(February 19, 2005)

## Bernstein's Rationality Lemma

Paul Garrett garrett@math.umn.edu http://www.math.umn.edu/~garrett/

Here we give a proof of a basic algebraic form of Bernstein's Rationality Lemma.

Let k be a field of characteristic zero, and V a k-vectorspace. A **linear system** (over k, with coefficients in V) is a set  $\Xi$  of ordered pairs  $(v_i, c_i)$  where  $v_i \in V$  and  $c_i \in k$  and  $i \in I$  for some index set I. A **solution** to the linear system is  $\lambda \in V^*$  so that, for all indices i,

$$\lambda(v_i) = c_i$$

where  $V^* = \text{Hom}_k(V, k)$  is the k-linear dual space of V. Obviously the set of all solutions is an affine subspace of  $V^*$ , so has a sense of **dimension**. A system  $\Xi$  is **homogeneous** if all the constants  $c_i$  are 0. In that case, the collection of solutions is a vector subspace of  $V^*$ . Two systems are **equivalent** if they have the same set of solutions.

**Proposition:** (Existence, Uniqueness, and Rationality) Let  $\Xi = \{(v_i, c_i) : i \in I\}$  be a k-linear system with coefficients  $v_i$  in a k-vectorspace V. Suppose that there is at most one index  $i_o \in I$  so that  $c_{i_o} \neq 0$ .

• If  $v_{i_o}$  does not lie in the k-span of  $\{v_i : i \neq i_o\}$  then there is at least one solution to the linear system.

• If the coefficient vectors  $\{v_i : i \in I\}$  span V, then there is at most one solution.

*Proof:* If  $v_{i_o}$  does not lie in the span of the other coefficient vectors, then (via the Axiom of Choice) there is a linear functional  $\lambda$  in the dual space  $V^*$  so that  $\lambda(v_i) = 0$  for  $i \neq i_o$ , but  $\lambda(v_o) = 1$ . Then  $c_{i_o}\lambda$  is a solution of the system  $\Xi$ .

Next, for two solutions  $\lambda, \lambda'$  of  $\Xi$  the difference  $\mu = \lambda - \lambda'$  is a solution of the homogeneous system  $\Xi_o = \{(v_i, 0)\}$ . If the  $v_i$  span V, then the condition

$$\mu(v_i) = 0$$
 for all  $i \in I$ 

implies that  $\mu = 0$ . This is the uniqueness.

Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a commutative k-algebra, and suppose further that  $\mathcal{O}$  is an integral domain. Let V be an  $\mathcal{O}$ -module. A **parametrized linear system** over  $\mathcal{O}$  (or over X) with coefficients in  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$  is a collection  $\Xi$  of ordered pairs  $(\mu_i, f_i)$  with  $\mu_i \in M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$ ,  $f_i \in \mathcal{M}$ .

A generic solution to such a parametrized system is

$$\lambda \in (V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M})^* = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$$

so that for all indices i

$$\lambda(\mu_i) = f_i$$

That is, a generic solution is simply a *solution* (in the previous sense) to the  $\mathcal{M}$ -linear system on the  $\mathcal{M}$ -vectorspace  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$ .

Note that we do not require the coefficient vectors  $\mu_i$  to be in the module V, but only in  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$ , and likewise the  $f_i$  need not be in  $\mathcal{O}$ , but only in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Of course, the same collection of generic solutions would be obtained if each  $(\mu_i, f_i)$  were replaced by  $(g_i\mu_i, g_if_i)$  for non-zero  $g_i \in \mathcal{O}$ . Thus, one *could* assume without loss of generality that all the  $\mu_i$  are in V and the  $f_i$  are in  $\mathcal{O}$ , but it is not necessary to do so.

For  $x \in X$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{M}$  is **holomorphic at** x if f is in the local ring  $\mathcal{O}_x$  of  $\mathcal{O}$  at x. An element  $\mu$  of  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$  is **holomorphic at** x if  $\mu \in M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}_x$ . A parametrized system  $\Xi = \{(\mu_i, f_i)\}$  is **holomorphic at** x if for all indices i both  $f_i$  and  $\mu_i$  are holomorphic at x. (From the definitions, every parametrized system is holomorphic at the generic point  $0 \in X$ ).

Let  $k_x$  be the residue field  $k_x = \mathcal{O}/x\mathcal{O}_x$  of  $\mathcal{O}$  at x. For any  $x \in X$  at which the parametrized system  $\Xi$  is holomorphic, we have the **associated pointwise system**  $\Xi_x$ , obtained by replacing all the elements

|||

 $\mu_i \in M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}_x$  by their images in  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_x$ , and likewise by replacing the  $f_i \in \mathcal{O}_x$  by their images in  $k_x$ . Thus,  $\Xi_x$  is a  $k_x$ -linear system with coefficients in  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_x$ .

