

## ERRATA FOR THE PRACTICE OF ALGEBRAIC CURVES

DAVID EISENBUD AND JOE HARRIS

p. 9, Theorem 0.3: We should have added the hypothesis that  $X \cap Y$  is generically smooth.

As stated, this version of Bézout's theorem can fail when the intersection scheme  $X \cap Y$  is not generically smooth. For example If  $X$  is the union of two 2-planes meeting in a point in  $\mathbb{P}^4$  and  $Y$  is a generic 2-plane passing through this point, then the degree of  $X \cap Y$  is 3, not 2 as asserted. (This example can be massaged to make  $X$  into a variety).

However the generically smooth case implies the correct result  $\deg([X][Y]) = \deg(X) \deg(Y)$ , where  $[X][Y]$  is the product in the Chow ring.

p. 17 line -11: "it is a" should be "it corresponds to a"

p. 25, line 16: "the map  $C \rightarrow \phi(C)$  is finite". Correct, but we should have mentioned "quasifinite & projective implies finite" in the prerequisites section.

p. 30, line 4:  $\div$  prints as the sign for dividing one number by another. Should print as Div .

p. 31, line -3 : after the summation sign,  $dx_1$  should be  $dx_0$

p. 36, line -3:  $(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}, W) \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(d), W)$

p. 49: line -4, formula for  $p_a$ :  $K_X$  should be  $K_S$

p. 50, Theorem 2.8: Delete the +1 at the end of the formula.

p. 53, This is not correct. The correct version is given in exercise 2.14. Delete exercise 2.2 (2).

p. 61, line -1,-2: delete the (incorrect) phrase beginning ", so  $\Gamma$  imposes...".

p. 65, line -9:  $H_*^0(I_C/Q)$  should be  $H_*^0(\mathcal{I}_C/Q)$

p. 65, line -5 :  $I_C/Q$  should be  $\mathcal{I}_C/Q$

p.72: "sum of  $\text{Sym}^{e_i} V$ " . It would be better to say "a sum of representations  $\text{Sym}^d V$  for various  $d$  (the symbols  $e_i$  were used for the basis of  $V$ ).

p. 78, line 17: "normal sheaf"  $\rightarrow$  "conormal sheaf"

p. 78, line -10: "is a globally on  $C$ "  $\rightarrow$  "is a global section of  $\omega_C$ ."

p. 82, part (2) of the proof of Corollary 4.8. Replace this paragraph (which is nonsense) by:

(2) In this case a divisor  $\Gamma$  in the series  $\mathcal{V}$  fails by 2 to impose independent conditions on forms of degree  $d - 3$ . It follows that if we subtract a point from  $\Gamma$  the resulting divisor  $\Gamma'$  fails by at least one to impose independent conditions on forms of degree  $d - 3$ . Thus  $\Gamma$  has degree at least  $d$ , and by

part (1),  $\Gamma'$  is contained in a line. Repeating this argument with another point of  $\Gamma$ , we see that  $\Gamma$  must be the intersection of  $C$  with a line; that is,  $\mathcal{V}$  is the series  $|\mathcal{O}_C(1)|$ .

p. 83, paragraph beginning on line -7. What is written is insufficient; the degree of the polynomial equation could conceivably be 0. Here is a characteristic 0 argument: We may assume  $n > 1$ . By the Riemann-Roch theorem, the linear series  $|np|$  has no basepoints, so the corresponding map  $\phi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$  is well-defined of degree  $n$ , and if  $n > 2$  then  $\phi$  is an embedding.

If  $\phi$  were not surjective, it would be constant; equivalently,  $np \sim nq$  for every pair of points  $p, q$ . If  $n = 2$ , this would mean that then every point would be a ramification point of  $\phi$  and in characteristic 0 this is impossible, for example by [1, Theorem 7.11a].

We note that the surjectivity of  $[n]$  holds in positive characteristic as well; for a characteristic-free proof, see for example [2, Corollary 6.4] which proves the finiteness.

p. 90: In the skew-symmetric matrix  $B$ , the top 2 rows should be

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_0 & x_2 & x_3 \\ 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_3 & x_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the first two columns should, similarly, be the negative transpose of this matrix.

