

# A Quick Tour of Derived Algebraic Geometry

Xiaolong Liu

May 17, 2024

## Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Commutative Differential Graded Algebras	1
3	Basic Concepts of Infinity Categories	2
3.1	Categories Enriched in Topological Spaces	3
3.2	Model Categories	3
3.3	Simplicial Sets and Simplicial Categories	5
3.4	Kan Complexes and Weak Kan Complexes	5
3.5	Quasicategories	5
3.6	Stable Infinity Categories	5
3.7	Dg-categories and Segal Categories	5
3.8	Stable Infinity Categories	5
4	Derived Schemes and Derived Stacks	5
4.1	Higher Stacks	5
4.2	Derived Schemes and Derived Stacks	5
5	Geometry of Derived Stacks	5
6	Need to add	5
	References	5

## 1 Introduction

We will assume the base ring  $\mathbb{K}$  containing  $\mathbb{Q}$ . We will follow [EP23] and Joyce's slides as in <https://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/~joyce/DAG2022/index.html>.

## 2 Commutative Differential Graded Algebras

**Definition 2.1.** (a) A differential graded  $\mathbb{K}$ -algebra (dga or dg-algebra for short)  $A^\bullet = (A^*, d)$  consists of a chain complex with a unital associative multiplication. Concretely, that is a family of  $\mathbb{K}$ -modules  $\{A^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , an associative  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear multiplication  $(-\cdot-) : A^i \times A^j \rightarrow A^{i+j}$  (for all  $i, j$ ), a unit  $1 \in A^0$  and a differential  $d : A^i \rightarrow A^{i+1}$  (for all  $i$ ) which is  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear, satisfies  $d^2 = 0$  and is a derivation with respect to the multiplication, which means  $d(a \cdot b) = d(a) \cdot b + (-1)^{\deg(a)} a \cdot d(b)$ .

(b) A graded  $\mathbb{K}$ -algebra  $A$  is graded-commutative if  $a \cdot b = (-1)^{\deg(a) \cdot \deg(b)} b \cdot a$ .

(c) A morphism of dg-algebras is a map  $f : A^\bullet \rightarrow B^\bullet$  that respects the differentials (i.e.  $fd_A = d_B f$ ), and the multiplication (i.e.  $f(a \cdot_A b) = f(a) \cdot_B f(b)$ ).

In this note we mainly focus on the following:

**Definition 2.2.** We define the category  $\mathbf{cdg}^- \mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbb{K}}$  of the graded-commutative differential graded  $\mathbb{K}$ -algebras which are concentrated in non-positive degree. Hence  $A^\bullet \in \mathbf{cdg}^- \mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbb{K}}$  we have  $A^\bullet = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{-\infty} A^k$ . Moreover, for  $R^\bullet \in \mathbf{cdg}^- \mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbb{K}}$ , we can define  $\mathbf{cdg}^- \mathbf{Alg}_{R^\bullet} := R^\bullet \downarrow \mathbf{cdg}^- \mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbb{K}}$  of  $\mathbf{cdga}$   $R^\bullet$ -algebras.

**Definition 2.3.** (a) Let  $A^\bullet, B^\bullet \in \mathbf{cdg}^- \mathbf{Alg}_{R^\bullet}$ . A morphism  $f : A^\bullet \rightarrow B^\bullet$  of  $R^\bullet$ - $\mathbf{cdga}$  is a quasi-isomorphism (or weak equivalence) if it induces an isomorphism on cohomology  $H^*(A^\bullet) \cong H^*(B^\bullet)$ .  
(b) We say that  $R^\bullet$ - $\mathbf{cdga}$   $A^\bullet$  and  $B^\bullet$  are quasi-isomorphic if there exists a diagram  $A^\bullet \leftarrow C^\bullet \rightarrow B^\bullet$  of quasi-isomorphisms in  $\mathbf{cdg}^- \mathbf{Alg}_{R^\bullet}$ .

