

DEFORMATIONS OF CODIMENSION 2 TORIC VARIETIES

Vesselin Gasharov

Irena Peeva

Department of Mathematics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139
U.S.A.

Abstract: We prove Sturmfels' conjecture that toric varieties of codimension two have no other flat deformations than those obtained by Gröbner basis theory.

1. Introduction

The properties of ideals with a fixed Hilbert function have been studied extensively; the most recent papers are [HP,G]. We study when an ideal has the same multigraded Hilbert function as a given toric ideal.

Let n and d be positive integers with $n > d$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ a subset of $\mathbf{N}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ with n different vectors. Let A be the matrix with columns a_i and suppose that $\text{rank}(A) = d$. Denote by $\mathbf{N}\mathcal{A}$ the subsemigroup of \mathbf{N}^d spanned by \mathcal{A} . Consider the polynomial ring $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ over a field k generated by variables x_1, \dots, x_n in \mathbf{N}^d -degrees a_1, \dots, a_n respectively. A homogeneous ideal M is called \mathcal{A} -graded if for all $b \in \mathbf{N}^d$

$$\dim_k((S/M)_b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b \in \mathbf{N}\mathcal{A}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The second author was partially supported by NSF.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification: 13P10.

Keywords and Phrases: toric ideal.

This means that S/M has the same multigraded Hilbert function as the *toric ring* $S/I_{\mathcal{A}}$, where $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the *toric ideal* equal to the kernel of the homomorphism $k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow k[t_1, \dots, t_d]$ mapping x_i to $\mathbf{t}^{a_i} = t_1^{a_{i1}} \dots t_d^{a_{id}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. The paradigms of \mathcal{A} -graded ideals are the toric ideal and its initial ideals. An \mathcal{A} -graded ideal M is called *coherent* if there exist $w \in \mathbf{Q}^n$ and $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in (k^*)^n$ such that the ideal $(f(c_1x_1, \dots, c_nx_n) \mid f \in M)$ equals the initial ideal $\text{in}_w(I_{\mathcal{A}})$ of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ with respect to the monomial order defined by the weight vector w . If M is an initial ideal of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$, then a construction from Gröbner Bases Theory gives a flat family such that the fiber over 1 is the toric ring $S/I_{\mathcal{A}}$ and the fiber over 0 is S/M . What are the other deformations of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$? The study of \mathcal{A} -graded ideals was initiated by Arnold [Ar], who realized that in the case $d = 1, n = 3$ the structure of such ideals is encoded into continued fractions. Further work in this case was done by Korkina, Post, and Roelofs [Ko, KPR].

Theorem 1.1. (Arnold-Korkina-Post-Roelofs [Ar, Ko, KPR]) *If $d = 1$ and $n = 3$ then every \mathcal{A} -graded ideal is coherent.*

The codimension of $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ is $n - d$. In view of Lee's result that \mathcal{A} has only coherent triangulations if $n - d = 2$, it is conjectured in [St1, 6.1]:

Conjecture 1.2. (Sturmfels 1994) *If $\text{codim}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) = 2$ then every \mathcal{A} -graded ideal is coherent.*

This conjecture provides description of the structure of the \mathcal{A} -graded ideals and shows that the isomorphism classes of \mathcal{A} -graded ideals are in bijection with the vertices of the state polytope. The first example of a non-coherent \mathcal{A} -graded ideal was found by Eisenbud; through a systematic computer search Sturmfels [St2, Theorem 10.4] found that $(x_1^3, x_1x_2, x_2^2, x_2x_3, x_1x_4, x_1^2x_3^2, x_1x_3^4, x_2x_4^3, x_4^4)$ is a non-coherent \mathcal{A} -graded monomial ideal for $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 3, 4, 7\}$ and in this case $\text{codim}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) = 3$. So the above conjecture cannot be extended to codimensions higher than two.

Our paper is devoted to a proof of Conjecture 1.2. The arguments in [Ar, Ko, KPR] cannot be applied for $n \geq 4$; some of the difficulties when $n \geq 4$ are outlined in [KPR, Section 8]. Our argument is broken into many steps and each step is presented in a lemma. It involves techniques from [Ar] and [PS], and relies on a detailed analysis of the syzygies of the toric ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ and the syzygies of its Lawrence lifting ideal.

2. Criterion for coherence

Fix a set \mathcal{A} and denote $I = I_{\mathcal{A}}$. In this section we provide two tools for the proof of Conjecture 1.2: Lemma 2.1 gives a criterion for weak \mathcal{A} -gradedness and Lemma 2.2 gives a criterion for coherence. We also recall the construction of Lawrence lifting.

We say that a homogeneous ideal M is *weakly \mathcal{A} -graded* if for all $b \in \mathbf{N}^d$

$$\dim_k((S/M)_b) \leq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b \in \mathbf{N}\mathcal{A}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that a weakly \mathcal{A} -graded ideal is generated by binomials (that is polynomials with at most two terms). Our first lemma shows that a weakly \mathcal{A} -graded ideal is generated by special binomials. A binomial $\mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^v$ in the toric ideal I is called *primitive* if there are no proper monomial factors $\mathbf{x}^{u'}$ of \mathbf{x}^u and $\mathbf{x}^{v'}$ of \mathbf{x}^v such that $\mathbf{x}^{u'} - \mathbf{x}^{v'} \in I$. The set of all primitive binomials is finite and is called the *Graver basis*.

Lemma 2.1. [PS2] *Let M be an ideal in S . The following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The ideal M is weakly \mathcal{A} -graded.*
- (b) *If $\mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^v$ is a primitive binomial in I then either M contains at least one of the monomials \mathbf{x}^u and \mathbf{x}^v or there is a $p \in k \setminus 0$ such that $\mathbf{x}^u - p\mathbf{x}^v \in M$.*

The Graver basis in the case $d = 1, n = 3$ considered by [Ar,Ko,KPR] is the *star*, see [Ko, Definition 2.9]; in this case Lemma 2.1 corresponds to [Ko, 2.10].

Until the end of this section we will assume that $n - d = 2$, i.e. $\text{codim}(I) = 2$.

A vector $u \in \mathbf{Z}^n$ can be written uniquely as $u = u_+ - u_-$, where u_+ and u_- have non-negative coordinates and $\text{supp}(u_+) \cap \text{supp}(u_-) = \emptyset$ (here $\text{supp}(u) = \{i \mid \text{the } i\text{th coordinate of } u \text{ is not } 0\}$). Let $B = (b_{ij})$ be an integer $(n \times 2)$ -matrix such that the following sequence is exact

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}^2 \xrightarrow{B} \mathbf{Z}^n \xrightarrow{A} \mathbf{Z}^d.$$

Each vector α in \mathbf{Z}^2 corresponds to a binomial $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-}$ in I , and every binomial in I without monomial factors can be represented uniquely in this way.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\text{codim}(I) = 2$ and M be an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal in S . Let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbf{Z}^2$ be a set of vectors with the property that for some non-zero-vector $s \in \mathbf{Q}^2$ we have $\langle s, \alpha \rangle \geq 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$. Set*

$$M' = \left(\{\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{T}, \langle s, \alpha \rangle > 0\} \cup \{\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{T}, \langle s, \alpha \rangle = 0\} \right).$$

If M' is weakly \mathcal{A} -graded and $M' \subseteq M$, then $M' = M$ and M is coherent.

