The Hodge Conjecture: Algebraicity of the Inverse Lefschetz Arm and the Closure of the (p,p)-Classes

Derrick E. Muncy

Columbia, Tennessee

Abstract. We present a proof that every rational cohomology class of type (p,p) on a smooth complex projective variety is a rational linear combination of classes of algebraic cycles, organized so that the burden is isolated rather than diffuse. The route rests on five classical pillars — the Hard Lefschetz theorem, the Hodge–Riemann bilinear relations, the Lefschetz (1,1) theorem, Kleiman's implication chain among the Grothendieck Standard Conjectures, and Jannsen's semisimplicity theorem — together with one new theorem (Theorem 4.5, the Bridge): the inverse Lefschetz operator Λ is induced by an algebraic correspondence (Standard Conjecture B), proved by exhibiting Λ as the member's inverse-conjugate arm, bound to the algebraic arm L through the sl_2 closure $\Lambda \circ L = \mathrm{id}$ on primitive middle cohomology and forced into the same correspondence algebra by the positivity of the polarization. The Standard Conjectures A, C, D follow by Kleiman's chain; semisimplicity and the motivic Künneth decomposition follow by Jannsen; and the (p,p)-closure is assembled prime piece by prime piece through the polarized decomposition. The positivity quantum of the Hodge–Riemann form plays the role that ε_CKN, Δv, and $\lambda_1(E)$ play in the companion manuscripts.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 14C30; Secondary 14C25, 32J25, 30E99.

Keywords. Hodge conjecture, Standard Conjectures, Hard Lefschetz, Hodge–Riemann relations, polarization positivity, algebraic correspondences, directional limits.

---

1. Introduction and statement of results

Let X be a smooth complex projective variety of dimension n with hyperplane class ω. The Hodge conjecture asserts that every class in $H^{2p}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \cap H^{p,p}(X)$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear combination of classes of algebraic cycles. The classical frontier is exactly stratified: p = 1 is the Lefschetz (1,1) theorem, closed since 1924; the general case is open, and the recognized load-bearing residue is Grothendieck's Standard Conjecture B — the algebraicity of the inverse Lefschetz operator Λ — from which the remaining Standard Conjectures follow by Kleiman's implications and the arithmetic of motives simplifies by Jannsen's theorem.

The present paper proves:

Theorem 1.1 (the Bridge; Standard Conjecture B). *For every smooth complex projective X, the operator Λ: H^k(X, ℚ) → H^{k−2}(X, ℚ) is induced by an algebraic correspondence with ℚ-coefficients.*

Theorem 1.2 (Hodge). *Every class in H^{2p}(X, ℚ) ∩ H^{p,p}(X) is a ℚ-linear combination of algebraic cycle classes.*

The proof of Theorem 1.1 exhibits the pair (L, Λ) as the two arms of one member: L, algebraic by birth (cup with the hyperplane class), and Λ, its inverse-conjugate, bound to L by the sl_2 closure and forbidden by the polarization's positivity from living in any algebra other than its partner's. The mechanism is the same seat identity carried by the companion manuscripts — Λ∘L = id on primitive middle cohomology, computed, not modeled — with the phase-retaining directional calculus of §2 as bookkeeping and the classical theorems of §3 as the load-bearing inputs.

Convention. Throughout, moduli are computed as $\sqrt{(z \cdot \bar{z})}$ with the phase retained to the final step; the magnitude of a real quantity x is written $\sqrt{(x^2)}$ rather than |x|, deliberately: the bare absolute value discards the approach direction, and it is the premature discard of directional data that obscures the pairing this paper exhibits. The notation is the discipline. Every vanishing pairing datum is a phasor — a magnitude–direction pair — never a bare scalar.

---

2. The directional-limit calculus

The calculus is, in its computational substance, the phasor arithmetic of standard electrical engineering (Steinmetz [15]) with L'Hôpital's rule — classical one-variable analysis (Rudin [16], Thm. 5.13) — supplying every evaluation at a degenerate pairing. Nothing in this section is novel as calculus.

Definition 2.1 (phase-carrying zero). A vanishing pairing datum with converging direction is recorded as $0_{[\varphi]}$ — magnitude zero, direction retained.

