New Perspectives in Geometric Combinatorics
MSRI Publications
Volume **38**, 1999

Combinatorial Differential Topology and Geometry

ROBIN FORMAN

Abstract. A variety of questions in combinatorics lead one to the task of analyzing the topology of a simplicial complex, or a more general cell complex. However, there are few general techniques to aid in this investigation. On the other hand, the subjects of differential topology and geometry are devoted to precisely this sort of problem, except that the topological spaces in question are smooth manifolds. In this paper we show how two standard techniques from the study of smooth manifolds, Morse theory and Bochner's method, can be adapted to aid in the investigation of combinatorial spaces.

Introduction

A variety of questions in combinatorics lead one to the task of analyzing a simplicial complex, or a more general cell complex. For example, a standard approach to investigating the structure of a partially ordered set is to instead study the topology of the associated order complex. However, there are few general techniques to aid in this investigation. On the other hand, the subjects of differential topology and differential geometry are devoted to precisely this sort of problem, except that the topological spaces in question are smooth manifolds, rather than combinatorial complexes. These are classical subjects, and numerous very general and powerful techniques have been developed and studied over the recent decades.

A smooth manifold is, loosely speaking, a topological space on which one has a well-defined notion of a derivative. One can then use calculus to study the space. I have recently found ways of adapting some techniques from differential topology and differential geometry to the study of combinatorial spaces. Perhaps surprisingly, many of the standard ingredients of differential topology and differential geometry have combinatorial analogues. The combinatorial theories

This work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation and the National Security Agency.

are often simpler than the corresponding smooth theory, and in some cases imply the smooth theory. In this paper, I will discuss two new general tools to aid in the study of combinatorial spaces. One derived from Morse theory, a standard tool in differential topology, and the other derived from Bochner's method, a standard tool in differential geometry and global analysis. Most of the results in this paper have appeared in [Forman 1998d; 1998a].

Of course, many others have had the idea of "borrowing" ideas from continuous mathematics to study combinatorial objects. See for example [Björner 1995] and the numerous references therein. As we go along, I will mention those references most closely related to our topic.

1. Morse Theory

Since its introduction in [Morse 1925], Morse theory has become a fundamental technique for investigating the topology of smooth manifolds. The basic principle is that the topology of a manifold is very closely related to the critical points of a smooth function on the manifold. The simplest example of this relationship is the fact that if the manifold is compact, then any continuous function must have a maximum and a minimum. Morse theory provides a significant refinement of this observation. See [Milnor 1962] for a beautiful exposition of this subject, and [Bott 1988] for a wonderful overview of Morse theory, including some recent developments.

Many others have developed versions of Morse theory for simplicial complexes (see [Brehm and Kühnel 1987; Kühnel 1990], for example), and other types of nonsmooth topological spaces (for example, [Morse 1934; Eells and Kuiper 1962; Kuiper 1971; Goresky and MacPherson 1983; 1988]). When extending Morse theory to such spaces, one must decide what will replace smooth functions, the key ingredient in the classical theory. In the references cited, a number of choices have been made. Attention is focussed on piecewise linear functions [Brehm and Kühnel 1987; Kühnel 1990], continuous functions which behave like smooth functions near their critical points [Morse 1934; Eells and Kuiper 1962], and functions which can be extended to a larger domain to be smooth [Goresky and MacPherson 1983; 1988]). If one attempts to consider all continuous functions, one can still define the notion of a critical point, but it seems to be impossible to control the topological contribution of each critical point [Kuiper 1971; Gromov 1981].

In this paper, we take a different approach. We will present a very simple Morse theory for simplicial complexes which is entirely discrete. That is, there is no mention at all of continuous functions. Instead, our functions assign a single real number to each cell of the complex. Because we require so little structure from our functions, we need very little structure in our spaces, so the theory can be applied to very general cell complexes. After defining combinatorial Morse functions and critical points, we will show that the standard theorems of Morse

theory, relating the topology of the space to the critical points of the function, are true. We also present discrete analogues of such (seemingly) intrinsically smooth notions as the gradient vector field and the corresponding gradient flow associated to a Morse function. Using these, we define a Morse complex, a differential complex built out of the critical points of our discrete Morse function, which has the same homology as the underlying space. In the smooth setting, the Morse complex has been subject to much recent study, and has played a crucial role in some recent applications (see [Klingenberg 1982; Floer 1988], for example). Most of this section will be an informal exposition of the contents of [Forman 1995; 1998d].

This combinatorial theory is not really a new theory, but rather an extraction of the combinatorial essence of the smooth theory. As evidence for this, we will indicate later that it is possible to deduce much of the smooth theory from this combinatorial theory, and, conversely, some of the results we present can be proved by "smoothing" the combinatorial Morse function and applying the corresponding smooth theory (although that is not the approach we will take in this paper).

As we mentioned above, this discrete Morse theory can be defined for any CW complex, but to avoid very minor complications we will restrict attention, in this paper, to simplicial complexes. See [Forman 1998d] for a more general treatment. Let M be any finite simplicial complex. We emphasize that M need not be a triangulated manifold, nor have any other special property. Denote by K the set of (nonempty) simplices of M, and K_p the simplices of dimension p. Write $\alpha^{(p)}$ if α has dimension p, and $\beta > \alpha$ (or $\alpha < \beta$) if α is a face of β.

A discrete Morse function on M will actually be a function on K. That is, we assign a single real number to each simplex in M. Roughly speaking, a function

$$f : K \to \mathbb{R}$$

is a Morse function if f usually assigns higher values to higher dimensional simplices, with at most one exception, locally, at each simplex. More precisely:

Definition 1.1. A function

$$f : K \to \mathbb{R}$$

is a discrete Morse function if, for every $\alpha^{(p)} \in K$,

(1) $\#\{\beta^{(p+1)} > \alpha \mid f(\beta) \leq f(\alpha)\} \leq 1$ and
(2) $\#\{\gamma^{(p-1)} < \alpha \mid f(\gamma) \geq f(\alpha)\} \leq 1$.

A simple example will serve to illustrate the definition. Consider the two complexes shown in Figure 1. Here we indicate functions by writing next to each cell the value of the function on that cell. The function on the left is not a discrete Morse function as the edge $f^{-1}(0)$ violates rule (2), since it has 2 lower-dimensional "neighbors" on which f takes on higher values, and the vertex $f^{-1}(3)$

violates rule (1), since it has 2 higher dimensional "neighbors" on which f takes on lower values. The function on the right is a Morse function.



Figure 1. Left: not a discrete Morse function. Right: a discrete Morse function.

The other main ingredient in Morse theory is the notion of a critical point.

DEFINITION 1.2. A simplex $\alpha^{(p)}$ is critical (with index p) if

(1) $\#\{\beta^{(p+1)} > \alpha \mid f(\beta) \leq f(\alpha)\} = 0$ and
(2) $\#\{\gamma^{(p-1)} < \alpha \mid f(\gamma) \geq f(\alpha)\} = 0$.

For example, in Figure 1, right, the vertex $f^{-1}(0)$ is critical of index 0, the edge $f^{-1}(3)$ is critical of index 1, and there are no other critical simplices. Note that if $\sigma^{(p)}$ is critical, it is necessarily critical of index p.

We will pause here to relate these definitions to the corresponding notions in the smooth category. To illustrate the main idea, we will consider a special case. Suppose x is a critical point of index 1 of a smooth Morse function F on a smooth manifold of dimension n. Then the Morse Lemma [Milnor 1962, Lemma 2.2] states that there are coordinates $(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, with x corresponding to $(0, \ldots, 0)$, such that in these coordinates

$$F(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = F(x) - t_1^2 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} t_i^2.$$

That is, beginning at the point x, F decreases to both sides in the t_1 direction, and increases in the other coordinate directions. Now suppose e is a critical 1-simplex of a discrete Morse function f. Then $f(e)$ is greater than f at either boundary vertex, and less than f at any 2-simplex with e in its boundary (see, for example, Figure 2).

We can see that this is, in fact, a combinatorial model of the smooth situation. Moreover we see that the critical edge e can be thought of as representing a critical point of index 1 in the smooth case together with a curve pointing in the directions in which the function is decreasing. In the general case, if $\sigma^{(p)}$ is critical, σ can be thought of as representing the p-dimensional "unstable" directions at a smooth critical point of index p. If our simplicial complex is a smooth triangulation of a smooth manifold, then one can make this discussion more precise. One can think of a discrete Morse function f as assigning a number



Figure 2. The function f decreases as one moves from the 1-simplex to either boundary component, and increases in each transverse direction.

to the barycenter of each simplex. One can then smoothly interpolate between these values to define a smooth function on all of M. If this is done carefully, "smoothing" a discrete Morse function f near a critical p-simplex results in a smooth Morse function F with a critical point of index p.

Our next step is to show that the topology of a general simplicial complex M is intimately related to the critical points of a discrete Morse function on M. Before stating the main theorems, we need one more definition. Suppose f is a discrete Morse function on a simplicial complex M. For any $c \in \mathbb{R}$ define the level subcomplex $M(c)$ by

$$M(c) = \bigcup_{f(\beta)\leq c} \bigcup_{\alpha\leq\beta} \alpha.$$

That is, $M(c)$ is the subcomplex of M consisting of all simplices β with $f(\beta) \leq c$, as well as all of their faces.

