steps above and construct a canonical isomorphism between them. \square

Applying the theorem to the situation of §3 gives:

Corollary 4.3. *Let \mathcal{A}, X, I and \preceq be as in Definition 3.1. Then there exists an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(I) = X$ and $\sigma(\{i\}) \cong S^i$ for $i \in I$, such that $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow X$ represents the subobject of X corresponding to J under the 1-1 correspondence of Proposition 3.8 for each s-set $J \subseteq I$, and $\sigma(L)$ is canonically isomorphic to U in Proposition 3.11 for each f-set $L \subseteq I$. This (σ, ι, π) is unique up to canonical isomorphism in \mathcal{A} .*

We can also apply Theorem 4.2 to *filtrations* $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_n = X$, as in Definition 2.5. Set $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, with the usual total order \leq . Then the s-sets of (I, \leq) are $\{1, 2, \dots, j\}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Define $S^{\{1, \dots, j\}} = A_j \subset X$ for $j = 0, \dots, n$. These $S^{\{1, \dots, j\}}$ satisfy (10), and Theorem 4.2 gives:

Corollary 4.4. *Let $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_n = X$ be a filtration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Set $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, with the usual total order \leq . Then there is an (I, \leq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} , unique up to canonical isomorphism, such that $\iota(\{1, \dots, j\}, I) : \sigma(\{1, \dots, j\}) \rightarrow X$ represents $A_j \subset X$ for $j = 0, \dots, n$.*

This shows that we can regard (I, \preceq) -configurations as *generalized filtrations*. Here is the converse to Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 4.5. *Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, \mathcal{A} an abelian category, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Define $X = \sigma(I)$, and let $S^J \subset X$ be represented by $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow X$ for each s -set $J \subseteq I$. Then the S^J satisfy (10).*

Proof. The first two equations of (10) are obvious. So suppose $A, B \subseteq I$ are s -sets. Definition 2.4 with $S = \sigma(A)$, $T = \sigma(B)$, $i = \iota(A, I)$ and $j = \iota(B, I)$ gives $U \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a : U \rightarrow \sigma(A)$, $b : U \rightarrow \sigma(B)$ with $i \circ a = j \circ b$, such that $i \circ a : U \rightarrow X$ represents $S^A \cap S^B$. As $i \circ \iota(A \cap B, A) = \iota(A \cap B, I) = j \circ \iota(A \cap B, B)$, by exactness in (2) there is a unique $h : \sigma(A \cap B) \rightarrow U$ with

$$(\iota_{\sigma(A)} \circ a - \iota_{\sigma(B)} \circ b) \circ h = \iota_{\sigma(A)} \circ \iota(A \cap B, A) - \iota_{\sigma(B)} \circ \iota(A \cap B, B).$$

Composing $\pi_{\sigma(A)}, \pi_{\sigma(B)}$ gives $\iota(A \cap B, A) = a \circ h$ and $\iota(A \cap B, B) = b \circ h$. Now

$$\iota(A \cup B, I) \circ \iota(A, A \cup B) \circ a = i \circ a = j \circ b = \iota(A \cup B, I) \circ \iota(B, A \cup B) \circ b,$$

by Definition 4.1(B). Thus $\iota(A, A \cup B) \circ a = \iota(B, A \cup B) \circ b$, as $\iota(A \cup B, I)$ is injective. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(A, A \setminus B) \circ a &= \iota(A \setminus B, A \setminus B) \circ \pi(A, A \setminus B) \circ a = \\ \pi(A \cup B, A \setminus B) \circ \iota(A, A \cup B) \circ a &= \pi(A \cup B, A \setminus B) \circ \iota(B, A \cup B) \circ b = 0, \end{aligned}$$

using Definition 4.1(D) at the second step and exactness in (A) at the fourth.

But $\iota(A \cap B, A)$ is the kernel of $\pi(A, A \setminus B)$, so there is a unique $h' : U \rightarrow \sigma(A \cap B)$ with $a = \iota(A \cap B, A) \circ h'$. As $\iota(A \cap B, A) = a \circ h$ and $a, \iota(A \cap B, A)$ are injective we see that h, h' are *inverse*, so h is *invertible*. This implies that

$$\iota(A \cap B, I) = \iota(A, I) \circ \iota(A \cap B, A) = \iota(A, I) \circ a \circ h : \sigma(A \cap B) \rightarrow X$$

represents $S^A \cap S^B$, so that $S^{A \cap B} = S^A \cap S^B$. We prove $S^{A \cup B} = S^A + S^B$ in a similar way. \square

4.2 (I, \preceq) -configurations and $K(\mathcal{A})$

Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and $K(\mathcal{A})$ a quotient group of the Grothendieck group, as in Definition 2.2. Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Then each object $\sigma(J)$ for $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ has a class $[\sigma(J)]$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$. The following proposition shows how these classes are related.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose (I, \preceq) is a finite poset, \mathcal{A} an abelian category, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Then there exists a unique map $\kappa : I \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ such that $[\sigma(J)] = \sum_{j \in J} \kappa(j)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$ for all f -sets $J \subseteq I$.*

Proof. Combining Definitions 2.2 and 3.1(A) shows that

$$[\sigma(K)] = [\sigma(J)] + [\sigma(K \setminus J)] \quad \text{for all } (J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}. \quad (19)$$

Define $\kappa : I \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\kappa(i) = [\sigma(\{i\})]$. As $\{i\} \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ for all $i \in I$ this is well-defined, and also any κ satisfying $[\sigma(J)] = \sum_{j \in J} \kappa(j)$ for $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ has $\kappa(i) = [\sigma(\{i\})]$, so κ is *unique*.

Suppose $K \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ with $|K| \geq 1$. Let $j \in K$ be *minimal*. Then $(\{j\}, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$, so (19) gives $[\sigma(K)] = \kappa(j) + [\sigma(K \setminus \{j\})]$. We then easily prove $[\sigma(J)] = \sum_{j \in J} \kappa(j)$ for all $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ by induction on $|J|$, completing the proof. \square

4.3 Configurations and flasque sheaves

We briefly describe an alternative point of view on configurations, explained to me by Tom Bridgeland. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then as in §3 the q-sets in I are the open sets of a *topology* on I .

It can be shown that the data $\sigma(J)$ and $\pi(J, K) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma(K)$ for all q-sets $I \supseteq J \supseteq K$ comprises a *flasque sheaf* \mathcal{S} on I with the q-set topology, with values in \mathcal{A} . The rest of the data (σ, ι, π) can be reconstructed, up to canonical isomorphism, from the $\sigma(J)$ and $\pi(J, K)$ for q-sets J, K — this is essentially Theorems 4.2 and 4.5 with s-sets replaced by q-sets.

The f-sets $J \subseteq I$ are the *locally closed sets* in the q-set topology. In fact, a topology on a finite set I comes from a (unique) partial order \preceq if and only if every point is locally closed. For f-sets J we interpret $\sigma(J)$ as the sections of \mathcal{S} near J locally supported on J .

Alternatively, we can take the s-sets to be the open sets of a topology on I , which is more compatible with §3 and §4.1. Then (σ, ι, π) is equivalent to a *flasque cosheaf* with values in \mathcal{A} , or equivalently, a flasque sheaf with values in the *opposite category* \mathcal{A}° .

Probably one could use this to reduce parts of our theory to known facts on sheaves, and so shorten the proofs. In particular, Theorems 4.2 and 5.5 look like instances of general sheaf results. But I have been unable to find appropriate references. Note however that Baclawski [1, §1] studies sheaves on posets with the q-set topology. He calls q-sets *increasing subsets*, or *order filters*.

5 New (I, \preceq) -configurations from old

Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then we can derive (K, \preceq) -configurations $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ in \mathcal{A} from (σ, ι, π) for other, simpler finite posets (K, \preceq) , by forgetting some of the objects and morphisms in (σ, ι, π) . The next two definitions give two ways to do this.

Definition 5.1. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, and use the notation of §3 and §4. Suppose J is an f-set in I , so that $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$. Then (J, \preceq) is also a finite poset, and $K \subseteq J$ is an f-set in (J, \preceq) if and only if it is an f-set in (I, \preceq) . Hence

$\mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$. One can also show that $\mathcal{G}_{(J, \preceq)} = \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)} \cap (\mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)} \times \mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)})$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(J, \preceq)} = \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)} \cap (\mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)} \times \mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)})$, so that $\mathcal{G}_{(J, \preceq)} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(J, \preceq)} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$.

Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , and define $\sigma' : \mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)} \rightarrow \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$, $\iota' : \mathcal{G}_{(J, \preceq)} \rightarrow \text{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\pi' : \mathcal{H}_{(J, \preceq)} \rightarrow \text{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ by $\sigma' = \sigma|_{\mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)}}$, $\iota' = \iota|_{\mathcal{G}_{(J, \preceq)}}$ and $\pi' = \pi|_{\mathcal{H}_{(J, \preceq)}}$. Then (A)–(D) of Definition 4.1 for (σ, ι, π) imply (A)–(D) for (σ', ι', π') , so (σ', ι', π') is a (J, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . We call (σ', ι', π') a *subconfiguration* of (σ, ι, π) .

Definition 5.2. Let (I, \preceq) and (K, \trianglelefteq) be finite posets, and $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ a *surjective* map with $\phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)$ when $i, j \in I$ with $i \preceq j$. Use the notation of §3 and §4. If $J \subseteq K$ is an f-set in K then $\phi^{-1}(J) \subseteq I$ is an f-set in I . Hence $\phi^*(\mathcal{F}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$, where ϕ^* pulls back subsets of K to subsets of I in the obvious way. Similarly, if $(A, B) \in \mathcal{G}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)}$ then $(\phi^{-1}(A), \phi^{-1}(B)) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and if $(A, B) \in \mathcal{H}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)}$ then $(\phi^{-1}(A), \phi^{-1}(B)) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$.

Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , and define $\tilde{\sigma} : \mathcal{F}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)} \rightarrow \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$, $\tilde{\iota} : \mathcal{G}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)} \rightarrow \text{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\tilde{\pi} : \mathcal{H}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)} \rightarrow \text{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ by $\tilde{\sigma}(A) = \sigma(\phi^{-1}(A))$, $\tilde{\iota}(A, B) = \iota(\phi^{-1}(A), \phi^{-1}(B))$, and $\tilde{\pi}(A, B) = \pi(\phi^{-1}(A), \phi^{-1}(B))$. Then $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is a (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . We call $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ a *quotient configuration* of (σ, ι, π) . We also call (σ, ι, π) a *refinement* of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$, generalizing the notion of refinement of filtrations in §2.3.

Compositions of these constructions all behave in the obvious ways. Next we explain a method to *glue two configurations* (σ', ι', π') , $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ together, to get (σ, ι, π) containing (σ', ι', π') as a *subconfiguration*, and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ as a *quotient configuration*. Consider the following situation.

Definition 5.3. Let (J, \lesssim) and (K, \trianglelefteq) be finite posets and $L \subset K$ an f-set, with $J \cap (K \setminus L) = \emptyset$. Suppose $\psi : J \rightarrow L$ is a surjective map with $\psi(i) \trianglelefteq \psi(j)$ when $i, j \in J$ with $i \lesssim j$. Set $I = J \cup (K \setminus L)$, and define a binary relation \preceq on I by

$$i \preceq j \quad \text{for } i, j \in I \quad \text{if} \quad \begin{cases} i \lesssim j, & i, j \in J, \\ i \trianglelefteq j, & i, j \in K \setminus L, \\ \psi(i) \trianglelefteq j, & i \in J, \quad j \in K \setminus L, \\ i \trianglelefteq \psi(j), & i \in K \setminus L, \quad j \in J. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

It can be shown that \preceq is a *partial order* on I , and $J \subseteq I$ is an f-set in (I, \preceq) . The restriction of \preceq to J is \lesssim . Define $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ by $\phi(i) = \psi(i)$ if $i \in J$ and $\phi(i) = i$ if $i \in K \setminus L$. Then ϕ is *surjective*, with $\phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)$ when $i, j \in I$ with $i \preceq j$, as in Definition 5.2.

An (I, \preceq) -configuration gives the same (L, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in two ways.

Lemma 5.4. *In the situation of Definition 5.3, suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian category, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Let (σ', ι', π') be its (J, \lesssim) -subconfiguration, and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ its quotient (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration from ϕ . Let $(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi})$ be the quotient (L, \trianglelefteq) -configuration from (σ', ι', π') and ψ , and $(\check{\sigma}, \check{\iota}, \check{\pi})$ the (L, \trianglelefteq) -subconfiguration from $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. Then $(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi}) = (\check{\sigma}, \check{\iota}, \check{\pi})$.*

Our third construction is a kind of converse to Lemma 5.4.

Theorem 5.5. *In the situation of Definition 5.3, let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, (σ', ι', π') a (J, \lesssim) -configuration in \mathcal{A} , and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ a (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Define $(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi})$ to be the quotient (L, \trianglelefteq) -configuration from (σ', ι', π') and ψ , and $(\check{\sigma}, \check{\iota}, \check{\pi})$ to be the (L, \trianglelefteq) -subconfiguration from $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$.*

Suppose $(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi}) = (\check{\sigma}, \check{\iota}, \check{\pi})$. Then there exists an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} , unique up to canonical isomorphism, such that (σ', ι', π') is its (J, \lesssim) -subconfiguration, and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ its quotient (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration from ϕ .

Proof. We divide the proof into the following five steps:

Step 1. Characterize (I, \preceq) s-sets.

Step 2. Define $\sigma(B)$ for all (I, \preceq) s-sets, and some morphisms $\iota(B, C)$.

Step 3. Define $\iota(B, B')$ for all (I, \preceq) s-sets $B \subseteq B' \subseteq I$, and prove $\iota = \iota \circ \iota$.

Step 4. Let S^B be the subobject represented by $\iota(B, I) : \sigma(B) \rightarrow \sigma(I) = X$ for all (I, \preceq) s-sets B . Show that the S^B satisfy (10).

Step 5. Apply Theorem 4.2 to construct (σ, ι, π) , and complete the proof.

Step 1. The proof of the next lemma is elementary, and left as an exercise.

Lemma 5.6. *In the situation above, let $B \subseteq I$ be an s-set in (I, \preceq) . Define*

$$P = \{k \in K : \text{if } i \in I \text{ and } \phi(i) \trianglelefteq k, \text{ then } i \in B\}, \quad \text{and} \quad (21)$$

$$R = \{k \in K : k \trianglelefteq \phi(i) \text{ for some } i \in B\}. \quad (22)$$

Define $A = \phi^{-1}(P)$ and $C = \phi^{-1}(R)$. Then $P \subseteq R$ are (K, \trianglelefteq) s-sets, and $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ are (I, \preceq) s-sets, with $P \setminus L = R \setminus L = B \setminus J$. Define $D = A \cap J$, $E = B \cap J$ and $F = C \cap J$. Then $D \subseteq E \subseteq F$ are (J, \lesssim) s-sets, with

$$(P, R) \in \mathcal{G}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)} \quad \text{and} \quad (D, E), (D, F), (E, F) \in \mathcal{G}_{(J, \lesssim)}. \quad (23)$$

Define $U = P \cap L$ and $W = R \cap L$. Then $U \subseteq W$ are (L, \trianglelefteq) s-sets with $\phi^{-1}(U) = \psi^{-1}(U) = D$ and $\phi^{-1}(W) = \psi^{-1}(W) = F$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma'(D) = \hat{\sigma}(U) = \check{\sigma}(U) = \tilde{\sigma}(U), \quad \text{and similarly } \sigma'(F \setminus D) = \tilde{\sigma}(W \setminus U), \\ \sigma'(F) = \tilde{\sigma}(W), \quad \iota'(D, F) = \tilde{\iota}(U, W), \quad \pi'(F, F \setminus D) = \tilde{\pi}(W, W \setminus U). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Here P, R are the largest, smallest (K, \trianglelefteq) s-sets with $\phi^{-1}(P) \subseteq B \subseteq \phi^{-1}(R)$.

Step 2. Let B be an (I, \preceq) s-set, and use the notation of Lemma 5.6. As $R \setminus P = W \setminus U$ we have $\tilde{\sigma}(R \setminus P) = \tilde{\sigma}(W \setminus U) = \sigma'(F \setminus D)$ by (24). Consider

$$\pi'(F \setminus D, F \setminus E) \circ \tilde{\pi}(R, R \setminus P) : \tilde{\sigma}(R) \rightarrow \sigma'(F \setminus E). \quad (25)$$

Choose $\sigma(B) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\iota(B, C) : \sigma(B) \rightarrow \sigma(C) = \tilde{\sigma}(R)$ to be a *kernel* for (25). If $B = \phi^{-1}(Q)$ for some (K, \trianglelefteq) s-set Q then $B = C$ and (25) is zero, and we choose $\sigma(B) = \tilde{\sigma}(R)$ and $\iota(B, C) = \text{id}_{\sigma(B)}$. Define $\iota(B, I) = \tilde{\iota}(R, K) \circ \iota(B, C)$.

