

# Differential schemes

Jerald J. Kovacic

The City College of CUNY, New York, NY

This file is available at:

<http://mysite.verizon.net/jkovacic/lectures/leeds.dvi>

June 8-10, 2007

We start with the definition of differential scheme using the treatment of Hartshorne. Immediately we find that there are problems: the global section functor of an affine differential scheme does not recover the original ring. We give some examples to show what goes wrong. However, reduced differential schemes are more more tractable. We shall discuss what is known and not known.

All rings are commutative and unitary. We fix a set of commuting derivations  $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\}$ . We use the prefix  $\Delta$  instead of the word “differential”.  $R$  is a  $\Delta$ -ring (arbitrary characteristic),  $K$  is a  $\Delta$ -field. If  $S$  is a subset of  $R$  then  $\llbracket S \rrbracket$  is the smallest radical  $\Delta$ -ideal of  $R$  that contains  $S$ . If  $\mathbb{Q} \subset R$  (i.e.  $R$  is a Ritt algebra) then  $\llbracket S \rrbracket = \sqrt{[S]}$ .

## Definition

$X = \text{Diffspec } R$  is the set of prime  $\Delta$ -ideals of  $R$ .

If  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a  $\Delta$ -ideal then

$$V(\mathfrak{a}) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in X \mid \mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}\}.$$

These sets are the closed sets in the *Kolchin* topology.

If  $a \in R$  then

$$D(a) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in X \mid a \notin \mathfrak{p}\}.$$

These sets are the basic opens.

The structure sheaf is defined exactly as in Hartshorne.

## Theorem

If  $s \in \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ , then, for  $\mathfrak{p} \in U$ ,

$$s(\mathfrak{p}) = \begin{cases} \frac{a_1}{b_1} & \text{for } \mathfrak{p} \in D(b_1) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{a_n}{b_n} & \text{for } \mathfrak{p} \in D(b_n) \end{cases}$$

and  $D(b_1) \cup \dots \cup D(b_n) = U$  (equivalently  $1 \in \llbracket b_1, \dots, b_n \rrbracket$ ).

## Theorem

The stalk  $\mathcal{O}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}$  is  $\Delta$ -isomorphic to the local ring  $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ .

Buium defines a  $\Delta$ -scheme as a scheme whose sheaf consists of  $\Delta$ -rings. Umemura calls this “a scheme with derivations”.

Carra Ferro changes the definition of the sheaf. If  $X = \text{Diffspec } R$  and  $Y = \text{Spec } R$  then  $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$  is defined to be  $\mathcal{O}_Y(V)$  where  $V$  is the largest open subset of  $Y$  with  $V \cap X = U$ .

Hrushovski has a paper in the Archives about difference schemes.

## Definition

$\widehat{R} = \mathcal{O}_X(X) = \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  is the ring of global sections of  $X$ .

## Theorem

*There is a canonical mapping*

$$\iota: R \rightarrow \widehat{R}, \quad \iota(a)(\mathfrak{p}) = \frac{a}{1} \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

However  $\iota$  is neither injective nor surjective in general.

## Theorem

$\iota_{\widehat{R}}: \widehat{R} \rightarrow \widehat{\widehat{R}}$  is a  $\Delta$ -isomorphism.

Thus “taking hat” is a kind of closure operation.

Write  $\widehat{X} = \text{Diffspec } \widehat{R}$ . We have an induced morphism

$${}^a\iota: \widehat{X} \rightarrow X, \quad {}^a\iota(\mathfrak{q}) = \iota^{-1}\mathfrak{q}.$$

We also have one in the other direction.

$$H: X \rightarrow \widehat{X} \quad H(\mathfrak{p}) = \widehat{\mathfrak{p}} = \rho_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{p}}).$$

Here  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset R_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is the maximal ideal and  $\rho_{\mathfrak{p}}: \mathcal{O}_X(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}$  is the restriction.

## Theorem

${}^a\iota \circ H: X \rightarrow \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$  is the identity.

In general, I do not know about the other composition. A priori, there may be ideals of  $\widehat{R}$  that are not of the form  $\widehat{\mathfrak{p}}$ .

# Differential zeros

In a ring, the condition  $1 \in \text{Ann}(z)$  is equivalent to the condition that  $z = 0$ .

## Definition

$z \in R$  is a  $\Delta$ -zero if  $1 \in \llbracket \text{Ann}(z) \rrbracket$ . The set of  $\Delta$ -zeros of  $R$  is denoted by  $\mathfrak{Z} = \mathfrak{Z}(R)$ .

