

SMOOTHING NODAL CALABI-YAU n -FOLDS

SÖNKE ROLLENKE AND RICHARD THOMAS

ABSTRACT. Let X be an n -dimensional Calabi-Yau with ordinary double points, where n is odd. Friedman showed that for $n = 3$ the existence of a smoothing of X implies a specific type of relation between homology classes on a resolution of X . (The converse is also true, due to work of Friedman, Kawamata and Tian.)

We sketch a more topological proof of this result, and then extend it to higher dimensions. For $n > 3$ the result is nonlinear; the “Yukawa product” on the middle dimensional (co)homology plays an unexpected role. We also discuss a converse, proving it for nodal Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces of \mathbb{P}^{n+1} .

1. INTRODUCTION

Fix a Calabi-Yau n -fold X ; for simplicity in this introduction this will mean a projective variety with at worst ordinary double point (ODP, or nodal) singularities and trivial canonical bundle $K_X \cong \mathcal{O}_X$. Sometimes we will pick a trivialisation $\Omega \in H^0(K_X)$ of K_X – a “complex volume form”.

Smooth Calabi-Yaus. We recall that when X is smooth and three dimensional, first order deformations of (X, Ω) are given by its third homology $H_3(X, \mathbb{R})$. The form Ω gives an isomorphism between the first order deformations $H^1(T_X)$ of X and $H^1(\Omega_X^2) = H^{2,1}(X)$, while the choice of Ω adds $H^{3,0}$ to the deformation space. The isomorphism to $H_3(X, \mathbb{R})$ is then given by the composition of the natural maps

$$(1.1) \quad H_3(X, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\text{PD}} H^3(X, \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^3(X, \mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{\text{Pr}} H^{3,0}(X) \oplus H^{2,1}(X).$$

Equivalently, given a 3-cycle on (X, Ω) we take the $(3, 0) + (2, 1)$ part of its Poincaré dual and add this to the period point $[\Omega] \in H^3(X, \mathbb{C})$ to give the corresponding first order deformation; there will then be a unique first order deformation of the complex structure for which the new class $[\Omega]$ is represented by a holomorphic form of type $(3, 0)$.

More generally deformations of smooth Calabi-Yau n -folds are governed by the $H^{n,0} \oplus H^{n-1,1}$ part of their middle degree (co)homology. Therefore the Zariski tangent space to the moduli space of Calabi-Yaus has constant dimension, showing (by T^1 -lifting [Ra, Ka2]) that the moduli space is smooth (unobstructed); this is the Bogomolov-Tian-Todorov theorem.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J32; (32G05, 32J18, 14D15).

Nodal Calabi-Yaus 3-folds. Friedman’s theorem [Fr] can be seen as an extension of this theory to nodal Calabi-Yau 3-folds. That is, fixing a Calabi-Yau 3-fold X with at worst ODPs, one can interpret his result as saying that first order deformations of (X, Ω) are still isomorphic to $H_3(X, \mathbb{R})$. (Kawamata [Ka2] and Tian [Ti] later showed – in any dimension n – that again all first order deformations are unobstructed and the moduli space is smooth.)

Friedman stated his theorem as follows. There exist *small resolutions* of X given by replacing each ODP p_i with a smooth rational curve C_i with normal bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)$. Different small resolutions differ by flops of the curves C_i and need not be projective or even Kähler; we fix one X^+ .

Theorem 1.2. [Fr] X admits a first order smoothing if and only if there is a relation

$$\sum \delta_i [C_i] = 0 \quad \text{in } H_2(X^+, \mathbb{R})$$

with each $\delta_i \neq 0$.

Since small resolutions are special to three dimensions we rephrase this in terms of the blow up Y of X at the ODPs p_i . Each exceptional divisor Q_i is a 2-dimensional quadric $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ (the small resolutions come from blowing down one of the two rulings). Let A_i and B_i denote the homology classes of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \{\text{pt}\}$ and $\{\text{pt}\} \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Combined with the unobstructedness results mentioned above, Friedman’s theorem becomes the following.

Theorem 1.3. X admits a smoothing if and only if there is a relation

$$\sum \delta_i (A_i - B_i) = 0 \quad \text{in } H_2(Y, \mathbb{R})$$

with each $\delta_i \neq 0$.

(Notice that the classes A_i and B_i are nonzero in $H_2(Y)$, since each has intersection -1 with $[Q_i]$.)

By some elementary topology (excision, long exact sequence of a pair) we can interpret this as follows. The relation in homology is a 3-chain $\overline{\Delta}$ whose boundary may be taken to be a union of S^2 s – multiples δ_i of the C_i in X^+ (1.2), or of the anti-diagonals in $Q_i \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ in Y (1.3). On blowing down to X the S^2 s are collapsed to a point and $\overline{\Delta}$ projects to a 3-cycle Δ . This lifts on a topological model \tilde{X} of the smoothing to a cycle $\tilde{\Delta}$ whose intersection with the vanishing cycle at p_i is also δ_i (see [STY] for example). (There is a sign issue here; changing the orientation on the vanishing cycle corresponds to flopping the curve $C_i \subset X^+$ or swapping the cycles A_i and B_i in Y [STY].)

On this model \tilde{X} the holomorphic 3-form of X pulls back to a 3-form which is degenerate precisely along the vanishing cycles. Adding small multiples of the 3-cycle $\tilde{\Delta}$ to the 3-form (in the way described in (1.1)) breaks this degeneracy because its pairing with the vanishing cycle at p_i is $\delta_i \neq 0$. (We think of adding $\tilde{\Delta}$ to the $(3, 0)$ form as “inflating” the vanishing cycle.)

The result is a path of cohomology classes on \tilde{X} beginning at the pullback of the original $(3, 0)$ -form. There is a corresponding unique path of complex structures on \tilde{X} for which these classes are of type $(3, 0)$.

Thus we see that deformations of X again correspond to $H_3(X, \mathbb{R})$. A given class $[\Delta] \in H_3(X, \mathbb{R})$ corresponds to a deformation which smooths the ODP p_i if and only if the intersection of $[\Delta]$ and p_i is nonzero. Here we are defining the intersection number δ_i of $[\Delta]$ and p_i by any of the following equivalent prescriptions.

- Lift Δ to a 3-cycle $\tilde{\Delta}$ on a topological model \tilde{X} of the smoothing and intersect with the vanishing cycle at p_i ,
- Lift Δ to a chain $\bar{\Delta}$ on a small resolution X^+ , then $\partial\bar{\Delta}$ contains a multiple δ_i of the exceptional curve $[C_i]$,
- Lift Δ to a chain $\bar{\Delta}$ on the blowup Y , then $\partial\bar{\Delta}$ contains a multiple δ_i of the cycle $A_i - B_i$ on Q_i .

In Section 2 we sketch a short proof of Friedman's theorem along such topological lines, using logarithmic forms and residues to play the role of chains and boundaries (to which they are Poincaré dual).

