

EQUIVARIANT ELLIPTIC COHOMOLOGY AND MAPPING STACKS I

NICOLÒ SIBILLA AND PAOLO TOMASINI

ABSTRACT. Our aim in this paper is obtaining a new geometric construction of equivariant elliptic cohomology in terms of functions over a stack of maps out of the elliptic curve. In this paper we accomplish only the first half of this goal. We introduce a new cohomology theory of stacks, called *elliptic Hochschild homology*, we prove its fundamental properties, and compute it in interesting classes of examples. We show that the local behaviour of elliptic Hochschild homology of global quotient stacks exactly matches Grojnowski's description of equivariant elliptic cohomology. As a byproduct of our general results, we show that elliptic Hochschild homology recovers equivariant elliptic cohomology in the toric setting. For general varieties an extra step is required. Namely, elliptic Hochschild homology stands in the same relationship to elliptic cohomology as Hochschild homology to de Rham cohomology. In particular, the difference between the two vanishes when passing to the Tate fixed points under a natural action. The general comparison will not be proved in this article, but will appear in the forthcoming companion article [ST].

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	9
3. Codescent for quasi-constant maps	21
4. Calculations. The local model, and toric varieties.	34
5. Equivariant Elliptic Hochschild Homology	38
References	50

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study a new construction of equivariant elliptic cohomology via derived algebraic geometry. The use of techniques from derived algebraic geometry is by now pervasive in the study of elliptic cohomology, especially after the groundbreaking work of Lurie. However our aims here are more limited and somewhat different in spirit. First, we are only interested in rational phenomena, and therefore we will work over a fixed ground field of characteristic zero. Our goal is providing a geometric interpretation of the equivariant elliptic cohomology of algebraic varieties equipped with the action of an algebraic group G . We will show that the G -equivariant elliptic cohomology of a variety X can be described in terms of functions over a certain substack of the mapping stack

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, [X/G])$$

where E is an elliptic curve over k , and $[X/G]$ is the stacky quotient of X by G . Our approach is closely related to earlier works by other authors including Gorbounov–Malikov–Schechtman–Vaintrob [GMS99] [MSV98] [MS99b] [MS99a], Berwick-Evans [BE22] and Berwick-Evans–Tripathy [BET21], Costello [Cos] [Cos11] and others.

This is the first article in a series, and we should stress here we will only tell only part of this story. Namely, we will introduce the substack of $\underline{\text{Map}}(E, [X/G])$ parametrizing *almost constant maps* to $[X/G]$. We will show that functions over the stack of almost constant maps define a cohomology theory of stacks, which we call *elliptic Hochschild homology*. Then we will study the formal properties of elliptic Hochschild homology, and compute it in important classes of examples. The proof of the comparison with rationalized equivariant elliptic cohomology will appear in the forthcoming companion article [ST]. The comparison requires an additional step, namely passing to the Tate fixed points under a natural action. This is familiar from the theory of classical Hochschild homology, which recovers periodized de Rham cohomology only after passing to the Tate fixed points for the natural S^1 -action. The relationship between elliptic Hochschild homology and elliptic cohomology is entirely parallel to this. Also, we remark that in this article we shall restrict to the case where the group G is an algebraic torus. We defer the treatment of equivariance with respect to a general reductive group G to the follow-up paper [ST].

Equivariant elliptic cohomology. Elliptic genera were first introduced by Ochanine in the 80's. Subsequently Witten introduced what is now called the Witten genus, which is a kind of universal elliptic genus, as the index of a Dirac operator on the loop space [Wit88]. The work of Witten showed that elliptic genera had deep ties to quantum field theory [Wit87], and spurred a great deal of research in the area. Elliptic cohomology was introduced in the late 80-s to provide a conceptual framework for the study of elliptic genera. Elliptic cohomologies are even periodic cohomology theories whose associated formal group law is isomorphic to the completion of an elliptic curve at the identity. They have been the focus of great interest within homotopy theory for the last thirty years. Giving a satisfactory construction of elliptic cohomology, and its universal variant Tmf , is highly non-trivial. The state-of-the art is provided by ongoing work of Lurie [Lurc], [Lurd], [Lure], which depends in a crucial way on the comprehensive foundations for ∞ -categories and spectral geometry which he has been developing in a series of books [Lur09], [Lurg], [Lurf], and by independent work of Gepner and Meier [GM20] in the equivariant case.

It was understood early on by Ginzburg–Kapranov–Vasserot and Grojnowski that rationalized equivariant elliptic cohomology should give rise to coherent sheaves over the elliptic curve itself [GKV95] [Gro07]. This fits into a well established paradigm, first evinced by Atiyah–Segal's work on equivariant K-theory, that turning on equivariance is closely related to decompleting. In particular, as the formal group law of elliptic cohomology theories is the completion of an elliptic curve E at the identity, the equivariant elliptic cohomology of a space X with an S^1 -action should take values in coherent sheaves over E . Further, the stalks of this coherent sheaf can be also understood geometrically: they compute the Borel equivariant cohomology of various fixed points loci of X . Equivariance with respect to general Lie groups can be also understood in similar terms, and gives rise to coherent sheaves over the moduli of G -bundles over E . In the influential article [Gro07], Grojnowski

gives a beautiful construction of rationalized equivariant elliptic cohomology which implements this picture. Our work in this paper provides in particular a geometric explanation of Grojnowski’s construction in terms of the deformation theory of (almost constant) maps out of elliptic curves.

Elliptic cocycles and secondary Hochschild homology. One of the main challenges in elliptic cohomology is providing a geometric description of elliptic cocycles. Several influential proposals have been put forward starting from Segal’s famous 1988 lecture at the Bourbaki seminar [Seg88], and subsequent work of Stolz–Teichner [ST04], [ST11]. An implementation of this circle of ideas based on the concept of conformal nets has been pursued by Douglas, Bartels and Henriques in a series of works: we refer the reader to [DH11] for an overview of this important perspective.

A different, but related, point of view is that elliptic cohomology should be in some sense a categorification of K-theory. That fits with the heuristics that raising the chromatic level should be related to categorification. This suggests in particular that elliptic cocycles could be represented by appropriate categorified bundles. These ideas have been implemented in [BDR]. Within algebraic geometry, this perspective has been taken up by Toën–Vezzosi, who introduced *secondary Hochschild homology* as a model of elliptic cohomology. We refer the reader to the introduction of [TV09] for a beautiful discussion of these ideas, and also [TV14]. In this paper we do not attempt to provide a geometric interpretation of elliptic cocycles, although this is one of the broader goals of our project. However the definition of secondary Hochschild homology was an important motivation for our work, and thus it is useful to review it here and contrast it with our construction.

Recall that the Hochschild homology of a scheme X is given by the global sections of the structure sheaf of the derived loop space of X ,

$$\mathrm{HH}_*(X) \simeq \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}X)$$

Here the derived loop space $\mathcal{L}X = \mathrm{Map}(S^1, X)$ is the stack of maps from S^1 to X . Secondary Hochschild homology is defined as the global sections of the structure sheaf of the *double loop space* of X

$$(1) \quad \mathrm{HH}_*^{(2)}(X) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}X)$$

As a model of elliptic cohomology, $\mathrm{HH}_*^{(2)}(X)$ has several desirable features. First, the double loop space

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}X = \mathrm{Map}(S^1 \times S^1, X)$$

is the moduli space of maps out of a topological torus, which captures the underlying topology of an elliptic curve. Additionally categorified bundles yield cocycles in $\mathrm{HH}_*^{(2)}(X)$, as the heuristics on elliptic cohomology would dictate. See also [HSS17, HSS21] for additional information on secondary Hochschild homology and its properties.

On the other hand secondary Hochschild homology is insensitive to the complex moduli of elliptic curves, and therefore cannot be hoped to fully capture elliptic cohomology. Our construction can be described as a variant of (1), where we promote the topological torus $S^1 \times S^1$ to an elliptic curve E over a field k . When the ground field k is the field of complex numbers \mathbb{C} , and X is a complex scheme with an action of an algebraic group G , the

resulting theory is closely related to the complexified (equivariant) elliptic cohomology of the analytification of X ; and recovers it after passing to Tate fixed points for an appropriate action. One key difference with (1) is that the full mapping stack

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, X)$$

is too large, in general, as there might be topologically non-trivial maps between E and X . From the perspective of elliptic cohomology, the only maps that contribute are the *almost constant* ones. As we explain next, this concept can be easily formalized.

Almost constant maps. We fix a ground field k of characteristic zero, and an elliptic curve E over k . Let T be an algebraic torus and let X be a variety equipped with a T -action. We denote by

$$(2) \quad \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \subset \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, [X/T])$$

the smallest clopen substack containing the trivial maps, i.e. the maps factoring as

$$E \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(k) \rightarrow [X/T]$$

We call $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ the stack of *almost constant maps*.

In the main text we will consider a more general setting where T is the product of an algebraic torus and a finite abelian group. By itself this would be only a generalization of minor interest, but it turns out to be needed to carry out the argument, even if one is only interested in actions of connected tori. Working in that generality however requires tweaking somewhat the definition of quasi-constant maps. For the rest of this introduction however we will bracket this issue, and restrict attention to the case when T is a connected torus.

Working with maps that are close to being constant is familiar from many geometric contexts. The product structure on Chen–Ruan orbifold cohomology, for instance, is governed by almost constant maps out of marked rational curves. For an example which is closely related to our story recall that, in defining the Witten genus via Dirac operator on the loop space, Witten and Taubes actually work with *small loops*: i.e. with the normal bundle to constant loops, rather than with the full loop space. We regard almost constant maps out of E as an analogue, in our setting, of Witten and Taubes’ small loops.

A key property of the stack of quasi-constant maps is that it satisfies a form of Zariski codescent on the target.

Theorem A (Theorem 3.15). *Let $U_i \rightarrow X$ be a T -equivariant Zariski open cover. Then the natural map*

$$\varinjlim_i \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [U_i/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$$

is an equivalence.

Theorem A plays a crucial role in our construction. Codescent fails in general for the full mapping stack, as topologically non-trivial maps will not factor through any equivariant Zariski open cover of X . The fact that codescent holds for almost constant maps should be viewed as a counterpart of the Mayer–Vietoris principle in elliptic cohomology. It is an interesting question to what extent codescent is a general feature of stacks of almost constant maps from an arbitrary source; we refer the reader to Remark 3.1.1 in the main text for additional comments on this point.

Elliptic Hochschild homology. The stack of almost constant maps carries a structure morphism

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [pt/T]) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Pic}}^0(E) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T}$$

where T^\vee is the cocharacter lattice of T . The stack $\underline{\mathrm{Pic}}^0(E)$ is the connected component of the Picard stack of E which parametrizes degree 0 line bundles. We can rewrite this as

$$\underline{\mathrm{Pic}}^0(E) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T} \simeq (\mathrm{Pic}^0(E) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T}) \times [pt/T] \simeq (E \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T}) \times [pt/T] \simeq E^n \times [pt/T]$$

where $\mathrm{Pic}^0(E)$ is the Picard scheme of E and n is the rank of T . In particular, we have a natural map

$$p : \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Pic}^0(E) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} T^\vee$$

We set $E_T := \mathrm{Pic}^0(E) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} T^\vee$.

The following is the most important definition of this article.

Definition B. *The T -equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology of X is*

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) := p_*(\mathcal{O}_{\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])}) \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(E_T)$$

We denote by $\mathrm{HH}_E([X/T])$ the global sections of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$.

Note that, as a consequence of Theorem A, the sheaf $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ satisfies T -equivariant Zariski descent on X . That is, if $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}$ is a T -equivariant Zariski open cover of X

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) \simeq \varprojlim_i \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([U_i/T])$$

Remark 1.1. *The terminology elliptic Hochschild homology was already used by Moulinos-Robalo-Toën in the beautiful recent paper [MRT19] to refer to a seemingly different construction. There are differences between our setting and theirs. They work over a p -adic ring of integers R ; additionally they do not consider the equivariant setting, which is of primary importance for us.*

Note that Definition B does not depend on the choice of ground ring, and therefore makes sense also over a ring of p -adic integers. In this article we place ourselves over a field k of char. 0 because we are interested in establishing properties of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ which only hold in that setting; and ultimately we want to set $k = \mathbb{C}$ and compare our theory with complexified equivariant elliptic cohomology of the analytification of X . We claim however that if X is a derived scheme over R as considered in [MRT19], and T is the trivial group, then Definition B is equivalent to the elliptic Hochschild homology of X as defined in [MRT19]. This comparison result will appear in forthcoming work. This justifies our usage of the term elliptic Hochschild homology, as it is compatible with its earlier definition in [MRT19].

In this article we establish several fundamental formal properties of elliptic Hochschild homology. Our main results are a *localization theorem* for elliptic Hochschild homology, and a calculation of its *analytic stalks*. These results, which we will explain in the next section of this introduction, ought to be considered as direct analogues of the local structure of rationalized equivariant elliptic cohomology that was first described by Grojnowski in [Gro07]. They are the key steps to achieve a comparison with the equivariant elliptic cohomology of the analytification which will be established in the companion paper [ST]. A more recent reference, which is more closely related to our work from a methodological standpoint, is

the description of the local structure of Hochschild homology of global quotient stacks in [Che20].

Before presenting these results however, let us explain in some more detail the relationship between $\mathcal{HH}_E([X/T])$ and equivariant elliptic cohomology; and also discuss interesting classes of examples for which $\mathcal{HH}_E([X/T])$ can be explicitly computed. As we stressed, when $k = \mathbb{C}$, the equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology of a T -variety X is closely related to rationalized equivariant elliptic cohomology of the analytification of X . In fact, the two stand in the same relationship as Hochschild homology and de Rham cohomology, or rather rationalized equivariant complex K-theory. If X is a variety it is well-known that the Tate fixed points of the natural S^1 -action on

$$\mathrm{HH}_*(X) \simeq \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}X)$$

are equivalent to the \mathbb{Z}_2 -periodic de Rham cohomology of the analytification of X . This picture can be upgraded to incorporate equivariance under the action of a reductive group. It follows from work of Chen [Che20] and Halpern-Leistner–Pomerleano [HLP20] that the Tate fixed points of $\mathrm{HH}_*([X/G])$ compute the complexified G -equivariant K-theory of the analytification of X ; and further that the local behaviour of $\mathrm{HH}_*([X/G])$ over

$$\mathrm{Spec}(\mathrm{HH}_*([*/G])) \simeq G//G$$

recovers the well known description of the completions of genuine equivariant K-theory which ultimately goes back to Atiyah–Segal [AS69], see also [AHJM88].

Our work establishes an analogous picture relating equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology and complexified equivariant elliptic cohomology. The role of the S^1 -action is played by the natural action of the affinization of E . As we explained, in this article we study $\mathcal{HH}_E([X/T])$ per se, and defer to the forthcoming companion paper the proof of the comparison with equivariant elliptic cohomology. Let us blur the distinction between the two for the moment, as it is easily controlled by the E -action. Then our definition of equivariant elliptic (Hochschild) homology is closely tied to parallel constructions by Berwick–Evans and Tripathy in the differentiable category [BET21].

Let us explain next two classes of examples for which $\mathcal{HH}_E(X)$ can be explicitly computed. The first observation is that, as expected, in the absence of a group action elliptic Hochschild homology coincides with ordinary Hochschild homology. This is an analogue of the fact that, in the non-equivariant regime, rationalization collapses all cohomology theories to singular cohomology.

Theorem C (Corollary 3.10). *Let T be the trivial group. Then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{HH}_E(X) \simeq \mathrm{HH}_*(X)$$

Next, let us consider the case when X is a smooth toric variety equipped with the action of the maximal torus. Toric actions on toric varieties are treated at length in Section 4, for several reasons. First, calculations on affine spaces and projective spaces equipped with a torus actions are the cornerstone of our general structure results, as varieties equipped with a T -action admit an equivariant local embedding in affine space. Second, toric varieties provide fully computable examples of our theory owing to the codescent Theorem A. In

particular, when X is a smooth toric variety equipped with the action of a maximal torus T we have the following result.

Assume that $k = \mathbb{C}$ and let X be a smooth toric variety equipped with the action of the maximal torus T . We denote by $\mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{an})$ the complexified T -equivariant elliptic cohomology of X viewed as \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded coherent sheaf over E_T

$$\mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{an}) \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(E_T)_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$$

where the index \mathbb{Z}_2 indicates that we are taking the \mathbb{Z}_2 -folding of the stable category of quasi-coherent sheaves. The category $\mathrm{Qcoh}(E_T)_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$ carries an action of $k[u, u^{-1}]$, where u has degree two, witnessing the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading. If \mathcal{F} is a quasi-coherent sheaf over $\mathrm{Pic}^0(E) \otimes T^\vee$, its \mathbb{Z}_2 -folding is the object

$$\mathcal{F}[u, u^{-1}] \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(\mathrm{Pic}^0(E) \otimes T^\vee)_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$$

Theorem D (Corollary 4.8). *There is an equivalence in $\mathrm{Qcoh}(\mathrm{Pic}^0(E) \otimes T^\vee)_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$*

$$\mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{an}) \simeq \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])[u, u^{-1}]$$

Theorem D follows from two ingredients. The first is the calculation of the elliptic Hochschild homology of the affine space \mathbb{A}^N under an arbitrary torus action, which plays a key role in the proof of our main results, Theorem E and F. The second is codescent for almost constant maps, Theorem A.

Main results: localization and formal completions. Our main results in this article are two structure theorems that describe the local behaviour of elliptic Hochschild cohomology. They are exactly parallel to features of ordinary equivariant elliptic cohomology, and they will be key in the proof of the comparison which will appear in the forthcoming companion paper [ST]. As explained by Grojnowski, the local structure of elliptic cohomology is governed by information coming from the cohomology of fixed point loci. Further, on sufficiently small neighbourhoods of points of E_T , elliptic homology is equivalent to ordinary Borel equivariant cohomology of fixed point loci. In our setting, these two claims translate into the statements of Theorem E and Theorem F respectively. Analogous statements for ordinary Hochschild homology were proved by Chen in [Che20], which was an important inspiration for our work.