Step 3. Let $B \subseteq B'$ be (I, \preceq) s-sets. Use the notation of Lemma 5.6 for B , and $P', R', A', C', D', E', F'$ for B' in the obvious way. Then $P \subseteq P', R \subseteq R'$, and so on. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi'(F' \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R', R' \setminus P') \circ \tilde{\iota}(R, R') \circ \iota(B, C) = \\ & \pi'(F' \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \tilde{\iota}(R \setminus P', R' \setminus P') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R, R \setminus P') \circ \iota(B, C) = \\ & \pi'(F' \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \iota'(F \setminus D', F' \setminus D') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R \setminus P, R \setminus P') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R, R \setminus P) \circ \iota(B, C) = \\ & \iota'(F \setminus E', F' \setminus E') \circ \pi'(F \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \pi'(F \setminus D, F \setminus D') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R, R \setminus P) \circ \iota(B, C) = \\ & \iota'(F \setminus E', F' \setminus E') \circ \pi'(F \setminus E, F' \setminus E') \circ \pi'(F \setminus D, F \setminus E) \circ \tilde{\pi}(R, R \setminus P) \circ \iota(B, C) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

using Definition 4.1(C), (D), and the definition of $\iota(B, C)$.

Thus, as $\iota(B', C')$ is the kernel of $\pi'(F' \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R', R' \setminus P')$, there exists a unique $\iota(B, B')$ with $\tilde{\iota}(R, R') \circ \iota(B, C) = \iota(B', C') \circ \iota(B, B')$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(B', I) \circ \iota(B, B') &= \tilde{\iota}(R', K) \circ \iota(B', C') \circ \iota(B, B') = \\ & \tilde{\iota}(R', K) \circ \tilde{\iota}(R, R') \circ \iota(B, C) = \tilde{\iota}(R, K) \circ \iota(B, C) = \iota(B, I). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (12) from (11) then gives

$$\iota(B, B'') = \iota(B', B'') \circ \iota(B, B') \quad \text{when } B \subseteq B' \subseteq B'' \text{ are } (I, \preceq) \text{ s-sets.} \quad (26)$$

Step 4. Set $X = \sigma(I) = \tilde{\sigma}(K)$, and for each (I, \preceq) s-set B let $S^B \subset X$ be subobject represented by $\iota(B, I) : \sigma(B) \rightarrow \sigma(I) = X$. We must prove that these S^B satisfy (10). The first two equations of (10) are immediate. Let B', B'' be (I, \preceq) s-sets, and $B = B' \cap B''$. We shall show that $S^B = S^{B'} \cap S^{B''}$.

Use the notation of Lemma 5.6 for B , and P', R', \dots for B' and P'', R'', \dots for B'' in the obvious way. Apply Definition 2.4 with $i = \iota(B', I)$ and $j = \iota(B'', I)$, giving $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$ and morphisms a, b, c, d, e with $i \circ a = j \circ b$, $i = e \circ c$ and $j = e \circ d$, such that $i \circ a : U \rightarrow X$ represents $S^{B'} \cap S^{B''}$.

Set $\hat{C} = C' \cap C''$, $\hat{R} = R' \cap R''$ and $\hat{F} = F' \cap F''$, so that $C \subseteq \hat{C}$, $R \subseteq \hat{R}$, $F \subseteq \hat{F}$, $\hat{C} = \phi^{-1}(\hat{R})$, and $\hat{F} = \hat{C} \cap J$. Define $\hat{a} : U \rightarrow \sigma(C')$ and $\hat{b} : U \rightarrow \sigma(C'')$ by $\hat{a} = \iota(B', C') \circ a$ and $\hat{b} = \iota(B'', C'') \circ b$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\iota}(R', K) \circ \hat{a} &= \tilde{\iota}(R', K) \circ \iota(B', C') \circ a = \iota(B', I) \circ a = i \circ a = \\ & j \circ b = \iota(B'', I) \circ b = \tilde{\iota}(R'', K) \circ \iota(B'', C'') \circ b = \tilde{\iota}(R'', K) \circ \hat{b}. \end{aligned}$$

As $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is a configuration we see that $S^{\hat{C}} = S^{C'} \cap S^{C''}$ by Theorem 4.5. Thus there is a unique $\hat{h} : U \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}(\hat{R})$ with $\hat{a} = \tilde{\iota}(\hat{R}, R') \circ \hat{h}$ and $\hat{b} = \tilde{\iota}(\hat{R}, R'') \circ \hat{h}$.

As $\iota(B', C')$ is the kernel of $\pi'(F' \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R', R' \setminus P')$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \pi'(F' \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R', R' \setminus P') \circ \iota(B', C') \circ a = \\ & \pi'(F' \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R', R' \setminus P') \circ \hat{a} = \\ & \pi'(F' \setminus D', F' \setminus E') \circ \tilde{\pi}(R', R' \setminus P') \circ \tilde{\iota}(\hat{R}, R') \circ \hat{h} = \dots = \\ & \iota'(\hat{F} \setminus E', F' \setminus E') \circ \pi'(\hat{F} \setminus E, \hat{F} \setminus E') \circ \pi'(F \setminus D, \hat{F} \setminus E) \circ \tilde{\pi}(\hat{R}, \hat{R} \setminus P) \circ \hat{h}, \end{aligned}$$

by Definition 4.1(C), (D). Since $\iota'(\hat{F} \setminus E', F' \setminus E')$ is injective this gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi'(\hat{F} \setminus E, \hat{F} \setminus E') \circ \pi'(\hat{F} \setminus D, \hat{F} \setminus E) \circ \tilde{\pi}(\hat{R}, \hat{R} \setminus P) \circ \hat{h} = 0, \\ \text{and } & \pi'(\hat{F} \setminus E, \hat{F} \setminus E'') \circ \pi'(\hat{F} \setminus D, \hat{F} \setminus E) \circ \tilde{\pi}(\hat{R}, \hat{R} \setminus P) \circ \hat{h} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

proving the second equation in the same way using B'', C'', \dots

As (σ', ι', π') is a configuration and $E = E' \cap E''$, one can show that

$$\iota_{\sigma'(\hat{F} \setminus E')} \circ \pi'(\hat{F} \setminus E, \hat{F} \setminus E') + \iota_{\sigma'(\hat{F} \setminus E'')} \circ \pi'(\hat{F} \setminus E, \hat{F} \setminus E'')$$

is an *injective* morphism $\sigma'(\hat{F} \setminus E) \rightarrow \sigma'(\hat{F} \setminus E') \oplus \sigma'(\hat{F} \setminus E'')$. Therefore

$$\pi'(\hat{F} \setminus D, \hat{F} \setminus E) \circ \tilde{\pi}(\hat{R}, \hat{R} \setminus P) \circ \hat{h} = 0, \quad (28)$$

by (27). Composing (28) with $\pi'(\hat{F} \setminus E, \hat{F} \setminus F)$ and using Definition 4.1(C) shows that $\tilde{\pi}(\hat{R}, \hat{R} \setminus R) \circ \hat{h} = 0$. But $\tilde{i}(R, \hat{R})$ is the kernel of $\tilde{\pi}(\hat{R}, \hat{R} \setminus R)$, so $\hat{h} = \tilde{i}(R, \hat{R}) \circ \tilde{h}$ for some unique $\tilde{h} : U \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}(R) = \sigma(C)$.

Substituting $\hat{h} = \tilde{i}(R, \hat{R}) \circ \tilde{h}$ into (28) and using Definition 4.1(D) gives

$$\iota'(F \setminus E, \hat{F} \setminus E) \circ \pi'(F \setminus D, F \setminus E) \circ \tilde{\pi}(R, R \setminus P) \circ \tilde{h} = 0.$$

Hence $\pi'(F \setminus D, F \setminus E) \circ \tilde{\pi}(R, R \setminus P) \circ \tilde{h} = 0$, as $\iota'(F \setminus E, \hat{F} \setminus E)$ is injective. Thus, as $\iota(B, C)$ is the kernel of (25), there is a unique $h : U \rightarrow \sigma(B)$ with $\tilde{h} = \iota(B, C) \circ h$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(B', C') \circ a &= \hat{a} = \tilde{i}(\hat{R}, R') \circ \hat{h} = \tilde{i}(\hat{R}, R') \circ \tilde{i}(R, \hat{R}) \circ \tilde{h} = \\ & \tilde{i}(R, R') \circ \iota(B, C) \circ h = \iota(B, C') \circ h = \iota(B', C') \circ \iota(B, B') \circ h \end{aligned}$$

by (26), so $a = \iota(B, B') \circ h$ as $\iota(B', C')$ is injective, and similarly $b = \iota(B, B'') \circ h$.

Recall the definition of i, j, U, V, a, \dots, e above. By (26) we have

$$\begin{aligned} e \circ c \circ \iota(B, B') &= i \circ \iota(B, B') = \iota(B', I) \circ \iota(B, B') = \iota(B, I) = \\ & \iota(B'', I) \circ \iota(B, B'') = j \circ \iota(B, B'') = e \circ d \circ \iota(B, B''). \end{aligned}$$

Since e is injective this gives $c \circ \iota(B, B') = d \circ \iota(B, B'')$, and hence

$$(c \circ \pi_{\sigma(B')} \oplus d \circ \pi_{\sigma(B'')}) \circ (\iota_{\sigma(B')} \circ \iota(B, B') - \iota_{\sigma(B'')} \circ \iota(B, B'')) = 0,$$

factoring via $\sigma(B') \oplus \sigma(B'')$. So by (2) there is a unique $m : \sigma(B) \rightarrow U$ with

$$\iota_{\sigma(B')} \circ \iota(B, B') - \iota_{\sigma(B'')} \circ \iota(B, B'') = (\iota_{\sigma(B')} \circ a - \iota_{\sigma(B'')} \circ b) \circ m.$$

Composing with $\pi_{\sigma(B')}$ gives $\iota(B, B') = a \circ m$. As $a = \iota(B, B') \circ h$ and $a, \iota(B, B')$ are injective, we see that m and h are *inverse*, so h is an *isomorphism*.

Since $S^{B'} \cap S^{B''}$ is represented by $\iota(B', I) \circ a = \iota(B', I) \circ \iota(B, B') \circ h = \iota(B, I) \circ h$ and S^B by $\iota(B, I)$, this proves that $S^B = S^{B'} \cap S^{B''}$ for all (I, \preceq) s-sets B', B'' and $B = B' \cap B''$. A similar proof shows that $S^B = S^{B'} + S^{B''}$ when $B = B' \cup B''$. Hence the S^B satisfy (10).

Step 5. Theorem 4.2 now constructs an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) , unique up to canonical isomorphism, from the S^B . It follows from the construction of the S^B that the (J, \lesssim) -subconfiguration of (σ, ι, π) is canonically isomorphic to (σ', ι', π') , and the quotient (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration from ϕ is canonically isomorphic to $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. It is not difficult to see that we can choose (σ, ι, π) so that these sub- and quotient configurations are equal to (σ', ι', π') and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.5. \square

The case when $L = \{l\}$ is one point will be particularly useful.

Definition 5.7. Let (J, \lesssim) and (K, \trianglelefteq) be nonempty finite posets with $J \cap K = \emptyset$, and $l \in K$. Set $I = J \cup (K \setminus \{l\})$, and define a partial order \preceq on I by

$$i \preceq j \quad \text{for } i, j \in I \text{ if } \begin{cases} i \lesssim j, & i, j \in J, \\ i \trianglelefteq j, & i, j \in K \setminus \{l\}, \\ l \trianglelefteq j, & i \in J, \quad j \in K \setminus \{l\}, \\ i \trianglelefteq l, & i \in K \setminus \{l\}, \quad j \in J, \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

and a surjective map $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ by $\phi(i) = l$ if $i \in J$, and $\phi(i) = i$ if $i \in K \setminus \{l\}$.

Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, (σ', ι', π') a (J, \lesssim) -configuration in \mathcal{A} , and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ a (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma'(J) = \tilde{\sigma}(\{l\})$. Then by Theorem 5.5 there exists an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} , unique up to canonical isomorphism, such that (σ', ι', π') is its (J, \lesssim) -subconfiguration, and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ its quotient (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration from ϕ . We call (σ, ι, π) the *substitution of (σ', ι', π') into $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$* .

6 Improvements and best configurations

We now study *quotient configurations* from (I, \preceq) , (K, \trianglelefteq) when $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ is a *bijection*. So we identify I, K and regard \preceq, \trianglelefteq as two partial orders on I .

Definition 6.1. Let I be a finite set and \preceq, \trianglelefteq partial orders on I such that if $i \preceq j$ then $i \trianglelefteq j$ for $i, j \in I$. Then we say that \trianglelefteq *dominates* \preceq , and \trianglelefteq *strictly dominates* \preceq if \preceq, \trianglelefteq are distinct. Let s be the number of pairs $(i, j) \in I \times I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ but $i \not\preceq j$. Then we say that \trianglelefteq *dominates \preceq by s steps*. Clearly, \trianglelefteq strictly dominates \preceq if and only if $s > 0$. Also

$$\mathcal{F}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}. \quad (30)$$

We shall see below that for distinct \preceq, \trianglelefteq the second two inclusions are strict.

For each (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in an abelian category \mathcal{A} we have a quotient (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$, as in Definition 5.2 with $\phi = \text{id} : I \rightarrow I$. We call (σ, ι, π) an *improvement* or an (I, \preceq) -*improvement* of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$, and a *strict improvement* if \preceq, \trianglelefteq are distinct. If \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by s steps we also call (σ, ι, π) an *s step improvement* of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$.

We call an (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ *best* if there exists no strict improvement (σ, ι, π) of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. Note that improvements are a special kind of *refinement*, in the sense of Definition 5.2.

Our first result is simple. An (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) cannot have an infinite sequence of strict improvements, as I has finitely many partial orders. Thus, after finitely many steps we must reach an (I, \preceq) -configuration with no strict improvements, that is, a *best* configuration. This gives:

Lemma 6.2. *Let (I, \trianglelefteq) be a finite poset, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then (σ, ι, π) can be improved to a best (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ', ι', π') , for some partial order \preceq on I dominated by \trianglelefteq .*

After some preliminary results on partial orders in §6.1, section 6.2 proves a criterion for *best configurations* in terms of *split* short exact sequences.

6.1 Partial orders \trianglelefteq, \preceq where \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq

We study partial orders \trianglelefteq, \preceq on I where \trianglelefteq strictly dominates \preceq .

Lemma 6.3. *Let \trianglelefteq, \preceq be partial orders on a finite set I , where \trianglelefteq strictly dominates \preceq . Then there exist $i, j \in I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ and $i \not\preceq j$, such that there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \trianglelefteq k \trianglelefteq j$. Also*

$$(\{j\}, \{i, j\}) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)} \quad \text{and} \quad (\{i, j\}, \{i\}) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)}. \quad (31)$$

Proof. As \trianglelefteq strictly dominates \preceq there exist $i, j \in I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ and $i \not\preceq j$. Suppose there exists $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \trianglelefteq k \trianglelefteq j$. Then as $i \not\preceq j$ either (a) $i \not\preceq k$, or (b) $k \not\preceq j$. In case (a) we replace j by k , and in case (b) we replace i by k . Then the new i, j satisfy the original conditions, but are ‘closer together’ than the old i, j . As I is finite, repeating this process finitely many times we reach i, j for which there exists no such k . Equation (31) easily follows. \square

This implies that if \trianglelefteq strictly dominates \preceq then $\mathcal{G}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ in (30) are *strict* inclusions. But $\mathcal{F}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ need not be strict. For example, if $I = \{1, 2\}$ with $1 \trianglelefteq 2$ the only nontrivial relation, then $\mathcal{F}_{(I, \trianglelefteq)} = \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ are both the set of all subsets of I .

The following elementary lemma characterizes \trianglelefteq, \preceq differing by one step.

Lemma 6.4. *Let (I, \trianglelefteq) be a finite poset, and suppose $i \neq j \in I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ but there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \trianglelefteq k \trianglelefteq j$. Define \preceq on I by $a \preceq b$ if and only if $a \trianglelefteq b$ and $a \neq i, b \neq j$. Then \preceq is a partial order and \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by one step. Conversely, if \preceq is a partial order and \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by one step then \preceq arises as above for some unique $i, j \in I$.*

If \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by s steps, we can interpolate a chain of $s + 1$ partial orders differing by one step.

Proposition 6.5. *Let I be a finite set and \preceq, \trianglelefteq partial orders on I , where \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by s steps. Then there exist partial orders $\trianglelefteq = \lesssim_0, \lesssim_1, \dots, \lesssim_s = \preceq$ on I such that \lesssim_{r-1} dominates \lesssim_r by one step, for $r = 1, \dots, s$.*

Proof. Define $\lesssim_0 = \trianglelefteq$. Suppose by induction that $\lesssim_0, \dots, \lesssim_m$ have been chosen for $0 \leq m < s$ such that \lesssim_{r-1} dominates \lesssim_r by one step and \lesssim_r dominates \preceq by $s - r$ steps for $r = 1, \dots, m$. Then \lesssim_m strictly dominates \preceq as $s - m > 0$, so by Lemma 6.3 there exist $i, j \in I$ with $i \lesssim_m j$ but $i \not\lesssim_m j$, and such that there exist no $i \neq k \neq j$ with $i \lesssim_m k \lesssim_m j$.

