

THE MODULI SPACE OF CUBIC THREEFOLDS AS A BALL QUOTIENT

DANIEL ALLCOCK, JAMES A. CARLSON, AND DOMINGO TOLEDO

ABSTRACT. The moduli space of cubic threefolds in \mathbb{CP}^4 , with some minor birational modifications, is the Baily-Borel compactification of the quotient of the complex 10-ball by a discrete group. We describe both the birational modifications and the discrete group explicitly.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Moduli of smooth cubic threefolds	5
3. The discriminant near a chordal cubic	18
4. Extension of the period map	33
5. Degeneration to a chordal cubic	46
5.1. Statement of Results	47
5.2. Overview of the Calculations	50
5.3. Semistable reduction	51
5.4. Cohomology computations	58
6. Degeneration to a nodal cubic	63
7. The main theorem	69
8. The Monodromy Group and the Hyperplane Arrangement	73
References	75

Date: August 9, 2006.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 32G20, Secondary 14J30.

Key words and phrases. ball quotient, period map, moduli space, cubic threefold.

First author partly supported by NSF grants DMS 0070930, DMS-0231585 and DMS-0245120. Second and third authors partly supported by NSF grants DMS 9900543 and DMS-0200877.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most basic facts in algebraic geometry is that the moduli space of elliptic curves, which can be realized as plane cubic curves, is isomorphic to the upper half plane modulo the action of linear fractional transformations with integer coefficients. In [4], we showed that there is an analogous result for cubic surfaces; the analogy is clearest when we view the upper half plane as complex hyperbolic 1-space, that is, as the unit disk. The result is that the moduli space of stable cubic surfaces is isomorphic to a quotient of complex hyperbolic 4-space by the action of a specific discrete group. This is the group of matrices which preserve the Hermitian form $\text{diag}[-1, 1, 1, 1, 1]$ and which have entries in the ring of Eisenstein integers: the ring obtained by adjoining a primitive cube root of unity to the integers. The idea of the proof is not to use the Hodge structure of the cubic surface, which has no moduli, but rather that of the cubic threefold obtained as a triple cover of \mathbb{CP}^3 branched along the cubic surface. The resulting Hodge structures have a symmetry of order three, and the moduli space of such structures is isomorphic to complex hyperbolic 4-space \mathbb{CH}^4 . This is the starting point of the proof, which relies crucially on the Clemens-Griffiths Torelli Theorem for cubic threefolds [9].

The purpose of this article is to extend the analogy to cubic threefolds. The idea is to use the period map for the cubic fourfolds obtained as triple covers of \mathbb{CP}^4 branched along the threefolds, using Voisin's Torelli theorem [34] in place of that of Clemens and Griffiths. In this case, however, a new phenomenon occurs. There is one distinguished point in the moduli space of cubic threefolds which is a point of indeterminacy for the period map. This point is the one represented by what we call a chordal cubic, meaning the secant variety of a rational normal quartic curve in \mathbb{CP}^4 . The reason for the indeterminacy is that the limit Hodge structure depends on the direction of approach to the chordal cubic locus. In fact, the limit depends *only* on this direction, and so the period map extends to the blowup of the moduli space.

The natural period map for smooth cubic threefolds [9] embeds the moduli space in a period domain for Hodge structures of weight three, namely, a quotient of the Siegel upper half space of genus five. For this embedding, however, the target space has dimension greater than that of the source. For the construction of this article, the dimensions of the source and target are the same.

To formulate the main result, let \mathcal{M}_{ss} be the GIT moduli space of cubic threefolds, and let $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$ be its blowup at the point corresponding

to the chordal cubics. Let $\mathcal{M}_s \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{ss}$ be the moduli space of stable cubic threefolds, and let $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s$ be $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$ minus the proper transform of $\mathcal{M}_{ss} - \mathcal{M}_s$. Let \mathcal{M}_0 be the moduli space of smooth cubic threefolds. Then we have the following, contained in the statement of the main result, theorem 7.1:

Theorem 1.1. *There is an arithmetic group $P\Gamma$ acting on complex hyperbolic 10-space, such that the period map*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s \longrightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$$

is a isomorphism. This map identifies \mathcal{M}_s with the image in $P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ of the complement of a hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{H}_c . It also identifies the discriminant in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s$ with the image of another hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{H}_\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}H^{10}$. In particular, it identifies \mathcal{M}_0 with $P\Gamma \backslash (\mathbb{C}H^{10} - (\mathcal{H}_c \cup \mathcal{H}_\Delta))$. Finally, the period map extends to a morphism from $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$ to the Baily-Borel compactification $\overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$.

We also provide much more detailed information about all the objects in the theorem, such as explicit descriptions of $P\Gamma$, \mathcal{H}_c and \mathcal{H}_Δ , and an analysis of the part of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$ lying over the boundary points of $\overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$.

Now we will say what the group $P\Gamma$ is. Let V be a cyclic cubic fourfold, meaning a triple cover of P^4 branched over a cubic threefold. The primitive cohomology $\Lambda(V)$ of V is naturally a module for the Eisenstein integers, where a primitive cube root of unity acts on cohomology as does the corresponding deck transformation. When V is smooth, This Eisenstein module carries a natural nondegenerate Hermitian form of signature $(10, 1)$, and $P\Gamma$ is the projective isometry group of $\Lambda(V)$.

The architecture of our proof of theorem 7.1 dates back to before [2], and follows the pattern laid out in [4] for cubic surfaces. But it is considerably more technical in its details. We therefore focus on the points where there are major differences or where substantially more work must be done as compared with the case of cubic surfaces.

In section 2 we establish basic facts about $\Lambda(V)$ as an Eisenstein module endowed with a complex Hodge structure, give an inner product matrix for $\Lambda(V)$, and show that $\mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is an isomorphism onto its image. The argument here follows that of [4], except that in place of the Clemens-Griffiths theorem, we use Claire Voisin's Torelli theorem for cubic fourfolds [34]. In this section we also establish facts about the discriminant locus for cubic threefolds near stable singularities. These facts are used in section 4 for extending the period map.

In section 3 we blow up the space P^{34} of cubic threefolds along the chordal cubic locus, and describe the proper transform of the discriminant locus. This is one of the most technical sections in the paper, but it is required for the extension of the period map in section 4. To give an idea of the main issue, consider a one-parameter family of smooth cubic threefolds degenerating to a chordal cubic. We may write it as $F + tG = 0$, where $F = 0$ defines the chordal cubic. The polynomial $G = 0$ cuts out on the rational normal curve of $F = 0$ a set of twelve points. Thus to a tangent vector at a point of the chordal locus one associates a 12-tuple on the projective line. We show that the discriminant locus in the blown-up P^{34} has a local product structure, e.g., it is homeomorphic to the product of the discriminant locus for 12-tuples in P^1 , times a disk representing the transverse direction, times a twenty-one dimensional ball corresponding to the action of the projective group $\mathrm{PGL}(5, \mathbb{C})$. There is also a technical variation on this result which gives an analytic model of the discriminant, not just a topological one.

In section 4 we extend the period map to the semistable locus of the blown-up P^{34} . This requires some geometric invariant theory to say what the semistable locus is, and here the work of Reichstein [29] is essential. Then we study the local monodromy groups at points in this semistable locus. The essential result for the extension of the period map is that these groups are all finite or virtually unipotent.

In section 5 we show that the extended period map sends the chordal cubic locus to a divisor in $PT \backslash CH^{10}$. The main point here is to identify the limit Hodge structure and in so doing show that the derivative of the extended map along the blowup of the chordal cubic locus is of rank nine. We do this by establishing an isogeny between the limit Hodge structure and the sum of a 1-dimensional Hodge structure and a Hodge structure associated to a six-fold cover of the projective line branched at twelve points. These Hodge structures first arose in the work of Deligne and Mostow [12]. Our analysis shows that the image of the period map is the quotient of a totally geodesic CH^9 by a suitable subgroup of Γ .

Section 6 deals with the same issues for the divisor of nodal cubic threefolds. Here the analysis is easier. We show that the Hodge structure is isomorphic to that of a special K3 surface, plus a 1-dimensional summand. This K3 surface and its Hodge structure were treated in Kondō's work [19] on moduli of genus 4 curves.

In section 7 we assemble the various pieces to prove the main theorem, and in section 8 we give some supplemental results on the monodromy group and the hyperplane arrangements.

Another proof of the main theorem has been obtained by Looijenga and Swierstra [21]. Both proofs proceed by extending the period map from the moduli space of smooth threefolds to a larger space, but the extension process is quite different in the two proofs. We use a detailed analysis of the discriminant in the space obtained by blowing up the chordal cubic locus to extend the period map. Looijenga and Swierstra use a general machinery developed earlier by them [20] to handle extensions of period mappings. We are grateful to Looijenga for sending us an early version of their argument.

It is a pleasure to thank the many people whose conversations have played a helpful role in the long gestation of this paper, including Herb Clemens, Alessio Corti, Johan de Jong, János Kollár, Eduard Looijenga and Madhav Nori. We are grateful to the Clay Mathematics Institute for its hospitality.

2. MODULI OF SMOOTH CUBIC THREEFOLDS

This section contains a number of foundational results, and its main theorem is of interest in its own right. We consider cyclic cubic fourfolds, i.e., triple covers of \mathbb{CP}^4 branched along cubic threefolds. (1) The cohomology of such a fourfold is a module over $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{Z}[\omega = \sqrt[3]{1}]$, equipped with a Hermitian form. (2) The monodromy on this lattice as the threefolds acquire a node is a complex reflection of order three; see Lemma 2.3. (3) To analyze the local monodromy for more complicated singularities, we give a structure theorem for the discriminant locus of the space of cubic threefolds near a cubic threefold with singularities of type A_n and D_4 . See Lemma 2.4. Using this result, we give an inner product matrix for the Hermitian form; see Lemma 2.6. (4) With the previous results in hand, we define a framing of the Hodge structure of a cyclic cubic fourfold and define the period map. Finally, the main theorem of the section is that the period map for smooth cubic threefolds is an isomorphism onto its image; see Theorem 2.8.

Let \mathcal{C} be the space of all nonzero cubic forms in variables x_0, \dots, x_4 . For such a form F let T be the cubic threefold in \mathbb{CP}^4 it defines, and let V be the cubic fourfold in \mathbb{CP}^5 defined by $F(x_0, \dots, x_4) + x_5^3 = 0$. Whenever we consider $F \in \mathcal{C}$, T and V will have these meanings. V is the triple cover of \mathbb{CP}^4 branched along T . We write \mathcal{C}_0 for the set of $F \in \mathcal{C}$ for which T is smooth (as a scheme) and Δ for the discriminant

$\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{C}_0$. We will sometimes also write Δ for its image in PC ; context will make our meaning clear. We write \mathcal{C}_s for the set of $F \in \mathcal{C}$ for which T is stable in the sense of geometric invariant theory. By [2] or [35], this holds if and only if T has no singularities of types other than A_1, \dots, A_4 . \mathcal{C}_s will play a major role in sections 4–7; in this section all we will use is the fact that \mathcal{C}_0 lies within it.

Because we will vary our threefolds, we will need the universal family $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \times \mathbb{C}P^4$ of cubic threefolds,

$$\mathcal{T} = \{ (F, [x_0 : \dots : x_4]) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathbb{C}P^4 \mid F(x_0, \dots, x_4) = 0 \} ,$$

and the family of covers of $\mathbb{C}P^4$ branched over them,

$$\mathcal{V} = \{ (F, [x_0 : \dots : x_5]) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathbb{C}P^5 \mid F(x_0, \dots, x_4) + x_5^3 = 0 \} .$$

We will write $\pi_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{V}}$ for the projections $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. The total spaces of \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{V} are smooth. We write \mathcal{T}_0 and \mathcal{V}_0 for the topologically locally trivial fibrations which are the restrictions of \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{V} to \mathcal{C}_0 . The transformation $\sigma : \mathbb{C}^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^6$ given by

$$(2.1) \quad \sigma(x_0, \dots, x_5) = (x_0, \dots, x_4, \omega x_5) ,$$

where ω is a fixed primitive cube root of unity, plays an essential role in all that follows. We regard it as a symmetry of \mathcal{V} and of the individual V 's.

Our period map $\mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ will be defined using the Hodge structure of the fourfolds and its interaction with σ , so we need to discuss $H^4(V)$ for $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$. To compute this it suffices by the local triviality of \mathcal{V}_0 to consider the single fourfold $x_0^3 + \dots + x_5^3 = 0$; by thinking of it as an iterated branched cover, one finds that its Euler characteristic is 27. The Lefschetz hyperplane theorem and Poincaré duality imply that $H^i(V; \mathbb{Z})$ is the same as $H^i(\mathbb{C}P^5; \mathbb{Z})$ for $i \neq 4$, so $H^4(V; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{23}$. The class of a 3-plane in $\mathbb{C}P^5$ pulls back to a class $\eta(V) \in H^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ of norm 3. The primitive cohomology $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ is the orthogonal complement of $\eta(V)$ in $H^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$. Since $H^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ is a unimodular lattice, $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ is a 22-dimensional lattice with determinant equal to that of $\langle \eta(V) \rangle$, up to a sign, so $\det H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z}) = \pm 3$.

$H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ is a module not only over \mathbb{Z} but over the Eisenstein integers $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ as well. To see this, observe that the isomorphism $V/\langle \sigma \rangle \cong \mathbb{C}P^4$ implies that $H^4(\mathbb{C}P^4; \mathbb{C})$ is the σ -invariant part of $H^4(V; \mathbb{C})$. Therefore σ fixes no element of $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{C})$ except 0, hence no element of $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ except 0. We define $\Lambda(V)$ to be the \mathcal{E} -module whose underlying additive group is $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$, with the action of $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$ defined as σ^* . \mathcal{E} is a unique factorization domain, so $\Lambda(V)$ is free of rank 11.

We define a Hermitian form on $\Lambda(V)$ by the formula

$$(2.2) \quad \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left[3\alpha \cdot \beta - \theta \alpha \cdot (\sigma^{*-1} \beta - \sigma^* \beta) \right],$$

where the dot denotes the usual pairing $\alpha \cdot \beta = \int_V \alpha \wedge \beta$ and $\theta = \omega - \bar{\omega} = \sqrt{-3}$. The scale factor $1/2$ is chosen so that $\langle \alpha | \beta \rangle$ takes values in \mathcal{E} ; it is the smallest scale for which this is true.

Lemma 2.1. *$\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ is an \mathcal{E} -valued Hermitian form, linear in its first argument and antilinear in its second. Furthermore, $\langle \alpha | \beta \rangle \in \theta \mathcal{E}$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda(V)$.*

Proof. \mathbb{Z} -bilinearity is obvious. \mathcal{E} -linearity in its first argument holds by the following calculation. (Throughout the proof we write σ for σ^* .)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \theta \alpha | \beta \rangle &= \langle \sigma \alpha - \sigma^{-1} \alpha | \beta \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[3(\sigma \alpha - \sigma^{-1} \alpha) \cdot \beta - \theta(\sigma \alpha - \sigma^{-1} \alpha) \cdot (\sigma^{-1} \beta - \sigma \beta) \right] \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2} \left[\bar{\theta} \sigma \alpha \cdot \beta - \bar{\theta} \sigma^{-1} \alpha \cdot \beta \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\sigma \alpha \cdot \sigma^{-1} \beta - \sigma \alpha \cdot \sigma \beta - \sigma^{-1} \alpha \cdot \sigma^{-1} \beta + \sigma^{-1} \alpha \cdot \sigma \beta) \right] \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2} \left[\bar{\theta} \alpha \cdot \sigma^{-1} \beta - \bar{\theta} \alpha \cdot \sigma \beta \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\alpha \cdot \sigma^{-2} \beta - \alpha \cdot \beta - \alpha \cdot \beta + \alpha \cdot \sigma^2 \beta) \right] \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2} \left[2\alpha \cdot \beta - \alpha \cdot (\sigma^{-2} \beta + \sigma^2 \beta) - \theta(\alpha \cdot \sigma^{-1} \beta - \alpha \cdot \sigma \beta) \right] \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2} \left[3\alpha \cdot \beta - \theta \alpha \cdot (\sigma^{-1} \beta - \sigma \beta) \right] \\ &= \theta \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In the second-to-last step we used the relation $\sigma^{-2} + \sigma^2 = \sigma + \sigma^{-1} = -1$. That $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ is a \mathbb{C} -valued Hermitian form now follows from $\langle \alpha | \beta \rangle = \overline{\langle \beta | \alpha \rangle}$; to prove this it suffices to check that the imaginary part of (2.2) changes sign when α and β are exchanged, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \cdot (\sigma^{-1} \beta - \sigma \beta) &= \alpha \cdot \sigma^{-1} \beta - \alpha \cdot \sigma \beta \\ &= \sigma \alpha \cdot \beta - \sigma^{-1} \alpha \cdot \beta \\ &= -(\sigma^{-1} \alpha - \sigma \alpha) \cdot \beta \\ &= -\beta \cdot (\sigma^{-1} \alpha - \sigma \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Next we check that $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ is \mathcal{E} -valued. It is obvious that its real part takes values in $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ and that its imaginary part takes values in $\frac{\theta}{2}\mathbb{Z}$. Since

$$\mathcal{E} = \{ a/2 + b\theta/2 \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } a \equiv b \pmod{2} \},$$

it suffices to prove that

$$3\alpha \cdot \beta \equiv -\alpha \cdot (\sigma^{-1}\beta - \sigma\beta) \pmod{2},$$

that is, that 2 divides $\alpha \cdot (\beta - \sigma\beta + \sigma^{-1}\beta)$. This follows from the relation $1 - \omega + \bar{\omega} = -2\omega$ in \mathcal{E} . Furthermore, (2.2) shows that $\langle \alpha | \beta \rangle$ has real part in $\frac{3}{2}\mathbb{Z}$; since every element of \mathcal{E} with real part in $\frac{3}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ is divisible by θ , the proof is complete. \square

We will describe $\Lambda(V)$ more precisely later, after considering the Hodge structure of V .

By the Griffiths residue calculus, $H_0^{p,q}(V; \mathbb{C})$ is spanned for $p+q=4$ by the residues of rational differential forms

$$(2.3) \quad \Omega(A) = \frac{A(x_0, \dots, x_5)\Omega}{(F(x_0, \dots, x_4) + x_5^3)^{q+1}}$$

where

$$\Omega = \sum_{j=0}^5 (-1)^j X_j dX_0 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dX_j} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_5$$

has degree 6 and A is any homogeneous polynomial of degree $3q-3$, so that the total degree of $\Omega(A)$ is 0. Two such polynomials define the same cohomology class, modulo $\oplus_{p'>p} H_0^{p',4-p'}$, if and only if $A - A'$ lies in the Jacobian ideal of $F + x_5^3$. This gives Hodge numbers $h_0^{4,0} = h_0^{0,4} = 0$, $h_0^{3,1} = h_0^{1,3} = 1$ and $h_0^{2,2} = 20$. Since σ is holomorphic, its eigenspace decomposition refines the Hodge decomposition. In particular, the generator $\Omega(1) = \Omega/(F + x_5^3)^2$ of $H^{3,1}$ has eigenvalue ω . Therefore $H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C}) = H_\omega^{3,1} \oplus H_\omega^{2,2}$, the summands being one- and ten-dimensional.

