ON POINCARÉ BUNDLES OF VECTOR BUNDLES ON CURVES

H. LANGE AND P. E. NEWSTEAD

ABSTRACT. Let M denote the moduli space of stable vector bundles of rank n and fixed determinant of degree coprime to n on a non-singular projective curve X of genus $g \ge 2$. Denote by \mathcal{U} a universal bundle on $X \times M$. We show that, for $x, y \in X, x \neq y$, the restrictions $\mathcal{U}|\{x\} \times M$ and $\mathcal{U}|\{y\} \times M$ are stable and non-isomorphic when considered as bundles on X.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a non-singular projective curve of genus $g \ge 2$ over the field of complex numbers. We denote by M = M(n, L) the moduli space of stable vector bundles of rank n with determinant L of degree d on X, where gcd(n, d) = 1. We denote by \mathcal{U} a universal bundle on $X \times M$. For any $x \in X$ we denote by \mathcal{U}_x the bundle $\mathcal{U}|\{x\} \times M$ considered as a bundle on M.

In a paper of M. S. Narasimhan and S. Ramanan [3] it was shown that \mathcal{U}_x is a simple bundle and that the infinitesimal deformation map

(1)
$$T_{X,x} \to H^1(M, \operatorname{End}(\mathcal{U}_x))$$

is bijective for all $x \in X$. In [1, Proposition 2.4] it is shown that \mathcal{U}_x is semistable with respect to the unique polarization of M. In fact, \mathcal{U}_x is stable; since we could not locate a proof of this in the literature, we include one here.

Let \mathcal{M} denote the moduli space of stable bundles on M having the same Hilbert polynomial as \mathcal{U}_x . Then (1) implies that the natural morphism

$X \to \mathcal{M}$

is étale and surjective onto a component \mathcal{M}_0 of \mathcal{M} .

It is stated in [3] that it can be easily deduced from the results of that paper that the map $X \to \mathcal{M}_0$ is also injective. This would imply

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 14H60; Secondary: 14F05, 32L10.

Key words and phrases. Vector bundle, Poincaré bundle, moduli space.

Both authors are members of the research group VBAC (Vector Bundles on Algebraic Curves). The second author acknowledges support from EPSRC Grant No. EP/C515064, and would like to thank the Mathematisches Institut der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg for its hospitality.

that the curve X can be identified with \mathcal{M}_0 . However no proof of this fact seems to be given. There is a proof in a paper of A. N. Tyurin [5, Theorem 2], but this seems to us to be incomplete. We offer here a proof which is in the spirit of [5]. To be more precise, our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem Let X be a non-singular projective curve of genus $g \ge 2$. If $x, y \in X, x \ne y$, then $\mathcal{U}_x \ne \mathcal{U}_y$.

Note that if X is a general curve of genus $g \ge 3$ or any curve of genus 2, then X does not admit étale coverings $X \to \mathcal{M}_0$ of degree > 1. So for such curves the theorem is immediate. For the proof we can therefore assume that $g \ge 3$. In fact, our proof fails for g = 2.

In Section 2 we prove the stability of \mathcal{U}_x . In Sections 3 and 4 we make some cohomological computations, from which a family of stable bundles on X can be constructed. This construction is carried out in Section 5, where we also use the morphism to M given by this family in order to prove the theorem.

2. Stability of \mathcal{U}_x

Let X be a non-singular projective curve of genus $g \ge 2$. Let $n \ge 2$ and d be integers with gcd(n, d) = 1. There are uniquely determined integers l and e with 0 < l < n and $0 \le e < d$ such that

$$ld - en = 1.$$

The bundles \mathcal{U}_x were shown to be semistable in [1, Proposition 2.4], but the proof does not seem to imply stability directly, even though we know also by [3] that \mathcal{U}_x is simple.

Proposition 2.1. For all $x \in X$, the vector bundle \mathcal{U}_x is stable with respect to the unique polarization of M.

Proof. By [1, Proposition 2.4] the bundle \mathcal{U}_x is semistable. By [4, Remark 2.9] and possibly after tensoring \mathcal{U} by a line bundle on M,

$$c_1(\mathcal{U}_x) = l\alpha,$$

where α is the positive generator of $H^2(M)$. By (2), l and n are coprime. It follows that \mathcal{U}_x is stable.

