

# Stability of Frobenius pull-backs of tangent bundles and generic injectivity of Gauss maps in positive characteristic

ATSUSHI NOMA

*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Education, Yokohama National University, 79-2 Tokiwadai, Hodogaya-ku, Yokohama, 240, Japan; e-mail: nom@ms.ed.ynu.ac.jp*

Received 4 July 1995; accepted in final form 22 December 1995

**Abstract.** For a smooth projective variety  $X$  of dimension  $n$  in a projective space  $\mathbb{P}^N$  defined over an algebraically closed field  $k$ , the Gauss map is a morphism from  $X$  to the Grassmannian of  $n$ -planes in  $\mathbb{P}^N$  sending  $x \in X$  to the embedded tangent space  $T_x X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ . The purpose of this paper is to prove the generic injectivity of Gauss maps in positive characteristic for two cases; (1) weighted complete intersections of dimension  $n \geq 3$  of general type; (2) surfaces or 3-folds with  $\mu$ -semistable tangent bundles; based on a criterion of Kaji by looking at the stability of Frobenius pull-backs of their tangent bundles. The first result implies that a conjecture of Kleiman–Piene is true in case  $X$  is of general type of dimension  $n \geq 3$ . The second result is a generalization of the injectivity for curves.

**Mathematics Subject Classifications (1991):** Primary 14N05, 14F10; Secondary 14M10, 14J29, 14F05, 14J60

**Key words:** Gauss map, tangent bundle, stable vector bundle

## 1. Introduction

Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension  $n$  over an algebraically closed field  $k$  of characteristic  $p > 0$ . Let  $\iota: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$  be an embedding whose image is not linear. Set  $H = \iota^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(1)$  and  $L = \Omega_X^n \otimes H^{\otimes(n+1)}$ , where  $\Omega_X^q$  denotes the sheaf of differential  $q$ -forms. Recall that the Gauss map of  $\iota$  is a morphism  $\iota^{(1)}: X \rightarrow \mathbf{Grass}(\mathbb{P}^N, n)$  sending  $x \in X$  to the  $n$ -dimensional embedded tangent space  $T_x X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ .

A result of Zak [15, Ch. I, (2.8)] asserts the finiteness of the Gauss map  $\iota^{(1)}$ , equivalently the ampleness of  $L$ , in arbitrary characteristic, and the birationality of  $\iota^{(1)}$  in characteristic 0. In positive characteristic, the birationality and even the generic injectivity of  $\iota^{(1)}$  are no longer true in general. But several results suggest that the Gauss map would be generically injective for most cases; in other words, the field extension  $K(X)$  over  $K(\iota^{(1)}(X))$  would be purely inseparable ([6, 7, 8, 10, 12]).

The purpose of this paper is to prove the generic injectivity of Gauss maps in positive characteristic for two cases, by giving a criterion for the injectivity in terms of the stability of tangent bundles and by looking at the stability.

Our main results are the following:

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth weighted complete intersection defined over  $k$ . Suppose that  $X$  is of  $\dim X = n \geq 3$  and of general type. Then the Gauss maps  $\iota^{(1)}$  are generically injective for any embeddings  $\iota: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ .*

**THEOREM 1.2.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension  $n = 2$  or  $3$  over  $k$  and  $\iota: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$  an embedding. Set  $H = \iota^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  and  $L = \Omega_X^n \otimes H^{\otimes(n+1)}$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the first piece of the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of the tangent bundle  $T_X$  with respect to  $L$  (see Section 3). Assume that  $(c_1(\mathcal{T}), L^{n-1}) < 0$ . When  $n = 3$ , we assume in addition that  $\mathcal{T}$  is not of rank 2. Then the Gauss map  $\iota^{(1)}$  is generically injective.*

Here  $( )$  denotes the intersection products of line bundles.

Theorem 1.1 implies that a conjecture of Kleiman–Piene [10], the generic injectivity of the Gauss map of a smooth complete intersection  $X$  for the natural embedding, is true when  $X$  is of dimension  $n \geq 3$  and of general type. Our result is applicable not only to other projective variety than a ‘usual’ complete intersection but also to a complete intersection with any embedding in a projective space. Theorem 1.2 is one of a generalization of results for curves [6, 7] and [10]; roughly speaking, those assert that Gauss maps of smooth curves of genus  $g \geq 2$  are always generically injective for any embeddings. In fact, Theorem 1.2 implies that the Gauss map  $\iota^{(1)}$  of a smooth surface or 3-fold of general type with  $\mu$ -stable tangent bundle with respect to  $L$  is generically injective.

