

Notes: These are notes live-tex'd from a graduate course in 4-Manifolds taught by Philip Engel at the University of Georgia in Spring 2021. As such, any errors or inaccuracies are almost certainly my own.

4-Manifolds

Lectures by Philip Engel. University of Georgia, Spring 2021

D. Zack Garza

D. Zack Garza
University of Georgia
dzackgarza@gmail.com

Last updated: 2021-01-26

Table of Contents

Contents

Table of Contents	2
1 Tuesday, January 12	3
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Introduction	3
2 Friday, January 15	7
3 Main Theorems for the Course	9
3.1 Warm Up: \mathbb{R}^2 Has a Unique Smooth Structure	10
3.1.1 Sketch of Proof	11
4 Lecture 3 (Wednesday, January 20)	13
4.1 Sheaves	13
4.2 Bundles	16
5 Lecture 4 (Friday, January 22)	18
5.1 The Exponential Exact Sequence	18
6 Principal G-Bundles and Connections (Monday, January 25)	21
ToDoS	24
Definitions	25
Theorems	26
Exercises	27
Figures	28
Bibliography	29

1 | Tuesday, January 12

1.1 Background

From Phil's email:

There are very few references in the notes, and I'll try to update them to include more as we go. Personally, I found the following online references particularly useful:

- Dietmar Salamon: Spin Geometry and Seiberg-Witten Invariants [5]
- Richard Mandelbaum: Four-dimensional Topology: An Introduction [2]
 - This book has a nice introduction to surgery aspects of four-manifolds, but as a warning: It was published right before Freedman's famous theorem. For instance, the existence of an exotic \mathbb{R}^4 was not known. This actually makes it quite useful, as a summary of what was known before, and provides the historical context in which Freedman's theorem was proven.
- Danny Calegari: Notes on 4-Manifolds [1]
- Yuli Rudyak: Piecewise Linear Structures on Topological Manifolds [4]
- Akhil Mathew: The Dirac Operator [3]
- Tom Weston: An Introduction to Cobordism Theory [6]


A wide variety of lecture notes on the Atiyah-Singer index theorem, which are available online.

1.2 Introduction

Definition 1.2.1 (Topological Manifold)

Recall that a **topological manifold** (or C^0 manifold) X is a Hausdorff topological space *locally homeomorphic* to \mathbb{R}^n with a countable topological base, so we have charts $\varphi_u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ which are homeomorphisms from open sets covering X .

Example 1.2.2 (The circle): S^1 is covered by two charts homeomorphic to intervals:



Remark 1.2.3: Maps that are merely continuous are poorly behaved, so we may want to impose extra structure. This can be done by imposing restrictions on the transition functions, defined as

$$t_{uv} := \varphi_V \circ \varphi_U^{-1} : \varphi_U(U \cap V) \rightarrow \varphi_V(U \cap V).$$

Definition 1.2.4 (Restricted Structures on Manifolds)

- We say X is a **PL manifold** if and only if t_{UV} are piecewise-linear. Note that an invertible PL map has a PL inverse.
- We say X is a C^k **manifold** if they are k times continuously differentiable, and **smooth** if infinitely differentiable.
- We say X is **real-analytic** if they are locally given by convergent power series.
- We say X is **complex-analytic** if under the identification $\mathbb{R}^n \cong \mathbb{C}^{n/2}$ if they are holomorphic, i.e. the differential of t_{UV} is complex linear.
- We say X is a **projective variety** if it is the vanishing locus of homogeneous polynomials on \mathbb{CP}^N .

Remark 1.2.5: Is this a strictly increasing hierarchy? It's not clear e.g. that every C^k manifold is PL.

Question 1.2.6

Consider \mathbb{R}^n as a topological manifold: are any two smooth structures on \mathbb{R}^n diffeomorphic?

Remark 1.2.7: Fix a copy of \mathbb{R} and form a single chart $\mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \mathbb{R}$. There is only a single transition function, the identity, which is smooth. But consider

$$\begin{aligned} X &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ t &\mapsto t^3. \end{aligned}$$

This is also a smooth structure on X , since the transition function is the identity. This yields a different smooth structure, since these two charts don't like in the same maximal atlas. Otherwise there would be a transition function of the form $t_{VU} : t \mapsto t^{1/3}$, which is not smooth at zero. However, the map


$$\begin{aligned} X &\rightarrow X \\ t &\mapsto t^3. \end{aligned}$$

defines a diffeomorphism between the two smooth structures.

Claim: \mathbb{R} admits a unique smooth structure.

Proof (sketch).