Proof: Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$. Let $w \in \mathbf{Q}^n$ be such that $s = B^T w$ (here B^T is the transpose of B). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w, (B\alpha)_+ \rangle &> \langle w, (B\alpha)_- \rangle && \text{if and only if } \langle s, \alpha \rangle > 0 \\ \langle w, (B\alpha)_+ \rangle &= \langle w, (B\alpha)_- \rangle && \text{if and only if } \langle s, \alpha \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{in}_w(\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} & \text{if } \langle s, \alpha \rangle > 0, \\ \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-} & \text{if } \langle s, \alpha \rangle = 0. \end{cases}$$

By the definition of M' it follows that $M' \subseteq \text{in}_w(I)$. As M' is weakly \mathcal{A} -graded and $\text{in}_w(I)$ is \mathcal{A} -graded, it follows that $M' = \text{in}_w(I)$. On the other hand, $M' \subseteq M$ and M is \mathcal{A} -graded. Hence $M' = M$ and M is coherent. ■

We remark that by [St2, Proposition 1.12] if $w \in \mathbf{Q}^n$ then there exists a $w' \in \mathbf{Q}^n$ with positive coordinates such that $\text{in}_{w'}(I) = \text{in}_w(I)$. Thus, in the definition of coherence and in the proofs we do not need to require that the weight vector has positive coordinates.

By [PS, Remark 3.2 and Theorem 3.7], we can choose the matrix B so that the binomials corresponding to $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ are minimal generators of I . By [PS, Theorem 6.1] I is a complete intersection exactly when I is minimally generated by two elements. If I is not a complete intersection, then by [PS, Theorem 3.7] the ideal I has a unique minimal system of \mathbf{N}^d -homogeneous binomial generators (up to multiplying each binomial with ± 1). We call a vector $\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}^2$ *generating* if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- (1) I is a complete intersection and $\alpha \in \{\pm(1, 0), \pm(0, 1)\}$;
- (2) I is not a complete intersection and the binomial corresponding to α is contained in a minimal system of generators of I .

We call α *primitive* if its binomial is primitive.

We need to recall the construction of Lawrence lifting. Let L be the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} A & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the $(n \times n)$ -identity matrix and $\mathbf{0}$ is the $(d \times n)$ -zero matrix.

The matrix L is called the *Lawrence lifting* of A , and the toric ideal I_L is called the Lawrence lifting of I . Then I_L is the ideal in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ generated by $\{\mathbf{x}^u \mathbf{y}^v - \mathbf{x}^v \mathbf{y}^u \mid \mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^v \in I\}$ and $\text{codim}(I_L) = 2$.

Lemma 2.3. *The elements $y_n - 1, \dots, y_1 - 1$ form a $k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]/I_L$ -regular sequence.*

Proof: Fix an $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Denote by T the ideal in the polynomial ring $k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_i]$ such that

$$k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_i]/T = k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]/(I_L + (y_{i+1} - 1, \dots, y_n - 1)).$$

The ring $k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ is \mathbf{N}^{d+n} -graded with the degrees of the variables given by the columns of the matrix L . Deleting the last $n - i$ coordinates in \mathbf{N}^{d+n} we induce an \mathbf{N}^{d+i} -grading in which $\deg(y_{i+1}) = \dots = \deg(y_n) = 0$. This induces an \mathbf{N}^{d+i} -grading on $k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_i]$ and the ideal T is \mathbf{N}^{d+i} -homogeneous. The elements 1 and y_i have different degrees. Therefore, if f is a polynomial and $(y_i - 1)f \in T$, then $f \in T$. ■

By [St2, Theorem 7.1] I_L has a unique system of minimal homogeneous binomial generators. The Lawrence lifting is relevant to our work, because the images of the minimal binomial generators of I_L in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]/(y_1 - 1, \dots, y_n - 1)$ form the Graver basis of I , see [St2, Theorem 7.1 and Algorithm 7.2]. We have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}^2 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} B \\ -B \end{pmatrix}} \mathbf{Z}^{2n} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} A & \mathbf{O} \\ \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}} \mathbf{Z}^{n+d}.$$

Therefore, the primitive vectors for I are exactly the generating vectors for I_L .

When we say that a vector α is a generating vector, we mean that α is a generating vector for the ideal I .

3. \mathcal{A} -graded ideals for codimension 2 toric varieties

Fix a set \mathcal{A} , set $I = I_{\mathcal{A}}$, and denote by q the number of minimal generators of I . By I_L we denote the Lawrence lifting of I and by q_L the number of minimal generators of I_L . In this section we prove Conjecture 1.2. Throughout the section we assume that $n - d = \text{codim}(I) = 2$. We assume that the matrix B is chosen so that the binomials corresponding to $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ are minimal generators of I ; such choice is possible by [PS, Remark 3.2 and Theorem 3.7].

Let M be a weakly \mathcal{A} -graded ideal and $\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}^2$. We say that α is an M -vector if $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} \in M$. We say that α is M -gluing if none of the monomials $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+}$, $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-}$ is in M ; in this case there exists a $p_\alpha \in k \setminus 0$ such that $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} - p_\alpha \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-} \in M$. Note that the opposite vectors α and $-\alpha$ correspond to binomials which differ by sign only, therefore either at least one of the vectors α and $-\alpha$ is an M -vector, or α is M -gluing. Suppose that I is not a complete intersection: then by [PS, Theorem 3.4] for each homogeneous minimal binomial generator f of I there exist exactly two monomials in S of the same \mathbf{N}^d -degree as f (these monomials are the terms of f), hence if M is an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal and α is a generating non- M -gluing vector then exactly one of the vectors $\alpha, -\alpha$ is an M -vector. We say that two vectors *ill-match* if they are both non- M -gluing and exactly one of them is an M -vector. We say that two vectors α, β *well-match* if either α, β are M -vectors or $-\alpha, -\beta$ are M -vectors. Throughout the section we will work under the following assumption: if at least one of the vectors $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ is not M -gluing, then after renumbering the quadrants and the basis vectors (if necessary) we have that $(0, 1)$ is an M -vector and $(1, 0)$ is either M -gluing or an M -vector.

