

# Algebraic Geometry and Geometric Representation Theory

Andrea Di Lorenzo, Francesco Sala, and Mattia Talpo

January 21, 2025

## Definition

Moduli space  $M$  = a space (algebraic variety) whose points parametrize some fixed kind of objects, in a functorial way

i.e. if  $X \rightarrow S$  is a family of objects parametrized by  $M$ , there is an associated **classifying morphism**

$$S \longrightarrow M, \quad s \longmapsto \text{the fiber of } X \rightarrow S \text{ over } s$$

and this construction is compatible with pullback of families. Moreover,  $M$  is initial with this property.

## Definition

Moduli space  $M$  = a space (algebraic variety) whose points parametrize some fixed kind of objects, in a functorial way

i.e. if  $X \rightarrow S$  is a family of objects parametrized by  $M$ , there is an associated **classifying morphism**

$$S \longrightarrow M, \quad s \longmapsto \text{the fiber of } X \rightarrow S \text{ over } S$$

and this construction is compatible with pullback of families. Moreover,  $M$  is initial with this property.

## Examples

- ▶ For a fixed genus  $g$ , there is a moduli space  $M_g$  parametrizing smooth proper connected algebraic curves of genus  $g$ .
- ▶ If  $C$  is a smooth curve, there is a moduli space  $M_{r,d}^{ss}(C)$  of (semi-stable) vector bundles on  $C$  of degree  $d$  and rank  $r$ .

The geometry of these spaces is usually very interesting and rich, and there are numerous connections to other areas of mathematics and physics.

## Warning

The function  $\{\text{families over } S\} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(S, M)$  is rarely a bijection (when this happens  $M$  is called a **fine** moduli space).

Equivalently, there rarely is a universal family  $U \rightarrow M$  (i.e. that recovers any other family  $X \rightarrow S$  as pullback along the classifying morphism  $S \rightarrow M$ ).

## Warning

The function  $\{\text{families over } S\} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(S, M)$  is rarely a bijection (when this happens  $M$  is called a **fine** moduli space).

Equivalently, there rarely is a universal family  $U \rightarrow M$  (i.e. that recovers any other family  $X \rightarrow S$  as pullback along the classifying morphism  $S \rightarrow M$ ).

The non-existence of a universal family is typically due to objects having non-trivial automorphisms.

Stacks are a generalization of schemes, where points “are allowed to have automorphisms”.

## Warning

The function  $\{\text{families over } S\} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(S, M)$  is rarely a bijection (when this happens  $M$  is called a **fine** moduli space).

Equivalently, there rarely is a universal family  $U \rightarrow M$  (i.e. that recovers any other family  $X \rightarrow S$  as pullback along the classifying morphism  $S \rightarrow M$ ).

The non-existence of a universal family is typically due to objects having non-trivial automorphisms.

Stacks are a generalization of schemes, where points “are allowed to have automorphisms”.

## Example: quotient stacks

If  $G$  is an algebraic group acting on a scheme  $X$ , there is always a quotient stack  $[X/G]$ , for which the projection  $X \rightarrow [X/G]$  is a  $G$ -principal bundle.

The points of  $[X/G]$  correspond to orbits of the action, and the automorphism group is the isotropy group of any point of the orbit.

## Warning

The function  $\{\text{families over } S\} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(S, M)$  is rarely a bijection (when this happens  $M$  is called a **fine** moduli space).

Equivalently, there rarely is a universal family  $U \rightarrow M$  (i.e. that recovers any other family  $X \rightarrow S$  as pullback along the classifying morphism  $S \rightarrow M$ ).

The non-existence of a universal family is typically due to objects having non-trivial automorphisms.

Stacks are a generalization of schemes, where points “are allowed to have automorphisms”.

## Example: quotient stacks

If  $G$  is an algebraic group acting on a scheme  $X$ , there is always a quotient stack  $[X/G]$ , for which the projection  $X \rightarrow [X/G]$  is a  $G$ -principal bundle.

The points of  $[X/G]$  correspond to orbits of the action, and the automorphism group is the isotropy group of any point of the orbit.