To obtain these results, we essentially use Kaji’s criterion for the generic injectivity of Gauss maps given in [8] (see (2.1)). By using Kaji’s criterion, first we prove our key criterion via stability: Namely, if every  $e$ th Frobenius pull-back of the tangent bundle has no subsheaf of non-negative  $\mu$ -slope with respect to  $L$ , then the Gauss map  $\iota^{(1)}$  is generically injective (Proposition 3.1). Next we look at the stability of the Frobenius pull-backs of the tangent bundles and prove the main theorems. In Section 4, we show that every Frobenius pull-back of the tangent bundle of a smooth weighted complete intersection is  $\mu$ -stable if the intersection is of general type and of dimension  $\geq 3$  (Proposition 4.2). In Section 5, we show that if the tangent bundle of a smooth surface or 3-fold has no subsheaf of non-negative  $\mu$ -slope, then the same is true for every  $e$ th Frobenius pull-back of the tangent bundle, based on Shepherd–Barron’s argument [14, (9.1.3.3)]. Consequently, we obtain the main theorems by the above criterion.

### 1.1. NOTATION

Unless otherwise mentioned, we work over an algebraically closed field  $k$  of characteristic  $p > 0$  throughout. By a variety, we mean an irreducible and reduced algebraic scheme over  $k$ . By the  $e$ th Frobenius morphism of a variety  $X$  defined over  $k$ , we mean the induced morphism from the  $p^e$ th power map of the structure

sheaf. For a torsion-free  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{E}$  on a variety  $X$  over  $k$ , by  $\mathcal{E}^\vee$  we denote the dual  $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_X)$ , and by  $c_1(\mathcal{E})$  we mean  $\det(\mathcal{E})^{\vee\vee}$ .

## 2. Kaji's criterion for generic injectivity of Gauss maps

**PROPOSITION 2.1** (Kaji [8], [9]). *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of  $\dim X = n$  over  $k$  and  $\iota: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$  an embedding whose image is not linear. Set  $H = \iota^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$  and  $L = \Omega_X^n \otimes H^{\otimes(n+1)}$ . Consider the following condition for  $X$  and  $\iota$ , called Kaji's condition (K):*

$$H^0(Y, f^*(T_X \otimes H^\vee) \otimes \sigma^* f^* H) = 0$$

*holds for any finite surjective morphism  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  from a normal projective variety  $Y$  with a decomposition  $f = g \circ h$ ,  $h: Y \rightarrow Y'$  a finite, separable morphism to a normal projective variety  $Y'$  and  $g: Y' \rightarrow X$  a finite, purely inseparable morphism, and for any  $k$ -automorphism  $\sigma: Y \rightarrow Y$  of finite order with  $\sigma^* f^* L = f^* L$ .*

*If Kaji's condition (K) holds for  $X$  and  $\iota$ , then the Gauss map  $\iota^{(1)}$  is generically injective.*

*Remark 2.2.* Kaji's criterion above is a key step in his proof of the main theorem in [8] and hence it is not stated explicitly in [8]. The criterion in the form above will be given in the forthcoming paper [9]. Historically, the prototype of the criterion and its proof were already announced in Kaji's seminar talk at Waseda University in July 1989.

## 3. Criterion for generic injectivity of Gauss maps via stability

First we recall notation and results about stability (see, for example, [13]). In general, let  $X$  be a normal projective variety of dimension  $n$  over  $k$  with an ample line bundle  $L$ . For a torsion-free  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{E}$  of rank  $r$ , we set  $\mu_L(\mathcal{E}) = (c_1(\mathcal{E}), L^{n-1})/r$ . We say that  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $\mu$ -stable (resp.  $\mu$ -semistable) with respect to  $L$  if for every  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -submodule  $\mathcal{F}$  ( $0 < \text{rank } \mathcal{F} < r$ ), we have  $\mu_L(\mathcal{F}) < (\text{resp. } \leq) \mu_L(\mathcal{E})$ . For the Harder–Narasimhan filtration (or H.-N. filtration, for short)  $0 = \mathcal{E}_0 \subset \mathcal{E}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{E}_l = \mathcal{E}$  of a torsion-free  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{E}$  with respect to  $L$  (w.r.t.  $L$ ) (i.e.,  $\mathcal{E}_i/\mathcal{E}_{i-1}$  are torsion-free  $\mu$ -semistable with  $\mu_L(\mathcal{E}_1/\mathcal{E}_0) > \cdots > \mu_L(\mathcal{E}_l/\mathcal{E}_{l-1})$ ), we set

$$\mu_{L-\max}(\mathcal{E}) = \mu_L(\mathcal{E}_1/\mathcal{E}_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{L-\min}(\mathcal{E}) = \mu_L(\mathcal{E}_l/\mathcal{E}_{l-1})$$

and by the *type* of  $\mathcal{E}$  we mean a sequence of numbers  $(\text{rank}(\mathcal{E}_1/\mathcal{E}_0), \dots, \text{rank}(\mathcal{E}_l/\mathcal{E}_{l-1}))$ . We sometimes call  $\mathcal{E}_1$  the first piece of the H.-N. filtration of  $\mathcal{E}$ . With

this notation, for torsion-free  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$  with  $\mu_{L-\min}(\mathcal{E}') > \mu_{L-\max}(\mathcal{E})$ , we have  $\text{Hom}_X(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{E}) = 0$ .

Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of  $\dim X = n$  over  $k$  and  $\iota: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$  an embedding whose image is not linear. Set  $H = \iota^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  and  $L = \Omega_X^n \otimes H^{\otimes(n+1)}$ . Note that  $L$  is ample by a corollary of Zak's finiteness theorem of  $\iota^{(1)}$  [15, Ch. I, (2.14)].

**PROPOSITION 3.1.** *Let  $X$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $H$  and  $L$  be as above. If  $\mu_{L-\max}(F^{e*}T_X) < 0$  for every  $e$ th Frobenius morphism  $F^e: X \rightarrow X$  ( $e \geq 0$ ), then the Gauss map  $\iota^{(1)}$  is generically injective.*

*Proof.* By (2.1), we have only to show that the condition (K) holds. Assume to the contrary that the vanishing in (K) does not hold for some  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  and  $\sigma: Y \rightarrow Y$ . Hence  $f^*T_X$  has a submodule  $f^*H \otimes \sigma^*f^*H^\vee$  with  $((f^*L)^{n-1}, f^*H \otimes \sigma^*f^*H^\vee) = 0$ , and hence  $\mu_{f^*L-\max}(f^*T_X) \geq 0$ . Since  $h$  is finite and separable, by Gieseker [3, (1.1)], we have  $\mu_{g^*L-\max}(g^*T_X) \geq 0$ . By noting that  $g$  is purely inseparable, let  $\pi: X \rightarrow Y'$  a morphism with  $g \circ \pi = F^e$  for some  $e \geq 0$ . Since  $F^{e*}L = L^{\otimes p^e}$  and since  $\pi$  is flat in codimension 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p^{e(n-1)} \mu_{L-\max}(F^{e*}T_X) &= \mu_{F^{e*}L-\max}(\pi^*g^*T_X) \\ &\geq (\deg \pi) \mu_{g^*L-\max}(g^*T_X) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts to the assumption.  $\square$

From Proposition 3.1, we recover an improved version of Kaji [8] (see [9]). Recall that a vector bundle  $\mathcal{F}$  on a normal projective variety  $X$  of dimension  $n$  with an ample and globally generated line bundle  $L$  is *generically ample* with respect to  $L^{\otimes m_1}, \dots, L^{\otimes m_{n-1}}$  ( $m_i > 0$ ) if its restriction  $\mathcal{F}|_C$  is ample on  $C$  for a complete intersection scheme  $C = D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_{n-1}$  with  $D_i \in |L^{\otimes m_i}|$  (see [9]).

**COROLLARY 3.2** ([9]). *Let  $X$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $H$  and  $L$  be as in (3.1). If the tangent bundle  $T_X$  is an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -submodule of a vector bundle  $\mathcal{F}$  whose dual  $\mathcal{F}^\vee$  is generically ample with respect to  $L^{\otimes m_1}, \dots, L^{\otimes m_{n-1}}$  for some  $m_i > 0$ , then the Gauss map  $\iota^{(1)}$  is generically injective.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the first piece of the H.-N. filtration of  $F^{e*}\mathcal{F}$ . If  $D_i \in |L^{\otimes m_i}|$  are general, then  $\mathcal{F}^\vee|_C$  is ample on  $C = D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_{n-1}$  by the open property of ampleness ([4, Sect. 4, (4.4)]), and  $\mathcal{E}|_C$  is a subbundle of  $F^{e*}\mathcal{F}|_C$ . Since  $F^e|_C: C \rightarrow C$  is finite,  $(F^{e*}\mathcal{F}|_C)^\vee$  is ample, and hence  $\deg \mathcal{E}|_C < 0$ . Since  $F^e$  is flat, we have  $\mu_{L-\max}(F^{e*}T_X) \leq \mu_{L-\max}(F^{e*}\mathcal{F}) = \mu_L(\mathcal{E}) < 0$  as required.  $\square$

#### 4. Stability of $F^{e*}T_X$ for weighted complete intersections

In this section, we fix the following notation (see [11]). A weak projective space  $\mathbb{P}$  is an open subscheme  $\cap_{\nu > 1} D_+(\{T_\beta; \nu \nmid e_\beta\})$  of a weighted projective space

$\text{Proj } k[T_0, \dots, T_{n+m}]$ , where the grading of  $R := k[T_0, \dots, T_{n+m}]$  is defined by  $\deg T_\beta = e_\beta > 0 (0 \leq \beta \leq n+m)$  and  $\deg a = 0 (a \in k)$ . A weighted complete intersection  $X$  of  $\mathbb{P}$  is a complete subscheme of  $\mathbb{P}$  isomorphic to  $\text{Proj}(R/(F_1, \dots, F_m))$  for some homogeneous regular sequence  $F_1, \dots, F_m$  of  $R$  with  $\deg F_\alpha = d_\alpha$ . If  $e_\beta = 1$  for every  $\beta$ , then  $X$  is a complete intersection in the usual sense.