As pioneered by Grojnowski and explained by Roşu, we can associate to each closed point x of E_T a subgroup $T(x)$ of T . When T is of rank one, $T(x)$ is equal to T if x is non-torsion and is equal to $\mu_n \subset \mathbb{G}_m$ if x is torsion of (exact) order n . We denote $X^{T(x)}$ the derived fixed locus of X under the induced $T(x)$ -action. The classical fixed locus is given by the truncation $t_0(X^{T(x)})$.

Theorem E (Theorem 5.3). *Let X be a smooth variety over k . Then for any closed point $x \in E_T$ there exists a Zariski open neighborhood U of x such that the natural map*

$$(3) \quad \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0 X^{T(x)}/T]) \times_{E_T} U \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \times_{E_T} U$$

induced by the inclusion $t_0 X^{T(x)} \rightarrow X$, is an equivalence.

Recall that $T \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{HH}_*([*/T])$. If Y is a stack with a T -action, the Hochschild homology $\mathrm{HH}_*([Y/T])$ carries an action of $\mathrm{HH}_*([*/T])$.

Theorem F (Theorem 5.14). *The étale stalk of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ at a point x of E_T is equivalent to the completion of $\mathrm{HH}_*([t_0 X^{T(x)}/T])$ at $1 \in T \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{HH}_*([*/T])$*

1.1. Future work. As we explained this paper is the first in a series. In the forthcoming follow-up [ST] we will complete the picture initiated in this article by accomplishing the following three main tasks

- (1) Elliptic Hochschild homology carries a natural action induced by the E -action on the mapping stack. In terms of Theorem F, passing to the Tate fixed points under this action means replacing $\mathrm{HH}_*([t_0 X^{T(x)}/T])$ with its Tate fixed points under the S^1 -action. Thus the completions of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])^{Tate}$ compute 2-periodized de Rham cohomology of fixed loci, matching Grojnowski’s description of the completions of equivariant elliptic cohomology at points of E_T .
- (2) Our main result will be a proof of the equivalence

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])^{Tate} \simeq \mathcal{E}ll_T(X)$$

To lift the local equivalences described on the previous point to a global equivalence, we will make use of the technology of adelic descent [Gro15]. By adelic descent, a sheaf is uniquely determined by the data of its completions plus various compatibilities. In his original paper, Grojnowski defined equivariant elliptic cohomology via complex analytic descent. As a byproduct of our methods we will give a new construction of Grojnowski’s equivariant elliptic cohomology via adelic descent, which works over every field of characteristic 0.

- (3) Finally, we will extend our construction to account for equivariance under the action of an arbitrary reductive group G .

The project initiated in this article is part of a broader goal to obtain geometric descriptions of elliptic cohomology and Tmf , and their cocycles. One of the next objectives in this program will be giving a geometric description of rationalized Tmf , by working with stacks of almost constant maps out of the universal cubic curve. Along the way, we will obtain in particular new geometric descriptions of equivariant singular cohomology and equivariant K-theory in terms of almost constant maps out of cuspidal, and respectively nodal, cubic curves. All these questions will be pursued in future work.

Acknowledgements: This project started from an observation of Sarah Scherotzke, which appears in this article as Theorem C. We thank Sarah for generously sharing her ideas and for her encouragement. In the very early stages of this project we had a very enlightening email exchange with Jacob Lurie, that made clear that he was already aware of the results that we present in this paper. Pavel Safronov offered key insights at various points during our work. We benefitted from conversations with many members of the community. We thank David Gepner, Lennart Meier, Tasos Moulinos, James Pascaleff, Mauro Porta, Mattia Talpo and Bertrand Toën for useful exchanges and for their encouragement. The first author wants to thank David Ben-Zvi for very inspiring conversations during a visit to Austin in 2019, which sparked his interest in elliptic cohomology. A substantial part of this project was carried out while the second author was in residence at the Hausdorff Research Institute for Mathematics, in Bonn, as a participant in the Program “Spectral Methods in Algebra, Geometry, and Topology.” We thank the HIM for excellent working conditions.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper, k is a fixed field of characteristic zero. We use the term *variety* to mean a k -scheme which is integral separated and of finite type. Unless we explicitly state otherwise, all geometric objects in the following are implicitly assumed to be defined over k .

In this paper we use the language of ∞ -categories, as developed by Jacob Lurie in [Lur09]. The theory of derived algebraic geometry is developed in the context of E_∞ -rings by Jacob Lurie in [Lurf]. We will mostly work over a field of characteristic zero, where derived rings can be modelled equivalently by simplicial commutative algebras or by commutative differential-graded algebras. In the setting of commutative cdga-s foundations for derived algebraic geometry are developed by Toën and Vezzosi in [TV02] and [TV04].

2.1. Derived stacks. We recall some basic definitions in derived algebraic geometry. Let $\mathcal{C}\text{Alg}$ be the ∞ -category of simplicial commutative rings, and $\text{dAff} = \mathcal{C}\text{Alg}^{\text{op}}$ be the ∞ -category of derived affine schemes. We also use the name *derived rings* for simplicial commutative rings. Constant simplicial commutative rings embed fully faithfully in simplicial commutative rings, and the embedding has a left adjoint corresponding to the ring of connected components functor π_0 . We will refer to constant simplicial commutative rings as *underived*, *classical*, or *discrete* rings interchangeably.

The ∞ -category of derived prestacks is the ∞ -category of functors

$$\mathcal{P}(\text{dAff}) = \text{Fun}(\text{dAff}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S})$$

from simplicial commutative rings to the ∞ -category of spaces. The ∞ -category of derived stacks is the ∞ -category of (hypercomplete) sheaves on dAff with respect to the étale topology, dSt . The category of derived stacks is naturally an ∞ -topos. We denote by Spec the Yoneda embedding functor $\mathcal{C}\text{Alg}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}\text{Alg}^{\text{op}})$.

Analogously, we can define the ∞ -category of presheaves on affine spaces as the ∞ -category of functors $\mathcal{P}(\text{Aff}) = \text{Fun}(\text{CRing}, \mathcal{S})$ from classical commutative rings to the ∞ -category of spaces. The ∞ -category of hypercomplete sheaves on CRing with respect to the étale topology is the category of *higher stacks*, St . These embed fully faithfully in derived stacks; the embedding has a right adjoint called *truncation* functor and denoted by t_0 . We use the same language as for rings, by referring to derived stacks which are equivalent to their truncation as *underived*, *classical* or *discrete*.

In a relative setting, given a simplicial commutative ring k , we define $\mathcal{C}\text{Alg}_k$ to be the ∞ -category of commutative simplicial k -algebras. We denote the ∞ -category of derived prestacks over k , $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}\text{Alg}_k^{\text{op}})$, and the ∞ -category of stacks over k , dSt_k . If k is a field of characteristic zero, the ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}\text{Alg}_k$ is equivalent to the ∞ -category $\text{dg} - \text{cAlg}_k^{\leq 0}$ of connective commutative dg algebras¹. In this paper we mostly work in this setting.

2.2. Effective epimorphisms, geometricity, connected components. The natural notion of surjectivity of a map of derived stacks is that of *effective epimorphism*.

Definition 2.1 ([Lur09], Corollary 6.2.3.5). *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of derived stacks. f is an effective epimorphism if one of the following two equivalent conditions is satisfied:*

¹This means that this dg-algebras are concentrated in nonpositive degrees in cohomological indexing convention.

- (1) f is a (-1) -truncated object in the ∞ -topos $\mathrm{dSt}/_Y$ of derived stacks over Y
- (2) The Čech nerve $\check{C}(f)$ is a simplicial resolution of Y .

Effective epimorphisms are the natural notion of surjective maps in an ∞ -topos. When specialized to the ∞ -topos of derived stacks, being an effective epimorphism is equivalent to the following property:

Property 1. *A map of derived stacks $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an effective epimorphism if for any representable $\mathrm{Spec} S$ and any map $\mathrm{Spec} S \rightarrow Y$, there exists an étale cover of S , $\{S_i\}$, such that for all i the composition $\mathrm{Spec} S_i \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} S \rightarrow Y$ admits a lift $\mathrm{Spec} S_i \rightarrow X$.*

In other words, an effective epimorphism of derived stacks is an étale locally surjective map, just as in the classical theory of sheaves a surjective map of sheaves is a locally surjective map.

There is an important class of derived stacks called *geometric* (derived) stacks. This notion is a generalization to the setting of derived algebraic geometry of the more classical notion of Artin stack. Geometric stacks are characterized by an integer number called the *geometric level*. The definition is stated inductively on the level. We will state the definition in the context of smooth maps; in this situation n -geometric stacks are also known as n -Artin stacks. For a discussion in full generality see for example [PY16].

Definition 2.2. *Let X be a derived stack.*

- X is (-1) -geometric if it is an affine derived scheme. A map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of derived stacks is (-1) -representable if for every map

$$\mathrm{Spec} A \rightarrow Y$$

from a (-1) -geometric stack $\mathrm{Spec} A$, the fiber product $\mathrm{Spec} A \times_Y X$ is (-1) -geometric. A map is (-1) -smooth if it is (-1) -representable, and the induced map

$$\mathrm{Spec} A \times_Y X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} A$$

is a smooth map of affine derived schemes.

- X is n -geometric if the diagonal map $X \rightarrow X \times X$ is $(n-1)$ -representable and there exists an effective epimorphism $\coprod \mathrm{Spec} A_i \rightarrow X$, called an n -atlas for X , where each map $\mathrm{Spec} A_i \rightarrow X$ is $(n-1)$ -smooth. We say that X is geometric if it is n -geometric for some n .
- A map of derived stacks $X \rightarrow Y$ is n -representable if for every (-1) -geometric $\mathrm{Spec} A$ and any map $\mathrm{Spec} A \rightarrow Y$, the fiber product $\mathrm{Spec} A \times_Y X$ is n -geometric.
- A map $X \rightarrow Y$ is n -smooth if it is n -representable, and for any $\mathrm{Spec} A \rightarrow Y$ there exists a n -atlas $\mathrm{Spec} B_i$ of $\mathrm{Spec} A \times_Y X$ such that for all i the composition

$$\mathrm{Spec} B_i \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} A \times_Y X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} A$$

is smooth.

There is a notion of open and closed immersion of geometric stacks.

Definition 2.3. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of derived geometric stacks. We say that f is an open (resp. closed) immersion if for any map $g : \mathrm{Spec} S \rightarrow Y$ the fiber product*

$\mathrm{Spec} S \times_Y X$ is a derived scheme, and the induced map $\mathrm{Spec} S \times_Y X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} S$ is an open (resp. closed) immersion of derived schemes.

In the context of derived schemes, the above definition is equivalent to the definitions below.

Definition 2.4 ([PV18], Definition 4.2). *A map of derived schemes $f : X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} S$ with affine target is an open immersion if there exist affine derived schemes $\mathrm{Spec} A_i \rightarrow X$ over X such that the composite map $\coprod_i \mathrm{Spec} A_i \rightarrow X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} S$ is an effective epimorphism, and each composite $\mathrm{Spec} A_i \rightarrow X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} S$ exhibits A_i as a localization of S .*

Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of derived schemes. f is an open immersion if for any affine derived scheme $\mathrm{Spec} S$, the induced map $f_S : \mathrm{Spec} S \times_Y X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} S$ is an open immersion of derived schemes with affine target.

Definition 2.5. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of derived schemes. f is a closed immersion if the map on the underlying classical schemes $t_0 f : t_0 X \rightarrow t_0 Y$ is a closed immersion of classical schemes.*

We will also need the notion of connected component of a point in a derived geometric stack X . Let K be a field, and let $x : \mathrm{Spec} K \rightarrow X$ be a K -point. Consider the full subcategory of $\mathrm{dSt}/_X$ of open and closed maps to X whose image contains the K -point x :

$$\mathrm{Clopen}_x X = \{a : G \rightarrow X \text{ in } \mathrm{dSt} \text{ such that } x \text{ factors through } a\}$$

This subcategory has initial objects, which are all equivalent.

Definition 2.6. *The connected component of the point x in X , $X^{(x)}$, is one of the initial objects in the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Clopen}_x X$.*

It will be important to consider quasi-coherent sheaves on derived stacks. In derived algebraic geometry, we define quasi-coherent sheaves in the following way: for any simplicial commutative ring A we can consider the (derived) ∞ -category of modules over A , Mod_A .

Definition 2.7. *The ∞ -category of A -modules, Mod_A , is the underlying ∞ -category of the category of simplicial A -modules.*

For maps of simplicial commutative rings $f : A \rightarrow B$ we have base-change and pullback maps

$$f^* : \mathrm{Mod}_A \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_B$$

Definition 2.8. *Let X be a prestack. The ∞ -category of quasi-coherent sheaves on X , $\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$, is defined as the limit*

$$\mathrm{Qcoh}(X) := \lim_{\{\mathrm{Spec} A \rightarrow X\}} \mathrm{Mod}_A$$

over the ∞ -category of derived affine schemes with a map to X .

2.3. Betti stacks and affinization. We define an important class of derived stacks, called *Betti stacks*, which correspond to spaces.

Definition 2.9. *Let $X \in \mathcal{S}$ be a space. The Betti stack associated to the space X is the sheafification of the constant presheaf $\underline{X} : \mathrm{dAff}^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ sending any derived affine $\mathrm{Spec} A$ to X . We abuse notation by denoting the Betti stack associated to a space X again by X .*

A particularly important example is the derived Betti stack S^1 associated to the circle. This stack plays a key role in this paper and in derived algebraic geometry more broadly. For instance, it will appear in a construction that we will describe in Section 2.4. This stack will also play a role through its *affinization*, which we now describe as a general construction in derived algebraic geometry.

The *affinization* of a derived stack is a fundamental notion, and is strictly related to the concept of *affine stack* which we review below. The construction has been introduced in the nonderived setting by Toën in [Toe00], and studied in the derived context by Ben-Zvi and Nadler. A review is in [MRT19]. We recall the construction here for the reader's convenience.

Let k be a discrete commutative ring. We denote by coCAlg_k the ∞ -category of cosimplicial commutative algebras over k , and $\text{St}_k \subset \text{dSt}_k$ the ∞ -category of classical higher stacks.

Definition 2.10. *Denote by*

$$\text{Spec}^\Delta : \text{coCAlg} \rightarrow \text{St}_k$$

the functor that sends a coconnective commutative k -algebra A to the functor it corepresents, i.e. the functor sending a simplicial commutative ring B to the space of maps $\text{Map}_{\text{coCAlg}}(A, B)$. Stacks of the form $\text{Spec}^\Delta A$ for some cosimplicial commutative k -algebra A will be called affine stacks.²

The functor Spec^Δ has a left adjoint $\mathcal{O} : \text{St}_k \rightarrow \text{coCAlg}$. The composition $\text{Spec}^\Delta \mathcal{O} : \text{St}_k \rightarrow \text{St}_k$ is called the *affinization* functor.

Remark 2.11. *Working over a field k of characteristic zero we can model simplicial commutative algebras over k via connective commutative dg-algebras. In this setting, Ben-Zvi and Nadler develop in [BZN12] a similar construction. They consider the functor*

$$\text{Spec} : \text{dg-cAlg}_k \rightarrow \text{dSt}_k$$

sending A to the functor mapping $B \in \text{dg-cAlg}_k^{\leq 0}$ to $\text{Map}_{\text{dg-cAlg}_k}(A, B)$. This functor is right adjoint to \mathcal{O} , and the affinization functor is $\text{Spec} \mathcal{O} : \text{dSt}_k \rightarrow \text{dSt}_k$.

We will consider the affinization of an elliptic curve E over a field k of characteristic zero, i.e. the affine stack $\text{Spec}^\Delta \mathcal{O}(E)$. The derived global sections of the structure sheaf of E are formal, and thus isomorphic to its cohomology, which is given by

$$H^i(E; \mathcal{O}_E) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ or } i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Note that the formality of $\mathcal{O}(E)$ holds because we work over a field of characteristic 0. The dg-algebra of derived global functions of S^1 , $\mathcal{O}(S^1) = C^*(S^1; k)$, is also formal. Hence by formality we get an equivalence

$$\text{Aff}(E) \simeq \text{Aff}(S^1)$$

Since the algebra of derived global functions on S^1 is isomorphic to the commutative dg-algebra $k[\epsilon]$ with the variable ϵ in (cohomological) degree 1, the affine stack $\text{Aff}(S^1)$ is sometimes denoted also by $\mathbb{A}^1[1]$ and referred to as the *shifted affine line*.

²The same notion is referred to as *coaffine stacks* by Lurie in [Lurb].

2.4. Tangents and loops. The ∞ -category of derived stacks dSt is Cartesian closed, hence it admits internal mapping objects, also known as *mapping stacks*.

Remark 2.12. *The notation we use for mapping spaces in ∞ -categories is Map , in contrast with the notation for the mapping stack introduced below. If the ∞ -categories are linear over a simplicial ring R , we denote the mapping spaces as Hom .*

Given two derived stacks X and Y , we denote their mapping stack as $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(X, Y)$. As a presheaf on $\mathrm{CAlg}^{\mathrm{op}}$, the mapping stack is characterized by

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(X, Y)(S) = \mathrm{Map}(X \times \mathrm{Spec} S, Y)$$

The mapping stack can also be defined relative to some base derived stack B . If X and Y are derived stacks over B , the mapping stack $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(X, Y)_B$ relative to B is the presheaf over derived affine schemes over B given by the formula

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(X, Y)_B(S) = \mathrm{Map}_{/B}(X \times_B \mathrm{Spec} S, Y)$$

Given a derived geometric stack X , we can build new derived stacks via universal constructions. In this paper we will consider the shifted tangent $T_X[-1]$, the unipotent loop space $\mathcal{L}^u X$, the loop space $\mathcal{L}X$ and the derived stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, X)$ from an elliptic curve E . The first three constructions are well documented in the literature, and we will recall them in this section. The latter object is new and is the main object of study of this paper.

