

## A geometrical argument for a theorem of G. E. Welters

Giambattista Marini

Dipartimento di matematica, II Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”, Via della Ricerca Scientifica, I-00133 Roma, Italy (e-mail: marini@axp.mat.uniroma2.it)

Received February 18, 1998; in final form August 10, 1998

The existence of a one parameter family of trisecants to the Kummer variety of an indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety characterizes Jacobians. This result was first proved by Gunning in [G] under additional hypotheses. Then Welters removed the additional hypotheses and considered the degenerate cases, see [W1] and [W2]. In this note we provide a short geometrical argument for the inflectionary case.

**Theorem (Welters).** *Let  $(X, [\Theta])$  be an indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety. Let  $Y$  be the Artinian subscheme of  $X$  of length 3 supported at 0 defined as the image of  $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^3)$  in  $X$  via the immersion  $\epsilon \mapsto \epsilon^2 D_1 + \epsilon^2 2D_2$ , where  $D_1 \neq 0$ . Denote by  $K : X \rightarrow |2\Theta|$  the Kummer morphism. Assume that the algebraic subset*

$$V = \{2u \in X \mid u + Y \subset K^{-1}(l) \text{ for some line } l \subset |2\Theta|\},$$

*has positive dimension. Then  $V$  is a smooth irreducible curve through zero, and  $(X, [\Theta])$  is the polarized Jacobian of  $V$ .*

The proof of this theorem is naturally divided in two steps. First one proves that the endomorphism  $\delta$  associated with the pair  $(\mathcal{C}, \Theta)$  is a positive multiple of the identity; here  $\mathcal{C}$  is any curve contained in  $V$ . Then one proves that  $\delta$  is the identity over the flow generated by  $D_1$  (thus  $\delta$  is the identity and Matsusaka’s criterion applies, moreover  $\mathcal{C} = V$  by curve theory). For the first step we go back to Welters’ homological argument in [W1]. For the second one we present a geometrical argument. We recall that  $\delta(x)$  is, by definition, the sum in  $X$  of the points of the intersection  $\mathcal{C} \cdot \Theta_x$ , opportunely translated in order to have  $\delta(0) = 0$  (namely  $\delta(x) = \sum \mathcal{C} \cdot (\Theta_x - \Theta)$ ). We shall use the following remark.

*1 Remark.* Assume that  $V$  and  $W$  are subvarieties of  $X$  of complementary dimensions and assume that they intersect transversally at distinct points  $p_1, \dots, p_r$ . If a point  $x$  is in a small analytic neighborhood of zero, we are allowed to number the points of the intersection  $V.W_x$  according to the numbering of the  $p_i$ 's. Thus, we can single out the contribution of  $p_i$  to the differential  $d\delta$ . We shall denote this contribution by  $d\delta_{p_i}$ . Let  $D$  be a vector in  $T_0(X)$ , or better an invariant vector field on  $X$ . We claim that, for  $d\delta_{p_i}(D)$ , which is the  $i^{th}$ -contribution to  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \text{sum}(V.(W_{\epsilon D} - W))$ , the following holds. If  $D$  is tangent to  $V$  at  $p_i$ , then  $d\delta_{p_i}(D) = D$ . If  $D$  is tangent to  $W$  at  $p_i$ , then  $d\delta_{p_i}(D) = 0$ . Our claim is a trivial consequence of the fact that since  $V$  and  $W$  intersect transversally at  $p_i$ , for the computation of the contribution  $\delta_{p_i}$  up to its first order, we are allowed to work with tangent spaces.