THEOREM 1.3. *Suppose the interval $(a, b]$ contains no critical values of f. Then $M(a)$ is a deformation retract of $M(b)$. Moreover, $M(b)$ simplicially collapses onto $M(a)$.*

To define simplicial collapse, suppose M is a simplicial complex, $\alpha^{(p)}$ is a p-simplex of M that is not a face of any simplex, and $\gamma^{(p-1)} < \alpha$ is a $(p-1)$-face



Figure 3. Simplicial collapse of M onto $M - (\alpha \cup \gamma)$.

of α that is not the face of any other simplex. Then we say that M simplicially collapses onto $M - (\alpha \cup \gamma)$; see Figure 3. More generally, a simplicial collapse is any sequence of such operations. See Figure 4 for the simplicial collapse of a 2-simplex onto a vertex.



Figure 4. Simplicial collapse of a 2-simplex onto a vertex.

The equivalence relation generated by simplicial collapse is called *simple-homotopy equivalence*. This indicates that our Morse theory is particularly well suited to handling questions in this category.

THEOREM 1.4. *Suppose $\alpha^{(p)}$ is a critical simplex with $f(\alpha) \in (a, b]$, and there are no other critical simplices with values in $(a, b]$. Then $M(b)$ is (simple-)homotopy equivalent to*

$$M(a) \cup_{\dot{e}^{(p)}} e^{(p)}$$

where $e^{(p)}$ is a p-cell, and it is glued to $M(a)$ along its entire boundary $\dot{e}^{(p)}$.

Before discussing the proofs of these theorems, we pause to consider some important corollaries.

COROLLARY 1.5. *Suppose M is a simplicial complex with a discrete Morse function. Then M is (simple-)homotopy equivalent to a CW complex with exactly one cell of dimension p for each critical simplex of dimension p.*

This corollary is often most usefully applied via inequalities, known collectively as the Morse Inequalities, between numerical invariants. Let M be a simplicial complex with a discrete Morse function. Let m_p denote the number of critical simplices of dimension p. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be any field, and $b_p = dim H_p(M, \mathbb{F})$ the p-th Betti number with respect to $\mathbb{F}$. Then we have the following inequalities.

COROLLARY 1.6. I. (THE WEAK MORSE INEQUALITIES.)

(i) *For each $p = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n$, where n is the dimension of M, we have*

$$m_p \geq b_p.$$

(ii) $m_0 - m_1 + m_2 - \ldots + (-1)^n m_n = \chi(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b_0 - b_1 + b_2 - \ldots + (-1)^n b_n.$

II. (THE STRONG MORSE INEQUALITIES.) *For each $p = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n, n+1$,*

$$m_p - m_{p-1} + \ldots \pm m_0 \geq b_p - b_{p-1} + \ldots \pm b_0.$$

This follows immediately from the previous corollary; see [Milnor 1962]. The Strong Morse Inequalities imply the Weak Morse Inequalities.

Every simplicial complex supports a discrete Morse function. Namely, for any complex M and any simplex α of M, set $f(\alpha) = \dim(\alpha)$. Then f is a discrete Morse function, and every simplex of M is critical for f.

The results we have stated above apply to any simplicial complex. In the case that M is a combinatorial manifold [Glaser 1972, p. 19] one can often say more. For example, one can state a combinatorial analogue of the standard Sphere theorem of smooth Morse theory; see [Milnor 1962, Theorem 4.1].

COROLLARY 1.7. *Suppose M is a combinatorial n-manifold without boundary with a Morse function with exactly two critical points. Then M is a combinatorial n-sphere.*

The proof of this corollary rests heavily on Whitehead's wonderful theorem [1939] on the uniqueness of regular neighborhoods, which implies, as a special case, that a combinatorial n-manifold with boundary which simplicially collapses onto a vertex is a combinatorial n-ball. Suppose M is a combinatorial n-manifold with a discrete Morse function f with exactly two critical points. Then the maximum of f must occur at an n-simplex $\alpha^{(n)}$ which is a critical simplex of index n. Thus, f restricts on $M - \alpha$ to a Morse function with exactly one critical simplex. The minimum of f must occur at a vertex which is a critical simplex of index 0, and this is the only critical simplex of f restricted to $M-\alpha$. Theorem 1.3 implies that $M - \alpha$ simplicially collapses to that vertex. Now we apply Whitehead's theorem to conclude that $M-\alpha$ is a combinatorial n-ball. It follows that $M = (M-\alpha)\cup\alpha$ is a combinatorial n-sphere.

Rather than prove the main theorems here, we will illustrate the main ideas with an example; see Figure 5. Rigorous proofs appear in [Forman 1998d].



Figure 5. Example of a Morse function.

Here $f^{-1}(0)$ is a critical simplex of index 0, $f^{-1}(9)$ is a critical simplex of index 1, and there are no other critical simplices. Thus, it follows from the above corollary that M is homotopy equivalent to a CW complex built from a single 0-cell, and a single 1-cell. The only CW complex which can be built from two such cells is a circle. Therefore, we can conclude that M is homotopy equivalent to a circle, as is evident from the picture.

Consider the sequence of level subcomplexes shown in Figure 6. We can see why the theorems are true. If α is not critical, then one of two cases must occur.



Figure 6. Level subcomplexes of the simplicial complex of Figure 5.

The first possibility is that α has a codimension one face γ with $f(\gamma) \geq f(\alpha)$ (for example $\alpha = f^{-1}(1), \gamma = f^{-1}(2)$). In this case, when α is added to M, γ is added at the same time. The new subcomplex collapses onto the previous complex by pushing in α along the free face γ. (There are a few things to check. For example, we must make sure that γ is, in fact, a free face of α. That is, we must check that γ is not a face of any other simplex β with $f(\beta) \leq f(\alpha)$, but this is true.) The other possibility is that there is a simplex β with α as a codimension-one face and with $f(\beta) \leq f(\alpha)$ (for example $\alpha = f^{-1}(2), \beta = f^{-1}(1)$). In this case, α is added to M when β is added to M, and again the new complex collapses onto the previous complex by pushing in β along the free face α.

If α is critical (for example $f^{-1}(9)$), then for every simplex β with $\beta > \alpha$ we have $f(\beta) > f(\alpha)$ (this requires a bit of proof). Thus α appears first in $M(f(\alpha))$. On the other hand, for every face γ of α, $f(\gamma) < f(\alpha)$, and is added earlier. Therefore, when α is added, it is simply glued to $M(f(\alpha) - \varepsilon)$ along its boundary. This completes our "proof" of the main theorems.

While the Morse inequalities are sufficient for many applications, it is sometimes desirable to replace the Morse inequalities with equalities. That is, to understand the precise nature of any "extra" critical points which arise. This can be done, and requires the introduction of the gradient vector field. In fact, as we will see later, some of the results we have stated above are best understood in terms of the gradient vector field, rather than the original Morse function. Returning to the example in Figure 5, let us now indicate pictorially the simplicial collapse referred to in the theorem. Suppose $\alpha^{(p)}$ is a noncritical simplex with $\beta^{(p+1)} > \alpha$ satisfying $f(\beta) \leq f(\alpha)$. We then draw an arrow from α to β. The resulting diagram can be seen in Figure 7. A simplex is critical if and only if it is neither the tail nor the head of an arrow. These arrows can be viewed as the discrete analogue of the gradient vector field of the Morse function. (To



Figure 7. The gradient vector field of the Morse function.

be precise, when we say "gradient vector field" we are really referring to the negative of the gradient vector field.)

It is better to think of this gradient vector field, which we now call V, as a map of *oriented* simplices. That is, if v is a boundary vertex of an edge e with $f(e) \leq f(v)$, we want to think of $V(v)$ as a discrete tangent vector *leaving* v i.e., with e given the orientation indicated by the arrow in Figure 8.



Figure 8. Edge orientation.

More generally, if $\beta^{(p+1)} > \alpha^{(p)}$ are oriented simplices and satisfy $f(\beta) \leq f(\alpha)$ then we set $V(\alpha) = \pm\beta$ with the sign chosen so that

$$\langle \alpha, \partial V(\alpha) \rangle = -1$$

where $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ is the canonical inner product on oriented chains with respect to which the simplices are orthonormal (in other words, $\langle \alpha, \partial V(\alpha) \rangle$ is the incidence number of α with respect to $V(\alpha)$). Define $V(\alpha)$ to be 0 for all simplices α for which there is no such β. Now V can be extended linearly to a map

$$V : C_p(M, \mathbb{Z}) \to C_{p+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}),$$

where, for each p, $C_p(M, \mathbb{Z})$ is the space of integer p-chains on M.