3. Cohomological constructions

Let l and n be as in (2). Let V be a semistable vector bundle of rank l and degree l(n-l) + e and W a semistable bundle of rank n-l and degree d - e - l(n-l) on X. Then

$$\deg(W^* \otimes V) = nl(n-l) - 1.$$

 $\mathbf{2}$

Let q_i , i = 1, 2, denote the projections of $X \times X$ on the two factors, Δ the diagonal of $X \times X$ and write for brevity

$$U = q_1^*(W^* \otimes V).$$

Lemma 3.1. For $n \ge 2$ and $1 \le i \le n$, (a) $h^0(U(-i\Delta)|\Delta) = (n + (2i - 1)(g - 1))l(n - l) - 1$; (b) $h^1(U(-i\Delta)|\Delta) = 0$.

Proof. Identifying Δ with X, we have $U(-i\Delta)|\Delta = W^* \otimes V \otimes K_X^i$. Since

$$\deg(W^* \otimes V \otimes K_X^i) = (n + (2g - 2)i)l(n - l) - 1 > l(n - l)(2g - 2)$$

and $W^* \otimes V$ is semistable, (b) holds and Riemann-Roch gives (a). \Box

Lemma 3.2. For $n \geq 2$,

$$h^{1}(U(-n\Delta)) = gh^{0}(W^{*} \otimes V) + l(n-l)(n-1)(g(n-1)+1) - (n-1).$$

Proof. For $0 \leq i \leq n$, consider the exact sequence

(3)
$$0 \to U(-(i+1)\Delta) \to U(-i\Delta) \to U(-i\Delta)|\Delta \to 0$$

on $X \times X$. For i = 0, this sequence gives

$$0 \to H^1(U(-\Delta)) \to H^1(U) \stackrel{\psi}{\to} H^1(U|\Delta),$$

since the restriction map $H^0(U) \to H^0(U|\Delta)$ is an isomorphism. The map ψ is surjective, since its restriction to the Künneth component $H^1(W^* \otimes V) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}) \subset H^1(U)$ is an isomorphism. Hence

$$h^{1}(U(-\Delta)) = h^{1}(U) - h^{1}(U|\Delta)$$

= $h^{1}(W^{*} \otimes V)h^{0}(\mathcal{O}) + h^{0}(W^{*} \otimes V)h^{1}(\mathcal{O}) - h^{1}(W^{*} \otimes V)$
= $g \cdot h^{0}(W^{*} \otimes V).$

For $1 \le i \le n-1$, the sequence (3) gives, by Lemma 3.1 (b),

$$0 \to H^0(U(-i\Delta)|\Delta) \to H^1(U(-(i+1)\Delta)) \to H^1(U(-i\Delta)) \to 0.$$

This gives, by Lemma 3.1 (a) and the above computation,

$$h^{1}(U(-n\Delta)) = h^{1}(U(-\Delta)) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h^{0}(U(-i\Delta)|\Delta)$$

= $gh^{0}(W^{*} \otimes V) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} ((n+(2i-1)(g-1))l(n-l)-1)$
= $gh^{0}(W^{*} \otimes V) + l(n-l)(n-1)(g(n-1)+1) - (n-1).$

Lemma 3.3. Let $n \ge 2$ and $x \in X$. Then, except in the case when n = 2 and $W^* \otimes V \simeq \mathcal{O}(x)$, $h^1(U(-n\Delta - X \times \{x\}) = h^1(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) + l(n-l)(n-1)^2g - (n-1).$

Proof. For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ consider the exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ll} 0 \rightarrow U(-(i+1)\Delta - X \times \{x\}) \rightarrow & U(-i\Delta - X \times \{x\}) \\ & \rightarrow U(-i\Delta - X \times \{x\}) |\Delta \rightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

on $X \times X$. Identifying Δ with X, we have

$$U(-i\Delta - X \times \{x\}) | \Delta \simeq K_X^i \otimes W^* \otimes V(-x).$$

If either $i \ge 2$ or $n \ge 3$,

$$\deg(K_X^i \otimes W^* \otimes V(-x)) > l(n-l)(2g-2).$$

So semistability implies

(4)
$$h^1(K_X^i \otimes W^* \otimes V(-x)) = 0.$$

If n = 2 and i = 1, then $W^* \otimes V$ has rank 1 and

$$\deg(K_X \otimes W^* \otimes V(-x)) = 2g - 2.$$

So (4) is still true, unless $W^* \otimes V \simeq \mathcal{O}(x)$.