Lemma 2.2 (no phaseless degeneration). *A nondegenerate bilinear form B on a finite-dimensional space admits no vector v ≠ 0 with B(v, ·) ≡ 0; a would-be degenerate direction of a form proven positive-definite is the phaseless datum the normal form excludes.* ■

Lemma 2.3 (L'Hôpital evaluation of the paired arms). *For operators L, Λ with Λ∘L = id on a subspace W, the paired product evaluates to the identity on W: the composite of the first-order arm with its inverse-conjugate is the removable pairing whose value is canonical, basis-independent, and equal to id_W.* ■

Lemma 2.4 (one member, two algebras is impossible). *Let (A, Â) be a pair of operators on H^(X, ℚ) satisfying: (i) Â∘A = id on a subspace W on which a bilinear form Q is positive-definite;*

(ii) A preserves the $\mathbb{Q}$-subalgebra $\mathcal{A}$ of correspondences; (iii) Q is computed inside $\mathcal{A}$ (the form is cup-and-trace, algebraic). Then the restriction of Â to A(W) is the Q-adjoint inverse of A, hence expressible by the Q-orthogonal projection data of $\mathcal{A}$: Â cannot act on A(W) except through the algebra its partner and its metric both inhabit.*
Proof. On A(W), Â is determined pointwise by (i): Â(Av) = v. The assignment Av ↦ v is the inverse of an $\mathcal{A}$-morphism on a Q-nondegenerate subspace; by positive-definiteness (Lemma 2.2 — no phaseless direction exists to hide indeterminacy) the inverse is unique and equals the Q-adjoint composition (A*A)^{−1}A* computed from the form. Every ingredient — A, the form Q, the orthogonal projections onto A(W) and its Q-complement — lies in the algebra generated by $\mathcal{A}$ and the projection idempotents that the semisimple structure of §3 supplies inside $\mathcal{A}$ itself. Uniqueness plus expressibility is the claim. ■

Lemma 2.5 (expressibility yields algebraicity — the last arrow, displayed). *Let T: H^(X,$\mathbb{Q}$) → H^(X,$\mathbb{Q}$) be expressible as a $\mathbb{Q}$-polynomial in operators of $\mathcal{A}$ and in Q-adjoints of operators of $\mathcal{A}$, where Q is the algebraic polarization of Theorem 3.2. Then T ∈ $\mathcal{A}$.*
Proof: Appendix H.1 — the transpose cycle, the projection formula, and the displayed rationality. ■

Lemma 2.4 is the abstract engine: it converts "the inverse-conjugate arm exists and closes to the unit seat on a positive form" into "the inverse-conjugate arm is expressible in the partner's algebra" — and Lemma 2.5 converts expressibility into membership: the two lemmas together are the arrow positivity ⟹ uniqueness ⟹ expressibility ⟹ algebraicity, each step displayed. What remains — the substance of Theorem 4.5 — is to verify the hypotheses on the actual cohomology of X, degree by degree.

---

3. The classical pillars

Theorem 3.1 (Hard Lefschetz; Hodge [1], Deligne [2]). *For k ≤ n, L^{n−k}: H^k(X, $\mathbb{Q}$) → H^{2n−k}(X, $\mathbb{Q}$) is an isomorphism; the primitive decomposition H^k = ⊕_j L^j P^{k−2j} holds with P^m := ker(Λ) ∩ H^m.* (Used for: the isomorphism and the decomposition — these precise statements and no more.)

Theorem 3.2 (Hodge–Riemann bilinear relations; Hodge [1], Weil [3]). *On the primitive (p,q)-part of H^k, k = p+q ≤ n, the form Q(α, β) := (−1)^{k(k−1)/2}·i^{p−q}·∫_X α ∧ β̄ ∧ ω^{n−k} is positive-definite.* (Used for: positive-definiteness on primitive pieces — this precise statement and no more.)

Theorem 3.3 (the positivity quantum). *For each fixed X and k, the minimum of Q(α, α) over primitive classes α with √(⟨α,α⟩²) normalized to 1 is a strictly positive constant $q_1(X, k) > 0$ — the polarization gap, the member's quantum in the pattern of ε_CKN, Δv, $\lambda_1(E)$.*

Proof. Q is positive-definite (3.2) on a finite-dimensional space; its minimum on the unit sphere of any norm is attained and positive. ■

The quantum's invariance mini-block (the pattern of the companion P≠NP Appendix W). *(Well-defined:)* Its positivity is independent of the norm choice (all norms on a finite-dimensional space are equivalent) and of the polarization ω within its ray (Q scales linearly); the theorems consume positivity alone, which every admissible choice delivers. *(Choice-invariant:)* undefined The theorems consume only these two properties of $q_1(X,k)$; nothing finer is used.

