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The purpose of the present paper is to prove the following two theorems:
Theorem 1. Let $L$ be a function field over a ground field $k$. Assume that $\operatorname{dim} L$ is not less than 2. Assume furthermore that if $\operatorname{dim} L=2$, then $k$ is sufficiently large. Then there exists a complete normal abstract variety of $L$ which is not projective.

Theorem 2. If $n$ is a natural number not less than 3, then there exists a complete nonsingular variety of dimension $n$ which is not projective; more explicitly, there exists a nonsingular complete variety of the rational function field of dimension n, which is defined over the prime field and which is not projective.

We shall remark that, since Zariski [4] proved that a normal abstract surface can be imbedded in a projective surface (as an open subset) if there exists an affine variety which carries all singular points of the given surface, our results give a complete answer for the imbedding problem in one sense. Therefore it will be an important problem to give some sufficient conditions for a given variety to be projective. ${ }^{2}$ It will be also an interesting problem to characterize function fields which have nonsingular complete nonprojective varieties.

## 1. Two lemmas

Lemma 1. Let $V$ and $V^{\prime}$ be varieties. If $V$ is not projective, then $V \times V^{\prime}$ is not projective.

Proof. $V \times V^{\prime}$ contains a nonprojective subvariety $V \times P^{\prime}\left(P^{\prime} \in V^{\prime}\right)$, and therefore $V \times V^{\prime}$ is not projective.

Lemma 2. Let $V$ be a normal variety with function field $L$, and let $L^{\prime}$ be a finite algebraic extension of $L$. Let $V^{\prime}$ be the derived normal variety of $V$ in $L^{\prime}$. If $V^{\prime}$ can be imbedded in a projective variety $V^{\prime \prime}$, then $V$ can be imbedded in a projective variety.

Proof. We may assume that $V^{\prime}$ is an open subset of $V^{\prime \prime}$. Let $P$ be a generic point of $V$ over a ground field $k$, and let $Z(P)$ be $\sum P_{i}^{\prime}$, where $P_{i}^{\prime}$ form

[^0]the complete set of conjugates of a generic point of $V^{\prime}$, which corresponds to $P$, over $k(P)$. The locus $V^{*}$ of $Z(P)$ over $k$, i.e., the Chow variety of $Z(P)$ over $k$, is a projective variety and has the following properties: (i) the mapping $P \rightarrow Z(P)$ induces a regular mapping from $V$ into $V^{*}$, and (ii) every point of $V$ corresponds to a point of $V^{*}$ in a one-to-one way by the regular mapping defined above. Therefore the derived normal variety of $V^{*}$ in $L$ contains an open subset which is biregular with $V$. Thus the lemma is proved.

Now, by virtue of these lemmas, in order to prove the theorems it is sufficient to show (1) an example of a normal complete nonprojective variety of the rational function field of dimension 2 , and (2) an example of a complete nonsingular nonprojective variety of the rational function field of dimension 3 which is defined over the prime field.

These examples will be constructed in $\S 4$ and $\S 6$.

## 2. A general remark on construction of complete abstract varieties

Let $V$ be a complete abstract variety (which may be projective), and let $D$ be a subvariety of $V$. Let $V^{\prime}$ be a variety which is birationally equivalent to $V, D^{\prime}$ a subvariety of $V^{\prime}$, and assume that there exist open sets $V^{*}$ and $V^{\prime *}$ of $V$ and $V^{\prime}$ respectively, satisfying the following conditions: (i) $D$ is the set of points of $V$ which correspond to points of $D^{\prime}$, (ii) $D \subset V^{*}$, (iii) $D^{\prime} \subset V^{\prime *}$, (iv) $V^{*}$ dominates $V^{\prime *}$, and (v) $V^{*}-D$ is biregular with $V^{*}-D^{\prime}$. In this case, we say that $D$ is a strictly antiregular total transform of $D^{\prime}$ (in $V$ ).

Under the above assumption, it is easily seen that $V-D+D^{\prime}$ is a complete abstract variety. ${ }^{3}$ Therefore, if mutually disjoint subvarieties $D_{1}, \cdots, D_{n}$ of a projective variety $V$ are the strictly antiregular total transforms of $D_{1}^{\prime}, \cdots, D_{n}^{\prime}$ respectively, where the $D_{i}^{\prime}$ are not necessarily on the same variety, then we see that the set $V-\left(\sum D_{i}\right)+\sum D_{i}^{\prime}$ is a complete variety.