If X is a derived geometric stack its *cotangent complex* is a quasi-coherent sheaf

$$\mathbb{L}_X \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$$

Definition 2.13. *The shifted tangent bundle of X , $T_X[-1]$, is the relative spectrum over X*

$$T_X[-1] = \mathrm{Spec}_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathrm{Sym} \mathbb{L}_X[1]$$

Recall the definition of the shifted affine line given in the previous subsection, as the affinization of the Betti stack S^1 .

Definition 2.14. *The loop space of X , $\mathcal{L}X$, is the mapping stack*

$$\mathcal{L}X = \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(S^1, X)$$

The unipotent loop space of X , $\mathcal{L}^u X$, is the mapping stack

$$\mathcal{L}^u X = \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(S^1), X)$$

When X is a derived scheme, the shifted tangent bundle, the loop space and the unipotent loop space all coincide. This is a consequence of Zariski codescent for these three objects which was established, for instance, in [BZN12]. According to these codescent results, these three derived stacks cosheafify over the Zariski site of a derived scheme. This implies that these three objects are equivalent, as there are natural maps between them and their local cosections on affines are equivalent. As an example, we recall the statement for the loop space, which appears as Lemma 4.2 in [BZN12]:

Lemma 2.15 (Lemma 4.2, [BZN12]). *Let X be a derived scheme. The functor*

$$\begin{aligned} |X|_{\text{Zar}} &\rightarrow \text{dSt}_k \\ U &\rightarrow \mathcal{L}U \end{aligned}$$

is a cosheaf.

All these constructions have formal counterparts, where one formally completes the stacks at a closed locus corresponding to X . We start by recalling the notion of formal completion in derived algebraic geometry. A summary of this and related notions can be found for example in [Che20].

Definition 2.16. *Let X and Y be derived stacks, and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a map. We define the formal completion of Y at X , \widehat{Y}_X , as the derived stack whose functor of points is the following: for every ring S , the space $\widehat{Y}_X(S)$ is the space of commutative diagrams*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Spec } \pi_0(S)^{\text{red}} & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ \text{Spec } S & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array}$$

where $\pi_0(S)^{\text{red}}$ is the reduction of the discrete ring $\pi_0(S)$ considered as a constant simplicial commutative ring.

We can describe formal completions alternatively using the *de Rham* stack of a derived stack Y . Let $\text{CRing}^{\text{red}}$ be the category of reduced classical commutative rings. This category embeds in the ∞ -category of simplicial commutative rings CAlg , by embedding first into constant simplicial commutative rings. In particular, we get a restriction functor

$$i^* : \mathcal{P}(\widehat{\text{dAff}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{CRing}^{\text{red,op}})$$

from derived prestacks to presheaves on $\text{CRing}^{\text{red,op}}$. We can construct a right adjoint to this functor by sending a presheaf on $\text{CRing}^{\text{red,op}}$ to its right Kan extension along i . We call this functor i_* .

Definition 2.17. *Let Y be a derived prestack. Its de Rham prestack is the derived prestack $Y_{dR} = i_*i^*Y$.*

By definition, given a derived ring S , an S -point of Y_{dR} is a $\pi_0(S)^{\text{red}}$ -point of Y . Observe that the unit of the adjunction $\text{Id} \rightarrow i_*i^*$ gives us a map $Y \rightarrow Y_{dR}$. Via the de Rham stack we can describe the formal completion of Y at X as the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{Y}_X & \longrightarrow & X_{dR} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \longrightarrow & Y_{dR} \end{array}$$

Now we can define the formal completions at X of the objects we described earlier.

Definition 2.18. *The formal shifted tangent bundle of X is the formal completion of the shifted tangent bundle of X at the zero section, and is denoted by $\widehat{T}_X[-1]$. The formal loop space of X is the formal completion of the loop space of X at the constant maps, and is denoted by $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}X$.*

2.5. Quasi-constant maps. We can now introduce one of the main objects of the paper, the derived stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, X)$ between two derived stacks Y and X .

Consider the locus in $\underline{\text{Map}}(Y, X)$ of maps factoring through $[\text{Spec } k/A]$, where A is some finite abelian group isomorphic to a product of groups of roots of unity

$$A \simeq \prod_{i=1, \dots, r} \mu_{n_i}$$

When A is the trivial group these maps are constant. This locus in general is not connected. For each map

$$\alpha : Y \rightarrow [\text{Spec } k/A] \rightarrow X$$

let $(\underline{\text{Map}}(Y, X))^{(\alpha)}$ be the connected component of $\underline{\text{Map}}(Y, X)$ containing α .

Definition 2.19. *The derived stack of quasi-constant maps is the union*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, X) := \bigcup_{\alpha} \underline{\text{Map}}(Y, X)^{(\alpha)}$$

Remark 2.20. *The structure map $Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } k$ gives a closed embedding*

$$X \simeq \underline{\text{Map}}(\text{Spec } k, X) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}(Y, X)$$

which factors through $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, X)$.

The fact that we consider maps factoring through classifying stacks of finite abelian groups, instead of just constant maps, might seem surprising. Indeed, as we will show below, in many cases of interest the stack $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, X)$ does coincide with the connected component in $\underline{\text{Map}}(Y, X)$ of maps which are constant, i.e. factor as

$$Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } k \rightarrow X$$

In the following two remarks we clarify the rationale behind our definition, and illustrate it through some concrete example. Then we prove two Propositions giving sufficient conditions under which it is enough to look at connected components of constant maps.

Remark 2.21. *The variant of Definition 2.19 involving only connected components of constants maps might seem more natural, but it is general insufficient for our purposes. The issue arises from quotients $[X/T]$ that have points with finite non-trivial stabilizers. Let $Y = E$ be an elliptic curve over k . Consider $X = \mathbb{G}_m$ with an action of $T = \mathbb{G}_m$ with weight $w \neq 1$. The quotient $[X/T]$ is isomorphic to $[\text{Spec } k/\mu_w]$. In this case, a simple equivariant elliptic cohomology computation dictates that there should be an isomorphism*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{G}_m/\mathbb{G}_m]) \cong E[|w|] \times [\text{Spec } k/\mu_{|w|}]$$

where $E[|w|]$ denotes the $|w|$ -torsion points in E . In particular, note that this stack has $|w|$ -many connected components. Definition 2.19 is designed precisely so as to reproduce this

expected behaviour. If we were only to take into account the connected components of the constant maps, we would obtain instead the connected stack $[\mathrm{Spec} k/\mu_{|w|}]$.

Remark 2.22. *Definition 2.19 is designed to work in the setting where the target is the quotient $[X/T]$ of a variety by the action of a torus, which is the framework we place ourselves in in this paper. Though adequate for what we plan to do in this article, Definition 2.19 is somewhat ad hoc. A more conceptual definition can be obtained considering maps which are in a precise sense “locally trivializable.” Namely, the map $Y \rightarrow Y_{dR}$ induces a map*

$$(4) \quad \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(Y_{dR}, X) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(Y, X)$$

We believe that in general quasi-constant maps should be definable as the image of this map. As a reality check, consider the case when X is a classifying stack $[\mathrm{Spec} k/G]$, where G is an algebraic group. The image of (4) is the moduli stack of G -bundles which can be equipped with a flat connection (but where we forget the datum of the connection). These are precisely degree 0 G -bundles, which is what we would like to model via quasi-constant maps.

Proposition 2.23. *Let Y and X be derived schemes. Then the stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(Y, X)$ coincides with the union of the connected components of the constant maps. In particular, if X is connected, $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(Y, X)$ is connected.*

Proof. Since derived schemes embed fully faithfully into derived stacks, the spaces

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(Y, X)(S) = \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{dSt}}(Y \times \mathrm{Spec} S, X)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{dSch}}(Y \times \mathrm{Spec} S, X)$$

are homotopy equivalent. In particular, there are no factorizations of such maps through stacks of the form $[\mathrm{Spec} k/A]$ unless A is the trivial group. Hence $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(Y, X)$ will be made up of the connected components corresponding to the constant maps. The last claim is clear. \square

Proposition 2.24. *Let X be a variety with an action of an algebraic torus T , and let E be an elliptic curve over k . Assume the T -action on X is such that the T -orbits in X have connected stabilizers. Then the stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ coincides with the union of the connected components of the constant maps. In particular, if X is connected, $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ is connected.*

Proof. We will assume for simplicity that T is rank one. The general argument is a simple extension of the rank one case.

The proof of this fact requires using results that we will prove in the Section 3. The codecent property, which will be proved in Section 3, implies that points in $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ correspond to maps whose image is contained in a single T -orbit in X . Under our assumptions, this means that the image of such a map is either a free orbit or a fixed point.

Let $x \in X$ be a fixed point for the T -action. We need to consider maps from E to $[x/T]$ factoring through $[\mathrm{Spec} k/\mu_n]$ for all positive integers n . For $n = 1$, this is the constant map. For $n > 1$ maps factoring through $[\mathrm{Spec} k/\mu_n]$ classify T -bundles on E admitting a reduction of their structure group to μ_n . These still lie in the same connected component as the constant map, which classifies the trivial bundle. Let us turn our attention to free orbits

next. Call one such orbit O . Since T acts freely on O , we have that $[O/T] = \text{Spec } k$. This means that there is only one map to the free orbit, the one that maps the total space of the trivial T -bundle on E to the orbit O through the projection on $T: E \times T \xrightarrow{\pi_T} T \rightarrow O$. So again it is enough to look at maps factoring through $\text{Spec } k$. \square

An important class of examples satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 2.24 is given by toric varieties with the standard torus action. We state this as the following Corollary.

Corollary 2.25. *Let X be a connected smooth toric variety equipped with standard action by the torus T and let E be an elliptic curve. Then the stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ is connected and coincides with the connected component of the constant maps.*

Just as in the case of the shifted tangent bundle and of the loop space, we can consider a formal completion of the derived stack of quasi-constant maps.

Definition 2.26. *The derived stack of formal maps, denoted by $\widehat{\underline{\text{Map}}}^0(Y, X)$, is the formal completion of $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, X)$ at the constant maps*

$$X \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, X)$$

We conclude this subsection by giving sufficient conditions under which the derived stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, X)$ is geometric. This will be a key input in the proof of the codescent property in Section 3. In particular, we will use geometricity to establish the *pointwise criterion* to detect effective epimorphisms. The question of geometricity is delicate, but fortunately in the case of mapping stacks it has been addressed by Halpern-Leistner and Preygel in [HLP14]. We limit ourselves to cite their result, slightly simplifying their statement as we do not need it in the generality in which they formulate it.

Theorem 2.27 ([HLP14] Theorem 5.1.1). *Assume that Y is a smooth scheme and that X is a locally (almost) finitely presented algebraic stack over k with quasi-affine diagonal. Then $\underline{\text{Map}}(Y, X)$ is 1-geometric. In particular, $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, X)$ is also 1-geometric.*

We will apply this theorem in the case when

- $Y = E$ is an elliptic curve
- X is either a variety, or a stack which is a global quotient of a variety by the action of an algebraic group

Note that the assumptions of the theorem are clearly satisfied in this case, as X by definition is of finite type over a field k .

2.6. Equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology. In this section we define equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology, which is our main object of study in this article.

Definition 2.28. *Let G be a smooth algebraic group and let Y be a scheme.*

- *The derived stack of principal G -bundles on Y is the mapping stack*

$$\underline{\text{Bun}}_G(Y) := \underline{\text{Map}}(Y, [\text{Spec } k/G])$$

The derived stack of principal G -bundles of degree zero on Y is

$$\underline{\text{Bun}}_G^0(Y) := \underline{\text{Map}}^0(Y, [\text{Spec } k/G])$$

- If $G = \mathbb{G}_m$ is the multiplicative group we set

$$\underline{\text{Pic}}(Y) := \underline{\text{Bun}}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(Y)$$

and call it the Picard stack of Y . We also set

$$\underline{\text{Pic}}^0(Y) := \underline{\text{Bun}}_{\mathbb{G}_m}^0(Y)$$

Note that when Y is connected, $\underline{\text{Pic}}^0(Y)$ is the connected component of the trivial line bundle over Y (and so it is in particular connected).

- Let $G = T$ be an algebraic torus of rank n . We set

$$\underline{\text{Pic}}(Y)_T := \underline{\text{Bun}}_T(Y)$$

We also set

$$\underline{\text{Pic}}^0(Y)_T := \underline{\text{Bun}}_T^0(Y)$$

Note that when Y is connected, $\underline{\text{Pic}}^0(Y)_T$ is the connected component of the trivial rank n bundle over Y (and so it is in particular connected).

We will apply these definitions in the case when Y is an elliptic curve E over a field k of characteristic zero. In this case, $\underline{\text{Pic}}(E)$ is an underived stack, and is equivalent to the product

$$\underline{\text{Pic}}(E) \simeq \text{Pic}(E) \times [\text{Spec } k/\mathbb{G}_m]$$

where $\text{Pic}(E)$ denotes the Picard scheme of E . Analogously, the connected component of the trivial bundle is

$$\underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E) \simeq \text{Pic}^0(E) \times [\text{Spec } k/\mathbb{G}_m] \simeq E \times [\text{Spec } k/\mathbb{G}_m]$$

Let \check{T} be the cocharacter lattice of T . As in the rank 1 case, we have decompositions

$$\underline{\text{Pic}}(E)_T \simeq (\text{Pic}(E) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T}) \times [\text{Spec } k/T], \quad \underline{\text{Pic}}(E)_T^0 \simeq E \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T} \times [\text{Spec } k/T]$$

Although we are interested in torus actions, a few steps of our argument will depend on considering more general actions where T is the product of a torus T' and of a finite abelian group A isomorphic to a product of groups of roots of unity

$$A \simeq \prod_{i=1, \dots, r} \mu_{n_i}$$

Note that there is an equivalence

$$\underline{\text{Bun}}_A(E) \simeq \underline{\text{Bun}}_A^0(E) \simeq \prod_{i=1, \dots, r} (E[n_i] \times [\text{Spec } k/\mu_{n_i}])$$

where $E[n_i]$ denotes the n_i -torsion points in E . This induces an equivalence

$$\underline{\text{Bun}}_T^0(E) \simeq (E \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T}' \times [\text{Spec } k/T']) \times \left(\prod_{i=1, \dots, r} E[n_i] \times [\text{Spec } k/\mu_{n_i}] \right)$$

This stack carries a map towards the coarse moduli space

$$\underline{\text{Bun}}_T^0(E) \rightarrow E \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T}' \times \left(\prod_{i=1, \dots, r} E[n_i] \right)$$

To streamline the notation, we denote by E_T the scheme $E \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \check{T}' \times (\prod_{i=1, \dots, r} E[n_i])$. When T is a torus fixing an isomorphism $T \simeq (\mathbb{G}_m)^n$ identifies this scheme with a product of $rk(T)$ copies of E .

Consider a variety X over k with the action of an abelian group T which decomposes as the product of a torus T' and a finite abelian group A as above. The structure map $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } k$ induces a map

$$p' : \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\text{Spec } k/T])$$

In particular, $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ lives over E_T and over BT . Throughout the rest of the paper, we will denote p the composition of p' with the projection $E_T \times BT \rightarrow E_T$ and X^{E_T} the base change of $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ from BT to $\text{Spec } k$. We conclude this subsection with the most important definition in this paper.

Definition 2.29. *The equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology of X is*

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) := p_* \mathcal{O}_{\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])} \in \text{Qcoh}(E_T)$$

We denote by $\text{HH}_E([X/T])$ the global sections of the sheaf $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$.

We refer to $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ also as the *elliptic Hochschild homology* of $[X/T]$. We remark that $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ defines a cohomology theory for quotient stacks, at least in the weak sense that a T -equivariant map $Y \rightarrow X$ induces algebra maps

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([Y/T])$$

and

$$\text{HH}_E([X/T]) \rightarrow \text{HH}_E([Y/T])$$

Additionally $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E(-)$ satisfies a form of Mayer–Vietoris, which will be studied in the next Section 3.

Remark 2.30. *All our results on T -equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology will be formulated under the more restrictive assumption that T is a connected algebraic torus, which is the setting of greatest geometric interest. We believe that our results hold also in the more general setting where T is of the form $T' \times A$, but we remark that some of the ingredients in our proofs would require extra care to be carried over to that setting. However these more general actions will show up in some of our proofs, even though we focus on equivariance with respect to connected tori. This is why we developed part of the theory in this extra generality.*

Definition 2.29 makes sense for general reductive algebraic groups. We will study this extension of equivariant Hochschild homology in [ST].

2.7. Complexified Equivariant Elliptic Cohomology. The last section of the preliminaries is devoted to recalling the construction of complexified equivariant elliptic cohomology, originally due to Grojnowski. This is a fundamental object for us, as our construction of (complexified) equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology is similar to Grojnowski’s in many aspects, and acts as an algebraic counterpart to the topological theory. We review the Grojnowski’s construction following mostly the more recent exposition found in [Gan14] and [SS22]. The original paper is [Gro07], other reviews closer in style to the original can be

found in [AB02], [RK00] and [Gre05]. We remark that Grojnowski's paper only sketches the construction, and that the details were carried out by Roşu in [RK00], see also [Ros01].

Let X be a CW-complex with an action of a torus T of rank n . Grojnowski constructs the complex T -equivariant elliptic cohomology of X as a coherent sheaf of \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded algebras over the complex manifold $E_T := E \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} T$

$$\mathcal{E}ll_T(X) \in \text{Qcoh}(E_T)_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$$

Remark 2.31. *Note that equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology is also defined as an object in $\text{Qcoh}(E_T)$. One difference is that we work with the ordinary \mathbb{Z} -graded category of quasi-coherent sheaves, rather than with its \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded variant. As we explained in the Introduction, the passage to the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded theory involves taking Tate fixed points under a natural action on $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$. The resulting object is called elliptic periodic Hochschild homology and will be studied in the follow-up paper, where we will show that it recovers Grojnowski's equivariant elliptic cohomology.*

Let us now sketch the definition of the coherent sheaf $\mathcal{E}ll_T(X)$. Following [Gan14], we actually limit ourselves to describe its degree 0 part, as this is sufficient for our applications in this paper. This is constructed as a coherent analytic sheaf of \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded algebras on E_T . As E_T is compact, standard GAGA arguments allow to consider it as a coherent sheaf on E_T viewed as an algebraic variety. We describe first the sections of this sheaf over a sufficiently small analytic disk $U \subset E_T$.

