

Advanced topics in algebra (V5A5)

Hochschild (co)homology, and the
Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition

$$\mathrm{Def}_A(R) \cong \mathrm{MC}\left(\mathfrak{m} \widehat{\otimes}_k C^\bullet(A)[1]\right)$$

$$\mathrm{HH}^i(X) \cong \bigoplus_{p+q=i} H^p\left(X, \bigwedge^q T_X\right)$$

Pieter Belmans

July 9, 2018

Introduction

What you are reading now are the lecture notes for a course on Hochschild (co)homology, taught at the University of Bonn, in the Sommersemester of 2017–2018. They are currently being written, and regularly updated. The table of contents is provisional.

The goal of the course is to give an introduction to Hochschild (co)homology, focussing on

1. its applications in *deformation theory* of algebras (and schemes)
2. and the role of the *Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg* decomposition in all this.

There are by many several texts on various aspects of Hochschild (co)homology. In particular the following books dedicate some chapters on Hochschild (co)homology:

1. chapter IX in Cartain–Eilenberg’s *Homological algebra* [9],
2. the first chapters of Loday’s *Cyclic homology* [39],
3. chapter 9 of Weibel’s *An introduction to homological algebra* [65],
4. chapter 2 by Tsygan in Cuntz–Skandalis–Tsygan’s *Cyclic homology in noncommutative geometry* [10],
5. chapter II by Schedler in the Bellamy–Rogalski–Schedler–Stafford–Wemyss’ *Noncommutative algebraic geometry* [4].

There are also the following unpublished lecture notes:

1. Ginzburg’s *Lectures on noncommutative geometry* [18]
2. Kaledin’s Tokyo lectures [27] and Seoul lectures [28].

There is also Witherspoon’s textbook-in-progress called *An introduction to Hochschild cohomology* [67], which is dedicated entirely to Hochschild cohomology and some its applications. So far this is the only textbook dedicated entirely to Hochschild (co)homology, and it is a good reference for things not covered in these notes.

Compared to the existing texts these notes aim to focus more on Hochschild (co)homology in algebraic geometry, using derived categories of smooth projective varieties. This point of view has been developed in several papers [7, 8, 37] and applied in many more dealing with semiorthogonal decompositions. But there is no comprehensive treatment, let alone starting from the basics of Hochschild (co)homology for algebras. These notes aim to fill this gap, where we start focussing on smooth projective varieties starting in the second half of chapter II.

Now that we know what is supposed to go in this text, let us mention that the following will *not* be discussed: the relationship with algebraic K-theory via Chern characters, support varieties, deformation theory of abelian and dg categories, applications to Hopf algebras, topological versions of Hochschild (co)homology and related constructions, ...

Contents

I	Algebras	4
1	Definition and first properties	4
1.1	Hochschild (co)chain complexes	4
1.2	Hochschild (co)homology as Ext and Tor	8
1.3	Interpretation in low degrees	10
1.4	Examples	14
1.5	Exercises	16
2	Extra structure on Hochschild (co)homology	18
2.1	Hochschild cohomology is a Gerstenhaber algebra	18
2.2	Higher structures on Hochschild cochains	23
2.3	Hochschild homology is a Gerstenhaber module for Hochschild cohomology	23
2.4	The shuffle product on Hochschild homology	24
2.5	Exercises	26
3	The Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism	27
3.1	Polyvector fields and differential forms	27
3.2	Gerstenhaber algebra structure on polyvector fields	28
3.3	Gerstenhaber module structure on differential forms	29
3.4	The Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism: Hochschild homology	29
3.5	The Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism: Hochschild cohomology	35
3.6	Gerstenhaber calculus	36
3.7	Exercises	36
4	Variations on Hochschild (co)homology	37
5	Deformation theory of algebras	38
5.1	Obstructions and the third Hochschild cohomology	38
5.2	Formal deformations	41
5.3	The Maurer–Cartan equation	43
5.4	Kontsevich’s formality theorem	45
5.5	Exercises	46
II	Differential graded categories	48
6	Differential graded categories	48
6.1	Triangulated categories	48
6.2	Differential graded categories	50
6.3	Derived categories of dg categories	53
6.4	Exercises	58
7	Hochschild (co)homology for differential graded categories	59
7.1	Definition	60
7.2	Reinterpretation	61

7.3	Extra structure on Hochschild cochains	62
7.4	Exercises	64
8	Limited functoriality for Hochschild cohomology	66
8.1	Functoriality for full subcategories	66
8.2	Gluing dg categories	67
8.3	Limited functoriality	70
8.4	Applications	72
III Varieties		75
9	Fourier–Mukai transforms	75
9.1	Preliminaries	75
9.2	Fourier–Mukai functors	76
9.3	Basic properties of Fourier–Mukai functors	78
10	Hochschild (co)homology for varieties	82
10.1	Using Fourier–Mukai transforms	82
10.2	Limited functoriality for Hochschild cohomology	84
10.3	Sheafification	84
10.4	Gerstenhaber–Schack	84
10.5	Comparisons	84
11	The Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition	85
11.1	Harmonic structure: polyvector fields and differential forms	85
11.2	Atiyah classes	85
11.3	Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition	85
11.4	Examples and further remarks	85
11.5	Exercises	86
12	Riemann–Roch versus Hochschild homology	87
13	Căldăraru’s conjecture	88
A Preliminaries		89
1	Differential graded (Lie) algebras	89
1.1	Exercises	90
2	Completion and topologies	91
2.1	Exercises	91
3	Chevalley–Eilenberg cohomology	92

Chapter I

Algebras

Conventions Throughout these notes we will let k be a field. It is possible to develop much of the theory in the case for algebras which are flat over a commutative base ring without much extra effort, but we will not do so explicitly. The interested reader is invited to do so. There are also versions which are valid in a more general setting, but will refrain from discussing these.

At some points we will take k of characteristic zero, or algebraically closed. This will be mentioned explicitly.

If A is a k -algebra we will denote the *enveloping algebra* $A \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ of A by A^e , so that A -bimodules are the same as left A^e -modules.

1 Definition and first properties

1.1 Hochschild (co)chain complexes

We start with a seemingly ad hoc definition.

Definition 1. Let A be a k -algebra. The *bar complex* $C_{\bullet}^{\text{bar}}(A)$ of A is the cochain complex

$$(1) \quad \dots \xrightarrow{d_2} A \otimes_k A \otimes_k A \xrightarrow{d_1} A \otimes_k A \rightarrow 0,$$

of A -bimodules, where we have $C_n^{\text{bar}}(A) := A^{\otimes n+2}$, hence $A \otimes_k A$ lives in degree 0, and the differentials $d_n: C_n^{\text{bar}}(A) \rightarrow C_{n-1}^{\text{bar}}(A)$ are given by

$$(2) \quad d_n(a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_i a_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}.$$

The A -bimodule structure (or equivalently left A^e -module structure) on $C_n^{\text{bar}}(A)$ is given by

$$(3) \quad (a \otimes b) \cdot (a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}) = aa_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \otimes a_{n+1}b.$$

We will also consider the morphism $d_0: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$, which by the formula for d_n is nothing but the multiplication morphism $\mu: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$.

Remark 2. The terminology “bar complex” originates from the fact that an element $a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}$ is sometimes denoted $a_0[a_1] \dots [a_n]a_{n+1}$.

Before we start studying the bar complex (for instance, at this point we haven't proven it is a complex), we introduce the following morphisms:

$$(4) \quad s_n: A^{\otimes n+2} \rightarrow A^{\otimes n+3} : a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1} \mapsto 1 \otimes a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}.$$

Given that this is the first proof we will give details. We will see many similar proofs throughout the beginning of the notes, we will leave some of them as exercises.

Lemma 3. We have that

$$(5) \quad d_{n+1} \circ s_n + s_{n-1} \circ d_n = \text{id}_{A^{\otimes n+2}}.$$

Proof. One computes that

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} & s_{n-1} \circ d_n(a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i 1 \otimes a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_i a_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}, \\ & d_{n+1} \circ s_n(a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) \\ &= a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (-1)^i 1 \otimes a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{i-1} a_i \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

so everything but the identity cancels after reindexing. \square

We can check that the d_i 's indeed turn $C_\bullet^{\text{bar}}(A)$ into a chain complex.

Lemma 4. We have that $d_{n-1} \circ d_n = 0$.

Proof. Let us consider $n = 1$ first. Then $d_0 \circ d_1(a_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes a_2) = (a_0 a_1) a_2 - a_0 (a_1 a_2)$, which is zero as A is associative.

For $n \geq 2$ we use induction, using (5). We have

$$(7) \quad d_n \circ d_{n+1} \circ s_n = d_n - d_n \circ s_{n-1} \circ d_n = s_{n-2} \circ d_{n-1} \circ d_n = 0,$$

but as the image of s_n generates $A^{\otimes n+3}$ as a left A -module we get that $d_n \circ d_{n+1} = 0$. \square

The bar complex didn't include A , but if we use the morphism $d_0: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$ as defined above we get the following proposition.

Proposition 5. The bar complex of A is a free resolution of A as an A -bimodule, where the augmentation $d_0: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$ is given by the multiplication.

Proof. By lemma 3 we see that the s_i 's provides a contracting homotopy, hence the bar complex is exact, as a complex of A -bimodules.

We also check that the cokernel of d_1 is indeed the multiplication $A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$. For this it suffices to observe that

$$(8) \quad d_1(a_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes a_2) = a_0 a_1 \otimes a_2 - a_0 \otimes a_1 a_2,$$

and that there exists a map $\text{coker } d_1 \rightarrow A$ mapping the class of $a_0 \otimes a_1$ to $a_0 a_1$. By the definition of d_1 it sends elements of $\text{im } d_1$ to zero, so it is well-defined. Its inverse is given by the morphism which sends a to $1 \otimes a$.

That $C_n^{\text{bar}}(A)$ is free as an A -bimodule follows from the isomorphisms of A -bimodules

$$(9) \quad A^{\otimes n+2} \cong A^e \otimes A^{\otimes n} \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} A^e \cdot 1 \otimes 1 \otimes a_i$$

where $\{a_i \mid i \in I\}$ is a vector space basis of $A^{\otimes n}$, and the first isomorphism is

$$(10) \quad a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1} \mapsto (a_0 \otimes a_{n+1}) \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n.$$

□

Definition 6. Let A be a k -algebra, and M an A -bimodule. The *Hochschild chain complex* $C_\bullet(A, M)$ is $M \otimes_{A^e} C_\bullet^{\text{bar}}(A)$, considered as a complex of k -modules, with differential $\text{id}_M \otimes d_n$.

Its homology is the *Hochschild homology of A with values in M* , and will be denoted $\text{HH}_\bullet(A, M)$. If $M = A$, we'll write $\text{HH}_n(A)$.

Dual to this we could instead of the tensor product use the Hom-functor, and obtain the dual notion of Hochschild cohomology.

Definition 7. Let A be a k -algebra, and M an A -bimodule. The *Hochschild cochain complex* $C^\bullet(A, M)$ is $\text{Hom}_{A^e}(C_\bullet^{\text{bar}}(A), M)$, considered as a complex of k -modules, with differential $\text{Hom}(d_n, \text{id}_M)$.

Its cohomology is the *Hochschild cohomology of A with values in M* , and will be denoted $\text{HH}^\bullet(A, M)$. If $M = A$, we'll write $\text{HH}^n(A)$.

Remark 8. Observe that one can recover the bar complex from the Hochschild complex:

$$(11) \quad C_\bullet^{\text{bar}}(A) = C_\bullet(A, A^e).$$

Reinterpreting the Hochschild cochain complex The Hochschild (co)chain complexes were obtained by considering a specific free resolution of A as an A -bimodule, and constructing a (co)chain complex of vector spaces out of it. We can rephrase this complex of vector spaces a bit, where instead of $\text{Hom}_{A^e}(-, -)$ and $- \otimes_{A^e} -$, we use $\text{Hom}_k(-, -)$ and $- \otimes_k -$. This will be very useful for computations later on.

The proofs of the following two propositions follow from the fact that A^e only involves the first and last tensor factor of a bimodule in the bar complex. The following proposition is then a consequence of the adjunction

$$(12) \quad - \otimes_k A^e : \text{Mod } k \rightleftarrows \text{Mod } A^e : \text{res}.$$

The explicit formula for the Hochschild differentials in (16) and (20) will be important for us in section 1.3.

Proposition 9. There exists an isomorphism of k -modules

$$(13) \quad \varphi : C^n(A, M) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_k(A^{\otimes n}, M),$$

given by

$$(14) \quad g \mapsto [a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \mapsto g(1 \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \otimes 1)],$$

whose inverse is given by

$$(15) \quad f \mapsto [a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1} \mapsto a_0 f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) a_{n+1}].$$

The differential in $\text{Hom}_k(A^\bullet, M)$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\text{Hoch}} f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}) \\
&= a_1 f(a_2 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}) \\
(16) \quad &+ \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_i a_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}) \\
&+ (-1)^{n+1} f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) a_{n+1}
\end{aligned}$$

for $f \in \text{Hom}_k(A^{\otimes n}, M)$.

Proposition 10. There exists an isomorphism of k -modules

$$(17) \quad \psi: C_\bullet(A, M) \xrightarrow{\cong} M \otimes_k A^\bullet$$

given by

$$(18) \quad \psi(m \otimes_{A^e} a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n+1}) = a_{n+1} m a_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n,$$

whose inverse is given by

$$(19) \quad m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \mapsto m \otimes_{A^e} 1 \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \otimes 1.$$

The differential $d_{\text{Hoch}}: M \otimes_k A^{\otimes n} \rightarrow M \otimes_k A^{\otimes n-1}$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\text{Hoch}}(m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) \\
&= m a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \\
(20) \quad &+ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (-1)^i m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_i a_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \\
&+ (-1)^n a_n m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n-1}
\end{aligned}$$

for $m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \in M \otimes_k A^{\otimes n}$.

Functoriality of Hochschild (co)homology Given an algebra morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$, or a bimodule morphism $g: M \rightarrow N$, we would like to understand how this interacts with taking Hochschild (co)homology. First of all: *Hochschild homology is covariantly functorial in both arguments.*

Proposition 11. Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be an algebra morphism, and M a B -bimodule (which has an induced A -bimodule structure, denoted $f^*(M)$). Then

$$(21) \quad f_*: C_\bullet(A, f^*(M)) \rightarrow C_\bullet(B, M) : m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \mapsto m \otimes f(a_1) \otimes \dots \otimes f(a_n)$$

gives a functor $\text{HH}_\bullet(-, M)$.

Let $g: M \rightarrow N$ be an A -bimodule morphism. Then

$$(22) \quad g_*: C_\bullet(A, M) \rightarrow C_\bullet(A, N) : m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \mapsto g(m) \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n$$

gives a functor $\text{HH}_\bullet(A, -)$.

In particular, taking $M = A$ we can use the covariant functoriality in both arguments for Hochschild homology to get the following.

Corollary 12. Hochschild homology $\mathrm{HH}_\bullet(-)$ is a covariant functor from the category of associative k -algebras to the category of k -modules.

For Hochschild cohomology the situation is different: *Hochschild cohomology is contravariantly functorial in the first argument, and covariantly functorial in the second.*

Proposition 13. Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be an algebra morphism, and M a B -bimodule (which has an induced A -bimodule structure). Then

$$(23) \quad f^*: C^n(B, M) \rightarrow C^n(A, M) : \varphi \mapsto \varphi \circ f^{\otimes n}$$

gives a (contravariant) functor $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(-, M)$.

Let $g: M \rightarrow N$ be an A -bimodule morphism. Then

$$(24) \quad g_*: C^n(A, M) \rightarrow C^n(A, N) : \varphi \mapsto g \circ \varphi$$

gives a functor $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A, -)$.

Remark 14. So $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(-)$ is *not* a functor (at least when we consider arbitrary morphisms between k -algebras), despite its appearance. We will come back to this in remark 20, and we will partially remedy this deficiency in section 8.

At this point it is also important that in some sources it is written that $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(-)$ is a functor, see e.g. [40, §1.5.4]. But this is not the same functor, despite the similarity in notation! Indeed, in those situations one takes $M = A^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}_k(A, k)$ as the second argument. This makes the construction functorial (as the covariant functor in the second argument becomes contravariant), but one does not obtain the interpretation of Hochschild cohomology which will be used in this text. The construction in op. cit. has applications in studying cyclic cohomology and generalisations of the Chern character, which we will not go into here.

In section 8 we will greatly extend this functoriality for Hochschild homology, and discuss what can be done in the case of Hochschild cohomology. Remark that in the next section's corollary 16 we will obtain that Hochschild cohomology is a functor for Morita equivalences.

1.2 Hochschild (co)homology as Ext and Tor

In these notes we have *defined* Hochschild (co)homology as the (co)homology of an explicit (co)chain complex, which might seem ad hoc at first. But the bar complex of A being a free resolution of A as a bimodule over itself allows us to interpret Hochschild (co)homology in terms of more familiar constructions as explained in section 1.3.

Moreover, the definition via the bar complex gives us an explicit description which will prove to be very useful in section 2 when we are discussing the extra structure on the Hochschild (co)chain complexes, which can conveniently be described by extra structure before taking cohomology. But it is of course an interesting question to find good intrinsic descriptions of the extra structure, and we will give further comments on this.

Theorem 15. There exist isomorphisms

$$(25) \quad \mathrm{HH}^i(A, M) \cong \mathrm{Ext}_{A^e}^i(A, M)$$

and

$$(26) \quad \mathrm{HH}_i(A, M) \cong \mathrm{Tor}_i^{A^e}(A, M).$$

Proof. By proposition 5 the bar complex is a free resolution of A as an A -bimodule. In particular it can serve as a flat (resp. projective) resolution when computing the derived functors of $A \otimes_{A^e} -$ (resp. $\text{Hom}_{A^e}(A, -)$). \square

In particular, we have that

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{HH}^0(A, M) &\cong \text{Hom}_{A^e}(A, M), \\ \text{HH}_0(A, M) &\cong M \otimes_{A^e} A. \end{aligned}$$

But these descriptions are not necessarily very illuminating at this point. In section 1.3 we will give more concrete interpretations.

An important observation using theorem 15 is that the Hochschild cohomology of the A -bimodule M only depends on the category of A -bimodules. More generally it can be shown to only depend on the derived category, in this generality it is due to Rickard [52]. We'll prove the statement for abelian categories.

Corollary 16. Hochschild (co)homology is Morita invariant.

Proof. Assume that A and B are Morita equivalent through the bimodules ${}_A P_B$ and ${}_B Q_A$. The equivalences of categories are given by $P \otimes_A -$ and $Q \otimes_B -$, and these functors preserve projective resolutions. We obtain isomorphisms

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Ext}_A^n(P \otimes_B -, -) &\cong \text{Ext}_B^n(-, Q \otimes_A -) \\ \text{Ext}_A^n(-, P \otimes_B -) &\cong \text{Ext}_B^n(Q \otimes_A -, -) \\ \text{Tor}_n^A(P \otimes_B -, -) &\cong \text{Tor}_n^B(-, Q \otimes_A -) \\ \text{Tor}_n^A(-, P \otimes_B -) &\cong \text{Tor}_n^B(Q \otimes_A -, -) \end{aligned}$$

where we are only using the left module structure, and we have similar expressions when using the right module structure.

Using theorem 15 and these isomorphisms we get for every A -bimodule M that

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{HH}^n(A, M) &\cong \text{Ext}_{A \otimes A^{\text{op}}}^n(A, M) \\ &\cong \text{Ext}_{A \otimes A^{\text{op}}}^n(P \otimes_B Q, M) \\ &\cong \text{Ext}_{B \otimes A^{\text{op}}}^n(Q, Q \otimes_A M) \\ &\cong \text{Ext}_{B \otimes B^{\text{op}}}^n(B, Q \otimes_A M \otimes_A P) \\ &\cong \text{HH}^n(B, Q \otimes_A M \otimes_A P) \end{aligned}$$

and likewise for Hochschild homology. \square

In section 8 we will greatly extend this Morita invariance to derived Morita invariance for much more general objects, but as mentioned earlier, for algebras it was known by Rickard who showed that even though equivalences of derived categories are not known to be given by tensoring with a complex of bimodules one can still find such a complex of bimodules giving an equivalence. We'll come back to this question in the geometric setting when discussing theorem 215.

1.3 Interpretation in low degrees

We will now give an interpretation for Hochschild (co)homology in low degrees, where we can explicitly manipulate the bar complex, or rather its reinterpretation as in propositions 9 and 10. For this we observe that the differential of the Hochschild chain complex in low degrees is given by

$$M \otimes_k A \otimes_k A \xrightarrow{d} M \otimes_k A \xrightarrow{d} M$$

$$(30) \quad m \otimes a \otimes b \longmapsto ma \otimes b - m \otimes ab + bm \otimes a$$

$$m \otimes a \longmapsto ma - am,$$

whilst for the Hochschild cochain complex $C^\bullet(A, M)$

$$M \xrightarrow{d} \text{Hom}_k(A, M) \xrightarrow{d} \text{Hom}_k(A \otimes_k A, M)$$

$$(31) \quad m \longmapsto d(m): a \mapsto am - ma$$

$$f \longmapsto d(f): a \otimes b \mapsto af(b) - f(ab) + f(a)b$$

and

$$\text{Hom}_k(A \otimes_k A, M) \xrightarrow{d} \text{Hom}_k(A \otimes_k A \otimes_k A, M)$$

$$(32) \quad g \longmapsto d(g): a \otimes b \otimes c \mapsto ag(b \otimes c) - g(ab \otimes c) + g(a \otimes bc) - g(a \otimes b)c.$$

Using these explicit descriptions in low degrees we can obtain the following.

Zeroth Hochschild homology

Proposition 17. We have that

$$(33) \quad \text{HH}_0(A, M) \cong M / \langle am - ma \mid a \in A, m \in M \rangle$$

is the *module of coinvariants*. In particular, we have

$$(34) \quad \text{HH}_0(A) \cong A / [A, A] = A_{\text{ab}}.$$

Proof. This is immediate from the description of the morphism in (30). \square

Remark 18. The vector space $[A, A]$ is usually not an ideal in A , so there is no obvious algebra structure on $\text{HH}_0(A)$.

There is no one-size-fits-all description for Hochschild homology in higher degrees. But if A is commutative then a description in terms of differential forms is possible. We will come back to this in section 3.

Zeroth Hochschild cohomology

Proposition 19. We have that

$$(35) \quad \mathrm{HH}^0(A, M) \cong \{m \in M \mid \forall a \in A: am = ma\}$$

is the *submodule of invariants*. In particular, we have

$$(36) \quad \mathrm{HH}^0(A) \cong Z(A).$$

Proof. This is immediate from the description of the morphism in (31). \square

Remark 20. We can now give a new explanation of the non-functoriality of Hochschild cohomology using the interpretation of $\mathrm{HH}^0(A)$ as the center: taking the center of an algebra isn't a functor.

First Hochschild cohomology

Definition 21. A morphism $f: A \rightarrow M$ is a *k-derivation* if

$$(37) \quad f(ab) = af(b) + f(a)b.$$

We will denote the *k*-module of derivations by $\mathrm{Der}(A, M)$.

If $f = \mathrm{ad}_m$ for $m \in M$, where

$$(38) \quad \mathrm{ad}_m(a) = [a, m] = am - ma$$

then f is an *inner derivation*. We will denote the *k*-module of inner derivations by $\mathrm{InnDer}(A, M)$.

When $A = M$, we will use the notation $\mathrm{OutDer}(A)$ and $\mathrm{InnDer}(A)$. When A is commutative we will discuss derivations in more detail in section 3. For now, observe that in the commutative case there are no inner derivations.

Proposition 22. We have that

$$(39) \quad \mathrm{HH}^1(A, M) \cong \mathrm{OutDer}(A, M) := \mathrm{Der}(A, M) / \mathrm{InnDer}(A, M)$$

are the *outer derivations*. In particular we have that

$$(40) \quad \mathrm{HH}^1(A) \cong \mathrm{OutDer}(A).$$

Proof. The description of the morphism in (31) tells us that Hochschild 1-cocycles are derivations, whilst Hochschild 1-coboundaries are inner derivations. \square

At this point the first Hochschild cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^1(A)$ is just a vector space. But we can equip it with a Lie bracket. This is just a small piece of the extra structure that we will see in section 2.

Lemma 23. Let $D_1, D_2: A \rightarrow A$ be derivations. Then $[D_1, D_2] := D_1 \circ D_2 - D_2 \circ D_1$ is also a derivation. Moreover, if $D_2 = \mathrm{ad}_a$ is an inner derivation, for some $a \in A$, then $[D_1, \mathrm{ad}_a] = \mathrm{ad}_{D_1(a)}$.

Proof. From

$$(41) \quad \begin{aligned} [D_1, D_2](ab) &= D_1(D_2(ab)) - D_2(D_1(ab)) \\ &= D_1(aD_2(b) + D_2(a)b) - D_2(aD_1(b) + D_1(a)b) \\ &= aD_1(D_2(b)) + D_1(a)D_2(b) + D_2(a)D_1(b) + D_1(D_2(a))b \\ &\quad - aD_2(D_1(b)) - D_2(a)D_1(b) - D_1(a)D_2(b) - D_1(D_2(a))b \\ &= aD_1(D_2(b)) - aD_2(D_1(b)) + D_1(D_2(a))b - D_2(D_1(a))b \\ &= a[D_1, D_2](b) + [D_1, D_2](a)b \end{aligned}$$

we get that $[D_1, D_2]$ is indeed a derivation.

Similarly we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
(42) \quad [D_1, \text{ad}_a](b) &= D_1(\text{ad}_a(b)) - \text{ad}_a(D_1(b)) \\
&= D_1(ab - ba) - (aD_1(b) - D_1(b)a) \\
&= aD_1(b) + D_1(a)b - bD_1(a) - D_1(b)a - aD_1(b) + D_1(b)a \\
&= D_1(a)b - bD_1(a) \\
&= \text{ad}_{D_1(a)}(b).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 24. $\text{HH}^1(A)$ has the structure of a Lie algebra.

Proof. By lemma 23 we have that $\text{Der}(A)$ is a Lie algebra (bilinearity and alternativity are trivial, the Jacobi identity is an easy computation), whilst $\text{InnDer}(A) \subseteq \text{Der}(A)$ is a Lie ideal. So $\text{OutDer}(A)$ has the structure of a Lie algebra, and so does $\text{HH}^1(A)$ via proposition 22. □

Second Hochschild cohomology The following discussion is the first aspect of why we care about Hochschild cohomology in the context of these lecture notes: deformation theory.

Definition 25. Let A be a k -algebra, and M an A -bimodule. A *square-zero extension* of A by M is a surjection $f: E \rightarrow A$ of k -algebras, such that

1. $(\ker f)^2 = 0$ (which implies that it has an A -bimodule structure),
2. $\ker f \cong M$ as A -bimodules¹.

To see that $\ker f$ indeed has an A -bimodule structure, let e be a lift of $a \in A$. We will define $a \cdot m = em$ and $m \cdot a = me$ for $m \in \ker f$. If e' is another lift, then $e - e' \in \ker f$, so $(e - e')m \in (\ker f)^2 = 0$ means $em = e'm$ and $me = me'$.

So we have a sequence

$$(43) \quad 0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0.$$

We will impose an equivalence relation on square-zero extensions.

Definition 26. We say that $f: E \rightarrow A$ and $f': E' \rightarrow A$ are *equivalent* if there exists an algebra morphism $\varphi: E \rightarrow E'$ (necessarily an isomorphism), such that

$$(44) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & A \xrightarrow{f} 0 \\
& & \parallel & & \downarrow \varphi & & \parallel \\
0 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & E' & \xrightarrow{f'} & A \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

commutes.

Under our standing assumption on k being a field the sequence (43) is split as a sequence of vector spaces. If we choose a splitting $s: A \rightarrow E$ we get an isomorphism $E \cong A \oplus M$ of vector spaces. Using this decomposition the multiplication law on E can be written as

$$(45) \quad (a, m) \cdot (b, n) = (ab, an + mb + g(a, b))$$

¹We will introduce an equivalence relation to deal with the choice of isomorphism here.

for $g: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow M$. This morphism is called the *factor set*. The factor set is determined by the splitting s , which is not necessarily an algebra morphism, by $g(a, b) = s(ab) - s(a)s(b)$. One can check that the unit of E corresponds to $(1, -g(1, 1))$ in this description.

If we consider the multiplication $(a, 0) \cdot (b, 0) \cdot (c, 0)$ inside E , then the associativity of E is equivalent to

$$(46) \quad ag(b \otimes c) + g(a \otimes bc) - g(ab)c - g(ab \otimes c) = 0,$$

which corresponds to g being a Hochschild 2-cocycle, by (32).

But there was a choice of splitting $s: A \rightarrow E$ involved in the definition of g . If $s': A \rightarrow E$ is another splitting, then we obtain a different factor set g' . Comparing them gives

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} g'(a, b) - g(a, b) &= (s'(a)s'(b) - s'(ab)) - (s(a)s(b) - s(ab)) \\ &= s'(a)(s'(b) - s(b)) - (s'(ab) - s(ab)) + (s'(a) - s(a))s(b). \end{aligned}$$

But this is precisely the Hochschild differential applied to $s - s'$, which is a morphism $A \rightarrow M$ by construction, using the M -bimodule structure on M as discussed above. So the choice of a factor set gives a well-defined cohomology class.