A pointwise solution  $\lambda_x$  at x to the parametrized linear system  $\Xi$  is just a solution to the linear system  $\Xi_x$ . Thus, it is

$$\lambda \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(V, k_x) \approx \operatorname{Hom}_{k_x}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_x, k_x)$$

so that for all indices i

$$\lambda(\mu_i) = f_i \mod x\mathcal{O}_x$$

A solution  $\lambda$  to the pointwise system  $\Xi_y$  at y is holomorphic at x (where  $y \subset x$ ) if

$$\lambda(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_y) \subset \mathcal{O}_x / y \mathcal{O}_x$$

In that case, the solution  $\lambda$  to  $\Xi_y$  gives a solution to the pointwise system  $\Xi_x$  by taking the image of  $\lambda$  under the natural map

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{k_{y}}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_{y}, \mathcal{O}_{x}/y\mathcal{O}_{x}) \approx \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(V, \mathcal{O}_{x}/y\mathcal{O}_{x}) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(V, k_{x}) \approx \operatorname{Hom}_{k_{x}}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_{x}, k_{x})$$

where the last map arises from the quotient map

$$\mathcal{O}_x/y\mathcal{O}_x \to \mathcal{O}_x/x\mathcal{O}_x = k_x$$

The following lemma is usually assimilated into the physical intuition of algebraic geometry, but we should pay attention to what goes into its proof, since the sense of our notion of *meager set* depends upon the truth of this lemma.

**Lemma:** Suppose that  $\mathcal{O}$  is Noetherian. Given  $f \neq 0$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , there is a finite collection  $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n$  of irreducible hyperplanes so that  $1/f \in \mathcal{O}_x$  for x not in the union  $\eta_1 \cup \ldots \cup \eta_n$ . In particular, the hyperplanes are those attached to the isolated primes in a primary decomposition of the ideal  $f\mathcal{O}$ .

*Proof:* For a prime ideal  $x \in X$ , if  $f \notin x$  then  $1/f \in \mathcal{O}_x$ . Thus, we must show that if  $f \in x$  then there is a height-one prime y so that  $f \in y \subset x$ .

Let  $J = \bigcap_i Q_i$  be a primary decomposition of an ideal  $J \subset x$ , where  $Q_i$  is primary with associated prime  $x_i$ . Taking radicals,

$$x = \operatorname{rad} x \supset \bigcap_i \operatorname{rad} Q_i = \bigcap_i x_i$$

so, for some index  $i, x \supset x_i$ . Thus, x must contain some one of the minimal (i.e., isolated) primes among the primes associated to J. Krull's Principal Ideal Theorem asserts that every prime *minimal* among those occurring in a primary decomposition of  $f\mathcal{O}_x$  is height-one. This gives the result. ///

**Lemma:** Let Y be a non-meager subset of X, the prime spectrum of  $\mathcal{O}$ , where  $\mathcal{O}$  is a Noetherian integral domain. Then

$$\bigcap_{x \in Y} x\mathcal{O}_x = \{0\}$$

*Proof:* Let  $r \neq 0$  be in the indicated intersection. By the previous lemma, there would be finitely-many hypersurfaces  $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n$  so that for  $x \in X$  off the union of these hypersurfaces we would have both  $r \in \mathcal{O}_x$  and  $1/r \in \mathcal{O}_x$ . Removing from Y the intersections of Y with these hypersurfaces would still leave a non-meager set  $Y_r$ . In particular,  $Y_r$  would be non-empty, and, by construction, for all  $x \in Y_r$  both r and 1/r would lie in  $\mathcal{O}_x$ . But this would contradict the hypothesis  $r \in x\mathcal{O}_x$ . Thus, it must be that the indicated intersection is  $\{0\}$ , as claimed.

**Lemma:** Let  $\Xi = \{(\mu_i, f_i) : i \in I\}$  be a  $\mathcal{O}$ -parametrized system with coefficients in  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$ . Then • There is a union  $\bigcup_{i \in I} \eta_i$  of irreducible hyperplanes  $\eta_i$  off which the system  $\Xi$  is holomorphic.

• Let  $\{m_j : j \in J\}$  be a generating set for V over  $\mathcal{O}$ . For a generic solution  $\lambda$  of  $\Xi$ , there is a union  $\bigcup_{j \in J} \eta_i$  of irreducible hyperplanes  $\eta_i$  off which  $\lambda$  is holomorphic.

Proof: Let  $\{g_i : i \in I\}$  be a collection of non-zero elements of  $\mathcal{O}$  so that, for for all  $i, g_i \mu_i \in M$  and  $g_i f_i \in \mathcal{O}$ . Then  $\Xi$  is holomorphic off the union of the hyperplanes attached to the isolated primes occurring in the primary decompositions of the ideals  $g_i \mathcal{O}$ .

Similarly, let  $\{g_j : i \in J\}$  be a collection of non-zero elements of  $\mathcal{O}$  so that, for for all  $j \in J$ ,  $g_i \lambda(m_j) \in \mathcal{O}$ . Then  $\lambda$  is holomorphic off the union of the hyperplanes attached to the isolated primes occurring in the primary decompositions of the ideals  $g_j \mathcal{O}$ .

**Theorem:** Let k be a field, and  $\mathcal{O}$  a commutative Noetheria k-algebra. Let  $\Xi = \{(\mu_i, f_i) : i \in I\}$  be an  $\mathcal{O}$ -parametrized linear system with coefficients in  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$  where V is a countably-generated  $\mathcal{O}$ -module, where also the index set I is countable.