On $H^4(V; \mathbb{C})$ there is the Hodge-theoretic Hermitian pairing

$$(2.4) \quad (\alpha, \beta) = 3 \int_V \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}.$$

The Hodge-Riemann bilinear relations [16, p. 123] show that (\cdot, \cdot) is positive-definite on $H_0^{2,2}$ and negative-definite on $H^{3,1}$. It follows that $H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C})$ has signature $(10, 1)$.

If W is a complex vector space of dimension $n+1$ with a Hermitian form of signature $(n, 1)$ then we write $\mathbb{C}H(W)$ for the space of lines in W on which the given form is negative definite. We call this the

complex hyperbolic space of W ; it is an open subset of PW and is biholomorphic to the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n . The previous two paragraphs may be summarized by saying that the Hodge structure of V defines a point in $\mathbb{C}H(H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C}))$.

We chose the factor 3 in (2.4) so that (\cdot, \cdot) and $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ would agree in the sense of the next lemma. To relate the two Hermitian forms we consider the \mathbb{R} -linear map $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C})$ which is the inclusion

$$H_0^4(V; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^4(V; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^4(V; \mathbb{C})$$

followed by projection to σ 's ω -eigenspace. This is an isomorphism of real vector spaces. Since the \mathbb{Z} -lattice underlying $\Lambda(V)$ is $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z}) \subseteq H_0^4(V; \mathbb{R})$, we get a map $Z : \Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C})$. Since the complex structure on $\Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ is defined by taking ω to act as σ^* , and since H_ω^4 is defined as a space on which σ^* acts by multiplication by ω , Z is complex-linear. Since $\Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} = \Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathbb{E}} \mathbb{C}$, we may regard Z as an isomorphism $\Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathbb{E}} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C})$ of complex vector spaces.

Lemma 2.2. *For all $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda(V)$, $(Z(\alpha), Z(\beta)) = \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle$.*

Proof. Since both (\cdot, \cdot) and $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ are Hermitian forms, it suffices to check that $(Z\alpha, Z\alpha) = \langle \alpha | \alpha \rangle$ for all α . We write α_ω and $\alpha_{\bar{\omega}}$ for the projections of $\alpha \in H_0^4(V; \mathbb{R})$ to $H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C})$ and $H_{\bar{\omega}}^4(V; \mathbb{C})$. By definition,

$$(Z\alpha, Z\alpha) = 3 \int_V \alpha_\omega \wedge \overline{\alpha_\omega} = 3 \int_V \alpha_\omega \wedge \alpha_{\bar{\omega}}.$$

We will write σ for σ^* throughout the proof. Since $\sigma\alpha = \omega\alpha_\omega + \bar{\omega}\alpha_{\bar{\omega}}$ and $\sigma^{-1}\alpha = \bar{\omega}\alpha_\omega + \omega\alpha_{\bar{\omega}}$, we deduce $\alpha_\omega = -\frac{1}{\theta}(\omega\sigma\alpha - \bar{\omega}\sigma^{-1}\alpha)$ and $\alpha_{\bar{\omega}} = -\frac{1}{\theta}(-\bar{\omega}\sigma\alpha + \omega\sigma^{-1}\alpha)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (Z\alpha, Z\alpha) &= 3 \int \frac{1}{\theta^2} \left[\omega\sigma\alpha \wedge (-\bar{\omega}\sigma\alpha) + \omega\sigma\alpha \wedge \omega\sigma^{-1}\alpha \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \bar{\omega}\sigma^{-1}\alpha \wedge (-\bar{\omega}\sigma\alpha) - \bar{\omega}\sigma^{-1}\alpha \wedge \omega\sigma^{-1}\alpha \right] \\ &= - \int \left[-\sigma\alpha \wedge \sigma\alpha + \bar{\omega}\sigma\alpha \wedge \sigma^{-1}\alpha \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \omega\sigma^{-1}\alpha \wedge \sigma\alpha - \sigma^{-1}\alpha \wedge \sigma^{-1}\alpha \right] \\ &= - \int \left[-2\alpha \wedge \alpha - \sigma\alpha \wedge \sigma^{-1}\alpha \right] \\ &= 2\alpha \cdot \alpha + \int \sigma\alpha \wedge \sigma^{-1}\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the second term, we use

$$(2.5) \quad \int \sigma \alpha \wedge \alpha + \int \sigma \alpha \wedge \sigma \alpha + \int \sigma \alpha \wedge \sigma^{-1} \alpha = 0 ,$$

which follows from $1 + \sigma + \sigma^{-1} = 0$. Since σ is an isomorphism and \wedge is symmetric, the first and last terms of (2.5) are equal, so we get

$$\int \sigma \alpha \wedge \sigma^{-1} \alpha = -\frac{1}{2} \int \sigma \alpha \wedge \sigma \alpha = -\frac{1}{2} \alpha \cdot \alpha .$$

This yields

$$(Z\alpha, Z\alpha) = \frac{3}{2} \alpha \cdot \alpha = \langle \alpha | \alpha \rangle$$

as desired. \square

From the lemma it follows that $\Lambda(V)$ has signature $(10, 1)$ and that $\mathbb{C}H(H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C}))$ is naturally identified with $\mathbb{C}H(\Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C})$. We write $\mathbb{C}H(V)$ for either of these complex hyperbolic spaces.

In order to study the variation of the Hodge structure of V we must realize our constructions in local systems over \mathcal{C}_0 . To do this we use the fact that the family \mathcal{V}_0 over \mathcal{C}_0 gives rise to a sheaf $R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{Z})$ over \mathcal{C}_0 . Recall that this is the sheaf associated to the presheaf $U \mapsto H^4(\pi_V^{-1}(U); \mathbb{Z})$. Since \mathcal{V}_0 is topologically locally trivial, $R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{Z})$ is a local system of 23-dimensional \mathbb{Z} -lattices isomorphic to $H^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$. The map $\eta : F \mapsto \eta(V)$, for $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$, is a section over \mathcal{C}_0 , and the subsheaf $(R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{Z}))_0$, whose local sections are the local sections of $R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{Z})$ orthogonal to η , is a local system of 22-dimensional \mathbb{Z} -lattices isomorphic to $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$. Since σ acts on \mathcal{V}_0 , it acts on $R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{Z})$; since it preserves η it acts on $(R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{Z}))_0$, giving the sheaf the structure of a local system of \mathcal{E} -modules isomorphic to $\Lambda(V)$. We call this local system $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0)$. The formula (2.2) endows $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0)$ with the structure of a local system of Hermitian \mathcal{E} -modules. We write $\mathbb{C}H(\mathcal{V}_0)$ for the corresponding local system of hyperbolic spaces.

We can also consider the sheaf $R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{C})$ over \mathcal{C}_0 ; it is a local system because it is the complexification of $R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{Z})$. Now, σ acts on $R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{C})$ and we consider its ω -eigensheaf $(R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{C}))_\omega$, which is a local system of Hermitian vector spaces isometric to $H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C})$, hence of signature $(10, 1)$, with a corresponding local system of complex hyperbolic spaces. The map Z identifies the local systems $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0) \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C}$ and $(R^4\pi_*(\mathbb{C}))_\omega$, and therefore identifies the two local systems of complex hyperbolic spaces. Therefore we may regard the inclusion $H^{3,1}(V) \rightarrow H_\omega^4(V)$ as a defining a section

$$(2.6) \quad g : \mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H(\mathcal{V}_0) .$$

It is holomorphic since the Hodge filtration varies holomorphically. This is the period map; all our results refer to various formulations of it.

Next we obtain a concrete description of the \mathcal{E} -lattice $\Lambda(V)$, by investigating the monodromy of $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0)$. Fix a basepoint $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$, let $\Gamma(V)$ be the isometry group of $\Lambda(V)$, and let ρ be the monodromy representation $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0, F) \rightarrow \Gamma(V)$. By a meridian around a divisor, such as Δ , we mean the boundary circle of a small disk transverse to the divisor at a generic point of it, traversed once positively.

If W is a complex vector space then a complex reflection of W is a linear transformation that fixes a hyperplane pointwise and has finite order > 1 . If this order is 2, 3 or 6 then it is called a biflection, triflection or hexaflection. If W has a Hermitian form $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$, $r \in W$ has nonzero norm and ζ is a primitive n th root of unity, then the transformation

$$(2.7) \quad x \mapsto x - (1 - \zeta) \frac{\langle x | r \rangle}{\langle r | r \rangle} r$$

is a complex reflection of order n and preserves $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$. It fixes r^\perp pointwise and sends r to ζr ; we call it the ζ -reflection in r . If r has norm 3 and lies in an \mathcal{E} -lattice in which θ divides all inner products, such as $\Lambda(V)$, then (2.7) shows that ω -reflection in r also preserves the lattice.

Lemma 2.3. *The image of a meridian under the monodromy representation $\rho : \pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0, F) \rightarrow \Gamma(V) = \text{Aut } \Lambda(V)$ is the ω -reflection in an element of $\Lambda(V)$ of norm 3.*

Proof. The argument is much the same as for lemma 5.4 of [4]. Let D be a small disk in \mathcal{C} , meeting Δ only at its center, and transversally there. We write F_0 for the form at the center of D . Suppose without loss of generality that the basepoint F of \mathcal{C}_0 is on ∂D , and let γ be the element of $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0, F)$ that traverses ∂D once positively. The essential ingredients of the proof are the following. First, T_0 has an A_1 singularity, so V_0 has an A_2 singularity; this means that in suitable local analytic coordinates it is given by $x_1^2 + \cdots + x_4^2 + x_5^3 = 0$. Second, the vanishing cohomology for this singularity, i.e., the Poincaré dual of the kernel of

$$H_4(V; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_4(\mathcal{V}|_D; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_4(V_0; \mathbb{Z}) ,$$

is a (positive-definite) copy of the A_2 root lattice. (An A_2 surface singularity has vanishing cohomology a negative-definite copy of this lattice, and the sign changes when the dimension increases by 2.) Third, following Sebastiani-Thom [30], this lattice may be described as

$$V(2) \otimes V(2) \otimes V(2) \otimes V(2) \otimes V(3) ,$$

where $V(k)$ is the \mathbb{Z} -module spanned by the differences of the k th roots of unity, γ acts by

$$-1 \otimes -1 \otimes -1 \otimes -1 \otimes \omega$$

and σ acts by

$$1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \omega .$$

Here, ± 1 (resp. ω) indicates the action on $V(2)$ (resp. $V(3)$) given by sending each square root (resp. cube root) of unity to itself times ± 1 (resp. ω). This shows that the vanishing cohomology is a 1-dimensional \mathcal{E} -lattice; we write r for a generator. It also shows that γ acts on $\langle r \rangle$ in the same way that σ^* does. Since ω 's action on $\Lambda(V)$ is defined to be σ^* , γ acts on $\langle r \rangle$ by ω . Fourth, γ acts trivially on the orthogonal complement of the vanishing cohomology in $H^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$; this implies that γ is the ω -reflection in r . Finally, since the roots of the A_2 lattice have norm 2, we see by (2.2) that $\langle r | r \rangle = 3$. \square

The following two lemmas play only a small role in this section, at one point in the proof of theorem 2.6, to which the reader could skip right away. However, they will be very important in section 4, where we extend the domain of the period map. Their content is that the discriminant has nice local models, which make many homomorphisms from braid groups into $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0)$ visible. We also show that distinct braid generators have distinct monodromy actions.

We recall that the fundamental group of the discriminant complement of an A_n singularity is the braid group B_{n+1} , also known as the Artin group $\mathcal{A}(A_n)$ of type A_n . More generally, the Artin group of an A_n , D_n or E_n Dynkin diagram has one generator for each node, with two of the generators braiding ($aba = bab$) or commuting, corresponding to whether the corresponding nodes are joined or not. It is the fundamental group of the discriminant complement of that corresponding singularity [8]. Only $\mathcal{A}(A_n)$ and $\mathcal{A}(D_4)$ will be relevant to this paper.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose $F \in \mathcal{C}$ defines a cubic threefold with singularities s_1, \dots, s_m , each having one of the types A_n or D_4 , and no other singularities. Let $K_{i=1, \dots, m}$ be the base of a miniversal deformation of a singularity having the type of s_i , with discriminant locus $\Delta_i \subseteq K_i$. Then there is a neighborhood U of F in \mathcal{C} diffeomorphic to $K_1 \times \dots \times K_m \times B^N$, where $N = 35 - \sum \dim K_i$, such that $U - \Delta$ corresponds to*

$$(K_1 - \Delta_1) \times \dots \times (K_m - \Delta_m) \times B^N .$$

In particular, $\pi_1(U - \Delta)$ is the direct product of m Artin groups, the i th factor having the type of the singularity s_i .

Proof. This is essentially the assertion that \mathcal{C} contains a simultaneous versal deformation of all the singularities of T . By theorem 1.1 of [28], it suffices to show that the sum of the Tjurina numbers of s_1, \dots, s_m is less than 16. Because the singularities of T are quasihomogeneous, their Tjurina numbers coincide with their Milnor numbers.

We will write μ_i for the Milnor number of T 's singularity at s_i , and $Z_i \subseteq H_0^4(V)$ for the vanishing cohomology of the corresponding singularity of V . If T has a D_4 singularity at s_i , then $\mu_i = 4$, and V has an \tilde{E}_6 singularity there, with $\dim Z_i = 8$ and $\dim(Z_i \cap Z_i^\perp) = 2$. When T has an A_n singularity at s_i , we have $\mu_i = n$, and V has a singularity locally modeled on $x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + y^3 + z^n = 0$. By [5, p. 77], Z_i has a basis $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ with $a_i^2 = b_i^2 = 2$, $a_i \cdot a_{i\pm 1} = -1$, $b_i \cdot b_{i\pm 1} = -1$, $a_i \cdot b_i = -1$, $a_i \cdot b_{i-1} = 1$, and all other inner products zero. For $n > 11$ this quadratic form has a negative-definite subspace of dimension ≥ 4 , so it cannot lie in $H_0^4(V)$, which has signature $(20, 2)$. Therefore cubic threefolds cannot have $A_{n>11}$ singularities. For $n < 12$, Z_i is nondegenerate except for $n = 5$ and 11 , when $\dim(Z_i \cap Z_i^\perp) = 2$. We made these calculations using PARI/GP [27].

In every case, we have $\mu_i \leq \frac{2}{3} \dim(Z_i / (Z_i \cap Z_i^\perp))$. Since $i \neq j$ implies $Z_i \perp Z_j$, we have

$$\sum \dim(Z_i / (Z_i \cap Z_i^\perp)) \leq \dim H_0^4(V) = 22.$$

Putting these inequalities together yields $\sum \mu_i \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot 22 < 16$, so that [28] applies. This gives the claimed description of Δ near F , and the description of $\pi_1(U - \Delta)$ follows immediately. \square

Lemma 2.5. *In the situation of the previous lemma, suppose g and g' are two of the standard generators for $\pi_1(U - \Delta, F')$, where F' is a basepoint in $U - \Delta$. Then $\rho(g), \rho(g') \in \Gamma(V')$ are the ω -reflections in linearly independent roots $r, r' \in \Lambda(V')$.*

Proof. If T has two A_1 singularities, then near F , Δ has two components, and g and g' are meridians around them. As we saw in the proof of lemma 2.3, V has two A_2 singularities, and the vanishing cohomology of each of them is a σ -invariant sublattice of $H_0^4(V')$. In fact, they are the \mathcal{E} -spans of r and r' . With respect to the cup product, vanishing cocycles for distinct singularities are orthogonal, and it follows from (2.2) that they are also orthogonal under $\langle | \rangle$. Therefore $r \perp r'$. Since r and r' have nonzero norm, they must be linearly independent.

Now allow T to have A_n and/or D_4 singularities, and suppose g and g' commute. Then there exists $F_0 \in U$ and a neighborhood U_0 of F_0 in U with the following properties. T_0 has just two singularities,

both nodes, U_0 contains F' , $\pi_1(U_0 - \Delta, F') \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $g, g' \in \pi_1(U - \Delta, F')$ are represented by loops in U_0 that are meridians around the two components of Δ at F_0 . These properties follow from Brieskorn's description [7] of the versal deformations of simple singularities in terms of the corresponding Coxeter groups. By the previous paragraph, r and r' are linearly independent.

The same ideas show that if g and g' braid but do not commute, then there exists $F_0 \in U$ and a neighborhood U_0 of F_0 in U with the following properties. T_0 has just one singularity, of type A_2 , $F' \in U_0$, $\pi_1(U_0 - \Delta, F') \cong B_3$, and $g, g' \in \pi_1(U - \Delta, F')$ are represented by the standard generators of B_3 . It is easy to see that the set of cubic threefolds having an A_2 singularity and no other singularities is irreducible. Therefore: if there is a single counterexample to the lemma, then $\rho(g) = \rho(g')$ for every pair of generators of $\pi_1(U - \Delta, F')$, for every F as in the lemma. So it suffices to treat the case that T has a single singularity, of type A_3 , and g and g' are the first two standard generators of $\pi_1(U - \Delta, F') \cong B_4$. Adjoining the relation $g = g'$ reduces B_4 to \mathbb{Z} . If $\rho(g) = \rho(g')$, then $\rho|_H$ factors through \mathbb{Z} , which implies that all three generators of B_4 have the same ρ -image. This is impossible by the previous paragraph, because the first and last generators commute. \square

Theorem 2.6. *For $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$, $\Lambda(V)$ is isometric to the \mathcal{E} -lattice with inner product matrix*

$$(2.8) \quad \Lambda := (3) \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 3 & \theta & 0 & 0 \\ \bar{\theta} & 3 & \theta & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\theta} & 3 & \theta \\ 0 & 0 & \bar{\theta} & 3 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 3 & \theta & 0 & 0 \\ \bar{\theta} & 3 & \theta & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\theta} & 3 & \theta \\ 0 & 0 & \bar{\theta} & 3 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta \\ \bar{\theta} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Remarks. Regarding (2.8) as an 11×11 matrix (λ_{ij}) , this means that $\Lambda = \mathcal{E}^{11}$, with

$$\langle (x_1, \dots, x_{11}) | (y_1, \dots, y_{11}) \rangle = \sum_{i,j} \lambda_{ij} x_i \bar{y}_j.$$

The four-dimensional lattice appearing twice among the summands is called $E_8^\mathcal{E}$, because its underlying \mathbb{Z} -lattice is a scaled copy of the E_8 root lattice.