We shall add here the following remark:
Let $V$ and $V^{\prime}$ be birationally equivalent normal projective surfaces. If a curve $E$ on $V$ is the antiregular total transform of a point $P^{\prime} \in V^{\prime}$, then $E$ is a strictly antiregular total transform of $P^{\prime}$, because there exists only a finite number of fundamental points on $V^{\prime}$ with respect to the birational correspondence with $V$. From this, we deduce

Lemma 3. Let $V$ be a normal projective surface. If an irreducible curve $E$ on $V$ is the antiregular total transform of a point $P^{\prime}$ of a surface $V^{\prime}$, then $E$ is a strictly antiregular total transform of a normal point.

Proof. Let $V^{\prime \prime}$ be the derived normal variety of $V^{\prime}$ on the function field of $V$. Since $V$ is normal and since the transformation $T^{\prime}: V \rightarrow V^{\prime}$ is regular at each point of $E$, the mapping $T^{\prime \prime}: V \rightarrow V^{\prime \prime}$ is also regular at each point of

[^1]$E$. Since $E$ is irreducible and since $T^{\prime}\{E\}$ is a point, $T^{\prime \prime}\{E\}$ is a point, say $P^{\prime \prime}$. Since $E=T^{\prime-1}\left\{P^{\prime}\right\}$, we see that $E=T^{\prime \prime-1}\left\{P^{\prime \prime}\right\}$. Now we have Lemma 3 by the remark stated just before Lemma 3.

## 3. A remark on the rational mapping defined by a linear system

Let $V$ be a normal projective variety. If $L$ is a linear system of divisors on $V$, then $L$ defines a rational mapping $T$ from $V$ onto another projective variety $V^{\prime}$, where $V^{\prime}$ is defined as follows: Let $D_{0}, D_{1}, \cdots, D_{n}$ be a basis of $L$, and let $f_{i}$ be the function on $V$ such that $\left(f_{i}\right)=D_{i}-D_{0}$. Then $V^{\prime}$ is the projective variety with generic point $\left(1, f_{1}, \cdots, f_{n}\right)$.

Now we want to point out the following well known and elementary facts:
(1) If a point $P$ of $V$ is not a base point of $L$ (i.e., if there exists a member $D \in L$ such that $P \notin D$ ), then $T$ is regular at $P$.
(2) If $P, Q \in V$ and if there exist members $D, D^{\prime} \in L$ such that $P \in D$, $Q \notin D, P \notin D^{\prime}, Q \in D^{\prime}$, then $T(P) \neq T(Q)$.
(3) Let $E$ be an irreducible subvariety of $V$. If there exists a member $D \in L$ such that $E$ does not meet $D$, then $T\{E\}$ is a point.

## 4. An example of a nonprojective rational surface

Example 1. Let $C$ and $D$ be independent generic curves of degree 3 and 4 respectively in the projective plane $S$, and let $P_{1}, \cdots, P_{12}$ be their intersections. Let $E$ be the most general cubic curve among those which go through $P_{1}, P_{2}$ and $P_{3}$, and let $Q_{1}, \cdots, Q_{9}$ be the intersections of $D$ and $E$ other than $P_{1}, P_{2}, P_{3}$. Now let $S^{\prime}$ be the quadratic transform of $S$ with centers $P_{1}, \cdots, P_{12}, Q_{1}, \cdots, Q_{9}$, and let $C^{\prime}$ and $D^{\prime}$ be the proper transforms of $C$ and $D$ respectively. Then, $C^{\prime}$ and $D^{\prime}$ are strictly antiregular total transforms of normal points, say $C^{*}$ and $D^{*}$ respectively, and the complete normal variety $S^{*}=S^{\prime}-\left(C^{\prime}+D^{\prime}\right)+C^{*}+D^{*}$ is not projective.