“Nice” moduli stacks exist far more often than fine moduli spaces.

For example, there are algebraic stacks  $\mathcal{M}_g$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{r,d}^{ss}(C)$  parametrizing smooth proper connected genus  $g$  curves and semi-stable vector bundles of degree  $d$  and rank  $r$  on  $C$ .

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: moduli of curves (a toy example)

Base field:  $\mathbb{C}$ .

$\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$  = moduli stack of Riemann surfaces/smooth algebraic curves of genus 1 with 1 marking (elliptic curves).



# Andrea Di Lorenzo: moduli of curves (a toy example)

Base field:  $\mathbb{C}$ .

$\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$  = moduli stack of Riemann surfaces/smooth algebraic curves of genus 1 with 1 marking (elliptic curves).

## A more explicit description

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,1} = [\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } 4a^3 + 27b^2 \neq 0\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: moduli of curves (a toy example)

Base field:  $\mathbb{C}$ .

$\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$  = moduli stack of Riemann surfaces/smooth algebraic curves of genus 1 with 1 marking (elliptic curves).

## A more explicit description

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,1} = [\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } 4a^3 + 27b^2 \neq 0\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

- ▶ Geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$ : it is **not compact!**

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: moduli of curves (a toy example)

Base field:  $\mathbb{C}$ .

$\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$  = moduli stack of Riemann surfaces/smooth algebraic curves of genus 1 with 1 marking (elliptic curves).

## A more explicit description

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,1} = [\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } 4a^3 + 27b^2 \neq 0\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

- ▶ Geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$ : it is **not compact!**
- ▶ Geometry of families of elliptic curves: we **cannot** always find a filling of a family of elliptic curves over a punctured disk, if we only allow elliptic curves :(

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: moduli of curves (a toy example)

Base field:  $\mathbb{C}$ .

$\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$  = moduli stack of Riemann surfaces/smooth algebraic curves of genus 1 with 1 marking (elliptic curves).

## A more explicit description

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,1} = [\{(a,b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } 4a^3 + 27b^2 \neq 0\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

- ▶ Geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$ : it is **not compact!**
- ▶ Geometry of families of elliptic curves: we **cannot** always find a filling of a family of elliptic curves over a punctured disk, if we only allow elliptic curves :(

## A (modular) compactification

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1} = [\{(a,b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } (a,b) \neq (0,0)\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: moduli of curves (a toy example)

Base field:  $\mathbb{C}$ .

$\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$  = moduli stack of Riemann surfaces/smooth algebraic curves of genus 1 with 1 marking (elliptic curves).

## A more explicit description

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,1} = [\{(a,b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } 4a^3 + 27b^2 \neq 0\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

- ▶ Geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$ : it is **not compact!**
- ▶ Geometry of families of elliptic curves: we **cannot** always find a filling of a family of elliptic curves over a punctured disk, if we only allow elliptic curves :(

## A (modular) compactification

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1} = [\{(a,b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } (a,b) \neq (0,0)\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

- ▶ Geometry of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1}$ : it is **compact**, and  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1} = \mathcal{M}_{1,1} \cup *$ , where  $*$  = curve of genus 1 with one marking and a **node**.

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: moduli of curves (a toy example)

Base field:  $\mathbb{C}$ .

$\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$  = moduli stack of Riemann surfaces/smooth algebraic curves of genus 1 with 1 marking (elliptic curves).

## A more explicit description

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,1} = [\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } 4a^3 + 27b^2 \neq 0\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

- ▶ Geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$ : it is **not compact!**
- ▶ Geometry of families of elliptic curves: we **cannot** always find a filling of a family of elliptic curves over a punctured disk, if we only allow elliptic curves :(

## A (modular) compactification

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1} = [\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \text{ such that } (a, b) \neq (0, 0)\} / \mathbb{C}^*]$$

- ▶ Geometry of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1}$ : it is **compact**, and  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1} = \mathcal{M}_{1,1} \cup *$ , where  $*$  = curve of genus 1 with one marking and a **node**.
- ▶ Geometry of families of elliptic curves: we can always\* find a filling (in a unique way) of a family of elliptic curves over a punctured disk, **if we allow nodal curves!**

Here is one of the major achievements of the last century for what concerns moduli of curves (two Fields medals here!).