Let e be a point in E_T . Let $S(e)$ be the set of subtori $T' \subset T$ such that e belongs to $E_{T'} \subset E_T$. Then set

$$T(e) := \bigcap_{T' \in S(e)} T', \quad \text{and} \quad X^e := X^{T(e)}$$

i.e. X^e the fixed locus of X under the action of the subgroup $T(e) \subset T$.

For a CW-complex X with a T -action it is possible to describe the restrictions of the coherent sheaf $\mathcal{E}ll_T(X)$ over sufficiently small analytic disks U . Let $H_T(X) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} H_T^{2n}(X; \mathbb{C})$ denote the even Borel equivariant cohomology of X with complex coefficients. This is a module over $H_T(*) = \mathbb{C}[u_1, \dots, u_n]$, or equivalently a quasi-coherent sheaf over $\text{Spec } H_T(*) = \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$. Let us call $\mathcal{H}_T(X)$ this quasi-coherent sheaf. There is a quotient map

$$\exp : \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \rightarrow E_T$$

which is an isomorphism if restricted to sufficiently small analytic disks U in E_T . Let us call \log its local inverse. Moreover, the group structure on E_T induces translation maps

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_e : E_T &\rightarrow E_T \\ f &\mapsto fe \end{aligned}$$

for all closed points e in E_T . We use multiplicative notation for the group operation on E_T . Then, the degree zero part of the sheaf-valued cohomology theory can be defined as follows. For a closed point $e \in E_T$ and a sufficiently small analytic neighbourhood U_e of e , we set

$$\mathcal{E}ll_T^0(X)|_{U_e} = (\tau_e \circ \exp)_* \mathcal{H}_T(X^e)|_{\log(e^{-1}U_e)}$$

This construction can be extended canonically to a cohomology theory valued in quasi-coherent sheaves of \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded algebras. For more details on the construction, we refer to [Gan14].

3. CODESCENT FOR QUASI-CONSTANT MAPS

In this section we prove a fundamental property of the derived stack of quasi-constant maps, namely that it is Zariski local on the target. We show that under suitable assumptions on X quasi-constant maps to X factor through any affine cover of X . Note that this behaviour is in sharp contrast with the full mapping stack, where locality on the target is essentially never satisfied. We will give a proof of this statement in the case when the source is an elliptic curve, which is the case that is most relevant for our applications, but we will also comment on extensions of our results to more general settings (see Section 3.1.1). One of the ingredients in our argument is a simple criterion that allows us to detect when open immersions of geometric stacks are equivalences. We will refer to this as the *point-wise criterion* and we prove it as Proposition 3.3 below.

We start by proving a few simple general properties of quasi-constant mapping stacks. Recall that, throughout the paper, we work over a fixed ground field k of characteristic zero. We remark, however, that the next results Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 hold in much greater generality. Let S be a derived stack, and consider the functor

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, -) : \mathrm{dSt}_k \rightarrow \mathrm{dSt}_k$$

If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a map in dSt_k , we denote by r_f the induced map

$$r_f : \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, X) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, Y)$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let S be a derived stack. Then the functor*

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, -) : \mathrm{dSt}_k \rightarrow \mathrm{dSt}_k$$

preserves limits. In particular, if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a map in dSt_k , there is an equivalence of simplicial objects in dSt_k

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, \check{C}(f)) \simeq \check{C}(r_f)$$

Proof. Note that the functor from pointed stacks to stacks sending a pair (F, x) to the connected component of x preserves limits. Thus the statement follows from the analogous statement for $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(S, -)$, which is obvious. The second part of the claim is a formal consequence of the first one. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let S be a derived stack. Then the functor*

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, -) : \mathrm{dSt}_k \rightarrow \mathrm{dSt}_k$$

preserves both open and closed immersions of derived stacks. That is, if $i : Y \rightarrow X$ is an open (resp. closed) immersion of derived stacks then

$$r_i : \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, Y) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, X)$$

is an open (resp. closed) immersion of derived stacks.

Proof. We limit ourselves to prove the statement for open immersions, as the proof for closed immersions is the same. We need to show that for every affine scheme $\text{Spec } A$ and for every map

$$\text{Spec } A \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(S, X)$$

the pullback map $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(S, Y) \times_{\underline{\text{Map}}^0(S, X)} \text{Spec } A \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ is an open immersion of derived schemes.

Set $Z := \underline{\text{Map}}^0(S, Y) \times_{\underline{\text{Map}}^0(S, X)} \text{Spec } A$. Then by the universal property of the mapping stack, we obtain a fiber-product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z \times S & \longrightarrow & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Spec } A \times S & \longrightarrow & X \end{array}$$

Since the map $Y \rightarrow X$ is an open immersion, the map $Z \times E \rightarrow \text{Spec } A \times E$ must be an open immersion. Since this map is the identity on E , we conclude that $Z \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ is an open immersion; in particular we deduce that Z is necessarily a derived scheme. Summarizing, we have showed that for every map $\text{Spec } A \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, X)$, the pullback

$$Z = \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, Y) \times_{\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, X)} \text{Spec } A$$

is a derived scheme and the induced map $Z \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ is an open immersion. This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 3.3 (Point-wise criterion). *Let X be an n -geometric derived stack and let*

$$\phi : \coprod_{\alpha \in A} U_\alpha \rightarrow X$$

be a coproduct of open immersions of derived stacks. Assume that for every closed point $f : \text{Spec } K \rightarrow X$ for a field K there exists a lift

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \coprod_{\alpha \in A} U_\alpha & \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \phi \\ \text{Spec } K & \xrightarrow{f} & X \end{array}$$

Then the map ϕ is an effective epimorphism.

Proof. Since X is n -geometric, the map f factors through one of the affine schemes

$$\text{Spec } A \rightarrow X$$

which compose the chosen atlas of X . Open immersions of derived stacks are stable under base change, and thus the base change of ϕ along $\text{Spec } A \rightarrow X$

$$\left(\coprod_{\alpha \in A} U_\alpha \right) \times_X \text{Spec } A \simeq \coprod_{\alpha \in A} \left(U_\alpha \times_X \text{Spec } A \right) \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$$

is also a coproduct of open immersions. The equivalence above is a consequence of the universality of colimits in ∞ -topoi. Each summand $V_\alpha := U_\alpha \times_X \text{Spec } A$ is an open substack

of $\text{Spec } A$, and is therefore a derived scheme. Thus we can reduce to proving the claim when $X = \text{Spec } A$ is an affine derived scheme and

$$\coprod_{\alpha \in A} V_\alpha \rightarrow X = \text{Spec } A$$

is a disjoint union of open subschemes. Up to refining the cover $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$, by taking affine open covers of each scheme V_α , we can also assume that the V_α -s are affine.

In summary, it is enough to check that the claim holds in the case when X is affine and ϕ is a coproduct of open immersions of affine derived schemes, such that every closed point $f : \text{Spec } K \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ admits a lift, as in the diagram below

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \coprod_{\alpha \in A} \text{Spec } A_\alpha & \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \phi \\ \text{Spec } K & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{Spec } A \end{array}$$

Note that the existence of lifts of closed points is equivalent the statement that the collection of maps of simplicial k -algebras

$$\{A \rightarrow A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$$

is a Zariski cover of the simplicial k -algebra A , i.e.

- all the k -algebras A_α are localizations of the algebra A at some elements $a_\alpha \in A$;
- the collection of the elements $\{a_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ generates A .

But this implies that the map $\coprod_{\alpha \in A} \text{Spec } A_\alpha \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ is an effective epimorphism, and this concludes the proof. \square

3.1. Quasi-constant maps to varieties. Let X be a variety over k . Recall that this means that X is an integral, separated scheme of finite type. For the rest of the section we also assume that X is connected, as this allows for minor simplifications of the exposition. We remark that all our results remain true also if X is not connected.

In this section we prove the following statement.

Proposition 3.4. *The morphism*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), X) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, X)$$

induced by the unit map $E \rightarrow \text{Aff}(E)$, is an equivalence of derived stacks.

The codescent property for $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, X)$ will follow immediately from Proposition 3.4.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $S \subset E$ be an affine open subset. Let U be an affine variety, and fix a locally closed embedding $U \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Denote by \overline{U} the closure of U . Then there are natural monomorphisms of stacks*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}(S, U) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \underline{\text{Map}}(E, \overline{U}) \xrightarrow{\beta} \underline{\text{Map}}(E, \mathbb{P}^n)$$

That is, for every affine scheme Y the induced maps of sets

$$\pi_0 \text{Map}(S \times Y, U) \xrightarrow{\pi_0 \alpha} \pi_0 \text{Map}(E \times Y, \overline{U}) \xrightarrow{\pi_0 \beta} \pi_0 \text{Map}(E \times Y, \mathbb{P}^n)$$

are injective. Restricting to quasi-constant maps yields morphisms of stacks

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(S, U) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \overline{U}) \xrightarrow{\beta} \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathbb{P}^n)$$

which are also monomorphisms of stacks.

Remark 3.6. Before giving the proof, let us clarify our use of the word monomorphism in the statement of the Lemma 3.5. In Definition 2.1.23 of [Che20] Chen defines a monomorphism of prestacks as a map $X \rightarrow Y$ of prestacks such that, for any derived affine S and any point $y \in Y(S)$, the fiber product $\{y\} \times_{Y(S)} X(S)$ is a contractible space. We refer instead to the general notion of monomorphism in an ∞ -category as it appears in [Lur09].³ A map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in an ∞ -category is a monomorphism if for all objects Z the map

$$\mathrm{Map}(Z, X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Map}(Z, Y)$$

induces an injective map on the sets of connected components. In the ∞ -topos of derived stacks, we reduce to testing a monomorphisms on derived affines, obtaining the notion that appears in the proposition above.

Proof. The inclusion $\overline{U} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ determines a map $\mathrm{Map}(E, \overline{U}) \xrightarrow{\beta} \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathbb{P}^n)$ which has the desired properties. Let us define the map α . Let \overline{T} be a proper and separated derived scheme. As E is a discrete one-dimensional scheme, the valuative criterion of properness⁴ implies that there is an equivalence $\mathrm{Map}(E, \overline{T}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{Map}(S, \overline{T})$. Defining α requires defining maps

$$\alpha_Y : \mathrm{Map}(S \times Y, U) \rightarrow \mathrm{Map}(E \times Y, \overline{U})$$

for every $Y \in \mathrm{dAff}$, that are natural in Y . We define α_Y as the composition

$$\mathrm{Map}(S \times Y, U) \xrightarrow{(a)} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{dSt}/Y}(S \times Y, U \times Y) \xrightarrow{(b)} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{dSt}/Y}(E \times Y, \overline{U} \times Y) \xrightarrow{(c)} \mathrm{Map}(E \times Y, \overline{U})$$

where

- $\mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{dSt}/Y}(-, -)$ denotes the mapping space in the over-category dSt/Y
- on connected components, the map (a) is the assignment

$$(S \times Y \xrightarrow{f} U) \mapsto (S \times Y \xrightarrow{f \times_{\mathrm{pr}^Y}} U \times Y)$$

- the map (b) is the morphism on mapping spaces given by the valuative criterion of properness, relative to the base scheme Y , as $E \times Y \rightarrow Y$ is a discrete curve over Y , and $\overline{U} \times Y \rightarrow Y$ is proper
- the map (c) is induced by the projection $\overline{U} \times Y \rightarrow \overline{U}$

The fact that α is natural in Y is clear. Also, it is easy to see that α induces section-wise injections on connected components. As for the last statement, it follows from the fact that α and β preserve constant maps. Indeed, as the image of a connected stack under any map is connected, the maps α and β restrict to maps between the connected components of the constant maps. This is enough, as by Example 2.23 we know that in the case of a variety X the stack $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, X)$ is the connected component of the constant maps. \square

³See the discussion after example 5.5.6.13 and right before Proposition 6.2.1.3

⁴For a reference on the valuative criterion of properness in the derived setting, see for instance <https://www.preschema.com/lecture-notes/kdescent/lect6.pdf>.

Remark 3.7. *Let us make some more comments on the map α defined in Lemma 3.5. We can factorize α as follows*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \underline{\text{Map}}(S, \overline{U}) & & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(S, \overline{U}) \\
 \uparrow & \searrow \simeq & \uparrow \\
 \underline{\text{Map}}(S, U) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \underline{\text{Map}}(E, \overline{U}) & \quad & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(S, U) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, \overline{U}) \\
 & & & & & \searrow \simeq & \\
 & & & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Let us focus on then diagram on the left, as the one on the right is just obtained by restricting to quasi-constant maps. The vertical arrow is induced by the inclusion $U \rightarrow \overline{U}$, and thus is an open embedding as explained in Lemma 3.2. The diagonal arrow is an equivalence. It is the inverse of the natural map $\underline{\text{Map}}(E, \overline{U}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}(S, \overline{U})$ given by restriction to S . As explained in the proof of Lemma 3.5, the fact that this map is an equivalence follows from the valuative criterion for properness.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\text{Aff}(E)$ be the affinization of E . Then the map*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), X) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, X)$$

is an open embedding.

Proof. Recall from Section 2, that there is an equivalence

$$\text{Aff}(E) \simeq \text{Aff}(S^1)$$

This implies that $\underline{\text{Map}}(\text{Aff}(E), X)$ is equivalent to the derived loop space $\mathcal{L}X$; in particular, the stack $\underline{\text{Map}}(\text{Aff}(E), X)$ is connected, and thus there is an identification

$$\underline{\text{Map}}(\text{Aff}(E), X) = \underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), X)$$

Now this also implies that $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), X)$ satisfies Zariski codescent on X . Indeed, this is easily proved for the loop space $\mathcal{L}X$; a reference is, for instance, Lemma 4.2 of [BZN12].

Consider an affine open cover $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of X . By Lemma 3.2, for every $i \in I$ the vertical arrows in the commutative diagram below are open inclusions

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), X) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, X) \\
 \uparrow & \nearrow \subset & \uparrow \\
 \underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), U_i) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, U_i)
 \end{array}$$

Further the bottom universal arrow is an equivalence, by the universal property of the affinization. It follows that we have an open embedding $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), U_i) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, X)$. Thus the map from the realization of the Čech nerve of the open substacks $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), U_i)$ is also an open embedding

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), X) \simeq |\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), U_i)| \longrightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, X)$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Next we show Proposition 3.4 in the case when X is the projective space, as a stepping stone to the proof in the general case.

Lemma 3.9. *The morphism*

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathbb{P}^n) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathbb{P}^n)$$

induced by the unit map $E \rightarrow \mathrm{Aff}(E)$, is an equivalence of derived stacks.

Proof. Let $\phi_{\mathcal{O}(1)} : \mathbb{P}^n \rightarrow [\mathrm{Spec} k/\mathbb{G}_m]$ be the classifying map of the bundle $\mathcal{O}(1)$ over \mathbb{P}^n . By evaluating the composition

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathbb{P}^n) \times \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathbb{P}^n, [\mathrm{Spec} k/\mathbb{G}_m]) \longrightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, [\mathrm{Spec} k/\mathbb{G}_m]) = \underline{\mathrm{Pic}}(E)$$

at the point $\phi_{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ in the second factor, we obtain a map of stacks

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathbb{P}^n) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Pic}}(E)$$

As connected stacks map to connected stacks, this map must factor through the inclusion $\underline{\mathrm{Pic}}^0(E) \subset \underline{\mathrm{Pic}}(E)$. This implies that for every map $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ parametrized by a point of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathbb{P}^n)$, the bundle $f^*\mathcal{O}(1)$ has degree 0. Further $f^*\mathcal{O}(1)$ must have non-trivial global sections (as it is the pull-back of a very ample bundle). These two properties imply that $f^*\mathcal{O}(1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_E$.

Let us go back to the statement that we need to prove. By Lemma 3.8, the statement can be checked via the pointwise criterion given in Proposition 3.3. That is, we need to show that every map $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ factors through some affine open subset $U \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Note that to show this, it is enough to check a set-theoretic condition: namely that f induces a constant map between the set of geometric points of E and the set of geometric points of \mathbb{P}^n . Then it will be enough to choose as U an affine open neighborhood of $f(p)$, where $p \in E$ is any geometric point: indeed, it is easy to see that f will automatically factor through the inclusion $U \subset X$. The fact that f is constant on geometric points follows immediately from the fact that $f^*\mathcal{O}(1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_E$. Indeed the sections of \mathcal{O}_E are constants, and therefore do not distinguish points. \square

The proof of Proposition 3.4. As in the case of \mathbb{P}^n , we start by observing that by Lemma 3.8 the natural map

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(\mathrm{Aff}(E), X) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, X)$$

is an open embedding. Thus to prove that it is an equivalence we can use the point-wise criterion. Consider a map $f : E \rightarrow X$ corresponding to a geometric point of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, X)$. We need to show that f factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Aff}(E) & & \\ \uparrow & \searrow g & \\ E & \xrightarrow{f} & X \end{array}$$

for some $g : \mathrm{Aff}(E) \rightarrow X$. Let $U \subset X$ be an affine open subset such that $S = E \times_U X$ is non-empty. Note $S \subset E$ is an affine open subset. Now fix a locally closed embedding $U \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, and let \overline{U} be the closure of U . As \mathbb{P}^n is proper there is a unique map $h : E \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$

which makes the following diagram commute

$$(5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} U & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{P}^n \\ f \uparrow & & \uparrow h \\ S & \longrightarrow & E \end{array}$$

In fact more is true, namely S is the truncation of the fiber product: $S \cong t_0(U \times_{\mathbb{P}^n} E)$. By Lemma 3.5, the map h is parametrized by a closed point in $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, \mathbb{P}^n)$. Thus, by Lemma 3.9, f factors through the affinization of E . We can complete diagram (5) to the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \overline{U} & & \\ & & \uparrow & \searrow^{h'} & \\ & & U & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{P}^n \\ f \uparrow & & & & \uparrow h \\ S & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & \text{Aff}(E) \end{array}$$

The commutativity of the external triangle with edge h' follows from the fact that the image of h must be contained in the closure of the image of f . In order to conclude we need to show that h' factors through U

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{U} & & \\ \uparrow & \swarrow^{h'} & \\ U & \xleftarrow{g} & \text{Aff}(E) \end{array}$$

This is easy to check. Indeed as U and \overline{U} are schemes, we can replace $\text{Aff}(E)$ with S^1 and think in terms of loop spaces. It is a consequence of Zariski codescent for the loop space that if $\gamma : S^1 \rightarrow \overline{U}$ is a loop, and $U \subset \overline{U}$ is an open subset, then the following two facts are equivalent

- (1) The fiber product $S^1 \times_{\overline{U}} U$ is non-empty
- (2) The loop γ factors through U

By construction, the first condition is satisfied in our case. Thus h' factors through U , and this concludes the proof. □

Proposition 3.4 has the following useful consequence.

