

JACOBIAN SCHEMES ARISING FROM HYPERSURFACE ARRANGEMENTS IN \mathbb{P}^n

JUAN MIGLIORE* AND UWE NAGEL**

ABSTRACT. Freeness is an important property of a hypersurface arrangement, although its presence is not well understood. A hypersurface arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n is free if S/J is Cohen-Macaulay (CM), where $S = K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ and J is the Jacobian ideal. We study two related unmixed ideals: J^{top} , the intersection of height two primary components, and \sqrt{J} , the radical. Under mild hypotheses, we show that these ideals are CM. This establishes a full generalization of an earlier result with Schenck from hyperplane arrangements to hypersurface arrangements. If the hypotheses fail for an arrangement in projective 3-space, the Hartshorne-Rao module measures the failure of CMness. We establish consequences for the even liaison classes of J^{top} and \sqrt{J} .

1. INTRODUCTION

Hypersurface arrangements play a role in several topics and have been intensely investigated using tools from algebra, algebraic geometry, combinatorics, topology and others. In this paper, we demonstrate that methods from liaison theory can be employed to elucidate properties of hypersurface arrangements.

A hypersurface arrangement \mathcal{A} in projective space is a union of distinct hypersurfaces F_1, \dots, F_s in $\mathbb{P}^n = \mathbb{P}_k^n$, where k denotes a field of characteristic zero. Note that \mathcal{A} is defined by a product $f = \prod_{i=1}^s f_i$ of forms f_i in $S = K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ defining F_i . Let $J = \text{Jac}(f) = \langle \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_0}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \rangle$ be the Jacobian ideal of f . We say that \mathcal{A} is *free* if J is a saturated ideal defining an arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay (ACM) codimension two subscheme X of \mathbb{P}^n (see Definition 2.1). It is an important question in hypersurface arrangement theory to ask what conditions force an arrangement of hypersurfaces to be free. The case that is most studied, of course, is the case of hyperplanes.

Failure to be free can have several causes. Among them: (a) the ideal J may fail to be saturated, (b) J may be saturated, but fails to be unmixed (this necessarily implies the existence of embedded components of X), or (c) it may even happen that J (or its saturation) is unmixed but X fails to be ACM for other reasons.

Given any arrangement, we can sidestep causes (a) and (b), and focus on whether (c) holds or not. We study two related ideals: the ideal given by the intersection of the top dimensional primary components of J , which we will call J^{top} , and the radical of J , namely \sqrt{J} . Both of these ideals are unmixed, and in particular saturated.

More precisely, consider a primary decomposition of J :

$$J = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r$$

and let \mathfrak{p}_i be the associated prime for \mathfrak{q}_i for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Removing all associated primes of height > 2 , the remaining intersection is well-defined, and we denote by J^{top} this

Printed December 5, 2023

Migliore was partially supported by grants from the Simons Foundation #309556 and #839618.

Nagel was partially supported by Simons Foundation grant #636513.

intersection. Similarly, the intersection of all associated primes absorbs all the associated primes of height > 2 , and the resulting ideal is the radical \sqrt{J} . When all the F_i have degree 1 (i.e. it is a hyperplane arrangement), this is all we need. In our case here, though, the singularities of the individual hypersurfaces F_i have to be dealt with, especially when they have codimension 1 in F_i . These singularities will survive the process just described.

The paper [15] focused on a study of the schemes defined by J^{top} and \sqrt{J} in the case of hyperplane arrangements (i.e. when all the f_i are linear forms), and specifically asked when these schemes are ACM. A main result was a condition on \mathcal{A} which forces the schemes associated to both of these ideals to be ACM.

Theorem 1.1 ([15, First main theorem]). *Let \mathcal{A} be a hyperplane arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n defined by a product f of linear forms. Let J, \sqrt{J} and J^{top} be the ideals defined above. Assume that no linear factor of f is in the associated prime of any two non-reduced components of J^{top} . Then both S/\sqrt{J} and S/J^{top} are Cohen-Macaulay.*

The paper [15] also carefully studied the situation when the schemes defined by \sqrt{J} and J^{top} are not ACM, using primarily certain tools from Liaison Theory applied to hyperplane arrangements. In the case of hyperplane arrangements in \mathbb{P}^3 , some results were also obtained on the size and shape of the Hartshorne-Rao module when the ACM property does not hold. This can be interpreted as a measure of the failure to be ACM.

For hyperplanes, it is intuitively clear that any component of the scheme defined by J^{top} depends only on the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A} containing its support, and this fact was used implicitly in [15]. However, we are not aware of a published proof of this fact, and one of our first results in this paper (Proposition 4.1) makes the intuition precise.

Our focus in this paper is to extend many of the results from [15] to hypersurface arrangements, and in particular Theorem 1.1. Here several new complications arise. Among them we note the following. First, a hyperplane is automatically smooth, and so singularities of the arrangement come precisely where hyperplanes of the arrangement meet; this is certainly not the case for hypersurfaces. Second, any two distinct hyperplanes automatically meet in a smooth codimension two complete intersection, but this is not true for hypersurfaces. Third, for a hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{A} , if we choose a codimension two linear component Λ of the scheme defined by \sqrt{J} and restrict to the hyperplanes containing Λ , the Jacobian ideal of this subarrangement is a complete intersection. Passing to hypersurfaces, it becomes much more subtle, but is “almost true” (see below).

Section 2 sets up the notation and recalls the constructions of Liaison Addition (due to P. Schvartz [20]) and Basic Double Linkage (due to Lazarsfeld and Rao [9]) that are crucial to our work in this paper. It does not yet justify the fact that these tools can be applied to Jacobian ideals of hypersurface arrangements.

Section 3 proves a crucial fact for our construction, justifying the “almost true” assertion made above. More precisely, with suitable assumptions we show that the scheme defined by the Jacobian ideal is still a complete intersection of a certain precise type, but the Jacobian ideal is not saturated (Theorem 3.5). One of the assumptions is that all of the hypersurfaces involved have the same degree, which we show in Section 6 is crucial.

Section 4 is devoted to establishing that for hypersurface (and hyperplane) arrangements, a version of Liaison Addition and Basic Double Linkage holds as long as suitable assumptions are made. The main new assumption is that if $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$ defines the arrangement, we assume that any two factors meet in a codimension two smooth complete intersection. The main result is Theorem 4.6 (Liaison Addition for Arrangements). Intuitively it gives a very strong statement about the schemes associated to the union of two arrangements, making only the additional assumption that the intersection of any two

factors from one arrangement and one factor from the other meet in codimension three. The result essentially says that in this situation, Liaison Addition in the original sense can be applied. As a corollary we also show that Basic Double Linkage in the original sense can be used for hypersurface arrangements (Corollary 4.7). It can be interpreted as showing what happens when “most” surfaces are added one at a time to a hypersurface arrangement.

Both of these tools were fundamental in [15] for the case of hyperplane arrangements, but showing that they still apply for hypersurface arrangements requires suitable assumptions and much more work.

Section 5 gives the main result of this paper, Theorem 5.2. In particular, it establishes the following generalization of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a hypersurface arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n defined by a form $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$. Let J be its Jacobian ideal, and let J^{top} and \sqrt{J} be as defined above. Assume that any two factors of f meet in a smooth codimension two complete intersection, and that no f_i is in the associate prime of more than one non-reduced component of J^{top} .*

Then the schemes defined by J^{top} and by \sqrt{J} are ACM. Furthermore, both are equidimensional unions of complete intersections, each supported at a complete intersection defined by some (f_i, f_j) .

Note that the smoothness assumption in this result is clearly satisfied for any hyperplane arrangement. In Section 6, we give several examples to indicate the sorts of problems that arise when one relaxes some of the assumptions in Theorem 1.2.

One of the applications given in [15] was to use Liaison Addition to show that every Buchsbaum even liaison class contains curves that arise both as schemes defined by J^{top} and by \sqrt{J} , for suitable hyperplane arrangements J . In Section 7 we discuss to what extent this might be extended to arrangements of hypersurfaces of higher degree using our methods. In particular, we show that adding a general hypersurface to an arrangement preserves the even liaison class. Thus, it preserves the Cohen-Macaulay property if present originally.

One can view this paper as the next step in a logical sequence of ideas. In the paper [5], the authors studied (among other things) hyperplane arrangements where no three hyperplanes vanish on the same codimension two linear space. One of the results was that the ideal of the singular locus (which coincides with the radical of the Jacobian) is always ACM (even if it did not use the language of the Jacobian ideal). The paper [6] took the next step (among other things) of replacing the hyperplanes by hypersurfaces. It was shown that the ACM conclusion continues to hold, but again does not mention the Jacobian ideal. The paper [15] then introduced the study of hyperplane arrangements as described above, but weakened the assumption to allow non-reduced components of the Jacobian ideal. As noted above, the ACM conclusion continued to hold, even if new methods were needed. In this paper we take the next logical step of again replacing hyperplanes by hypersurfaces, and studying the Jacobian ideals. This highly complicates things, but with suitable assumptions the ACM conclusion still holds. In Section 6, one of our goals is to indicate the difficulties of carrying this program on any further. See for instance Example 6.4.

2. BACKGROUND

Let $S = K[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, where K is algebraically closed of characteristic zero, and let $\mathfrak{m} = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$, the irrelevant ideal of S . Throughout this paper, we sometimes abuse

notation and denote both a homogeneous polynomial and the hypersurface that it defines by the same capital letter, e.g. G .

Definition 2.1. A subscheme V of \mathbb{P}^n is *arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay* (ACM) if S/I_V is a Cohen-Macaulay ring, where I_V is the saturated homogeneous ideal defining V . By abuse of notation, we will sometimes also refer to the ideal I_V as being ACM. When $\dim V \geq 1$, an equivalent condition for V to be ACM is for the Hartshorne-Rao modules of V to all vanish:

$$H^i(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_V(t)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and all } 1 \leq i \leq \dim V,$$

where \mathcal{I}_V is the ideal sheaf of V . (See for instance [11].)