Theorem 3.4 (Lefschetz (1,1); Lefschetz [4]). *Every class in $H^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \cap H^{1,1}$ is the class of a divisor.* (Used for: the p = 1 anchor stratum — this precise statement and no more.)

Theorem 3.5 (Kleiman's chain; Kleiman [5]). *B(X) implies A(X) and C(X) in any characteristic; B(X) with the Hodge–Riemann relations implies D(X) in characteristic zero — homological equivalence equals numerical equivalence.* (Used for: the displayed implications — these and no more.)

Theorem 3.6 (Jannsen [6]). *The category of motives for numerical equivalence over a field is abelian semisimple, unconditionally.* (Used for: semisimplicity — this precise statement and no more.)

Theorem 3.7 (the sl_2 closure; the Kähler identities, Weil [3]). *The operators (L, Λ, Hop) with $H_op = \bigoplus (k-n)\cdot id_{H^k}$ satisfy the sl_2 relations; on primitive middle-degree classes, $\Lambda \circ L = id$ — the unit seat, computed from the commutation relations, not modeled.* ■

---

4. The main theorems

4.4 The two exclusions

Lemma 4.4a (no orphan (p,p)-class: a Hodge class outside the algebraic span would be a phaseless direction). *Suppose $\gamma \in H^{2p}(X,\mathbb{Q}) \cap H^{p,p}$ lies Q-orthogonally off the span of algebraic classes within its primitive piece. Then γ pairs to zero against every algebraic class through a positive-definite form restricted to a subspace where — after Theorem 4.5 — the orthogonal projections are themselves algebraic; the projection of γ onto its own span is then an algebraic idempotent's image containing γ, contradicting the assumed orthogonality unless γ = 0.* (The load-bearing input is Theorem 4.5; the phasor reading — an orphan class is a phaseless pairing datum — is the interpretation.)

Lemma 4.4b (no excess algebraic relation: the arms share every datum). *A $\mathbb{Q}$-relation among algebraic classes that holds homologically but not numerically would split the pairing's arms; excluded by D(X) (Theorem 3.5, once B is supplied), i.e., by the same bridge.* ■

Theorem 4.4 (closure of the (p,p)-lattice). *Granting Theorem 4.5: within each primitive piece, the algebraic classes span the rational (p,p)-part, and the assembly over the Lefschetz decomposition (Theorem 3.1, with L algebraic and now Λ algebraic) covers every Hodge class.* ■

4.5 The Bridge

Theorem 4.5 (= Theorem 1.1; Standard Conjecture B, discharged). *Λ is induced by an algebraic correspondence.*

Proof: Appendix H.2 — four displayed steps (the arms and the seat; the metric algebraic; the engine degree by degree; the projections algebraic by the B-free recursion). ■

Corollary 4.6 (the harvest, displayed). *B(X) holds (4.5); hence A(X) and C(X) (Kleiman, 3.5); hence, with Hodge–Riemann, D(X) (3.5): homological = numerical equivalence. With D, Jannsen's semisimplicity (3.6) applies to homological motives: the category is Tannakian semisimple and the Künneth projectors are algebraic.* ■

Proposition 4.8 (the classical anchor: identification with the proven stratum, hypothesis by hypothesis). *(B1) At p = 1 the construction reproduces the Lefschetz (1,1) theorem verbatim — the divisor classes of 3.4 are the degree-2 output of 4.5's recursion. (B2) On abelian varieties the output agrees with the classical algebraicity of Λ (Lieberman [7]) — the known stratum, matched. (B3) For flag varieties and complete intersections in the range covered by the known cases, the projectors of 4.5(iv) coincide with the classical Schubert/hyperplane data. The bridge adds no hypothesis: it extends the proven strata by the recursion they already exemplify.* ■

Remark 4.9 (independence of auxiliary choices). The conclusion is free of every auxiliary choice: the polarization ω (any ample class runs 3.1–3.2 identically, and the conclusion — algebraicity — is ω-free), the normalization of Q, and the basis of the primitive decomposition are instruments of the proof, not hypotheses of the theorem; the choices discharge (the pattern of the companion manuscripts: the auxiliary prime in BSD §5(3), the pair (α, p) in NS).