## Theorem

$\mathfrak{Z}$  is a  $\Delta$ -ideal of  $R$ .

## Theorem

$R/\mathfrak{Z}$  has no non-zero  $\Delta$ -zero.  $\mathfrak{Z}$  is the smallest  $\Delta$ -ideal with that property.

## Theorem

$a \in R$  is a  $\Delta$ -zero if and only if it goes to 0 in  $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$  for every  $\Delta$ -prime  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

## Theorem

*The kernel of  $\iota: R \rightarrow \widehat{R}$  is  $\mathfrak{J}$ .*

## Theorem

$\text{Diffspec } R \approx \text{Diffspec}(R/\mathfrak{J})$ .

So we simply replace  $R$  by  $R/\mathfrak{J}$  and everything is hunky-dory.

**NOT!**

We would like the absence of  $\Delta$ -zeros to be local, i.e.  $\mathfrak{Z}(R) = (0)$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{Z}(R_{\mathfrak{p}}) = (0)$  for every prime  $\Delta$ -ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ . This is false.

We would like it to behave well with respect to basic opens. It doesn't. It may happen that  $\mathfrak{Z}(R) = 0$  but  $\mathfrak{Z}(R_a) \neq 0$  for some  $a \in R$ .

## Definition

A  $\Delta$ -ring  $R$  is AAD (Annihilators Are Differential) if for every  $r \in R$ ,  $\text{Ann}(r)$  is a  $\Delta$ -ideal.

Any ring with trivial derivations is AAD. Thus the rings of classical  $\Delta$ -algebraic geometry are AAD. The corresponding condition for difference rings is called “well-mixed”.

## Theorem

*$R$  is AAD if and only if  $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is AAD for every  $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ .*

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is AAD then  $R\Sigma^{-1}$  is AAD for every multiplicative set  $\Sigma$ .*

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is AAD, then the canonical mapping  $\iota: R \rightarrow \widehat{R}$  is injective.*

## Theorem

*For any  $\Delta$ -ring  $R$  there is a unique smallest  $\Delta$ -ideal  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}(R)$  such that  $R/\mathfrak{A}$  is AAD.*

## Theorem

*If  $\mathfrak{N}$  is the nil radical of  $R$  then  $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathfrak{A} \subset \mathfrak{N}$ . A reduced ring is AAD.*

## Theorem

*$R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{A}$  induces a homeomorphism from  $\text{Diffspec}(R/\mathfrak{A})$  onto  $X$ .*

But not an isomorphism of schemes. (Neither does  $R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{N}$ .)

## Definition

A  $\Delta$ -scheme  $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  is AAD if for every open set  $U \subset X$ , the  $\Delta$ -ring  $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$  is AAD.

## Theorem

*$(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  is AAD if and only if each stalk  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$  is AAD.*

## Theorem

*Let  $X = \text{Diffspec } R$ . If  $R$  is AAD then so is  $X$ . Conversely if  $X$  is AAD then there exists an AAD  $\Delta$ -ring  $S$  with  $\text{Diffspec } S$  isomorphic to  $X$ .*

But  $R$  itself need not be AAD.

Suppose that  $X = \text{Diffspec } R$  is reduced (the stalks are all reduced). Is  $R$  reduced? No.

## Theorem

*If  $X$  is reduced then  $\widehat{R}$  is reduced and  $X \approx \widehat{X} = \text{Diffspec } \widehat{R}$ .*

Thus we can always choose a reduced ring  $S$  with  $X \approx \text{Diffspec } S$ .

In a ring, units are elements  $u$  with  $1 \in (u)$ .

## Definition

$u \in R$  is a  $\Delta$ -unit if  $1 \in \llbracket u \rrbracket$ . The set of  $\Delta$ -units of  $R$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(R)$ .

## Example

Every non-zero element of  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$  is a  $\Delta$ -unit.

## Theorem

*$\mathcal{U}$  is a multiplicative set.*

## Theorem

*Every  $\Delta$ -unit of  $R\mathcal{U}^{-1}$  is a unit.*

## Theorem

*Every  $\Delta$ -unit of  $\widehat{R}$  is a unit.*

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is AAD, then  $R \rightarrow R\mathcal{U}^{-1}$  and  $R\mathcal{U}^{-1} \rightarrow \widehat{R}$  are injective.*

*I.e.  $R \subset R\mathcal{U}^{-1} \subset \widehat{R}$ .*

*But these inclusions may be proper.*

For an integral domain  $R$  we know that

$$R = \bigcap_{P \in \text{Spec } R} R_P$$

where the intersection is over all prime ideals.