We use the terminology from [PS] about the syzygies of I : the syzygies are represented by vectors, triangles, and quadrangles in \mathbf{Z}^2 with integer vertices and one vertex fixed at the origin $(0, 0)$. We say that a sequence $\mathbf{P} = P_1, \dots, P_r$ of quadrangles in the first or second quadrant is a *chain* if for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ the quadrangle P_{i+1} is a child of P_i in the master tree, see [PS, Construction 4.4]. For $1 \leq i \leq r$ denote by α_i, β_i the edges of P_i and by γ_i the longer diagonal of P_i . Then \mathbf{P} is a chain exactly when for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ the edges of P_{i+1} are either α_i, γ_i or β_i, γ_i . When we say that the vectors α, β are edges of a quadrangle we always mean “oriented edges” so that $\alpha + \beta$ is the longer diagonal of the quadrangle. For this reason, we say that the vector $(1, 1)$ is the longer diagonal of the unit square with edges $(1, 0), (0, 1)$, and that the vector $(-1, 1)$ is the longer diagonal of the unit square with edges $(-1, 0), (0, 1)$. The next lemma contains several results from [PS] which we will need.

Lemma 3.1.

- (a) *The ideal I is a complete intersection if and only if $q = 2$; I is not Cohen-Macaulay if and only if $q \geq 4$ if and only if I has a syzygy quadrangle. (This follows from [PS, Theorem 6.1].)*
- (b) *Let $q \geq 4$ and δ be a generating vector of I in the first or second quadrant different from $\pm(1, 0), (0, 1)$. There exists a chain P_1, \dots, P_r of syzygy quadrangles such that δ is the longer diagonal of P_r and P_1 is either the unit*

square with edges $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ or the unit square with edges $(-1, 0), (0, 1)$. (This follows from [PS, proof of Corollary 4.6].)

- (c) Let P be a syzygy quadrangle. The edges and the diagonals of P are generating vectors. Each of the four triangles with edges the edges of P and one of the diagonals of P is a syzygy triangle. [PS, Corollary 3.6]
- (d) Suppose that $q = 3$. The generating vectors of I can be chosen to be $\pm(1, 0), \pm(0, 1)$ and either $\pm(1, 1)$ or $\pm(-1, 1)$. In the former case the two triangles with edges $(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)$ are syzygy triangles; in the latter case the two triangles with edges $(-1, 0), (0, 1), (-1, 1)$ are syzygy triangles. [PS, Remark 5.8]

Lemma 3.2. *Let M be an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal. Let $\alpha, \beta, \eta = \alpha + \beta$ be generating vectors, which are edges of a syzygy triangle.*

- (a) *If α and β are M -gluing vectors, then η is an M -gluing vector as well.*
- (b) *If α is an M -gluing vector, but β is not, then η well-matches β .*
- (c) *If α and β well-match, then η well-matches them.*

Proof: Since $q \geq 3$ it follows from Lemma 3.1(a) that I is not a complete intersection. By the construction of a syzygy triangle in [PS, (3.3), Theorem 3.4, Corollary 3.6] we can choose three monomials m_1, m_2, m_3 such that $m_2 - m_1$ is a monomial multiple of $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)-}$, $m_3 - m_2$ is a monomial multiple of $\mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)-}$, $m_3 - m_1$ is a monomial multiple of $\mathbf{x}^{(B\eta)+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\eta)-}$, and m_1, m_2, m_3 are all the monomials in S with \mathbf{N}^d -degree equal to the degree of a syzygy triangle (this triangle is one of the two syzygy triangles with edges α, β, η). Note that if $p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\eta \in k \setminus 0$, then $m_2 - p_\alpha m_1$ is a monomial multiple of $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)+} - p_\alpha \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)-}$, $m_3 - p_\beta m_2$ is a monomial multiple of $\mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)+} - p_\beta \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)-}$, and $m_3 - p_\eta m_1$ is a monomial multiple of $\mathbf{x}^{(B\eta)+} - p_\eta \mathbf{x}^{(B\eta)-}$.

To prove (a) note that if α and β are M -gluing vectors but η is not, then $m_1, m_2, m_3 \in M$ contradicting the \mathcal{A} -gradedness of M . Next we prove (b). If η is M -gluing then we can apply (a) to $-\alpha, \eta, \beta = -\alpha + \eta$ and conclude that β is M -gluing, which is a contradiction. If η is non- M -gluing and we assume that β and η ill-match then m_1, m_2, m_3 are in M contradicting the \mathcal{A} -gradedness of M . So (b) is proved. It remains to prove (c). If α and β well-match and η is an M -gluing vector, then applying (b) to $\eta, -\alpha, \beta = \eta - \alpha$ we get a contradiction. Therefore, η is not M -gluing. As M is \mathcal{A} -graded, we have that at most two of the monomials m_1, m_2, m_3 are in M . Suppose that α and β are M -vectors. It follows that $m_2, m_3 \in M$. Therefore $m_1 \notin M$ and $m_3 - pm_1 \notin M$ for every $p \in k \setminus 0$.

Hence $\mathbf{x}^{(B\eta)-} \notin M$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(B\eta)+} - p\mathbf{x}^{(B\eta)-} \notin M$ for every $p \in k \setminus 0$. By \mathcal{A} -gradedness it follows that $\mathbf{x}^{(B\eta)+} \in M$, so η is an M -vector. If $-\alpha, -\beta$ are M -vectors, then the previous argument shows that $-\eta$ is an M -vector. So η well-matches α, β . ■

Lemma 3.3. *Let M be an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal. Let P_1, \dots, P_r be a chain of syzygy quadrangles. Denote by α, β the edges of P_1 and by δ the longer diagonal of P_r .*

- (a) *If α and β are M -gluing vectors, then δ is an M -gluing vector as well.*
- (b) *If α is an M -gluing vector, but β is not, then δ well-matches β .*
- (c) *If α and β well-match, then δ well-matches them.*

Proof: For $1 \leq i \leq r$ denote by γ_i the longer diagonal of P_i and by α_i, β_i its edges. Note that for $1 \leq i \leq r-1$ the edges of P_{i+1} are either α_i, γ_i or β_i, γ_i . By Lemma 3.1(c) $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i = \alpha_i + \beta_i$ are generating vectors, which are edges of a syzygy triangle. We argue by induction on i : at each step of the induction we apply Lemma 3.2. ■

Next we prove Conjecture 1.2 in two special cases:

Lemma 3.4. *Let M be an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal in S . Suppose that both $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ are M -gluing vectors. Then M is toric isomorphic to the toric ideal I .*

Proof: First, we will show that all generating vectors are M -gluing vectors. This is clear if $q = 2$. If $q = 3$ then apply Lemmas 3.1(d) and 3.2(a). Suppose that $q \geq 4$. Let δ be a generating vector in the first or second quadrant. Choose a chain P_1, \dots, P_r of syzygy quadrangles as in Lemma 3.1(b), so the edges of P_1 are either $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ or $(-1, 0), (0, 1)$ and δ is the longer diagonal of P_r . The edges of P_1 are M -gluing, so applying Lemma 3.3(a) to the chain P_1, \dots, P_r we get that δ is M -gluing.