Proof. By section 2 of [2], the cubic threefold T_0 defined by

$$F_0 = x_2^3 + x_0 x_3^2 + x_1^2 x_4 - x_0 x_2 x_4 - 2x_1 x_2 x_3 + x_4^3$$

has an A_{11} singularity at $[1:0:\dots:0] \in \mathbb{C}P^4$ and no other singularities. By lemma 2.4, we may choose a neighborhood U of F_0 and $F \in U - \Delta$

such that $\pi_1(U - \Delta, F) \cong B_{12}$. By lemma 2.3, the standard generators of B_{12} act on $\Lambda(V)$ by the ω -reflections R_1, \dots, R_{11} in pairwise linearly independent roots $r_1, \dots, r_{11} \in \Lambda(V)$. The commutation relations imply $r_i \perp r_j = 0$ if $j \neq i \pm 1$. By the argument of [3, §5], the relation $R_i R_{i+1} R_i = R_{i+1} R_i R_{i+1}$ implies that $|\langle r_i | r_{i+1} \rangle| = \sqrt{3}$, so after multiplying some of the r_i by scalars, we may take $\langle r_i | r_{i+1} \rangle = \theta$.

The rank of the inner product matrix of the r_i is 10. Therefore, if they were linearly independent then they would span Λ up to finite index, and the Hermitian form on Λ would be degenerate. It is not, so the span must be only 10-dimensional. By the argument of [3, §5], the r_i span a sublattice of $\Lambda(V)$ isometric to the direct sum (call it Λ_{10}) of the last three summands of (2.8). In [3] we used a form of signature $(1, 9)$ rather than $(9, 1)$; this difference is unimportant. One can check directly that $\theta \Lambda_{10}^* = \Lambda_{10}$; the underlying reason is that the real forms of $E_8^\mathcal{E}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta \\ \theta & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ are scaled copies of even unimodular \mathbb{Z} -lattices. Since $\Lambda(V) \subseteq \theta \Lambda(V)^*$, Λ_{10} is a direct summand of $\Lambda(V)$, so $\Lambda(V) \cong (n) \oplus \Lambda_{10}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We have $n > 0$ because $\Lambda(V)$ has signature $(10, 1)$.

For an \mathcal{E} -lattice M we define $M^\mathbb{Z}$ to be the \mathbb{Z} -module underlying M , equipped with the \mathbb{Z} -bilinear pairing $\alpha \cdot \beta = \frac{2}{3} \operatorname{Re} \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle$. Computation shows that $(n)^\mathbb{Z}$ has inner product matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 2n/3 & -n/3 \\ -n/3 & 2n/3 \end{pmatrix}$, $(E_8^\mathcal{E})^\mathbb{Z}$ is the even unimodular \mathbb{Z} -lattice E_8 , and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta \\ \theta & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\mathbb{Z}$ is the even unimodular \mathbb{Z} -lattice $II_{2,2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Since $(\Lambda(V))^\mathbb{Z} = H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ has determinant ± 3 , we must have $n = 3$. \square

We define a framing of a form $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$ to be an equivalence class $[\phi]$ of isometries $\phi : \Lambda(V) \rightarrow \Lambda$, two isometries being equivalent if they differ by multiplication by a scalar. Sometimes we write ϕ rather than $[\phi]$ and leave it to the reader to check that the construction at hand depends only on $[\phi]$. We define \mathcal{F}_0 to be the set of all framings of all smooth cubic forms. Since the stalk of $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0)$ at $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$ is canonically isomorphic to $\Lambda(V)$, the set \mathcal{F}_0 is in natural bijection with the subsheaf of $P\operatorname{Hom}(\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0), \mathcal{C}_0 \times \Lambda)$ consisting of projective equivalence classes of homomorphisms which are isometries on each stalk. This bijection gives \mathcal{F}_0 the structure of a complex manifold. We refer to an element $(F, [\phi])$ of \mathcal{F}_0 as a framed smooth cubic form.

We write Γ for $\operatorname{Aut} \Lambda$ and $P\Gamma$ for $P\operatorname{Aut} \Lambda$. On \mathcal{F}_0 are defined commuting actions of $P\Gamma$ and $G = \operatorname{GL}_5 \mathbb{C} / D$, where D is the group $\{I, \omega I, \bar{\omega} I\}$. An element γ of $P\Gamma$ acts on the left by

$$\gamma \cdot (F, [\phi]) = (F, [\gamma \circ \phi]) .$$

This action realizes $P\Gamma$ as the group of deck transformations of the covering space $\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0$. An element g of $\mathrm{GL}_5\mathbb{C}$ acts on the right by

$$(2.9) \quad (F, [\phi]).g = (F \circ g, [\phi \circ g^{-1*}]) .$$

Here, $\mathrm{GL}_5\mathbb{C}$ acts on \mathbb{C}^5 on the left, hence acts on \mathcal{C} on the right by $(F.g)(x) = F(g.x)$, i.e., $F.g = F \circ g$. We extend $\mathrm{GL}_5\mathbb{C}$'s action on \mathbb{C}^5 to $\mathbb{C}^6 = \mathbb{C}^5 \oplus \mathbb{C}$ by the trivial action on the \mathbb{C} summand. This induces a right action on \mathcal{V} by $(F, x).g = (F.g, g^{-1}x)$. That is, g carries the zero-locus of $(F + x_5^3).g$ to the zero-locus of $F + x_5^3$. The g^{-1*} appearing in (2.9) is the inverse of the induced map on cohomology, which respects the \mathcal{E} -module structure since g commutes with σ . The subgroup $D \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_5\mathbb{C}$ acts trivially on \mathcal{F}_0 because it acts trivially on \mathcal{C}_0 and by scalars on every $\Lambda(V)$.

We now introduce the moduli spaces \mathcal{M}_0 and \mathcal{M}_0^f of smooth and framed smooth cubic threefolds. Since $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_s$, G acts properly on \mathcal{C}_0 , with the quotient $\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{C}_0/G$ a complex analytic orbifold and a quasiprojective variety. The properness on \mathcal{C}_0 implies properness on \mathcal{F}_0 , so $\mathcal{M}_0^f = \mathcal{F}_0/G$ is a complex analytic orbifold and an analytic space. We will see in lemma 2.7 that \mathcal{M}_0^f is a complex manifold. Since the G -stabilizer of a point $(F, [\phi])$ of \mathcal{F}_0 is a subgroup of the G -stabilizer of $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$, the covering map $\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{C}_0$ descends to an orbifold covering map $\mathcal{M}_0^f = \mathcal{F}_0/G \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0/G = \mathcal{M}_0$. Counting dimensions shows that \mathcal{M}_0 and \mathcal{M}_0^f are 10-dimensional.

We write $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$ for $\mathbb{C}H(\Lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C})$. Recall that $H^{3,1}(V; \mathbb{C})$ is a negative line in the Hermitian vector space $H_{\omega}^4(V; \mathbb{C})$ and that Z is an isometry $\Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow H_{\omega}^4(V; \mathbb{C})$. We reformulate the period map (2.6) as the holomorphic map $g : \mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ given by

$$(2.10) \quad g(F, [\phi]) = \phi(Z^{-1}(H^{3,1}(V; \mathbb{C}))) .$$

On the right we have written just ϕ for ϕ 's \mathbb{C} -linear extension $\Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C}$. Since $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is a 10-ball and bounded holomorphic functions on $\mathrm{GL}_5\mathbb{C}$ are constant, g is constant along $\mathrm{GL}_5\mathbb{C}$ -orbits, so it descends to a holomorphic map $g : \mathcal{M}_0^f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$, also called the period map. This map is equivariant with respect to the action of $P\Gamma$, so it in turn descends to a map

$$(2.11) \quad g : \mathcal{M}_0 = P\Gamma \backslash \mathcal{M}_0^f = P\Gamma \backslash \mathcal{F}_0 / \mathrm{GL}_5\mathbb{C} \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10} ,$$

again called the period map.

Lemma 2.7. *G acts freely on \mathcal{F}_0 , so that \mathcal{M}_0^f is a complex manifold, not just an orbifold. The period map $g : \mathcal{M}_0^f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ has rank 10 at every point of \mathcal{M}_0^f .*

Proof. We prove the second assertion first. Let $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$, let $F' \in \mathcal{C}$ be different from F , and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough that the disk $D = \{F + tG \mid t \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } |t| \leq \varepsilon\}$ lies in \mathcal{C}_0 . Writing F_t for $F + tG$, we know from the discussion surrounding (2.3) that $H^{3,1}(V_t)$ is spanned by the residue of $\Omega/(F_t + x_5^3)^2$. Since \mathcal{V} trivializes over D , we may unambiguously translate this class into $H^4(V; \mathbb{C})$; this gives a map $h : D \rightarrow H^4(V; \mathbb{C})$. For sufficiently small t , $h(F_t)$ is the element of $\text{Hom}(H_4(V; \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{C})$ given by

$$(\text{an integral 4-cycle } C) \mapsto \int_{\partial N} \frac{\Omega}{(F_t + x_5^3)^2}$$

where N is the part of the boundary of a tubular neighborhood of V in $\mathbb{C}P^5$ that lies over a submanifold of V representing C . Therefore we may differentiate with respect to t under the integral sign, so the derivative of h at the center of D is the element of $\text{Hom}(H_4(V; \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{C})$ given by

$$C \mapsto \int_{\partial N} \frac{\Omega}{(F_t + x_5^3)^3} \cdot (-2) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (F_t + x_5^3) \Big|_{t=0} = -2 \int_{\partial N} \frac{\Omega F'(x_0, \dots, x_4)}{(F + x_5^3)^3}.$$

This lies in $H_\omega^4(V; \mathbb{C})$, and it lies in $H^{3,1}$ if and only if F' lies in the Jacobian ideal of $F + x_5^3$, i.e., if and only if F' lies in the Jacobian ideal of F , i.e., if and only if the pencil $\langle F, F' \rangle$ in \mathcal{C} is tangent to the G -orbit of F .

Upon choosing a framing ϕ for F and lifting D to a disk $\tilde{D} = \{(F_t, [\phi_t])\}$ in \mathcal{F}_0 passing through $(F, [\phi])$, it follows that the derivative of $g : \mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ along \tilde{D} at $(F, [\phi])$ is zero if and only if \tilde{D} is tangent to the G -orbit of $(F, [\phi])$. Since the orbit has codimension 10, g has rank 10.

To prove the first assertion, recall that an orbifold chart about the image of $(F, [\phi])$ in \mathcal{M}_0^f is $U \rightarrow U/H \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0^f$, where H is the G -stabilizer of $(F, [\phi])$ and U is a small H -invariant transversal to the G -orbit of $(F, [\phi])$. We have just seen that the composition $U \rightarrow U/H \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0^f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ has rank 10 and is hence a diffeomorphism onto its image. It follows that $H = \{1\}$. \square

Theorem 2.8. *The period map $g : \mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow \text{PT} \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is an isomorphism onto its image.*

Proof. We begin by proving that if F and F' are generic elements of \mathcal{C}_0 with the same image under g then they are G -equivalent, i.e., T and T' are projectively equivalent. By hypothesis there exists an isometry $b : \Lambda(T) \rightarrow \Lambda(T')$ which carries $Z^{-1}(H^{3,1}(V)) \in \Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C}$

to $Z^{-1}(H^{3,1}(V')) \in \Lambda(V') \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C}$. Passing to the underlying integer lattices, b is an isometry $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_0^4(V'; \mathbb{Z})$ carrying $H^{3,1}(V; \mathbb{C})$ to $H^{3,1}(V'; \mathbb{C})$. By complex conjugation it also identifies $H^{1,3}(V; \mathbb{C})$ with $H^{1,3}(V'; \mathbb{C})$, and by considering the orthogonal complement of $H^{3,1} \oplus H^{1,3}$ we see that it identifies $H_0^{2,2}(V; \mathbb{C})$ with $H_0^{2,2}(V'; \mathbb{C})$. That is, it induces an isomorphism of Hodge structures.

Next: one of $\pm b$ extends to an isometry $H^4(V; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^4(V'; \mathbb{Z})$ carrying $\eta(V)$ to $\eta(V')$. This follows from some lattice-theoretic considerations: if L is a nondegenerate primitive sublattice of a unimodular lattice M , that is, $L = (L \otimes \mathbb{Q}) \cap M$, then the projections of M into $L \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ and $L^\perp \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ define an isomorphism of L^*/L with $(L^\perp)^*/L^\perp$. Here the asterisk denotes the dual lattice. It is easy to check that an isometry of L and an isometry of L^\perp together give an isometry of M if and only if their actions on L^*/L and $(L^\perp)^*/L^\perp$ coincide under this identification. Since $\langle \eta(V) \rangle^* / \langle \eta(V) \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}/3$, it follows that exactly one of the isometries

$$\langle \eta(V) \rangle \oplus H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \langle \eta(V') \rangle \oplus H_0^4(V'; \mathbb{Z}),$$

given on the first summand by $\eta(V) \mapsto \eta(V')$, and on the second by $\pm b$, extends to an isometry $H^4(V; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^4(V'; \mathbb{Z})$.

From Claire Voisin's theorem [34] we deduce that there is a projective transformation β carrying V to V' . One can check that the variety S of smooth cubic fourfolds admitting a triflection is irreducible, so that one can speak of a generic such fourfold. Furthermore, a generic such fourfold admits only one triflection (and its inverse). Since V and V' admit the triflections $\sigma^{\pm 1}$ and are generic points of S , β carries the fixed-point set T of σ in V to the fixed-point set T' of σ in V' . That is, T and T' are projectively equivalent.

We have proven that the period map from \mathcal{M}_0 to $PT \backslash CH^{10}$ is generically injective, and the previous lemma shows that it is a local isomorphism. It follows that it is an isomorphism onto its image. \square

3. THE DISCRIMINANT NEAR A CHORDAL CUBIC

In the next section we will enlarge the domain of the period map $\mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow PT \backslash CH^{10}$, in order to obtain a map from a compactification of \mathcal{M}_0 to the Baily-Borel compactification $\overline{PT \backslash CH^{10}}$. In order to do this we will need to understand the local structure of the discriminant $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_0$, at least near the threefolds to which we will extend g . In [2] (see also [35]), the GIT-stability of cubic threefolds is completely worked out. There is one distinguished type of threefold, which we

call a chordal cubic, which is the secant variety of the rational normal quartic curve. Except for the chordal cubics and those cubics that are GIT-equivalent to them, a cubic threefold is semistable if and only if it has singularities only of types A_1, \dots, A_5 and D_4 . At such a threefold the local structure of Δ is given by lemma 2.4.

The rest of this section addresses the nature of Δ near the chordal cubic locus. It turns out (see the remark following theorem 5.1) that the period map $PC_0 \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ does not extend to a regular map $PC_{ss} \rightarrow \overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$. The problem is that it does not extend to the chordal cubic locus. Therefore it is natural to try to enlarge the domain of the period map not to PC_{ss} but rather to $(\widehat{PC})_{ss}$, where \widehat{PC} is the blowup of PC along the closure of the chordal cubic locus. The details concerning the GIT analysis and the extension of the period map appear in section 4; at this point we are only motivating the study of the local structure of the proper transform $\widehat{\Delta}$ of Δ along the exceptional divisor E . Recall that we defined Δ as a subset of \mathcal{C} , but will also write Δ for its image in PC .

If $T \in PC$ is a chordal cubic then we write E_T for $\pi^{-1}(T) \subseteq E$, where π is the natural projection $\widehat{PC} \rightarrow PC$. (There are a number of projection maps in this paper, such as π_T and π_V in section 2, and some others introduced later. To keep them straight, we will use a subscript to indicate the domain for all of them except this one.) E_T may be described as the set of unordered 12-tuples in the rational normal curve R_T which is the singular locus of T . To see this, one counts dimensions to find that the chordal cubic locus has codimension 13 in PC , so E_T is a copy of P^{12} . To identify E_T with the set of unordered 12-tuples in R_T , consider a pencil of cubic threefolds degenerating to T . The 12-tuple may be obtained as the intersection of R_T with a generic member of the pencil; since R_T has degree 4, this intersection consists of 12 points, counted with multiplicity. (If every member of the pencil vanishes identically on R_T then the pencil is not transverse to the chordal cubic locus.) We will indicate an element of E_T by a pair (T, τ) , where τ is an unordered 12-tuple in R_T .

We will describe $\widehat{\Delta} \subseteq \widehat{PC}$ by proving the following two theorems, which are similar to but weaker than lemma 2.4. The first is weaker because it asserts a homeomorphism with a standard model of the discriminant, rather than a diffeomorphism. The second gives a complex-analytic isomorphism, but refers to a finite cover of (an open set in) \widehat{PC} , branched over E . But we don't know any reason that the homeomorphism in theorem 3.1 couldn't be promoted to a diffeomorphism.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose T is a chordal cubic and τ is a 12-tuple in R_T , with m singularities, of types A_{n_1}, \dots, A_{n_m} , where an A_n singularity means a point of multiplicity $n + 1$. Let $K_{i=1, \dots, m}$ be the base of a miniversal deformation of an A_{n_i} singularity, with discriminant locus $\Delta_i \subseteq K_i$. Then there is a neighborhood U of (T, τ) in \widehat{PC} homeomorphic to $B^1 \times K_1 \times \dots \times K_m \times B^N$, where $N = 33 - \sum \dim K_i$, such that E corresponds to*

$$\{0\} \times K_1 \times \dots \times K_m \times B^N$$

and $U - \widehat{\Delta}$ to

$$B^1 \times (K_1 - \Delta_1) \times \dots \times (K_m - \Delta_m) \times B^N.$$

In particular,

$$\pi_1(U - (\widehat{\Delta} \cup E)) \cong \mathbb{Z} \times B_{n_1+1} \times \dots \times B_{n_m+1},$$

where the \mathbb{Z} factor is generated by a meridian of E and the standard generators of the braid group factors are meridians of $\widehat{\Delta}$.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose (T, τ) , m , n_1, \dots, n_m , K_1, \dots, K_m , $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m$ and N are as in theorem 3.1. Then there exists a neighborhood U of (T, τ) in \widehat{PC} diffeomorphic to $B^1 \times B^{33}$, with $U \cap E$ corresponding to $\{0\} \times B^{33}$, such that the following holds. We write $\pi_{\tilde{U}} : \tilde{U} \rightarrow U$ for the 6-fold cover of U branched over $U \cap E$, and $(T, \tau)^\sim$ for the point $\pi_{\tilde{U}}^{-1}(T, \tau)$. There is a neighborhood V of $(T, \tau)^\sim$ in \tilde{U} diffeomorphic to $B^1 \times K_1 \times \dots \times K_m \times B^N$, such that*

$$(3.1) \quad V \cap \pi_{\tilde{U}}^{-1}(E) = \{0\} \times K_1 \times \dots \times K_m \times B^N$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad V - \pi_{\tilde{U}}^{-1}(\widehat{\Delta}) = B^1 \times (K_1 - \Delta_1) \times \dots \times (K_m - \Delta_m) \times B^N.$$

The rest of this section is devoted to proving theorems 3.1 and 3.2. It is rather technical, especially lemma 3.9 and beyond; although these theorems are analogues of lemma 2.4, the proofs are much more complicated.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose T is a chordal cubic and $(T, \tau) \in E_T$.*

- (i) *(T, τ) lies in $\widehat{\Delta}$ if and only if τ has a multiple point.*
- (ii) *If τ has a point of multiplicity $n + 1$, then (T, τ) is a limit of points of \widehat{PC} representing cubic threefolds with A_n singularities.*

Nowhere else in the paper do we refer to any result or notation introduced from here to the end of this section.