Corollary 3.10. *Let X be a variety, and let $|X|_{\text{Zar}}$ denote its small Zariski site.*

- (1) *The assignment mapping an open subset $U \in |X|_{\text{Zar}}$ to the stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, U) \in \text{dSt}_k$ defines a cosheaf on $|X|_{\text{Zar}}$*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, -) : |X|_{\text{Zar}} \rightarrow \text{dSt}_k$$

- (2) *The natural map $\mathcal{L}U \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, U)$ defines an equivalence of dSt_k -valued cosheaves on $|X|_{\text{Zar}}$*

$$\mathcal{L}(-) \simeq \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, -) : |X|_{\text{Zar}} \rightarrow \text{dSt}_k$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.4. Indeed by Proposition 3.4 for every $U \in |X|_{\text{Zar}}$ there is an equivalence

$$\mathcal{L}(U) \simeq \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, U)$$

which is natural for maps in $|X|_{\text{Zar}}$. This implies that $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, -)$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{L}(-)$ as dSt_k -valued precosheaves on $|X|_{\text{Zar}}$. This proves statement (2) at the level of precosheaves. As $\mathcal{L}(-)$ is a cosheaf, it follows that $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, -)$ is also a cosheaf. This proves statement (1) and statement (2) at the level of cosheaves. \square

3.1.1. *Some generalizations of Proposition 3.4.* Before proceeding, let us comment on some possible generalizations of the results from this section. We formulated Proposition 3.4 for an elliptic curve E , as this is the case we will be interested in the remainder of the paper. However the statement holds more generally for any smooth and proper curve C over k , namely the unit map $C \rightarrow \text{Aff}(C)$ induces an equivalence

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(C), X) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(C, X)$$

The proof we have given for the case $C = E$ extends without variations to this more general setting.

Corollary 3.10 also generalizes to the case of a general smooth and proper curve C . In characteristic 0, there is an equivalence between $\text{Aff}(C)$ and the affinization of the Betti stack of a wedge of g circles S_g , where g is the genus of C

$$\text{Aff}(C) \simeq \text{Aff}(S_g) \simeq k[\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_g]$$

where

- $k[\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_g]$ denotes the square-zero extension of k by g generators with $\deg(\varepsilon_i) = 1$
- the last equivalence follows from the fact that, in characteristic zero, the cdga-s

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_C, \mathcal{O}_C) \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\text{sing}}^*(S_g)$$

are both formal and therefore quasi-equivalent to their cohomology.

This implies in particular that there are equivalences

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(C, X) \simeq \underline{\text{Map}}^0(S_g, X) \simeq \mathcal{L}X \times_X \dots \times_X \mathcal{L}X$$

where the last one follows from the presentation of S_g as an iterated push-out

$$S_g \simeq S^1 \coprod_{pt} S^1 \coprod_{pt} \dots \coprod_{pt} S^1$$

A simple but key observation is that $\mathcal{L}X$ is local with respect to the Zariski topology on X ; as we mentioned, a proof is given in Lemma 4.2 of [BZN12]. That argument immediately extends to show that $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(S_g, X)$ also defines a cosheaf on $|X|_{\text{Zar}}$. It follows that the conclusions of Corollary 3.10 apply to the case of a general smooth and proper curve, and in particular $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(C, X)$ defines a cosheaf on $|X|_{\text{Zar}}$.

It is natural to ask whether Proposition 3.4 and Corollary 3.10 are in fact general features of quasi-constant maps, beyond the curve case. As this will not play any role in the sequel, we will limit ourselves to formulate two relevant questions without attempting to answer them in this article.

Question 3.11. *Let X be a scheme.*

- (1) *Under what assumptions on T does $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(T, X)$ define a cosheaf of stacks on $|X|_{\text{Zar}}$?*
- (2) *Under what assumptions on T is there an equivalence of stacks*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(T), X) \simeq \underline{\text{Map}}^0(T, X) ?$$

Remark 3.12. *Lemma 5.12 provides a positive answer to question (2) in the formal case. Indeed, although Lemma 5.12 is formulated in the setting where T is an elliptic curve, that plays no role in the proof. Thus the conclusions of Lemma 5.12 are still valid for general T .*

Remark 3.13. *It should be possible to extend Proposition 3.4 to the setting where the target X is an algebraic space satisfying suitable properties. The key observation should be that, although in general loops are not local for the étale topology, they are when the target is a scheme or an algebraic space. As this extra generality is not essential for our intended applications, we will not pursue this any further.*

3.2. Quasi-constant maps to global quotient stacks. Let X be a variety over k , and assume that X carries an action of an algebraic torus T .

Definition 3.14. *The small T -equivariant Zariski site of X , which we denote by $|X|_{\text{Zar}}^T$, is the site having*

- (1) *as objects, schemes U equipped with an action of T , and a T -equivariant open immersion $U \rightarrow X$*
- (2) *as morphisms, T -equivariant open immersions $V \rightarrow U$ over X*
- (3) *as covering families, jointly surjective families of T -equivariant immersions*

The main result of this Section is Theorem 3.15 below, which generalizes the first part of Corollary 3.10 to the setting of stacks that are global quotients of varieties by a T -action. We remark that the second part of Corollary 3.10 fails in the presence of a T -action, and this is a key feature differentiating elliptic Hochschild homology from ordinary Hochschild homology. Another important difference with Corollary 3.10 is that in the statement of Theorem 3.15 we require X to be normal. The reason is that the argument we will give relies on Sumihiro’s Theorem [Sum74], which does not hold in general without the normality assumption.

Theorem 3.15. *Assume that X is normal. Then the assignment mapping $U \in |X|_{\text{Zar}}^T$ to the stack of quasi-constant maps*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [U/T]) \in \text{dSt}_k$$

defines a cosheaf on $|X|_{\text{Zar}}^T$,

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [-/T]) : |X|_{\text{Zar}}^T \rightarrow \text{dSt}_k$$

If X satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 3.15, we say that $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ satisfies T -equivariant Zariski codescent on $[X/T]$. In its main lines the proof of Theorem 3.15 closely parallels the argument given in the Section 3.1 in non-equivariant case. However there are a few minor subtleties that arise when taking into account the T -action.

Remark 3.16. *Let us stress that Theorem 3.15 fails if we consider finer topologies such as the étale or smooth topology on $[X/T]$. This is easily verified in examples. Consider for instance the case when $T = \mathbb{G}_m$ and $X = \text{Spec } k$. Then $\text{Spec } k \rightarrow [\text{Spec } k/\mathbb{G}_m]$ is a smooth cover, but*

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, \text{Spec } k) \simeq \text{Spec } k \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\text{Spec } k/\mathbb{G}_m]) \simeq \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)$$

clearly is not.

We start by proving Theorem 3.15 in two important special cases, namely when X is isomorphic to an affine space or to a projective space. Up to fixing an isomorphism

$$T \cong (\mathbb{G}_m)^n$$

and applying a change of basis to \mathbb{A}^N , we can diagonalize the action of T , which can then be written in standard form as follows. For every $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in (\mathbb{G}_m)^n \cong T$, and $(z_1 \dots z_N) \in \mathbb{A}^N$

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \cdot (z_1 \dots z_N) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{w_i^1} z_1, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{w_i^N} z_N \right)$$

for an appropriate collection of integers $\{w_i^j\}$, called *weights*.

Lemma 3.17. *The stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^N/T])$ satisfies T -equivariant Zariski codescent on $[\mathbb{A}^N/T]$.*

Proof. We fix an isomorphism $T \cong (\mathbb{G}_m)^n$ and a diagonalization of the T -action. Maps to $[\mathbb{A}^N/(\mathbb{G}_m)^n]$ classify the datum of

- (1) n line bundles \mathcal{L}_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$
- (2) and N sections $s_j \in H^0(\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_i^{w_i^j})$, $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

There is a natural map

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^N/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\text{Spec } k/T]) \simeq \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)^N$$

which forgets the information on sections.

By the pointwise criterion Proposition 3.3, it is sufficient to show that given a T -equivariant open cover $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of \mathbb{A}^N and a map

$$f : E \times_{\text{Spec } k} \text{Spec } K = E_K \rightarrow [\mathbb{A}^N/T]$$

corresponding to a geometric point of $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^N/T])$, there is an open subset U_i such that f factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & [U_i/T] \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ E_K & \xrightarrow{f} & [\mathbb{A}^N/T] \end{array}$$

We will prove this by showing the stronger claim that f has to factor through the image of a T -orbit in $[\mathbb{A}^N/T]$.

As we discussed, giving the map f is the same as giving n line bundles \mathcal{L}_i on E_K and N sections s_j of appropriate tensor powers of the \mathcal{L}_i -s. As f is parametrized by a point in

$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^N/T])$ all the \mathcal{L}_i -s have degree zero. Thus the sections s_j are all constant. This immediately implies that the image of f is a single orbit of the T -action, which is what we wanted to show. \square

Next, let us consider a T -action on the projective space \mathbb{P}^N . Up to fixing an isomorphism $T \cong (\mathbb{G}_m)^n$ and applying an automorphism of \mathbb{P}^N , we can put the T -action in the following standard form. For every $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in (\mathbb{G}_m)^n \cong T$, and $[z_0, \dots, z_N] \in \mathbb{P}^N$

$$(6) \quad \lambda \cdot [z_0, z_1 \dots z_N] = [z_0, \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{w_i^1} z_1, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{w_i^N} z_N] \in \mathbb{P}^N$$

for an appropriate collection of integers $\{w_i^j\}$. In particular, we can assume that the standard toric affine open cover of \mathbb{P}^N is T -equivariant.

Lemma 3.18. *The stack of quasi-constant maps $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{P}^N/T])$ satisfies T -equivariant Zariski codescend on $[\mathbb{P}^N/T]$.*

Proof. The proof strategy is the same as for Lemma 3.17. Namely, consider a map

$$f : E_K \rightarrow [\mathbb{P}^N/T]$$

classified by a geometric point of $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{P}^N/T])$.

We need to show that f factors through the image of a T -orbit in $[\mathbb{P}^N/T]$. Now we make the following observations:

- (1) Note first that all line bundles on \mathbb{P}^N admit a T -equivariant structure
- (2) Moreover there exists a $r > 0$ such that there exists a non-vanishing T -equivariant section σ of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(r)$
- (3) We can further assume that, in point (2), $r = 1$ on condition of replacing, if needed, \mathbb{P}^N with a larger projective space \mathbb{P}^M equipped with a T -action and such that there is a T -equivariant Veronese embedding

$$\mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^M$$

Although these are all standard facts, let us sketch a proof. We start with (1). We identify \mathbb{P}^N with the projectivization $\mathbb{P}(V)$ of the vector space V which is dual to $H^0(\mathbb{P}^N, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(1))$. Note that we can lift the T -action on \mathbb{P}^N to a linear action on V . This turns V into a T -representation. Taking the dual representation gives a T -action on $H^0(\mathbb{P}^N, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(1))$. This induces a T -equivariant structure on the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(1)$. Taking tensor powers and duals generates T -equivariant structures on all the bundles $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(m)$, for all integers m .

Let us consider (2) next. The existence of such a section σ for some r is equivalent to fact that the GIT quotient $\mathbb{P}^N//T$ is non-empty, i.e. it is equivalent to the existence of a semistable point of \mathbb{P}^N with respect to the T -action. A semistable point in \mathbb{P}^N with respect to a linear action is by definition a semistable point of the lift of the action to the vector space $V \cong k^{N+1}$ such that $\mathbb{P}^N \cong \mathbb{P}(V)$, i.e. a point in V such that the closure of its orbit under the T -action does not contain $0 \in V$. The existence of a semistable point is clear after we write the action in standard form (see equation (6) above). Indeed, the point $(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ in k^{N+1} is fixed by the lift of the action, and hence it is in particular semistable, as the closure of its orbit does not contain the point 0. This implies that the point $[1 : 0 : 0 : \dots : 0]$ in \mathbb{P}^N

is also semistable, hence the GIT quotient $\mathbb{P}^N // T$ is nonempty. This proves the existence of non-vanishing equivariant section σ of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(r)$ for some r .

As for point (3), i.e. the reduction to the case $r = 1$, it is sufficient to linearize the action of T on \mathbb{P}^N by choosing an equivariant structure on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(r)$ which makes σ into an equivariant section. As familiar from GIT, the choice of linearization yields a T -equivariant embedding

$$\mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(r))^*) \cong \mathbb{P}^M$$

In particular, we obtain an isomorphism of T -modules

$$H^0(\mathbb{P}^M, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^M}(1)) \cong H^0(\mathbb{P}^N, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(r))$$

which restricts to the spaces of equivariant sections

$$H^0(\mathbb{P}^M, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^M}(1))^T \cong H^0(\mathbb{P}^N, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(r))^T$$

hence a bijective correspondence between the T -equivariant sections of the two bundles. Note that f factors through the image of a T -orbit if and only the composite map

$$E_K \rightarrow [\mathbb{P}^N/T] \rightarrow [\mathbb{P}^M/T]$$

factors through the image of a T -orbit. Thus, from the perspective of the argument we are carrying out, we can harmlessly replace \mathbb{P}^N with \mathbb{P}^M . We do this implicitly in the sequel, and in particular assume that $r = 1$ and σ is linear, but we will not rename either \mathbb{P}^N or σ .

Consider the map ϕ classifying the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{[\mathbb{P}^N/T]}(r)$, $\phi : [\mathbb{P}^N/T] \rightarrow [\text{Spec } k/\mathbb{G}_m]$.

If the map f is classified by a geometric point of $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{P}^N/T])$, the pull-back line bundle $f^*(\mathcal{O}_{[\mathbb{P}^N/T]}(r))$ is classified by the composition

$$\text{Spec}(K) \xrightarrow{f} \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{P}^N/T]) \xrightarrow{\phi} \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\text{Spec } k/\mathbb{G}_m]) \cong \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)$$

In particular, $f^*(\mathcal{O}_{[\mathbb{P}^N/T]}(r))$ is a degree-zero line bundle on E . This is a completely general fact: quasi-constant maps always pull-back line bundles to degree zero line bundles.

Now let $H \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be the zero locus of σ , and consider its complement U . As σ is linear H is a hyperplane and U is a T -equivariant open subset of \mathbb{P}^N isomorphic to \mathbb{A}^N . We claim that the image of f is entirely contained either in H or in U . Indeed, assume to the contrary that the image of f intersects both H and U . Consider the pull-back section $f^*\sigma$

$$f^*\sigma \in H^0(E, f^*\mathcal{O}_{[\mathbb{P}^N/T]}(1))$$

Note that $f^*\sigma$ is not constant, as the image of f intersects both the zero-locus of σ and its complement. However the line bundle $f^*\mathcal{O}_{[\mathbb{P}^N/T]}(r)$ must be of degree zero, and therefore its sections are necessarily constant. Thus as we claimed f factors either through

$$[\mathbb{A}^N/T] \cong [U/T] \subset [\mathbb{P}^N/T] \quad \text{or through} \quad [H/T] \subset [\mathbb{P}^N/T]$$

In the first case, by Lemma 3.17 the map f factors through the image of a T -orbit, and we are done. In the second case, f factors through the lower dimensional space $[H/T] \cong [\mathbb{P}^{N-1}/T]$, and we can conclude by induction on the dimension N : note indeed that the base case of the statement $N = 1$ is clear, as the complement of a T -invariant open subset $\mathbb{A}^1 \cong U \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ is a fixed point, which is a T -orbit. This concludes the proof. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.15.

Proof of Theorem 3.15. The proof is very similar to the proof of Proposition 3.4, and thus we will give a somewhat abbreviated treatment of the argument. By Sumihiro’s Theorem [Sum74] there exist a T -equivariant open cover $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of X such that each U_i is affine. Further any T -equivariant open cover of X can be refined to such a affine T -equivariant open cover. Thus we can restrict, without loss of generality, to covers in $|X|_{Zar}^T$ given by disjoint unions of affines equipped with a T -action.

Let $\{U_i \rightarrow X\}_{i \in I}$ be such a cover. By the pointwise criterion, it is enough to show that for every quasi-constant map $f : E_K \rightarrow [X/T]$ there exists a $i \in I$ such that there is a factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & [U_i/T] \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ E_K & \xrightarrow{f} & [X/T] \end{array}$$

Let U_i be such that the fiber product

$$S := [U_i/T] \times_{[X/T]} E_K$$

is non-empty, and fix a T -equivariant embedding

$$U_i \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^N \subset \mathbb{P}^N$$

where \mathbb{A}^N are \mathbb{P}^N equipped with a suitable T -action. The existence of such an embedding is a simple application of Lemma 5.2 in [Dre04], specialized to the case in which the reductive group is a torus T . Note that $[\mathbb{P}^N/T]$ satisfies the valuative criterion for properness. This is a simple fact, but for completeness we give an argument for this in Remark 3.19 below. As a consequence, there always exists a (non unique) arrow h making the diagram below commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [U_i/T] & \longrightarrow & [\mathbb{P}^n/T] \\ f|_S \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow h \\ S & \longrightarrow & E_K \end{array}$$

Thus, by Lemma 3.18, h admits a lift represented by the dashed arrow in the diagram. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.19. *Let us explain why $[\mathbb{P}^N/T]$ satisfies the valuative criterion of properness. The reason is that T -torsors are locally trivial in the Zariski topology, and thus every T -torsor on the fraction field of a DVR has a section. Indeed, let R be a DVR and consider a map $m : \text{Frac}(R) \rightarrow [\mathbb{P}^N/T]$. Let us show that it admits a lift*

$$\bar{m} : \text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow [\mathbb{P}^N/T]$$

The map m classifies a diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{P}^N \\ \downarrow & \nearrow n & \downarrow \\ \text{Spec}(\text{Frac}(R)) & \xrightarrow{m} & [\mathbb{P}^N/T] \end{array}$$

where P is a T -torsor; as P is trivial we can pick a section (represented by a dashed arrow) and this induces a lift n . Applying the ordinary valuative criterion for properness to \mathbb{P}^n , we obtain a map \bar{n} which makes the following diagram commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Spec}(R) & \xrightarrow{\bar{n}} & \mathbb{P}^N \\ \uparrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Spec}(\mathrm{Frac}(R)) & \xrightarrow{n} & \mathbb{P}^N \end{array}$$

Then the composite map

$$\bar{m} : \mathrm{Spec}(R) \xrightarrow{\bar{n}} \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow [\mathbb{P}^N/T]$$

is the desired lift of m .