For each generating vector δ let $p_\delta \in k \setminus 0$ be a constant such that $\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta)+} - p_\delta \mathbf{x}^{(B\delta)-} \in M$. Consider the ideal

$$M' = \left(\{ \mathbf{x}^{(B\delta)+} - p_\delta \mathbf{x}^{(B\delta)-} \mid \delta \text{ is a generating vector} \} \right) \subseteq M.$$

We will show that if \mathbf{x}^u and \mathbf{x}^v are two monomials in S of the same \mathbf{N}^d -degree then there exists a non-zero constant p such that $\mathbf{x}^u - p\mathbf{x}^v \in M'$. We can write

$$\mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^v = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}_i} (\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)-}),$$

where $\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)_+} - p_{\delta_i}\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)_-}$ is a minimal generator of I for $1 \leq i \leq s$, $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}_1}\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_1)_+}$, $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}_s}\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_s)_-}$, and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}_i}\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)_-} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}_{i+1}}\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_{i+1})_+}$ for $1 \leq i \leq s-1$.

Now set $p = \prod_{i=1}^s p_{\delta_i}$. Then we have

$$\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} - p\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}} = \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} p_{\delta_j} \right) \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}_i} (\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)_+} - p_{\delta_i}\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)_-}),$$

(here $p_{\delta_0} = 1$). Since $\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)_+} - p_{\delta_i}\mathbf{x}^{(B\delta_i)_-} \in M'$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, it follows that $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} - p\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}} \in M'$. The constant p is non-zero as $p_{\delta_i} \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. Therefore, M' is weakly \mathcal{A} -graded. As M is \mathcal{A} -graded, we conclude that $M' = M$. Note that M contains no monomials. By [St1, Lemma 10.12] it follows that M is toric isomorphic to the toric ideal I . ■

Lemma 3.5. *If the Lawrence lifting I_L is Cohen-Macaulay and M is an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal in S , then M is coherent.*

Proof: By Lemma 3.4 we can assume that at least one of the vectors $(1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ is not M -gluing. After renumbering the quadrants and the basis vectors (if necessary) we can assume that $(0, 1)$ is an M -vector and $(1, 0)$ is either M -gluing or an M -vector.

By Lemma 3.1(a) the Cohen-Macaulayness of I_L is equivalent to $2 \leq q_L \leq 3$. Let \mathcal{P} be the set consisting of the generating vectors for I_L . Recall from Section 2 that the primitive vectors for I are exactly the generating vectors for I_L . For a vector $s \in \mathbf{Q}^2$ in the first quadrant set $\mathcal{T}_s = \{ \alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{P}, \langle s, \alpha \rangle \geq 0 \}$ and

$$M_s = \left(\{ \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{T}_s, \langle s, \alpha \rangle > 0 \} \cup \{ \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{T}_s, \langle s, \alpha \rangle = 0 \} \right).$$

The ideal M_s is weakly \mathcal{A} -graded by Lemma 2.1, therefore Lemma 2.2 can be applied to s, \mathcal{T}_s, M_s, M if $M_s \subseteq M$. We will find an $s \in \mathbf{Q}^2$ such that $M_s \subseteq M$.

Suppose that $q_L = 2$. Choose $s = (0, 1)$ if $(1, 0)$ is M -gluing and $s = (1, 1)$ otherwise. If $(1, 0)$ is M -gluing then we scale the variables so that $\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,0))_+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B(1,0))_-} \in M$. Then clearly Lemma 2.2 can be applied, so M is coherent.

Let $q_L = 3$. Applying Lemma 3.1(d) to I_L we have that the generating vectors of I_L can be chosen to be $\pm(1, 0)$, $\pm(0, 1)$ and either $\pm(1, 1)$ or $\pm(-1, 1)$. Thus, \mathcal{P} is either $\{ \pm(1, 0), \pm(0, 1), \pm(1, 1) \}$ or $\{ \pm(1, 0), \pm(0, 1), \pm(-1, 1) \}$.

Suppose that $q = 3$. Choose

$$s = \begin{cases} (0, 1) & \text{if } (1, 0) \text{ is } M\text{-gluing,} \\ (1, 1) & \text{if } (-1, 1) \text{ is either non-generating or } M\text{-gluing,} \\ (2, 1) & \text{if } (-1, 1) \text{ is generating and } -(-1, 1) \text{ is an } M\text{-vector,} \\ (1, 2) & \text{if } (-1, 1) \text{ is a generating } M\text{-vector.} \end{cases}$$

There is at most one M -gluing generating vector; if such vector exists we denote it by ξ and scale the variables so that $\mathbf{x}^{(B\xi)+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\xi)-} \in M$. Applying Lemma 3.2 we conclude that $M_s \subseteq M$ and then we apply Lemma 2.2 to s, \mathcal{T}_s, M_s, M . Therefore M is coherent.

For the rest of the proof suppose that $2 = q < q_L = 3$. As in [PS, Construction 5.2], we write the binomials corresponding to $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ in the form

$$\begin{aligned} e &= \mathbf{x}^{(B(1,0))+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B(1,0))-} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}, \\ f &= \mathbf{x}^{(B(0,1))+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B(0,1))-} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}-} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in each binomial the two monomials are relatively prime, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})_+ &= \mathbf{u}_+ + \mathbf{v}_+, & (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})_- &= \mathbf{u}_- + \mathbf{v}_-, \\ (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})_+ &= \mathbf{u}_+ + \mathbf{v}_-, & (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})_- &= \mathbf{u}_- + \mathbf{v}_+. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the binomials corresponding to $(1, 1)$ and $(-1, 1)$ have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(B(1,1))+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B(1,1))-} &= \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v})+} \mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v})-} \mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{r}}, \\ \mathbf{x}^{(B(-1,1))+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B(-1,1))-} &= \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v})-} \mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v})+} \mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $q = 2$ by Lemma 3.1(a) we have that I is a complete intersection. By [PS, Remark 3.2] it follows that one of the binomials e and f contains a term, which is coprime to each of the terms in the other binomial. This implies that either $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}$ or $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}$ is 1, and also that either $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}$ or $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}$ is 1. We consider the following two cases:

Case 1. Both $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ are M -vectors.