**LEMMA 4.1.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth weighted complete intersection of dimension  $n$ . For every  $e$ th Frobenius morphism  $F^e: X \rightarrow X (e \geq 0)$ ,*

$$H^t(X, (F^{e*}\Omega_X^q) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(\ell)) = 0 \tag{4.1.0}$$

holds for  $\ell < 0, 0 \leq t + q \leq n - 1$ , and  $1 \leq q \leq n - 1$ .

*Proof.* For an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $X$  and for  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we set  $\mathcal{G}(\ell) = \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(\ell)$ . First we claim that

$$H^t(X, F^{e*}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}^q \otimes \mathcal{O}_X)(\ell)) = 0 \tag{4.1.1}$$

for  $0 \leq t \leq n - 1, 1 \leq q \leq n - 1$ , and  $\ell < 0$ . To prove this, we consider the Frobenius pull-back of the restriction of the Euler sequence on  $\mathbb{P}(e)$  to  $X$  (see [11, Remark 2.4]),

$$0 \rightarrow F^{e*}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}^1 \otimes \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n+m} \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e e_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0.$$

By taking the exterior product  $\wedge^q$  and the twist by  $\mathcal{O}_X(\ell)$ , for each  $q (1 \leq q \leq n - 1)$ , we have an exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow F^{e*}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}^q \otimes \mathcal{O}_X)(\ell) &\rightarrow (\wedge^q \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n+m} \mathcal{O}_X(-e_i p^e))(\ell) \\ &\rightarrow F^{e*}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}^{q-1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X)(\ell) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.2}$$

We note that

$$H^t(X, (\wedge^q \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n+m} \mathcal{O}_X(-e_i p^e))(\ell)) = 0$$

for every  $t (0 \leq t \leq n - 1)$  and  $q (0 \leq q \leq n - 1)$  (see [11, Proposition 3.3]). So the claim (4.1.1) follows from (4.1.2) by induction on  $q$ .

Now we prove the vanishing (4.1.0) by induction on  $q$ . By pulling back the conormal-to-cotangents sequence of  $X$  to  $\mathbb{P}$  by  $F^e$ , we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\alpha=1}^m \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e d_\alpha) \rightarrow F^{e*}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}^1 \otimes \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow F^{e*}\Omega_X^1 \rightarrow 0. \tag{4.1.3}$$

When  $q = 1$ , by using (4.1.3), the vanishing (4.1.0) follows from  $H^t(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\ell - p^e d_\alpha)) = 0 (0 \leq t \leq n - 1, 1 \leq \alpha \leq m)$  and from (4.1.1) for  $q = 1$ .

When  $1 < q \leq n-1$ , the exact sequence (4.1.3) induces a filtration of  $F^{e*}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}^q \otimes \mathcal{O}_X)$ ,

$$0 = \mathcal{F}_{q+1} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_q \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_j \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_0 = F^{e*}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}^q \otimes \mathcal{O}_X)$$

such that

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{j+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_j \rightarrow (F^{e*}\Omega_X^{q-j}) \otimes (\wedge^j \oplus_{\alpha=1}^m \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e d_{\alpha})) \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.1.4)$$

are exact for  $j$  ( $j = 0, \dots, q$ ) (see, for example, [5, Ch. II Ex. 5.16]). Before proving the vanishing (4.1.0) for this  $q$ , we prove that

$$H^t(X, \mathcal{F}_j(\ell)) = 0 \quad (4.1.5)$$

for every  $j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq q$ ) and  $t$  ( $0 \leq t \leq n - q - 1 + j$ ), by descending induction on  $j$ . If  $1 < q \leq m$ , we have only to start this induction from  $j = q$  with

$$\mathcal{F}_q(\ell) = \bigoplus_{1 \leq \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_q \leq m} \mathcal{O}_X(\ell - p^e(d_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + d_{\alpha_q})),$$

and hence our claim (4.1.5) for  $j = q$  follows. If  $q > m$ , we have only to start from  $j = m$  with

$$\mathcal{F}_m(\ell) = (F^{e*}\Omega_X^{q-m})(\ell - p^e \sum_{\alpha=1}^m d_{\alpha}),$$

and hence our claim (4.1.5) for  $j = m$  follows from the inductive hypothesis (4.1.0) on  $q$ . For general  $j \geq 1$ , by using (4.1.4), our claim (4.1.5) follows from the inductive hypothesis (4.1.5) on  $j$  and the inductive hypothesis (4.1.0) on  $q$ . Thus, in particular, we have  $H^t(X, \mathcal{F}_1(\ell)) = 0$  for  $0 \leq t \leq n - q$ . Therefore, (4.1.0) for  $q$  ( $1 < q \leq n - 1$ ) follows from the vanishing above and (4.1.1), by using the exact sequence (4.1.4) for  $j = 0$ .  $\square$

