

Counter-example to global Torelli problem for irreducible symplectic manifolds

Yoshinori Namikawa

A simply connected compact Kaehler manifold X is an irreducible symplectic manifold if there is an everywhere non-degenerate holomorphic 2-form Ω on X with $H^0(X, \Omega_X^2) = \mathbf{C}[\Omega]$. By definition, X has even complex dimension. There is a canonical symmetric form q_X on $H^2(X, \mathbf{Z})$, which is called the Beauville-Bogomolov form (cf. [Be]).

On the other hand, since X is Kaehler, $H^2(X, \mathbf{Z})$ has a natural Hodge structure of weight 2. If two irreducible symplectic manifolds X and Y are bimeromorphically equivalent, then there is a natural Hodge isometry between $(H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}), q_X)$ and $(H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z}), q_Y)$ (cf. [O, Proposition (1.6.2)], [Huy, Lemma 2.6]).

Debarre [De] has constructed bimeromorphically equivalent irreducible symplectic manifolds X and Y such that X and Y are not isomorphic. This is a counter-example to the following problem.

Biregular Torelli Problem: *Let X and Y be irreducible symplectic manifolds of the same dimension such that there is a Hodge isometry $\phi : (H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}), q_X) \rightarrow (H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z}), q_Y)$. Is X isomorphic to Y ?*

In this paper we shall give a counter-example to the following problems.

Bimeromorphic Torelli Problem (cf. [Mu, (5.10)], [Huy, (10.1)]): *Let X and Y be irreducible symplectic manifolds of the same dimension such that there is a Hodge isometry $\phi : (H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}), q_X) \rightarrow (H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z}), q_Y)$. Are X and Y bimeromorphically equivalent?*

Polarized Torelli Problem: *Let (X, L) and (Y, M) be polarized irreducible symplectic manifolds of the same dimension such that there is a Hodge isometry $\phi : (H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}), q_X) \rightarrow (H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z}), q_Y)$ with $\phi([L]) = [M]$. Is (X, L) isomorphic to (Y, M) as a polarized variety?*

In the paragraphs 1, ..., 4 we construct a counter-example to Bimeromorphic Torelli Problem, and in 5 we discuss Polarized Torelli Problem.

1. Let T be a complex torus of dimension 2 and let $\text{Hilb}^{n+1}(T)$ be the Hilbert scheme (or Douady space) that parametrizes length $n+1$ points on T . There is a Hilbert- Chow map $h : \text{Hilb}^{n+1}(T) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^{n+1}(T)$. Here $\text{Sym}^{n+1}(T)$ is the $n+1$ symmetric product of T . Given a group structure on T , we have

a holomorphic map $\alpha : \text{Sym}^{n+1}(T) \rightarrow T$ by sending $[p_1, \dots, p_{n+1}]$ to Σp_i . Let $K^n(T)$ be the fiber over $0 \in T$ of the composite of two maps:

$$\text{Hilb}^{n+1}(T) \rightarrow T.$$

Then $K^n(T)$ becomes an irreducible symplectic manifold of $\dim 2n$ (cf. [Be]). Let q be the Beauville-Bogomolov form on $K^n(T)$.

Let us consider the case where $n = 2$. Put $\bar{K}^2(T) := \alpha^{-1}(0)$. Then $\bar{K}^2(T)$ has only quotient singularities. The singular locus Σ of $\bar{K}^2(T)$ is isomorphic to T . There is a bimeromorphic map $h_0 : K^2(T) \rightarrow \bar{K}^2(T)$ and its exceptional locus E is an irreducible divisor of $K^2(T)$. The general fiber of the map $E \rightarrow \Sigma$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{P}^1 . Let F be a resolution of E . Then there is a holomorphic surjective map from F to Σ . This map coincides with the Albanese map of F . Therefore, the Albanese variety of F is isomorphic to T .

