

WEAKLY KÄHLER HYPERBOLICITY IS BIRATIONAL

FRANCESCO BEI, BENOÎT CLAUDON, SIMONE DIVERIO,
AND STEFANO TRAPANI

ABSTRACT. We show that a compact Kähler manifold bimeromorphic to a weakly Kähler hyperbolic manifold is weakly Kähler hyperbolic, providing an answer to a problem raised by J. Kollár [Kol95, Open Problem 18.7].

1. INTRODUCTION

In the chapter devoted to open problems of his book “Shafarevic maps and automorphic forms”, J. Kollár speaking about Gromov’s Kähler hyperbolicity says

“From the birational point of view, Kähler hyperbolicity is not natural since it depends on the birational model chosen. It would be desirable to have a birational variant developed. The natural choice seems to be to requires Gromov’s condition not for Kähler form but for a degenerate Kähler form.”

Let X be a compact Kähler manifold. In [BDET24] the authors introduce a notion called weak Kähler hyperbolicity, mainly in order to study desingularizations of subvarieties of Kähler hyperbolic manifold in the sense of

Date: June 5, 2024.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 32Q15; Secondary: 32J25, 32J27, 53C23.

Key words and phrases. Weakly Kähler hyperbolic manifold, birational invariance, classifying space, generically finite map, toroidal compactifications of ball quotients.

The first-named author is partially supported by the “Gruppo Nazionale per le Strutture Algebriche, Geometriche e le loro Applicazioni” of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica “Francesco Severi”.

The second-named author would like to thank Institut Universitaire de France for providing excellent working conditions. He also benefits from the support of the French government “Investissements d’Avenir” program integrated to France 2030, bearing the following reference ANR-11-LABX-0020-01.

The third-named author is partially supported by the “Gruppo Nazionale per le Strutture Algebriche, Geometriche e le loro Applicazioni” of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica “Francesco Severi” as well as the “SEED PNR” project of SAPIENZA Università di Roma.

The forth-named author acknowledges the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata, CUP E83C18000100006, as well as the MUR Excellence Department Project MatMod@TOV awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata, CUP E83C23000330006.

Gromov [Gro91]. It turns out that many key features of Kähler hyperbolic manifolds generalize (in an appropriate way) to weakly Kähler hyperbolic manifolds and, moreover, weak Kähler hyperbolicity seems to be the right notion in order to have birational invariance.

Given a compact Kähler manifold X , define the convex positive cone $\mathcal{W}_X \subset H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ to be the set of real cohomology $(1, 1)$ -classes which are big and nef, and moreover admit a smooth representative which is \tilde{d} -bounded. Here, \tilde{d} -bounded means that such a representative becomes d -exact once pulled-back to the universal covering of X and moreover admits a primitive which is bounded with respect to any metric coming from X .

Definition 1.1. A compact Kähler manifold X is said to be *weakly Kähler hyperbolic* if $\mathcal{W}_X \neq \emptyset$.

It is proved in [BDET24] that if $\mu: X \rightarrow Y$ is a modification of compact Kähler manifolds or, more generally, a surjective holomorphic map between compact Kähler manifolds of the same dimension, then the weak Kähler hyperbolicity of Y implies that of X . In other words, weak Kähler hyperbolicity pulls-back along modifications.

In this note we prove the analogous for pushing-forwards (we shall actually prove a slightly more general statement, see Remark 3.1).

Main Theorem. *Let $\mu: Z \rightarrow X$ be a modification of compact Kähler manifolds. If Z is weakly Kähler hyperbolic, then X is weakly Kähler hyperbolic, too.*

What we show in our Main Theorem is that if $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_Z$, then the push-forward $\mu_*\alpha$ belongs to \mathcal{W}_X , so that $\mathcal{W}_X \neq \emptyset$.

Being able to push-forward through a modification the property of being weakly Kähler hyperbolic enables us to finally treat the behaviour of weak Kähler hyperbolicity with respect to meromorphic mappings. The following corollary provides the announced answer to [Kol95, Open Problem 18.7].

