

SCHUR-FINITENESS IN  $\lambda$ -RINGS

C. MAZZA AND C. WEIBEL

ABSTRACT. We introduce the notion of a Schur-finite element in a  $\lambda$ -ring.

Since the beginning of algebraic  $K$ -theory in [G57], the splitting principle has proven invaluable for working with  $\lambda$ -operations. Unfortunately, this principle does not seem to hold in some recent applications, such as the  $K$ -theory of motives. The main goal of this paper is to introduce the subring of Schur-finite elements of any  $\lambda$ -ring, and study its main properties, especially in connection with the virtual splitting principle.

A rich source of examples comes from Heinloth's theorem [Hl], that the Grothendieck group  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$  of an idempotent-complete  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear tensor category  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\lambda$ -ring. For the category  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}$  of effective Chow motives, we show that  $K_0(\text{Var}) \rightarrow K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$  is not an injection, answering a question of Grothendieck.

When  $\mathcal{A}$  is the derived category of motives  $\mathbf{DM}_{gm}$  over a field of characteristic 0, the notion of Schur-finiteness in  $K_0(\mathbf{DM}_{gm})$  is compatible with the notion of a Schur-finite object in  $\mathbf{DM}_{gm}$ , introduced in [Mz].

We begin by briefly recalling the classical splitting principle in Section 1, and answering Grothendieck's question in Section 2. In section 3 we recall the Schur polynomials, the Jacobi-Trudi identities and the Pieri rule from the theory of symmetric functions. Finally, in Section 4, we define Schur-finite elements and show that they form a subring of any  $\lambda$ -ring. We also state the conjecture that every Schur-finite element is a virtual sum of line elements.

**Notation.** We will use the term  $\lambda$ -ring in the sense of [Ber, 2.4]; we warn the reader that our  $\lambda$ -rings are called *special  $\lambda$ -rings* by Grothendieck, Atiyah and others; see [G57] [AT] [A].

A  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear category  $\mathcal{A}$  is a category in which each hom-set is uniquely divisible (i.e., a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -module). By a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear tensor category (or QTC) we mean a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear category which is also symmetric monoidal and such that the tensor product is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear. We will be interested in QTC's which are idempotent-complete.

---

*Date:* November 8, 2010.

Weibel's research was supported by NSA and NSF grants.

1. FINITE-DIMENSIONAL  $\lambda$ -RINGS

Almost all  $\lambda$ -rings of historical interest are finite-dimensional. This includes the complex representation rings  $R(G)$  and topological  $K$ -theory of compact spaces [AT, 1.5] as well as the algebraic  $K$ -theory of algebraic varieties [G57]. In this section we present this theory from the viewpoint we are adopting. Little in this section is new.

Recall that an element  $x$  in a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R$  is said to be *even* of finite degree  $n$  if  $\lambda_t(x)$  is a polynomial of degree  $n$ , or equivalently that there is a  $\lambda$ -ring homomorphism from the ring  $\Lambda_n$  defined in 1.2 to  $R$ , sending  $a$  to  $x$ . We say that  $x$  is a *line element* if it is even of degree 1, i.e., if  $\lambda^n(x) = 0$  for all  $n > 1$ .

We say that  $x$  is *odd* of degree  $n$  if  $\sigma_t(x) = \lambda_{-t}(x)^{-1}$  is a polynomial of finite degree  $n$ . Since  $\sigma_{-t}(x) = \lambda_t(-x)$ , we see that  $x$  is odd just in case  $-x$  is even. Therefore there is a  $\lambda$ -ring homomorphism from the ring  $\Lambda_{-n}$  defined in 1.2 to  $R$  sending  $b$  to  $x$ .

We say that an element  $x$  is *finite-dimensional* if it is the difference of two even elements, or equivalently if  $x$  is the sum of an even and an odd element. The subset of even elements in  $R$  is closed under addition and multiplication, and the subset of finite-dimensional elements forms a subring of  $R$ .

*Example 1.1.* If  $R$  is a binomial  $\lambda$ -ring, then  $r$  is even if and only if some  $r(r-1)\cdots(r-n) = 0$ , and odd if and only if some  $r(r+1)\cdots(r+n) = 0$ . The binomial rings  $\prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}$  are finite dimensional. If  $R$  is connected then the subring of finite-dimensional elements is just  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

There is a well known family of universal finite-dimensional  $\lambda$ -rings  $\{\Lambda_n\}$ .

**Definition 1.2.** Following [AT], let  $\Lambda_n$  denote the free  $\lambda$ -ring generated by one element  $a = a_1$  of finite degree  $n$  (i.e., subject to the relations that  $\lambda^k(a) = 0$  for all  $k > n$ ). By [Ber, 4.9],  $\Lambda_n$  is just the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Z}[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  with  $a_i = \lambda^i(a_1)$ .

Similarly, we write  $\Lambda_{-n}$  for the free  $\lambda$ -ring generated by one element  $b = b_1$ , subject to the relations that  $\sigma^k(b) = 0$  for all  $k > n$ . Using the antipode  $S$ , we see that there is a  $\lambda$ -ring isomorphism  $\Lambda_{-n} \cong \Lambda_n$  sending  $b$  to  $-a$ , and hence that  $\Lambda_{-n} \cong \mathbb{Z}[b_1, \dots, b_n]$  with  $b_k = \sigma^k(b)$ .

Consider finite-dimensional elements in  $\lambda$ -rings  $R$  which are the difference of an even element of degree  $m$  and an odd element of degree  $n$ . The maps  $\Lambda_m \rightarrow R$  and  $\Lambda_{-n} \rightarrow R$  induce a  $\lambda$ -ring map from  $\Lambda_m \otimes \Lambda_{-n}$  to  $R$ .

**Lemma 1.3.** *If an element  $x$  is both even and odd in a  $\lambda$ -ring, then  $x$  and all the  $\lambda^i(x)$  are nilpotent. Thus  $\lambda_t(x)$  is a unit of  $R[t]$ .*

*Proof.* If  $x$  is even and odd then  $\lambda_t(x)$  and  $\sigma_{-t}(x)$  are polynomials in  $R[t]$  which are inverse to each other. It follows that the coefficients  $\lambda^i(x)$  of the  $t^i$  are nilpotent for all  $i > 0$ .  $\square$

If  $R$  is a graded  $\lambda$ -ring, an element  $\sum r_i$  is even (resp., odd, resp., finite-dimensional) if and only if each homogeneous term  $r_i$  is even (resp., odd, resp., finite-dimensional). This is because the operations  $\lambda^n$  multiply the degree of an element by  $n$ .