Let $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}$ be some exotic \mathbb{R} , i.e. a smooth manifold homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} . Cover this by coordinate charts to the standard \mathbb{R} :



Fact

There exists a cover which is *locally finite* and supports a *partition of unity*: a collection of smooth functions $f_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f_i \geq 0$ and $\text{supp } f_i \subseteq U_i$ such that $\sum f_i = 1$ (i.e., *bump functions*). It is also a purely topological fact that $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}$ is orientable.

So we have bump functions:



Take a smooth vector field V_i on U_i everywhere aligning with the orientation. Then $\sum f_i V_i$ is a smooth nowhere vector field on X that is nowhere zero in the direction of the orientation. Taking the associated flow

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{R}} \\ t &\mapsto \varphi(t). \end{aligned}$$

such that $\varphi'(t) = V(\varphi(t))$. Then φ is a smooth map that defines a diffeomorphism. This follows from the fact that the vector field is everywhere positive.

Slogan

To understand smooth structures on X , we should try to solve differential equations on X .

■

Remark 1.2.10: Note that here we used the existence of a global frame, i.e. a trivialization of the tangent bundle, so this doesn't quite work for e.g. S^2 .

Question 1.2.11

What is the difference between all of the above structures? Are there obstructions to admitting any particular one?

Answer 1.2.12

1. (Munkres) Every C^1 structure gives a unique C^k and C^∞ structure.¹
2. (Grauert) Every C^∞ structure gives a unique real-analytic structure.
3. Every PL manifold admits a smooth structure in $\dim X \leq 7$, and it's unique in $\dim X \leq 6$, and above these dimensions there exists PL manifolds with no smooth structure.
4. (Kirby–Siebenmann) Let X be a topological manifold of $\dim X \geq 5$, then there exists a cohomology class $ks(X) \in H^4(X; \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ which is 0 if and only if X admits a PL structure.

¹Note that this doesn't start at C^0 , so topological manifolds are genuinely different! There exist topological manifolds with no smooth structure.

Moreover, if $\text{ks}(X) = 0$, then (up to concordance) the set of PL structures is given by $H^3(X; \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$.

5. (Moise) Every topological manifold in $\dim X \leq 3$ admits a unique smooth structure.
6. (Smale et al.): In $\dim X \geq 5$, the number of smooth structures on a topological manifold X is finite. In particular, \mathbb{R}^n for $n \neq 4$ has a unique smooth structure. So dimension 4 is interesting!
7. (Taubes) \mathbb{R}^4 admits uncountably many non-diffeomorphic smooth structures.
8. A compact oriented smooth surface Σ , the space of complex-analytic structures is a complex orbifold² of dimension $3g - 2$ where g is the genus of Σ , up to biholomorphism (i.e. *moduli*).

Remark 1.2.13: Kervaire-Milnor: S^7 admits 28 smooth structures, which form a group.


2 | Friday, January 15

Remark 2.0.1: Let

$$V := \{a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^3 + e^{6k-1} = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^5$$

$$S_\varepsilon := \{|a|^2 + |b|^2 + |c|^2 + |d|^2 + |e|^2\}.$$

Then $V_k \cap S_\varepsilon \cong S^7$ is a homeomorphism, and taking $k = 1, 2, \dots, 28$ yields the 28 smooth structures on S^7 . Note that V_k is the cone over $V_k \cap S_\varepsilon$.



? Admits a smooth structure, and $\bar{V}_k \subseteq \mathbb{CP}^5$ admits no smooth structure.


Question 2.0.2

Is every triangulable manifold PL, i.e. homeomorphic to a simplicial complex?

²Locally admits a chart to \mathbb{C}^n/Γ for Γ a finite group.

Answer 2.0.3

No! Given a simplicial complex, there is a notion of the **combinatorial link** L_V of a vertex V :



It turns out that there exist simplicial manifolds such that the link is not homeomorphic to a sphere, whereas every PL manifold admits a “PL triangulation” where the links are spheres.

Remark 2.0.4: What’s special in dimension 4? Recall the **Kirby-Siebenmann** invariant $ks(x) \in H^4(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ for X a topological manifold where $ks(X) = 0 \iff X$ admits a PL structure, with the caveat that $\dim X \geq 5$. We can use this to cook up an invariant of 4-manifolds.

Definition 2.0.5 (Kirby-Siebenmann Invariant of a 4-manifold)

Let X be a topological 4-manifold, then

$$ks(X) := ks(X \times \mathbb{R}).$$

Remark 2.0.6: Recall that in $\dim X \geq 7$, every PL manifold admits a smooth structure, and we can note that

$$H^4(X; \mathbb{Z}_2) = H^4(X \times \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2, .$$

since every oriented 4-manifold admits a fundamental class. Thus

$$\text{ks}(X) = \begin{cases} 0 & X \times \mathbb{R} \text{ admits a PL and smooth structure} \\ 1 & X \times \mathbb{R} \text{ admits no PL or smooth structures .} \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.0.7: $\text{ks}(X) \neq 0$ implies that X has no smooth structure, since $X \times \mathbb{R}$ doesn't. Note that it was not known if this invariant was nonzero for a while!