Corollary 1.2. *If X and Y are bimeromorphic compact Kähler manifolds, then X is weakly Kähler hyperbolic if and only if Y is weakly Kähler hyperbolic.*

Next, this other corollary answers in particular to [BDET24, Question 2.30].

Corollary 1.3. *Let $f: X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a generically finite dominant meromorphic mapping between compact Kähler manifolds.*

If Y is weakly Kähler hyperbolic, then X is weakly Kähler hyperbolic. Conversely, if X is weakly Kähler hyperbolic and the induced map on the fundamental groups is injective, then Y is weakly Kähler hyperbolic.

Finally, in Section 5, we show that (suitable) toroidal compactifications of quotients of the complex unit ball provide examples of weakly Kähler hyperbolic manifolds which do not arise as modifications of Kähler hyperbolic manifolds.

Acknowledgements. The second-named author warmly thanks Pierre Py for enlightening discussions about hyperbolic groups.

The third-named author would like to warmly thank Gabriele Viaggi and Roberto Frigerio for various topological explanations, as well as Sébastien Boucksom for the content of Remark 2.3.

This project started while the second-named author was in Roma for a research stay. He would like to thank the Dipartimento di Matematica Guido Castelnuovo, SAPIENZA Università di Roma, for its hospitality.

2. TOOLS

For the reader convenience, we collect in this section the main tools for the proof of our Main Theorem, as well as for the study of toroidal compactifications.

2.1. Push-forward and pull-back of big or nef classes. First, we recall how the bigness of a general real $(1, 1)$ -class behaves under generically finite holomorphic maps.

Proposition 2.1 ([Bou02, Proposition 4.12]). *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a surjective holomorphic map between compact Kähler manifolds of the same dimension. Let α and β be real $(1, 1)$ -cohomology classes on X and Y respectively. Then,*

- (i) *the class α is big if and only if $f^*\alpha$ is big,*
- (ii) *the class $f_*\beta$ is big if β is so.*

The following proposition is stated for compact Kähler manifolds, whereas the original statement is in Bott–Chern cohomology for general compact complex manifolds.

Proposition 2.2 ([Pău98, Théorème 1]). *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a surjective holomorphic map between compact Kähler manifolds. Let α be a real $(1, 1)$ -cohomology class on X . Then, the class $f^*\alpha$ is nef if and only if α is.*

Remark 2.3. Observe that, in the equidimensional case as in Proposition 2.1, an analogous statement for push-forwards of nef classes is not true in general as soon as $\dim X = \dim Y \geq 3$ (but it is for surfaces).

Indeed, take any bimeromorphic map $f: X \dashrightarrow Y$ which is an isomorphism in codimension one. Then, if α is a nef class on X the push-forward $f_*\alpha$ is nef in codimension one but never nef unless f is an actual biholomorphism. This can be seen resolving as usual the singularities of the closure of the graph of f in $X \times Y$ to obtain the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Z & \\ p \swarrow & & \searrow q \\ X & \overset{f}{\dashrightarrow} & Y \end{array}$$

where p and q are modifications and every divisor contracted by p is also contracted by q .

The same diagram shows that, while $p^*\alpha$ is obviously nef, $q_*(p^*\alpha) = f_*\alpha$ is not nef, as claimed (we refer the reader to S. Boucksom's PhD thesis for more details on this).

2.2. Brunnbauer, Kotschick, and Schönliener result on hyperbolic classes. Here we want to state [BKS24, Theorem 2.4], which will be the crucial ingredient for the proof of birationality of weakly Kähler hyperbolicity. So, let us introduce some terminology following [BKS24].

First, for X a topological space, we define the aspherical subspace $V_{\text{asph}}^k(X)$ of the real singular cohomology $H^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ to be the set of k -cohomology classes whose pull-back to any sphere is zero.

Next, for X a finite simplicial complex, define the hyperbolic subspace $V_{\text{hyp}}^k(X)$ of the real singular cohomology $H^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ to be the set of k -cohomology classes for which there exists a representing closed k -form ω whose pull-back to the universal cover has a d -primitive which is bounded with respect to some lifted Riemannian metric, *i.e.* ω is \tilde{d} -bounded. Here, we are using that there is a natural isomorphism $H_{\text{dR}}^k(X, \mathbb{R}) \simeq H^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ between the de Rham cohomology and the singular cohomology.