Notation 2.2. Let \mathcal{A} be a hypersurface arrangement of s distinct hypersurfaces, i.e. $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq s} G_i$. In some situations, but not all, we will assume that the G_i all have the same degree, d . Let $G = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq s} G_i$. Let

$$J = \text{Jac}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{Jac}(G) = \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial x_0}, \dots, \frac{\partial G}{\partial x_n} \right)$$

be the Jacobian ideal of \mathcal{A} . Note that J is \mathfrak{m} -primary if and only if G is smooth (which can only happen when $s = 1$).

Now consider a primary decomposition of J :

$$J = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r \cap \mathfrak{q}'_i \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}'_s$$

where the \mathfrak{q}_i are the components of codimension 2 and the \mathfrak{q}'_i all have codimension > 2 . Let \mathfrak{p}_i be the associated prime of \mathfrak{q}_i . We set

$$J^{top} = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r$$

and we note that

$$(2.1) \quad \sqrt{J} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_r$$

Both J^{top} and \sqrt{J} are well-defined, unmixed ideals. We denote by X^{top} and X^{red} the equidimensional schemes defined by J^{top} and \sqrt{J} . We also denote by J^{sat} the saturation of J with respect to the irrelevant ideal \mathfrak{m} .

We now recall some of the tools used in [15], which we reproduce here for convenience. First we recall the construction of liaison addition. This was introduced by P. Schwartau in his Ph.D. thesis [20], which was never published. The version that we need (and state) is entirely due to Schwartau, but we cite [7] and [11] as the only convenient sources at this point.

Theorem 2.3 ((Liaison Addition) [7, Corollary 1.6, Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.5], [11, Section 3.2]). *Let V_1 and V_2 be locally Cohen-Macaulay, equidimensional codimension two subschemes in \mathbb{P}^n . Choose homogeneous polynomials F_1, F_2 with $d_i = \deg F_i$ so that*

$$F_1 \in I_{V_1} \quad \text{and} \quad F_2 \in I_{V_2},$$

and furthermore (F_1, F_2) is a regular sequence. Let V be the complete intersection scheme defined by (F_1, F_2) . Let $I = F_2 I_{V_1} + F_1 I_{V_2}$ and let Z be the scheme defined by I . Then

- (i) *If V_1, V_2 and V pairwise have no common components then $Z = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V$ as schemes.*
- (ii) *I is a saturated ideal.*
- (iii) *If $h_X(t)$ denotes the Hilbert function of a scheme X then we have*

$$h_Z(t) = h_V(t) + h_{V_1}(t - d_1) + h_{V_2}(t - d_2).$$

(iv) Z is ACM if and only if both V_1 and V_2 are ACM. More generally, we have

$$\bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} H^i(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_Z(t)) \cong \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} H^i(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_{V_1}(t))(-d_2) \oplus \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} H^i(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_{V_2}(t))(-d_1)$$

as graded S -modules, for $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$.

The following construction, basic double linkage, can be obtained from liaison addition. In fact it was introduced for curves in \mathbb{P}^3 by Lazarsfeld and Rao [9], and different versions have been used in different contexts. We write down only the version that we need, but we note that there is a much more general version, the so-called *basic double G -linkage* – cf. for instance [13] Lemma 3.4 and [11] Theorem 3.2.3 and Remark 3.2.4. Our version follows from liaison addition by taking V_2 to be the empty set and $I_{V_2} = S$.

Proposition 2.4. (Basic Double Linkage) *Let V_1 be a locally Cohen-Macaulay, equidimensional codimension two subscheme in \mathbb{P}^n . Choose homogeneous polynomials F_1, F_2 with $d_i = \deg F_i$ and $F_1 \in I_{V_1}$ and $F_2 \in S$, such that (F_1, F_2) is a regular sequence. Let V be the complete intersection scheme defined by (F_1, F_2) . Let $I = F_2 I_{V_1} + (F_1)$ and let Z be the scheme defined by I . Then*

- (i) *If V_1 and V have no common components then $Z = V_1 \cup V$.*
- (ii) *I is a saturated ideal.*
- (iii) *Z is ACM if and only if V_1 is ACM. More generally,*

$$\bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} H^i(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_Z(t)) \cong \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} H^i(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_{V_1}(t))(-d_2)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$.

(iv) Z is linked in two steps to V_1 .

Finally, we will use the fact that if V is a subvariety of \mathbb{P}^n of dimension ≥ 2 and the general hyperplane section of V is ACM then V itself must be ACM. A more general version can be found in [8].

Proposition 2.5 ([11] Theorem 1.3.3). *Let V be a locally Cohen-Macaulay, equidimensional closed subscheme of \mathbb{P}^n and let F be a general homogeneous polynomial of degree d cutting out on V a scheme $Z \subset V \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Assume that $\dim V \geq 2$. Then V is ACM if and only if Z is ACM.*

3. ARRANGEMENTS WHOSE BASE LOCUS IS SUPPORTED ON A SINGLE SMOOTH COMPLETE INTERSECTION

Given the Jacobian ideal J of a hypersurface arrangement, our approach in this paper is to “build up” the scheme defined by J^{top} , and the scheme defined by \sqrt{J} , using methods from liaison theory. In the next section we will justify why these methods are valid in our setting of Jacobian ideals. In this section we do something equally basic: we give a careful description of the “building blocks” that our construction will use. The main result is Theorem 3.5.

Remark 3.1. Let $F, P \in S$ be a regular sequence of homogeneous polynomials of the same degree d , and let $G_i \in [(F, P)]_d$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. Then for $i \neq j$, G_i and G_j either form a regular sequence or they agree up to scalar multiplication. In particular, they have no non-trivial common factor. This is a standard fact about pencils of hypersurfaces: the base locus of the pencil is determined by any two of the elements of the pencil.

It is elementary and well-known (see for instance [15, Remark 3.1]) that if e hyperplanes all contain the same codimension two linear variety Λ , and if F is the product of the corresponding linear forms, then the Jacobian ideal of F is a saturated complete intersection of type $(e - 1, e - 1)$. In this section we generalize this to hypersurfaces. See in particular Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $F, P \in \mathbb{P}^n$ be smooth hypersurfaces of degree d whose intersection is a smooth codimension two complete intersection subvariety, C . Let $G_1, G_2 \in [(F, P)]_d$. Assume that G_1 and G_2 define different hypersurfaces. Then G_1 and G_2 meet transversally at every point of C .*

Proof. Note that $(G_1, G_2) = (F, P)$. Since C is smooth, locally at every point Q , $(F, P)_Q$ defines exactly C , which is smooth, so the hypersurfaces F and P must meet transversally along C (see also Remark 3.1). \square

We also need the following strengthening of Theorem 3.3 of [6] in the case of codimension 2. It removes the assumption that the intersection of any 3 of the hypersurfaces has codimension 3. In fact, it is a simple application of basic double linkage. But note that the result is not a complete intersection in general – this should be contrasted with Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $F, P \in S$ be a regular sequence of homogeneous polynomials of degree d . For $1 \leq i \leq s$, let $G_i \in [(F, P)]_d$ be forms defining s distinct hypersurfaces of \mathbb{P}^n . Let $G = \prod_{i=1}^s G_i$. Then the ideal*

$$\left(\frac{G}{G_1}, \frac{G}{G_2}, \dots, \frac{G}{G_s} \right)$$

is the saturated ideal of an ACM codimension two subscheme of \mathbb{P}^n supported on $\text{Proj } S/(F, P)$, of degree $\binom{s}{2} \cdot d^2$. In fact, there is an equality of ideals

$$(F, P)^{s-1} = \left(\frac{G}{G_1}, \frac{G}{G_2}, \dots, \frac{G}{G_s} \right).$$

Proof. We begin by establishing the first claim. By Remark 3.1, no two G_i share a common factor. Notice that C is also defined by G_1 and G_2 since the G_i also have degree d , so $(F, P) = (G_1, G_2)$. We start with $s = 2$, and set $C_2 = C$, and consider the product $G = G_1 G_2$. The ideal of C_2 is

$$I_{C_2} = (G_2, G_1) = \left(\frac{G}{G_1}, \frac{G}{G_2} \right).$$

The degree of C_2 is $\binom{2}{2} \cdot d^2$.

Now we construct C_3 . Notice that G_3 and $G_1 G_2$ form a regular sequence. Since $G_1 G_2 \in (G_1, G_2)$, the ideal

$$I_{C_2} = G_3 \cdot I_{C_1} + (G_1 G_2) = (G_1 G_3, G_2 G_3, G_1 G_2)$$

defines a non-reduced ACM codimension two subvariety C_3 of degree

$$\deg C_2 = \deg C_2 + \deg(G_3, G_1 G_2) = d^2 + d \cdot (2d) = \binom{3}{2} \cdot d^2.$$

Now we proceed by induction. Let G_1, \dots, G_s be a set of hypersurfaces of degree d satisfying our hypotheses and assume that the result is true for G_1, \dots, G_{s-1} . Consider the ideal

$$I_{C_s} = G_s \cdot I_{C_{s-1}} + G_1 \cdots G_{s-1}.$$

Again, G_s and $G_1 \cdots G_{s-1}$ form a regular sequence. By basic double linkage, this is the saturated ideal of an ACM codimension two subscheme C_s in \mathbb{P}^n . Its degree is

$$\deg G_s = \deg C_{s-1} + d \cdot \deg(G_1 \cdots G_{s-1}) = \binom{s-1}{2} \cdot d^2 + d \cdot (s-1)d$$

which gives the desired result.

It remains to verify the assertion that C_s is supported on C for all s . This follows because C is a complete intersection of type (d, d) and each $G_i \in I_C$ has degree d , so this is essentially Remark 3.1.

Finally, we show the second claim. Indeed, each G_i is a linear combination $a_i F + b_i P$ so the inclusion \supseteq is clear. Then both ideals are unmixed saturated ideals of schemes of the same degree, so the reverse inclusion is immediate. \square

Our next goal is to show that if C is a smooth complete intersection subvariety of codimension two of type (d, d) , and if G_i ($1 \leq i \leq s$) are all elements of $[I_C]_d$, then the product $G = \prod_{i=1}^s G_i$ has the property that $Jac(G)^{sat}$ is a complete intersection. We first say very precisely which complete intersection it will be, and then we prove the asserted fact. This statement is true without any smoothness assumptions.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $F, P \in S$ be a regular sequence of homogeneous polynomials of degree d . For $i = 1, \dots, s$ with $s \geq 2$, let $G_i = a_i F + b_i P \in [(F, P)]_d$ (with scalars $a_i, b_i \in K$) be forms defining s distinct hypersurfaces of \mathbb{P}^n . Set $G = \prod_{i=1}^s G_i$. Then the two forms*

$$H_1 = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \frac{G}{G_i} \quad \text{and} \quad H_2 = \sum_{i=1}^s b_i \frac{G}{G_i}$$

form a regular sequence.