Remark 2.0.8: Note that $H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ admits a symmetric bilinear form Q_X defined by

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \mapsto \int_X \alpha \wedge \beta = \alpha \smile \beta([X]) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

where $[X]$ is the fundamental class.

3 | Main Theorems for the Course

Proving the following theorems is the main goal of this course.

Theorem 3.0.1 (Freedman).

If X, Y are compact oriented topological 4-manifolds, then $X \cong Y$ are homeomorphic if and only if $\text{ks}(X) = \text{ks}(Y)$ and $Q_X \cong Q_Y$ are isometric, i.e. there exists an isometry

$$\varphi : H^2(X; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(Y; \mathbb{Z}).$$

that preserves the two bilinear forms in the sense that $\langle \varphi\alpha, \varphi\beta \rangle = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle$.

Conversely, every **unimodular** bilinear form appears as $H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ for some X , i.e. the pairing induces a map

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(X; \mathbb{Z}) &\rightarrow H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})^\vee \\ \alpha &\mapsto \langle \alpha, \cdot \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

which is an isomorphism. This is essentially a classification of simply-connected 4-manifolds.

Remark 3.0.2: Note that preservation of a bilinear form is a stand-in for “being an element of the orthogonal group”, where we only have a lattice instead of a full vector space.

Remark 3.0.3: There is a map $H^2(X; \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{PD} H_2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ from Poincaré, where we can think of elements in the latter as closed surfaces $[\Sigma]$, and

$$\langle \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \rangle = \text{signed number of intersections points of } \Sigma_1 \pitchfork \Sigma_2.$$

Note that Freedman's theorem is only about homeomorphism, and is not true smoothly. This gives a way to show that two 4-manifolds are homeomorphic, but this is hard to prove! So we'll black-box this, and focus on ways to show that two *smooth* 4-manifolds are *not* diffeomorphic, since we want homeomorphic but non-diffeomorphic manifolds.

Definition 3.0.4 (Signature)

The **signature** of a topological 4-manifold is the signature of Q_X , where we note that Q_X is a symmetric nondegenerate bilinear form on $H^2(X; \mathbb{R})$ and for some a, b

$$(H^2(X; \mathbb{R}), Q_X) \xrightarrow{\text{isometric}} \mathbb{R}^{a,b}.$$

where a is the number of +1s appearing in the matrix and b is the number of -1s. This is \mathbb{R}^{ab} where $e_i^2 = 1, i = 1 \dots a$ and $e_i^2 = -1, i = a + 1, \dots b$, and is thus equipped with a specific bilinear form corresponding to the Gram matrix of this basis.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} = I_{a \times a} \oplus -I_{b \times b}.$$

Then the signature is $a - b$, the dimension of the positive-definite space minus the dimension of the negative-definite space.

Theorem 3.0.5 (Rokhlin's Theorem).

Suppose $\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ and X a simply connected **smooth** 4-manifold. Then 16 divides $\text{sig}(X)$.

Remark 3.0.6: Note that Freedman's theorem implies that there exists topological 4-manifolds with no smooth structure.

Theorem 3.0.7 (Donaldson).

Let X be a smooth simply-connected 4-manifold. If $a = 0$ or $b = 0$, then Q_X is diagonalizable and there exists an orthonormal basis of $H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$.

Remark 3.0.8: This comes from Gram-Schmidt, and restricts what types of intersection forms can occur.

3.1 Warm Up: \mathbb{R}^2 Has a Unique Smooth Structure

Remark 3.1.1: Last time we showed \mathbb{R}^1 had a unique smooth structure, so now we'll do this for \mathbb{R}^2 . The strategy of solving a differential equation, we'll now sketch the proof.

Definition 3.1.2 (Riemannian Metrics)

A **Riemannian metric** $g \in \text{Sym}^2 T^*X$ for X a smooth manifold is a metric on every T_pX given by


$$g_p : T_pX \times T_pX \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$g(v, v) \geq 0, g(v, v) = 0 \iff v = 0.$$

Definition 3.1.3 (Almost complex structure)

An **almost complex structure** is a $J \in \text{End}(TX)$ such that $J^2 = -\text{id}$.

Remark 3.1.4: Let $e \in T_pX$ and $e \neq 0$, then if X is a surface then $\{e, Je\}$ is a basis of T_pX .