The forgetful functor from  $\lambda$ -rings to commutative rings has a right adjoint; see [Kn, pp.20–21]. It follows that the category of  $\lambda$ -rings has all colimits. In particular, if  $B \leftarrow A \rightarrow C$  is a diagram of  $\lambda$ -rings, the tensor product  $B \otimes_A C$  has the structure of a  $\lambda$ -ring. Here is a typical, classical application of this construction, originally proven in [AT, 6.1].

**Proposition 1.4** (Splitting Principle). *If  $x$  is any even element of finite degree  $n$  in a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R$ , there exists an inclusion  $R \subseteq R'$  of  $\lambda$ -rings and line elements  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n$  in  $R'$  so that  $x = \sum \ell_i$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega_n$  denote the tensor product of  $n$  copies of the  $\lambda$ -ring  $\Lambda_1 = \mathbb{Z}[\ell]$ ; this is a  $\lambda$ -ring whose underlying ring is the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Z}[\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n]$ , and the  $\lambda$ -ring  $\Lambda_n$  of Definition 1.2 is the subring of symmetric polynomials in  $\Omega_n$ ; see [AT, §2]. Let  $R'$  be the pushout of the diagram  $\Omega_n \leftarrow \Lambda_n \rightarrow R$ . Since the image of  $x$  is  $1 \otimes x = a \otimes 1 = (\sum \ell_i) \otimes 1$ , it suffices to show that  $R \rightarrow R'$  is an injection. This follows from the fact that  $\Omega_n$  is free as a  $\Lambda_n$ -module.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.5.** *If  $x$  is any finite-dimensional element of a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R$ , there is an inclusion  $R \subseteq R'$  of  $\lambda$ -rings and line elements  $\ell_i, \ell'_j$  in  $R'$  so that*

$$x = \left( \sum \ell_i \right) - \left( \sum \ell'_j \right).$$

*Scholium 1.6.* For later use, we record an observation, whose proof is implicit in the proof of Proposition 4.2 of [AT]:  $\lambda^m(\lambda^n x) = P_{m,n}(\lambda^1 x, \dots, \lambda^{mn} x)$  is a sum of monomials, each containing a term  $\lambda^i x$  for  $i \geq n$ . For example,  $\lambda^2(\lambda^3 x) = \lambda^6 x - x \lambda^5 x + \lambda^4 x \lambda^2 x$  (see [Kn, p. 11]).

## 2. $K_0$ OF TENSOR CATEGORIES

The Grothendieck group of a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear tensor category provides numerous examples of  $\lambda$ -rings, and forms the original motivation for introducing the notion of Schur-finite elements in a  $\lambda$ -ring.

A  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear tensor category is *exact* if it has a distinguished family of sequences, called *short exact sequences* and satisfying the axioms of [Q], and such that each  $A \otimes -$  is an exact functor. In many applications  $\mathcal{A}$  is *split exact*: the only short exact sequences are those which split. By  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$  we mean the Grothendieck group as an exact category, i.e., the quotient of the free abelian group on the objects  $[A]$  by the relation that  $[B] = [A] + [C]$  for every short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an idempotent-complete exact category which is a QTC for  $\otimes$ . For any object  $A$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , the symmetric group  $\Sigma_n$  (and hence the group ring  $\mathbb{Q}[\Sigma_n]$ ) acts on the  $n$ -fold tensor product  $A^{\otimes n}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  is idempotent-complete, we define  $\wedge^n A$  to be the direct summand of  $A^{\otimes n}$  corresponding to the alternating idempotent  $\sum (-1)^\sigma \sigma / n!$  of  $\mathbb{Q}[\Sigma_n]$ . Similarly, we can define the symmetric powers  $\text{Sym}^n(A)$ . It turns out that  $\lambda^n(A)$  only depends upon the element  $[A]$  in  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ , and that  $\lambda^n$  extends to a well defined operation on  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ .

The following result was proven by F. Heinloth in [Hl, Lemma 4.1], but the result seems to have been in the air; see [Dav, p. 486], [LL04, 5.1] and [B1, B2]. A special case of this result was proven long ago by Swan in [Sw].

**Theorem 2.1.** *If  $\mathcal{A}$  is any idempotent-complete exact QTC,  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$  has the structure of a  $\lambda$ -ring. If  $A$  is any object of  $\mathcal{A}$  then  $\lambda^n([A]) = [\wedge^n A]$ .*

Kimura [Kim] and O'Sullivan have introduced the notion of an object  $C$  being finite-dimensional in any QTC  $\mathcal{A}$ :  $C$  is the direct sum of an even object  $A$  (one for which some  $\wedge^n A \cong 0$ ) and an odd object  $B$  (one for which some  $\text{Sym}^n(B) \cong 0$ ). It is immediate that  $[C]$  is a finite-dimensional element in the  $\lambda$ -ring  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ . Thus the two notions of finite dimensionality are related.

*Example 2.2.* Let  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}$  denote the category of  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear pure effective Chow motives with respect to rational equivalence over a field  $k$ . Its objects are summands of smooth projective varieties over a field  $k$  and morphisms are given by Chow groups. Thus  $K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$  is the group generated by the classes of objects, modulo the relation  $[M_1 \oplus M_2] = [M_1] + [M_2]$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}$  is a QTC,  $K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$  is a  $\lambda$ -ring.

By adjoining an inverse to the Lefschetz motive to  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}$ , we obtain the category  $\mathcal{M}$  of Chow motives (with respect to rational equivalence). This is also a QTC, so  $K_0(\mathcal{M})$  is a  $\lambda$ -ring.

The category  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}$  embeds into the triangulated category  $\mathbf{DM}_{gm}^{\text{eff}}$  of effective geometric motives; see [MVW, 20.1]. Similarly, The category  $\mathcal{M}$  embeds in the triangulated category  $\mathbf{DM}_{gm}$  of geometric motives [MVW, 20.2]. Bondarko proved in [Bo, 6.4.3] that  $K_0(\mathbf{DM}_{gm}^{\text{eff}}) \cong K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$  and  $K_0(\mathbf{DM}_{gm}) \cong K_0(\mathcal{M})$ . Thus we may investigate  $\lambda$ -ring questions in these triangulated settings. As far as we know, it is possible that every element of  $K_0(\mathbf{DM}_{gm})$  is finite-dimensional.

Here is an application of these ideas. Recall that any quasiprojective scheme  $X$  has a motive with compact supports in  $\mathbf{DM}^{\text{eff}}$ ,  $M^c(X)$ . If  $k$  has characteristic 0, this is an effective geometric motive, and if  $U$  is open in  $X$  with complement  $Z$  there is a triangle  $M^c(Z) \rightarrow M^c(X) \rightarrow M^c(U)$ ; see [MVW, 16.15]. It follows that  $[M^c(X)] = [M^c(U)] + [M^c(Z)]$  in  $K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$ . (This was originally proven by Gillet and Soulé in [GS, Thm. 4] before the introduction of  $\mathbf{DM}$ , but see [GS, 3.2.4].