2. By [Yo, Lemma(4.10), Proposition(4.11)], there is a natural Hodge isometry for $n \geq 2$:

$$H^2(K^n(T), \mathbf{Z}) \cong H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}) \oplus \mathbf{Z}\delta,$$

where the left hand side is equipped with the Beauville-Bogomolov form q and the right hand side is the direct sum of two lattices $(H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}), (\cdot, \cdot))$ and $\mathbf{Z}\delta$ with $\delta^2 = -2(n+1)$. The Hodge structure on the right hand side is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H^{2,0} &:= H^{2,0}(T), \\ H^{1,1} &:= H^{1,1}(T) \oplus \mathbf{C}\delta, \text{ and} \\ H^{0,2} &:= H^{0,2}(T). \end{aligned}$$

By the construction (cf. [Yo, (4.3.1)]) we have $2\delta = [E]$.

3. Let T be a complex torus of dimension 2 such that

- (1) the dual torus T^* of T is not isomorphic to T , and
- (2) the Neron-Severi group of T is trivial: $\text{NS}(T) = 0$.

Since $H_1(T, \mathbf{Z}) \cong H^1(T^*, \mathbf{Z})$, we have a pairing $H^1(T, \mathbf{Z}) \times H^1(T^*, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$. This induces the non-degenerate pairing $\wedge^2 H^1(T, \mathbf{Z}) \times \wedge^2 H^1(T^*, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$. Since $\wedge^2 H^1(T, \mathbf{Z}) = H^2(T, \mathbf{Z})$ and $\wedge^2 H^1(T^*, \mathbf{Z}) = H^2(T^*, \mathbf{Z})$, we have the non-degenerate pairing $H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}) \times H^2(T^*, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$. This pairing induces an isomorphism $H^2(T^*, \mathbf{Z}) \cong \text{Hom}(H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{Z})$. By the cup-product $H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}) \times H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H^4(T, \mathbf{Z}) \cong \mathbf{Z}$, $\text{Hom}(H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{Z})$ is identified with $H^2(T, \mathbf{Z})$. Therefore we obtain a canonical isomorphism

$$\alpha_T : H^2(T^*, \mathbf{Z}) \cong H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}).$$

By Shioda [Sh], this isomorphism is a Hodge isometry. By the paragraph **2**, there is a Hodge isometry $H^2(K^2(T^*), \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(K^2(T), \mathbf{Z})$ extending this Hodge isometry. Now we shall prove the following.

¹The isomorphism $H^4(T, \mathbf{Z}) \cong \mathbf{Z}$ is given by the orientation defined by the complex structure

Proposition. *There are no bimeromorphic maps from $K^2(T)$ to $K^2(T^*)$.*

4. (*Proof of Proposition*): We put $X := K^2(T)$ and $Y := K^2(T^*)$. Assume that there is a bimeromorphic map $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$. Since $\omega_X \cong \mathcal{O}_X$ and $\omega_Y \cong \mathcal{O}_Y$ we see that f is an isomorphism in codimension 1. Therefore, f induces an isomorphism $f^* : H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z}) \cong H^2(X, \mathbf{Z})$. Moreover, this map induces an isomorphism $\text{Pic}(Y) \cong \text{Pic}(X)$. By **2** and the assumption (2) of **3** we see that $\text{Pic}(X) = \mathbf{Z}\delta$ and $\text{Pic}(Y) = \mathbf{Z}\delta^*$. Since f^* is a Hodge isometry with respect to Beauville-Bogomolov forms (cf. [O, Proposition (1.6.2)], [Huy, Lemma 2.6]), we conclude that $f^*(\delta^*) = \delta$ or $f^*(\delta^*) = -\delta$. But, since 2δ (resp. $2\delta^*$) is represented by E (resp. E^*) (see paragraph **2**), the latter case does not occur because X and Y are Kaehler manifolds. Now, since f is an isomorphism in codimension 1, f induces a bimeromorphic map between E and E^* . As in **1**, let F (resp. F^*) be a resolution of E (resp. E^*). Since F and F^* are bimeromorphic, there should be a natural isomorphism between their Albanese varieties. By **1**, $\text{Alb}(F) = T$ and $\text{Alb}(F^*) = T^*$. This contradicts the assumption (1) of **3**.