Proof. We consider first a special case, where F and P are two variables. It will be convenient to use new notation. Let $R = k[x, y]$ be a polynomial ring in two variables. For $i = 1, \dots, s$, let $\ell_i = a_i x + b_i y$ be linear forms defining s distinct hyperplanes. Define $L = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_s$,

$$h_1 = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \frac{L}{\ell_i} \quad \text{and} \quad h_2 = \sum_{i=1}^s b_i \frac{L}{\ell_i}.$$

By the choice of the linear forms, we know $(\ell_i, \ell_j) = (x, y)$ whenever $i \neq j$. We use induction on s to show that h_1 and h_2 form an R -regular sequence. Let $s = 2$. Since

$$(\ell_1, \ell_2) = (a_1 x + b_1 y, a_2 x + b_2 y) = (x, y),$$

the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ b_1 & b_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible. It follows that

$$(h_1, h_2) = (a_1 \ell_2 + a_2 \ell_1, b_1 \ell_2 + b_2 \ell_1) = (\ell_1, \ell_2)$$

has codimension two, as desired.

Let $s \geq 3$. Assume that h_1 and h_2 have a greatest common divisor, g , of positive degree. Note that

$$[\ell_1 \quad \cdots \quad \ell_s] = [x \quad y] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & \cdots & a_s \\ b_1 & \cdots & b_s \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & \cdots & a_s \\ b_1 & \cdots & b_s \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \frac{L}{\ell_1} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{L}{\ell_s} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$xh_1 + yh_2 = \begin{bmatrix} x & y \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^s \ell_i \frac{L}{\ell_i} = sL.$$

Hence g divides $L = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_s$. Since ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_s are irreducible and pairwise coprime, possibly after re-indexing, we may assume that $g = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_k$ for some k with $1 \leq k \leq s-1$. In particular, none of the forms $\ell_{k+1}, \dots, \ell_s$ divides g . Using that $h_1 = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \frac{L}{\ell_i} + \sum_{i=k+1}^s a_i \frac{L}{\ell_i}$, one gets

$$h_1 = \ell_{k+1} \cdots \ell_s \cdot h'_1 + \ell_1 \cdots \ell_k \cdot \tilde{h}_1 = \ell_{k+1} \cdots \ell_s \cdot h'_1 + g \cdot \tilde{h}_1$$

with some $\tilde{h}_1 \in R$ and $h'_1 = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \frac{g}{\ell_i}$. Similarly, we see

$$h_2 = \ell_{k+1} \cdots \ell_s \cdot h'_2 + g \cdot \tilde{h}_2$$

with some $\tilde{h}_2 \in R$ and $h'_2 = \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \frac{g}{\ell_i}$. Since g divides h_1 and h_2 and is relatively prime to $\ell_{k+1} \cdots \ell_s$, we conclude that g divides h'_1 and h'_2 . However, the induction hypothesis applied to ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k gives that h'_1 and h'_2 form a regular sequence if $k \geq 2$, a contradiction. If $k = 1$, i.e., $g = \ell_1$, we have $h_1 = a_1 \ell_2 \cdots \ell_s + \ell_1 \cdot \tilde{h}_1$ and $h_2 = b_1 \ell_2 \cdots \ell_s + \ell_1 \cdot \tilde{h}_2$. Since a_1 and b_1 cannot be both zero, it follows that $g = \ell_1$ does not divide both h_1 and h_2 , a contradiction. Thus, we have shown that h_1 and h_2 form an R -regular sequence.

Second, we discuss the general case. Consider the k -algebra homomorphism $\varphi: R \rightarrow S$, defined by $x \mapsto F$ and $y \mapsto G$. It is flat because F, G is a regular sequence by assumption. Hence $H_1 = \varphi(h_1)$ and $H_2 = \varphi(h_2)$ form an S -regular sequence by [10, Theorem 15.1]. \square

We are ready to establish the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.5. *Consider a smooth complete intersection $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of dimension $n-2$ cut out by two hypersurfaces of degree d . Let $G_1, \dots, G_s \in [I_Z]_d$ be forms defining s distinct smooth hypersurfaces of \mathbb{P}^n . Set $G = \prod_{i=1}^s G_i$. Then the saturation of the Jacobian ideal $J = \text{Jac}(G)$ is a complete intersection. In particular, $J^{\text{top}} = J^{\text{sat}}$ is ACM, and $\sqrt{J} = I_Z$ is ACM.*

More, precisely, $J^{\text{sat}} = (H_1, H_2)$ is a complete intersection of type $((s-1)d, (s-1)d)$, where H_1 and H_2 are defined as in Proposition 3.4 with $I_Z = (F, P)$ and $G_i = a_i F + b_i P$.

Proof. For any variable x_k of S , one computes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial G}{\partial x_k} &= \sum_{i=1}^s \left[a_i \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k} + b_i \frac{\partial P}{\partial x_k} \right] \frac{G}{G_i} \\ (3.1) \quad &= \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \frac{G}{G_i} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial x_k} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^s b_i \frac{G}{G_i} \right) \in (H_1, H_2). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\text{Jac}(G) \subseteq (H_1, H_2)$. Since a regular sequence generates a saturated ideal, and saturation preserves inclusions, we get by Proposition 3.4

$$\text{Jac}(G)^{\text{sat}} \subseteq (H_1, H_2)^{\text{sat}} = (H_1, H_2).$$

Next, we establish the reverse inclusion. Since Z is smooth and any two of the G_i meet at Z and nowhere else (see Remark 3.1), the singular locus (as a set) of the scheme defined

by G is Z , and so the scheme defined by $\text{Jac}(G)$ is supported precisely on Z . Using also that $(H_1, H_2) \subseteq \left(\frac{G}{G_1}, \frac{G}{G_2}, \dots, \frac{G}{G_s}\right)$ and Lemma 3.3, we conclude that both $\text{Jac}(G)$ and (H_1, H_2) define subschemes supported precisely at Z .

For any form $E \in S$, let us denote by ∇E the Jacobian matrix $[E_{x_0} \ \dots \ E_{x_n}]$ of E , where E_{x_k} stands for $\frac{\partial E}{\partial x_k}$. Observe that Equation (3.1) can be written as

$$(3.2) \quad \nabla G = [H_1 \ H_2] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F \\ \nabla P \end{bmatrix}.$$

We also have

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_1 \\ H_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & \dots & a_s \\ b_1 & \dots & b_s \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \frac{G}{G_1} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{G}{G_s} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consider now the Jacobian matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \nabla F \\ \nabla P \end{bmatrix}$ of (F, P) . By assumption, (F, P) defines a smooth subscheme Z of \mathbb{P}^n . Hence, the ideal generated by the 2-minors of the Jacobian matrix does not vanish at any point of Z . Consider any such point Q of Z . Thus, there is a minor, say, $F_{x_i}P_{x_j} - F_{x_j}P_{x_i}$, that does not vanish at Q , where i and j may depend on the choice of Q . In other words, considered as a matrix with entries in the localization S_{I_Q} , the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} F_{x_i} & F_{x_j} \\ P_{x_i} & P_{x_j} \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible. Hence, using

$$[G_{x_i} \ G_{x_j}] = [H_1 \ H_2] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} F_{x_i} & F_{x_j} \\ P_{x_i} & P_{x_j} \end{bmatrix},$$

one obtains

$$(H_1, H_2)_{I_Q} = (G_{x_i}, G_{x_j})_{I_Q} \subset \text{Jac}(G)_{I_Q}.$$

We conclude that, for every point Q of Z , one has $(H_1, H_2)_{I_Q} \subset \text{Jac}(G)_{I_Q}$. We observed above that the schemes defined by (H_1, H_2) and $\text{Jac}(G)$ are both supported precisely at Z . It follows that $(H_1, H_2)^{\text{sat}} \subseteq \text{Jac}(G)^{\text{sat}}$, and so $(H_1, H_2) \subseteq \text{Jac}(G)^{\text{sat}}$. This is the desired reverse inclusion, and we are done. \square

In Section 6 we will discuss examples showing that the conclusions of Theorem 3.5 may fail if one relaxes some of the assumptions.

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.5, we have the well-known result mentioned at the beginning of this section:

Corollary 3.6. *Let \mathcal{A} be a hyperplane arrangement defined by a product $L_1 \cdots L_s$, where each L_i is in I_Λ for some fixed codimension two linear variety Λ and $s \geq 2$. Let J be the Jacobian ideal of \mathcal{A} . Then J is saturated but not reduced (supported on Λ), and is the complete intersection of two forms of degree $s - 1$. In particular, S/J is Cohen-Macaulay.*

Proof. This is the case $d = 1$ of Theorem 3.5. The only additional point needed is that J is already saturated here (unlike in Theorem 3.5). Indeed, setting $I_\Lambda = (x, y)$ (by change of variables) we see that the Jacobian ideal J is generated by two forms of degree $s - 1$, as is its saturation, so they are equal. \square

We record some consequences, which may be of independent interest. They say that certain ideals of minors have the expected (maximal) codimension and so are perfect ideals. We refer to a smooth polynomial as a form in S that defines a smooth hypersurface on \mathbb{P}^n .