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $K_0(\text{Var})$  be the Grothendieck ring of varieties obtained by imposing the relation  $[U] + [X \setminus U] = [X]$  for any variety  $X$ . By the above remarks, there is a well defined ring homomorphism  $K_0(\text{Var}) \rightarrow K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$ .

Grothendieck asked in [G64, p.174] if this morphism was far from being an isomorphism. We can now answer his question.

**Theorem 2.4.** *The homomorphism  $K_0(\text{Var}) \rightarrow K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$  is not an injection.*

For the proof, we need to introduce Kapranov's zeta-function. If  $X$  is any quasiprojective variety, its symmetric power  $S^n X$  is the quotient of  $X^n$  by the action of the symmetric group. We define  $\zeta_t(X) = \sum [S^n X] t^n$  as a power series with coefficients in  $K_0(\text{Var})$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** ([Gul]) *The following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_0(\text{Var}) & \xrightarrow{\zeta_t} & 1 + K_0(\text{Var})[[t]] \\ M^c \downarrow & & \downarrow M^c \\ K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_t} & 1 + K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})[[t]]. \end{array}$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $[M^c(S^n X)] = \text{Sym}^n [M^c(X)]$  in  $K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$  for any  $X$ . This is proven by del Baño and Navarro in [dBN, 5.3].  $\square$

**Definition 2.6.** Following [LL04, 2.2], we say that a power series  $f(t) = \sum r_n t^n \in R[[t]]$  is *determinantly rational* over a ring  $R$  if there exists an  $m > 0$  such that the  $m \times m$  symmetric matrices  $(r_{n+i+j})_{i,j=1}^m$  have determinant 0 for all large  $n$ . The name comes from the classical fact ([1894]) that when  $R$  is a field (or a domain) a power series is determinantly rational if and only if it is a rational function.

Clearly, if  $f(t)$  is not determinantly rational over  $R$  and  $R \subset R'$  then  $f(t)$  cannot be determinantly rational over  $R'$ .

If  $x = a + b$  is a finite-dimensional element of a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R$ , with  $a$  even and  $b$  odd, then  $\lambda_t(a)$  and  $\lambda_t(-b)$  are polynomials so  $\lambda_t(x) = \lambda_t(a)\lambda_t(-b)$  and  $\sigma_t(x) = \lambda_t(x)^{-1}$  are rational functions, and hence rational functions. This was observed by André in [A05].

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* Let  $X$  be the product  $C \times D$  of two smooth projective curves of genus  $> 0$ , so that  $p_g(X) > 0$ . Larsen and Lunts showed in [LL04, 2.4, 3.9] that  $\zeta_t(X)$  is not determinantly rational over  $R = K_0(\text{Var})$ . On the other hand, Kimura proved in [Kim] that  $X$  is a finite-dimensional object in  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}$ , so  $\sigma_t(X) = \lambda_t(X)^{-1}$  is a determinantly rational function in  $R' = K_0(\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}})$ . It follows that  $R \rightarrow R'$  cannot be an injection.  $\square$

## 3. SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

We devote this section to a quick study of the ring  $\Lambda$  of symmetric functions, and especially the Schur polynomials  $s_\pi$ , referring the reader to [Macd] for more information. In the next section, we will use these polynomials to define the notion of Schur-finite elements in a  $\lambda$ -ring.

The ring  $\Lambda$  is defined as the ring of symmetric polynomials in variables  $x_i$ ; a major role is played by the *elementary symmetric polynomials*  $e_i \in \Lambda$  and the *homogeneous power sums*  $h_n = \sum x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_n}$  (where the sum being taken over  $i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_n$ ). Their generating functions  $E(t) = \sum e_n t^n$  and  $H(t) = \sum h_n t^n$  are  $\prod(1 + x_i t)$  and  $\prod(1 - x_i t)^{-1}$ , so that  $H(t)E(-t) = 1$ . In fact,  $\Lambda$  is a graded polynomial ring in two relevant ways (with  $e_n$  and  $h_n$  in degree  $n$ ):

$$\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[e_1, \dots, e_n, \dots] = \mathbb{Z}[h_1, \dots, h_n, \dots].$$

Given a partition  $\pi = (n_1, \dots, n_r)$  of  $n$  (so that  $\sum n_i = n$ ), we let  $s_\pi \in \Lambda_n$  denote the Schur polynomial of  $\pi$ . The elements  $e_n$  and  $h_n$  of  $\Lambda$  are identified with  $s_{(1, \dots, 1)}$  and  $s_{(n)}$ , respectively. The Schur polynomials also form a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $\Lambda$  by [Macd, 3.3]. By abuse, we will say that a partition  $\pi$  *contains* a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$  if  $n_i \geq \lambda_i$  and  $r \geq s$ , which is the same as saying that the Young diagram for  $\pi$  contains the Young diagram for  $\lambda$ .

Here is another description of  $\Lambda$ , taken from [Kn]:  $\Lambda$  is isomorphic to the direct sum  $R_*$  of the representation rings  $R(\Sigma_n)$ , made into a ring via the outer product  $R(\Sigma_m) \otimes R(\Sigma_n) \rightarrow R(\Sigma_{m+n})$ . Under this identification,  $e_n \in \Lambda_n$  is identified with the class of the trivial simple representation  $V_n$  of  $\Sigma_n$ . More generally,  $s_\pi$  corresponds to the class  $[V_\pi]$  in  $R(\Sigma_n)$  of the irreducible representation corresponding to  $\pi$ . (See [Kn, III.3].)