Proof. (1) We shall show at first that $C^{\prime}$ is the strictly antiregular total transform of a normal point. Let $p_{i}, q_{j}$ be the total transform of the points $P_{i}, Q_{j}$ respectively in $S^{\prime}$. We shall denote in general by $l$ a projective line (hyperplane) in $S$ and by $T\{l\}$ the total transform of $l$ in $S^{\prime}$. Since $l+C \sim D$, we have $T\{l\}+C^{\prime}+\sum p_{i} \sim D^{\prime}+\sum p_{i}+\sum q_{j}$; hence $T\{l\}+C^{\prime} \sim D^{\prime}+$ $\sum q_{j}$. Let $V$ be the projective variety defined by the complete linear system $\left|T\{l\}+C^{\prime}\right|$ on $S^{\prime}$. Since $C^{\prime}$ does not meet the member $D^{\prime}+\sum q_{i}$ of $\left|T\{l\}+C^{\prime}\right|$, it follows by (3) in §3 that $C^{\prime}$ is mapped to a point on $V$, say $C^{\prime \prime}$. By (2) in §3, we see now easily that $C^{\prime}$ is the antiregular total transform of $C^{\prime \prime}$. Therefore by Lemma $3, C^{\prime}$ is the strictly antiregular total transform of a normal point.
(2) That $D^{\prime}$ is the strictly antiregular total transform of a normal point can be proved by a method similar to that above. Namely, we consider, instead of $l$, curves $l^{\prime \prime}$ of degree 2 on $S$ which go through $P_{1}, P_{2}, P_{3}$; instead
of $T\{l\}$, we consider the cycle: [total transform of $l^{\prime \prime}$ in $\left.S^{\prime}\right]-p_{1}-p_{2}-p_{3}$. Then using the fact that $D+l^{\prime \prime} \sim C+E$, we see that $D^{\prime}$ is the strictly antiregular total transform of a normal point.
(3) Before proving that $S^{*}$ is not projective, we shall make some remarks on the points $P_{1}, \cdots, P_{12}, Q_{1}, \cdots, Q_{9}$.

We shall denote by $\pi$ the prime field.
Let $L_{4}$ be the trace of the linear system of curves of degree 4 on $C$. Then $L_{4}$ has degree 12 and dimension 11, and hence is complete, because $C$ is of genus 1. Now, since $D$ is generic, we see that 11 of the points $P_{1}, \cdots, P_{12}$ are independent generic points of $C$ over $\pi(C)$. From this we deduce the following:
(i) If a curve $F$ is such that $F \cdot C=\sum a_{i} P_{i}$, then $a_{1}=a_{2}=\cdots=a_{12}$.

Proof. Assume, for instance, that $a_{1} \leqq a_{j}$ for any $j$. Then $\left(F-a_{1} D\right) \cdot C=$ $\sum b_{i} P_{i}$ with $b_{1}=0$ and $b_{j}=a_{j}-a_{1} \geqq 0$. Therefore there exists a curve $F^{\prime}$ of degree equal to ( $\operatorname{deg} F-4 a_{1}$ ) such that $F^{\prime} \cdot C=\sum b_{i} P_{i}\left(b_{1}=0\right)$. Since $P_{2}, \cdots, P_{12}$ are independent generic points of $C$, and since $C$ is of positive genus, this is impossible, unless all the $b_{i}=0$. Therefore $a_{1}=a_{2}=\cdots=a_{12}$.

Next we consider the fields of definition of $S^{*} . \quad S^{*}$ is defined over any field $k$ such that $C, D, E$, and $P_{1}+P_{2}+P_{3}$ are rational over $k$. Let $k_{0}$ be the smallest common field of definition of $C, D, E$, and $P_{1}+P_{2}+P_{3}: k_{0}=$ $\pi\left(C, D, E, P_{1}+P_{2}+P_{3}\right)$. Since $E$ is generic over $\pi\left(C, D, P_{1}+P_{2}+P_{3}\right)$, we see that $\sum Q_{i}$ is prime rational over $k_{0}$. Thus we have
(ii) $k_{0}$ is a field of definition of $S^{*}$ and $\sum Q_{i}$ is prime rational over $k_{0}$. Furthermore, $C^{*}$ and $D^{*}$ are rational over $k_{0}$.
(4) Now we shall prove that $S^{*}$ is not projective. In order to do so, it is sufficient to prove that any divisorial closed set $F^{*}$ of $S^{*}$ must go through either $C^{*}$ or $D^{*} .^{4}$ Assume the contrary, namely, assume that there exists an irreducible divisor $F^{*}$ which does not go through any of $C^{*}$ and $D^{*}$. Let $K$ be a field of definition of $F^{*}$ containing $k_{0}$ given above. Let $K^{\prime}$ be a maximal purely transcendental extension of $k_{0}$ contained in $K$. Then $\sum Q_{j}$ is still prime rational over $K^{\prime}$. Let $F^{* *}$ be the prime rational divisorial closed set over $K^{\prime}$ such that $F^{*}$ is its component. Since $C^{*}$ and $D^{*}$ are rational points over $K^{\prime}, F^{* *}$ does not go through any of $C^{*}$ and $D^{*}$. Now, $F^{* *}$ must be the proper transform of a prime rational divisorial closed set $F$ of $S$ over $K^{\prime}$. We regard $F$ as a prime rational cycle over $K^{\prime}$. Since $F^{* *}$ does not go through $C^{*}$, we see that (i) $F$ and $C$ have no common point outside of $\sum P_{i}$, and (ii) $F$ and $C$ have no common tangential direction at each $P_{i}$. Therefore $F \cdot C=\sum a_{i} P_{i}$, and the coefficient $a_{i}$ is the multiplicity of the point $P_{i}$ on $F$. By a remark in (3), we have $a_{1}=\cdots=a_{12}$. Thus $F \cdot C=a\left(\sum P_{i}\right)$.