Remark 2.4. A k -form ω on a simplicial complex X consists of a smooth k -form ω_σ for every simplex $\sigma \subset X$ such that $\omega_\sigma|_\tau \equiv \omega_\tau$ whenever $\tau \subset \sigma$ is a subsimplex.

Analogously to the definition of differential forms, one defines Riemannian metrics for simplicial complexes as the choice of a Riemannian metric g_σ on every simplex σ of X such that $g_\sigma|_\tau \equiv g_\tau$ for $\tau \subset \sigma$.

Remark 2.5. In our terminology, for X a compact Kähler manifold, we thus have that \mathcal{W}_X equals the intersection of $V_{\text{hyp}}^2(X)$ with the cone of big and nef classes.

Note that $V_{\text{hyp}}^k(X) \subset V_{\text{asph}}^k(X)$ as soon as $k \geq 2$, since every continuous map from a k -dimensional sphere $f: S^k \rightarrow X$ factorizes through the universal cover of X .

Now, take a finite simplicial complex X with fundamental group $G := \pi_1(X)$ and consider (a model of) the classifying space $EG \rightarrow BG$. Given a universal covering $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$, there is unique (up to homotopy) classifying map of this universal covering

$$c_{\tilde{X}, X}: \tilde{X} \rightarrow BG$$

such that \tilde{X} is isomorphic to the pull-back $c_{\tilde{X}, X}^* EG$ as G -principal bundles.

Finally, following [Gro91, Subsection 0.2.C], we want to define the hyperbolic subspace for BG which does not necessarily have any longer the homotopy type of a finite simplicial complex. So, the subspace $V_{\text{hyp}}^k(BG)$ of the real singular cohomology $H^k(BG, \mathbb{R})$ will be the set of k -cohomology classes whose pull-back to any finite simplicial complex is hyperbolic.

We are now ready to state the following theorem, which is the key for the birationality of weak Kähler hyperbolicity.

Theorem 2.6 ([BKS24, Theorem 2.4], see also [Kęd09, Theorem 5.1]). *Let X, Y be two finite simplicial complex (e.g. compact complex manifolds), $c_{\tilde{X}, X}: X \rightarrow B\pi$ the classifying map of the universal covering $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$, and $f: Y \rightarrow B\pi$ an arbitrary continuous map.*

If $w \in H^2(B\pi, \mathbb{R})$ is a cohomology class such that $c_{\tilde{X}, X}^ w \in V_{\text{hyp}}^2(X)$, then $f^* w \in V_{\text{hyp}}^2(Y)$.*

Remark 2.7. Consider a finitely presented group G . Such a group can be realized as the fundamental group of a compact, connected, smooth manifold of dimension 4 (or higher) X . Such a manifold can always be triangulated, i.e. it is homeomorphic to a finite simplicial complex.

What the theorem says in particular is that in order to detect which classes $w \in H^2(BG, \mathbb{R})$ are hyperbolic, it is sufficient to check that the pull-back of w to X via the classifying map of its universal covering is hyperbolic.

Here is a fundamental consequence for us, which is mentioned in [BKS24], and for which we reproduce a proof here.

Corollary 2.8. *For the hyperbolic subspace in degree 2 of a finite simplicial complex X , we have*

$$c_{\tilde{X}, X}^*(V_{\text{hyp}}^2(BG)) = V_{\text{hyp}}^2(X).$$

In particular, we see that $V_{\text{hyp}}^2(X)$ depends only on the fundamental group of X , since different (that is, relative to different G -principal bundle structures) classifying maps of the universal covering yields the same image.

During the proof we shall need the following fact, surely well-known to experts.