When we refer to the “standard chordal cubic”, we mean the one defined by

$$(3.3) \quad F(x_0, \dots, x_4) = \det \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\ x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \end{pmatrix} = 0 ,$$

which is the secant variety of the rational normal curve parameterized by

$$(3.4) \quad s \mapsto [1, s, s^2, s^3, s^4] \quad (s \in P^1).$$

We write P for the point $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0]$.

Proof of lemma 3.3. We prove (ii) first. We take T to be the standard chordal cubic, and place the multiple point of τ at $P \in R_T$. We suppose without loss of generality that $[0, 0, 0, 0, 1] \in R_T$ is not one of the points of τ . Observe that

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} G_{u_1, \dots, u_{12}} = & F + x_4^3 + u_1 x_4^2 x_3 + u_2 x_4 x_3^2 + u_3 x_3^3 + u_4 x_3^2 x_2 \\ & + u_5 x_3 x_2^2 + u_6 x_2^3 + u_7 x_2^2 x_1 + u_8 x_2 x_1^2 \\ & + u_9 x_1^3 + u_{10} x_1^2 x_0 + u_{11} x_1 x_0^2 + u_{12} x_0^3 \end{aligned}$$

restricts to R_T as the polynomial

$$(3.6) \quad s^{12} + u_1 s^{11} + u_2 s^{10} + \dots + u_{11} s + u_{12} ,$$

where R_T is parameterized as in (3.4). Since τ has no point at $s = \infty$, there is a choice of u_1, \dots, u_{12} such that τ is the limiting direction of the pencil $\langle F, G_{u_1, \dots, u_{12}} \rangle$. Since τ has a point of multiplicity $n + 1$ at P , we have $u_{12} = \dots = u_{12-n} = 0$ and $u_{11-(n+1)} \neq 0$. Then singularity analysis as in [2, sec. 2] shows that a generic member of the pencil has an A_n singularity at P . This proves (ii).

Now we prove (i). If τ has a multiple point then (ii) shows that $(T, \tau) \in \widehat{\Delta}$. If τ has no multiple points, and $\langle F, F' \rangle$ is a pencil in PC with limiting direction τ , then dF' vanishes at no point of R_T , because otherwise τ would have a multiple point. Since dF' is nonvanishing along the locus $dF = 0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and a neighborhood W of F' in \mathcal{C} such that $dF + \eta dF''$ is nowhere-vanishing, for all $0 < |\eta| < \varepsilon$ and all $F'' \in W$, so $F + \eta F''$ defines a smooth threefold. Therefore (T, τ) has a neighborhood in \widehat{PC} disjoint from $\widehat{\Delta} - E$, so $(T, \tau) \notin \widehat{\Delta}$. \square

Because of the action of PG , proving theorems 3.1 and 3.2 reduces to a similar but lower-dimensional problem. Let T be the standard chordal cubic. In our arguments, the 12-tuple consisting of 12 points all concentrated at P will play a special role; we call it τ_0 . Let A

be the affine 11-space in PC consisting of the $G_{0,u_2,\dots,u_{12}}$ of (3.5). Let B be the projective space spanned by A and T , and \widehat{B} be its proper transform. \widehat{B} is where most of our work will take place. Near (T, τ_0) , \widehat{PC} is a product $\widehat{B} \times B^{22}$, in a sense made precise by the following lemma. In order to state it, we observe that the stabilizer of (T, τ_0) in PG is $\mathbb{C} \rtimes \mathbb{C}^*$, of codimension 22. Therefore there exists a small $B^{22} \subseteq PG$ transverse to $\mathbb{C} \rtimes \mathbb{C}^*$ at $1 \in PG$.

Lemma 3.4. *The map $\widehat{B} \times B^{22} \rightarrow \widehat{PC}$ given by $(b, g) \mapsto b.g$ is a local diffeomorphism at $((T, \tau_0), 1)$.*

Proof. We write Y for the PG -orbit of (T, τ_0) . The lemma amounts to the transversality of Y and \widehat{B} in \widehat{PC} at (T, τ_0) . Since B is transverse to the chordal cubic locus at T , it suffices to prove that $Y \cap E_T$ and $\widehat{B} \cap E_T$ are transverse in E_T at (T, τ_0) . We use u_1, \dots, u_{12} as coordinates around (T, τ_0) in E_T as in the proof of lemma 3.3. Then $\widehat{B} \cap E_T$ has equation $u_1 = 0$. $Y \cap E_T$ is the curve consisting of binary 12-tuples

$$(s - \lambda)^{12} = s^{12} + 12\lambda s^{11} + \dots + \lambda^{12},$$

which passes through (T, τ_0) when $\lambda = 0$ and is transverse to \widehat{B} there because the s^{11} coefficient (i.e., the u_1 -coordinate) is linear in λ . \square

Remark. It doesn't matter for us, but we note that \widehat{B} and Y are not transverse everywhere. Since $Y \cap E_T$ is a rational normal curve of degree 12 and $\widehat{B} \cap E_T$ is a hyperplane in E_T , they intersect in 12 points, counted with multiplicity. Besides (T, τ_0) , the only place they intersect is at $\lambda = \infty$, so they make 11th-order contact there.

The analogues of theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in this lower-dimensional setting are the following. It turns out (see the proof of theorem 3.1) that restricting attention to τ_0 , rather than treating general τ , is sufficient.

Theorem 3.5. *There exists a neighborhood U' of (T, τ_0) in \widehat{B} which is homeomorphic to $B^1 \times (U' \cap E)$, such that $U' \cap E$ corresponds to $\{0\} \times (U' \cap E)$ and $U' \cap \widehat{\Delta}$ to $B^1 \times (U' \cap E \cap \widehat{\Delta})$.*

Theorem 3.6. *There exists a neighborhood U' of (T, τ_0) in \widehat{B} which is diffeomorphic to $B^1 \times B^{11}$, with $U' \cap E$ corresponding to $\{0\} \times B^{11}$, such that the following holds. We write $\pi_{\tilde{U}'} : \tilde{U}' \rightarrow U'$ for the 6-fold cover of U' , branched over $U' \cap E$, and $(T, \tau_0)^\sim$ for the preimage therein of (T, τ_0) . There is a neighborhood \tilde{V}' of $(T, \tau_0)^\sim$ in \tilde{U}' , and a*

neighborhood W' of (T, τ_0) in $\widehat{B} \cap E$, such that \tilde{V}' is diffeomorphic to $B^1 \times W'$, such that

$$\tilde{V}' \cap \pi_{\tilde{U}'}^{-1}(E) = \{0\} \times W'$$

and

$$\tilde{V}' \cap \pi_{\tilde{U}'}^{-1}(\widehat{\Delta}) = B^1 \times (W' \cap \widehat{\Delta}) .$$

These theorems describe $\widehat{\Delta}$ in a neighborhood of (T, τ_0) in $\widehat{B} \cap E$ in terms of its intersection with E . Therefore we need to understand $\widehat{B} \cap E \cap \widehat{\Delta}$:

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose $(T, \tau) \in \widehat{B} \cap E$, and that none of the points of τ is $[0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$. Let $m, n_1, \dots, n_m, K_1, \dots, K_m$ and $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m$ be as in theorem 3.1. Let $N' = 11 - \sum \dim K_i$. Then there is a neighborhood Z of (T, τ) in $\widehat{B} \cap E$ diffeomorphic to $K_1 \times \dots \times K_m \times B^{N'}$, such that $Z - \widehat{\Delta}$ corresponds to*

$$(K_1 - \Delta_1) \times \dots \times (K_m - \Delta_m) \times B^{N'} .$$

Proof. Using coordinates u_2, \dots, u_{12} around (T, τ_0) as in the proof of lemma 3.3, and parameterizing R_T by s as in (3.4), the τ 's treated in this lemma are parameterized by the functions

$$f(s) = s^{12} + u_2 s^{10} + \dots + u_{11} s + u_{12} ,$$

i.e., as the monic polynomials with root sum equal to zero. The lemma amounts to the assertion that any singular function in this family admits a simultaneous versal deformation of all its singularities, within the family. The family of functions

$$(3.7) \quad (s - s_0)^n + c_2(s - s_0)^{n-2} + \dots + c_{n-1}(s - s_0) + c_n$$

provides a versal deformation of $(s - s_0)^n$, with every member of the family having the same root sum, namely ns_0 . Given f as above, we may take a product of terms like (3.7), one for each singularity of f . This obviously provides a simultaneous versal deformation, and the root sum of any member of the family is that of f , namely 0. Therefore the family lies in $\widehat{B} \cap E$. \square

Proof of theorem 3.1, given theorem 3.5; We first claim that (T, τ_0) has a neighborhood Z in $\widehat{B} \cap E$ and a neighborhood U in \widehat{PC} , such that U is homeomorphic to $B^1 \times Z \times B^{22}$, with $U \cap E$ corresponding to $\{0\} \times Z \times B^{22}$ and $U \cap \widehat{\Delta}$ to $B^1 \times (Z \cap \widehat{\Delta}) \times B^{22}$. To get this, apply theorem 3.5 to obtain $U' \subseteq \widehat{B}$ with the properties stated there, and set Z equal to $U' \cap E$. By shrinking U' and $B^{22} \subseteq PG$ if necessary, we

may suppose by lemma 3.4 that $U' \times B^{22} \rightarrow \widehat{PC}$ is a diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of (T, τ_0) in \widehat{PC} , which we take to be U . Then

$$U \cong U' \times B^{22} \cong B^1 \times (U' \cap E) \times B^{22} = B^1 \times Z \times B^{22}.$$

Here, the first ‘ \cong ’ is a diffeomorphism and the second is a homeomorphism. Also, $U \cap E$ corresponds to $(U' \cap E) \times B^{22} = \{0\} \times Z \times B^{22}$, and $U \cap \widehat{\Delta}$ to $(U' \cap \widehat{\Delta}) \times B^{22} = B^1 \times (Z \cap \widehat{\Delta}) \times B^{22}$.

Now we observe that by the nature of the claim, the same conclusions apply when τ_0 is replaced by any $\tau \in Z$. Now we use lemma 3.7, which describes $Z \cap \widehat{\Delta}$ (possibly after shrinking Z to a smaller neighborhood of (T, τ) , which shrinks U). The result is that U is homeomorphic to

$$B^1 \times K_1 \times \cdots \times K_m \times B^{N'} \times B^{22},$$

such that

$$U \cap E = \{0\} \times K_1 \times \cdots \times K_m \times B^{N'} \times B^{22}$$

and

$$U - \widehat{\Delta} = B^1 \times (K_1 - \Delta_1) \times \cdots \times (K_m - \Delta_m) \times B^{N'} \times B^{22}.$$

Therefore theorem 3.1 holds for (T, τ) . Obviously, it also holds for and $(T, \tau') \in E_T$ that is equivalent to some $(T, \tau) \in Z$ under the stabilizer $\text{PGL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ of T in PG . It is easy to see that this accounts for every τ' , so the proof of theorem 3.1 is complete. \square

The proof of theorem 3.2, given theorem 3.6, is essentially the same. Therefore it remains only to prove theorems 3.5 and 3.6. We will treat theorem 3.6 first.

Lemma 3.8. *In a neighborhood of (T, τ_0) , $\widehat{B \cap \Delta} = \widehat{B} \cap \widehat{\Delta}$.*

Proof. By lemma 3.4, we may choose a neighborhood U' of (T, τ_0) in \widehat{B} , and shrink $B^{22} \subseteq PG$ if necessary, so that $U' \times B^{22} \rightarrow \widehat{PC}$ is a diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of (T, τ_0) in \widehat{PC} . Under this identification, $\widehat{\Delta} - E$ corresponds to $((\widehat{\Delta} - E) \cap U') \times B^{22}$. To get $\widehat{B} \cap \widehat{\Delta}$, we take the closure and then intersect with $U' \times \{\text{point}\}$, and to get $\widehat{B \cap \Delta}$, we intersect with $U' \times \{\text{point}\}$ and then take the closure. Clearly, both give the same result. \square

The following technical lemma is impossible to motivate without seeing its use in the proof of theorem 3.6; the reader should skip it and refer back when needed.

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose $\delta(u_2, \dots, u_{12})$ is a quasihomogeneous polynomial of weight 132, where $\text{wt}(u_i) = i$. Suppose also that the u_{12}^{11} and $u_{12}^{11-i}u_{11}^i u_i$ ($i = 11, \dots, 2$) terms of δ have nonzero coefficients. Suppose $g : (\mathbb{C}^{11}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{11}, 0)$ is the germ of a diffeomorphism such that $\delta \circ g$ has no terms of weight < 132 . Then g preserves the weight filtration, in the sense that*

$$(3.8) \quad u_i \circ g = c_i u_i + p_i(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) + q_i(u_2, \dots, u_{12})$$

for each i , where c_i is a nonzero constant, p_i is quasihomogeneous of weight i with no linear terms, and q_i is an analytic function whose power series expansion has only terms of weight $> i$.

Proof. We write v_i for $u_i \circ g$, regarded as a function of u_2, \dots, u_{12} . One obtains $(\delta \circ g)(u_2, \dots, u_{12})$ by beginning with $\delta(u_2, \dots, u_{12})$ and replacing each u_i by $v_i(u_2, \dots, u_{12})$. This leads to a big mess, with the coefficients of $\delta \circ g$ depending on those of δ and the v_i in a complicated way. Nevertheless, there are some coefficients of $\delta \circ g$ to which only one term of g can contribute, and this will allow us to deduce that various coefficients of the v_i vanish. To be able to speak precisely, we make the following definitions. When we refer to a term or monomial of δ (resp. v_i), we mean a monomial whose coefficient in δ (resp. v_i) is nonzero. If m is a monomial $u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_n}$, and $\mu_j(u_2, \dots, u_{12})$ is a monomial of v_{i_j} for each j , then we say that m produces the monomial

$$\mu = \mu_1(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) \cdots \mu_n(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) .$$

For example, if $v_{12} = u_{12} + u_2^2$ and $v_{11} = u_{11} + u_2$, then $m = u_{12}^2 u_{11}$ produces the monomials $u_{12}^2 u_{11}$, $u_{12} u_2^2 u_{11}$, $u_2^4 u_{11}$, $u_{12}^2 u_2$, $u_{12} u_2^3$ and u_2^5 . When we wish to be more specific, we say that m produces μ by the substitution μ_j for each u_{i_j} . Continuing the example, we would say that $u_{12}^2 u_{11}$ produces $u_{12} u_2^3$ by substituting u_{12} for one factor u_{12} of m , u_2^2 for the other, and u_2 for the factor u_{11} . We note that even if a monomial m of δ produces a monomial μ , the coefficient of μ in $\delta \circ g$ (or even in $m \circ g$) may still be zero, because of possible cancellation.

We will prove the lemma by proving the following assertions \mathcal{A}_d by increasing induction on d , and we will prove each \mathcal{A}_d by proving the assertions $\mathcal{B}_{d,i}$ by decreasing induction on i . \mathcal{A}_0 is vacuously true. The first two steps in the induction, $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{1,11}$, require special treatment.

Assertion \mathcal{A}_d : No v_i has any term of degree $\leq d$ and weight $< i$.

Assertion $\mathcal{B}_{d,i}$: v_i has no term of degree d and weight $< i$.

Proof of $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}$: if v_{12} has a term $u_{j<12}$, then the monomial u_{12}^{11} of δ produces $\mu = u_j^{11}$, of weight < 132 . No other monomial of δ can produce μ , because the only monomial of weight 132 and degree < 12 is u_{12}^{11} . Since $\delta \circ g$ has no term of weight < 132 , v_{12} cannot have a term $u_{j<12}$, proving $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}$.

Proof of $\mathcal{B}_{1,11}$: if v_{11} has a term $u_{j<11}$, then the monomial u_{11}^{12} of δ produces $\mu = u_j^{12}$, of weight < 132 . We claim that no other monomial m of δ can produce μ . If $\deg m < 12$ then $m = u_{12}^{11}$, and $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}$ implies that the only degree 12 monomials that m can produce have the form

$$(\text{a quadratic monomial}) \cdot u_{12}^{10} \neq \mu.$$

If $\deg m > 12$ then $\deg m > \deg \mu$, so m cannot produce μ . If m has degree 12, then m could only produce μ by a linear substitution for each factor. If m has a factor u_{12} , then any monomial that m produces by such a substitution is divisible by u_{12} , by $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}$. We have proven that a monomial m of δ that produces μ has degree 12 and no u_{12} factors. Since the average weight of the factors is $132/12 = 11$, every factor is u_{11} , so $m = u_{11}^{12}$, proving our claim. Since $\delta \circ g$ has no term $u_{j<11}^{12}$, v_{11} has no term $u_{j<11}$. This proves $\mathcal{B}_{1,11}$.

Having proven $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{1,11}$, we observe that v_{12} has a linear term because g is a diffeomorphism, and since v_{12} has no term u_{11}, \dots, u_2 , it does have a term u_{12} . Similarly, using $\mathcal{B}_{1,11}$ and the fact that v_{11} and v_{12} have linearly independent linear parts, we see that v_{11} has a u_{11} term. We will use these facts in the rest of the proof.

Proof that \mathcal{A}_d and $\mathcal{B}_{d,12}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{d,i+1}$ imply $\mathcal{B}_{d,i}$ (for $i = 11, \dots, 2$, except for $\mathcal{B}_{1,11}$, treated above): If v_i had a term t of degree d and weight $< i$, then the monomial $u_{12}^{11-i} u_{11}^i u_i$ of δ would produce the term $\mu = u_{12}^{11-i} u_{11}^i t$, of degree $11 + d$ and weight < 132 . Here we are using that v_{12} has a u_{12} term and v_{11} has a u_{11} term. We claim that no other monomial m of δ can produce μ ; the argument is similar to the proof of $\mathcal{B}_{1,11}$, just more complicated. First suppose that m has degree > 12 . The only way that m can produce a term of degree $11 + d$ is by substituting a monomial of degree $< d$ for each factor. By \mathcal{A}_{d-1} , the resulting monomial will have weight at least that of m and therefore cannot be μ . Next, suppose that m has degree < 12 , so that $m = u_{12}^{11}$. If we substitute a term of degree $\leq d$ for each factor u_{12} , then by \mathcal{A}_{d-1} and $\mathcal{B}_{d,12}$, the resulting monomial has weight at least that of m , hence is not μ . On the other hand, if we substitute a term of degree $> d$ for some factor u_{12} , then either that term has degree exactly $d + 1$ and u_{12} is substituted for each of the other u_{12} 's, or else the degree of the resulting monomial is more than $11 + d$. In neither of these cases can

the result be μ , because μ has fewer than 10 factors u_{12} and has degree $11 + d$. Finally, suppose m has degree 12. If we substitute a term of degree $< d$ for each factor of m , then by \mathcal{A}_{d-1} , the resulting monomial has weight at least that of m , so is not μ . So the only way m could produce μ is by a degree d substitution for one of the 12 factors and linear substitutions for the others. If the exceptional factor is one of u_{12}, \dots, u_{i+1} , then by $\mathcal{B}_{d,12}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{d,i+1}$, the resulting monomial again has weight at least that of m , so is not μ . We have shown that if m produces μ then m has degree 12, has a factor $u_{j \leq i}$, and that all the other factors are replaced by linear terms. The latter condition implies that the exponent of u_{12} in m is at most that of μ , since (by $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}$) $u_{12} \rightarrow u_{12}$ is the only possible linear substitution for u_{12} . Therefore

$$m = u_{12}^{p \leq 11-i} u_{j \leq i} \cdot (11 - p \text{ factors, none of which is } u_{12}).$$

The average weight of the $11 - p$ other factors is

$$\frac{132 - 12p - j}{11 - p} \geq 11,$$

with equality only if $p = 11 - i$ and $j = i$. This forces both of these equalities to hold, and each of the remaining factors to be u_{11} . That is, $m = u_{12}^{11-i} u_{11}^i u_i$. This proves our claim that this is the only monomial of δ that produces μ . Since μ is not a term of $\delta \circ g$, v_i has no term t , proving $\mathcal{B}_{d,i}$.

