

# ON A PROBLEM OF PICARD CONCERNING SYMMETRIC COMPOSITUMS OF FUNCTION-FIELDS<sup>1</sup>

BY JUN-ICHI IGUSA

## 1. Introduction

Let  $K$  be a fixed algebraically closed ground-field of arbitrary characteristic. Function-fields and varieties will be considered over  $K$ . Function-fields of Abelian varieties will be called Abelian function-fields. Let  $\Sigma$  be a function-field of dimension  $r$ , and let  $\Sigma(m)$  be its  $m$ -fold symmetric compositum, i.e., the invariant subfield of the  $m$ -fold direct compositum of  $\Sigma$  under the symmetric group of permutations of factors. Obviously,  $\Sigma(1)$  is an Abelian function-field if and only if  $\Sigma$  is so. Moreover,  $\Sigma(m)$  is an Abelian function-field if and only if  $m$  is the genus of  $\Sigma$  in case  $r = 1$ . In this paper, *we shall show that  $\Sigma(m)$  can never become an Abelian function-field for  $r, m > 1$* . This fact was already remarked by Picard in the case  $r = 2$ .<sup>2</sup> His reasoning applies to the case of even  $r$ , but, as he himself observed, not directly to the case of odd  $r$ . Thus, our result includes the case which Picard failed to discuss.

## 2. Reduction of the problem

Let  $V$  be a projective model of  $\Sigma$ , and let  $U$  and  $V(m)$  be the  $m$ -fold direct and symmetric products of  $V$ . Then, there is a canonical rational map from  $U$  to  $V(m)$ , and  $\Sigma(m)$  is the function-field of  $V(m)$ . Moreover,  $V$  and  $V(m)$  have the same Albanese variety, say  $A$ . In fact, let  $p_i$  be the projection of  $U$  to its  $i^{\text{th}}$  factor for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ; let  $f$  be a canonical map of  $V$  to its Albanese variety  $A$ . Then,  $F = \sum_{i=1}^m f \circ p_i$  is the product of the canonical rational map from  $U$  to  $V(m)$  and a canonical map of  $V(m)$  to  $A$ . The converse is also true.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, if we replace  $V$  by the graph of  $f$ , we can assume that  $f$  is regular on  $V$ . Furthermore, if we replace  $V$  by its derived normal model, we can assume, in addition, that  $V$  has negligible singularities, i.e., that the singular locus of  $V$  is of co-dimension at least equal to 2.<sup>4</sup> In this case,  $U$  has also negligible singularities.

Now, assume that  $\Sigma(m)$  is an Abelian function-field for some  $r, m > 1$ . Let  $A$  be an Abelian variety such that  $\Sigma(m)$  is the corresponding function-field. Then,  $A$  is the Albanese variety of  $V(m)$ , and a canonical map of  $V(m)$

---

Received July 10, 1956.

<sup>1</sup> This work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation; the subject of this paper was called to our attention by Professor Chow.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. PICARD AND G. SIMART, *Théorie des fonctions algébriques de deux variables indépendentes*, 2, Paris, 1906, pp. 469–474. The problem is raised on p. 474.

<sup>3</sup> These are immediate consequences of the definition of Albanese varieties and of the Corollary on p. 32 of A. WEIL, *Variétés abéliennes et courbes algébriques*, Paris, 1948.

<sup>4</sup> The passage from  $V$  to the derived normal model of the graph of  $f$  is a standard process introduced by Zariski. Cf., *Foundations of a general theory of birational correspondences*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 53 (1943), pp. 490–542.

to  $A$  is birational. In general, we shall denote by  $\Omega = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \Omega_q$  the graded algebra over  $K$  of differential forms of the first kind on a variety. Also, we shall use the symbol  $\delta$  for contravariant map of differential forms. Let  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$  be differential forms on  $V$ . Then, the exterior product

$$\delta p_1 \cdot \theta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \delta p_m \cdot \theta_m$$

is a differential form on  $U$ , which we shall denote by  $p^* \cdot (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)$ . We note that  $p^*$  is  $\Sigma$ -multilinear. The following lemma is a consequence of a general theorem due to Koizumi:<sup>5</sup>