This is a basis because if Je and e are parallel, then ??? In particular, J_p is determined by a point in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{\text{the } x\text{-axis}\}$

3.1.1 Sketch of Proof


Let $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2$ be an exotic \mathbb{R}^2 .

Step 1 Choose a metric on $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2$ $g := \sum f_i g_i$ with g_i metrics on coordinate charts U_i and f_i a partition of unity.

Step 2 Find an almost complex structure on $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2$. Choosing an orientation of $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2$, g defines a unique almost complex structure $J_p e := f \in T_p \tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2$ such that

- $g(e, e) = g(f, f)$
- $g(e, f) = 0$.
- $\{e, f\}$ is an oriented basis of $T_p \tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2$

This is because after choosing e , there are two orthogonal vectors, but only one choice yields an *oriented* basis.



Step 3 We then apply a theorem:

Theorem 3.1.5(?).

Any almost complex structure on a surface comes from a complex structure, in the sense that there exist charts $\varphi_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that J is multiplication by i .

So $d\varphi(J \cdot e) = i \cdot d\varphi_i(e)$, and $(\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^2, J)$ is a complex manifold. Since it's simply connected, the Riemann Mapping Theorem shows that it's biholomorphic to \mathbb{D} or \mathbb{C} , both of which are diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 .

See the Newlander-Nirenberg theorem, a result in complex geometry.

4 | Lecture 3 (Wednesday, January 20)

Today: some background material on sheaves, bundles, connections.

4.1 Sheaves


Definition 4.1.1 (Presheaves and Sheaves)

Recall that if X is a topological space, a **presheaf** of abelian groups \mathcal{F} is an assignment $U \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U)$ of an abelian group to every open set $U \subseteq X$ together with a restriction map $\rho_{UV} : \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(V)$ for any inclusion $V \subseteq U$ of open sets. This data has to satisfying certain conditions:

- a. $\mathcal{F}(\emptyset) = 0$, the trivial abelian group.
- b. $\rho_{UU} : \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}(U)}$
- c. Compatibility if restriction is taken in steps: $U \subseteq V \subseteq W \implies \rho_{VW} \circ \rho_{UV} = \rho_{UW}$.

We say \mathcal{F} is a **sheaf** if additionally:

- d. Given $s_i \in \mathcal{F}(U_i)$ such that $\rho_{U_i \cap U_j}(s_i) = \rho_{U_i \cap U_j}(s_j)$ implies that there exists a unique $s \in \mathcal{F}(\bigcup_i U_i)$ such that $\rho_{U_i}(s) = s_i$.



Example 4.1.2(?): Let X be a topological manifold, then $\mathcal{F} := C^0(\cdot, \mathbb{R})$ the set of continuous functions form a sheaf. We have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 U & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & C^0(U; \mathbb{R}) \\
 \uparrow & & \downarrow \text{restrict cts. functions} \\
 V & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & C^0(V; \mathbb{R})
 \end{array}$$

[Link to diagram](#)


Property (d) holds because given sections $s_i \in C^0(U_i; \mathbb{R})$ agreeing on overlaps, so $s_i|_{U_i \cap U_j} = s_j|_{U_i \cap U_j}$, there exists a unique $s \in C^0(\bigcup_i U_i; \mathbb{R})$ such that $s|_{U_i} = s_i$ for all i – continuous functions glue.

Remark 4.1.3: Recall that we discussed various structures on manifolds: PL, continuous, smooth, complex-analytic, etc. We can characterize these by their sheaves of functions, which we'll denote \mathcal{O} . For example, $\mathcal{O} := C^0(\cdot; \mathbb{R})$ for topological manifolds, and $\mathcal{O} := C^\infty(\cdot; \mathbb{R})$ is the sheaf for smooth manifolds. Note that this also works for PL functions, since pullbacks of PL functions are again PL. For complex manifolds, we set \mathcal{O} to be the sheaf of holomorphic functions.

Example 4.1.4 (Locally Constant Sheaves): Let $A \in \mathbf{Ab}$ be an abelian group, then \underline{A} is the sheaf defined by setting $\underline{A}(U)$ to be the locally constant functions $U \rightarrow A$. E.g. let $X \in \mathbf{Mfd}_{\text{Top}}$ be a topological manifold, then $\underline{\mathbb{R}}(U) = \mathbb{R}$ if U is connected since locally constant \implies globally constant in this case.

Warning 4.1.5

Note that the presheaf of constant functions doesn't satisfy (d)! Take \mathbb{R} and a function with two different values on disjoint intervals:




Note that $s_1|_{U_1 \cap U_2} = s_2|_{U_1 \cap U_2}$ since the intersection is empty, but there is no constant function that restricts to the two different values.