**Remark 2.4.** Note that there is a global version of these.

A very important example of  $\mathbf{cdga}$ s and derived schemes:

**Example 2.5.** Let  $M^\bullet$  be a graded  $\mathbb{K}$ -module. The free graded-commutative  $\mathbb{K}$ -algebra generated by  $M^\bullet$  is

$$\mathbb{K}[M^\bullet] := \left( \bigoplus \mathrm{Sym}^n M^{\mathrm{even}} \right) \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \left( \bigoplus \bigwedge^n M^{\mathrm{odd}} \right)$$

with the degree of a product of elements being the sum of the degrees of those elements.

In particular, we consider the free graded-commutative  $\mathbb{K}$ -algebra  $A^\bullet$  generated by  $x_1, \dots, x_m; y_1, \dots, y_n$  where  $\deg x_i = 0$  and  $\deg y_j = -1$ . Hence

$$A^k = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_m] \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \bigwedge^{-k} \mathbb{K}^n$$

for  $k = 0, -1, \dots, -n$  and  $A^k = 0$  for otherwise. Pick  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ , as  $A^\bullet$  is free there are unique maps  $d : A^k \rightarrow A^{k+1}$  satisfying the Leibnitz rule, such that  $d(y_i) = p_i(x_1, \dots, x_m)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Also  $d^2 = 0$  and  $A^\bullet \in \mathbf{cdg}^- \mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbb{K}}$ .

Now  $H^0(A^\bullet) = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_m]/(p_1, \dots, p_n)$  and hence  $\mathrm{Spec} H^0(A^\bullet)$  is a subscheme defined by these polynomials. Now the derived scheme  $\mathbf{Spec} A^\bullet$  remembers information about the dependencies between  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  which have more information than the truncated classical scheme  $\mathrm{Spec} H^0(A^\bullet)$ .

### 3 Basic Concepts of Infinity Categories

In this lecture ‘ $\infty$ -category’ always means ‘ $(\infty, 1)$ -category’, that is, all  $n$ -morphisms are invertible for  $n \geq 2$ . (Although ‘ $n$ -morphism’ may not make sense, depending on your model for  $\infty$ -categories.)

There are a bunch of different but related structures which are more-or-less kinds of  $\infty$ -category:

- Model categories.
- Categories enriched in topological spaces.
- Simplicial categories; simplicial model categories.
- Quasicategories.

Of these, model categories are the oldest (Quillen 1967), and look least like an  $\infty$ -category (they have no visible higher morphisms). But most of the other kinds of  $\infty$ -category use model categories under the hood. Toën-Vezzosi’s DAG is written in terms of model categories and simplicial categories. Lurie works with quasicategories, which may be the best and coolest version.

- If you start with an ordinary category  $\mathcal{C}$  and invert some class of morphisms  $\mathcal{W}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  (‘weak equivalences’), the result  $\mathcal{C}[\mathcal{W}^{-1}]$  should really be an  $\infty$ -category with homotopy category  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathcal{C}[\mathcal{W}^{-1}])$  an ordinary category.

This idea is similar as derived category  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A})$  construct from  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Com}(\mathcal{A}))$  by inverting the class  $\mathcal{W}$  of quasi-isomorphisms. Note that  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathrm{Ho}(\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A}))$  for a stable  $\infty$ -category  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A})$ .

Here we give some idea how to consider the  $\infty$ -category. We know that a  $(2, 1)$ -category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a category enriched in groupoids. A  $(3, 1)$ -category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a category enriched in 2-groupoids. So similarly, an  $(\infty, 1)$ -category is really a ‘category enriched in  $\infty$ -groupoids’. But what is an  $\infty$ -groupoid?

Two models for the (model/ $\infty$ -)category of  $\infty$ -groupoids are topological spaces  $\mathbf{Top}$  (up to homotopy), and simplicial sets  $\mathbf{sSets}$ . Note that  $\mathbf{Top}$  and  $\mathbf{sSets}$  are Quillen equivalent as model categories, theories of  $\infty$ -categories based on  $\mathbf{Top}$  and  $\mathbf{sSets}$  are essentially equivalent. But it seems no one uses categories enriched in  $\mathbf{Top}$  except as motivation.