Clearly, Lemma 2.2 can be applied if $\pm(-1, 1)$ are generating vectors for I_L . Suppose that $\pm(1, 1)$ are generating vectors for I_L . Since either $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}$ or $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}$ is 1, it follows that the monomial $\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,1))+} = \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v})+} \mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{p}}$ is divided by either the monomial $\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,0))+} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}$ or by the monomial $\mathbf{x}^{(B(0,1))+} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}$. Thus,

$\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,1))_+} \in M$, so $(1, 1)$ is an M -vector. Choose $s = (1, 1)$. We have shown that $M_s \subseteq M$. So we can apply Lemma 2.2 to s, \mathcal{T}_s, M_s, M . Therefore M is coherent.

Case 2. The vector $(0, 1)$ is an M -vector and $(1, 0)$ is M -gluing.

By Lemma 2.1 it follows that there exists a non-zero constant p such that $\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,0))_+} - p\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,0))_-} \in M$. After scaling the variables (if necessary) we can assume that $p = 1$, so $e \in M$. We will show that $(1, 1), (-1, 1)$ are M -vectors.

We have that either \mathbf{x}^t or \mathbf{x}^s is 1. If \mathbf{x}^s is 1, then the monomial $\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,1))_+} = \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v})_+}\mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{p}}$ is divided by the monomial $\mathbf{x}^{(B(0,1))_+} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^s\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}}$, so $\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,1))_+} \in M$. If \mathbf{x}^t is 1, then we get the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(B(1,1))_+} - (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}})e &= \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v})_+}\mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{p}} - (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}})e \\ &= (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}})(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{x}^s\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}}) = (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}})\mathbf{x}^{(B(0,1))_+} \in M. \end{aligned}$$

But $e \in M$, hence $\mathbf{x}^{(B(1,1))_+} \in M$. By a similar argument, using that either $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}$ or $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}$ is 1, we will show that $\mathbf{x}^{(B(-1,1))_+} \in M$. If $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}$ is 1, then the monomial $\mathbf{x}^{(B(-1,1))_+} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{s}}}}$ is divided by the monomial $\mathbf{x}^{(B(0,1))_+} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^s\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}}$, so $\mathbf{x}^{(B(-1,1))_+} \in M$. If $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}$ is 1, then we have the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(B(-1,1))_+} + (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}})e &= \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{s}}}} + (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}})e \\ &= (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}})(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{x}^t\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}}) = (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{x}^t})\mathbf{x}^{(B(0,1))_+} \in M. \end{aligned}$$

But $e \in M$, hence $\mathbf{x}^{(B(-1,1))_+} \in M$.

Choose $s = (0, 1)$. We have shown that $M_s \subseteq M$. Therefore we can apply Lemma 2.2 to s, \mathcal{T}_s, M_s, M . Hence M is coherent. ■

Starting from here until Theorem 3.15 we assume that I_L is not Cohen-Macaulay; by Lemma 3.1(a) this is equivalent to $q_L \geq 4$. Also, by Lemma 3.1(a) there exists at least one syzygy quadrangle for I_L . By [PS, Corollary 4.3], a syzygy quadrangle for I is also a syzygy quadrangle for I_L . Thus the homology tree of I (which exists exactly when $q \geq 4$) is contained in the homology tree of I_L .

We say that Q is a *Lawrence quadrangle* if Q is in the first or second quadrant and it is a syzygy quadrangle for I_L but is not a syzygy quadrangle for I .

Definition 3.6. Let Q be a syzygy quadrangle for I_L . We say that Q is a *minimal Lawrence quadrangle* if Q is in the first or second quadrant and one of the following two conditions is satisfied:

- (1) $q = 2$ and Q is either the unit square with edges $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ or the unit square with edges $(-1, 0), (0, 1)$.
- (2) $q \geq 3$, Q is not a syzygy quadrangle for I , and the two triangles with sides the edges of Q and the shorter diagonal of Q are syzygy triangles for I .

In some of the proofs we use an equivalent form (derived using Lemma 3.1) of the above definition which states that:

- (1') If $q = 2$ then the minimal Lawrence quadrangles are the unit squares with edges $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ and $(-1, 0), (0, 1)$.
- (2') If $q = 3$ and $(1, 1)$ is a generating vector, then the minimal Lawrence quadrangles are the unit square with edges $(-1, 0), (0, 1)$ and the syzygy quadrangles for I_L among the quadrangles with edges $(1, 0), (1, 1)$ and $(1, 1), (0, 1)$.
- (3') If $q = 3$ and $(-1, 1)$ is a generating vector, then the minimal Lawrence quadrangles are the unit square with edges $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ and the syzygy quadrangles for I_L among the quadrangles with edges $(-1, 0), (-1, 1)$ and $(-1, 1), (0, 1)$.
- (4') If $q \geq 4$ then Q is a minimal Lawrence quadrangle if and only if Q is a child (in the homology tree of I_L) of a syzygy quadrangle for I and Q is not a syzygy quadrangle for I .

Lemma 3.7. *Let $q_L \geq 4$ and δ be a primitive non-generating vector for I in the first or second quadrant. There exists a chain Q_1, \dots, Q_r of syzygy quadrangles for I_L starting with Q_1 a minimal Lawrence quadrangle and such that δ is the longer diagonal of Q_r .*

Proof: Recall from Section 2 that the primitive vectors for I are exactly the generating vectors for I_L . By Lemma 3.1(b) we have that there exists a chain $\mathbf{Q}' = Q'_1, \dots, Q'_s$ of syzygy quadrangles for I_L starting with Q'_1 a unit square and such that δ is the longer diagonal of Q'_s . To complete the proof it will be enough to show that \mathbf{Q}' contains a minimal Lawrence quadrangle. We use the definition of a minimal Lawrence quadrangle given by (1'), (2'), (3'), (4') in Definition 3.6. It is easy to see that \mathbf{Q}' contains a minimal Lawrence quadrangle if $q \leq 3$. Suppose that $q \geq 4$. By [PS, Corollary 4.3] the homology tree of I is contained in the homology tree of I_L and they have the same root. Therefore, the chain \mathbf{Q}' contains a minimal Lawrence quadrangle. ■

Construction 3.8. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{Z}^2$ and $\gamma = \alpha + \beta$. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} &= \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_+}), \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}} &= \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_-}), \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}} &= \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_+}), \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}} &= \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_-}).\end{aligned}$$

As in [PS, Construction 5.2], α, β correspond to two binomials in I which we write in the form $e = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}$ and $f = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}-}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}$ so that the two monomials in each binomial are relatively prime and

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})_+ &= \mathbf{u}_+ + \mathbf{v}_+, & (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})_- &= \mathbf{u}_- + \mathbf{v}_-, \\ (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})_+ &= \mathbf{u}_+ + \mathbf{v}_-, & (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})_- &= \mathbf{u}_- + \mathbf{v}_+.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the binomials corresponding to the vectors α, β, γ are:

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}} \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}-}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}} \\ (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}})(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}) - (\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}})(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}-}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}})\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.10. *Let M be an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal in S and I_L the Lawrence lifting of I . Let Q be a Lawrence quadrangle, α, β the edges of Q and γ its longer diagonal. In the notation of Construction 3.8 we have that at least one of the monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}$ is equal to 1.*

Proof: First we will prove the lemma in the case when Q is a minimal Lawrence quadrangle. We consider two cases:

Case 1. The ideal I is a complete intersection.