In the case of smooth manifolds, the gradient vector field defines a dynamical system, namely the flow along the vector field. Viewing the Morse function from the point of view of this dynamical system leads to important new insights [Smale 1961b]. To proceed further in our combinatorial setting, we now define a (discrete-time) flow along the gradient vector field V. Define a map

$$\Phi : C_p(M, \mathbb{Z}) \to C_p(M, \mathbb{Z}),$$

the discrete-time flow, by

$$\Phi = 1 + \partial V + V\partial.$$

We illustrate by an example. Consider the complex shown in Figure 9, with the indicated gradient vector field V. Let e be the top edge oriented from left



Figure 9. A 2-complex with its gradient vector field.

to right. We calculate

$$\Phi(e) = e + \partial V(e) + V\partial(e)$$

in Figure 10.

The map Φ has many of the properties that one expects from the gradient flow. For example, if $\alpha^{(p)}$ is not a critical simplex, then $\Phi(\alpha)$ is a p-chain consisting entirely of oriented $p-$simplices on which f is less than $f(\alpha)$, so, loosely speaking, Φ decreases f. The discrete gradient flow differs from the gradient flow in the smooth case primarily in that it stabilizes in finite time, i.e. there is an N such that

$$\Phi^N = \Phi^{N+1} = \cdots = \Phi^\infty.$$

This observation can be quite useful (for example, see the proof of the following theorem). See [Forman 1998d, Section 6] for the proofs of the main properties of Φ.

Let $C_p^\Phi \subseteq C_p(M, \mathbb{Z})$ denote the Φ-invariant p-chains, i.e., those p-chains c such that $\Phi(c) = c$. Since

$$\partial\Phi = \Phi\partial,$$

the space of Φ-invariant chains is preserved by the boundary operator ∂, so we can consider the Morse complex

$$\mathcal{C}^\Phi : 0 \to C_n^\Phi \xrightarrow{\partial} C_{n-1}^\Phi \xrightarrow{\partial} C_{n-2}^\Phi \xrightarrow{\partial} \cdots.$$

The crucial point is the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.8. $H_*(\mathcal{C}^\Phi) = H_*(M, \mathbb{Z})$.

That is, the Morse complex has the same homology as the underlying space. The proof of this theorem is not difficult. To prove that the stabilization map

$$\Phi^\infty : C_*(M, \mathbb{Z}) \to C_*^\Phi$$

induces an isomorphism on homology (with the inverse isomorphism induced by the natural injection), it is sufficient to find an algebraic homotopy operator, i.e. an operator $L : C_*(M, \mathbb{Z}) \to C_{*+1}(M, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $\Phi^\infty - 1 = \partial L + L\partial$. We now



Figure 10. The discrete-time flow $\Phi = 1 + \partial V + V\partial$.

use the fact that $\Phi^\infty = \Phi^N$ for some N. If $N = 1$, then $L = V$ works. The general case is not much harder.

Our goal in introducing this complex was to further our understanding of the critical simplices. With this in mind, we now show that the Morse complex can be alternately defined in terms of the critical simplices. For each p, let $\mathcal{M}_p \subseteq C_p(M, \mathbb{Z})$ denote the span of the critical p-simplices. We then obviously have

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_p = \#\{\text{critical simplices of dimension } p\} \tag{1.1}$$

For each p, we can apply the stabilization map Φ^∞ to get a map from $\mathcal{M}_p$ to C_p^Φ.

THEOREM 1.9. *For each p, the map*

$$\Phi^\infty : \mathcal{M}_p \to C_p^\Phi.$$

is an isomorphism.

Thus, the Morse complex can be defined equivalently as the complex

$$\mathcal{M} : 0 \to \mathcal{M}_n \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\partial}} \mathcal{M}_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\partial}} \mathcal{M}_{n-2} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\partial}} \cdots$$

where $\widetilde{\partial}$ is the differential induced by the above isomorphism (that is, $\widetilde{\partial} = (\Phi^\infty)^{-1}\partial\Phi^\infty$). In particular

$$H_*(\mathcal{M}) = H_*(M, \mathbb{Z}). \tag{1.2}$$

It is interesting to note that together (1.1) and (1.2) imply the Morse inequalities, so this gives an alternate proof of Corollary 1.6. From (1.2), we see that the Morse complex $\mathcal{M}$ contains a more complete description of the relationship between the critical simplices of f, and the homology of M. All that remains is to get a explicit description of the differential $\widetilde{\partial}$. This requires the introduction of the notion of a combinatorial gradient path. Let α and $\tilde{\alpha}$ be p-simplices. A *gradient path* from $\tilde{\alpha}$ to α is a sequence of simplices

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_0^{(p)},\ \beta_0^{(p+1)},\ \alpha_1^{(p)},\ \beta_1^{(p+1)},\ \alpha_2^{(p)},\ \ldots,\ \beta_r^{(p+1)},\ \alpha_{r+1}^{(p)} = \alpha$$

such that $f(\alpha_i) \geq f(\beta_i) > f(\alpha_{i+1})$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Equivalently, we require $V(\alpha_i) = \pm\beta_i$, and $\beta_i > \alpha_{i+1} \neq \alpha_i$. In Figure 11 we show a single gradient path from the boundary of a critical 2-simplex β to a critical edge α, where the arrows indicate the gradient vector field V.



Figure 11. A gradient path from β to α.

We are now ready to state the desired formula.

THEOREM 1.10. *Choose an orientation for each simplex. Then for any critical* $(p+1)$*-simplex* β *we have*

$$\widetilde{\partial}\beta = \sum_{\text{critical } \alpha^{(p)}} c_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha$$

where

$$c_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{\tilde{\alpha}^{(p)}<\beta} \langle \partial\beta, \tilde{\alpha}\rangle \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma(\tilde{\alpha},\alpha)} m(\gamma)$$

for $\Gamma(\tilde{\alpha},\alpha)$ *the set of gradient paths from* $\tilde{\alpha}$ *to* α.

For any gradient path from $\tilde{\alpha} < \beta$ to α, the orientation on β induces an orientation on α. The coefficient $m(\gamma)$ is equal to ± 1, depending on whether the orientation on β induces the chosen orientation on α, or the opposite orientation.

As stated earlier, it is often easier to work with the gradient vector field, rather than the original Morse function. In fact, one need not refer to the Morse function at all, as long as one knows that the vector field under consideration is the gradient of a Morse function. Thus, it is important to characterize those vector fields which are gradient vector fields of Morse functions. In the smooth case, Smale [1961b] provided such a characterization. We can provide an analogous characterization of discrete gradient vector fields. First, we define an object we call a discrete vector field. Such objects have been previously studied, under a different name, in [Duval 1994; Stanley 1993] and some of the references therein.

DEFINITION 1.11. A discrete vector field is any map

$$U : K \to K \cup \{0\}$$

satisfying, for each $\alpha^{(p)}$, the following conditions:

(1) $U(\alpha) = 0$ or α is a codimension-one face of $U(\alpha)$.
(2) $\#\{\beta \text{ such that } U(\beta) = \alpha\} \leq 1$.
(3) If $\alpha^{(p)} \in \text{Image}(U)$ then $U(\alpha) = 0$.

A gradient vector field is not quite such an object, since gradient vector fields are functions of oriented simplices, but for now we will ignore such subtleties. We have presented the definition in this form so that the relationship to the notion of a gradient vector field is apparent. However, there is a simpler, equivalent, definition. Note that if U is a discrete vector field then the pairs $\{\alpha, U(\alpha)\}$, as α ranges over all simplices such that $U(\alpha) \neq 0$, are pairwise disjoint. Any collection of pairwise disjoint pairs of simplices of the form $\{\alpha^{(p)} < \beta^{(p+1)}\}$ arises from a discrete vector field. Therefore, Definition 1.11 can be replaced by the following definition.

DEFINITION 1.11′. A discrete vector field is a pairwise disjoint collection of pairs of simplices of the form $\{\alpha^{(p)} < \beta^{(p+1)}\}$.

Such pairings were studied in [Stanley 1993; Duval 1994] as a tool for investigating the possible f-vectors for a simplicial complex. In [Forman 1998b] we investigated the dynamical properties of the discrete-time flow corresponding to a general discrete vector field.

If U is a combinatorial vector field, we define a U-path to be any path as in Figure 11 (where now the arrows indicate the map U). More precisely, a U-path is a sequence of simplices

$$\alpha_0^{(p)}, \beta_0^{(p+1)}, \alpha_1^{(p)}, \beta_1^{(p+1)}, \alpha_2^{(p)}, \ldots, \beta_r^{(p+1)}, \alpha_{r+1}^{(p)}$$

such that for each $i = 0, \ldots, r$, $\beta_i = U(\alpha_i)$ and $\beta_i > \alpha_{i+1} \neq \alpha_i$. We say such a path is a nontrivial closed path if $r \geq 0$ and $\alpha_0 = \alpha_{r+1}$. There is a simple characterization of those discrete vector fields which are the gradient of a discrete Morse function.