### 3.1 Categories Enriched in Topological Spaces

Our first model for an  $(\infty, 1)$ -category is the categories enriched in topological spaces:

**Definition 3.1.** A category enriched in topological spaces is a category  $\mathcal{C}$  such that for all objects  $X, Y$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , the set  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$  of morphisms  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is given the structure of a topological space (generally a nice topological space, e.g. Hausdorff, ..., and homotopy equivalent to a CW complex), and for objects  $X, Y, Z$  the composition  $\mu_{X,Y,Z} : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, Z) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Z)$  is a continuous map. Moreover, there is a homotopy between  $\mu_{W,X,Y} \circ (\mu_{W,X,Y} \times \text{id}) \rightarrow \mu_{W,X,Y} \circ (\text{id} \times \mu_{X,Y,Z})$ .

The higher-morphism of  $\mathcal{C}$  defined as follows:

- A 1-morphism  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a point of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$ .
- If  $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$  are 1-morphisms, a 2-morphism  $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$  is a continuous path  $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$  with  $\eta(0) = f$  and  $\eta(1) = g$ . Note that  $\eta$  is invertible with  $\eta^{-1}(s) = \eta(1 - s)$ .
- If  $\eta, \zeta : f \Rightarrow g$  are 2-morphisms, a 3-morphism  $\aleph : \eta \Rightarrow \zeta$  is a continuous map  $\aleph : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$  such that for  $s, t \in [0, 1]$  we have

$$\aleph(0, t) = f, \aleph(1, t) = g, \aleph(s, 0) = \eta, \aleph(s, 1) = \zeta.$$

- $n$ -morphisms are continuous maps  $[0, 1]^{n-1} \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$  with prescribed boundary conditions on  $\partial([0, 1]^{n-1})$ .
- Moreover, if  $\eta : f \Rightarrow g, \zeta : g \Rightarrow h$  are 2-morphisms, the vertical composition  $\zeta \odot \eta : f \Rightarrow h$  is  $(\zeta \odot \eta)(s) = \eta(2s)$  if  $s \in [0, 1/2]$  and  $(\zeta \odot \eta)(s) = \zeta(2s - 1)$  if  $s \in [1/2, 1]$ . This is not associative, but is associative up to homotopy, i.e. up to 3-isomorphism. Other kinds of composition can be defined in a similar way.

**Definition 3.2.** For any higher category  $\mathcal{C}$  (as we will used), the homotopy category  $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C})$  which is an ordinary category, where objects  $X$  of  $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C})$  are objects of  $\mathcal{C}$ , and morphisms  $[f] : X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C})$  are 2-isomorphism classes of 1-morphisms  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Now for a category enriched in topological spaces  $\mathcal{C}$ . we have  $\text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C})}(X, Y) = \pi_0(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y))$ .

### 3.2 Model Categories

Now we introduce some model categories invented by Quillen to abstract methods of homotopy theory into category theory.

**Definition 3.3.** A model category is a complete and cocomplete category  $\mathcal{M}$  equipped with three distinguished classes of morphisms: the weak equivalences  $\mathcal{W}$ , the fibrations  $\mathcal{F}$ , and the cofibrations  $\mathcal{C}$ . These must satisfy:

- $\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C}$  are closed under composition and include identities.
- $\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C}$  are closed under retracts. Here  $f$  is a retract of  $g$  if there exist  $i, j, r, s$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\quad i \quad} & Y & \xrightarrow{\quad r \quad} & X \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow f \\ X' & \xrightarrow{\quad j \quad} & Y' & \xrightarrow{\quad s \quad} & X' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{id}_X \\ \text{id}_{X'} \end{array}$$

- For  $f : X \rightarrow Y, g : Y \rightarrow Z$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , if two of  $f, g, g \circ f$  are in  $\mathcal{W}$  then so is the third.
- A (co)fibration which is also a weak equivalence is called *acyclic*. Acyclic cofibrations have the left lifting property with respect to fibrations, and cofibrations have the left lifting property with

respect to acyclic fibrations. Explicitly, if the square below commutes, where  $i$  is a cofibration,  $p$  is a fibration, and  $i$  or  $p$  is acyclic, then there exists  $h$  as shown:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ \downarrow i & \nearrow h & \downarrow p \\ B & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \end{array}$$

- (e) Every morphism  $f$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  can be written as  $f = p \circ i$  for a fibration  $p$  and an acyclic cofibration  $i$ .
- (f) Every morphism  $f$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  can be written as  $f = p \circ i$  for an acyclic fibration  $p$  and a cofibration  $i$ .

