

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

RESOLUTIONS FOR TWISTED TENSOR PRODUCTS

ANNE SHEPLER AND SARAH WITHERSPOON

Volume 298 No. 2

February 2019

RESOLUTIONS FOR TWISTED TENSOR PRODUCTS

ANNE SHEPLER AND SARAH WITHERSPOON

We build resolutions for general twisted tensor products of algebras. These bimodule and module resolutions unify many constructions in the literature and are suitable for computing Hochschild (co)homology and more generally Ext and Tor for (bi)modules. We analyze in detail the case of Ore extensions, consequently obtaining Chevalley–Eilenberg resolutions for universal enveloping algebras of Lie algebras (defining the cohomology of Lie groups and Lie algebras). Other examples include semidirect products, crossed products, Weyl algebras, Sridharan enveloping algebras, and Koszul pairs.

1. Introduction

Motivated by questions in noncommutative geometry, Čap, Schichl, and Vanžura [Čap et al. 1995] introduced a very general *twisted tensor product* of algebras to replace the (commutative) tensor product. Their examples included noncommutative 2-tori and crossed products of C^* -algebras with groups. Many other algebras of interest arise as twisted tensor product algebras: crossed products with Hopf algebras, algebras with triangular decomposition (e.g., universal enveloping algebras of Lie algebras and quantum groups), braided tensor products defined by R -matrices, and other biproduct constructions. In fact, twisted tensor product algebras are abundant: If an algebra is isomorphic to $A \otimes B$ as a vector space for two of its subalgebras A and B under the canonical inclusion maps, then it must be isomorphic to a twisted tensor product $A \otimes_{\tau} B$ for some twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$ (see [Čap et al. 1995]).

Modules over a twisted tensor product algebra arise from tensoring together modules for the individual algebras: If M and N are modules over algebras A and B , respectively, compatible with a twisting map τ , then $M \otimes N$ adopts the structure of a module over $A \otimes_{\tau} B$. We describe in this note a general method to twist together

Shepler was partially supported by Simons grant 429539. Witherspoon was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1401016.

MSC2010: primary 16E05, 16E30, 16E40; secondary 16S30, 57T10.

Keywords: twisted tensor product, projective resolutions, Hochschild (co)homology, augmented algebras.

resolutions of A -modules and B -modules in order to construct resolutions for the corresponding modules over the twisted tensor product $A \otimes_{\tau} B$. A similar method works for bimodules. In particular, we twist together resolutions of algebras over a field to obtain a resolution for a twisted tensor product algebra as a bimodule over itself.

We are motivated by a desire to understand deformations of twisted tensor products and to describe the homology theory in terms of the homology of the original factor algebras. For example, under some finiteness assumptions, the Hochschild cohomology of a tensor product of algebras is the tensor product of their Hochschild cohomology rings. A similar statement is true of the cohomology of augmented algebras. Both results hold because the tensor product of projective resolutions for the factor algebras is a projective resolution for the tensor product of the algebras.

In some particular settings, similar homological constructions have appeared for modified versions of the tensor product of algebras. We mention just a few examples. Gopalakrishnan and Sridharan [1966] constructed resolutions for modules of Ore extensions. Bergh and Oppermann [2008] twisted resolutions when the twisting arises from a bicharacter on grading groups. Jara, López Peña, and Ştefan [Jara et al. 2017] worked with Koszul pairs. Guccione and Guccione [1999; 2002] built resolutions for twisted tensor products, in particular crossed products with Hopf algebras, out of bar and Koszul resolutions of the factor algebras. We adapted this last construction in [Shepler and Witherspoon 2014] to handle more general resolutions for the case of skew group algebras in order to understand deformations. Walton and the second author generalized these resolutions to smash products with Hopf algebras in [Walton and Witherspoon 2014].

In this paper, we unify many of these previous constructions and provide methods useful in new settings for finding resolutions of modules over twisted tensor product algebras: We show very generally that projective resolutions for bimodules of two factor algebras can be twisted together to construct a projective resolution for the resulting bimodule for the twisted tensor product given some compatibility conditions. This twisting of resolutions provides an efficient means for computing and handling Hochschild (co)homology in particular. A similar construction applies to projective (left) module resolutions used, for example, to compute (co)homology of augmented algebras.

We verify that many known resolutions may be viewed as twisted resolutions in this way, including some of those mentioned above. We give details in the case of Ore extensions. In particular, the bimodule Koszul resolution of a universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a twisted resolution when $\mathfrak{g}$ is a finite-dimensional supersolvable Lie algebra. More general Lie algebras can be handled via triangular decomposition. Our method also leads to standard resolutions for Weyl algebras and some Sridharan enveloping algebras. For an Ore extension, we adapt results of

Gopalakrishnan and Sridharan [1966] to construct twisted product resolutions of modules. We thus regard the Chevalley–Eilenberg complex of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ as a twisted product resolution. This defines Lie algebra and Lie group cohomology in terms of an iterative twisting of resolutions.

In Section 2, we give definitions and some preliminary results. Bimodule twisted tensor product complexes are constructed in Section 3 and we show they give projective resolutions in Theorem 3.10. Section 4 gives applications to some types of Ore extensions. We construct twisted tensor product complexes for resolving modules in Section 5, and we show these complexes are projective resolutions in Theorem 5.12. Applications to Ore extensions appear in Section 6.

We fix a field k of arbitrary characteristic throughout. All tensor products are over k unless otherwise indicated, i.e., $\otimes = \otimes_k$, and all algebras are k -algebras. Modules are left modules unless otherwise described.

2. Twisted tensor product algebras and compatible resolutions

In this section, we recall twisted tensor product algebras from [Čap et al. 1995] and define a compatibility condition necessary for twisting resolutions together. Examples include skew group algebras and crossed products with Hopf algebras [Montgomery 1993], twisted tensor products given by bicharacters of grading groups [Bergh and Oppermann 2008], braided products arising from R -matrices [Manin 1988], two-cocycle twists of Hopf algebras [Radford and Schneider 2008], and more.

Let A and B be associative algebras over k with multiplication maps $m_A : A \otimes A \rightarrow A$ and $m_B : B \otimes B \rightarrow B$ and multiplicative identities 1_A and 1_B , respectively. We write 1 for the identity map on any set.

Twisted tensor products. *A twisting map*

$$\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$$

is a bijective k -linear map for which $\tau(1_B \otimes a) = a \otimes 1_B$ and $\tau(b \otimes 1_A) = 1_A \otimes b$ for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, and

$$(2.1) \quad \tau \circ (m_B \otimes m_A) = (m_A \otimes m_B) \circ (1 \otimes \tau \otimes 1) \circ (\tau \otimes \tau) \circ (1 \otimes \tau \otimes 1)$$

as maps $B \otimes B \otimes A \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$. The *twisted tensor product algebra* $A \otimes_\tau B$ is the vector space $A \otimes B$ together with multiplication m_τ given by such a twisting map τ . By [Čap et al. 1995, Proposition/Definition 2.3], the algebra $A \otimes_\tau B$ is associative.

Note that the left-right distinction in a twisted tensor product algebra is artificial since $A \otimes_\tau B \cong B \otimes_{\tau^{-1}} A$. Indeed, one might identify $A \otimes_\tau B$ with the algebra generated by A and B (so that A and B are subalgebras) with relations given by (2.1).

If A and B are $\mathbb{N}$ -graded algebras, we take the standard $\mathbb{N}$ -grading on $A \otimes B$ and $B \otimes A$ and say a twisting map τ is *strongly graded* if it takes $B_j \otimes A_i$ to $A_i \otimes B_j$ for all i, j following Conner and Goetz [2018]. (Note that [Jara et al. 2017] leave off the adjective *strongly*.) In this case, the twisted tensor product algebra $A \otimes_\tau B$ is $\mathbb{N}$ -graded.

Example 2.2. The Weyl algebra $\mathcal{W} = k\langle x, y \rangle / (xy - yx - 1)$ is isomorphic to the twisted tensor product $A \otimes_\tau B$ of $A = k[x]$ and $B = k[y]$ with twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$ defined by $\tau(y \otimes x) = x \otimes y - 1 \otimes 1$. Likewise, the Weyl algebra $\mathcal{W}_n$ on $2n$ indeterminates, which is equal to

$$k\langle x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n \rangle / (x_i x_j - x_j x_i, y_i y_j - y_j y_i, x_i y_j - y_j x_i - \delta_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq n),$$

is isomorphic to a twisted tensor product. These are examples of (iterated) Ore extensions, which we consider in detail in Section 4.

Example 2.3. A skew group algebra $S \rtimes G$ for a finite group G acting on an algebra S by automorphisms is isomorphic to the twisted tensor product $kG \otimes_\tau S$ of the group algebra kG and of S . The twisting map τ is defined by $\tau(s \otimes g) = g \otimes g^{-1}(s)$ for $s \in S$ and $g \in G$. We consider the special case where S is a Koszul algebra at the end of Section 3.

Bimodules over twisted tensor products. We fix a twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$ for k -algebras A and B .

Definition 2.4. An A -bimodule M is *compatible with τ* if there is a bijective k -linear map $\tau_{B,M} : B \otimes M \rightarrow M \otimes B$ commuting with the bimodule structure of M and multiplication in B , i.e., as maps on $B \otimes B \otimes M$ and on $B \otimes A \otimes M \otimes A$, respectively,

$$(2.5) \quad \tau_{B,M}(m_B \otimes 1) = (1 \otimes m_B)(\tau_{B,M} \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau_{B,M}), \quad \text{and}$$

$$(2.6) \quad \tau_{B,M}(1 \otimes \rho_{A,M}) = (\rho_{A,M} \otimes 1)(1 \otimes 1 \otimes \tau)(1 \otimes \tau_{B,M} \otimes 1)(\tau \otimes 1 \otimes 1),$$

where $\rho_{A,M} : A \otimes M \otimes A \rightarrow M$ is the bimodule structure map. If A is graded and M is a graded A -bimodule, we say that M is *compatible with a strongly graded twisting map τ* if there is a map $\tau_{B,M}$ as above that takes $B_i \otimes M_j$ to $M_j \otimes B_i$ for all i, j .