Remark 1. As is well known, three Torelli problems are affirmative for $K3$ surfaces. Our counter-example is valid only for $K^n(T)$ with $n \geq 2$. The situation is quite different for the Kummer surface $K^1(T)$. First note that the exceptional locus of the bimeromorphic map $h_0 : K^1(T) \rightarrow \bar{K}^1(T)$ consists of sixteen (-2) -curves C_i . Let M be the smallest primitive sublattice of $H^2(K^1(T), \mathbf{Z})$ containing $\oplus \mathbf{Z}[C_i]$.

In $H^2(K^1(T), \mathbf{Z})$, the primitive sublattice $H^2(\bar{K}^1(T), \mathbf{Z})$ is isomorphic to $(H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}), 2<, >)$, where $<, >$ is the cup product on T . Since $H^2(K^1(T), \mathbf{Z})$ is a unimodular lattice, $H^2(\bar{K}^1(T), \mathbf{Z}) \oplus M$ is of finite index > 1 in $H^2(K^1(T), \mathbf{Z})$.

As in **3**, let T^* be the dual torus of T . Then the Hodge isometry $H^2(T^*, \mathbf{Z}) \cong H^2(T, \mathbf{Z})$ constructed in **3** induces an isometry between $H^2(\bar{K}^1(T^*), \mathbf{Z}) \oplus M^*$ and $H^2(\bar{K}^1(T), \mathbf{Z}) \oplus M$. However, this isometry does not extend to an isometry between $H^2(K^1(T^*), \mathbf{Z})$ and $H^2(K^1(T), \mathbf{Z})$.

5. One can construct an example in the category of projective varieties. For example, let T be an Abelian surface such that

- (1) the dual torus T^* of T is not isomorphic to T , and
- (2) $\text{NS}(T) = \mathbf{Z}[H]$ with $H^2 = 6$.

Put $H^* := \alpha_T^{-1}(H)$. One can check that H^* is an ample class of $H^2(T^*, \mathbf{Z})$. Then, in the proof of Proposition, $\text{Pic}(X) = \mathbf{Z}H \oplus \mathbf{Z}\delta$ and $\text{Pic}(Y) = \mathbf{Z}H^* \oplus \mathbf{Z}\delta^*$. Since f^* induces an isometry between these two lattices, it is easily checked that $f^*(H^*) = H$ or $-H$, and $f^*(\delta^*) = \delta$ or $-\delta$. By the same argument as Proposition, the latter cases are excluded and we have $f^*(H^*) = H$ and $f^*(\delta^*) = \delta$. Therefore, we conclude that $K^2(T)$ and $K^2(T^*)$ are not bimeromorphically equivalent.

Let us identify $H^2(K^2(T), \mathbf{Z})$ (resp. $H^2(K^2(T^*), \mathbf{Z})$) with $H^2(T, \mathbf{Z}) \oplus \mathbf{Z}\delta$ (resp. $H^2(T^*, \mathbf{Z}) \oplus \mathbf{Z}\delta^*$) as in **2**. If $m > 0$ is a sufficiently large integer, then

$[L] := m[H] - \delta \in H^2(K^2(T), \mathbf{Z})$ and $[M] := m[H^*] - \delta^* \in H^2(K^2(T^*), \mathbf{Z})$ are both ample classes. The Hodge isometry $H^2(K^2(T), \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(K^2(T^*), \mathbf{Z})$ in **3** sends $[L]$ to $[M]$. So this gives a counter-example to Polarized Torelli Problem.

Remark 2. If we replace the Abelian surface T in **5** by the one with $H^2 = 4$, then a Fourier-Mukai transform induces an isomorphism $\phi : K^2(T^*) \rightarrow K^2(T)$ such that $\phi^*(H) = 5H^* - 4\delta^*$, $\phi^*(\delta) = 6H^* - 5\delta^*$ (cf. [Yo, Propositions (3.5),(4.9)]).