Nodal Calabi-Yau n -folds. Let X be an odd dimensional Calabi-Yau n -fold with ODPs $p_i \in X$. Let Y denote the blow up of X in the p_i , with exceptional divisors Q_i . These are $(n - 1)$ -dimensional quadrics with standard $(n - 1)/2$ -dimensional planes whose homology classes we denote A_i, B_i ; see (4.17).

Extending Friedman's results to higher dimensions is complicated by the other Hodge summands in the middle degree (co)homology. For instance the $A_i - B_i$ classes on Y are of pure Hodge type $(\frac{n+1}{2}, \frac{n+1}{2})$. For a linear combination of them to be zero in $H^{n+1}(Y)$ as in Theorem 1.3 would require it to be $\bar{\partial}$ of a form of type $(\frac{n+1}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2})$. Only in $n = 3$ dimensions is this a form of type $(n - 1, 1)$ (i.e. a form of the type that controls deformations of complex structure). So the relation must be more complicated when $n > 3$.

The best way of explaining the difference between three and higher dimensions is as follows. The local model of the smoothing

$$X_\epsilon = \left\{ f_\epsilon := \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i^2 - \epsilon = 0 \right\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$$

has the natural parameter (or modulus) ϵ . In fact this generates the sheaf of local smoothings $\mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega_{X_0}, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})$; see Lemma 2.2.

However there is another natural modulus given by the pairing of the holomorphic n -form with the vanishing cycle (the "complex volume" of the vanishing cycle). A local model of the $(n, 0)$ -form is given by

$$\Omega_{f_\epsilon} := \frac{dx_1 \dots dx_n}{\partial f_\epsilon / \partial x_{n+1}} = \frac{dx_1 \dots dx_n}{2x_{n+1}}$$

on X_ϵ . (This is the Poincaré residue of the form $dx_1 \dots dx_{n+1}/f_\epsilon$ on \mathbb{C}^{n+1} with first order poles along X_ϵ .)

The vanishing cycle L_ϵ is the n -sphere real slice of X_ϵ given by taking those points with $x_i \in \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{R}$ for all i . The integral of Ω_{f_ϵ} over this can be computed [Ott] to be

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{L_\epsilon} \Omega_{f_\epsilon} = O(\epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}}).$$

(In even dimensions the vanishing cycle has monodromy $[L_\epsilon] \mapsto -[L_\epsilon]$ as ϵ circles the origin, which explains the ambiguity in the square root.) Therefore the two moduli are the same only in 3 dimensions; in general one has to take the $(n-1)/2$ th power of the complex structure smoothing modulus to get the modulus related to homology. Another way of saying this is that the homological modulus does not correspond to a first order deformation of complex structure (except in dimension 3) but an $(n-1)/2$ th order deformation.

Therefore, working entirely algebraically, we take the $(n-1)/2$ th power of any first order deformation via the *Yukawa product*¹, since this gives the $((\frac{n+1}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2})$ Hodge part of the) $(n-1)/2$ th derivative of the period point of X under a path of smoothings with the given first order derivative. In Section 4 we show that this gives rise to homology relations amongst the $A - B$ classes from smoothings that simultaneously smooth each of the ODPs:

Theorem 4.19. *Fix a first order deformation $e \in \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$. Let $\oplus_i \epsilon_i$ be the image of e under the global-to-local map to $H^0(\mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)) \cong H^0(\oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{p_i})$. Then we have the relation*

$$\sum \delta_i (A_i - B_i) = 0 \in H_{n-1}(Y),$$

where $\delta_i = \epsilon_i^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ and e gives rise to a smoothing if and only if all δ_i are nonzero.

Remarks. Our choice of generator of $\mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \cong \oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{p_i}$ at each double point is explained in Section 4. If there are k ODPs then this gives an isomorphism $H^0(\mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)) \cong \mathbb{C}^k$ and natural coordinates $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k$ thereon. In these coordinates, then, the image of the (linear!) global to local map $\text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X))$ is contained in

$$\left\{ (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k) : \sum_i \epsilon_i^{\frac{n-1}{2}} (A_i - B_i) = 0 \text{ in } H_{n-1}(Y) \right\}.$$

In other words the linear subspace of local infinitesimal first order deformations that are realised globally is contained in an intersection of degree

¹On a smooth Calabi-Yau n -fold the (B-model) Yukawa product on its middle dimensional (co)homology,

$$H^{n-i,i}(X) \otimes H^{n-j,j}(X) \rightarrow H^{n-(i+j),i+j}(X),$$

is given by the isomorphism $\Lambda^i T_X \cong \Omega_X^{n-i}$ (induced by the complex volume form Ω) and the cup product $H^i(\Lambda^i T_X) \otimes H^j(\Lambda^j T_X) \rightarrow H^{i+j}(\Lambda^{i+j} T_X)$. In particular in odd dimensions the $(n-1)/2$ th power of a class in $H^1(T_X)$ lies in $H^{\frac{n+1}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2}}(X)$.

$\frac{n-1}{2}$ Fermat hypersurfaces in $H^0(\mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X))$. We are very grateful to the referee for this point of view on Theorem 4.19; it seems very rare to have such nonlinear constraints on either a (linear) first order deformation problem or a (linear) spectral sequence.

The analysis (1.4) also suggests a differential geometric approach to proving Theorem 4.19. The idea would be to show that in a smoothing the vanishing cycles L_i smoothing the ordinary double points p_i admit representatives which are *special Lagrangian*. This is widely expected to be true (the local model above is indeed special Lagrangian) but has not yet been proved.

It would follow that their pairings with the cohomology class of the holomorphic n -form on the smoothing are all *nonzero* complex numbers δ_i . The Poincaré dual of the holomorphic n -form is an n -cycle (with complex coefficients) $\tilde{\Delta}$ which deforms naturally to an n -cycle Δ in the original Calabi-Yau with ODPs as we degenerate back from the smoothing to the central fibre. Lifting to the resolution Y produces a chain $\overline{\Delta}$ whose boundary is $\sum_i \delta_i(A_i - B_i)$.

Conversely one might wonder whether all such homology relations arise from smoothings. We formulate a precise question in Section 5 and prove it for nodal hypersurfaces of projective space. (This does *not* mean we are confident that it holds in general, however.)

Even dimensions. There is no analogue of Theorem 4.19 since odd dimensional quadrics have no middle dimensional homology and the homology of Y is simply the direct sum of that of X and the exceptional divisors Q_i . Anyway when n is even there is already a cycle on any smoothing \tilde{X} which intersects the vanishing cycle nontrivially (thus playing the role of $\tilde{\Delta}$ above in odd dimensions) – the vanishing cycle itself. Therefore if the converse formulated in Section 5 turned out to be true then we would expect *any* nodal even-dimensional Calabi-Yau to have a smoothing, without any conditions.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Lev Borisov, Mark Gross, James Otterson and Dmitri Panov for useful conversations. In particular the simplified proof of Friedman’s theorem sketched in Section 2 was worked out jointly with Otterson as part of his Imperial College PhD [Ott]. The referee also made some suggestions which greatly improved the paper.