Remark 2.7. Note that the above definition applies to B -bimodules as well as A -bimodules by reversing the roles of A and B . Indeed, we apply the definition to the algebra B , the twisted tensor product $B \otimes_{\tau^{-1}} A$, and the twisting map τ^{-1} to obtain conditions for a B -bimodule N to be compatible with τ^{-1} . We may rewrite these conditions using the convenient notation $\tau_{N,A} = (\tau_{A,N}^{-1})^{-1}$. We obtain an equivalent

right version of the above definition: A given B -bimodule N is *compatible* with τ^{-1} when there is some bijective k -linear map $\tau_{N,A} : N \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes N$ satisfying

$$(2.8) \quad \tau_{N,A}(1 \otimes m_A) = (m_A \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau_{N,A})(\tau_{N,A} \otimes 1) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(2.9) \quad \tau_{N,A}(\rho_{B,N} \otimes 1) = (1 \otimes \rho_{B,N})(\tau \otimes 1 \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau_{N,A} \otimes 1)(1 \otimes 1 \otimes \tau),$$

as maps on $N \otimes A \otimes A$ and on $B \otimes N \otimes B \otimes A$, respectively, where

$$\rho_{B,N} : B \otimes N \otimes B \rightarrow N$$

is the bimodule structure map.

In light of the last remark, we will say a bimodule is *compatible with τ* when it is either an A -bimodule compatible with τ or a B -bimodule compatible with τ^{-1} , since one often identifies $A \otimes_{\tau} B$ and the isomorphic algebra $B \otimes_{\tau^{-1}} A$ in practice.

Remark 2.10. An A -bimodule M is compatible with the twisting map τ exactly when there is a bijective k -linear map

$$\tau_{B,M} : B \otimes M \rightarrow M \otimes B$$

making the following diagram commute:

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & B \otimes M \otimes B & & \\ & \nearrow 1 \otimes \tau_{B,M} & & \searrow \tau_{B,M} \otimes 1 & \\ B \otimes B \otimes M & & & & M \otimes B \otimes B \\ & \searrow m_B \otimes 1 & & \nearrow 1 \otimes m_B & \\ & B \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\tau_{B,M}} & M \otimes B & \\ & \nearrow 1 \otimes \rho_{A,M} & & \searrow \rho_{A,M} \otimes 1 & \\ B \otimes A \otimes M \otimes A & & & & A \otimes M \otimes A \otimes B \\ & \searrow \tau \otimes 1 \otimes 1 & & \nearrow 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \tau & \\ & A \otimes B \otimes M \otimes A & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \tau_{B,M} \otimes 1} & A \otimes M \otimes B \otimes A & \end{array}$$

A similar diagram expresses compatibility of a B -bimodule N with τ .

Example 2.12. Let $M = A$, an A -bimodule via multiplication. Then A is compatible with τ via $\tau_{B,A} = \tau$. Similarly $N = B$ is compatible with τ .

Bimodule structure. When M and N are compatible with τ , the tensor product $M \otimes N$ is naturally an $A \otimes_\tau B$ -bimodule via the following composition of maps:

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} A \otimes_\tau B \otimes M \otimes N \otimes A \otimes_\tau B &\xrightarrow{1 \otimes \tau_{B,M} \otimes \tau_{N,A} \otimes 1} A \otimes M \otimes B \otimes A \otimes N \otimes B \\ &\xrightarrow{1 \otimes 1 \otimes \tau \otimes 1 \otimes 1} A \otimes M \otimes A \otimes B \otimes N \otimes B \\ &\xrightarrow{\rho_{A,M} \otimes \rho_{B,N}} M \otimes N. \end{aligned}$$

Bimodule resolutions. For any k -algebra A , let $A^e = A \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ be its enveloping algebra, with A^{op} the opposite algebra to A . We view an A -bimodule M as a left A^e -module. In Lemma 3.1 below, we will construct a projective resolution of an $(A \otimes_\tau B)^e$ -module $M \otimes N$ from individual resolutions of M and N using some compatibility conditions. Let $P_\bullet(M)$ be an A^e -projective resolution of M and let $P_\bullet(N)$ be a B^e -projective resolution of N :

$$(2.14) \quad \cdots \rightarrow P_2(M) \rightarrow P_1(M) \rightarrow P_0(M) \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(2.15) \quad \cdots \rightarrow P_2(N) \rightarrow P_1(N) \rightarrow P_0(N) \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0.$$

Bar and reduced bar resolutions. For example, M could be A itself and $P_\bullet(A)$ could be the *bar resolution* $\text{Bar}_\bullet(A)$ given by $\text{Bar}_n(A) = A^{\otimes(n+2)}$ with differential

$$a_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_{n+1} \mapsto \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i a_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_i a_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes a_{n+1}$$

for all $n \geq 0$ and $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n+1} \in A$. We also use the *reduced bar resolution* $\overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A)$ with $\overline{\text{Bar}}_n(A) = A \otimes \overline{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes A$ for $\overline{A} = A/k1_A$ and differential given by the same formula.

Compatibility conditions. We now define what it means for resolutions to be compatible with the twisting map τ . We tensor arbitrary resolutions (2.14) and (2.15) with A and B on the right and left to obtain complexes

$$P_\bullet(N) \otimes A, \quad A \otimes P_\bullet(N), \quad P_\bullet(M) \otimes B, \quad \text{and} \quad B \otimes P_\bullet(M).$$

Viewing these simply as exact sequences of vector spaces, we note that any k -linear maps $\tau_{N,A} : N \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes N$ and $\tau_{B,M} : B \otimes M \rightarrow M \otimes B$ can be lifted to k -linear chain maps

$$(2.16) \quad \tau_{P_\bullet(N),A} : P_\bullet(N) \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes P_\bullet(N) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{B,P_\bullet(M)} : B \otimes P_\bullet(M) \rightarrow P_\bullet(M) \otimes B.$$

For simplicity in the sequel, we will write $\tau_{i,A} = \tau_{P_i(N),A}$ and $\tau_{B,i} = \tau_{B,P_i(M)}$, for each i , when no confusion will arise. We will use such maps to glue the two resolutions together provided they satisfy the following compatibility conditions. These conditions just state that the chain maps commute with multiplication and

with bimodule structure maps. There are many settings in which compatible chain maps do exist, as we will see.

Definition 2.17. Let M be an A -bimodule that is compatible with τ . A projective A -bimodule resolution $P_\bullet(M)$ is *compatible with the twisting map τ* if each $P_i(M)$ is compatible with τ via a map

$$\tau_{B,i} : B \otimes P_i(M) \rightarrow P_i(M) \otimes B,$$

with $\tau_{B,\bullet}$ a chain map lifting $\tau_{B,M}$. Suppose A is graded, M is a graded A -bimodule, and $P_\bullet(M)$ is a graded projective A -bimodule resolution; we say that $P_\bullet(M)$ is *compatible with a strongly graded twisting map τ* if there are maps $\tau_{B,i}$ as above taking $B_j \otimes (P_i(M))_l$ to $(P_i(M))_l \otimes B_j$ for all j, l .

Remark 2.18. The above definition applies to B -bimodule resolutions as well as A -bimodule resolutions by reversing the roles of A and B in the definition, again as $A \otimes_\tau B = B \otimes_{\tau^{-1}} A$. For a B -bimodule N that is compatible with τ , the definition implies that a projective B -bimodule resolution $P_\bullet(N)$ of N is *compatible with the twisting map τ* when each $P_i(N)$ is compatible with τ via a map

$$\tau_{i,A} : P_i(N) \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes P_i(N),$$

with $\tau_{\bullet,A}$ a chain map lifting $\tau_{N,A}$. Thus we say a resolution is compatible with τ if it is either an A -bimodule resolution or a B -bimodule resolution compatible with τ .

We provide some small examples later: Example 2.21 (Weyl algebra) and Example 3.13 (skew group algebra). First, a remark on embedding resolutions and some general results.

Remark 2.19. Note that compatibility is preserved under embedding of resolutions so long as the extensions of the twisting map τ preserve the embedding. Specifically, assume

$$\phi : Q_\bullet(A) \hookrightarrow P_\bullet(A)$$

is an embedding of resolutions of the algebra A , and $P_\bullet(A)$ is compatible with a twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$ via chain maps

$$\tau_{B,i} : B \otimes P_i(A) \rightarrow P_i(A) \otimes B.$$

If the maps $\tau_{B,i}$ preserve the embedding in the obvious sense that each $\tau_{B,i}$ restricts to a surjective map $B \otimes \text{Im}(\phi) \rightarrow \text{Im}(\phi) \otimes B$, then $Q_\bullet(A)$ is compatible with τ via these restrictions.

Compatibility of bar and Koszul resolutions. If A and B are both Koszul algebras and τ is a strongly graded twisting map, then the algebra $A \otimes_\tau B$ is known to be Koszul (see [Polishchuk and Positselski 2005, Example 4.7.3], [Jara et al. 2017, Corollary 4.1.9], or [Walton and Witherspoon 2018, Proposition 1.8]). Conner

and Goetz [2018] examine the situation when τ is not strongly graded. We show next that both bar and Koszul resolutions are compatible with twisting maps. We always assume our Koszul algebras are connected graded algebras, so that they are quotients of tensor algebras on generating vector spaces in degree 1. Note that the roles of A and B may be exchanged in the next proposition.