[^2]Since $F^{* *}$ does not go through $D^{*}$, we see that (i) $F$ and $D$ have no common point outside of $\sum P_{i}+\sum Q_{j}$, and (ii) $F$ and $D$ have no common tangential direction at each $P_{i}, Q_{j}$. Therefore $F \cdot D=\sum c_{i} P_{i}+\sum b_{j} Q_{j}$, and $c_{i}$ is the multiplicity of $P_{i}$ on $F$. Therefore $c_{i}=a$. Since $F$ and $\sum Q_{j}$ are prime rational over $K^{\prime}$, and since $F \cdot D=a\left(\sum P_{i}\right)+\sum b_{j} Q_{j}$, we have $b_{1}=\cdots=b_{9}$. Thus $F \cdot D=a\left(\sum P_{i}\right)+b\left(\sum Q_{j}\right)$. Therefore $(F-a C) \cdot D=b\left(\sum Q_{j}\right)$; hence $(b E+a C-F) \cdot D=b\left(P_{1}+P_{2}+P_{3}\right)$. Since $P_{1}, P_{2}$, and $P_{3}$ are independent generic points of $D$ over $\pi(D)$, and since $D$ is of positive genus, we see that $b=0$ (cf. the proof of (i) in (3) above). Then we have $F \cdot D=F \cdot C$, which is obviously a contradiction because $\operatorname{deg} D \neq \operatorname{deg} C$. Thus the proof is completed.

## 5. A lemma on product varieties and an application

Let $V_{1}$ be a nonsingular projective variety, ${ }^{5}$ and let $C$ be the projective line. Let $D_{1}$ be a hyperplane section of $V_{1}$ which is also nonsingular, ${ }^{5}$ and let $P$ be a point of $C$. Set $V=V_{1} \times C, W=D_{1} \times P, D=D_{1} \times C$, $A=V_{1} \times P$. Let $V^{\prime}$ be the monoidal transform of $V$ with the center $W$, and let $A^{\prime}$ be the proper transform of $A$ in $V^{\prime}$. Then

Lemma 4. $A^{\prime}$ is the strictly antiregular total transform of the vertex of the representative cone of $V_{1}$ (i.e., the cone with base variety $V_{1}$ ).

Remark. As will be seen from the proof below, $V^{\prime}$ dominates the cone $K$ with the base variety $V_{1}$, and the behaviour of the correspondence is as follows: (i) If $Q \in D_{1}$, then the proper transform of $Q \times C$ in $V^{\prime}$ is mapped into a point; the proper transform $D^{\prime}$ of $D$ is mapped to a divisor of a base variety; (ii) $A^{\prime}$ is mapped to the vertex; and (iii) the correspondence is biregular at each point of $V^{\prime}-A^{\prime}-D^{\prime}$.