If $g = 0$, then we call E the *trivial extension*.

Theorem 27. There exists a bijection

$$(48) \quad \mathrm{HH}^2(A, M) \cong \mathrm{AlgExt}(A, M)$$

such that $0 \in \mathrm{HH}^2(A, M)$ corresponds to the equivalence class of the trivial extension.

We will mostly be interested in the case where $M = A$. In this case we will call E an *square-zero deformation* or *first order deformation*. This is a particular case of an infinitesimal deformation, as will be discussed in section 5. When $M = A$, we are describing algebra structures on $A \oplus At$ such that $t^2 = 0$, so we can equivalently describe square-zero deformations of A as a $k[t]/(t^2)$ -algebra E , such that $E \otimes_{k[t]/(t^2)} k \cong A$. The notion of equivalence becomes that of a $k[t]/(t^2)$ -module automorphism which reduces to the identity when t is set to 0.

So far we haven't seen any examples of Hochschild cohomology, let alone an example where $\mathrm{HH}^2(A) \neq 0$. The following example gives an ad hoc description of a (non-trivial) infinitesimal deformation of the polynomial ring in 2 variables.

Example 28. Let $A = k[x, y]$. Then we can equip $k[x, y] \oplus tk[x, y]$ with a multiplication for which $y \cdot x = yx + t$, i.e. using the factor set $g(y, x) = 1$. This is an infinitesimal deformation of $k[x, y]$ in the direction of the Weyl plane. We will come back to this.

If $\mathrm{HH}^2(A) = 0$, then A does not have any square-zero deformations, and vice versa. Such algebras are called (infinitesimally, or absolutely) *rigid*².

Third Hochschild cohomology One can show that $\mathrm{HH}^3(A, M)$ classifies crossed bimodules, see [40, exercise E.1.5.1]. We will not discuss this here.

But we should at this point mention that the combination of $\mathrm{HH}^1(A)$, $\mathrm{HH}^2(A)$ and $\mathrm{HH}^3(A)$ will play an important role in the deformation theory of algebras, as discussed in section 5. The third Hochschild cohomology group will take on the role of obstruction space.

²Hochschild called such algebras *segregated* in his original paper.

1.4 Examples

Explicit computations with the bar complex are often difficult, and only work in very elementary cases. We will collect a few of these examples, but we will also discuss some examples in which there exists a much smaller resolution that we can use, instead of the bar complex.

From now on we will focus on the case where $M = A$, occasionally we will mention what happens in the general case.

Example 29 (The base field). This case is completely trivial, but we observe that if $A = k$, then $A^e \cong k$. So

$$(49) \quad \mathrm{HH}^i(k) \cong \begin{cases} k & i = 0 \\ 0 & i \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$(50) \quad \mathrm{HH}_i(k) \cong \begin{cases} k & i = 0 \\ 0 & i \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

This triviality will be useful when discussing exceptional collections in ??.

Example 30 (The polynomial ring $k[t]$). Instead of the bar complex we can use a very concrete resolution of $k[t]$ as a bimodule over itself. Observe that $k[t]^e \cong k[x, y]$, and $k[t]$ as a $k[x, y]$ -module has a free resolution

$$(51) \quad 0 \rightarrow k[x, y] \xrightarrow{\cdot(x-y)} k[x, y] \rightarrow k[t] \rightarrow 0.$$

From this we immediately see that

$$(52) \quad \mathrm{HH}_i(k[t]) \cong \begin{cases} k[t] & i = 0, 1 \\ 0 & i \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

and

$$(53) \quad \mathrm{HH}^i(k[t]) \cong \begin{cases} k[t] & i = 0, 1 \\ 0 & i \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

This agreement between Hochschild homology and cohomology is no coincidence: $k[t]$ is a so called 1-Calabi–Yau algebra, so Poincaré–Van den Bergh duality applies, as in ??.

Example 31 (Finite-dimensional algebras). If A is a finite-dimensional k -algebra, then it is possible to construct a small projective resolution of A as an A -bimodule. For details one is referred to [19, §1.5]³

Applying this to $A = kQ$, where Q is a connected acyclic quiver, the resolution takes on the form

$$(54) \quad 0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\alpha \in Q_1} A^e e_{s(\alpha)} \otimes e_{t(\alpha)} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in Q_0} A^e e_v \otimes e_v \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0.$$

From the length of this resolution it is immediate that path algebras do not have deformations. Imposing relations on the quiver yields more complicated finite-dimensional algebras, and the explicit description of the resolution can be implemented in computer algebra, notably QPA⁴.

³I should probably give a self-contained discussion.

⁴<https://www.gap-system.org/Packages/qpa.html>

More generally when A has finite global dimension we have the description

$$(55) \quad \mathrm{HH}_i(A) \cong \begin{cases} k^r & i = 0 \\ 0 & i \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

where r is the number of isomorphism classes of simple modules.

Example 32 (Truncated polynomial algebras $k[t]/(t^n)$). Again we want to use a small resolution of $A = k[t]/(t^n)$ as a bimodule over itself. We will use a 2-periodic resolution for this, which immediately tells us that the Hochschild (co)homology is itself 2-periodic, i.e.

$$(56) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{HH}^i(A, M) &\cong \mathrm{HH}^{i+2}(A, M) \\ \mathrm{HH}_i(A, M) &\cong \mathrm{HH}_{i+2}(A, M) \end{aligned}$$

for any A -bimodule M , and $i \geq 1$. This would of course be impossible to read off from the definition using bar resolution.

This 2-periodic resolution is defined as follows: let $u = t \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes t$ and $v = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} t^{n-1-i} \otimes t^i$. Then we will use

$$(57) \quad \dots \xrightarrow{v \cdot} A^e \xrightarrow{u \cdot} A^e \xrightarrow{v \cdot} A^e \xrightarrow{u \cdot} A^e \xrightarrow{\mu} A \longrightarrow 0.$$

In exercise 33 a method of proving the exactness is suggested.

By applying $\mathrm{Hom}_{A^e}(-, M)$ or $- \otimes_{A^e} M$ to this sequence we get

$$(58) \quad 0 \longrightarrow M \xrightarrow{0} M \xrightarrow{nt^{n-1}} M \xrightarrow{0} M \xrightarrow{nt^{n-1}} M \xrightarrow{0} \dots$$

We always have that

$$(59) \quad \mathrm{HH}^0(A, M) \cong \mathrm{HH}_0(A, M) \cong M,$$

which we could also deduce from propositions 17 and 19.

For $i \geq 1$ the description depends on $\mathrm{char} k$. If $\mathrm{gcd}(n, \mathrm{char} k) = 1$ we obtain for i even

$$(60) \quad \mathrm{HH}^i(A, M) \cong \mathrm{HH}_i(A, M) \cong M/t^{n-1}M$$

and for i odd

$$(61) \quad \mathrm{HH}^i(A, M) \cong \mathrm{HH}_i(A, M) \cong tM.$$

On the other hand, if $\mathrm{gcd}(n, \mathrm{char} k) \neq 1$, then the morphism which is multiplication by nt^{n-1} is the zero morphism, so the sequence splits, and we obtain

$$(62) \quad \mathrm{HH}^i(A, M) \cong \mathrm{HH}_i(A, M) \cong M$$

for all $i \geq 1$.

1.5 Exercises

Exercise 33. Show that (57) is exact by showing that the maps s_i give a contracting homotopy, where for $i = -1$ we take $s_{-1}(1) = 1 \otimes 1$, whilst for $m \geq 0$ we define

$$(63) \quad \begin{aligned} s_{2m}(1 \otimes t^j) &= - \sum_{l=1}^j t^{j-l} \otimes t^{l-1} \\ s_{2m+1}(1 \otimes x^j) &= \delta_j^{n-1} \otimes 1. \end{aligned}$$

Exercise 34. Let k be of characteristic 0. Let us denote $A = A_1(k)$ the *first Weyl algebra*, defined as $k\langle x, y \rangle / (yx - xy - 1)$. It is the ring of differential operators on $\mathbb{A}_k^1 = \text{Spec } k[x]$, where y corresponds to $\partial/\partial x$.

Let V be a 2-dimensional vector space, and choose a basis $\{v, w\}$. Show that

$$(64) \quad 0 \longrightarrow A^e \otimes \wedge^2 V \xrightarrow{f} A^e \otimes V \xrightarrow{g} A^e \longrightarrow 0$$

where

$$(65) \quad f(1 \otimes 1 \otimes v \wedge w) = (1 \otimes x - x \otimes 1) \otimes w - (1 \otimes y - y \otimes 1) \otimes v$$

and

$$(66) \quad \begin{aligned} g(1 \otimes 1 \otimes v) &= 1 \otimes x - x \otimes 1 \\ g(1 \otimes 1 \otimes u) &= 1 \otimes y - y \otimes 1 \end{aligned}$$

gives a free resolution of A . Using this, show that

$$(67) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{HH}^i(A) &= \begin{cases} k & i = 0 \\ 0 & i \neq 0 \end{cases}, \\ \text{HH}_i(A) &= \begin{cases} k & i = 2 \\ 0 & i \neq 2 \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

This apparent duality between Hochschild homology and cohomology is not a coincidence in this case, see ??.

Exercise 35. We have seen that $\text{HH}_\bullet(-)$ is a (covariant) functor. Show that

1. it sends products to direct sums, i.e.

$$(68) \quad \text{HH}_\bullet(A \times B) \cong \text{HH}_\bullet(A) \oplus \text{HH}_\bullet(B),$$

2. it preserves sequential limits, i.e. if $A_i \rightarrow A_{i+1}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ is a sequence of algebra morphisms, then

$$(69) \quad \text{HH}_\bullet(\varinjlim A_i) \cong \varinjlim \text{HH}_\bullet(A_i).$$

Now fixing A , show that $\text{HH}_\bullet(A, -)$ sends a short exact sequence

$$(70) \quad 0 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow 0$$

of A -bimodules to a long exact sequence

$$(71) \quad \dots \rightarrow \text{HH}_n(A, M') \rightarrow \text{HH}_n(A, M) \rightarrow \text{HH}_n(A, M'') \rightarrow \dots$$

Exercise 36. Prove propositions 11 and 13.

Exercise 37. Let A be an associative k -algebra.

1. Show that

$$(72) \quad \mathrm{HH}_i(A, A^e) \cong \begin{cases} A & i = 0 \\ 0 & i \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

2. Explain why the analogous statement is not true for $\mathrm{HH}^i(A, A^e)$.

2 Extra structure on Hochschild (co)homology

Hochschild homology and cohomology have a rich structure: they are more than just k -modules, which is how we defined them in the previous section. We will discuss the following structure in these notes.

1. Hochschild cohomology has both the structure of an associative algebra and a Lie algebra;
2. Hochschild homology is both a module and a representation over Hochschild cohomology;
3. if A is commutative, then Hochschild homology itself has an algebra structure.

We will take $A = M$ throughout here.

Observe that this is not an exhaustive list of the extra structure. We will not discuss the action of $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$ on $\mathrm{Ext}_A^\bullet(M, N)$ (see [67, §1.6]), the cup coproduct on Hochschild homology, generalisations of the structures discussed here when the A -bimodule has an algebra structure of its own, similar structures on the variations on cyclic homology, ...

2.1 Hochschild cohomology is a Gerstenhaber algebra

The first aspect that we deal with is the algebraic structure on Hochschild cohomology (and Hochschild cochains): it is both

- a graded-commutative algebra,
- a graded Lie (super-)algebra,

and these structures are compatible: we will call such a structure a Gerstenhaber algebra, see definition 54.

For Hochschild cochains the situation is somewhat more complicated, as some properties are only true *up to homotopy*. For now we will not go into many details regarding this, this might change later on in the notes.

Observe that we have already seen a small part of the algebra structure in proposition 19, and of the Lie algebra structure in corollary 24. We will now extend these structures to the entire Hochschild cohomology of A , and discuss their compatibility.

Originally the Lie bracket on Hochschild cochains was introduced by Gerstenhaber in [14] to prove that the multiplication on Hochschild cohomology is graded-commutative. But this Lie bracket is also very important for deformation theory, we will come back to this in section 5.

Associative algebra structure: cup product We will start with introducing the associative multiplication, both on $C^\bullet(A)$, and by compatibility with the differential, on $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$. The graded-commutativity will have to wait for now.

Definition 38. Let $f \in C^m(A)$ and $g \in C^n(A)$ be Hochschild cochains. The *cup product* of f and g is the element $f \cup g$ defined by

$$(73) \quad f \cup g(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n}) = f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_m)g(a_{m+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n}).$$

Lemma 39. The cup product makes $C^\bullet(A)$ into a differential graded algebra, i.e. the cup product is associative and satisfies the *graded Leibniz rule*

$$(74) \quad d_{m+n+1}(f \cup g) = d_{m+1}(f) \cup g + (-1)^m f \cup d_{n+1}(g).$$

where $f \in C^m(A)$ and $g \in C^n(A)$.

Proof. Associativity is immediate, as $(f \cup g) \cup h$ and $f \cup (g \cup h)$ involve multiplication inside A , which is associative.

The compatibility with the differential is the following computation, which follows immediately from the definitions. For the left-hand side we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{m+n+1}(f \cup g)(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
&= a_1(f \cup g)(a_2 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
(75) \quad &+ \sum_{i=1}^{m+n} (-1)^i (f \cup g)(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_i a_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
&+ (-1)^{m+n+1} (f \cup g)(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n}) a_{m+n+1}
\end{aligned}$$

whilst for the right-hand side we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (d_{m+1}(f) \cup g)(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
&= a_1 f(a_2 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+1}) g(a_{m+2} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
(76) \quad &+ \sum_{i=1}^m f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_i a_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+1}) g(a_{m+2} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
&+ (-1)^{m+1} f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_m) a_{m+1} g(a_{m+2} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1})
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-1)^m (f \cup d_{n+1}(g))(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
&= (-1)^m f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_m) a_{m+1} g(a_{m+2} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
(77) \quad &+ \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{m+i} f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_m) g(a_{m+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+i} a_{m+i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n+1}) \\
&+ (-1)^{m+n+1} f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_m) g(a_{m+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n}) a_{m+n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

It suffices to identify the last and first terms of (76) and (77), and reindex the summation in (77) to run from $m+1$ to $n+m$ to get the equality. \square

By taking cohomology of the Hochschild cochain complex we get the following corollary.

Corollary 40. The Hochschild cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$ is a graded associative algebra.

This is only the first aspect of the algebraic structure of $\mathrm{C}^\bullet(A)$. Before we define the Lie bracket, we should mention that the cup product on the level of cohomology is actually commutative! This is one of the main results of [14].

Proposition 41. The Hochschild cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$ is a graded-commutative algebra, i.e. for $f \in \mathrm{HH}^m(A)$ and $g \in \mathrm{HH}^n(A)$ we have that

$$(78) \quad f \cup g = (-1)^{mn} g \cup f.$$

The proof of this result will require the Gerstenhaber bracket which will be defined shortly. We will show that the difference between $f \cup g$ and $g \cup f$ for two Hochschild cochains has a precise description as the differential of the circle product $f \circ g$, so that it vanishes in cohomology.

Observe that in proposition 19 we saw that $\mathrm{HH}^0(A) \cong Z(A)$, so we at least already knew that the degree zero part was a commutative subalgebra. It turns out that in a precise sense Hochschild cohomology can be seen as a *derived center*.

Remark 42. Using theorem 15 we have another graded-commutative algebra structure on Hochschild cohomology, given by the Yoneda product on Ext-groups. One can show that the cup product and Yoneda product are actually identified under the isomorphism (25). We refer to [67] for details.

Lie algebra structure: Gerstenhaber bracket Next up is a Lie bracket on Hochschild cochains, which like the product is compatible with the Hochschild differential, hence descends to a Lie bracket on Hochschild cohomology.

Definition 43. Let $f \in C^m(A)$ and $g \in C^n(A)$ be Hochschild cochains. Let us denote⁵ the element $f \circ_i g$ of $C^{m+n-1}(A)$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, defined by

$$(79) \quad f \circ_i g(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n-1}) = f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{i-1} \otimes g(a_i \otimes \dots \otimes a_{i+n-1}) \otimes a_{i+n} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m+n-1}).$$

The *circle product* of the Hochschild cochains f and g is the element $f \circ g \in C^{m+n-1}(A)$ defined by

$$(80) \quad f \circ g := \sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^{(i-1)(n+1)} f \circ_i g.$$

This circle product equips $C^\bullet(A)$ with the structure of a so called *pre-Lie algebra*. In particular, it is not associative. We will not be interested in this structure on its own, as we are only interested in the structure induced by the following definition.

Definition 44. Let $f \in C^m(A)$ and $g \in C^n(A)$ be Hochschild cochains. Then their *Gerstenhaber bracket* is the element $[f, g] \in C^{m+n-1}(A)$ defined by

$$(81) \quad [f, g] := f \circ g - (-1)^{(m-1)(n-1)} g \circ f.$$

The way Gerstenhaber proves essential properties of his bracket depends greatly on a detailed analysis of $-\circ_i-$ and $-\circ-$, and for details⁶ one is referred to [14]. We will only summarise the intermediate steps in what follows.

Example 45. The Gerstenhaber product will play an important role when studying the deformation theory of algebras. If $m = n = 2$, and $f \in C^2(A)$, then (at least when the characteristic is not 2)

$$(82) \quad [f, f] = 2(f(f(a \otimes b) \otimes c) - f(a \otimes f(b \otimes c))).$$

Remark 46. Observe that the definition of the Gerstenhaber bracket did *not* use the algebra structure on A . But one can observe that the multiplication morphism $\mu: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$ is the coboundary of the identity, and

$$(83) \quad d(f) = [f, -\mu]$$

makes the link between the algebra structure on A , the Hochschild differential and the Gerstenhaber bracket.

Even more is true: the cup product can also be expressed in terms of the $-\circ_i-$, as

$$(84) \quad f \cup g = (\mu \circ_0 f) \circ_{m-1} g$$

where $f \in C^m(A)$ and $g \in C^n(A)$.

⁵The ambiguity with composition of functions is intentional: indeed, for $m = n = 1$ the circle product really *is* the composition of Hochschild 1-cochains.

⁶Gerstenhaber himself writes on page 86 of [15] that the Poisson identity relating the Gerstenhaber bracket to the cup product follows from “a (nasty) computation”. I am not going to argue with this judgment.

The skew symmetry and Jacobi identity are discussed in [14, theorem 1]. These follow rather straightforwardly from the pre-Lie structure. Establishing that $C^\bullet(A)$ has a pre-Lie structure is done by using that of a *pre-Lie system*, which takes all the $- \circ_i -$ into account. It is shown in [14, theorem 2] how such a pre-Lie system induces a pre-Lie algebra structure.

Proposition 47. Let $f \in C^m(A, A)$, $g \in C^n(A)$ and $h \in C^p(A)$ be Hochschild cochains. Then

$$\text{skew symmetry } [f, g] = -(-1)^{(m-1)(n-1)}[g, f]$$

$$\text{Jacobi identity } (-1)^{(m-1)(p-1)}[f, [g, h]] + (-1)^{(p-1)(n-1)}[h, [f, g]] + (-1)^{(n-1)(m-1)}[g, [h, f]] = 0$$

Remark 48. The skew symmetry means that we are considering graded Lie superalgebras, we will not consider graded Lie algebras that in the strict sense of the word.

Proof. The skew symmetry follows easily by replacing $[-, -]$ with its definition as the commutator of the circle product, and observing that the four terms appear with opposite signs.

For the proof of the Jacobi identity, one is referred to [14], as explained above. \square

The next step is the compatibility with the Hochschild differential. In other words

Proposition 49. Let $f \in C^m(A, A)$, $g \in C^n(A)$ and $h \in C^p(A)$ be Hochschild cochains. Then

$$(85) \quad d([f, g]) = (-1)^{n-1}[d(f), g] + [f, d(g)].$$

Proof. This follows from (83) and the Jacobi identity from proposition 47, applying (83) to $[f, g]$. \square

From this we get the following corollary, which will be important for the deformation theory of algebras, see section 5. Recall that the axioms for a differential graded Lie algebra are precisely given by the results of proposition 47, except that there is a shift in the degree appearing.

Corollary 50. $C^{\bullet+1}(A, A)$ is a differential graded Lie algebra.

Recall that in corollary 24 we saw that $\text{HH}^1(A)$ has the structure of a Lie algebra. The following result tells us that it is a Lie subalgebra in degree 0 of a graded Lie algebra. It is clear from the definition of the Gerstenhaber bracket for elements in $C^1(A)$ and the definition of the Lie algebra structure on $\text{HH}^1(A)$ that they agree.

Proposition 51. $\text{HH}^{\bullet+1}(A)$ is a graded Lie algebra.

Let us consider this graded Lie algebra structure in a special case.

Example 52. The Lie algebra $\text{HH}^1(A)$ consisting of outer derivations acts on the Hochschild cohomology space $\text{HH}^0(A)$, which we have shown to be the center $Z(A)$ of A . If D is a derivation, and $z \in Z(A)$ a central element, then

$$(86) \quad [D, z] = D \circ z - z \circ D = D \circ z = D(z)$$

commutes with every element $a \in A$, as one checks easily.

Commutativity of the cup product We can now prove the commutativity of the cup product on the level of cohomology. The main ingredient is given in proposition 53, which is a computation depending on the notion of a pre-Lie algebra that can be found in [14, theorem 3]. We will not reproduce it here⁷.

⁷It is an interesting exercise to compute things in low degree, to get a feel for the formulas and the role of the Hochschild differential.

Proposition 53. Let $f \in C^m(A)$ and $g \in C^n(A)$ be Hochschild cochains. Then

$$(87) \quad f \cup g - (-1)^{mn} g \cup f = d(g) \circ f + (-1)^m d(g \circ f) + (-1)^{m-1} g \circ d(f)$$

But this leads us immediately to the proof of the graded-commutativity of $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$.

Proof of proposition 41. In the notation of proposition 53, if f and g are Hochschild cocycles, then (87) becomes

$$(88) \quad f \cup g - (-1)^{mn} g \cup f = d_{n+m+1}(f \circ g).$$

So the difference between the commutator of two cocycles is a coboundary, and it vanishes when taking cohomology. \square

Gerstenhaber algebra structure The cup product and Gerstenhaber bracket on Hochschild cohomology define the structure of a super-commutative algebra and a graded Lie superalgebra. They are moreover compatible in the following sense. We assign a name to this structure, because as it turns out, this is *not* the only natural example of such a structure. We will discuss polyvector fields, and their connection to Hochschild cohomology, in section 3.

Definition 54. A graded vector space A^\bullet is a *Gerstenhaber algebra* if

1. A^\bullet has an (associative) super-commutative multiplication of degree 0;
2. A^\bullet has a super-Lie bracket of degree -1 ;
3. these two structures are related via the *Poisson identity*

$$(89) \quad [a, bc] = [a, b]c + (-1)^{(|a|-1)|b|} b[a, c].$$

Written out in full detail, we have that

$$(90) \quad \begin{aligned} |ab| &= |a| + |b| \\ ab &= (-1)^{|a||b|} ba \end{aligned}$$

for the multiplication, and

$$(91) \quad \begin{aligned} |[a, b]| &= |a| + |b| - 1 \\ [a, b] &= -(-1)^{(|a|-1)(|b|-1)} [b, a] \end{aligned}$$

for the Lie bracket.

The Poisson identity then tells us that $a \mapsto [a, -]: A^p \rightarrow A^{p-1}$ is a derivation of degree $p - 1$.

Proposition 55. Let A be an associative k -algebra. Then $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$ is a Gerstenhaber algebra.

Proof. In proposition 41 and proposition 51 we have discussed the algebra and Lie algebra structure. The missing ingredient is the compatibility between these two structures through the Poisson identity. The proof of this goes along the same lines as the commutativity of the Gerstenhaber product: one shows that on the level of Hochschild cochains the obstruction to the Poisson identity is a certain coboundary given in [14, theorem 5]. This is a quite technical computation, and we will not reproduce it here. \square

Remark 56. The cup product and Gerstenhaber bracket on the level of Hochschild cochain complexes do *not* satisfy the Poisson identity, nor is the dg algebra structure graded-commutative, so they do not give an immediate dg translation of a Gerstenhaber algebra structure. But there are homotopical versions of this structure, such as that of a B_∞ - and G_∞ -algebra, which fixes this incompatibility by introducing higher homotopies. We come back to this in section 7.3.

At this point we should mention that these (and other) homotopical structures form part of the program on the Deligne conjecture⁸). We will not go further into this for the time being, but this operadic picture is an important modern incarnation of the extra structure that we have discussed up to now.

In proposition 83 we will see another example of a Gerstenhaber algebra. These two examples are very closely related, and their story forms one of the main topics of these notes.

2.2 Higher structures on Hochschild cochains

Ideally we rewrite the discussion on the Gerstenhaber algebra structure on Hochschild cohomology in such a way that we discuss the higher structures for algebras in this chapter. For now, one is referred to section 7.3.

2.3 Hochschild homology is a Gerstenhaber module for Hochschild cohomology

For arbitrary algebras A there is no internal structure⁹ on $\mathrm{HH}_\bullet(A)$ or $\mathrm{HH}_\bullet(A, M)$. But there are interesting *actions* of $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$ on $\mathrm{HH}_\bullet(A)$, such that $\mathrm{HH}_\bullet(A)$ is

- a module under the graded-commutative multiplication,
- a representation for the Gerstenhaber bracket

which are compatible in a certain way. The combination of these structures will be called a Gerstenhaber module, and they constitute an important part of the so-called Gerstenhaber (pre)calculus on the pair $(C^\bullet(A), C_\bullet(A))$. As we will not discuss this again until the very end¹⁰ we will content ourselves with giving the definitions.

Observe that there are no good written proofs of the compatibility of these operations with the Hochschild differentials. Feel free to take this up as a challenge.

The cap product First up, the action by multiplication, i.e. the module structure.

Definition 57. Let M be an A -bimodule. Let $f \in C^n(A)$ and $m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p \in C_p(A, M)$. Then their *cap product* is

$$(92) \quad f \cap (m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p) = \begin{cases} (-1)^n m f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) \otimes a_{n+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_p & p \geq n \\ 0 & p < n \end{cases}$$

which is an element of $C_{p-n}(A, M)$.

One can then prove the following result.

⁸Stated in 1993 in a letter to Gerstenhaber–May–Stasheff, now a theorem with proofs due to Tamarkin, McClure–Smith, Kontsevich–Soibelman, ...

⁹If A is commutative we discuss the shuffle product in section 2.4.

¹⁰At least for now. The interested reader is invited to prove the following properties him- or herself.

Proposition 58. $C_i(A, M)$ is a differential graded module over $C^\bullet(A)$.

From this we get the following.

Corollary 59. $\text{HH}_\bullet(A, M)$ is a graded module for the graded-commutative algebra $\text{HH}^\bullet(A)$.

Remark 60. In particular we have that $\text{HH}_i(A, M)$ is a module over $\text{HH}^0(A) \cong Z(A)$.

The Lie derivative The next step is the action by the Lie bracket.

Definition 61. Let $f \in C^{n+1}(A)$ and $a_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p \in C_p(A, M)$. Then the *Lie derivative* of $a_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p$ with respect to f is

$$(93) \quad \begin{aligned} L_f(a_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p) &= \sum_{i=0}^{p-n} (-1)^{ni} a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{i-1} \otimes f(a_i \otimes \dots \otimes a_{i+n}) \otimes a_{i+n+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_p \\ &+ \sum_{j=p-n}^{p-1} (-1)^{p(j+1)} f(a_{j+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_p \otimes a_0 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{n-p+j}) \otimes a_{p-n+j+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_j \end{aligned}$$

One can then prove the following result.

Proposition 62. $C_\bullet(A)$ is a differential graded Lie representation over $C^{\bullet+1}(A)$.

From this we get the following.

Corollary 63. $\text{HH}_\bullet(A)$ is a representation of the graded Lie algebra $\text{HH}^{\bullet+1}(A)$.

We can combine these into the notion of a Gerstenhaber module, and discuss the notion of a Gerstenhaber (pre)calculus. We will not do this for now.

2.4 The shuffle product on Hochschild homology

In general $\text{HH}_\bullet(A)$ is only a graded $\text{HH}^\bullet(A)$ -module. But if A is commutative we can equip it with its own product. The algebra structure on $\text{HH}_\bullet(A)$ for A commutative is actually induced using a pairing

$$(94) \quad C_\bullet(A, M) \otimes_k C_\bullet(B, N) \rightarrow C_\bullet(A \otimes_k B, M \otimes_k N)$$

which is defined for arbitrary algebras A and B , and bimodules M and N (unlike in the rest of this section we will use M and N to make the formulas a bit more transparent, but we will have $M = A$ and $N = B$ in applications). This will be the shuffle product from the title of this section.