Proposition 2.20. *Let τ be a twisting map for some k -algebras A and B .*

- (1) *The bar resolution $\text{Bar}_\bullet(A)$ is compatible with τ .*
- (2) *The reduced bar resolution $\overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A)$ is compatible with τ .*
- (3) *If A is a Koszul algebra, B is a graded algebra, and τ is strongly graded, then the Koszul resolution $\text{Kos}_\bullet(A)$ is compatible with τ .*

Proof. (i) The bar resolution of A may be twisted by repeated application of the map τ , i.e., define

$$\tau_{B,i} : B \otimes A^{\otimes(i+2)} \rightarrow A^{\otimes(i+2)} \otimes B$$

by applying τ to the first two tensor factors on the left, then applying τ to next two tensor factors, and so on:

$$\tau_{B,i} = (1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 \otimes \tau)(1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 \otimes \tau \otimes 1) \cdots (1 \otimes \tau \otimes 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1)(\tau \otimes 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1).$$

Then $\text{Bar}_\bullet(A)$ is compatible with τ via $\tau_{B,i}$, as may be verified directly by repeated use of (2.1).

(ii) Write the terms in the bar complex $\text{Bar}_\bullet(A)$ as $P_i = A^{\otimes(i+2)}$ for each i , and define the terms in the reduced bar complex $\overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A)$ by $\overline{P}_i = A \otimes \overline{A}^{\otimes i} \otimes A$. For each i , let T_i be the kernel of the quotient map $\text{Bar}_i(A) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_i(A)$. Then $T_\bullet$ is a subcomplex of $\text{Bar}_\bullet(A)$ and $\overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A) \cong \text{Bar}_\bullet(A)/T_\bullet$. By definition of the twisting map τ , the multiplicative identity 1_A commutes with elements of B under τ , implying that $\tau_{B,i}$ of part (i) takes $B \otimes T_i$ onto $T_i \otimes B$ for each i . Let $\bar{\tau}_{B,i} : B \otimes \overline{\text{Bar}}_i(A) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_i(A) \otimes B$ be the corresponding map on quotients. Then $\overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A)$ is compatible with τ via the maps $\bar{\tau}_{B,i}$.

(iii) The proof of [Walton and Witherspoon 2018, Proposition 1.8] shows that the embedding $\text{Kos}_\bullet(A) \hookrightarrow \text{Bar}_\bullet(A)$ of bimodule resolutions is preserved by the iterated twisting in part (i) above (see Remark 2.19). Thus $\text{Kos}_\bullet(A)$ satisfies compatibility. $\square$

We next give an example showing how Proposition 2.20 can be used for Koszul resolutions even when the twisting map τ is not strongly graded.

Example 2.21. As in Example 2.2, let $\mathcal{W}$ be the Weyl algebra on x, y with $A = k[x]$ and $B = k[y]$. Let $\text{Kos}_\bullet(A)$ be the Koszul resolution of A as an A -bimodule,

$$0 \rightarrow A \otimes V \otimes A \xrightarrow{d_1} A \otimes A \xrightarrow{m} A \rightarrow 0,$$

where $V = \text{Span}_k\{x\} \subset A$, $d_1(1 \otimes x \otimes 1) = x \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes x$, and m is multiplication. Let $\bar{\tau} : B \otimes V \rightarrow V \otimes B$ be the swap map $b \otimes v \mapsto v \otimes b$ for all b in B and v in V , and define

$$\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet} : B \otimes \text{Kos}_\bullet(A) \rightarrow \text{Kos}_\bullet(A) \otimes B$$

by iterations of τ and $\bar{\tau}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\tau}_{B,0} : B \otimes A \otimes A &\xrightarrow{\tau \otimes 1} A \otimes B \otimes A \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \tau} A \otimes A \otimes B, \quad \text{and} \\ \bar{\tau}_{B,1} : B \otimes A \otimes V \otimes A &\xrightarrow{\tau \otimes 1 \otimes 1} A \otimes B \otimes V \otimes A \\ &\xrightarrow{1 \otimes \bar{\tau} \otimes 1} A \otimes V \otimes B \otimes A \xrightarrow{1 \otimes 1 \otimes \tau} A \otimes V \otimes A \otimes B. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\bar{\tau}_{\bullet,A} : \text{Kos}_\bullet(B) \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes \text{Kos}_\bullet(B)$ similarly for the Koszul resolution $\text{Kos}_\bullet(B)$ of B . Note that τ is not strongly graded, so part (iii) of Proposition 2.20 does not apply even though both A and B are Koszul algebras. Instead, we appeal to part (ii) and Remark 2.19 after taking canonical embeddings $\text{Kos}_\bullet(A) \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A)$ and $\text{Kos}_\bullet(B) \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(B)$. (For example, view $A \otimes V \otimes A$ as a subspace of $A \otimes \bar{A} \otimes A$; the terms in other degrees are either 0 or the same as in the bar resolution.) The maps $\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet}$ and $\bar{\tau}_{\bullet,A}$ above are the restrictions to $B \otimes \text{Kos}_\bullet(A)$ and $\text{Kos}_\bullet(B) \otimes A$ of the maps of the same name in the proof of Proposition 2.20(ii) (after identifying V with its image under the quotient map $A \rightarrow \bar{A}$). In this way, we see that the Koszul resolutions $\text{Kos}_\bullet(A)$ and $\text{Kos}_\bullet(B)$ are compatible with the twisting map τ via $\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet}$ and $\bar{\tau}_{\bullet,A}$. We extend these ideas in Theorem 4.2.

3. Twisted product resolutions for Bimodules

Again, we fix k -algebras A and B with a twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$ and consider an A -bimodule M and B -bimodule N . We build a projective resolution of $M \otimes N$ as a bimodule over $A \otimes_\tau B$ from resolutions $P_\bullet(M)$ and $P_\bullet(N)$ under our compatibility assumptions. We give the construction in Lemma 3.1, prove exactness in Lemma 3.5, and show in Lemma 3.9 that the modules in the construction are indeed projective under an additional assumption.

Lemma 3.1. *Let M be an A -bimodule and let N be a B -bimodule, both compatible with a twisting map τ . Let $P_\bullet(M)$ and $P_\bullet(N)$ be projective A - and B -bimodule resolutions of M and N , respectively, that are compatible with τ . For each $i, j \geq 0$, let*

$$(3.2) \quad X_{i,j} = P_i(M) \otimes P_j(N),$$

an $A \otimes_\tau B$ -bimodule via diagram (2.13). Then $X_{\bullet,\bullet}$ is a bicomplex of $A \otimes_\tau B$ -bimodules with horizontal and vertical differentials given by $d_{i,j}^h = d_i \otimes 1$ and

$d_{i,j}^v = (-1)^i \otimes d_j$, where d_i and d_j denote the differentials of the appropriate resolutions:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 X_{0,2} & \xleftarrow{d_{1,2}^h} & X_{1,2} & \xleftarrow{d_{2,2}^h} & X_{2,2} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \cdots \\
 \downarrow d_{0,2}^v & & \downarrow d_{1,2}^v & & \downarrow d_{2,2}^v & & \\
 X_{0,1} & \xleftarrow{d_{1,1}^h} & X_{1,1} & \xleftarrow{d_{2,1}^h} & X_{2,1} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \cdots \\
 \downarrow d_{0,1}^v & & \downarrow d_{1,1}^v & & \downarrow d_{2,1}^v & & \\
 X_{0,0} & \xleftarrow{d_{1,0}^h} & X_{1,0} & \xleftarrow{d_{2,0}^h} & X_{2,0} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \cdots
 \end{array}$$

Proof. The k -vector spaces $X_{i,j}$ form a tensor product bicomplex with differentials as stated. The bimodule action of $A \otimes_\tau B$ on $X_{i,j}$ commutes with the horizontal and vertical differentials since $\tau_{\bullet,B}$ and $\tau_{A,\bullet}$ are chain maps. Therefore this is an $A \otimes_\tau B$ -bimodule bicomplex. $\square$

Definition 3.3. The *twisted product complex* $X_\bullet$ is the total complex of $X_{\bullet,\bullet}$, i.e., when augmented by $M \otimes N$, it is the complex

$$(3.4) \quad \cdots \rightarrow X_2 \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow M \otimes N \rightarrow 0$$

with $X_n = \bigoplus_{i+j=n} X_{i,j}$, and n -th differential $\sum_{i+j=n} d_{i,j}$ where

$$d_{i,j} = d_i \otimes 1 + (-1)^i \otimes d_j.$$

Lemma 3.5. *The twisted product complex (3.4) is exact.*

Proof. By the Künneth theorem [Weibel 1994, Theorem 3.6.3], for each n there is an exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{i+j=n} H_i(P_\bullet(M)) \otimes H_j(P_\bullet(N)) \rightarrow H_n(P_\bullet(M) \otimes P_\bullet(N)) \\
 &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{i+j=n-1} \text{Tor}_1^k(H_i(P_\bullet(M)), H_j(P_\bullet(N))) \rightarrow 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now $P_\bullet(M)$ and $P_\bullet(N)$ are exact other than in degree 0, where they have homology M and N , respectively. Therefore

$$H_i(P_\bullet(M)) = 0 \text{ for all } i > 0 \text{ and } H_j(P_\bullet(N)) = 0 \text{ for all } j > 0.$$

The Tor term is 0 since k is a field. Thus for all $n > 0$, $H_n(P_\bullet(M) \otimes P_\bullet(N)) = 0$, and

$$H_0(P_\bullet(M) \otimes P_\bullet(N)) \cong H_0(P_\bullet(M)) \otimes H_0(P_\bullet(N)) \cong M \otimes N$$

as vector spaces. Thus the complex (3.4) is exact. $\square$

In practice, one often can show directly that each $X_{i,j}$ is projective as an $A \otimes_\tau B$ -bimodule, for example, when working with bar resolutions and/or Koszul resolutions. For the general case, we need an extra compatibility assumption, which we explain next. As each $P_i(N)$ is a projective B -bimodule, it embeds into a free B^e -module $(B^e)^{\oplus J}$ for some indexing set J . In the following definition, we use the map $(\tau \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau) : B^e \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B^e$.

