

Last time: $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}]$
not a PID but
still glob dim = 1.

could have said:

$\forall \underline{m} \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}_{\underline{m}}$ is a PID.

Worksheet: $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]$

$$\underline{m} = (2, 1 + \sqrt{3})$$

Show that

$$\text{Tor}_*^{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}/\underline{m}, \mathbb{R}/\underline{m}) = 1 \ 2 \ 2 \ 2 \ 2 \ \dots$$

glob dim = ∞ .

Today: Koszul complexes and

$$\text{glob dim } k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = n.$$

You saw: for $R = k[x, y]$

$$\underline{m} = (x, y)$$

this is a res of R/\underline{m} :

$$0 \rightarrow R \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{y} \\ \xrightarrow{x} \end{matrix} R^2 \xrightarrow{(x \ y)} R \rightarrow R/\underline{m} \rightarrow 0$$

$$\text{so } \text{Tor}_x^R(R/\underline{m}, R/\underline{m}) = (1, 2, 1, 0, \dots)$$

What about $n > 2$?

let $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$

$M = R^n$ with basis $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}$

(just symbols; or $M =$ vector fields on k^n)

$\xi = x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + \dots + x_n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}$ "Euler vector field"

$M^* = R^n$ w/ dual basis dx_1, \dots, dx_n

(just symbols; or 1-forms)

pairing betw. M and M^* :

$$dx_i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i=j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$$

Koszul complex:

$$0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 M^* \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Lambda^k M^* \rightarrow \Lambda^{k-1} M^* \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Lambda^0 M^* \rightarrow M^* \rightarrow R \rightarrow 0$$

$\omega \longmapsto \xi \lrcorner \omega$ or $\xi \lrcorner \omega$

(for contracting / interior mult with a v.f.:
read Jack Lee, Smooth Manifolds
Ch. 14 of 2nd ed.)

$\omega \mapsto \sum \omega$ is an \mathbb{R} -lin. map

determined by $dx_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{i_k} \in \Lambda^k M^*$

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{j+1} x_{i_j} \overbrace{dx_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{i_k}}^{\wedge}$$

Claim: Koszul complex is a res of $\mathbb{R}/(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

not surprising: the map $M^* = \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
is just (x_1, \dots, x_n)

so coker = $\mathbb{R}/(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

but why is it exact elsewhere?

define $d: \Lambda^k M^* \rightarrow \Lambda^{k+1} M^*$
 \mathbb{C} -linear but not \mathbb{R} -linear.

$$d\left(f dx_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{i_k}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} dx_j \wedge dx_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{i_k}$$

exactness follows from $d(\sum w) + \sum dw = w$. corrected next time.

do it by hand for $n=3$, $k=2$

$$w = f \, dx \, dy$$

$$dw = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} dx \, dy + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} dy \, dx + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} dz \, dx \, dy$$

$$= f_z \, dx \, dy \, dz$$

$$\sum w = \cancel{xf_z \, dy \, dz} - \cancel{yf_z \, dx \, dz} + z f_z \, dx \, dy$$

0704

$$\sum w = xf \, dy - yf \, dx$$

$$d(\text{that}) = (f + xf_x) dx \, dy + \cancel{xf_y \, dy \, dy} \, \cancel{xf_z \, dz \, dy} - \cancel{yf_x \, dx \, dx} - (f + yf_y) dy \, dx - \cancel{yf_z \, dz \, dx}$$

$$\sum dw + d(\sum w) = (2f + xf_x + yf_y + zf_z) dx \, dy$$

if f is homog of deg e

$$\text{then } xf_x + yf_y + zf_z = e \cdot f$$

$$= (2+e) \cdot w \quad ? ?$$

fix it next time, sorry.

worksheet: understand differentials by hand
when $n=3$.