Also, delete the reference to [Eisenbud 1995, Theorem 11], as I'm no longer sure what was intended.

p. 90: The result of Exercise 4.1 is the same as Corollary 4.8.

p. 90: Exercise 4.3. the  $x_0^2$  is multiplying the wrong side of the equation.

p. 91: The statement of the Sylvester Gallaï theorem should be: In any finite set  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{R}}^2$  not contained in a line there is a line containing just 2 points of  $\Gamma$ .

p. 97, last sentence of 2nd para of 5.6: " $\text{Pic}_d(C)$  is a for  $\text{Pic}_0(C)$  should say " $\text{Pic}_d(C)$  is a torsor for  $\text{Pic}_0(C)$ , which means that if  $\mathcal{L}_0$  is an invertible sheaf of degree  $d$  on  $C$ , then the map  $\text{Pic}_0(C) \rightarrow \text{Pic}_d(C)$  sending  $\mathcal{L}$  to  $\mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{L}_0$  is an isomorphism."

p. 104, line -15: end of line, should be  $\geq 4$ . Better argument for this para: If  $D$  is a special divisor, then  $|D|$  is a subseries of the canonical series, which itself is not very ample.

Theorem 10.1:  $n$  should be  $r$ .

p. 106, third line before subsection 5.8: Should be  $\omega_C \otimes \mathcal{L}'^{-1}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}'$  has degree 1

p. 107: Lemma 5.17: change  $\mathbb{P}^r$  to  $\mathbb{P}^n$  to avoid the conflict of notation between that  $r$  and the superscript on  $\Sigma_d^r$ .

p. 107, next to last sentence before the Proof of Martens Theorem: Should say: we see that  $\Sigma_d^{r-1} \setminus \Sigma_d^{r-1}$  is dense in  $\Sigma_d^{r-1}$ .

p. 107 line -7 Marten's should be Martens'

p. 108 Exc 5.2: This is the wrong defn of "freely". Should be:  $gx = x$  only when  $g$  is the identity.

p. 108 Exc 5.3.2 :  $A^2$  should be  $\mathbb{A}^2$ .

p. 114. This whole discussion assumes that the "topological covering space" is a finite covering.

p. 142, line 4:  $m$  should be  $m_0$ .

p. 143, Example 7.14: the wording is confusing. Better: In the Grassmannian of lines  $\mathbb{G}(1, 3)$ , the Plücker coordinates of the line  $L$  that is the span of the points  $q, r$  are the  $2 \times 2$  minors of the matrix..."

p. 149, line 2: "locally" should be "locally analytically" (or étale locally?) on  $B$  in order to find these sections. So in the end, you are using descent to "glue" together the morphism.

150: Second para of the proof: It might be necessary to make a base change before there are sections sections of your family of genus 1 curves This is OK since to construct an isomorphism of the pullbacks of the families after finite base change.

p. 153 In constructing  $Hilb^\circ$ , the curves should be smooth, irreducible and non-degenerate.

p. 187: The proof given for the case of equality in Castelnuovo's theorem is not correct: the top line of the first displayed diagram is NOT left exact.

To fix it, redraw the diagram, eliminating the top row, and replacing  $m$  by  $k$ .

Let  $a_k$  denote the right-hand map in the middle row of the diagram, and let  $b_k$  denote the right hand map in the bottom row of the diagram. Equality in Castelnuovo's theorem implies that for all  $k$  the rank of  $a_k$ , which is the number of conditions imposed on  $V_k$  by  $\Gamma$ , is equal to the rank of  $b$ , which is the number of conditions imposed on  $H^0(\mathcal{O}_C(k))$  by  $\Gamma$

Since the bottom row of the diagram is left exact, the rank of  $b$  is  $h^0(\mathcal{O}_C(k)) - h^0(\mathcal{O}_C(k-1))$ . Since  $V_{k-1}$  is contained in the kernel of  $a$ , the rank of  $a$  is  $\leq \dim V_k - \dim V_{k-1}$ , whence

$$\dim V_k - \dim V_{k-1} \geq h^0(\mathcal{O}_C(k)) - h^0(\mathcal{O}_C(k-1))$$

for every  $k$ . The rest of the proof can be taken starting with "For large  $m$  the restriction map..."

p. 201: last para before 11.3. can intersect... should be cannot intersect...

p. 202: We are rather cavalier about the fiber product, and this can be confusing.

p. 203, statement of Thm 11. delete first half of 2nd line (it's a broken, repeated phrase).

p. 212: Cor 12.5. Hypothesis should be  $r \geq 1$ .

p. 213:  $C_{d-1} = \binom{2d-2}{d-1}/d$  is the correct number.

page 224, between the first two displayed equations: "and the on  $C$  to be" presumably should be "and the *ramification divisor* on  $C$  to be"

page 242, line 7: "an" should be "on"

page 242, last displayed equation:  $d + 1$  should be  $d$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris. *3264 and all that: a second course in algebraic geometry*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [2] Joseph H. Silverman. *The arithmetic of elliptic curves*, volume 106 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY,  
BERKELEY, CA 94720, USA

*Email address:* de@msri.org

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE MA 02138

*Email address:* harris@math.harvard.edu