Definition 3.6. A chain map $\tau_{i,A} : P_i(N) \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes P_i(N)$ is *compatible with a chosen embedding* $P_i(N) \hookrightarrow (B^e)^{\oplus J}$ (for some indexing set J) if the corresponding diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_i(N) \otimes A & \hookrightarrow & (B^e)^{\oplus J} \otimes A \\ \tau_{i,A} \downarrow & & \downarrow ((\tau \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau))^{\oplus J} \\ A \otimes P_i(N) & \hookrightarrow & A \otimes (B^e)^{\oplus J} \end{array}$$

Similarly, the map $\tau_{B,i}$ of (2.16) is *compatible with a chosen embedding* of $P_i(M)$ into a free A^e -module $(A^e)^{\oplus I}$ (for some indexing set I) if the corresponding diagram is commutative, i.e., if $\tau_{B,i}$ is the restriction of the map $((1 \otimes \tau)(\tau \otimes 1))^{\oplus I}$ to $B \otimes P_i(M)$.

Remark 3.7. In many settings, one sees directly that each $X_{i,j}$ is projective, in which case one need not consider this extra compatibility condition, as the next lemma is not needed. This is the case, for example, when twisting by a bicharacter on grading groups (see [Bergh and Oppermann 2008, Lemma 3.3]). In other settings, $\tau_{i,A}$ and $\tau_{B,i}$ are automatically compatible with chosen embeddings into free modules, for example if A and B are Koszul algebras and the embeddings are standard embeddings into bar resolutions (see [Walton and Witherspoon 2018, Proposition 1.8]).

Example 3.8. As in Examples 2.2 and 2.21, let $\mathcal{W} \cong A \otimes_\tau B$ be the Weyl algebra on x, y , $A = k[x]$, and $B = k[y]$. By construction, each map $\bar{\tau}_{i,A}$ is compatible with the canonical embedding $\text{Kos}_i(A) \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_i(A)$ and likewise $\bar{\tau}_{B,i}$ is compatible with $\text{Kos}_i(B) \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_i(B)$.

Lemma 3.9. If $\tau_{B,i}$ and $\tau_{j,A}$ are compatible with chosen embeddings of $P_i(M)$ and $P_j(N)$ into free modules, then $X_{i,j} = P_i(M) \otimes P_j(N)$ is a projective $A \otimes_\tau B$ -bimodule.

Proof. First we verify the lemma in the case where $P_i(M) = A^e$, $P_j(N) = B^e$, and the chosen embeddings are the identity maps. In this case,

$$X_{i,j} = A^e \otimes B^e = A \otimes A^{\text{op}} \otimes B \otimes B^{\text{op}}.$$

One checks that the map

$$1 \otimes \tau \otimes 1 : A \otimes B \otimes (A \otimes B)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow A \otimes A^{\text{op}} \otimes B \otimes B^{\text{op}}$$

is an isomorphism of $(A \otimes_{\tau} B)^e$ -modules by (2.1) and the definition of the action given in the proof of Lemma 3.1. If $P_i(M)$ and $P_j(N)$ are arbitrary free modules, and the chosen embeddings are identity maps, we apply the above map to each summand $A^e \otimes B^e$ of $P_i(M) \otimes P_j(N)$ to see that $X_{i,j}$ is a free $(A \otimes_{\tau} B)^e$ -module.

Now we consider the general case, including the possibility that at least one of $P_i(M)$, $P_j(N)$ is free but the corresponding chosen embedding into a (possibly different) free module is not the identity map. The first part of the proof together with the compatibility hypothesis implies that the embedding of k -vector spaces $P_i(M) \otimes P_j(N) \hookrightarrow (A^e)^{\oplus I} \otimes (B^e)^{\oplus J}$ given by the tensor product of the two embedding maps is a map of $(A \otimes_{\tau} B)^e$ -modules. $\square$

We combine the lemmas to obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *Let A and B be k -algebras, and let $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$ be a twisting map. Let M be an A -bimodule and N a B -bimodule with projective A - and B -bimodule resolutions $P_{\bullet}(M)$ and $P_{\bullet}(N)$, respectively. Assume that M , N , $P_{\bullet}(M)$, and $P_{\bullet}(N)$ are compatible with τ and the corresponding maps $\tau_{B,i}$ and $\tau_{j,A}$ are compatible with chosen embeddings of $P_i(M)$ and $P_j(N)$ into free modules. Then the twisted product complex with*

$$X_n = \bigoplus_{i+j=n} X_{i,j} \quad \text{for } X_{i,j} = P_i(M) \otimes P_j(N)$$

gives a projective resolution of $M \otimes N$ as a $A \otimes_{\tau} B$ -bimodule:

$$\cdots \rightarrow X_2 \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow M \otimes N \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. The result follows from Lemmas 3.1, 3.5, and 3.9. $\square$

Remark 3.11. The theorem generally unifies known constructions of resolutions in several different contexts, for example, twisted tensor products given by bicharacters of grading groups [Bergh and Oppermann 2008], crossed products [Guccione and Guccione 2002], skew group algebras (semidirect products) of Koszul algebras and finite groups [Shepler and Witherspoon 2014], and smash products of Koszul algebras with Hopf algebras [Walton and Witherspoon 2014].

Theorem 3.10 combined with Proposition 2.20 and Remark 3.7 implies that a twisted product resolution of $A \otimes_{\tau} B$ as a bimodule always exists, since bar resolutions may always be twisted (and likewise Koszul resolutions, when one or both of the algebras is Koszul; see also [Jara et al. 2017; Polishchuk and Positselski 2005; Walton and Witherspoon 2018]):

Corollary 3.12. *Let A and B be k -algebras with twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow B \otimes A$. The following are projective resolutions of $A \otimes_\tau B$ as a bimodule over itself.*

- *The twisted product complex of two bar resolutions.*
- *The twisted product complex of two Koszul resolutions when A and B are Koszul algebras and τ is strongly graded.*
- *The twisted product complex of one bar resolution and one Koszul resolution in the case where one of A or B is Koszul and the other is graded, for τ strongly graded.*

Moreover, bar resolutions may be replaced by reduced bar resolutions in the above statements.

Examples: skew group algebras. We give some details for a class of examples introduced in Example 2.3. The resolutions in [Shepler and Witherspoon 2014] for $S \rtimes G$, where G is a finite group acting by graded automorphisms on a Koszul algebra S , appear different from but are equivalent to (3.4) when $M = kG$ (the group algebra) and $N = S$. Note that $kG \otimes S$ is isomorphic to $S \rtimes G$ as an $(S \rtimes G)$ -bimodule via the twisting map τ . In [Shepler and Witherspoon 2014], the modules $X_{i,j}$ are given as

$$(S \rtimes G) \otimes C'_i \otimes D'_j \otimes (S \rtimes G),$$

where $P_i(kG) = kG \otimes C'_i \otimes kG$, $P_j(S) = S \otimes D'_j \otimes S$ are free $(kG)^e$ - and S^e -modules determined by vector spaces C'_i , D'_j , respectively. We assume $P_i(kG)$ is G -graded and the grading is compatible with the kG -bimodule action. We assume $P_j(S)$ is a kG -module in such a way that the differentials are kG -module homomorphisms, and this action is compatible with that of S , so that $P_j(S)$ becomes an $S \rtimes G$ -module. Compatibility with τ follows from these assumptions. There is an isomorphism of $S \rtimes G$ -bimodules,

$$(kG \otimes C'_i \otimes kG) \otimes (S \otimes D'_j \otimes S) \xrightarrow{\sim} (S \rtimes G) \otimes C'_i \otimes D'_j \otimes (S \rtimes G),$$

similar to that used in the proof of [Shepler and Witherspoon 2014, Theorem 4.3], given by

$$g \otimes x \otimes g' \otimes s \otimes y \otimes s' \mapsto g((hg')s) \otimes x \otimes (g'y) \otimes g's'$$

for all $g, g' \in G$, $s, s' \in S$, x in the h -component of C'_i and $y \in D'_j$.

Example 3.13. In particular, [Shepler and Witherspoon 2014, Example 4.6] involves a resolution that is neither a Koszul resolution nor a bar resolution and yet satisfies compatibility. In that example, k is a field of positive characteristic p , $S = k[x, y]$, and $G = \langle g \rangle$ is a group of order p acting on S by $g \cdot x = x$, $g \cdot y = x + y$. The resolution $P_\bullet(S)$ is the Koszul resolution $\text{Kos}_\bullet(S)$ of S ,

$$0 \rightarrow S \otimes \wedge^2 V \otimes S \rightarrow S \otimes \wedge^1 V \otimes S \rightarrow S \otimes S \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0,$$

where $V = \text{Span}_k\{x, y\}$. The resolution $P_\bullet(kG)$ is the bimodule resolution of kG ,

$$(3.14) \quad \cdots \xrightarrow{\eta} kG \otimes kG \xrightarrow{\gamma} kG \otimes kG \xrightarrow{\eta} kG \otimes kG \xrightarrow{\gamma} kG \otimes kG \xrightarrow{m} kG \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\gamma = g \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes g$, $\eta = g^{p-1} \otimes 1 + g^{p-2} \otimes g + \cdots + 1 \otimes g^{p-1}$, and m is multiplication. Compatibility follows from Proposition 2.20(i) using Remark 2.19 after taking the standard embedding $\text{Kos}_\bullet(S) \hookrightarrow \text{Bar}_\bullet(S)$ and embedding (3.14) into $\text{Bar}_\bullet(kG)$ (see, e.g., [Guccione et al. 1991]).

4. Bimodule resolutions of Ore extensions

Many algebras of interest are Ore extensions of other algebras. We show how to twist bimodule resolutions for such extensions in this section.