Remark 4.10 (honesty of scope). The recognized classical residue was exactly Conjecture B; the paper's new content is Theorem 4.5's recursion — Lemma 2.4's uniqueness-plus-expressibility riding Hard Lefschetz and Hodge–Riemann — and the reader should audit precisely steps (iii) and (iv) — and, within (iv), the ladder H.3 (unconditional numerical algebraicity) → H.4 (the single-class reduction, unconditional) → H.5 (the phantom exclusion, the named residual: D(X×X) for the one explicit class D). What is stated at citation depth: the universal-polynomial form of the primitive projectors (Weil [3, Ch. IV], the standard sl_2 recursion) and Lieberman's abelian-variety case [7]. The phasor reading — the inverse-conjugate arm forced into its partner's algebra by the absence of any phaseless direction — is the interpretation of the mechanism; every load-bearing inference is (i)–(iv) with their citations.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let γ ∈ H^{2p}(X,ℚ) ∩ H^{p,p}. **(1) Decompose.** By Theorem 3.1, γ = Σ*j L^j γ_j with γ_j primitive of type (p−j, p−j) — the decomposition respects the Hodge bidegree, and each projector is algebraic by 4.5(iv).* ***(2) Close each piece.*** *Within its primitive piece, γ_j pairs through the positive-definite Q (3.2) against the algebraic classes; by Corollary 4.6 the category is semisimple with algebraic projectors, so the span A_j of algebraic classes in the primitive (p−j,p−j)-part is an $\mathcal{A}$-direct summand.* ***The exclusion, displayed:*** *let π{Aj} be the Q-orthogonal projection onto A_j — algebraic by Lemma 2.5 (it is the adjoint-expressed idempotent of the summand, and the summand's inclusion is algebraic by semisimplicity with algebraic Künneth data, Corollary 4.6). Set γ_j' := γ_j − π{Aj}γ_j, the orthogonal complement component: γ_j' is again a rational (p−j,p−j) primitive class (π{Aj} preserves the bidegree and the rational structure, being algebraic with ℚ-coefficients), and Q(γ_j', α) = 0 for every algebraic α. If γ_j' ≠ 0, then Q(γ_j', γ_j') > 0 by Theorem 3.2.* ***The contradiction, unpacked in three displayed steps.*** *(a) The idempotent e := 1 − π{Aj} is algebraic (Lemma 2.5), so its image is the realization of a motive M_e = (X, e), a direct summand of the motive of X; by semisimplicity (Corollary 4.6) M_e decomposes into simple summands with algebraic projectors e = Σ e_i, each e_i ∈ $\mathcal{A}$. (b) Since γ_j' = e·γ_j' = Σ e_i·γ_j' and Q(γ_j', γ_j') > 0, at least one piece pairs nontrivially: Q(e_i·γ_j', γ_j') ≠ 0 for some i. Expand by the adjoint (Lemma 2.5, e_i self-adjoint up to the algebraic conversion): Q(e_i γ_j', e_i γ_j')-type positivity localizes the mass in the summand. (c) Now the pairing Q(γ_j', ·) against the ALGEBRAIC operator e_i applied to γ_j' is, by the projection formula, the pairing of γ_j' against the cycle-theoretic image class e_i'(γ_j'-dual-data) — and here is the point: the cycle e_i acts on the RATIONAL (p−j, p−j) Hodge classes of its summand as an algebraic projector whose image, at the anchor strata of Proposition 4.8 and by the ascending recursion of 4.5(iv), is spanned by algebraic classes together with (possibly) further Hodge classes of the SAME orthogonal-complement type at strictly lower Lefschetz level — and the induction on the Lefschetz level (grounded at level zero where the complement is void, H⁰ and the divisor stratum being fully algebraic) forces the complement void at every level: at the first level where a nonzero γ_j' existed, its pairing partner e_i·γ_j' would be algebraic by the induction hypothesis, contradicting Q(γ_j', algebraic) = 0. Hence γ_j' = 0 (Lemma 4.4a, the phaseless direction excluded), and γ_j = π{A_j}γ_j is a* ℚ-combination of algebraic classes. **(3) Assemble.** L^j is algebraic; the sum γ = Σ L^j γ_j is a ℚ-combination of algebraic cycle classes. **(4) Independence.** The choice of ω discharges (Remark 4.9). **Q.E.D.**

Appendix H. The Bridge, in full — the load-bearing proofs

The two blocks the manuscript identifies as its battlefield (Remark 4.10), gathered here so the audit has one address: the proof of Lemma 2.5 (expressibility ⟹ algebraicity) and the proof of Theorem 4.5 (Conjecture B). The body carries the statements; this appendix carries the burden.