Some basic elements in a model category:

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$  be a model category with initial object  $\emptyset$  and final object  $*$ .

- (a) An object  $X \in \mathcal{M}$  is called **fibrant** if  $[X \rightarrow *] \in \mathcal{F}$ , and **cofibrant** if  $[\emptyset \rightarrow X] \in \mathcal{C}$ .
- (b) If  $X \in \mathcal{M}$  and there is a weak equivalence  $w : C \rightarrow X$  with  $C$  cofibrant then  $C$  is a **cofibrant replacement** for  $X$ . If there is a weak equivalence  $w : X \rightarrow F$  with  $F$  fibrant then  $F$  is a **fibrant replacement** for  $X$ . Such replacements always exist.
- (c) If  $X \in \mathcal{M}$ , a **cylinder object** is an object  $X \times [0, 1]$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  with a factorization  $X \sqcup X \xrightarrow{c} X \times [0, 1] \xrightarrow{w} X$  of the codiagonal  $X \sqcup X \rightarrow X$ , with  $c$  a cofibration and  $w$  a weak equivalence. Cylinder objects exist by Definition 3.3(d).
- (d) If  $X \in \mathcal{M}$ , a **path object** is an object  $\text{Map}([0, 1], X)$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  with a factorization  $X \xrightarrow{w} \text{Map}([0, 1], X) \xrightarrow{f} X \times X$  of the diagonal  $X \rightarrow X \times X$ , with  $w$  a weak equivalence and  $f$  a fibration. Path objects exist by Definition 3.3(e).
- (e) Morphisms  $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$  are called **(left) homotopy equivalent** if there exists  $h : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  with  $h \circ c = f \sqcup g$  where  $c$  as in (c).
- (f) The **homotopy category** is  $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{M}) := \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{W}^{-1}]$ , the category obtained by formally inverting all weak equivalences. Note that this is independent of  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}$ .

Note that two of  $\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C}$  determine the third. Now we introduce an important theorem:

**Theorem 3.5** (Fundamental Theorem of Model Categories). *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a model category. Then  $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{M})$  is equivalent to the category whose objects are fibrant-cofibrant objects in  $\mathcal{M}$ , and whose morphisms are homotopy classes of morphisms in  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

**Example 3.6.** (a) The category **Top** of topological spaces has a model structure with  $\mathcal{W}$  the weak homotopy equivalences, and  $\mathcal{F}$  the Serre fibrations (maps with the homotopy lifting property for CW complexes). In this case by Theorem 3.5,  $\text{Ho}(\mathbf{Top})$ , which is the homotopy category of homotopy types, can be described as the category whose objects are CW complexes and morphisms are homotopy classes of continuous maps.

- (b) If  $R$  is a commutative ring then  $\text{Com}(\text{Mod}_R)$  has two canonical model structures with weak equivalences quasi-isomorphisms and
  - cofibrations morphisms  $\phi : E^\bullet \rightarrow F^\bullet$  with  $\phi^k : E^k \rightarrow F^k$  injective for all  $k$ ;
  - fibrations morphisms  $\phi : E^\bullet \rightarrow F^\bullet$  with  $\phi^k : E^k \rightarrow F^k$  surjective for all  $k$ .

The first one is the injective model category and the second one is the projective model category. In this case by Theorem 3.5,  $\text{Ho}(\text{Com}(\text{Mod}_R)) = \mathbf{D}(R)$ , can be described as the category whose objects are either  $K$ -injective, or  $K$ -projective, complexes, and morphisms are homotopy classes of maps between these complexes.