The first author was supported by a Forschungsstipendium of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). The second author was partially supported by a Royal Society university research fellowship.

2. SET UP

We first fix some notation. Let X be an n -dimensional compact analytic space with trivial canonical bundle $K_X = \mathcal{O}_X$ whose only singularities are ordinary double points $p_i \in X$. Denoting by $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ the blow-up of

the double points, we assume further that Y is Kähler. The exceptional divisor of π is a disjoint union of quadrics $Q = \coprod_i Q_i$ with normal bundle $\mathcal{O}_Q(Q) = \mathcal{O}_Q(-1)$ and $K_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y((n-2)Q)$. So long as X has at least one ODP then $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ by [Ka1, Theorem 8.3] so, as remarked by Friedman, every smoothing will again have trivial canonical bundle and is a smooth Calabi-Yau provided it is Kähler.

We denote by T_Y the tangent sheaf of Y . We often use the isomorphism

$$(2.1) \quad \Omega_Y^k \cong \Lambda^{n-k} T_Y \otimes K_Y = \Lambda^{n-k} T_Y((n-2)Q).$$

Lemma 2.2. $\mathcal{E}xt^i(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is nonzero only for $i = 0$ and $i = 1$. For $i = 0$ we denote the sheaf $\mathcal{H}om(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ by T_X . For $i = 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \cong \oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{p_i}.$$

Proof. Locally, around a double point, X is isomorphic to a hypersurface in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} described by the equation $f = \sum_i x_i^2$. Thus we have a locally-free resolution

$$(2.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{df} \Omega_{\mathbb{C}^{n+1}|_X} \rightarrow \Omega_X \rightarrow 0.$$

Dualising yields

$$0 \rightarrow T_X \rightarrow T_{\mathbb{C}^{n+1}|_X} \xrightarrow{df} \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow 0,$$

with vanishing higher $\mathcal{E}xt$ s. The central map is

$$\mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus(n+1)} \xrightarrow{(2x_1, \dots, 2x_n)} \mathcal{O}_X$$

with cokernel the structure sheaf of the origin. \square

Therefore the local-to-global spectral sequence $H^i(\mathcal{E}xt^j) \Rightarrow \text{Ext}^{i+j}$ collapses to the long exact sequence

$$(2.4) \quad 0 \rightarrow H^1(T_X) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i}) \rightarrow H^2(T_X).$$

The second term governs the first order deformations of X , while the first describes the equisingular ones: those that do not smooth the ordinary double points. The third term looks locally about each p_i and compares a global deformation to the local universal deformation $\sum_j x_j^2 = \epsilon$. The last arrow is the obstruction to finding a global first order deformation matching a given local one about each p_i .

Lemma 2.5. $\pi^* \Omega_X = \Omega_Y(\log Q)(-Q)$ with no higher $L_j \pi^*$ s.

Proof. We work locally on the blow up of the affine ODP $\{\sum x_i^2 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. This is the subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{P}^n$ defined by the equations $x_i X_j = x_j X_i$ and $\sum X_i^2 = 0$, where the X_i are the standard homogeneous coordinates on \mathbb{P}^n .

It is clear that $\pi^* \Omega_X$ is a subsheaf of Ω_Y . To work out which one, we work on the patch $X_{n+1} = 1$ without loss of generality. This has coordinates X_1, \dots, X_n and x_{n+1} (the others being determined by the relations $x_i =$

$x_{n+1}X_i$) subject to the relation $X_1^2 + \dots + X_n^2 + 1 = 0$. The pullbacks $\bar{x}_i := x_i \circ \pi$ of the coordinates x_i are $\bar{x}_i = X_i x_{n+1}$ and $\bar{x}_{n+1} = x_{n+1}$. Since Ω_X is locally generated by dx_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) and dx_{n+1} , it follows that $\pi^*\Omega_X$ is locally generated by $d\bar{x}_i = X_i dx_{n+1} + x_{n+1} dX_i$ and dx_{n+1} . It is therefore generated by dx_{n+1} and $x_{n+1} dX_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

The exceptional divisor Q is described by $x_{n+1} = 0$, so $(\pi^*\Omega_X)(Q)$ is locally generated by dx_{n+1}/x_{n+1} and dX_i . But these are the generators of $\Omega_Y(\log Q)$, by definition.

Finally, pull back the locally-free resolution $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{C}^{n+1}}|_X$ of (2.3):

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{(2\bar{x}_1, \dots, 2\bar{x}_n)} \mathcal{O}_Y^{\oplus(n+1)}.$$

Since this has no kernel the higher Tors $L_j \pi^* \Omega_X$ vanish. \square

Proposition 2.6. $R\mathcal{H}om(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) = R\pi_* \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)$.

Proof. Notice that there is a perfect pairing of vector bundles $\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q) \otimes \Omega_Y^1(\log Q)(-Q) \rightarrow K_Y$ given by wedging differential forms. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} R\pi_* \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q) &\cong R\pi_* \mathcal{H}om(\Omega_Y^1(\log Q)(-Q), K_Y) \\ &\cong R\pi_* R\mathcal{H}om(L\pi^* \Omega_X, K_Y) \\ &\cong R\mathcal{H}om(\Omega_X, R\pi_* K_Y), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.5 and the projection formula.

It remains to prove that $R\pi_* K_Y \cong \mathcal{O}_X$. By relative Serre duality down the (relative dimension 0) projective morphism π , $R\pi_* K_Y$ is dual to $(R\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y) \otimes K_X$. But $K_X \cong \mathcal{O}_X$ and the ordinary double point is a rational singularity so $R\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y \cong \mathcal{O}_X$. \square

3. DIMENSION THREE

We first consider the case $n = 3$ treated by Friedman, proving the variant Theorem 1.3 of his result. Our treatment will be very brief; the details can be worked out in much the same way as the higher dimensional case in the next section.