LEMMA 1. *The map  $p^*$  induces a bijective  $K$ -linear isomorphism of the  $m$ -fold tensor product of  $\Omega(V)$  over  $K$  to  $\Omega(U)$ .*

On the other hand, the symmetric group of degree  $m$ , say  $G$ , operates on  $U$  as group of permutations of  $m$  factors. Hence,  $G$  operates canonically on the space of differential forms on  $U$ . We shall denote by  $\Omega^G(U) = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \Omega_q^G(U)$  the graded algebra over  $K$  of  $G$ -invariant differential forms of the first kind on  $U$ . Since, in the notation and the convention we introduced before,  $F$  is a separable map,  $\delta F$  is injective.

LEMMA 2. *The map  $\delta F$  gives a bijective  $K$ -linear isomorphism of  $\Omega(A)$  to  $\Omega^G(U)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\theta$  be a differential form of the first kind on  $A$ . Then,  $\delta F \cdot \theta$  is a differential form of the first kind on  $U$ .<sup>6</sup> Moreover,  $\delta F \cdot \theta$  is  $G$ -invariant, hence it is an element of  $\Omega^G(U)$ . Conversely, let  $\theta^*$  be a  $G$ -invariant differential form on  $U$ . Then, we can find a differential form  $\theta$  on  $A$  such that  $\theta^* = \delta F \cdot \theta$ . If  $\theta$  is not of the first kind on  $A$ , it has a polar variety, say  $W$ , because  $A$  is nonsingular. Let  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots$  be a system of local coordinates of  $A$  along  $W$ . Then, in the expression of  $\theta$  as a linear combination of exterior products of  $d\tau_1, d\tau_2, \dots$ , at least one coefficient, say  $\phi$ , is not contained in the local ring of  $A$  along  $W$ . Let  $w$  be a generic point of  $W$  over  $K$ , and let

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$$

be a point of  $U$  such that  $F(x) = w$ . There exists such a point, because  $U$  is complete and  $F$  is regular on  $U$ . Since  $w$  is of co-dimension 1 over  $K$ , so is  $x$ . In particular,  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  are distinct simple points of  $V$ . Therefore,  $\delta F \cdot \tau_1, \delta F \cdot \tau_2, \dots$  form a system of local coordinates of  $U$  along the locus, say  $W^*$ , of  $x$  over  $K$ , i.e.,  $W^*$  is unramified over  $W$ . Moreover,  $\delta F \cdot \phi$  is a coefficient of  $\delta F \cdot \theta = \theta^*$  as a linear combination of the exterior products of  $d(\delta F \cdot \tau_1), d(\delta F \cdot \tau_2), \dots$ . Since the local ring of  $A$  along  $W$  is the intersection of the local ring of  $U$  along  $W^*$  and the function-field of  $A$ , we see that  $\delta F \cdot \phi$

<sup>5</sup> S. KOIZUMI, *On the differential forms of the first kind on algebraic varieties. II*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, vol. 2 (1951), pp. 267-269.

<sup>6</sup> Basic properties of differential forms are summarized with references in our earlier paper, *A fundamental inequality in the theory of Picard varieties*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., vol. 41 (1955), pp. 317-320.

is not contained in the local ring of  $U$  along  $W^*$ . Hence,  $\theta^*$  is not of the first kind on  $U$ , i.e., the image of  $\Omega(A)$  by  $\delta F$  is  $\Omega^G(U)$ , Q.E.D.

The following lemma is well known:

LEMMA 3. *The graded algebra  $\Omega(A)$  is a Grassmann algebra over  $K$ ; the dimension of  $\Omega_1(A)$  over  $K$  is equal to the dimension  $rm$  of  $A$ .*

The above three lemmas permit us to derive a contradiction by formal arguments.