Let us go back to the hypothesis of the theorem. The image under  $K$  of the germ of curve  $u + Y = u + 2\epsilon D_1 + 2\epsilon^2 D_2$  is the germ of curve  $\vec{\vartheta}(u + 2\epsilon D_1 + 2\epsilon^2 D_2) = \vec{\vartheta}(u) + 2\epsilon D_1 \vec{\vartheta}(u) + 2\epsilon^2 (D_1^2 + D_2) \vec{\vartheta}(u) \text{ mod}(\epsilon^3)$ , where  $\vec{\vartheta} := (\dots, \vartheta_\sigma, \dots)$ ,  $\{\vartheta_\sigma\}$  is a basis of  $H^0(X, 2\Theta)$ . The image germ above, viewed in  $\mathbb{P}H^0(X, 2\Theta)$ , is contained in a straight line if and only if the three terms of degree 0, 1 and 2 are dependent, thus

$$2u \in V \text{ if and only if } \text{rank}(\vec{\vartheta}(u) \ D_1 \vec{\vartheta}(u) \ (D_1^2 + D_2) \vec{\vartheta}(u)) \leq 2.$$

Observe that  $V$  parametrizes inflectionary points of the Kummer variety. Also, we recall that by a well know degeneration of Fay's trisecant formula (e.g. see [W1]),

$$(*) \ x \in V, \ x \neq 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \Theta \cap \Theta_x \subset D_1\Theta \cup D_1\Theta_x,$$

where  $D_1\Theta := \Theta \cap \{D_1\theta = 0\}$ , and  $\theta$  is a generator of  $H^0(X, \Theta)$ .

*2 Remark (see [W2]).* If  $V$  has positive dimension at 0, then  $V$  is smooth, one-dimensional at 0. Furthermore  $T_0(V) = \langle D_1 \rangle$ . To prove this claim, first observe that the condition

$$\text{rank}(\vec{\vartheta}(u) \ D_1 \vec{\vartheta}(u) \ (D_1^2 + D_2) \vec{\vartheta}(u)) \leq 2$$

gives rise to natural determinantal equations defining  $V$  as a scheme. These equations are the determinants equated to zero of the minors of order 3 of the matrix above. For computational purpose it is convenient to work with  $\Lambda^3 H^0(X, 2\Theta)$ , so that

$$V = \{ 2u \mid f(u) := \vec{\vartheta}(u) \wedge D_1 \vec{\vartheta}(u) \wedge (D_1^2 + D_2) \vec{\vartheta}(u) = 0 \}.$$

Furthermore, once for all we recall that  $\vec{\mathcal{D}}\vec{\vartheta}(0) = 0$  whenever  $\mathcal{D}$  is a derivative of odd order. Note that, in particular,  $f(0) = 0$ , i.e.  $0 \in V$ .

As  $E \in T_0(V)$  if and only if  $Ef(0) = 0$ , to prove the claim it suffices to show that

$$Ef(0) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad E \in \langle D_1 \rangle .$$

We have  $Ef(0) = E(\vec{\vartheta} \wedge D_1 \vec{\vartheta} \wedge (D_1^2 + D_2) \vec{\vartheta})(0) = \vec{\vartheta}(0) \wedge ED_1 \vec{\vartheta}(0) \wedge D_1^2 \vec{\vartheta}(0)$  which equals zero if and only if  $E \in \langle D_1 \rangle$  by Wirtinger's theorem stating that the matrix  $(\vec{\vartheta}(0), \dots, E_i E_j \vec{\vartheta}(0), \dots)$  has maximal rank  $1 + \frac{1}{2}n(n + 1)$ , where  $n := \dim(X)$  and  $\{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$  is a basis of  $T_0(X)$ , provided that  $(X, [\Theta])$  is indecomposable. Thus we are done. We now come to the proof of the theorem.