## Theorem (Deligne–Mumford, 1969)

The moduli stack  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$  can be compactified by adding nodal algebraic curves having finitely many automorphisms (technically, stable curves).

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$  = moduli stack of stable algebraic curves of genus  $g$  with  $n$  markings.

Here is one of the major achievements of the last century for what concerns moduli of curves (two Fields medals here!).

## Theorem (Deligne–Mumford, 1969)

The moduli stack  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$  can be compactified by adding nodal algebraic curves having finitely many automorphisms (technically, stable curves).

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$  = moduli stack of stable algebraic curves of genus  $g$  with  $n$  markings.

But there is more than just algebraic curves out there!

- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(BG, \beta)$  = moduli stack of smooth curves + **a principal  $G$ -bundle of degree  $\beta$** .



Here is one of the major achievements of the last century for what concerns moduli of curves (two Fields medals here!).

## Theorem (Deligne–Mumford, 1969)

The moduli stack  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$  can be compactified by adding nodal algebraic curves having finitely many automorphisms (technically, stable curves).

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$  = moduli stack of stable algebraic curves of genus  $g$  with  $n$  markings.

But there is more than just algebraic curves out there!

- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(BG, \beta)$  = moduli stack of smooth curves + **a principal  $G$ -bundle of degree  $\beta$** .
- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1}, \beta)$  = moduli stack of smooth curves + **a fibration in elliptic curves of degree  $\beta$** .

Here is one of the major achievements of the last century for what concerns moduli of curves (two Fields medals here!).

## Theorem (Deligne–Mumford, 1969)

The moduli stack  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$  can be compactified by adding nodal algebraic curves having finitely many automorphisms (technically, stable curves).

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$  = moduli stack of stable algebraic curves of genus  $g$  with  $n$  markings.

But there is more than just algebraic curves out there!

- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(BG, \beta)$  = moduli stack of smooth curves + a **principal  $G$ -bundle of degree  $\beta$** .
- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1}, \beta)$  = moduli stack of smooth curves + a **fibration in elliptic curves of degree  $\beta$** .

## Open problem

At the moment, there is no general method for compactifying  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$  in a modular way. Exciting!

**Partial solutions** (depending on  $\mathcal{X}$ ): Kontsevich, Abramovich–Vistoli, Caporaso, Pandharipande, etc. etc.

Here is one of the major achievements of the last century for what concerns moduli of curves (two Fields medals here!).

## Theorem (Deligne–Mumford, 1969)

The moduli stack  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$  can be compactified by adding nodal algebraic curves having finitely many automorphisms (technically, stable curves).

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$  = moduli stack of stable algebraic curves of genus  $g$  with  $n$  markings.

But there is more than just algebraic curves out there!

- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(BG, \beta)$  = moduli stack of smooth curves + a **principal  $G$ -bundle of degree  $\beta$** .
- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1}, \beta)$  = moduli stack of smooth curves + a **fibration in elliptic curves of degree  $\beta$** .

## Open problem

At the moment, there is no general method for compactifying  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$  in a modular way. Exciting!

**Partial solutions** (depending on  $\mathcal{X}$ ): Kontsevich, Abramovich–Vistoli, Caporaso, Pandharipande, etc. etc.

Recently, Giovanni Inchiostro and Andrea have been exploring new directions for tackling this problem.