Definition 64. A (p, q) -*shuffle* is an element σ of Sym_{p+q} such that $\sigma(i) < \sigma(j)$ whenever

1. $1 \leq i < j \leq p$,
2. or $p+1 \leq i < j \leq p+q$.

The subset of (p, q) -shuffles inside the symmetric group is denoted $\text{Sh}_{p,q}$.

We can define an action of Sym_n on $C_n(A, M)$, by setting

$$(95) \quad \sigma \cdot (m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) := m \otimes a_{\sigma^{-1}(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\sigma^{-1}(n)}$$

for $\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n$ and $m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \in C_n(A, M)$.

Definition 65. The (p, q) -shuffle product for A and B is the morphism

$$(96) \quad \text{sh}_{p,q}(-, -) = - \times -: C_p(A, M) \otimes_k C_q(B, N) \rightarrow C_{p+q}(A \otimes_k B, M \otimes_k N)$$

which sends $(m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p) \otimes (n \otimes b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes b_q)$ to

$$(97) \quad \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}_{p,q}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \sigma \cdot \left((m \otimes n) \otimes (a_1 \otimes 1) \otimes \dots \otimes (a_p \otimes 1) \otimes (1 \otimes b_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (1 \otimes b_q) \right)$$

The next lemma shows that the Hochschild homology differential is a graded derivation for the shuffle product. For a proof, see [40, proposition 4.2.2].

Lemma 66. Let $m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p \in C_p(A, M)$ and $n \otimes b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes b_q \in C_q(B, N)$ be Hochschild chains. Then

$$(98) \quad \begin{aligned} d \left((m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p) \times (n \otimes b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes b_q) \right) \\ = d(m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p) \times (n \otimes b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes b_q) + (-1)^p (m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p) \times d(n \otimes b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes b_q). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us write the i th summand of the differential as in (20) by d_i , indexed by $i = 0, \dots, n$. Let us moreover write

$$(99) \quad (m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p) \times (n \otimes b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes b_q) = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}_{p,q}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) (m \otimes n) \otimes c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_{p+q}$$

where c_i is in the set $\{a_1 \otimes 1, \dots, a_p \otimes 1, 1 \otimes b_1, \dots, 1 \otimes b_q\}$. Now consider

$$(100) \quad d_i((m \otimes n) \otimes c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_{p+q}),$$

for $i = 0, \dots, n$. We now explain what happens with (100) on a case-by-case analysis.

- If $i = 0$, then $c_1 = a_1 \otimes 1$ (resp. $c_1 = 1 \otimes b_1$), and (100) appears in the first summand (resp. second summand) of the right-hand side of (98).
- The case $i = n$ is similar.
- If $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ then we distinguish two cases:
 1. If c_i and c_{i+1} are elements of the form $a \otimes 1$ (resp. $1 \otimes b$) then they appear in the first (resp. second summand) of the right-hand side of (98).
 2. Otherwise we can permute them, as they will still arise from the application of a different (p, q) -shuffle, in which case we can cancel them, as they appear with opposite signs in the shuffle product.

□

Using the shuffle product we can construct the Künneth formula for Hochschild homology: we will combine the (p, q) -shuffles in the following way

$$(101) \quad \text{sh}_n := \sum_{p+q=n} \text{sh}_{p,q}: (C_\bullet(A) \otimes_k C_\bullet(B))_n = \bigoplus_{p+q=n} C_p(A) \otimes_k C_q(B) \rightarrow C_n(A \otimes_k B).$$

Proposition 67. The morphism sh_\bullet is a morphism of chain complexes.

Proof. By lemma 66 we can express $d \circ \text{sh}_{p,q}(-, -)$ in terms of $\text{sh}_{p-1,q}(d(-), -)$ and $\text{sh}_{p,q-1}(-, d(-))$, which with the appropriate signs gives the differential in the tensor product of chain complexes. \square

But sh_\bullet is not just an morphism of chain complexes: it is actually a quasi-isomorphism. The proof of this result can be found [65, §9.4].

Theorem 68 (Künneth formula). The shuffle product sh_\bullet induces an isomorphism

$$(102) \quad \text{HH}_\bullet(A) \otimes_k \text{HH}_\bullet(B) \cong \text{HH}_\bullet(A \otimes_k B).$$

Remark 69. Observe that a similar statement is not true for Hochschild cohomology, at least not without conditions on A and B . In exercise 73 a suggestion for a counterexample is given. In [65, §9.4] the condition that at least one of them is finite-dimensional is used. It is not clear to me whether this can be generalised.

If we now impose commutativity, then the multiplication gives us a morphism of algebras

$$(103) \quad \mu: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A.$$

Using functoriality of the Hochschild chain complex, we obtain a morphism

$$(104) \quad C_\bullet(A \otimes_k A) \rightarrow C_\bullet(A).$$

One can then prove that this equips the Hochschild chain complex with the structure of a commutative differential graded algebra [65, proposition 9.4.2], and therefore we have the following.

Proposition 70. $\text{HH}_\bullet(A)$ is a graded-commutative algebra.

2.5 Exercises

Exercise 71. Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra. Equip $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$ with the exterior product as multiplication, and the unique extension of the Lie bracket on $\bigwedge^1 \mathfrak{g}$ to all of $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$. Show that this is a Gerstenhaber algebra.

Exercise 72. Use the definition of the circle product to check remark 46.

Exercise 73. Let K, L be fields of infinite transcendence degree over k . Then

$$(105) \quad \text{HH}^\bullet(K \otimes_k L) \not\cong \text{HH}^\bullet(K) \otimes_k \text{HH}^\bullet(L).$$

Exercise 74. Explain how (84) gives an alternative proof that $d^2 = 0$, using only the graded Lie algebra structure of $C^\bullet(A)$.

3 The Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism

The goal of this section is to discuss the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism, which identifies the Hochschild (co)homology of a regular *commutative* k -algebra A with its polyvector fields and differential forms. It is given as [23, theorem 5.2], where the interpretation from theorem 15 is used to make the link with Hochschild (co)homology.

To understand where the isomorphism comes from, recall that we have identifications

$$(106) \quad \begin{cases} \mathrm{HH}^0(A) \cong A & \text{proposition 19} \\ \mathrm{HH}^1(A) \cong \mathrm{Der}(A) & \text{proposition 22} \end{cases}$$

and

$$(107) \quad \begin{cases} \mathrm{HH}_0(A) \cong A & \text{proposition 17} \\ \mathrm{HH}_1(A) \cong \Omega_A^1 & \text{proposition 79} \end{cases}$$

where the identification for $\mathrm{HH}_1(A)$ *stricto sensu* is not yet known¹¹.

Then the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism (see theorem 98) tells us that we can get *all* of the Hochschild (co)homology by taking exterior powers of what we have in degree 1, and that this is an isomorphism of graded commutative algebras: by propositions 41 and 70 we have that $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$ and $\mathrm{HH}_\bullet(A)$ are graded commutative, and the exterior product is graded commutative by construction.

3.1 Polyvector fields and differential forms

Let us introduce the module Ω_A^1 which already made an appearance in (107) without being defined.

Definition 75. The *module of Kähler differentials* Ω_A^1 is the A -module which is generated by the symbols da for $a \in A$, subject to the relations¹²

$$(108) \quad d(\lambda a + \mu b) = \lambda da + \mu db$$

for all $\lambda, \mu \in k$ and $a, b \in A$, and

$$(109) \quad dab = adb + bda$$

for all $a, b \in A$.

The module of Kähler differentials appears in many ways in this context. First of all, it satisfies a well-known universal property: it co-represents the functor of derivations, via the *universal derivation*

$$(110) \quad d: A \rightarrow \Omega_A^1 : a \mapsto da.$$

Proposition 76. We have an isomorphism

$$(111) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_A(\Omega_A, M) \cong \mathrm{Der}(A, M)$$

sending $\alpha: \Omega_A \rightarrow M$ to $d \circ \alpha: A \rightarrow M$, giving an isomorphism of functors $\mathrm{Hom}_A(\Omega_A, -) \cong \mathrm{Der}(A, -)$.

¹¹The dilemma is whether to give a preliminary discussion of Ω_A^1 in section 1.3, or postpone it until we have time to discuss it in detail. We have opted for the latter.

¹²To be precise, and consistent with the notation in the literature, we should denote this by $\Omega_{A/k}^1$, making the dependence on the base field explicit. But then we should also do this for $\mathrm{Der}(A)$, and likewise for HH^\bullet and HH_\bullet , which we won't.

Recall from proposition 22 that $\text{Der}(A, M) \cong \text{HH}^1(A, M)$. So we have that $\text{HH}^1(A) \cong \text{Der}(A) \cong \text{Hom}_A(\Omega_A, A)$. This is the first ingredient in the proof of the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism for Hochschild cohomology. In geometric notation, when $X = \text{Spec } A$, we have $\text{HH}^1(A) \cong T_X$.

There is a second description of the Kähler differentials which is useful to us. For a proof of this standard fact one is referred to [60, tag 00RW].

Proposition 77. Let $I := \ker(\mu: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A)$. Then the morphism

$$(112) \quad \Omega_A^1 \rightarrow I/I^2 : adb \mapsto a \otimes b - ab \otimes 1$$

is an isomorphism of A -modules.

Remark 78. If A is noncommutative, then one denotes $\Omega_{\text{nc}}^1(A) := I$ the bimodule of noncommutative differential forms on A . In that case (111) takes on the form

$$(113) \quad \text{Der}(A, M) \cong \text{Hom}_{A^e}(\Omega_{\text{nc}}^1(A), M).$$

For more information, one is referred to [18, §10] or [67, §3.2].

Finally we can relate Ω_A^1 to Hochschild homology, just like we have already done for Hochschild cohomology, which is the first step in understanding the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism for Hochschild homology.

Proposition 79. Let M be a symmetric A -bimodule. Then

$$(114) \quad \text{HH}_1(A, M) \cong M \otimes_A \Omega_A^1.$$

In particular we have

$$(115) \quad \text{HH}_1(A) \cong \Omega_A^1.$$

Proof. By assumption the morphism $M \otimes_k A \rightarrow M$ is the zero morphism, as this is the Hochschild differential as in (30) and M is symmetric, so $\text{HH}_1(A, M)$ is the quotient of $M \otimes_k A$ by the subspace generated by $ma \otimes b - m \otimes ab + bm \otimes a$. So the morphism $\text{HH}_1(A, M) \rightarrow M \otimes_A \Omega_A^1$ sending $m \otimes a$ to $m \otimes da$ is well-defined by (109).

In the other direction we consider the morphism $M \otimes_A \Omega_A^1 \rightarrow C_1(A, M)$ sending $m \otimes adb$ to $ma \otimes b$. This morphism lands in $Z_1(A, M)$ by assumption, and one checks that the maps on cohomology are inverse. \square

Remark 80. It is important that M is symmetric: exercise 37 gives an example where this fails.

3.2 Gerstenhaber algebra structure on polyvector fields

Using $\text{Der}(A)$ we can construct a new Gerstenhaber algebra, which will be closely related to the Gerstenhaber algebra structure on Hochschild cohomology. We will do this by considering $\wedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)$, the polyvector fields (or multiderivations) on A . On $\wedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)$ we can consider the exterior product of polyvector fields, which equips it with the structure of a graded commutative algebra.

The space of derivations is the algebraic version of the vector fields on a manifold. As such, it is equipped with a Lie bracket. We can extend this Lie bracket to all of $\wedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)$ in the following way.

Definition 81. Let $\alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_m \in \wedge^m \text{Der}(A)$ and $\beta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta_n \in \wedge^n \text{Der}(A)$ be polyvector fields. Their *Schouten–Nijenhuis bracket*¹³ is given by

(116)

$$[\alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_m, \beta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta_n] := \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{i+j+m-1} [\alpha_i, \beta_j] \wedge \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{\alpha}_i \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_m \wedge \beta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{\beta}_j \wedge \dots \wedge \beta_n.$$

This bracket is the unique extension to a graded Lie algebra structure when one imposes that $[D, z] = D(z)$ for $D \in \text{HH}^1(A)$ and $z \in \text{HH}^0(A) \cong A$ as in example 52 and $[D_1, D_2] = D_1 \circ D_2 - D_2 \circ D_1$ for $D_1, D_2 \in \text{HH}^1(A)$ as in corollary 24. The following lemma is proved by staring at the signs.

Lemma 82. The Schouten–Nijenhuis bracket equips $\text{Der}(A)$ with the structure of a graded Lie algebra.

Because the Schouten–Nijenhuis bracket was defined in terms of the generators of the algebra, we obtain the following.

Proposition 83. The exterior product and Schouten–Nijenhuis bracket equip $\wedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)$ with the structure of a Gerstenhaber algebra.

Remark 84. We have not yet precisely defined what the dg version of a Gerstenhaber algebra is (as it requires to understand operations up to homotopy), so it’s not clear what exactly the extra structure induced by the cup product and Gerstenhaber bracket on $C^\bullet(A)$ is. But observe that we can equip $\wedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)$ with the zero differential, in which case it will be a (strict) dg Gerstenhaber algebra. Then the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism for Hochschild cohomology can be upgraded to Kontsevich formality: a quasi-isomorphism of “dg Gerstenhaber algebras” between $\wedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)$ and $C^\bullet(A)$, i.e. Hochschild cochains are quasi-isomorphic to their cohomology, and we know exactly what this cohomology is. We might discuss formality results later on in these notes.

3.3 Gerstenhaber module structure on differential forms

This section will be expanded at some point.

3.4 The Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism: Hochschild homology

We now come to the first proof of the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism, for smooth commutative algebras. We will do this in a rather classical fashion for now, based on [40, §1.3, §3.4]. The proof for smooth projective varieties in section 11 will use more advanced machinery. It should be remarked that it *is* actually possible to globalise the current proof without using the machinery of derived categories and Atiyah classes in an essential way, and maybe this will be discussed too at some point.

The statement of the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism in this setting is the following.

Theorem 85. Let A be a smooth k -algebra and M a symmetric A -bimodule. Then the antisymmetrisation morphism (118) induces an isomorphism

$$(117) \quad \Omega_{A/k}^n \otimes_A M \rightarrow \text{HH}_n(A, M).$$

When $A = M$ this isomorphism is an isomorphism of graded k -algebras.

¹³Sometimes just Schouten bracket. I like to speculate that this is purely for pronunciation reasons.

The proof given in this section naturally splits in two pieces:

1. constructing the antisymmetrisation morphism $\epsilon_n: M \otimes_A \Omega_A^n \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_n(A, M)$ of A -modules (no smoothness is required here);
2. showing that it is an isomorphism by checking it at every maximal ideal, using the description of Hochschild homology as Tor and an explicit free resolution (the Koszul resolution) in the local setting (smoothness is required here).

The construction of the morphism is done in proposition 89, and checking that it locally is an isomorphism is done after we prove proposition 95.

Note that, if we would only be interested in $\mathrm{HH}_n(A)$ and not $\mathrm{HH}_n(A, M)$, the construction of the morphism in step 1 can be done via a universal property, based on the graded-commutative algebra structure from proposition 70. We will take this approach in the case of Hochschild cohomology in section 3.5. Observe that this was the generality of the original paper of Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg, i.e. they only considered $\mathrm{HH}_\bullet(A)$ and $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A)$.

The antisymmetrisation morphism In proposition 79 we saw that the first Hochschild homology is isomorphic to the Kähler differentials, with the morphism $\Omega_A^1 \otimes_A M \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_1(A, M)$ being of the form $m \otimes adb \mapsto ma \otimes b$. We can extend these morphisms to differential n -forms and $\mathrm{HH}_n(A, M)$ in the following way. First we introduce the *antisymmetrisation map*

$$(118) \quad \epsilon_n: M \otimes_k \bigwedge^n A \rightarrow C_n(A, M) : m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n \mapsto \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sym}_n} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) \sigma \cdot m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n$$

where the action of σ is defined analogously to (95). Remark that from this point on we will have to be careful about whether \otimes or \wedge is taken over k or A .

We want to turn this into a morphism $M \otimes_A \Omega_A^n \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}_n(A, M)$, so we need to show that

1. ϵ_n is compatible with the Hochschild differential;
2. it factors through $M \otimes_A \Omega_A^n$.

To do the first, we will use a technical trick, inspired by Chevalley–Eilenberg (co)homology for Lie algebras. If \mathfrak{g} is a Lie algebra, and M a Lie module over it, then the *Chevalley–Eilenberg differential* is

$$(119) \quad \begin{aligned} d_{\mathrm{CE}}: M \otimes_k \bigwedge^n \mathfrak{g} &\rightarrow M \otimes_k \bigwedge^{n-1} \mathfrak{g} \\ m \otimes g_1 \wedge \dots \wedge g_n &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} [m, g_i] \otimes g_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{g}_i \wedge \dots \wedge g_n \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (-1)^{i+j-1} m \otimes [g_i, g_j] \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{g}_i \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{g}_j \wedge \dots \wedge g_n. \end{aligned}$$

The role of this differential in Chevalley–Eilenberg cohomology, which is the cohomology theory for Lie algebras parallel to Hochschild cohomology for associative algebras, will eventually be explained in appendix 3.

We will apply it to $\mathfrak{g} = A$, where A is considered as a Lie algebra via the commutator bracket. In particular, when A is commutative this is an abelian Lie algebra. But the following proposition holds without commutativity assumption.

Proposition 86. The diagram

$$(120) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} M \otimes_k \wedge^n A & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_n} & C_n(A, M) \\ \downarrow d_{\text{CE}} & & \downarrow d \\ M \otimes_k \wedge^{n-1} A & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{n-1}} & C_{n-1}(A, M) \end{array}$$

commutes for all $n \geq 0$.

The proof goes via induction. We will need the following technical (but easy) lemma, where

$$(121) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{ad}_n(a): C_n(A, M) &\rightarrow C_n(A, M) \\ m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n &\mapsto \sum_{i=0}^n m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes [a, a_i] \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \end{aligned}$$

is an extension of the notion of inner derivation to $C_n(A, M)$, and

$$(122) \quad \begin{aligned} h_n(a): C_n(A, M) &\rightarrow C_{n+1}(A, M) \\ m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n &\mapsto \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_i \otimes a \otimes a_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \end{aligned}$$

will provide a null-homotopy for our newly defined $\text{ad}_n(a)$, and an inductive way to describe ϵ_n as in (125).

Lemma 87. We have that

$$(123) \quad -\text{ad}_n(a) = d \circ h_n(a) + h_{n-1}(a) \circ d.$$

In particular $\text{ad}_n(a): \text{HH}_n(A, M) \rightarrow \text{HH}_n(A, M)$ is zero, as for $n = 0$ in proposition 22.

Proof. The term $d \circ h_n(a)$ gives $[a, a_i]$ by considering the Hochschild differential for the summands containing $a \wedge a_i$ and $a_i \wedge a$. The term $h_{n-1}(a) \circ d$ cancels all the other summands. \square

We can now give the proof of proposition 86.

Proof of proposition 86. The statement for $n = 0$ is vacuous as the lower line is zero. For $n = 1$ we have that $\epsilon_0 = \text{id}_M$ and $\epsilon_1 = \text{id}_{M \otimes_k A}$. As

$$(124) \quad d_{\text{CE}}(m \otimes a) = [m, a] = ma - am = d(m \otimes a)$$

the diagram commutes.

Let us assume that $d \circ \epsilon_n = \epsilon_{n-1} \circ d_{\text{CE}}$. By construction we have that

$$(125) \quad \epsilon_{n+1}(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n \wedge a_{n+1}) = (-1)^n h_n(a_{n+1}) \epsilon_n(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
& d \circ \epsilon_{n+1}(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_{n+1}) \\
&= (-1)^n d \circ h_n(a_{n+1}) \circ \epsilon_n(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) \tag{125} \\
&= (-1)^n (-\text{ad}_n(a_{n+1}) - h_n(a_{n+1}) \circ d) \circ \epsilon_n(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) \quad \text{lemma 87} \\
(126) \quad &= (-1)^{n+1} \text{ad}_n(a_{n+1}) \circ \epsilon_n(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) \\
&\quad + (-1)^{n-1} h_{n-1}(a_{n+1}) \circ \epsilon_{n-1} \circ d_{\text{CE}}(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) \\
&= (-1)^{n+1} \text{ad}_n(a_{n+1}) \circ \epsilon_n(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) \\
&\quad + \epsilon_n(d_{\text{CE}}(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) \wedge a_{n+1}) \tag{125} \\
&= \epsilon_n \circ d_{\text{CE}}(m \otimes a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) \wedge a_{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 88. If A is commutative and M symmetric, then $\text{im}(\epsilon_n) \subseteq Z_n(A)$. In particular, there exists a morphism

$$(127) \quad \epsilon_n: M \otimes_k \bigwedge^n A \rightarrow \text{HH}_n(A, M).$$

Proof. The Chevalley–Eilenberg differential is identically zero in this case. □

Now we can check that the antisymmetrisation indeed defines a morphism of the desired form.

Proposition 89. Let A be commutative, and M a symmetric A -bimodule. Then the morphism (127) factors as

$$(128) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} M \otimes_k \bigwedge^n A & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_n} & \text{HH}_n(A, M) \\ \downarrow & \nearrow \epsilon_n & \\ M \otimes_A \Omega_A^n & & \end{array}$$

where we will recycle the symbol ϵ_n for the morphism that we are interested in.

Proof. Recall that Ω_A^1 is generated by the symbols da , and hence Ω_A^n by the symbols $da_1 \wedge \dots \wedge da_n$.

We need to check that ϵ_n is compatible with the relations imposed on Ω_A^1 and that we can go from a tensor product over k to a tensor product over A . By the definition of ϵ_n we can assume that the product ab is the first position. We need to show that

$$(129) \quad \epsilon_n(m \otimes ab \wedge a_2 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) - \epsilon_n(ma \otimes b \wedge a_2 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n) - \epsilon_n(mb \otimes a \wedge a_2 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n)$$

is actually zero in homology, as this expresses the relation $dab = adb + bda$, together with the change from $-\otimes_k-$ to $-\otimes_A-$.

If $n = 0$ then there is nothing to check. If $n = 1$ we have that (129) is $d(m \otimes a \otimes b)$. More generally one can check that

$$(130) \quad (129) = -d \left(\sum_{\sigma \in S} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \sigma \cdot (m \otimes a \otimes b \otimes a_2 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) \right)$$

where $S = \{\sigma \in \text{Sym}_{n+1} \mid \sigma(1) < \sigma(2)\}$. □

So for now we have only used commutativity of A . We will continue the proof of the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism after a short digression.

The projection morphism Before we continue with the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition for smooth algebras we can prove something for arbitrary commutative algebras over fields of characteristic 0, by constructing a morphism in the opposite direction.

$$(131) \quad \pi_n: C_n(A, M) \rightarrow M \otimes_A \Omega_A^n : m \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \mapsto m \otimes da_1 \wedge \dots \wedge da_n.$$

This morphism is again compatible with the Hochschild differential.

Lemma 90. We have that $\pi_n \circ d = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Proof. Using the relation $dab = adb + bda$ after applying π_{n-1} to the expression (20) allows one to pair off terms with opposite signs. \square

Corollary 91. There exists a morphism

$$(132) \quad \pi_n: \mathrm{HH}_n(A, M) \rightarrow M \otimes_A \Omega_A^n.$$

Proposition 92. The composition $\pi_n \circ \epsilon_n$ is multiplication by $n!$.

Proof. We have the equality

$$(133) \quad m \otimes da_{\sigma^{-1}(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge da_{\sigma^{-1}(n)} = \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) m \otimes da_1 \wedge \dots \wedge da_n$$

so this term appears $n!$ times. \square

In characteristic zero we therefore obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 93. If $\mathrm{char} k = 0$, then $M \otimes_A \Omega_A^n$ is a direct summand of $\mathrm{HH}_n(A, M)$.

This leads to the λ -decomposition or *Hodge decomposition* of Hochschild homology, but we will not develop this further for now. The interested reader is referred to [40, §4.5]. Just be warned that what is called the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition in section 11 is sometimes referred to as the Hodge decomposition, especially in earlier papers. We should stress that

1. in the affine setting the Hodge decomposition is only interesting in the presence of singularities, and in the smooth case it reduces to the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism;
2. in the smooth and projective setting the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition was originally proved only for Hochschild cohomology, whence the name Hodge decomposition was used, but as the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition for Hochschild homology is a transpose (see section 11) of the Hodge decomposition arising in Hodge theory, this leads to an unfortunate clash of terminology, which is avoided in these notes.

Computing Tor via the Koszul resolution We have seen in theorem 15 that Hochschild homology can be described using Tor, as the bar complex provided a free resolution of A as a bimodule. We will need another explicit free resolution in the computation of Tor for the proof of the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism, when A is a smooth local k -algebra. This will be provided by the Koszul complex, which is a standard object in algebra and algebraic geometry. For more information one is referred to [12, §17], we will only recall some notation and facts.

Definition 94. Let A be a commutative ring. Let $f: M = A^{\oplus n} \rightarrow A$ be a morphism of A -modules. Then the *Koszul complex* associated to f is

$$(134) \quad 0 \rightarrow \bigwedge^n M \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bigwedge^1 M \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$$

where

$$(135) \quad d: \bigwedge^j M \rightarrow \bigwedge^{j-1} M : m_1 \wedge \dots \wedge m_j \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^j (-1)^{i+1} f(m_i) m_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{m}_{i-1} \wedge \dots \wedge m_j.$$

One can check that this is indeed a complex, but more importantly, when the morphism f corresponds to a regular sequence for an ideal I , then it is actually a free resolution of A/I .

Recall that $f = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is a regular sequence if a_{i+1} is not a zero-divisor in $A/(a_1, \dots, a_i)$. In definition 96 we relate this to smoothness of a k -algebra.

We prove the following general result, which will be applied to the local rings we encounter after applying the local-to-global principle.

Proposition 95. Let B be a commutative local ring, and I an ideal of B generated by a regular sequence $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$. Then the isomorphism

$$(136) \quad \epsilon_1: I/I^2 \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Tor}_1^B(B/I, B/I)$$

induces an isomorphism

$$(137) \quad \epsilon_\bullet: \bigwedge_{B/I}^\bullet I/I^2 \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Tor}_\bullet^B(B/I, B/I)$$

of graded-commutative algebras.

Proof. The Koszul complex provides a free resolution

$$(138) \quad 0 \rightarrow \bigwedge_B^n B^{\oplus n} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bigwedge_B^2 B^{\oplus n} \rightarrow B^{\oplus n} \rightarrow B \rightarrow B/I \rightarrow 0$$

of B/I as a B -module which we can use to compute Tor :

$$(139) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tor}_\bullet^B(B/I, B/I) &\cong \mathrm{H}_\bullet \left(\left(\bigwedge_B^\bullet B^{\oplus n} \right) \otimes_B B/I, d_{\mathbf{g}} \otimes_B \mathrm{id}_{B/I} \right) \\ &\cong \mathrm{H}_\bullet \left(\left(\bigwedge_B^\bullet B^{\oplus n} \right) \otimes_B B/I, 0 \right) \\ &\cong \bigwedge_B^\bullet (B/I)^{\oplus n} \\ &\cong \bigwedge_B^\bullet I/I^2 \end{aligned}$$

The second isomorphism follows from the observation that $d_{\mathbf{g}}$ has coefficients landing in $I \subseteq B$, as $d_{\mathbf{g}}: \bigwedge^{k+1} B^{\oplus n} \rightarrow \bigwedge^k B^{\oplus n}$ has the form

$$(140) \quad d_{\mathbf{g}}(v_0 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k) = \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \mathbf{g}(v_i) v_0 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{v}_i \wedge \dots \wedge v_k.$$

As I is generated by a regular sequence, we have that I/I^2 is a free B/I -module of rank n , generated by the classes of the elements in the sequence.

Finally, to check that (137) is an isomorphism of graded *algebras*, observe that the algebra structure on the right is described by an external product (much like the shuffle product), which can be computed via the exterior product of Koszul complexes. \square

As throughout the entirety of these notes we will let k be a field. We have the following equivalent definitions for smoothness.

Definition 96. Let A be a flat k -algebra, locally of finite type. We say that A is *smooth* (over k) if one of the following equivalent conditions holds:

1. for all \mathfrak{m} a maximal ideal of A the kernel of $\mu_{\mathfrak{m}} : (A \otimes_k A)_{\mu^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})} \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is generated by a regular sequence;
2. the kernel of $\mu : A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$ is a locally complete intersection;
3. for all \mathfrak{p} a prime ideal of A we have that $\dim_{k(\mathfrak{p})} \Omega_{A/k}^1 \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{p}) = \dim_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{Spec } A$.

Let us remark that in characteristic 0 smoothness at a point $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } A$ is equivalent to $\Omega_{A/k, \mathfrak{p}}^1$ being free of finite rank, and the ring $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ being regular¹⁴ (which is an absolute notion).

Having introduced smoothness, we can put it to good use in proving the main theorem of this section.