4.2 Bundles


Remark 4.2.1: Let $\pi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow X$ be a **vector bundle**, so we have local trivializations $\pi^{-1}(U) \xrightarrow{h_u} Y^d \times U$ where we take either $Y = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$, such that $h_v \circ h_u^{-1}$ preserves the fibers of π and acts linearly on each fiber of $Y \times (U \cap V)$. Define

$$t_{UV} : U \cap V \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(Y)$$

where we require that t_{UV} is continuous, smooth, complex-analytic, etc depending on the context.



Example 4.2.2 (Bundles over S^1): There are two \mathbb{R}^1 bundles over S^1 :



Note that the Möbius bundle is not trivial, but can be locally trivialized.

Remark 4.2.3: We abuse notation: \mathcal{E} is also a sheaf, and we write $\mathcal{E}(U)$ to be the set of sections $s : U \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ where s is continuous, smooth, holomorphic, etc where $\pi \circ s = \mathrm{id}_U$. I.e. a bundle is a sheaf in the sense that its sections *form* a sheaf.

Example 4.2.4(?): The trivial line bundle gives the sheaf \mathcal{O} : maps $U \xrightarrow{s} U \times Y$ for $Y = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ such that $\pi \circ s = \text{id}$ are the same as maps $U \rightarrow Y$.

Definition 4.2.5 (\mathcal{O} -modules)

An \mathcal{O} -module is a sheaf \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{F}(U)$ has an action of $\mathcal{O}(U)$ compatible with restriction.

Example 4.2.6(?): If \mathcal{E} is a vector bundle, then $\mathcal{E}(U)$ has a natural action of $\mathcal{O}(U)$ given by $f \cdot s := fs$, i.e. just multiplying functions.

Example 4.2.7(Non-example): The locally constant sheaf \mathbb{R} is not an \mathcal{O} -module: there isn't natural action since the sections of \mathcal{O} are generally non-constant functions, and multiplying a constant function by a non-constant function doesn't generally give back a constant function.

We'd like a notion of maps between sheaves:

Definition 4.2.8 (Morphisms of Sheaves)

A **morphism** of sheaves $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is a group morphism $\varphi(U) : \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(U)$ for all opens $U \subseteq X$ such that the diagram involving restrictions commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}(U) & \xrightarrow{\varphi(U)} & \mathcal{G}(U) \\ \downarrow \rho_{UV} & & \downarrow \rho_{UV} \\ \mathcal{F}(V) & \xrightarrow{\varphi(V)} & \mathcal{G}(V) \end{array}$$

Example 4.2.9(An \mathcal{O} -module that is not a vector bundle.): Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ and define the **skyscraper sheaf** at $p \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathbb{R}_p(U) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{R} & p \in U \\ 0 & p \notin U. \end{cases}$$

The $\mathcal{O}(U)$ -module structure is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(U) \times \mathcal{O}(U) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_p(U) \\ (f, s) &\mapsto f(p)s. \end{aligned}$$

This is not a vector bundle since $\mathbb{R}_p(U)$ is not an infinite dimensional vector space, whereas the space of sections of a vector bundle is generally infinite dimensional (?). Alternatively, there are arbitrarily small punctured open neighborhoods of p for which the sheaf makes trivial assignments.

Example 4.2.10(of morphisms): Let $X = \mathbb{R} \in \text{Mfd}_{\text{Sm}_k}$ viewed as a smooth manifold, then multiplication by x induces a morphism of structure sheaves:

$$\begin{aligned} (x \cdot) : \mathcal{O} &\rightarrow \mathcal{O} \\ s &\mapsto x \cdot s \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{O}(U)$, noting that $x \cdot s \in \mathcal{O}(U)$ again.

Exercise 4.2.11(?)

Check that $\ker \varphi$ is naturally a sheaf and $\ker(\varphi)(U) = \ker(\varphi(U)) : \mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(U)$

Here the kernel is trivial, i.e. on any open U we have $(x \cdot) : \mathcal{O}(U) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}(U)$ is injective. Taking the cokernel $\text{coker}(x \cdot)$ as a presheaf, this assigns to U the quotient presheaf $\mathcal{O}(U)/x\mathcal{O}(U)$, which turns out to be equal to \mathbb{R}_0 . So $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0$ by restricting to the value at 0, and there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{(x \cdot)} \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0 \rightarrow 0.$$

This is one reason sheaves are better than vector bundles: the category is closed under taking quotients, whereas quotients of vector bundles may not be vector bundles.