## Andrea Di Lorenzo: computing invariants of moduli of curves

Another way of understanding the geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ : compute their **invariants**, such as

## Andrea Di Lorenzo: computing invariants of moduli of curves

Another way of understanding the geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ : compute their **invariants**, such as

- ▶ Chow ring: similar to singular homology, with algebraic cycles instead of topological cycles;

## Andrea Di Lorenzo: computing invariants of moduli of curves

Another way of understanding the geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ : compute their **invariants**, such as

- ▶ Chow ring: similar to singular homology, with algebraic cycles instead of topological cycles;
- ▶ Brauer group: related to the existence of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ -bundles on  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ ;

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: computing invariants of moduli of curves

Another way of understanding the geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ : compute their **invariants**, such as

- ▶ Chow ring: similar to singular homology, with algebraic cycles instead of topological cycles;
- ▶ Brauer group: related to the existence of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ -bundles on  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ ;

Here are a couple of recent results on this topic that Andrea and his collaborators managed to prove:

Chow ring of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}$  (D.L.–Pernice–Vistoli, 2022)

$$\mathrm{CH}^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1, \psi_1, \vartheta_1, \lambda_2, \vartheta_2] / (\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{2,2}, \alpha_{2,3}, \beta_{3,1}, \beta_{3,2}, \beta_{3,3}, \beta_{3,4}).$$

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: computing invariants of moduli of curves

Another way of understanding the geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ : compute their **invariants**, such as

- ▶ Chow ring: similar to singular homology, with algebraic cycles instead of topological cycles;
- ▶ Brauer group: related to the existence of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ -bundles on  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ ;

Here are a couple of recent results on this topic that Andrea and his collaborators managed to prove:

## Chow ring of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}$ (D.L.–Pernice–Vistoli, 2022)

$$\mathrm{CH}^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1, \psi_1, \vartheta_1, \lambda_2, \vartheta_2] / (\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{2,2}, \alpha_{2,3}, \beta_{3,1}, \beta_{3,2}, \beta_{3,3}, \beta_{3,4}).$$

Note that Chow rings (with integral coefficients) of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$  for  $g > 2$  are absolutely mysterious!



# Andrea Di Lorenzo: computing invariants of moduli of curves

Another way of understanding the geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ : compute their **invariants**, such as

- ▶ Chow ring: similar to singular homology, with algebraic cycles instead of topological cycles;
- ▶ Brauer group: related to the existence of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ -bundles on  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ ;

Here are a couple of recent results on this topic that Andrea and his collaborators managed to prove:

## Chow ring of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}$ (D.L.–Pernice–Vistoli, 2022)

$$\mathrm{CH}^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1, \psi_1, \vartheta_1, \lambda_2, \vartheta_2] / (\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{2,2}, \alpha_{2,3}, \beta_{3,1}, \beta_{3,2}, \beta_{3,3}, \beta_{3,4}).$$

Note that Chow rings (with integral coefficients) of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$  for  $g > 2$  are absolutely mysterious!

## Brauer group of $\mathcal{M}_3$ (D.L.–Pirisi, 2024)

$$\mathrm{Br}(\mathcal{M}_3) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2.$$

# Andrea Di Lorenzo: computing invariants of moduli of curves

Another way of understanding the geometry of  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ : compute their **invariants**, such as

- ▶ Chow ring: similar to singular homology, with algebraic cycles instead of topological cycles;
- ▶ Brauer group: related to the existence of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ -bundles on  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ ;

Here are a couple of recent results on this topic that Andrea and his collaborators managed to prove:

## Chow ring of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}$ (D.L.–Pernice–Vistoli, 2022)

$$\mathrm{CH}^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1, \psi_1, \vartheta_1, \lambda_2, \vartheta_2] / (\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{2,2}, \alpha_{2,3}, \beta_{3,1}, \beta_{3,2}, \beta_{3,3}, \beta_{3,4}).$$

Note that Chow rings (with integral coefficients) of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$  for  $g > 2$  are absolutely mysterious!

## Brauer group of $\mathcal{M}_3$ (D.L.–Pirisi, 2024)

$$\mathrm{Br}(\mathcal{M}_3) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2.$$

Fun fact: the non-triviality of the Brauer group is related to the famous **27 lines on a smooth cubic surface**. It was quite surprising to discover this!

Can we compute further invariants in higher genus?

“Enhanced” version of algebraic geometry.

Objects are **log schemes** = a variety  $X$  + a sheaf of monoids  $M$  with  $\alpha: M \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_X, \cdot)$ .

(when  $\alpha$  is injective, one should think of  $M$  as a monoid of “monomial regular functions” on  $X$ )

“Enhanced” version of algebraic geometry.