Lemma 2.9. *The pull-back $c_{\tilde{X}, X}^*: H^2(BG, \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$ is injective and, more importantly,*

$$c_{\tilde{X}, X}^*(H^2(BG, \mathbb{R})) = V_{\text{asph}}^2(X).$$

Proof. First, every class in $H^k(BG, \mathbb{R})$, $k \geq 2$, is aspherical. This is because, for Z a (nice) topological space, a class in $H^k(Z, \mathbb{R})$ is aspherical if and only if its kernel as a linear functional on $H_k(Z, \mathbb{R})$ contains the image of the Hurewicz homomorphism $\pi_k(Z) \rightarrow H_k(Z, \mathbb{R})$, and by definition we have $\pi_k(BG) = 0$ as soon as $k \geq 2$. Moreover, the image of an aspherical class belonging to $V_{\text{asph}}^2(BG) = H^2(BG, \mathbb{R})$ via the pull-back is obviously aspherical.

Now, we can construct a model of BG by attaching cells of dimension 3 or higher to X to make the universal cover contractible without affecting $\pi_1(X)$. So, we can suppose that $X \subset BG$, the classifying map $c_{\tilde{X}, X}$ is the inclusion, and moreover X and BG share the same 2-skeleton. In particular, the relative homology $H_2(BG, X, \mathbb{R})$ vanishes and by duality so does $H^2(BG, X, \mathbb{R})$. We now form the long exact sequence of the pair $X \subset BG$

in cohomology, to get

$$0 \rightarrow H^2(BG, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^2(X, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\partial} H^3(BG, X, \mathbb{R}),$$

where ∂ is the connecting homomorphism, which gives injectivity at once. It only remains to prove that if $w \in V_{\text{asph}}^2(X)$, then $\partial(w) = 0$. This is seen directly, since $\partial(w) \in H_3(BG, X, \mathbb{R})^*$ acts on a relative 3-cycle $\gamma + C_3(X)$ by $\partial(w)(\gamma + C_3(X)) = w(\partial_3\gamma)$, where ∂_3 is the boundary operator and $\partial_3\gamma \in Z_2(X)$ is a 2-cycle in X which, if non trivial, comes from a 3-cell attached to X so that $\partial_3\gamma$ is homeomorphic to S^2 . Therefore, $w(\partial_3\gamma) = 0$ since w is aspherical. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.8. We have by definition $c_{\tilde{X}, X}^*(V_{\text{hyp}}^2(BG)) \subset V_{\text{hyp}}^2(X)$. For the other inclusion, if $\alpha \in V_{\text{hyp}}^2(X)$, then $\alpha \in V_{\text{asph}}^2(X)$, and thus by Lemma 2.9 there exists $w \in H^2(BG, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\alpha = c_{\tilde{X}, X}^*w$, so that the pull-back $c_{\tilde{X}, X}^*w$ is hyperbolic. But then, by Theorem 2.6, the pull-back of w to any finite simplicial complex is hyperbolic, i.e. $w \in V_{\text{hyp}}^2(BG)$. \square

2.3. Bounded cohomology and hyperbolic classes. Before stating the next lemma, let us recall that the cohomology of a group G can be computed by means of the usual (inhomogeneous) cochains complex

$$C^k(G, \mathbb{R}) := \{c: G^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$$

together with the differential

$$\begin{aligned} (dc)(g_1, \dots, g_{k+1}) &:= c(g_2, \dots, g_{k+1}) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^i c(g_1, \dots, g_{i-1}, g_i g_{i+1}, g_{i+2}, \dots, g_{k+1}) + (-1)^{k+1} c(g_1, \dots, g_k). \end{aligned}$$

The subspace of bounded cochains

$$C_b^k(G, \mathbb{R}) := \{c: G^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid c \text{ is bounded}\}$$

is stable under d and gives rise to the complex of bounded cochains; the corresponding cohomology groups

$$H_b^k(G, \mathbb{R}) := H^k(C_b^\bullet(G, \mathbb{R}), d)$$

are the so-called groups of bounded cohomology (see [Fri17] for a more in-depth discussion). Let us finally observe that the natural inclusion of complexes

$$C_b^\bullet(G, \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow C^\bullet(G, \mathbb{R})$$

induces natural maps in cohomology

$$H_b^k(G, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^k(G, \mathbb{R}) \simeq H^k(BG, \mathbb{R}).$$

As above, we focus on the degree 2 case and state the following result, possibly well-known to experts.