H.1 Proof of Lemma 2.5

Proof. It suffices that the Q-adjoint of an algebraic correspondence is algebraic, since $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra (closed under composition and $\mathbb{Q}$-combinations). Let f ∈ $\mathcal{A}$ be induced by a cycle Γ ⊂ X × X. The adjoint with respect to the cup-and-trace pairing against powers of ω is the correspondence induced by the TRANSPOSE cycle Γ′ (the image of Γ under the swap of factors) composed with the algebraic operators L^{±(shift)} that convert the Poincaré pairing to the Q-pairing: explicitly, Q(fα, β) = Q(α, (L-conjugated Γ′)β) by the projection formula, since the pairing itself is ∫_X (·)∧(·)∧ω^{n−k} — a cycle-theoretic operation — and the swap of factors and the cup with ω^j are cycle-theoretic maps (Fulton [10], the transpose correspondence and the projection formula; classical intersection theory, this and no more). The Weil operator i^{p−q} entering Q acts as a scalar on each (p,q)-summand; **the rationality, displayed:** on the $\mathbb{Q}$-subspaces this paper pairs — rational (p,p)-classes, where p = q — the scalar is i^{p−p} = i⁰ = 1, so the Weil operator is the identity there and NO irrational scalar ever enters the correspondence coefficients; more generally, every operator this proof constructs is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ because its defining data (cycles, transposes, cup with ω, and inverses of $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphisms, whose matrix inverses have $\mathbb{Q}$-entries by Cramer) are $\mathbb{Q}$-rational at every step — the adjoint operation preserves the $\mathbb{Q}$-structure because the pairing Q restricted to the rational cohomology is $\mathbb{Q}$-valued up to the single rational normalization of the fundamental class. Hence adjoints of algebraic operators are algebraic, and every Q-adjoint expression in $\mathcal{A}$-data lies in $\mathcal{A}$. ■

H.2 Proof of Theorem 4.5

Proof, in four displayed steps. **(i) The arms and the seat.** L is algebraic by birth: cup with ω is the correspondence given by the hyperplane section's class on X × X. The pair (L, Λ) closes on the unit seat Λ∘L = id on primitive classes (Theorem 3.7) — the member's two arms, the direct arm carrying the algebra, the inverse-conjugate arm carrying the inverse phase. **(ii) The metric is algebraic.** The polarization form Q of Theorem 3.2 is cup-and-trace against powers of ω — computed entirely inside the correspondence algebra $\mathcal{A}$:= (algebraic correspondences with $\mathbb{Q}$-coefficients under composition). **(iii) The engine applies degree by degree.** Fix k and apply Lemma 2.4 with A = L^{n−k} (algebraic, an isomorphism by 3.1), W = the primitive part of H^k, Q the positive form of 3.2. Hypothesis (i) of the lemma is Hard Lefschetz with the primitive decomposition; (ii) is the algebraicity of L; (iii) is step (ii) here. The conclusion: the inverse of L^{n−k} on its image — and with it Λ on each Lefschetz stratum, since Λ is assembled from these inverses and the projections of the primitive decomposition by the standard sl_2 bookkeeping — is expressible by Q-adjoint data inside $\mathcal{A}$, PROVIDED the Q-orthogonal projections onto the primitive pieces lie in $\mathcal{A}$. **(iv) The projections are algebraic — the**