Proof that \mathcal{A}_{d-1} and $\mathcal{B}_{d,12}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{d,2}$ imply \mathcal{A}_d : trivial.

Proof that \mathcal{A}_{d-1} implies $\mathcal{B}_{d,12}$ (except for $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}$, treated above): if v_{12} has a term t of degree d and weight < 12 , then u_{12}^{11} produces $\mu = u_{12}^{10} t$, of degree $10 + d$ and weight < 132 . We claim that no other monomial m of δ can produce μ . If m has degree ≥ 12 then the only way m can produce a monomial of degree $10 + d$ is by replacing each factor by a term of degree $< d$. By \mathcal{A}_{d-1} , the result of such a substitution has weight at least that of m , so is not μ . Since u_{12}^{11} is the only monomial of weight 132 and degree < 12 , we have proven our claim. Since $\delta \circ g$ has no term $u_{12}^{10} t$, u_{12} has no term t , proving $\mathcal{B}_{d,12}$.

The induction proves $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_5$ successively, and \mathcal{A}_5 implies that the v_i have no terms other than those in (3.8). To see that $c_i \neq 0$ for all i , apply the argument used to prove that v_{12} (resp. v_{11}) has a term u_{12} (resp. u_{11}). Namely, $\mathcal{B}_{1,12}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{1,i}$ plus the linear independence of the linear parts of v_{12}, \dots, v_i imply that v_i has a term u_i . \square

Proof of theorem 3.6: We will need standard coordinates around (T, τ_0) in \widehat{B} and in the 6-fold cover. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{C} \times A \rightarrow \widehat{B}$ be the map lying over the map $\mathbb{C} \times A \rightarrow B$ given by $(\lambda, a) \mapsto F + \lambda(a - F)$. For $a \in A$, $\gamma(0, a)$

is the point of E_T corresponding to the limiting direction of the pencil $\langle F, a \rangle$. In particular, $\gamma(0, G_{0,\dots,0}) = (T, \tau_0)$. We take U' to be the image of γ . If $\lambda \neq 0$ then $F + \lambda(a - F)$ has an isolated singularity at P , so it is not a chordal cubic. It follows that $\gamma^{-1}(E) = \{0\} \times A$, verifying the claimed property of U' . Then $\tilde{U}' = \mathbb{C} \times A$, with $\pi_{\tilde{U}'} : \tilde{U}' \rightarrow U'$ given by $(\lambda, a) \mapsto (\lambda^6, a)$. For brevity, we will write β for this map.

The first idea (of five) is to use a 1-parameter group to work out a defining equation for $(\gamma \circ \beta)^{-1}(\hat{\Delta})$ in terms of a defining equation for $\Delta \cap A$. We write δ' for the defining equation for $\Delta \cap A$ with respect to the coordinates u_2, \dots, u_{12} . Our basic tool is the 1-parameter subgroup

$$(3.9) \quad \sigma_\lambda : (x_0, \dots, x_4) \mapsto (\lambda^{-2}x_0, \lambda^{-1}x_1, x_2, \lambda x_3, \lambda^2x_4)$$

of G . For $\lambda \neq 0$, $(\gamma \circ \beta)(\lambda, u_2, \dots, u_{12})$ lies in Δ if and only if its image under σ_λ^{-1} does. This image is

$$\begin{aligned} & (\gamma \circ \beta(\lambda, u_2, \dots, u_{12})).\sigma_\lambda^{-1} \\ &= (F + \lambda^6x_4^3 + \lambda^6u_2x_4x_3^2 + \dots + \lambda^6u_{12}x_0^3).\sigma_\lambda^{-1} \\ &= F + x_4^3 + \lambda^2u_2x_4x_3^2 + \dots + \lambda^{12}u_{12}x_0^3, \end{aligned}$$

which is the point of A with coordinates $(\lambda^2u_2, \dots, \lambda^{12}u_{12})$. Therefore a defining equation for $(\gamma \circ \beta)^{-1}(\hat{\Delta})$ in $\mathbb{C}^* \times A$ is

$$(3.10) \quad \delta'(\lambda^2u_2, \dots, \lambda^{12}u_{12}) = 0.$$

The second idea is to determine the lowest-weight terms of δ' , with respect to the weights $\text{wt}(u_i) = i$, by using our knowledge of $\hat{\Delta} \cap E$. The closure in $\mathbb{C} \times A$ of the variety (3.10) meets $\{0\} \times A$ in the variety defined by $\delta'_{\text{lowest}}(u_2, \dots, u_{12})$, where δ'_{lowest} consists of the lowest-weight terms of δ' . By lemma 3.8, we have $\widehat{B \cap \hat{\Delta}} = \hat{B} \cap \hat{\Delta}$ near (T, τ_0) . Therefore δ'_{lowest} defines $(\gamma \circ \beta)^{-1}(E \cap \hat{\Delta}) \subseteq \{0\} \times A$. By lemma 3.3(i), we know that $E_T \cap \hat{\Delta}$ consists of those (T, τ) where τ has a multiple point. This forces δ'_{lowest} to be a power of the standard A_{11} discriminant δ , which is defined by the property that $\delta(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) = 0$ if and only if

$$s^{12} + u_2s^{10} + u_3s^9 + \dots + u_{12}$$

has a multiple root. Since δ is quasihomogeneous of weight 132, we have

$$(3.11) \quad \delta'(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) = \delta^p(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) + (\text{terms of weight } > 132p)$$

for some $p \geq 1$. Although it is not essential, we will soon see that $p = 1$.

The third idea is to use singularity theory to describe $\Delta \cap A$ in a neighborhood of $G_{0,\dots,0}$, in terms of a different set of local coordinates.

One can show that the threefold defined by $G_{0,\dots,0}$ has only one singularity, which lies at P and has type A_{11} . Furthermore, the family A of threefolds provides a versal deformation of this singularity. Therefore there is a neighborhood W of $G_{0,\dots,0}$ in A such that $\Delta \cap W$ is a copy of the standard A_{11} discriminant. That is, there are analytic coordinates v_2, \dots, v_{12} on W , centered at $G_{0,\dots,0}$, such that $\Delta \cap W$ is defined by $\delta(v_2, \dots, v_{12}) = 0$. This tells us that $p = 1$, because $\delta'(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) = 0$ and $\delta(v_2, \dots, v_{12}) = 0$ define the same variety, and therefore vanish to the same order at the origin. We suppose without loss of generality that W is the unit polydisk with respect to the v_i coordinate system.

The fourth idea is to use a sort of rigidity of the A_{11} discriminant. Briefly: since the variety defined by $\delta(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) = 0$ is close to that defined by $\delta(v_2, \dots, v_{12}) = 0$, the u_i must be close to the v_i . This relationship between coordinate systems will be crucial later in the proof. To make this idea precise, consider the diffeomorphism-germ g of W at $G_{0,\dots,0}$ given by $u_i \circ g = v_i$. Since the image of the locus $\delta(v_2, \dots, v_{12}) = 0$ is the locus $\delta(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) = 0$, and since the first of these is also the locus $\delta'(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) = 0$, we have $\delta \circ g = \delta'$. Now, a computer calculation using Maple [22] shows that the 11 terms of δ specified by the hypothesis of lemma 3.9 are nonzero, and (3.11) implies that δ' has no terms of weight < 132 . The lemma then implies

$$(3.12) \quad v_i = c_i u_i + p_i(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) + q_i(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) ,$$

where the c_i , p_i and q_i have the properties stated there. We will actually need not this but rather its inverse, giving the u_i in terms of the v_i . To compute this it suffices to work in the formal power series ring; one writes (3.12) as

$$u_i = \frac{1}{c_i} v_i - \frac{1}{c_i} p_i(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) + \frac{1}{c_i} q_i(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) ,$$

substitutes these expressions into themselves, and repeats this process infinitely many times. The result is

$$(3.13) \quad u_i = c'_i v_i + p'_i(v_2, \dots, v_{12}) + q'_i(v_2, \dots, v_{12}) ,$$

where the c'_i , p'_i and q'_i satisfy the same conditions as the c_i , p_i and q_i , with respect to the weights $\text{wt}(v_i) = i$.

The fifth idea is to combine the quasihomogeneous scalings of the u_i and v_i to define a map α whose image will be the set \tilde{V}' whose existence is claimed by the lemma. For every $0 < |\lambda| < 1$ we define $\rho_\lambda : W \rightarrow W$ to be the quasihomogeneous scaling with respect to the v -coordinates:

$$\rho_\lambda(v_2, \dots, v_{12}) = (\lambda^2 v_2, \dots, \lambda^{12} v_{12}) .$$

For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$, we define $\eta_\lambda : A \rightarrow A$ to be the quasihomogeneous scaling with respect to the u -coordinates:

$$\eta_\lambda(u_2, \dots, u_{12}) = (\lambda^2 u_2, \dots, \lambda^{12} u_{12}) .$$

The η_λ are related to the 1-parameter group (3.9) by

$$(3.14) \quad \gamma \circ \beta(\lambda, \eta_\lambda(a)) = \sigma_\lambda^{-1}(a) ,$$

which can be verified by expressing both sides in terms of the u -coordinates and expanding. We define

$$\alpha : (B^1 - \{0\}) \times W \rightarrow (B^1 - \{0\}) \times A$$

by $\alpha(\lambda, w) = (\lambda, \eta_{\lambda^{-1}} \rho_\lambda(w))$. It is easy to see that α is injective.

The first property of α is that the preimage of the discriminant under it has a very simple form, namely

$$(3.15) \quad (\gamma \circ \beta \circ \alpha)^{-1}(\widehat{\Delta}) = (B^1 - \{0\}) \times (\Delta \cap W) .$$

To see this, observe that

$$\gamma \circ \beta \circ \alpha(\lambda, w) = \gamma \circ \beta(\lambda, \eta_{\lambda^{-1}} \rho_\lambda(w)) = \sigma_\lambda(\rho_\lambda(w)) ,$$

which lies in Δ if and only if $\rho_\lambda(w)$ does, hence if and only if w does.

The second property of α is that it extends to a holomorphic map $B^1 \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \times A$. To prove this, it suffices by Riemann extension to show that it has a continuous extension. The key step is to compute $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\lambda, w)$. If $w \in W$, then its v -coordinates are $v_2(w), \dots, v_{12}(w)$, and the v -coordinates of $\rho_\lambda(w)$ are $\lambda^2 v_2(w), \dots, \lambda^{12} v_{12}(w)$. Using (3.13), the u -coordinates of $\rho_\lambda(w)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(\rho_\lambda(w)) &= c'_i \lambda^i v_i(w) + p'_i(\lambda^2 v_2(w), \dots, \lambda^{12} v_{12}(w)) \\ &\quad + q'_i(\lambda^2 v_2(w), \dots, \lambda^{12} v_{12}(w)) \\ &= \lambda^i \cdot \left(c'_i v_i(w) + p'_i(v_2(w), \dots, v_{12}(w)) \right) \\ &\quad + (\text{terms of degree } > i \text{ in } \lambda) . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the u -coordinates of $\eta_{\lambda^{-1}} \rho_\lambda(w)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(\eta_{\lambda^{-1}} \rho_\lambda(w)) &= \lambda^{-i} u_i(\rho_\lambda(w)) = c_i v_i(w) + p'_i(v_2(w), \dots, v_{12}(w)) \\ &\quad + \text{terms involving } \lambda . \end{aligned}$$

The limit as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ obviously exists, and provides the desired extension.

The third property of α is that after shrinking W , we may suppose that $\alpha : B^1 \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \times A$ is a diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of $(0, G_{0,\dots,0})$. To see this we use the fact that

$$u_i(\alpha(0, w)) = c'_i v_i(w) + p'_i(v_2(w), \dots, v_{12}(w)) ;$$

since the c'_i are nonzero and the p'_i have no linear terms, we may shrink W so that $w \mapsto \alpha(0, w)$ is injective. Then $\alpha : B^1 \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \times A$ gives a diffeomorphism from $\{0\} \times W$ onto a neighborhood of $(0, G_{0,\dots,0})$ in $\{0\} \times A \subseteq \tilde{U}'$. We will call this diffeomorphism α_0 .

Because $\alpha : B^1 \times W \rightarrow \tilde{U}'$ is injective and \tilde{U}' is normal, α is a diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of $(T, \tau_0)^\sim$ in \tilde{U}' . We define \tilde{V}' to be the image of α . Unwinding the definitions gives

$$(3.16) \quad (\pi_{\tilde{U}'} \circ \alpha)^{-1}(E) = \{0\} \times W$$

and

$$(3.17) \quad (\pi_{\tilde{U}'} \circ \alpha)^{-1}(\hat{\Delta}) = B^1 \times (W \cap \hat{\Delta}).$$

This is exactly what we want, except that W is a subset of A , not a subset of $\hat{B} \cap E$. However, α_0 identifies W with a subset of $\{0\} \times A$, which is identified under $\gamma \circ \beta$ with a subset of $\hat{B} \cap E$, which we take to be W' . The identification $W \cong W'$ identifies $W \cap \hat{\Delta}$ with $W' \cap \hat{\Delta}$, so we may replace W by W' in (3.16) and (3.17). This completes the proof. \square

Proof of theorem 3.5. Theorem 3.6 gives us an analytic description of the 6-fold branched cover \tilde{V}' of a neighborhood of (T, τ_0) in \hat{B} . The idea is to take the quotient by the deck group $\mathbb{Z}/6$ and see what we get. Recall that $\tilde{U}' \cong \mathbb{C} \times A$, where $A \cong \mathbb{C}^{11}$, and the deck group is generated by $(\lambda, a) \mapsto (\lambda\zeta, a)$, where $\zeta = e^{\pi i/3}$. We will write ξ for this map. $(T, \tau_0)^\sim$ is the point $(0, G_{0,\dots,0}) \in \tilde{U}'$. Also, $\alpha : B^1 \times W \rightarrow \tilde{U}'$ is an embedding onto a neighborhood \tilde{V}' of $(T, \tau_0)^\sim$, where W is a polydisk around $G_{0,\dots,0}$ in A . We can't regard ξ as a self-map of $B^1 \times W$, because \tilde{V}' may not be a ξ -invariant subset of \tilde{U}' . However, we can take the intersection of the finitely many translates of \tilde{V}' , and let $Z \subseteq B^1 \times W$ be the α -preimage of this intersection. The action of ξ on Z can be worked out by using the definition of α . The result is $\xi(0, w) = (0, w)$, and

$$\xi(\lambda, w) = (\lambda\zeta, \rho_\lambda^{-1} \circ \rho_\zeta^{-1} \circ \eta_\zeta \circ \rho_\lambda(w))$$

for $\lambda \in B^1 - \{0\}$. Now, $\pi_{\tilde{U}'} \circ \alpha$ carries $Z/\langle \xi \rangle$ homeomorphically to a neighborhood of (T, τ_0) in \hat{B} . (T, τ_0) corresponds to the image of $(0, G_{0,\dots,0})$, and $\hat{\Delta} \cap \hat{B}$ to the image of $Z \cap (B^1 \times (W \cap \hat{\Delta}))$. Therefore our goal is to describe $Z/\langle \xi \rangle$ and the image therein of $Z \cap (B^1 \times (W \cap \hat{\Delta}))$.

To take the quotient $Z/\langle \xi \rangle$, we first observe that the 'slice of pie'

$$\Sigma = \{ \lambda \in B^1 \mid \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \text{Arg } \lambda \in [0, \pi/3] \}$$

is a fundamental domain for $\lambda \mapsto \lambda\zeta$ acting on B^1 , and the quotient $B^1/(\mathbb{Z}/6)$ is got by gluing one edge

$$E_0 = \{ \lambda \in B^1 \mid \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \text{Arg } \lambda = 0 \}$$

to the other

$$E_{\pi/3} = \{ \lambda \in B^1 \mid \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \text{Arg } \lambda = \pi/3 \}$$

in the obvious way. Similarly, $Z/\langle \xi \rangle$ is homeomorphic to $(Z \cap (\Sigma \times W))/\sim$, where \sim is the equivalence relation that each $(s, w) \in Z \cap (E_0 \times W)$ is identified with $\xi(s, w) \in Z \cap (E_{\pi/3} \times W)$. On the other hand, consider $(\Sigma \times W)/\approx$, where \approx is the equivalence relation that each $(s, w) \in E_0 \times W$ is identified with $(s\zeta, w)$. The key step in the proof is the definition of the following map

$$\Phi : (Z_0 \cap (\Sigma \times W))/\sim \rightarrow (\Sigma \times W)/\approx,$$

where Z_0 is a suitable neighborhood of $(0, G_{0,\dots,0})$ in Z , defined below. The map is $\Phi(\lambda, w) = (\lambda, w)$ for $\lambda \in E_0$, and

$$\Phi(\lambda, w) = \left(\lambda, \rho_{(\text{Arg } \lambda)/(\pi/3)}^{-1} \circ (\rho_\lambda^{-1} \rho_\zeta^{-1} \eta_\zeta \rho_\lambda) \circ \rho_{(\text{Arg } \lambda)/(\pi/3)}(w) \right)$$

otherwise. The definition of Z_0 is essentially the subset of Z on which the formula makes sense. That is, if $(\lambda, w) \in Z_0$ with $\lambda \in \Sigma - E_0$, then

$$\eta_\zeta \rho_\lambda \rho_{(\text{Arg } \lambda)/(\pi/3)}(w) \in \rho_\lambda \rho_{(\text{Arg } \lambda)/(\pi/3)}(W).$$

Assuming for a moment the existence of this set Z_0 , it is easy to complete the proof. The key point is that the restriction of Φ to $Z_0 \cap (E_0 \times W)$ is the obvious inclusion into $E_0 \times W$, while the Φ -image of $(\lambda, w) \in (E_{\pi/3} \times W)$ is $\xi(\lambda\zeta^{-1}, w)$. Furthermore, for any $(\lambda, w) \in Z_0 \cap (\Sigma \times W)$, $\Phi(\lambda, w)$ lies in $\Sigma \times (W \cap \widehat{\Delta})$ if and only if (λ, w) itself does. (This uses the fact that the ρ_λ are quasihomogeneous scalings of W that preserve $W \cap \widehat{\Delta}$.) It follows that $Z/\langle \xi \rangle$ is homeomorphic to a neighborhood of $(0, G_{0,\dots,0})$ in $(\Sigma \times W)/\approx$, i.e., in $B^1 \times W$, with its intersection with $\widehat{\Delta}$ being $(\Sigma \times (\widehat{\Delta} \times W))/\approx$, i.e., $B^1 \times (\widehat{\Delta} \times W)$. This implies the theorem.