Objects are **log schemes** = a variety  $X$  + a sheaf of monoids  $M$  with  $\alpha: M \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_X, \cdot)$ .

(when  $\alpha$  is injective, one should think of  $M$  as a monoid of “monomial regular functions” on  $X$ )

## Prototypical examples

Pairs  $(X, D)$  with  $X$  smooth and  $D$  a SNC divisor (e.g.  $\mathbb{A}^n$  or  $\mathbb{P}^n$  with the coordinate hyperplanes), toric varieties.

The extra data typically keeps track of either a (partial) compactification (e.g.  $X \setminus D \subseteq X$ ), or of a family of which the space is a (typically singular) fiber.

“Enhanced” version of algebraic geometry.

Objects are **log schemes** = a variety  $X$  + a sheaf of monoids  $M$  with  $\alpha: M \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_X, \cdot)$ .

(when  $\alpha$  is injective, one should think of  $M$  as a monoid of “monomial regular functions” on  $X$ )

## Prototypical examples

Pairs  $(X, D)$  with  $X$  smooth and  $D$  a SNC divisor (e.g.  $\mathbb{A}^n$  or  $\mathbb{P}^n$  with the coordinate hyperplanes), toric varieties.

The extra data typically keeps track of either a (partial) compactification (e.g.  $X \setminus D \subseteq X$ ), or of a family of which the space is a (typically singular) fiber.

- ▶ It is “combinatorial” in nature, building blocks are affine toric varieties  $\text{Spec } k[P]$ .
- ▶ There are interesting and fruitful connections to tropical geometry (i.e. “piecewise linear” algebraic geometry).

One can systematically develop “algebraic geometry of log schemes”.

In particular there is a notion of smoothness in the logarithmic category (log smoothness). Some classically non-smooth morphisms become log smooth when equipped with appropriate log structures.

One can systematically develop “algebraic geometry of log schemes”.

In particular there is a notion of smoothness in the logarithmic category (log smoothness). Some classically non-smooth morphisms become log smooth when equipped with appropriate log structures.

## Example

The simplest example is probably the family of curves given by

$$\mathbb{A}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$$

$$(x, y) \mapsto xy.$$

One consequence: moduli spaces of log smooth objects are more often already compact.

One can systematically develop “algebraic geometry of log schemes”.

In particular there is a notion of smoothness in the logarithmic category (log smoothness). Some classically non-smooth morphisms become log smooth when equipped with appropriate log structures.

## Example

The simplest example is probably the family of curves given by

$$\mathbb{A}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$$

$$(x, y) \mapsto xy.$$

One consequence: moduli spaces of log smooth objects are more often already compact.

For example: a log smooth curve is the same as a nodal curve. The moduli space (stack) of stable log smooth curves is precisely the Deligne–Mumford compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ .



One can systematically develop “algebraic geometry of log schemes”.

In particular there is a notion of smoothness in the logarithmic category (log smoothness). Some classically non-smooth morphisms become log smooth when equipped with appropriate log structures.

## Example

The simplest example is probably the family of curves given by

$$\mathbb{A}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$$

$$(x, y) \mapsto xy.$$

One consequence: moduli spaces of log smooth objects are more often already compact.

For example: a log smooth curve is the same as a nodal curve. The moduli space (stack) of stable log smooth curves is precisely the Deligne–Mumford compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ .

Equipping objects with log structures allows for better control over degenerations. This has applications to (for example) enumerative geometry and mirror symmetry.

I also work with parabolic bundles, a notion of decorated vector bundles that naturally live on log schemes.

## Example

On a curve with marked points  $(C, p_1, \dots, p_n)$ , these are vector bundles  $E$ , together with weighted filtrations of the fibers  $E_{p_i}$  over the markings.

I also work with parabolic bundles, a notion of decorated vector bundles that naturally live on log schemes.

## Example

On a curve with marked points  $(C, p_1, \dots, p_n)$ , these are vector bundles  $E$ , together with weighted filtrations of the fibers  $E_{p_i}$  over the markings.

