

- Recall:
- A a configuration in \mathbb{C} -vector space V
 - U_A the complement of the associated hyperplane arrangement in V^*

Then the wonderful compactification Y_A is the closure of the image of

$$\psi: \mathbb{P}U_A \hookrightarrow \prod_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{L}(A) \\ F \neq \emptyset}} \mathbb{P}(V^*/H_F),$$

where $H_F = \bigcap_{e \in F} H_e$.

For a proper, non-empty flat F , we set

$$D_F := \overline{\pi^{-1}(\mathbb{P}U_F)}$$

where $U_F = H_F \setminus \bigcup_{G \not\supseteq F} H_G$ and

$$\pi: Y_A \rightarrow \mathbb{P}V^*$$

is the natural projection.

Thm: For each proper, non-empty flat F ,

$$D_F \cong \mathbb{P}(H_F) \times \mathbb{P}(V^*/H_F)$$

$\text{rk } F - 1$ $(r - \text{rk } F) - 1$

Cor: $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} D_F = \text{rk } M - 2$
 $= \dim_{\mathbb{C}} Y_A - 1$

Proof sketch: Approach $\mathbb{P}U_F$ along a path in $\mathbb{P}U_A$.

In the limit, we get a point $x \in \mathbb{P}U_F \subseteq \mathbb{P}V^*$.

Via

$$U_F \longleftrightarrow V^* \longrightarrow V^*/H_G$$

"
 $H_F \setminus \bigcup_{G \neq F} H_G$

x will have a well-defined image in $\mathbb{P}(V^*/H_G)$

so long as $H_F \not\subseteq H_G \iff G \neq F$.

By continuity, whenever this image is defined, it will be a coordinate of the limit point in Y_A .

For the remaining coordinates, we look at the tangent line to the path at x .

This determines a point

$$u \in \mathbb{P}(V^*/H_F)$$

which will be a coordinate of the limit point.

By continuity, the remaining coordinates are given by the images of u under the maps

$$\mathbb{P}(V^*/H_F) \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}(V^*/H_G)$$

which are well-defined whenever $H_F \subseteq H_G$

$$\Leftrightarrow G \in F.$$

Thus, the limit point in Y_A is uniquely determined by $x \in \mathbb{P}U_F$ and $u \in \mathbb{P}(V^*/H_F)$.

In the closure, x can be any point in $\mathbb{P}H_F$, so

$$D_F \cong \mathbb{P}H_F \times \mathbb{P}(V^*/H_F).$$

Cor: $D_F \cap D_G \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow F \subseteq G$ or $G \subseteq F$
 "F and G are comparable"

The Chow ring

If $M = M(\lambda)$ is a simple \mathbb{Q} -representable matroid, and Y_λ is the wonderful compactification.

We know

$$\bullet \partial Y_\lambda = Y_\lambda \setminus \pi^{-1}(\text{IPU}_\lambda) = \bigcup_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{L}(M) \\ F \neq \emptyset, E}} D_F$$

• D_F has complex codimension one in Y_λ

• $D_F \cap D_G \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow F \subseteq G$ or $G \subseteq F$

$$\bullet \pi^{-1}(H_e) = \bigcup_{F \ni e} D_F$$

Each D_F is a subvariety (closed submanifold) so defines a class $[D_F] \in H^2(Y_\lambda; \mathbb{Z})$.

Thm (De Concini - Procesi '95): Let M be a simple \mathbb{C} -representable matroid on ground set E , and let A be a configuration in a \mathbb{C} -vector space V representing M .

Then the map

$$\mathbb{Z}[x_F \mid F \in \mathcal{L}(M) \setminus \{E, \emptyset\}] \longrightarrow H^*(Y_A; \mathbb{Z})$$

$$x_F \longmapsto [D_F]$$

is surjective, i.e., the $[D_F]$ generate $H^*(Y_A; \mathbb{Z})$.

The kernel is generated by

$$\bullet x_F x_G \quad \text{for } F, G \text{ incomparable}$$

$$\bullet \sum_{F \ni e} x_F - \sum_{G \ni f} x_G \quad \text{for } e, f \in E.$$