

MA 206 notes: Review of math 205

Dan Abramovich

Brown University

January 20, 2019

Algebraic geometry

- At its core, algebraic geometry is the study of **varieties**,
- namely the zero sets of collections of polynomials in \mathbb{A}^n or \mathbb{P}^n ,
- assumed irreducible (and reduced).
- We are interested in intrinsic properties (dimension, smoothness ...)
- We are interested in ways to embed a variety in projective space,
- We are interested in classifying: telling things apart, similarities, parameters ...
- **Birational geometry** is a special topic of algebraic geometry
- **moduli spaces** are a phenomenon best studied in algebraic geometry.

- At its core, algebraic geometry is the study of **varieties**,
- namely the zero sets of collections of polynomials in \mathbb{A}^n or \mathbb{P}^n ,
- assumed irreducible (and reduced).
- We are interested in intrinsic properties (dimension, smoothness . . .)
- We are interested in ways to embed a variety in projective space,
- We are interested in classifying: telling things apart, similarities, parameters . . .
- **Birational geometry** is a special topic of algebraic geometry
- **moduli spaces** are a phenomenon best studied in algebraic geometry.

Algebraic geometry

- At its core, algebraic geometry is the study of **varieties**,
- namely the zero sets of collections of polynomials in \mathbb{A}^n or \mathbb{P}^n ,
- assumed irreducible (and reduced).
- We are interested in intrinsic properties (dimension, smoothness ...)
- We are interested in ways to embed a variety in projective space,
- We are interested in classifying: telling things apart, similarities, parameters ...
- **Birational geometry** is a special topic of algebraic geometry
- **moduli spaces** are a phenomenon best studied in algebraic geometry.

Affine Schemes

- The current language is alertschemes.
- An affine scheme $\text{Spec } A$ is the set of **primes** in the commutative ring A ,
- which is a departure from varieties, where maximal ideals are taken.
- $\text{Spec } A$ is provided a topology by declaring $V(f) = \{\mathfrak{p} : f \in \mathfrak{p}\}$ to be closed
- (or $D(f) = \{\mathfrak{p} : f \notin \mathfrak{p}\}$ to be open).
- $X = \text{Spec } A$ is made a locally ringed space by declaring $\mathcal{O}_X(D(f)) = A[f^{-1}]$
- (and taking \mathcal{O}_X the sheaf determined by this \mathcal{B} -sheaf).

Affine Schemes

- The current language is alertschemes.
- An affine scheme $\text{Spec } A$ is the set of **primes** in the commutative ring A ,
- which is a departure from varieties, where maximal ideals are taken.
- $\text{Spec } A$ is provided a topology by declaring $V(f) = \{\mathfrak{p} : f \in \mathfrak{p}\}$ to be closed
- (or $D(f) = \{\mathfrak{p} : f \notin \mathfrak{p}\}$ to be open).
- $X = \text{Spec } A$ is made a locally ringed space by declaring $\mathcal{O}_X(D(f)) = A[f^{-1}]$
- (and taking \mathcal{O}_X the sheaf determined by this \mathcal{B} -sheaf).

- The current language is alertschemes.
- An affine scheme $\text{Spec } A$ is the set of **primes** in the commutative ring A ,
- which is a departure from varieties, where maximal ideals are taken.
- $\text{Spec } A$ is provided a topology by declaring $V(f) = \{\mathfrak{p} : f \in \mathfrak{p}\}$ to be closed
- (or $D(f) = \{\mathfrak{p} : f \notin \mathfrak{p}\}$ to be open).
- $X = \text{Spec } A$ is made a locally ringed space by declaring $\mathcal{O}_X(D(f)) = A[f^{-1}]$
- (and taking \mathcal{O}_X the sheaf determined by this \mathcal{B} -sheaf).

- **Schemes** are locally ringed spaces which are locally affine schemes.
- Arrows are arrows of locally ringed spaces (so $Sch \subset LRS$ a full subcategory).
- $AffSch \simeq ComRings^{op}$.
- Then starts a barrage of adjectives: reduced, irreducible, integral, quasicompact, noetherian, regular, ...
- Further adjectives for morphisms (or S -schemes).
- Important: *separated* and *proper* morphisms.
- A **variety** over $k = \bar{k}$ is a separated integral scheme of finite type over k .

- **Schemes** are locally ringed spaces which are locally affine schemes.
- Arrows are arrows of locally ringed spaces (so $Sch \subset LRS$ a full subcategory).
- $AffSch \simeq ComRings^{op}$.
- Then starts a barrage of adjectives:
reduced, irreducible, integral, quasicompact, noetherian, regular, ...
- Further adjectives for morphisms (or S -schemes).
- Important: *separated* and *proper* morphisms.
- A **variety** over $k = \bar{k}$ is a separated integral scheme of finite type over k .