Define \lesssim_{m+1} by $a \lesssim_{m+1} b$ if $a \lesssim_m b$ and $a \neq i, b \neq j$. Then \lesssim_{m+1} is a partial order on I and \lesssim_m dominates \lesssim_{m+1} by one step by Lemma 6.4, and \lesssim_{m+1} dominates \preceq by $s - m - 1$ steps. Therefore by induction $\lesssim_0, \dots, \lesssim_s$ exist, and as \lesssim_s dominates \preceq by 0 steps we have $\lesssim = \preceq$. \square

6.2 Best (I, \preceq) -configurations and split sequences

We now prove a criterion for *best* (I, \trianglelefteq) -configurations. First we decompose certain objects $\sigma(J \cup K)$ as *direct sums* $\sigma(J) \oplus \sigma(K)$.

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose (I, \preceq) is a finite poset, \mathcal{A} an abelian category, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Let $J, K \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ with $j \not\lesssim k$ and $k \not\lesssim j$ for all $j \in J$ and $k \in K$. Then $J \cup K \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ is an f -set and there is a canonical isomorphism $\sigma(J) \oplus \sigma(K) \cong \sigma(J \cup K)$ identifying $\iota_{\sigma(J)}, \iota_{\sigma(K)}, \pi_{\sigma(J)}, \pi_{\sigma(K)}$ with $\iota(J, J \cup K), \iota(K, J \cup K), \pi(J \cup K, J), \pi(J \cup K, K)$ respectively. Hence*

$$\iota(J, J \cup K) \circ \pi(J \cup K, J) + \iota(K, J \cup K) \circ \pi(J \cup K, K) = \text{id}_{\sigma(J \cup K)}. \quad (32)$$

Proof. The conditions on J, K imply that $J \cap K = \emptyset$ and $J \cup K \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ with $(J, J \cup K), (K, J \cup K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(J \cup K, J), (J \cup K, K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$. Definition 4.1(A) applied to $(J, J \cup K)$ shows that $\pi(J \cup K, K) \circ \iota(J, J \cup K) = 0$, and similarly $\pi(J \cup K, J) \circ \iota(K, J \cup K) = 0$. Parts (ii), (iii) and (D) of Definition 4.1 with $J, J \cup K, J$ in place of J, K, L give $\pi(J \cup K, J) \circ \iota(J, J \cup K) = \iota(J, J) \circ \pi(J, J) = \text{id}_{\sigma(J)}$, and similarly $\pi(J \cup K, K) \circ \iota(K, J \cup K) = \text{id}_{\sigma(K)}$. The proposition then quickly follows from Popescu [16, Cor. 2.7.4, p. 48]. \square

Recall from Definition 2.2 that a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{A} is called *split* if there is a compatible isomorphism $Y \cong X \oplus Z$.

Proposition 6.7. *Suppose (I, \trianglelefteq) is a finite poset, \mathcal{A} an abelian category, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} which is not best. Then there exist $i \neq j \in I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ but there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \trianglelefteq k \trianglelefteq j$, such that the following short exact sequence is split:*

$$0 \longrightarrow \sigma(\{i\}) \xrightarrow{\iota(\{i\}, \{i, j\})} \sigma(\{i, j\}) \xrightarrow{\pi(\{i, j\}, \{j\})} \sigma(\{j\}) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (33)$$

Proof. As (σ, ι, π) is not best it has a strict (I, \preceq) -improvement (σ', ι', π') , for some \preceq dominated by \trianglelefteq . Let i, j be as in Lemma 6.3. Then $i \neq j$ as $i \not\lesssim j$, and there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \trianglelefteq k \trianglelefteq j$. As $i \not\lesssim j, j \not\lesssim i$

Proposition 6.6 shows that $\sigma'(\{i, j\}) \cong \sigma'(\{i\}) \oplus \sigma'(\{j\})$. But $\sigma'(\{i\}) = \sigma(\{i\})$, $\sigma'(\{i, j\}) = \sigma(\{i, j\})$, $\sigma'(\{j\}) = \sigma(\{j\})$, so $\sigma(\{i, j\}) \cong \sigma(\{i\}) \oplus \sigma(\{j\})$.

Proposition 6.6 and equalities between ι, ι' and π, π' show that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma(\{i\}) & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\sigma(\{i\})}} & \sigma(\{i\}) \oplus \sigma(\{j\}) & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma(\{j\})}} & \sigma(\{j\}) \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \text{id}_{\sigma(\{i\})} \downarrow & & h \downarrow & & \text{id}_{\sigma(\{j\})} \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma(\{i\}) & \xrightarrow{\iota(\{i\}, \{i, j\})} & \sigma(\{i, j\}) & \xrightarrow{\pi(\{i, j\}, \{j\})} & \sigma(\{j\}) \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

commutes, where $h = \iota(\{i\}, \{i, j\}) \circ \pi_{\sigma(\{i\})} + \iota'(\{j\}, \{i, j\}) \circ \pi_{\sigma(\{j\})}$ is an isomorphism. Therefore by (1), the short exact sequence (8) is split. \square

We *classify improvements* for a two point indexing set $K = \{i, j\}$.

Lemma 6.8. *Define partial orders $\trianglelefteq, \lesssim$ on $K = \{i, j\}$ by $i \trianglelefteq i$, $i \trianglelefteq j$, $j \trianglelefteq j$, $i \lesssim i$ and $j \lesssim j$. Let (σ, ι, π) be a (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then there exists a (K, \lesssim) -improvement (σ', ι', π') of (σ, ι, π) if and only if the short exact sequence (33) is split, and then such (K, \lesssim) -improvements (σ', ι', π') are in 1-1 correspondence with $\text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$.*

Proof. If there exists a (K, \lesssim) -improvement of (σ, ι, π) then (33) is split by Proposition 6.7, which proves the ‘only if’ part. For the ‘if’ part, suppose (33) is split. Then we can choose morphisms $\iota'(\{j\}, K) : \sigma(\{j\}) \rightarrow \sigma(K)$ and $\pi'(K, \{i\}) : \sigma(K) \rightarrow \sigma(\{i\})$ with

$$\pi'(K, \{i\}) \circ \iota(\{i\}, K) = \text{id}_{\sigma(\{i\})} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(K, \{j\}) \circ \iota'(\{j\}, K) = \text{id}_{\sigma(\{j\})}. \quad (34)$$

Defining $\sigma' = \sigma$, $\iota'|_{\mathcal{G}(K, \trianglelefteq)} = \iota$, $\pi'|_{\mathcal{H}(K, \trianglelefteq)} = \pi$ then gives a (K, \lesssim) -improvement (σ', ι', π') of (σ, ι, π) , proving the ‘if’ part.

Finally, fix $\iota'_0(\{j\}, K), \pi'_0(K, \{i\})$ satisfying (34). We can easily prove that every (K, \lesssim) -improvement (σ', ι', π') of (σ, ι, π) is defined uniquely by $\sigma' = \sigma$, $\iota'|_{\mathcal{G}(K, \trianglelefteq)} = \iota$, $\pi'|_{\mathcal{H}(K, \trianglelefteq)} = \pi$ and

$$\iota'(\{j\}, K) = \iota'_0(\{j\}, K) + \iota(\{i\}, K) \circ f, \quad \pi'(K, \{i\}) = \pi'_0(K, \{i\}) - f \circ \pi(K, \{j\})$$

for some unique $f \in \text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$, and every $f \in \text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$ gives a (K, \lesssim) -improvement. This establishes a 1-1 correspondence between (K, \lesssim) -improvements (σ', ι', π') and $f \in \text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$. \square

Here is the converse to Proposition 6.7.

Proposition 6.9. *Suppose (I, \trianglelefteq) is a finite poset, \mathcal{A} an abelian category, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Let $i \neq j \in I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ but there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \trianglelefteq k \trianglelefteq j$, such that the short exact sequence (33) is split. Define a partial order \preceq on I by $a \preceq b$ if $a \trianglelefteq b$ and $a \neq i, b \neq j$, so that \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by one step. Then there exists an (I, \preceq) -improvement $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ of (σ, ι, π) . Such improvements up to canonical isomorphism are in 1-1 correspondence with $\text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$.*

Proof. Set $K = \{i, j\}$, and let $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ be the (K, \preceq) -subconfiguration of (σ, ι, π) . As (33) is split, Lemma 6.8 shows that there exists a (K, \lesssim) -improvement (σ', ι', π') of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. Then (σ, ι, π) and (σ', ι', π') satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5.5 with $\phi = \text{id}$, I in place of K , and K in place of both J and L . Therefore Theorem 5.5 gives the (I, \preceq) -improvement $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ that we want.

For the last part, note that every (I, \preceq) -improvement $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ of (σ, ι, π) may be constructed this way, taking (σ', ι', π') to be the (K, \preceq) -subconfiguration of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. Thus, uniqueness up to canonical isomorphism in Theorem 5.5 shows that such improvements $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ up to canonical isomorphism are in 1-1 correspondence with (K, \lesssim) -improvements (σ', ι', π') of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. But Lemma 6.8 shows that these are in 1-1 correspondence with $\text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$. \square

Propositions 6.7 and 6.9 imply a *criterion for best configurations*:

Theorem 6.10. *Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then (σ, ι, π) is best if and only if for all $i \neq j \in I$ with $i \preceq j$ but there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \preceq k \preceq j$, the short exact sequence (33) is split.*

If this criterion holds, it also holds for any *subconfiguration* of (σ, ι, π) , giving:

Corollary 6.11. *Suppose (σ, ι, π) is a best (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then all subconfigurations of (σ, ι, π) are also best.*

7 Varieties and Euler characteristics

We now briefly recall some facts we will need about complex quasi-projective varieties, Euler characteristics, and constructible sets and functions.

7.1 Varieties, subvarieties and constructible sets

We first introduce *complex quasi-projective varieties*, following Hartshorne [6].

Definition 7.1. A *complex projective variety* is a subset P of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m$ for some $m \geq 0$ which is the zero set of finitely many homogeneous polynomials in \mathbb{C}^{m+1} . A *complex quasi-projective variety* is a subset Q of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m$ of the form $Q = R \setminus P$ for projective varieties $P \subseteq R \subseteq \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m$. Note that we do *not* require (quasi)-projective varieties to be *irreducible*, as some authors do [6, p. 10].

If $P \subseteq Q \subseteq \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m$ with P, Q quasi-projective varieties, we call P a *subvariety* of Q . Note that subvarieties are *locally closed* in the Zariski topology. *Morphisms of varieties* are defined in [6, §I.3]. We consider isomorphic varieties to be the same. Then a quasi-projective variety Q can be embedded in $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m$ in many ways for different $m \geq 0$, and no one way is preferred.

For $m, n \geq 0$ the disjoint union $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m \amalg \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ can be embedded as a subvariety of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^{m+n+1}$. It follows that *finite disjoint unions of varieties are varieties*. Intersections and closures of subvarieties are subvarieties.

However, finite unions of subvarieties need not be subvarieties, and the image of a subvariety $P \subseteq Q$ under a morphism $\phi : Q \rightarrow R$ need not be a subvariety.

Because of this, the subvarieties of a variety Q are not a large enough class of subsets of Q for our purposes, and we work instead with *constructible sets*.

Definition 7.2. Let Q be a complex quasi-projective variety. A *constructible set* in Q is a finite union of subvarieties of Q .

By taking intersections, closures and complements we can always write a constructible set as a finite union of *disjoint* subvarieties of Q . Mumford [14, p. 51] proves the following. The last part is due to Chevalley.

Proposition 7.3. Let P, Q be varieties, A, B constructible sets in P , and $\phi : P \rightarrow Q$ a morphism. Then $A \cap B$, $A \cup B$ and $P \setminus A$ are constructible sets in P , and $\phi(A)$ is a constructible set in Q .

7.2 Euler characteristics

Next we discuss the *Euler characteristics* of a variety and its subvarieties.

Definition 7.4. Let Q be a complex quasi-projective variety. Regard Q as a topological space with the *analytic topology*, induced from the manifold topology on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m$ by the inclusion $Q \subseteq \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m$. Write $\chi(Q)$ for the (*topological*) *Euler characteristic* of Q , computed using *compactly-supported cohomology*.

As this definition involves the analytic topology it is special to varieties over \mathbb{C} . However, it is implicit in Kennedy [11] that $\chi(Q)$ can in fact be defined purely algebraically, and the definition is then valid for varieties over any field \mathbb{K} of characteristic zero. The following properties of χ are well known.

Proposition 7.5. (i) $\chi(\mathbb{C}^m) = 1$ and $\chi(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^m) = m + 1$ for all $m \geq 0$.

(ii) If P is a closed subvariety of a variety Q , then $\chi(Q) = \chi(P) + \chi(Q \setminus P)$.

(iii) If P, Q are varieties then $\chi(P \times Q) = \chi(P)\chi(Q)$.

(iv) If $\phi : P \rightarrow Q$ is a morphism of varieties which is a locally trivial fibration in the analytic topology with fibre F , then $\chi(P) = \chi(F)\chi(Q)$.

The Euler characteristic is additive over partitions into disjoint subvarieties.

Lemma 7.6. Suppose Q is a complex quasi-projective variety, and \mathcal{D} is a finite set of disjoint subvarieties of Q , such that $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{D}} U = Q$, and \bar{U} is the union of sets in \mathcal{D} for all $U \in \mathcal{D}$. Then $\chi(Q) = \sum_{U \in \mathcal{D}} \chi(U)$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $|\mathcal{D}|$. If $|\mathcal{D}| = 1$ then $\mathcal{D} = \{Q\}$ and the result is trivial. Suppose the lemma holds whenever $|\mathcal{D}| \leq n$, and let Q, \mathcal{D} satisfy the hypotheses with $|\mathcal{D}| = n + 1$. Choose $U \in \mathcal{D}$ with maximal dimension. If $U \neq V \in \mathcal{D}$ then $U \cap V = \emptyset$, and so $U \not\subseteq \bar{V}$ as $\dim V \leq \dim U$. As \bar{V} is a union of sets in \mathcal{D} , which are disjoint, we see that $U \cap \bar{V} = \emptyset$.

Since $Q \setminus U$ is the union of $V \in \mathcal{D}$ with $V \neq U$ we have $U \cap \overline{(Q \setminus U)} = \emptyset$, so U is open, and $Q \setminus U$ is a closed subvariety of Q . Hence $\chi(Q) = \chi(Q \setminus U) + \chi(U)$ by Proposition 7.5(ii). But $Q' = Q \setminus U$ and $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{D} \setminus \{U\}$ satisfy the inductive hypothesis with $|\mathcal{D}'| = n$, so $\chi(Q \setminus U) = \sum_{V \in \mathcal{D}': V \neq U} \chi(V)$. The lemma follows by induction. \square

We can dispense with the conditions on \bar{U} in Lemma 7.6.

Proposition 7.7. *Suppose a complex quasi-projective variety Q is the disjoint union of subvarieties U_1, \dots, U_m . Then $\chi(Q) = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_i)$.*

Proof. By taking intersections and complements of closures of subvarieties we can construct a finite set \mathcal{D} of disjoint subvarieties of Q , such that Q and each U_i is a union of sets in \mathcal{D} , and \bar{V} is a union of sets in \mathcal{D} for each $V \in \mathcal{D}$. Then

$$\chi(Q) = \sum_{V \in \mathcal{D}} \chi(V) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{V \in \mathcal{D}: V \subseteq U_i} \chi(V) = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_i),$$

applying Lemma 7.6 to Q, \mathcal{D} and $U_i, \{V \in \mathcal{D} : V \subseteq U_i\}$. \square

Using this we define the Euler characteristic of a *constructible set*.

Definition 7.8. Let Q be a complex quasi-projective variety and $A \subseteq Q$ a constructible set. Then we can write A as the *disjoint union* of subvarieties U_1, \dots, U_m of Q . Define $\chi(A) = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_i)$. To show this is well-defined, suppose A is also the disjoint union of subvarieties V_1, \dots, V_n . Then U_i is the disjoint union of subvarieties $U_i \cap V_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, so Proposition 7.7 gives $\chi(U_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n \chi(U_i \cap V_j)$, and similarly $\chi(V_j) = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_i \cap V_j)$. Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \chi(U_i \cap V_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_i \cap V_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \chi(V_j).$$

7.3 Constructible functions

Finally we define and study *constructible functions*.

Definition 7.9. Let P be a complex quasi-projective variety. A *constructible function* on P is a function $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f(P)$ is finite and $f^{-1}(c)$ is a constructible set for each $c \in f(P)$. Write $\text{CF}(P)$ for the abelian group of constructible functions on P . For $f \in \text{CF}(P)$, define the *weighted Euler characteristic* $\chi(P, f)$ by

$$\chi(P, f) = \sum_{c \in f(P)} c \chi(f^{-1}(c)). \quad (35)$$

Let $\phi : P \rightarrow Q$ be a morphism of varieties, and $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ a constructible function on P . Define the *push-forward* $\text{CF}(\phi)f : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ of f to Q by

$$(\text{CF}(\phi)f)(q) = \chi(\phi^{-1}(q), f|_{\phi^{-1}(q)}) \quad \text{for } q \in Q. \quad (36)$$

This is well-defined as $\phi^{-1}(q)$ is a subvariety, and $f|_{\phi^{-1}(q)}$ is constructible.

MacPherson [13, Prop. 1] showed that constructible functions $\text{CF}(Q)$ and the push-forward $\text{CF}(\phi)$ form a *functor*.