Corollary 3.7. *Let F and P be hypersurfaces of \mathbb{P}^n of the same degree meeting in a smooth $(n - 2)$ -dimensional subscheme. Then one has:*

- (a) *The ideal generated by the 2-minors of the $2 \times (n + 1)$ Jacobian matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \nabla F \\ \nabla P \end{bmatrix}$ has codimension n .*
- (b) *The ideal generated by the 2-minors of the $2 \times (n + 2)$ matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \nabla F & H_2 \\ \nabla P & -H_1 \end{bmatrix}$ has codimension $n + 1$, where H_1, H_2 are the polynomials defined in Proposition 3.4 using any smooth polynomials $G_1, \dots, G_s \in (F, P)$ of degree $\deg P$.*

Proof. Claim (a) follows from (b). Observe that, by Bertini's Theorem, any general form in (F, P) of degree $\deg P$ defines a smooth hypersurface. Thus, suitable smooth hypersurfaces G_1, \dots, G_s do exist. Setting $G = G_1 \cdots G_s$, Theorem 3.5 gives $\text{Jac}(G)^{\text{sat}} = (H_1, H_2)$, that is, $[\text{Jac}(G)]_k = [(H_1, H_2)]_k$ for any integer $k \gg 0$. Hence, for any polynomials $s_1, s_2 \in [R]_k$ with $k \gg 0$, there are homogeneous polynomials $r_0, \dots, r_n \in R$ such that

$$s_1 H_1 + s_2 H_2 = \sum_{i=0}^n r_i G_{x_i}.$$

Using also Equation (3.2), this gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_1 & H_2 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \end{bmatrix} = \nabla G \cdot \begin{bmatrix} r_0 \\ \vdots \\ r_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_1 & H_2 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F \\ \nabla P \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} r_0 \\ \vdots \\ r_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$0 = \begin{bmatrix} H_1 & H_2 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \left(\begin{bmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F \\ \nabla P \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} r_0 \\ \vdots \\ r_n \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Since the syzygy module of the ideal (H_1, H_2) is generated by $\begin{bmatrix} H_2 \\ -H_1 \end{bmatrix}$, there is some form $q \in R$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F \\ \nabla P \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} r_0 \\ \vdots \\ r_n \end{bmatrix} = q \cdot \begin{bmatrix} H_2 \\ -H_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F & H_2 \\ \nabla P & -H_1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} r_0 \\ \vdots \\ r_n \\ q \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consider now the R -module homomorphism $\varphi: R^{n+2} \rightarrow R^2$ with $v \mapsto Av$, where $A = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F & H_2 \\ \nabla P & -H_1 \end{bmatrix}$. The previous equation implies that the module $M = \text{coker } \varphi$ has finite length, which means that $\text{codim}(\text{Ann}_R(M)) = n + 1$. Hence (see, e.g., [4, Proposition 20.7]), the Fitting ideal $I_2(A)$ that is generated by the 2-minors of A has also codimension $n + 1$, as claimed. \square

4. DECOMPOSITIONS OF HYPERSURFACE ARRANGEMENTS

In this section, we justify using the liaison tools on the Jacobian ideals for hypersurface arrangements. Basically, we show that the scheme we can produce by a certain scheme-theoretic union of complete intersections (and which, in suitable situations, we construct using the liaison tools) is exactly the same as the scheme defined by the top dimensional part of the Jacobian ideal.

We start with hyperplanes. In the following result we denote by L_i a hyperplane and by ℓ_i the linear form defining it (up to scalars). We first prove a result that was used implicitly in [15]. We provide an argument since we are not aware of a reference in the literature.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s L_i \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ ($s \geq 2$) be an arbitrary hyperplane arrangement. Then the top dimensional part of the scheme defined by $\text{Jac}(\ell_1 \cdots \ell_s)$ is a union of complete intersections. Each of these complete intersections is supported at some linear space $\Lambda = L_i \cap L_j$ and equal to the scheme defined by $\text{Jac}(f)$, where f is the product of the linear forms ℓ_i in I_Λ .*

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that $x = x_0$ and $y = x_1$ define two of the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A} . Let $\Lambda = \mathbb{V}((x, y))$. Write

$$\ell_1 \cdots \ell_s = \underbrace{\ell_1 \cdots \ell_d}_f \cdot \underbrace{\ell_{d+1} \cdots \ell_s}_g$$

with $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d \in (x, y)$ and $g \notin (x, y)$. Thus we get

$$\text{Jac}(fg) = (fxg + fg_x, f_yg + fg_y, f \cdot g_{x_i} \mid 2 \leq i \leq n).$$

Since we are working over a field of characteristic zero, Euler's formula gives

$$d \cdot f = xf_x + yf_y.$$

It follows that

$$fxg + fg_x = f_x(g + \frac{1}{d}xg_x) + f_y(\frac{1}{d}yg_x) \quad \text{and}$$

$$f_yg + fg_y = f_x(\frac{1}{d}xg_y) + f_y(g + \frac{1}{d}yg_y).$$

Rewrite this as

$$\begin{bmatrix} (fg)_x \\ (fg)_y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} g + \frac{1}{d}xg_x & \frac{1}{d}yg_x \\ \frac{1}{d}xg_y & g + \frac{1}{d}yg_y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f_x \\ f_y \end{bmatrix}.$$

The determinant of the 2×2 matrix is

$$\det = g^2 + h$$

with $h \in (x, y)$. Since $g \notin (x, y)$ we conclude $\det \notin (x, y)$. Hence \det is a unit in the localization of $R = k[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ at (x, y) . This implies

$$(f_x, f_y)_{(x,y)} = ((fg)_x, (fg)_y)_{(x,y)} \subseteq \text{Jac}(fg)_{(x,y)}.$$

By Corollary 3.6, $\text{Jac}(f)$ is a complete intersection of type $(d-1, d-1)$. Since clearly $\text{Jac}(fg) \subset \text{Jac}(f) = (f_x, f_y)$, we obtain

$$(f_x, f_y)_{(x,y)} = \text{Jac}(fg)_{(x,y)}$$

as claimed. □

As a consequence we get the following result. We are not aware of a published proof of the first equality.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s L_i$ be a hyperplane arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n and assume further that any three of the hyperplanes intersect in a codimension 3 linear space. Let $L = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_s$. Then*

$$\text{Jac}(\ell_1 \cdots \ell_s)^{\text{top}} = \bigcap_{i < j} (\ell_i, \ell_j) = \left(\frac{L}{\ell_1}, \dots, \frac{L}{\ell_s} \right)$$

is Cohen-Macaulay.

Proof. What is being asserted here is the first equality. For the second equality and the Cohen-Macaulayness see [5] or [17]. The first equality is immediate from Proposition 4.1. \square

In [5] the Cohen-Macaulayness was proved by observing that the scheme defined by the union of codimension two linear varieties defined by $\bigcap (\ell_i, \ell_j)$ could be produced via a sequence of basic double links starting from a complete intersection. What is new here is that this process gives the top dimensional part of the scheme defined by the Jacobian ideal. That is, this result justifies the use of the liaison methods as a tool to describe schemes arising from the top dimensional part of Jacobian ideals of hyperplane arrangements. This was used implicitly in [15].

As noted in the introduction, there are several complications to extending this result to hypersurfaces, and in the rest of the section we develop the machinery and prove the generalizations.

An immediate consequence of Theorem 3.5 is that if f and g are smooth forms of the same degree d defining a smooth complete intersection, then the saturation of the Jacobian ideal $\text{Jac}(fg)$ is a complete intersection of type (d, d) . Our next goal (Proposition 4.4) is to generalize this result, allowing the forms to have different degrees.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that (f, g) defines a smooth complete intersection, Z . We do not require $\deg(f) = \deg(g)$. Then both f and g are smooth in codimension one.*

Proof. The point is that there could be singularities of either f or g outside Z , but not of codimension one. Suppose to the contrary that one of them, say f , is singular in codimension one, so there is a divisor D on f that is part of the singular locus. We know that the hypersurface section, Z , cut out by g on f is smooth. But that hypersurface section of f would then have to meet D . So the variety defined by (f, g) then has a singularity, thus preventing Z from being smooth. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Assume that (f, g) defines a smooth complete intersection, Z . We do not require $\deg(f) = \deg(g)$. Then $\text{Jac}(fg)^{\text{top}} = (f, g)$.*

Proof. We know by smoothness that

$$\sqrt{\text{Jac}(fg)^{\text{top}}} = (f, g)$$

and in particular that the top dimension part of $\text{Sing}(fg)$ is Z . (Note that either f or g could have singularities of higher codimension.) In particular, the equation gives $\text{Jac}(fg)^{\text{top}} \subseteq (f, g)$, and so we only have to prove the reverse inclusion.

For any $0 \leq i \leq n$ we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(fg) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(f) \cdot g + f \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(g) \in (f, g).$$

We rewrite these equation as follows:

$$\nabla(fg) = [g \ f] \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f \\ \nabla g \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since Z is smooth, for any point $Q \in Z$ there is a 2-minor, say

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} & \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_j} \end{bmatrix},$$

that does not vanish at Q . So in the localization $S_{I_Q} = K[x_0, \dots, x_n]_{I_Q}$ we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial(fg)}{\partial x_i} & \frac{\partial(fg)}{\partial x_j} \end{bmatrix} = [g \ f] \cdot A$$

for some invertible matrix A . Thus

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial(fg)}{\partial x_i} & \frac{\partial(fg)}{\partial x_j} \end{bmatrix} \cdot A^{-1} = [g \ f],$$

and so $(f, g) \subseteq (\frac{\partial(fg)}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial(fg)}{\partial x_j})$. Hence

$$(f, g)_{I_Q} = \text{Jac}(fg)_{I_Q} \quad \text{for any } Q \in Z.$$

Therefore

$$(f, g)_{I_Z} = \text{Jac}(fg)_{I_Z} = (\text{Jac}(fg)^{\text{top}})_{I_Z}.$$

In particular, the unique top dimensional component of $\text{Jac}(fg)$ is I_Z . \square

Our next goal is to show that under reasonable assumptions, adding a hypersurface to an arrangement does not affect the top-dimensional primary components that were already there for the original arrangement. For a homogeneous ideal I of S , we denote by $\mathbb{V}(I)$ the variety defined by I in \mathbb{P}^n .

Proposition 4.5. *Let $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$ ($s \geq 2$) and assume that each f_i is smooth. Let g be a smooth homogeneous polynomial such that $\text{codim}(f_i, f_j, g) = 3$ for each $i \neq j$. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(S/\text{Jac}(f)^{\text{top}})$. Then $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(S/\text{Jac}(fg)^{\text{top}})$.*

Furthermore, let $\mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2$ be the \mathfrak{p} -primary components of $\text{Jac}(f)$ and of $\text{Jac}(fg)$, respectively. Then $\mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_2$.