• If there is a unique generic solution  $\lambda$  to  $\Xi$ , then for  $x \in X$  off a meager set there is a unique solution  $\lambda_x$  to the pointwise linear system  $\Xi_x$  at x, and this pointwise solution is obtained from  $\lambda$  via the natural map

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(V, \mathcal{O}_x) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(V, \mathbf{K}_x)$$
$$\approx \operatorname{Hom}_{k_x}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_x, k_x)$$

• Suppose that Y is a non-meager subset of X so that for  $x \in Y$  the system  $\Xi$  is holomorphic at x, and so that for  $x \in Y$  the pointwise system  $\Xi_x$  at x has a unique solution  $\lambda_x$ . Then there is a unique generic solution to  $\Xi$ .

*Proof:* First, we reduce to the case that at most one of the  $f_i$  is not  $0 \in \mathcal{M}$ . If all  $f_i$  are already 0, we are done. So suppose that some  $f_{i_o}$  is non-zero. For another index i, replace the condition

$$\lambda(v_i) = f_i$$

by the condition

$$\lambda(v_i - \frac{f_i}{f_{i_o}}v_{i_o}) = 0$$

The collection of generic solutions is unchanged by such an adjustment, and off a meager subset of X this change gives pointwise systems equivalent to the original pointwise system  $\Xi_x$ . Thus, overlooking a meager subset of X, we can assume without loss of generality that for at most one index  $i_o$  is  $f_{i_o}$  not 0.

Also, we ignore the countably-many hypersurfaces on which the system  $\Xi$  fails to be holomorphic.

If there is a unique generic solution  $\lambda$ , then by the proposition the vectors  $\mu_i$  span  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$ , and if  $f_{i_o}$  is not 0 then  $\mu_{i_o}$  does not lie in the  $\mathcal{M}$ -span of the other vectors.

Let  $v_1, v_2, \ldots$  be a countable collection of generators for the  $\mathcal{O}$ -module V. The images of these  $v_j$  span all the vectorspaces  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_x$  for  $x \in X$ . Then  $v_1 \otimes 1, v_2 \otimes 1, \ldots$  is an  $\mathcal{M}$ -basis for  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}$ . Express each  $m_j \otimes 1$ as an  $\mathcal{M}$ -linear combination of the  $\mu_i$  as

$$v_j \otimes 1 = \sum_i g_{ji} \mu_i$$

with  $g_{ji} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Off the meager set of points  $x \in X$  where some one of the  $g_{ji}$  fails to be holomorphic, tensoring with  $k_x = \mathcal{O}_x/x\mathcal{O}_x$  expresses the image of  $v_j$  as a  $k_x$ -linear combination of the images of  $\mu_i$  in  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_x$ . (We have already excluded the meager set on which any one of the  $\mu_i$  fails to be holomorphic). That is, we conclude that off a meager set the pointwise system  $\Xi_x$  has at most one solution.

Then, given a generic solution  $\lambda$ , off the meager set where  $\lambda$  fails to be holomorphic, the image of  $\lambda$  under the natural map

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}_x) \approx \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(V, \mathcal{O}_x) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(V, k_x) \approx \operatorname{Hom}_{k_x}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_x, k_x)$$

is a solution of the pointwise system  $\Xi_x$ . Thus, uniqueness of the generic solution implies uniqueness of solution to pointwise systems  $\Xi_x$  for x off a meager set.

On the other hand, suppose that for x in a non-meager subset Y (on which  $\Xi$  is holomorphic) the pointwise system  $\Xi_x$  has a unique solution. To prove that a generic solution exists, we must show that  $\mu_{i_o}$  does not lie in the  $\mathcal{M}$ -span of the other  $\mu_i$ . Indeed, if

$$\mu_{i_o} = \sum_{i \neq i_o} g_i \mu_i$$

with  $g_i \in \mathcal{M}$ , then, off the meager set where some one of the  $g_i$  or  $\mu_i$  fails to be holomorphic, the image of  $\mu_{i_o}$  in  $V \otimes \mathcal{O}k_x$  would be a  $k_x$ -linear combination of the images of the other elements  $\mu_i$  with  $i \neq i_o$ . The proposition above assures that this cannot happen. Thus, there is at least one generic solution.

Suppose that there were two distinct generic solutions, and call their difference  $\delta$ . The pointwise uniqueness hypothesis assures that, for x in a non-meager set Y (on which we may assume  $\delta$  holomorphic), the image of  $\delta$  in  $\operatorname{Hom}_{k_x}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k_x, k_x)$  is 0. Thus, for all  $x \in Y$ , for all of the countably-many  $\mathcal{O}$ -generators  $m_j$  for V,

$$\delta(m_j \otimes 1) \subset x\mathcal{O}_x$$

But we saw above that the intersection of sets  $x\mathcal{O}_x$  for x ranging over any non-meager set is  $\{0\}$ . Thus,  $\delta(m_j \otimes 1) = 0$ , proving uniqueness. ///