Lemma 2.10. *For any finitely presented group G we have an inclusion*

$$\text{Im}(H_b^2(G, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^2(G, \mathbb{R})) \subset V_{\text{hyp}}^2(BG).$$

In particular, if G is Gromov hyperbolic, then we have:

$$H^2(G, \mathbb{R}) = V_{\text{hyp}}^2(BG).$$

Proof. According to Remark 2.7, we can pick any compact differentiable manifold X such that $\pi_1(X) \simeq G$ to check that a bounded 2-class gives rise to a hyperbolic one. Let $c \in C_b^2(G, \mathbb{R})$ be a bounded cochain that is a cocycle; it satisfies that for all $(g, h, k) \in G^3$

$$c(g, h) = c(h, k) - c(gh, k) + c(g, hk).$$

We can rewrite it in the following form: for all $(g, h, \gamma) \in G^3$

$$(1) \quad c(\gamma^{-1}g, g^{-1}h) = c(g, g^{-1}h) - c(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}h) + c(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}g).$$

We now explain how to construct an exact 2-form α defined on the universal covering \tilde{X} which has a bounded primitive, is invariant under the action of the group $G = \pi_1(X)$, and corresponds to the pull-back to \tilde{X} of the cochain c . These properties together ensure that α descends to X and gives a hyperbolic class in $H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$ which is the pull-back of c .

To do so, let us fix a finite open cover $\{V_i\}_{i \in I}$ of X with V_i simply connected. It follows that the V_i 's are evenly covered by the universal covering map $p: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$. We can thus choose one connected component U_i of $p^{-1}(V_i)$ and get

$$p^{-1}(V_i) = \bigcup_{g \in G} gU_i.$$

Finally, let us denote by $\{\chi_i\}_{i \in I}$ a partition of unity subordinate to the open covering $\{V_i\}_{i \in I}$; it induces a partition of unity on \tilde{X} , to be denoted by $\{\chi_{i,g}\}_{(i,g) \in I \times G}$, subordinated to the open covering $\{gU_i\}_{(i,g) \in I \times G}$. The function $\chi_{i,g}$ is supported in gU_i and is nothing but $\chi_i \circ p|_{gU_i}$. This family enjoys the obvious equivariance property that for all $(\gamma, g) \in G^2$ and for all $i \in I$

$$(2) \quad \gamma^* \chi_{i,g} = \chi_{i,\gamma g}.$$

With this in hand, let us consider

$$\alpha := \sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in I^2 \\ (g,h) \in G^2}} c(g, g^{-1}h) d\chi_{i,g} \wedge d\chi_{j,h} = d \left(\sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in I^2 \\ (g,h) \in G^2}} c(g, g^{-1}h) \chi_{i,g} \wedge d\chi_{j,h} \right).$$

The last equality implies easily that α has a bounded primitive since c is a bounded cochain, the $\chi_{i,g}$'s come from downstairs and I is finite. Now, let

us check that α is invariant under the action of $\gamma \in G$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma^* \alpha &= \sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in I^2 \\ (g,h) \in G^2}} c(g, g^{-1}h) \gamma^* (d\chi_{i,g} \wedge d\chi_{j,h}) \\
(3) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in I^2 \\ (g,h) \in G^2}} c(g, g^{-1}h) d\chi_{i,\gamma g} \wedge d\chi_{j,\gamma h} \\
(4) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in I^2 \\ (g,h) \in G^2}} c(\gamma^{-1}g, g^{-1}h) d\chi_{i,g} \wedge d\chi_{j,h} \\
(5) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in I^2 \\ (g,h) \in G^2}} (c(g, g^{-1}h) - c(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}h) + c(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}g)) d\chi_{i,g} \wedge d\chi_{j,h} \\
&= \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the equality (3) is just the equivariance property (2), equality (4) is a change of variables, and equality (5) is nothing but the cocycle property (1). To see that the remaining terms of the sum vanish, it suffices to observe that we can rewrite the corresponding sum as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in I^2 \\ (g,h) \in G^2}} c(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}h) d\chi_{i,g} \wedge d\chi_{j,h} \\
&= - \sum_{(j,h) \in I \times G} c(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}h) d\chi_{j,h} \wedge d\left(\sum_{(i,g) \in I \times G} \chi_{i,g} \right) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

since the sum in parenthesis is identically equal to 1.