- **Schemes** are locally ringed spaces which are locally affine schemes.
- Arrows are arrows of locally ringed spaces (so $Sch \subset LRS$ a full subcategory).
- $AffSch \simeq ComRings^{op}$.
- Then starts a barrage of adjectives: reduced, irreducible, integral, quasicompact, noetherian, regular, ...
- Further adjectives for morphisms (or S -schemes).
- Important: *separated* and *proper* morphisms.
- A **variety** over $k = \bar{k}$ is a separated integral scheme of finite type over k .

- **Schemes** are locally ringed spaces which are locally affine schemes.
- Arrows are arrows of locally ringed spaces (so $Sch \subset LRS$ a full subcategory).
- $AffSch \simeq ComRings^{op}$.
- Then starts a barrage of adjectives: reduced, irreducible, integral, quasicompact, noetherian, regular, ...
- Further adjectives for morphisms (or S -schemes).
- Important: *separated* and *proper* morphisms.
- A **variety** over $k = \bar{k}$ is a separated integral scheme of finite type over k .

Reminder: sheaves and sections

- We are working with **schemes** X .
- The structure is governed by **sheaves** of abelian groups, such as \mathcal{O}_X .
- Most important are **Sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules**.
- Particularly useful are **Quasi-coherent** sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.
- We want to understand their **sections**.
- For instance: we classified morphisms $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ through sections of an invertible sheaf.¹
- Understanding sections is a fundamental question of **varieties**.

¹also related to divisors and linear systems

Reminder: sheaves and sections

- We are working with **schemes** X .
- The structure is governed by **sheaves** of abelian groups, such as \mathcal{O}_X .
- Most important are **Sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules**.
- Particularly useful are **Quasi-coherent** sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.
- We want to understand their **sections**.
- For instance: we classified morphisms $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ through sections of an invertible sheaf.¹
- Understanding sections is a fundamental question of **varieties**.

¹also related to divisors and linear systems

Reminder: sheaves and sections

- We are working with **schemes** X .
- The structure is governed by **sheaves** of abelian groups, such as \mathcal{O}_X .
- Most important are **Sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules**.
- Particularly useful are **Quasi-coherent** sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.
- We want to understand their **sections**.
- For instance: we classified morphisms $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ through sections of an invertible sheaf.¹
- Understanding sections is a fundamental question of **varieties**.

¹also related to divisors and linear systems

Reminder: sheaves and sections

- We are working with **schemes** X .
- The structure is governed by **sheaves** of abelian groups, such as \mathcal{O}_X .
- Most important are **Sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules**.
- Particularly useful are **Quasi-coherent** sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.
- We want to understand their **sections**.
- For instance: we classified morphisms $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ through sections of an invertible sheaf.¹
- Understanding sections is a fundamental question of **varieties**.

¹also related to divisors and linear systems

Reminder: sheaves and sections

- We are working with **schemes** X .
- The structure is governed by **sheaves** of abelian groups, such as \mathcal{O}_X .
- Most important are **Sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules**.
- Particularly useful are **Quasi-coherent** sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.
- We want to understand their **sections**.
- For instance: we classified morphisms $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ through sections of an invertible sheaf.¹
- Understanding sections is a fundamental question of **varieties**.

¹also related to divisors and linear systems

Reminder: sheaves and sections

- We are working with **schemes** X .
- The structure is governed by **sheaves** of abelian groups, such as \mathcal{O}_X .
- Most important are **Sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules**.
- Particularly useful are **Quasi-coherent** sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.
- We want to understand their **sections**.
- For instance: we classified morphisms $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ through sections of an invertible sheaf.¹
- Understanding sections is a fundamental question of **varieties**.

¹also related to divisors and linear systems

Reminder: sheaves and sections

- We are working with **schemes** X .
- The structure is governed by **sheaves** of abelian groups, such as \mathcal{O}_X .
- Most important are **Sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules**.
- Particularly useful are **Quasi-coherent** sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.
- We want to understand their **sections**.
- For instance: we classified morphisms $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ through sections of an invertible sheaf.¹
- Understanding sections is a fundamental question of **varieties**.

¹also related to divisors and linear systems

Reminder: failure of right-exactness

- Recall the sheaf axiom $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_i) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_{ij})$.
- If $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$ exact then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}''(X)$ exact. . .
- but right exactness fails in general:
- say $Y = \text{two points}$ in $X = \mathbb{P}_k^1$;
- then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow 0$, but
- $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow k^2 \rightarrow 0$ is not.

Reminder: failure of right-exactness

- Recall the sheaf axiom $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_i) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_{ij})$.
- If $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$ exact then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}''(X)$ exact. . .
- but right exactness fails in general:
- say $Y = \text{two points}$ in $X = \mathbb{P}_k^1$;
- then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow 0$, but
- $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow k^2 \rightarrow 0$ is not.

Reminder: failure of right-exactness

- Recall the sheaf axiom $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_i) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_{ij})$.
- If $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$ exact then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}''(X)$ exact. . .
- but right exactness fails in general:
- say $Y =$ two points in $X = \mathbb{P}_k^1$;
- then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow 0$, but
- $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow k^2 \rightarrow 0$ is not.