**PROPOSITION 4.2.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth weighted complete intersection of dimension  $n \geq 3$ . The  $e$ th Frobenius pull-backs  $F^{e*}\Omega_X^1$  ( $e \geq 0$ ) are  $\mu$ -stable (resp.  $\mu$ -semistable) with respect to  $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$  (and hence with respect to every ample line bundle on  $X$ ) if  $X$  is of general type (resp. of Kodaira dimension 0).*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a submodule of  $F^{e*}\Omega_X^1$  of rank  $r$  ( $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$ ). So there is an injection  $(\wedge^r \mathcal{F})^{\vee\vee} \rightarrow F^{e*}\Omega_X^r$ . Since  $\text{Pic } X \cong \mathcal{O}_X(1) \cdot \mathbb{Z}$  by Grothendieck–Lefschetz theorem for  $\dim X \geq 3$  [11, Theorem 3.7], we may assume that  $c_1(\mathcal{F}) = (\wedge^r \mathcal{F})^{\vee\vee} = \mathcal{O}_X(\ell)$  for some  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Hence  $H^0(X, (F^{e*}\Omega_X^r) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-\ell)) \neq 0$ . By (4.1), we have  $\ell \leq 0$ . Therefore

$$\mu_{\mathcal{O}_X(1)}(\mathcal{F}) = (\deg X/r)\ell \leq 0 < (\text{resp. } \leq) \mu_{\mathcal{O}_X(1)}(F^{e*}\Omega_X^1).$$

Thus  $F^{e*}\Omega_X^1$  is  $\mu$ -stable (resp.  $\mu$ -semistable) w.r.t.  $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ . Since  $\text{Pic } X \cong \mathcal{O}_X(1) \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ , the same is true for the  $\mu$ -stability w.r.t. any ample line bundle on  $X$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* By (4.2), for every  $e$ th Frobenius morphism  $F^e : X \rightarrow X$  ( $e \geq 0$ ),  $F^{e*}\Omega_X^1$  is  $\mu$ -stable with respect to  $L$ , and hence the dual  $F^{e*}T_X$  is  $\mu$ -stable of  $\mu_L(F^{e*}T_X) < 0$ . Therefore the theorem follows from (3.1).  $\square$

*Remark 4.3.* In (4.2), the assumption  $n = 3$  is used only when we deduce  $\text{Pic } X \cong \mathcal{O}_X(1) \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus the same results as in (4.2) and hence (1.1) hold for a weighted complete intersection surface with  $\text{Pic } X \cong \mathcal{O}_X(1) \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ .

### 5. Stability of $F^{e*}T_X$ for surfaces and 3-folds

First we slightly generalize a lemma of Shepherd–Barron. To this purpose, we recall a result from foliation theory in positive characteristic due to Ekedahl ([1], see also [14, (9.1.2.1)]). A smooth 1-foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  on a smooth variety  $X$  is a subbundle of  $T_X$  closed under the bracket and  $p$ th power operation of derivations. Then there exist a smooth variety, denoted by  $X/\mathcal{F}$ , and a  $k$ -morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow X/\mathcal{F}$  with the following properties:  $X/\mathcal{F}$  is homeomorphic to  $X$  via  $\pi$ ;  $\mathcal{O}_{X/\mathcal{F}}$  consists of those elements of  $\mathcal{O}_X$  killed by the derivations of  $\mathcal{F}$ ; and  $\pi$  is purely inseparable of  $\text{deg } \pi = p^{\text{rank } \mathcal{F}}$  factoring through the  $k$ -Frobenius morphism  $F_X : X \rightarrow X^{(-1)}$  as  $F_X = \lambda \circ \pi$  for some  $\lambda : X/\mathcal{F} \rightarrow X^{(-1)}$ . Here  $X^{(e)}$  denotes the base change of  $X$  by the  $p^e$ th power map of  $k$ . Conversely, a factorization  $X \xrightarrow{\pi} Y \xrightarrow{\lambda} X^{(-1)}$  with a smooth variety  $Y$  and a finite surjective  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  is recovered by a smooth 1-foliation  $\mathcal{F} := \text{Ker}(d\pi)$  in this way.