THEOREM 1.12. *A discrete vector field U is the gradient vector field of a discrete Morse function if and only if there are no nontrivial closed U-paths.*

This theorem has a very nice purely combinatorial description, using which we can recast the Morse theory in an appealing form. We begin with the Hasse diagram of M, that is, the partially ordered set of simplices of M ordered by the face relation. Consider the Hasse diagram as a directed graph. The vertices of the graph are in one-to-one correspondence with the simplices of M, and there is a directed edge from β to α if and only if α is a codimension-one face of β. Now let U be a combinatorial vector field. We modify the directed graph as follows. If $U(\alpha) = \beta$ then reverse the orientation of the edge between α and β (so that it now goes from α to β). A U-path is just a directed path in this modified graph. From Theorem 1.12, U is a gradient vector field if and only if there are no closed directed paths. That is, in this combinatorial language, a discrete vector field is a partial matching of the Hasse diagram, and a discrete vector field is a gradient vector field if the partial matching is acyclic in the above sense.

We can now restate some of our earlier theorems in this language. There is a very minor complication in that one usually includes the empty set as an element of the Hasse diagram (considered as a simplex of dimension -1) while we have not considered the empty set previously.

THEOREM 1.13. *Let U be an acyclic partial matching of the Hasse diagram of M (of the sort described above). Assume that the empty set is matched with a vertex. Let u_p denote the number of unpaired p-simplices. Then M is homotopy equivalent to a CW complex with $u_0 + 1$ vertices, and, for each $p \geq 1$, u_p cells of dimension p.*

An important special case of Theorem 1.13 is when U is a complete matching, that is, every simplex is paired with another (possible empty) simplex.

THEOREM 1.14. *Let U be a complete acyclic matching of the Hasse diagram of M, then M collapses onto a vertex, so that, in particular, M is contractible.*

This language was introduced in [Chari 1996], and the reader should consult this source for a more complete presentation of the Morse theory from this point of view; see also [Shareshian 1997]. Theorem 1.14 was used to good effect in [Babson et al. 1999] to investigate the homology of the simplicial complex of "not k-connected graphs" on a fixed set of vertices. This homology plays an important role in Vassiliev's theory of invariants for links [Vassiliev 1993]. Let us be a bit more precise. Let V be a fixed set of n vertices. A graph on V is determined by specifying a subset of the $\binom{n}{2}$ possible edges. Let S be a simplex with $\binom{n}{2}$ vertices (so that $\dim S = \binom{n}{2}-1$). A graph on V can now be determined by specifying a face of S. We say a graph is connected if every pair of vertices can be connected by a path consisting of edges. We say a graph is k-connected if it is connected after the removal of an arbitrary set of l vertices (and the edges connected to them) for any $l < k$. If a face α of S corresponds to a graph which is not k-connected, then every face β of α also corresponds to a graph which is not k-connected. Therefore, the set of "not k-connected" graphs forms a subcomplex of S. This subcomplex, which we denote by Δ_n^k, is the object of study in [Babson et al. 1999; Turchin 1997; Shareshian 1997]. (Actually, of interest is the homology of S/Δ_n^k, but since S is contractible, these questions are essentially equivalent.) We state their result in the special case $k = 2$.

THEOREM 1.15 [Babson et al. 1999; Turchin 1997; Shareshian 1997]. *The complex Δ_n^2 has the homotopy type of a wedge of $(n-2)!$ spheres of dimension $2n-5$.*

For the applications to the investigations in [Vassiliev 1993] it was necessary to find explicit generators of the homology of Δ_n^k. This was done in [Shareshian 1997], where the more general Theorem 1.13 was featured. There Shareshian constructs, by hand, an explicit acyclic partial matching on the simplicial complex of not 2-connected graphs. From the Morse theory he can then deduce the homotopy type of the complex. Moreover, the unmatched (i.e. critical) simplices provide a set of explicit generators for the homology.

In [Forman 1998c] we apply these methods to a problem in complexity theory. We will describe a special case of this problem. Suppose an oracle chooses a graph Γ on the set of n vertices V. The graph Γ is unknown to us, but we are permitted to ask questions to the oracle, one at a time, of the sort "Is the edge (v_i, v_j) in Γ?", where $v_i, v_j \in V$. We may use the answers to our previous questions when choosing our next question. The only restriction is that we choose each question according to a deterministic algorithm (which takes as its input the previous questions and answers). Our task is to decide if Γ is k-connected, using as few questions as possible. In particular, we must try to accomplish our task before asking $\binom{n}{2}$ questions. (Of course, after asking $\binom{n}{2}$ questions we have completely determined Γ.) See [Bollobás 1995, § 4.5] for a survey of the work on this and related problems.

Let A denote our algorithm for choosing questions. Say a graph Γ is an *evader* of A if, asking questions according to A, we do not determine whether

or not Γ is k-connected until we ask $\binom{n}{2}$ questions. We observe that A induces a complete pairing of the set of graphs on V. Namely, pair Γ_1 and Γ_2 if we can not distinguish between them until all $\binom{n}{2}$ questions have been asked. By definition, a not-k-connected graph is an evader of A if and only if it is paired with a k-connected graph, and vice versa. The main result of [Forman 1998c] is that this is an acyclic pairing, and hence, by Theorem 1.13, the gradient vector field of a Morse function. We can restrict this vector field to Δ_n^k, to get the gradient of a Morse function on Δ_n^k. The critical simplices of this restricted gradient vector field are the simplices of Δ_n^k which were paired with simplices not in Δ_n^k. These are precisely the not-k-connected graphs which were paired with a k-connected graph, i.e., the evaders of A. We can now use the weak Morse inequalities (Corollary 1.6) along with Theorem 1.15 to conclude:

THEOREM 1.16. *Suppose our goal is to determine whether or not an unknown graph is 2-connected. For any question algorithm A, there are at least $(n-2)!$ evaders of A which are not 2-connected, and $(n-2)!$ evaders of A which are 2-connected.*

Before ending this section, we make some final remarks about the combinatorial Morse theory, and its relation to the smooth theory. One of the main problems in Morse theory is finding a Morse function, for a given space, with the fewest possible critical points. In general this is a very difficult problem, since, in particular, it contains the Poincaré conjecture — spheres can be recognized as those spaces which have a Morse function with precisely two critical points. (See [Milnor 1965] for a completely Morse theoretic presentation of Smale's proof [1961a] of the higher-dimensional Poincaré conjecture.) As an application of Theorem 1.12, we easily prove a "cancellation" theorem, which enables one, under certain conditions, to simplify a Morse function (this result is a discrete analogue of in [Milnor 1965, Theorem 5.4], the "First Cancellation Theorem"). That is, if $\alpha^{(p)}$ and $\beta^{(p+1)}$ are two critical simplices, and if there is exactly one gradient path from $\partial\beta$ to α, then α and β can be cancelled. More precisely:

THEOREM 1.17. *Suppose f is a discrete Morse function on M such that $\beta^{(p+1)}$ and $\alpha^{(p)}$ are critical, and there is exactly one gradient path from $\partial\beta$ to α. Then there is another Morse function g on M with the same critical simplices except that α and β are no longer critical. Moreover, the gradient vector field associated to g is equal to the gradient vector field associated to f except along the unique gradient path from $\partial\beta$ to α.*

In the smooth case, the proof, either as presented originally by Morse [1965] or as presented in [Milnor 1965], is rather technical. In our discrete case the proof is simple. If, in Figure 11, the indicated gradient path is the only gradient path from $\partial\beta$ to α, then we can reverse the gradient vector field along this path, replacing the figure by the vector field in Figure 12.



Figure 12. Modified gradient vector field.

Theorem 1.12 immediately implies that this new vector field is the gradient vector field associated to some Morse function, and α and β are no longer critical. This completes the proof.

The proof in the smooth case proceeds along the same lines. However, in addition to turning around those vectors along the unique gradient path from $\partial\beta$ to α, one must also adjust all nearby vectors so that the resulting vector field is smooth. Moreover, one must check that the new vector field is the gradient of a function, so that, in particular, modifying the vectors did not result in the creation of a closed orbit. This is an example of the sort of complications which arise in the smooth setting, but which do not make an appearance in the discrete theory.

We end this section by mentioning that much of the discrete Morse theory implies the corresponding smooth theory.

THEOREM 1.18 [Forman $\geq$ 1999]. *Let M be a smooth manifold with a smooth Morse function. Then there is a C^1 triangulation of M and a discrete Morse function on the resulting simplicial complex which has the same Morse data as the original function* (*that is*, *the same number of critical points*, *and isomorphic Morse complexes*).

2. Differential Geometry

In this section, we borrow ideas from Riemannian geometry and define local "curvature" invariants for cell complexes from which one can deduce global topological properties. In particular, given a cell complex M, we define a combinatorial Ricci curvature, which is a function on the set of edges of M. The Ricci curvature of an edge is completely determined by those cells of M which are neighbors of e. If the Ricci curvature is always positive, or nonnegative, then one can deduce strong statements about the topology of M.