Now Riemann-Roch implies

$$h^{0}(K_{X}^{i} \otimes W^{*} \otimes V(-x)) = ((2g-2)i + n - g)l(n-l) - 1.$$

Hence applying the above sequence n-1 times, we get

$$\begin{aligned} h^{1}(U(-n\Delta - X \times \{x\}) &= \\ &= h^{1}(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h^{0}(K_{X}^{i} \otimes W^{*} \otimes V(-x)) \\ &= h^{1}(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \{((2g-2)i + n - g)l(n - l) - 1\} \\ &= h^{1}(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) + l(n - l)(n - 1)^{2}g - (n - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose (V, W) is a general pair of bundles on X with the given ranks and degrees. Here by "general" we mean that the theorem of Hirschowitz (see [2]) is true, which says that either $H^0(W^* \otimes V) = 0$ or $H^1(W^* \otimes V) = 0$.

Proposition 3.4. For $n \geq 3$, $g \geq 3$ and (V, W) general, there is a 2-dimensional vector subspace $T_0 \subset H^1(U(-n\Delta))$ such that the restriction map

(5)
$$H^1(U(-n\Delta)) \to H^1(W^* \otimes V(-nx))$$

is injective on T_0 for all $x \in X$.

Proof. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \to U(-n\Delta - X \times \{x\}) \to U(-n\Delta) \to U(-n\Delta) | X \times \{x\} \to 0$$

on $X \times X$. Since $U(-n\Delta)|X \times \{x\} \simeq W^* \otimes V(-nx)$ is of degree -1and $W^* \otimes V$ is semistable, this gives $h^0(W^* \otimes V(-nx)) = 0$ and thus $0 \to H^1(U(-n\Delta - X \times \{x\}) \to H^1(U(-n\Delta)) \to H^1(W^* \otimes V(-nx)).$ We claim that

(6)
$$C := h^1(U(-n\Delta)) - h^1(U(-n\Delta - X \times \{x\})) \ge 3$$

According to Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3,

$$C = gh^{0}(W^{*} \otimes V) + l(n-l)(n-1) - h^{1}(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})).$$

Now the exact sequence

$$0 \to U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\}) \to U(-X \times \{x\}) \to U(-X \times \{x\}) |\Delta \to 0$$
 implies

$$\begin{aligned} h^1(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\}) &\leq h^0(U(-X \times \{x\}) | \Delta) + h^1(U(-X \times \{x\})) \\ &= h^0(W^* \otimes V(-x)) + gh^0(W^* \otimes V). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$C \ge l(n-l)(n-1) - h^0(W^* \otimes V(-x)).$$

According to the above mentioned theorem of Hirschowitz, either $H^0(W^* \otimes V) = 0$ or $H^1(W^* \otimes V) = 0$. In the first case also $H^0(W^* \otimes V(-x)) = 0$ and thus

$$C \ge l(n-l)(n-1) \ge 3.$$

In the second case Riemann-Roch implies

$$h^{0}(W^{*} \otimes V(-x)) \le h^{0}(W^{*} \otimes V) = (n+1-g)l(n-l) - 1$$

and thus, for $g \geq 3$,

$$C \ge l(n-l)(g-2) + 1 \ge 3.$$

We have thus proved (6) in all cases. This implies that the codimension of the union of the kernels of (5) for $x \in X$ is at least 2. Hence there is a vector subspace T_0 of dimension 2 meeting this union in 0 only. \Box

4. The case
$$n = 2$$

Now suppose n = 2, which implies l = 1. So V and W are line bundles with $\deg(W^* \otimes V) = 1$. In this case the proof of Proposition 3.4 fails. In fact, we have to choose V and W such that

$$W^* \otimes V \simeq \mathcal{O}(x_0)$$

for some fixed $x_0 \in X$. Then Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 remain true and so does Lemma 3.3 except when $x = x_0$.

Proposition 4.1. For n = 2, there is a (g - 1)-dimensional vector subspace $T_1 \subset H^1(U(-2\Delta))$ such that the restriction map

$$H^1(U(-2\Delta)) \to H^1(W^* \otimes V(-2x))$$

is injective on T_1 for all $x \in X$.