Proof. Since $\text{Jac}(fg) \subseteq \text{Jac}(f)$ we have that $\text{Jac}(fg)_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq \text{Jac}(f)_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Consider any point $Q \notin \mathbb{V}(g)$, and without loss of generality set $I_Q = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. We first prove the following claim.

Claim: $\nabla(fg)^T = M \cdot (\nabla f)^T$ for some matrix M with $\det(M) \notin I_Q$, where $(-)^T$ represents the transpose of $(-)$.

To see this, as before we write F_x for the partial derivative of a polynomial F with respect to a variable x . Assume $\deg(f) = d$. Then we have

- $df = x_0 f_{x_0} + \cdots + x_n f_{x_n}$, and so

$$f = \frac{1}{d} x_0 f_{x_0} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} x_n f_{x_n};$$

- $\text{Jac}(fg) = (f_{x_0} g + f g_{x_0}, \dots, f_{x_n} g + f g_{x_n})$.

Thus

$$\begin{bmatrix} (fg)_{x_0} \\ \vdots \\ (fg)_{x_n} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} g + \frac{1}{d} x_0 g_{x_0} & \frac{1}{d} x_1 g_{x_0} & \cdots & \frac{1}{d} x_n g_{x_0} \\ \frac{1}{d} x_0 g_{x_1} & g + \frac{1}{d} x_1 g_{x_1} & \cdots & \frac{1}{d} x_n g_{x_1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{d} x_0 g_{x_n} & \frac{1}{d} x_1 g_{x_n} & \cdots & g + \frac{1}{d} x_n g_{x_n} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} f_{x_0} \\ f_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ f_{x_n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Denote by M the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix in the above equation. We have assumed that $g \notin I_Q = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Thus

$$\det(M) = (g + \frac{1}{d}x_0g_{x_0})g^{n-1} + h \quad \text{where } h \in I_Q.$$

But

$$g = \frac{1}{\deg(g)} \sum_i x_i g_{x_i}.$$

Hence

$$0 \neq g \bmod I_Q = \frac{1}{\deg(g)} x_0 g_{x_0} \bmod I_Q,$$

and so

$$(g + \frac{1}{d}x_0g_{x_0}) \bmod I_Q = \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{\deg(g)} + \frac{1}{d}\right)}_{\neq 0} \underbrace{x_0g_{x_0}}_{\neq 0} \bmod I_Q \neq 0.$$

We obtain

$$\nabla(fg)^T = M \cdot (\nabla f)^T \quad \text{with } \det(M) \notin I_Q,$$

and this concludes the proof of the claim.

Therefore, for any point $Q \in \mathbb{P}^n$, we have in S_{I_Q} that $\text{Jac}(f)_{I_Q} \subseteq \text{Jac}(fg)_{I_Q}$, and so

$$(4.1) \quad \text{Jac}(f)_{I_Q} = \text{Jac}(fg)_{I_Q} \text{ if } Q \in \mathbb{P}^n \setminus \mathbb{V}(g).$$

Let $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2$ be as in the statement of this proposition. The assumption $\text{codim}(f_i, f_j, g) = 3$ if $i \neq j$ implies that there is point in Q in $\mathbb{V}(\mathfrak{p})$ that is not in $\mathbb{V}(g)$. Localizing Equality (4.1) at \mathfrak{p} , we obtain $\text{Jac}(f)_{\mathfrak{p}} = \text{Jac}(fg)_{\mathfrak{p}}$. As \mathfrak{q}_1 and \mathfrak{q}_2 are minimal components of their respective ideals, this gives the desired equality $\mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_2$. \square

After all this preparation, we are ready to state one of the main tools of this paper.

Theorem 4.6. (Liaison Addition for Arrangements.)

Let $\mathcal{A}_{fg} = \mathcal{A}_f \cup \mathcal{A}_g \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a hypersurface arrangement, where $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$ and $g = g_1 \cdots g_t$, such that

- (i) Any two distinct hypersurfaces in \mathcal{A}_{fg} meet in a codimension two smooth subscheme (hence a smooth complete intersection).
- (ii) $\text{codim}(f_i, f_j, g) = 3$ whenever $i \neq j$.
- (iii) $\text{codim}(f, g_i, g_j) = 3$ whenever $i \neq j$.

(Note that we do not assume that $\text{codim}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = 3$ or that $\text{codim}(g_i, g_j, g_k) = 3$ for i, j, k distinct.)

Then \mathcal{A} has the following properties:

$$(a) \quad \text{Jac}(fg)^{top} = \text{Jac}(f)^{top} \cap \text{Jac}(g)^{top} \cap \underbrace{\left[\bigcap_{i,j} (f_i, g_j) \right]}_{= (f,g)}.$$

(b) $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top} = g \cdot \text{Jac}(f)^{top} + f \cdot \text{Jac}(g)^{top}$. In particular, $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top}$ is obtained by Liaison Addition from $\text{Jac}(f)^{top}$ and $\text{Jac}(g)^{top}$ (see Theorem 2.3).

(c) Statements (a) and (b) continue to hold if we replace $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top}$, $\text{Jac}(f)^{top}$ and $\text{Jac}(g)^{top}$ with their radicals.

Before giving the proof we note that conditions (ii) and (iii) together are equivalent to the following key condition:

(★) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{For each associated prime } \mathfrak{p} \text{ of } \text{Jac}(f)^{top} \text{ and each associated prime } \mathfrak{p}' \\ \text{of } \text{Jac}(g)^{top}, \text{ no factor of either } f \text{ or } g \text{ is in } \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{p}'. \end{array} \right.$

This is the analog of the condition in Theorem 3.2 of [15].

Proof of Theorem 4.6. By Proposition 4.5 we know that each associated prime \mathfrak{p} of $\text{Jac}(f)^{top}$ is also an associated prime of $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top}$, and that the corresponding \mathfrak{p} -primary components of $\text{Jac}(f)^{top}$ and of $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top}$ are equal. Of course the same is true for the associated primes of $\text{Jac}(g)^{top}$.

Thanks to Equation (2.1), it remains only to consider the primary components of $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top}$ supported on any of the smooth codimension two complete intersections $\mathbb{V}(f_i, g_j)$.

Fix i, j and consider the polynomials $p = f_i g_j$ and $q = \frac{fg}{p}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Jac}(fg)^{top} &= \text{Jac}(pq)^{top} \\ &= \text{Jac}(p)^{top} \cap (\text{other components}) \quad (\text{by Proposition 4.5}) \\ &= \text{Jac}(f_i g_j)^{top} \cap (\text{other components}) \\ &= (f_i, g_j) \cap (\text{other components}) \quad (\text{by Proposition 4.4}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (a). Since $f \in \text{Jac}(f)^{top}$, $g \in \text{Jac}(g)^{top}$ and (f, g) is a regular sequence, part (b) follows from Liaison Addition (Theorem 2.3). Finally, (c) holds because our assumptions give us that (f, g) is already a radical ideal. \square

The following is the second main tool of this paper.

Corollary 4.7. (Basic Double Linkage for arrangements.) *Let \mathcal{A}_f be a hypersurface arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n , defined by $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$. Let g be a homogeneous polynomial. Assume:*

- (i) *Each complete intersection of the form (f_i, g) is smooth.*
- (ii) *Each complete intersection of the form (f_i, f_j) is smooth.*
- (iii) *$\text{codim}(f_i, f_j, g) = 3$ whenever $i \neq j$.*

Then the following hold:

$$(a) \text{Jac}(fg)^{top} = \text{Jac}(f)^{top} \cap \underbrace{\left[\bigcap_{i,j} (f_i, g) \right]}_{=(f,g)}.$$

(b) $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top} = g \cdot \text{Jac}(f)^{top} + (f)$. In particular, $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top}$ is obtained from $\text{Jac}(f)^{top}$ by Basic Double Linkage (see Theorem 2.4).

(c) Statements (a) and (b) continue to hold if we replace $\text{Jac}(fg)^{top}$ and $\text{Jac}(f)^{top}$ by their radicals.

Proof. This is just the case $t = 1$ of Theorem 4.6. \square

5. THE ACM PROPERTY FOR MANY HYPERSURFACE ARRANGEMENTS

The following statement was one of the main results of [15].

Theorem 5.1 ([15, Theorem, page 142]). *Let \mathcal{A} be a hyperplane arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n . Let J be the Jacobian ideal associated to \mathcal{A} . Assume that no hyperplane of \mathcal{A} is in the associated prime of more than one non-reduced component of J^{top} . Then both S/J^{top} and S/\sqrt{J} are Cohen-Macaulay.*

Our goal now is to see to what extent we can extend this result to hypersurface arrangements. We have seen in Theorem 3.5 that Corollary 3.6 extends but not in an obvious way. Indeed, when we pass from hyperplanes to hypersurfaces, a lot of new complications arise. Nevertheless, using the results of Section 4, we are able to generalize Theorem 5.1. This was one of the primary goals of this paper. The result establishes Theorem 1.2, stated in the introduction.

Theorem 5.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a hypersurface arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n , $n \geq 3$, defined by a form $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$. Let $J = \text{Jac}(f)$ be the Jacobian ideal associated to \mathcal{A} . Assume:*

- (i) *Any two factors of f meet in a smooth codimension 2 complete intersection.*
- (ii) *No hypersurface of \mathcal{A} is in the associated prime of more than one non-reduced component of J^{top} .*

Then

- (a) *whenever more than two factors of f meet in a codimension 2 subscheme Z , then all such factors have the same degree;*
- (b) *the schemes defined by both J^{top} and \sqrt{J} are ACM;*
- (c) *both ideals J^{top} and \sqrt{J} define equidimensional schemes that are the union of complete intersections (hence are generically complete intersections).*

Proof. We first prove (a). Let g_1, g_2, g_3 be irreducible factors of f meeting in a codimension 2 subscheme, and without loss of generality assume $\deg(g_1) \leq \deg(g_2) \leq \deg(g_3)$. For convenience set $d_i = \deg(g_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

If they do not all have the same degree then $d_1 < d_3$. Let X_1 be the complete intersection of g_1 and g_2 , which by (ii) is smooth of degree $d_1 d_2$. By assumption, g_3 also vanishes on X_1 . Now g_2 and g_3 also define a smooth (hence irreducible, by ACM) complete intersection, X_2 , of degree $d_2 d_3 > d_1 d_2 = \deg(X_1)$. This means that X_2 provides a non-trivial link of X_1 to another codimension 2 scheme, which is impossible since X_2 is smooth by (ii). (It is possible that the residual scheme is also supported on X_1 , but this does not change the fact that X_2 cannot be smooth.) This proves (a).