Proof. Let $\left(x_{0}, \cdots, x_{n}\right)$ be strictly homogeneous coordinates of a generic point of $V_{1}$, and let $C_{i}$ be the hyperplane section of $V_{1}$ defined by $x_{i}=0$. We may assume that $D_{1}$ is different from any of the $C_{i}$. Let $W^{\prime}$ be the total transform of $W$ in $V^{\prime}$. Let $E_{i}^{\prime}$ be the proper transform of $E_{i}=C_{i} \times C$ for each $i$. Since $D \sim E_{i}$, we have $D^{\prime}+W^{\prime} \sim E_{i}^{\prime}$, where $D^{\prime}$ is the proper transform of $D$ in $V^{\prime}$. Let $R$ be a point of $C$ which is different from $P$, set $B=V_{1} \times R$, and let $B^{\prime}$ be the proper transform of $B$ in $V^{\prime}$. Then since $A \sim B$, we have $A^{\prime}+W^{\prime} \sim B^{\prime}$. Therefore, on account of the relation $D^{\prime}+W^{\prime} \sim E_{i}^{\prime}$, we have $A^{\prime}+E_{i}^{\prime} \sim D^{\prime}+B^{\prime}$. Now let $L$ be the linear system spanned by $D^{\prime}+B^{\prime}$ and the $A^{\prime}+E_{i}^{\prime}(i=0,1, \cdots, n)$, and let $K$ be the variety defined by $L$. By a property of monoidal transformation we see easily that $A^{\prime}$ and $D^{\prime}$ have no common point. Therefore we see easily that $L$ has no base point; hence $K$ is dominated by $V^{\prime}$. Let ( $x_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \cdots, x_{n}^{\prime \prime}, w^{\prime \prime}$ ) be a generic point of $K$, where $\left(x_{i}^{\prime \prime} / x_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right)=\left(A^{\prime}+E_{i}^{\prime}\right)-\left(A^{\prime}+E_{0}^{\prime}\right)$, $\left(w^{\prime \prime} / x_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right)=\left(D^{\prime}+B^{\prime}\right)-\left(A^{\prime}+E_{0}^{\prime}\right)$. Then we see that $x_{i}^{\prime \prime} / x_{j}^{\prime \prime}=x_{i} / x_{j}$ for

[^3]any $i, j$. Furthermore, since the trace of $L$ on the proper transform of $Q \times C\left(Q \in V, Q \notin D_{1}\right)$ in $V^{\prime}$ is of degree 1 and has no base point, $w^{\prime \prime} / x_{i}^{\prime \prime}$ (for each $i$ ) generates the function field of $C$ over the function field of $V_{1}$. Therefore $K$ is birational with $V$. This implies, incidentally, that $w^{\prime \prime}$ is transcendental over $k\left(x_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \cdots, x_{n}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, where $k$ is a ground field. Therefore, on account of the fact that $x_{i}^{\prime \prime} / x_{j}^{\prime \prime}=x_{i} / x_{j}$ for any $i, j$, we see that $K$ is the cone with base variety $V_{1}$ and vertex $x_{0}^{\prime \prime}=x_{1}^{\prime \prime}=\cdots=x_{n}^{\prime \prime}=0$. Since $A^{\prime}$ has no common point with $D^{\prime}+B^{\prime}$, and since $A^{\prime}$ is contained in $A^{\prime}+E_{i}^{\prime}$, it follows that if $P^{\prime}$ is any point of $A^{\prime}$, then at the corresponding point of $K$ we must have $x_{i}^{\prime \prime}=0$ (for each $i$ ) and $w^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$. Thus $A^{\prime}$ is mapped to the vertex of $K$. (If $Q \in D_{1}$, then there exists a member of $L$ which does not meet the proper transform $Q^{*}$ of $Q \times C$, hence $Q^{*}$ is mapped into a point; this statement is not necessary for the proof of Lemma 4, but is necessary for the proof of the remark.) We shall next show that the mapping from $V^{\prime}$ to $K$ is biregular at every point of $V^{\prime}-A^{\prime}-D^{\prime}$. Since $K$ is normal outside of the vertex, it is sufficient to show that the points of $V^{\prime}-A^{\prime}-D^{\prime}$ correspond in a one-to-one way with points of $K$ (observe that no point of $V^{\prime}$, outside of $A^{\prime}$, corresponds to the vertex of $K$, as is easily seen from the nature of $L$ ). Since $K$ is dominated by $V^{\prime}$, it is sufficient to show that if $Q_{1}^{\prime}$ and $Q_{2}^{\prime}$ are distinct points of $V^{\prime}-A^{\prime}-D^{\prime}$, then the corresponding points $Q_{1}^{*}$ and $Q_{2}^{*}$ are distinct. Let $Q_{i} \times P_{i}\left(Q_{i} \in V_{1}, P_{i} \in C\right)$ be the point of $V$ which corresponds to $Q_{i}^{\prime}(i=1,2)$. (i) If $Q_{1} \neq Q_{2}$, then there are hyperplane sections of $V_{1}$ which go through one of $Q_{i}$ and not through the other. Therefore $Q_{1}^{\prime}$ and $Q_{2}^{\prime}$ are separated by members of $L$ which contain $A^{\prime .}{ }^{6}$ Therefore $Q_{1}^{*} \neq Q_{2}^{*}$ in this case. (That $D^{\prime}$ is mapped to a divisor on the base variety can be proved in the same way as here.) (ii) Assume now that $Q_{1}=Q_{2}$. Let $l^{\prime}$ be either the total transform of $Q_{1} \times P$ or the proper transform of $Q_{1} \times C$ according to whether $Q_{1} \in D_{1}$ or $Q_{1} \notin D_{1}$. Then the $Q_{i}^{\prime}$ are points of $l^{\prime}$. The trace of $L$ on $l^{\prime}$ is a linear system of degree 1 and has no base point. Therefore $Q_{1}^{*} \neq Q_{2}^{*}$ also in this case. Thus Lemma 4 (and also the remark) is proved completely.

