

# Algebraic cycles and representation theory

## PART I : Algebraic cycles and their Hodge-theoretic invariants

### A. Cycle groups

#### 1. Operations on cycles

Let  $k = \bar{k}$  be a field (algebraically closed),  $X/k$  a smooth quasi-projective variety of dimension  $d$ . We define the groups of algebraic cycles:

Definition 1:  $\mathbb{Z}_q(X) = \mathbb{Z}^{d-q}(X) :=$  the free abelian group generated by subvarieties  $W \subset X$  (irred./ $k$ ) of  $\dim_q W$  (cd.  $d-q$ )

$$\mathbb{Z} = \sum_{(m_i \in \mathbb{Z})} V_i$$

Given a morphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  of varieties, we define the push-forward of cycles by

$$(1) \quad f_*: \mathbb{Z}_q(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_q(Y)$$

$$W \xrightarrow[\text{(irred.)}]{} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \dim \overline{f(W)} < \dim W \\ [k(W): k(\overline{f(W)})] \cdot \overline{f(W)} & \text{if } \dim \overline{f(W)} = \dim W \end{cases} \xleftarrow[\text{(surjective)}]$$

This preserves dimension.

Next, given two cycles  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$ , we want to define an intersection product. We define on the level of irreducible subvarieties  $V, W \subset X$  of cd.  $i$  resp.  $j$ , then extend by linearity.

First write  $V \cap W = \cup V_\lambda$ ,  $V_\lambda$  mod. of cd.  $\leq i+j$ .

This intersection is proper  $\Leftrightarrow \text{cd}_X V_\lambda = i+j$  ( $\forall \lambda$ ), in which case

$$(2) \quad i(V_\lambda; V \cdot W; X) := \sum_{r=0}^d (-1)^r \int_G \left\{ \text{Tors}_r^G(\Omega/I_V, \Omega/I_W) \right\}$$

↑  
length [  $\Omega = \Omega_{V_\lambda, X}$  ]

and

$$(3) \quad V \cdot W := \sum i(V_\lambda; V \cdot W; X) V_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^{i+j}(X).$$

There is a more geometric way to understand the intersection multipliers (2) : given a fiber square

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z & \subset & f^{-1}(W) = Y & \hookrightarrow & \tilde{V} \\ \text{(mod. component of } Y) & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ & & W & \hookrightarrow & X \\ & & \text{regular env. of codim. j} & & \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \text{fun (mapping onto } V \\ \text{of same dimension} \\ (\text{e.g. resolution of sing.}) \end{array}$$

with  $V, W$  as above, write  $I_Y \subset \Omega_{Z, \tilde{V}}$  for the ideal of  $Y$ .

The quotient has finite length and

$$(4) \quad 1 \leq i(f(Z); V \cdot W; X) \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} l(\Omega_{Z, \tilde{V}} / I_Y)$$

$\underbrace{\phantom{f(Z)}}_{(\text{this is one of the } V_\lambda \text{'s})}$

where  $(*)$  is - an equality if  $Z \hookrightarrow \tilde{V}$  is regular.

$$\text{Ex/ } \begin{array}{ll} X = \mathbb{A}^4, & V = \text{image of } f: \mathbb{A}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^4 \\ \tilde{V} = \mathbb{A}^2, & (s, t) \mapsto (s^4, s^3t, st^3, t^4) \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{l} W = V(x_1, x_4) \\ f^{-1}W = V(s^4, t^4) \end{array}$$

$Z = \text{point } \underline{o} \in \mathbb{A}^2$ , so  $(*)$  is equality

$$\Rightarrow i(\underline{o}; V \cdot W; X) = l(\Omega_{\underline{o}, \mathbb{A}^2} / I_{f^{-1}(W)}) = l(k(s, t)/(s^4, t^4)) = 16.$$

This is all in line with the general philosophy of parametrizing one of the varieties being intersected, & pulling back the defining eqns. of the other //

Now we turn to cycle-theoretic pullback along a morphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ . Write  $\pi_X, \pi_Y$  for the projections  $X \times Y \xrightarrow{\pi_X} X$ , and  $\Gamma_f \subset X \times Y$  for the graph of  $f$ . Given any  $\bar{z} \in \bar{Z}^p(Y)$  for which

$$(5) \quad \Gamma_f \cap (X \times \bar{z}) \text{ is proper,}$$

we may define

$$(6) \quad f^*(\bar{z}) := (\pi_X)_* \{ \Gamma_f \cdot (X \times \bar{z}) \} \in \bar{Z}^p(X).$$

(Notice that this preserves codimension.) The issue with (5) is that we need  $\bar{z}$  to intersect properly the locus in  $Y$  along which (\*) the fiber-dimension of  $f$  jumps (up), as well as its image  $\overline{f(X)}$ .  
the Zariski closure of

Proposition 1: If  $f$  is dominant, then  $f^*: \bar{Z}^p(Y) \rightarrow \bar{Z}^p(X)$  is defined on all cycles.

Proof: For  $f$  dominant, flatness is equivalent to equidimensionality. Since (5)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (\*), the Prop. follows.  $\square$

This is often called "flat pullback", but the criterion (\*) is much more general & useful.

Remark: •  $f$  dominant means  $\overline{f(X)} = Y$   
•  $f$  flat means that any exact sequence of  $\mathcal{O}_{Y,Y}$  modules remains exact upon tensoring  $\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{Y,Y}} \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$  ( $\forall y \in Y, x \in f^{-1}(y) \subset X$ ) .

Remark 2: Chap. 8 of Fulton's Intersection Theory describes a refined intersection product which does not require proper intersection. If  $V$  and  $W$  are subvarieties of  $X$  (smooth), then one may define a cycle class  $\sim \underline{V \cdot W} \in H_{\dim i + \dim j}(V \cap W)$  whose push-forward into  $H_{\dim i}(X)$  is the correct class. (See §32-3 below.) Likewise there is a "refined pullback": given  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  and  $Z \overset{\text{cdP}}{\subset} Y$ , this is a class  $\widetilde{f^*z} \in H^*(f^{-1}Z)$  which maps to  $f^*z \in H^*(X)$ .