- (c) Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a Grothendieck abelian category (such as  $\text{Qcoh}(X)$  for any scheme  $X$ ). Then  $\text{Com}(\mathcal{A})$  has a model structure with weak equivalences quasi-isomorphisms and cofibrations morphisms  $\phi : E^\bullet \rightarrow F^\bullet$  with  $\phi^k : E^k \rightarrow F^k$  injective for all  $k$ . In this case by Theorem 3.5,  $\text{Ho}(\text{Com}(\mathcal{A})) = \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A})$ , can be described as the category whose objects are either  $K$ -injective complexes, and morphisms.

### 3.3 Simplicial Sets and Simplicial Categories

### 3.4 Kan Complexes and Weak Kan Complexes

### 3.5 Quasicategories

### 3.6 Stable Infinity Categories

We will give a reason why we need stable  $\infty$ -categories:

**Example 3.7.** *I would argue that triangulated categories are not quite the ‘right’ theory. However, they are a very good approximation - you can work with them for years and not notice the problems.*

*As a signal that there should be something more, recall that if  $\mathcal{T}$  is a triangulated category, and  $u : X \rightarrow Y$  a morphism in  $\mathcal{T}$ , there is  $\text{cone}(u) \in \mathcal{T}$ , in a distinguished triangle  $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \text{cone}(u) \rightarrow X[1]$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . This is begging to be turned into a **cone functor**: we would like a category  $\text{Mor}(\mathcal{T})$  of morphisms in  $\mathcal{T}$ , and a functor  $\text{cone} : \text{Mor}(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  mapping  $u \mapsto \text{cone}(u)$  on objects. To try to define cone on morphisms in  $\text{Mor}(\mathcal{T})$ , consider the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{u} & Y & \longrightarrow & \text{cone}(u) & \longrightarrow & X[1] \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow \text{cone}(f,g) & & \downarrow f[1] \\ X' & \xrightarrow{u'} & Y' & \longrightarrow & \text{cone}(u') & \longrightarrow & X'[1] \end{array}$$

and extension via the definition of triangulated categories. But it is not unique, so we cannot define cone.

So the explanation is  $\mathcal{T}$  should be a higher category (an  $\infty$ -category)! In this case  $n$ -morphisms in  $\text{Mor}(\mathcal{T})$  correspond to  $(n+1)$ -morphisms in  $\mathcal{T}$ . So to define cone on 1-morphisms in  $\text{Mor}(\mathcal{T})$ , we should be using 2-morphisms in  $\mathcal{T}$ . We consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{u} & Y & \longrightarrow & \text{cone}(u) & \longrightarrow & X[1] \\ \downarrow f & \nearrow \eta & \downarrow g & & \downarrow \text{cone}(f,g;\eta) & & \downarrow f[1] \\ X' & \xrightarrow{u'} & Y' & \longrightarrow & \text{cone}(u') & \longrightarrow & X'[1] \end{array}$$

where  $\eta : u' \circ f \Rightarrow g \circ u$  is a 2-morphism. Then  $\text{cone}(f,g;\eta)$  should exist and be unique up to 2-isomorphism. When we pass to the homotopy category  $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{T})$ , this choice of  $\eta$  is forgotten, which is why we lose uniqueness of  $\text{cone}(f,g)$ . Note moreover that if we want  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\text{Mor}(\mathcal{T})$  to be objects of the same type we cannot truncate to  $n$ -categories for any finite  $n$  — we need  $n = \infty$ .

### 3.7 Dg-categories and Segal Categories

### 3.8 Stable Infinity Categories

## 4 Derived Schemes and Derived Stacks

### 4.1 Higher Stacks

### 4.2 Derived Schemes and Derived Stacks

## 5 Geometry of Derived Stacks

## 6 Need to add

## References

- [EP23] Jon Eugster and Jon P Pridham. An introduction to derived (algebraic) geometry. *Rendiconti di Matematica*, September 2023.