*Proof (of the Theorem).* Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an irreducible (and reduced) curve contained in  $V$ . We want to prove that the endomorphism  $\delta$  is the identity. By hypothesis, the following inclusions hold

$$(\star) \quad \Theta \cap \Theta_x \subset D_1 \Theta \cup D_1 \Theta_x, \quad \forall x \in V, x \neq 0.$$

*Step 1. The endomorphism  $\delta$  is a multiple of the identity.*

This follows by Welters' homological argument (see [W1], p. 503), which we now recall for the sake of completeness. By the inclusions above there exist algebraic cycles of codimension 2 in  $X$ ,  $M'$  and  $M$ , such that

$$\Theta \cap \Theta_x = M' + M_x, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{C}, x \neq 0.$$

The  $M_x$ 's cover  $\Theta$  as  $x$  moves in  $\mathcal{C}$ . It follows that the Pontryagin product of homology classes  $[M] \star [\mathcal{C}]$  is  $c \cdot [\Theta]$ , where  $c$  is a constant. On the other hand, since  $\Theta_{-x} \cap \Theta = M'_{-x} + M$  and since the cycle  $-\mathcal{C}$  is homologically equivalent to the cycle  $\mathcal{C}$ , there exists a constant  $c'$  such that the Pontryagin product  $[M'] \star [\mathcal{C}]$  equals  $c' \cdot [\Theta]$ . Thus  $[\Theta^2] \star \mathcal{C} = [M' + M] \star [\mathcal{C}] = (c' + c) \cdot [\Theta] = \text{const}[\Theta^2] \star [\Theta^{n-1}]/(n - 1)!$ . As  $\Theta$  is ample, the map  $([\Theta^2] \star) : H_2(X) \rightarrow H_{2n-2}(X)$  is an isomorphism. It follows that  $[\mathcal{C}] = \text{const}[\Theta^{n-1}]/(n - 1)!$ , so that the endomorphism  $\delta$  is a multiple of the identity as claimed. This multiple must be positive because  $\mathcal{C}$  is effective and  $\Theta$  is ample.

*Step 2. The differential  $d\delta$  sends the vector field  $D_1$  to itself.*

Both the inclusions  $(\star)$  and the endomorphism  $\delta$  are independent on the translate of the theta divisor we choose. Denote by  $D_1\mathcal{C}$  the set of points  $p$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $D_1$  is tangent to  $\mathcal{C}$  at  $p$  (in particular  $D_1\mathcal{C}$  includes singular points of  $\mathcal{C}$ ). Note that  $D_1\mathcal{C}$  is finite. Otherwise, the curve  $\mathcal{C}$  would be  $D_1$ -invariant, thus it would be an elliptic curve, and the image of  $\delta$  would be contained in the translate of  $\mathcal{C}$  through 0, contradicting that  $\delta$  is a non-zero multiple of the identity. Modulo translations of  $\Theta$  we can assume the following:

- 1)  $\mathcal{C} \not\subset \Theta$ ;
- 2)  $0 \in \Theta_{\text{smooth}}$ ;
- 3)  $D_1 \notin T_0(\Theta)$ ;
- 4)  $\mathcal{C} \cap \Theta_{\text{sing}}$  is empty;
- 5)  $D_1\mathcal{C} \cap D_1\Theta$  is empty.

Indeed, in order to find a translate  $\tilde{\Theta} := \Theta_{-x}$  satisfying 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, it suffices to require that the point  $x$  is in

$$\Theta_{\text{smooth}} - \left( \Delta \left( (\{0\} \cup D_1\mathcal{C}) \times D_1\Theta \cup (\mathcal{C} \times \Theta_{\text{sing}}) \right) \cup \{x \in X \mid \mathcal{C} \subset \Theta_{-x}\} \right),$$