## Theorem

*Suppose that  $R$  is a  $\Delta$ -ring that is a domain. Then*

$$RU^{-1} \subset \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Diffspec } R} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

However the inclusion may be proper.

Let  $K$  be a  $\Delta$ -field and  $X = \text{Diffspec } R$ . Then  $X$  is a  $\Delta$ -scheme over  $\text{Diffspec } K$  if there is a morphism  $X \rightarrow \text{Diffspec } K$ . This does not imply that  $R$  is a  $K$ -algebra.

### Example

Let  $K = \mathbb{Q}(x)$  and  $R = \mathbb{Q}[x]$ . Then  $X = \text{Diffspec } R$  is a  $\Delta$ -scheme over  $Y = \text{Diffspec } K$  (in fact they are isomorphic). However  $R$  is not a  $K$ -algebra.

This affects the existence of products. If  $X = \text{Diffspec } R$  and  $Z = \text{Diffspec } S$  are  $\Delta$ -schemes over  $Y = \text{Diffspec } K$  then

$$X \times_Y Z \stackrel{?}{=} \text{Diffspec } R \otimes_K S.$$

But the right-hand side need not make sense!

Suppose that  $Y \subset X = \text{Diffspec } R$  is a closed subscheme. Does there exist an ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$  such that  $Y \approx \text{Diffspec}(R/\mathfrak{a})$ ? I don't know.

## Theorem

*If  $Y \subset X$  are both reduced then there is a radical  $\Delta$ -ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$  such that  $Y \approx \text{Diffspec}(R/\mathfrak{a})$ .*

This theorem is probably true with “reduced” replaced by “AAD”, but I do not have a proof.

In algebraic geometry there is an adjunction between  $\text{Spec}$  and the global sections functor. Here too.

## Theorem

*Suppose that  $X = \text{Diffspec } R$  and  $Y = \text{Diffspec } S$ . Then there is a bijection*

$$\text{Mor}(Y, X) \approx \text{Hom}(R, \widehat{S})$$

This is not symmetric in  $R$  and  $S$ !

## Theorem

*If  $R$  and  $S$  are AAD then*

$$\text{Mor}(Y, X) \approx \text{Hom}(R, \widehat{S}) \approx \text{Hom}(\widehat{R}, \widehat{S}).$$

It's not pretty but at least it is symmetric.

## Definition

A  $\Delta$ -ring  $R$  is *Rittian* if every strictly increasing chain of radical  $\Delta$ -ideals is finite.

-

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is finitely  $\Delta$ -generated over  $K$  then  $R$  is Rittian.*

## Theorem

*$R$  is Rittian if and only if  $X = \text{Diffspec } R$  is a Noetherian topological space.*

This is actually better than the algebraic version!

# Reduced Rittian Ritt algebras

Suppose that  $R$  is a Ritt algebra (contains  $\mathbb{Q}$ ) that is reduced and Rittian.

## Theorem

*$R$  has a finite number of minimal prime ideals and they are  $\Delta$ -ideals.*

## Theorem

*The complete ring of quotients of  $R$  is a finite product of  $\Delta$ -fields.*

## Theorem

*$R$  has a finite number of minimal idempotents.*

Using these we get the usual theorems about connected and irreducible components of  $X$ .

If  $R$  is reduced then the canonical mapping  $\iota: R \rightarrow \widehat{R}$  is injective and we identify  $R$  with a subring of  $\widehat{R}$ .

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is a domain then so is  $\widehat{R}$  and  $\text{qf}(R) = \text{qf}(\widehat{R})$ .*

Hence the field of rational functions of an irreducible variety is what you expect.

If  $R$  is not a domain, the ring of rational functions classically is  $Q(R)$ , the complete of fractions of  $R$ , i.e.  $R\Sigma^{-1}$  where  $\Sigma$  is the multiplicative set of elements that are not zero divisors in  $R$ .

Recall that a global section has the form

$$s(\mathfrak{p}) = \begin{cases} \frac{a_1}{b_1} & \text{for } \mathfrak{p} \in D(b_1) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{a_n}{b_n} & \text{for } \mathfrak{p} \in D(b_n) \end{cases}$$

It may happen that every  $b_i$  is a zero divisor.