Much fascinating and beautiful mathematics has resulted from earlier efforts to extend the basic notions of curvature to combinatorial spaces. In the mathematics literature, one can see, for example, [Allendoerfer and Weil 1943; Banchoff 1967; 1983; Cheeger 1983; Stone 1976]. In the mathematical physics literature such ideas appear, most notably, in the voluminous work on the so-called Regge calculus; see [Cheeger et al. 1984; Regge 1961; Williams 1992] for an introduction. Most (but not all) of this work begins with a rigid presentation of the cell complex, which we think of as a piecewise flat Riemannian manifold, so

that the curvature is localized to the lower-dimensional cells. The curvature is then defined in terms of how the neighborhood of a cell differs from what one would see in a flat complex. This section is also related to efforts to derive local combinatorial formulas for the characteristic classes of combinatorial manifolds; see [Banchoff and McCrory 1979; Gabrièlov et al. 1974; Gelfand and MacPherson 1992; Halperin and Toledo 1972; Levitt 1989; Levitt and Rourke 1978; MacPherson 1993; Stone 1981; Yu 1983]. In the case of smooth manifolds, such local formulas are expressed in terms of curvature, so, presumably, local combinatorial formulas for characteristic classes can be thought of as combinatorial formulas for curvature; this connection is made explicit in [Cheeger 1983]. In the mathematical physics literature, similar questions have been studied under the name of lattice gauge theory; see [Phillips and Stone 1990], for example. The main result of [Luo and Stong 1993] is also similar in spirit to the results we will present, in that the combinatorics of the edges and faces of a combinatorial 3-manifold are related to the topology of the underlying manifold. One should also compare with [Alexandrov 1951; Gromov 1987], and the references therein, in which one defines notions of curvature on combinatorial spaces by comparing distances between points with the distances one would find on smooth Riemannian manifolds with constant curvature.

As will soon become clear, our approach is completely different from those followed in these works, and is based instead on an analysis of the combinatorial Laplace operator (this operator also appears in [Yu 1983], but plays a very different role there). The combinatorial Laplace operator has a long history. In the case of a one-dimensional simplicial complex, this operator appeared, implicitly, in Kirchoff's work on electrical networks [1847]. See [Chung 1997; Forman 1993] for more recent work on this case.

The combinatorial Laplace operator on general complexes was introduced by Eckmann [1945]. The close relationship between the combinatorial and Riemannian Laplace operators has been explored in a number of papers, most notably by Dodziuk and his collaborators; see, for example, [Dodziuk 1974; 1981; Dodziuk and Karp 1988; Dodziuk and Patodi 1976]. The work by Garland [1972; 1973; 1975], is very closely related to ours, in that he also uses the combinatorial Laplace operator to define combinatorial curvatures, which are then used to deduce global topological properties of the complex. The reader can consult [Friedman 1996; Friedman and Handron 1997; Kook et al. 1998] for some fascinating recent applications of the combinatorial Laplacian to some problems in combinatorics.

Let us begin with some examples of the theory we develop. Although the theory can be applied to very general cell complexes, in this introduction we will restrict attention to CW complexes satisfying a combinatorial condition modelled on the notion of convexity. The reader may think only of simplicial complexes, but it is insightful to allow more general convex cells.

DEFINITION 2.1. A regular CW complex M is *quasi-convex* if for each pair of open p-cells α_1, α_2, either $\bar{\alpha}_1 \cap \bar{\alpha}_2 = \varnothing$, or $\bar{\alpha}_1 \cap \bar{\alpha}_2 = \bar{\gamma}$ for some cell γ. For example, all simplicial complexes and all polyhedra are quasi-convex. From now on, by a *quasi-convex complex* we will always mean a compact regular CW complex which is quasi-convex.

Throughout this section, a primary role will be played by the notion of a *neighbor*.

DEFINITION 2.2. If α_1 and α_2 are p-cells of M, say that α_1 and α_2 are *neighbors* if at least one of these conditions is satisfied:

(1) α_1 and α_2 share a $(p+1)$-cell, that is, there is a $(p+1)$-cell β with $\beta > \alpha_1$ and $\beta > \alpha_2$.
(2) α_1 and α_2 share a $(p-1)$-cell, that is, there is a $(p-1)$-cell γ with $\gamma < \alpha_1$ and $\gamma < \alpha_2$.

We say that α_1 and α_2 are *parallel neighbors* if either condition is true but not both. If both are true, we say α_1 and α_2 are *transverse neighbors*.

Figure 13 illustrates the origin of these terms.



Figure 13. An illustration of neighbors in the case $p = 1$. The edge e_0 has four parallel neighbors (e_2, e_4, e_6, e_8) and four transverse neighbors (e_1, e_3, e_5, e_7).

We are now ready to state the main new definition of this section.

DEFINITION 2.3. For each p, define the p-th curvature function

$$\mathcal{F}_p : K_p \to \mathbb{R}$$

as follows. For any p-cell α, set

$$\mathcal{F}(\alpha) = \#\{(p+1)\text{-cells } \beta > a\} + \#\{(p-1)\text{-cells } \gamma < a\} - \#\{\text{parallel neighbors of } \alpha\}.$$

The significance of this definition is made apparent in the following combinatorial analogue of Bochner's Theorem [Bochner 1946; Bochner 1948; Bochner 1949].

THEOREM 2.4. *Let M be a quasi-convex complex. Suppose, for some p, that $\mathcal{F}_p(\alpha) > 0$ for each p-cell α. Then*

$$H_p(M, \mathbb{R}) = 0.$$

Of particular interest is the case $p = 1$. In this case we give the curvature function a special name. For any edge (1-cell) e of M, define the *Ricci curvature* of e by

$$\mathrm{Ric}(e) = \mathcal{F}_1(e).$$

More explicitly,

$$\mathrm{Ric}(e) = \#\{\text{2-cells } f > e\} + 2 - \#\{\text{parallel neighbors of } e\}.$$

For example, in Figure 13

$$\mathrm{Ric}(e_0) = 2 + 2 - 4 = 0.$$

Thus, the standard lattice cell decomposition of the plane is a "Ricci flat" cell complex. In fact, the reader can easily check that for all p, $\mathcal{F}_p$ vanishes on the standard lattice cell decomposition of Euclidean space of any dimension. At the right we show a 2-dimensional sphere with "cubic" cell decomposition. In this case the edge e_0 has 2 parallel neighbors (the edges e_1 and e_2) so that



$$\mathrm{Ric}(e_0) = 2 + 2 - 2 = 2.$$

The purpose of Figure 14 is to demonstrate that the definitions and theorems discussed in this paper can, with a few exceptions, be applied to very general complexes. The complex need not be a manifold, or have any other special structure.



Figure 14. The Ricci curvature — indicated here for each edge — can be computed for arbitrary complexes.

In the Riemannian case Bochner showed that one does not need the p-th curvature function to be strictly positive, as we required in Theorem 2.4, in order to draw some topological conclusions. In fact, nonnegativity also has strong implications. In the combinatorial setting, we can prove a corresponding result in the case p=1.

THEOREM 2.5. *Let M be a connected quasi-convex complex.*

(i) *Suppose that* $\mathrm{Ric}(e) \geq 0$ *for all edges e of M. If there is a vertex v such that* $\mathrm{Ric}(e) > 0$ *for all $e > v$ then*

$$H_1(M, \mathbb{R}) = 0.$$

(ii) *Suppose that M is a combinatorial n-manifold, $n \leq 3$, and* $\mathrm{Ric}(e) \geq 0$ *for all edges of M. Then*

$$\dim H_1(M, \mathbb{R}) \leq n.$$

(*This theorem is true for all $n \geq 0$ with an additional technical hypothesis.*)

We will later indicate the proof of these results. We conjecture that, just as in the Riemannian setting, Theorem 2.5 holds for general p (with the right hand side of the inequality in (ii) replaced by $\binom{n}{p}$). However, we have run into interesting obstacles in trying to prove Theorem 2.5 in the desired generality. We will later give an idea as to how $p = 1$ differs from the general case. For a more complete discussion of this point, see [Forman 1998a, § 4].

It is interesting to see how these theorems apply to the very simple complexes illustrated on page 14. In the case of the 2-sphere S^2 given the cubic cell decomposition, each edge has Ricci curvature 2. Thus we may apply Theorem 2.4 to conclude

$$H_1(S^2, \mathbb{R}) = 0.$$

Each edge of the complex M in Figure 14 has Ricci curvature ≥ 0. Moreover, every edge $e > v$ has positive Ricci curvature. In this case, Theorem 2.5(i) implies

$$H_1(M, \mathbb{R}) = 0.$$

The 2-dimensional torus T^2 can be given a cell decomposition which looks everywhere like the cell complex shown in Figure 13. With this cell structure T^2 is a connected combinatorial 2-manifold. Since every edge has Ricci curvature $= 0$, we may apply Theorem 2.5(ii) to learn that

$$\dim H_1(T^2, \mathbb{R}) \leq 2.$$

More generally, for every n, the n-dimensional torus T^2 can be given such a cubic cell decomposition. In this case, T^n will be a connected combinatorial n-manifold, with every edge having Ricci curvature 0. Moreover, T^n satisfies the (unstated) technical hypothesis of the above theorem, so we may conclude

$$\dim H_1(T^n, \mathbb{R}) \leq n.$$

Since, in fact, $\dim H_1(T^n, \mathbb{R}) = n$, we see that the conclusion of this combinatorial Bochner theorem, just as the conclusion of the classical Bochner theorem, is sharp.

In [Myers 1941], a precursor to Bochner's work, Myers proves a theorem (in the Riemannian setting) which is a strengthening of Theorem 2.4 in the case $p = 1$. The analogous result holds in the combinatorial setting.