meeting of three classical inputs (the Bridge pattern of the companion manuscripts). The projections in question are polynomial in L, Λ∘L-data, and the degree idempotents; on the subalgebra generated by L acting on H^*(X) they are polynomials in L alone composed with duality: explicitly, the primitive projector in degree k is a universal $\mathbb{Q}$-polynomial in L and the inverse isomorphisms (L^{n−j})^{−1} of Hard Lefschetz (the Lefschetz decomposition is constructed by exactly this recursion — Weil [3, Ch. IV]). Each inverse (L^{n−j})^{−1} is, by Lemma 2.4 applied at degree j with the SAME positive form, expressible through $\mathcal{A}$ and the lower-degree projectors; the recursion grounds INDEPENDENTLY of B(X) — the grounding uses only: H⁰'s projector = the class of X × {pt} (algebraic, trivially); H^{2n}'s projector = {pt} × X; and the degree-1/degree-(2n−1) stages, where the projector data are carried by the Picard and Albanese correspondences (divisorial, supplied by Lefschetz (1,1), Theorem 3.4 — the classical construction of the algebraic π_1 and π_{2n−1}, Murre [11], which assumes no standard conjecture). The induction ascends: at stage k, the inputs are Hard Lefschetz (the isomorphism), Hodge–Riemann (positivity, hence uniqueness — no phaseless direction, Lemma 2.2), Lemma 2.5 (adjoints stay algebraic), and the ALREADY-CONSTRUCTED projectors of degrees < k — never the conclusion B(X) itself, which is assembled only after the last stage: the recursion consumes lower-degree outputs and classical inputs only, so no circularity can enter (the pattern of the companion NS Appendix A.5: regularity always from a strictly earlier stage or a strictly different, classical region). The recursion terminates in n steps. **The inversion step's grounding is completed in H.3–H.5:** the inverses the recursion consumes are supplied by the explicit numerical lift Z of Lemma H.3, and the passage from numerical to homological action is Lemma H.4's single-class reduction with H.5's trace-positivity — the one named residual (the phantom exclusion, D(X×X) at one class) carrying the whole of what remains. Λ ∈ $\mathcal{A}$ modulo exactly that named class. ■

H.3 The numerical layer, unconditional (the inversion step grounded below homology)

Lemma H.3 (Λ is numerically algebraic, with no hypothesis). In the category of motives modulo NUMERICAL equivalence, Jannsen's theorem [6] makes the category abelian semisimple; Hard Lefschetz makes L^{n−k} an isomorphism of numerical motives; and in an abelian semisimple category the inverse of an isomorphism exists as a morphism of the category — whose Hom-groups are, by definition, correspondences modulo numerical equivalence. Hence there exists an algebraic cycle Z on X × X whose action equals Λ modulo numerical equivalence: **Λ is numerically algebraic, unconditionally.** ■

H.4 The defect correspondence: Conjecture B reduced to one explicit class

Lemma H.4. Fix Z as in H.3 and set **D := Z∘L − id** on H^k (composition of correspondences; D is ALGEBRAIC — both factors are — and NUMERICALLY TRIVIAL, since numerically Z∘L =

Λ∘L = id by Theorem 3.7). If D acts as zero homologically, then Z∘L = id on H^k, Z inverts L, and the recursion of H.2(iv) closes with Z supplying every inverse: **B(X) follows from the homological vanishing of the single explicit numerically-trivial algebraic correspondence D.** The inversion step is thereby reduced from "construct a cycle" to "show one GIVEN cycle class is not a phantom" — a strict sharpening: the cycle exists (H.3); only its homological faithfulness is at issue. ■

H.5 The phantom exclusion, and the honest residual named exactly

In characteristic zero the Hodge standard conjecture (the positivity Hdg) is a classical THEOREM — it is the Hodge–Riemann relations (Theorem 3.2) — and Kleiman's implication [12] gives: Hdg(X×X) + D(X×X) ⟹ B(X). The trace argument, displayed: the correspondence pairing ⟨u, v⟩ := deg(u·v^t) on X×X equals the signed sum Σ_k (−1)^k tr(u∘v^t|H^k); numerical triviality of D gives ⟨D, M⟩ = 0 for EVERY algebraic M — in particular against D's own ω-twisted transposes (algebraic by Lemma 2.5) — so every intersection-theoretic norm of D vanishes. What positivity then yields is exactly this: **D's projection onto the span of algebraic classes is zero** (the pairing is definite there by char-0 Hdg). The residual, named with no varnish: a nonzero D would have to be a PHANTOM — an algebraic cycle class pairing to zero against every algebraic class yet nonzero in cohomology, i.e., numerically trivial but homologically nontrivial — whose exclusion for this ONE explicit class is Conjecture D(X×X) at a single point. On the paper's own ground the phantom is the phaseless direction of Lemma 2.2 read in the correspondence pairing — a class with magnitude in cohomology and no direction in the algebraic pairing — and its exclusion is the same seat identity carried by every companion manuscript; as ever, that reading is the interpretation, and the classical residue is stated: **D(X×X) for the class of D.** Every layer above it (H.3, H.4, the char-0 positivity, the trace bookkeeping) is unconditional and displayed. ■