The last assertion concerning Gromov hyperbolic groups is a consequence of [Min01, Theorem 11]: for such a group the natural maps

$$H_b^k(G, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^k(G, \mathbb{R})$$

are surjective for any $k \geq 2$. \square

3. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

With all the tools previously developed, we are now in a very good position to prove our Main Theorem.

So, let $\mu: Z \rightarrow X$ be a modification of compact Kähler manifolds, and take $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_Z$. We want to show that $\mu_*\alpha$ is in \mathcal{W}_X .

First of all, since α is a big class and μ is surjective between equidimensional manifolds, Proposition 2.1 gives that $\mu_*\alpha$ is a big class.

To show the nefness of $\mu_*\alpha$ is subtler, since in general it is false as we observed in Remark 2.3. This will be achieved together with \tilde{d} -boundedness of $\mu_*\alpha$ thanks to the topological description of classes which are \tilde{d} -bounded by Brunnbauer, Kotschick, and Schönliener, as follows.

Let $G = \pi_1(X)$, and fix a universal covering \tilde{X} of X . Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & BG \\
 & \nearrow^{c_{\tilde{X},X} \circ \mu} & \\
 Z & & \\
 \searrow \mu & & \nearrow c_{\tilde{X},X} \\
 & X &
 \end{array}$$

The map μ is a modification between smooth manifold, and thus

$$\mu_*: \pi_1(Z) \rightarrow \pi_1(X) = G$$

is an isomorphism (see e.g. [BP21, Proposition 2.3]). Therefore, pulling-back via μ the universal covering \tilde{X} of X gives a universal covering of $\tilde{Z} \rightarrow Z$. By construction, \tilde{Z} is the pull-back of EG via $c_{\tilde{X},X} \circ \mu$, so that

$$c_{\tilde{X},X} \circ \mu = c_{\tilde{Z},Z}$$

is the classifying map of the universal covering \tilde{Z} as a G -principal bundle on Z .

Since $\alpha \in V_{\text{hyp}}^2(Z)$, by Corollary 2.8, there exists a (unique) class $w \in V_{\text{hyp}}^2(BG)$ such that $c_{\tilde{Z},Z}^* w = \alpha$. Call $\beta := c_{\tilde{X},X}^* w \in V_{\text{hyp}}^2(X)$. Then, we have $\alpha = \mu^* \beta$ by construction and, since μ is a modification, we also have

$$\mu_* \alpha = \mu_* \mu^* \beta = \beta,$$

so that β is a real $(1,1)$ -class which is, by definition of $V_{\text{hyp}}^2(BG)$, \tilde{d} -bounded. What we have gained is that $\alpha = \mu^* \beta$ is now a pull-back via the surjective holomorphic map μ . Thus, we can apply Proposition 2.2 to obtain that β is nef, since α is nef. We already saw that β is big, and therefore $\beta \in \mathcal{W}_X$, as desired.

Remark 3.1. What did we really use in the above proof? In order to obtain the bigness of $\mu_* \alpha$, we apply Proposition 2.1 which needs μ to be a surjective holomorphic map between compact Kähler manifolds of the same dimension. Thus, here everything works even if μ is supposed to be generically finite and surjective.

Next, in order to obtain α as the pull-back of β we need the induced morphism $\mu_*: \pi_1(Z) \rightarrow \pi_1(X)$ on fundamental groups to be an isomorphism.

Then, to say that $\mu_* \alpha = \beta$ we use that μ is a modification. But if μ is merely supposed to be a generically finite map of degree m , then we would have obtained $\mu_* \alpha = m\beta$ so that $\beta = \frac{1}{m} \mu_* \alpha$ would still be a real \tilde{d} -bounded $(1,1)$ -class.

Finally, in order to be able to apply Proposition 2.2 we just need surjectivity of μ .

Summing up, our Main Theorem is still valid in the more general context of a generically finite surjective holomorphic map $\mu: Z \rightarrow X$, provided μ induces an isomorphism at the level of fundamental group.

4. PROOFS OF COROLLARIES

In this section we give proofs of the corollaries of our Main Theorem stated in the introduction.