4. CALCULATIONS. THE LOCAL MODEL, AND TORIC VARIETIES.

Our purpose in this section is twofold. First, we will compute the elliptic Hochschild homology of quotient stacks of the form

$$(7) \quad [\mathbb{A}^l \times \mathbb{G}_m^k/T]$$

where T is an algebraic torus. This calculation is relatively straightforward, but important. It is obtained by combining the results of propositions 4.1, 4.3 and 4.5. It will play a key role in the next section as, via Luna slice theorem, we will often be able to reduce our arguments to this simple local case. Then, using codescent, we compute the elliptic Hochschild homology of smooth toric varieties with their standard torus action. This will give us a broad supply of geometrically interesting examples for which elliptic Hochschild homology can be explicitly described. We show that when $k = \mathbb{C}$ this coincides with the complexified equivariant cohomology of the analytification of X . This is the content of Theorem 4.7.

We begin this section with the following simple observation, which is an analogue of the Künneth isomorphism for mapping stacks. We will refer to it often when doing computations with quasi-constant maps in this section and the next.

Proposition 4.1 (Künneth formula). *Let G be an algebraic group and let X and Y be G -varieties. Then*

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X \times Y/G]) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/G]) \times_{\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [\mathrm{Spec} k/G])} \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [Y/G])$$

where G acts on $X \times Y$ diagonally. Similarly, if we equip the product $X \times Y$ with the product action, we have that

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X \times Y/G \times G]) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/G]) \times \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [Y/G])$$

Proof. Note that if X and Y are two G -varieties, and we equip their product $X \times Y$ with the diagonal G -action, then

$$[X \times Y/G] \simeq [X/G] \times_{[\mathrm{Spec} k/G]} [Y/G]$$

As $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, -)$ preserves limits, we obtain a pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X \times Y/G]) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/G]) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [Y/G]) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\text{Spec } k/G]) \end{array}$$

For the second formula, we only need to observe that we have an equivalence

$$[X \times Y/G \times G] \simeq [X/G] \times [Y/G]$$

and argue as in the previous case. \square

4.1. The local model. In this section we will compute the elliptic Hochschild homology of quotient stacks of the form $[\mathbb{A}^l \times \mathbb{G}_m^k/T]$. Iterated applications of the Künneth formula allow us to break down the computations for a product $\mathbb{A}^l \times \mathbb{G}_m^k$ to the cases of \mathbb{A}^1 and \mathbb{G}_m , and thus we will limit ourselves to describe these explicitly. This will be achieved in a sequence of Propositions. Let us consider trivial actions first.

Proposition 4.2. *Let X be a variety over k and let T be an algebraic torus acting trivially on X . Then*

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) = \text{HH}_*(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{E_T}$$

Proof. Since the action is trivial, we have that $[X/T] \simeq X \times BT$. The proposition follows because $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, -)$ preserves limits. \square

Proposition 4.3. *Let T be an algebraic torus of rank r acting on \mathbb{A}^1 . Assume that the T -action is non-trivial. Then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([\mathbb{A}^1/T]) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{E_T}$$

Proof. Let us choose an isomorphism $T \cong \mathbb{G}_m^r$. We describe the action in coordinates as

$$\lambda \cdot z = \prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^{w_i} z$$

Recall that the stack $[\mathbb{A}^1/\mathbb{G}_m^r]$ classifies r -tuples $\{\mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^r$ of degree zero line bundles on E together with a section $s \in H^0(\otimes_{i=1}^r \mathcal{L}_i^{w_i})$. In particular, we obtain the following description of the mapping stack $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^1/T])$, when the action is non-trivial. Let Z be the closed subscheme of E_T cut out by the equation

$$(8) \quad \prod_{i=1}^r e_i^{w_i} = 1$$

Then we have a push-out diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [Z \times \text{Spec } k/T] & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T \\ \downarrow 0 & & \downarrow \\ [Z \times \mathbb{A}^1/T] & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^1/T]) \end{array}$$

where the left vertical map is the zero section of the projection $[Z \times \mathbb{A}^1/T] \rightarrow [Z/T]$, and T acts trivially on E_T and in particular on Z . Note that if T is rank 1, Z is a finite subset of the torsion points in E_T .

In particular, the coarse moduli space of the stack $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^1/T])$ is given by E_T , which implies that

$$p_* \mathcal{O}_{\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^1/T])} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{E_T}$$

which ends the proof. \square

Remark 4.4. *In particular, if the base field $k = \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1/T]) \simeq \mathcal{E}ll_T^0(\mathbb{C})$$

if the action is nontrivial. In the trivial case, instead, compare the following two expressions:

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([\mathbb{A}^1/T]) \simeq \text{HH}_*(\mathbb{A}^1) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{E_T}$$

$$\mathcal{E}ll_T^0(\mathbb{C}) \simeq H^*(\mathbb{C}) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{E_T}$$

Proposition 4.5. *Let T be an algebraic torus of rank r acting on \mathbb{G}_m . Let*

$$p : \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{G}_m/T]) \rightarrow E_T$$

be the structure map. Let $Z \subset E_T$ be the closed subscheme of E_T cut out by equation (8). Then, as soon as the action is nontrivial, we have an equivalence

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([\mathbb{G}_m/T]) \simeq \mathcal{O}_Z$$

as quasi-coherent sheaves on E_T .

The proof of this proposition is the same as the proof of proposition 4.3, and in fact the geometry is simpler. The stack $[\mathbb{G}_m/T]$ classifies r -tuples $\{\mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^r$ of degree zero line bundles on E , and *trivializations* of the tensor product

$$(9) \quad \bigotimes_{i=1}^r \mathcal{L}_i^{w_i} \simeq \mathcal{O}_E$$

where the w_i -s are the weights of the action. Thus the stack $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{G}_m/T])$ sits over the locus $Z \subset E_T$ of those bundles satisfying (9).

Remark 4.6. *As in the case of \mathbb{A}^1 , if the base field $k = \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathbb{C}}/T]) \cong \mathcal{E}ll_T^0(\mathbb{C}^*)$$

if the action is nontrivial. In the trivial case, instead,

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([\mathbb{G}_m/T]) \cong \text{HH}_*(\mathbb{G}_m) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{E_T}$$

$$\mathcal{E}ll_T^0(\mathbb{C}^*) \cong H^*(\mathbb{C}^*) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_{E_T}$$

4.2. The case of maximal tori. In this subsection we compute the equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology of smooth toric varieties equipped with the toric action of their maximal torus. In particular, we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4.7. *Let X be a smooth (normal) toric variety over \mathbb{C} , and let the maximal torus T act on X either with the standard toric action or with weights $\{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$ all non-zero. Then there is an isomorphism of quasi-coherent sheaves on E_T*

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) \simeq \mathcal{E}ll_T^0(X^{\text{an}})$$

where X^{an} denotes the analytification of X , and $\mathcal{E}ll_T^0(X^{\text{an}})$ is its complexified T -equivariant elliptic cohomology in the sense of Grojnowski, i.e. the non-periodic version.

The proof of theorem 4.7 rests on the local computations carried out in proposition 4.3 and 4.5.

Proof of theorem 4.7. As X is a toric variety, we can find a T -equivariant open cover \mathcal{U} by products $\mathbb{A}^n \times \mathbb{G}_m^k$. Let us assume for simplicity that $k = 0$, as the case $k \neq 0$ is basically the same due to the Künneth formula. By the codescent property we know that the natural map

$$\coprod_{U_i \in \mathcal{U}} \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [U_i/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$$

induced by the cover \mathcal{U} is an effective epimorphism, and that the functor

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [-/T]) : |X|_{\text{Zar}}^T \rightarrow \text{dSt}_k$$

is a cosheaf, as explained in theorem 3.15. This implies that the functor

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([-/T]) : |X|_{\text{Zar}}^T \rightarrow \text{Qcoh}(E_T)$$

is a sheaf, and in particular $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ is obtained as the totalization of the cosimplicial object $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([\mathcal{U}_\bullet/T])$, where \mathcal{U}_\bullet is the Čech nerve of the cover \mathcal{U} . Similarly, T -equivariant elliptic cohomology satisfies the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence, that implies that we can compute the quasi-coherent sheaf $\mathcal{E}ll_T^0(X)$ as the totalization of the cosimplicial object $\mathcal{E}ll_T^0(\mathcal{U}_\bullet)$. Propositions 4.3 and 4.5 imply that this two cosimplicial objects coincide at all levels, hence they have the same totalization. This concludes the proof. \square

We can obtain an analogous result for the full sheaf $\mathcal{E}ll_T(X)$, without restricting to the degree zero part. Indeed, toric varieties X have vanishing singular cohomology in odd degrees. As explained in [SS22], Remark 2.1, this has the consequence that the equivariant elliptic cohomology of X splits as a sum

$$\mathcal{E}ll_T(X) \cong \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{E}ll_T^0(X)[2k]$$

where $[2k]$ denotes shift by $2k$ in the category of \mathbb{Z}_2 -periodic complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on E_T , $\text{Qcoh}(E_T)_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$. This observation together with theorem 4.7 proves the following

Corollary 4.8. *Let X be a smooth (normal) toric variety over \mathbb{C} , and let the maximal torus T act on X with the standard toric action. Then there is an isomorphism of \mathbb{Z}_2 -periodic complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on E_T*

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])[u, u^{-1}] \simeq \mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{\text{an}})$$

where u is a variable in degree 2 and $\mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{\text{an}})$ is the \mathbb{Z}_2 -periodic complexified T -equivariant elliptic cohomology of the analytification of X .

5. EQUIVARIANT ELLIPTIC HOCHSCHILD HOMOLOGY

In this section we study the local behaviour of equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ when X is a smooth variety over k equipped with an action of T . We relate this to Hochschild homology and equivariant elliptic cohomology. In particular, this involves completing the quasi-constant maps at the constants and comparing this formal stack with the completion of the loop space at the constant maps. A localization phenomenon, combined with the group structure on the elliptic curve E , allows for the computation of the completions over all closed points of E_T . Our main results in this section are direct analogues of theorems established by Chen in [Che20] in the setting of ordinary Hochschild homology.

First, we need a few definitions.

Definition 5.1. *Let G be a derived group scheme acting on a derived stack X . The derived fixed locus of the G -action is the following fiber product of derived stacks*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X^G & \longrightarrow & X \times G \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow (\pi, a) \\ X & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & X \times X \end{array}$$

where π is the projection and a is the action map.

The following definition, in the underived setting, goes back to Grojnowski [Gro07], see [Gan14] for a more recent reference. The following is just a derived version of the classical definition.

Definition 5.2. *Let e be a closed point in E_T . Let $S(e)$ be the set of subtori $T' \subset T$ such that e belongs to $E_{T'} \subset E_T$. Then set*

$$T(e) := \bigcap_{T' \in S(e)} T'$$

We denote by X^e the derived fixed locus of X under the action of $T(e)$,

$$X^e := X^{T(e)}$$

Recall that fixing an isomorphism $T \cong \mathbb{G}_m^n$ induces an isomorphism $E_T \cong E^n$. Under this identification, we can characterize the subgroup $T(e)$ as follows. Let $e = (e_1, \dots, e_n) \in E^n$ and assume that

- $e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_l} \in E$ are torsion with order $|e_{i_j}| = n_j$
- For all $k \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}$, $e_k \in E$ is not torsion

Then, up to shuffling the factors,

$$T(e) = \left(\prod_{i=i_1}^{i_l} \mu_{n_i} \right) \times (\mathbb{G}_m)^{n-l} \subset T$$

5.1. The localization formula for quasi-constant maps. In this section we establish a localization theorem for quasi-constant maps. This is an analogue of Theorem 3.1.12 in [Che20].

Theorem 5.3 (Localization formula). *Let X be a smooth variety over k equipped with an action of an algebraic torus T . Then for any closed point $e \in E_T$ there exists a Zariski open set $U \subset E_T$ containing e such that the natural map*

$$(10) \quad \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0 X^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \times_{E_T} U$$

induced by the inclusion of the classical fixed locus $t_0 X^e \rightarrow X$, is an equivalence.

To prove this statement, we proceed by first establishing it for \mathbb{A}_k^n in Lemma 5.4 below. Then we will show that this example is prototypical, by an application of the Luna étale slice theorem.

Lemma 5.4 (Localization for the affine space). *Consider the n -dimensional affine space \mathbb{A}^n , equipped with an action of a torus T of rank k . Fix a closed point e in E_T . Then there exists a Zariski open U in E_T such that the natural map*

$$\phi : \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0(\mathbb{A}^n)^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U \rightarrow \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^n/T]) \times_{E_T} U$$

induced by the inclusion of the classical fixed locus $t_0(\mathbb{A}^n)^e \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^n$ is an equivalence.

Proof. In the case of $[\mathbb{A}^n/T]$ we can describe explicitly the open U . First of all, observe that, since the action of T on \mathbb{A}^n is linear, the fixed loci will be a linear subspace, in particular there exists a natural number p such that $t_0(\mathbb{A}^n)^e = \mathbb{A}^p$. We distinguish two situations:

- (1) $e = 1$ in E_T . In this case, the statement is true for any U ;
- (2) $e \neq 1$. In this case, the open set U can be described in terms of the weights $\{w_i^j\}$ of the action.

Let us focus on the second case. Recall that the stack $[\text{Spec } k/T]$ classifies principal T -bundles or equivalently k -tuples of line bundles $\{\mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k$, while $[\mathbb{A}^n/T]$ classifies such k -tuples $\{\mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ together with an n -tuple of sections $s_j \in H^0(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mathcal{L}_i^{w_i^j})$ for all values of j in $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Since degree zero bundles on elliptic curves have sections if and only if they are trivial, the stacks $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^n/T])$ and $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^p/T])$ will differ only over the locus of those points $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ in E_T such that $\sum_{i=1}^k f_i^{w_i^j} = 0$ for more than p values of j in $\{1, \dots, n\}$. This is because, for points f of this kind, there will be more than p line bundles of the form $\otimes_{i=1}^k \mathcal{L}_i^{w_i^j}$ (indexed by j) that admit non-vanishing sections, hence n -tuples of sections may differ from p -tuples of sections. Then, the open U is defined by removing from E_T the locus of the points f having this property. □

Remark 5.5. *The lemma above can be viewed as a statement about deformation theory of bundles with sections on elliptic curves. In particular, it is possible to compute the relative cotangent complex of the map*

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0(\mathbb{A}^n)^e/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [\mathbb{A}^n/T])$$

Its vanishing on closed points lying over the Zariski open U depends on the fact that nontrivial degree zero line bundles on E have no non-zero sections.

5.1.1. *The localization theorem on closed points.* Before proceeding with the proof of Theorem 5.3, we will explain why the statement is true on closed points. This will clarify the geometry underlying Theorem 5.3. Further the partial results we will obtain in this section will actually be needed in the course of the proof of Theorem 5.3, which we will present in the next section.

In section 3 we have shown that the derived stack of quasi-constant maps from E satisfies a codescent property with respect to equivariant Zariski open covers. We proved this by showing that the images of the total spaces of principal T -bundles are always contained inside T -orbits in the target space X . This property of quasi-constant maps allows us to show that the map (11) is a homotopy equivalence on closed points, as the type of T -orbit selects which bundles are allowed to map to it.

Proposition 5.6 (Localization formula on closed points). *Let X be a smooth variety over k equipped with an action of an algebraic torus T . Then for any closed point $e \in E_T$ there exists a Zariski open set $U \subset E_T$ containing e such that the natural map*

$$(11) \quad \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \times_{E_T} U$$

is a homotopy equivalence on K -points, for every field K .

Proof. Let us choose a T -orbit in X , O , generated by a closed point x with stabilizer T_x . Then considering the mapping stack to $O \simeq T/T_x$ we obtain

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [O/T]) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [\mathrm{Spec} k/T_x])$$

which is the classifying stack of degree zero T_x -bundles on E . Hence, we conclude that only the principal T -bundles that admit a reduction of the structure group from T to T_x are allowed to map to the orbit O . In particular, as the subscheme t_0X^e is a union of orbits of the form T/S , where S is a subgroup of T containing $T(e)$, the bundles that do not admit a reduction of the structure group to $T(e)$ will not map to $t_0(X^e)$. In order to have that the map (11) is a homotopy equivalence on K -points, we need to remove maps from bundles whose total space can map to orbits not contained in $t_0(X^e)$, i.e. orbits of the form $T/T(e)$. To do so, it is sufficient to remove the bundles that admit a reduction of the structure group to a subgroup of $T(e)$, and this is implemented by restricting the mapping stack to a Zariski open U of E_T . \square

5.1.2. *The proof.* We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.3. The key ingredient in the proof is Luna's slice theorem [Dre04], which allows us to reduce to the case of a linear action on affine space, which was treated in Lemma 5.4.