5 | Lecture 4 (Friday, January 22)

5.1 The Exponential Exact Sequence


Let $X = \mathbb{C}$ and consider \mathcal{O} the sheaf of holomorphic functions and \mathcal{O}^\times the sheaf of *nonvanishing* holomorphic functions. The former is a vector bundle and the latter is a sheaf of abelian groups. There is a map $\exp : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$, the **exponential map**, which is the data $\exp(U) : \mathcal{O}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times(U)$ on every open U given by $f \mapsto e^f$. There is a kernel sheaf $2\pi i\mathbb{Z}$, and we get an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow 2\pi i\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\exp} \mathcal{O}^\times \rightarrow \text{coker}(\exp) \rightarrow 0.$$


Question 5.1.1

What is the cokernel sheaf here?

Let U be a contractible open set, then we can identify $\mathcal{O}^\times(U)/\exp(\mathcal{O}^\times(U)) = 1$.



Any $f \in \mathcal{O}^\times(U)$ has a logarithm, say by taking a branch cut, since $\pi_1(U) = 0 \implies \log f$ has an analytic continuation. Consider the annulus U and the function $z \in \mathcal{O}^\times(U)$, then $z \notin \exp(\mathcal{O}(U))$ – if $z = e^f$ then $f = \log(z)$, but $\log(z)$ has monodromy on U :



Thus on any sufficiently small open set, $\text{coker}(\exp) = 1$. This is only a presheaf: there exists an open cover of the annulus for which $z|_{U_i}$, and so the naive cokernel doesn't define a sheaf. This is because we have a locally trivial section which glues to z , which is nontrivial.

Exercise 5.1.2 (?)

Redefine the cokernel so that it is a sheaf. Hint: look at sheafification, which has the defining property $\text{Hom}_{\text{Presheaf}}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{Presheaf}}) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sheaf}}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{Sh}})$ for any sheaf \mathcal{G} .

Definition 5.1.3 (Global Sections Sheaf)

The **global sections** sheaf of \mathcal{F} on X is given by $H^0(X; \mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}(X)$.

Example 5.1.4(?):

- $C^\infty(X) = H^0(X, C^\infty)$ are the smooth functions on X
- $VF(X) = H^0(X; T)$ are the smooth vector fields on X for T the tangent bundle
- If X is a complex manifold then $\mathcal{O}(X) = H^0(X; \mathcal{O})$ are the globally holomorphic functions on X .
- $H^0(X; \mathbb{Z}) = \underline{\mathbb{Z}}(X)$ are ??

Remark 5.1.5: Given vector bundles V, W , we have constructions $V \oplus W, V \otimes W, V^\vee, \text{Hom}(V, W) = V^\vee \otimes W, \text{Sym}^n V, \Lambda^p V$, and so on. Some of these work directly for sheaves:


- $\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{G}(U) := \mathcal{F}(U) \oplus \mathcal{G}(U)$
- For tensors, duals, and homs $\mathcal{H}\text{om}(V, W)$ we only get presheaves, so we need to sheafify.

⚠ Warning 5.1.6

$\text{Hom}(V, W)$ will denote the *global* homomorphisms $\mathcal{H}\text{om}(V, W)(X)$, which is a sheaf.

Example 5.1.7(?): Let $X^n \in \text{Mfd}_{\text{sm}}$ and let Ω^p be the sheaf of smooth p -forms, i.e. $\Lambda^p T^\vee$, i.e. $\Omega^p(U)$ are the smooth p forms on U , which are locally of the form $\sum f_{i_1, \dots, i_p}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_{i_1} \wedge dx_{i_2} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{i_p}$ where the f_{i_1, \dots, i_p} are smooth functions.

Example 5.1.8(Sub-example): Take $X = S^1$, writing this as \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , we have $\Omega^1(X) \ni dx$. There are two coordinate charts which differ by a translation on their overlaps, and $dx(x+c) = dx$ for c a constant:

**Exercise 5.1.9(?)**


Check that on a torus, dx_i is a well-defined 1-form.

Remark 5.1.10: Note that there is a map $d: \Omega^p \rightarrow \Omega^{p+1}$ where $\omega \mapsto d\omega$.

⚠ Warning 5.1.11

d is **not** a map of \mathcal{O} -modules: $d(f \cdot \omega) = f \cdot \omega + df \wedge \omega$, where the latter is a correction term. In particular, it is not a map of vector bundles, but is a map of sheaves of abelian groups since $d(\omega_1 + \omega_2) = d(\omega_1) + d(\omega_2)$, making d a sheaf morphism.

Let $X \in \text{Mfd}_{\mathbb{C}}$, we'll use the fact that TX is complex-linear and thus a \mathbb{C} -vector bundle.



Remark 5.1.12 (Subtlety 1): Note that Ω^p for complex manifolds is $\Lambda^p T^{\vee}$, and so if we want to view $X \in \text{Mfd}_{\mathbb{R}}$ we'll write $X_{\mathbb{R}}$. $TX_{\mathbb{R}}$ is then a real vector bundle of rank $2n$.