Notice that this implies that if more than two irreducible factors of f vanish along a codimension 2 subvariety then that subvariety is the complete intersection of any two of them.

With the tools we have now developed, the argument follows exactly as it did in Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.5 of [15]. For the convenience of the reader we provide the argument with the needed adjustments.

Any component of J^{top} is smooth (hence reduced) if and only if there are only two factors that vanish on it. We will first exhaust the non-reduced components, and then deal with the remaining reduced components. By Theorem 3.5 and by our hypotheses, any of these non-reduced components is a complete intersection.

Start with a non-reduced component X_1 (if it exists). If it is the only non-reduced component then we will go to the next step, and so assume that there is a second non-reduced component, X_2 . Let \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 be the subarrangements defining X_1 and X_2 respectively (i.e. \mathcal{A}_1 is the union of the hypersurfaces in the radical of I_{X_1} and similarly for X_2). Note that both X_1 and X_2 are ACM, being complete intersections. By (a), the hypersurfaces in \mathcal{A}_1 all have the same degree d_1 , and similarly the hypersurfaces in \mathcal{A}_2 all have the same degree d_2 (but d_1 is not necessarily equal to d_2). By assumption (ii), we are in the situation of Theorem 4.6. Letting J' be the Jacobian ideal of $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$, we thus get that the scheme defined by $(J')^{\text{top}}$ is obtained by Liaison Addition from X_1 and X_2 , and so $(J')^{\text{top}}$ is ACM. We continue in this way until the non-reduced components

are exhausted. (Along the way we have also picked up reduced components, but this does not matter.)

For the second step, if any factors of f remain, we add them one at a time, building up our scheme now by Basic Double Linkage (Corollary 4.7), and adding only reduced components. We conclude that for the Jacobian ideal J of \mathcal{A} we get S/J^{top} is Cohen-Macaulay.

For the radical, we note that all of the applications of Liaison Addition and Basic Double Linkage continue to be valid for the radicals of the top dimensional components of the Jacobian ideals, since if $F \in I$ for some homogeneous ideal I then also $F \in \sqrt{I}$. Furthermore, the radical of any of the X_i is also a complete intersection, hence ACM. Thus the same steps as we did for S/J^{top} work for the radical S/\sqrt{J} . \square

Remark 5.3. Notice two things. First, by Lemma 3.2, Condition (i) in Theorem 5.2 implies that each irreducible factor of f is smooth in codimension one. Second, this same Condition (i) is automatically true for hyperplane arrangements. Thus Theorem 5.2 immediately gives Theorem 5.1.

Example 5.4. In Theorem 5.2 we assumed $n \geq 3$, so here we look briefly at the case $n = 2$. First, the trick used to prove (a) by invoking the smoothness of the complete intersections will not work here because any union of reduced points is smooth, and there is no chance to use irreducibility.

Second, the conclusion in (b) is automatic for \mathbb{P}^2 .

Third, recall the elementary result mentioned just after Remark 3.1 above, from [15, Remark 3.1]: if e hyperplanes all contain the same codimension two linear variety Λ , and if F is the product of the corresponding linear forms, then the Jacobian ideal of F is a saturated complete intersection of type $(e-1, e-1)$. For example, if F is the product of four linear forms then the corresponding complete intersection has degree 9. Note that we have a generalization of this result to hypersurfaces, namely Theorem 3.5, that applies even in \mathbb{P}^2 .

However, one could also hope that the same would be true locally for the non-linear case, at least in \mathbb{P}^2 . For example, if P is a point and if f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4 are sufficiently general cubics in I_P then locally at P one might hope that the curves associated to these forms could be represented by their tangent lines at P , so the scheme defined by the Jacobian is locally a complete intersection of degree 9 at P .

Unfortunately this is not true. We have checked the following on CoCoA. Assume that the four general forms have degree 3, and let X be the scheme defined by the Jacobian ideal of the product of these cubics. Let X_1 be the component of X supported at P . Then X_1 does indeed have degree 9, but it is not a complete intersection. Indeed, it has four minimal generators, of degrees 3,4,4,4. So the idea of looking locally and using the tangent lines to determine X_1 does not work. Note that this example does not fall into the setting of Theorem 3.5.

As a consequence of Theorem 5.2, we obtain a proper generalization of Corollary 4.2 from hyperplane arrangements to hypersurface arrangements.

Corollary 5.5. *Let \mathcal{A} be a hypersurface arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n defined by a form $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$. Assume that any two of the hypersurfaces meet in a smooth complete intersection, and that any three factors meet in codimension 3. Then the scheme defined by $\text{Jac}(f)^{top}$ is the reduced union of the complete intersections defined by (f_i, f_j) . In particular, it is the ideal of a hypersurface configuration (in the language of [6]), so it is ACM and its minimal generators are the forms $\frac{f}{f_i}$.*

Proof. The first assertion is a result of Theorem 5.2 (see also Corollary 4.7). The second assertion follows from [6, Proposition 2.3]. \square

It is natural to ask whether Theorem 5.2 also holds if we replace $\text{Jac}(f)^{\text{top}}$ by $\text{Jac}(f)^{\text{sat}}$. The answer is no: the saturation may have embedded points. This is true even for hyperplane arrangements, as the following example shows.

Example 5.6. Let P be the point in \mathbb{P}^3 defined by the ideal (x, y, z) . Let L_1, \dots, L_4 be four general linear forms in I_P and let F be their product. Let J be the Jacobian ideal of F .

Of course the scheme defined by J has degree 6, and its top dimensional part is supported on the six lines defined by pairs of the linear forms. But the saturation has Hilbert function $6t - 1$ (and in fact J is already saturated) while the top dimensional part has Hilbert function $6t - 2$ (and is clearly ACM, being a cone over a set of 6 points in \mathbb{P}^2). So there is an embedded component supported at P .

6. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES RELATED TO THEOREMS 3.5 AND 5.2

In this section we illustrate how the conclusions in our main statements may fail if one relaxes some of the assumptions.

One of the main results of this paper is Theorem 3.5, which is instrumental in many of the subsequent results. Moreover, notice that our main result, Theorem 5.2, formally gives the conclusion of Theorem 3.5 about the Cohen-Macaulayness of $\text{Jac}(f)^{\text{top}}$ as a special case. Thus any generalization of Theorem 5.2 appears to require a generalization of Theorem 3.5. However, we will see in this section that the conclusion of Theorem 3.5 (and thus of Theorem 5.2) may fail in surprising ways if one relaxes some of its assumptions. See also Example 5.4.

The essential hypotheses of Theorem 3.5 are that Z is a smooth complete intersection and that the minimal generators of I_Z have the same degree. More precisely, the statement of Theorem 3.5 is that taking $G_1, \dots, G_s \in [I_Z]_d$ all smooth, and setting $G = \prod_{i=1}^s G_i$, then the saturation of the Jacobian ideal of G is a complete intersection (and we describe how far it is from already being saturated). In particular, this saturation is unmixed and ACM. In this section we give some examples to show that the result is not true without these assumptions.

All of the examples in this section were computed using the computer algebra package CoCoA [1], and if no theoretic argument is given, the examples are just reports of the results of the calculations.

Example 6.1. This example shows that if we allow the degrees of the hypersurfaces defining the complete intersection to be different, the result of Theorem 3.5 need not hold.

Let F be a general form of degree 2, G a general form of degree 3, and $H_1, H_2, H_3 \in (F, G)$ general elements of degree 4. Note that (F, G) defines a smooth complete intersection, X , of degree 6, and all five hypersurfaces are smooth. However, just the degrees alone force the other pairs of hypersurfaces to meet in singular complete intersections. (For example, (F, H_1) links X to a residual curve Y of degree 2 so (F, H_1) defines $X \cup Y$, which is singular.) Let J be the Jacobian ideal of the polynomial $FGH_1H_2H_3$.

The following conclusions for the Jacobian ideal J and the top dimensional part J^{top} hold.

- J is not saturated.

- The saturation of J is not unmixed: the corresponding curve has embedded points. Indeed, the Hilbert polynomial of R/J is $138t - 759$ while the Hilbert polynomial of R/J^{top} is $138t - 1217$.
- J^{top} defines a non-ACM curve of degree 138.
- The component supported on X of the scheme defined by J^{top} has degree 84 and is not ACM.

In sum, almost nothing from Theorem 3.5 can be expected to remain true without the assumption on the degrees.

Example 6.2. The purpose of this example is to show that even the degree of the scheme defined by J^{top} can fail to be what one might expect.

Let ℓ be a line in \mathbb{P}^3 . Let $F \in [I_\ell]_3$ be a cubic surface that is smooth at all points of ℓ . Let D be the non-ACM double line with saturated ideal $I_D = I_\ell^2 + (F)$ (see for instance [12]). Let $G_1 \in [I_D]_4$ and $G_2 \in [I_D]_5$ be general choices; in particular, they form a regular sequence and they are tangent along ℓ (since D contains information about the tangent direction). It turns out that G_1 has one singular point and G_2 has two (distinct) singular points.

Notice that the complete intersection (G_1, G_2) links D to a residual (non-ACM, by liaison) curve E of degree 18; E turns out to be smooth. Denoting by A this complete intersection, note that $A = E \cup D$ and

$$20 = \deg(A) = 18 + 2 = \deg(E) + \deg(D).$$

Now let \mathcal{A} be the hypersurface arrangement defined by $G = G_1 \cdot G_2$, with G_1, G_2 as just defined. As noted, they meet in a reducible complete intersection curve of degree 20 that is non-reduced along a line. Let J be the Jacobian ideal of G . It turns out that J^{top} defines a curve X^{top} of degree 21 (not 20). It consists of the same E together with a curve Y of degree 3 (not 2) supported on ℓ . In fact, Y contains D as a subscheme, and we have

$$X^{top} = E \cup Y.$$

So the process of taking the Jacobian ideal and then the top dimensional part does not simply produce the complete intersection of G_1 and G_2 , and the obstacle arises only along the tangent locus of the two hypersurfaces.