The proof of Theorem 5.3. By codescent we can reduce without loss of generality to affine varieties, hence we will assume that X is a smooth affine variety for the purpose of this proof. Our goal is to prove that the map

$$(12) \quad \phi : \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0 X^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \times_{E_T} U$$

is an equivalence, for a specific choice of Zariski open subset U of E_T . We know that the map (12) is a homotopy equivalence on closed points thanks to Proposition 5.6 for some U , so we choose the U that realizes such homotopy equivalence as a candidate for the proof. We will first prove that this map is étale. Choose a point x of $t_0(X^e)$ such that the orbit Tx is closed. Applying the Luna slice theorem to x , we find a locally closed smooth subvariety V of X closed under the action of the stabilizer T_x of x such that the natural T -equivariant map $\psi : T \times^{T_x} V \rightarrow X$ is étale and has image given by a Zariski open Z of X . We have an induced commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0(T \times^{T_x} V)^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U & \xrightarrow{\phi_V} & \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [T \times^{T_x} V/T]) \times_{E_T} U \\ \downarrow i_e & & \downarrow i \\ \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0(X)^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \times_{E_T} U \end{array}$$

for the mapping stacks. First note that the map (12) is locally finitely presented: see Remark 5.7 after this proof for a thorough discussion of this point. Thus in order to prove that it is étale we are reduced to showing that it is formally étale, i.e. its relative cotangent complex vanishes. To do so, we first show that the vertical maps have vanishing relative cotangent complex. We focus on the right vertical composition, as the argument is the same as for the one on the left. Choose an S -point

$$x : \mathrm{Spec} S \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [T \times^{T_x} V/T])$$

We need to show that the relative cotangent vanishes at any such S -point. To compute the cotangent complexes we are interested in, we use the formula given by Halpern-Leistner and Preygel in [HLP14] as Proposition 5.1.10:

$$\mathbb{L}_{\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(X,Y)} = \pi_+ f^* \mathbb{L}_Y$$

where the S -point $f : \mathrm{Spec} S \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(X, Y)$ is viewed as a map $f : \mathrm{Spec} S \times X \rightarrow Y$ and π_+ is a left adjoint to the pullback along the projection $\pi : \mathrm{Spec} S \times X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} S$.

Applying Halpern-Leistner and Preygel's formula as in [HLP14], we can compute the pullback $x^* \mathbb{L}_i$:

$$x^* \mathbb{L}_i = \pi_+ x^* \mathbb{L}_\psi \cong 0$$

as Luna's slice theorem guarantees that the map ψ is étale. In particular, we obtain that the map i (and similarly i_e) is formally étale. One consequence of this fact is that we have an equivalence

$$(13) \quad i_e^* \mathbb{L}_\phi \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{L}_{\phi_V}$$

To see this, recall that for a commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ & \searrow h & \downarrow g \\ & & Z \end{array}$$

of derived stacks, there is an induced cofiber (and fiber) sequence of the relative cotangent complexes:

$$f^*\mathbb{L}_g \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_f$$

A reference for this result is for example Corollary 1.44 in [Lura]. In our case, we get two cofiber sequences:

$$\phi_V^*\mathbb{L}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{i \circ \phi_V} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{\phi_V}$$

and

$$i_e^*\mathbb{L}_\phi \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{\phi \circ i_e} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{i_e}$$

Since we know that the two relative cotangent complexes \mathbb{L}_i and \mathbb{L}_{i_e} vanish, we get equivalences

$$\mathbb{L}_{i \circ \phi_V} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbb{L}_{\phi_V}$$

and

$$i_e^*\mathbb{L}_\phi \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbb{L}_{\phi \circ i_e}$$

Since there is an equivalence $\phi \circ i_e \simeq i \circ \phi_V$, we conclude that the equivalence (13) holds.

We shift focus on the map ϕ_V , and show it is formally étale. Recall that, for smooth closed points $x \in X$, the Luna étale slice theorem gives us an additional map $V \rightarrow T_{V,x}$ from V to its tangent space at x which is T_x -equivariant and étale onto its image, which is an open subscheme of $T_{V,x}$. We have a further commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0(T \times^{T_x} V)^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U & \xrightarrow{\phi_V} & \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [T \times^{T_x} V/T]) \times_{E_T} U \\ \downarrow j_e & & \downarrow j \\ \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0(T \times^{T_x} T_{V,x})^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U & \xrightarrow{\phi_x} & \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [T \times^{T_x} T_{V,x}/T]) \times_{E_T} U \end{array}$$

and, reasoning as in the previous case, we obtain an equivalence

$$j_e^*\mathbb{L}_{\phi_x} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbb{L}_{\phi_V}$$

But the map

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0(T \times^{T_x} T_{V,x})^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [T \times^{T_x} T_{V,x}/T]) \times_{E_T} U$$

is formally étale: the linear case has already been analysed in lemma 5.4, which shows that the above map is an equivalence. In particular, we conclude that the map ϕ_V is formally étale. Finally, recall the equivalence (13): we deduce that $i_e^*\mathbb{L}_\phi = 0$. Let us observe that, in the case of algebraic actions of tori on affine varieties, there is a sufficient supply of points with closed orbit: that means, there is a collection of closed points in X such that the orbit they span is closed, and the images of the Luna slice maps ψ at each of these points form an open cover of X .

Let us show why this is the case. First of all, recall that in an affine variety with an action of an algebraic group G , every orbit contains a unique closed orbit in its closure. Moreover, the Zariski open sets Z given by images of the étale slice maps $\psi : T \times^{T_x} V \rightarrow X$ are saturated, that means that given a point $z \in Z$ and any other point $x \in X$, if the intersection $\overline{Tz} \cap \overline{T_x}$ of the closure of the orbits is non-empty, then $x \in Z$. In particular, given an orbit O in X , there always exists a point $x \in X$ whose orbit is closed, and such that the image Z of the Luna slice at the point x contain the orbit O . As a consequence, it is always possible to cover X with images of Luna slices.

Now we can conclude: for each induced map i_e relative to each of these points we know that $i_e^* \mathbb{L}_\phi$ vanishes, and the coproduct of all the maps i_e is an étale effective epimorphism by equivariant Zariski codescent. This is enough to prove that $\mathbb{L}_\phi = 0$, and since ϕ is locally finitely presented we obtain that it is étale, as we desired to show.

We now argue that (12) is an equivalence. Since it is étale and a closed immersion, it is also an open immersion; in particular it exhibits $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0 X^e/T])$ as a union of connected components of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$, since it is a clopen map. Since $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ is a union of connected components of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, [X/T])$ by definition, checking that the map (12) is an equivalence amounts only to understanding if its image contains all such connected components, which can be checked on closed points. But Proposition 5.6 tells us that such map is a homotopy equivalence on the spaces of closed points, and this concludes the proof. \square

Remark 5.7. *We explain briefly why the map (12) is locally finitely presented. We will prove that, if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a locally finitely presented map of derived stacks, the induced map $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, X) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, Y)$ is locally finitely presented. Indeed, the property of being locally finitely presented is local on the target, hence it can be tested over affines*

$$\mathrm{Spec} A \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [t_0 X^e/T])$$

Then we reason exactly like in the proof of Lemma 3.2.

Specializing the above observation to our case, we only need to show that the map

$$[t_0 X^e/T] \rightarrow [X/T]$$

is locally finitely presented. This is equivalent to saying that the map

$$t_0(X^e) \rightarrow X$$

is a locally finitely presented map of schemes. First of all, we always assume throughout the paper that the target of our mapping stack is a locally finitely presented derived stack to guarantee that the derived mapping stack $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ is 1-geometric: this means, for quotient stacks $[X/T]$, that X is finitely presented. This corresponds to finite type over a field k . At this point, the map $t_0(X^e) \rightarrow X$

has locally finitely presented source and target; this implies it is locally finitely presented.⁵

A simple consequence of the localization formula is the following description of the fibers of the structure map $p' : \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Pic}}^0(E)_T$.

⁵See for example Lemma 29.21.11 in <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu/tag/01T0>.

Corollary 5.8. *Let X be a smooth variety over k . Then given a closed point*

$$\bar{e} : \text{Spec } K \rightarrow \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T$$

the fiber of the structure map $p' : \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T$ over the point \bar{e} is given by the derived fixed locus X^e , where e is the closed point in E_T corresponding to the composition $\text{Spec } K \xrightarrow{\bar{e}} \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E) \rightarrow E_T$.

Proof. We are interested in computing the fiber $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \times_{\underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T} \bar{e}$. The closed immersion $\bar{e} : \text{Spec } K \rightarrow \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T$ will factor through $\underline{U}_e = U_e \times BT$, where U_e is the Zariski open determined by Proposition 5.3 for the point e . An application of the same proposition allows us to reduce the computation to the fiber

$$(\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \times_{\underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T} \underline{U}_e) \times_{\underline{U}_e} \bar{e} \simeq (\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T]) \times_{\underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T} \underline{U}_e) \times_{\underline{U}_e} \bar{e}$$

which in turn is the fiber of the structure map $p' : \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T$ over the point \bar{e} . Notice we abuse notation by calling the structure map with the same name p' .

Let $T(e)$ be the subgroup associated to the point e in E_T . The map $\bar{e} : \text{Spec } K \rightarrow \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T$ will factor through the stack $\underline{\text{Bun}}_{T(e)}^0(E)$, hence we can compute the fiber using the following pasting of pullback diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F_e & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T(e)]) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T]) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Spec } K & \xrightarrow{\bar{e}} & \underline{\text{Bun}}_{T(e)}^0(E) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T \end{array}$$

where we called F_e the fiber we are interested in computing. The square on the right is a pullback since $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, -)$ commutes with limits, and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [t_0X^e/T(e)] & \longrightarrow & [t_0X^e/T] \\ \downarrow p_e & & \downarrow \\ [\text{Spec } k/T(e)] & \longrightarrow & [\text{Spec } k/T] \end{array}$$

is a pullback. The calculation of F_e follows easily from the observation that, by definition, $T(e)$ acts trivially on t_0X^e , and in particular we have that

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T(e)]) \simeq \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, t_0X^e \times BT(e)) \simeq \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, t_0X^e) \times \underline{\text{Bun}}_{T(e)}^0(E)$$

hence the map p_e necessarily has fiber over \bar{e} given by $\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, t_0X^e)$, as p_e is isomorphic to the projection to $\underline{\text{Bun}}_{T(e)}^0(E)$. An application of Corollary 1.0.1 in [Che20] reveals that

$$\underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, t_0X^e) \simeq \mathcal{L} t_0X^e \simeq X^e$$

hence we are done. □

Remark 5.9. *Note that the fiber of the structure map*

$$p' : \underline{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)_T$$

over a stacky point $[\bar{e}/T] : [\text{Spec } K/T] \rightarrow \underline{\text{Pic}}^0(E)$ is given by $[X^e/T]$ instead.

5.2. The local structure of the quasi-constant maps. We study the local structure of the quasi-constant maps by computing their completions. First, we focus on the formal completion of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$ at the constant maps.

Recall that for a derived stack \mathcal{X} , there is a natural map

$$\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{\cong} \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Spec} k, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$$

induced by the structure morphism $E \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} k$. We call the completion of this map *the completion of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$ at the constant maps* or *formal maps* from E to \mathcal{X} . There is an analogous map for the loop space $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{X}$, and its formal completion is usually called the *formal loop space*.

Remark 5.10. *The formal completion of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$ at the constant maps is the same as that of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X})$, as $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$ is in general a collection of connected components of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X})$ containing the constant maps.*

Proposition 5.11. *Let \mathcal{X} be a geometric derived stack over a field k of characteristic zero, and E be an elliptic curve over k . There is a natural map between formal completions at the constant maps*

$$\psi : \widehat{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \widehat{\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})}$$

Further, ψ is an equivalence.

Proposition 5.11 is closely related to results that have already appeared in the literature in slightly different settings, and in particular to Theorem 6.9 of [BZN12]. The point is that the deformation theory of quasi-constant maps out of E near the constant maps is controlled by the affinization of E . As the latter is equivalent to the affinization of S^1 the completion of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$ is equivalent to the completion of $\mathcal{L}X$.

We will follow a similar proof strategy as [BZN12]. In Theorem 6.9, the authors define a natural map between formal completions at the constant maps

$$\exp : \widehat{T}_{\mathcal{X}}[-1] \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{X}}$$

and show that it is an equivalence.

The authors prove this theorem by directly constructing the map, and then showing that it is an equivalence by comparing the cotangent complexes. As it is a map of formal derived stacks, this is sufficient to prove the equivalence. Our argument for the proof of Proposition 5.11 goes along the same lines. First, we prove the following intermediate result:

Lemma 5.12. *Let \mathcal{X} be a derived stack with affine diagonal. Then the natural map*

$$\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X})$$

induces an equivalence of the pullbacks of the cotangent complexes over the constant maps.

Proof of lemma 5.12. The key point in the proof of this lemma is to consider the restriction of the cotangent complexes of $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X})$ and $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}^0(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X})$ to the constant maps. First

of all, define the maps

$$\begin{aligned} u &: \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X}) \\ c' &: \mathcal{X} \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Spec} k, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X}) \\ c &: \mathcal{X} \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Spec} k, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X}) = u \circ c' \end{aligned}$$

given by composition with the unit of the affinization $E \rightarrow \mathrm{Aff}(E)$ and with the structure maps $\mathrm{Aff}(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} k$ and $E \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} k$ respectively. The map u induces a fiber-cofiber sequence

$$u^* \mathbb{L}_{\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X})} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X})} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_u$$

of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X})$. Here, \mathbb{L}_u denotes the relative cotangent complex of the map u . Pulling this back along the map c' we get a fiber-cofiber sequence

$$c'^* \mathbb{L}_{\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X})} \rightarrow c'^* \mathbb{L}_{\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X})} \rightarrow c'^* \mathbb{L}_u$$

of quasi-coherent sheaves on \mathcal{X} . Our goal is to show that $c'^* \mathbb{L}_u$ vanishes. To do so, we show the stronger fact that the map of the based loop spaces

$$\Omega_x(u) : \Omega_x \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \Omega_x \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X})$$

is an equivalence. Indeed, the cotangent complex of a based loop space is a shift of the original cotangent complex: let $F : \mathrm{dAff}^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be a prestack, and let $x : \mathrm{Spec} S \rightarrow F$ be a S -point of F . The point x canonically induces a point $\delta_x : \mathrm{Spec} S \rightarrow \Omega_x F$, and the following relation holds:

$$\mathbb{L}_{F, x} \simeq \mathbb{L}_{\Omega_x F, \delta_x}[-1]$$

In particular, showing that $\Omega_x(u)$ is an equivalence is enough to conclude.

To show that $\Omega_x(u)$ is an equivalence, observe that the based loop spaces have a presentation as mapping stacks: in particular we have equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_x \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X}) &\simeq \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \Omega_x \mathcal{X}) \\ \Omega_x \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \mathcal{X}) &\simeq \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \Omega_x \mathcal{X}) \end{aligned}$$

obtained by applying the tensor-hom adjunction twice on different factors. Since \mathcal{X} has affine diagonal the based loop space $\Omega_x \mathcal{X}$ is an affine scheme, hence we have an identification $\underline{\mathrm{Map}}(\mathrm{Aff}(E), \Omega_x \mathcal{X}) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Map}}(E, \Omega_x \mathcal{X})$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of proposition 5.11. First of all we need to construct a map

$$\psi : \widehat{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$$

This is done imitating the construction in [BZN12]. Let $U_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be an atlas for \mathcal{X} and $U_\bullet \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be its Čech nerve. Then applying $\widehat{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, -)$ to this map we obtain

$$\widehat{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, U_\bullet) \simeq \widehat{\mathcal{L}}U_\bullet \rightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$$

which in turn yields a map

$$|\widehat{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, U_\bullet)| \simeq |\widehat{\mathcal{L}}U_\bullet| \rightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$$

from the geometric realizations. Passing to the structure sheaves, we get maps

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})} \rightarrow \text{Tot} \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{U}}.$$

The content of [BZN12][Theorem 6.9] is that $\text{Tot} \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{U}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{X}}$. Applying the relative Spec construction we obtain a map between the geometric objects:

$$(14) \quad \psi : \widehat{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, \mathcal{X})$$

The next task is to prove that this map is an equivalence. To do so, we will apply Lemma 5.12. The proposition follows automatically. Indeed, the equivalence

$$\text{exp} : \widehat{T}_{\mathcal{X}}[-1] \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{X}$$

factors via formal unipotent loops $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^u \mathcal{X}$. The latter are equivalent to the completion

$$\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(\text{Aff}(E), \mathcal{X})$$

and this completes the proof. \square

Proposition 5.11 can be used to compute the completion of equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ at the identity of E_T . Let us first set up some notation. Denote by

$$i : \{1_{E_T}\} \rightarrow E_T \quad j : \{1_T\} \rightarrow T$$

the inclusion of the identity elements. Let \widehat{E}_T be the completion of E at i and denote by

$$\widehat{i} : \widehat{E}_T \rightarrow E_T$$

the natural map. Similarly, let \widehat{T} be the completion of T at j and denote by

$$\widehat{j} : \widehat{T} \rightarrow T$$

the natural map.