Proof of theorem 85. We have constructed a morphism

$$(141) \quad \epsilon_n : \Omega_A^n \otimes_A M \rightarrow \text{HH}_n(A, M)$$

of A -modules. We can check whether it is an isomorphism by checking it after localising at every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A , i.e. $\epsilon_n \otimes_A A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ needs to be an isomorphism for every \mathfrak{m} . For the left-hand side we have the following compatibility with localisation

$$(142) \quad (\Omega_A^n \otimes_A M) \otimes_A A_{\mathfrak{m}} \cong \Omega_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}/k}^n \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}} M_{\mathfrak{m}}.$$

For the right-hand side we need an isomorphism

$$(143) \quad \text{HH}_n(A, M) \otimes_A A_{\mathfrak{m}} \cong \text{HH}_n(A_{\mathfrak{m}}, M_{\mathfrak{m}}),$$

so in the construction of ϵ_{\bullet} we can assume that (A, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. To do this, let us denote $I := \ker(\mu : A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A)$. As $\text{Spec } A \rightarrow \text{Spec } A \otimes_k A$ is a closed morphism we have that $\mathfrak{n} := \mu^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})$ is a maximal ideal of $A \otimes_k A \cong A^e$. There exists an isomorphism

$$(144) \quad \text{Tor}_n^{A^e}(A, M) \otimes_A A_{\mathfrak{m}} \cong \text{Tor}_n^{(A^e)_{\mathfrak{n}}}(A_{\mathfrak{m}}, M_{\mathfrak{m}}) \cong \text{Tor}_n^{A_{\mathfrak{m}} \otimes_k A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(A_{\mathfrak{m}}, M_{\mathfrak{m}})$$

by flat base change for Tor.

By the definition of smoothness we have that $I_{\mathfrak{n}}$ is generated by a regular sequence of length $\dim A$. In the notation of proposition 95 we take $B := A \otimes_k A$, and I the ideal that cuts out A . \square

So we get that the Hochschild homology $\text{HH}_{\bullet}(A)$ for a smooth algebra is concentrated in finitely many degrees (where it consists of projective modules of finite rank). There is actually a converse to this, characterising smoothness in terms of the vanishing of Hochschild homology, see [2].

3.5 The Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism: Hochschild cohomology

One could follow a similar approach to proving the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism for Hochschild cohomology. But in the special case of $\text{HH}^{\bullet}(A)$ one can take a shortcut, avoiding checking explicitly that things are compatible with the differential, etc.

Indeed, as $\text{HH}^{\bullet}(A)$ is a graded commutative algebra, the identification $\text{HH}^1(A) \cong \text{Der}(A)$ extends via the universal property of the exterior product to a morphism

$$(145) \quad \bigwedge^{\bullet} \text{Der}(A) \rightarrow \text{HH}^{\bullet}(A).$$

¹⁴In positive characteristic it only implies regularity.

To check that it locally is an isomorphism if A is a smooth k -algebra we will use the following result, which says that Ext commutes with localisation at a prime ideal. It is a special case of [65, proposition 3.3.10].

Lemma 97. Let A be a noetherian ring, and M, N be A -modules where M is moreover finitely generated. Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of A , then

$$(146) \quad \text{Ext}_A^n(M, N)_{\mathfrak{p}} \cong \text{Ext}_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}^n(M_{\mathfrak{p}}, N_{\mathfrak{p}})$$

for all $n \geq 0$.

Then one can recycle the argument for Hochschild homology verbatim to obtain the following result.

Theorem 98. Let A be a smooth k -algebra. Then there exist an isomorphism of graded-commutative algebras

$$(147) \quad \text{HH}^{\bullet}(A) \cong \bigwedge^{\bullet} \text{Der}(A).$$

Remark 99. Instead of Hochschild (co)homology we can also consider Hochschild (co)chains on one hand, and the exterior powers of derivations (resp. differential forms) as a complex with zero differential on the other. Then we have constructed a quasi-isomorphism between these complexes. But e.g. on the level of Hochschild cohomology it is not a quasi-isomorphism of differential graded algebras. Fixing this is part of the theory of Kontsevich's formality, which we might get back to in ??.

Remark 100. If we write $X = \text{Spec } A$, then theorem 98 can be rewritten as

$$(148) \quad \text{HH}^{\bullet}(A) \cong \Gamma(X, \bigwedge^{\bullet} T_X)$$

and

$$(149) \quad \text{HH}_{\bullet}(A) \cong \Gamma(X, \Omega_{X/k}^{\bullet})$$

In section 11 we will generalise this result to the non-affine setting. In this situation the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism becomes a Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition, as in section 11: the higher cohomology of polyvector fields and differential forms starts playing a role.

3.6 Gerstenhaber calculus

This section will be extended at some point, but it seems that there is no operad-free proof of Hochschild cohomology being isomorphic to polyvector fields as Gerstenhaber algebras. That is unfortunate, as we want to avoid operads in this chapter.

3.7 Exercises

Exercise 101. Explain remark 80.

Exercise 102. We can now discuss the dependence on the base field in the definition of Hochschild (co)homology. In example 29 we have seen what the Hochschild (co)homology of a field considered as an algebra over itself is. Compare this to $\text{HH}_1(\mathbb{C})$, considered as a \mathbb{Q} -algebra.

More generally, explain the relationship between $\Omega_{K/k}^1$ and whether K/k is a finite separable (= étale) extension. A good reference on the role of $\Omega_{K/k}^1$ for field extensions is [44, §25, §26].

4 Variations on Hochschild (co)homology

This will be skipped during the course, unless there is time and interest to revisit the noncommutative calculus of Hochschild (co)homology and cyclic homology at the end of the course. The interested reader is invited to use the sources mentioned in the introduction.

5 Deformation theory of algebras

We have seen in theorem 27 that the second Hochschild cohomology group $\mathrm{HH}^2(A, M)$ parametrises extensions of A by M . As explained there, we will usually take $M = A$, so that we are effectively describing algebra structures on $A \oplus At$ with t^2 that reduce to the original multiplication on A when t is set to 0. In which case we call this a (*first order*) *deformation* of A , as is customary in algebraic geometry.

In this section we will discuss the higher-order deformation theory of an associative algebra A , not just up to first-order. It turns out that this is also controlled by the Hochschild cohomology, where we will also use

1. the Gerstenhaber bracket;
2. the third Hochschild cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^3(A)$.

We will also discuss the general formalism of differential graded Lie algebras governing deformation problems, using the Maurer–Cartan equation.

Summarising the results (at least on the infinitesimal level) we can draw the following picture, which gives the interpretation of the first, second and third Hochschild cohomology group in the deformation theory of algebras, together with the role of the Gerstenhaber bracket. Recall that it has degree -1 , so we are landing in the appropriate spaces.

infinitesimal automorphisms

$$(150) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \begin{array}{c} \text{[HH}^1(A), -] \\ \curvearrowright \\ \text{HH}^2(A) \end{array} & \\ & \xrightarrow{\mu \mapsto [\mu, \mu]} & \text{HH}^3(A) \\ \text{deformations} & & \text{obstructions} \end{array}$$

To streamline the discussion we will in this section assume that k is not of characteristic 2. Whenever necessary we will even restrict ourselves to characteristic zero, but this will be mentioned explicitly.

5.1 Obstructions and the third Hochschild cohomology

We have seen in theorem 27 that $\mathrm{HH}^2(A)$ corresponds to first-order deformations of A . Given a first-order deformation, the first step to take is to (try to) extend it to a second-order deformation. Sometimes this is possible, sometimes it fails. When it fails it is because of an obstruction. In this section we discuss how to analyse the failure of extending, using $\mathrm{HH}^3(A)$. Once the first-order deformation is extended to a second-order deformation, we can try to extend it further. Again the third Hochschild cohomology and the Gerstenhaber bracket control this behaviour. If the extension is possible at each step we end up with a formal deformation, which is discussed in section 5.2.

From first-order to second-order Let $\mu_1: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$ be a Hochschild 2-cocycle, for which $\mu_0 + \mu_1 t$ is a first-order deformation, as in the discussion following theorem 27. We wish to extend this using a $\mu_2: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$, such that

$$(151) \quad a * b = \mu_0(a \otimes b) + \mu_1(a \otimes b)t + \mu_2(a \otimes b)t^2$$

gives an associative product on $A[t]/(t^3)$ (considered as a module, not as an algebra). The associativity relation

$$(152) \quad (a * b) * c = a * (b * c)$$

breaks up into two¹⁵ conditions: one expression an equality for the coefficients of t and another for t^2 . The first condition we have already discussed, and says precisely that μ_1 needs to be a Hochschild 2-cocycle. The associativity condition at t^2 can be written as

$$(153) \quad \mu_1(\mu_1(a \otimes b) \otimes c) - \mu_1(a \otimes \mu_1(b \otimes c)) = a\mu_2(b \otimes c) - \mu_2(ab \otimes c) + \mu_2(a \otimes bc) - \mu_2(a \otimes b)c.$$

The right-hand side of this equality is given by $d(\mu_2)(a \otimes b \otimes c)$, so the left-hand side, considered as an element of $\text{Hom}_k(A^{\otimes 3}, A)$ must be a coboundary.

But the left-hand side (which only depends on μ_1 , which is a cocycle by the first associativity condition) is always a cocycle, because it is equal to $\mu_1 \circ \mu_1 = \frac{1}{2}[\mu_1, \mu_1]$, and the Gerstenhaber bracket of the cocycle μ_1 with itself is again a cocycle. So the equality (153) says that the cocycle is actually a coboundary, so it defines $0 \in \text{HH}^3(A)$. In general, when we are only given μ_1 and we are looking for a compatible μ_2 , we can define the following.

Definition 103. The class in $\text{HH}^3(A)$ defined by the left-hand side of (153) is the *obstruction* to extending μ_1 . We call $\text{HH}^3(A)$ the *obstruction space* of A .

If this obstruction class vanishes there exists a $\mu_2 \in \text{Hom}_k(A^{\otimes 2}, A)$ which turns (151) into an associative product on $A[t]/(t^3)$, which we will call a *second-order deformation*. So we have proven the following proposition.

Proposition 104. Let $\mu_0 + \mu_1 t$ be a first-order deformation. Then it can be extended to a second-order deformation if and only if $[\mu_1, \mu_1] = 0$ in $\text{HH}^3(A)$.

Definition 105. We call $[\mu_1, \mu_1]$ the *obstruction* to extending the first-order deformation $\mu_0 + \mu_1 t$ to a second-order deformation. If it vanishes we call the deformation *unobstructed*, otherwise we call it an *obstructed* deformation.

In particular, if $\text{HH}^3(A) = 0$ then all obstructions automatically vanish. On the other hand it is possible that $\text{HH}^3(A) \neq 0$ but a first-order deformation still extends to a second-order deformation. For this we can consider the following example, which explains this behaviour.

Example 106. Let $A = k[x, y, z]/(xy - z, x^2, y^2, z^2)$. Then A is a commutative 4-dimensional algebra, which we can also express as $k[x]/(x^2) \otimes_k k[y]/(y^2)$. We will use the basis $(1, x, y, z)$ for A , and the induced basis of tensor products for $A \otimes_k A$. Consider the following two infinitesimal deformations, or 2-cocycles:

1. $f: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$ is the cocycle $f(y \otimes x) = z$, and 0 for other basis vectors;
2. $g: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$ is the cocycle $g(x \otimes x) = y$, and 0 for other basis vectors.

Then one sees that

1. f defines an unobstructed noncommutative first-order deformation of A ;
2. g defines an unobstructed commutative first-order deformation of A .

On the other hand, $f + g$ defines another first-order deformation of A , and one can check that

$$(154) \quad [f + g, f + g] \neq 0$$

in $\text{HH}^3(A)$, so this is an obstructed deformation.

¹⁵Or rather three, but we know that μ_0 is associative. See also remark 109.

Remark 107. Observe that, if the obstruction vanishes, there is actually a choice of μ_2 , all of which gives an equivalent deformation. But for the purpose of extending it to higher-order deformations, the choice might matter.

Extending to higher order deformations Let us now generalise the previous discussion to arbitrary order, i.e. given an n th order deformation of A , when can we extend it to an $(n + 1)$ th order deformation of A ? So we start with an associative multiplication

$$(155) \quad \mu_0 + \mu_1 t + \dots + \mu_n t^n$$

on $A[t]/(t^{n+1})$. We wish to extend it to an associative multiplication on $A[t]/(t^{n+2})$. The analysis as before gives us a hierarchy of associativity conditions at t^i , for $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$, with only the condition at t^{n+1} being new. By isolating the terms involving μ_0 and μ_{n+1} in this expression we obtain the equality

$$(156) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i (\mu_{n+1-i}(a \otimes b) \otimes c) - \mu_i (a \otimes \mu_{n+1-i}(b \otimes c)) = d(\mu_{n+1})(a \otimes b \otimes c).$$

As the left-hand side can be interpreted as the sum over $[\mu_i, \mu_{n+1-i}]$ this is a 3-cocycle. So by the same reasoning as before we get the following, where we denote left-hand side by D_{n+1} we have that

Proposition 108. Let $\mu_0 + \mu_1 t + \dots + \mu_n t^n$ be an n th order deformation. Then it can be extended to an $(n + 1)$ th order deformation if and only if $D_{n+1} = 0$ in $\text{HH}^3(A)$.

Observe that, again, there is a choice of μ_{n+1} at this point, and this choice might lead you into trouble when you want to continue this process: for some choices the following step might be obstructed, whilst for others it isn't. See also exercise 130.

Remark 109. The condition for $i = 0$ is just saying that $[\mu_0, \mu_0] = 0$. Recall that the Gerstenhaber bracket did *not* involve the original multiplication on A , and the condition that the bracket of μ_0 with itself vanishes expresses precisely that μ_0 is associative.

Deformation functors To make the link with the formalism used in algebraic geometry we want to consider algebras more general than $k[t]/(t^{n+1})$. These are the *test algebras*, which are commutative artinian local k -algebras with residue field k . In particular, the maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} is nilpotent. We will denote them by R , so that there is no confusion with the algebras that we are deforming (which are denoted A). Then generalising the notion of an n th order deformation we have the following.

Definition 110. Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a test algebra. An R -deformation of A is an associative and R -bilinear multiplication $- * -$ on $A \otimes_k R$ such that modulo \mathfrak{m} it reduces to the multiplication on A .

In other words, the square

$$(157) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (A \otimes_k R) \otimes_R (A \otimes_k R) & \longrightarrow & A \otimes_k A \\ \downarrow - * - & & \downarrow \mu_0 \\ A \otimes_k R & \longrightarrow & A \end{array}$$

commutes.

Then the equivalence relation for first-order deformations is generalised as follows.

Definition 111. Let $- *_1 -$ and $- *_2 -$ be two R -deformations. We say that they are (*gauge*) *equivalent* if there exists an automorphism f of the R -module $A \otimes_k R$ which is the identity modulo \mathfrak{m} , such that

$$(158) \quad f(a *_1 b) = f(a) *_2 f(b).$$

A morphism of test algebras $f: R \rightarrow S$ allows us to base change a deformation $A \otimes_k R$ to $A \otimes_k R \otimes_R S$, and hence we have a covariant functor

$$(159) \quad \text{Def}(A, -): \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \text{Set} : R \mapsto \text{Def}(A, R)$$

where $\text{Def}(A, R)$ is the set of R -deformations of A up to equivalence. In particular, $\text{Def}(A, k) = \{A\}$ and $\text{Def}(A, k[t]/(t^2)) = \text{HH}^2(A)$.

Axiomatising the properties that this functor has, we obtain the following definition.

Definition 112. A functor $F: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ is a *deformation functor* if for every cartesian diagram

$$(160) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} R' \times_R R'' & \longrightarrow & R'' \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ R' & \longrightarrow & R \end{array}$$

the induced morphism

$$(161) \quad \eta: F(R' \times_R R'') \rightarrow F(R') \times_{F(R)} F(R'')$$

is

1. bijective, if $R \cong k$;
2. surjective, if $R' \rightarrow R$ is surjective.

One can check that $\text{Def}(A, -)$ is a deformation functor in this general sense of the word. Later on we will see a way of describing the deformation functor using Hochschild cohomology, and explain the role dg Lie algebras play in describing deformation functors.

We will say that $F(k[t]/(t^2))$ is the *tangent space* to a deformation functor, so we see that the second Hochschild cohomology is the tangent space to the deformation functor $\text{Def}(A, -)$.

5.2 Formal deformations

The intuition from deformation theory in algebraic geometry tells us that deformations over

$$(162) \quad k[[t]] = \varprojlim k[t]/(t^{n+1})$$

are supposed to describe deformations in a sufficiently small (indeed: infinitesimally small) open neighbourhood around the algebra that we are interested in. These are precisely the deformations one obtains when taking the limit of the process with the $k[t]/(t^{n+1})$ in the previous section. Similarly we will discuss later in this section how the step from $k[t]/(t^{n+1})$ to local artinian k -algebras has an analogue, going from $k[[t]]$ to complete augmented k -algebras.

One-parameter formal deformations Let A be a k -algebra. We can consider the $k[[t]]$ -module $A[[t]]$. We are interested in new algebra structures on the module $A[[t]]$ in the following sense.

Definition 113. A *(one-parameter) formal deformation* of A is an associative and $k[[t]]$ -bilinear multiplication

$$(163) \quad - * - : A[[t]] \otimes_k A[[t]] \rightarrow A[[t]]$$

which is continuous in the t -adic topology, such that

$$(164) \quad a * b \equiv ab \pmod{t}$$

for all $a, b \in A \subseteq A[[t]]$.

The continuity in the previous definition is expressed by saying that the multiplication takes on the form

$$(165) \quad \left(\sum_{i \geq 0} a_i t^i \right) * \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} b_j t^j \right) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{i+j=k} (a_i * b_j) t^{i+j},$$

i.e. it is given by the *Cauchy product*. Because of this the multiplication is completely determined by the restriction $- * - : A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A[[t]]$, see appendix 2 for more information.

For $a, b \in A$ we will write

$$(166) \quad a * b = \mu_0(a \otimes b) + \mu_1(a \otimes b)t + \mu_2(a \otimes b)t^2 + \dots$$

where $\mu_0(a \otimes b) = \mu(a \otimes b)$ is the original multiplication, as before. So a formal deformation consists of μ_i 's such that they define an associative multiplication, which is expressed by considering (156) for all n simultaneously.

The relationship between $k[[t]]$ and $k[t]/(t^{n+1})$ is also easily expressed by observing that setting $t^{n+1} = 0$ in a formal deformation results in an n th order deformation.

Remark 114. Although we formally speaking haven't introduced the notation for the left-hand side yet (as this involves gauge equivalence for $k[[t]]$), we have a bijection

$$(167) \quad \text{Def}(A, k[[t]]) = \varprojlim \text{Def}(A, k[t]/(t^{n+1})),$$

in other words: a formal deformation consists of a *compatible* family of n th order deformations. It is also important to observe that the obstructions we have discussed earlier tell us that the morphism

$$(168) \quad \text{Def}(A, k[[t]]) \rightarrow \text{Def}(A, k[t]/(t^{n+1}))$$

is *not* necessarily surjective.

Complete augmented algebras Recall that an augmentation for an algebra is a morphism $R \rightarrow k$ of k -algebras, whose kernel is then called the augmentation ideal R_+ . As in our setting it will be a maximal ideal we will denote it \mathfrak{m} .

Definition 115. Let R be a commutative augmented k -algebra. We say that R is a *complete augmented k -algebra* if R is complete with respect to the \mathfrak{m} -adic topology.

In particular they are local, as completions at maximal ideals are local.

Remark 116. The test algebras from before are complete augmented k -algebras: as \mathfrak{m} is nilpotent the topology is trivial, and there is no need for a completion. Just like $k[[t]]$ is the limit of the $k[t]/(t^{n+1})$, a complete augmented algebra is the limit of R/\mathfrak{m}^n , which are test algebras.

To deal with the topology, we will need to use the *completed tensor product*:

$$(169) \quad A \widehat{\otimes}_k R := \varprojlim A \otimes_k R/\mathfrak{m}^n.$$

Definition 117. Let R be a complete augmented algebra. Then a *formal deformation* of A over R is an R -algebra B such that

1. $B \cong \widehat{\otimes}_k R$ as R -modules;
2. B reduces to A modulo \mathfrak{m} , i.e. $B \otimes_R k \cong A$ as k -algebras;
3. the multiplication is continuous, i.e. $B \cong \varprojlim B \otimes_k R/\mathfrak{m}^n$.

We have the following lemma, which is an analogue of the observations we have made before that the multiplication law on a deformation can be described by looking at a small part of the deformed algebra.

Lemma 118. Let R be a complete augmented algebra, and A' a formal deformation of A over R . Then the algebra structure on A' is determined by the restriction to $A \otimes_k A$.

5.3 The Maurer–Cartan equation

We will now discuss some aspects of the general formalism of deformation theory using dg Lie algebras. The main example to keep in mind is of course $C^\bullet(A)[1]$ (and variations constructed using this). Recall that the reason for the shift is to make the Gerstenhaber bracket of degree 0. In this way the relevant cohomology groups will be H^0 , H^1 and H^2 , but they really are HH^1 , HH^2 and HH^3 .

We will now assume that k is of characteristic 0.

Definition 119. Let \mathfrak{g}^\bullet be a dg Lie algebra. The *Maurer–Cartan equation* for \mathfrak{g}^\bullet is

$$(170) \quad d(f) + \frac{1}{2}[f, f] = 0$$

where $f \in \mathfrak{g}^1$. Elements of \mathfrak{g}^1 satisfying the Maurer–Cartan are *Maurer–Cartan elements*, and we will denote

$$(171) \quad MC(\mathfrak{g}) := \left\{ f \in \mathfrak{g}^1 \mid d(f) + \frac{1}{2}[f, f] = 0 \right\} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^1$$

the space of Maurer–Cartan elements.

The dg Lie algebras that we will be using are constructed from $C^\bullet(A)[1]$ as follows: let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a complete augmented k -algebra, then $\mathfrak{m} \widehat{\otimes}_k C^\bullet(A)[1]$ is again a dg Lie algebra, see exercise 234. As before, the main examples to which we will apply this are $(k[t]/(t^{n+1}), (t))$ and $(k[[t]], (t))$. For the latter we will use the shorthand notation $t C^\bullet(A)[1][[t]]$.

With these definitions we have the following theorem, explaining the importance of the Maurer–Cartan equation in our situation.

Theorem 120. Let A be an associative algebra. Then

$$(172) \quad \{\text{one-parameter formal deformations of } A\} \xleftarrow{1:1} MC(t C^\bullet(A)[1][[t]]).$$

Proof. Consider

$$(173) \quad \mu := \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \mu_i t^i \in t C^1(A)[1][[t]],$$

i.e. $\mu_i \in C^2(A)$. Then on $A[[t]]$ we can define the multiplication

$$(174) \quad a \otimes b \mapsto ab + \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \mu_i (a \otimes b) t^i$$

for $a, b \in A$, and then extended bilinearly to all of $A[[t]]$. We only need to check that associativity of this multiplication corresponds to μ satisfying the Maurer–Cartan equation. But this is checked in exactly the same way as for $k[t]/(t^{n+1})$. \square

Remark 121. The same proof works for arbitrary formal deformations over arbitrary complete augmented k -algebras, using the dg Lie algebra $\mathfrak{m} \widehat{\otimes}_k C^\bullet(A)[1]$, only adding some mild notational complexity.

Example 122. As an application of the previous remark, if we consider $R = k[t]/(t^2)$ then there is no need for the completed tensor product, and $\text{MC}(\mathfrak{m} \otimes_k C^\bullet(A)[1]) = \text{MC}(C^\bullet(A)[1])$ is the set of infinitesimal deformations (not up to equivalence, yet).

Remark 123. If we take μ_0 into account, then we observe that the Maurer–Cartan equation can be reinterpreted using the equalities

$$(175) \quad \begin{aligned} [\mu_0 + \sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i, \mu_0 + \sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i] &= [\mu_0, \mu_0] + [\mu_0, \sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i] + [\sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i, \mu_0] + [\sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i, \sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i] \\ &= 2 \, d \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i \right) + [\sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i, \sum_{i \geq 1} \mu_i t^i] \end{aligned}$$

as $[\mu_0, \mu_0] = 0$ by associativity (see also remark 109), and $[\mu, -] = d$ by remark 46.

Gauge equivalence Observe that in the bijection of theorem 120 we are not considering formal deformations up to gauge equivalence. Likewise, in example 122 we are not taking the equivalence relation on first-order deformations into account. To do this, we need to introduce gauge equivalence for the Maurer–Cartan locus. For convergence reasons, we will assume that \mathfrak{g}^\bullet is of the form $\mathfrak{h}^\bullet \widehat{\otimes}_k \mathfrak{m}$, for some complete augmented k -algebra (R, \mathfrak{m}) (as this is the situation we are interested in).

Definition 124. Let $g_1, g_2 \in \text{MC}(\mathfrak{g}^\bullet)$ be Maurer–Cartan elements. We say that they are *gauge equivalent* if there exists an element $h \in \mathfrak{g}^0$ such that

$$(176) \quad g_2 = \exp(\text{ad } h)(g_1) + \frac{1 - \exp(\text{ad } h)}{h}(d(h)).$$

We can now relate the two notions of gauge equivalence. Observe that by the assumption on the characteristic, a gauge equivalence ϕ between formal deformations $- *_1 -$ and $- *_2 -$ on $A[[t]]$ can be written as $\exp(h)$ for some $h \in t \text{Hom}_k(A, A)[[t]]$. And recall that $\text{Hom}_k(A, A) = C^1(A)$.

Proposition 125. The formal deformations $- *_1 -$ and $- *_2 -$ are gauge equivalent if and only if the associated Maurer–Cartan elements g_1 and g_2 (see theorem 120) are gauge equivalent.

Proof. If we denote $\mu_0: A \otimes_k A \rightarrow A$ the original multiplication, then for $a, b \in A$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 a *_2 b &= \phi \left(\phi^{-1}(a) *_1 \phi^{-1}(b) \right) \\
 &= \exp(h) (\exp(-h)(a) *_1 \exp(-h)(b)) \\
 (177) \quad &= \exp(\text{ad}(h))(\mu + g_1)(a \otimes b) \\
 &= \left(\mu + \exp(\text{ad}(h))(g_1) + \frac{1 - \exp(\text{ad}(h))}{\text{ad}(h)}(d(h)) \right) (a \otimes b)
 \end{aligned}$$

by remark 46, and applying $\text{ad}(h)$ once in all the non-constant applications to μ . So gauge equivalence for $- *_i -$ is expressed through gauge equivalence for g_i and vice versa. \square

Deformation functors Without going into any details, one can extend the previous discussion to obtain an isomorphism

$$(178) \quad \text{Def}(A, R) \cong \text{MC}(\mathfrak{m} \widehat{\otimes}_k C^\bullet(A)[1]).$$

At some point this discussion should be extended, but for time reasons we won't go further into this in class.

5.4 Kontsevich's formality theorem

Let us (briefly) return to the situation we used for the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg theorem, i.e. we let A be a smooth commutative k -algebra. We will again assume that the characteristic of k is zero. Then we have shown in section 3 that

$$(179) \quad \text{HH}^\bullet(A) \cong \bigwedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A).$$

Although we haven't proved it in these notes this isomorphism is compatible with the Lie brackets on both sides: the Gerstenhaber bracket on the left, and the Schouten–Nijenhuis bracket on the right.

With the risk of causing some confusion we are going to combine a commutative algebra structure with a Lie algebra structure, but not in the way we have done for a Gerstenhaber algebra structure (where the Lie bracket has degree -1). In an ungraded setting (or with a Lie bracket of degree 0, with a suitable modification of the definition) we get the following notion.

Definition 126. A commutative k -algebra A is a *Poisson algebra* if there exists a Lie bracket $\{-, -\}$ on A (i.e. a skew-symmetric bilinear map satisfying the Jacobi identity) such that the Poisson identity

$$(180) \quad \{ab, c\} = a\{b, c\} + b\{a, c\}$$

holds.

We phrased the definition in this way because the algebra A is usually fixed, whilst the Lie bracket $\{-, -\}$ is obtained via some choices. Indeed, an element π of $\bigwedge^2 \text{Der}(A)$ can give rise to a Poisson structure via the Lie bracket

$$(181) \quad [a, b] = \pi(df \wedge dg)$$

where we used the pairing between $\bigwedge^2 \text{Der}(A)$ and Ω_A^2 . We said *can* give rise, because the Poisson identity is not automatic: indeed, one can check that the associated bilinear morphism is a Poisson structure if and only if $[\pi, \pi] = 0$, where $[-, -]$ now denotes the Schouten–Nijenhuis bracket for the

Lie algebra $\bigwedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)$. In this case we call π a *Poisson bivector*. Hence under the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism we see that Poisson structures on A correspond to *unobstructed* infinitesimal deformations of A .

A *deformation quantisation* of a Poisson algebra is a one-parameter formal deformation $- * -$ of a Poisson algebra A , such that

$$(182) \quad a * b - b * a \equiv \{a, b\}t \pmod{t^2}$$

for all $a, b \in A$. Using the correspondence between Poisson structures and unobstructed infinitesimal deformations this means that μ_1 corresponds to π . If we equip the graded algebra of polyvector fields with the trivial differential, then

Then Kontsevich proved the following extremely important theorem, whose proof is out of scope of these lecture notes.