Theorem 7.10. *Let $\phi : P \rightarrow Q$ be a morphism of complex quasi-projective varieties and $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ a constructible function. Then $\text{CF}(\phi)f$ is constructible. Thus $\text{CF}(\phi) : \text{CF}(P) \rightarrow \text{CF}(Q)$ is a morphism of abelian groups.*

Suppose $\psi : Q \rightarrow R$ is another morphism of varieties. Then $\text{CF}(\psi \circ \phi) = \text{CF}(\psi) \circ \text{CF}(\phi)$ as maps $\text{CF}(P) \rightarrow \text{CF}(R)$. Hence CF is a functor from the category of complex quasi-projective varieties to the category of abelian groups.

Using results of Sabbah [18] on Lagrangian cycles, Kennedy [11] provides a purely algebraic definition of the constructible functions functor, which is valid for varieties over any field \mathbb{K} of characteristic zero. It should be possible to use this to generalize the results of this paper and [7].

Let $\{0\}$ be a single point, considered as a variety, and for a variety P let $\pi_P : P \rightarrow \{0\}$ be the projection, considered as a morphism. Then $\text{CF}(\pi_P) : \text{CF}(P) \rightarrow \text{CF}(\{0\}) = \mathbb{Z}$ maps $f \mapsto \chi(P, f)$. If $\phi : P \rightarrow Q$ is a morphism of varieties then $\pi_P = \pi_Q \circ \phi$. So from $\text{CF}(\psi \circ \phi) = \text{CF}(\psi) \circ \text{CF}(\phi)$ in Theorem 7.10 we deduce:

Corollary 7.11. *Let $\phi : P \rightarrow Q$ be a morphism of complex quasi-projective varieties and $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be constructible. Then $\chi(P, f) = \chi(Q, \text{CF}(\phi)f)$.*

Viro [20] gives an interesting point of view on constructible functions. One can regard the Euler characteristic as a *measure*, defined on constructible sets. Then $\chi(P, f)$ is the integral of f with respect to this measure, and the push-forward $\text{CF}(\phi)f$ integrates f over the fibres of ϕ .

8 Quot-schemes and varieties of subobjects

In §9 we shall define and study *moduli spaces of configurations* $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . To prove that $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ is a *complex quasi-projective variety*, we need to make some assumptions on \mathcal{A} , to do with the variety structure on *families of subobjects* $S \subset X$ for $X \in \mathcal{A}$. This section sets out these assumptions, and shows they hold for many interesting examples. We shall use the following notation.

Definition 8.1. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, choose $K(\mathcal{A})$ as in Definition 2.2, and let $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Suppose $S \subset X$ is a subobject, represented by an injective morphism $i : U \rightarrow X$. Write $[S]$ for $[U] \in K(\mathcal{A})$. This is well-defined, as U is determined by S up to isomorphism. For $\alpha \in K(\mathcal{A})$ define $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X) = \{S : S \subset X \text{ is a subobject, } [S] = \alpha\}$.

Here are our assumptions on \mathcal{A} .

Assumption 8.2. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and let $K(\mathcal{A})$ be a quotient of the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ as in Definition 2.2. Suppose that:

- (i) $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$ has the structure of a *finite-dimensional complex vector space* for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, and the composition maps $\text{Hom}(X, Y) \times \text{Hom}(Y, Z) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(X, Z)$ are *complex bilinear*, so \mathcal{A} is \mathbb{C} -linear.

- (ii) $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X)$ has the structure of a *complex projective variety* for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha \in K(\mathcal{A})$.
- (iii) $\text{Inc}^{\alpha,\beta}(X)$ is a *closed subvariety* of $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X) \times \text{Sub}^\beta(X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in K(\mathcal{A})$, where

$$\text{Inc}^{\alpha,\beta}(X) = \{(S, T) : S \in \text{Sub}^\alpha(X), T \in \text{Sub}^\beta(X), S \subset T \subset X\}. \quad (37)$$

- (iv) For all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in K(\mathcal{A})$,

$$\{(S, T, U) \in \text{Sub}^\alpha(X) \times \text{Sub}^\beta(X) \times \text{Sub}^\gamma(X) : U = S \cap T\} \quad (38)$$

$$\text{and } \{(S, T, U) \in \text{Sub}^\alpha(X) \times \text{Sub}^\beta(X) \times \text{Sub}^\gamma(X) : U = S + T\} \quad (39)$$

are subvarieties of $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X) \times \text{Sub}^\beta(X) \times \text{Sub}^\gamma(X)$.

- (v) Let $U, V, W, X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $0 \rightarrow U \xrightarrow{i} V \xrightarrow{\pi} W \rightarrow 0$ exact and $j : V \rightarrow X$ injective. Let $R \subset X$ and $T \subset X$ be the subobjects represented by $j \circ i : U \rightarrow X$ and $j : V \rightarrow X$. Let $\alpha = [U]$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$, and for each $\beta \in K(\mathcal{A})$ define $\Theta^\beta : \text{Sub}^\beta(W) \rightarrow \text{Sub}^{\alpha+\beta}(X)$ as follows.

Let $Q \in \text{Sub}^\beta(W)$ be represented by $e : E \rightarrow W$. Let $c : W \rightarrow C$ be a cokernel for e . Let $k : K \rightarrow V$ be a kernel for $c \circ \pi : V \rightarrow C$. Define $\Theta^\beta(Q) \in \text{Sub}^{\alpha+\beta}(X)$ to be the subobject represented by $j \circ k : K \rightarrow X$. Then Θ^β is a well-defined *isomorphism of varieties*

$$\Theta^\beta : \text{Sub}^\beta(W) \longrightarrow \{S \in \text{Sub}^{\alpha+\beta}(X) : R \subset S \subset T \subset X\}, \quad (40)$$

where the right hand side is a *closed subvariety* of $\text{Sub}^{\alpha+\beta}(X)$.

- (vi) Let $W, X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[W] = \alpha$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$. Write

$$\text{Inj}(W, X) = \{i \in \text{Hom}(W, X) : i \text{ is injective}\}. \quad (41)$$

Regard $\text{Hom}(W, X) \cong \mathbb{C}^l$ as an affine variety. Then $\text{Inj}(W, X)$ is an open subvariety of $\text{Hom}(W, X)$, and $\text{Aut}(W)$ is an algebraic group which acts freely and algebraically on $\text{Inj}(W, X)$. Hence $\text{Inj}(W, X)/\text{Aut}(W)$ is a *quasi-projective variety*. The natural 1-1 correspondence

$$\text{Inj}(W, X)/\text{Aut}(W) \xrightarrow{\cong} \{S \in \text{Sub}^\alpha(X) : S \cong W\} \quad (42)$$

taking $i \text{Aut}(W)$ to the subobject represented by $i : W \rightarrow X$, is an *isomorphism of varieties*, where the r.h.s. is a *subvariety* of $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X)$.

Although this list of assumptions is long, it is satisfied in many interesting cases, as the following two theorems show.

Theorem 8.3. *Let P be a smooth complex projective variety, and \mathcal{A} the abelian category of coherent sheaves on P . Then \mathcal{A} is of finite type over \mathbb{C} in the sense of §2.5, and satisfies Assumption 8.2 with $K(\mathcal{A}) = K_0(\mathcal{A})$ or $K(\mathcal{A}) = K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. From §2.5, \mathcal{A} is of *finite type over* \mathbb{C} , so $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$ is well-defined. We recall the construction of Grothendieck's *Quot-scheme* [4] (see also Kollar [12, §I.1 & Th. I.5.16]), translating into our categorical notation. In particular, $\text{Ext}^k(\mathcal{O}(-n), X)$ below is written $H^k(P, X(n))$ in [12].

Let $\mathcal{O}(1)$ be a very ample line bundle on P , which exists as P is projective. Write $\mathcal{O}(n)$ for $\otimes^n \mathcal{O}(1)$ or $\otimes^{-n} \mathcal{O}(1)^*$, as usual. Then $\mathcal{O}(n) \in \mathcal{A}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. For each $\alpha \in K(\mathcal{A})$ the *Hilbert polynomial* p_α is a polynomial $p_\alpha : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, linear in α , given by $p_\alpha(n) = \chi([\mathcal{O}(-n)], \alpha)$, where χ is the *Euler form* of §2.5. As the Euler form is well-defined on both $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ and $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$, the following arguments hold with $K(\mathcal{A}) = K_0(\mathcal{A})$ or $K(\mathcal{A}) = K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$.

Now fix $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha \in K(\mathcal{A})$. Then using [12, Th. I.1.5] one can prove that there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, whenever $S \in \text{Sub}^\alpha(X)$ is represented by $i : W \rightarrow X$, we have

- (i) $\text{Ext}^k(\mathcal{O}(-n), W) = 0$ for $k > 0$, so $\dim \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), W) = p_\alpha(n)$ by (7).
- (ii) The tautological morphism $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), W) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-n) \rightarrow W$ is *surjective*.

For $n \geq n_0$ and S, i, W as above, define

$$A_n^S = \{i \circ f : f \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), W)\} \subseteq \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), X).$$

Then A_n^S depends only on S, n .

As i is injective the map $f \mapsto i \circ f$ is injective, so A_n^S is a vector subspace of $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), X)$ isomorphic to $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), W)$. Thus $\dim A_n^S = p_\alpha(n)$ by (i). Also, using (ii) one can show that the image (kernel of the cokernel) of the tautological morphism $A_n^S \otimes \mathcal{O}(-n) \rightarrow X$ represents $S \subset X$, so we can recover S from A_n^S . Therefore we have constructed an *injective map*

$$\Xi_n^\alpha : \text{Sub}^\alpha(X) \longrightarrow \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^{p_\alpha(n)}, \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), X)) \quad \text{given by } S \longmapsto A_n^S,$$

where $\text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^p, V)$ is the *Grassmannian* of l -dimensional subspaces of a finite-dimensional complex vector space V . It is a *complex projective variety*.

Grothendieck [4] shows that Ξ_n^α identifies $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X)$ with a *closed subvariety* of $\text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^{p_\alpha(n)}, \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), X))$ for $n \gg 0$. The induced projective variety structure on $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X)$ is independent of n . This proves Assumption 8.2(ii).

The rest of Assumption 8.2 is now fairly straightforward. Part (i) is standard. Since $S \subset T \subset X$ if and only if $A_n^S \subseteq A_n^T \subseteq \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-n), X)$ for $n \gg 0$, part (iii) holds as $\{(A, B) \in \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^p, V) \times \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^q, V) : A \subseteq B\}$ is a closed subvariety of $\text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^p, V) \times \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^q, V)$. For (iv), one can show that $U = S \cap T$ if and only if $A_n^U = A_n^S \cap A_n^T$ for $n \gg 0$, and (38) follows as

$$\{(A, B, C) \in \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^p, V) \times \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^q, V) \times \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^r, V) : C = A \cap B\}$$

is a subvariety of $\text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^p, V) \times \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^q, V) \times \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^r, V)$, not necessarily closed. Also $U = S + T$ if and only if $A_n^U = A_n^S + A_n^T$ for $n \gg 0$, and (39) follows in a similar way. We leave (v) and (vi) as an exercise. \square

I can also prove the following result.

Theorem 8.4. *Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian category of finite length, $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$, $\text{Ext}^1(X, Y)$ are finite-dimensional vector spaces over \mathbb{C} for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, and the multiplication maps of Definition 2.12(ii) are complex bilinear for $(m, n) = (0, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$. Then \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 8.2 with $K(\mathcal{A}) = K_0(\mathcal{A})$.*

Sketch proof. Suppose $X \in \mathcal{A}$ has nonisomorphic simple factors S_1, \dots, S_n with multiplicities $l_1, \dots, l_n > 0$. Using Definition 2.12(iii), by a finite sequence of ‘universal’ extensions by direct sums of S_m we construct $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$ such that if $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ has simple factors S_m with multiplicity k_m for $m = 1, \dots, n$ and $0 \leq k_m \leq l_m$, then

- (a) There exists $f : U \rightarrow Y$ surjective, and $\dim \text{Hom}(U, Y) = \sum_{m=1}^n k_m l_m$.
- (b) There exists $g : Y \rightarrow V$ injective, and $\dim \text{Hom}(Y, V) = \sum_{m=1}^n k_m l_m$.

Here is how to define V . Set $V^1 = \bigoplus_{m=1}^n \bigoplus^{l_m} S_m$. Given V^i , let V^{i+1} fit into an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow V^i \rightarrow V^{i+1} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{m=1}^n S_m \otimes \text{Ext}^1(S_m, V^i) \rightarrow 0. \quad (43)$$

By Definition 2.12(iii), sequences (43) are classified by an element of

$$\text{Ext}^1\left(\bigoplus_{m=1}^n S_m \otimes \text{Ext}^1(S_m, V^i), V^i\right) \cong \bigoplus_{m=1}^n \text{Ext}^1(S_m, V^i) \otimes \text{Ext}^1(S_m, V^i)^*$$

up to isomorphism. Let V^{i+1} correspond to the sum over m of the identity in $\text{Ext}^1(S_m, V^i) \otimes \text{Ext}^1(S_m, V^i)^*$. By induction this defines a series $V^1, V^2, \dots \in \mathcal{A}$. Set $V = V^{\sum_{m=1}^n l_m}$. We define U similarly, but reversing arrows.

Any subobject $S \subset X$ determines an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow W \xrightarrow{\iota} X \xrightarrow{\pi} Y \longrightarrow 0 \quad (44)$$

up to isomorphism, where $S \subset X$ is the equivalence class of $\iota : W \rightarrow X$. Given (44), define vector subspaces $A \subseteq \text{Hom}(U, X)$, $B \subseteq \text{Hom}(X, V)$ by

$$A = \{\iota \circ f : f \in \text{Hom}(U, W)\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{g \circ \pi : g \in \text{Hom}(Y, V)\}.$$

Then two sequences (44) determine the same A, B if and only if they correspond to the same subobject $S \subset X$.

Moreover, subspaces $A \subseteq \text{Hom}(U, X)$, $B \subseteq \text{Hom}(X, V)$ correspond to a subobject $S \subset X$ if and only if they satisfy

- (i) $b \circ a = 0$ in $\text{Hom}(U, V)$ for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$; and
- (ii) $\dim A + \dim B = \sum_{m=1}^n l_m^2$.

This gives a 1-1 correspondence between subobjects $S \subset X$ and pairs (A, B) satisfying (i), (ii). Under this $\text{Sub}^\alpha(X)$ corresponds to a closed subvariety of the product of Grassmannians $\text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^p, \text{Hom}(U, X)) \times \text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^q, \text{Hom}(X, V))$, which proves Assumption 8.2(ii). The rest of Assumption 8.2 is easily verified. \square

9 Generalized Hilbert schemes

When an abelian category \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 8.2, we shall define moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ of (I, \preceq) -configurations (σ, ι, π) with $\sigma(I) = X$, which we call *generalized Hilbert schemes*. We also define subspaces $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ depending on Z, θ , according to whether (σ, ι, π) is *best*, or $\sigma(\{i\})$ is θ -(*semi*)*stable* for all $i \in I$.

Sections 9.2–9.4 show that the $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ are *complex quasi-projective varieties*, various natural maps between them are *morphisms of varieties*, and that the subspaces are *constructible sets*, provided Z, θ are *permissible*. The name ‘generalized Hilbert scheme’ will be explained in §9.5.

9.1 (I, \preceq, κ) -configurations and moduli spaces

We begin by defining (I, \preceq, κ) -*configurations*, and notions of *isomorphism*.

Definition 9.1. Suppose \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 8.2. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset and $\kappa : I \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ a map. For the rest of the paper we use the following notation: we *extend κ to the set of subsets of I* by defining $\kappa(J) = \sum_{j \in J} \kappa(j)$. To motivate this, note that Proposition 4.6 simplifies to $[\sigma(J)] = \kappa(J)$ for all $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$. Define a set of \mathcal{A} -*data* to be a triple (I, \preceq, κ) such that (I, \preceq) is a finite poset and $\kappa : I \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ a map with $\kappa(J) \neq 0$ for all $\emptyset \neq J \subseteq I$. Define an (I, \preceq, κ) -*configuration* to be an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} with $[\sigma(\{i\})] = \kappa(i)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$ for all $i \in I$.

- (i) For \mathcal{A} -data (I, \preceq, κ) , define $\text{Aut}(I, \preceq, \kappa)$ to be the set of bijections $\psi : I \rightarrow I$ with $\psi(i) \preceq \psi(j)$ if and only if $i \preceq j$ and $\kappa(\psi(i)) = \kappa(i)$ for all $i \in I$. Then $\text{Aut}(I, \preceq, \kappa)$ is a *finite group*.
- (ii) Let $(\sigma, \iota, \pi), (\sigma', \iota', \pi')$ be (I, \preceq) -configurations in \mathcal{A} . An *isomorphism* $\alpha : (\sigma, \iota, \pi) \rightarrow (\sigma', \iota', \pi')$ is a collection of isomorphisms $\alpha(J) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow \sigma'(J)$ for each $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(K) \circ \iota(J, K) &= \iota'(J, K) \circ \alpha(J) && \text{for all } (J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}, \text{ and} \\ \alpha(K) \circ \pi(J, K) &= \pi'(J, K) \circ \alpha(J) && \text{for all } (J, K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}. \end{aligned}$$

Isomorphisms compose in the obvious way.

We shall study *moduli spaces of configurations* (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(I) = X$.

Definition 9.2. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2. Let (I, \preceq, κ) be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$.