LEMMA 5.1 (Shepherd-Barron, cf. [14, (9.1.3.3)]). *Let  $X$  be a normal projective variety of  $\dim X = n$ , and  $L$  an ample line bundle on  $X$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a torsion-free  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module that is  $\mu$ -semistable with respect to  $L$  but the Frobenius pull-back  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} := F^*\mathcal{E}$  is not. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a piece of the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ , and set  $\mathcal{B} = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}/\mathcal{A}$ . Then there exists a nonzero map  $T_X \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{B})^{\vee\vee}$ , and hence  $\mu_{L-\min}(T_X) \leq \mu_{L-\max}((\mathcal{A}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{B})^{\vee\vee})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{E}^{(-1)}$  be the pull-back of  $\mathcal{E}$  to  $X^{(-1)}$ , and hence  $F^*\mathcal{E} = F_X^*\mathcal{E}^{(-1)}$ . We consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{F}} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^{(-1)}) \\
 & \searrow \sigma & \downarrow \tilde{\pi} & \square & \downarrow \pi \\
 & & X & \xrightarrow{F_X} & X^{(-1)}.
 \end{array}$$

Here  $\pi, \tilde{\pi}$ , and  $\sigma$  are natural projections and  $\tilde{F}$  is the base change morphism of  $F_X$  by  $\pi$ . Let  $U \subseteq X$  be the largest open subset of points  $x$  where  $\mathcal{O}_{x,X}$  is regular, and  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_x$  and  $\mathcal{B}_x$  are free. Set  $\mathbb{P} = \pi^{-1}(U^{(-1)})$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} = \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(U)$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}' = \sigma^{-1}(U)$ . Since  $\tilde{F}$  factors through  $F_{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}})}$ , by Ekedahl [1],  $\mathcal{H} := T_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}/\mathbb{P}} = \text{Ker}(d\tilde{F})$  is a smooth 1-foliation with  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}/\mathcal{H} \cong \mathbb{P}$ . Since  $\tilde{\pi}$  is the base change of  $\pi$  by  $F_X$ , a natural map  $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\pi}^*T_U$  is isomorphism. Let  $\tau: \mathcal{H}' := \mathcal{H}|_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'/\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$  be the composition of the inclusion and a natural map  $T_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'/\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$  to the normal bundle of  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'$  to  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ .

Then we claim that  $\tau$  is nonzero. Indeed, if not,  $\mathcal{H}'$  is a smooth 1-foliation of  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'$ . Set  $\mathbb{P}' = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}'/\mathcal{H}'$ . Then the induced inclusion  $\mathbb{P}' \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}$  is a bundle homomorphism over  $U^{(-1)}$ , since  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}' \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  is a bundle homomorphism and  $\mathbb{P} = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}/\mathcal{H}$ . So a torsion-free quotient  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{B}'$  of  $\mathcal{E}^{(-1)}$  such that  $\mathcal{B}'|_{U^{(-1)}}$  corresponds to  $\mathbb{P}'$  destroys the stability of  $\mathcal{E}$ , since  $\mu_L(\mathcal{B}) < \mu_L(\tilde{\mathcal{E}})$  and since  $p(c_1(\mathcal{B}'), L^{n-1}) = (c_1(\mathcal{B}), L^{n-1})$ . Thus  $\tau$  is nonzero. By pushing  $\tau$  out by  $\sigma$ , we have a nonzero map  $T_X \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{B})^{\vee\vee}$ . By stability, we have  $\mu_{L-\min}(T_X) \leq \mu_{L-\max}((\mathcal{A}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{B})^{\vee\vee})$ .  $\square$

**COROLLARY 5.2.** *Let  $X, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ , and  $L$  be as in (5.1). Let  $0 = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0 \subset \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1 \subset \dots \subset \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_l = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  ( $l \geq 2$ ) be the Harder–Narasimhan filtration  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  with respect to  $L$ . Assume that  $\text{rank } \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \leq 3$ . Set  $\rho(1, 1) = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\rho(2, 1) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $\rho(1, 2) = \frac{2}{3}$ , and  $\rho(1, 1, 1) = 1$ . Then we have*

$$\mu_L(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1) \leq p\mu_L(\mathcal{E}) - \rho(\text{rank } \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1/\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0, \dots, \text{rank } \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_l/\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{l-1}) \cdot \mu_{L-\min}(T_X).$$

*Proof.* Set  $\mathcal{G}_i = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i/\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{i-1}$ . Since  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i$  or  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}/\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i$  is of rank 1 and hence  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i = \mathcal{G}_i$  or  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}/\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i = \mathcal{G}_{i+1}$ , for each  $i$ , we have

$$\mu_{L-\max}((\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i^\vee \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{E}}/\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i)^{\vee\vee}) = \mu_L((\mathcal{G}_i^\vee \otimes \mathcal{G}_{i+1})^{\vee\vee}) = \mu_L(\mathcal{G}_{i+1}) - \mu_L(\mathcal{G}_i).$$

Applying (5.1) to  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i$ , we have  $\mu_L(\mathcal{G}_i) - \mu_L(\mathcal{G}_{i+1}) \leq -\mu_{L-\min}(T_X)$ . By the definition of  $\mu_L$ , we have  $\sum_i \text{rank } \mathcal{G}_i \cdot \mu_L(\mathcal{G}_i) = \text{rank } \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \cdot \mu_L(\tilde{\mathcal{E}})$ . Thus we get the required inequalities.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* By (3.1), we have only to show that  $\mu_{L-\max}(F^{e*}T_X) < 0$  for every  $e \geq 0$ . By stability, we have only to check that for every  $e \geq 0$ ,  $F^{e*}T_X$  has a (possibly trivial) filtration each of whose graded piece is a torsion-free  $\mu$ -semistable  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module of negative  $\mu$ -slope.