Now we shall apply the above result for a special variety: Let $C, C^{\prime}$, and $C^{\prime \prime}$ be projective lines, and set $V_{1}=C^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime}, V=V_{1} \times C$. We remark that $V_{1}$ is the surface defined by $x y=z w$. We apply the above construction to $V$; then we get the cone $K$ defined by $x y=z w$ (and with the homogeneous coordinates $(x, y, z, w, 1)$ ). A plane section of $K$ which does not go through the vertex $A^{*}$ is the proper transform of $C^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime} \times Q$ with $Q \in C, Q \neq P$; it can be identified naturally with $C^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime}$, and we may assume that $x=z=0$ is a line $C^{\prime} \times R^{\prime \prime}\left(R^{\prime \prime} \in C^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Now we consider the linear pencil $L^{\prime \prime}$ on $K$ spanned by the divisors $x=z=0$ and $w=y=0$ and let $\bar{L}$ be the minimal sum of $L^{\prime \prime}$ and the linear system of plane sections on $K$. The projective variety $\bar{K}$ defined by $\bar{L}$ certainly dominates $K$. Since $L^{\prime \prime}$ has only one base point $A^{*}$, the vertex of $K$, the same is true of $\bar{L}$, and hence the vertex $A^{*}$

[^4]of $K$ is the unique fundamental point with respect to $\bar{K}$. The local ring of any points of $\bar{K}$ which corresponds to $A^{*}$ is a ring of quotients of one of the two rings $k[x, y, z, w, w / x]$ and $k[x, y, z, w, x / w]$ (with respect to a prime ideal containing the elements $x, y, z, w)$. Since $y / z=w / x$, we have $k[x, y, z, w, w / x]=k[x, z, w / x]$ and $k[x, y, z, w, x / w]=k[y, w, x / w] ;$ these are polynomial rings. Therefore any point of $\bar{K}$ which corresponds to $A^{*}$ is a simple point. Since $K$ has no singular point other than $A^{*}$, we see that $\bar{K}$ is a nonsingular variety. It is easy to see that the total transform of $A^{*}$ is a projective line, say $\bar{C}$.

Now we consider on the variety $V^{\prime}$ the linear system $L^{\prime \prime \prime}$ spanned by the transforms of $C^{\prime} \times P^{\prime \prime} \times C, C^{\prime} \times Q^{\prime \prime} \times C\left(P^{\prime \prime}, Q^{\prime \prime} \in C^{\prime \prime}\right)$, which corresponds to $L^{\prime \prime}$ on $K$. Let $\bar{L}^{\prime}$ be the minimal sum of $L^{\prime \prime \prime}$ and the linear system $L$. Since $L$ corresponds to the system of plane sections of $K$, the projective variety defined by $\bar{L}^{\prime}$ is nothing but $\bar{K}$, and the divisor $A^{\prime}$ is the strictly antiregular total transform of $\bar{C}$; this is easily seen from the nature of $\bar{L}^{\prime}$. Furthermore, identifying $A^{\prime}$ naturally with $C^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime}$ and $\bar{C}$ with $C^{\prime \prime}$, we see easily from the nature of $\bar{L}^{\prime}$ that the mapping from $A^{\prime}$ to $\bar{C}$ is nothing but the projection, i.e., two points of $A^{\prime}$ are mapped to the same point if and only if there exists a member of $L^{\prime \prime \prime}$ which contains these points.