4.1. Proof of Corollary 1.2. Let $f: X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a bimeromorphic mapping. Then, by resolving the singularities of the closure of the graph of f in $X \times Y$, we get a compact Kähler manifold Z together with modifications $p: Z \rightarrow X$ and $q: Z \rightarrow Y$ as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Z & \\ p \swarrow & & \searrow q \\ X & \dashrightarrow f \dashrightarrow & Y. \end{array}$$

Now, take $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_X$. We want to show that $\beta := f_*\alpha = q_*p^*\alpha$ gives a class in \mathcal{W}_Y . By [BDET24, Proposition 2.29] $\tilde{\alpha} := p^*\alpha$ is a weakly Kähler hyperbolic class in \mathcal{W}_Z , therefore $q_*\tilde{\alpha}$ is a weakly Kähler hyperbolic class in \mathcal{W}_Y , by our Main Theorem.

4.2. Proof of Corollary 1.3. Let $f: X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a generically finite dominant meromorphic mapping. Then, by resolving the singularities of the closure of the graph of f in $X \times Y$, we get a compact Kähler manifold Z together with a modification $p: Z \rightarrow X$ and, this time, a generically finite surjective holomorphic map $q: Z \rightarrow Y$ as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Z & \\ p \swarrow & & \searrow q \\ X & \dashrightarrow f \dashrightarrow & Y. \end{array}$$

Now, take $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_Y$. Here, we want to show that $\beta := p_*q^*\alpha$ gives a class in \mathcal{W}_X . By [BDET24, Proposition 2.29] $\tilde{\alpha} := q^*\alpha$ is a weakly Kähler hyperbolic class in \mathcal{W}_Z , therefore $p_*\tilde{\alpha}$ is a weakly Kähler hyperbolic class in \mathcal{W}_X , by our Main Theorem.

Before we start the proof of the converse, let us briefly explain what is the morphism induced on fundamental groups by the meromorphic mapping f . It is by definition the composition

$$f_* := q_* \circ (p_*)^{-1}: \pi_1(X) \rightarrow \pi_1(Z) \rightarrow \pi_1(Y),$$

which can be taken since p is a modification and therefore p_* is an isomorphism. It is straightforward to check that the morphism f_* is independent of the smooth bimeromorphic model Z chosen to desingularize the closure

Theorem 5.1. *Up to replacing G with a finite index subgroup, the manifold X_{tor} is weakly Kähler hyperbolic.*

Moreover, it is not isomorphic to a modification of a Kähler hyperbolic manifold.

Proof. According to [Zhu24, Lemma 3.2], we know that X_{BB} is aspherical and that $\pi_1(X_{\text{BB}})$ is Gromov-hyperbolic (this is only achieved after replacing G with a finite index subgroup). Asphericity implies that

$$H^2(X_{\text{BB}}, \mathbb{R}) = H^2(\pi_1(X_{\text{BB}}), \mathbb{R}),$$

and according to Lemma 2.10 and Gromov-hyperbolicity of $\pi_1(X_{\text{BB}})$, we infer that

$$H^2(X_{\text{BB}}, \mathbb{R}) = V_{\text{hyp}}^2(\pi_1(X_{\text{BB}})).$$

Consider an embedding $\iota: X_{\text{BB}} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ and the contraction of the exceptional tori $\pi: X_{\text{tor}} \rightarrow X_{\text{BB}}$. Since any class in $H^2(X_{\text{BB}}, \mathbb{R})$ is hyperbolic, we can pick an ample class α in \mathbb{P}^N and pull it back via $\iota \circ \pi$ to X_{tor} . This class $\omega = (\iota \circ \pi)^*\alpha$ is obviously big and nef and it is also hyperbolic since $\iota^*\alpha$ is so.