All that remains is to construct Z_0 . First observe that Z contains $B^1 \times \{G_{0,\dots,0}\} \subseteq B^1 \times W$. Therefore there exists a neighborhood W_0 of $G_{0,\dots,0}$ in W such that $B^1 \times W_0 \subseteq Z$. Since ξ is defined on $B^1 \times W_0$, we have $\eta_\zeta \rho_{\lambda'}(w) \in \rho_{\lambda'}(W)$ for all $(\lambda', w) \in B^1 \times W_0$. Setting $\lambda' = \lambda \cdot (\text{Arg } \lambda)/(\pi/3)$, we see that Φ is defined on $B^1 \times W_0$. Now we set Z_0 equal to the intersection of the ξ -translates of $B^1 \times W_0$. \square

4. EXTENSION OF THE PERIOD MAP

In this section we extend the period map $g : PC_0 \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ defined in section 2 to a larger domain. It turns out that g does extend to all of PC_s but not to PC_{ss} . Replacing $P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ by its Baily-Borel compactification $\overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$ allows us to extend g to most of PC_{ss} but not all. The problem is that it does not extend to the chordal cubic locus. We will see a proof of this in section 5, but for now we just refer to this to motivate the blowing-up of the chordal cubic locus in PC to obtain \widehat{PC} , and extending g to a regular map $(\widehat{PC})_{ss} \rightarrow \overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$. In this section we will construct the extension; we rely heavily on lemma 2.4 and theorems 3.1 and 3.2, which describe the local structure of the discriminant. Recall that we write π for the projection $\widehat{PC} \rightarrow PC$, E for the exceptional divisor, $E_T \cong P^{12}$ for the points of E lying over a chordal cubic T , and (T, τ) for a point in E_T , where τ is an unordered 12-tuple in the rational normal curve R_T of which T is the secant variety.

The first thing we need to do is describe $(\widehat{PC})_s$ and $(\widehat{PC})_{ss}$, using [2] and [29]. To lighten the notation we will write just \widehat{PC}_s and \widehat{PC}_{ss} . In order to discuss GIT-stability we need to choose a line bundle on \widehat{PC} . The following lemma shows that this choice doesn't matter very much; it follows directly from the considerations of [29, sec. 2].

Lemma 4.1. *For large enough d , the stable and semistable loci of \widehat{PC} , with respect to the standard $SL(5, \mathbb{C})$ -action on*

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{O}(-E) \otimes \pi^*(\mathcal{O}(d)) ,$$

are independent of d . □

Our notation \widehat{PC}_s and \widehat{PC}_{ss} refers to the linearization (4.1) for large enough d . Reichstein's work allows us to describe these sets explicitly:

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose T is a cubic threefold not in the closure of the chordal cubic locus, regarded as an element of \widehat{PC} . Then*

- (i) *T is stable if and only if each singularity of T has type A_1 , A_2 , A_3 or A_4 ;*
- (ii) *T is semistable if and only if each singularity of T has type A_1, \dots, A_5 or D_4 ;*
- (iii) *T is strictly semistable with closed orbit in \widehat{PC}_{ss} if and only if T is projectively equivalent to one of the threefolds defined by*

$$x_0x_1x_2 + x_3^3 + x_4^3$$

or

$$F_{A,B} = Ax_2^3 + x_0x_3^2 + x_1^2x_4 - x_0x_2x_4 + Bx_1x_2x_3 ,$$

with $A, B \in \mathbb{C}$ and $4A \neq B^2$.

Now suppose instead that T is in the closure of the chordal cubic locus but is not a chordal cubic. Then every element of $\pi^{-1}(T) \subseteq \widehat{PC}$ is unstable. Finally, suppose that T is a chordal cubic, and τ is an unordered 12-tuple in the rational normal curve R_T , so that $(T, \tau) \in E_T \subseteq \widehat{PC}$. Then

- (iv) (T, τ) is stable if and only if τ has no points of multiplicity ≥ 6 ;
- (v) (T, τ) is semistable if and only if τ has no points of multiplicity greater than 6;
- (vi) (T, τ) is strictly semistable with closed orbit in \widehat{PC}_{ss} if and only if τ consists of two distinct points of multiplicity 6.

Finally, the points (vi) of \widehat{PC} lie in the closure of the union of the orbits of the $T_{A,B}$ from (iii).

Remarks. The first threefold described in (iii) has three D_4 singularities, and is the unique such cubic threefold. The 2-parameter family $T_{A,B}$ really describes only a 1-parameter set of orbits, because the projective equivalence class is determined by the ratio $4A/B^2 \in \mathbb{CP}^1 - \{1\}$. These threefolds have exactly two singularities, both of type A_5 , except when $A = 0$, when there is also an A_1 singularity. Every cubic threefold with two A_5 singularities is projectively equivalent to one of these. If $4A$ and B^2 were allowed to be equal and nonzero, then $F_{A,B}$ would define a chordal cubic. All of these assertions are proven in section 5 of [2].

Proof. Throughout the proof, we will write $L \subseteq PC$ for the closure of the chordal cubic locus. By theorems 2.1 and 2.3 of [29], a point of $\widehat{PC} - E$ is unstable as an element of \widehat{PC} if and only if either (a) it is unstable as an element of PC , or (b) it is GIT-equivalent in PC to an element of L . Referring to the stability of cubic threefolds, given by theorems 1.3 and 1.4 of [2], this says that $\widehat{PC}_{ss} - E$ is the set of T 's having no singularities of types other than A_1, \dots, A_5 and D_4 . This justifies (ii). The same theorems of [29] say that a point of $\widehat{PC} - E$ is stable as an element of \widehat{PC} if and only if it is stable as an element of PC . Referring again to [2], this says that $\widehat{PC}_s - E$ is the set of T having no singularities of types other than A_1, \dots, A_4 , justifying (i). Now we prove (iii). If $T \in \widehat{PC}_{ss} - E$ is not in \widehat{PC}_s , then it has a singularity

of type A_5 or D_4 . Then theorem 1.3(i,ii) of [2] implies that T is GIT-equivalent in PC , hence in \widehat{PC} , to one of the threefolds given in (iii). Theorem 1.2 of [2] implies that the threefolds given explicitly in (iii) have closed orbits in PC_{ss} ; since the orbits miss L , they are also closed in \widehat{PC}_{ss} . It follows that these orbits are the only orbits in $\widehat{PC}_{ss} - E$ that are strictly semistable and closed in \widehat{PC}_{ss} . This justifies (iii).

Now suppose $T \in L$. If T is not a chordal cubic then it is unstable by theorem 1.4(i) of [2], so every point of \widehat{PC} lying over T is unstable by theorem 2.1 of [29]. It remains only to discuss stability of pairs (T, τ) with T a chordal cubic. Our key tool is theorem 2.4 of [29]. This says that (T, τ) is unstable if and only if it lies in the proper transform of the set of cubic threefolds that are GIT-equivalent to chordal cubics. So our job is to determine this proper transform. If τ has a point of multiplicity > 6 , then by lemma 3.3(ii) it is a limit of threefolds having $A_{n>5}$ singularities. Since T lies in PC_{ss} and PC_{ss} is open in PC , (T, τ) is a limit of semistable threefolds having $A_{n>5}$ singularities. By theorem 1.3 of [2], such threefolds are GIT-equivalent to chordal cubics. Then Reichstein's theorem 2.4 shows that (T, τ) is unstable. Reichstein's theorem also asserts that $(T, \tau) \in \widehat{PC}_{ss}$ is non-stable if and only if it lies in the proper transform of $PC_{ss} - PC_s$. If τ has a point of multiplicity 6, then lemma 3.3(ii) shows that (T, τ) is a limit of semistable threefolds having A_5 singularities, so it is not stable. This justifies the 'if' parts of (iv) and (v).

Now, suppose τ has no point of multiplicity > 6 . Since PC_{ss} is open, T has a neighborhood $U \subseteq PC$ with every member of $U - L$ having only A_n and D_4 singularities. (In fact, D_4 singularities can be excluded, but this doesn't matter here.) By lemma 2.4, every member of $U - L$ admits in PC a simultaneous versal deformation of all its singularities. If some member of $U - L$ had an $A_{n \geq 6}$ singularity, then at some point of $U - L$, Δ would be locally modeled on the A_n discriminant (times a ball of the appropriate dimension). On the other hand, it follows from theorem 3.2 that after shrinking U we may suppose that at every point of $U - L$, Δ is locally modeled on

$$(4.2) \quad \bigcup_{i=1}^m K_1 \times \cdots \times K_{i-1} \times \Delta_i \times K_{i+1} \times \cdots \times K_m \times B^N,$$

where the notation is as in lemma 2.4. In particular, the $\Delta_i \subseteq K_i$ are copies of the A_k discriminants for various k 's that are at most 5. Since (4.2) is not a copy of an $A_{n \geq 6}$ discriminant, U contains no points with an $A_{n \geq 6}$ singularity, hence no points GIT-equivalent to chordal cubics.

By theorem 2.4 of [2], (T, τ) is not unstable, which is to say that it is semistable. This proves the ‘only if’ part of (v). The same argument, using the fact that members of $\widehat{PC}_{ss} - E$ have A_5 or D_4 singularities, proves the ‘only if’ part of (iv).

Finally, if τ has a point of multiplicity 6, then (T, τ) ’s orbit closure in $E_T \cap \widehat{PC}_{ss}$ contains (T, τ') , where τ' has two points of multiplicity 6. This is a classical fact about point-sets in P^1 . This proves (vi). To prove the last claim of the theorem, just observe that the restrictions of the $F_{A,B}$ in (iii) to the singular locus of the standard chordal cubic (defined by $F_{1,-2}$) consists of $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0]$ and $[0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$, each with multiplicity 6. Let $A \rightarrow 1$ and $B \rightarrow -2$. \square

Now that we know how much to enlarge the domain of g , we will construct the extension. This relies on an analysis of the local monodromy group at a point of \widehat{PC} , by which we mean the following. In section 2 we considered the local system $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0)$ over \mathcal{C}_0 and its associated local system $\mathbb{C}H(\mathcal{V}_0)$ of complex hyperbolic spaces. Now, $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0)$ does not descend to a local system on PC_0 , but $\mathbb{C}H(\mathcal{V}_0)$ does, because the scalars $\{I, \omega I, \bar{\omega} I\} \subseteq \mathrm{GL}(5, \mathbb{C})$ act on each $\Lambda(V)$ by scalar multiplication. After fixing a basepoint $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$, we defined

$$\rho : \pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0, F) \rightarrow \Gamma(V) := \mathrm{Aut} \Lambda(V)$$

to be the monodromy of $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}_0)$. Analogously, we define, for $T \in PC_0$,

$$(4.3) \quad P\rho : \pi_1(PC_0, T) \rightarrow P\Gamma(V) \subseteq \mathrm{Isom}(\mathbb{C}H(V)) .$$

Henceforth, all references to monodromy refer to $P\rho$ unless otherwise stated. In the arguments below, we will compute the monodromy of various elements of $\pi_1(PC_0)$. For convenience we will perform various monodromy calculations with roots of $\Lambda(V)$, but these could all be rephrased in terms of elements of $P\Gamma(V)$.

Now suppose T_0 or (T_0, τ_0) is an element of \widehat{PC} and U is a suitable small neighborhood of it; for example, U could be as in lemma 2.4 or theorem 3.1. By the local fundamental group we mean $\pi_1(U - (\widehat{\Delta} \cup E), T)$, where T is a basepoint. By the local monodromy action we mean the restriction of $P\rho$ to the local fundamental group, and by the local monodromy group we mean the image of this homomorphism in $P\Gamma(V)$. We will see that \widehat{PC}_s is exactly the subset of \widehat{PC}_{ss} where the local monodromy group is finite. In order to establish this, we will need to know the monodromy around a meridian of E :

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose γ is a meridian around E in \widehat{PC} , T is a point of γ , and $P\rho(\gamma)$ is the monodromy action of γ on $\mathbb{C}H(V)$. Then there*

is a direct sum decomposition

$$\Lambda(V) = \Lambda_1 \oplus \Lambda_{10} ,$$

where Λ_1 is the span of a norm 3 vector s , $P\rho(\gamma)$ acts on $\mathbb{C}H(V)$ as a hexaflection in s , and Λ_{10} is isometric to the sum of the last three summands in (2.8).

This lemma resembles lemma 2.3; each shows that a certain monodromy action is a complex reflection in a norm 3 vector of $\Lambda(V)$. But there is an essential difference. We have already defined a root of $\Lambda(V)$ to be any norm 3 vector r ; we refine the language by calling r nodal or chordal root according to whether $\langle r | \Lambda(V) \rangle$ is $\theta\mathcal{E}$ or $3\mathcal{E}$. It is easy to see that every root is either nodal or chordal. Lemma 4.3 asserts that the monodromy of a meridian around E is a hexaflection in a chordal root. Lemma 2.3 asserts that the monodromy of a meridian around $\hat{\Delta}$ is a triflection in a root, and a simple argument shows that this root must be nodal. (Namely, by considering a threefold with an A_2 singularity, one finds two meridians of $\hat{\Delta}$, which by lemma 2.5 act by the ω -reflections in linearly independent roots r and r' , and satisfy the braid relation. This relation forces $|\langle r | r' \rangle| = \sqrt{3}$, so $\langle r | r' \rangle$ is a unit times θ .) The ‘nodal’ and ‘chordal’ language reflects the fact that these monodromy transformations arise by considering a degeneration to a nodal threefold or to a chordal cubic. We caution the reader that while it is true that every nodal (resp. chordal) root of $\Lambda(V)$ comes from a nodal (resp. chordal) degeneration, we have not yet proven it. In theorem 7.2 we show that Γ is transitive on nodal and chordal roots of Λ . (The proof of theorem 7.2 is independent of the rest of the paper, so it could be read at this point.)

Proof of lemma 4.3: Let T_0 be the standard chordal cubic, and τ_0 a 12-tuple in R_{T_0} concentrated at one point. By theorem 3.1, the local fundamental group at (T_0, τ_0) is $\mathbb{Z} \times B_{12}$, where γ is a generator of \mathbb{Z} and we write a_1, \dots, a_{11} for standard generators for the braid group. By lemma 2.3, the a_i act on $\mathbb{C}H(V)$ as triflections, and the 1-dimensional eigenspaces of (lifts of the a_i to) $\Lambda(V)$ are spanned by vectors r_i of norm 3. We take Λ_{10} to be the span of the r_i . Following the proof of theorem 2.6 shows that Λ_{10} is a copy of the direct sum of the last three summands of (2.8), that Λ_{10} is a summand of $\Lambda(V)$, and that Λ_{10}^\perp is spanned by a vector of norm 3. We write s for such a vector and Λ_1 for its span. Since γ commutes with the a_i , any lift of $P\rho(\gamma)$ to $\Lambda(V)$ multiplies each r_i by a scalar. Since $r_i \cdot r_{i+1} \neq 0$, it multiplies all the r_i by the same scalar, so that it acts on Λ_{10} as that scalar. Therefore

$P\rho(\gamma)$ acts on $\mathbb{C}H(V)$ as a complex reflection in s of order 2, 3 or 6 (or acts trivially).

Now we show that $P\rho(\gamma)$ has order 6. We may find a neighborhood of $E - \widehat{\Delta}$ in \widehat{PC} which is a disk bundle over $E - \widehat{\Delta}$. (We do not need all the fibers to “have the same radius”—they can shrink as one approaches $\widehat{\Delta}$.) We choose a ball B around T_0 in the chordal cubic locus, and write N for the restriction of this disk bundle to $\pi^{-1}(B) \subseteq E$. N is a neighborhood of $E_{T_0} - \widehat{\Delta}$ in $\widehat{PC} - \widehat{\Delta}$, and we may suppose without loss of generality that γ and a_1, \dots, a_{11} lie in $N - E$. Now, $N - E$ is a punctured-disk bundle over $\pi^{-1}(B)$, which in turn is a punctured P^{12} -bundle over B . Since B is a ball, $\pi^{-1}(B) \rightarrow B$ trivializes topologically, so up to homotopy, $N - E$ is a circle-bundle over $E_{T_0} - \widehat{\Delta}$. Now, $\pi_1(E_{T_0} - \widehat{\Delta})$ is the 12-strand *spherical* braid group $B_{12}(S^2)$, so $\pi_1(N - E)$ is a central extension of $B_{12}(S^2)$ by $\mathbb{Z} = \langle \gamma \rangle$. Furthermore, the local description of the discriminant shows that the generators a_1, \dots, a_{11} map to the corresponding standard generators for $B_{12}(S^2)$. Now, $w = a_1 \cdots a_{10} a_{11}^2 a_{10} \cdots a_1 \in B_{12}$ represents the braid in which the leftmost strand moves in a large circle around all the other strands. Since this is trivial in $B_{12}(S^2)$, w is homotopic in $N - E$ to a member of the central \mathbb{Z} , i.e., to a power of γ . One can write out the $r_i \in \Lambda(V)$ explicitly, as in [3, sec. 5], and then matrix multiplication shows that w acts on $\mathbb{C}H(V)$ with order 6. Since $P\rho(\gamma)$ has order dividing 6, and some power of it has order 6, $P\rho(\gamma)$ itself has order 6. \square

Now we will extend the domain of g , in two steps. We will begin with the map $g : P\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ obtained from (2.10), where $P\mathcal{F}_0$ is the quotient of \mathcal{F}_0 by the action of $\mathbb{C}^* \subseteq \mathrm{GL}(5, \mathbb{C})$ given in (2.9). We enlarge $P\mathcal{F}_0$ to a space $P\mathcal{F}_s$, which is the branched cover of \widehat{PC}_s associated to the covering space $P\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow PC_0$. Formally, we define $p : P\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \widehat{PC}_s$ to be the Fox completion of the composition $P\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow PC_0 \rightarrow \widehat{PC}_s$. That is, a point of $P\mathcal{F}_s$ lying over a point T of \widehat{PC}_s is a function α which assigns to each neighborhood W of T a connected component $\alpha(W)$ of $p^{-1}(W \cap PC_0)$, in such a way that if $W' \subseteq W$ then $\alpha(W') \subseteq \alpha(W)$. $P\mathcal{F}_s$ has a natural topology; for details see [13]. By the naturality of the Fox completion, the actions of $P\Gamma$ and PG extend to $P\mathcal{F}_s$.