- (a) Define $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ to be the set of \sim -equivalence classes of (I, \preceq, κ) -configurations (σ, ι, π) with $\sigma(I) = X$, where $(\sigma, \iota, \pi) \sim (\sigma', \iota', \pi')$ if there exists an isomorphism $\alpha : (\sigma, \iota, \pi) \rightarrow (\sigma', \iota', \pi')$ with $\alpha(I) = \text{id}_X$. We call $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ a *generalized Hilbert scheme*. Write $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ for the equivalence class of (σ, ι, π) .

- (b) Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ be the subset of $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ with (σ, ι, π) *best*, as in Definition 6.1.

Now suppose Z is a *slope function* on \mathcal{A} with *phase* θ , as in Definition 2.7.

- (c) Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ be the subset of $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ with $\sigma(\{i\})$ θ -*semistable* for all $i \in I$, as in Definition 2.7.
- (d) Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ be the subset of $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ with $\sigma(\{i\})$ θ -*stable* for all $i \in I$.
- (e) Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$.

Configurations (σ, ι, π) with $\sigma(\{i\})$ θ -(semi)stable for all $i \in I$ will themselves be called θ -(semi)stable.

Let $\text{Aut}(I, \preceq, \kappa)$ act on $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ by $\psi \cdot [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] = [(\sigma', \iota', \pi')]$, where $\sigma'(J) = \sigma(\psi^{-1}(J))$ for $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$, $\iota'(J, K) = \iota(\psi^{-1}(J), \psi^{-1}(K))$ for $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and $\pi'(J, K) = \pi(\psi^{-1}(J), \psi^{-1}(K))$ for $(J, K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$.

We also define *characteristic functions* of moduli spaces.

Definition 9.3. Let $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and \mathcal{F} be any finite disjoint union of moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, as above. For \mathcal{A} -data (I, \preceq, κ) with $[X] = \kappa(I)$, define $\delta_{\text{all}}, \delta_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and $\delta_{\text{st}}, \delta_{\text{ss}}, \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}, \delta_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ to be the *characteristic functions* of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ on \mathcal{F} , that is, they are 1 on the appropriate subset $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa), \dots$, and zero elsewhere.

Now the notions of isomorphism in Theorem 4.2 and Definition 9.2 are the same, so Theorems 4.2 and 4.5 yield:

Proposition 9.4. *Given $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, for each s -set $J \subseteq I$ define the subobject $S^J \subset X$ to be the equivalence class of $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow X$. This defines a 1-1 correspondence between $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and collections of subobjects $S^J \subset X$ for s -sets J satisfying (10) and $[S^J] = \kappa(J)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$.*

Corollary 9.5. *The action of $\text{Aut}(I, \preceq, \kappa)$ on $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ is free.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that the action is not free, so that there exists $\text{id} \neq \psi \in \text{Aut}(I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ with $\psi \cdot [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] = [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$. Let the subobjects $S^J \subset X$ be as in Proposition 9.4. Then $S^J \equiv S^{\psi(J)}$ as $\psi \cdot [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] = [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$. Since $\text{id} \neq \psi$ there exists an s -set $J \subseteq I$ with $K = \psi(J) \neq J$. Thus $S^{J \cap K} = S^J \cap S^K = S^J$ as $S^J = S^K$, so the factor $S^J/S^{J \cap K}$ is zero. Hence $\kappa(J \setminus K) = [S^J/S^{J \cap K}] = 0$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$, which contradicts Definition 9.1, as $J \setminus K \neq \emptyset$. \square

Next we define maps between moduli spaces using *quotient configurations*.

Definition 9.6. Let (I, \preceq, κ) be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, (K, \trianglelefteq) a finite poset, and $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ a surjective map with $\phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)$ when $i, j \in I$ with $i \preceq j$. Define $\mu : K \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\mu(k) = \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k))$. Then $(K, \trianglelefteq, \mu)$ is a set of \mathcal{A} -data.

Suppose $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I) = \mu(K)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$. Define a map

$$\begin{aligned} Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu) \\ \text{by } Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] &\longmapsto [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})], \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is the *quotient* (K, \trianglelefteq) -*configuration* of (σ, ι, π) from $\phi : I \rightarrow K$, as in Definition 5.2. In the special case when $I = K$ and $\phi : I \rightarrow I$ is the identity map id_I , so that $\mu = \kappa$ and \trianglelefteq, \preceq are partial orders on I where \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq , write $Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) = Q(I, \preceq, I, \trianglelefteq, \text{id}_I)$.

Observe that $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \mapsto [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]$ means (σ, ι, π) is a *refinement* of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$, and $Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) : [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \mapsto [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]$ means (σ, ι, π) is an *improvement* of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$, in the sense of Definitions 5.2 and 6.1.

9.2 Moduli spaces are complex quasi-projective varieties

We now show that the $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ in §9.1 are *quasi-projective varieties*, and the natural maps between them are *morphisms of varieties*.

Theorem 9.7. *Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, (I, \preceq, κ) be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$. Then*

- (i) $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ has the structure of a complex quasi-projective variety.
- (ii) Let (K, \trianglelefteq) be a finite poset and $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ surjective with $i \preceq j$ implies $\phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)$. Define $\mu : K \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\mu(k) = \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k))$. Then $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu)$ is a morphism of varieties in (45).

Proof. Define a map

$$\Psi_{(I, \preceq, \kappa)} : \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \rightarrow \prod_{\text{s-sets } J} \text{Sub}^{\kappa(J)}(X) \text{ by } [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \mapsto \prod_{\text{s-sets } J} S^J, \quad (46)$$

where $S^J \subset X$ is represented by $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \rightarrow X$. Proposition 9.4 shows that $\Psi_{(I, \preceq, \kappa)}$ is a 1-1 correspondence with its image, which is

$$\left\{ \prod_{\text{s-sets } J} S^J \in \prod_{\text{s-sets } J} \text{Sub}^{\kappa(J)}(X) : S^\emptyset = 0, S^I = X, S^A \cap S^B = S^{A \cap B}, S^A + S^B = S^{A \cup B} \text{ for all s-sets } A, B \subseteq I \right\}.$$

Thus, the image of $\Psi_{(I, \preceq, \kappa)}$ is the solutions of a collection of equations in the complex projective variety $\prod_{\text{s-sets } J} \text{Sub}^{\kappa(J)}(X)$.

We shall see that each of these equations defines a *subvariety* of the product. Clearly $S^\emptyset = 0$ and $S^I = X$ define subvarieties. And $S^A \cap S^B = S^{A \cap B}$, $S^A + S^B = S^{A \cup B}$ define subvarieties for each pair of s-sets A, B by Assumption 8.2(iv). Thus, the image of $\Psi_{(I, \preceq, \kappa)}$ is a finite intersection of subvarieties in $\prod_{\text{s-sets } J} \text{Sub}^{\kappa(J)}(X)$, so it is a *complex quasi-projective variety*, which is identified with $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$. This proves (i).

If $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ then $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \mapsto [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]$, where $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is the quotient (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration of (σ, ι, π) . Let

$$\Psi_{(I, \preceq, \kappa)}([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]) = \prod_{(I, \preceq) \text{ s-sets } J} S^J \text{ and } \Psi_{(K, \trianglelefteq, \mu)}([(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]) = \prod_{(K, \trianglelefteq) \text{ s-sets } L} \tilde{S}^L.$$

If $L \subseteq K$ is a (K, \trianglelefteq) s-set then $J = \phi^{-1}(L)$ is an (I, \preceq) s-set, and $\tilde{\sigma}(L) = \sigma(J)$, $\tilde{\iota}(L, K) = \iota(J, I)$ by definition of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. Hence $\tilde{S}^L = S^J = S^{\phi^{-1}(L)}$.

Therefore the map $\Psi_{(I, \preceq, \kappa)}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)) \rightarrow \Psi_{(K, \trianglelefteq, \mu)}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu))$ induced by $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)$ takes $\prod_{(I, \preceq) \text{ s-sets } J} S^J \mapsto \prod_{(K, \trianglelefteq) \text{ s-sets } L} S^{\phi^{-1}(L)}$. This is clearly a morphism of varieties, proving (ii). \square

Next we describe the structure of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$.

Proposition 9.8. *Let $\mathcal{A}, (I, \preceq, \kappa), X$ be as above. Then $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ is a constructible set in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$.*

Proof. By definition of best configurations, we see that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) = \bigcup_{\substack{\text{p.o.s } \lesssim \text{ on } I: \\ \preceq \text{ strictly dominates } \lesssim}} Q(I, \lesssim, \preceq)(\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \lesssim, \kappa)).$$

But $Q(I, \lesssim, \preceq)(\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \lesssim, \kappa))$ is constructible by Theorem 9.7 and Proposition 7.3. So $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, and hence $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, is constructible by Proposition 7.3. \square

From Theorem 9.7(i) and Proposition 9.8 we deduce:

Corollary 9.9. *The characteristic functions $\delta_{\text{all}}, \delta_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ of Definition 9.3 are constructible functions on the quasi-projective variety \mathcal{F} .*

9.3 Permissible slope functions

Here are the conditions we need a slope function Z on \mathcal{A} to satisfy.

Definition 9.10. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, let Z be a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and let $X \in \mathcal{A}$. We call Z, θ *permissible* with respect to X if they satisfy the conditions:

- (i) \mathcal{A} is θ -artinian and θ -noetherian, in the sense of Definition 2.8.
- (ii) There exists a subset $K_{\text{ss}}^{\theta}(X) \subseteq K(\mathcal{A})$ such that if $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ is a θ -semistable factor of X then $[Y] \in K_{\text{ss}}^{\theta}(X)$, and $\{\alpha \in K_{\text{ss}}^{\theta}(X) : |Z(\alpha)| \leq R\}$ is finite for all $R \geq 0$.

Remark 9.11. If \mathcal{A} has *finite length*, as in Definition 2.5, then *every* slope function Z on \mathcal{A} is permissible with respect to all $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Part (i) holds as artinian implies θ -artinian and noetherian implies θ -noetherian. For (ii), if X

has n simple factors, counted with multiplicity, then as the simple factors of Y are a subset of those of X , there are at most 2^n possibilities for $[Y] \in K(\mathcal{A})$.

Furthermore, there is a *natural slope function* $Z : K_0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $Z([X])$ is the *number of simple factors* of X , counted with multiplicity. The corresponding phase function θ is identically zero. It easily follows that all $X \in \mathcal{A}$ are θ -semistable, and X is θ -stable if and only if it is *simple*.

For permissible Z, θ we will show that $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ are *constructible subsets* of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$. Here are two preparatory results.

Lemma 9.12. *Let $\mathcal{A}, X, Z, \theta$ be as in Definition 9.10 with $X \not\cong 0$, and let $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ be the filtration given by Theorem 2.10, with $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ θ -semistable and $\theta([S_1]) > \theta([S_2]) > \cdots > \theta([S_n])$. Then for all subobjects $S \subset X$ with $0 \neq S \neq X$ we have $0 < \theta([S_n]) \leq \theta([X] - [S])$.*

Proof. This follows from the proof of Theorem 2.10 in [17, §1], as $S_n = X/A_{n-1}$ is constructed to be the *nonzero quotient object* of X with least phase. \square

Proposition 9.13. *Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, let Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with phase θ , and let (I, \preceq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data with $\kappa(I) = [X]$. Then there exists a finite subset $P \subset K(\mathcal{A})$ such that whenever (σ, ι, π) is an (I, \preceq, κ) -configuration in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(I) = X$, and $Y = \sigma(\{i\})$ for some $i \in I$, and $U \in \mathcal{A}$ is one of the θ -semistable factors of Y in the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of Theorem 2.10, then $[U] \in P$, and if V is one of the θ -stable factors of U in Theorem 2.11, then $[V] \in P$.*

Proof. Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \preceq, κ) -configuration and $i \in I$. Set $Y = \sigma(\{i\})$, and let $0 = B_0 \subset \cdots \subset B_m = Y$ be the filtration given by Theorem 2.10, with $T_k = B_k/B_{k-1}$ θ -semistable and $\theta([T_1]) > \cdots > \theta([T_m])$. Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow T_m$ be a surjective morphism representing the quotient object $Y/B_{m-1} \cong T_m$.

Define an s-set $J = \{j \in I : j \preceq i\}$. Choose a, A to fit into the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{a} \sigma(J) \xrightarrow{\pi(J, \{i\}) \circ \pi} T_m \longrightarrow 0. \quad (47)$$

Let $S \subset X$ be the subobject represented by $\iota(J, I) \circ c$. Then $[S] = [A] = \kappa(J) - [T_m]$ by (47), so Lemma 9.12 gives

$$0 < \theta([S_n]) \leq \theta([X] - [T]) = \theta(\sigma(I \setminus J) + [T_m]). \quad (48)$$

If $\theta \circ \kappa(i) = 1$ then as $1 \geq \theta([T_1]) > \cdots > \theta([T_m])$ we find that $m = 1$ and $[T_1] = \kappa(i)$. So suppose $\theta \circ \kappa(i) < 1$. Then we have

$$1 > \theta \circ \kappa(i) \geq \theta([T_m]), \quad (49)$$

as $\theta \circ \kappa(i)$ lies between $\theta([T_1])$ and $\theta([T_m])$. Also

$$0 \leq \text{Im}(Z([T_j])) \leq \text{Im}(Z \circ \kappa(i)) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, m, \quad (50)$$

since $0 \leq \text{Im}(Z([T_j]))$ by Definition 2.7, and $Z([T_1]) + \cdots + Z([T_m]) = Z \circ \kappa(i)$.

Combining (48), (49) and (50) for $j = m$ and noting that $Z([T_m])$ has phase $\pi\theta([T_m])$, we see that $Z([T_m])$ lies in a *bounded* region of \mathbb{C} . As T_m is θ -semistable, Definition 9.10(ii) gives a finite set $Q_i \subset K_{\text{ss}}^\theta(X) \subseteq K(\mathcal{A})$ depending only on $\mathcal{A}, Z, X, (I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and i with $[T_m] \in Q_i$.

As $[T_m] \in Q_i$ and $1 \geq \theta([T_1]) > \dots > \theta([T_m])$ we see that

$$0 < \min_{\alpha \in Q_i} \theta(\alpha) \leq \theta([T_j]) \leq 1 \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Combining this with $Z([T_1]) + \dots + Z([T_m]) = Z \circ \kappa(i)$ and noting that $Z([T_j])$ has phase $\pi\theta([T_j])$, we see that $Z([T_j])$ lies in a bounded subset of \mathbb{C} for $j = 1, \dots, m$, so that $|Z([T_j])| \leq R_i$ for some $R_i > 0$ depending only on $\mathcal{A}, Z, X, (I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and i .

Let $R = \max_{i \in I} R_i$, and set $P = \{\alpha \in K_{\text{ss}}^\theta(X) : |Z(\alpha)| \leq R\}$. Then P is *finite* by Definition 9.10(ii). Let $(\sigma, \iota, \pi), i, Y, U$ and V be as in the proposition. Then $U \cong T_j$ for some $j = 1, \dots, m$ from above, so $|Z([U])| \leq R_i \leq R$, and thus $[U] \in P$ as U is θ -semistable, as we have to prove. As the θ -stable factors of U have the same phase we see that $|Z([V])| \leq |Z([U])| \leq R_i \leq R$, and so $[V] \in P$ as V is θ -semistable. This completes the proof. \square

Here is our result, similar to Proposition 9.8 and Corollary 9.9.

Theorem 9.14. *Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, let Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with phase θ , and let (K, \preceq, μ) be \mathcal{A} -data with $\mu(K) = [X]$. Then $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$ are constructible subsets of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu)$, and $\delta_{\text{st}}, \delta_{\text{ss}}, \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}, \delta_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$ in Definition 9.3 are constructible functions on \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. Let $P \subset K(\mathcal{A})$ be the finite subset given by Proposition 9.13 with (K, \preceq, μ) in place of (I, \preceq, κ) . We shall prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu) \setminus \bigcup_{\substack{I, \preceq, \kappa, \phi: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \phi: I \rightarrow K \text{ is surjective,} \\ \kappa(I) \subseteq P \cup \mu(K), |I| > |K|, \\ \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K, \\ \text{if } i, j \in I \text{ with } \phi(i) \neq \phi(j) \text{ then} \\ i \not\preceq j \text{ if and only if } \phi(i) \preceq \phi(j), \\ i, j \in I, \phi(i) = \phi(j) \text{ and } i \not\preceq j \\ \text{implies } \theta \circ \kappa(i) < \theta \circ \kappa(j)}} Q(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi) \\ \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta) = [\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)]. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

First suppose that $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu)$ lies in the right hand side of (51). Then $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] = Q(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi)([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)])$ for for some I, \preceq, κ, ϕ satisfying the conditions and $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$. Choose (σ, ι, π) in its isomorphism class so that $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is its quotient configuration from ϕ .

As $|I| > |K|$ and ϕ is surjective we have $|\phi^{-1}(k)| > 1$ for some $k \in K$. Set $J = \phi^{-1}(k)$, and let j be \preceq -minimal in J . If $j \neq i \in J$ then $i \not\preceq j$, so $\theta \circ \kappa(i) < \theta \circ \kappa(j)$. As $|J| > 1$, this implies that

$$\theta(\sigma(\{j\})) = \theta \circ \kappa(j) > \theta \circ \kappa(J) = \theta(\sigma(J)) = \theta(\tilde{\sigma}(\{k\})), \quad (52)$$

noting that $\sigma(J) = \tilde{\sigma}(\{k\})$. But $\iota(\{j\}, J) : \sigma(\{j\}) \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}(\{k\})$ is injective, so (52) shows that $\tilde{\sigma}(\{k\})$ is θ -unstable by Definition 2.7. Hence $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \notin \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$, so the left hand side of (51) contains the right hand side.