Remark 3. Let T be an Abelian surface and T^* its dual. Put $X = K^2(T)$ and $Y = K^2(T^*)$. Let $D(X)$ (resp. $D(Y)$) be the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves on X (resp. Y). Then there is an equivalence of categories between $D(X)$ and $D(Y)$. In fact, the symmetric group $G := S_3$ acts on $T^3 := T \times T \times T$ by the permutation. G acts also on $N := \{(x, y, z) \in T^3; x + y + z = 0\}$. Let $G\text{-Hilb}(N)$ be the G -Hilbert scheme of the G -variety N (cf. [B-K-R]). Then the irreducible component of $G\text{-Hilb}(N)$ containing the free orbits becomes X (cf. [Ha, Theorem 5.1]). Now apply [B-K-R, Corollary 1.3] to the diagram

$$X \rightarrow N/G \leftarrow N.$$

Then we have an equivalence of categories $\psi : D(X) \cong D^G(N)$, where $D^G(N)$ is the bounded derived category of coherent G -sheaves on N . Similarly we get an equivalence of categories $\psi^* : D(Y) \cong D^G(N^*)$, where $N^* := \{(x, y, z) \in (T^*)^3; x + y + z = 0\}$. Since N^* is the dual Abelian variety of N , the Fourier-Mukai transform induces an equivalence between $D^G(N)$ and $D^G(N^*)$. Therefore, we have an equivalence between $D(X)$ and $D(Y)$.

Question: Let X and Y be two irreducible symplectic manifolds such that there is a Hodge isometry $(H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}), q_X) \cong (H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z}), q_Y)$. Then, is there an equivalence of categories between $D(X)$ and $D(Y)$?

When X and Y are $K3$ surfaces, $D(X)$ and $D(Y)$ are equivalent if and only if there is a Hodge isometry between transcendental lattices of $H^2(X, \mathbf{Z})$ and $H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ ([Or]).

There are another series of examples of irreducible symplectic manifolds, namely those which are deformation equivalent to $\text{Hilb}^n(S)$ with S being a $K3$ surface. I do not know any negative evidence for Bimeromorphic Torelli Problem for such manifolds.

Acknowledgement. The author thanks A. Fujiki, S. Mukai, Y. Kawamata and D. Huybrechts for discussion or comments on this paper.

References

- [Be] Beauville, A.: Variétés Kähleriennes dont la première classe de Chern est nulle, J. Diff. Geom. **18**, 755-782 (1983)

- [B-K-R] Bridgeland, T., King, A., Reid, M.: The McKay correspondence as an equivalence of derived categories, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (3), 535-554 (2001)
- [De] Debarre, Un contre-exemple au théorème de Torelli pour les variétés symplectiques irréductibles, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris, t. **299**, Série I, **14** 681- 684 (1984)
- [Ha] Haiman, M.: Hilbert schemes, polygraphs and the MacDonalld positivity conjecture, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (4), 941-1006 (2001)
- [Huy] Huybrechts, D.: Compact hyper-Kaehler manifolds: basic results, Invent. Math. **135**, 63-113 (1999)
- [Mu] Mukai, S.: Moduli of vector bundles on $K3$ surfaces, and symplectic manifolds, Sugaku Exposition **1**, 139-174 (1988)
- [O] O'Grady, K.: The weight-two Hodge structure of moduli spaces of sheaves on a $K3$ surface, J. Alg. Geom. **6**, 599-644 (1997)
- [Or] Orlov, D.: Equivalences of derived categories and $K3$ surfaces, J. Math. Sci.(New York) **84**, (5), 1361-1381 (1997)
- [Sh] Shioda, T.: The period map of abelian surfaces, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sect. IA, **25**, 47-59 (1978)
- [Yo] Yoshioka, K.: Moduli spaces of stable sheaves on Abelian surfaces, preprint, math.AG/0009001

Erratum.(added in Aug. 4, 2002): Remark 3 is not correct. In fact, the G action on N induces a natural G action on N^* , but this action *differs* from the permutaion of $(x, y, z) \in N^*$. Let $D^G(N^*)$ be the same as in Remark 3 and let $D^G(N^*)'$ be the bounded derived category of coherent G -sheaves with respect to this induced G -action. There is an equivalence between $D^G(N)$ and $D^G(N^*)'$ by the same reason as Remark 3, but there is no such equivalence between $D^G(N)$ and $D^G(N^*)$. The quotient variety N^*/G for the induced G -action on N^* is actually a symplectic V-manifold, but it has no crepant resolutions.

Department of Mathematics, Graduate school of science, Osaka University,
Toyonaka, Osaka 560, Japan