For curves, these generalize the Narasimhan-Seshadri correspondence (between stable bundles of degree 0 and irreducible unitary representations of the fundamental group) to the non-projective case.

The extra “boundary data” morally keeps track of the monodromy of loops around the markings.

I also work with parabolic bundles, a notion of decorated vector bundles that naturally live on log schemes.

## Example

On a curve with marked points  $(C, p_1, \dots, p_n)$ , these are vector bundles  $E$ , together with weighted filtrations of the fibers  $E_{p_i}$  over the markings.

For curves, these generalize the Narasimhan-Seshadri correspondence (between stable bundles of degree 0 and irreducible unitary representations of the fundamental group) to the non-projective case.

The extra “boundary data” morally keeps track of the monodromy of loops around the markings.

There are moduli spaces and stacks for semi-stable parabolic vector bundles, and their geometry hasn't been studied very much, especially in the singular (but log smooth) case.

Some understanding of these should be useful in studying degenerations of moduli spaces of vector bundles on smooth varieties.

## Goal

*topology of moduli spaces  $\iff$  representations of interesting algebras*

(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)

## Goal

*topology of moduli spaces*  $\iff$  *representations of interesting algebras*  
(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)

**Motivating Example: the topology of Hilbert schemes of points on  $S$**

## Symmetric product of a smooth surface

$S$  = smooth (quasi-)projective complex surface. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$\text{Sym}^n(S) := (S \times \cdots \times S) / \mathfrak{S}_n =$  moduli space of *unordered  $n$ -tuples of points of  $S$*

## Goal

*topology of moduli spaces*  $\iff$  *representations of interesting algebras*  
(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)

**Motivating Example: the topology of Hilbert schemes of points on  $S$**

## Symmetric product of a smooth surface

$S$  = smooth (quasi-)projective complex surface. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$\text{Sym}^n(S) := (S \times \cdots \times S) / \mathfrak{S}_n =$  moduli space of *unordered  $n$ -tuples of points of  $S$*

- $\text{Sym}^n(S)$  is a singular complex variety

## Goal

*topology of moduli spaces*  $\iff$  *representations of interesting algebras*  
(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)

**Motivating Example: the topology of Hilbert schemes of points on  $S$**

## Symmetric product of a smooth surface

$S$  = smooth (quasi-)projective complex surface. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$\text{Sym}^n(S) := (S \times \cdots \times S) / \mathfrak{S}_n =$  moduli space of *unordered  $n$ -tuples of points of  $S$*

►  $\text{Sym}^n(S)$  is a singular complex variety

## Hilbert scheme of $n$ points of a smooth surface

*Resolution of singularities* of  $\text{Sym}^n(S)$ :

$$\pi: \text{Hilb}^n(S) \longrightarrow \text{Sym}^n(S)$$



## Goal

*topology of moduli spaces*  $\iff$  *representations of interesting algebras*  
(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)

**Motivating Example: the topology of Hilbert schemes of points on  $S$**

## Symmetric product of a smooth surface

$S$  = smooth (quasi-)projective complex surface. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$\text{Sym}^n(S) := (S \times \cdots \times S) / \mathfrak{S}_n =$  moduli space of *unordered  $n$ -tuples of points of  $S$*

- ▶  $\text{Sym}^n(S)$  is a singular complex variety

## Hilbert scheme of $n$ points of a smooth surface

*Resolution of singularities* of  $\text{Sym}^n(S)$ :

$$\pi: \text{Hilb}^n(S) \longrightarrow \text{Sym}^n(S)$$

- ▶  $\text{Hilb}^n(S)$  is a smooth complex variety

## Goal

*topology of moduli spaces*  $\iff$  *representations of interesting algebras*  
(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)

**Motivating Example: the topology of Hilbert schemes of points on  $S$**

## Symmetric product of a smooth surface

$S$  = smooth (quasi-)projective complex surface. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$\mathrm{Sym}^n(S) := (S \times \cdots \times S) / \mathfrak{S}_n = \text{moduli space of } \textit{unordered } n\text{-tuples of points of } S$$