**Proposition 3.1.**  *$\Lambda$  is a graded Hopf algebra, with coproduct  $\Delta$  and antipode  $S$  determined by the formulas*

$$\Delta(e_n) = \sum_{i+j=n} e_i \otimes e_j, \quad S(e_n) = h_n \text{ and } S(h_n) = e_n.$$

*Proof.* The graded bialgebra structure is well known and due to Burroughs [Bu], who defined the coproduct on  $R_*$  as the map induced from the restriction maps  $R(\Sigma_{m+n}) \rightarrow R(\Sigma_m) \otimes R(\Sigma_n)$ , and established the formulas  $\Delta(e_n) = \sum_{i+j=n} e_i \otimes e_j$ . The fact that there is a ring involution  $S$  interchanging  $e_n$  and  $h_n$  is also well known. The fact that  $S$  is an antipode does not seem to be well known, but it is immediate from the formula  $\sum (-1)^r e_r h_{n-r}$  of [Macd, (2.6)].  $\square$

*Remark 3.2.* Atiyah shows in [A, 1.2] that  $\Lambda$  is isomorphic to the graded dual  $R^* = \bigoplus \text{Hom}(R(\Sigma_n), \mathbb{Z})$ . That is, if  $\{v_\pi\}$  is the dual basis in  $R^n$  to the basis  $\{[V_\pi]\}$  of simple representations in  $R_n$  and the restriction of  $[V_\pi]$  is  $\sum c_\pi^{\mu\nu} [V_\mu] \otimes [V_\nu]$  then  $v_\mu v_\nu = \sum_\pi c_\pi^{\mu\nu} v_\pi$  in  $R^*$ . Thus the product studied by Atiyah on the graded dual  $R^*$  is exactly the algebra structure dual to the coproduct  $\Delta$ .

Let  $\pi'$  denote the conjugate partition to  $\pi$ . The *Jacobi-Trudi identities*  $s_\pi = \det |h_{\pi_i + j - i}| = \det |e_{\pi'_i + j - i}|$  show that the antipode  $S$  interchanges  $s_\pi$  and  $s_{\pi'}$ . (Jacobi conjectured the identities, and his student Nicoló Trudi verified them in 1864; they were rediscovered by Giovanni Giambelli in 1903 and are sometimes called the *Giambelli identities*).

Let  $I_{e,n}$  denote the ideal of  $\Lambda$  generated by the  $e_i$  with  $i \geq n$ . The quotient  $\Lambda/I_{e,n}$  is the polynomial ring  $\Lambda_{n-1} = \mathbb{Z}[e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}]$ . Let  $I_{h,n}$  denote  $S(I_{e,n})$ , i.e., the ideal of  $\Lambda$  generated by the  $h_i$  with  $i \geq n$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *The Schur polynomials  $s_\pi$  for partitions  $\pi$  containing  $(1^n)$  (i.e., with at least  $n$  rows) form a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis for the ideal  $I_{e,n}$ . The Schur polynomials with at most  $n$  rows form a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $\Lambda_n$ .*

*Similarly, the Schur polynomials  $s_\pi$  for partitions  $\pi$  containing  $(n)$  (i.e., with  $\pi_1 \geq n$ ) form a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis for the ideal  $I_{h,n}$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the assertions about  $I_{e,n}$ ; the assertion about  $I_{h,n}$  follows by applying the antipode  $S$ . By [Macd, 3.2], the  $s_\pi$  which have fewer than  $n$  rows project onto a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $\Lambda_{n-1} = \Lambda/I_{e,n}$ . Since the  $s_\pi$  form a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $\Lambda$ , it suffices to show that every partition  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r)$  with  $r > n$  is in  $I_{e,n}$ . Expansion along the first row of the Jacobi-Trudi identity  $s_\pi = \det |e_{\pi'_i + j - i}|$  shows that  $s_\pi$  is in the ideal  $I_{e,r}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.** *The ideal  $I_{h,m} \cap I_{e,n}$  of  $\Lambda$  has a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis consisting of the Schur polynomials  $s_\pi$  for partitions  $\pi$  containing the hook  $(m, 1^{n-1}) = (m, 1, \dots, 1)$ .*

**Definition 3.5.** For any partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$ , let  $I_\lambda$  denote the subgroup of  $\Lambda$  generated by the Schur polynomials  $s_\pi$  for which  $\pi$  contains  $\lambda$ , i.e.,  $\pi_i \geq \lambda_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . We have already encountered the special cases  $I_{e,n} = I_{(1, \dots, 1)}$  and  $I_{h,n} = I_{(n)}$  in Proposition 3.3, and  $I_{(m, 1, \dots, 1)} = I_{h,m} \cap I_{e,n}$  in Corollary 3.4.

*Example 3.6.* Consider the partition  $\lambda = (2, 1)$ . Since  $I_\lambda = I_{h,2} \cap I_{e,2}$  by Corollary 3.4,  $\Lambda_\lambda$  is the pullback of  $\mathbb{Z}[a]$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[b]$  along the common quotient  $\mathbb{Z}[a]/(a^2) = \Lambda/(I_{(1,1)} + I_{(2)})$ . The universal element of  $\Lambda_\lambda$  is  $x = (a, b)$  and if we set  $y = (0, b^2)$  then  $\Lambda_{(2,1)} \cong \mathbb{Z}[x, y]/(y^2 - x^2y)$ . Since  $\lambda^n(b) = b^n$  for all  $n$ , it is easy to check that  $\lambda^{2i}(x) = y^i$  and  $\lambda^{2i+1}(x) = xy^i$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *The  $I_\lambda$  are ideals of  $\Lambda$ , and  $\{I_\lambda\}$  is closed under intersection.*

*Proof.* The Pieri rule writes  $h_p s_\pi$  as a sum of  $s_\mu$ , where  $\mu$  runs over partitions containing  $\pi$ . Thus  $I_\lambda$  is closed under multiplication by the  $h_p$ . As every element of  $\Lambda$  is a polynomial in the  $h_p$ ,  $I_\lambda$  is an ideal.

If  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_s)$  is another partition, then  $s_\pi$  is in  $I_\lambda \cap I_\mu$  if and only if  $\pi_i \geq \max\{\lambda_i, \mu_i\}$ . Thus  $I_\lambda \cap I_\mu = I_{\lambda \cup \mu}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.8.* The  $\lambda$ -ideal  $I_\lambda + I_\mu$  need not be of the form  $I_\nu$  for any  $\nu$ . For example,  $I = I_{(2)} + I_{(1,1)}$  contains every Schur polynomial except 1 and  $s_1 = e_1$ .

We conclude this section by connecting  $\Lambda$  with  $\lambda$ -rings. Recall from [Ber, 4.4], [G57, I.4] or [AT, §2] that the universal  $\lambda$ -ring on one generator  $a = a_1$  is the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Z}[a_1, \dots, a_n, \dots]$ , with  $\lambda^n(a) = a_n$ . This ring is naturally isomorphic to the ring of natural operations on the category of  $\lambda$ -rings, with  $a_n$  corresponding to the operation  $\lambda^n$ ; an operation  $\phi$  corresponds to  $\phi(a) \in \Lambda$ .

Following [A] and [Kn], we may identify this universal  $\lambda$ -ring with  $\Lambda$ , where the  $a_i$  are identified with the  $e_i \in \Lambda$ . The operation  $\sigma^n$ , defined by  $\sigma^n(x) = (-1)^n \lambda^n(-x)$ , corresponds to  $h_n$ ; this may be seen by comparing the generating functions  $H(t) = E(-t)^{-1}$  and  $\sigma_t(x) = \lambda_{-t}(x)^{-1}$ .