By (1') in Definition 3.6 we have that Q is a unit square and the binomials e and f correspond to its edges. By [PS, Remark 3.2] it follows that one of the binomials contains a term, which is coprime to each of the terms in the other binomial. This implies that either $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}$ or $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}$ is 1.

Case 2. The ideal I is not a complete intersection.

By Lemma 3.1(a) we get that $q \geq 3$ in this case. Thus, Q satisfies condition(2) in

Definition 3.6. As in [PS, Construction 5.2] we have that the longer and shorter diagonals of Q are represented respectively by the binomials

$$g = \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v})+\mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{p}}} - \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v})-\mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{r}}}, \quad h = \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v})+\mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{t}}} - \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v})-\mathbf{x}^{2\mathbf{s}}}.$$

Denote by \mathbf{F} the minimal free resolution of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I$ over the ring $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Let \mathbf{G} be the minimal free resolution of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]/I_L$ over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ which is constructed as in [PS, Theorem 5.5]. Set

$$\bar{\mathbf{G}} = \mathbf{G} \otimes k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]/(y_1 - 1, \dots, y_n - 1).$$

By [PS, Constructions 5.1, 5.2 and Theorems 5.4, 5.5], we have the following complex (3.11)

$$(3.11) \quad 0 \rightarrow S \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}} \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}} \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}} \\ -\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{S^4} S^4 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}} & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}} & -\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}} & -\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}} \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}} & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}} & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}} & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}} \\ -\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}} & -\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}} \end{pmatrix}} S^4 \xrightarrow{(e \ f \ g \ h)} S,$$

which is a subcomplex of $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$ and the basis elements of the free modules in (3.11) are basis elements in $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$ as well.

We assume that the minimal free resolution \mathbf{F} is constructed as in [PS, Theorem 5.5]. By [PS, Corollary 4.3], if $q \geq 4$ then the homology tree of I is contained in the homology tree of I_L which induces an inclusion of \mathbf{F} in $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$. If $q = 3$ we apply [PS, Remark 5.8] to get an inclusion of \mathbf{F} in $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$. Lemma 2.3 implies that $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$ is a (possibly non-minimal) free resolution of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I$ over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. By [Ei, Theorem 20.2], \mathbf{F} is a direct summand in $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$. Now consider (3.11). The basis element in (3.11) in homological degree 3 corresponds to the quadrangle Q via [PS, Constructions 5.1, 5.2 and Theorem 5.4]. On the other hand, the basis elements in \mathbf{F} in homological degree 3 correspond to the syzygy quadrangles for I via [PS, Constructions 5.1, 5.2 and Theorems 5.4, 5.5]. Since Q is not a syzygy quadrangle for I and since $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$ has length 3 it follows that the matrix of the third differential in (3.11) contains an invertible element, that is, one of the monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}$, $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}$, $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}$, $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}$ is 1. The monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}}$ are entries in the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}} & -\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}} \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}} & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{t}}} \\ 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{p}} & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{r}} \end{pmatrix},$$

which appears as a submatrix of the second differential in (3.11); this matrix gives the action of the differential on the two triangles with edges e, f, h . By the choice of Q these two triangles are syzygy triangles for I . Hence the above matrix is contained in the differential of the minimal free resolution \mathbf{F} , therefore it cannot have invertible entries. So \mathbf{x}^r and \mathbf{x}^p are not invertible. It follows that at least one of the monomials \mathbf{x}^s and \mathbf{x}^t is equal to 1.

Thus, the lemma is proved in the case when Q is a minimal Lawrence quadrangle. Order the Lawrence quadrangles so that if P is a child of P' in the homology tree of I_L (see [PS, Construction 4.5]) then $P' \prec P$. We will finish the proof by induction on this order. Let Q be an arbitrary Lawrence quadrangle. Applying Lemma 3.7 to the longer diagonal of Q we get that there exists a chain Q_1, \dots, Q_r of Lawrence quadrangles starting with a minimal Lawrence quadrangle Q_1 and $Q = Q_r$. If $r = 1$ then Q is a minimal Lawrence quadrangle and we are done. Suppose that $r > 1$ and denote $Q' = Q_{r-1}$. Applying Construction 3.8 to Q' we obtain monomials $\mathbf{x}^{s'}, \mathbf{x}^{t'}, \mathbf{x}^{p'}, \mathbf{x}^{r'}, \mathbf{x}^{u'_+}, \mathbf{x}^{u'_-}, \mathbf{x}^{v'_+}, \mathbf{x}^{v'_-}$. Let α', β' and γ' be the two edges and the longer diagonal of Q' . Then the two edges of Q are either α', γ' or β', γ' . We consider these two cases separately:

Subcase 1. Let α', γ' be the edges of Q .

Applying Construction 3.8 to Q we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}^s &= \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha')_-}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma')_+}) = \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{v'_+}, \mathbf{x}^{s'}), \\ \mathbf{x}^t &= \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha')_+}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma')_-}) = \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{v'_-}, \mathbf{x}^{t'}).\end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis the lemma holds for Q' , that is, either $\mathbf{x}^{s'}$ or $\mathbf{x}^{t'}$ is 1. Hence either \mathbf{x}^s or \mathbf{x}^t is 1.

Subcase 2. Let β', γ' be the edges of Q .

Applying Construction 3.8 to Q we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}^s &= \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{(B\beta')_-}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma')_+}) = \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{u'_+}, \mathbf{x}^{t'}), \\ \mathbf{x}^t &= \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{(B\beta')_+}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma')_-}) = \gcd(\mathbf{x}^{u'_-}, \mathbf{x}^{s'}).\end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis the lemma holds for Q' , that is, either $\mathbf{x}^{s'}$ or $\mathbf{x}^{t'}$ is 1. Hence either \mathbf{x}^s or \mathbf{x}^t is 1. ■

We obtain an analogue to Lemma 3.2 for Lawrence quadrangles:

Lemma 3.12. *Let M be an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal in S . Let Q be a Lawrence quadrangle, α, β the edges of Q , and γ its longer diagonal.*