By Proposition 2.6 the deformation space $\text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ of X is simply $H^1(\Omega_Y^2(\log Q))$. There is a standard exact sequence

$$(3.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \Omega_Y^2 \rightarrow \Omega_Y^2(\log Q) \rightarrow \Omega_Q^1 \rightarrow 0,$$

with the last map the residue map. We obtain the long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_Y^2) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_Y^2(\log Q)) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_Q^1) \rightarrow H^2(\Omega_Y^2).$$

The last arrow is the Gysin map $H^{1,1}(Q) \rightarrow H^{2,2}(Y)$. This is an injection on the $A_i + B_i$ classes since their intersection with $[Q_i] \in H^{1,1}(Y)$ is -2 . Dividing out by these classes gives

$$(3.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_Y^2) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i \langle A_i - B_i \rangle \rightarrow \frac{H^{2,2}(Y)}{\bigoplus_i \langle A_i + B_i \rangle}.$$

It is easy to show that in fact this is precisely the exact sequence (2.4) for $n = 3$; something very similar will be shown in Corollary 4.4 in the next section for dimensions $n > 3$. As we will see there, the point is the following: by Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.6, the complex $R\pi_*\Omega_Y^2(\log Q)$ has cohomology sheaves only in degrees 0 and 1. And on applying $R\pi_*$ to the exact sequence (3.1) the first term provides all of the 0th cohomology of $R\pi_*\Omega_Y^2(\log Q)$, and the third term provides all of the 1st cohomology. For $n = 3$ this amounts to

$$R^0\pi_*\Omega_Y^2 = R^0\pi_*\Omega_Y^2(\log Q), \quad R^{\geq 1}\pi_*\Omega_Y^2 = 0,$$

and

$$\frac{R^1\pi_*\Omega_Q}{\bigoplus_i \langle A_i + B_i \rangle} = R^1\pi_*\Omega_Y^2(\log Q), \quad R^{\neq 1}\pi_*\Omega_Q = 0.$$

Now a first order smoothing of X is a class in $\text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ which maps to a nonzero first order smoothing of the ODP p_i in the sequence (2.4) for each i . Therefore it is a class which maps to a nonzero multiple δ_i of $A_i - B_i$ in (3.2) for each i . By the exactness of (3.2) such a class exists if and only if $\sum_i \delta_i(A_i - B_i)$ is zero in $H^{2,2}(Y)/\bigoplus_i \langle A_i + B_i \rangle$. This is equivalent to $\sum_i \delta_i(A_i - B_i)$ being zero in the isomorphic group which is the kernel in $H^{2,2}(Y)$ of cupping with all of the $\text{PD}[Q_i]$ classes. Therefore it is equivalent to $\sum_i \delta_i(A_i - B_i)$ being zero in $H^{2,2}(Y)$. And by [Ka2, Ti] any first order smoothing can be realised as the first derivative of an actual smoothing.

4. FROM SMOOTHINGS TO HOMOLOGY

We assume $n \geq 5$ from now on. (In fact $n \geq 3$ works similarly with minor modifications.) We first show that in the isomorphism of Proposition 2.6, we can pass to the subsheaf $\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)$ of $\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Fix $n \geq 5$. The inclusions*

$$\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-4)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)$$

combined with Proposition 2.6 induce isomorphisms

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} R\mathcal{H}om(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) &\cong R^{\leq 2}\pi_*(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-4)Q)) \\ &\cong R^{\leq 2}\pi_*(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 2.2,

$$R\mathcal{H}om(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) = R^{\leq 2}\pi_*\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q).$$

The inclusions

$$\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(i+1)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-iQ) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-iQ)$$

have cokernels $\Omega_Q^{n-1}(i)$ and $\Omega_Q^{n-2}(i)$ respectively. These have vanishing $H^{\leq 2}$ for $i = n-4, n-5, \dots, 0$ by Proposition A.1 in the Appendix. Therefore they induce isomorphisms on $R^{\leq 2}\pi_*$, proving the result inductively. \square

Proposition 4.3. *Fix $n \geq 5$. The inclusion $T_Y \cong \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-2)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q)$ induces isomorphisms*

- $\pi_* T_Y \cong \pi_* \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q) \cong \pi_* \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q) \cong T_X$,
- $R^i \pi_* T_Y = 0 = R^i \pi_* \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. The inclusions

$$\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-2)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-2)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q)$$

have cokernels $\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-2)$ and $\Omega_Q^{n-1}(n-3)$ respectively. By Proposition A.1 in the Appendix these have vanishing $H^{\leq 2}$, so they induce isomorphisms on $R^{\leq 2} \pi_*$.

The inclusion

$$\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)$$

has cokernel $\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)$, which has no H^0 by Proposition A.1. It therefore induces an isomorphism on π_* , which by Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 2.2 gives the first sequence of isomorphisms.

Since $R^1 \pi_* T_Y$ and $R^2 \pi_* T_Y$ are supported on the double points we can calculate them in the local model $Y = \mathcal{O}_Q(-1)$ and $X = \{\sum x_i^2 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Since $\mathcal{O}_Q(-1)$ is rigid and X is affine it follows that $R^1 \pi_* T_Y = 0$. We therefore get the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow R^1 \pi_* \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q) \rightarrow R^1 \pi_* \Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3) \rightarrow R^2 \pi_* T_Y \rightarrow 0.$$

The first term is isomorphic to \mathcal{O}_0 by Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 2.2. The second term is also \mathcal{O}_0 , by Proposition A.1. Therefore $R^2 \pi_* T_Y = 0$. \square

Corollary 4.4. *Taking sheaf cohomology of the exact sequence*

(4.5)

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q) \rightarrow \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} \Omega_Q^{n-2}(-(n-3)Q) \rightarrow 0$$

induces the sequence (2.4).

Proof. Let E denote the complex

$$E = R\mathcal{H}om(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) = R^{\leq 2} \pi_* (\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)).$$

By Lemma 2.2 this has cohomology sheaves $\mathcal{H}^0(E) = T_X$ and $\mathcal{H}^1(E) = \oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{p_i}$ only in degrees 0 and 1. The sequence (2.4) arises by taking H^1 and H^2 of the tautological exact triangle

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{H}^0(E) \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^1(E)[-1].$$

By Proposition 4.3 the $\mathcal{H}^0(E)$ part comes entirely from the first term of (4.5). That is, the inclusion $\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)$ induces an isomorphism

$$R^{\leq 2} \pi_* \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{H}^0(E).$$

Therefore by (4.5) the residue map $\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q) \rightarrow \Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)$ induces an isomorphism on $R^1 \pi_*$, while $R^0 \pi_*$ and $R^2 \pi_*$ vanish on $\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)$

by Proposition A.1. Since $R^1\pi_*(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)) = \mathcal{H}^1(E)$ this says that the residue map induces an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{H}^1(E)[-1] \xrightarrow{\cong} R^{\leq 2}\pi_*\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3).$$

That is, the $\mathcal{H}^1(E)[-1]$ part of E all comes from the third term of (4.5).

Therefore applying $R^{\leq 2}\pi_*$ to (4.5) gives an exact triangle

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\leq 2}\pi_*(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q)) &\rightarrow R^{\leq 2}\pi_*(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)) \\ &\rightarrow R^{\leq 2}\pi_*(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(-(n-3)Q)), \end{aligned}$$

and this is exactly (4.6). So applying $H_Y^i = H_X^i(R\pi_*) = H_X^i(R^{\leq 2}\pi_*)$ (for $i = 1, 2$) to the sequence (4.5) gives (2.4). \square

Remark. By Proposition 4.3, $H^i(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-3)Q)) = H^i(T_Y)$ for $i \leq 2$. Therefore (2.4), the cohomology exact sequence of (4.5), can also be written

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(T_Y) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i}) \rightarrow H^2(T_Y) \rightarrow \dots$$

That is, the equisingular deformations of X correspond to deformations of the resolution Y ; a well known fact in more general situations.