**Proposition 3.9.** *If  $\phi$  is an element of  $\Lambda$ , and  $\Delta(\phi) = \sum \phi'_i \otimes \phi''_i$  then the corresponding natural operation on  $\lambda$ -rings satisfies  $\phi(x+y) = \sum \phi'_i(x) \phi''_i(y)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the set  $\Lambda'$  of all operations in  $\Lambda$  satisfying the condition of the proposition. Since  $\Delta$  is a ring homomorphism,  $\Lambda'$  is a subring of  $\Lambda$ . Since  $\Delta(e_n) = \sum e_i \otimes e_{n-i}$  and  $\lambda^n(x+y) = \sum \lambda^i(x) \lambda^{n-i}(y)$ ,  $\Lambda'$  contains the generators  $e_n$  of  $\Lambda$ , and hence  $\Lambda' = \Lambda$ .  $\square$

The Littlewood-Richardson rule states that  $\Delta([V_\pi])$  is a sum  $\sum c_{\pi}^{\mu\nu} [V_\mu] \otimes [V_\nu]$ , where  $\mu \subseteq \pi$  and  $\pi$  is obtained from  $\mu$  by concatenating  $\nu$  in a certain way. By Proposition 3.9, we then have

**Corollary 3.10.**  $s_\pi(x + y) = \sum c_\pi^{\mu\nu} s_\mu(x) s_\nu(y)$ .

#### 4. SCHUR-FINITE $\lambda$ -RINGS

In this section we introduce the notion of a Schur-finite element in a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R$ , and show that these elements form a subring of  $R$  containing the subring of finite-dimensional elements. We conjecture that they are the elements for which the virtual splitting principle holds.

**Definition 4.1.** We say that an element  $x$  in a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R$  is *Schur-finite* if there exists a partition  $\lambda$  such that  $s_\mu(x) = 0$  for every partition  $\mu$  containing  $\lambda$ . That is,  $I_\lambda$  annihilates  $x$ . We call such a  $\lambda$  a *bound* for  $x$ .

By Remark 3.8,  $x \in R$  may have no unique minimal bound  $\lambda$ . By Example 4.5 below,  $s_\lambda(x) = 0$  does not imply that  $\lambda$  is a bound for  $x$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *Each  $I_\lambda$  is a  $\lambda$ -ideal, and  $\Lambda_\lambda = \Lambda/I_\lambda$  is a  $\lambda$ -ring. Thus every Schur-finite  $x \in R$  with bound  $\lambda$  determines a  $\lambda$ -ring map  $f : \Lambda_\lambda \rightarrow R$  with  $f(a) = x$ .*

*Moreover, if  $\lambda$  is a rectangular partition then  $I_\lambda$  is a prime ideal, and  $\Lambda_\lambda$  is a subring of a polynomial ring in which  $a$  becomes finite-dimensional.*

Proposition 4.2 verifies Conjecture 3.9 of [KKT].

*Proof.* Fix a rectangular partition  $\beta = ((m+1)^{n+1}) = (m+1, \dots, m+1)$ , and set  $a = \sum_1^m a_i$ ,  $b = \sum_1^n b_j$ . Consider the universal  $\lambda$ -ring map

$$f : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_m \otimes \Lambda_{-n} \cong \mathbb{Z}[a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_n]$$

sending  $e_1$  to the finite-dimensional element  $a + b$  (see Definition 1.2). We claim that the kernel of  $f$  is  $I_\beta$ . Since  $\text{Ker}(f)$  is a  $\lambda$ -ideal, this proves that  $I_\beta$  is a  $\lambda$ -ideal and that  $\Lambda/I_\beta$  embeds into the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Z}[a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_n]$ . Since any partition  $\lambda$  can be written as a union of rectangular partitions  $\beta_i$ , Lemma 3.7 implies that  $I_\lambda = \cap I_{\beta_i}$  is also a  $\lambda$ -ideal.

By the Littlewood-Richardson rule 3.10,  $s_\pi(a + b) = \sum c_\pi^{\mu\nu} s_\mu(a) s_\nu(b)$ , where  $\pi$  is obtained from  $\mu$  by concatenating  $\nu$  in a certain way. If  $\pi$  contains  $\beta$  then  $s_\pi(a + b) = 0$ , because either the length of  $\mu$  is  $> m$  or else  $\nu_1 > n$ ; by Proposition 3.3,  $s_\mu(a) = 0$  in the first case and  $s_\nu(b) = 0$  in the second case. Thus  $I_\lambda \subseteq \text{Ker}(f)$ .

If  $\pi$  does not contain  $\beta$  then the length of  $\mu$  is at most  $m$  and  $\nu_1 \leq n$ . By Proposition 3.3,  $s_\mu(a) \neq 0$  in  $\Lambda_m$  and  $s_\nu(b) \neq 0$  in  $\Lambda_{-n}$ . As the  $s_\mu(a)$  run over a basis of  $\Lambda_m$  and the  $s_\nu(b)$  run over a basis of  $\Lambda_{-n}$ , by Proposition 3.3, we have  $f(s_\pi) = s_\pi(a + b) \neq 0$ . Thus  $I_\lambda = \text{Ker}(f)$ , as claimed.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.3.**  $\Lambda_{(2,2)}$  is the subring  $\mathbb{Z} + x\mathbb{Z}[a, b]$  of  $\mathbb{Z}[a, b]$ , where  $x = a + b$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.2,  $\Lambda_{(2,2)}$  is the subring of  $\mathbb{Z}[a, b]$  generated  $x = a + b$  and the  $\lambda^n(x)$ . Since

$$\lambda^{n+1}(x) = a\lambda^n(b) + \lambda^{n+1}(b) = ab^n + b^{n+1} = xb^n,$$

we have  $\Lambda_{(2,2)} = \mathbb{Z}[x, xb, xb^2, \dots, xb^n, \dots] = \mathbb{Z} + x\mathbb{Z}[a, b]$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.4.* The ring  $\Lambda_{(2,2)}$  was studied in [KKT, 3.8], where it was shown that  $\Lambda_{(2,2)}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{Z}[x, y]$  sending  $e_n$  to  $xy^{n-1}$ . This is the same as the embedding in Corollary 4.3, up to the change of coordinates  $(x, y) = (a + b, b)$ .