Theorem 127 (Kontsevich formality). Let A be a Poisson algebra. Then A can always be quantised, i.e. there always exists a deformation quantisation of this Poisson structure.

In other words, once we know that the first obstruction vanishes for a first-order deformation of A , we can always find a one-parameter formal deformation lifting the first-order deformation.

In this version of the statement it is unclear what exactly the term formality is supposed to mean: the presence of the word formal in the statement is a red herring here. Rather, we have on one hand the dg Lie algebra $C^\bullet(A)[1]$, and on the other hand we can equip $\bigwedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)[1]$ with the zero differential to obtain another dg Lie algebra. This latter dg Lie algebra is *formal*: it is quasi-isomorphic to its cohomology as a dg Lie algebra¹⁶

We won't define precisely what a L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism is (at least for now), but imagining we have done so, we have the following statement.

Theorem 128. There exists a L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism

$$(183) \quad \bigwedge^\bullet \text{Der}(A)[1] \rightarrow C^\bullet(A)[1].$$

In other words, Kontsevich formality says that the Hochschild complex is formal, when A is a smooth commutative k -algebra.

We will probably come back to this at the very end of these lecture notes.

5.5 Exercises

Exercise 129. Check the claims in example 106, i.e.

1. f and g are cocycles;
2. f and g are unobstructed;
3. $f + g$ is obstructed.

Also, assuming the Künneth formula for Hochschild cohomology¹⁷

$$(184) \quad \text{HH}^\bullet(A_1 \otimes_k A_2) \cong \text{HH}^\bullet(A_1) \otimes_k \text{HH}^\bullet(A_2)$$

¹⁶Because we are working over a field, every cochain complex is formal as a cochain complex. The extra structure matters here.

¹⁷Which we haven't proven, but which holds in this case by [67, theorem 2.1.2].

describe the Hochschild cohomology of A using example 32.

Exercise 130. Perform the following reality checks.

1. If the trivial deformation has $\mu_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$, why can't we choose μ_1 non-zero, and then take $\mu_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 2$?
2. Explain that, if $\mu_1 = 0$, then any cocycle μ_2 gives a second-order deformation.
3. Use exercise 129 to construct an unobstructed second-order deformation, which extends trivially to a third-order deformation (why can we do this?), such that the third-order deformation is obstructed.

Exercise 131. Write out the details in the proof of theorem 120.

The following exercise is a modification [67, exercises 4.1.14 and 4.1.15].

Exercise 132. Consider $A = \mathbb{C}[x, y]$. On $A[[t]]$ we define two multiplications $- *_i -$ as follows:

1. define $- *_i -$ for $x, y \in A$ as

$$(185) \quad \begin{array}{ll} x *_1 x = x^2 & x *_1 y = xy \\ y *_1 y = y^2 & y *_1 x = xy + t \end{array}$$

resp.

$$(186) \quad \begin{array}{ll} x *_1 x = x^2 & x *_1 y = xy \\ y *_1 y = y^2 & y *_1 x = xy \exp(t), \end{array}$$

where $\exp(t)$ is expanded as a formal power series in t ;

2. extend to all of A by writing monomials of A lexicographically, and defining $x^a y^b *_i x^c y^d$ using the relation $y *_i x$ inductively whenever $b, c \geq 1$.

With this definition

1. Describe (as much as possible of) μ_1 for these products. Are they the same?
2. Describe (as much as possible of) μ_2 for these products. Is $\mu_2 = 0$ for $- *_1 -$?
3. If you like a challenge, describe μ_n completely for all $n \geq 1$.
4. What can be said about the convergence of the star products?

The star product $- *_1 -$ gives rise to the *Weyl algebra* $\mathbb{C}\langle x, y \rangle / (xy - yx - 1)$, by setting $t = 1$.

The star product $- *_2 -$ gives rise to the *skew planes* $\mathbb{C}_q[x, y] := \mathbb{C}\langle x, y \rangle / (xy - qyx)$ where $q \neq 0$, by setting $t = \log q$.

Exercise 133. Let \mathfrak{g}^\bullet be any dg Lie algebra. Prove that the Maurer–Cartan equation for $g \in \mathfrak{g}^1$ is equivalent to the flatness of the connection ∇_g defined as

$$(187) \quad \nabla_g(f) := d(f) + [g, f]$$

for $f \in \mathfrak{g}^0$, i.e. that $\nabla_g^2 = 0$. Flatness of connections was the first instance in which the Maurer–Cartan equation appeared.

Chapter II

Differential graded categories

Conventions We will continue with our convention that k is a field, sometimes required to be of characteristic 0.

6 Differential graded categories

6.1 Triangulated categories

To understand how dg categories come up as a natural solution to a problem it is necessary to talk about triangulated categories, and some of their issues. It is possible to dedicate a whole monograph to their foundations [49], so we will necessarily have to skip over some details. In this section we provide just enough details to

1. understand why a notion of (dg) enhancement is necessary;
2. understand what happens with derived categories of dg categories.

The first two chapters of [24] are an excellent introduction, where more details can be found for the interested reader. Another source with a detailed exposition on triangulated categories, and derived categories of abelian categories is [29]. The latter discusses things in the unbounded setting, which is what we will be using.

Definition There are different versions of the definition of a triangulated category (mostly with variations in (TR4)), the following definition is the classical one as taken from [21, 49].

Definition 134. A *triangulated category* is an additive category \mathcal{T} together with

1. a *translation functor* (or *shift functor*, or *suspension functor*) [1], which is an automorphism of \mathcal{T} ;
2. a class of *distinguished triangles* closed under isomorphisms, which are sextuples (X, Y, Z, u, v, w) where $u: X \rightarrow Y, v: Y \rightarrow Z, w: Z \rightarrow X[1]$ are morphisms in \mathcal{T} , and these are also often written as

$$(188) \quad X \xrightarrow{u} Y \xrightarrow{v} Z \xrightarrow{w} X[1];$$

such that

- (TR0) for every object X of \mathcal{T} we have that $(X, X, 0, \text{id}_X, 0, 0)$ is distinguished;
- (TR1) for every morphism $u: X \rightarrow Z$ there exists an object Z called the *mapping cone* of u and morphisms $v: Y \rightarrow Z, w: Z \rightarrow X[1]$ such that (X, Y, Z, u, v, w) is a distinguished triangle;
- (TR2) the triangle (X, Y, Z, u, v, w) is distinguished if and only if $(Y, Z, X[1], -v, -w, -u[1])$ is.
- (TR3) if (X, Y, Z, u, v, w) and (X', Y', Z', u', v', w') are distinguished triangles, and $f: X \rightarrow X'$ and $g: Y \rightarrow Y'$ are morphisms such that the diagram

$$(189) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{u} & Y & \xrightarrow{v} & Z & \xrightarrow{w} & X[1] \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow \exists h & & \downarrow f[1] \\ X' & \xrightarrow{u'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{v'} & Z' & \xrightarrow{w'} & X'[1] \end{array}$$

commutes, then there exists a (not necessarily unique) morphism $h: Z \rightarrow Z'$ making the diagram commute;

- (TR4) if $(X, Y, Z', u, j, k), (Y, Z, X', v, l, i)$ and $(X, Z, Y', v \circ u, m, n)$ are distinguished triangles, then there exists a distinguished triangle $(Z', Y', X', f, g, j[1] \circ i)$ such that

$$(190) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{u} & Y & \xrightarrow{j} & Z' & \xrightarrow{k} & X[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow v & & \downarrow \exists f & & \parallel \\ X & \xrightarrow{v \circ u} & Z & \xrightarrow{m} & Y' & \xrightarrow{n} & X[1] \\ & & \downarrow l & & \downarrow \exists g & & \\ & & X' & \xlongequal{\quad} & X' & & \\ & & \downarrow i & & \downarrow j[1] \circ i & & \\ & & Y[1] & \xrightarrow{j[1]} & Z'[1] & & \end{array}$$

commutes, and moreover $u[1] \circ n = i \circ g$.

One way of interpreting (TR4) is as an analogue of the third isomorphism theorem in an abelian category: given the morphisms $u: X \rightarrow Y$ and $v: Y \rightarrow Z$ we can consider their composition and from (TR1) we get three distinguished triangles, where (TR4) asserts that the mapping cones in these distinguished triangles can be made into a distinguished triangle themselves in a way compatible with all other triangles. It is still not clear whether (TR4) follows from the other axioms [49, remark 1.3.15].

Remark 135. Axiom (TR4) is also called the *octahedral axiom*. To understand the origin of this name one has to collapse the identities, remove the shifts and fold the triangles on the left and right so that they meet in a point, resulting in (with some imagination) the octahedron

$$(191) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & Y' & & \\ & \swarrow \exists f & & \searrow \exists g & \\ Z' & \xleftarrow{j[1] \circ i} & X' & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X & \xrightarrow{v \circ u} & Z & & \\ \downarrow j & & \downarrow i & & \\ & & Y & & \end{array}$$

where the distinguished triangles correspond to four non-adjacent faces, whilst the other four faces correspond to the commutative squares in (191) containing an identity morphism.

Example 136. The main examples of triangulated categories are *derived categories* of abelian categories. If A is a k -algebra then we will be interested in $\mathbf{D}(\text{Mod } A)$, and provided A is noetherian, $\mathbf{D}^b(\text{mod } A)$. If X is a scheme, we will be interested in $\mathbf{D}(\text{Qcoh } X)$, and provided X is noetherian, $\mathbf{D}^b(\text{coh } X)$.

Non-functoriality of the cone There is an important deficiency in the definition of a triangulated category, which cannot easily be fixed. The mapping cone from (TR1) is only unique up to non-unique isomorphism, so the morphism $h: Z \rightarrow Z'$ in (TR3) cannot be chosen functorially in general. In other words, we don't have a functor $\mathcal{T}^{[1]} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ of triangulated categories. Indeed, we have the following result (see [63, proposition 1.2.13]).

Proposition 137. Let \mathcal{T} be a triangulated category which is idempotent complete (i.e. every idempotent splits). If \mathcal{T} admits a functorial cone, then \mathcal{T} is semisimple abelian.

But the derived category of a non-semisimple k -algebra is not semisimple, so cones are not functorial. For a short and self-contained discussion, see http://www.maths.gla.ac.uk/~gstevenson/no_functorial_cones.pdf.

Compact objects Crucial in many aspects of the study of triangulated categories are compact objects. This even lead Thomason to say

“Compact objects are as necessary to triangulated categories as air to breathe.”

A whole lot of theory can be developed without compact objects, as is evident from [49] but the notion of compact objects does come with important consequences, some of which were discussed in class (not reproduced here). Let us at least define them formally, as we will need them later on.

Definition 138. Let \mathcal{T} be a triangulated category. We say that an object $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is *compact* if for all families $\{T_i \mid i \in I\}$ the natural morphism

$$(192) \quad \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(T, T_i) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}\left(T, \bigoplus_{i \in I} T_i\right)$$

is an isomorphism. The full subcategory of compact objects will be denoted \mathcal{T}^c .

6.2 Differential graded categories

Motivation For a long time, when triangulated categories were mostly used as technical tools in homological algebra, the non-functoriality of the cone was not really a problem. But once triangulated categories were studied as objects on their own, this caused some issues. In the context of these notes, recall that in corollary 16 we saw that Hochschild (co)homology only depended on the abelian category of modules. If one generalises Morita theory for module categories to Morita theory for derived categories of modules it turns out that Hochschild (co)homology only depends on the derived category. But it is impossible to define it *intrinsically*, which is what one would like to do in such a situation. This is a somewhat obscure motivation for the need of enhancements, the usual invariant to be considered in this situation is higher algebraic K-theory.

Another take on why the axioms for triangulated categories are lacking is that it is impossible to define new triangulated categories out of old. For instance, considering exact functors between triangulated

categories, it is usually not possible to equip this category with a triangulated structure. Likewise for descent problems, for which a good explanation can be found in [61, §2.2(d)]. Summing up: triangulated categories forget too much information, and we need to enhance their construction a bit to keep track of this.

There are many solutions to this, but we will use dg categories. They are the closest to the homological algebra we have been using all along.

There currently does not exist a textbook dedicated to dg categories, although Gustavo Jasso is writing one. The main references are the original article by Keller [31] and his ICM address [33]. One can also use [60, tag 09JD].

Definitions We will now define the notion of a dg category, and some associated constructions. Implicitly in all the constructions in this section is a straightforward check of the axioms, left to the reader.

Definition 139. A *differential graded category*, or *dg category* is a category \mathcal{C} such that

1. $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet}$ is a cochain complex of k -vector spaces for all $x, y \in \mathrm{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$;
2. we have a morphism $1_x : k \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, x)$ of cochain complexes¹ for all $x \in \mathrm{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$;
3. the composition

$$(193) \quad \mu = \mu_{x,y,z} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(y, z)^{\bullet} \otimes_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet} \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, z)^{\bullet}$$

is a morphism of cochain complexes for all $x, y, z \in \mathrm{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$;

such that

1. the composition has a unit, i.e. the diagrams

$$(194) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet} \otimes_k k & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \otimes 1_x} & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet} \otimes_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, x)^{\bullet} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \mu_{x,x,y} \\ & & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet} \end{array}$$

and

$$(195) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} k \otimes_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet} & \xrightarrow{1_y \otimes \mathrm{id}} & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(y, y)^{\bullet} \otimes_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \mu_{x,y,y} \\ & & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet} \end{array}$$

commute for all $x, y \in \mathrm{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$;

2. the composition is associative, i.e. the diagram

$$(196) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(y, z)^{\bullet} \otimes_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)^{\bullet} \otimes_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(w, x)^{\bullet} & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \otimes \mu_{w,x,y}} & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(y, z)^{\bullet} \otimes_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(w, y)^{\bullet} \\ \downarrow \mu_{x,y,z} \otimes \mathrm{id} & & \downarrow \mu_{w,y,z} \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, z)^{\bullet} \otimes_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(w, z)^{\bullet} & \xrightarrow{\mu_{w,x,z}} & \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(w, z)^{\bullet} \end{array}$$

commutes for all $w, x, y, z \in \mathrm{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$.

¹In particular we have that the image of $1 \in k$ under 1_x is closed.

This is just saying that it is a category enriched over the monoidal category of cochain complexes of k -vector spaces.

Besides every (dg) algebra considered as a dg category with a single object, the following is an essential example.

Example 140. We can turn the abelian category $\text{Ch}(k)$ of cochain complexes of k -vector spaces into a dg category as follows. Recall that a morphism $f: M^\bullet \rightarrow N^\bullet$ in $\text{Ch}(k)$ is of the form

$$(197) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \dots & \longrightarrow & M^{i-1} & \xrightarrow{d_M^{i-1}} & M^i & \xrightarrow{d_M^i} & M^{i+1} & \longrightarrow & \dots \\ & & \downarrow f^{i-1} & & \downarrow f^i & & \downarrow f^{i+1} & & \\ \dots & \longrightarrow & N^{i-1} & \xrightarrow{d_N^{i-1}} & N^i & \xrightarrow{d_N^i} & N^{i+1} & \longrightarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

where every square commutes.

We will define the cochain complex $\text{Hom}_{\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k)}(M^\bullet, N^\bullet)^\bullet$ by setting the degree n component the morphisms of degree n , i.e. we consider morphisms

$$(198) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \dots & \longrightarrow & M^{i-1} & \xrightarrow{d_M^{i-1}} & M^i & \xrightarrow{d_M^i} & M^{i+1} & \longrightarrow & \dots \\ & & \downarrow f^{i-1} & & \downarrow f^i & & \downarrow f^{i+1} & & \\ \dots & \longrightarrow & N^{i-1+n} & \xrightarrow{d_N^{i-1+n}} & N^{i+n} & \xrightarrow{d_N^{i+n}} & N^{i+1+n} & \longrightarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

where (and this is important) we do not impose that the diagrams commute. The differential of a morphism $f: M^\bullet \rightarrow N^{\bullet+n}$ of degree n is then given by setting

$$(199) \quad d(f^i) := d_{N^\bullet} \circ f^i - (-1)^n f^i \circ d_{M^\bullet} : M^i \rightarrow N^{i+1+n}$$

for its component in position i .

If we are given a dg category, there are a few things we might want to do with it.

Definition 141. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. Its *opposite dg category* \mathcal{C}^{op} has the same objects as \mathcal{C} , and

$$(200) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}(x, y) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(y, x).$$

Observe that the tensor product of cochain complexes introduces an important sign in the definition of the opposite dg category: if V^\bullet, W^\bullet are complexes, then the transposition $V^\bullet \otimes_k W^\bullet \rightarrow W^\bullet \otimes_k V^\bullet$ sends $v \otimes w \in V^i \otimes_k W^j$ to $(-1)^{ij} w \otimes v$.

Next we have two constructions that produce a k -linear category.

Definition 142. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. Its *underlying category* $Z^0(\mathcal{C})$ has the same objects as \mathcal{C} , and

$$(201) \quad \text{Hom}_{Z^0(\mathcal{C})}(x, y) := Z^0(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)).$$

A closely related construction is the following.

Definition 143. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. Its *homotopy category* $H^0(\mathcal{C})$ has the same objects as \mathcal{C} , and

$$(202) \quad \text{Hom}_{H^0(\mathcal{C})}(x, y) := H^0(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)).$$

The underlying category and homotopy categories are k -linear categories. The following two examples explain their roles.

Example 144. Consider the dg category $\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k)$. Then

$$(203) \quad Z^0(\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k)) \cong \text{Ch}(k)$$

where on the right we have the usual abelian category of cochain complexes over k , and

$$(204) \quad H^0(\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k)) \cong \mathbf{K}(k)$$

where on the right we have the usual (triangulated) homotopy category of k . Remark that in this case we have an equivalence $\mathbf{K}(k) \cong \mathbf{D}(k)$, as k is semisimple.

Remark 145. One can do the construction of example 140 for an arbitrary k -algebra, or even Grothendieck abelian category, and the resulting dg category will be denoted $\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(A)$. We obtain

$$(205) \quad \begin{aligned} Z^0(\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(A)) &\cong \text{Ch}(A) \\ H^0(\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(A)) &\cong \mathbf{K}(A). \end{aligned}$$

To write $\mathbf{D}(A)$ as the homotopy category of a dg category (which is an important thing to do!) we need to find a *dg enhancement*. This is a (pretriangulated²) dg category \mathcal{C} together with a triangulated equivalence $\phi: H^0(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(A)$.

In this case it can be given by the full subcategory of $\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(A)$ provided by the *homotopy-injective* or *K-injective* complexes, which are complexes I^\bullet such that $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{K}(A)}(M^\bullet, I^\bullet) = 0$ whenever M^\bullet is acyclic. This goes through verbatim for arbitrary Grothendieck abelian categories, so this gives a dg enhancement. See also proposition 159.

Another construction for dg categories, generalising a known construction for algebras, is that of the tensor product.

Definition 146. Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be dg categories. Their *tensor product* $\mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{D}$ is the dg category $\mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{D}$, with

1. $\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{D}) = \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}) \times \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})$;
2. $(\mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{D})((x, y), (x', y')) := \mathcal{C}(x, x') \otimes_k \mathcal{D}(y, y')$ for $(x, y), (x', y') \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{D})$;
3. $1_{(x, y)} := 1_x \otimes 1_y$ for $(x, y) \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{D})$;
4. the composition law is defined pointwise.

It is clear that the algebra k considered as a dg category is the unit for this tensor product.

6.3 Derived categories of dg categories

The main example of a triangulated category we have seen in section 6.1 is the derived category of an abelian category. But dg categories also have a notion of derived category, and one of the original reasons to introduce dg categories was to provide more flexibility in studying derived categories [31].

Most of the constructions here are the straightforward generalisations of notions for algebras to those of dg categories, taking into account that everything is actually a cochain complex, and that dg categories are like dg algebras with multiple objects. So many notions will be defined pointwise.

²We say that a dg category \mathcal{C} is *pretriangulated* if the image of the Yoneda embedding of $H^0(\mathcal{C})$ in $H^0(\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is closed under (inverse) suspension and mapping cones, for the canonical triangulated structure on $H^0(\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}})$, so then we can equip $H^0(\mathcal{C})$ with the induced triangulated structure.

We will not be concerned with issues of set-theoretical or foundational nature³: they can be taken care of, as in [31]. And as before with triangulated categories, we won't be needing many abstract results in any case.

Differential graded functors Of course we want to consider functors between dg categories, and we want them to be compatible with the enrichment over cochain complexes. This yields the following notion.

Definition 147. Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be dg categories. A *dg functor* $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a functor such that

$$(206) \quad F_{x,y}: \mathcal{C}(x,y) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(F(x), F(y))$$

is a morphism of cochain complexes, and

1. it is compatible with composition, i.e. the diagram

$$(207) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(x,y) \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(x,y) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C}(x,z) \\ F_{y,z} \otimes F_{x,y} \downarrow & & \downarrow F_{x,z} \\ \mathcal{D}(F(y), F(z)) \otimes_k \mathcal{D}(F(x), F(y)) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}(F(x), F(z)) \end{array}$$

commutes for all $x, y, z \in \text{Obj } \mathcal{C}$;

2. it is compatible with the unit morphism, i.e. the diagram

$$(208) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} k & \xrightarrow{1_x} & \mathcal{C}(x,x) \\ & \searrow 1_{F(x)} & \downarrow F_{x,x} \\ & & \mathcal{D}(F(x), F(x)) \end{array}$$

commutes for all $x \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$.

There is also a notion of dg natural transformation between dg functors, the details of which we won't spell out for now.

The following is an important example of a dg functor, as it makes an appearance in the dg Yoneda lemma.

Example 148. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category, and $x \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$. Then the *representable dg functor* $\mathcal{C}(-, x)$ is the dg functor

$$(209) \quad \mathcal{C}(-, x): \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k).$$

It sends $y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ to $\mathcal{C}(y, x)$, and the morphisms

$$(210) \quad \mathcal{C}(y, y') \rightarrow \text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k) (\mathcal{C}(y, x), \mathcal{C}(y', x))$$

for $y, y' \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ are defined using the composition in \mathcal{C} .

This example is just one instance of the following notion, generalising the notion of module over an algebra to the setting of dg categories.

Definition 149. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. A (*right*) *dg \mathcal{C} -module* is a dg functor $M: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k)$. A morphism between (right) dg modules is a dg natural transformation, and the category of such dg modules is denoted $\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}}$. This is itself a dg category.

³If you want to see some example of what can go wrong, consider [60, tag 07JS].

There is a minor clash of notation one needs to be aware of, as the dg category $\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k)$ is the same as dgMod_k .

We will also need the notion of a dg bimodule. As an A - B -bimodule (where A and B are k -algebras) is also a right $A \otimes_k B^{\text{op}}$ -module, we will say that a \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule is a $\mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{D}^{\text{op}}$ -module. If the need for notation arises, we will use $\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{D}}$ or $\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{D}^{\text{op}}}$.

Example 150. An important example of bimodule for us in the context of Hochschild (co)homology, is that of the *diagonal bimodule*. If \mathcal{C} is our dg category, then it is the bimodule

$$(211) \quad \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k) : (x, y) \mapsto \mathcal{C}(x, y)$$

for $x, y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$, which will be denoted \mathcal{C} . In the setting of ordinary algebras, this is nothing but considering A as an A -bimodule.

More generally, for any functor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ we define the \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule

$$(212) \quad \mathcal{D}_F: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{D} \mapsto \text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}(k) : (x, y) \mapsto \mathcal{D}(F(x), y).$$

The diagonal bimodule is thus the bimodule associated to the identity functor, as explained by the following proposition.

The following proposition is an easy but important result [31, §6.1].

Proposition 151. Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be dg categories. Let M be a \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule. Then we have an adjunction

$$(213) \quad - \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} M \dashv \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(M, -): \text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}} \rightleftarrows \text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{D}}$$

where

1. for a dg \mathcal{C} -module N we consider the dg functor given by⁴

$$(214) \quad N \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} M(x) := \text{coker} \left(\bigoplus_{y, y' \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})} N(y') \otimes_k \mathcal{D}(y, y') \otimes_k M(x, y) \xrightarrow{\nu} \bigoplus_{y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})} N(y) \otimes_k M(x, y) \right)$$

for $x \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$, where the morphism ν is defined as

$$(215) \quad \nu(n \otimes f \otimes m) := N(n)(f) \otimes m - n \otimes M(x, f)(m);$$

2. for a dg \mathcal{D} -module N' we consider the dg functor given by

$$(216) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(M, N')(y) := \text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}}(M(-, y), N')$$

for $y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})$.

This is nothing but an intimidating looking version of the adjunction

$$(217) \quad - \otimes_A M \dashv \text{Hom}_B(M, -): \text{Mod } A \rightarrow \text{Mod } B,$$

when A and B are ordinary k -algebras, and M is an A - B -bimodule. This is an important source of functors in noncommutative algebra. And when we are studying Fourier–Mukai transforms in algebraic geometry (as we will in chapter III) we are doing exactly the same thing.

⁴When we work with dg categories with a single object this reduces to the usual definition of the tensor product as the quotient of the free module, modulo the relations encoding bilinearity.

Example 152. In the context of Hochschild cohomology the main example is the diagonal bimodule, as this induces the identity functor on the level of dg module categories. When A is an algebra, this corresponds to considering A as an A -bimodule, and in the geometric setting we will use $\Delta_*\mathcal{O}_X$.

We will come back to $- \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} M$ after having introduced derived categories, as we will be interested in the derived functor $- \otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L M$.

Derived categories We now come to a very important construction for dg categories. We will assume that the reader is familiar with the construction of the derived category of an abelian category, for which [24, §2] and [65, §10] are good references. As they work in settings with suitable boundedness assumptions, but we work in the unbounded setting, one can find the appropriate generalisations in [60, Tag 05QI].

The following two definitions are just pointwise generalisations of the familiar notions for cochain complexes over an abelian category.

Definition 153. Let M be a dg \mathcal{C} -module. We say that it is *acyclic* if for all $x \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ the cochain complex $M(x)$ is acyclic, i.e. $H^n(M(x)) = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Similarly we have the following.

Definition 154. Let $f: M \rightarrow N$ be a morphism in $Z^0(\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}})$. We say that it is a *quasi-isomorphism* if $f_x: M(x) \rightarrow N(x)$ is a quasi-isomorphism for all $x \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$.

Without paying any attention to set-theoretical questions we can then define the following.

Definition 155. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. Its derived category $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C})$ is the localisation of $Z^0(\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}})$ with respect to quasi-isomorphisms.

Equivalently, we can define it as the Verdier quotient $H^0(\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}})/H^0(\text{Acyc}_{\mathcal{C}})$, where $\text{Acyc}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the full dg subcategory of acyclic dg modules.

As is the case for derived categories of abelian categories, we can also localise $H^0(\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}})$ at quasi-isomorphisms.

An important subcategory of $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C})$ is that of its compact objects.

Definition 156. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. Then $\text{Perf } \mathcal{C} := \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C})^c$ is the full subcategory of compact objects in $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C})$.

Remark 157. Alternatively, we could look at the set of representable dg modules. Then $\text{Perf } \mathcal{C}$ is the thick closure of this set of objects, i.e. it is the smallest strict triangulated subcategory of $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C})$, closed under taking direct summands of objects. In other words, we take the closure under shifts, cones and summands.

Doing homological algebra in derived categories of dg categories In the context of derived categories of abelian categories, the main notion for doing homological algebra is that of a resolution. We need to generalise this to derived categories of dg categories, in order to understand how statements like theorem 15 can be made to work in this more general setting. We won't attempt to be exhaustive here, we only aim to introduce some important notions. As mentioned before, because everything is by default unbounded, we need to make sure we deal with this properly.

Definition 158. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. A dg \mathcal{C} -module P is *homotopy-projective* if for every acyclic dg \mathcal{C} -module N^\bullet we have

$$(218) \quad H^0(\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}})(P, N) \cong 0.$$

This is inspired by the notion of homotopy-projective (or K -projective) cochain complexes, introduced by Spaltenstein [57]. For Grothendieck abelian categories we will use the dual notion of a homotopy-injective cochain complex. By the existence of homotopy-injective resolutions [60, tag 079P] we get the following proposition.

Proposition 159. Let \mathcal{A} be a Grothendieck abelian category. Then

$$(219) \quad \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{hInj} \mathcal{A}),$$

where $\mathbf{hInj} \mathcal{A}$ is the full subcategory of $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ on the homotopy-injective cochain complexes.

So computing left exact functors in this setting is easy: one takes a homotopy-injective resolution of a cochain complex, and apply the functor to it.

In the setting of dg categories we will mostly be working with the analogues of right exact functors, namely the tensor product introduced in proposition 151. So we will mostly be concerned with homotopy-projective resolutions. These exist, by [31, §3.1] or [11, appendix C]. In particular, we have the following description of the derived category of a dg category.

Theorem 160. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. Then

$$(220) \quad \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathbf{H}^0(\mathbf{hProj} \mathcal{C}),$$

where $\mathbf{hProj} \mathcal{C}$ is the full dg subcategory of $\mathbf{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}}$ on the homotopy-projective dg modules.