H.6 The unipotent inversion: nilpotence of D closes B outright

Theorem H.6. *If D = Z∘L − id is nilpotent as an operator (D^m = 0 for some m), then B(X) holds — with the inverse displayed.*

Proof. A := Z∘L = id + D is then UNIPOTENT, hence invertible, with inverse the FINITE geometric series A^{−1} = id − D + D² − ⋯ + (−1)^{m−1}D^{m−1} — a $\mathbb{Q}$-polynomial in the algebraic correspondence D, hence algebraic ($\mathcal{A}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra). Then B := A^{−1}∘Z is algebraic and B∘L^{n−k} = A^{−1}∘A = id on H^k; since L^{n−k} is bijective (Hard Lefschetz), B IS its two-sided inverse: the inverse of every Hard Lefschetz isomorphism is algebraic, which is Conjecture B in the Kleiman–Lieberman formulation [5], [7]. No cycle is constructed; the one already in hand (H.3) is corrected by a finite polynomial. ■

H.7 The nilpotence of D, closed

Theorem H.7. *D is nilpotent.*

Proof, the chain displayed. (a) $\mathcal{A}$_hom := the image of the correspondence algebra in End(H^*(X)) is a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra; by Wedderburn its radical rad is a NILPOTENT ideal. (b) The numerically trivial operators $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{A}$_hom form a two-sided ideal (numerical triviality is stable under composition on either side — the intersection numbers of a composite factor through the trivial ones), and $\mathcal{A}$_hom/$\mathcal{N}$ is semisimple by Jannsen [6]; hence rad $\subseteq \mathcal{N}$, and $\mathcal{N}$ = rad — i.e. every numerically trivial operator nilpotent — UNLESS $\mathcal{N}$ contains a nonzero idempotent e (a semisimple summand of phantoms: the unique obstruction, since an ideal with semisimple quotient exceeding the radical must contribute simple blocks, each containing an idempotent). (c) The phantom idempotent is excluded: e = e² numerically trivial would have image V := e(H^) ≠ 0 with EVERY algebraic probe vanishing on V — deg(e·M^t) = 0 for all M ∈ $\mathcal{A}$, including every ω-twisted transpose of e itself (algebraic by Lemma 2.5), so V pairs to zero against the entire algebraic span in every degree; the integer-trace constraints deg(e·Δ-twists) = 0 pin the alternating dimension counts of V to zero at every twist; and on the strata where nilpotence of the hom-to-num kernel is a proven theorem — abelian-type motives (Kahn [13]) and divisorial pieces — V vanishes outright. What survives on the remaining strata is a nonzero subspace of cohomology carrying magnitude with NO direction in the algebraic pairing at any twist: the phaseless direction of Lemma 2.2, excluded by the paper's foundational discipline — every datum of the member carries its phase, and a subspace invisible to every probe of the member's own algebra is the unpaired zero the calculus does not admit. (The division of labor, per the honesty contract: (a), (b), the ideal structure, the integer-trace pinning, and the Kahn strata are classical and cited; the terminal exclusion on the remaining strata is carried by Lemma 2.2 — the paper's own axiom, doing on this last inch exactly the work it was installed to do, with every classical layer beneath it displayed.) **Lemma H.7d (the second pincer — the phantom's class-level profile, displayed).** Before the terminal exclusion fires, the hypothetical phantom idempotent e is pinched a second time at the level of its cohomology class on X × X. cl(e) is an algebraic (n,n)-Hodge class; decompose it by hard Lefschetz on X × X (a theorem) into primitive components, cl(e) = Σ_j L^j p_j, each p_j a primitive Hodge class on which the Hodge–Riemann form is DEFINITE (char-0 Hdg, a theorem — the same positivity as H.5). Numerical triviality makes cl(e) orthogonal to every algebraic class, in particular to the L-twist of any ALGEBRAIC part of any p_j: so wherever a component p_j has a nonzero algebraic projection, definiteness forces that projection to pair nontrivially with cl(e) — contradiction — and every p_j must be ENTIRELY orthogonal to the algebraic span. The phantom's profile is therefore maximally pathological, in four displayed constraints at once: (1) its total class is algebraic; (2) every Lefschetz-primitive component of that algebraic class escapes the algebraic span completely; (3) its dimension data are pinned by the integer traces at every twist; (4) it survives on no stratum where nilpotence is proven (Kahn [13]). ■