*Example 4.5.* Let  $I$  be the ideal of  $\Lambda_{(2,2)}$  generated by the  $\lambda^{2i}(x)$  ( $i > 0$ ) and set  $R = \Lambda_{(2,2)}/I$ . Then  $R$  is a  $\lambda$ -ring and  $x$  is a nonzerodivisor such that  $\lambda^{2i}(x) = 0$  but  $\lambda^{2i+1}(x) \neq 0$ . In particular,  $\lambda^2(x) = 0$  yet  $\lambda^3(x) \neq 0$ .

To see this, we use the embedding of Corollary 4.3 to see that  $I$  contains  $x(xb^{2i-1})$  and  $(xb)(xb^{2i-1})$  and hence the ideal  $J$  of  $\mathbb{Z}[a, b]$  generated by  $x^2b$ . In

fact,  $I$  is additively generated by  $J$  and the  $\{xb^{2i-1}\}$ . It follows that  $R$  has basis  $\{1, x^n, xb^{2n} | n \geq 1\}$ . Since  $\lambda^n(\lambda^{2i}(x))$  is equivalent to  $\lambda^{2in}(x) = xb^{2in-1}$  modulo  $J$  (by 1.6), it lies in  $I$ . Hence  $I$  is a  $\lambda$ -ideal of  $\Lambda_{(2,2)}$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *If  $x$  and  $y$  are Schur-finite, so is  $x + y$ .*

*Proof.* Given a partition  $\lambda$ , there is a partition  $\pi_0$  such that whenever  $\pi$  contains  $\pi_0$ , one of the partitions  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  appearing in the Littlewood-Richardson rule 3.10 must contain  $\lambda$ . If  $x$  and  $y$  are both killed by all Schur polynomials indexed by partitions containing  $\lambda$ , we must therefore have  $s_\pi(x + y) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.7.** *Finite-dimensional elements are Schur-finite.*

*Proof.* Proposition 3.3 shows that even and odd elements are Schur-finite.  $\square$

*Example 4.8.* If  $R$  is a binomial ring containing  $\mathbb{Q}$ , then every Schur-finite element is finite-dimensional. This follows from Example 1.1 and [Macd, Ex.I.3.4], which says that  $s_\pi(r)$  is a rational number times a product of terms  $r - c(x)$ , where the  $c(x)$  are integers.

*Example 4.9.* The universal element  $x$  of  $\Lambda_{(2,1)}$  is Schur-finite but not finite-dimensional. To see this, recall from Example 3.6 that  $\Lambda_{(2,1)} \cong \mathbb{Z}[x, y]/(y^2 - x^2y)$ . Because  $\Lambda_{(2,1)}$  is graded, if  $x$  were finite-dimensional it would be the sum of an even and odd element in the degree 1 part  $\{nx\}$  of  $\Lambda_{(2,1)}$ . If  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $nx$  cannot be even because the second coordinate of  $\lambda^k(nx)$  is  $\binom{-n}{k} b^k$  by 1.2. And  $nx$  cannot be odd, because the first coordinate of  $\sigma^k(nx)$  is  $(-1)^k \binom{-n}{k} a^k$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $R \subset R'$  be an inclusion of  $\lambda$ -rings. If  $x \in R$  is Schur-finite in  $R'$ , then  $x$  is Schur-finite in  $R$ . In particular, if  $x$  is finite-dimensional in  $R'$ , then  $x$  is Schur-finite in  $R$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $s_\pi(x)$  may be computed in either  $R$  or  $R'$ , the set of partitions  $\pi$  for which  $s_\pi(x) = 0$  is the same for  $R$  and  $R'$ . The final assertion follows from Lemma 4.7.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.11.** *If  $\pi$  is a partition on  $n$ ,  $s_{\pi'}(-x) = (-1)^n s_\pi(x)$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $s_\pi$  as a homogeneous polynomial  $f(e_1, e_2, \dots)$  of degree  $n$ . Applying the antipode  $S$  in  $\Lambda$ , we have  $s_{\pi'} = f(h_1, h_2, \dots)$ . It follows that  $s_{\pi'}(-x) = f(\sigma^1, \sigma^2, \dots)(-x)$ . Since  $\sigma^i(-x) = (-1)^i \lambda^i(x)$ , and  $f$  is homogeneous, we have

$$s_{\pi'}(-x) = f(-\lambda^1, +\lambda^2, \dots)(x) = (-1)^n f(\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \dots)(x) = s_\pi(x). \quad \square$$

**Theorem 4.12.** *The Schur-finite elements form a subring of any  $\lambda$ -ring, containing the subring of finite-dimensional elements.*

*Proof.* The Schur-finite elements are closed under addition by Lemma 4.6. Since  $\pi$  contains  $\lambda$  just in case  $\pi'$  contains  $\lambda'$ , Lemma 4.11 implies that  $-x$  is Schur-finite whenever  $x$  is. Hence the Schur-finite elements form a subgroup of  $R$ . It suffices to show that if  $x$  and  $y$  are Schur-finite in  $R$ , then  $xy$  and all  $\lambda^i(x)$  are Schur-finite.

Let  $x$  be Schur-finite with rectangular bound  $\mu$ , so there is a map from the  $\lambda$ -ring  $\Lambda_\mu$  to  $R$  sending the generator  $e$  to  $x$ . Embed  $\Lambda_\mu$  in  $R' = \mathbb{Z}[a_1, \dots, b_1, \dots]$  using Proposition 4.2. Since every element of  $R'$  is finite-dimensional,  $\lambda^n(e)$  is finite-dimensional in  $R'$ , and hence Schur-finite in  $\Lambda_\mu$  by Lemma 4.10. It follows that the image  $\lambda^n(x)$  of  $\lambda^n(e)$  in  $R$  is also Schur-finite.

Let  $x$  and  $y$  be Schur-finite with rectangular bounds  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , and let  $\Lambda_\mu \rightarrow R$  and  $\Lambda_\nu \rightarrow R$  be the  $\lambda$ -ring maps sending the generators  $e_\mu$  and  $e_\nu$  to  $x$  and  $y$ . Since the induced map  $\Lambda_\mu \otimes \Lambda_\nu \rightarrow R$  sends  $e_\mu \otimes e_\nu$  to  $xy$ , we only need to show that  $e_\mu \otimes e_\nu$  is Schur-finite. But  $\Lambda_\mu \otimes \Lambda_\nu \subset \mathbb{Z}[a_1, \dots, b_1, \dots] \otimes \mathbb{Z}[a_1, \dots, b_1, \dots]$ , and in



the larger ring every element is finite-dimensional, including the tensor product. By Lemma 4.10,  $e_\mu \otimes e_\nu$  is Schur-finite in  $\Lambda_\mu \otimes \Lambda_\nu$ .  $\square$

*Conjecture 4.13* (Virtual Splitting principle). Let  $x$  be a Schur-finite element of a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R$ . Then  $R$  is contained in a larger  $\lambda$ -ring  $R'$  such that  $x$  is finite-dimensional in  $R'$ , i.e., there are line elements  $\ell_i, \ell'_j$  in  $R'$  so that

$$x = \left( \sum \ell_i \right) - \left( \sum \ell'_j \right).$$

*Example 4.14.* The virtual splitting principle holds in the universal case, where  $R_0 = \Lambda_\beta$ . Indeed, we know that  $x$  is  $\sum a_i + \sum b_j$  in  $R'_0 = \mathbb{Z}[a_1, \dots, b_1, \dots]$ . Since  $\ell_j = -b_j$  is a line element,  $x$  is a difference of sums of line elements in  $R'_0$ .