Remark 5.1.13 (Subtlety 2): Ω^p will denote *holomorphic* p -forms, i.e. local expressions $\sum f_I(z_1, \dots, z_n) \Lambda dz_I$. For example, $e^z dz \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{C})$ but $z\bar{z}dz$ is not, where $dz = dx + idy$. We'll use a different notation when we allow the f_I to just be smooth: $A^{p,0}$, the sheaf of $(p,0)$ -forms. Then $z\bar{z}dz \in A^{1,0}$.

Remark 5.1.14: Note that $T^{\vee}X_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} = A^{1,0} \oplus A^{0,1}$ since there is a unique decomposition $\omega = f dz + g d\bar{z}$ where f, g are smooth. Then $\Omega^d X_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} = \bigoplus_{p+q=d} A^{p,q}$. Note that $\Omega_{\mathbb{C}}^p \neq A^{p,q}$ and these are really quite different: the former are more like holomorphic bundles, and the latter smooth. Moreover $\dim \Omega^p(X) < \infty$, whereas $\Omega_{\mathbb{C}}^1$ is infinite-dimensional.

6 | Principal G -Bundles and Connections (Monday, January 25)

Definition 6.0.1 (Principal Bundles)

Let G be a (possibly disconnected) Lie group. Then a **principal G -bundle** $\pi : P \rightarrow X$ is a space admitting local trivializations $h_u : \pi^{-1}(U) \rightarrow G \times U$ such that the transition functions are given by left multiplication by a continuous function $t_{UV} : U \cap V \rightarrow G$.



Consider TX for $X \in \text{Mfd}_{\text{Sm}_k}$, and let g be a metric on the tangent bundle given by $g_p : T_p X^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a symmetric bilinear form with $g_p(u, v) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $v = 0$.

Definition 6.0.2 (The Frame Bundle)

Define $\text{Frame}_p(X) := \{\text{bases of } T_p X\}$, and $\text{Frame}X := \bigcup_{p \in X} \text{Frame}_p X$.

Remark 6.0.3: More generally, $\text{Frame}\mathcal{E}$ can be defined for any vector bundle \mathcal{E} , so $\text{Frame}X := \text{Frame}TX$. Note that $\text{Frame}X$ is a principal $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ -bundle where $n := \text{rank}(\mathcal{E})$. This follows from the fact that the transition functions are fiberwise in $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$, so the transition functions are given by left-multiplication by matrices.

Remark 6.0.4 (Important): A principal G -bundle admits a G -action where G acts by *right* multiplication:

$$\begin{aligned} P \times G &\rightarrow P \\ ((g, x), h) &\mapsto (gh, x). \end{aligned}$$

This is necessary for compatibility on overlaps. **Key point:** the actions of left and right multiplication commute.

Definition 6.0.5 (Orthogonal Frame Bundle)

The **orthogonal frame bundle** of a vector bundle \mathcal{E} equipped with a metric g is defined as $\text{OFrame}_p \mathcal{E} := \{\text{orthonormal bases of } \mathcal{E}_p\}$, also written $O_r(\mathbb{R})$ where $r := \text{rank}(\mathcal{E})$.

Remark 6.0.6: The fibers $P_x \rightarrow \{x\}$ of a principal G -bundle are naturally **torsors** over G , i.e. a set with a free transitive G -action.

Definition 6.0.7 (?)

Let $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow X$ be a complex vector bundle. Then a **hermitian metric** is a hermitian form on

every fiber, i.e. $h_p : \mathcal{E}_p \times \overline{\mathcal{E}}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ where $h_p(v, \bar{v}) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $v = 0$. Here we define $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_p$ as the fiber of the complex vector bundle $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ whose transition functions are given by the complex conjugates of those from \mathcal{E} .

Remark 6.0.8: Note that $\mathcal{E}, \overline{\mathcal{E}}$ are genuinely different as complex bundles. There is a *conjugate-linear* map given by conjugation, i.e. $L(cv) = \bar{c}L(v)$, where the canonical example is


$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}^n &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n \\ (z_1, \dots, z_n) &\mapsto (\bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_n). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 6.0.9 (Unitary Frame Bundle)

We define the **unitary frame bundle** $\text{UFrame}(\mathcal{E}) := \bigcup_p \text{UFrame}(\mathcal{E})_p$, where at each point this is given by the set of orthogonal frames of \mathcal{E}_p given by (e_1, \dots, e_n) where $h(e_i, \bar{e}_j) = \delta_{ij}$.

Remark 6.0.10: This is a principal G -bundle for $G = U_r(\mathbb{C})$, the invertible matrices $A_{/\mathbb{C}}$ satisfy $A\bar{A}^t = \text{id}$.