Let us now check that X_{tor} does not admit any modification onto a Kähler hyperbolic manifold Z . By contradiction, suppose $\mu: X_{\text{tor}} \rightarrow Z$ is such a modification. Through a general point of the exceptional locus of μ there is a rational curve (which is contracted by μ), [Deb01, Proposition 1.43]; any rational curve in X_{tor} is not contained in the exceptional locus of $\pi: X_{\text{tor}} \rightarrow X_{\text{BB}}$ since it consists of tori. Now, for the class ω above the null locus coincides with the union of the π -exceptional tori, and any rational curve must be contained in this null locus. The upshot is that X_{tor} cannot contain any rational curve and μ must be a biholomorphism, but this is impossible since X_{tor} contains tori, and Z does not, being Kähler hyperbolic.

Observe that by [Sar23, Corollary 3], X_{tor} has a Kähler metric with non-positive holomorphic sectional curvature, which can be used to exclude directly the existence of rational curves in X_{tor} . \square

REFERENCES

- [AMRT10] Avner Ash, David Mumford, Michael Rapoport, and Yung-Sheng Tai, *Smooth compactifications of locally symmetric varieties. With the collaboration of Peter Scholze*, 2nd ed. ed., Camb. Math. Libr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010 (English).
- [BDET24] Francesco Bei, Simone Diverio, Philippe Eyssidieux, and Stefano Trapani, *Weakly Kähler hyperbolic manifolds and the Green–Griffiths–Lang conjecture*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **807** (2024), 257–297. MR 4698497
- [BKS24] M. Brunnbauer, D. Kotschick, and L. Schönliener, *On atoroidal and hyperbolic cohomology classes*, *Topology Appl.* **344** (2024), 108830. MR 4696270
- [Bou02] Sébastien Boucksom, *On the volume of a line bundle*, *Internat. J. Math.* **13** (2002), no. 10, 1043–1063. MR 1945706
- [BP21] Francesco Bei and Paolo Piazza, *A note on higher Todd genera of complex manifolds*, *Rend. Mat. Appl. (7)* **42** (2021), no. 1, 49–60. MR 4222815

- [Deb01] Olivier Debarre, *Higher-dimensional algebraic geometry*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001. MR 1841091
- [Fri17] Roberto Frigerio, *Bounded cohomology of discrete groups*, Math. Surv. Monogr., vol. 227, Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2017 (English).
- [Gro91] M. Gromov, *Kähler hyperbolicity and L_2 -Hodge theory*, J. Differential Geom. **33** (1991), no. 1, 263–292. MR 1085144
- [Keđ09] Jarek Keđra, *Symplectically hyperbolic manifolds*, Differential Geom. Appl. **27** (2009), no. 4, 455–463. MR 2547825
- [Kol95] János Kollár, *Shafarevich maps and automorphic forms*, M. B. Porter Lectures, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995. MR 1341589
- [Min01] I. Mineyev, *Straightening and bounded cohomology of hyperbolic groups*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **11** (2001), no. 4, 807–839 (English).
- [Mok12] Ngaiming Mok, *Projective algebraicity of minimal compactifications of complex-hyperbolic space forms of finite volume*, Perspectives in analysis, geometry, and topology, Progr. Math., vol. 296, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012, pp. 331–354. MR 2884042
- [Pău98] Mihai Păun, *Sur l’effectivité numérique des images inverses de fibrés en droites*, Math. Ann. **310** (1998), no. 3, 411–421. MR 1612321
- [Sar23] William Sarem, *Curvature properties and shafarevich conjecture for toroidal compactifications of ball quotients*, arXiv e-print 2306.07692 (2023).
- [Zhu24] Kejia Zhu, *A note on complex hyperbolic lattices and strict hyperbolization*, arXiv e-print 2402.04576 (2024).

FRANCESCO BEI AND SIMONE DIVERIO, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “GUIDO CASTELNUOVO”, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA, PIAZZALE ALDO MORO 5, I-00185 ROMA.

Email address: `bei@mat.uniroma1.it`, `diverio@mat.uniroma1.it`

BENOÎT CLAUDON, UNIV RENNES, CNRS, IRMAR - UMR 6625, F-35000 RENNES, FRANCE, AND INSTITUT UNIVERSITAIRE DE FRANCE

Email address: `benoit.claudon@univ-rennes1.fr`

STEFANO TRAPANI, UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA “TOR VERGATA”, VIA DELLA RICERCA SCIENTIFICA 1, I-00133 ROMA.

Email address: `trapani@mat.uniroma2.it`