From Proposition 4.1 we further deduce that

$$\text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \cong H^1(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)) \cong H^1(\Omega_Y^{n-1}) = H^{n-1,1}(Y),$$

so deformations of X are controlled by the topology of Y . This is the origin of the unobstructedness result of [Ka2]: any smoothing X_t of X has deformation space $H^{n-1,1}(X_t)$ which can be shown by mixed Hodge structures to be of the same dimension as $H^{n-1,1}(Y)$. Therefore T^1 -lifting applies.

4.1. The Yukawa product. Now fix $n = 2m + 1 \geq 5$ to be odd. The isomorphisms $\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-4)Q) \cong T_Y(2Q)$ and $\Omega_Y^{m+1} \cong \Lambda^m T_Y((n-2)Q)$ of (2.1) induce

$$(4.7) \quad \bigwedge^m(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-4)Q)) \cong \bigwedge^m(T_Y(2Q)) \cong \Omega_Y^{m+1}(Q).$$

Lemma 4.8. *Under the above isomorphism (4.7), the subsheaf*

$$(4.9) \quad \bigwedge^m(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)) \subseteq \bigwedge^m(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-4)Q))$$

is $\Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{m+1}(Q)$.

Proof. Define K be the kernel of $T_Y(2Q) \rightarrow N_Q(2Q)$, where $N_Q = \mathcal{O}_Q(-1)$ is the normal bundle to Q . Then under the isomorphism (2.1) the inclusion $\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q) \subseteq \Omega_Y^{n-1}(-(n-4)Q)$ becomes $K \subseteq T_Y(2Q)$.

Wedging m times shows that (4.9) is isomorphic to $\bigwedge^m K \subseteq \bigwedge^m(T_Y(2Q))$, i.e. the kernel of $\bigwedge^m(T_Y(2Q)) \rightarrow \bigwedge^{m-1}(T_Y(2Q))|_Q \otimes N_Q(2Q)$. Under the final isomorphism of (4.7) this is the kernel of $\Omega_Y^{m+1}(Q) \rightarrow \Omega_Q^{m+1}(Q)$. But this is $\Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q)$, as claimed. \square

Next we use the Poincaré residue maps $\Omega_Y^k(\log Q) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} \Omega_Q^{k-1}$. These factor through the restriction of $\Omega_Y^k(\log Q)$ to Q , followed by the quotient map in the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \Omega_Q^k \rightarrow \Omega_Y^k(\log Q)|_Q \rightarrow \Omega_Q^{k-1} \rightarrow 0$ of bundles on Q .

Combined with the above isomorphism of Lemma 4.8 we get the following Lemma. The right hand vertical map is given by a similar construction to the others of this section, but on Q instead of Y . That is, we use the canonical bundle of Q to identify $\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)$ with $T_Q(-2)$, wedge m times and then identify $(\Lambda^m T_Q)(1-n)$ with Ω_Q^m .

Lemma 4.10. *The following diagram is commutative,*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda^m(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)) & \xrightarrow{\Lambda^m \text{Res}} & \Lambda^m(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)) \\ \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \sim \\ \Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} & \Omega_Q^m. \end{array}$$

Proof. For bundles, wedging and restriction to Q commute, and as remarked above the Poincaré residue maps factor through restriction to Q . Therefore the above claim is a statement that can be checked on Q , where it follows from the following standard duality of the Koszul exact sequence.

Suppose that $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence of vector bundles on Q of ranks $1, n$ and $n-1$ respectively. Then we get an exact sequence

$$(4.11) \quad 0 \rightarrow L \otimes \Lambda^{m-1} F \rightarrow \Lambda^m E \rightarrow \Lambda^m F \rightarrow 0.$$

On tensoring with the determinant $\Lambda^n E^* \cong L^* \otimes \Lambda^{n-1} F^*$ and recalling that $n = 2m + 1$, this becomes the sequence

$$(4.12) \quad 0 \rightarrow \Lambda^{m+1} F^* \rightarrow \Lambda^{m+1} E^* \rightarrow L^* \otimes \Lambda^m F^* \rightarrow 0.$$

Then it is a standard fact that this is the same exact sequence as the one obtained by taking Λ^{m+1} of the dual sequence $0 \rightarrow F^* \rightarrow E^* \rightarrow L^* \rightarrow 0$.

We apply this to L, E and F being $\Omega_Q^{n-1}(n-3)$, $\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)|_Q(n-3)$ and $\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)$ respectively. The two quotient maps in the sequences (4.11) and (4.12) become (on composition with the restriction map to Q) the two residue maps in the Lemma. \square

Combined with the cup product on cohomology this gives a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigotimes^m H^1(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}^{\otimes m}} & \bigotimes^m H^1(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^m(\Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q)) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} & H^m(\Omega_Q^m). \end{array}$$

Since both wedging and cup product are skew-commutative, the vertical multiplication maps are now commutative. Composing with the m -th tensor

product map $V \rightarrow V^{\otimes m}$ in each case we get a commutative diagram whose vertical maps are nonlinear:

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^1(\Omega_Y^{n-1}(\log Q)(-(n-3)Q)) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} & H^1(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)) \\ \downarrow \mu_Y & & \downarrow \mu_Q \\ H^m(\Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q)) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} & H^m(\Omega_Q^m). \end{array}$$

In particular we get the nonlinear map

$$(4.14) \quad \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{\mu_Y} H^m(\Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q)) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} H^{m,m}(Q).$$

Remark. More generally one can define (commutative) rings

$$(4.15) \quad R_Y := \bigoplus_{k=0}^n H^k(\Lambda^k T_Y(2kQ)) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^n H^k(\Omega_Y^{n-k}((2k+2-n)Q))$$

and

$$(4.16) \quad R_Q := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n-1} H^k(\Lambda^k T_Q(-2k)) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n-1} H^k(\Omega_Q^{n-1-k}(n-1-2k))$$

with product induced by the wedge product of polyvector fields and cup product on cohomology. By some easily checked cohomology vanishing on Q one sees that in the definition (4.16) of R_Q one can replace $\Lambda^* T_Q$ by $\Lambda^* T_Y|_Q$ in every degree except $k = n-1$. Since the wedge and cup products commute with restriction to Q , we can define a ring homomorphism $R_Y \rightarrow R_Q$. (To deal with the troublesome degree $n-1$ classes we can pick a complement in $H^{n-1}(\Omega_Y^1(nQ))$ to the kernel of the composition

$$H^{n-1}(\Omega_Y^1(nQ)) \rightarrow H^{n-1}(\Omega_Y^1(nQ)|_Q) \rightarrow H^{n-1}(\Omega_Q^1(-n))$$

and map this to zero in R_Q . The degree n part of R_Y is already zero.)