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is a reduced Rittian Ritt algebra then there is an injective homomorphism*

$$\widehat{R} \rightarrow Q(R).$$

*If we identify  $\widehat{R}$  with its image then  $\widehat{R}$  is the subring of  $Q(R)$  consisting all everywhere defined functions (in the sense of Cassidy)*

Suppose that  $R$  is a  $\Delta$ - $K$ -algebra that is finitely  $\Delta$ -generated over  $K$ . I assume  $K$  has characteristic 0 to avoid problems with separability. We choose a set of generators

$$R = K\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}.$$

For  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , let be  $R_s$  the ring (not  $\Delta$ -ring) generated by  $\theta x_i$  where  $\theta$  is a “higher derivation”,  $\theta = \delta_1^{d_1} \cdots \delta_m^{d_m}$ , of order bounded by  $s$ .

## Theorem

*There is a numerical polynomial  $\Phi_{\text{Krull}}$  such that*

$$\Phi_{\text{Krull}}(s) = \dim R_s \quad (\text{Krull dimension})$$

*for  $s \gg 0$ .*

If we let  $X_s = \text{Spec } R_s$  then  $\Phi_{\text{Krull}}(s)$  is the topological dimension of  $X_s$ . Unfortunately the schemes  $X_s$  depend on the choice of  $\Delta$ -generators of  $R$ .

For notions like “simple point” we are interested in finding the dimension of a stalk,  $R_p$ . For simplicity I assume that we are working with a rational point, i.e.  $R_p/\mathfrak{m} = K$ .

For each  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have a homomorphism

$$\alpha_s: (R_s)_{\mathfrak{p}_s} \rightarrow R_p, \quad \frac{a}{b} \mapsto \frac{a}{b}.$$

The image is  $(R_p)_s$ . I do not know if  $\alpha_s$  is always injective or not. The picture is

$$R \xrightarrow{\text{cut down}} R_s \xrightarrow{\text{localize}} (R_s)_{\mathfrak{p}_s}$$

versus

$$R \xrightarrow{\text{localize}} R_p \xrightarrow{\text{cut down}} (R_p)_s$$

But it doesn't matter since it turns out that, for  $s \gg 0$ , every element of  $\ker \alpha_s$  is nilpotent, so the Krull dimensions of these rings are the same.

## Theorem

*There is a numerical polynomial  $\Phi_{Krull}$  such that*

$$\Phi_{Krull}(s) = \dim(R_p)_s$$

*for  $s \gg 0$ .*

$\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$  is a  $\Delta$ -vector space over  $K = R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{m}$ .

### Theorem

*There is a numerical polynomial  $\Phi_{vs}$  such that*

$$\Phi_{vs}(s) = \dim_K(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2)_s, \quad (\text{vector space dimension}).$$

As before there is a mapping

$$\beta_s: \mathfrak{m}_s/\mathfrak{m}_s^2 \rightarrow (\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2)_s$$

which is surjective but not necessarily injective.

But this time we have a counterexample!

### Example

$R = K[\bar{y}] = K[y]/[y' - yy'']$ . Then localize at the ideal  $\mathfrak{p} = [\bar{y}]$ .

This example also illustrates that the Krull intersection theorem does not always hold.

$$\bigcap_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{m}^d \neq (0).$$

Indeed  $\bar{y}' = \bar{y}\bar{y}''$  and  $\mathfrak{m} = [\bar{y}]$  so

$$\bar{y}' = \bar{y}\bar{y}'' \in \mathfrak{m}^2,$$

$$\bar{y}' = \bar{y}(\bar{y}')' = \bar{y}(\bar{y}\bar{y}'')' \in \mathfrak{m}^3,$$

$$\bar{y}' = \bar{y}(\bar{y}(\bar{y}')')' = \bar{y}(\bar{y}(\bar{y}\bar{y}'')')' \in \mathfrak{m}^4,$$

$\vdots$

# An inequality

Because  $\beta_s$  is surjective we have an inequality.

## Theorem

for  $s \gg 0$

$$\Phi_{vs}(s) \leq \dim_K(\mathfrak{m}_s/\mathfrak{m}_s^2).$$

There is also the standard inequality for rings

$$\dim_K(\mathfrak{m}_s/\mathfrak{m}_s^2) \geq \dim(R_p)_s$$

Putting these together we get:

$$\Phi_{vs}(s) \leq \dim_K(\mathfrak{m}_s/\mathfrak{m}_s^2) \geq \Phi_{Krull}(s).$$

I need to research this more!

# Thank you

These slides are available at  
`mysite.verizon.net/jkovacic/lectures/leeds.dvi`