

Last time: graded ring  $S$ ,  $\rightsquigarrow$  scheme

covered by  $D_+(f) \cong \text{Spec} \left( \left( S_+ \left[ \frac{S}{f} \right] \right)_0 \right)$   
 $f \in S_d$  for  $d > 0$   
 $\nearrow \text{Proj } S$

basic examples:  $\text{Proj } k[x_0, \dots, x_n] =: \mathbb{P}_k^n$   
 $\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{\text{deg } 1}$

$\text{Proj } k[x_0, \dots, x_n]/I = \underbrace{\text{closed subscheme}}_{\text{of } \mathbb{P}_k^n \text{ "cut out by } I \text{"}}$   
 $\uparrow$   
homog. ideal

still need to justify  
by constructing a morphism  
 $\text{Proj } S_+/I \hookrightarrow \text{Proj } S$ .

Def: A morphism of graded rings  $\varphi: T_+ \rightarrow S_+$

is a ring homomorphism such that for some integer  $d \geq 0$ ,  $\varphi(T_n) \subseteq S_{dn}$  for all  $n \geq 0$ .

(Example:  $k[y_0, y_1] \rightarrow k[x_0, x_1]$   
 $y_0 \mapsto f_0(x_0, x_1)$   
 $y_1 \mapsto f_1(x_0, x_1)$  } homog of deg  $d$ .)

Lemma: A morphism of graded rings  $\varphi: T_+ \rightarrow S_+$  induces a morphism of schemes.

$$\varphi^*: \text{Proj } S_+ \setminus \underbrace{V(\varphi(T_+))}_{\varphi} \rightarrow \text{Proj } T_+$$

On points, this morphism is  $[y] \mapsto [\varphi^{-1}(y)]$ .

$$\text{(will have: } (\varphi^*)^{-1}(\mathcal{D}(f)) = \mathcal{D}(\varphi(f)) \text{ for } f \in T_+)$$

(Recall:  $\text{Proj } T = \{ [y] \in \text{Spec } T \mid y \text{ is homog.} \}$   
 $\emptyset \neq y \in T_+$ )

So if  $V(\mathcal{U}(T_+)) = \emptyset$ , get a morphism

$$\mathcal{U}^*: \text{Proj } S \rightarrow \text{Proj } S$$

$\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(T_+)} = S_+$

$$V(x_0^2, \dots, x_n^2) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$$

"  $\emptyset$

Examples:

1)  $\mathbb{P}_k^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_k^1$  ↙ relatively prime

$$[x_0, x_1] \mapsto [f(x_0, x_1) : g(x_0, x_1)]$$

2)  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow S/\mathcal{I}$ ,  $\mathcal{I}$  a homog. ideal  
 defines  $\mathcal{U}^*: \text{Proj } S/\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \text{Proj } S$ .

Easy check: this  $\mathcal{U}^*$  is a closed embedding.

2 natural questions:

1) Can two different ideals  $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2 \subseteq S$  give the same closed subscheme? Yes.

2) Is every closed subscheme of  $\text{Proj } S$  given in this way? Yes for reasonable  $S$ .



Thm: Suppose  $S_0$  is a f.g. graded ring. Then every closed subscheme of  $\text{Proj } S$  is of the form  $V(I) = \text{Proj } (S/I) \hookrightarrow \text{Proj } S$  for some (not unique) homog. ideal  $I$ .

Pf: (pset).

Def: A projective  $A$ -scheme is an  $A$ -scheme isom. to  $\text{Proj } S$ , for  $S_0$  a f.g. graded ring over  $A$  ( $S_0 = A$ ). A quasiprojective  $A$ -scheme is a quasicompact, open subscheme of a projective  $A$ -scheme.  $\leftarrow$  immediate if  $A$  is Noetherian.

think of a scheme "between  $A_k^n$  and  $P_k^n$ "

(Note: a somewhat tricky result gives that a proj.  $A$ -scheme is actually  $\text{Proj } S$ , for  $S_0$  f.g. in degree 1, i.e.  $\text{Proj } A[x_0, \dots, x_m]/I$ , i.e. a closed subscheme of  $P_A^m$ .)

Basic properties: (quasi)projective  $A$ -schemes are  
finite type (over  $\text{Spec } A$ ) and qcqs

Why? we have a good understanding of an  
affine open base for  $\text{Proj } S$ , namely we  
have the  $D_+(f)$  and they behave well, e.g.

$$D_+(f) \cap D_+(g) = D_+(fg) \text{ is still true.}$$

# Summary:

- projective  $k$ -schemes are a large, well-behaved class of  $k$ -scheme, usually not affine.

< they look like  $\text{Proj } k[x_0, \dots, x_n] / (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ , the closed  $k$ -valued points are

"classical"  $\left\{ [x_0 : \dots : x_n] \mid \begin{array}{l} x_i \in k, \text{ not all } 0 \\ f_j(x_0, \dots, x_n) = 0 \\ \text{for } j=1, \dots, m \end{array} \right\} / \sim$  scaling.

- Many (but not all) morphisms

$$\text{Proj } k[x_0, \dots, x_n] / (f_1, \dots, f_m) \rightarrow \text{Proj } k[y_0, \dots, y_m] / (g_1, \dots, g_m)$$

are given by homog. polys compatible with  $(f_j), (g_j)$  that don't simultaneously vanish, i.e.

such that  $[x_0 : \dots : x_n] \mapsto [h_0(x_0, \dots, x_n) : \dots : h_n(x_0, \dots, x_n)]$

makes sense

$$(\text{Proj } S \rightarrow \text{Spec } S_0) \text{ is proper}$$

- more good properties to come:

"proper"  
("complete")

"like being a compact manifold"  
i.e.  $\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{C}^1 = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  is compact,  $\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{C}^1 = \mathbb{C}$  is not.

Def: A hypersurface of degree  $d$  in  $\mathbb{P}_k^n$  is a closed subscheme defined by a single homog. polynomial of degree  $d$ , i.e.

$$V(f) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_k^n \text{ for } f \in S_d \quad (S = k[x_0, \dots, x_n])$$

(names for  $d=1, 2, 3, \dots$ : hyperplane, quadric/conic, cubic, ...)

(e.g.  $V(x_1^2)$  is a quadric hypersurface in  $\mathbb{P}_k^1$   
looks like "double point"  $\leftrightarrow$  at the "origin"  $[1:0]$ )

We know that given two closed subschemes  $Z_1, Z_2 \hookrightarrow X$ , we can get a third as the intersection.

Can check:  $V(f) \cap V(g) = V(f, g)$

$$\text{Proj } k[x_0, \dots, x_n] / (f, g)$$

Question: If we take  $n$  hypersurfaces of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_n$  inside  $\mathbb{P}_k^n$ , how many intersection points do we expect?





Bezout's Thm: Let  $k$  be a field. Let  $n > 0$ . Suppose  $f_1, \dots, f_n \in k[x_0, \dots, x_n]$  are homog. polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_n$ . Let  $X = V(f_1) \cap \dots \cap V(f_n)$  (scheme-theoretic intersection of hypersurfaces in  $\mathbb{P}_k^n$ ), so  $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_k^n$  is a closed subscheme.

$\parallel$   
 $\text{Proj } k[x_0, \dots, x_n] / (f_1, \dots, f_n)$

Suppose that  $X$  is a finite  $k$ -scheme. Then  $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$  is a  $k$ -vector space of rank exactly  $d_1 d_2 \dots d_n$ .

$$\sum_{p \in X} \parallel \text{multiplicity at } p \parallel$$