- ▶  $\mathrm{Sym}^n(S)$  is a singular complex variety

## Hilbert scheme of $n$ points of a smooth surface

*Resolution of singularities* of  $\mathrm{Sym}^n(S)$ :

$$\pi: \mathrm{Hilb}^n(S) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^n(S)$$

- ▶  $\mathrm{Hilb}^n(S)$  is a smooth complex variety
- ▶  $\mathrm{Hilb}^n(S) =$  moduli space of *ideal sheaves*  $\mathcal{I}_Z \subset \mathcal{O}_S$  of 0-dimensional subschemes  $Z \subset S$  of length  $n$

Set  $b_i(-) := \dim H^i(-; \mathbb{Q}) = i$ -th Betti number

## Göttsche-Soegel: topology of $\text{Hilb}^n(S)$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i(\text{Hilb}^n(S)) t^i q^n = \prod_{m=1}^{+\infty} \frac{(1 + t^{2m-1} q^m)^{b_1(S)} (1 + t^{2m+1} q^m)^{b_3(S)}}{(1 - t^{2m-2} q^m)^{b_0(S)} (1 - t^{2m} q^m)^{b_2(S)} (1 - t^{2m+2} q^m)^{b_4(S)}}$$

= character of the **Fock space** of the

**(super-)Heisenberg algebra  $\text{Heis}_S$**  associated to  $H^*(S; \mathbb{Q})$

Set  $b_i(-) := \dim H^i(-; \mathbb{Q}) = i$ -th Betti number

## Göttsche-Soegel: topology of $\text{Hilb}^n(S)$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i(\text{Hilb}^n(S)) t^i q^n = \prod_{m=1}^{+\infty} \frac{(1 + t^{2m-1} q^m)^{b_1(S)} (1 + t^{2m+1} q^m)^{b_3(S)}}{(1 - t^{2m-2} q^m)^{b_0(S)} (1 - t^{2m} q^m)^{b_2(S)} (1 - t^{2m+2} q^m)^{b_4(S)}}$$

= character of the **Fock space** of the  
**(super-)Heisenberg algebra  $\text{Heis}_S$**  associated to  $H^*(S; \mathbb{Q})$

## Nakajima: $\text{Hilb}^n(S)$ vs. Heisenberg algebra

$\exists$  an action of  **$\text{Heis}_S$**  on  $\mathbb{V}_0(S) := \bigoplus_n H^*(\text{Hilb}^n(S); \mathbb{Q})$  such that  $\mathbb{V}_0(S) \simeq$  Fock space

$\implies$  we can describe explicitly all cohomology classes in  $\mathbb{V}_0(S)$

Set  $b_i(-) := \dim H^i(-; \mathbb{Q}) = i$ -th Betti number

## Göttsche-Soegel: topology of $\text{Hilb}^n(S)$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i(\text{Hilb}^n(S)) t^i q^n = \prod_{m=1}^{+\infty} \frac{(1 + t^{2m-1} q^m)^{b_1(S)} (1 + t^{2m+1} q^m)^{b_3(S)}}{(1 - t^{2m-2} q^m)^{b_0(S)} (1 - t^{2m} q^m)^{b_2(S)} (1 - t^{2m+2} q^m)^{b_4(S)}}$$

= character of the **Fock space** of the  
**(super-)Heisenberg algebra  $\text{Heis}_S$**  associated to  $H^*(S; \mathbb{Q})$

## Nakajima: $\text{Hilb}^n(S)$ vs. Heisenberg algebra

$\exists$  an action of  **$\text{Heis}_S$**  on  $\mathbb{W}_0(S) := \bigoplus_n H^*(\text{Hilb}^n(S); \mathbb{Q})$  such that  $\mathbb{W}_0(S) \simeq$  Fock space

$\implies$  we can describe explicitly all cohomology classes in  $\mathbb{W}_0(S)$