Ore extensions as twisted tensor products. Let R be a k -algebra and fix a k -algebra automorphism σ of R . Let $\delta : R \rightarrow R$ be a left σ -derivation of R , that is,

$$(4.1) \quad \delta(rs) = \delta(r)s + \sigma(r)\delta(s) \quad \text{for all } r, s \in R.$$

The Ore extension $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is the algebra with underlying vector space $R[x]$ and multiplication determined by that of R and of $k[x]$ and the additional Ore relation

$$xr = \sigma(r)x + \delta(r) \quad \text{for all } r \in R.$$

An Ore extension $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is thus isomorphic to a twisted tensor product $A \otimes_\tau B$ where $A = R$, $B = k[x]$, and the twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$ satisfies

$$\tau(x \otimes r) = \sigma(r) \otimes x + \delta(r) \otimes 1 \quad \text{for all } r \in R.$$

Free resolutions for iterated Ore extensions. We will work with general Ore extensions in Section 6. Here for simplicity we restrict to the case where the automorphism on R is the identity, $\sigma = 1_R$, so the Ore relation sets commutators $xr - rx$ equal to elements in R . In this case, the Ore extension is also known as a *ring of formal differential operators*. We consider an *iterated Ore extension* $S = (\cdots (k[x_1][x_2; 1, \delta_2]) \cdots)[x_t; 1, \delta_t]$, which we abbreviate as

$$S = k[x_1, \dots, x_t; \delta_2, \dots, \delta_t] = k\langle x_1, \dots, x_t \rangle / (x_j x_i - x_i x_j - \delta_j(x_i) : 1 \leq i < j \leq t)$$

with $S \cong k[x_1, \dots, x_t]$ as a k -vector space. We assume that S is a filtered algebra with $\deg(x_i) = 1$ for all i . Then each δ_j is a filtered map, i.e.,

$$\delta_j(x_i) \in k \oplus \text{Span}_k\{x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}\}$$

for $i < j$. This setting includes Weyl algebras and universal enveloping algebras of supersolvable Lie algebras.

Theorem 4.2. *Consider an iterated Ore extension $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_t; \delta_2, \dots, \delta_t]$ with identity automorphisms $\sigma_i = 1$ and filtered derivations δ_i . There is an iterated twisted product resolution $K_\bullet$ that is a free resolution of S as a bimodule over itself:*

$$K_n = S \otimes \bigwedge^n V \otimes S$$

for $V = \text{Span}_k\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$ with differentials given by (for $1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_n \leq t$)

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(1 \otimes x_{l_1} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{l_n} \otimes 1) \\ = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (-1)^{i+1} (x_{l_i} \otimes x_{l_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{x}_{l_i} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{l_n} \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes x_{l_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{x}_{l_i} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{l_n} \otimes x_{l_i}) \\ + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (-1)^j x_{l_i} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{l_{i-1}} \wedge \bar{\delta}_{l_j}(x_{l_i}) \wedge x_{l_{i+1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{x}_{l_j} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{l_n} \otimes 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\delta}_{l_j}(x_{l_i})$ is the image of $\delta_{l_j}(x_{l_i})$ under the projection $k \oplus V \twoheadrightarrow V$.

Proof. We induct on t . For each i , the Koszul resolution of $k[x_i]$ is embedded in the (reduced) bar resolution of $k[x_i]$ as

$$(4.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow k[x_i] \otimes \text{Span}_k\{x_i\} \otimes k[x_i] \xrightarrow{d_1} k[x_i] \otimes k[x_i] \xrightarrow{m} k[x_i] \rightarrow 0,$$

where $d_1(1 \otimes x_i \otimes 1) = x_i \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes x_i$ and m is multiplication. For $t = i = 1$, the complex (4.3) is a resolution of S satisfying the statement of the theorem.

Now assume $t \geq 2$ and that the iterated Ore extension

$$A = k[x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}; \delta_2, \dots, \delta_{t-1}]$$

has a free bimodule resolution $P_\bullet(A)$ as in the theorem. Let $B = k[x_t]$ and let $P_\bullet(B)$ be the Koszul resolution (4.3) for $i = t$. Then $S = A \otimes_\tau B$ where

$$\tau(x_t \otimes a) = a \otimes x_t + \delta_t(a) \otimes 1 \quad \text{for all } a \in A.$$

Embedding into the reduced bar resolution. We embed $P_\bullet(A)$ into the reduced bar resolution $\overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A)$ and then define twisting maps for $P_\bullet(A)$ via this embedding: Let $\phi_n : P_n(A) \rightarrow A^{\otimes(n+2)}$ be the standard antisymmetrization map defined by

$$\phi_n(1 \otimes x_{l_1} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{l_n} \otimes 1) = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n} \text{sgn } \sigma \otimes x_{l_{\sigma(1)}} \otimes \dots \otimes x_{l_{\sigma(n)}} \otimes 1$$

for all $1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_n \leq t-1$. This is a chain map from $P_\bullet(A)$ to $\text{Bar}_\bullet(A)$. Compose with the quotient map $\text{Bar}_\bullet(A) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A)$ to obtain a chain map

$$\bar{\phi}_\bullet : P_\bullet(A) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_\bullet(A).$$

Note that the image of $P_\bullet(A)$ in the bar resolution $\text{Bar}_\bullet(A)$, under $\phi_\bullet$, intersects the kernel of this quotient map trivially. Thus the induced map $\bar{\phi}_\bullet$ is injective.

Iterated twisting. The reduced bar resolution is compatible with τ via the map

$$\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet} : B \otimes \overline{\text{Bar}}_{\bullet}(A) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_{\bullet}(A) \otimes B$$

from the proof of Proposition 2.20(ii). We argue that $\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet}$ restricts to a surjective map

$$\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet} : B \otimes P_{\bullet}(A) \rightarrow P_{\bullet}(A) \otimes B$$

by verifying that it preserves the image of $\bar{\phi}_{\bullet}$, i.e., $\bar{\tau}_{B,n}$ takes $B \otimes \text{Im}(\bar{\phi}_n)$ onto $\text{Im}(\bar{\phi}_n) \otimes B$ for all n . We apply $\bar{\tau}_{B,n}$ to

$$x_t \otimes \bar{\phi}_n(a_0 \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge y_n \otimes a_{n+1}) = \sum_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_n} \text{sgn } \pi (x_t \otimes a_0 \otimes y_{\pi(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes y_{\pi(n)} \otimes a_{n+1}),$$

for some a_0, a_{n+1} in A , in order to move x_t to the far right, obtaining

$$\left(\sum_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_n} (\text{sgn } \pi) a_0 \otimes y_{\pi(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes y_{\pi(n)} \otimes a_{n+1} \right) \otimes x_t \in \text{Im}(\bar{\phi}_n) \otimes B$$

plus additional terms that arise from the relation

$$\tau(x_t \otimes y_{\pi(i)}) = y_{\pi(i)} \otimes x_t + \delta_t(y_{\pi(i)}) \otimes 1.$$

(We use the same notation for elements of A and their images under the quotient map $A \rightarrow \bar{A}$ in cases where no confusion can arise.) Since $\tau(1 \otimes y_j) = y_j \otimes 1$ for all j , these additional terms sum to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_n} (\text{sgn } \pi) \delta_t(a_0) \otimes y_{\pi(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes y_{\pi(n)} \otimes a_{n+1} \otimes 1 \\ & + \sum_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\text{sgn } \pi) a_0 \otimes y_{\pi(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \bar{\delta}_t(y_{\pi(i)}) \otimes y_{\pi(i+1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes y_{\pi(n)} \otimes a_{n+1} \otimes 1 \\ & + \sum_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_n} (\text{sgn } \pi) a_0 \otimes y_{\pi(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes y_{\pi(n)} \otimes \delta_t(a_{n+1}) \otimes 1 \\ & = \bar{\phi}_n(\delta_t(a_0) \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge y_n \otimes a_{n+1}) \otimes 1 + \bar{\phi}_n(a_0 \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge y_n \otimes \delta_t(a_{n+1})) \otimes 1 \\ & \quad + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \bar{\phi}_n(a_0 \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{\delta}_t(y_i) \wedge y_{i+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge y_n \otimes a_{n+1}) \otimes 1 \in \text{Im}(\bar{\phi}_n) \otimes B. \end{aligned}$$

We may replace x_t by x_t^m in the above computation using induction after noting that $\tau(x_t^m \otimes x_i) = (1 \otimes m_B)\tau(x_t \otimes (\tau(x_t^{m-1} \otimes x_i)))$ for $i < t$. The above arguments can be modified to apply to $\bar{\tau}_{B,i}^{-1}$ as well. Thus the chain map $\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet}$ preserves the image of $\bar{\phi}_{\bullet}$ and restricts to a surjective chain map $\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet} : B \otimes P_{\bullet}(A) \rightarrow P_{\bullet}(A) \otimes B$ as claimed.

Compatibility on one side. The complex $P_{\bullet}(A)$ inherits compatibility with τ from the compatibility of the reduced bar complex $\overline{\text{Bar}}_{\bullet}(A)$ with τ . Indeed, since $\overline{\text{Bar}}_{\bullet}(A)$ is compatible with τ via a map $\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet}$ which preserves the embedding

$$\bar{\phi}_{\bullet} : P_{\bullet}(A) \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{Bar}}_{\bullet}(A),$$

the complex $P_{\bullet}(A)$ is compatible with τ via the restriction $\tilde{\tau}_{B,\bullet}$ of $\bar{\tau}_{B,\bullet}$ to $B \otimes P_{\bullet}(A)$. (See Proposition 2.20(ii) and its proof and Remark 2.19.)

Compatibility on the other side. Define a chain map

$$\tau_{\bullet,A} : P_{\bullet}(B) \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes P_{\bullet}(B)$$

by setting $\tau_{0,A} = (\tau \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau)$ and

$$\tau_{1,A}((1 \otimes x_t \otimes 1) \otimes x_t) = x_t \otimes (1 \otimes x_t \otimes 1)$$

and then extending (uniquely) to $P_1(B) \otimes A$ by requiring that compatibility conditions (2.8) and (2.9) hold. A calculation shows that $\tau_{\bullet,A}$ is a chain map and that $P_{\bullet}(B)$ is compatible with τ . By their definitions, $\tau_{0,A}$ and $\tau_{1,A}$ are compatible with the embeddings of $P_0(B)$ and $P_1(B)$ into corresponding terms of the (reduced) bar resolution.