Now suppose $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu) \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$. Then $\tilde{\sigma}(\{l\})$ is not θ -semistable for some $l \in K$. Set $Y = \tilde{\sigma}(\{l\})$, and let $0 = A_0 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = Y$ be the filtration given by Theorem 2.10 for Y , with $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ θ -semistable and $\theta([S_1]) > \cdots > \theta([S_n])$.

Set $J = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and let (σ', ι', π') be the (J, \leq) -configuration constructed from $0 = A_0 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = Y$ by Corollary 4.4, with $\sigma'(J) = Y = \sigma(\{j\})$. Suppose for simplicity that $J \cap K = \emptyset$. Then Definition 5.7 constructs a finite poset (I, \preceq) with $J \subseteq I$, a surjective map $\phi : I \rightarrow K$, and an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) with quotient (K, \preceq) -configuration $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ and (J, \leq) -subconfiguration (σ', ι', π') .

Now I, \preceq, κ, ϕ satisfy all the conditions in (51). In particular, as Y is not θ -semistable $n > 1$ and so $|I| = |K| + n - 1 > |K|$, and Proposition 9.13 implies that $\kappa(J) \subseteq P$, and $\kappa(I \setminus J) \subseteq \mu(K)$, giving $\kappa(I) \subseteq P \cup \mu(K)$. But $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] = Q(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi)([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)])$. Thus $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]$ lies in the right hand side of (51). This proves (51).

By Proposition 7.3 and Theorem 9.7, each $Q(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi)[\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)]$ is a *constructible subset* of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu)$. As P is finite, there are only finitely many isomorphism classes of I, \preceq, κ, ϕ on the right hand side of (51). Thus $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu) \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$ is a finite union of constructible sets by (51), so $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$ is constructible by Proposition 7.3.

A similar proof shows that $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu) \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$ is given by the right hand side of (51) with $\theta \circ \kappa(i) \leq \theta \circ \kappa(j)$ instead of $\theta \circ \kappa(i) < \theta \circ \kappa(j)$. Hence $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$ is also constructible. As the intersection of constructible sets is constructible, Definition 9.2(e) and Proposition 9.8 imply that $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$ are constructible. The last part of the theorem is immediate. \square

9.4 Morphisms from subconfigurations

Let (I, \preceq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data and $J \subseteq I$ an f-set. Then each (I, \preceq, κ) -configuration (σ', ι', π') has a (J, \preceq, κ) -subconfiguration $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. We would like to say that $[(\sigma', \iota', \pi')] \mapsto [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]$ is a morphism between appropriate moduli spaces.

However, this does not make sense, as $Y = \tilde{\sigma}(J)$ depends on (σ', ι', π') , so the target space $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(Y, J, \preceq, \kappa)$ is not fixed. To get round this we restrict to $[(\sigma', \iota', \pi')]$ in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ with a fixed quotient (K, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) under $\phi : I \rightarrow K$, which determines $Y = \tilde{\sigma}(J)$.

Definition 9.15. Let (I, \preceq, κ) , (K, \preceq) , $\phi : I \rightarrow K$, X , μ and $Q(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi)$ be as in Definition 9.6. Let $L \in \mathcal{F}_{(\kappa, \preceq)}$, and set $J = \phi^{-1}(L)$. Suppose (σ, ι, π) is a (K, \preceq, μ) -configuration, and set $Y = \sigma(L)$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} S(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi, J) : Q(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi)^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi]) &\rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(Y, J, \preceq, \kappa) \\ \text{by } S(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi, J) : [(\sigma', \iota', \pi')] &\mapsto [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})], \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is defined as follows. As $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : [(\sigma', \iota', \pi')] \mapsto [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$, the quotient (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration of (σ', ι', π') from ϕ is isomorphic to (σ, ι, π) .

Choose (σ', ι', π') in its isomorphism class such that this quotient configuration is *equal to* (σ, ι, π) . Then $\sigma'(J) = \sigma(L) = Y$ as $J = \phi^{-1}(L)$. Let $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ be the (J, \preceq) -subconfiguration of (σ', ι', π') . Then $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(Y, J, \preceq, \kappa)$. One can easily check that $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]$ is independent of the choice of (σ', ι', π') , so $S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, J)$ is well-defined.

Theorem 9.16. $S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, J)$ is a morphism of varieties in (53).

Proof. Note that $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)^{-1}([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)])$ is a subvariety of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ by Theorem 9.7. Let (σ', ι', π') , $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ be as in Definition 9.15. For each (I, \preceq) s-set $A \subseteq I$, let $S^A \subset X$ be the subobject represented by $\iota'(A, I) : \sigma'(A) \rightarrow X$, and for each (J, \preceq) s-set $B \subseteq J$, let $T^B \subset Y$ be the subobject represented by $\tilde{\iota}(B, J) : \tilde{\sigma}(B) \rightarrow Y$. Then by (46) we have

$$\Psi_{(I, \preceq, \kappa)}([(\sigma', \iota', \pi')]) = \prod_{(I, \preceq) \text{ s-sets } A} S^A \text{ and } \Psi_{(J, \preceq, \kappa)}([(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]) = \prod_{(J, \preceq) \text{ s-sets } B} T^B.$$

As the variety structures on $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(Y, J, \preceq, \kappa)$ are induced by those on $\prod_{\text{s-sets } A \subseteq I} \text{Sub}^{\kappa(A)}(X)$ and $\prod_{\text{s-sets } B \subseteq J} \text{Sub}^{\kappa(B)}(Y)$, we must show that the map $\prod_A S^A \mapsto \prod_B T^B$ is a morphism of the appropriate subvarieties.

As L is a (K, \trianglelefteq) f-set there exist (K, \trianglelefteq) s-sets $E \subseteq F \subseteq K$ with $L = F \setminus E$. Set $C = \phi^{-1}(E)$ and $D = \phi^{-1}(F)$. Then $C \subseteq D \subseteq I$ are (I, \preceq) s-sets with $J = D \setminus C$. If B is a (J, \preceq) s-set then $A = B \cup D$ is an (I, \preceq) s-set with $B = A \setminus D$, and this gives a 1-1 correspondence between (J, \preceq) s-sets B and (I, \preceq) s-sets A with $C \subseteq A \subseteq D$.

As $C = \phi^{-1}(E)$, $I = \phi^{-1}(K)$ we see that $\iota'(C, I) : \sigma'(C) \rightarrow X$ coincides with $\sigma(E, K) : \sigma(E) \rightarrow X$. Hence S^C depends only on (σ, ι, π) , and is *independent* of (σ', ι', π') . Similarly S^D is independent of (σ', ι', π') . Note also that if A is an (I, \preceq) s-set with $C \subseteq A \subseteq D$ then $S^C \subset S^A \subset S^D \subset X$.

Apply Assumption 8.2(v) with U, V, W, i, j replaced by $\sigma'(C)$, $\sigma'(D)$, Y , $\iota'(C, D)$ and $\pi'(D, J)$ respectively. This gives an isomorphism of varieties

$$\Theta^\beta : \text{Sub}^\beta(Y) \rightarrow \{S \in \text{Sub}^{\kappa(C)+\beta}(X) : S^C \subset S \subset S^D \subset X\}. \quad (54)$$

Careful thought shows that for each (J, \preceq) s-set B we have $\Theta^{\kappa(B)}(T^B) = S^A$, where $A = B \cup D$. Hence the map $\prod_A S^A \mapsto \prod_B T^B$ is given by $T^B = (\Theta^{\kappa(B)})^{-1}(S^{B \cup D})$, which is a morphism of varieties as $\Theta^{\kappa(B)}$ is an isomorphism. This completes the proof. \square

Now suppose that (I, \preceq) , J , (K, \trianglelefteq) and ϕ are as in Definition 5.7. Then in (53), $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is the (J, \preceq) -subconfiguration of (σ', ι', π') . But also, (σ', ι', π') is the result of *substituting* $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ into (σ, ι, π) . Theorem 5.5 shows that (σ', ι', π') and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ determine each other up to canonical isomorphism, so $S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, J)$ is a *1-1 correspondence*. As Θ^β in (54) is an *isomorphism*, examining the proof of Theorem 9.16 shows that $S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, J)$ is also an isomorphism, and we have proved:

Proposition 9.17. *Let $(I, \preceq), J, (K, \trianglelefteq)$ and $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ be as in Definition 5.7, and suppose $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ for some X, κ . Then $S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, J)$ in (53) is an isomorphism of varieties.*

We now extend Proposition 6.9 to varieties.

Theorem 9.18. *Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, $(I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa)$ be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I)$, and $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa)$. Suppose $i \neq j \in I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ but there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \trianglelefteq k \trianglelefteq j$, such that (33) is split. Define \preceq on I by $a \preceq b$ if $a \trianglelefteq b$ and $a \neq i, b \neq j$, so that \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by one step. Then there is an isomorphism of varieties*

$$\mathbb{C}^l \cong \text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\})) \cong Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi]) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa),$$

where the right hand side is a closed subvariety of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$.

Proof. As (33) is split, by Proposition 6.9 we may fix an (I, \preceq) -improvement $(\sigma'_0, \iota'_0, \pi'_0)$ of (σ, ι, π) . Then by Lemma 6.8 and Proposition 6.9, for each $f \in \text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$ there is an (I, \preceq) -improvement (σ', ι', π') of (σ, ι, π) , unique up to isomorphism, with

$$\begin{aligned} \iota'(\{j\}, \{i, j\}) &= \iota'_0(\{j\}, \{i, j\}) + \iota(\{i\}, \{i, j\}) \circ f \\ \text{and } \pi'(\{i, j\}, \{i\}) &= \pi'_0(\{i, j\}, \{i\}) - f \circ \pi(\{i, j\}, \{j\}), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

and every (I, \preceq) -improvement of (σ, ι, π) is isomorphic to (σ', ι', π') constructed in this way for unique $f \in \text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$. This gives a 1-1 correspondence

$$\text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\})) \in f \mapsto [(\sigma', \iota', \pi')] \in Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi]). \quad (56)$$

Since $Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ is a morphism by Theorem 9.7(ii), $Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])$ is a closed subvariety of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, as we have to prove. By Assumption 8.2(i), $\text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\})) \cong \mathbb{C}^l$ for some $l \geq 0$, which is a variety. We shall show (56) is an isomorphism of varieties.

Suppose $D \subseteq I$ is an (I, \preceq) s-set, but not an (I, \trianglelefteq) s-set. Then $i \notin D$ and $j \in D$. Define $C = D \setminus \{j\}$ and $E = D \cup \{i\}$. Then $C \subset D \subset E$ and C, E are both (I, \preceq) and (I, \trianglelefteq) s-sets. Apply Assumption 8.2(v) with U, V, W, i, j, π replaced by $\sigma(C), \sigma(E), \sigma(\{i, j\}), \iota(C, E), \iota(E, I), \pi(E, \{i, j\})$ respectively. This gives an isomorphism of varieties

$$\Theta^{\kappa(j)} : \text{Sub}^{\kappa(j)}(\sigma(\{i, j\})) \mapsto \{S \in \text{Sub}^{\kappa(D)}(X) : S^C \subset S \subset S^E\}.$$

Let $T^f \in \text{Sub}^{\kappa(j)}(\sigma(\{i, j\}))$ be represented by $\iota'(\{j\}, \{i, j\}) : \sigma(\{j\}) \rightarrow \sigma(\{i, j\})$, which depends on $f \in \text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$ as in (55). Let $S^D \in \text{Sub}^{\kappa(D)}(X)$ be represented by $\iota'(D, I) : \sigma'(D) \rightarrow X$, which also depends on f . Calculating $\Theta^{\kappa(j)}(T^f)$ in Assumption 8.2(v), we have $e = \iota'(\{j\}, \{i, j\})$, $c = \pi'(\{i, j\}, \{i\})$, $c \circ \pi = \pi'(E, \{i\})$, $k = \iota'(D, E)$, and $j \circ k = \iota'(E, I)$. Hence $\Theta^{\kappa(j)}(T^f) = S^D$.

Now using Assumption 8.2(vi) we find that $f \mapsto T^f$ is a *morphism of varieties* $\text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\})) \rightarrow \text{Sub}^{\kappa(j)}(\sigma(\{i, j\}))$, and an *isomorphism with its image*. As $\Theta^{\kappa(j)}(T^f) = S^D$ and $\Theta^{\kappa(j)}$ is an isomorphism, we see that if $D \subseteq I$ is an (I, \preceq) s-set, but not an (I, \trianglelefteq) s-set, then $f \mapsto S^D$ is a morphism, $\text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\})) \rightarrow \text{Sub}^{\kappa(D)}(X)$, and an isomorphism with its image. But if $D \subseteq I$ is both an (I, \preceq) s-set and an (I, \trianglelefteq) s-set then S^D is represented by $\iota(D, I) : \sigma(D) \rightarrow X$, and is independent of (σ', ι', π') and f . Therefore (56) is an isomorphism. \square

9.5 Hilbert schemes and correspondences

We conclude this section with some remarks on a possible application of our ideas. Let P be a complex (quasi-)projective surface with structure sheaf \mathcal{O} , and \mathcal{A} the abelian category of coherent sheaves on P , so that $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the *Hilbert scheme* $\text{Hilb}^n(P)$ of n points in P is just $\text{Sub}^{[\mathcal{O}] - n[x]}(\mathcal{O})$ in the notation of §8, where $[x] \in K(\mathcal{A})$ is the class of the sheaf supported at $x \in P$ with stalk \mathbb{C} at x . Hence $\text{Hilb}^n(P) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(\mathcal{O}, \{1\}, \leq, [\mathcal{O}] - n[x])$ is a moduli space of configurations for the one-point poset $I = \{1\}$. This is why we regard our moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ as *generalized Hilbert schemes*.

Much work has been done on Hilbert schemes. We are interested in ideas of Nakajima [15] and Grojnowski [3]. Nakajima constructs natural *correspondences*, essentially subvarieties of products $\text{Hilb}^m(P) \times \text{Hilb}^n(P) \times P$. These induce maps of homology groups $P_\alpha : H_*(\text{Hilb}^m(P)) \rightarrow H_*(\text{Hilb}^n(P))$ for each $\alpha \in H_*(P)$. He puts these maps together to construct a representation on $\bigoplus_{n=0}^\infty H_*(\text{Hilb}^n(P))$ of an infinite-dimensional Lie algebra coming from $H_*(P)$. Grojnowski's results are similar.

Now the correspondences used by Nakajima and Grojnowski can be easily explained in terms of generalized Hilbert schemes $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(\mathcal{O}, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, and the natural maps $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)$ between them. However, the configuration formalism exposes a much richer structure, with many different moduli spaces and maps between them, and many ways of constructing correspondences. It seems likely that extending the ideas of [3, 15] to generalized Hilbert schemes might reveal some exciting new mathematics.

10 Euler characteristics of moduli spaces

We now prove several results on Euler characteristics of moduli spaces, which will be essential tools in [7, 8]. We express our results in terms of *constructible functions*.

10.1 Counting best improvements

It would be convenient if every (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} had a *unique best improvement*. In general this is not true, and the family of all best improvements of (σ, ι, π) is a complicated constructible set in a complex quasi-projective

variety. However, we *can* show that that the Euler characteristic of this family is 1, so that (σ, ι, π) has 1 best improvement ‘counted with Euler characteristic’. This is essentially what the next theorem says.

Theorem 10.1. *Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, $(I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa)$ be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I)$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{partial orders } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq}} \text{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)) \delta_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) = \delta_{\text{all}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa). \quad (57)$$

If also Z is a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} w.r.t. X with phase θ , then

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq}} \text{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)) \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\text{st}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta) \quad (58)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \sum_{\substack{\text{p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq}} \text{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)) \delta_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\text{ss}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta). \quad (59)$$

Proof. Define $S = \{(i, j) \in I \times I : i \neq j \text{ and } i \trianglelefteq j\}$, and let $s = |S|$. Choose some arbitrary total order \leq on S . Define

$$\mathcal{F} = \prod_{\substack{\text{p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa).$$

Theorem 9.7(i) implies that \mathcal{F} is a *complex quasi-projective variety*. Define $\phi_r : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ for $r = 1, \dots, s$ by

$$\phi_r|_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)} = \begin{cases} \text{id} : \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa), & m \neq r, \\ Q(I, \preceq, \lesssim) : \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \lesssim, \kappa), & m = r, \end{cases}$$

if \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by m steps, where \lesssim is defined as follows: let $(i, j) \in S$ be least in the total order \leq such that (a) $i \not\trianglelefteq j$, (b) if $i \neq k \in I$ with $i \preceq k$ then $j \preceq k$, and (c) if $j \neq k \in I$ with $k \preceq i$, then $k \preceq j$. Then define \lesssim on I by $a \lesssim b$ if either $a \preceq b$ or $a = i, b = j$.