Unfortunately, although the induced map  $f : R \rightarrow R \otimes_{R_0} R'_0$  sends a Schur-finite element  $x$  to a difference of sums of line elements, the map  $f$  need not be an injection.

As partial evidence for Conjecture 4.13, we show that the virtual splitting principle holds for elements bounded by the hook  $(2, 1)$ .

**Theorem 4.15.** *Let  $x$  be a Schur-finite element in a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R$ . If  $x$  has bound  $(2, 1)$ , then  $R$  is contained in a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R'$  in which  $x$  is a virtual sum  $\ell_1 + \ell_2 - a$  of line elements.*

*Proof.* The polynomial ring  $R[a]$  becomes a  $\lambda$ -ring once we declare  $a$  to be a line element. Set  $y = x + a$ , and let  $I$  be the ideal of  $R[a]$  generated by  $\lambda^3(y)$ .

For all  $n \geq 2$ , the equation  $s_{n,1}(x) = 0$  yields  $\lambda^{n+1}(x) = x\lambda^n(x) = x^{n-1}\lambda^2(x)$  in  $R$ , and therefore  $\lambda^{n+1}(y) = (a+x)x^{n-2}\lambda^2(x) = x^{n-2}\lambda^3(y)$ . It follows from Scholium 1.6 that  $\lambda^m(\lambda^3 y) \in I$  for all  $m \geq 1$  and hence that

$$\lambda^n(f \cdot \lambda^3 y) = P_n(\lambda^1(f), \dots, \lambda^n(f); \lambda^1(\lambda^3 y), \dots, \lambda^n(\lambda^3 y))$$

is in  $I$  for all  $f \in R[a]$ . Thus  $I$  is a  $\lambda$ -ideal of  $R[a]$ ,  $A = R[a]/I$  is a  $\lambda$ -ring, and the image of  $y$  in  $A$  is even of degree 2. By the Splitting Principle 1.4, the image of  $x = y - a$  in some  $\lambda$ -ring  $A'$  containing  $A$  is a virtual sum  $\ell_1 + \ell_2 - a$  of line elements.

To conclude, it suffices to show that  $R$  injects into  $A = R[a]/I$ . If  $r \in R$  vanishes in  $A$  then  $r = f\lambda^3(y)$  for some  $f = f(a)$  in  $R[a]$ . We may take  $f$  to have minimal degree  $d \geq 0$ . Writing  $f(a) = ca^d + g(a)$ , with  $c \in R$  and  $\deg(g) < d$ , the coefficient of  $a^{d+1}$  in  $f\lambda^3(y)$ , namely  $c\lambda^2(x)$ , must be zero. But then  $c\lambda^3 y = 0$ , and  $r = g\lambda^3 y$ , contradicting the minimality of  $f$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.16.* The rank of a Schur-finite object with bound  $\pi$  cannot be well defined unless  $\pi$  is a rectangular partition. This is because any rectangular partition  $\mu = (m+1)^{n+1}$  contained in  $\pi$  yields a map  $R \rightarrow R'$  sending  $x$  to an element of rank  $m-n$ . If  $\pi$  is not rectangular there are different maximal rectangular subpartitions with different values of  $m-n$ .

**Example 4.16.1.** *Let  $x$  be the element of Theorem 4.15. By Lemma 4.11,  $-x$  also has bound  $(2, 1)$ . Applying Theorem 4.15 to  $-x$  shows that  $R$  is also contained in a  $\lambda$ -ring  $R''$  in which  $x$  is a virtual sum  $a - \ell_1 - \ell_2$  of line bundles. Therefore  $x$  has rank 1 in  $R'$ , and has rank  $-1$  in  $R''$ .*

Let  $R$  be a  $\lambda$ -ring and  $x \in R$ . One central question is to determine when the power series  $\lambda_t(x)$  is a rational function. (See [A05], [LL04], [HI], [Gul], [B1, B2], [KKT] for example.) For concreteness, we consider the question of being determinantly rational (see 2.6). This is connected to Schur-finiteness.

**Proposition 4.17.** *If  $x$  is Schur-finite, then  $\lambda_t(x)$  is determinantly rational.*

*Conversely, if  $\lambda_t(x)$  is determinantly rational, there is an  $m$  such that the sequence  $s_{(1^m)}(x), \dots, s_{(n^m)}(x), \dots$  is eventually 0.*

The first assertion of this proposition was proven in [KKT, 3.10] for  $\lambda$ -rings of the form  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$  using categorical methods.

*Proof.* By definition,  $\lambda_t(x)$  is determinantly rational if and only if for some  $m$  the determinants of the  $m \times m$  matrices  $A_n = (\lambda^{n+i+j}(x))$  are 0 for all large  $n$ . Reversing the rows in  $A_{n-m}$  yields the matrix in the Jacobi-Trudi identity for  $s_\pi(x)$ ,  $\pi = (n^m) = (n, n, \dots, n)$ . Since  $\det(A_{m-n}) = \pm s_\pi(x)$ ,  $\lambda_t(x)$  is determinantly rational if and only if for some  $m$  the sequence  $\{s_{(n^m)}(x)\}$  is eventually 0.

If  $x$  is Schur-finite, some bound for  $x$  is a rectangular partition  $(N^m)$ . Then  $s_{(n^m)}(x) = 0$  for all  $n \geq N$ , because the partition  $(n^m)$  contains  $(N^m)$ .  $\square$

We conclude by connecting our notion of Schur-finiteness to the notion of a Schur-finite object in a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear tensor category  $\mathcal{A}$ , given in [Mz]). By definition, an object  $A$  is *Schur-finite* if some  $S_\lambda(A) \cong 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . By [Mz, 1.4], this implies that  $S_\mu(A) = 0$  for all  $\mu$  containing  $\lambda$ . It is evident that if  $A$  is a Schur-finite object of  $\mathcal{A}$  then  $[A]$  is a Schur-finite element of  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ . However, the converse need not hold. For example, if  $\mathcal{A}$  contains infinite direct sums then  $K_0(\mathcal{A}) = 0$  by the Eilenberg swindle, so  $[A]$  is always Schur-finite.