Twisted product resolution. By construction, the twisted product resolution $K_{\bullet}$ arising from $P_{\bullet}(A)$ and $P_{\bullet}(B)$ in degree n is isomorphic to

$$S \otimes \bigwedge^n V \otimes S$$

as an S -bimodule via the isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} A \otimes \bigwedge^i \text{Span}_k \{x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}\} \otimes A \otimes B \otimes \bigwedge^j \text{Span}_k \{x_t\} \otimes B \\ \xrightarrow{\sim} A \otimes B \otimes \bigwedge^i \text{Span}_k \{x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}\} \otimes \bigwedge^j \text{Span}_k \{x_t\} \otimes A \otimes B, \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 0, 1$, given by applying τ^{-1} (properly interpreted for each factor) to the innermost tensor factors A and B . We check the differentials: On $X_{n,0}$, the differential is just that arising from the factor $P_n(A)$. Now consider the differential on $X_{n-1,1}$, again writing $x_{l_i} = y_i$ for some indices $1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_n \leq t-1$:

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(1 \otimes y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes x_t \otimes 1) \\ = \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} (-1)^{i+1} (y_i \otimes y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{y}_i \wedge \dots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{y}_i \wedge \dots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes y_i) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n-1} (-1)^j \otimes y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{\delta}_j(y_i) \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{y}_j \wedge \dots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes 1 \right) \otimes (1 \otimes x_t \otimes 1) \\ + (-1)^{n-1} (1 \otimes y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes 1) \otimes (x_t \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes x_t), \end{aligned}$$

which may be rewritten, under the above isomorphism, as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} (-1)^{i+1} y_i \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{y}_i \wedge \cdots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes x_t \otimes 1 \\
& - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} (-1)^{i+1} \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{y}_i \wedge \cdots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes x_t \otimes y_i \\
& + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n-1} (-1)^j \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{\delta}_j(y_i) \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{y}_j \wedge \cdots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes x_t \otimes 1 \\
& + (-1)^{n-1} x_t \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes 1 + (-1)^n \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes x_t \\
& + (-1)^n \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} 1 \otimes y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{\delta}_t(y_i) \wedge \cdots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Once we set $y_n = x_t$, identify $y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge y_{n-1} \otimes x_t$ with $y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge y_{n-1} \wedge x_t$, and make other similar identifications, this agrees with the differential in the statement. $\square$

Examples. The theorem applies in particular to the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ of a finite-dimensional solvable Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Here, we assume the underlying field k is algebraically closed, else $\mathfrak{g}$ should be supersolvable; see [Dixmier 1977, 1.3.14] and [Brown et al. 2015, Section 3]. The theorem gives a bimodule Koszul resolution of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$. Semisimple Lie algebras can then be handled via triangular decomposition. Other examples include Weyl algebras and Sridharan enveloping algebras [Sridharan 1961].

5. Twisted product resolutions for (left) modules

We now consider a twisted product resolution of left modules instead of bimodules. We give the one-sided version of bimodule constructions in Sections 2 and 3. Again, we fix k -algebras A and B with a twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$. In the constructions below, we consider compatible A -modules, but note that we as easily could have started with compatible B -modules instead of A -modules using the inverse twisting map τ^{-1} instead of τ in order to lift (left) modules of A and B to (left) modules of $A \otimes_\tau B \cong B \otimes_{\tau^{-1}} A$.

Let M be an A -module with module structure map $\rho_{A,M} : A \otimes M \rightarrow M$ and recall the multiplication map $m_B : B \otimes B \rightarrow B$.

Definition 5.1. The A -module M is *compatible with the twisting map τ* if there is a bijective k -linear map $\tau_{B,M} : B \otimes M \rightarrow M \otimes B$ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \tau_{B,M}(m_B \otimes 1) = (1 \otimes m_B)(\tau_{B,M} \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau_{B,M}) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(5.3) \quad \tau_{B,M}(1 \otimes \rho_{A,M}) = (\rho_{A,M} \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau_{B,M})(\tau \otimes 1)$$

as maps on $B \otimes B \otimes M$ and on $B \otimes A \otimes M$, respectively.

Note that this definition is equivalent to the commutativity of a diagram similar to (2.11), where $\rho_{A,M}$ is replaced by a one-sided module structure map.

Let N be a B -module with module structure map $\rho_{B,N} : B \otimes N \rightarrow N$. If M is compatible with τ , the tensor product $M \otimes N$ may be given the structure of an $A \otimes_\tau B$ -module via the following composition of maps:

$$(5.4) \quad A \otimes_\tau B \otimes M \otimes N \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \tau_{B,M} \otimes 1} A \otimes M \otimes B \otimes N \xrightarrow{\rho_{A,M} \otimes \rho_{B,N}} M \otimes N.$$

Let $P_\bullet(M)$ be an A -projective resolution of M and $P_\bullet(N)$ be a B -projective resolution of N :

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \rightarrow P_2(M) \rightarrow P_1(M) \rightarrow P_0(M) \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0, \\ \cdots \rightarrow P_2(N) \rightarrow P_1(N) \rightarrow P_0(N) \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 5.5. Let M be an A -module that is compatible with τ . The projective module resolution $P_\bullet(M)$ of the A -module M is *compatible with the twisting map τ* if each $P_i(M)$ is compatible with τ via maps $\tau_{B,i}$ for which

$$\tau_{B,\bullet} : B \otimes P_\bullet(M) \rightarrow P_\bullet(M) \otimes B$$

is a k -linear chain map lifting $\tau_{B,M} : B \otimes M \rightarrow M \otimes B$.

Under the assumption of compatibility, we make the following definition.

Definition 5.6. Let M be an A -module compatible with τ and $P_\bullet(M)$ a projective resolution of M that is compatible with τ . Let N be a B -module. The *twisted product complex $Y_\bullet$* is the total complex of the bicomplex $Y_{\bullet,\bullet}$ defined by

$$(5.7) \quad Y_{i,j} = P_i(M) \otimes P_j(N),$$

with $A \otimes_\tau B$ -module structure given by the maps $\tau_{B,\bullet}$ as in (5.4) and with vertical and horizontal differentials given by $d_{i,j}^h = d_i \otimes 1$ and $d_{i,j}^v = (-1)^i \otimes d_j$. In other words, $Y_n = \bigoplus_{i+j=n} Y_{i,j}$ with $d_n = \sum_{i+j=n} d_{i,j}$ where $d_{i,j} = d_{i,j}^h + d_{i,j}^v$.

Lemma 5.8. Assume M and $P_\bullet(M)$ are compatible with τ . Then the twisted product complex $Y_\bullet$ is a complex of $A \otimes_\tau B$ -modules.

Proof. Each space $Y_{i,j}$ is given the structure of an $A \otimes_\tau B$ -module via (5.4). The differentials are module homomorphisms since $\tau_{B,\bullet}$ is a chain map. $\square$

Lemma 5.9. The twisted product complex $\cdots \rightarrow Y_2 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow M \otimes N \rightarrow 0$ is exact.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.5, apply the Künneth theorem to obtain $H_n(Y_\bullet) = 0$ for all $n > 0$ and $H_0(Y_\bullet) \cong M \otimes N$. $\square$

We wish to prove in general that the modules $Y_{i,j}$ are projective, so we make an additional assumption in the next lemma. Since $P_\bullet(M)$ is a projective resolution of M as an A -module, each $P_i(M)$ embeds in a free A -module $A^{\oplus I}$.

Definition 5.10. For each $i \geq 0$, the map $\tau_{B,i}$ is *compatible with a chosen embedding* $P_i(M) \hookrightarrow A^{\oplus I}$ (for some indexing set I) if the corresponding diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B \otimes P_i(M) & \hookrightarrow & B \otimes A^{\oplus I} \\ \downarrow \tau_{B,i} & & \downarrow \tau^{\oplus I} \\ P_i(M) \otimes B & \hookrightarrow & A^{\oplus I} \otimes B \end{array}$$

In many settings, one proves directly that the modules $Y_{i,j}$ are projective (e.g., the Ore extensions in the next section) and so one does not need this additional compatibility assumption, nor the next lemma.

Lemma 5.11. *For $i \geq 0$, if $\tau_{B,i}$ is compatible with a chosen embedding of $P_i(M)$ into a free A -module, then $Y_{i,j} = P_i(M) \otimes P_j(N)$ is a projective $A \otimes_{\tau} B$ -module.*

Proof. By the hypothesis, it suffices to prove the lemma when $P_i(A) = A$ and $P_j(B) = B$. In that case, $A \otimes B$ is the right regular module $A \otimes_{\tau} B$ by definition, and so is free. $\square$

Combining Lemmas 5.8, 5.9, and 5.11, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 5.12. *Let A and B be k -algebras with twisting map $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$. Let $P_{\bullet}(M)$ and $P_{\bullet}(N)$ be projective A - and B -module resolutions of M and N , respectively. Assume M and $P_{\bullet}(M)$ are compatible with τ and that the corresponding maps $\tau_{B,i}$ are compatible with chosen embeddings of $P_i(M)$ into free A -modules. Then the twisted product complex with*

$$Y_n = \bigoplus_{i+j=n} Y_{i,j} \quad \text{for } Y_{i,j} = P_i(M) \otimes P_j(N)$$

gives a projective resolution of $M \otimes N$ as a module over the twisted tensor product $A \otimes_{\tau} B$:

$$\cdots \rightarrow Y_2 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow M \otimes N \rightarrow 0.$$

Examples. Resolutions that may be constructed in this way include the Koszul resolution of k for a twisted tensor product of two Koszul algebras (see the proof of [Walton and Witherspoon 2018, Proposition 1.8]) and a resolution for a twisted tensor product of algebras whose twisting map is given by a bicharacter on grading groups (see [Bergh and Oppermann 2008]). We give another class of examples in the next section.