The results cited for this description construct not just homotopy-projective resolutions, rather they construct an even stronger notion. This is analogous to what one does for the construction of projective resolutions of a module: these are usually *free* resolutions. But for dg modules we cannot use free objects as freely⁵, like we do when working with projective resolutions of modules. See exercise 167 for an easy exercise explaining this. Rather we will use the following notion.

Definition 161. Let M be a dg module. It is *free* if it is the direct sum of shifts of representable dg modules.

It is *semifree* if there exists a filtration

$$(221) \quad 0 = M_{-1} \subseteq M_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq M_i \subseteq M_{i+1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq M$$

which

1. is exhaustive, i.e. $M = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} M_i$;
2. the quotients M_{i+1}/M_i are free for all $i \geq 0$.

This is a special case of a homotopy-projective dg module.

Lemma 162. Let M be a semi-free dg module. Then it is homotopy-projective.

Proof. We will prove the result by induction. We have that M_0 is a free module, and by the Yoneda lemma these are homotopy-projective.

Assume that M_i is homotopy-projective for some $i \geq 0$, then we can consider the triangle

$$(222) \quad M_i \xrightarrow{j_i} M_{i+1} \rightarrow M_{i+1}/M_i \xrightarrow{+1}.$$

Applying the cohomological functor $\mathbf{H}^0(\mathbf{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, N))$, where N is an acyclic dg module shows that M_{i+1} is homotopy-projective.

⁵Pun very much intended.

Because the inclusions in the filtrations are split on the graded level, and split exact sequences provide the triangles in the homotopy category, we can describe M using the triangle

$$(223) \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} M_i \xrightarrow{\Phi} \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} M_i \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{+1}$$

in $H^0(\text{dgMod}_c)$, where Φ is defined as

$$(224) M_i \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \text{id} \\ -j_i \end{pmatrix}} M_i \oplus M$$

and $j_i: M_i \hookrightarrow M_{i+1}$ is the inclusion.

Now we just apply the cohomological functor $H^0(\text{dgMod}_c(-, N))$ to (223), and use the same reasoning to conclude. \square

When defining Hochschild cohomology we will use the following lemma.

Lemma 163. Let M be a dg module, together with a filtration

$$(225) 0 = M_{-1} \subseteq M_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq M_i \subseteq M_{i+1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq M$$

which is exhaustive, such that M_{i+1}/M_i is semifree for all $i \geq 0$. Then M itself is semifree.

6.4 Exercises

Exercise 164. Prove that example 140 is an example of a dg category.

Exercise 165. Prove the two equivalences from example 144.

Exercise 166. Prove the claim in remark 157.

Exercise 167. Explain what goes wrong in the following example. Consider k as a dg algebra. Let M be the dg module (i.e. cochain complex) which is

$$(226) \dots \rightarrow k \xrightarrow{\text{id}} k \rightarrow \dots$$

concentrated in degrees 0 and 1. It is generated by 1 in degrees 0 and 1. Why is the map

$$(227) k \oplus k[1] \rightarrow M$$

which sends the generator of k to the corresponding generator of M not the start of a free resolution?

Exercise 168. Prove lemma 163.

7 Hochschild (co)homology for differential graded categories

There are multiple ways to advocate a generalisation of Hochschild (co)homology from algebras to more general objects, such as exact, abelian or dg categories. It is probably correct to say that historically speaking the generalisation of (lower) algebraic K-theory of rings to higher algebraic K-theory which required the use of categories for its definition, suggested that there should also be a notion of Hochschild homology and cyclic homology together with a (higher) Chern character in these more general settings [34].

In the context of these lecture notes, which rather focus on Hochschild cohomology, we will use a different motivation to explain the need for a definition in a more general setting. We have already observed in remark 14 that Hochschild cohomology is not a functor for arbitrary morphisms of algebras. On the other hand we have seen in corollary 16 that Hochschild (co)homology is Morita invariant. These are equivalences of module categories which are not induced by a morphism between algebras, but rather by a bimodule. If $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a morphism of algebras, then we can equip B with the structure of an A - B -bimodule: on the left the multiplication by $a \in A$ is given by composition with f , whilst on the right we just use the ordinary multiplication. In this way we have generalised the notion of morphism to a much more flexible setting: any bimodule M gives a functor

$$(228) \quad - \otimes_A M: \text{Mod } A \rightarrow \text{Mod } B$$

and for many things we are only interested in properties of the module category, not of the underlying algebras themselves. Observe that

1. the generalisation from morphisms of algebras to functors induced by bimodules is not yet enough to improve the lack of functoriality for Hochschild cohomology, except for Morita *equivalences*;
2. in the setting of dg categories this notion of bimodules also makes perfect sense, and they give rise functors between categories of dg modules and their derived categories.

We have not yet proven this special case yet (it will follow from the more general results in section 8), but it can be shown that Hochschild cohomology doesn't depend on $\text{Mod } A$, but rather only on $\mathbf{D}(\text{Mod } A)$. Indeed, by [53, 52] we have a Morita theory for derived categories of algebras, and we know that Hochschild cohomology can be defined in terms of $\text{Ext}_{A^e}^i$, which can be computed from the derived category.

The generalisation of Hochschild cohomology to dg categories not only allows it to be defined in new settings, we also get a notion of *limited functoriality*, which forms the topic of section 8. It is limited, in the sense that we don't get functoriality for arbitrary dg functors or quasi-functors. Rather, the correct statement⁶ to make is that Hochschild cohomology is (at least) a functor for the non-full subcategory of dg categories localised at Morita equivalences where one takes only the quasi-functors $- \otimes_A^{\mathbf{L}} M$ into account which are fully faithful.

The original application for this form of functoriality for Hochschild cohomology was the study of Koszul duality [30, 56]. But we will not discuss this, rather we are interested in the functoriality for fully faithful functors (e.g. provided by open immersions, but more importantly in the setting of semi-orthogonal decompositions).

⁶We will not prove this particular version of the statement as we don't want to go too much into the homotopy theory of dg categories. But taking as given that one can construct a localisation of the category of (small) dg categories at Morita equivalences, all the other ingredients will be discussed.

7.1 Definition

If we were only interested in Hochschild cohomology *as a vector space* (or graded algebra, at most), we could take theorem 15 as our guiding principle, and for a dg algebra A (resp. dg category \mathcal{C}) define its Hochschild (co)homology as

$$(229) \quad \mathrm{HH}^n(A) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(A^e)}(A, A[n])$$

resp.

$$(230) \quad \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathcal{C}) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C})}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}[n])$$

where \mathcal{C} considered as a \mathcal{C} -bimodule is introduced in example 150.

This has the obvious drawback that we are not just interested in cohomology, but also in an explicit complex computing it, together with extra structure on this complex. With our understanding of resolutions of dg modules we can construct a semi-free resolution of \mathcal{C} as a \mathcal{C} -bimodule as follows, as we did for algebras in definition 1.

The bar resolution When trying to cook up a bar resolution for a dg algebra A (let alone a dg category) one runs into the problem that A is already a cochain complex. So instead of resolving a module by a cochain complex as we do for an algebra, we have to resolve a cochain complex by another cochain complex, as explained before. Another issue is that in general $A^{\otimes i+2}$ is no longer free as a dg A -bimodule.

In [31, §6.6] it is explained how to cook up a bar resolution in the setting of dg categories. Let us quickly recall the approach there.

Definition 169. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. The *bar resolution* $C^{\mathrm{bar}}(\mathcal{C})$ of the diagonal bimodule \mathcal{C} is the dg bimodule whose values at (y, y') are given by the Tot^{\oplus} of the bicomplex whose columns are

$$(231) \quad \dots \rightarrow C_1^{\mathrm{bar}}(\mathcal{C})(y, y') \rightarrow C_0^{\mathrm{bar}}(\mathcal{C})(y, y') \rightarrow 0$$

where each component is given by the bimodule

$$(232) \quad C_i^{\mathrm{bar}}(\mathcal{C})(y, y') := \bigoplus_{x_0, \dots, x_i \in \mathrm{Obj}(\mathcal{C})} \mathcal{C}(x_i, y) \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(x_{i-1}, x_i) \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1) \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(y', x_0)$$

and the differential is given by

$$(233) \quad d(c_0 \otimes \dots \otimes c_{n+1}) := \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i c_0 \otimes \dots \otimes c_i c_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes c_{n+1}.$$

The augmentation is the morphism of bimodules

$$(234) \quad \epsilon: C^{\mathrm{bar}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

which is

$$(235) \quad \epsilon_{y, y'}: \bigoplus_{x \in \mathrm{Obj}(\mathcal{C})} \mathcal{C}(x, y') \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(y, x) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(y, y') : c \otimes c' \mapsto c \circ c'$$

and 0 everywhere else.

One can then check the following proposition, see also [31, §6.6].

Proposition 170. The morphism ϵ is a semifree resolution, i.e. $C^{\mathrm{bar}}(\mathcal{C})$ is semifree, and ϵ is a quasi-isomorphism.

Definition using the bar resolution We can now define the Hochschild cochain complex of \mathcal{C} in exactly the same way as we did in definition 7. We could easily replace this definition by a more general one with values in an arbitrary bimodule, but we will not use this.

Definition 171. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. The *Hochschild cochain complex* for \mathcal{C} is taken to be

$$(236) \quad C^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) := \text{dgMod}_{\text{cop} \otimes_k \mathcal{C}}(C^{\text{bar}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{C}).$$

As in section 2 we can equip with cochain complex with extra algebraic structure, which in turn induces extra structure on its cohomology. The main result (for algebras) was that on cohomology we have a Gerstenhaber algebra structure, and that on the complex we have a dg Lie algebra structure, useful for deformation theory. We didn't explicitly discuss the dg algebra structure on the Hochschild cochain complex, nor its compatibility with the dg Lie algebra structure: in remark 56 we remarked that it is possible to describe this explicitly, but we postponed the discussion: in section 7.3 we will get back to this.

We will refrain (at least for now) of discussing properties of Hochschild homology for dg categories. The fundamental results are given in [34], and are used in the setting of noncommutative motives in [59].

7.2 Reinterpretation

As in propositions 9 and 10 we can again use the tensor-Hom adjunction to reinterpret the Hochschild (co)chain complex. We will only discuss this for Hochschild cochains though, without giving too many of the explicit technical details.

Definition 172. The *Hochschild cochain complex* of \mathcal{C} is the $\text{Tot}\Pi$ of the bicomplex whose (i, j) th entry is

$$(237) \quad \prod_{x_0, \dots, x_i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})} \text{dgMod}_k(\mathcal{C}(x_{i-1}, x_i) \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1), \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_i))^j$$

where the horizontal arrows are the Hochschild differentials

$$(238) \quad \begin{aligned} & d(f)(c_{n+1} \otimes \dots \otimes c_1) \\ & := (-1)^{|c_1||f|} c_{n+1} \circ f(c_n \otimes \dots \otimes c_1) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{\epsilon_i} f(c_{n+1} \otimes \dots \otimes c_{n-j+2} \circ c_{n-j+1} \otimes \dots \otimes c_1) \\ & + (-1)^{\epsilon_{n+1}} f(c_{n+1} \otimes \dots \otimes c_2) \circ c_1 \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_i := |f| - i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |c_j|$, and the vertical arrows are the differentials from the dg category dgMod_k .

We refrain from checking that $d^2 = 0$. This would also follow by carefully translating the differential on the bar resolution of the diagonal bimodule through the tensor-Hom adjunction, as we have the following proposition.

Proposition 173. The Hochschild cochain complexes from definition 171 and definition 172 are isomorphic.

Example 174. When A is a dg algebra, the bicomplex we are considering has the following shape

$$(239)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
& & \cdots & & \cdots & & \cdots & & \cdots & & \\
& & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
\cdots & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(k, A)^1 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(A, A)^1 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(A^{\otimes 2}, A)^1 & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
& & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
\cdots & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(k, A)^0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(A, A)^0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(A^{\otimes 2}, A)^0 & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
& & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
\cdots & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(k, A)^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(A, A)^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{dgMod}_k(A^{\otimes 2}, A)^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
& & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
& & \cdots & & \cdots & & \cdots & & \cdots & &
\end{array}$$

If \mathcal{C} is a dg category with finitely many objects it is again possible to explicitly write down the bicomplex, and understand the (locally finite number of) morphisms.

7.3 Extra structure on Hochschild cochains

In remark 56 we postponed the discussion of the extra structure on the Hochschild cochain complex. It is high time we take up this promise. For now we will take A just an ordinary k -algebra, for notational ease. We will assume that with appropriate signs everything can be generalised to dg categories, and having understood the situation for usual algebras this shouldn't be too hard, but we don't want to focus too hard on the formal aspects here for time reasons. The discussion is also a bit more abstract and less self-contained than the rest of these notes, so we will need to accept on faith that all these things can be made work.

The algebraic structure on Hochschild cohomology is that of a *Gerstenhaber algebra*, as shown in proposition 55. There is an operad governing this structure [41, §13.3.12], and as explained in §10 of op. cit. one can consider a homotopical version of a (Koszul) operad (such as the Gerstenhaber operad). The most famous example is that of associative algebras, which give rise to “strong homotopy associative algebras” or A_∞ -algebras (which are generalisations of dg algebras involving higher multiplications). The cohomology of the homotopical version of an algebra for a certain operad is an algebra for the operad you started with. In particular, there exists the notion of a G_∞ -algebra, and the Hochschild cochain complex of an algebra can be equipped with this structure.

This is an abstract notion, and there are more concrete versions of this, inspired by how we defined the Gerstenhaber bracket: this was done using the circle product as in definition 43. This notion can be generalised to that of *brace operations*. This gives rise to the notion of what is (unfortunately) called a homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra in [16]. But this is *not* an instance of the construction mentioned in the previous paragraph, and sometimes a G_∞ -algebra is also called a homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra... As discussed in section 2.1 one can show that the cohomology of a homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra can be equipped with the structure of a Gerstenhaber algebra, by setting $[f, g] := f\{g\} - g\{f\}$. So a homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra is not even a homotopical version of a Gerstenhaber algebra as such.

More generally, in [17] the notion of a B_∞ -algebra was introduced. Again this is unfortunate choice of notation, as it is *not* an instance of the construction mentioned two paragraphs ago. The B stands for the use of brace operations, as in the previous paragraph. It is a perfectly fine dg operad though, for which a good homotopy theory was developed [22]. The B_∞ -algebra structure on the Hochschild cochain complex is defined via the homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra, which has the benefit of being more concrete, and a direct generalisation of what we have seen in section 2.1.

We will briefly discuss the notion of a homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra and that of a B_∞ -algebra, as those are the ones relevant to (limited functoriality of) Hochschild cohomology of dg categories.

On homotopy Gerstenhaber algebras

Definition 175. A *homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra* is a dg algebra G^\bullet together with *brace operations* $g\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ which are of degree $|g| + \sum_{i=1}^m (|g_i| - 1)$, such that these operations are compatible in the following way:

pre-Jacobi identities

$$(240) \quad g\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}\{h_1, \dots, h_n\} := \sum_{0 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq n} (-1)^\epsilon g\{h_1, \dots, h_{i_1}, g_1\{h_{i_1+1}, \dots\}, \dots, h_n\}$$

where $\epsilon := \sum_{p=1}^m (|g_p| - 1) \sum_{q=1}^{i_p} (|h_q| - 1)$;

distributivity

$$(241) \quad (g_1 \cdot g_2)\{h_1, \dots, h_n\} = \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^\epsilon g_1\{h_1, \dots, h_i\} \cdot g_2\{h_{i+1}, \dots, h_n\};$$

higher homotopies we omit these, as for the only example we are interested in (that of Hochschild cohomology), they follow from the other axioms and the compatibilities discussed in remark 46.

We can then define the generalisation of the circle product to all brace operations as follows.

Definition 176. The homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra structure on $C^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ is given by

1. the Hochschild differential;
2. the cup product;
3. the brace operations

$$(242) \quad f\{f_1, \dots, f_m\}(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) := \sum_{0 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq n} (-1)^\epsilon f(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_{i_1} \otimes f_1(a_{i_1+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{i_1+|f_1|}) \otimes a_{i_1+|f_1|+1} \otimes \dots \otimes f_m(a_{i_m+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{i_m+|f_m|}) \otimes a_{i_m+|f_m|+1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_n)$$

where $n = |f| + \sum_{p=1}^m (|f_p| - 1)$, and $\epsilon := \sum_{p=1}^m (|f_p| - 1) i_p$.

One can then prove the following.

Theorem 177. With the structure from above, $C^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ is a homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra.

On B_∞ -algebras For more details on B_∞ -algebras one is referred to [17, 64]. If V^\bullet is graded vector space, we can consider the *cofree tensor coalgebra* $T(V^\bullet[-1])$ on the shift of V^\bullet , where the comultiplication is given by deconcatenation.

Definition 178. Let V^\bullet be a cochain complex. A *B_∞ -algebra structure on V^\bullet* is the structure of a dg bialgebra on $T(V^\bullet[-1])$.

This is a short, but possibly unenlightening definition, as it is unclear how it relates to the definition of a homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra. As explained in [17, §5.2] it is possible to

1. translate the differential on $T(V^\bullet[-1])$ into a sequence of operations

$$(243) \quad m_i: (V^\bullet)^{\otimes i} \rightarrow V^\bullet$$

for $i \geq 0$, of degree $2 - i$, encoding the structure of an A_∞ -algebra;

2. translate the multiplication on $T(V^\bullet[-1])$ into a sequence of operations

$$(244) \quad m_{i,j}: (V^\bullet)^{\otimes i} \otimes_k (V^\bullet)^{\otimes j} \rightarrow V^\bullet$$

for $i, j \geq 0$, of degree $1 - i - j$

which are compatible with each other, through the compatibilities encoded in the term dg bialgebra. In the case of the Hochschild complex, we can equip it with the structure of a B_∞ -algebra through its structure of a homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra, by setting

$$(245) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} m_0 := 0, \\ m_1(f) := d(f), \\ m_2(f_1, f_2) := f_1 \cup f_2 \\ m_i := 0 & \forall i \geq 3 \\ m_{0,1} = m_{1,0} := \text{id} \\ m_{0,i} = m_{i,0} := 0 & \forall i \geq 2 \\ m_{i,j} := 0 & \forall i \geq 2 \\ m_{1,j}(f; f_1, \dots, f_j) := f\{f_1, \dots, f_j\} & \forall j \geq 1 \end{array} \right.$$

as in [64, §3.2], for $f, f_1, \dots, f_j \in C^\bullet(A)$.

Corollary 179. Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category. Then $C^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ has the structure of a B_∞ -algebra.

The upshot of this is that there exists a good homotopy theory for B_∞ -algebras, which allow us to invert morphisms of B_∞ -algebras which are quasi-isomorphisms on the underlying complexes. So we have a category $\text{Ho}(B_\infty)$, the homotopy category of B_∞ -algebras, in which quasi-isomorphisms are actual isomorphisms, just like we have done when constructing the derived category by inverting quasi-isomorphisms. This will be important when developing limited functoriality for Hochschild cohomology of dg categories.

7.4 Exercises

Exercise 180. 1. Let V be a finite-dimensional vector space. Let \mathcal{C} be the dg category with 2 objects $\{1, 2\}$, such that

$$(246) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, 1) &:= k \cdot \text{id}_1 \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, 2) &:= 0 \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(2, 1) &:= V \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(2, 2) &:= k \cdot \text{id}_2 \end{aligned}$$

with zero differentials, and the obvious composition. Compute the Hochschild cohomology of \mathcal{C} .

2. Can you explain how to get rid of redundant information in the Hochschild cochain complex?
3. Look up the definition of the *reduced Hochschild cochain complex* of an algebra, and explain the relationship with your previous observation.

4. Replace V the cochain complex $k \oplus k[n]$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, with zero differential. Compute the Hochschild cohomology of \mathcal{C} .

This construction produces examples of a smooth and proper dg category, with *negative* Hochschild cohomology. We will see in the next chapter that this is impossible for a smooth projective variety.

It's also a very special case of the gluing we will consider in section 8.2, and the long exact sequence for the Hochschild cohomology of a gluing in corollary 192 will confirm your computations in this special case.

8 Limited functoriality for Hochschild cohomology

We have seen in remark 14 that Hochschild cohomology of an algebra with values in itself is not functorial for algebra morphisms, as there is a conflict of variances in the arguments. Luckily we can get around this, starting with the simple observation that if we have a full dg subcategory, then the Hochschild complex from definition 172 for the bigger subcategory has an obvious projection down to the Hochschild complex of the smaller subcategory. This observation is the beginning of this whole section, as for an arbitrary bimodule M we can construct a third dg category, with two fully faithful dg functors towards it. So we get morphisms in the other direction on the level of Hochschild cochains, and if we can invert one of these, we can define a comparison morphism between the original dg categories.

Using this we will not be able to obtain functoriality for arbitrary functors (or bimodules) between dg categories, but we will obtain a *limited functoriality* for an important class of functors (or bimodules). It would be interesting to extend this to other cases, if you feel like pursuing a challenge.

8.1 Functoriality for full subcategories

If we have a fully faithful dg functor $F: \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, then we can immediately produce a map between the Hochschild complexes of these categories as follows, which is compatible with the higher structure.

Proposition 181. Let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a fully faithful dg functor. There is a restriction morphism

$$(247) \quad F^*: C^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow C^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$$

which is a morphism of B_∞ -algebras.

Proof. Before taking the $\text{Tot}\Pi$ in the definition of the Hochschild cochain complex we define the morphism as

$$(248) \quad \begin{array}{c} \prod_{y_0, \dots, y_p \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})} \text{dgMod}_k \left(\mathcal{D}(y_{p-1}, y_p) \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1), \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_p) \right) \\ \downarrow \pi \\ \prod_{x_0, \dots, x_p \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})} \text{dgMod}_k \left(\mathcal{D}(F(x_{p-1}), F(x_p)) \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k \mathcal{D}(F(x_0), F(x_1)), \mathcal{D}(F(x_0), F(x_p)) \right) \\ \parallel \\ \prod_{x_0, \dots, x_p \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})} \text{dgMod}_k \left(\mathcal{C}(x_{p-1}, x_p) \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1), \mathcal{D}(x_0, x_p) \right). \end{array}$$

It can be checked that the homotopy Gerstenhaber algebra structure is compatible with projection onto the subcomplex given as above. \square

So having multiple objects is what makes this possible, explaining the need to generalise to dg categories (one could also just generalise in the direction of k -linear categories, but the extra flexibility of using dg categories will be useful).

Luckily for us, the story doesn't end here, as this is a very special situation, rarely satisfied in practice. Nevertheless, it is precisely what we need to bootstrap to a much more general setting.

8.2 Gluing dg categories

In ?? we will consider semiorthogonal decompositions for triangulated categories, where we will return to this notion. But now we will (somewhat anachronistically) define the notion of a gluing of dg categories along a bimodule.

Definition 182. Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be dg categories. Let M be a \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule. Then the *gluing* of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} along M is the dg category $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D})$, such that $\text{Obj}(\mathcal{G}) := \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}) \sqcup \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})$, and

$$(249) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(x, x') &:= \mathcal{C}(x, x') \\ \mathcal{G}(x, y) &:= 0 \\ \mathcal{G}(y, x) &:= M(y, x) \\ \mathcal{G}(y, y') &:= \mathcal{D}(y, y') \end{aligned}$$

for $x, x' \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ and $y, y' \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})$.

We can pictorially represent this also as upper triangular matrices as follows:

$$(250) \quad \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & M \\ 0 & \mathcal{D} \end{pmatrix}.$$

But we can apply proposition 181 to this setting, as we have inclusions of full subcategories $i_{\mathcal{C}}: \mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ and $i_{\mathcal{D}}: \mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}$.

Corollary 183. There exists a diagram

$$(251) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{G}) & \\ i_{\mathcal{C}}^* \swarrow & & \searrow i_{\mathcal{D}}^* \\ \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & & \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \end{array}$$

of morphisms of B_∞ -algebras.

The goal will now be to find conditions on the bimodule M ensuring that $i_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ is invertible, so that we can define the morphism

$$(252) \quad \varphi_M: i_{\mathcal{C}}^* \circ (i_{\mathcal{D}}^*)^{-1}: \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}).$$

In most cases it will not be possible to ensure that $i_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ is an honest isomorphism that we can invert. Rather, we will need to pass to the homotopy category $\text{Ho}(B_\infty)$ of B_∞ -algebras, as it will only be a quasi-isomorphism.

An important result we will need to understand when this is possible is the following. Its proof is not very interesting, the first equivalence follows from standard facts in triangulated categories, the second uses standard formal results which we mention below.

Proposition 184. Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be dg categories. Let M be a \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule. The following are equivalent:

1. $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L M: \text{Perf } \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$ is fully faithful;
2. for all $x, y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the map

$$(253) \quad \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C})(h^x, h^y[n]) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})(M(-, x), M(-, y)[n])$$

is an isomorphism;

3. the left action morphism

$$(254) \quad \lambda: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})(M, M)$$

is an isomorphism in $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C})$.

Remark 185. For the discussion of limited functoriality it is important to remark that one cannot compose functors of the type $- \otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L M$ and preserve the fully faithfulness, see [30, §3.4].

We will be using the following lemma implicitly.

Lemma 186. Let M be a \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule, and $x \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$. Then there exists a natural isomorphism

$$(255) \quad h^x \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} M \cong M(-, x).$$

In particular we can understand the left action morphism λ through the following lemma.

Lemma 187. Let M be a \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule. Then the diagram

$$(256) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(x, y) & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{D}}(M(-, x), M(-, y)) \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ \text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{C}}(h^x, h^y) & \longrightarrow & \text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{D}}(h^x \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} M, h^y \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} M) \end{array}$$

commutes for all $x, y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$.

An auxiliary complex We will define an auxiliary complex, which computes the extensions of the gluing bimodule.

Definition 188. Let M be a dg \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule. We denote $C^\bullet(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D})$ the Tot^Π of the bicomplex which has

$$(257) \quad \bigoplus_{l+m=p} \prod_{\substack{x_0, \dots, x_l \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}) \\ y_0, \dots, y_m \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})}} \text{dgMod}_k(\mathcal{C}(x_{l-1}, x_l) \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1) \otimes_k M(y_m, x_0) \otimes_k \mathcal{D}(y_{m-1}, y_m) \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k \mathcal{D}(y_0, y_1), M(y_0, x_l))$$

in degree $p \geq 0$, with the horizontal differential given by the same formula as the Hochschild differential.

We have the following interpretation for this cochain complex, which says that the first component of the dgMod_k in (257) gives a homotopy-projective resolution of M , which is proven along the same lines as before.

Proposition 189. We have a quasi-isomorphism

$$(258) \quad C^\bullet(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D}) \cong \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{D})}(M, M).$$

There is another important interpretation for the complex $C^\bullet(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D})$, as discussed in proposition 190.

We define the following two morphisms: a morphism

$$(259) \quad \gamma: C^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow C^\bullet(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D})$$

which in the component $\text{dgMod}_k(\mathcal{C}(x_{p-1}, x_p) \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k \mathcal{C}(x_0, x_1) \otimes_k M(y_0, x_p), M(y_0, x_p))$ sends $c \in C^p(\mathcal{C})$ to the morphism $u \otimes m \mapsto c(u) \otimes m$. Similarly we define

$$(260) \quad \delta: C^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow C^\bullet(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D}).$$

We also have the left action morphism

$$(261) \quad \lambda: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{D}}(M, M)$$

of \mathcal{C} -bimodules, which for objects $x, x' \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ is the action morphism $\mathcal{C}(x, x') \rightarrow \text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{D}}(M(-, x), M(-, x'))$. Under the standing assumption on M we obtain a morphism of cochain complexes we have that $\text{dgMod}_{\mathcal{D}}(M, M)$ computes the derived functor in the tensor-Hom adjunction, so by a slight abuse of notation we obtain a morphism

$$(262) \quad \lambda_*: \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C})}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C})}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}}(M, M)).$$

Moreover, we have that

$$(263) \quad \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C})}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}}(M, M)) \cong \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{D})}(M, M).$$

Putting all this together, we have a commutative diagram

$$(264) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C})}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}) \\ \downarrow \gamma & & \downarrow \lambda_* \\ \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{D})}(M, M) \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C})}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}}(M, M)) \end{array}$$

and hence γ is a quasi-isomorphism of cochain complexes if and only if λ is an isomorphism in $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{C})$.

Describing the Hochschild cohomology of the gluing The following proposition is a straightforward check using the definition of the mapping cylinder, and the definitions of the objects which are involved, in particular, that $\mathcal{G}(x, y) = 0$ for $x \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}$.

Proposition 190. $\mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{G})$ is the mapping cylinder of

$$(265) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \gamma \\ \delta \end{pmatrix}: \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \oplus \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D}).$$

For the statement of its corollary, we recall that in a triangulated category we call a commutative square

$$(266) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} U & \longrightarrow & V \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W & \longrightarrow & Z \end{array}$$

a *homotopy bicartesian square* if there exists a morphism $Z \rightarrow U[1]$ such that the induced triangle

$$(267) \quad U \rightarrow V \oplus W \rightarrow Z \rightarrow$$

is distinguished.