Reminder: failure of right-exactness

- Recall the sheaf axiom $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_i) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_{ij})$.
- If $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$ exact then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}''(X)$ exact. . .
- but right exactness fails in general:
- say $Y =$ two points in $X = \mathbb{P}_k^1$;
- then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow 0$, but
- $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow k^2 \rightarrow 0$ is not.

Reminder: failure of right-exactness

- Recall the sheaf axiom $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_i) \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}(U_{ij})$.
- If $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$ exact then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}''(X)$ exact. . .
- but right exactness fails in general:
- say $Y =$ two points in $X = \mathbb{P}_k^1$;
- then $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow 0$, but
- $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow k^2 \rightarrow 0$ is not.

Measuring the failure

- Failure of right exactness is a fact of life².
- We want to understand it, measure it, control it, interpret it in geometric terms,
- We need to study **cohomology of sheaves**.

²Mathematical life

Measuring the failure

- Failure of right exactness is a fact of life².
- We want to understand it, measure it, control it, interpret it in geometric terms,
- We need to study **cohomology of sheaves**.

²Mathematical life

Measuring the failure

- Failure of right exactness is a fact of life².
- We want to understand it, measure it, control it, interpret it in geometric terms,
- We need to study **cohomology of sheaves**.

²Mathematical life

Comments on how this is resolved

- We'll follow Hartshorne, who follows GROTHENDIECK, *Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique*³, to resolve this using **derived functors**. This works in the context of left-exact additive functors on abelian categories with enough injective objects.
- Liu follows SERRE, *Faisceaux algébriques cohérents*, to resolve using **Čech cohomology**. This works for sections of quasi-coherent sheaves, and will be subsumed in Hartshorne's treatment.
- An important modern approach uses **derived categories** (GELFAND–MANIN, WEIBEL), still in the additive realm.
- Homotopy theory has even loftier approaches (model categories, ...)

³never do that to yourself!

Comments on how this is resolved

- We'll follow Hartshorne, who follows GROTHENDIECK, *Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique*³, to resolve this using **derived functors**. This works in the context of left-exact additive functors on abelian categories with enough injective objects.
- Liu follows SERRE, *Faisceaux algébriques cohérents*, to resolve using **Čech cohomology**. This works for sections of quasi-coherent sheaves, and will be subsumed in Hartshorne's treatment.
- An important modern approach uses **derived categories** (GELFAND–MANIN, WEIBEL), still in the additive realm.
- Homotopy theory has even loftier approaches (model categories, ...)

³never do that to yourself!

Comments on how this is resolved

- We'll follow Hartshorne, who follows GROTHENDIECK, *Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique*³, to resolve this using **derived functors**. This works in the context of left-exact additive functors on abelian categories with enough injective objects.
- Liu follows SERRE, *Faisceaux algébriques cohérents*, to resolve using **Čech cohomology**. This works for sections of quasi-coherent sheaves, and will be subsumed in Hartshorne's treatment.
- An important modern approach uses **derived categories** (GELFAND–MANIN, WEIBEL), still in the additive realm.
- Homotopy theory has even loftier approaches (model categories, ...)

³never do that to yourself!

Comments on how this is resolved

- We'll follow Hartshorne, who follows GROTHENDIECK, *Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique*³, to resolve this using **derived functors**. This works in the context of left-exact additive functors on abelian categories with enough injective objects.
- Liu follows SERRE, *Faisceaux algébriques cohérents*, to resolve using **Čech cohomology**. This works for sections of quasi-coherent sheaves, and will be subsumed in Hartshorne's treatment.
- An important modern approach uses **derived categories** (GELFAND–MANIN, WEIBEL), still in the additive realm.
- Homotopy theory has even loftier approaches (model categories, ...)

³never do that to yourself!

Comments on how this is resolved

- We'll follow Hartshorne, who follows GROTHENDIECK, *Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique*³, to resolve this using **derived functors**. This works in the context of left-exact additive functors on abelian categories with enough injective objects.
- Liu follows SERRE, *Faisceaux algébriques cohérents*, to resolve using **Čech cohomology**. This works for sections of quasi-coherent sheaves, and will be subsumed in Hartshorne's treatment.
- An important modern approach uses **derived categories** (GELFAND–MANIN, WEIBEL), still in the additive realm.
- Homotopy theory has even loftier approaches (model categories, ...)

³never do that to yourself!

Comments on how this is resolved

- We'll follow Hartshorne, who follows GROTHENDIECK, *Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique*³, to resolve this using **derived functors**. This works in the context of left-exact additive functors on abelian categories with enough injective objects.
- Liu follows SERRE, *Faisceaux algébriques cohérents*, to resolve using **Čech cohomology**. This works for sections of quasi-coherent sheaves, and will be subsumed in Hartshorne's treatment.
- An important modern approach uses **derived categories** (GELFAND–MANIN, WEIBEL), still in the additive realm.
- Homotopy theory has even loftier approaches (model categories, ...)

³never do that to yourself!