The ring structure on R_Q can be determined explicitly and turns out to be closely related to the cohomology ring of the quadric.

Recall that a quadric Q of dimension $n-1 = 2m$ carries two natural classes of m -planes which we call $A \cong \mathbb{P}^m$ and $B \cong \mathbb{P}^m$. For instance, describing $Q \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{2m+1}$ with homogeneous coordinates $x_0, \dots, x_m, y_0, \dots, y_m$ as the zero locus of $\sum_{i=0}^m x_i y_i$ then we can take

$$(4.17) \quad A = \{x_0 = 0 = x_1 = \dots = x_m\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{y_0 = 0 = x_1 = \dots = x_m\}.$$

Together their cohomology classes (which we also call A and B) generate $H^m(\Omega_Q^m)$, which is the middle degree part of the ring R_Q (4.16).

Proposition 4.18. *Let Q be a quadric of dimension $2m = n-1$. There is a generator η of $H^1(T_Q(-2))$ such that*

$$R_Q = \langle \eta, \eta^2, \dots, \eta^{m-1}, A, B, \eta^{m+1}, \dots, \eta^{n-1} \rangle$$

with $\eta^m = A - B$ and $\eta(A + B) = 0$.

Proof. The normal bundle sequence, twisted by $\mathcal{O}_Q(-2)$,

$$0 \rightarrow T_Q(-2) \rightarrow T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-2)|_Q \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q \rightarrow 0$$

induces, by Lemma A.5, an isomorphism $H^0(\mathcal{O}_Q) \cong H^1(T_Q(-2))$. So we can identify η with (a nonzero multiple of) the extension class of this sequence.

Therefore in the wedge powers of the conormal bundle sequence, twisted by $\mathcal{O}_Q(n-1-2k)$,

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_Q^{n-2-k}(n-3-2k) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1-k}|_Q(n-1-2k) \rightarrow \Omega_Q^{n-1-k}(n-1-2k) \rightarrow 0,$$

the boundary map

$$H^k(\Omega_Q^{n-1-k}(n-1-2k)) \xrightarrow{\eta^\perp} H^{k+1}(\Omega_Q^{n-2-k}(n-3-2k))$$

is given by contraction with η . This corresponds to multiplication by η in R_Q under the isomorphism $H^1(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)) \cong H^1(T_Q(-2))$.

If $n-1 = 2m$ is even then the kernel and cokernel of this map always vanish by Lemma A.5 unless $k = m-1$ or $k = m$. In these degrees we get exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^{m-1}(\Omega_Q^{m+1}(2)) & \xrightarrow{\eta^\perp} & H^m(\Omega_Q^m) & \longrightarrow & H^m(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{m+1}|_Q) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & & \searrow \gamma & \parallel \\ & & & & & & H^{m+1}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{m+1}), \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & H^m(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^m) & & & & \\ & & \parallel & \searrow \alpha & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^m(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^m|_Q) & \longrightarrow & H^m(\Omega_Q^m) & \xrightarrow{\eta^\perp} & H^{m+1}(\Omega_Q^{m-1}(-2)) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Since γ is the Gysin homomorphism, with kernel generated by $A-B$, we can arrange (by rescaling) that $\eta^m = A-B$. The image of α is the restriction of the m th power of the Fubini-Study class to Q and hence equal to $A+B$. Therefore $\eta(A+B) = 0$. \square

Remark. We recognise this description of R_Q as very much like $H^*(Q, \mathbb{C})$, which has a generator ω in degree 1 and can be described as

$$R_Q = \langle \omega, \omega^2, \dots, \omega^{m-1}, A, B, \omega^{m+1}, \dots, \omega^{n-1} \rangle,$$

with $\omega^m = A+B$ and $\omega(A-B) = 0$ (notice the differences in sign from Proposition 4.18).

This is no coincidence: the quadric is defined by a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2)$; differentiating twice along its zero set Q gives a symmetric map $T_Q \otimes T_Q \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q(2)$ which is nondegenerate. The resulting isomorphism $T_Q(-2) \cong \Omega_Q$ induces an identification $R_Q \rightarrow \bigoplus_i H^i(\Omega_Q^i) = H^*(Q, \mathbb{C})$ which takes η to ω .

However in the middle degree m this isomorphism differs from the one defined by the pairing $\Omega_Q^m \otimes \Omega_Q^m \rightarrow K_Q$ which was employed in (4.16); this explains how it can interchange the classes $A-B$ and $A+B$.

In the following we tacitly identify the local deformation space at p_i with \mathbb{C} via η . Recall that $2m + 1 = n \geq 5$.

Theorem 4.19. *A class $e \in \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ that maps to $(\epsilon_i) \in \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$ under (2.4) maps to $(\epsilon_i^m(A_i - B_i)) \in \bigoplus_i H^{n-1}(Q_i)$ under (4.14).*

Any such class gives rise to a relation

$$(4.20) \quad \sum_i \delta_i(A_i - B_i) = 0 \in H_{n-1}(Y),$$

where $\delta_i = \epsilon_i^m$. In particular, e is a (first order) smoothing if and only if all δ_i are nonzero.

Proof. The first statement follows immediately from the commutativity of (4.13) and the calculation $\eta^m = A - B$ of Proposition 4.18. We obtain the second statement by Poincaré duality from the cohomology exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow H^m(\Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q)) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} H^{m,m}(Q) \rightarrow H^{m+1,m+1}(Y) \rightarrow \dots$$

induced from

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_Y^{m+1} \rightarrow \Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} \Omega_Q^m \rightarrow 0.$$

The deformation smooths the double point p_i if and only if its value ϵ_i at p_i under the map (2.4) is nonzero, if and only if $\delta_i \neq 0$. \square

To show that the Theorem is not vacuous we exhibit an example where not all $A_i - B_i$ classes are zero in $H_{n-1}(Y)$. In dimension n we let X denote Schoen's nodal Calabi-Yau hypersurface

$$\{x_0^{n+2} + \dots x_{n+1}^{n+2} - (n+2)x_0 \dots x_{n+1} = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+1}.$$

This is smooth except for $(n+2)^n$ ODPs at the points $[\zeta^{a_0} : \dots, \zeta^{a_n} : 1]$, where $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/(n+2)}$ and $\sum a_i \equiv 0 \pmod{n+2}$.

Then by [Sch, Proposition 3.4], the $A_i - B_i$ classes span a subspace of dimension $(n+1)!$ in $H_{n-1}(Y)$. Since X can certainly be smoothed to a smooth degree $n+2$ hypersurface of \mathbb{P}^{n+1} , Theorem 4.19 provides some of the $(n+2)^n - (n+1)!$ relations between the $A_i - B_i$ classes. In fact it linearly generates them *all*, as we shall see in the next Section.

5. NODAL HYPERSURFACES

In this section we discuss a possible converse to Theorem 4.19. Recall that we have the linear map

$$(5.1) \quad \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$$

of (2.4). Call its image $I \subseteq \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$. This is the space of local smoothings of the ODPs that can be realised by a global smoothing.