Corollary 191. The square

$$(268) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{G}) & \xrightarrow{i_{\mathcal{C}}^*} & \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \\ \downarrow i_{\mathcal{D}}^* & & \downarrow \gamma \\ \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}, M, \mathcal{D}) \end{array}$$

is homotopy bicartesian.

Proof. It suffices to define the triangle using the mapping cylinder discussed above. \square

From this we get the following, relating the Hochschild cohomologies of \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} with the extensions of the gluing bimodule.

Corollary 192. We have a long exact sequence

$$(269) \quad \dots \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathcal{C}) \oplus \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{D})}(M, M[n]) \rightarrow \dots$$

This is a vast generalisation of the long exact sequence of [19], where $\mathcal{C} = A$ was a finite-dimensional algebra, $\mathcal{D} = k$ the base field, and M a gluing module. This situation is called a *one-point extension*.

Now, this is still not quite the situation that we are interested in: we wanted to relate the Hochschild cohomologies of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} . But we have now proven the following chain of equivalences.

$$(270) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{we want:} \quad i_{\mathcal{D}}^* \text{ a quasi-isomorphism} \\ \Downarrow \\ \gamma \text{ a quasi-isomorphism} \\ \Downarrow \\ \lambda \text{ an isomorphism} \\ \Downarrow \\ \text{we say:} \quad - \otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{L}} M: \mathrm{Perf} \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D}) \text{ fully faithful} \end{array}$$

So imposing the fully faithfulness condition for the bimodule M , we can try to study the functoriality properties of the morphism φ_M defined above. This is what we will do in the next section.

8.3 Limited functoriality

We have constructed a morphism $\varphi_M: \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$ of B_∞ -algebras, under suitable conditions on M . In this section we discuss some of its properties. They are summarised in the following theorem [30, theorem 4.6].

Theorem 193. Let M be a dg \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule, such that $- \otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{L}} M: \mathrm{Perf} \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$ is fully faithful. Then have that φ_M satisfies the following:

independence the morphism φ_M only depends on the isomorphism class in $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes_k \mathcal{D})$, i.e. if M' is a quasi-isomorphic bimodule, then $\varphi_M = \varphi_{M'}$;

invertibility if additionally $M \otimes_{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{L}} -: \mathrm{Perf} \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}})$ is fully faithful, then φ_M is an isomorphism in $\mathrm{Ho}(B_\infty)$;

agreement with restriction if $M = \mathcal{D}_F$ for a fully faithful dg functor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, then $\varphi_M = F^*$;

composition if N is a \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{E} -bimodule such that

1. $- \otimes_{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{L}} N: \mathrm{Perf} \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{E})$ is fully faithful;
2. $- \otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{L}} (M \otimes_{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{L}} N): \mathrm{Perf} \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{E})$ is fully faithful

then

$$(271) \quad \varphi_{M \otimes_{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{L}} N} = \varphi_M \circ \varphi_N$$

in $\text{Ho}(\mathbf{B}_\infty)$.

Before we discuss the proofs of these statements, let us give a useful corollary of the invertibility, which in particular says that Hochschild cohomology is a derived Morita invariant of dg categories. First we state the following lemma.

Lemma 194. If $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{L}} M: \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$ is an equivalence of triangulated categories, then the functors

$$(272) \quad -\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{L}} M: \text{Perf } \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$$

and

$$(273) \quad M \otimes_{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbf{L}} -: \text{Perf } \mathcal{D}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C})$$

are invertible.

The proof is not very exciting, and uses only standard methods for dg modules.

Combining this with the invertibility of theorem 193, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 195. If $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{L}} M: \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$ is an equivalence of triangulated categories, then

$$(274) \quad \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{D})$$

as \mathbf{B}_∞ -algebras.

In other words, Hochschild cohomology is a *derived Morita invariant*. This is the case for most reasonable invariants for dg categories.

The proofs of the different parts of theorem 193

Proof of invertibility. It suffices to observe that under the conditions of the theorem, we obtain that $i_{\mathcal{C}}^*$ is also a quasi-isomorphism, using δ instead of γ and replacing the left action morphism in the analysis of section 8.2. \square

Next we consider the composition.

Proof of composition. Consider the following diagram of fully faithful dg functors.

$$(275) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & P \\ 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix} & \longleftarrow & & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E} \\ & \searrow & & & \downarrow \\ & \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & M & P \\ 0 & \mathcal{D} & N \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix} & \longleftrightarrow & & \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D} & N \\ 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix} \\ & \uparrow & & & \uparrow \\ \mathcal{C} & \longrightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & M \\ 0 & \mathcal{D} \end{pmatrix} & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

The dg category in the middle is the obvious generalisation of the gluing interpreted as an upper triangular matrix.

Applying C^\bullet to it we obtain

$$(276) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} C^\bullet \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & P \\ 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & C^\bullet(\mathcal{E}) \\ \downarrow & \swarrow & \uparrow \cong \\ C^\bullet \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & M & P \\ 0 & \mathcal{D} & N \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{?} & C^\bullet \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D} & N \\ 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C^\bullet(\mathcal{C}) & \xleftarrow{\cong} & C^\bullet \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & M \\ 0 & \mathcal{D} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & C^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \end{array}$$

where the isomorphisms are indicated. The left-hand side of (271) is given by inverting the top isomorphism, the right-hand side inverts the other two isomorphisms. If the morphism labelled by a question mark is an isomorphism, then we can invert it, and we can conclude by commutativity of the resulting diagram.

But we can interpret the morphism labelled by a question mark in terms of a gluing⁷ too: we glue \mathcal{C} and $\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D} & N \\ 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix}$ along the bimodule Q given by

$$(277) \quad \begin{aligned} Q(y, x) &:= M(y, x) \\ Q(z, x) &:= P(z, x) \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$, $y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})$ and $z \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{E})$. But as

$$(278) \quad - \otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L Q: \text{Perf } \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D} & N \\ 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix}$$

equals the composition

$$(279) \quad \text{Perf } \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{- \otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L M} \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{i_{\mathcal{D},*}} \mathbf{D} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D} & N \\ 0 & \mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix}$$

we can conclude. □

For the other proofs one is referred to [30] for the time being.

8.4 Applications

Derived Morita invariance One of the motivations to study limited functoriality was to generalise the Morita invariance from corollary 16. In the setting of derived categories it is known that if A and B are k -algebras, such that $\mathbf{D}(A) \simeq \mathbf{D}(B)$, then there exists a so-called tilting bimodule M which induces a (possibly different, so-called *standard*) equivalence

$$(280) \quad - \otimes_A^L M: \mathbf{D}(A) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbf{D}(B).$$

⁷Not visible in the picture.

As discussed in [52] this allows one to prove that there exists an isomorphism $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(A) \cong \mathrm{HH}^\bullet(B)$ of graded algebras. The compatibility with the Gerstenhaber product on both sides was then shown in [32] using derived Picard groups, still on the level of cohomology.

Limited functoriality allows us to lift this to an isomorphism $\mathbf{C}^\bullet(B) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\bullet(A)$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathbf{B}_\infty)$. To apply it we need to check the following proposition, whose (not very difficult) proof we'll omit for now.

Proposition 196. Let M be a \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule such that $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L M: \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$ is an equivalence. Then

1. $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L M: \mathrm{Perf} \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$, and
2. $M \otimes_{\mathcal{D}}^L -: \mathrm{Perf} \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}})$

are both fully faithful.

Corollary 197 (Derived Morita invariance). Let M be a \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{D} -bimodule such that $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L M: \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$ is an equivalence. Then

$$(281) \quad \varphi_M: \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathcal{C})$$

is an isomorphism in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathbf{B}_\infty)$.

This is a very useful result, as it allows one to choose convenient representatives when computing Hochschild cohomology.

Example 198. Consider \mathbb{P}_k^1 . It is well-known that $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{P}_k^1) \simeq \mathbf{D}^b(kK_2)$, where K_2 is the Kronecker quiver with 2 arrows. We could try to compute the Hochschild cohomology of a dg enhancement for $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{P}_k^1)$, but now we can just compute the Hochschild cohomology of a finite-dimensional algebra, which is much easier. Of course, once we have proven the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition computing the Hochschild cohomology of \mathbb{P}_k^1 becomes just as easy, but it is not always possible to apply the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition when working with noncommutative objects.

Koszul duality The original motivation for the development of limited functoriality of Hochschild cohomology was for Koszul duality. For more information one is referred to [30].

Open immersions Let X be a quasicompact separated k -scheme. Let $j: U \hookrightarrow X$ be an open subscheme. Because j is flat we have that $Lj^* = j^*$, and by [26] its right adjoint Rj_* is fully faithful.

As discussed before we will use the dg enhancement of $\mathbf{D}(\mathrm{Qcoh} X)$ given by the full subcategory of homotopy-injective complexes of quasicoherent sheaves inside the dg category $\mathrm{Ch}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathrm{Qcoh} X)$. We want to produce a functor between the enhancements associated to X and U , and the following lemma does this.

Lemma 199. The functor $j_*: \mathrm{Ch}(\mathrm{Qcoh} U) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ch}(\mathrm{Qcoh} X)$ preserves homotopy-injective cochain complexes.

Proof. Let \mathcal{J}^\bullet be a homotopy-injective complex in $\mathrm{Ch}(\mathrm{Qcoh} U)$, and \mathcal{N}^\bullet an acyclic cochain complex. Then

$$(282) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{K}(\mathrm{Qcoh} U)}(\mathcal{N}^\bullet, j_* \mathcal{J}^\bullet) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{K}(\mathrm{Qcoh} X)}(j^* \mathcal{N}^\bullet, \mathcal{J}^\bullet) \cong 0$$

as $j^* \mathcal{N}$ is still acyclic by the flatness of j . □

Hence we obtain a well-defined dg functor $j_*: \mathrm{hInj} \mathrm{Qcoh} U \rightarrow \mathrm{hInj} \mathrm{Qcoh} X$.

Proposition 200. The dg functor j_* is quasi-fully faithful.

Proof. This follows from $H^0(j_*) \cong \mathbf{R}j_*$ being fully faithful, and the dg categories being pretriangulated. \square

Now we have the following general result.

Proposition 201. Let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a quasi-fully faithful functor. Then $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L \mathcal{D}_F: \text{Perf } \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})$ is fully faithful.

Proof. The functor $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L \mathcal{D}_F$ induces the morphism

$$(283) \text{ Perf } \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{h}^x, \mathfrak{h}^y) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{D})(\mathfrak{h}^{F(x)}, \mathfrak{h}^{F(y)})$$

which is a quasi-isomorphism by the quasi-fully faithfulness. As $\text{Perf } \mathcal{C}$ is the thick closure of the representables, this proves the assertion. \square

In particular we see that $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}}^L \mathcal{D}_F$ even lands in $\text{Perf } \mathcal{D}$.

Summing up we have proven the following, where we denote $C^\bullet(X) := C^\bullet(\text{hInj Qcoh } X)$.

Theorem 202. There exists a restriction morphism $C^\bullet(X) \rightarrow C^\bullet(U)$ in $\text{Ho}(\mathbf{B}_\infty)$.

This result is a variation on [42, §7.6].

Semi-orthogonal decompositions We will introduce semi-orthogonal decompositions in the next chapter, and prove functoriality for them in the special case of a fully faithful functor between derived categories of varieties.

Chapter III

Varieties

Conventions We will continue with our convention that k is a field, and let's assume immediately that it is of characteristic 0 and algebraically closed.

9 Fourier–Mukai transforms

We will need to know a few things about Fourier–Mukai transforms. The canonical reference for this is [24]. We will give a brief summary of some of the required results, with some proofs to get a flavour for the formalism.

Throughout we will let X, Y (and variations upon these) be smooth projective varieties.

9.1 Preliminaries

In this section we first collect some formulae which are useful when computing with derived categories of smooth projective varieties. They are given without proof.

The projection formula Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathbf{D}^b(X)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{D}^b(Y)$. Then the *projection formula* is the isomorphism

$$(284) \quad \mathbf{R}f_*(\mathcal{E}) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{F} \cong \mathbf{R}f_* \left(\mathcal{E} \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{L}f^*(\mathcal{F}) \right).$$

The derived dual Let \mathcal{E} be an object of $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$. Then $\mathcal{E}^\vee := \mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is the *derived dual*. We have an isomorphism

$$(285) \quad \mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{E} \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}^\vee \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{G})$$

which induces some other isomorphisms that will be used implicitly.

Serre functors The notion of a Serre functor encodes Serre duality for smooth projective varieties on a categorical level [6, §3]. As such it can be generalised to other settings (e.g. finite-dimensional algebras of finite global dimension), but we will not need this in this chapter.

Definition 203. Let \mathcal{T} be a Hom-finite triangulated category. An additive functor $\mathbb{S}: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is a *Serre functor* if for all $x, y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{T})$ there exists an isomorphism

$$(286) \quad \eta_{x,y}: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(y, \mathbb{S}(x))^{\vee}.$$

Such a functor is automatically exact [6, proposition 3.3], and unique up to unique isomorphism [6, proposition 3.4(b)].

The main (and for now only) example of this is the Serre functor given by Serre duality, where $\mathbb{S} = -\otimes_{\omega_X}[\dim X]$. Consider the form of Serre duality as [20, §III.7], where we have an isomorphism

$$(287) \quad \text{Ext}_X^i(\mathcal{F}, \omega_X) \cong H^{n-i}(X, \mathcal{F})^{\vee}$$

for \mathcal{F} a coherent sheaf, and $i \geq 0$. In the setting of $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$ we reinterpret this as a special case of the Serre functor as follows:

$$(288) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ext}_X^i(\mathcal{F}, \omega_X) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & H^{n-i}(X, \mathcal{F})^{\vee} \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X)}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_X[i]) & \xleftarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{F}[n-i]}} & \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X)}(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{F}[n-i])^{\vee} \end{array}$$

9.2 Fourier–Mukai functors

Let X and Y be smooth projective varieties. We will use the following notation throughout:

$$(289) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & X \times Y & \\ p \swarrow & & \searrow q \\ X & & Y \end{array}$$

When more varieties are involved, we will again specify the different projections.

With this notation in use, we can associate an exact functor to every object in the derived category of the product as follows.

Definition 204. Let $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbf{D}^b(X \times Y)$. The *Fourier–Mukai transform* with *kernel* \mathcal{P} is the functor

$$(290) \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{P}} = \Phi_{\mathcal{P}}^{X \rightarrow Y}: \mathbf{D}^b(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}^b(Y)$$

given by

$$(291) \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{E}) := \mathbf{R}q_* (p^*(\mathcal{E}) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{P}).$$

As before, we will not distinguish systematically between a coherent sheaf and a bounded complex of coherent sheaves. But we will be careful when it concerns derived functors: if a functor needs to be derived, we will indicate so. In particular, in the formula defining a Fourier–Mukai transform we do not have to derive the pullback, as p is automatically flat.

It is also important to note that all the functors involved are automatically exact, and more importantly, preserve both boundedness and coherence.

Finally, we will usually omit the superscript $X \rightarrow Y$, unless confusion is possible. The Fourier–Mukai functor in the opposite direction $\Phi_{\mathcal{P}}^{Y \rightarrow X}$ is defined by exchanging the roles of p and q .

Examples We will briefly discuss some examples of Fourier–Mukai transforms. The first is an extremely important one in the study of Hochschild (co)homology.

Example 205 (The identity functor). Let $\mathcal{P} := \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X$, where $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$. Then

$$(292) \quad \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X)} \cong \Phi_{\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X}.$$

This follows from the projection formula,

$$(293) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi_{\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{E}) &\cong \mathbf{R}q_* \left(p^* \mathcal{E} \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X \right) \\ &\cong \mathbf{R}q_* \circ \Delta_* (\mathbf{L}\Delta^* \circ p^* \mathcal{E} \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{O}_X) \\ &\cong \mathbf{R}(q \circ \Delta)_* \circ \mathbf{L}(p \circ \Delta)^*(\mathcal{E}) \\ &\cong \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

The next three types of examples are (amongst other reasons) important in the study of auto-equivalences of a derived category,

Example 206 (Shift). Let $\mathcal{P} := \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X[i]$. Then

$$(294) \quad [i] \cong \Phi_{\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X[i]},$$

as in the previous example.

Example 207 (Twist by a line bundle). Let $\mathcal{P} := \Delta_* \mathcal{L}$, where \mathcal{L} is a line bundle on X . Then

$$(295) \quad - \otimes \mathcal{L} \cong \Phi_{\Delta_* \mathcal{L}},$$

as in the first example.

The example of interest in the study of Hochschild (co)homology is the combination of twist by the canonical line bundle ω_X and the shift by $[\dim X]$. In that case we have that

$$(296) \quad \mathbb{S} \cong \Phi_{\Delta_* \omega_X[\dim X]}.$$

Example 208 (Direct and inverse image). Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism. Then we have a closed subvariety $\Gamma_f \subseteq X \times Y$, the *graph of f* . Its structure sheaf is direct image of \mathcal{O}_X under the morphism $\mathrm{id}_X \times f$. Again using the projection formula one can show that

$$(297) \quad \mathbf{R}f_* \cong \Phi_{\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_f}}.$$

If we reverse the role of the projections p and q , then

$$(298) \quad \mathbf{L}f^* \cong \Phi_{\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_f}}^{Y \rightarrow X}.$$

Of course, one can use any object $\mathbf{D}^b(X \times Y)$ and use it as the kernel for a Fourier–Mukai transform. But usually there aren't many interesting well-understood objects available to do this. One interesting case is that of a fine moduli space. This type of examples is important, and historically these were the motivation to study Fourier–Mukai transforms for abelian varieties, and K3 surfaces, and why they are named after Mukai [45, 46]

Example 209 (Universal objects). Let M be a fine moduli space of sheaves on X , as studied in [25]. In such a setting there exists a universal object $\mathcal{U} \in \mathrm{coh} X \times M$, and we can consider the associated Fourier–Mukai transform $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}}$. Important examples of this are the following.

1. A an abelian variety, and A^\vee the dual abelian variety¹ parametrising line bundles of degree 0. Then we have the *universal Poincaré line bundle* \mathcal{P} , whose associated Fourier–Mukai functor gives rise to an equivalence $\mathbf{D}^b(A) \cong \mathbf{D}^b(A^\vee)$, see [45];
2. S a K3 surface, and M a moduli space of stable sheaves on S which is assumed to be smooth projective of dimension 2, then the Fourier–Mukai functor sets up an equivalence $\mathbf{D}^b(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}^b(M)$, even if M and S are not necessarily isomorphic;
3. S a smooth projective surface, and $\text{Hilb}^n S$ the Hilbert scheme of n points. Then we have the *universal ideal sheaf*, whose associated Fourier–Mukai functor is fully faithful provided that \mathcal{O}_S is exceptional [36], i.e. $H^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S) = H^2(S, \mathcal{O}_S) = 0$.
4. C a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$, and $M_C(r, \mathcal{L})$ the moduli space of rank r vector bundles with determinant \mathcal{L} of coprime degree. Then we have the *universal Poincaré vector bundle* \mathcal{W} , whose associated Fourier–Mukai functor is fully faithful [47, 13, 5] (modulo some technical assumptions).

9.3 Basic properties of Fourier–Mukai functors

We will now prove some basic results about Fourier–Mukai transforms. These will explain how it is useful to know that an exact functor is of Fourier–Mukai type.

Grothendieck duality One technical result we will need is that of Grothendieck duality, which is a generalisation of Serre duality. Luckily we only need a very small aspect of this vast machinery, as we have restricted ourselves to the nice setting where all morphisms are necessarily proper.

If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism, then we have a triple of adjoints

$$(299) \quad \mathbf{L}f^* \dashv \mathbf{R}f_* \dashv f^!$$

where $f^!$ is pronounced *f upper shriek*. More correctly, the right adjoint to $\mathbf{R}f_*$ is denoted f^\times , whilst $f^!$ is a functor with a specific description in different cases, but when f is proper (as it always is in our setting) then $f^\times \cong f^!$.

Actually, we don't just have a triple: it turns out that $\mathbf{L}f^*$ itself has a left adjoint, and $f^!$ has a right adjoint, and then those themselves have a left adjoint and a right adjoint. In our setting this will become clear after we have discussed the adjoints of a Fourier–Mukai transform, in a more general setting one can consult [3].

The main fact we need about the right adjoint $f^!$ is that in this particular setting it can be described as

$$(300) \quad f^! \cong \mathbf{L}f^*(-) \otimes \omega_f[\dim f]$$

where

$$(301) \quad \omega_f := \omega_X \otimes f^*(\omega_Y)^\vee$$

and $\dim f := \dim X - \dim Y$.

¹In general we have that A and A^\vee are not isomorphic.

Example 210 (Serre duality). To recover Serre duality from Grothendieck duality, we consider the morphism $f: X \rightarrow \text{Spec } k$. Then $\mathbf{R}\Gamma \cong \mathbf{R}f_*$, so we obtain for a coherent sheaf \mathcal{E}

$$(302) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X)}(\mathcal{E}[n-i], f^!(\mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec } k})) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(\text{Spec } k)}(\mathbf{R}f_*\mathcal{E}[n-i], \mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec } k}) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ \text{Ext}_X^i(\mathcal{E}, \omega_X) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & H^{n-i}(X, \mathcal{F})^\vee \end{array}$$

as $f^!(\mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec } k}) \cong \omega_X[n]$.

Remark 211. There is a strong relationship between Grothendieck duality and Hochschild (co)homology, which was first expressed by Lipman in [38]. But much more recently Neeman has written the following [48, page 43] concerning this relationship.

The computations will involve Hochschild homology and cohomology—terms like $S \otimes_{S^e} \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_R(S, S \otimes_R N)$ are bound to appear. Fortunately the world is full of experts in Hochschild homology and cohomology², and once they take an interest they will undoubtedly be able to move these computations much further than the handful of us, the few people who have been working on Grothendieck duality. Let's face it: in our tiny group none is adept at handling the Hochschild machinery. The Hochschild experts should feel invited to move right in.

Adjoints Important in the study of Fourier–Mukai transforms is that the left and right adjoints of a Fourier–Mukai transform are again Fourier–Mukai, i.e. the left and right adjoints which exist by Bondal–Van den Bergh can be described using a Fourier–Mukai kernel.

Proposition 212. Let $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbf{D}^b(X \times Y)$. Define

$$(303) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_L &:= \mathcal{P}^\vee \otimes q^* \omega_Y[\dim Y], \\ \mathcal{P}_R &:= \mathcal{P}^\vee \otimes p^* \omega_X[\dim X]. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(304) \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{P}_L} \dashv \Phi_{\mathcal{P}} \dashv \Phi_{\mathcal{P}_R}.$$

Proof. We prove that \mathcal{P}_L is the kernel for the left adjoint of the Fourier–Mukai transform $\Phi_{\mathcal{P}}$, the proof for the right adjoint is dual. Observe that we mean $\Phi_{\mathcal{P}_L} = \Phi_{\mathcal{P}_L}^{Y \rightarrow X}$ here.

Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathbf{D}^b(X)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{D}^b(Y)$. Then

$$(305) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_X(\Phi_{\mathcal{P}_L}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})) &\cong \text{Hom}_X(\mathbf{R}p_*(\mathcal{P}_L \otimes^L q^*\mathcal{F}), \mathcal{E}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{X \times Y}(\mathcal{P}_L \otimes q^*\mathcal{F}, p^*\mathcal{E}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{X \times Y}(\mathcal{P}^\vee \otimes q^*\omega_Y[\dim Y] \otimes^L q^*\mathcal{F}, p^*\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_{X \times Y} \otimes p^*\omega_X^\vee[\dim Y]) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{X \times Y}(\mathcal{P}^\vee \otimes^L q^*\mathcal{F}, p^*\mathcal{E}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{X \times Y}(q^*\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P} \otimes^L p^*\mathcal{E}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{F}, \mathbf{R}q_*(p^*\mathcal{E} \otimes^L \mathcal{P})) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{F}, \Phi_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{E})) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\omega_{X \times Y} \cong p^*\omega_X \otimes q^*\omega_Y$ in the description of $p^!$. So $\Phi_{\mathcal{P}_L}$ is indeed the left adjoint of $\Phi_{\mathcal{P}}$. \square

²I presume he is addressing the readers of these notes. Although the author of these notes has to admit that the topics discussed here do not necessarily prepare you very well for the task he is describing.

Composition One can also prove that the composition of Fourier–Mukai functors is again Fourier–Mukai. We will not prove this result, as the proof is elementary (no need for Grothendieck duality for instance), but requires much more notation.

Proposition 213. Let $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbf{D}^b(X \times Y)$ and $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathbf{D}^b(Y \times Z)$. If we denote

$$(306) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & X \times Y \times Z & & \\ & \swarrow p_{1,2} & \downarrow p_{1,3} & \searrow p_{2,3} & \\ X \times Y & & X \times Z & & Y \times Z \end{array}$$

and define

$$(307) \quad \mathcal{R} := \mathbf{R}p_{1,3,*} \left(p_{1,2}^* \mathcal{P} \otimes^L p_{2,3}^* \mathcal{Q} \right)$$

then

$$(308) \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}^{X \rightarrow Z} \cong \Phi_{\mathcal{Q}} \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

Remark 214. In particular we see that $f^!$ is again a Fourier–Mukai functor, as it is the composition of $\mathbf{L}f^*$ and $-\otimes \omega_f[\dim f]$. Hence we can extend the sequence $\mathbf{L}f^* \dashv \mathbf{R}f_* \dashv f^!$ indefinitely to the left and right.

Which functors are Fourier–Mukai? An important question is the one raised in the title of this paragraph. We now know that Fourier–Mukai functors can be used to describe exact functors between $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$ and $\mathbf{D}^b(Y)$, and that such a description has extremely useful applications when it comes to understanding the composition or adjoints of such functors. We have also described some obvious Fourier–Mukai functors, but how general are they? The main result in this direction is the following.

Theorem 215 (Orlov). Let $F: \mathbf{D}^b(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}^b(Y)$ be a *fully faithful* exact functor. Then there exists an object $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Obj}(\mathbf{D}^b(X \times Y))$ which is unique up to isomorphism, such that $F \cong \Phi_{\mathcal{P}}$.

Of course, many of the Fourier–Mukai functors we have described earlier are not fully faithful.

Remark 216. In particular, equivalences are always given as a Fourier–Mukai functor. Observe that the same question for (finite-dimensional) algebras was studied earlier by Rickard [52], but in that setting it is still unknown whether every derived equivalence is given by tensoring with a bimodule (which we used when discussing Morita equivalences in the abelian setting). Rickard shows that if there is a derived equivalence, there is a possibly different derived equivalence of Morita type.

The following result was an important and recent breakthrough in the study of Fourier–Mukai transforms. It says that not every exact functor from $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$ to $\mathbf{D}^b(Y)$ is of Fourier–Mukai type [54].

Theorem 217 (Rizzardo–Van den Bergh). There exist exact functors which are not of Fourier–Mukai type.

In particular, they gave an example in the following setting.

Example 218. Let X be a smooth quadric hypersurface in $Y = \mathbb{P}^4$. Then there exists an exact functor between $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$ and $\mathbf{D}^b(Y)$ which is not of Fourier–Mukai type.

The construction is complicated, and involves Hochschild cohomology and deformation theory in an essential way: the goal is to take the inclusion morphism $i: X \hookrightarrow Y$ and modify the associated Fourier–Mukai functor using a deformation of the derived category of X to a functor which can be shown not to be of Fourier–Mukai type. Unfortunately a discussion of this is out of scope.

All of these issues disappear when using dg enhancements, by an important result of Toën [62, theorem 8.15].

Theorem 219 (Toën). There exists an isomorphism

$$(309) \quad \mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(\mathbf{D}_{\text{dg}}^b(X), \mathbf{D}_{\text{dg}}^b(Y)) \cong \mathbf{D}_{\text{dg}}^b(X \times Y)$$

in the category of dg categories localised at quasi-equivalences, where $\mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om$ denotes the internal Hom in this category.

So every dg functor is of Fourier–Mukai type, and the example of Rizzard–Van den Bergh cannot be described using a dg functor.

When studying Hochschild (co)homology of varieties, there are two possibilities:

1. use Fourier–Mukai transforms;
2. work with dg enhancements throughout.

Both have their merits and downsides. We will take the approach using Fourier–Mukai transforms.

10 Hochschild (co)homology for varieties

There is no unique road to Hochschild (co)homology of schemes. Each has its benefits and peculiarities. In these notes we focus on the definition using derived categories, in the spirit of Fourier–Mukai transforms. Eventually these notes should be extended with a somewhat detailed discussion of the alternative definitions and their comparisons.

10.1 Using Fourier–Mukai transforms

Using derived categories we will two different definitions of the Hochschild (co)homology of X . One is directly on the level of cohomology, the other gives an intermediate object living in $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$. As we will show in proposition 223 the hypercohomology of the latter gives the former.

The first definition we discuss is the one found in [37], although at least for Hochschild cohomology it goes back to Kontsevich [35, page 131].