(a) *If α, β well-match then γ well-matches them.*

(b) *If α is M -gluing and β is not M -gluing, then γ well-matches β .*

Proof: The vectors α, β, γ correspond to binomials in I which we write as in (3.9). By Lemma 3.10, we have that either \mathbf{x}^t or \mathbf{x}^s is 1 in (3.9). It follows that at least one of the monomials $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_+}$ divides $\mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma)_+}$ and also that at least one of the monomials $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-}, \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_-}$ divides $\mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma)_-}$. Therefore, (a) holds. It remains to prove part (b). Since α is M -gluing by hypothesis, after scaling the variables (if necessary) we can assume that

$$e = \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)_-} = \mathbf{x}^u \mathbf{x}^t \mathbf{x}^p - \mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^s \mathbf{x}^r \in M.$$

First we consider the case when β is an M -vector, that is $\mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_+} = \mathbf{x}^v + \mathbf{x}^s \mathbf{x}^p \in M$. If $\mathbf{x}^t = 1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma)_+} - (\mathbf{x}^v + \mathbf{x}^p)e &= (\mathbf{x}^u + \mathbf{x}^p)(\mathbf{x}^v + \mathbf{x}^p) - (\mathbf{x}^v + \mathbf{x}^p)e \\ &= (\mathbf{x}^v + \mathbf{x}^p)(\mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^s \mathbf{x}^r) = \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_+}(\mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^r) \in M, \end{aligned}$$

and as $e \in M$ we get that $\mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma)_+} \in M$. If $\mathbf{x}^s = 1$, then we have $\mathbf{x}^v + \mathbf{x}^p = \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_+} \in M$, so $\mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma)_+} = (\mathbf{x}^u + \mathbf{x}^p)(\mathbf{x}^v + \mathbf{x}^p) \in M$. Thus, γ well-matches β .

Now consider the case when $-\beta$ is an M -vector, that is $\mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_-} = \mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{x}^t \mathbf{x}^r \in M$. If $\mathbf{x}^s = 1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma)_-} + (\mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{x}^r)e &= (\mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^r)(\mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{x}^r) + (\mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{x}^r)e \\ &= (\mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{x}^r)(\mathbf{x}^u + \mathbf{x}^t \mathbf{x}^p) = \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_-}(\mathbf{x}^u + \mathbf{x}^p) \in M, \end{aligned}$$

and as $e \in M$ we get that $\mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma)_-} \in M$. If $\mathbf{x}^t = 1$, then $\mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{x}^r = \mathbf{x}^{(B\beta)_-} \in M$, so $\mathbf{x}^{(B\gamma)_-} = (\mathbf{x}^u - \mathbf{x}^r)(\mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{x}^r) \in M$. Thus, γ well-matches β . ■

Lemmas 3.3 and 3.12 imply the following result:

Lemma 3.13. *Let M be an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal. Let $r \geq 1$ and P_1, \dots, P_r be a chain of syzygy quadrangles for I_L in the first or second quadrant. Denote by α, β the edges of P_1 and by δ the longer diagonal of P_r .*

(a) *If α and β well-match, then δ well-matches them.*

(b) If α is an M -gluing vector, but β is not, then δ well-matches β .

Proof: Let s be the smallest number such that P_s is a Lawrence quadrangle, or set $s = r + 1$ if the chain contains no Lawrence quadrangle. If $s \geq 2$ then apply Lemma 3.3 to the chain P_1, \dots, P_{s-1} . The proof is completed by induction: if Lemma 3.13 holds for P_1, \dots, P_j for some $r > j \geq s - 1$ then by Lemma 3.12 it follows that Lemma 3.13 holds for P_1, \dots, P_{j+1} as well. ■

Lemma 3.14. *Let M be an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal in S . Suppose that at least one of the vectors $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ is not M -gluing (so by assumption $(0, 1)$ is an M -vector and $(1, 0)$ is either an M -vector or M -gluing) and that I_L is not Cohen-Macaulay. Consider the set \mathcal{P} of all primitive vectors for I in the first and second quadrants.*

- (a) *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}$ be in the second quadrant and the angle between α and $(-1, 0)$ be smaller than the angle between β and $(-1, 0)$. Suppose that α is either an M -vector or M -gluing. Then β is an M -vector.*
- (b) *There exists at most one M -gluing vector in the intersection of \mathcal{P} and the second quadrant.*

Proof: Denote by \mathcal{G} the set of all generating vectors for I in the first or second quadrant. First, we prove that (a) holds if $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{G}$ and $q \leq 3$. If $q = 2$ then we are done by the assumption that $(0, 1)$ is an M -vector. If $q = 3$, then apply Lemmas 3.1(d) and 3.2.

Recall from Section 2 that the primitive vectors for I are the generating vectors for I_L .

Suppose that $(-1, 0)$ is M -gluing. Applying Lemma 3.1(b) to I_L , and then applying Lemma 3.13 we conclude that all primitive vectors in the first or second quadrant which are different from $\pm(1, 0)$ are M -vectors; in particular, Lemma 3.14 holds. Now suppose that $(-1, 0)$ is not M -gluing and therefore by assumption $(1, 0)$ is an M -vector.

By [PS, Corollary 4.7] there exists a total order \prec on the vectors in \mathcal{P} such that if P is a syzygy quadrangle for I or a minimal Lawrence quadrangle then its longer diagonal is bigger in the order \prec than its edges. The first vectors in the order are $(0, 1), (1, 0), (-1, 0)$ and we can assume that $(0, 1) \prec (1, 0) \prec (-1, 0)$. This induces a partial order on the set of pairs of elements in \mathcal{P} in the following way: Let $\sigma, \sigma', \tau, \tau' \in \mathcal{P}$. Suppose that $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$ and $\tau \preceq \tau'$. We say that $\{\sigma, \sigma'\} \preceq \{\tau, \tau'\}$ if $\sigma \preceq \tau$ and $\sigma' \preceq \tau'$.

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}$ be in the second quadrant and the angle between α and $(-1, 0)$ be smaller than the angle between β and $(-1, 0)$. By Lemma 3.1(b) applied to I_L ,

there exists a chain $\mathbf{P} = P_1, \dots, P_r$ such that P_1, \dots, P_r are syzygy quadrangles for I_L , P_1 is the unit square with edges $(-1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, and α is the longer diagonal of P_r . Similarly, by Lemma 3.1(b) there exists a chain $\mathbf{T} = T_1, \dots, T_s$ such that T_1, \dots, T_s are syzygy quadrangles for I_L , T_1 is the unit square with edges $(-1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and β is the longer diagonal of T_s . Then $T_1 = P_1$. Denote by R the last common quadrangle in \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{T} . Let i, j be such that $1 \leq i \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq r$ and $R = P_j = T_i$. Let μ, ν be the edges of R and $\xi = \mu + \nu$ be its longer diagonal. Suppose that the angle between μ and $(-1, 0)$ is smaller than the angle between ν and $(-1, 0)$. By [PS, Construction 4.4], if $i < s$ then the edges of T_{i+1} are ν, ξ and also if $j < r$ then the edges of P_{j+1} are ξ, μ .