We also have the linear map taking the $A_i - B_i$ cycles to their (co)homology classes in Y ,

$$(5.2) \quad \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i}) \cong \bigoplus_i \mathbb{C} \cdot (A_i - B_i) \subseteq \bigoplus_i H^{m,m}(Q_i) \rightarrow H^{m+1,m+1}(Y).$$

Call its kernel $K \subseteq \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$. This is the space of homology relations amongst the $A_i - B_i$ cycles in Y .

Think of $\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{p_i}$ as a semisimple algebra (by multiplication of functions independently at each point p_i). Then we have the m th-power map

$$(5.3) \quad (\epsilon_i)_{i=1}^N \mapsto (\epsilon_i^m)_{i=1}^N$$

from $\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{p_i}$ to itself. Here N is the number of ODPs p_i . By Theorem 4.19 this maps I to K (and its composition with (5.1) gives μ_Y of (4.14)). Friedman's theorem says that in dimension $n = 3$ this map $I \rightarrow K$ is a (linear) isomorphism.

Since (5.3) is nonlinear for $n \neq 3$ it is not sensible to ask for it to be an isomorphism. Simple calculations with nodal hypersurfaces show that in general $\dim K > \dim I$, so we cannot expect it to be onto. It makes more sense to ask for the following converse.

Question 1. *Does the image of the map (5.3) restricted to I linearly span K ?*

Using the algebra structure on $\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{p_i}$ we can talk about polynomials in the elements of $I \subseteq \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$. Question 1 involves only polynomials of the form $\sum_j a_j x_j^m$ on elements $x_j = (\epsilon_{j,i})_{i=1}^N$ of I . But by some elementary linear algebra (for any vector space V , the symmetric power $S^m V$ is generated by elements of the form $x^{\otimes m}$ for $x \in V$), Question 1 is equivalent to the following *a priori* weaker question.

Question 2. *Do degree m polynomials on $I \subseteq \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$ generate K ?*

Another way of saying this is to consider the linear map

$$S^m I \rightarrow \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$$

induced from $I \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$ by the algebra structure on $\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{p_i}$. Then this maps into K , and we are asking whether or not it is *onto* K . This can also be phrased in terms of the ring homomorphism $R_Y \rightarrow R_Q$ introduced in 4.16 and 4.15: we ask if K is contained in the image of the subring of R_Y generated by $H^1(T_Y(2Q)) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$.

In particular if the answer to Question 2 were true then, by the formulation in Question 1, a homology relation

$$\sum_i \delta_i (A_i - B_i) = 0 \in H_m(Y)$$

with each $\delta_i \neq 0$ would imply the existence of a deformation of X which smooths *every* ODP p_i .

We study this problem for nodal Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces of projective space using Schoen's extension of the Griffiths-Dwork method [Sch].

Fix an anticanonical (i.e. degree $n+2$) divisor $X \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$. Suppose X has only ODPs, and let $Z = \bigcup_i \{p_i\}$ be the nodal set. As before let Y denote the blow up of X in Z with exceptional divisor $Q = \bigcup_i Q_i$.

Applying $\text{Hom}(\cdot, \mathcal{O}_X)$ to $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(-X) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}|_X} \rightarrow \Omega_X \rightarrow 0$ gives the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}|_X}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(X)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow 0.$$

The middle group is $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}}(n+2))/\langle f \rangle$, where $f \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}}(n+2))$ is the section defining X . Adding elements of this group to f gives a surjection to the first order deformations $\text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ of X . The kernel $H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}|_X})$ describes the infinitesimal action of automorphisms of \mathbb{P}^n . The first arrow differentiates f down a vector field in $H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}|_X})$, but f vanishes to second order on Z , so its image in fact lies in $H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(X) \otimes \mathcal{I}_Z) \subset H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(X))$. This is easily seen to be precisely the subspace of deformations of the divisor X which preserve the ODPs p_i to first order (i.e. they may move them, but not smooth them). Therefore we get a commutative diagram

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}|_X}) & \xlongequal{\quad} & H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}|_X}) & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(X) \otimes \mathcal{I}_Z) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(X)) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i}) & \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(X) \otimes \mathcal{I}_Z) \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & \downarrow \\ 0 \longrightarrow & H^0(T_X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i}) & \longrightarrow H^2(T_X) \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \\ & 0 & & 0 & & & \end{array}$$

Schoen's generalisation [Sch] of the Griffiths-Dwork method of generating primitive cohomology of hypersurfaces via residues gives, with a little work, the following commutative diagram.

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{I}_Z(mX)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(mX)) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i}) & \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{I}_Z(mX)) \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & \parallel \\ 0 \longrightarrow & H^m(\Omega_Y^{m+1}) & \longrightarrow & H^m(\Omega_Y^{m+1}(\log Q)) & \longrightarrow & \langle A_i - B_i \rangle_Q & \longrightarrow \langle A_i - B_i \rangle_Y \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \\ & 0 & & 0 & & & \end{array}$$

Here the cohomology groups in the upper row are calculated on X . (To make contact with [Sch] one should, for instance, write $H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(mX))$ as $H^0(K_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}}((m+1)X))/H^0(K_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}}(mX))$ and take residues on X to get the vertical maps.) The penultimate term on the bottom row is the span of the $A_i - B_i$ classes in $H^m(\Omega_Q^m) = \bigoplus_i \langle A_i, B_i \rangle$. The final term is their span after push forward to $H^{m+1}(\Omega_Y^{m+1})$.

In this case I , as defined in (5.1), is the image of $H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(X))$ in the lower $\bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i})$ in the diagram (5.4). And K (5.2) is, by the exactness of the diagram (5.5), the image of $H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(mX))$ in $\langle A_i - B_i \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$. The map from I to K factors through the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(X)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(mX)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{O}_{p_i}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_i \mathbb{C}(A_i - B_i). \end{array}$$

The vertical maps are those coming from the diagrams (5.4, 5.5), while both horizontal maps take the m th power. However, for hypersurfaces X of projective space, the map

$$S^m H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(X)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(mX))$$

is onto. It follows that Question 2 can be answered positively for such X , and therefore the converse (Question 1) is true in this case.

That the converse is true for hypersurfaces is the nodal analogue of the fact that for smooth Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces of projective space, $H^1(T_Y)$ generates $H^m(\Lambda^m T_X) \cong H^{m+1,m}(X)$. (This is most easily proved by the Griffiths-Dwork method.) For general smooth Calabi-Yau manifolds it is dual to the condition that on any mirror manifold Y , $H^2(Y, \mathbb{C})$ should generate $H^{2*}(Y, \mathbb{C})$ under the quantum cohomology product. It also seems that it is probably not true in general (as Lev Borisov explained to us) even for a Calabi-Yau hypersurface in a toric variety \mathbb{P}_{Δ} , for instance when some lattice points in the multiples of the reflexive polytope Δ are not sums of lattice points in Δ . Therefore we think it unlikely that the answer to Questions 1 or 2 is positive in general.