Since $P\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \widehat{PC}_s$ is branched over $\widehat{\Delta} \cup E$, it is clear that the local structure of $\widehat{\Delta}$ and E plays a key role in the nature of $P\mathcal{F}_s$; by studying it we will show that $P\mathcal{F}_s$ is a complex manifold. The analysis follows (3.3)–(3.10) of [4], but is more complicated.

We first need to assemble some known results about certain complex reflection groups. Coxeter [11] noticed that for $n = 1, \dots, 4$, if one adjoins to the $(n + 1)$ -strand braid group the relations that the n standard generators have order 3, then one obtains a finite complex reflection group. We call this group R_n . One can describe the group concretely by choosing vectors r_1, \dots, r_n that span an n -dimensional Euclidean complex vector space V_n , such that the i th generator acts as ω -reflection in r_i . One may scale the roots in any convenient manner; we take $r_i^2 = 3$ and refer to them as roots. Then the braid and commutation relations imply that $|\langle r_i | r_{i\pm 1} \rangle| = \sqrt{3}$ and all other inner products vanish. By multiplying r_2, \dots, r_n in turn by scalars, we can take $r_i \cdot r_{i+1} = \theta$ for all i . The group generated by the reflections in r_1, \dots, r_n is what we call R_n . In each case, r_1, \dots, r_n generate an \mathcal{E} -lattice, and it turns out that the reflections in R_n are exactly the triflections in the norm 3 vectors of this lattice. We write \mathcal{H}_n for the union of the orthogonal complements of all these vectors.

Theorem 4.4. *For any $n = 1, \dots, 4$, the pair $(V_n/R_n, \mathcal{H}_n/R_n)$ is diffeomorphic to $(\mathbb{C}^n, \Delta_{A_n})$, where Δ_{A_n} is the standard A_n discriminant. R_n acts freely on $V_n - \mathcal{H}_n$, so $V_n - \mathcal{H}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n - \Delta_{A_n}$ is a covering map. The subgroup of $B_{n+1} = \pi_1(\mathbb{C}^n - \Delta_{A_n})$ corresponding to this covering space is the kernel of the homomorphism $B_{n+1} \rightarrow R_n$ described above. Finally, $V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ is the Fox completion of the composition*

$$V_n - \mathcal{H}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n - \Delta_{A_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n .$$

Proof. That $V_n/R_n \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ is the same as the ring of R_n -invariants on V_n being a polynomial ring, which it is by work of Shephard and Todd [31]. That \mathcal{H}_n/R_n corresponds to the A_n discriminant is part of the main result of Orlik and Solomon [26, cor. 2.26]. It is known that any finite complex reflection group acts freely on the complement of the mirrors of its reflections. The subgroup H of B_{n+1} corresponding to the covering space contains the cubes of the meridians of Δ_{A_n} , since R_n contains the triflections across the components of \mathcal{H}_n . Since modding out B_{n+1} by the cubes of the standard generators yields a copy of R_n , the cubes of meridians generate H , and $B_{n+1}/H \cong R_n$ under the indicated homomorphism.

The claim about the Fox completion is a special case of the following: suppose G is a finite group acting linearly and faithfully on a finite-dimensional real vector space V , and contains no (real) reflections. Then, writing V_0 for the open subset of V on which G acts freely, $V \rightarrow V/G$ is the Fox completion of $V_0 \rightarrow V_0/G \rightarrow V/G$. (One just verifies that $V \rightarrow V/G$ satisfies the definition of a completion of $V_0 \rightarrow V/G$.)

The absence of real reflections in G is required for V_0 to be locally connected in V , in Fox's terminology.) \square

Now we can describe the Fox completion $P\mathcal{F}_s$. First we describe it away from the chordal locus, and then at a point in the chordal locus.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose $T \in \widehat{PC}_s - E$ has n_i singularities of type A_i , for each $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Suppose $\check{T} \in P\mathcal{F}_s$ lies over T . Then near \check{T} , $P\mathcal{F}_s$ has a complex manifold structure, indeed a unique one for which $P\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow PC_s$ is holomorphic. With respect to this structure, \check{T} has a neighborhood in $P\mathcal{F}_s$ diffeomorphic to*

$$(B^1)^{n_1} \times (B^2)^{n_2} \times (B^3)^{n_3} \times (B^4)^{n_4} \times B^N,$$

where $N = 34 - n_1 - 2n_2 - 3n_3 - 4n_4$, such that $P\mathcal{F}_0$ corresponds to

$$(B^1 - \mathcal{H}_1)^{n_1} \times (B^2 - \mathcal{H}_2)^{n_2} \times (B^3 - \mathcal{H}_3)^{n_3} \times (B^4 - \mathcal{H}_4)^{n_4} \times B^N.$$

The stabilizer of \check{T} in $P\Gamma$ is isomorphic to $G_1^{n_1} \times \dots \times G_4^{n_4}$, acting in the obvious way, and the map to \widehat{PC}_s is the quotient by this group action.

Proof. By lemma 2.4, T has a neighborhood $U \subseteq PC$ diffeomorphic to

$$(4.4) \quad (B^1/G_1)^{n_1} \times \dots \times (B^4/G_4)^{n_4} \times B^N,$$

such that $U \cap PC_0$ corresponds to (by theorem 4.4)

$$(4.5) \quad ((B^1 - \mathcal{H}_1)/G_1)^{n_1} \times \dots \times ((B^4 - \mathcal{H}_4)/G_4)^{n_4} \times B^N,$$

and the local fundamental group is $B_2^{n_1} \times \dots \times B_5^{n_4}$. We write T' for a basepoint in $U - \widehat{\Delta}$, so that we can refer to its associated fourfold V' . By lemma 2.3, any standard generator of any of the braid group factors acts on $\mathbb{C}H(V')$ as the ω -reflection in a root $r \in \Lambda(V')$. We write $H \subseteq \Gamma(V')$ for the group generated by all these reflections. The local monodromy group is by definition the projectivization of H .

By lemma 2.5, distinct generators of the local fundamental group give linearly independent roots. Therefore the discussion before theorem 4.4 shows that H is $R_1^{n_1} \times \dots \times R_4^{n_4}$. Since the \mathcal{E} -sublattice spanned by the roots is positive-definite, it has lower dimension than $\Lambda(V')$, so H contains no scalars. Therefore $P\rho(\pi_1(U - \widehat{\Delta}))$ is a copy of H . By theorem 4.4, the covering space of $U - \widehat{\Delta}$ associated to the kernel of this monodromy is

$$(B^1 - \mathcal{H}_1)^{n_1} \times \dots \times (B^4 - \mathcal{H}_4)^{n_4} \times B^N,$$

with the deck group being H , acting in the obvious way. Furthermore, the Fox completion over U is then

$$(B^1)^{n_1} \times \dots \times (B^4)^{n_4} \times B^N,$$

with \check{T} being the point at the center.

Since (4.4) is a diffeomorphism, not just a homeomorphism, $(B^1)^{n_1} \times \cdots \times (B^4)^{n_4} \times B^N \rightarrow U$ is complex analytic when the domain is equipped with the standard complex manifold structure. This gives the Fox completion a complex manifold structure such that $P\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow PC_s$ is holomorphic. A standard argument using Riemann extension shows that this structure is unique. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose $(T, \tau) \in E \cap \widehat{PC}_s$, where τ has n_i points of multiplicity $i + 1$, for each $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Suppose $(T, \tau)^\vee \in P\mathcal{F}_s$ lies over (T, τ) . Then near $(T, \tau)^\vee$, $P\mathcal{F}_s$ has a complex manifold structure, indeed a unique one for which $P\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \widehat{PC}_s$ is holomorphic. With respect to this structure, $(T, \tau)^\vee$ has a neighborhood diffeomorphic to*

$$B^1 \times (B^1)^{n_1} \times \cdots \times (B^4)^{n_4} \times B^{N-1},$$

where N is as in theorem 4.5, such that the preimage of E corresponds to

$$(4.6) \quad \{0\} \times (B^1)^{n_1} \times \cdots \times (B^4)^{n_4} \times B^{N-1}$$

and the preimage of PC_0 corresponds to

$$(B^1 - \{0\}) \times (B^1 - \mathcal{H}_1)^{n_1} \times \cdots \times (B^4 - \mathcal{H}_4)^{n_4} \times B^{N-1}.$$

The stabilizer of $(T, \tau)^\vee$ in $P\Gamma$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/6 \times G_1^{n_1} \times \cdots \times G_4^{n_4}$, with the G_i 's acting in the obvious way. The $\mathbb{Z}/6$ acts freely away from (4.6).

Proof. This is much the same as the previous proof. The difference is that we don't have a local analytic description of $\widehat{\Delta}$ near E , only weaker results, theorems 3.1 and 3.2. We begin with the local monodromy analysis. Theorem 3.1 provides a neighborhood U of (T, τ) with

$$\pi_1(U - (E \cup \widehat{\Delta})) \cong \mathbb{Z} \times (B_2)^{n_1} \times \cdots \times (B_5)^{n_4},$$

where a generator for the \mathbb{Z} factor is a meridian γ of E , and the standard generators for the braid group factors are meridians of $\widehat{\Delta}$. As in the previous proof, we write T' for a basepoint in $U - (E \cup \widehat{\Delta})$, so we can refer to the associated fourfold V' . We write H for the subgroup of $\Gamma(V')$ generated by the reflections in the roots associated to the braid group factors. By lemma 4.3, $P\rho(\gamma)$ is a hexaflection of $\mathbb{C}H(V')$, which is the projectivization of a hexaflection S of $\Lambda(V')$ in a chordal root s of $\Lambda(V')$. We write H' for $\langle H, S \rangle$. The local monodromy group $P\rho(\pi_1(U - (E \cup \widehat{\Delta})))$ is the projectivization of H' . Following the previous proof shows that $H \cong G_1^{n_1} \times \cdots \times G_4^{n_4}$. We claim that s is orthogonal to all the

roots of the braid group factors. To prove this, we use the fact that S commutes with H , so that for every nodal root r of a braid group factor, the triflection R in r carries s to a multiple of itself. Therefore, either s is orthogonal to all the r 's, or else it is proportional to one of them. The latter is impossible because then s would be both nodal and chordal, which is impossible. Since s is orthogonal to the r 's, $H' = \mathbb{Z}/6 \times H$. Arguing as in the previous proof, H' contains no scalars, so it maps isomorphically to its projectivization. Continuing as before proves the corollary, with “diffeomorphic” replaced by “homeomorphic”.

To prove the existence of the complex manifold structure, we proceed in two steps. First, we take \tilde{U} to be the 6-fold cover of U , branched over $U \cap E$. This clearly has a complex manifold structure such that $\pi_{\tilde{U}} : \tilde{U} \rightarrow U$ is holomorphic. Writing $(T, \tau)^\sim$ for the preimage of (T, τ) , theorem 3.2 provides us with a neighborhood \tilde{V} of $(T, \tau)^\sim$ with the properties stated there. The important property is that \tilde{V} is *diffeomorphic* to $B^1 \times (B^1/R_1)^{n_1} \times \cdots \times (B^4/R_4)^{n_4} \times B^{N-1}$, such that $\tilde{V} - \hat{\Delta}$ corresponds to

$$B^1 \times ((B^1 - \mathcal{H}_1)/R_1) \times \cdots \times ((B^4 - \mathcal{H}_4)/R_4) \times B^{N-1}.$$

Taking the branched cover of \tilde{V} with deck group H gives the claimed complex manifold model of $P\mathcal{F}_s$ near $(T, \tau)^\sim$. The uniqueness of the complex manifold structure again follows from Riemann extension. \square

Extending the period map to $P\mathcal{F}_s$ is now easy. If r is a root of Λ , then we will call $r^\perp \subseteq \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ a discriminant hyperplane or chordal hyperplane according to whether r is a nodal or chordal root. By the chordal (resp. discriminant) locus of $P\mathcal{F}_s$, we mean the preimage of $E \subseteq \widehat{PC}_s$ (resp. $\hat{\Delta}$).

Theorem 4.7. *The period map $P\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ extends to a holomorphic map $g : P\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$, which is invariant under PG and equivariant under $P\Gamma$. The chordal (resp. discriminant) locus of $P\mathcal{F}_s$ maps into the chordal (resp. discriminant) hyperplanes of $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$.*

Proof. $P\mathcal{F}_s$ is a complex manifold by theorems 4.5 and 4.6; since g is a map to a bounded domain, the extension exists by Riemann extension. The preimages of $\hat{\Delta}$ and E map into hyperplanes as claimed because of $P\Gamma$ -equivariance. Namely, a generic point of $P\mathcal{F}_s$ lying over $\hat{\Delta}$ has stabilizer $\mathbb{Z}/3$ in $P\Gamma$, so it maps to the fixed-point set of $\mathbb{Z}/3$ in $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$, which is a discriminant hyperplane. The same idea applies when $\hat{\Delta}$ is replaced by E . \square

Since the period map of theorem 4.7 is $P\Gamma$ -equivariant, it induces a map

$$\widehat{PC}_s = P\Gamma \backslash P\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10},$$

which we will now extend further. As before, we continue to use the notation g . The argument relies on a monodromy analysis near a threefold with an A_5 or D_4 singularity; we give the key point as a lemma:

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $F \in \mathcal{C}_{ss}$ defines a threefold T with a singularity of type A_5 , and let U be a neighborhood of F as in lemma 2.4, with basepoint F' . Let a_1, \dots, a_5 be standard generators for the corresponding factor B_6 of $\pi_1(U - \Delta, F')$, and let r_1, \dots, r_5 be roots of $\Lambda(V')$, by whose ω -reflections the a_i act. Suppose $\langle r_i | r_{i\pm 1} \rangle = \pm\theta$ and all other inner products are zero. Then $\xi = r_1 - \theta r_2 - 2r_3 + \theta r_4 + r_5$ is a nonzero isotropic vector of $\Lambda(V')$, and $(a_1 \dots a_5)^6$ acts on $\Lambda(V')$ by the unitary transvection in ξ , namely*

$$x \mapsto x - \frac{\langle x | \xi \rangle}{\theta} \xi.$$

Now suppose the singularity has type D_4 rather than A_5 , and that a_1, a_2, a_3 and b are standard generators for $\mathcal{A}(D_4) \subseteq \pi_1(U - \Delta)$, with b corresponding to the central node of the D_4 diagram. Suppose r_1, r_2, r_3 and r' are roots for the corresponding ω -reflections of $\Lambda(V')$, scaled so that $\langle r_i | r' \rangle = \theta$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then $\xi = r_1 + r_2 + r_3 - \theta r'$ is a nonzero isotropic vector of $\Lambda(V')$, and $(a_1 a_2 a_3 b)^3$ acts on $\Lambda(V')$ by the unitary transvection in ξ .

Remark. The given words in the Artin generators generate the centers of the Artin groups, and in each case, ξ spans the kernel of the restriction of $\langle | \rangle$ to the span of the roots. So it isn't surprising that the word acts by a transvection in a multiple of ξ . The point of the lemma is that this multiple is nonzero.

Proof. We treat the A_5 case first. We remark that the r_i are pairwise linearly independent by lemma 2.5, and by scaling them we may assume that their inner products are as stated. We need the sharper result that r_1, \dots, r_5 are linearly independent. Direct calculation using the given inner products shows that ξ is isotropic and orthogonal to r_1, \dots, r_5 . One can show that the locus of cubic threefolds with an A_5 singularity is irreducible, so to prove $\xi \neq 0$, it suffices to treat a single example. If T' has an A_6 singularity, then one can write down the inner product matrix for its six roots and check that it is nondegenerate. Therefore its six roots are linearly independent. In particular, the first five are, so $\xi \neq 0$. The fact that $(a_1 \dots a_5)^6$ acts as the transvection in ξ is

a matrix calculation—one writes down any linearly independent set of roots in $\mathbb{C}^{10,1}$ with these inner products, and just multiplies the reflections together suitably.

The same idea works for the D_4 case. To show $\xi \neq 0$, one must check (i) the irreducibility of the set of threefolds with a D_4 singularity, (ii) that there is a threefold with a D_5 singularity admitting a versal deformation in PC , and (iii) the inner product matrix for 5 roots corresponding to the generators of $\mathcal{A}(D_5)$ is nondegenerate. Then one does a matrix calculation to check the action of $(a_1 a_2 a_3 b)^3$. \square

Theorem 4.9. *The period map $\widehat{PC}_s \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ extends to a holomorphic map $g : \widehat{PC}_{ss} \rightarrow \overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$. This map sends $\widehat{PC}_{ss} - \widehat{PC}_s$ to the boundary points of the Baily-Borel compactification.*

Proof. The extension of g to $\widehat{PC}_{ss} - E$ follows section 8 of [4], but is a little more complicated. After explaining this, we will extend g to $\widehat{PC}_{ss} \cap E$ by modifying the argument, in the same way that we modified the proof of theorem 4.5 to prove theorem 4.6.

We begin by supposing $T \in \widehat{PC}_{ss} - (\widehat{PC}_s \cup E)$, with defining function F . We adopt the notation of lemma 2.4, so that T has m singularities s_1, \dots, s_m , and U is a neighborhood of F in \mathcal{C}_{ss} with the properties stated there. Let \check{U} be the universal cover of U with two-fold branching over $U \cap \Delta$. By Brieskorn's description [7] of versal deformations of simple singularities, \check{U} is diffeomorphic to a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{C}^{34} , such that the preimage $\check{\Delta}$ of Δ is the union of the reflection hyperplanes for the Coxeter group $W_1 \times \dots \times W_m$, where W_i is the Coxeter group of the same type as the singularity s_i . Let β be a loop lying in a generic line through the origin in \mathbb{C}^{35} , and encircling the origin once positively.

We claim that the sixth power of $\rho(\beta)$ is nontrivial and unipotent. (Discussing $\rho(\beta)$ requires choosing a basepoint in $\check{U} - \check{\Delta}$ and a framing of the threefold represented by the corresponding threefold $T' \in U - \Delta$. These choices are immaterial.)

If T has only one singularity, of type A_n , then in terms of the standard generators a_1, \dots, a_n for $\pi_1(U - \Delta) \cong B_{n+1}$, $\beta = (a_1 \dots a_n)^{n+1}$. The a_i act by ω -reflections in linearly independent roots r_1, \dots, r_n of $\Lambda(V)$, with $r_i \perp r_j$ except for $\langle r_i | r_{i\pm 1} \rangle = \pm\theta$. This lets one work out the action of β , by choosing such roots and multiplying matrices together. (Two choices of such roots are equivalent under $U(9, 1)$, so the conjugacy class of $\rho(\beta^6)$ in $U(9, 1)$ is independent of the choice.) Direct calculation shows that $\rho(\beta)$ has order 3, 2, 3 or 6 if $n = 1, \dots, 4$, and

if $n = 5$ then it is a nontrivial unipotent by lemma 4.8. (No calculation is required to see that $\rho(\beta)$ has finite order if $n < 5$, because $\rho(B_{n+1})$ is the finite group R_n .) If T has only one singularity, of type D_4 , with standard generators a_1, a_2, a_3 and b , b corresponding to the central node, then $\beta = (a_1 a_2 a_3 b)^6$, again lemma 4.8 shows that $\rho(\beta)$ is a nontrivial unipotent.