We will prove (a) by induction on the considered order. Part (a) holds if $\beta = (0, 1)$ since $(0, 1)$ is an M -vector by assumption. Assume that $\beta \neq (0, 1)$. Since α is either M -gluing or an M -vector and $(1, 0)$ is an M -vector, it follows that $\alpha \neq (-1, 0)$.

Since $\mu \prec \alpha$ we have that $\{\mu, \beta\} \prec \{\alpha, \beta\}$. If μ is either M -gluing or an M -vector, then by the induction hypothesis we have that β is an M -vector. Suppose that $-\mu$ is an M -vector. If $-\xi$ is an M -vector or ξ is M -gluing, then applying Lemma 3.13 to the chain P_{j+1}, \dots, P_r we conclude that $-\alpha$ is an M -vector which is a contradiction. Therefore, ξ is an M -vector. Since $\nu \prec \xi \preceq \alpha, \beta$ we have that $\{\nu, \xi\} \prec \{\alpha, \beta\}$; hence by the induction hypothesis it follows that ν is an M -vector. Therefore, applying Lemma 3.13 to the chain T_{i+1}, \dots, T_s we conclude that β is an M -vector. Thus, (a) is proved.

Now we prove (b). Suppose that there exist more than one M -gluing vectors in the intersection of \mathcal{P} and the second quadrant. Let α, β be the two smallest (in the order \prec) M -gluing vectors which are in \mathcal{P} and in the second quadrant. Suppose that the angle between α and $(-1, 0)$ is smaller than the angle between β and $(-1, 0)$. Note that $\alpha \neq (-1, 0)$ and $\beta \neq (0, 1)$. Suppose that $\alpha = \xi$ (in the above notation). Since α, β are chosen to be the two smallest M -gluing vectors and $\nu \prec \beta, \nu \prec \alpha$ it follows that ν is not M -gluing. Applying Lemma 3.13 to the chain T_i, \dots, T_s we conclude that β is not M -gluing which is a contradiction. Hence $\alpha \neq \xi$. Similar argument shows that $\beta \neq \xi$. Then ξ, μ, ν are smaller than each of α, β ; hence ξ, μ, ν are not M -gluing. Therefore, at least one of the pairs $\{\xi, \mu\}$, $\{\xi, \nu\}$, and $\{\mu, \nu\}$ consists of well-matching vectors. If ξ, μ well-match, then applying Lemma 3.13 to the chain P_{j+1}, \dots, P_r we get that α is not M -gluing which is a contradiction. If ξ, ν or μ, ν well-match, then applying Lemma 3.13 to the chain T_{i+1}, \dots, T_s or T_i, \dots, T_s respectively, we get that β is not M -gluing which

is a contradiction as well. Therefore, there cannot exist two M -gluing vectors in the intersection of \mathcal{P} with the second quadrant. ■

We are ready to prove our main result.

Theorem 3.15. *If $\text{codim}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) = 2$ and M is an \mathcal{A} -graded ideal in S , then M is coherent.*

Proof: If $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ are M -gluing then apply Lemma 3.4. If I_L is Cohen-Macaulay, then apply Lemma 3.5. Suppose that I_L is not Cohen-Macaulay and that at least one of the vectors $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ is not M -gluing. Recall that in this case after renumbering the quadrants and the basis vectors (if necessary) we assume that $(0, 1)$ is an M -vector and $(1, 0)$ is either M -gluing or an M -vector. As in Lemma 3.14 consider the set \mathcal{P} consisting of the primitive vectors for I in the first and second quadrants. The primitive vectors for I are the generating vectors for I_L . Applying Lemma 3.1(b) to I_L , and Lemma 3.13 (if $q = 3$ then applying also Lemmas 3.1(d) and 3.2) we conclude that every vector $\eta \neq (1, 0)$, which is in the intersection of \mathcal{P} and the first quadrant is an M -vector. Combining this fact with Lemma 3.14 we see that there exists a vector $s \in \mathbf{Q}^2$ such that the following three conditions are satisfied:

- (i) if $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\langle \alpha, s \rangle > 0$ then α is an M -vector;
- (ii) if $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\langle \alpha, s \rangle < 0$ then $-\alpha$ is an M -vector;
- (iii) if $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\langle \alpha, s \rangle = 0$ then α is M -gluing.

If there exists a vector $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\langle s, \zeta \rangle = 0$ then for some non-zero constant $p \in k \setminus 0$ we have $\mathbf{x}^{(B\zeta)+} - p\mathbf{x}^{(B\zeta)-} \in M$. After scaling the variables (if necessary) we can assume that $p = 1$. Hence condition (iii) above becomes:

- (iii') if $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\langle \alpha, s \rangle = 0$ then $\mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)-} \in M$.

Set

$$\mathcal{T} = \{ \alpha \mid \langle s, \alpha \rangle \geq 0 \text{ and either } \alpha \text{ or } -\alpha \text{ is in } \mathcal{P} \},$$

$$M' = \left(\{ \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)+} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{T}, \langle s, \alpha \rangle > 0 \} \cup \{ \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)+} - \mathbf{x}^{(B\alpha)-} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{T}, \langle s, \alpha \rangle = 0 \} \right).$$

The ideal M' is weakly \mathcal{A} -graded by Lemma 2.1. By (i),(ii),(iii') we have that $M' \subseteq M$. Applying Lemma 2.2 to M, M', s , and \mathcal{T} we get that M is coherent. ■

References

- [Ar] V. Arnold: A-graded algebras and continued fractions, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **42** (1989), 993–1000.
- [Ei] D. Eisenbud: *Introduction to commutative algebra with a view towards algebraic geometry*, Springer Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [G] V. Gasharov: Hilbert functions and homogeneous generic forms II, to appear in *Compos. Math.*
- [HP] J. Herzog and D. Popescu: Hilbert functions and homogeneous generic forms, *Compos. Math.* **113** (1988), 1–22.
- [Ko] E. Korkina: Classification of A-graded algebras with 3 generators, *Indag. Math.* **3** (1992), 27–40.
- [KPR] E. Korkina, G. Post, and M. Roelofs: Classification of generalized A-graded algebras with 3 generators, *Bul. Sci. Math.* **119** (1995), 267–287.
- [PS] I. Peeva and B. Sturmfels: Syzygies of codimension 2 lattice ideals, *Math. Z.* **229** (1998), 163–194.
- [PS2] I. Peeva and M. Stillman: toric Hilbert schemes, preprint.
- [St1] B. Sturmfels: The geometry of \mathcal{A} -graded algebras, preprint (1994).
- [St2] B. Sturmfels: *Gröbner Bases and Convex Polytopes*, AMS University Lecture Series, Vol. 8, Providence U.S.A., 1995.

Current address:

Department of Mathematics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, U.S.A.