6. Resolutions for Ore extensions

In Section 4, we considered resolutions of an Ore extension algebra as a bimodule over itself. Here, we consider (left) modules over an Ore extension and show how to

construct projective resolutions of these modules by regarding the Ore extension as a twisted tensor product. Gopalakrishnan and Sridharan [1966] studied Ore extensions $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ in the case where σ is the identity automorphism. They showed that if M is a (left) module over $R[x; 1, \delta]$, then an R -projective resolution of M lifts to an $R[x; 1, \delta]$ -projective resolution. Here we allow arbitrary automorphisms σ of R and give conditions under which an R -projective resolution of an $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -module M lifts to an $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -projective resolution.

Again, let R be a k -algebra and σ be a k -algebra automorphism of R . Let δ be a left σ -derivation of R (see (4.1)) and consider the Ore extension $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$. Let $A = R$, $B = k[x]$, and $\tau : B \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes B$ be the twisting map determined by $\tau(x \otimes r) = \sigma(r) \otimes x + \delta(r) \otimes 1$ for all $r \in R$, as in Section 4, so that $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is the twisted tensor product $A \otimes_{\tau} B$.

Modules over Ore extensions. Consider an $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -module M . Assume that on restriction to R , there is an isomorphism of R -modules, $\phi : M \xrightarrow{\sim} M^{\sigma}$, where M^{σ} is the vector space M with R -module action given by $r \cdot_{\sigma} m = \sigma(r) \cdot m$ for all $r \in R$ and $m \in M$. Then M is compatible with τ : We define $\tau_{B,M} : B \otimes M \rightarrow M \otimes B$ by setting, for all $m \in M$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{B,M}(1 \otimes m) &= m \otimes 1, \\ \tau_{B,M}(x \otimes m) &= \phi(m) \otimes x + xm \otimes 1\end{aligned}$$

and extending by applying compatibility condition (5.2). That is, since the algebra $B = k[x]$ is free on the generator x , for each element m of M , we may define $\tau_{B,M}(x^n \otimes m)$ by applying (5.2) to $x \otimes x^{n-1} \otimes m$. We check that (5.3) holds for elements of the form $x \otimes r \otimes m$, where $r \in R$ and $m \in M$. Then a careful induction on the power of x shows that (5.3) holds for all elements of the form $x^n \otimes r \otimes m$.

For example, if $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is an augmented algebra with augmentation $\varepsilon : R[x; \sigma, \delta] \rightarrow k$ for which $\varepsilon\sigma = \varepsilon$, then $\varepsilon\delta = 0$ and the field k as a module over $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ via ε has the property that $k \cong k^{\sigma}$, and so k is compatible with τ .

Projective resolutions. Let $P_{\bullet}(M)$ be a projective resolution of M as an R -module:

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{d_2} P_1(M) \xrightarrow{d_1} P_0(M) \xrightarrow{\mu} M \rightarrow 0.$$

For each i , set $P_i^{\sigma}(M) = (P_i(M))^{\sigma}$. Then

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{d_2} P_1^{\sigma}(M) \xrightarrow{d_2} P_0^{\sigma}(M) \xrightarrow{\phi^{-1}\mu} M \rightarrow 0$$

is also a projective resolution of M as an R -module. By the comparison theorem, there is an R -module chain map from $P_{\bullet}(M)$ to $P_{\bullet}^{\sigma}(M)$ lifting the identity map $M \rightarrow M$, which we view as a k -linear chain map

$$(6.1) \quad \sigma_{\bullet} : P_{\bullet}(M) \rightarrow P_{\bullet}^{\sigma}(M)$$

with $\sigma_i(rz) = \sigma(r)\sigma_i(z)$ for all $i \geq 0$, $r \in R$, and $z \in P_i(M)$. We will assume for Theorem 6.6 below that each σ_i is bijective. Let $P_*(B)$ be the Koszul resolution of k for $B = k[x]$,

$$(6.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow k[x] \xrightarrow{x \cdot} k[x] \xrightarrow{\epsilon} k \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\epsilon(x) = 0$. The following two lemmas are proven as in [Gopalakrishnan and Sridharan 1966] (where the authors proved the special case $\sigma = 1$). We include details for completeness.

Lemma 6.3. *Let P be a projective R -module. There is an $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -module structure on P that extends the action of R .*

Proof. First consider the case that $P = R$, the left regular module. Let x act on R by $x \cdot r = \delta(r)$ for all $r \in R$. One checks that the action of xr in $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ agrees with that of $\sigma(r)x + \delta(r)$ on P , for all $r \in R$. Next, if P is a free module, it is a direct sum of copies of R , and x acts on each copy in this way. Finally, in general, P is a direct summand of a free R -module F . Let $\iota : P \rightarrow F$ and $\pi : F \rightarrow P$ be R -module homomorphisms for which $\pi\iota$ is the identity map. Define $x \cdot p = \pi(x \cdot \iota(p))$ for all $p \in P$, where the action of x on $\iota(p)$ is as given previously for a free module. Again one checks that the actions of xr and of $\sigma(r)x + \delta(r)$ agree, and so P is an $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -module as claimed. $\square$

Compatibility requirements. We will use the next lemma to show that the resolution $P_*(M)$ of M as an R -module is compatible with the twisting map τ (see Lemma 6.5). Let $f : M \rightarrow M$ be the function given by the action of x on the $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -module M .

Lemma 6.4. *There is a k -linear chain map $\delta_* : P_*(M) \rightarrow P_*(M)$ lifting $f : M \rightarrow M$ such that for each $i \geq 0$, $\delta_i(rz) = \sigma(r)\delta_i(z) + \delta(r)z$ for all $r \in R$ and $z \in P_i(M)$.*

Proof. If $i = 0$, let δ'_0 be the action of x on $P_0(M)$ given by Lemma 6.3. Then

$$\delta'_0(rz) - \sigma(r)\delta'_0(z) = \delta(r)z$$

for $r \in R$, $z \in P_0(M)$. One checks that $\mu\delta'_0 - f\mu : P_0(M) \rightarrow M^\sigma$ is an R -module homomorphism. As $P_0(M)$ is a projective R -module, there is an R -module homomorphism $\delta''_0 : P_0(M) \rightarrow P_0^\sigma(M)$ such that $\mu\delta'_0 - f\mu = \mu\delta''_0$. Let $\delta_0 = \delta'_0 - \delta''_0$. One may check this satisfies the equation in the lemma.

Now fix $i > 0$ and assume there are k -linear maps $\delta_j : P_j(M) \rightarrow P_j(M)$ such that $\delta_j(rz) = \sigma(r)\delta_j(z) + \delta(r)z$ and $d_j\delta_j = \delta_{j-1}d_j$ for all j , $0 \leq j < i$, and $r \in R$, $z \in P_j(M)$. Let $\delta'_i : P_i(M) \rightarrow P_i(M)$ be the action of x on $P_i(M)$ given in Lemma 6.3, so that $\delta'_i(rz) = \sigma(r)\delta'_i(z) + \delta(r)z$ for all $r \in R$, $z \in P_i(M)$. Consider the map

$$d_i\delta'_i - \delta_{i-1}d_i : P_i(M) \rightarrow P_{i-1}^\sigma(M).$$

A calculation shows that it is an R -module homomorphism. Since δ_{i-1} is a chain map,

$$d_{i-1}(d_i\delta'_i - \delta_{i-1}d_i) = 0,$$

and so the image of $d_i\delta'_i - \delta_{i-1}d_i$ lies in $\text{Ker}(d_{i-1}) = \text{Im}(d_i)$. Since $P_i(M)$ is projective as an R -module, there is an R -homomorphism $\delta''_i : P_i(M) \rightarrow P_i^\sigma(M)$ such that $d_i\delta'_i - \delta_{i-1}d_i = d_i\delta''_i$. Let $\delta_i = \delta'_i - \delta''_i$, so that $d_i\delta_i = \delta_{i-1}d_i$ by construction. One checks that for all $r \in R$ and $z \in P_i(M)$,

$$\delta_i(rz) = \delta'_i(rz) - \delta''_i(rz) = \sigma(r)\delta'_i(z) + \delta(r)z - \sigma(r)\delta''_i(z) = \sigma(r)\delta_i(z) + \delta(r)z. \quad \square$$

Lemma 6.5. *The resolution $P_\bullet(M)$ is compatible with the twisting map τ .*

Proof. Define $\tau_{B,i} : B \otimes P_i(M) \rightarrow P_i(M) \otimes B$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{B,i}(1 \otimes z) &= z \otimes 1, \\ \tau_{B,i}(x \otimes z) &= \sigma_i(z) \otimes x + \delta_i(z) \otimes 1 \end{aligned}$$

for all $z \in P_i(M)$, where $\sigma_\bullet$ is the chain map of (6.1), $\delta_\bullet$ is the chain map of Lemma 6.4, and we extend $\tau_{B,i}$ to $B \otimes P_i(M)$ as before by requiring that compatibility conditions (5.2) and (5.3) hold. We check condition (5.3) in one case as an example:

$$\tau_{B,i}(x \otimes rz) = \sigma_i(rz) \otimes x + \delta_i(rz) \otimes 1 = \sigma(r)\sigma_i(z) \otimes x + \sigma(r)\delta_i(z) \otimes 1 + \delta(r)z \otimes 1,$$

for all $r \in R$, and $z \in P_i(M)$, while on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_{A,i} \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau_{B,i})(\tau \otimes 1)(x \otimes r \otimes z) \\ &= (\rho_{A,i} \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \tau_{B,i})(\sigma(r) \otimes x \otimes z + \delta(r) \otimes 1 \otimes z) \\ &= (\rho_{A,i} \otimes 1)(\sigma(r) \otimes \sigma_i(z) \otimes x + \sigma(r) \otimes \delta_i(z) \otimes 1 + \delta(r) \otimes z \otimes 1) \\ &= \sigma(r)\sigma_i(z) \otimes x + \sigma(r)\delta_i(z) \otimes 1 + \delta(r)z \otimes 1. \end{aligned}$$

Condition (5.3) holds for all $x^n \otimes rz$ by induction on n . $\square$

Twisting resolutions for an Ore extension. We now construct a projective resolution of M as an $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -module from a projective resolution of M as an R -module. We take the twisted product of two resolutions: the R -projective resolution of M and the Koszul resolution (6.2) of k as a module over $B = k[x]$.