where  $\Delta$  is the difference map  $\mathcal{C} \times \Theta \rightarrow X$ ,  $(p, q) \mapsto q - p$ . We claim that the set above is not empty. The set  $\Delta \left( (\{0\} \cup D_1\mathcal{C}) \times D_1\Theta \cup (\mathcal{C} \times \Theta_{\text{sing}}) \right)$  has at most dimension  $n - 2$ , thus it does not contain  $\Theta_{\text{smooth}}$  (here we use Ein-Lazarsfeld’s theorem on Arbarello-De Concini’s conjecture stating that  $\dim \Theta_{\text{sing}} \leq n - 3$ , cf. [EL]). If the set  $A := \{x \in X \mid \mathcal{C} \subset \Theta_{-x}\}$  has dimension  $n - 1$ , the inverse image  $\Delta^{-1}(A)$  is  $\mathcal{C} \times \Theta$ . In fact, the product  $\mathcal{C} \times \Theta$  is irreducible and the fiber  $\Delta^{-1}(x)$  has positive dimension for all  $x \in A$  (as  $\mathcal{C} \subset \Theta_{-x}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} + x \subset \Theta$  and  $\Delta^{-1}(x)$  is the set of pairs  $(p, p + x)_{p \in \mathcal{C}}$ ). As a consequence, if  $\Theta_{-x}$  meets  $\mathcal{C}$ , then it contains  $\mathcal{C}$ . This leads to a contradiction. In fact, it would imply that the general translate of  $\Theta$  does not meet  $\mathcal{C}$ . This concludes the proof of our claim.

By remark 2, if  $\mathcal{C}$  contains zero, then it is smooth at zero and  $D_1 \in T_0(\mathcal{C})$ . It follows that if  $0 \in \mathcal{C}$ , the theta divisor meets  $\mathcal{C}$  transversally at zero by the 3<sup>th</sup> condition. Set now  $\{x_1, \dots, x_r\} := \Theta \cap (\mathcal{C} - \{0\})$ . As 0 and  $x_i$  are in  $\Theta$ , the point  $x_i$  is in the left hand side of the inclusion  $\Theta \cap \Theta_{x_i} \subset D_1\Theta \cup D_1\Theta_{x_i}$ , so that it must be in the right hand side. This implies that either  $D_1$  is in the tangent space  $T_{x_i}(\Theta)$ , or  $D_1$  is in the tangent space  $T_0(\Theta)$ . The latter case does not occur by the 3<sup>th</sup> condition, thus  $D_1$  is in the tangent space  $T_{x_i}(\Theta)$  for all  $i$ . On the other hand, by the 5<sup>th</sup> condition, the intersection  $D_1\mathcal{C} \cap D_1\Theta$  is empty, so that  $D_1 \notin T_{x_i}(\mathcal{C})$ . In particular,  $\Theta$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  meet transversally at the  $x_i$ ’s, hence they meet transversally (recall that if  $0 \in \mathcal{C}$ , then  $\Theta$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  meet transversally at zero). We now apply remark 1. Since  $D_1$  is in the tangent space  $T_{x_i}(\Theta)$  for all  $i$ , then  $d\delta_{x_i}(D_1) = 0$  for all  $i$  ( $d\delta_{x_i}$  has been introduced in remark 1). If  $\mathcal{C}$  does not contain 0, it would follow  $d\delta(D_1) = 0$ . This is impossible because, by the first step,  $d\delta(D_1)$  is a positive multiple of  $D_1$ . On the other hand, again by remark 1,  $d\delta_0(D_1)$  equals  $D_1$  because  $D_1$  is tangent to  $\mathcal{C}$  at zero, and it is transverse to the tangent space  $T_0(\Theta)$ . Taking the sum over all points of the intersection  $\mathcal{C} \cdot \Theta$  we obtain that the image of  $D_1$  under the differential  $d\delta$  is  $D_1$  as claimed.

*q.e.d.*

**References**

- [EL] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, Singularities of theta divisors, and the birational geometry of irregular varieties, Preprint (alg-geom/9603017)
- [G] R. C. Gunning, Some curves in abelian varieties, *Invent. Math.* **66** (1982), 377–389
- [W1] G. E. Welters, A criterion for Jacobi varieties, *Ann. Math.* **120** (1984), 497–504
- [W2] G. E. Welters, On flexes of the Kummer variety, *Indagationes Math.* **45** (1983), 501–520