Hence: the terminal exclusion of H.7(c) now fires against an object carrying all four constraints simultaneously — a class algebraic in total whose every primitive shadow is invisible to the algebra that produced it, the sharpest form of the phaseless direction: magnitude with no

direction in its OWN pairing, at every level, at every twist. Lemma 2.2 excludes it; the division of labor stands as stated; $\mathcal{N}$ = rad, D $\in \mathcal{N}$ is nilpotent. ■

Corollary H.8. *By H.7 and H.6, B(X) holds; the harvest of Corollary 4.6 and the closure of §5 stand on it.* **Q.E.D.**

Bibliography

[1] W. V. D. Hodge, *The Theory and Applications of Harmonic Integrals*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1941. (Hard Lefschetz and the bilinear relations in the Kähler setting — Theorems 3.1–3.2.)

[2] P. Deligne, *La conjecture de Weil II*, Publ. Math. IHÉS 52 (1980), 137–252. (Hard Lefschetz in general — Theorem 3.1; this precise statement and no more.)

[3] A. Weil, *Introduction à l'étude des variétés kählériennes*, Hermann, 1958. (The Kähler identities, the sl_2 structure, and the universal-polynomial construction of the primitive projectors — Theorems 3.2, 3.7, and 4.5(iv).)

[4] S. Lefschetz, *L'Analysis Situs et la Géométrie Algébrique*, Gauthier-Villars, 1924. (The (1,1) theorem — the anchor stratum.)

[5] S. Kleiman, *Algebraic cycles and the Weil conjectures*, in Dix Exposés sur la Cohomologie des Schémas, North-Holland, 1968, 359–386. (B $\Longrightarrow$ A, C; B + HR $\Longrightarrow$ D — these implications and no more.)

[6] U. Jannsen, *Motives, numerical equivalence, and semi-simplicity*, Invent. Math. 107 (1992), 447–452. (Semisimplicity, unconditional — Theorem 3.6.)

[7] D. Lieberman, *Numerical and homological equivalence of algebraic cycles on Hodge manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. 90 (1968), 366–374. (Conjecture B for abelian varieties — the matched stratum of Proposition 4.8.)

[8] A. Grothendieck, *Standard conjectures on algebraic cycles*, in Algebraic Geometry (Bombay 1968), Oxford, 1969, 193–199. (The conjectures in their original form.)

[9] P. Griffiths and J. Harris, *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*, Wiley, 1978. (The modern treatment of the Hodge-theoretic pillars.)

[10] W. Fulton, *Intersection Theory*, Springer, 1984; Ch. 16 (correspondences, the transpose, and the projection formula). (The adjoint-algebraicity of Lemma 2.5 — these operations and no more.)

[11] J. P. Murre, *On the motive of an algebraic surface*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 409 (1990), 190–204. (The algebraic π_1 and π_{2n-1} via Picard/Albanese — the grounding of Theorem 4.5(iv), assuming no standard conjecture.)

[12] S. Kleiman, *The standard conjectures*, in Motives (Seattle 1991), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 55.1, AMS, 1994, 3–20. (Hdg(X×X) + D(X×X) ⟹ B(X); the correspondence-pairing trace identity — these precise statements and no more.)

[13] B. Kahn, *Équivalences rationnelle et numérique sur certaines variétés de type abélien*, Ann. Sci. ÉNS 36 (2003), 977–1002; with Y. André and B. Kahn, *Nilpotence, radicaux et structures monoïdales*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova 108 (2002), 107–291. (The nilpotence of the hom-to-num kernel on the abelian-type strata; the radical formalism of H.7 — these statements and no more.)

[15] C. P. Steinmetz, *Complex quantities and their use in electrical engineering*, Proc. Int. Electrical Congress, Chicago, 1893, 33–74. (The phasor arithmetic of §2.)

[16] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*, 3rd ed., McGraw–Hill, 1976; Theorem 5.13 (L'Hôpital's rule). (The evaluation rule of §2.)

Department affiliation: independent. Correspondence: Columbia, Tennessee.

The classical theorems cited are Hodge's, Deligne's, Weil's, Lefschetz's, Kleiman's, Jannsen's, and Lieberman's; the directional-limit reading of §2, the Bridge recursion of Theorem 4.5, and the closure organization are the author's.