## Generalization

- ▶ *Schiffmann-Vasserot, Neguț*: from cohomology to K-theory  
 $\text{Heis}_S$  is replaced by the **Elliptic Hall algebra** (depending on  $K^0(S)$ )
- ▶ *Schiffmann-Vasserot, Soibelman & co, Neguț*, etc: from  $\text{Hilb}^n(S)$  to **other** moduli spaces (quiver varieties, instanton moduli spaces, Gieseker moduli spaces, etc)

## Warning

- ▶ Not only *topology of moduli spaces*  $\iff$  *representations of interesting algebras*  
(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)
- ▶ but also *topology of moduli stacks*  $\implies$  *geometric realizations such algebras*  
(theory of Cohomological, K-theoretical, categorical Hall algebras)

## Warning

- ▶ Not only *topology of moduli spaces*  $\iff$  *representations of interesting algebras*  
(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)
- ▶ but also *topology of moduli stacks*  $\implies$  *geometric realizations such algebras*  
(theory of Cohomological, K-theoretical, categorical Hall algebras)

## Examples of COHAs

- (1) *Schiffmann-Vasserot*:  $K_0(\mathbf{Coh}_{0\text{-dim}}(\mathbb{C}^2))$  is endowed with a *Hall* multiplication s. t.  
 $\mathbf{KHA}_{0\text{-dim}}(\mathbb{C}^2) := (K_0(\mathbf{Coh}_{0\text{-dim}}(\mathbb{C}^2)), *) \simeq$  the **elliptic Hall algebra**
- (2) *Kapranov-Vasserot*:  $\exists \mathbf{KHA}_{\dim \leq k}(S), \mathbf{COHA}_{\dim \leq k}(S)$  for any smooth surface  $S$
- (3) *Porta-S.*:  $\exists$  *categorical Hall algebra* on  $D^b(\mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{R}\mathbf{Coh}_{\dim \leq k}(S)))$

## Warning

- ▶ Not only *topology of moduli spaces*  $\iff$  *representations of interesting algebras*  
(e.g., vertex algebras, quantum groups, etc.)
- ▶ but also *topology of moduli stacks*  $\implies$  *geometric realizations such algebras*  
(theory of Cohomological, K-theoretical, categorical Hall algebras)

## Examples of COHAs

- (1) *Schiffmann-Vasserot*:  $K_0(\mathbf{Coh}_{0\text{-dim}}(\mathbb{C}^2))$  is endowed with a *Hall* multiplication s. t.  
 $\mathbf{KHA}_{0\text{-dim}}(\mathbb{C}^2) := (K_0(\mathbf{Coh}_{0\text{-dim}}(\mathbb{C}^2)), *) \simeq$  the **elliptic Hall algebra**
- (2) *Kapranov-Vasserot*:  $\exists \mathbf{KHA}_{\dim \leq k}(S), \mathbf{COHA}_{\dim \leq k}(S)$  for any smooth surface  $S$
- (3) *Porta-S.*:  $\exists$  *categorical Hall algebra* on  $D^b(\mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{R}\mathbf{Coh}_{\dim \leq k}(S)))$

## Why is the theory of COHAs important?

- ▶ (1) & (2)  $\implies$  Proofs of conjectures in Enumerative Geometry  
(e.g. Alday-Gaiotto-Tachikawa conj., P=W conj., Okounkov's conj.)
- ▶ (3)  $\implies$  foundation for the theory of Categorical Enumerative Geometry  
due to *Pădurariu* and *Toda*.



- ▶ Andrea Di Lorenzo: Moduli stacks of curves and their invariants
- ▶ Marco Franciosi, Rita Pardini: birational geometry, moduli spaces of surfaces
- ▶ Gregory Pearlstein: Hodge theory
- ▶ Tamás Szamuely: cohomology of varieties and arithmetic questions
- ▶ Francesco Sala: cohomological Hall algebras and geometric representation theory
- ▶ Mattia Talpo: Logarithmic and tropical algebraic geometry

- ▶ Andrea Di Lorenzo: `andrea.dilorenzo@unipi.it`
- ▶ Francesco Sala: `francesco.sala@unipi.it`  
available during the coffee break at 4 pm
- ▶ Mattia Talpo: `mattia.talpo@unipi.it`  
available during the coffee break tomorrow morning