Following Remark 2.4.9 in [Che20], we define the derived completion of a quasi-coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} on E_T at the identity element as the pull-push

$$\widehat{i}_* \widehat{i}^* \mathcal{F}$$

Corollary 5.13. *The derived completion of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ at the identity of E_T*

$$\widehat{i}_* \widehat{i}^* \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$$

is equivalent to the push-forward along \widehat{i} of the completion of $\text{HH}_([X/T])$ at the prime ideal corresponding to the point $1 \in T = \text{Spec HH}_*([\text{Spec } k/T])$.*

Proof. To prove this statement we need to evaluate the series of pullbacks and pushforwards appearing in $\widehat{i}_* \widehat{i}^* \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$. Observe that we have a pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{i}_X} & \text{Map}^0(E, [X/T]) \\ \downarrow \widehat{p} & & \downarrow p \\ \widehat{E}_T & \xrightarrow{\widehat{i}} & E_T \end{array}$$

This square allows us to trade \widehat{i}_*p_* with $\widehat{p}_*\widehat{i}_X^*$ in the expression $\widehat{i}_*\widehat{j}^*\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$. There is an analogous pullback square for the loop space

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}[X/T] & \xrightarrow{\widehat{j}_X} & \mathcal{L}[X/T] \\ \downarrow \widehat{q} & & \downarrow q \\ \widehat{T} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{j}} & T \end{array}$$

We may consider similar completions for the loop space, namely $\widehat{j}_*\widehat{j}^*q_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}[X/T]}$. Using the pullback square for the loop space we may rewrite this completion as

$$(15) \quad \widehat{j}_*\widehat{j}^*q_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}[X/T]} \simeq \widehat{j}_*\widehat{q}_*\widehat{j}_X^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}[X/T]} \simeq \widehat{j}_*\widehat{q}_*\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[X/T]}$$

Now, $\widehat{j}_*\widehat{q}_*\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[X/T]}$ is a quasi-coherent sheaf on T , which is affine, hence it is completely determined by its global sections. These correspond to the global sections of the structure sheaf of the completion of $\mathcal{L}[X/T]$ at the constant maps. This object indeed corresponds to the completion of the Hochschild homology of $[X/T]$ at the maximal ideal corresponding to the identity element of the torus T .

Proposition 5.11 provides identifications $\widehat{T} \simeq \widehat{E}_T$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[X/T] \simeq \widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])$. In particular, when evaluating the expression $\widehat{i}_*\widehat{i}^*\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ we obtain

$$\widehat{i}_*\widehat{i}^*\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) \simeq \widehat{i}_*\widehat{p}_*\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])} \simeq \widehat{i}_*\widehat{q}_*\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[X/T]}$$

Viewing the completion of the Hochschild homology of $[X/T]$ as the quasi-coherent sheaf $\widehat{q}_*\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[X/T]}$ on the completion \widehat{T} , instead of as a quasi-coherent sheaf on the torus T , the corollary is proved. \square

The completions over other closed points e of E_T can be computed from the completion at the identity using the localization formula explained in 5.1 and the group structure on E_T . Indeed, the group structure on E_T provides canonical identifications between the completions at various closed points, which allow a generalization of corollary 5.13.

Before stating the main theorem of this section and proving it, let us fix some notations. Choose a closed point e of E_T . Let $\widehat{i}_e : \widehat{E}_{T,e} \rightarrow E_T$ be the natural map from the derived formal completion of E_T at the closed point e to E_T . Moreover, call $\widehat{\mu}_e : \widehat{E}_T \rightarrow \widehat{E}_{T,e}$ the completion of the map of multiplication by e , which is an equivalence of formal derived schemes. In particular, the group structure on E_T gives canonical identifications between completions at different closed points.

Theorem 5.14. *The (derived) completion of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ at the closed point e of E_T , $(\widehat{i}_e)_*\widehat{i}_e^*\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$, is equivalent to the completion of $\text{HH}_*([t_0X^e/T])$ at the prime ideal corresponding to the point $1 \in T = \text{Spec HH}_*([\text{Spec } k/T])$*

Proof. Using a similar base change procedure as in the proof of Corollary 5.13 we can rewrite the derived completion of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ at e as

$$(\widehat{i}_e)_*\widehat{i}_e^*\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) \simeq (\widehat{i}_e)_*(\widehat{p}_e)_*\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])}$$

where $p_{\widehat{e}} : \widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T])_e \rightarrow \widehat{E}_{T,e}$ is the completion at e of the structure map p . Proposition 5.3 gives us a Zariski open U of E_T containing e such that

$$\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T]) \times_{E_T} U \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [X/T]) \times_{E_T} U$$

is an equivalence, which implies that the completion at e of $\mathcal{HH}_E([X/T])$ is equivalent to the completion at the same point of the sheaf given by $\mathcal{HH}_E([t_0X^e/T])$.

Consider the following pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T]) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\mu}_{e,X}} & \widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T])_e \\ \downarrow \widehat{p} & & \downarrow \widehat{p}_e \\ \widehat{E}_T & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\mu}_e} & \widehat{E}_{T,e} \end{array}$$

Since $\widehat{\mu}_e$ is an equivalence, we have the following relation:

$$(\widehat{p}_e)_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T])_e} \simeq (\widehat{\mu}_e)_* \widehat{p}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T])}$$

Corollary 5.13 implies that we can identify $\widehat{p}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T])}$ with $\widehat{q}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[t_0X^e/T]}$. By plugging in this equivalence in the previous expression we obtain

$$(\widehat{p}_e)_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T])_e} \simeq (\widehat{\mu}_e)_* \widehat{q}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[t_0X^e/T]}$$

as quasi-coherent sheaves on the formal completion $\widehat{E}_{T,e}$. In order to obtain the desired quasi-coherent sheaf on E_T we need to take the pushforward along \widehat{i}_e : we obtain

$$(\widehat{i}_e)_* \widehat{i}_e^* \mathcal{HH}_E([X/T]) \simeq (\widehat{i}_e)_* (\widehat{p}_e)_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\text{Map}}^0(E, [t_0X^e/T])_e} \simeq (\widehat{i}_e)_* (\widehat{\mu}_e)_* \widehat{q}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[t_0X^e/T]}$$

Since the map $\widehat{i} : \widehat{E}_T \rightarrow E_T$ factors as $\widehat{\mu}_e : \widehat{E}_T \rightarrow \widehat{E}_{T,e}$ followed by $\widehat{i}_e : \widehat{E}_{T,e} \rightarrow E_T$, we can rewrite the previous formula as

$$(\widehat{i}_e)_* \widehat{i}_e^* \mathcal{HH}_E([X/T]) \simeq (\widehat{i}_e)_* (\widehat{\mu}_e)_* \widehat{q}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[t_0X^e/T]} \simeq \widehat{i}_* \widehat{q}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[t_0X^e/T]}$$

and this completes the proof. \square

Theorem 5.14 is the key input in the proof of the equivalence between the Tate fixed points of equivariant elliptic cohomology, and the rationalized equivariant elliptic cohomology of the analytification, which will appear in the companion article [ST]. We conclude by explaining how Theorem 5.14 compares to Grojnowski's local description of elliptic cohomology, and by outlining some of the ideas going in the comparison result that will be proved in [ST].

We can use equation (15) to express the final statement of theorem 5.14 in a slightly more convenient way:

$$(\widehat{i}_e)_* \widehat{i}_e^* \mathcal{HH}_E([X/T]) \simeq \widehat{i}_* \widehat{q}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[t_0X^e/T]} \simeq \widehat{i}_* \widehat{j}_* q_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}[t_0X^e/T]}$$

where $q : \mathcal{L}[X/T] \rightarrow T$ is the natural map. Since the torus $T = \text{Spec HH}([\text{Spec } k/T])$ is an affine scheme, there is an equivalence of ∞ -categories $\Gamma : \text{Qcoh}(T) \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\text{HH}([\text{Spec } k/T])}$ given by taking global sections. Under this equivalence, the Hochschild homology of $[X/T]$, given by $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}[X/T])$ as a $\text{HH}([\text{Spec } k/T])$ -module, becomes the quasi-coherent sheaf $q_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}[X/T]}$. Let us denote the sheaf $q_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}[t_0X^e/T]}$ as $\mathcal{HH}([X/T])$.

Theorem 5.14 is an analogue of Grojnowski’s definition of equivariant elliptic cohomology, where equivariant singular cohomology is replaced by the Hochschild homology of the quotient stack. Let the base field be \mathbb{C} and fix a closed point e in E_T . Let us compare the completion at e of equivariant elliptic Hochschild homology with the completion at e of equivariant elliptic cohomology. First, let us fix some notations. Call $\widehat{k} : \widehat{\mathfrak{t}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}$ the map from the completion at 0 of the Lie algebra of T to the Lie algebra of T . Denote by $\mathcal{H}([X/T])$ the quasi-coherent sheaf on $\mathfrak{t} = \text{Spec } H_T(\ast)$ having as global sections given the \mathbb{Z}_2 -periodized T -equivariant cohomology of X^{an} , $H_T(X^{\text{an}})_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{i}_e)_* \widehat{i}_e^* \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T]) &\simeq \widehat{i}_* \widehat{q}_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}[t_0 X^e/T]} \simeq \widehat{i}_* \widehat{j}^* \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}([t_0 X^e/T]) \\ (\widehat{i}_e)_* \widehat{i}_e^* \mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{\text{an}}) &\simeq \widehat{i}_* \widehat{k}^* \mathcal{H}([t_0(X^{\text{an}})^e/T]) \end{aligned}$$

The completions of equivariant elliptic cohomology over E_T compute Borel equivariant cohomology. This fact is crucial for Grojnowski’s definition of equivariant elliptic cohomology. As he shows, in order to define a global equivariant elliptic cohomology sheaf over E_T it is enough to appropriately glue together these local descriptions.

By Theorem 5.14, the completions of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ and $\mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{\text{an}})$ are formally identical, except in the setting elliptic Hochschild homology the role of Borel equivariant cohomology is taken up by the Hochschild homology of the quotient stack. The sheaf $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}_E([X/T])$ carries a natural action, which is induced by the action of E on the mapping stack. This action will be studied in detail in the companion paper [ST]. Passing to the Tate fixed points yields a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded sheaf on E_T called *elliptic periodic cyclic homology*, and denoted $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{P}_E([X/T])$. The completions of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{P}_E([X/T])$ compute the periodic cyclic homology of the quotient stack, and therefore are equivalent to the equivariant de Rham cohomology of X . Thus, using the notations introduced above, one has equivalences

$$(\widehat{i}_e)_* \widehat{i}_e^* \mathcal{H}\mathcal{P}_E([X/T]) \simeq \widehat{i}_* \widehat{k}^* \mathcal{H}([t_0(X^{\text{an}})^e/T]) \simeq (\widehat{i}_e)_* \widehat{i}_e^* \mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{\text{an}})$$

This is one of the key step in the proof of the equivalence

$$\mathcal{H}\mathcal{P}_E([X/T]) \simeq \mathcal{E}ll_T(X^{\text{an}})$$

which will be established in [ST]. The other ingredient will be an adelic descent package, which will allow us to upgrade the equivalence on completions to a global equivalence.

REFERENCES

- [AB02] M. Ando and M. Basterra, *The witten genus and equivariant elliptic cohomology*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **240** (2002), no. 4, pp. 787–822
- [AHJM88] J. Adams, J.-P. Haeberly, S. Jackowski, and J. May, *A generalization of the Atiyah-Segal completion theorem*, Topology **27** (1988), no. 1, pp. 1–6, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/004093838890002X>
- [AS69] M. F. Atiyah and G. B. Segal, *Equivariant K-theory and completion*, Journal of Differential Geometry **3** (1969), no. 1-2, pp. 1 – 18, <https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1214428815>
- [BDR] N. A. Baas, B. I. Dundas, and J. Rognes, *Two-vector bundles and forms of elliptic cohomology*
- [BE22] D. Berwick-Evans, *Equivariant elliptic cohomology, gauged sigma models, and discrete torsion*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society (2022), no. 375, pp. 369–427

- [BET21] D. Berwick-Evans and A. Tripathy, *A de Rham model for complex analytic equivariant elliptic cohomology*, *Advances in Mathematics* **380** (2021), p. 107575, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000187082100013X>
- [BZN12] D. Ben-Zvi and D. Nadler, *Loop spaces and connections*, *Journal of Topology* **5** (2012), no. 2, pp. 377–430, preprint <https://academic.oup.com/jtopol/article-pdf/5/2/377/3000229/jts007.pdf>
- [Che20] H. Chen, *Equivariant localization and completion in cyclic homology and derived loop spaces*, *Advances in Mathematics* **364** (2020), p. 107005, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000187082030030X>
- [Cos] K. Costello, *A geometric construction of the Witten genus, I*, *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*
- [Cos11] K. J. Costello, *A geometric construction of the Witten genus, II*, 2011
- [DH11] C. L. Douglas and A. G. Henriques, *Topological modular forms and conformal nets*, *Mathematical foundations of quantum field theory and perturbative string theory* **83** (2011), pp. 341–354
- [Dre04] J. M. Drezet, *Luna Slice Theorem and Applications*, *Algebraic Group Actions and Quotients*, Hindawi Publishing Corporation, 2004
- [GKV95] V. Ginzburg, M. M. Kapranov, and E. Vasserot, *Elliptic Algebras and Equivariant Elliptic Cohomology*, arXiv: Quantum Algebra (1995)
- [GM20] D. Gepner and L. Meier, *On equivariant topological modular forms*, 04 2020
- [GMS99] V. Gorbounov, F. Malikov, and V. Schechtman, *Gerbes of chiral differential operators*, 1999
- [Gan14] N. Ganter, *The elliptic Weyl character formula*, *Compositio Mathematica* **150** (2014), no. 7, p. 1196–1234
- [Gre05] J. Greenlees, *Rational S^1 -equivariant elliptic cohomology*, *Topology* **44** (2005), no. 6, pp. 1213–1279, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040938305000480>
- [Gro07] I. Grojnowski, *Delocalised equivariant elliptic cohomology (with an introduction by Matthew Ando and Haynes Miller)*, *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, p. 114–121, Cambridge University Press, 2007
- [Gro15] M. Groechenig, *Adelic Descent Theory*, *Compositio Mathematica* **153** (2015)
- [HLP14] D. Halpern-Leistner and A. Preygel, *Mapping stacks and categorical notions of properness*
- [HLP20] D. Halpern-Leistner and D. Pomerleano, *Equivariant Hodge theory and noncommutative geometry*, *Geometry & Topology* **24** (2020), no. 5, pp. 2361–2433, <https://doi.org/10.2140/2Fgt.2020.24.2361>
- [HSS17] M. Hoyois, S. Scherotzke, and N. Sibilla, *Higher traces, noncommutative motives, and the categorified Chern character*, *Advances in Mathematics* **309** (2017), pp. 97–154
- [HSS21] M. Hoyois, P. Safronov, S. Scherotzke, and N. Sibilla, *The categorified Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch theorem*, *Compositio Mathematica* **157** (2021), no. 1, p. 154–214
- [Lura] J. Lurie, *DAG IV: Deformation Theory*
- [Lurb] ———, *DAG VIII: Quasi-Coherent Sheaves and Tannaka Duality Theorems*
- [Lurc] ———, *Elliptic Cohomology I: Spectral Abelian Varieties*
- [Lurd] ———, *Elliptic Cohomology II: Orientations*
- [Lure] ———, *Elliptic Cohomology III: Tempered Cohomology*
- [Lurf] ———, *Spectral Algebraic Geometry*
- [Lurg] J. Lurie, *Higher Algebra*
- [Lur09] ———, *Higher Topos Theory*, *Annals of Mathematical Studies*, Princeton University Press, 2009
- [MRT19] T. Moulinos, M. Robalo, and B. Toën, *A Universal HKR Theorem*, working paper or preprint, June 2019, <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02157779>
- [MS99a] F. Malikov and V. Schechtman, *Chiral Poincaré duality*, arXiv: Algebraic Geometry (1999)
- [MS99b] ———, *Chiral de Rham complex. II*, arXiv: Algebraic Geometry (1999)
- [MSV98] F. Malikov, V. Schechtman, and A. Vaintrob, *Chiral de Rham Complex*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **204** (1998), pp. 439–473
- [PV18] T. Pantev and G. Vezzosi, *Introductory topics in Derived Algebraic Geometry*, working paper or preprint, 2018, <http://www.dma.unifi.it/~vezzosi/papers/tou.pdf>

- [PY16] M. Porta and T. Y. Yu, *Higher analytic stacks and GAGA theorems*, *Advances in Mathematics* **302** (2016), pp. 351–409, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870816309288>
- [RK00] I. Rosu and A. Knutson, *Equivariant K-theory and Equivariant Cohomology*, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **243** (2000)
- [Ros01] I. Rosu, *Equivariant Elliptic Cohomology and Rigidity*, *American Journal of Mathematics* **123** (2001), no. 4, pp. 647–677, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25099077>
- [SS22] S. Scherotzke and N. Sibilla, *Equivariant elliptic cohomology, toric varieties, and derived equivalences*, 2022
- [ST] N. Sibilla and P. Tomasini, *Equivariant Elliptic Cohomology and Mapping Stacks II*, In preparation
- [ST04] S. Stolz and P. Teichner, *What is an elliptic object?*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, p. 247–343, Cambridge University Press, 2004
- [ST11] ———, *Supersymmetric field theories and generalized cohomology*, 2011
- [Seg88] G. Segal, *Elliptic cohomology*, *Séminaire Bourbaki* **30** (1987–1988), pp. 187–201, <http://eudml.org/doc/110095>
- [Sum74] H. Sumihiro, *Equivariant completion*, *Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University* **14** (1974), no. 1, pp. 1–28
- [TV02] B. Toën and G. Vezzosi, *Homotopical Algebraic Geometry. I. Topos theory.*, *Advances in Mathematics* **193** (2002), pp. 257–372
- [TV04] B. Toën and G. Vezzosi, *Homotopical Algebraic Geometry II: Geometric Stacks and Applications*, 2004
- [TV09] B. Toën and G. Vezzosi, *Chern Character, Loop Spaces and Derived Algebraic Geometry*, pp. 331–354, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-01200-6_11
- [TV14] B. Toën and G. Vezzosi, *Caractères de Chern, traces équivariantes et géométrie algébrique dérivée*, *Selecta Mathematica* **21** (2014), pp. 449–554
- [Toe00] B. Toën, *Affine stacks (Champs affines)*, 2000
- [Wit87] E. Witten, *Elliptic genera and quantum field theory*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **109** (1987), no. 4, pp. 525 – 536, <https://doi.org/>
- [Wit88] E. Witten, *The index of the dirac operator in loop space*, *Elliptic Curves and Modular Forms in Algebraic Topology (Berlin, Heidelberg)* (P. S. Landweber, ed.), Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1988, pp. 161–181

NICOLÒ SIBILLA, SISSA, VIA BONOMEA 265, 34136 TRIESTE TS, ITALY
Email address: nsibilla@sissa.it

PAOLO TOMASINI, SISSA, VIA BONOMEA 265, 34136 TRIESTE TS, ITALY
Email address: ptomasin@sissa.it