PERTURBATION THEORY IN DIFFERENTIAL HOMOLOGICAL ALGEBRA I

BY

V.K.A.M. GUGENHEIM AND L.A. LAMBE

1. Introduction and notation

1.1. Introduction. Differential homological algebra extends the classical machinery of homological algebra to differential algebras and modules. As first introduced by Eilenberg and Moore [5], the functor Tor (differential Tor) can be constructed in terms of resolutions relative to the category of differential modules, that is, in terms of bicomplexes. The category DGA of differential graded augmented algebras and differential graded augmented algebra maps was enlarged to the category DASH in [7]. DASH and DGA have the same objects; but $DASH(A, A') = DC(\overline{B}A, \overline{B}A')$ where DC is the category of differential graded augmented coalgebras and \overline{B} denotes the bar construction functor. The functoriality of Tor and Cotor was extended to this larger category and used to explain certain "collapse theorems" for the Eilenberg-Moore spectral sequence. These collapse theorems are subsumed by the theory in [6] which uses multicomplexes, a useful generalization of bicomplexes [22]. Perturbation theory has come to refer to a systematic way of constructing multicomplexes and the purpose of this paper is to begin a study of such algorithms.

DASH itself can be expanded to include more objects and this can be done in a way that generalizes results from [7]. More specifically, it is shown in [10] that if $A \in \mathbf{DGA}$ is chain homotopy equivalent to a differential graded *module* M in a certain way (see 1.2 below) then M inherits an A_{∞} structure and there is a differential graded coalgebra map which is a homology isomorphism from the "tilde construction" (which is what is meant by an " A_{∞} structure" [20], [21]) of M to the bar construction of A. With strong conditions on a chain homotopy equivalence between an algebra A and another algebra M, an algorithm was given in [7, 4.1] for the construction of a chain homotopy equivalence which is a differential graded coalgebra map $\overline{B}M \to \overline{B}A$. In §3 we will show that the algorithm given in [10] reduces to this one under these special hypotheses. In other words, a special case of the proof in [10] is the proof of the special case in [7]. Next, we consider the algorithm presented in [8] and called "the basic perturbation lemma" in [14]. We show that the

Received July 31, 1987.

^{© 1989} by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois Manufactured in the United States of America