Here are two examples of Schur-finite objects whose class in  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$  is finite-dimensional even though they are not finite-dimensional objects.

*Example 4.18.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the abelian category of positively graded modules over the graded ring  $A = \mathbb{Q}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2 = 0)$ . It is well known that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a tensor category under  $\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}$ , with the  $\lambda$ -ring  $K_0(\mathcal{A}) \cong \Lambda_{-1} = \mathbb{Z}[b]$ ;  $1 = [Q]$  and  $b = [Q[1]]$ . The graded object  $A$  is Schur-finite but not finite-dimensional in  $\mathcal{A}$  by [Mz, 1.12]. However,  $[A]$  is a finite-dimensional element in  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$  because  $[A] = [Q] + [Q[1]]$ .

*Example 4.19* (O’Sullivan). Let  $X$  a Kummer surface; then there is an open subvariety  $U$  of  $X$ , whose complement  $Z$  is a finite set of points, such that  $M(U)$  is Schur-finite but not finite-dimensional in the Kimura-O’Sullivan sense [Mz, 3.3]. However, it follows from the distinguished triangle

$$M(Z)(2)[3] \rightarrow M(U) \rightarrow M(X) \rightarrow M(Z)(2)[4]$$

that  $[M(U)] = [M(Z)(2)[3]] + [M(X)]$  in  $K_0(\mathbf{DM}_{gm})$  and hence in  $K_0(\mathcal{M})$ . Since both  $M(X)$  and  $M(Z)(2)[3]$  are finite-dimensional,  $[M(U)]$  is a finite-dimensional element of  $K_0(\mathcal{M})$ .

**Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank Anders Buch, Alessio Del Padrone and Christophe Soulé for valuable discussions.

## REFERENCES

- [1894] E. Borel, Sur une application d’un théorème de M. Hadamard, *Bull. Sciences Math.* 18 (1894), 22–25.
- [A] M. Atiyah, Power operations in  $K$ -theory, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* 17 (1966), 165–193.
- [AT] M. Atiyah and D. Tall, Group representations,  $\lambda$ -rings and the  $J$ -homomorphism, *Topology* 8 (1969), 253–297.
- [A05] Y. André, Motifs de dimension finie (d’après S.-I. Kimura, P. O’Sullivan ...), *Astérisque* 299 (2005), 115–145.
- [Ber] P. Berthelot, Generalites sur les  $\lambda$ -anneaux, Exposé V (pages 297–364) in SGA6, Lecture Notes in Math. 225, Springer, 1971.
- [B1] S. Biglari, On finite dimensionality of mixed Tate motives *J. K-Theory* 4 (2009), 145–161
- [B2] S. Biglari, Lambda ring structure on the Grothendieck ring of mixed motives, preliminary version, 2009. Available at <http://www.math.uni-bielefeld.de/~biglari/manuscripts/lrsmm.pdf>

- [B3] S. Biglari, On rings and categories of general representations, preprint, 2010. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1002.2801>
- [Bo] M. Bondarko, Differential graded motives: weight complex, weight filtrations and spectral sequences for realizations; Voevodsky versus Hanamura. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* 8 (2009), no. 1, 39–97.
- [Bu] J. Burroughs, Operations in Grothendieck rings and the symmetric group, *Canad. J. Math* XXVI (1974), 543–550.
- [Dav] A. A. Davidov, *Monoidal Categories*, *Journal of Mathematical Sciences* 88(4) (1998), 457–519.
- [dBN] S. del Baño Rollin and V. Navarro Aznar, On the motive of a quotient variety, *Collectanea Math.* 49 (1998), no. 2-3, 203–226.
- [G57] A. Grothendieck, Classes de Faisceaux et Théorème de Riemann-Roch, Exposé 0-App (pages 20–77) in SGA6, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 225, Springer, 1971. Original preprint dated November 1957.
- [G64] A. Grothendieck, Letter to Serre, August 16, 1964, pp.172–175 in *Correspondance Grothendieck-Serre*, Ed. P. Colmez and J.-P. Serre, Soc. Math. France, 2001.
- [GS] H. Gillet and C. Soulé, Descent, motives and  $K$ -theory, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 478 (1996), 127–176.
- [GN] F. Guillén and V. Navarro Aznar, Un critère d’extension des foncteurs définis sur les schémas lisses, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* 95 (2002), 1–91.
- [Gul] V. Guletskii, Zeta-functions in triangulated categories, *Mathematical Notes.* 87 (2010), 369–381.
- [HI] F. Heinloth, A note on functional equations for zeta functions with values in Chow motives, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 57 (2007), 927–1945.
- [Kap] M. Kapranov, The elliptic curve in the  $S$ -duality theory and Eisenstein series for Kac-Moody groups, preprint, 2000. Available at [math.AG/0001005](http://math.AG/0001005)
- [Kim] S. Kimura, Chow groups are finite dimensional, in some sense, *Math. Annalen* 331 (2005), 173–201.
- [KKT] K. Kimura, S. Kimura and N. Takahashi, Motivic Zeta functions in additive monoidal categories, preprint, 2009.
- [Kn] D. Knutson,  $\lambda$ -rings and the Representation Theory of the Symmetric Group, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 308 (1973)
- [LL03] M. Larsen and V. Lunts, Motivic measures and stable birational geometry, *Mosc. Math. J.* 3 (2003), 85–95, 259.
- [LL04] M. Larsen and V. Lunts, Rationality criteria for motivic zeta functions, *Compositio* 140 (2004), 1537–1560.
- [Macd] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*, Clarendon Press, 1979
- [Mz] C. Mazza, Schur functors and motives, *K-Theory* 33 (2004), 89–106.
- [MVW] C. Mazza, V. Voevodsky, and C. Weibel, *Lecture notes on motivic cohomology*, Clay Math. Monographs, vol. 2, AMS, 2006.
- [Q] D. Quillen, Higher algebraic  $K$ -theory I, pages 85–147 in *Lecture Notes in Math.* 341, Springer, 1973.
- [Sw] R. G. Swan, A splitting principle in algebraic  $K$ -theory. *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, Vol. XXI, (1971), pp. 155–159.
- [WHA] C. A. Weibel, *An introduction to homological algebra*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994.

DIMA – UNIVERSITÀ DI GENOVA, GENOVA, ITALY  
*E-mail address:* [mazza@dim.unige.it](mailto:mazza@dim.unige.it)

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08901, USA  
*E-mail address:* [weibel@math.rutgers.edu](mailto:weibel@math.rutgers.edu)