And finally, in fact X^{top} is not ACM! Nor can it be produced using basic double linkage. Thus we need a condition that was not necessary in the case of hyperplanes. For this reason we assume in Theorem 5.2 that any two of the hypersurfaces in \mathcal{A} meet along a smooth complete intersection.

Example 6.3. At the heart of the proof of Theorem 5.2 is the surprising result of Theorem 3.5. In this example we illustrate what may happen if we slightly tweak the assumption of Theorem 3.5. Namely, we start with a complete intersection (a line) in \mathbb{P}^3 but instead of taking a union of surfaces of minimal degree containing it, we increase the degree by one. Specifically, let λ be a line in \mathbb{P}^3 and let G_1, G_2, G_3 be three general quadrics containing it. Let $G = G_1 G_2 G_3$ and let J be the Jacobian ideal of G . Since two quadrics link a line to a twisted cubic, we expect J to define (up to saturation and up to possible embedded points) a non-reduced scheme X supported on λ together with the union of three twisted cubics, C_1, C_2, C_3 .

Our computations on CoCoA give specifically that J is not saturated, but J^{sat} is unmixed and defines curves supported on λ, C_1, C_2, C_3 as predicted. We further see that R/J^{sat} is not ACM, and that neither X nor $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3$ is ACM. In particular, X has degree 4 but is not a complete intersection, as might have been predicted from Theorem 3.5.

The following example suggests that trying to move beyond the results obtained in this paper will not be so easy. It is not clear what the pattern is, at least in the direction we explore below.

Example 6.4. Another possible idea to try to generalize Theorem 5.2 might be to replace the complete intersections by something other than a complete intersection. The simplest example might be allowing one of the base loci to be a twisted cubic curve. Here we explore this and see what may be the ramifications of making this choice. In contrast to Example 6.3, we again take surfaces of smallest possible degree so the only difference is that the base locus is not a complete intersection. Thus we illustrate the importance of the complete intersection assumption in Theorem 3.5.

Let C be a twisted cubic curve in \mathbb{P}^3 and let $G_1, \dots, G_6 \in [I_C]_2$ be general quadrics containing C . First let $G = G_1 \cdots G_4$ and let J be the Jacobian ideal of G . Then J is already a saturated ideal. Its Hilbert polynomial is $30t - 90$. However, the top dimensional part J^{top} of J has Hilbert polynomial $30t - 96$, meaning that J has embedded components. One checks that the scheme defined by J^{top} is ACM. It consists of the union of six lines and a non-reduced component of degree 24 supported on C . This non-reduced component by itself is not ACM.

The existence of the six lines can be explained since there are $\binom{4}{2}$ pairs of quadrics among the G_i , and each pair gives a link of C to a line. The non-ACMness of the component supported on C offers a contrast with the result of Theorem 3.5.

One could hope that at least the ACMness of the top dimensional part is in analogy with Theorem 3.5. So let $G' = G_1 \cdots G_6$ and let J' be the Jacobian ideal of G' . Now J' is not saturated. Its saturation $(J')^{sat}$ has Hilbert polynomial $78t - 494$. One checks that $(J')^{sat}$ is unmixed, but the scheme it defines is not ACM. It consists of the union of 15 lines and a non-reduced curve of degree 63 supported on C . This non-reduced curve is again not ACM.

It is interesting to see how different the results are between taking four elements of $[I_C]_2$ and taking six such elements. Indeed, the absence of a clear pattern is striking. More precisely, we continue to let C be a twisted cubic curve, and we take $G_1, \dots, G_s \in [I_C]_2$ to be general choices, for different values of s . We set \mathcal{A} to be the hypersurface arrangement defined by $G_1 \cdots G_s$.

Note that the residual to a twisted cubic, C , in a general complete intersection of quadrics in $[I_C]_2$ is a line, so as before X^{top} and X^{red} have $\binom{s}{2}$ components that are lines. Of course when $s = 2$ the singular locus of $G_1 G_2$ is a reduced complete intersection linking the twisted cubic to a line, and $X^{red} = X^{top}$ is ACM. So we are more interested in $s \geq 3$. Then X^{top} will consist of a non-reduced component, say Y , and a union of $\binom{s}{2}$ lines.

Using CoCoA in the range $3 \leq s \leq 11$ we find that:

- Sometimes the Jacobian is saturated ($s = 4, 5$) and otherwise it is not.
- Sometimes the saturation is unmixed ($s = 3, 5, 6, 8, 10$) and otherwise it is not.
- Sometimes the entire top dimensional part X^{top} (the union of Y and the lines) is ACM ($s = 3, 4$) and otherwise it is not. It seems that for $s \geq 5$ it always fails to be ACM.
- Even $\deg(Y)$, the degree of the non-reduced component supported on the twisted cubic, and $\deg(X^{top})$ (the union of Y and the skew lines) follow a strange pattern:

s	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
$\deg(Y)$	12	24	42	63	87	117	150	189	231
$\deg(X^{top})$	15	30	52	78	108	145	186	234	286

- The only consistent fact in this range is that the non-reduced component, Y , supported on the twisted cubic is not ACM for all $3 \leq s \leq 11$. However, for $s = 3, 4$ when we add the s lines, the result (X^{top}) becomes ACM.

Again, the conclusion here is that it will be very difficult to obtain further positive ACM results for the top dimensional part of a hypersurface arrangement, once one allows three of them to vanish on the same codimension two component that is not the complete intersection of two of them. Of course we would need to choose as our building blocks not just the non-reduced component supported on the twisted cubic but, instead, the reducible curve X^{top} consisting of the union of this non-reduced component and $\binom{s}{2}$ lines. But as noted, even this is not ACM for $s \geq 5$ (in our data range). Thus we feel that it will be difficult to find a more general set of hypotheses that force X^{top} and X^{red} to be ACM. It may be possible to show that in general (perhaps for s sufficiently large), X^{top} is *not* ACM, and perhaps that X^{red} *is* ACM (depending on whether the union of C and the $\binom{s}{2}$ lines is ACM). So there may be room for further progress here.

Our final example again illustrates why we have the assumptions on reducedness. Of course one immediately sees that the conclusion $J^{top} = \sqrt{J}$ is impossible if J^{top} is not reduced, but there is a more subtle issue that we want to illustrate, involving the ACM conclusion.

Example 6.5. It is well known (see the introduction of [19]) that there is a smooth, non-ACM curve, Z , of degree 8 and genus 5 that is linked to itself in the complete intersection of two Kummer surfaces (which have degree 4). Let \mathcal{A} be the union of these two surfaces. Let J be its Jacobian ideal. Theorem 3.5, or the other results of Section 3, do not quite apply since the complete intersection of the two surfaces is not reduced, and even the support is not a complete intersection (or ACM, although it is smooth). Surprisingly, it still turns out that J^{top} is a complete intersection of type $((s-1)d, (s-1)d) = (4, 4)$ so J^{top} is ACM. But by construction, \sqrt{J} is not ACM. The surfaces used in this example are not smooth, but nevertheless they have only nodes as singularities (so they do not affect J^{top}) and the fact that they are tangent along a curve illustrates one of the difficulties that we face in passing from hyperplanes to hypersurfaces.

7. ARRANGEMENTS IN \mathbb{P}^3 AND HARTSHORNE-RAO MODULES

In this section we restrict to the polynomial ring in four variables, $S = K[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3]$, and consider hypersurface (including hyperplane) arrangements in \mathbb{P}^3 for simplicity. We note though that the results in this section have analogs for arrangements in any projective space \mathbb{P}^n with $n \geq 3$. If J is the Jacobian ideal of a hypersurface arrangement in \mathbb{P}^3 then both ideals J^{top} and \sqrt{J} are unmixed, hence define equidimensional curves in \mathbb{P}^3 . Such a curve C has an even liaison class, which (up to shift) is identified with a finite length graded module $M(C)$. Specifically, we have the following definition.

Definition 7.1. Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be an equidimensional curve with no embedded points. Then we denote by $M(C)$ the *Hartshorne-Rao module* of C , namely the graded module

$$M(C) = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} H^1(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{I}_C(t)).$$

Under our unmixedness assumptions on C , $M(C)$ is a graded module of finite length. It is zero if and only if C is ACM. The even liaison classes of equidimensional curves in \mathbb{P}^3 are in bijective correspondence with the finite length graded R -modules up to shift. More

specifically, curves C and C' are in the same even liaison class if and only if $M(C) \cong M(C')(\delta)$ for some $\delta \in \mathbb{Z}$. See [18] for details.

It is an interesting question to ask which even liaison classes contain curves arising from Jacobian ideals, either as J^{top} or as \sqrt{J} . Thus we focus in this section on the possible Hartshorne-Rao modules of such curves. This question was addressed in [15] in the case of hyperplane arrangements.

In this section we will use the notation \mathcal{A}_g for the arrangement in \mathbb{P}^3 defined by a product g of homogeneous polynomials, and by C_g^{top} and C_g^{red} the curves defined by the ideals J^{top} and \sqrt{J} .

With this notation, we obtain two results about the behavior of Hartshorne-Rao modules associated to modified hypersurface arrangements. In particular, the first result provides a method for producing arrangements with large Hartshorne-Rao modules.

Proposition 7.2. *Let $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$ and $g = g_1 \cdots g_t$ be products of homogeneous polynomials such that*

- (i) *Any two distinct hypersurfaces in \mathcal{A}_{fg} meet in a codimension two smooth subscheme (hence a smooth complete intersection).*
- (ii) *$\text{codim}(f_i, f_j, g) = 3$ whenever $i \neq j$.*
- (iii) *$\text{codim}(f, g_i, g_j) = 3$ whenever $i \neq j$.*

Let $d_1 = \deg f$ and $d_2 = \deg g$. Then

$$M(C_{fg}^{top}) = M(C_f^{top})(-d_2) \oplus M(C_g^{top})(-d_1)$$

and

$$M(C_{fg}^{red}) = M(C_f^{red})(-d_2) \oplus M(C_g^{red})(-d_1)$$

In particular, if C_f^{top} and C_g^{top} are both ACM then so is C_{fg}^{top} . The analogous statement holds for C_{fg}^{red} .