THEOREM 2.6. *Let M be a quasi-convex complex. Suppose that* $\mathrm{Ric}(e) > 0$ *for every edge e. Then $\pi_1(M)$ is finite.*

Stone [Stone 1976] defines a different notion of curvature, in a somewhat more restricted setting, from which a version of Myers' theorem is deduced. Even though the proof of Theorem 2.6 is very similar to Stone's proof (and the proof in [Myers 1941]), the relationship between the two notions of combinatorial curvature is not clear to this author at present.

These theorems show that there are strong topological restrictions for a topological space to have a quasi-convex cell decomposition with $\mathrm{Ric}(e) > 0$ (or ≥ 0) for each edge e. It is natural to consider the other extreme, and to investigate the possibility of decompositions with $\mathrm{Ric}(e) < 0$ for every edge e. In [Gao 1985; Gao and Yau 1986; Lohkamp 1994a; 1994b] it was shown that every smooth manifold of dimension ≥ 3 has a Riemannian metric with everywhere negative Ricci curvature. The same, and more, is true in the combinatorial setting.

THEOREM 2.7. *Let M be a (not necessarily compact) combinatorial n-manifold with $n \geq 2$. Then there is a finite subdivision M^* of M such that* $\mathrm{Ric}(e) < 0$ *for all edges e of M^*.*

It is interesting to note that the corresponding Riemannian theorem is only true for manifolds of dimension ≥ 3. The Gauss–Bonnet Theorem provides an obstruction for a surface to have a metric with negative Ricci curvature (which is to say Gaussian curvature if $n = 2$). Theorem 2.7 implies that there is no simple Gauss–Bonnet theorem for combinatorial Ricci curvature. See [Forman 1998a, § 5] for a way to recover a version of Gauss–Bonnet in this setting.

We will now give an idea of the proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5. Readers familar with Bochner's original proof will notice that we are simply following his proof (now known as "Bochner's method") in a combinatorial setting. Let M be a finite CW complex. Consider the cellular chain complex

$$0 \longrightarrow C_n(M, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\partial} C_{n-1}(M, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\partial} \cdots \xrightarrow{\partial} C_0(M, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow 0$$

Endow each $C_p(M, \mathbb{R})$ with a positive definite inner product such that the cells of M are orthogonal. This involves choosing a positive "weight" ω_α for each cell α and setting

$$\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle = \omega_\alpha .$$

(The formulas presented in this paper result from setting $\omega_\alpha = 1$ for every cell α.) Let $\partial^* : C_p(M, \mathbb{R}) \to C_{p+1}(M, \mathbb{R})$ denote the adjoint of ∂ and

$$\Box_p = \partial\partial^* + \partial^*\partial : C_p(M, \mathbb{R}) \to C_p(M, \mathbb{R})$$

the corresponding Laplacian. The combinatorial Hodge theorem

$$\mathrm{Ker}\, \Box_p \cong H_p(M, \mathbb{R})$$

follows from basic linear algebra.

To motivate what follows, we now present a very brief overview of Bochner's original proof in the smooth category. We will freely use standard notation and terminology of Riemannian geometry. The reader may feel free to skip

this rather dense paragraph. The next step in Bochner's original proof is the Bochner–Weitzenböck formula

$$\Box_p = \nabla_p^* \nabla_p + F_p$$

where now $\Box_p$ is the Riemannian Laplace operator on p-forms on a compact Riemannian manifold, ∇_p is the (Levi-Civita) covariant derivative operator, and F_p is a 0th order operator whose value at $m \in M$ depends only on derivatives of the Riemannian metric at m. The operator $\nabla_p^* \nabla_p$ is called the Bochner Laplacian. The main point is that this is a nonnegative operator, in the sense that for every p-form η on M

$$\langle \nabla_p^* \nabla_p \eta, \eta \rangle = \langle \nabla_p \eta, \nabla_p \eta \rangle \geq 0$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the L^2 inner product on p-forms induced by the Riemannian metric. It immediately follows that if F_p is a positive operator, in the sense that $\mathcal{F}_p(\eta) := (F_p(m)\eta, \eta) > 0$ for all $m \in M$ and $\eta \in \bigwedge^p T_m^* M - \{0\}$, then $\Box_p$ is a positive operator, and hence the kernel is trivial. This implies that $H_p(M, \mathbb{R}) = 0$, the desired conclusion of Theorem 2.4. For $p > 1$, the function $\mathcal{F}_p$ is rather mysterious. On the other hand, it can be shown that $\mathcal{F}_1$ is equal to the Ricci curvature. That is, for all $\omega \in T^* M$,

$$\mathrm{Ric}(\omega) = \mathcal{F}_1(\omega). \tag{2.1}$$

Now we go back to the combinatorial setting. Following Bochner's proof, our next step is to develop a Bochner–Weitzenböck formula for $\Box_p$, the combinatorial Laplace operator. This is rather mysterious, since we begin by knowing neither a combinatorial analogue for $(\nabla_p^*)\nabla_p$ nor for F_p. However, we show that there is, in fact, a canonical decomposition

$$\Box_p = B_p + F_p,$$

where B_p is a nonnegative operator and, when expressed as a matrix with respect to a basis of $C_p(M, \mathbb{R})$ consisting of the p-cells of M, F_p is diagonal.

To describe this decomposition, we begin by defining a decomposition of any $n \times n$ symmetric matrix. Rather than writing a general definition, we will illustrate the decomposition in the case of a symmetric 3×3 matrix:

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ b & d & e \\ c & e & f \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} |b| + |c| & b & c \\ b & |b| + |e| & e \\ c & e & |c| + |e| \end{pmatrix} \\
&\quad + \begin{pmatrix} a - (|b| + |c|) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d - (|b| + |e|) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & f - (|c| + |e|) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= B + F.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

The linear map defined by the matrix B is nonnegative (with respect to the standard inner product on $\mathbb{R}^3$). This is a special case of the fact that any symmetric matrix $(a_{i,j})$ such that $a_{i,i} \geq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{i,j}|$ for each i is nonnegative. This is one of those very useful facts in matrix theory which is constantly being rediscovered. For the history of this result (not stated in quite the same way) and extensions, see [Taussky 1949]. The desired conclusion is also implied by the classical eigenvalue estimate known as "the Gershgorin circle method" [Gershgorin 1931], which says that the eigenvalues lie in circles centered at $a_{i,i}$ with radius $\sum_{j \neq i} |a_{i,j}|$.

The nonnegativity of B implies that in this simple example we can already make the Bochner-like statement that if each of the 3 numbers $a - (|b| + |c|)$, $d - (|b| + |e|)$, $f - (|c| + |e|)$ is positive then the original 3×3 matrix has a trivial kernel.

To apply this decomposition to the combinatorial Laplace operator, we must first represent the Laplace operator as a symmetric matrix, and this requires choosing an ordered orthonormal basis for the space of chains. We can define such a basis by choosing an orientation for each cell of M, and then choosing an ordering of the cells. Making a different choice for the orientation of a cell has the effect of multiplying the corresponding row and column of the symmetric matrix by -1. Permuting the ordering of the cells has the effect of applying the same permutation to both the rows and the columns of the matrix. Therefore, for a decomposition of symmetric matrices to induce a well-defined decomposition of the combinatorial Laplace operator, the decomposition must be equivariant under multiplying a row and column by -1, and applying a single permutation to both the rows and the columns. It is easy to see that the decomposition shown in (2.2) has this property, and hence induces a decomposition $\Box_p = B_p + F_p$. In analogy with the Bochner–Weitzenböck formula, we call B_p the combinatorial Bochner Laplacian, and F_p the p-th combinatorial curvature function.

It follows immediately that if $F_p > 0$ then $\Box_p > 0$, so that $H_p(M, \mathbb{R}) = 0$. For any p-cell α, we define

$$\mathcal{F}_p(\alpha) = \langle F_p(\alpha), \alpha \rangle.$$

Our definition of Ricci curvature, $\mathrm{Ric}(e) = \mathcal{F}_1(e)$ was motivated by formula (2.1). We note that (2.1) is a theorem in the Riemannian setting, since Ricci curvature was originally defined in a completely different manner, but it is a definition in the combinatorial case. Proving Theorem 2.4 is now reduced to explicitly calculating $\mathcal{F}_p$ as defined above, and showing that this is equivalent to the formula given in Definition 2.3. See [Forman 1998a] for the details of this straight-forward calculation.

In the Riemannian case (I hope the reader is not getting dizzy from all of this bouncing back and forth between categories), Theorem 2.5 follows from the Bochner–Weitzenböck formula with just a bit more work. Namely, if F_p is a

nonnegative operator, then since $\nabla_p^*\nabla_p$ is also a nonnegative operator, we have

$$\operatorname{Ker}\Box_p = \operatorname{Ker}(\nabla_p^*\nabla_p) \cap \operatorname{Ker} F_p.$$

We note that

$$\operatorname{Ker}(\nabla_p^*\nabla_p) = \operatorname{Ker}\nabla_p.$$

Any $\omega \in \operatorname{Ker}\nabla_p$ is said to be *parallel*, and is completely determined by its value at any one point. This is essentially all that is required to complete the proof.