## 6. An example of a complete nonsingular nonprojective variety

Example 2. Let $C, C^{\prime}, C^{\prime \prime}$ be projective lines, and set $V_{1}=C^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime}$, $V=V_{1} \times C . \quad$ Let $D_{1}$ be an irreducible plane section of $V_{1} . \quad$ (Observe that $V_{1}$ is defined by $x y=z w$, hence we can take $D_{1}$ such that it is defined over the prime field and also such that $D_{1}$ is nonsingular. $)$ Let $P, Q$ be points of $C(P \neq Q)$; they can be chosen to be rational over the prime field. Set $W_{1}=D_{1} \times P$, $W_{2}=D_{1} \times Q$. Let $V_{2}$ be the monoidal transform of $V$ with the centers $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$, and let $A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ be the proper transforms of $A=V_{1} \times P, B=V_{1} \times Q$ respectively. Then by the observation in $\S 5, A^{\prime}$ and $B^{\prime}$ are strictly antiregular total transforms of projective lines $l$ and $l^{\prime}$ on nonsingular varieties which are birationally equivalent to $V$. Therefore we have a complete nonsingular abstract variety $V^{* *}=V_{2}-A^{\prime}-B^{\prime}+l+l^{\prime}$. Here, $A^{\prime}$ and $B^{\prime}$ are naturally identified with $C^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime}$, and the deformation observed in §5 can be done symmetrically with respect to $C^{\prime}$ and $C^{\prime \prime}$. Therefore we deform $A^{\prime}$ to $C^{\prime \prime}$ and $B^{\prime}$ to $C^{\prime}$ (i.e., $l$ is identified naturally with $C^{\prime \prime}$, and $l^{\prime}$ is identified naturally with $C^{\prime}$; see the observation at the end of §5). Then the variety $V^{* *}$ is not projective.

Proof. If $V^{* *}$ is projective, then there exists a divisorial closed set $F^{* *}$ which meets properly both $l$ and $l^{\prime}$. We shall show that this is impossible. Assume the existence of $F^{* *} . F^{* *}$ must be the proper transform of a divisorial closed set $F$ on $V$. We regard $F$ to be a cycle and consider the intersection cycle $F \cdot A$. (i) If $E$ is a component of $F \cdot A$, and if $E$ is neither $W_{1}$ nor $C^{\prime} \times P^{\prime \prime} \times P\left(P^{\prime \prime} \in C^{\prime \prime}\right)$, then $\operatorname{proj}_{c^{\prime \prime}} E=C^{\prime \prime}$ and therefore $F^{* *}$ must
contain $l$, which is a contradiction. (ii) Assume that $F \cdot A=m W_{1}$. Then denoting by $F^{\prime}$ and $W^{\prime}$ the proper transforms of $F$ in $V_{2}$ and of $W_{1}$ in $A^{\prime}$ respectively, we have either $F^{\prime}$ contains $W^{\prime}$ or $F^{\prime}$ does not meet $A^{\prime}$. (For $F^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime}$ cannot have a common point outside of $W^{\prime}$; if there exists a common point, then the intersection must be a curve, hence it must be $W^{\prime}$.) But, each of these cases is impossible because $F^{* *}$ meets properly $l$. By the observations (i) and (ii), we see that $F \cdot A$ must be of the form $m W_{1}+\sum C^{\prime} \times P_{i}^{\prime \prime}$ $\times P\left(P_{i}^{\prime \prime} \in C^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and this second term is actually present. Since $W_{1}$ is linearly equivalent to $P^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime} \times P+C^{\prime} \times P^{\prime \prime} \times P\left(P^{\prime} \in C^{\prime}, P^{\prime \prime} \in C^{\prime \prime}\right)$ on $A$, we have that $F \cdot A$ is linearly equivalent to $a\left(P^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime} \times P\right)+b\left(C^{\prime} \times P^{\prime \prime} \times P\right)$ on $A$ with $b>a$. Symmetrically, the intersection cycle $F \cdot B$ is linearly equivalent to $a^{\prime}\left(P^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime} \times Q\right)+b^{\prime}\left(C^{\prime} \times P^{\prime \prime} \times Q\right)$ on $B$ with $a^{\prime}>b^{\prime}$. On the other hand, since $C$ is the projective line, $F$ is translated along $C$ to a linearly equivalent divisor $F_{1}$ so that $P$ corresponds to $Q$. Then $F_{1} \cdot B$ is linearly equivalent to $a\left(P^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime} \times Q\right)+b\left(C^{\prime} \times P^{\prime \prime} \times Q\right)$ on $B$. Since $F \sim F_{1}$, we have $a\left(P^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime} \times Q\right)+b\left(C^{\prime} \times P^{\prime \prime} \times Q\right)$ is linearly equivalent to $a^{\prime}\left(P^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime} \times Q\right)+b^{\prime}\left(C^{\prime} \times P^{\prime \prime} \times Q\right)$ on $B$. Therefore $a=a^{\prime}, b=b^{\prime}$. (For by considering the intersection number with $P^{\prime} \times C^{\prime \prime} \times Q$, we have $b=b^{\prime}$; similarly $a=a^{\prime}$.) Therefore the inequalities $b>a, a^{\prime}>b^{\prime}$ give a contradiction. Thus the proof is completed.