However, it is still possible that a weaker condition might hold; namely one could ask whether for deformations of any given *smooth* Calabi-Yau manifold X ,

Question 3. *Does the image of the period map span $H^n(X, \mathbb{C})$?*

It seems not to be known whether one should expect this in general or not.

If this were true then a finite number of the derivatives of the period point at any given (X, Ω) would generate $H^n(X, \mathbb{C})$. In this case we would expect that also for *nodal* X , some high order deformation of the complex structure would produce a holomorphic n -form with a nonzero coefficient of the dual of the class Δ . Its pullback to a topological model of the smoothing would then contain $\text{PD}(\tilde{\Delta})$ and so would have nonzero integral against the vanishing cycles. It would thus correspond to a genuine smoothing of X .

So if the answer to Question 3 is positive for *all smooth Calabi-Yau manifolds* then we still expect a weak converse for nodal X . That is, a homology relation as in Theorem 4.19, with all $\delta_i \neq 0$, would imply the existence of a smoothing.

APPENDIX A. COHOMOLOGY CALCULATIONS

In this appendix we compute some cohomology groups of twists of sheaves of holomorphic forms on a quadric hypersurface $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. For simplicity we will always assume that $n \geq 5$.

Proposition A.1. *The cohomology groups $H^{\leq 2}(\Omega_Q^{n-1}(j))$ and $H^{\leq 2}(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(j))$ vanish for all $j \leq n - 2$ except $H^1(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)) \cong \mathbb{C}$.*

The proof consists mainly in book-keeping in the long exact cohomology sequences of both

$$(A.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^k(j-2) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^k(j) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^k(j)|_Q \rightarrow 0$$

and the (twisted) wedge powers of the conormal bundle sequence,

$$(A.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow \Omega_Q^{k-1}(j-2) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^k(j)|_Q \rightarrow \Omega_Q^k(j) \rightarrow 0.$$

First of all we need to recall Bott's formula for the dimension of the various cohomology groups on projective space:

Theorem A.4 ([Bott]). *Let $0 \leq p \leq n$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $h^q(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(m))$ vanishes for all q apart from $h^p(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p) = 1$ and*

$$h^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(m)) = \binom{m-1}{p} \binom{m+n-p}{m} = h^n(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-p}(-m))$$

for $p < m$.

Lemma A.5. *The cohomology of $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(j)|_Q$ is*

$$j < 0: h^q(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(j)|_Q) = 0 \text{ unless } q = n-1 \text{ and } j < p+2-n.$$

$$j = 0: h^q(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(0)|_Q) = \begin{cases} 1 & 0 \leq p = q \leq n-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

$$j = 1: h^q(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(1)|_Q) = \begin{cases} n+1 & q = n-1, p = n \text{ or } q = p = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

$$j = 2: h^q(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(2)|_Q) = 0 \text{ unless } p = q = 0 \text{ or } 0 \leq q = p-1 \leq n-1.$$

$$j > 2: h^q(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(j)|_Q) = 0 \text{ unless } q = 0 \text{ and } j > p.$$

Proof. All statements follow pretty directly from the long exact sequence associated to the restriction sequence (A.2), so we will give the details only for the last assertion.

If $j > 2$ then neither $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(j)$ nor $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(j-2)$ can have higher cohomology and the only nonzero part of the long exact sequence is

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(j-2)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(j)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^p(j)|_Q) \rightarrow 0,$$

which immediately implies the assertion. \square

Proof of Proposition (A.1). The $j = 0, p < 0$ part of the preceding Lemma A.5 gives the required cohomology vanishing for the twists of Ω_Q^{n-1} , since $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}|_Q = \mathcal{O}_Q \cong \Omega_Q^{n-1}(n-1)$.

For the twists of Ω_Q^{n-2} we use the sequences (A.2) and (A.3) with $k = n - 1, n - 2$. Using the assumption that $n \geq 5$ we see that

$$H^1(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1}(j)|_Q) = H^1(\Omega_Q^{n-1}(j)) = H^2(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1}(j)|_Q) = 0.$$

Thus also $H^2(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(j-2)) = 0$ and the relevant terms of the long exact sequence are

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow H^0(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(j-2)) \rightarrow H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1}(j)|_Q) \rightarrow H^0(\Omega_Q^{n-1}(j)) \\ \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(j-2)) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

The central two cohomology groups vanish for $j \leq n - 2$ so we only have to analyse the cases $j = n - 1, n$. If $j = n - 1$ then still $H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1}(j)|_Q) = 0$ so $H^0(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)) = 0$ and

$$H^1(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-3)) \cong H^0(\Omega_Q^{n-1}(n-1)) \cong H^0(\mathcal{O}_Q) \cong \mathbb{C}.$$

If $j = n$ then $H^0(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n-1}(n)|_Q) \rightarrow H^0(\Omega_Q^{n-1}(n))$ is the map $H^0(T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_Q(1))$ which differentiates the quadratic form Q (thought of as the section of $\mathcal{O}(2)$ defining the quadric Q) down vector fields in \mathbb{P}^n . This is nothing but the isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{n+1})^*$ induced by the nondegenerate quadratic form Q on \mathbb{C}^{n+1} . So $H^0(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-2)) = H^1(\Omega_Q^{n-2}(n-2)) = 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [Bott] Bott, R. (1957). *Homogeneous vector bundles*, Ann. of Math. (2) **66**, 203–248.
- [Fr] Friedman, R. (1986). *Simultaneous resolution of threefold double points*, Math. Ann. **274**, 671–689.
- [Gri] Griffiths, P. A. (1969). *On the periods of certain rational integrals. I, II*, Ann. of Math. (2) **90**, 460–495, *ibid.* 496–541
- [Ka1] Kawamata, Y. (1985) *Minimal models and the Kodaira dimension of algebraic fiber spaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **363**, 1–46.
- [Ka2] Kawamata, Y. (1992). *Unobstructed deformations – a remark on a paper of Z. Ran*, J. Alg. Geom. **1**, 183–190.
- [Ott] Otterson, J. (2007). Imperial College London PhD transfer report.
- [Ra] Ran, Z. (1992). *Deformations of manifolds with torsion or negative canonical bundle*, J. Alg. Geom. **1**, 279–291.
- [Sch] Schoen, C. (1985). *Algebraic cycles on certain desingularized nodal hypersurfaces*, Math. Ann. **270**, 17–27 .
- [STY] Smith, I., Thomas, R. P. and Yau, S.-T. (2002). *Symplectic conifold transitions*, Jour. Diff. Geom. **62**, 209–242. math.SG/0209319.
- [Ti] Tian, G. (1992). *Smoothing 3-folds with trivial canonical bundle and ordinary double points*, Essays on mirror manifolds, 458–479. Internat. Press.