### 3. Derivation of a contradiction

The vector space  $\Omega_0(V)$  is of dimension 1. We shall first determine the dimension of  $\Omega_1(V)$ . Let  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots$  be a base of  $\Omega_1(V)$  over  $K$ . Then, by Lemma 1 an element  $\theta$  of  $\Omega_1(U)$  can be written uniquely in the form  $\theta = \sum a_{ij} \delta p_i \cdot \omega_j$  with  $a_{ij}$  in  $K$ . Moreover,  $\theta$  is  $G$ -invariant if and only if  $a_{ij} = a_{1j}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Therefore,  $\Omega_1(V)$  and  $\Omega_1^G(U)$  are of the same dimension. However, by Lemma 2 we know that  $\Omega_1^G(U)$  is of the same dimension as  $\Omega_1(A)$ , and by Lemma 3 this vector space is of dimension  $rm$ . Next, we shall show that  $\Omega_2(V) = 0$ . Let  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$  be a base of  $\Omega_2(V)$  over  $K$ . Then, by Lemma 1 an element  $\theta$  of  $\Omega_2(U)$  can be written uniquely in the form

$$\theta = \sum_{i < i'} a_{ii'jj'} \delta p_i \cdot \omega_j \wedge \delta p_{i'} \cdot \omega_{j'} + \sum b_{ij} \delta p_i \cdot \theta_j$$

with  $a_{ii'jj'}$  and  $b_{ij}$  in  $K$ . Moreover,  $\theta$  is  $G$ -invariant if and only if  $a_{ii'jj'} = a_{12jj'}$  and  $b_{ij} = b_{1j}$  for  $i < i'$  and for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , and, in addition, if  $a_{12jj'}$  are skew-symmetric in the last two suffixes. Therefore, if  $p$  denotes the characteristic of  $K$ , we have

$$\dim \Omega_2^G(U) = \begin{cases} C_2^{rm} + rm + \dim \Omega_2(V), & p = 2 \\ C_2^{rm} + \dim \Omega_2(V), & p \neq 2. \end{cases}$$

However, by Lemmas 2 and 3 we know that  $\dim \Omega_2^G(U)$  is equal to  $\dim \Omega_2(A) = C_2^{rm}$ . Hence, we have  $p \neq 2$ , and also  $\Omega_2(V) = 0$ . Once we know that  $\Omega_2(V) = 0$ , by the same argument we get  $\Omega_3(V) = 0$ , and, in this way, we finally get  $\Omega_2(V) = \dots = \Omega_m(V) = 0$ . Naturally, in case  $m > r$ , the part  $\Omega_{r+1}(V) = \dots = \Omega_m(V) = 0$  is trivial. Anyway, in the case  $m \geq r$ , we have  $\Omega_r(V) = 0$ , and then, by Lemma 1 we get  $\Omega_{rm}(U) = 0$ , hence a fortiori  $\Omega_{rm}^G(U) = 0$ . However, by Lemmas 2 and 3 this vector space is of dimension 1. This is a contradiction. Therefore, the case  $m \geq r$  is not possible, and we have  $r > m$ . In this case, by an argument similar to that used before, we get  $\dim \Omega_{m+1}^G(U) = \dim \Omega_{m+1}(V)$ , and this is equal to  $\dim \Omega_{m+1}(A) = C_{m+1}^{rm}$ . Here, even if  $r = m + 1$ , we can go one step further. We get  $\dim \Omega_{m+2}^G(U) = \dim \Omega_1(V) \cdot \dim \Omega_{m+1}(V) + \dim \Omega_{m+2}(V)$ , and this is equal to  $\dim \Omega_{m+2}(A) = C_{m+2}^{rm}$ . However,  $\dim \Omega_1(V) \cdot \dim \Omega_{m+1}(V) = rm \cdot C_{m+1}^{rm}$  is strictly larger than  $C_{m+2}^{rm}$ . This is a contradiction, and the contradiction is derived from the assumption that  $\Sigma(m)$  is an Abelian function-field for some  $r, m > 1$ .