Lemma 6.4 and (a)–(c) imply that \lesssim is a partial order and dominates \preceq by one step, and $(i, j) \in S$ gives $i \trianglelefteq j$, so that \trianglelefteq dominates \lesssim . Conversely, if \trianglelefteq dominates \lesssim dominates \preceq by one step then it arises in this way for a unique $(i, j) \in S$. As $r \geq 1$ there is at least one \lesssim with \trianglelefteq dominates \lesssim dominates \preceq by one step, by Proposition 6.5. Thus the set of $(i, j) \in S$ which from which we choose the \leq -least element is nonempty, and ϕ_r is *well-defined*.

If \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by m steps then ϕ_r fixes \preceq if $m \neq r$, and takes \preceq to \lesssim if $m = r$, where \trianglelefteq dominates \lesssim by $r - 1$ steps. So by induction $\phi_r \circ \phi_{r+1} \circ \dots \circ \phi_s$ takes each \preceq to some \lesssim , where \trianglelefteq dominates \lesssim by less than r steps. When $r = 1$ we have $\lesssim = \trianglelefteq$, as \trianglelefteq dominates \lesssim by 0 steps. It follows easily that

$$\phi_1 \circ \phi_2 \circ \dots \circ \phi_s|_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)} = Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq). \quad (60)$$

Theorem 9.7(ii) implies that ϕ_r is a *morphism of varieties*. Define

$$\mathcal{C}_s = \coprod_{\substack{\text{p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \triangleleft \text{ dominates } \preceq}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \subseteq \mathcal{F}. \quad (61)$$

Then \mathcal{C}_s is a *constructible set* in \mathcal{F} by Proposition 9.8. For $r = s, s-1, \dots, 1$ define $\mathcal{C}_{r-1} = \phi_r(\mathcal{C}_r)$. As ϕ_r is a morphism, Proposition 7.3 shows that \mathcal{C}_r is also constructible for $r = s, s-1, \dots, 0$. Equation (60) gives

$$\mathcal{C}_0 = \coprod_{\substack{\text{p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \triangleleft \text{ dominates } \preceq}} Q(I, \preceq, \triangleleft)(\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \triangleleft, \kappa), \quad (62)$$

as every $(I, \triangleleft, \kappa)$ -configuration admits a best improvement by Lemma 6.2.

Suppose $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{C}_{r-1}$ for $r \leq s$, with (σ, ι, π) an (I, \lesssim) -configuration. We shall determine $\phi_r^{-1}([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)])$ in \mathcal{C}_r . If (σ, ι, π) is not best then by Theorem 6.10 there are $i \neq j \in I$ with $i \lesssim j$ but there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \neq k \neq j$ and $i \lesssim k \lesssim j$, such that (33) is split.

Now $i \triangleleft j$ as \triangleleft dominates \lesssim , so $(i, j) \in S$. Let (i, j) be greatest in the total order \leq on S satisfying these conditions. Define \preceq by $a \preceq b$ if $a \lesssim b$ and $a \neq i$ or $b \neq j$. Then \preceq is a partial order on I and \lesssim dominates \preceq by one step. Furthermore, Theorem 6.10 and the construction of the \mathcal{C}_r, ϕ_r imply that $\phi_r^{-1}([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)])$ is exactly the set of isomorphism classes $[(\sigma', \iota', \pi')]$ of (I, \preceq) -improvements (σ', ι', π') of (σ, ι, π) .

Thus, Theorem 9.18 gives an *isomorphism* between $\text{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$ and $\phi_r^{-1}([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)])$. If (σ, ι, π) is best then $\phi_r^{-1}([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]) = \{[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]\} \cong \mathbb{C}^0$. Hence, for all $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{C}_{r-1}$, $\phi_r^{-1}([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)])$ is a subvariety of \mathcal{F} isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^l for some $l \geq 0$.

Write $\delta_{\mathcal{C}_r}$ for the *characteristic function* of \mathcal{C}_r . Then $\delta_{\mathcal{C}_r}$ is a *constructible function*, as \mathcal{C}_r is a constructible set. Since $\phi_r^{-1}([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]) \cong \mathbb{C}^l$ for each point $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ and $\chi(\mathbb{C}^l) = 1$ by Proposition 7.5(i), we see that $\text{CF}(\phi_r)\delta_{\mathcal{C}_r} = \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{r-1}}$ for all r . Hence $\text{CF}(\phi_1 \circ \dots \circ \phi_s)\delta_{\mathcal{C}_s} = \delta_{\mathcal{C}_0}$, by Theorem 7.10. Equation (57) then follows from (60)–(62). To prove (58) and (59) we proceed in the same way, but define \mathcal{C}_s in (61) using $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ or $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ rather than $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, and using Theorem 9.14 rather than Proposition 9.8. \square

The use of $\chi(\mathbb{C}^l) \equiv 1$ in this proof is an important reason for restricting to \mathbb{C} -linear abelian categories, rather than \mathbb{R} -linear ones, for instance.

10.2 Counting best θ -stable configurations

Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, let Z be a *permissible slope function* on \mathcal{A} with *phase* θ , and let $X \in \mathcal{A}$ be θ -semistable. If $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ with $\theta \circ \kappa(i) = \theta([X])$ for all $i \in I$ then $\sigma(\{i\})$ is θ -stable for all $i \in I$ with the *same phase as* X , and we call (σ, ι, π) a *θ -stable configuration*. From Theorem 2.11 we find that $\sigma(\{i\})$ for $i \in I$ are the *θ -stable factors* of X , and up to isomorphism

depend only on X . Hence $|I|$ is the *number of θ -stable factors* of X , and also depends only on X .

We shall study the family of all *best θ -stable configurations* for X up to isomorphism, the union of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ over isomorphism classes of \mathcal{A} -data (I, \preceq, κ) with $\theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])$. In general this is a complicated constructible set in a complex quasi-projective variety, but as in §10.1 we can calculate its Euler characteristic. Consider the following situation.

Definition 10.2. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, let Z be a *permissible slope function* on \mathcal{A} with *phase* θ , and let $X \in \mathcal{A}$ be *θ -semistable*. Then Theorem 2.11 decomposes X into *θ -stable factors* with the same phase as X , uniquely up to isomorphism and order. Let X have nonisomorphic θ -stable factors S_1, \dots, S_n with multiplicities $l_1, \dots, l_n > 0$.

For any θ -stable (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) for X , the $\sigma(\{i\})$ for $i \in I$ are isomorphic to S_m with multiplicities l_m for $m = 1, \dots, n$. Thus $|I| = \sum_{m=1}^n l_m$. Fix an indexing set I with $|I| = \sum_{m=1}^n l_m$. For $m = 1, \dots, n$ define $k_m = \dim \text{Hom}(S_m, X)$. Then $\bigoplus^{k_m} S_m \cong S_m \otimes \text{Hom}(S_m, X) \subset X$, so $0 \leq k_m \leq l_m$.

Fix $a \in I$, and set $J = I \setminus \{a\}$. Let \lesssim be a partial order on J , and define \trianglelefteq on I by $i \trianglelefteq j$ for $i, j \in I$ if either $i, j \in J$ and $i \lesssim j$, or $i = a$. Let $K = \{1, 2\}$ have total order \leq , and define $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ by $\phi(a) = 1$ and $\phi(j) = 2$ for $j \in J$.

Let $T \subset X$ be a *θ -stable subobject* with $\theta([T]) = \theta([X])$. Then there exists a (K, \leq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) , unique up to isomorphism, such that $\sigma(K) = X$ and $\iota(\{1\}, K) : \sigma(\{1\}) \rightarrow X$ represents $T \subset X$. Note that $\sigma(\{1\})$ is *θ -stable*. Define $Y = \sigma(\{2\})$. Choose $\kappa : I \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ such that $(I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa)$ is \mathcal{A} -data, $\kappa(a) = [\sigma(\{1\})] = [T]$, and $[X] = \kappa(I)$. Then $(J, \lesssim, \kappa|_J)$ is also \mathcal{A} -data, and $[Y] = \kappa(J)$.

Definition 9.15 and Proposition 9.17 now define an *isomorphism of varieties* $S(I, \trianglelefteq, K, \leq, \phi, J)$. As $\sigma(\{1\})$ is θ -stable, this isomorphism is a 1-1 correspondence between θ -stable configurations in its domain and range. Hence

$$\text{CF}(S(I, \trianglelefteq, K, \leq, \phi, J))(\delta_{\text{st}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta)|_{Q^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])}) = \delta_{\text{st}}(Y, J, \lesssim, \kappa, \theta), \quad (63)$$

writing $Q^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])$ as a shorthand for $Q(I, \trianglelefteq, K, \leq, \phi)^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])$.

We now apply Theorem 10.1 to rewrite $\delta_{\text{st}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta)|_{Q^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])}$ as a sum over partial orders \preceq on I dominated by \trianglelefteq . As (58) is a fibrewise identity we may restrict it to $Q^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])$. Substituting this into (63) gives

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq}} \text{CF}(S(I, \trianglelefteq, K, \leq, \phi, J) \circ Q(I, \trianglelefteq, \preceq)) \cdot \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)|_{Q^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])} = \delta_{\text{st}}(Y, J, \lesssim, \kappa, \theta). \quad (64)$$

One can show using Theorem 6.10 that the image of a *best* configuration under $S(I, \trianglelefteq, K, \leq, \phi, J) \circ Q(I, \trianglelefteq, \preceq)$ is best if and only if $\preceq|_J = \lesssim$. So restricting (64) to \preceq with $\preceq|_J = \lesssim$ and noting that $S(I, \trianglelefteq, K, \leq, \phi, J) \circ Q(I, \trianglelefteq, \preceq) = S(I, \preceq, K, \leq, \phi, J)$ in this case yields:

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \preceq|_J = \lesssim \\ \text{and } j \not\trianglelefteq a \text{ for all } j \in J}} \text{CF}(S(I, \preceq, K, \leq, \phi, J))(\delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)|_{Q^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])}) = \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(Y, J, \lesssim, \kappa, \theta).$$

Taking weighted Euler characteristics of both sides and using Corollary 7.11, and then fixing X, Y, T, I, a, J and summing over all possible $\preceq, \lesssim, \kappa$ proves:

Proposition 10.3. *Let X, I be as above, $a \in I$ and $J = I \setminus \{a\}$. Suppose $T \subset X$ is θ -stable with $\theta([T]) = \theta([X])$, and $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ with $Y \cong X/T$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ a \text{ is } \preceq\text{-minimal,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi \left(\{[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) : \right. \\ & \quad \left. \iota(\{a\}, I) : \sigma(\{a\}) \rightarrow X \text{ defines } T \subset X\} \right) = \\ & \sum_{\substack{\lesssim, \lambda: (J, \lesssim, \lambda) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \lambda(J) = [Y], \theta \circ \lambda \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(Y, J, \lesssim, \lambda, \theta)). \end{aligned}$$

We can easily extend this proof to fix not just one \preceq -minimal element $a \in I$, but a subset $A \subseteq I$. Here the condition $\sum_{a \in A} T_a \cong \bigoplus_{a \in A} T_a$ means that the subobjects T_a for $a \in A$ are ‘linearly independent’. This is necessary for them to be defined by $\iota(\{a\}, I) : \sigma(\{a\}) \rightarrow X$ for any (σ, ι, π) .

Proposition 10.4. *Let X, I be as above, $A \subseteq I$ and $J = I \setminus A$. Suppose $T_a \subset X$ is θ -stable subobject with $\theta([T_a]) = \theta([X])$ for each $a \in A$, with $\sum_{a \in A} T_a \cong \bigoplus_{a \in A} T_a$. Set $T = \sum_{a \in A} T_a$ and choose $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ with $Y \cong X/T$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \text{each } a \in A \text{ is } \preceq\text{-minimal,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi \left(\{[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) : \right. \\ & \quad \left. \iota(\{a\}, I) : \sigma(\{a\}) \rightarrow X \text{ defines } T_a \subset X \forall a \in A\} \right) = \\ & \sum_{\substack{\lesssim, \lambda: (J, \lesssim, \lambda) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \lambda(J) = [Y], \theta \circ \lambda \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(Y, J, \lesssim, \lambda, \theta)). \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

As S_m is θ -stable with the same phase as X , a morphism $i : S_m \rightarrow X$ is injective if and only if it is nonzero, so $\text{Inj}(S_m, X) = \text{Hom}(S_m, X) \setminus \{0\}$, and $\text{Aut}(S_m) = \mathbb{C}^*$. Hence, applying Assumption 8.2(vi) with $W = S_m$ gives:

Lemma 10.5. *For each $m = 1, \dots, n$, $\{T \subset X : T \cong S_m\}$ is a subvariety of $\text{Sub}^{[S_m]}(X)$ isomorphic to $P(\text{Hom}(S_m, X)) \cong \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^{k_m-1}$.*

We now study the family of collections of $T_a \subset X$ in Proposition 10.4.

Proposition 10.6. *Let X, I and S_m, k_m, l_m for $m = 1, \dots, n$ be as in Definition 10.2, and set $k = \sum_{m=1}^n k_m$. For $A \subseteq I$ with $|A| \leq k$, define \mathcal{N}_A to be the set of*

$$\psi : A \longrightarrow \prod_{m=1}^n \{T \in \text{Sub}^{[S_m]}(X) : T \cong S_m\} \tag{66}$$

with $\sum_{a \in A} \psi(a) \cong \bigoplus_{a \in A} \psi(a)$ as subobjects of X . Then \mathcal{N}_A is a subvariety of $\prod_{a \in A} (\prod_{m=1}^n \text{Sub}^{[S_m]}(X))$ with $\chi(\mathcal{N}_A) = k! / (k - |A|)!$.

Proof. Lemma 10.5 shows that the r.h.s. of (66) is a projective subvariety of $\coprod_{m=1}^n \text{Sub}^{[S_m]}(X)$ naturally isomorphic to $\coprod_{m=1}^n P(\text{Hom}(S_m, X))$. Thus \mathcal{N}_A corresponds to a set of maps $A \rightarrow \coprod_{m=1}^n P(\text{Hom}(S_m, X))$.

Rewriting $\sum_{a \in A} \psi(a) \cong \bigoplus_{a \in A} \psi(a)$ using the $P(\text{Hom}(S_m, X))$ gives a 1-1 correspondence

$$\mathcal{N}_A \cong \left\{ \psi : A \rightarrow \coprod_{m=1}^n P(\text{Hom}(S_m, X)) : \psi \text{ is injective and } \psi(A) \cap P(\text{Hom}(S_m, X)) \text{ is linearly independent for all } m \right\}. \quad (67)$$

Here a finite subset S of a projective space $P(V)$ is called *linearly independent* if there exists no linear subspace $P(U) \subseteq P(V)$ with $S \subseteq P(U)$ and $\dim U < |S|$.

The r.h.s. of (67) is an *open subvariety* of $\prod_{a \in A} (\coprod_{m=1}^n P(\text{Hom}(S_m, X)))$. Hence \mathcal{N}_A is a subvariety of $\prod_{a \in A} (\coprod_{m=1}^n \text{Sub}^{[S_m]}(X))$, and (67) an isomorphism of varieties. As $P(\text{Hom}(S_m, X)) \cong \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^{k_m-1}$ and $k = \sum_{m=1}^n k_m$, we can use (67) and Proposition 7.5 to compute $\chi(\mathcal{N}_A)$, by a long but elementary calculation that we leave as an exercise. \square

In the next proposition, note that the set of \preceq -minimal elements in I contains A in (68), and is equal to A in (69).

Proposition 10.7. *Let X, I and S_m, k_m, l_m for $m = 1, \dots, n$ be as in Definition 10.2, and set $k = \sum_{m=1}^n k_m$. Then for each $A \subseteq I$ with $|A| \leq k$ we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \text{each } a \in A \text{ is } \preceq\text{-minimal,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^b(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)) = \frac{(|I| - |A|)!k!}{(k - |A|)!}, \text{ and} \quad (68)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ A \text{ is the } \preceq\text{-minimal set,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^b(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)) = \begin{cases} 0, & |A| < k, \\ (|I| - k)!k!, & |A| = k. \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

Proof. First we show (68) and (69) are equivalent. Suppose (69) holds. Then letting the \preceq -minimal set in (68) be A' , the l.h.s. of (68) may be rewritten

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{subsets } A' : \\ A \subseteq A' \subseteq I}} \left[\sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ A' \text{ is the } \preceq\text{-minimal set,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^b(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)) \right] = \sum_{\substack{\text{subsets } A' : \\ A \subseteq A' \subseteq I, |A'| = k}} (|I| - k)!k! = \binom{|I| - |A|}{k - |A|} \cdot (|I| - k)!k! = \frac{(|I| - |A|)!k!}{(k - |A|)!}$$

by (69), which proves (68). Note that the \preceq -minimal set A' always has $|A'| \leq k$ by definition of k, k_m , as X has only k linearly independent θ -stable subobjects.

Therefore (69) implies (68). Now any partial order \preceq on I has a nonempty minimal set, so if $|A| = 0$ both sides of (69) are zero. Thus (69) holds trivially when $|A| = 0$. Hence, (69) for $1 \leq |A| \leq k$ implies (68). By a similar but more complicated argument we can show that (68) for $1 \leq |A| \leq k$ implies (69). Hence, if (68) holds when $1 \leq |A| \leq k$, then both (68) and (69) hold for $|A| \leq k$.