First we consider the case when  $T_X$  is  $\mu$ -semistable. Hence  $\mu_{L-\min}(T_X) = \mu_L(T_X)$ . When  $F^{e*}T_X$  is also  $\mu$ -semistable for  $e > 0$ , then there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, let  $e_0 (< e)$  be the least non-negative integer such that  $F^{e_0*}T_X$  is  $\mu$ -semistable but  $F^{e_0+1*}T_X$  is not. Let  $0 = \mathcal{T}_0 \subset \mathcal{T}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{T}_l = F^{e_0+1*}T_X$  be the H.-N. filtration and set  $e_1 = e - (e_0 + 1)$ .

When  $F^{e_0+1*}T_X$  is of type (1, 1) (resp. (1, 1, 1)), by (5.2) for  $\mathcal{E} = F^{e_0*}T_X$  and our assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_2/\mathcal{T}_1) &< \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_1) \leq p\mu_L(F^{e_0*}T_X) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_L(T_X) \\ &= (p^{e_0+1} - \frac{1}{2})\mu_L(T_X) < 0 \\ \text{(resp. } \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_3/\mathcal{T}_2) &< \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_2/\mathcal{T}_1) < \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_1) \leq (p^{e_0+1} - 1)\mu_L(T_X) < 0.) \end{aligned}$$

Thus for  $e_1 := e - (e_0 + 1)$ ,  $F^{e_1*}(\mathcal{T}_{i+1}/\mathcal{T}_i)$  are torsion-free sheaves of rank 1 of negative  $\mu$ -slopes, as required.

When  $F^{e_0+1*}T_X$  is of type (2, 1) (resp. (1, 2)), by (5.2) and our assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_2/\mathcal{T}_1) &< \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_1) \leq (p^{e_0+1} - \frac{1}{3})\mu_L(T_X) < 0 \\ \text{(resp. } \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_2/\mathcal{T}_1) &< \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_1) \leq (p^{e_0+1} - \frac{2}{3})\mu_L(T_X) < 0.) \end{aligned}$$

Set  $e_1 = e - (e_0 + 1)$  and  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}_1$  (resp.  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}_2/\mathcal{T}_1$ ). If  $F^{e_1*}\mathcal{G}$  is  $\mu$ -semistable, then there is nothing to prove. If  $F^{e_1*}\mathcal{G}$  is not  $\mu$ -semistable, let  $e_2$  be the least integer with  $e - (e_0 + 1) > e_2 \geq 0$  such that  $F^{e_2*}\mathcal{G}$  is  $\mu$ -semistable but  $F^{e_2+1*}\mathcal{G}$  is not. For the H.-N. filtration  $0 \subset \mathcal{S}_1 \subset \mathcal{S}_2 = F^{e_2+1*}\mathcal{G}$  of  $F^{e_2+1*}\mathcal{G}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_L(\mathcal{S}_2/\mathcal{S}_1) &< \mu_L(\mathcal{S}_1) \leq p\mu_L(F^{e_2*}\mathcal{G}) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_L(T_X) \\ &\leq \{p^{e_2+1}(p^{e_0+1} - \frac{1}{3}) - \frac{1}{2}\}\mu_L(T_X) < 0 \\ \text{(resp.} &\leq \{p^{e_2+1}(p^{e_0+1} - \frac{2}{3}) - \frac{1}{2}\}\mu_L(T_X) < 0) \end{aligned}$$

by (5.2) and our assumption. Thus for  $e_3 := e - (e_0 + e_2 + 2)$ , we have  $\mu_L(F^{e_3*}(\mathcal{S}_2/\mathcal{S}_1)) < \mu_L(F^{e_3*}\mathcal{S}_1) < 0$  and  $\mu_L(F^{e_1*}(\mathcal{T}_2/\mathcal{T}_1)) < 0$  (resp.  $\mu_L(F^{e_1*}\mathcal{T}_1) < 0$ ), as required.

Second we consider the case when  $T_X$  is not  $\mu$ -semistable with H.-N. filtration  $0 = \mathcal{T}_0 \subset \mathcal{T}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{T}_l = T_X$ . By assumption, the type of  $T_X$  is (1, 1), (1, 1, 1), or (1, 2).