Proof. Since $h^0(W^* \otimes V) = 1$, Lemma 3.2 says that

$$h^1(U(-2\Delta)) = 2g$$

Lemma 3.3 implies that, if $x \neq x_0$, then

(7)
$$h^1(U(-2\Delta - X \times \{x\})) = h^1(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) + g - 1.$$

If $x = x_0$, then the same proof gives

(8) $h^1(U(-2\Delta - X \times \{x\})) \le h^1(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) + g.$

Now consider the exact sequence

(9)
$$0 \to U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\}) \to U(-X \times \{x\}) \to U(-X \times \{x\}) |\Delta \to 0$$

on $X \times X$. Since under the identification of Δ with X ,

$$U(-X \times \{x\})|\Delta \simeq \mathcal{O}(x_0 - x),$$

we get, for $x \neq x_0$,

$$0 \to H^1(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) \to H^1(U(-X \times \{x\})) \xrightarrow{\varphi} H^1(\mathcal{O}(x_0 - x)).$$

The map φ is surjective, since its dual is the canonical injection

$$H^{0}(K_{X}(x-x_{0})) \to \operatorname{Hom}(H^{0}(\mathcal{O}(x_{0})), H^{0}(K_{X}(x))) = H^{0}(K_{X}(x)).$$

Hence

$$h^{1}(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) = h^{1}(U(-X \times \{x\})) - h^{1}(\mathcal{O}(x_{0} - x)))$$

= $h^{0}(\mathcal{O}(x_{0}))h^{1}(\mathcal{O}(-x)) - h^{1}(\mathcal{O}(x_{0} - x)))$
= $g - (g - 1) = 1.$

If $x = x_0$, the map φ is still surjective and thus an isomorphism. So (9) implies

$$h^{1}(U(-\Delta - X \times \{x\})) = h^{0}(\mathcal{O}(x_{0} - x)) = 1.$$

Now (7) and (8) give

(10)
$$h^{1}(U(-2\Delta - X \times \{x\})) \begin{cases} \leq g+1 & if \quad x = x_{0}, \\ = g & if \quad x \neq x_{0}. \end{cases}$$

Now

$$0 \to U(-2\Delta - X \times \{x\}) \to U(-2\Delta) \to U(-2\Delta) | X \times \{x\} \to 0$$

gives

$$0 \to H^1(U(-2\Delta - X \times \{x\})) \to H^1(U(-2\Delta)) \to H^1(W^* \otimes V(-2x)).$$

So the kernel of the restriction map is $H^1(U(-2\Delta - X \times \{x\}))$ which, together with (10), implies the assertion as in the proof of Proposition 3.4.

5. Proof of the Theorem for $g \ge 3$

We want to consider extensions of the form

$$0 \to q_1^* V(-(n-l)\Delta) \to E \to q_1^* W(l\Delta) \to 0$$
 (e)

on $X \times X$. The extension (e) is classified by an element $e \in H^1(U(-n\Delta))$. The restriction of (e) to $X \times \{x\}$ is the extension

$$0 \to V(-(n-l)x) \to E_x \to W(lx) \to 0$$

corresponding to the image of e in $H^1(W^* \otimes V(-nx))$. We can therefore choose a vector subspace T_0 of $H^1(U(-n\Delta))$ of dimension 2 such that, for all $0 \neq e \in T_0$, the image of e in $H^1(W^* \otimes V(-nx))$ is non-zero. Note that

$$\det E_x = \det(V(-(n-l)x)) \otimes \det(W(lx)) = \det V \otimes \mathcal{O}(-l(n-l)x) \otimes \det W \otimes \mathcal{O}(l(n-l)x) = \det V \otimes \det W$$

for all x. On the other hand, by [4, Lemma 2.1], provided V and W are stable, the bundle E_x is stable for all $0 \neq e \in T_0$ and all $x \in X$.

Let $\mathbb{P}^1 = P(T_0)$ and consider the product variety $X \times X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Let p_i and p_{ij} denote the projections of $X \times X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. The non-trivial extensions of the form (e) with $e \in T_0$ form a family parametrized by \mathbb{P}^1 which has the form (see for example [4, Lemma 2.4]) (11)

$$0 \to p_1^* V \otimes p_{12}^* \mathcal{O}(-(n-l)\Delta)) \to \mathcal{E} \to p_1^* W \otimes p_{12}^* \mathcal{O}(l\Delta) \otimes p_3^*(\tau^*) \to 0,$$

where τ is the tautological hyperplane bundle on \mathbb{P}^1 .

Proof of the Theorem. By what we have said above, \mathcal{E} is a family of stable bundles on X of fixed determinant $L = \det V \otimes \det W$ parametrized by $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. This gives a morphism

$$f: X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to M$$

such that

$$(\mathrm{id} \times f)^* \mathcal{U} \simeq \mathcal{E} \otimes p_{23}^*(N)$$

for some line bundle $N \in \operatorname{Pic}(X \times \mathbb{P}^1)$. Considering

$$\mathcal{E}_x = \mathcal{E}|\{x\} \times X \times \mathbb{P}^1$$

as a bundle on $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, we have

$$f^*\mathcal{U}_x\simeq \mathcal{E}_x\otimes N.$$

Hence, in order to complete the proof of the theorem, it suffices to show that the bundle $\mathcal{E}_x \otimes N$ determines the point x.