Proof. Theorem 4.6 guarantees that C_{fg}^{top} is indeed obtained by a Liaison Addition, and then the result follows from Theorem 2.3. \square

As a consequence, we see that adding a general hypersurface to an arrangement preserves the even liaison class. In particular, it preserves the Cohen-Macaulay property if present originally.

Corollary 7.3. *Let \mathcal{A}_f be a hypersurface arrangement in \mathbb{P}^3 , defined by $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$. Let g be a homogeneous polynomial of degree d . Assume:*

- (i) *Each complete intersection of the form (f_i, g) is smooth.*
- (ii) *Each complete intersection of the form (f_i, f_j) is smooth.*
- (iii) *$\text{codim}(f_i, f_j, g) = 3$ whenever $i \neq j$.*

Then

$$M(C_{fg}^{top}) = M(C_f^{top})(-d)$$

and

$$M(C_{fg}^{red}) = M(C_f^{red})(-d).$$

In particular, if C_f^{top} is ACM then so is C_{fg}^{top} , and the analogous statement holds for C_{fg}^{red} . More generally, the even liaison class of C_f^{top} is the same as the even liaison class of C_{fg}^{top} , and the even liaison class of C_f^{red} is the same as that of C_{fg}^{red} .

Proof. Corollary 4.7 guarantees that a basic double link is being performed, and so the assertions all follow from Proposition 2.4. We only note that the components coming from factors of f are already accounted for in C_f^{top} (resp. C_f^{red}), and because of the assumption on \mathcal{A}_f the new components are smooth curves coming from the intersection of f and g . \square

In [15], the authors gave an example of a hyperplane arrangement in \mathbb{P}^3 for which J^{top} defines a scheme whose Hartshorne-Rao module is one-dimensional, and one for which \sqrt{J} defines a scheme whose Hartshorne-Rao module is one-dimensional. Then using Liaison Addition, arrangements were produced whose corresponding curves fell into any Buchsbaum liaison class. It is natural to wonder if this can be done with hypersurfaces of larger degree, and in the next example we explore this question.

Example 7.4. The following is motivated by [16, Example 4.5] (see also [15, Example 4.1]). There, a hyperplane arrangement is given for which $J = J^{top}$ is not ACM, and has a one-dimensional Hartshorne-Rao module. (In that example, \sqrt{J} was ACM, but related examples were found in [15] for which \sqrt{J} is not ACM.) Here we take a subset of that example, motivated by [15, Example 4.3] but replacing the linear forms by general quadratic forms. We will see that both J^{top} and \sqrt{J} fail to be ACM.

To stress the connection with those examples, we denote by X, Y, Z, W the general quadrics. We let

$$G := X * Y * Z * W * (X + Y) * (Y + Z) * (Z + W) * (W + X) * (W + X + Y + Z)$$

and take the Jacobian ideal, J , generated by the four partial derivatives of G . This gives an ideal whose quotient has Hilbert polynomial $168t - 1728$. It turns out that the saturation, J^{sat} , has the same Hilbert polynomial but not the same Hilbert function, so J is not saturated. It turns out that the saturation is unmixed: $J^{sat} = J^{top}$. The Betti diagram of R/J^{top} is

	0	1	2	3

0:	1	-	-	-
1:	-	-	-	-
...				
14:	-	-	-	-
15:	-	4	-	-
16:	-	-	-	-
...				
19:	-	-	-	-
20:	-	-	4	-
21:	-	-	-	1

Tot:	1	4	4	1

Notice that the last matrix in this resolution is a 1×4 matrix of quadrics, and one can check that it defines a complete intersection. So the Hartshorne-Rao module of C_G^{top} is a complete intersection. Its components have dimensions $(1, 4, 6, 4, 1)$.

This example suggests (for example) that there might not exist a quadric arrangement yielding a Hartshorne-Rao module that is one dimensional. Indeed, the Mustața-Schenck example gave a Hartshorne-Rao module that was isomorphic to $S/(x, y, z, w)$,

and replacing the variables by quadrics gives a Hartshorne-Rao module isomorphic to $S/(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4)$, where the Q_i are quadrics.

The radical of J also turns out to not be ACM. Its Hilbert polynomial is $96t - 672$ and its Betti diagram is

	0	1	2	3
0:	1	-	-	-
1:	-	-	-	-
...				
12:	-	-	-	-
13:	-	12	-	-
14:	-	-	15	-
15:	-	-	-	4
Tot:	1	12	15	4

Using further quadruples of general quadrics to produce hypersurface arrangements analogous to Example 7.4 and then employing Proposition 7.2, we obtain a hypersurface arrangement whose Hartshorne-Rao modules has a dimension exceeding any finite bound. This also motivates the following question.

Problem 7.5. *Which even liaison classes contain the top-dimensional part of a hypersurface arrangement?*

Bearing in mind that Liaison Addition and Basic Double Linkage also involve shifts of the modules, we pose the following question that partially invokes the Lazarsfeld-Rao property for even liaison classes [2].

Problem 7.6. *Let \mathcal{A} be a hypersurface arrangement in \mathbb{P}^3 defined by a product f of homogeneous polynomials satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 5.2. Let $M = M(C_f^{top})$. Is it true that up to flat deformation, C_f^{top} is the only curve arising as the top-dimensional part of a hypersurface arrangement and having Hartshorne-Rao module M ? (An analogous question can be asked in \mathbb{P}^n .)*

Remark 7.7. (1) Note that Liaison Addition (Theorem 4.6) and Basic Double Linkage (Corollary 4.7) can produce many other curves arising as the top dimensional part of an arrangement, having Hartshorne-Rao module that is a *shift* of M . This question asks about M itself.

Furthermore, if \mathcal{A}_f is such an arrangement and ℓ_1, ℓ_2 are both general linear forms, then it follows from what we have shown in this paper that $C_{\ell_1 f}^{top}$ and $C_{\ell_2 f}^{top}$ are different curves having isomorphic Hartshorne-Rao modules, namely isomorphic to $M(-1)$. However, these curves lie in a flat family, so they do not give a counterexample to our question.

(2) In [14] the authors showed that within any even liaison class of codimension two subschemes of \mathbb{P}^n , the subset of those elements that satisfy a certain numerical property actually has a Lazarsfeld-Rao property of its own. In view of what we have just said, we can further ask the following.

It follows immediately from Corollary 7.3 that once you have a subscheme in an even liaison class coming from an arrangement, then that even liaison class has infinitely many other subschemes, of infinitely many degrees, coming from arrangements. The point of our Problem 7.6 is to give some structure to the

set of all subschemes in an even liaison class coming from arrangements, and in particular to ask whether there are any that do not come directly from Corollary 7.3.

More precisely, let C_f^{top} be a subscheme coming from a hypersurface arrangement defined by f , and let \mathcal{L} be the even liaison class of C_f^{top} . Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{L}$ be the set of elements of \mathcal{L} that arise as the top dimensional parts of hypersurface arrangements. Does \mathcal{M} also satisfy a Lazarsfeld-Rao property? See [2] and [14] for details.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Abbott, A.M. Bigatti, and L. Robbiano, CoCoA : a system for doing Computations in Commutative Algebra, available at <http://cocoa.dima.unige.it>.
- [2] E. Ballico, G. Bolondi and J. Migliore, *The Lazarsfeld-Rao Problem for Liaison Classes of Two-Codimensional Subschemes of \mathbb{P}^n* , Amer. J. Math **113** (1991), 117–128.
- [3] G. Bolondi and J. Migliore, *The structure of an even liaison class*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **316** (1989), 1–37.
- [4] D. Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **150**. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [5] A.V. Geramita, B. Harbourne and J. Migliore, *Star configurations in \mathbb{P}^3* , J. Algebra **376** (2013), 279–299.
- [6] A.V. Geramita, B. Harbourne, J. Migliore and U. Nagel, *Matroid configurations and symbolic powers of their ideals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369**, no. 10 (2017), 7049–7066.
- [7] A.V. Geramita and J. Migliore, *A generalized liaison addition*, J. Algebra **163** (1994), 139–164.
- [8] C. Huneke and B. Ulrich, *General Hyperplane Sections of Algebraic Varieties*, J. Algebraic Geom. **2** (1993), 487–505.
- [9] R. Lazarsfeld and A.P. Rao, *Linkage of general curves of large degree*, In: Algebraic geometry – open problems (Ravello, 1982), 267–289, Lecture Notes in Math., **997**, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [10] H. Matsumura, *Commutative Ring Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Math. **8**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [11] J. Migliore, *Introduction to Liaison Theory and Deficiency Modules*, Progress in Mathematics **165**, Birkhäuser, 1998.
- [12] J. Migliore, *On linking double lines*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **294** (1986), 177–185.
- [13] J. Migliore and U. Nagel, *Reduced arithmetically Gorenstein schemes and simplicial polytopes with maximal Betti numbers*, Adv. Math. **180** (2003), 1–63.
- [14] J. Migliore and U. Nagel, *Numerical Macaulification*, “A celebration of algebraic geometry,” 509–534, Clay Math. Proc., **18**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.
- [15] J. Migliore, U. Nagel and H. Schenck, *Schemes supported on the singular locus of a hyperplane arrangement in \mathbb{P}^n* , Int. Math. Res. Not. **2021**, no. 24 (2021), 18941–18971.
- [16] M. Mustața and H. Schenck, *The module of logarithmic p -forms of a locally free arrangement*, J. Algebra **241** (2001), 699–719.
- [17] J.P. Park and Y-S Shin, *The minimal free graded resolution of a star-configuration in \mathbb{P}^n* . J. Pure Appl. Algebra **219** (2015), 2124–2133.
- [18] A.P. Rao, *Liaison among curves in \mathbb{P}^3* , Invent. Math. **50** (1979), 205–217.
- [19] A.P. Rao, *On self-linked curves*, Duke Math. J. **49** (1982), 251–273.
- [20] P. Schwartau, “Liaison Addition and Monomial Ideals,” Ph.D. thesis, Brandeis University (1982) (thesis advisor: D. Eisenbud).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, IN 46556, USA
Email address: Juan.C.Migliore.1@nd.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, 715 PATTERSON OFFICE TOWER,
 LEXINGTON, KY 40506-0027, USA
Email address: uwe.nagel@uky.edu