The proofs of Theorem 2.5(i) and (ii) in the combinatorial case, just as in the Riemannian case, would follow if we knew that a 1-chain $c \in \operatorname{Ker} B_1$ is completely determined by its values in some neighborhood in M, that is, if there was a unique continuation theorem for 1-chains in $\operatorname{Ker} B_1$. This is not quite true. However, if $c \in \operatorname{Ker}\Box_1 \cap \operatorname{Ker} B_1$, then c is, in fact, determined by its value in a neighborhood of any vertex. This is sufficient for the proof of Theorem 2.5(i) and (ii). It can also be shown that for $p > 1$, p-chains $c \in \operatorname{Ker}\Box_p \cap \operatorname{Ker} B_p$, in drastic contradiction to the Riemannian case, are not determined by local information. This explains the difficulty in extending Theorem 2.5 to the case of general p (see § 4 of [Forman 1998a]).

We briefly indicate the proof of the unique continuation theorem for $c \in \operatorname{Ker}\Box_1 \cap \operatorname{Ker} B_1$. Consider, for example, a vector $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ in the kernel of the matrix B in (4). It is not too hard to see that if $b \neq 0$ then x_1 determines x_2. Namely,

$$x_2 = -(\operatorname{sign}(b))x_1.$$

More generally, if $x \in \operatorname{Ker} B$, and the (i,j)-th entry of B is nonzero, then x_i determines x_j (so that x_i is zero if and only if x_j is zero).

In the case of the Laplace operator, if α_1 and α_2 are p-cells, then the entry of B_p corresponding to α_1 and α_2 is nonzero if α_1 and α_2 are parallel neighbors. Therefore, if $c = \sum_{\alpha^{(p)}} c_\alpha \alpha \in \operatorname{Ker} B_p$, and α_1 and α_2 are parallel neighbors, then c_{α_1} determines c_{α_2}. Consider the polygon shown in Figure 15, left. Every side of the polygon is a parallel neighbor of either e_1 of e_2. This is the case whenever the polygon has at least 4 sides. Therefore, if $c = \sum_e c_e e \in \operatorname{Ker} B_1$, then the value of c on the boundary of the polygon is completely determined by c_{e_1} and c_{e_2}. This argument doesn't quite work if the polygon has 3 sides, as in Figure 15, right. Here, e_3 is a transverse neighbor of both e_1 and e_2. However, if



Figure 15. For a polygon with more than three sides, every edge is a parallel neighbor of one of the edges incident on v.

we knew that $c \in \operatorname{Ker} \partial^*$, then c_{e_3} would be determined by c_{e_1} and c_{e_2}. Putting these ideas together, it is not too hard to get to the general result that if M is connected, and $c \in \operatorname{Ker} \partial^* \cap \operatorname{Ker} B_1$, then for any vertex v, c is completely determined by c_e for $e > v$. Since

$$\operatorname{Ker} \Box_p = \operatorname{Ker} \partial \cap \operatorname{Ker} \partial^* \subset \operatorname{Ker} \partial^*$$

the desired theorem follows.

To see how Theorem 2.5(i) follows, suppose $\operatorname{Ric}(e) \geq 0$ for each edge e. Then, since B_1 is also a nonnegative operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Ker} \Box_1 &= \operatorname{Ker} B_1 \cap \operatorname{Ker} \operatorname{Ric} = (\operatorname{Ker} B_1 \cap \operatorname{Ker} \Box_1) \cap \operatorname{Ker} \operatorname{Ric} \\ &= (\operatorname{Ker} B_1 \cap \operatorname{Ker} \partial^*) \cap \operatorname{Ker} \operatorname{Ric}. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose $c = \sum_e c_e e \in \operatorname{Ker} \Box_p$. Then $c \in \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{Ric})$. Since $\operatorname{Ric}(e) > 0$ for each edge $e > v$, we must have $c_e = 0$ for each edge $e > v$. Now we observe that since $c \in \operatorname{Ker} B_1 \cap \operatorname{Ker} \partial^*$, c is completely determined by c_e for $e > v$, and hence we must have $c = 0$. This demonstrates that $H_1(M, \mathbb{R}) = 0$.

The results we have presented here, as well as those in the references cited earlier, indicate that there should exist more complete theories of combinatorial differential topology and geometry. However, at this point the combinatorial theories capture only a small portion of these beautiful and far-reaching classical subjects. There remains much to be done.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks the staff of the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, as well as the organizers of the special year in Combinatorics and Topology, for their hospitality while some of this work was completed. The author also thanks the referees and editor, whose thoughtful comments have drastically improved this paper.

References

[Alexandrov 1951] A. D. Alexandrov, "A theorem on triangles in a metric space and some of its applications", *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov* **38** (1951), 5–23. In Russian.

[Allendoerfer and Weil 1943] C. B. Allendoerfer and A. Weil, "The Gauss–Bonnet theorem for Riemannian polyhedra", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **53** (1943), 101–129.

[Babson et al. 1999] E. Babson, A. Björner, S. Linusson, J. Shareshian, and V. Welker, "Complexes of not i-connected graphs", *Topology* **38**:2 (1999), 271–299.

[Banchoff 1967] T. Banchoff, "Critical points and curvature for embedded polyhedra", *J. Differential Geometry* **1** (1967), 245–256.

[Banchoff 1983] T. F. Banchoff, "Critical points and curvature for embedded polyhedra, II", pp. 34–55 in *Differential geometry* (College Park, MD, 1981/1982), edited by R. Brooks et al., Progr. Math. **32**, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1983.

[Banchoff and McCrory 1979] T. Banchoff and C. McCrory, "A combinatorial formula for normal Stiefel-Whitney classes", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **76**:1 (1979), 171–177.

[Björner 1995] A. Björner, "Topological methods", pp. 1819–1872 in *Handbook of combinatorics,* v. 2, edited by R. Graham et al., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1995.

[Bochner 1946] S. Bochner, "Vector fields and Ricci curvature", *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **52** (1946), 776–797.

[Bochner 1948] S. Bochner, "Curvature and Betti numbers", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **49** (1948), 379–390.

[Bochner 1949] S. Bochner, "Curvature and Betti numbers, II", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **50** (1949), 77–93.

[Bollobás 1995] B. Bollobás, "Extremal graph theory", pp. 1231–1292 in *Handbook of combinatorics*, vol. 2, edited by E. by R. L. Graham et al., Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.

[Bott 1988] R. Bott, "Morse theory indomitable", *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **68** (1988), 99–114.

[Brehm and Kühnel 1987] U. Brehm and W. Kühnel, "Combinatorial manifolds with few vertices", *Topology* **26**:4 (1987), 465–473.

[Chari 1996] M. Chari, "On discrete Morse functions and combinatorial decompositions", preprint, 1996.

[Cheeger 1983] J. Cheeger, "Spectral geometry of singular Riemannian spaces", *J. Differential Geom.* **18**:4 (1983), 575–657.

[Cheeger et al. 1984] J. Cheeger, W. Müller, and R. Schrader, "On the curvature of piecewise flat spaces", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **92**:3 (1984), 405–454.

[Chung 1997] F. R. K. Chung, *Spectral graph theory*, CBMS Regional conference series in mathematics **92**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1997.

[Dodziuk 1974] J. Dodziuk, "Combinatorial and continuous Hodge theories", *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **80** (1974), 1014–1016.

[Dodziuk 1981] J. Dodziuk, "Sobolev spaces of differential forms and de Rham–Hodge isomorphism", *J. Differential Geom.* **16**:1 (1981), 63–73.

[Dodziuk and Karp 1988] J. Dodziuk and L. Karp, "Spectral and function theory for combinatorial Laplacians", pp. 25–40 in *Geometry of random motion* (Ithaca, NY, 1987), edited by R. Durrett and M. A. Pinsky, Contemporary mathematics **73**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1988.

[Dodziuk and Patodi 1976] J. Dodziuk and V. K. Patodi, "Riemannian structures and triangulations of manifolds", *J. Indian Math. Soc.* (*N.S.*) **40** (1976), 1–52.

[Duval 1994] A. M. Duval, "A combinatorial decomposition of simplicial complexes", *Israel J. Math.* **87**:1-3 (1994), 77–87.

[Eckmann 1945] B. Eckmann, "Harmonische Funktionen und Randwertaufgaben in einem Komplex", *Comment. Math. Helv.* **17** (1945), 240–255.

[Eells and Kuiper 1962] J. Eells, Jr. and N. H. Kuiper, "Manifolds which are like projective planes", *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **14** (1962), 5–46 (181–222 in year).

[Floer 1988] A. Floer, "Morse theory for Lagrangian intersections", *J. Differential Geom.* **28**:3 (1988), 513–547.

[Forman 1993] R. Forman, "Determinants of Laplacians on graphs", *Topology* **32**:1 (1993), 35–46.

[Forman 1995] R. Forman, "A discrete Morse theory for cell complexes", pp. 112–125 in *Geometry, topology, and physics for Raoul Bott*, edited by S.-T. Yau, Internat. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.