We can now prove the proposition by induction on $|I|$. The result is trivial when $|I| = 1$, giving the first step. Suppose by induction that (68) and (69) hold whenever $|I| \leq m$, and let $|I| = m + 1$. Let $A \subseteq I$ with $1 \leq |A| \leq k$, and set $J = I \setminus A$. Let \mathcal{N}_A be as in Proposition 10.6. Define

$$Q = \coprod_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \text{each } a \in A \text{ is } \preceq\text{-minimal,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X]), \\ \{\kappa(i) : i \in I\} \subseteq \{[S_m] : 1 \leq m \leq n\}}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa), \quad R = \coprod_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \text{each } a \in A \text{ is } \preceq\text{-minimal,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta). \quad (70)$$

As there are only finitely many nonempty sets in each disjoint union, Q is a *complex quasi-projective variety* by Theorem 9.7(i), and R is a *constructible set* by Theorem 9.14. Define

$$\phi : Q \longrightarrow \left\{ \text{maps } \psi : A \rightarrow \bigcup_{m=1}^n \text{Sub}^{[S_m]}(X) \right\} = \mathcal{S}_A \quad (71)$$

as follows. Let $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \subseteq Q$. As each $a \in A$ is \preceq -minimal $(\{a\}, I) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and $\iota(\{a\}, I) : \sigma(\{a\}) \rightarrow X$ defines a subobject $T_a \subset X$. Define $\psi(a) = T_a$ for $a \in A$. As $[T_a] = \kappa(a) \in \{[S_m] : 1 \leq m \leq n\}$ by (70), ψ maps as in (71). Set $\phi([(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]) = \psi$. Then ϕ maps as in (71). By definition of the variety structure on Q , we see that ϕ is a *morphism*.

Now \mathcal{N}_A in Proposition 10.6 is contained in the right hand side of (71). If $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ lies in R in (70) then each T_a is θ -stable, so $T_a \cong S_m$ for some $m = 1, \dots, n$, and ψ maps as in (66). Combined with $\sum_{a \in A} T_a \cong \bigoplus_{a \in A} T_a$, which is necessary for the T_a to come from a configuration, this implies that $\psi \in \mathcal{N}_A$. Therefore $\phi(R) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_A$.

Let $\psi \in \mathcal{N}_A$, and put $T_a = \psi(a)$ for $a \in A$, so that $\sum_{a \in A} T_a \cong \bigoplus_{a \in A} T_a$. Set $T = \sum_{a \in A} T_a$, and choose $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ with $Y \cong X/T$. Then Proposition 10.4 applies, and (65) holds. The l.h.s. of (65) is $\chi(R \cap \phi^{-1}(\psi))$, by (70) and the definition of ϕ . Also, the r.h.s. of (65) is the l.h.s. of (68) with Y in place of X , J in place of I , and \emptyset in place of A .

Since $|I| = m + 1$, $|A| \geq 1$ and $J = I \setminus A$ we have $|J| \leq m$. Hence by the inductive hypothesis, (65) holds for Y, J, \emptyset . So for all $\psi \in \mathcal{N}_A$ we have

$$\chi(R \cap \phi^{-1}(\psi)) = |J|! = (|I| - |A|)!.$$

Thus $\text{CF}(\phi)\delta_R \equiv (|I| - |A|)!\delta_{\mathcal{N}_A}$, where $\delta_R : Q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $\delta_{\mathcal{N}_A} : \mathcal{S}_A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ are the characteristic functions of R, \mathcal{N}_A . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \text{each } a \in A \text{ is } \preceq\text{-minimal,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X]}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)) &= \chi(R) = \chi(Q, \delta_R) = \chi(\mathcal{S}_A, \text{CF}(\phi)\delta_R) \\ &= (|I| - |A|)!\chi(\mathcal{N}_A) = \frac{(|I| - |A|)!k!}{(k - |A|)!}, \end{aligned}$$

by Corollary 7.11 and Proposition 10.6. Hence (68) holds for $1 \leq |A| \leq k$ with this fixed I , and so (68) and (69) hold for $|A| \leq k$ with this I from above. This completes the inductive step, and the proof of Proposition 10.7. \square

Here are two ways to write the Euler characteristic of the family of all *best θ -stable configurations* for X . The first follows from (68) with $A = \emptyset$.

Theorem 10.8. *Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, let Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ be θ -semistable. Fix a finite set I such that X has $|I|$ θ -stable factors in Theorem 2.11, counted with multiplicity. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)) = |I|!. \quad (72)$$

Theorem 10.9. *Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 8.2, let Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and let $X \in \mathcal{A}$ be θ -semistable. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes of} \\ \mathcal{A}\text{-data } (I, \preceq, \kappa): \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \\ \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \frac{\chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta))}{|\text{Aut}(I, \preceq, \kappa)|} = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes of} \\ \mathcal{A}\text{-data } (I, \preceq, \kappa): \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \\ \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \chi\left(\frac{\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)}{\text{Aut}(I, \preceq, \kappa)}\right) = 1. \quad (73)$$

Proof. With I fixed as in Theorem 10.8, consider the disjoint union

$$\coprod_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \kappa(I) = [X], \theta \circ \kappa \equiv \theta([X])}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta). \quad (74)$$

Theorem 10.8 shows that the Euler characteristic of (74) is $|I|!$.

Now I is just a finite indexing set, with no additional structure. Let $\text{Aut}(I)$ be the permutation group of I , so that $|\text{Aut}(I)| = |I|!$. Then $\text{Aut}(I)$ acts on (74), and the subgroup preserving $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ in (74) is $\text{Aut}(I, \preceq, \kappa)$. Hence $\text{Aut}(I)$ acts *freely* on (74), by Corollary 9.5. Therefore the Euler characteristic of the quotient of (74) by $\text{Aut}(I)$ is $|I|!$ divided by $|\text{Aut}(I)|$, which is 1. Equation (73) gives two ways to express this. \square

The sums over isomorphism classes in (73) have to be interpreted carefully, to avoid misunderstanding. They are sums over equivalence classes of \mathcal{A} -data (I, \preceq, κ) , where (I, \preceq, κ) and (I', \preceq', κ') are equivalent if there exists a bijection $\beta: I \rightarrow I'$ which identifies \preceq, κ with \preceq', κ' .

Taking $I = I'$ and $\beta \in \text{Aut}(I)$, this equivalence relation identifies (I, \preceq, κ) and (I, \preceq', κ') if (\preceq, κ) and (\preceq', κ') differ by a permutation of I . So we can think of the sum as first fixing the indexing set I up to isomorphism, and then summing over $\text{Aut}(I)$ -orbits of pairs (\preceq, κ) such that (I, \preceq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data.

Theorem 10.9 is neater and more attractive than Theorem 10.8. However, in §10.3 and throughout [7, 8] we will use the set up of Theorem 10.8, fixing I

and then summing over \preceq, κ . This is because manipulating sums over equivalence classes of complicated equivalence relations, such as (73), and especially substituting one such sum into another, takes a lot of care to get right.

10.3 Counting best θ -stable refinements

Our final result in effect computes the Euler characteristic of the family of all *best θ -stable refinements* of a θ -semistable (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) .

Theorem 10.10. *Suppose \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 8.2, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and Z is a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all \mathcal{A} -data $(K, \trianglelefteq, \mu)$ with $\mu(K) = [X]$ we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa, \phi: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \phi: I \rightarrow K \text{ is surjective,} \\ i \preceq j \text{ implies } \phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j), \\ \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K, \\ \theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa: I \rightarrow (0, 1]}} \text{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)) \quad \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\text{ss}}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu, \theta). \quad (75)$$

Only finitely many functions $\delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ in this sum are nonzero.

Proof. Suppose I, \preceq, κ, ϕ are as in (75), and $\delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ is nonzero. Let $k \in K$. Then $\kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k)$ gives $\sum_{i \in I: \phi(i)=k} Z(\kappa(i)) = Z(\mu(k))$. But $\theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa$ implies that all $Z(\kappa(i))$ in this sum have the *same phase*. Therefore $|Z(\kappa(i))| \leq |Z(\mu(k))|$, and so

$$|Z(\kappa(i))| \leq \max_{k \in K} |Z(\mu(k))| = R \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (76)$$

As $\delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ is nonzero there exists $[(\sigma', \iota', \pi')] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$. Then $\sigma'(\{i\})$ is a θ -stable factor of X for $i \in I$, with $[\sigma'(\{i\})] = \kappa(i)$. Therefore (76) and Definition 9.10(ii) shows that there exists a *finite* subset P of $K_{\text{ss}}^{\theta}(X) \subseteq K(\mathcal{A})$, depending only on K, μ , such that $\kappa(i) \in P$ for all $i \in I$. It is then easy to see that only finitely many $\delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ in (75) are nonzero.

Fix $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu, \theta)$. Then $\sigma(\{k\})$ is θ -semistable for each $k \in K$. Let n_k be the number of θ -stable factors of $\sigma(\{k\})$ in Theorem 2.11, counted with multiplicity. Fix a finite set I with $|I| = \sum_{k \in K} n_k$, and choose a surjective map $\phi: I \rightarrow K$ such that $|\phi^{-1}(k)| = n_k$ for each $k \in K$. This is clearly possible.

For each $k \in K$ define $X_k = \sigma(\{k\})$ and $I_k = \phi^{-1}(k)$. Let \lesssim_k be partial orders on I_k for each $k \in K$, and define a partial order \lesssim on I by $i \lesssim j$ for $i, j \in I$ if either (a) $\phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)$ and $\phi(i) \neq \phi(j)$, or (b) $i \lesssim_k j$ and $\phi(i) = \phi(j) = k$. Choose $\kappa_k: I_k \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ such that $(I_k, \lesssim_k, \kappa_k)$ is \mathcal{A} -data for $k \in K$, with $\kappa_k(I_k) = \mu(k) = [X_k]$ and $\theta \circ \kappa_k \equiv \theta \circ \mu(k)$. Define $\kappa: I \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\kappa|_{I_k} = \kappa_k$. Then (I, \lesssim, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data with $\kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k)$ for $k \in K$.

Definition 9.15 gives a map $S(I, \lesssim, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, I_k)$ for each $k \in K$. Putting all these together yields a map

$$\prod_{k \in K} S(I, \lesssim, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, I_k) : Q(I, \lesssim, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi]) \longrightarrow \prod_{k \in K} \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X_k, I_k, \lesssim_k, \kappa_k) \quad \text{taking } [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \mapsto \prod_{k \in K} [(\tilde{\sigma}_k, \tilde{\iota}_k, \tilde{\pi}_k)], \quad (77)$$

where $(\tilde{\sigma}_k, \tilde{\iota}_k, \tilde{\pi}_k)$ is the (I_k, \lesssim_k) -subconfiguration of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ for $k \in K$, and $Q(I, \lesssim, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!]) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \lesssim, \kappa)$. Now the inverse of (77) is obtained by *substituting* $(\tilde{\sigma}_k, \tilde{\iota}_k, \tilde{\pi}_k)$ into (σ, ι, π) at k for $k \in K$. Generalizing Proposition 9.17 therefore shows that (77) is an *isomorphism of varieties*.

As $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is θ -stable if and only if all $(\tilde{\sigma}_k, \tilde{\iota}_k, \tilde{\pi}_k)$ are θ -stable, we see that

$$\text{CF}(\prod_{k \in K} S(I, \lesssim, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, I_k)) \delta_{\text{st}}(X, I, \lesssim, \kappa, \theta) |_{Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])} = \prod_{k \in K} \delta_{\text{st}}(X_k, I_k, \lesssim_k, \kappa_k, \theta), \quad (78)$$

writing $Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])$ as a shorthand for $Q(I, \lesssim, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])$.

We now apply Theorem 10.1 to rewrite $\delta_{\text{st}}(X, I, \lesssim, \kappa, \theta) |_{Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])}$ as a sum over partial orders \preceq on I dominated by \lesssim . Since (58) is a fibrewise identity we may restrict it to $Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])$. Substituting this into (78) gives

$$\sum_{\substack{\preceq \text{ p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \preceq \text{ dominates } \lesssim}} \text{CF}(\prod_{k \in K} S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, I_k) \circ Q(I, \trianglelefteq, \preceq)) \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) |_{Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])} = \prod_{k \in K} \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X_k, I_k, \lesssim_k, \kappa_k, \theta). \quad (79)$$

One can show using Theorem 6.10 that the image of a *best* configuration under $S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, I_k) \circ Q(I, \trianglelefteq, \preceq)$ is best if and only if $\preceq|_{I_k} = \lesssim_k$. So restricting (79) to \preceq with $\preceq|_{I_k} = \lesssim_k$ for all k and noting that $S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, I_k) \circ Q(I, \trianglelefteq, \preceq) = S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, I_k)$ in this case yields:

$$\sum_{\substack{\preceq \text{ p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \preceq|_{I_k} = \lesssim_k, k \in K, \\ i \preceq j \text{ implies } \phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)}} \text{CF}(\prod_{k \in K} S(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi, I_k)) \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) |_{Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])} = \prod_{k \in K} \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X_k, I_k, \lesssim_k, \kappa_k, \theta).$$

Taking weighted Euler characteristics and using Corollary 7.11 proves

$$\sum_{\substack{\preceq \text{ p.o.s } \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \preceq|_{I_k} = \lesssim_k, k \in K, \\ i \preceq j \text{ implies } \phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \cap Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])) = \prod_{k \in K} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X_k, I_k, \lesssim_k, \kappa_k, \theta)).$$

Summing this over all possible \lesssim_k, κ_k with $\theta \circ \kappa_k \equiv \theta \circ \mu(k)$ and applying Theorem 10.8 then gives:

$$\sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ i \preceq j \text{ implies } \phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j), \\ \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k), k \in K, \\ \theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \rightarrow (0, 1]}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \cap Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])) = \prod_{k \in K} |I_k|! = \prod_{k \in K} n_k!. \quad (80)$$

So far we have worked with a fixed $\phi : I \rightarrow K$. It is easy to see that there are $|I|! / \prod_{k \in K} n_k!$ distinct maps $\phi : I \rightarrow K$ satisfying the conditions above. Summing (80) over all such ϕ , we find:

$$\sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa, \phi: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,} \\ \phi : I \rightarrow K \text{ is surjective,} \\ i \preceq j \text{ implies } \phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j), \\ \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k), k \in K, \\ \theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \rightarrow (0, 1]}} \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \cap Q^{-1}([\!(\sigma, \iota, \pi)\!])) = |I|!. \quad (81)$$

Here we use the fact that if \preceq, κ, ϕ are as in (81) and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \cap Q^{-1}([\sigma, \iota, \pi])$ is nonempty, then Theorem 2.11 implies that $|\phi^{-1}(k)| = n_k$ for all $k \in K$, so that $|I| = \sum_{k \in K} n_k$.

By the same argument, if $\text{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, K, \preceq, \phi))\delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ is nonzero at $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ in (75) then $|I| = \sum_{k \in K} n_k$. Since the first sum in (75) selects a unique I with $|I| = \sum_{k \in K} n_k$, equation (81) is equivalent to (75) at $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$. As this holds for all $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ss}}(X, K, \preceq, \mu, \theta)$, the proof is complete. \square

References

- [1] K. Baclawski, *Whitney Numbers of Geometric Lattices*, Advances in Math. 16 (1975), 125–138.
- [2] T. Bridgeland, *Stability conditions on triangulated categories*, math.AG/0212237, version 2, 2003.
- [3] I. Grojnowski, *Instantons and affine algebras I: the Hilbert scheme and vertex operators*, Math. Res. Letters 3 (1996), 275–291.
- [4] A. Grothendieck, *Techniques de construction et théorèmes d’existence en géométrie algébrique*, Sémin. Bourbaki 221, 1960/61.
- [5] G. Harder and M.S. Narasimhan, *On the Cohomology Groups of Moduli Spaces of Vector Bundles on Curves*, Math. Ann. 212 (1975), 215–248.
- [6] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 52, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.
- [7] D.D. Joyce, *Configurations in abelian categories. II. Combinatorial identities*, math.AG/0312192, 2003.
- [8] D.D. Joyce, *Configurations in abelian categories. III. Stability conditions and invariants*, in preparation, 2004.
- [9] D.D. Joyce, in preparation, 2004.
- [10] S.I. Gelfand and Y.I. Manin, *Methods of Homological Algebra*, second edition, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [11] G. Kennedy, *MacPherson’s Chern classes of singular algebraic varieties*, Communications in Algebra 18 (1990), 2821–2839.
- [12] J. Kollar, *Rational Curves on Algebraic Varieties*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 32, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [13] R.D. MacPherson, *Chern classes for singular algebraic varieties*, Ann. Math. 100 (1974), 423–432.
- [14] D. Mumford, *The Red Book of Varieties and Schemes*, second edition, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1358, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

- [15] H. Nakajima, *Lectures on Hilbert schemes of points on surfaces*, Univeristy Lecture Series 18, A.M.S., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [16] N. Popescu, *Abelian Categories with Applications to Rings and Modules*, L.M.S. Monographs 3, Academic Press, London, 1973.
- [17] A. Rudakov, *Stability for an Abelian Category*, Journal of Algebra 197 (1997), 231–245.
- [18] C. Sabbah, *Quelques remarques sur la géométrie des espaces conormaux*, Asterisque 130 (1985), 161–192.
- [19] C.S. Seshadri, *Space of unitary vector bundles on a compact Riemann surface*, Ann. Math. 85 (1967), 303–336.
- [20] O.Y. Viro, *Some integral calculus based on Euler characteristic*, pages 127–138 in *Topology and Geometry – Rohlin seminar*, editor O.Y. Viro, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1346, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.