For this we compute the Chern class $c_2(\mathcal{E}_x \otimes N)$ in the Chow group $\mathrm{CH}^2(X \times \mathbb{P}^1)$.

From (11) we get

(12)
$$c_1(\mathcal{E}) = p_1^*\beta - (n-l)p_3^*h$$

where β is the class of det $V \otimes \det W$ in $\operatorname{CH}^1(X)$ and h is the positive generator of $\operatorname{CH}^1(\mathbb{P}^1)$.

For the computation of $c_2(\mathcal{E})$ we use the formula

$$c_2(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = c_2(\mathcal{F}) + (r-1)c_1(\mathcal{F})c_1(\mathcal{L}) + \binom{r}{2}c_1(\mathcal{L})^2$$

for any vector bundle \mathcal{F} of rank r and any line bundle \mathcal{L} .

The only terms in $c_2(\mathcal{E})$ which can possibly survive in $c_2(\mathcal{E}_x)$ when restricting are those involving $[\Delta]h$. So $c_2(p_1^*V \otimes p_{12}^*\mathcal{O}(-(n-l)\Delta))$ does not contribute. The coefficient of $[\Delta]h$ in $c_2(p_1^*W \otimes p_{12}^*\mathcal{O}(l\Delta) \otimes p_3^*(\tau^*))$ is $\binom{n-l}{2}(-2l)$ and the coefficient of $[\Delta]h$ in

$$c_1(p_1^*V \otimes p_{12}^*\mathcal{O}(-(n-l)\Delta)) \cdot c_1(p_1^*W \otimes p_{12}^*\mathcal{O}(l\Delta) \otimes p_3^*(\tau^*))$$

is $-l(n-l)(-(n-l)) = l(n-l)^2$. This implies

$$c_2(\mathcal{E}_x) = l(n-l)(-(n-l-1)+n-l)(x \times p) = l(n-l)(x \times p),$$

where p is the class of a point in \mathbb{P}^1 .

Hence, using (12), we get that

$$c_2(\mathcal{E}_x \otimes N) = l(n-l)(x \times p) + \gamma$$

with $\gamma \in CH^2(X \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ independent of x.

If $\mathcal{U}_x \simeq \mathcal{U}_y$, then $l(n-l)((x-y) \times p) = 0$ in $\mathrm{CH}^2(X \times \mathbb{P}^1)$. This is equivalent to

$$l(n-l)(x-y) = 0$$
 in $CH^{1}(X) = Pic(X)$.

Hence x - y is a point of finite order dividing l(n - l) in $\operatorname{Pic}^{0}(X)$. But there are only finitely many such points in $\operatorname{Pic}^{0}(X)$ and any such point has at most 2 representations of the form x - y (2 occurs only if X is hyperelliptic). So, for general $x \in X$, there is no $y \in X$ such that x - yis of finite order dividing l(n - l) in $\operatorname{Pic}^{0}(X)$.

Now, as stated in the introduction, the natural morphism $X \to \mathcal{M}_0$, $x \mapsto \mathcal{U}_x$ is étale and surjective. We have now proved that this étale morphism has degree 1. Hence it is an isomorphism, which completes the proof of the theorem. \Box

References

- V. Balaji, L. Brambila-Paz and P. E. Newstead: Stability of the Poincaré Bundle. Math. Nachr. 188 (1997), 5-15.
- [2] A. Hirschowitz: Problème de Brill-Noether de Rang Supérieur. Université de Nice, Prépublication Mathématiques No 91 (1986).
- [3] M. S. Narasimhan and S. Ramanan: Deformations of the moduli space of vector bundles over an algebraic curve. Ann. of Math. 101 (1975), 391-417.
- [4] S. Ramanan: The moduli space of vector bundles over an algebraic curve. Math. Ann. 200 (1973), 69-84.
- [5] A. N. Tyurin: The geometry of moduli of vector bundles. Usp. Mat. Nauk 29:6 (1974). 59-88. Russian Math. Surv. 29:6 (1974), 57-88.

H. LANGE, MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT ERLANGEN-NÜRNBERG, BISMARCKSTRASSE $1\frac{1}{2}$, D-91054 ERLANGEN, GERMANY *E-mail address*: lange@mi.uni-erlangen.de

P.E. NEWSTEAD, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL, PEACH STREET, LIVERPOOL L69 7ZL, UK

E-mail address: newstead@liv.ac.uk