When  $T_X$  is of type (1, 1) (resp. (1, 1, 1)), by assumption, we have  $0 > \mu_L(F^{e*}(\mathcal{T}_1/\mathcal{T}_0)) > \dots > \mu_L(F^{e*}(\mathcal{T}_l/\mathcal{T}_{l-1}))$ , as required.

When  $T_X$  is of type (1, 2) with H.-N. filtration  $0 \subset \mathcal{T}_1 \subset \mathcal{T}_2 = T_X$ , we have  $0 > \mu_L(\mathcal{T}_1) > \mu_L(T_X) > \mu(T_X/\mathcal{T}_1) = \mu_{L-\min}(T_X)$ . By the similar argument as in the case of  $F^{e_0+1*}T_X$  of type (1, 2), we have  $\mu_{L-\max}(F^{e*}T_X) < 0$  for  $e \geq 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark 5.3.* (1) When  $X$  is a smooth 3-fold such that the first piece  $\mathcal{T}$  of the H.-N. filtration of  $T_X$  is of rank 2, by the same argument as above, it turns out that the Gauss map  $\iota^{(1)}$  is generically injective if  $(2(p + 1)/3)\mu_L(\mathcal{T}) < \mu_L(T_X) < \mu_L(\mathcal{T}) < 0$ .

(2) In the proof of (1.2) above, by using only the ampleness of  $L$  but without using the form of  $L = \Omega_X^n \otimes H^{\otimes n+1}$ , we show that for a smooth projective surface or 3-fold, if  $\mu_{L-\max}(T_X) < 0$ , then  $\mu_{L-\max}(F^{e*}T_X) < 0$  for every  $e$ th Frobenius morphism  $F^e$ , with the exceptional case for  $n = 3$ .

(3) A result of Ekedahl [2, Theorem 2.4] tells us the structure of surfaces of non- $\mu$ -stable tangent bundles in case  $\mu_{L-\max}(T_X) \geq (\Omega_X^2, L)/(p-1)$ .

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Hajime Kaji for his several seminar talks on the Gauss map at Waseda University and for giving me his preprint [8]. I am also grateful to Professor Noboru Nakayama for informing me Shepherd–Barron’s paper [14] before this work.

### References

1. Ekedahl, T.: Foliations and inseparable morphisms, In Algebraic Geometry, Bowdoin 1985, (Proc. of Symp. Pure Math., Vol. 46-2) S. Bloch (ed.), *Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1987, pp. 139–150.
2. Ekedahl, T.: Canonical models of surfaces of general type in positive characteristic, *Publ. Math. IHES* 67 (1988), 98–144.
3. Gieseker, D.: On a theorem of Bogomolov on Chern classes of stable bundles, *Amer. J. Math.* 101 (1979), 77–85.
4. Hartshorne, R.: Ample vector bundles, *Publ. Math. IHES* 29 (1966), 63–94
5. Hartshorne, R.: *Algebraic Geometry*, (Graduate Texts in Math. Vol. 52), Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1977.
6. Kaji, H.: On the Gauss maps of space curves in characteristic  $p$ , *Compositio Math.* 70 (1989), 177–197.
7. Kaji, H.: On the Gauss maps of space curves in characteristic  $p$ , II, *Compositio Math.* 78 (1991), 261–269.
8. Kaji, H.: On the pure inseparability of the Gauss map, preprint 1992 (unpublished).
9. Kaji, H. and Noma, A.: On the generic injectivity of the Gauss map in positive characteristic, to appear in *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 482 (1997).
10. Kleiman, S. and Piene, R.: On the inseparability of the Gauss map, In Enumerative Algebraic Geometry, Proceedings of the 1989 Zeuthen Symposium (Contemp. Math., Vol. 123), *Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1991, pp. 107–129.
11. Mori, S.: On a generalization of complete intersections, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* 15-3 (1975), 619–646.
12. Piene, R.: Projective algebraic geometry in positive characteristic, In Analysis, Algebra and Computer in Mathematical Research, Proc. Twenty-First Nordic Congress of Math., M. Gyllenberg and L. Persson, (eds.) Dekker, New York-Basel-Hong Kong, 1994, pp. 263–273
13. Shatz, S.: The decomposition and specialization of algebraic families of vector bundles, *Compositio Math.* 35 (1977), 163–187.
14. Shepherd-Barron, N.I.: Miyaoka’s theorems on the generic semi-negativity of  $T_X$  and on the Kodaira dimension of minimal regular threefolds, In Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds, A summer seminar at the university of Utah, Salt Lake City, 1991 (Astérisque Vol. 211), J. Kollár (ed.), *Soc. Math. France*, 1992, pp. 103–114.
15. Zak, F.L.: Tangents and secants of algebraic varieties, Transl. Math. Monographs, *Amer. Math. Soc.* 127 (1993).