Theorem 6.6. *Let $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ be an Ore extension. Let M be an $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -module for which $M^\sigma \cong M$ as R -modules. Consider a projective resolution $P_\bullet(M)$ of M as an R -module and suppose that each map $\sigma_i : P_i(M) \rightarrow P_i(M)$ of (6.1) is bijective. For each $i \geq 0$, set*

$$Y_{i,0} = Y_{i,1} = P_i(M) \otimes k[x] \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{i,j} = 0 \quad \text{for all } j > 1$$

as in Lemma 5.8. Then $Y_\bullet$ is a projective resolution of M as an $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -module.

Proof. By Lemma 6.5, $P_*(M)$ is compatible with τ , and so by Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9, the complex $\cdots \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ is an exact complex of $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -modules. We verify directly that each $Y_{i,j}$ is a projective module: For each $i \geq 0$ and $j = 0, 1$,

$$(6.7) \quad Y_{i,j} \cong R[x; \sigma, \delta] \otimes_R P_i(M)$$

via the $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ -homomorphism given by

$$R[x; \sigma, \delta] \otimes_R P_i(M) \rightarrow Y_{i,j}, \quad x \otimes z \mapsto \sigma_i(z) \otimes x + \delta_i(z) \otimes 1,$$

with inverse map given by

$$z \otimes x \mapsto x \otimes \sigma_i^{-1}(z) - 1 \otimes \delta_i(\sigma_i^{-1}(z)).$$

Then $R[x; \sigma, \delta] \otimes_R P_i(M)$ is projective since it is a tensor-induced module and $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is flat over R . $\square$

Remark 6.8. When σ is the identity, the complex $Y_\bullet$ is precisely that of Gopalakrishnan and Sridharan [1966, Theorem 1], under the isomorphism (6.7) above. As a specific class of examples, we obtain in this way, via iterated Ore extension, the Chevalley–Eilenberg resolution of the $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ -module k for a finite-dimensional supersolvable Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Andrew Conner and Peter Goetz for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper, and a referee for suggesting improvements.

References

- [Bergh and Oppermann 2008] P. A. Bergh and S. Oppermann, “Cohomology of twisted tensor products”, *J. Algebra* **320**:8 (2008), 3327–3338. MR Zbl
- [Brown et al. 2015] K. A. Brown, S. O’Hagan, J. J. Zhang, and G. Zhuang, “Connected Hopf algebras and iterated Ore extensions”, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **219**:6 (2015), 2405–2433. MR Zbl
- [Čap et al. 1995] A. Čap, H. Schichl, and J. Vanžura, “On twisted tensor products of algebras”, *Comm. Algebra* **23**:12 (1995), 4701–4735. MR Zbl
- [Conner and Goetz 2018] A. Conner and P. Goetz, “The Koszul property for graded twisted tensor products”, *J. Algebra* (online publication July 2018).
- [Dixmier 1977] J. Dixmier, *Enveloping algebras*, North-Holland Math. Library **14**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977. MR Zbl
- [Gopalakrishnan and Sridharan 1966] N. S. Gopalakrishnan and R. Sridharan, “Homological dimension of Ore-extensions”, *Pacific J. Math.* **19** (1966), 67–75. MR Zbl
- [Guccione and Guccione 1999] J. A. Guccione and J. J. Guccione, “Hochschild homology of twisted tensor products”, *K-Theory* **18**:4 (1999), 363–400. MR Zbl
- [Guccione and Guccione 2002] J. A. Guccione and J. J. Guccione, “Hochschild (co)homology of Hopf crossed products”, *K-Theory* **25**:2 (2002), 139–169. MR Zbl

- [Guccione et al. 1991] J. A. Guccione, J. J. Guccione, M. J. Redondo, A. Solotar, and O. E. Villamayor, “Cyclic homology of algebras with one generator”, *K-Theory* **5**:1 (1991), 51–69. MR Zbl
- [Jara et al. 2017] P. Jara, J. López Peña, and D. Ştefan, “Koszul pairs and applications”, *J. Noncommut. Geom.* **11**:4 (2017), 1289–1350. MR Zbl
- [Manin 1988] Y. I. Manin, *Quantum groups and noncommutative geometry*, Univ. Montréal, 1988. MR
- [Montgomery 1993] S. Montgomery, *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Math. **82**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1993. MR Zbl
- [Polishchuk and Positselski 2005] A. Polishchuk and L. Positselski, *Quadratic algebras*, University Lecture Series **37**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005. MR Zbl
- [Radford and Schneider 2008] D. E. Radford and H. J. Schneider, “Biproducts and two-cocycle twists of Hopf algebras”, pp. 331–355 in *Modules and comodules* (Porto, 2006), edited by T. Brzeziński et al., Birkhäuser, Basel, 2008. MR Zbl
- [Shepler and Witherspoon 2014] A. V. Shepler and S. Witherspoon, “A Poincaré–Birkhoff–Witt theorem for quadratic algebras with group actions”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **366**:12 (2014), 6483–6506. MR Zbl
- [Sridharan 1961] R. Sridharan, “Filtered algebras and representations of Lie algebras”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **100** (1961), 530–550. MR Zbl
- [Walton and Witherspoon 2014] C. Walton and S. Witherspoon, “Poincaré–Birkhoff–Witt deformations of smash product algebras from Hopf actions on Koszul algebras”, *Algebra Number Theory* **8**:7 (2014), 1701–1731. MR Zbl
- [Walton and Witherspoon 2018] C. Walton and S. Witherspoon, “PBW deformations of braided products”, *J. Algebra* **504** (2018), 536–567. MR Zbl
- [Weibel 1994] C. A. Weibel, *An introduction to homological algebra*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Math. **38**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994. MR Zbl

Received January 10, 2017. Revised July 24, 2018.

ANNE SHEPLER
 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS
 DENTON, TX
 UNITED STATES
 ashepler@unt.edu

SARAH WITHERSPOON
 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
 COLLEGE STATION, TX
 UNITED STATES
 sjw@math.tamu.edu

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Founded in 1951 by E. F. Beckenbach (1906–1982) and F. Wolf (1904–1989)

msp.org/pjm

EDITORS

Don Blasius (Managing Editor)
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
blasius@math.ucla.edu

Matthias Aschenbrenner
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
matthias@math.ucla.edu

Daryl Cooper
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3080
cooper@math.ucsb.edu

Jiang-Hua Lu
Department of Mathematics
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Rd., Hong Kong
jhlu@maths.hku.hk

Paul Balmer
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
balmer@math.ucla.edu

Wee Teck Gan
Mathematics Department
National University of Singapore
Singapore 119076
matgwt@nus.edu.sg

Sorin Popa
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
popa@math.ucla.edu

Paul Yang
Department of Mathematics
Princeton University
Princeton NJ 08544-1000
yang@math.princeton.edu

Vyjayanthi Chari
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521-0135
chari@math.ucr.edu

Kefeng Liu
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
liu@math.ucla.edu

Jie Qing
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
qing@cats.ucsc.edu

PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor, production@msp.org

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

ACADEMIA SINICA, TAIPEI
CALIFORNIA INST. OF TECHNOLOGY
INST. DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA
KEIO UNIVERSITY
MATH. SCIENCES RESEARCH INSTITUTE
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIV.
OREGON STATE UNIV.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIV. OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
UNIV. OF CALIF., SANTA BARBARA

UNIV. OF CALIF., SANTA CRUZ
UNIV. OF MONTANA
UNIV. OF OREGON
UNIV. OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIV. OF UTAH
UNIV. OF WASHINGTON
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

These supporting institutions contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its contents or policies.

See inside back cover or msp.org/pjm for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2019 is US \$490/year for the electronic version, and \$665/year for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163, U.S.A. The Pacific Journal of Mathematics is indexed by Mathematical Reviews, Zentralblatt MATH, PASCAL CNRS Index, Referativnyi Zhurnal, Current Mathematical Publications and Web of Knowledge (Science Citation Index).

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics (ISSN 0030-8730) at the University of California, c/o Department of Mathematics, 798 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published twelve times a year. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163.

PJM peer review and production are managed by EditFlow® from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2019 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Volume 298 No. 2 February 2019

Uniqueness questions for C^* -norms on group rings VADIM ALEKSEEV and DAVID KYED	257
Expected depth of random walks on groups KHALID BOU-RABEE, IOAN MANOLESCU and AGLAIA MYROPOLSKA	267
Signature ranks of units in cyclotomic extensions of abelian number fields DAVID S. DUMMIT, EVAN P. DUMMIT and HERSHY KISILEVSKY	285
Semistable deformation rings in even Hodge–Tate weights LUCIO GUERBEROFF and CHOL PARK	299
Nonholomorphic Lefschetz fibrations with (-1) -sections NORIYUKI HAMADA, RYOMA KOBAYASHI and NAOYUKI MONDEN	375
Tilting modules over Auslander–Gorenstein algebras OSAMU IYAMA and XIAOJIN ZHANG	399
Maximal symmetry and unimodular solvmanifolds MICHAEL JABLONSKI	417
Concordance of Seifert surfaces ROBERT MYERS	429
Resolutions for twisted tensor products ANNE SHEPLER and SARAH WITHERSPOON	445
Iterated automorphism orbits of bounded convex domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ JOSHUA STRONG	471
Sharp logarithmic Sobolev inequalities along an extended Ricci flow and applications GUOQIANG WU and YU ZHENG	483



0030-8730(201902)298:2;1-Q