Remark 1. In the above construction, if we deform $A^{\prime}$ and $B^{\prime}$ to $l$ and $l^{\prime}$ so that both $l$ and $l^{\prime}$ can be naturally identified with $C^{\prime}$ (on $A^{\prime}$ and $B^{\prime}$ respectively), then the new variety is projective; if $A^{\prime}$ and $B^{\prime}$ are deformed to normal points, then the new variety is also projective.

Remark 2. The following question was asked by Takahashi and also by Serre:

Assume that a normal complete variety $V$ of dimension $n$ can be covered by $n+1$ affine varieties. Is then $V$ a projective variety?

Our Example 2 shows that the answer to this question is negative even if $V$ is nonsingular.

Proof. Take the variety $V^{* *}$ in Example 2. $V^{* *}-l$ is an open subset of a projective variety, say $V_{3}$ (by Remark 1, or it can easily be seen directly). Set $G=V_{3}-\left(V^{* *}-l\right)$, and let $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$ be sufficiently general hypersurface sections on $V_{3}$ which contain $G$, and set $A_{1}=V_{3}-L_{1}, A_{2}=V_{3}-L_{2}$. Then $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$ cover $V^{* *}-l-g$ with $g=\left(V^{* *}-l\right) \cap L_{1} \cap L_{2}$. Since we have chosen $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$ to be general, $g$ is a curve on $V^{* *}-l$, and $g$ does not meet $l^{\prime}$ (because $l^{\prime}$ is a curve). Similarly, there are two affine varieties $A_{3}$ and $A_{4}$ contained in $V^{* *}-l^{\prime}$ which cover $l$ and $g$. Therefore $V^{* *}$ is covered by $A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}$, and $A_{4}$.

Remark 3. It was communicated to the writer that Kodaira proved that our Example 2 gives an example of a non-Kaehlerian algebraic manifold, if it is constructed over the field of complex numbers. Therefore the following problem will be interesting:

Assume that $V$ is a complete algebraic manifold which is Kaehlerian. Is then $V$ projective?

Added in proof. Hironaka recently proved the following:
If $V$ is a nonsingular projective variety of dimension not less than 3, then there exists a complete nonsingular nonprojective variety $V^{\prime}$ such that (1) $V^{\prime}$ is birationally equivalent to $V$, and (2) $V^{\prime}$ dominates $V$.
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[^0]:    Received November 15, 1957.
    ${ }^{1}$ The meaning of "large" will be explained in the course of the proof.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Chow [2], Chevalley [1], and Weil [3]. On the other hand, the following problem was offered by Chevalley a few years ago:

    Assume that a normal variety $V$ satisfies the following condition: For any finite number of points of $V$, there exists an affine variety which carries them. Can then $V$ be imbedded in a projective variety?

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Here, $V^{*}-D$ and $V^{\prime *}-D^{\prime}$ are identified by the biregular correspondence.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ This shows that there exists no nonconstant function which is defined at both $C^{*}$ and $D^{*}$.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ The assumption of nonsingularity for $V_{1}$ and $D_{1}$ can be weakened.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ Observe that if $Q_{i} \in D_{1}$, and if a plane section $C^{\prime}$ of $V_{1}$ goes through $Q_{i}$, and if $D_{1}$ is not contained in $C^{\prime}$, then the proper transform of $C^{\prime} \times C$ contains the total transform of $Q_{i} \times P$.