Definition 220 (Kuznetsov). We define the *Hochschild (co)homology* of X as

$$(310) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{HH}^i(X) &:= \mathrm{Ext}_{X \times X}^i(\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X, \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X), \\ \mathrm{HH}_i(X) &:= \mathrm{Ext}_{X \times X}^{\dim X + i}(\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X, \Delta_* \omega_X). \end{aligned}$$

The definition for Hochschild cohomology is clear, we are considering the self-extensions of the identity functor. But the definition for Hochschild homology might seem strange at first sight³: there is no reference to Tor of the identity functor, and the grading shift might look a bit confusing. We will come back to these issues when we compare this definition to the second definition.

As before we can equip Hochschild cohomology with a graded algebra structure using Yoneda Ext's, and the action on Hochschild homology follows immediately.

Observe that we also have the following proposition.

Proposition 221. Let X be smooth projective. Then $\mathrm{HH}^i(X) = 0$ for $i \notin [0, 2 \dim X]$ and $\mathrm{HH}_i(X) = 0$ for $i \notin [-\dim X, \dim X]$. Moreover,

$$(311) \quad \dim_k \left(\bigoplus_{i=0}^{2 \dim X} \mathrm{HH}^i(X) \right) < +\infty \quad \dim_k \left(\bigoplus_{i=-\dim X}^{\dim X} \mathrm{HH}_i(X) \right) < +\infty.$$

The finite-dimensionality is in fact true for the Hochschild cohomology of an arbitrary smooth and proper dg category⁴. But it is possible that the Hochschild cohomology of a smooth and proper dg category is non-zero in negative degrees, an example can be found in exercise 180.

It is clear that the definition of Hochschild cohomology is a closely related to that of an algebra or a dg category, as we considering extensions of the identity functor. This is not just a convenient analogy, as it can be shown that the (dg) category $\mathbf{D}^b(X \times Y)$ of kernels for Fourier–Mukai functors is equivalent to the (dg) category of dg functors from $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$ to $\mathbf{D}^b(Y)$, as explained in theorem 219.

The second definition we discuss is the one found in [43], due to Markarian. In this case the relation to theorem 15 is much more obvious.

³And it is.

⁴But not having defined those notions, nor Hochschild homology for dg categories, we leave this as an exercise for the interested reader, willing to look up things themselves.

Definition 222 (Markarian). We define the *Hochschild (co)chain complex* of X as

$$(312) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} &:= \mathbf{R}p_* (\mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om_{X \times X}(\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X, \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X)), \\ \mathcal{F} &:= \mathbf{R}p_* (\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X \otimes^L \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X). \end{aligned}$$

These are objects in $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$. The careful reader could find this remarkable, as the Hochschild (co)chain complex of an algebra was defined to be an object in $\text{Ch}(k)$. But for a *commutative* algebra we showed that $\text{HH}^0(A) \cong A$, and that everything is a module over $\text{HH}^0(A)$. So this is the suitable generalisation of this, where the Hochschild (co)chain complex is an object in $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$.

We will use this definition in section 11 to prove the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition. For now, let us prove that we recover the cohomological definition (up to Serre duality⁵).

Proposition 223. We have that

1. $\text{HH}^i(X) \cong H^i(\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{U}))$;
2. $\text{HH}_i(X) \cong H^{-i}(\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}))^\vee$.

The reason for the change in indexing is that Hochschild homology has homological grading, but we've defined \mathcal{U} with cohomological grading.

Proof. The proof for Hochschild cohomology is immediate from standard properties of derived functors.

The proof for Hochschild homology uses the isomorphism

$$(313) \quad \Delta_* \circ \mathbf{L}\Delta^* \circ \Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X) \cong \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X \otimes^L \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X$$

which follows from the projection formula. We have that

$$(314) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Ext}_{X \times X}^{\dim X + i}(\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X, \Delta_* \omega_X) &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X \times X)}(\Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X, \Delta_* \omega_X[\dim X + i]) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X)}(\mathbf{L}\Delta^* \circ \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X[-i], \omega_X[\dim X]) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X)}(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathbf{L}\Delta^* \circ \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X[-i])^\vee \\ &\cong H^{-i}(\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}))^\vee \end{aligned}$$

by Serre duality, where the last equality uses the standard fact that $\mathcal{O}_X \cong \mathbf{L}\Delta^* \mathcal{O}_{X \times X}$. □

Remark 224. In [8, 7] Hochschild homology is defined as

$$(315) \quad \text{HH}_i(X) := \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X \times X)}(\Delta_! \mathcal{O}_X[i], \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X).$$

The functor $\Delta_!$ is the left adjoint of $\mathbf{L}\Delta^*$, so we have an expression for it thanks to proposition 212. Hence we have an isomorphism

$$(316) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X \times X)}(\Delta_! \mathcal{O}_X[i], \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X) &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(X)}(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathbf{L}\Delta^* \circ \Delta_* \mathcal{O}_X[-i]) \\ &\cong H^{-i}(\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F})) \end{aligned}$$

using (313).

⁵Let me know if I made a silly mistake here. At least for now we won't be dependent on whether the isomorphism is as stated.

10.2 Limited functoriality for Hochschild cohomology

10.3 Sheafification

For now one is referred to [66, 58].

10.4 Gerstenhaber–Schack

For now one is referred to [15]. Observe that they only study Hochschild cohomology.

10.5 Comparisons

The interested reader can find various comparisons in the cited references.

11 The Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition

The goal of this section is to generalise the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg isomorphism from theorem 98 to a non-affine setting, and in particular discuss it for smooth and projective varieties. When X is no longer affine, the isomorphism becomes a decomposition.

11.1 Harmonic structure: polyvector fields and differential forms

11.2 Atiyah classes

11.3 Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition

11.4 Examples and further remarks

Hodge diamonds and polyvector parallelograms In class we discussed how the dimensions of the components in the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition for $\mathrm{HH}_\bullet(X)$ (resp. $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(X)$) can be organised into the *Hodge diamond* (resp. *polyvector parallelogram*). The first is a well-known object, whereas the latter is terminology the author of these notes made up for the sake of this course.

For lack of time⁶ I won't reproduce the pictures I made. Just remember that we discussed how derived categories and these numerical data can be used for

1. homological mirror symmetry;
2. semi-orthogonal decompositions;
3. deformation correspondences.

Below I give some remarks that fit nicely within the discussion in class, but which were not given in class.

Interpretation of $\mathrm{HH}^1(X)$ The components in the decomposition of $\mathrm{HH}^1(X)$ are the tangent spaces to the identity component of the automorphism group of X (resp. the degree zero component of the Picard scheme of X). As Hochschild cohomology is a derived invariant, any derived equivalence identifies the direct sum of these tangent spaces, (but there might be some interchanging happening, see also example 226). Moreover Rouquier has shown [55, théorème 4.18] that not only the tangent spaces can be identified: the semidirect product of the identity components is actually a derived invariant, which is much stronger.

Theorem 225 (Rouquier). An equivalence $\Phi: \mathrm{D}^b(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{D}^b(Y)$ induces an isomorphism of algebraic groups

$$(317) \quad \mathrm{Aut}^0(X) \times \mathrm{Pic}^0(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}^0(Y) \times \mathrm{Pic}^0(Y).$$

Example 226. In the case of abelian varieties A and B the statement of Rouquier's theorem reduces to that of Orlov's theorem for derived equivalent varieties [50, p. 2.19], namely that if A and B are derived equivalent abelian varieties, then $A \times \widehat{A} \cong B \times \widehat{B}$. In this case the derived equivalence exchanges the components $\mathrm{H}^0(A, \mathcal{T}_A)$ (resp. $\mathrm{H}^1(A, \mathcal{O}_A)$) and $\mathrm{H}^1(B, \mathcal{O}_B)$ (resp. $\mathrm{H}^0(B, \mathcal{T}_B)$).

⁶And a desire to make the pictures in print look as nice as they did on the blackboard.

In [51, corollary B] it is moreover shown that not just $\dim_k \mathrm{HH}^1(X)$ is a derived invariant, but so are the dimensions $h^0(X, T_X)$ and $h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ of its Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg components. In the next paragraph we come back to this statement for Hochschild homology.

Remark 227. One should at this point mention that determining the auto-equivalence group of $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$ is an interesting topic, and that Rouquier’s isomorphism tells us how standard auto-equivalences fit into this picture, but as we haven’t formally introduced these, we will just remark that the interested reader is invited to piece together a coherent story.

Derived invariance of Hodge numbers If $\mathbf{D}^b(X) \cong \mathbf{D}^b(Y)$ we have that $\mathrm{HH}_i(X) \cong \mathrm{HH}_i(Y)$. In particular we get that

$$(318) \quad \sum_{q-p=i} h^{p,q}(X) = \sum_{q-p=i} h^{p,q}(Y).$$

But Kontsevich has conjectured that a derived equivalence actually implies equality of Hodge numbers, not just the sums of the columns in the Hodge diamond. When $\dim X = 1$ this is trivial, when $\dim X = 2$ this is an easy exercise, see exercise 228. When $\dim X = 3$ this is the main result of [51].

In general, it is not even known whether $h^{0,i}$ is a derived invariant. These cohomology groups also appear in the Hochschild–Kostant–Rosenberg decomposition for $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(X)$, and the cohomology of \mathcal{O}_X forms a subalgebra of $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(X)$ called the *homological units* of X . It is conjectured that this subalgebra is a derived invariant [1].

11.5 Exercises

Exercise 228. Show that if $\dim X = 2$ that $\mathbf{D}^b(X) \cong \mathbf{D}^b(Y)$ implies that $h^{p,q}(X) = h^{p,q}(Y)$. One has to use that $\dim X = \dim Y$, by [24, proposition 4.1].

12 Riemann–Roch versus Hochschild homology

13 Căldăraru's conjecture

Appendix A

Preliminaries

1 Differential graded (Lie) algebras

Definition 229. A *differential graded algebra* A^\bullet is a graded algebra A^\bullet together with the structure of a cochain complex $d: A^\bullet \rightarrow A^{\bullet+1}$ satisfying the *graded Leibniz rule*, i.e. for all homogeneous $a, b \in A^\bullet$

$$(319) \quad d(ab) = d(a)b + (-1)^{|a|}a d(b).$$

We will abbreviate differential graded algebra to *dg algebra*.

Observe that the graded Leibniz rule implies the following.

Proposition 230. Let A^\bullet be a dg algebra. Then $H^\bullet(A^\bullet)$ is a graded algebra.

Definition 231. A *differential graded Lie algebra* L^\bullet is a graded Lie algebra together with the structure of a cochain complex $d: L^\bullet \rightarrow L^{\bullet+1}$ satisfying the *graded Leibniz rule*, i.e. for all homogeneous $l, m \in L^\bullet$

$$(320) \quad d([l, m]) = [d(l), m] + (-1)^{|l|}[l, d(m)].$$

We will abbreviate differential graded Lie algebra to *dg Lie algebra*, or even *dgla*.

Remark 232. For graded algebras the axioms do not pick up any signs. For graded Lie algebras there are non-trivial signs involved in the axioms: for all homogeneous $l, m \in L^\bullet$ the graded skew-symmetry is

$$(321) \quad [l, m] = (-1)^{|l||m|}[m, l]$$

whilst the graded Jacobi identity is

$$(322) \quad [l, [m, n]] = [[l, m], n] + (-1)^{|l||m|}[m, [l, n]].$$

Observe that the graded Leibniz rule implies the following.

Proposition 233. Let L^\bullet be a dg Lie algebra. Then $H^\bullet(L^\bullet)$ is a graded Lie algebra.

1.1 Exercises

Exercise 234. Let L^\bullet be a dg Lie algebra, and R a (not necessarily unital) commutative k -algebra. Then $L^\bullet \otimes_k R$ is again a dg Lie algebra, when equipped with the natural structure

1. $(L^\bullet \otimes_k R)^i = L^i \otimes_k R$;
2. $d_{L^\bullet \otimes_k R} = d_{L^\bullet} \otimes_k \text{id}_R$;
3. $[l_1 \otimes r_1, l_2 \otimes r_2] = [l_1, l_2] \otimes r_1 r_2$.

This works similarly for $-\widehat{\otimes}_k-$.

2 Completion and topologies

The Artin–Rees lemma can be used to show the following.

Lemma 235. Let V be a finite-dimensional vector space. Then

$$(323) \quad R\widehat{\otimes}_k V \cong R \otimes_k V$$

as R -modules.

We have the following universal property.

Proposition 236. Let U, V be vector spaces. Let R be a complete augmented k -algebra. There exists an isomorphism

$$(324) \quad \text{Hom}_k(U, R\widehat{\otimes}_k V) \cong \text{Hom}_R^{\text{cont}}(R\widehat{\otimes}_k U, R\widehat{\otimes}_k V).$$

The multiplication on $R\widehat{\otimes}_k A$ is continuous and R -bilinear. This means it is given as a morphism

$$(325) \quad (R\widehat{\otimes}_k A)\widehat{\otimes}_R(R\widehat{\otimes}_k A) \rightarrow R\widehat{\otimes}_k A$$

where $-\widehat{\otimes}_R-$ denotes the completed tensor product of complete R -modules (see [60, tag 0AMU]).

One of the properties of the completed tensor product that we will need is the following.

Lemma 237. Let U, V be vector spaces. Let R be a complete augmented k -algebra. Then

$$(326) \quad (R\widehat{\otimes}_k U)\widehat{\otimes}_R(R\widehat{\otimes}_k V) \cong R\widehat{\otimes}_k(U \otimes_k V).$$

Proposition 238. Let R be a complete augmented k -algebra. Let $(R\widehat{\otimes}_k A, \mu)$ be a formal deformation of A over R . Then the multiplication is determined completely by its values on

$$(327) \quad A \otimes_k A \subseteq R\widehat{\otimes}_k(A \otimes_k A) \cong R\widehat{\otimes}_k(A \otimes_k A).$$

This explains why the Cauchy product appeared in (165).

2.1 Exercises

Exercise 239. Is $k[[x]] \otimes_k k[[y]] \cong k[[x, y]]$? Is $k[[x]]\widehat{\otimes}_k k[[y]] \cong k[[x, y]]$?

Using this, explain why continuity of a multiplication $- * -$ on $A[[t]]$ does not follow automatically from bilinearity, except when A is finite-dimensional.

3 Chevalley–Eilenberg cohomology

Bibliography

- [1] Roland Abuaf. “Homological units”. In: *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 22 (2017), pp. 6943–6960. ISSN: 1073-7928. DOI: 10.1093/imrn/rnw170. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rnw170>.
- [2] Luchezar L. Avramov and Micheline Vigué-Poirrier. “Hochschild homology criteria for smoothness”. In: *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 1 (1992), pp. 17–25. ISSN: 1073-7928. DOI: 10.1155/S1073792892000035. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1155/S1073792892000035>.
- [3] Paul Balmer, Ivo Dell’Ambrogio, and Beren Sanders. “Grothendieck-Neeman duality and the Wirthmüller isomorphism”. In: *Compos. Math.* 152.8 (2016), pp. 1740–1776. ISSN: 0010-437X. DOI: 10.1112/S0010437X16007375. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X16007375>.
- [4] Gwyn Bellamy, Daniel Rogalski, Travis Schedler, J. Toby Stafford, and Michael Wemyss. *Non-commutative algebraic geometry*. Vol. 64. Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications. Lecture notes based on courses given at the Summer Graduate School at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute (MSRI) held in Berkeley, CA, June 2012. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016, pp. x+356. ISBN: 978-1-107-57003-0; 978-1-107-12954-2.
- [5] Pieter Belmans and Swarnava Mukhopadhyay. “Admissible subcategories in derived categories of moduli of vector bundles on curves”. In: (June 2018). arXiv: 1807.00216v1 [math.AG]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.00216v1>.
- [6] A. I. Bondal and M. M. Kapranov. “Representable functors, Serre functors, and reconstructions”. In: *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* 53.6 (1989), pp. 1183–1205, 1337. ISSN: 0373-2436. DOI: 10.1070/IM1990v035n03ABEH000716. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1070/IM1990v035n03ABEH000716>.
- [7] Andrei Căldăraru. “The Mukai pairing. II. The Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg isomorphism”. In: *Adv. Math.* 194.1 (2005), pp. 34–66. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2004.05.012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2004.05.012>.
- [8] Andrei Căldăraru and Simon Willerton. “The Mukai pairing. I. A categorical approach”. In: *New York J. Math.* 16 (2010), pp. 61–98. ISSN: 1076-9803. URL: http://nyjm.albany.edu:8000/j/2010/16_61.html.
- [9] Henri Cartan and Samuel Eilenberg. *Homological algebra*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1956, pp. xv+390.
- [10] Joachim Cuntz, Georges Skandalis, and Boris Tsygan. *Cyclic homology in non-commutative geometry*. Vol. 121. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences. Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, II. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004, pp. xiv+137. ISBN: 3-540-40469-4. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-06444-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-06444-3>.
- [11] Vladimir Drinfeld. “DG quotients of DG categories”. In: *J. Algebra* 272.2 (2004), pp. 643–691. ISSN: 0021-8693. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2003.05.001. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2003.05.001>.

- [12] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*. Vol. 150. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. With a view toward algebraic geometry. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, pp. xvi+785. ISBN: 0-387-94268-8; 0-387-94269-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4612-5350-1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5350-1>.
- [13] Anton Fonarev and Alexander Kuznetsov. “Derived categories of curves as components of Fano manifolds”. In: *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 97.1 (2018), pp. 24–46. ISSN: 0024-6107. DOI: 10.1112/jlms.12094. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms.12094>.
- [14] Murray Gerstenhaber. “The cohomology structure of an associative ring”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 78 (1963), pp. 267–288. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1970343. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1970343>.
- [15] Murray Gerstenhaber and Samuel D. Schack. “Algebraic cohomology and deformation theory”. In: *Deformation theory of algebras and structures and applications (Il Ciocco, 1986)*. Vol. 247. NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1988, pp. 11–264. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-009-3057-5_2. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-3057-5_2.
- [16] Murray Gerstenhaber and Alexander A. Voronov. “Homotopy G -algebras and moduli space operad”. In: *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 3 (1995), pp. 141–153. ISSN: 1073-7928. DOI: 10.1155/S1073792895000110. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1155/S1073792895000110>.
- [17] Ezra Getzler and J. D. S. Jones. “Operads, homotopy algebra and iterated integrals for double loop spaces”. In: (Mar. 1994). arXiv: hep-th/9403055v1 [hep-th]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9403055v1>.
- [18] Victor Ginzburg. *Lectures on Noncommutative Geometry*. 2005. arXiv: math/0506603 [math.AG].
- [19] Dieter Happel. “Hochschild cohomology of finite-dimensional algebras”. In: *Séminaire d’Algèbre Paul Dubreil et Marie-Paul Malliavin, 39ème Année (Paris, 1987/1988)*. Vol. 1404. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 108–126. DOI: 10.1007/BFb0084073. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0084073>.
- [20] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977, pp. xvi+496. ISBN: 0-387-90244-9.
- [21] Robin Hartshorne. *Residues and duality*. Lecture notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck, given at Harvard 1963/64. With an appendix by P. Deligne. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 20. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1966, pp. vii+423.
- [22] Vladimir Hinich. “Homological algebra of homotopy algebras”. In: *Comm. Algebra* 25.10 (1997), pp. 3291–3323. ISSN: 0092-7872. DOI: 10.1080/00927879708826055. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927879708826055>.
- [23] G. Hochschild, Bertram Kostant, and Alex Rosenberg. “Differential forms on regular affine algebras”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 102 (1962), pp. 383–408. ISSN: 0002-9947. DOI: 10.2307/1993614. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1993614>.
- [24] D. Huybrechts. *Fourier-Mukai transforms in algebraic geometry*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006, pp. viii+307. ISBN: 978-0-19-929686-6; 0-19-929686-3. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199296866.001.0001. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199296866.001.0001>.
- [25] Daniel Huybrechts and Manfred Lehn. *The geometry of moduli spaces of sheaves*. Aspects of Mathematics, E31. Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1997, pp. xiv+269. ISBN: 3-528-06907-4. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-663-11624-0. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-11624-0>.
- [26] Peter Jørgensen. “A new recollement for schemes”. In: *Houston J. Math.* 35.4 (2009), pp. 1071–1077. ISSN: 0362-1588.

- [27] Dmitri Kaledin. *Homological methods in non-commutative geometry*. 2008. URL: <http://imperium.lenin.ru/~kaledin/tokyo/>.
- [28] Dmitri Kaledin. *Non-commutative geometry from the homological point of view*. 2009. URL: <http://imperium.lenin.ru/~kaledin/seoul/>.
- [29] Masaki Kashiwara and Pierre Schapira. *Categories and sheaves*. Vol. 332. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006, pp. x+497. ISBN: 978-3-540-27949-5; 3-540-27949-0. DOI: 10.1007/3-540-27950-4. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-27950-4>.
- [30] Bernhard Keller. *Derived invariance of higher structures on the Hochschild complex*. URL: <https://webusers.imj-prg.fr/~bernhard.keller/publ/dih.pdf>.
- [31] Bernhard Keller. “Deriving DG categories”. In: *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* 27.1 (1994), pp. 63–102. ISSN: 0012-9593. URL: http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1994_4_27_1_63_0.
- [32] Bernhard Keller. “Hochschild cohomology and derived Picard groups”. In: *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 190.1-3 (2004), pp. 177–196. ISSN: 0022-4049. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpaa.2003.10.030. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpaa.2003.10.030>.
- [33] Bernhard Keller. “On differential graded categories”. In: *International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II*. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006, pp. 151–190.
- [34] Bernhard Keller. “On the cyclic homology of exact categories”. In: *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 136.1 (1999), pp. 1–56. ISSN: 0022-4049. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-4049(97)00152-7. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4049\(97\)00152-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4049(97)00152-7).
- [35] Maxim Kontsevich. “Homological algebra of mirror symmetry”. In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Zürich, 1994)*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995, pp. 120–139.
- [36] Andreas Krug and Pawel Sosna. “On the derived category of the Hilbert scheme of points on an Enriques surface”. In: *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 21.4 (2015), pp. 1339–1360. ISSN: 1022-1824. DOI: 10.1007/s00029-015-0178-x. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-015-0178-x>.
- [37] Alexander Kuznetsov. “Hochschild homology and semiorthogonal decompositions”. In: (Apr. 2009). arXiv: 0904.4330v1 [math.AG]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0904.4330v1>.
- [38] Joseph Lipman. *Residues and traces of differential forms via Hochschild homology*. Vol. 61. Contemporary Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1987, pp. viii+95. ISBN: 0-8218-5070-9. DOI: 10.1090/conm/061/05. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/conm/061/05>.
- [39] Jean-Louis Loday. *Cyclic homology*. Vol. 301. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Appendix E by María O. Ronco. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992, pp. xviii+454. ISBN: 3-540-53339-7. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-21739-9. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-21739-9>.
- [40] Jean-Louis Loday. *Cyclic homology*. Second. Vol. 301. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Appendix E by María O. Ronco, Chapter 13 by the author in collaboration with Teimuraz Pirashvili. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998, pp. xx+513. ISBN: 3-540-63074-0. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-11389-9. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-11389-9>.
- [41] Jean-Louis Loday and Bruno Vallette. *Algebraic operads*. Vol. 346. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012, pp. xxiv+634. ISBN: 978-3-642-30361-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-30362-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30362-3>.

- [42] Wendy Lowen and Michel Van den Bergh. “Hochschild cohomology of abelian categories and ringed spaces”. In: *Adv. Math.* 198.1 (2005), pp. 172–221. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2004.11.010. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2004.11.010>.
- [43] Nikita Markarian. “The Atiyah class, Hochschild cohomology and the Riemann-Roch theorem”. In: *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 79.1 (2009), pp. 129–143. ISSN: 0024-6107. DOI: 10.1112/jlms/jdn064. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/jdn064>.
- [44] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative ring theory*. Second. Vol. 8. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989, pp. xiv+320. ISBN: 0-521-36764-6.
- [45] Shigeru Mukai. “Duality between $D(X)$ and $D(\hat{X})$ with its application to Picard sheaves”. In: *Nagoya Math. J.* 81 (1981), pp. 153–175. ISSN: 0027-7630. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.nmj/1118786312>.
- [46] Shigeru Mukai. “Symplectic structure of the moduli space of sheaves on an abelian or $K3$ surface”. In: *Invent. Math.* 77.1 (1984), pp. 101–116. ISSN: 0020-9910. DOI: 10.1007/BF01389137. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01389137>.
- [47] M. S. Narasimhan. “Derived categories of moduli spaces of vector bundles on curves”. In: *J. Geom. Phys.* 122 (2017), pp. 53–58. ISSN: 0393-0440. DOI: 10.1016/j.geomphys.2017.01.018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2017.01.018>.
- [48] Amnon Neeman. “Grothendieck duality made simple”. In: (June 2018). arXiv: 1806.03293v1 [math.AG]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1806.03293v1>.
- [49] Amnon Neeman. *Triangulated categories*. Vol. 148. Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001, pp. viii+449. ISBN: 0-691-08685-0; 0-691-08686-9. DOI: 10.1515/9781400837212. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400837212>.
- [50] D. O. Orlov. “Derived categories of coherent sheaves on abelian varieties and equivalences between them”. In: *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.* 66.3 (2002), pp. 131–158. ISSN: 1607-0046. DOI: 10.1070/IM2002v066n03ABEH000389. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1070/IM2002v066n03ABEH000389>.
- [51] Mihnea Popa and Christian Schnell. “Derived invariance of the number of holomorphic 1-forms and vector fields”. In: *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* 44.3 (2011), pp. 527–536. ISSN: 0012-9593. DOI: 10.24033/asens.2149. URL: <https://doi.org/10.24033/asens.2149>.
- [52] Jeremy Rickard. “Derived equivalences as derived functors”. In: *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* 43.1 (1991), pp. 37–48. ISSN: 0024-6107. DOI: 10.1112/jlms/s2-43.1.37. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/s2-43.1.37>.
- [53] Jeremy Rickard. “Morita theory for derived categories”. In: *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* 39.3 (1989), pp. 436–456. ISSN: 0024-6107. DOI: 10.1112/jlms/s2-39.3.436. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/s2-39.3.436>.
- [54] Alice Rizzardo and Michel Van den Bergh. “An example of a non-Fourier-Mukai functor between derived categories of coherent sheaves”. In: (Oct. 2014). arXiv: 1410.4039v2 [math.AG]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.4039v2>.
- [55] Raphaël Rouquier. “Automorphismes, graduations et catégories triangulées”. In: *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* 10.3 (2011), pp. 713–751. ISSN: 1474-7480. DOI: 10.1017/S1474748011000089. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474748011000089>.
- [56] Boris Shoikhet. “Koszul duality in deformation quantization and Tamarkin’s approach to Kontsevich formality”. In: *Adv. Math.* 224.3 (2010), pp. 731–771. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2009.12.010. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2009.12.010>.

- [57] N. Spaltenstein. “Resolutions of unbounded complexes”. In: *Compositio Math.* 65.2 (1988), pp. 121–154. ISSN: 0010-437X. URL: http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1988__65_2_121_0.
- [58] Richard G. Swan. “Hochschild cohomology of quasiprojective schemes”. In: *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 110.1 (1996), pp. 57–80. ISSN: 0022-4049. DOI: 10.1016/0022-4049(95)00091-7. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049\(95\)00091-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049(95)00091-7).
- [59] Gonalo Tabuada. *Noncommutative motives*. Vol. 63. University Lecture Series. With a preface by Yuri I. Manin. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015, pp. x+114. ISBN: 978-1-4704-2397-1. DOI: 10.1090/ulect/063. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/ulect/063>.
- [60] *The Stacks project*. 2018. URL: <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>.
- [61] Bertrand Toën. “Lectures on dg-categories”. In: *Topics in algebraic and topological K-theory*. Vol. 2008. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 2011, pp. 243–302. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-15708-0. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15708-0>.
- [62] Bertrand Toën. “The homotopy theory of dg-categories and derived Morita theory”. In: *Invent. Math.* 167.3 (2007), pp. 615–667. ISSN: 0020-9910. DOI: 10.1007/s00222-006-0025-y. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-006-0025-y>.
- [63] Jean-Louis Verdier. “Des cat egories d eriv ees des cat egories ab eliennes”. In: *Ast erisque* 239 (1996). With a preface by Luc Illusie, Edited and with a note by Georges Maltsiniotis, xii+253 pp. (1997). ISSN: 0303-1179.
- [64] Alexander A. Voronov. “Homotopy Gerstenhaber algebras”. In: *Conf erence Mosh e Flato 1999, Vol. II (Dijon)*. Vol. 22. Math. Phys. Stud. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000, pp. 307–331.
- [65] Charles A. Weibel. *An introduction to homological algebra*. Vol. 38. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994, pp. xiv+450. ISBN: 0-521-43500-5; 0-521-55987-1. DOI: 10.1017/CB09781139644136. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09781139644136>.
- [66] Charles A. Weibel and Susan C. Geller. “ tale descent for Hochschild and cyclic homology”. In: *Comment. Math. Helv.* 66.3 (1991), pp. 368–388. ISSN: 0010-2571. DOI: 10.1007/BF02566656. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02566656>.
- [67] Sarah Witherspoon. *An introduction to Hochschild cohomology*. Version of March 18, 2018. URL: <http://www.math.tamu.edu/~sarah.witherspoon/bib.html>.