Example 6.0.11 (of more principal bundles): For $G = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and $X = S^1$, the Mobius band is a principal G -bundle:



Example 6.0.12 (more principal bundles): For $G = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, for any (possibly non-oriented) manifold X there is an *orientation principal bundle* P which is locally a set of orientations on U , i.e. $P := \{(x, O) \mid x \in X, O \text{ is an orientation of } T_p X\}$. Note that P is an oriented manifold,

$P \rightarrow X$ is a local isomorphism, and has a canonical orientation.? This can also be written as $P = \text{Frame}X / \text{GL}_n^+(\mathbb{R})$, since an orientation can be specified by a choice of n linearly independent vectors where we identify any two sets that differ by a matrix of positive determinant.

Definition 6.0.13 (Associated Bundles)

Let $P \rightarrow X$ be a principal G -bundle and let $G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ be a continuous representation. The **associated bundle** is defined as $P \times_G V = \{(p, v)\} / (p, v) \sim (pg, g^{-1}v)$ since there is a right action on the first component and a left action on the second.

Example 6.0.14(?): Note that $\text{Frame}(\mathcal{E})$ is a $\text{GL}_r(\mathbb{R})$ -bundle and the map $\text{GL}_r(\mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^r)$ is a representation. At every fiber, we have $G \times_G V = (p, v) / \sim$ where there is a unique representative of this equivalence class given by (e, pv) . So $P \times_G V_p \rightarrow \{p\} \cong V_x$.

Exercise 6.0.15(?)

Show that $\text{Frame}(\mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{GL}_r(\mathbb{R})} \mathbb{R}^r \cong \mathcal{E}$. This follows from the fact that the transition functions of $P \times_G V$ are given by left multiplication of $t_{UV} : U \cap V \rightarrow G$, and so by the equivalence relation, $\text{im } t_{UV} \in \text{GL}(V)$.

Remark 6.0.16: Suppose that M^3 is an oriented Riemannian 3-manifold. Then $TM \rightarrow \text{Frame}(M)$ which is a principal $\text{SO}(3)$ -bundle. The universal cover is the double cover $\text{SU}(2) \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$, so can the transition functions be lifted? This shows up for spin structures, and we can get a \mathbb{C}^2 bundle out of this.

ToDos

List of Todos

Definitions

1.2.1	Definition – Topological Manifold	3
1.2.4	Definition – Restricted Structures on Manifolds	4
2.0.5	Definition – Kirby-Siebenmann Invariant of a 4-manifold	8
3.0.4	Definition – Signature	10
3.1.2	Definition – Riemannian Metrics	11
3.1.3	Definition – Almost complex structure	11
4.1.1	Definition – Presheaves and Sheaves	14
4.2.5	Definition – \mathcal{O} -modules	17
4.2.8	Definition – Morphisms of Sheaves	17
5.1.3	Definition – Global Sections Sheaf	19
6.0.1	Definition – Principal Bundles	21
6.0.2	Definition – The Frame Bundle	22
6.0.5	Definition – Orthogonal Frame Bundle	22
6.0.7	Definition – ?	22
6.0.9	Definition – Unitary Frame Bundle	23
6.0.13	Definition – Associated Bundles	24

Theorems

3.0.1	Theorem – Freedman	9
3.0.5	Theorem – Rokhlin's Theorem	10
3.0.7	Theorem – Donaldson	10
3.1.5	Theorem – ?	12

Exercises

4.2.11	Exercise – ?	18
5.1.2	Exercise – ?	19
5.1.9	Exercise – ?	20
6.0.15	Exercise – ?	24

Figures

List of Figures

Bibliography

- [1] Danny Calegari. *Notes on 4-manifolds*. https://math.uchicago.edu/~dannyc/courses/4manifolds_2018/4_manifolds_notes.pdf.
- [2] Richard Mandelbaum. “Four-dimensional topology: an introduction”. In: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 2.1 (Jan. 1980), pp. 1–159. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org:443/euclid.bams/1183545202>.
- [3] Akhil Matthew. *The Dirac Operator*. <https://math.uchicago.edu/~amathew/dirac.pdf>.
- [4] Yuli Rudyak. *Piecewise Linear Structures on Topological Manifolds*. <https://hopf.math.purdue.edu/Rudyak/PLstructures.pdf>.
- [5] Dietmar Salamon. *Spin Geometry and Seiberg-Witten Invariants*. <https://people.math.ethz.ch/~salamon/PREPRINTS/witsei.pdf>. 1999.
- [6] Tom Weston. *An Introduction to Cobordism Theory*. <https://people.math.umass.edu/~weston/oldpapers/cobord.pdf>.