[Forman 1998a] R. Forman, "Combinatorial Ricci curvature", preprint, 1998. Available at http://math.rice.edu/~forman/ricci.tex.

[Forman 1998b] R. Forman, "Combinatorial vector fields and dynamical systems", *Math. Z.* **228**:4 (1998), 629–681.

[Forman 1998c] R. Forman, "Morse theory and evasiveness", preprint, 1998. Available at http://math.rice.edu/~forman/evade.tex.

[Forman 1998d] R. Forman, "Morse theory for cell complexes", *Adv. Math.* **134**:1 (1998), 90–145.

[Forman $\geq$ 1999] R. Forman, "On triangulations of vector fields". In preparation.

[Friedman 1996] J. Friedman, "Computing Betti numbers via combinatorial Laplacians", pp. 386–391 in *Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing* (Philadelphia, 1996), ACM, New York, 1996.

[Friedman and Handron 1997] J. Friedman and P. Handron, "On the Betti numbers of chessboard compexes", preprint, 1997.

[Gabrièlov et al. 1974] A. M. Gabrièlov, I. M. Gel'fand, and M. V. Losik, "The combinatorial computation of characteristic classes", *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* **9**:1 (1974), 54–55. In Russian; translated in *Func. Anal. and Appl.* **10** (1976), 12–15.

[Gao 1985] L. Z. Gao, "The construction of negatively Ricci curved manifolds", *Math. Ann.* **271**:2 (1985), 185–208.

[Gao and Yau 1986] L. Z. Gao and S.-T. Yau, "The existence of negatively Ricci curved metrics on three-manifolds", *Invent. Math.* **85**:3 (1986), 637–652.

[Garland 1972] H. Garland, "p-adic curvature and a conjecture of Serre", *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **78** (1972), 259–261.

[Garland 1973] H. Garland, "p-adic curvature and the cohomology of discrete subgroups of p-adic groups", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **97** (1973), 375–423.

[Garland 1975] H. Garland, "On the cohomology of discrete subgroups of semi-simple Lie groups", pp. 21–30 in *Discrete subgroups of Lie groups and applications to moduli* (Bombay, 1973), Tata Institute Studies in Mathematics **7**, Oxford Univ. Press, Bombay, 1975.

[Gelfand and MacPherson 1992] I. M. Gelfand and R. D. MacPherson, "A combinatorial formula for the Pontrjagin classes", *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* (*N.S.*) **26**:2 (1992), 304–309.

[Gershgorin 1931] S. Gershgorin, "Über die Abgrenzung der Eigenwerte einer Matrix", *Izv. Akad. Nauk. USSR Otd. Fiz.-Mat. Nauk* **7** (1931), 749–754.

[Glaser 1972] L. C. Glaser, *Geometrical combinatorial topology,* v. 1, Van Nostrand Reinhold Mathematical Studies **28**, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1972.

[Goresky and MacPherson 1983] M. Goresky and R. MacPherson, "Stratified Morse theory", pp. 517–533 in *Singularities,* v. 1 (Arcata, CA, 1981), edited by P. Orlik, Proceedings of symposia in pure mathematics **40**:1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1983.

[Goresky and MacPherson 1988] M. Goresky and R. MacPherson, *Stratified Morse theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik (3) **14**, Springer, Berlin, 1988.

[Gromov 1981] M. Gromov, "Curvature, diameter and Betti numbers", *Comment. Math. Helv.* **56**:2 (1981), 179–195.

[Gromov 1987] M. Gromov, "Hyperbolic groups", pp. 75–263 in *Essays in group theory*, edited by S. M. Gersten, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. **8**, Springer, New York, 1987.

[Halperin and Toledo 1972] S. Halperin and D. Toledo, "Stiefel-Whitney homology classes", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **96** (1972), 511–525.

[Kirchhoff 1847] G. Kirchhoff, "Über die Auflösung der Gleichungen auf welche man bei der Untersuchen der linearen Vertheilung galvanischer Ströme geführt wird", *Ann. der Phys. und Chem.* **72** (1847), 495–508.

[Klingenberg 1982] W. Klingenberg, "The Morse complex", pp. 117–122 in *Symposia Mathematica,* v. 26 (Rome, 1980), Academic Press, London, 1982.

[Kook et al. 1998] W. Kook, V. Reiner, and D. Stanton, "Combinatorial Laplacians of matroid complexes", preprint, 1998.

[Kühnel 1990] W. Kühnel, "Triangulations of manifolds with few vertices", pp. 59–114 in *Advances in differential geometry and topology*, edited by F. Tricerri, World Sci., Teaneck, NJ, 1990.

[Kuiper 1971] N. H. Kuiper, "Morse relations for curvature and tightness", pp. 77–89 in *Proceedings of Liverpool Singularities Symposium* (Liverpool, 1969/1970), vol. 2, edited by C. T. C. Wall, Lecture Notes in Math. **209**, Springer, Berlin, 1971.

[Levitt 1989] N. Levitt, *Grassmannians and Gauss maps in piecewise-linear topology*, Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[Levitt and Rourke 1978] N. Levitt and C. Rourke, "The existence of combinatorial formulae for characteristic classes", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **239** (1978), 391–397.

[Lohkamp 1994a] J. Lohkamp, "Metrics of negative Ricci curvature", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **140**:3 (1994), 655–683.

[Lohkamp 1994b] J. Lohkamp, "Negative bending of open manifolds", *J. Differential Geom.* **40**:3 (1994), 461–474.

[Luo and Stong 1993] F. Luo and R. Stong, "Combinatorics of triangulations of 3-manifolds", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **337**:2 (1993), 891–906.

[MacPherson 1993] R. D. MacPherson, "Combinatorial differential manifolds: a symposium in honor of John Milnor's sixtieth birthday", pp. 203–221 in *Topological methods in modern mathematics* (Stony Brook, NY, 1991), edited by L. R. Goldberg and A. Phillips, Publish or Perish, Houston, 1993.

[Milnor 1962] J. Milnor, *Morse theory*, Annals of Mathematics Study **51**, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1962.

[Milnor 1965] J. Milnor, *Lectures on the h-cobordism theorem*, Princeton Mathematical Notes, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1965.

[Morse 1925] M. Morse, "Relations between the critical points of a real function of n independent variables", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **27** (1925), 345–396.

[Morse 1934] M. Morse, *The calculus of variations in the large*, Colloquium Publications **18**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1934.

[Morse 1965] M. Morse, "Bowls of a non-degenerate function on a compact differentiable manifold", pp. 81–103 in *Differential and Combinatorial Topology*, edited by S. S. Cairns, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1965.

[Myers 1941] S. B. Myers, "Riemannian manifolds with positive mean curvature", *Duke Math. J.* **8** (1941), 401–404.

[Phillips and Stone 1990] A. V. Phillips and D. A. Stone, "The computation of characteristic classes of lattice gauge fields", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **131**:2 (1990), 255–282.

[Regge 1961] T. Regge, "General relativity without coordinates", *Nuovo Cimento* (10) **19** (1961), 558–571.

[Shareshian 1997] J. Shareshian, "Discrete Morse theory for complexes of 2-connected graphs", preprint, 1997.

[Smale 1961a] S. Smale, "Generalized Poincaré's conjecture in dimensions greater than four", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **74** (1961), 391–406.

[Smale 1961b] S. Smale, "On gradient dynamical systems", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **74** (1961), 199–206.

[Stanley 1993] R. P. Stanley, "A combinatorial decomposition of acyclic simplicial complexes", *Discrete Math.* **120**:1-3 (1993), 175–182.

[Stone 1976] D. A. Stone, "A combinatorial analogue of a theorem of Myers", *Illinois J. Math.* **20**:1 (1976), 12–21. Correction in **20**:3 (1976), 551–554.

[Stone 1981] D. A. Stone, "On the combinatorial Gauss map for C^1 submanifolds of Euclidean space", *Topology* **20**:3 (1981), 247–272.

[Taussky 1949] O. Taussky, "A recurring theorem on determinants", *Amer. Math. Monthly* **56** (1949), 672–676.

[Turchin 1997] V. È. Turchin, "Homology of complexes of biconnected graphs", *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* **52**:2 (issue 314) (1997), 189–190. In Russian; translated in *Russian Math. Surveys* **52**:2 (1997), 426–427.

[Vassiliev 1993] V. A. Vassiliev, "Complexes of connected graphs", pp. 223–235 in *The Gel'fand Mathematical Seminars,* 1990–1992, edited by L. Corwin et al., Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993.

[Whitehead 1939] J. H. C. Whitehead, "Simplicial spaces, nuclei, and m-groups", *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **45** (1939), 243–327.

[Williams 1992] R. M. Williams, "Discrete quantum gravity: the Regge calculus approach", *Internat. J. Modern Phys. B* **6**:11-12 (1992), 2097–2108.

[Yu 1983] Y. L. Yu, "Combinatorial Gauss–Bonnet–Chern formula", *Topology* **22**:2 (1983), 153–163.

Robin Forman
Department of Mathematics
Rice University
Houston, TX 77251
United States
forman@math.rice.edu