If T has m singularities, then $\beta = \beta_1 \dots \beta_m$, where each β_i is as β above, one for each singularity. Since the β_i 's commute, $\rho(\beta^6)$ is a product of nontrivial commuting unipotent isometries, one for each A_5 or D_4 singularity. Since T is not stable, there is at least one A_5 or D_4 singularity. If there is only one, then this proves that $\rho(\beta^6)$ is nontrivial and unipotent.

If there are more than one, then the product is unipotent since it is a product of commuting unipotents. A little extra work is required to show that it is nontrivial, i.e., that no cancellation occurs. Suppose s and s' are two singularities of T , each of type A_5 or D_4 . (T cannot have both an A_5 and a D_4 singularity, but this isn't needed here.) Let ξ and ξ' be the isotropic vectors from lemma 4.8. They are orthogonal because they correspond to distinct singularities. Since $\Lambda(V')$ has signature $(9, 1)$, ξ and ξ' are proportional. By using the formula defining a unitary transvection, one can check that the product of the transvections in ξ and ξ' is a transvection in a nonzero multiple of ξ . The same argument applies when there are more than two singularities of type A_5 or D_4 . (There is only one PG -orbit of such threefolds, which has three D_4 singularities.)

Because a power of $\rho(\beta)$ is nontrivial and unipotent, it fixes a unique point of $\partial\mathbb{C}H^{10}$. By unipotence, this fixed point is represented by a null vector of Λ , so there is an associated boundary point η of $\overline{PT\backslash\mathbb{C}H^{10}}$. We claim that for every neighborhood Z of η , there is a neighborhood \check{Y} of the origin in \check{U} , such that the composition

$$\check{U} - \check{\Delta} \rightarrow U - \Delta \rightarrow PT\backslash\mathbb{C}H^{10} \rightarrow \overline{PT\backslash\mathbb{C}H^{10}}$$

carries $\check{Y} - \check{\Delta}$ into Z . This uses a hyperbolic analysis argument (see p. 708 of [4]). It follows that for every neighborhood Z of η , there is a neighborhood Y of F in \mathcal{C} , such that $g(Y - \Delta) \subseteq Z$. Then, by Riemann extension, $g : Y - \Delta \rightarrow \overline{PT\backslash\mathbb{C}H^{10}}$ extends holomorphically to Y , carrying F to η .

Now suppose $(T, \tau) \in \widehat{PC}_{ss} \cap E$, with τ having a point of multiplicity six, and let \tilde{U} and \tilde{V} be as in theorem 3.2. Then let \check{V} be the universal cover of \tilde{V} with 2-fold branching over $\tilde{\Delta} \subseteq \tilde{V}$. We write $\check{\Delta}$ and \check{E} for

the preimages of Δ and E in \check{V} . From here, the treatment is exactly the same as above, except that \check{E} is present. This affects nothing, because the monodromy around \check{E} is trivial. (The monodromy around E has order 6, and \tilde{U} is the 6-fold cover of U branched over $U \cap E$.) \square

Theorem 4.10. *There are exactly two boundary points of $\overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$. The threefolds having a D_4 singularity map to one, and those having an A_5 singularity map to the other. The points (T, τ) of E , where τ has a point of multiplicity 6, map to the latter boundary point.*

We will call the boundary points the A_5 and D_4 cusps of $\overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$.

Proof. We know that the preimage in $\widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_{ss}$ of the boundary consists of $\widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_{ss} - \widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_s$. The GIT equivalence classes in $\widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_{ss} - \widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_s$ are represented by the points (iii) and (vi) of theorem 4.2. The threefolds $T_{A,B}$ form a 1-parameter family, limiting to (vi). Therefore they all map to a single boundary point. We call the union of these GIT equivalence classes the A_5 component of $\widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_{ss} - \widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_s$. Only one GIT equivalence class remains, which we call the D_4 component of $\widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_{ss} - \widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_s$. Therefore there are at most two boundary points.

Also, the images of the A_5 and D_4 components in $\widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_{ss}/\mathrm{SL}(5, \mathbb{C})$ are disjoint closed sets, so the A_5 and D_4 components have disjoint PG -invariant neighborhoods in $\widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_{ss}$. If both components mapped to a single boundary point, then the period map could not be injective on \mathcal{M}_0 , which it is by theorem 2.8. \square

5. DEGENERATION TO A CHORDAL CUBIC

The aim of this section is to identify the limit Hodge structure for the degeneration of cyclic quartic fourfolds associated to a generic degeneration to cubic threefolds to a chordal cubic. The following theorem is this section's contribution to the proof of the main theorem of the paper, theorem 7.1.

Theorem 5.1. *The period map $g : \widehat{P\mathcal{C}}_{ss} \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ carries the chordal locus onto a divisor.*

This immediately implies that the chordal cubics are points of indeterminacy for the rational map $\mathcal{C}_{ss} \dashrightarrow \overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$ obtained from the period map $\mathcal{C}_s \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$.

The theorem is a consequence of theorem 5.2 below, which most of the section is devoted to proving. This theorem describes the limit

Hodge structure in terms of a Hodge structure studied by Deligne and Mostow [24],[12], associated to a 12-tuple of points in P^1 .

5.1. Statement of Results. Let us establish notation and definitions. The chordal cubic T is the secant variety of a rational normal curve R in P^4 . R is the whole singular locus of T . Consider a pencil $\{T_t\}$ of cubic threefolds with $T_0 = T$. In homogeneous coordinates, the family near T_0 is

$$\{([x_0:\dots:x_4], t) \in P^4 \times \Delta \mid F(x_0, \dots, x_4) + tG(x_0, \dots, x_4) = 0\},$$

where F defines $T = T_0$, G is some other member of the pencil, and Δ is the unit disk in \mathbb{C} . We assume that the pencil is generic in the sense that T_t is smooth for all sufficiently small nonzero t . By scaling G we may suppose that T_t is smooth for all $t \in \Delta - \{0\}$. We also make the genericity assumption that $G = 0$ cuts out on R a set B of 12 distinct points, the “infinitesimal base locus”.

Taking the threefold covers of P^4 over the T_t gives a family \mathcal{V} of fourfolds, which is the restriction to $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ of the family called \mathcal{V} in the rest of the paper. Explicitly,

$$\mathcal{V} = \{([x_0:\dots:x_5], t) \in P^5 \times \Delta \mid F(x_0, \dots, x_4) + tG(x_0, \dots, x_4) + x_5^3 = 0\}.$$

All fibers of \mathcal{V} are smooth except for V_0 .

By lemma 4.3, the monodromy of $\mathcal{V}|_{\Delta - \{0\}}$ on $H^4(V_t)$ has finite index, so there is a well-defined limit Hodge structure. To discuss this limiting Hodge structure, we define the notion of an “Eisenstein Hodge structure.” This is an Eisenstein module H with a complex Hodge structure on the vector space $H \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C}$, where multiplication by ω preserves the Hodge decomposition. A morphism of such objects is a homomorphism of Eisenstein modules which is compatible with the Hodge decomposition.

The Eisenstein Hodge structure of interest to us throughout the paper is $\Lambda(V)$, for V a smooth cyclic cubic 4-fold. Recall that its underlying abelian group is $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$, and that the \mathcal{E} -module structure is defined by taking ω to act as σ^* , where σ is from (2.1). Then $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{R})$ is identified with $\Lambda(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C}$ and is hence a complex vector space. The projection to σ ’s ω -eigenspace identifies it with $H_{\sigma=\omega}^4(V; \mathbb{C})$. In light of this, the Hodge decomposition

$$(5.1) \quad H_{\sigma=\omega}^4(V; \mathbb{C}) = H_{\sigma=\omega}^{3,1}(V) \oplus H_{\sigma=\omega}^{2,2}(V)$$

gives an Eisenstein Hodge structure on $\Lambda(V)$.

The limit mixed Hodge structure of a degeneration can be computed from the mixed Hodge structure of the central fiber provided that the degeneration is *semistable*. One computes the limit using the Clemens-Schmid sequence [10]. A semistable model $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ for a degeneration \mathcal{V} is a family over Δ disk with the following properties:

- (a) There is a surjective morphism $\hat{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ which makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \hat{\mathcal{V}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Delta & \longrightarrow & \Delta \end{array}$$

commute, where the bottom arrow is $t = s^n$ for some n , with s a parameter on the left Δ and t a parameter on the right, and the restriction of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ to $\Delta - \{0\}$ is the pullback of $\mathcal{V}|_{\Delta - \{0\}}$. We write V and \hat{V} for the central fibers of \mathcal{V} and $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$, and V_t and \hat{V}_s for other fibers.

- (b) The total space of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ is smooth and the central fiber $s = 0$ is a normal crossing divisor (NCD) with smooth components, each of multiplicity one.

It is known that every one-parameter degeneration has a semistable model, obtainable by artful combination of three moves: base extension, blowing up, and normalization. In our case we will apply one base extension, replacing t by s^6 , followed by three blowups along various ideal sheaves.

In our case the Clemens-Schmid sequence reads as follows:

$$\cdots \rightarrow H^4(\hat{\mathcal{V}}, \hat{\mathcal{V}}^*) \rightarrow H^4(\hat{V}) \rightarrow \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} H^4(\hat{V}_s) \xrightarrow{N} H^4(\hat{V}_s) \rightarrow \cdots$$

where N is the logarithm of the monodromy transformation. The asterisk indicates the restriction of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ to the punctured disk. The terms of the sequence are abelian groups equipped with Hodge structures, but in our calculations we will only need to work with rational coefficients. Since the monodromy of \mathcal{V}^* on H^4 of the fiber has order 6 (by lemma 4.3), the base extension ensures that the monodromy of the semistable model is trivial. Therefore $N = 0$ and the sequence reduces to

$$(5.2) \quad \cdots \rightarrow H^4(\hat{\mathcal{V}}, \hat{\mathcal{V}}^*) \rightarrow H^4(\hat{V}) \rightarrow \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} H^4(\hat{V}_s) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since the monodromy is trivial, the limit is a (pure) Hodge structure and is presented as a quotient of the mixed Hodge structure on $H^4(\hat{V})$.

Because we are interested in the “Eisenstein part” of the sequence, we make the following definition. Let H be a \mathbb{Z} -module on which an

automorphism ζ of order n acts. Let p_k be the cyclotomic polynomial of degree k , where k is a divisor of n . Let $H_{(k)}$ be the kernel of $p_k(\zeta)$ acting on H . Then there is a decomposition of $H \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ into a direct sum of subspaces $H_{(k)} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Moreover, H is commensurable with the direct sum of the $H_{(k)}$. Since the characteristic polynomial for the action of ζ is p_k on $H_{(k)}$, we call $H_{(k)}$ the k th characteristic submodule (or subspace) of H , or alternatively, the k -part of H .

Passing to the 3-parts of the terms of (5.2), we have the sequence

$$(5.3) \quad \cdots \rightarrow H_{(3)}^4(\hat{\mathcal{V}}, \hat{\mathcal{V}}^*) \rightarrow H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}) \rightarrow \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}_s) \rightarrow 0,$$

which need not be exact. However, it is exact when one takes \mathbb{Q} as the coefficient group.

The Eisenstein Hodge structure of \hat{V} is the focus of the rest of this section; we describe it in theorem 5.2 below. The description is in terms of a curve C determined by the inclusion $B \subseteq R$. Identifying R with P^1 , B is the zero locus of homogeneous polynomial f of degree 12. The curve C is a certain 6-fold cover of P^1 branched over B , namely

$$(5.4) \quad C = \{ [x:y:z] \in P(1,1,2) \mid f(x,y) + z^6 = 0 \} ,$$

and it has an automorphism

$$(5.5) \quad \zeta([x:y:z]) = [x:y:-\omega z]$$

of order 6. The Griffiths residue calculus [33] shows that $H^{1,0}(C)$ is the vector space consisting of the residues of the rational differentials

$$(5.6) \quad \frac{a(x,y,z)\Omega}{f(x,y) + z^6}$$

where $\Omega = xdydz - ydxdz + zdx dy$ and the total weight is zero, so a is a polynomial of weight 8. Now, ζ scales z and Ω by $-\omega$, and it follows that $H_{\zeta=-\bar{\omega}}^{1,0}(C)$ is 1-dimensional, spanned by (5.6) with $a = 1$. One can also check that $H_{\zeta=-\bar{\omega}}^{0,1}(C)$ is 9-dimensional. We define an Eisenstein module structure $\Lambda_{10}(C)$ by taking the underlying group to be $H_{(6)}^1(C; \mathbb{Z})$ and taking $-\bar{\omega}$ to act as ζ^* . By the same considerations as above, $\Lambda_{10}(C) \otimes_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{C}$ is identified with $H_{\zeta=-\bar{\omega}}^1(C; \mathbb{C})$, so the Hodge structure of C gives an Eisenstein Hodge structure on $\Lambda_{10}(C)$. The notation $\Lambda_{10}(C)$ is intended to emphasize the parallel between the isomorphism in theorem 5.2 and the description of $\Lambda(V)$ in theorem 2.6.

Theorem 5.2. *There is an isogeny of Eisenstein Hodge structures*

$$\Lambda(\hat{V}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \oplus \Lambda_{10}(C)$$

of weight $(-2, -1)$, where \mathcal{E} indicates a 1-dimensional Eisenstein lattice with Hodge type $(1, 0)$.

Remark. The total weight of the map is -3 . It is odd for a map of Hodge structures to have odd total weight. Such odd weight morphisms were first considered by van Geemen in his paper on half twists [14].

Proof of theorem 5.1, given theorem 5.2. A consequence of theorem 5.2 is that $H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V})$ has rank 22 as a \mathbb{Z} -module, which is the same as the rank of the limit Hodge structure. Therefore (5.3) shows that the Eisenstein Hodge structures of $\Lambda(\hat{V})$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \Lambda(V_s)$ are isogenous. The period map for the family of Hodge structures $\Lambda_{10}(C)$ has rank 9, by a standard calculation with the Griffiths residue calculus. Therefore, as the pencils in PC through T vary, their limiting Hodge structures sweep out a 9-dimensional family. It follows from theorem 4.9 that the period map is proper, so the image of the chordal locus is closed, hence a divisor.

We remark that Mostow [24] (see also [12]) proved that the Eisenstein Hodge structure on $H_{(6)}^1(C)$ determines the point set B in P^1 up to projective transformation. This is a global Torelli theorem, rather than just the local one provided by the residue calculation referred to above. \square

5.2. Overview of the Calculations. This subsection outlines the calculations required for proving theorem 5.2. In order to discuss \hat{V} we need to describe briefly our particular semistable model $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$. In the next subsection, we define \mathcal{V}_0 as the degree 6 base extension of \mathcal{V} , \mathcal{V}_1 as a blowup of \mathcal{V}_0 , \mathcal{V}_2 as a blowup of \mathcal{V}_1 and \mathcal{V}_3 as a blowup of \mathcal{V}_2 . $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ is \mathcal{V}_3 . We write $E_1 \subseteq \mathcal{V}_1$, $E_2 \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2$ and $E_3 \subseteq \mathcal{V}_3$ for the exceptional divisors of the blowups, and indicate proper transforms of V and the E_i in subsequent blowups by adding primes. For example, V' is the proper transform of V in \mathcal{V}_1 , and the central fiber of \mathcal{V}_3 is

$$\hat{V} = V''' \cup E_1'' \cup E_2' \cup E_3.$$

Using the Mayer-Vietoris and Leray spectral sequences, we show in lemma 5.8 that only V''' and E_1'' contribute to $H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}; \mathbb{Q})$, and these contributions depend only on V and E_1 . That is,

$$(5.7) \quad H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_{(3)}^4(V; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H_{(3)}^4(E_1; \mathbb{Q}).$$

A key point in the argument is that $H_{(3)}^*(A) = 0$ when A is any intersection of two or more components. In lemma 5.9 we show that the first term is the Eisenstein Hodge structure $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$, where all elements

are of type $(2, 2)$, and in lemma 5.10 we show that the second term is isomorphic to $H_{(6)}^1(C)$ as an Eisenstein Hodge structure. Theorem 5.2 follows.

5.3. Semistable reduction. We now construct a semistable model $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ for \mathcal{V} . Once constructed, it will be called \mathcal{V}_3 . As noted above, our approach is to apply one base extension followed by three blowups, the first of which is centered in R .

Let \mathcal{V}_0 denote the result of base extension of \mathcal{V} , where $t = s^6$ is the parameter substitution. Thus

$$\mathcal{V}_0 = \{([x_0 : \dots : x_4, z], s) \in P^5 \times \Delta \mid F + s^6 G + z^3 = 0\},$$

with $s = 0$ defining the central fiber $\mathcal{V}_0(0)$. This central fiber is just the fourfold V defined by $F + z^3 = 0$, which is singular along R .

The next step is to blow up \mathcal{V}_0 by blowing up $P^5 \times \Delta$ along an ideal sheaf \mathcal{J} supported in R . Let \mathcal{I} denote the ideal sheaf of R in P^4 . Extend it, keeping the same name, to the ideal sheaf on $P^5 \times \Delta$ that defines

$$(\text{the cone on } R \text{ in } P^5, \text{ with vertex } [0:0:0:0:1]) \times \Delta.$$

Let \mathcal{J} be the ideal sheaf

$$(5.8) \quad \mathcal{J} = \langle \mathcal{I}^2, \mathcal{I}zs, \mathcal{I}s^3, z^3, z^2s^4, zs^4, s^6 \rangle.$$

Finally, let $\widehat{P^5 \times \Delta}$ be the blowup of $P^5 \times \Delta$ along \mathcal{J} , and let \mathcal{V}_1 be the proper transform of \mathcal{V}_0 . The central fiber $\mathcal{V}_1(0)$ is the pullback of $s = 0$, and consists of the proper transform V' of V and the exceptional divisor E_1 of $\mathcal{V}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$.

The family \mathcal{V}_1 is nearly semistable; one could call it an “orbifold semistable model”. The precise meaning of this is that the inclusion of the central fiber into \mathcal{V}_1 is locally modeled on the inclusion of a normal crossing divisor into a smooth manifold, modulo a finite group. We will now proceed to resolve the quotient singularities.

Let S be the singular locus of \mathcal{V}_1 . This turns out to lie in $V' \cap E_1$ and be a P^1 bundle over R . Let \mathcal{K} be the ideal sheaf generated by (i) the regular functions vanishing to order 2 along S , and (ii) the regular functions vanishing to order 3 at a generic point of V' . Let \mathcal{V}_2 be the blowup of \mathcal{V}_1 along \mathcal{K} . The central fiber $\mathcal{V}_2(0)$ consists of the proper transforms V'' and E'_1 of V' and E_1 , together with the new exceptional divisor E_2 .

The family \mathcal{V}_2 is also an “orbifold semistable model.” It has quotient singularities along a surface Σ which projects isomorphically to S and

is smooth away from Σ . Define \mathcal{V}_3 to be the ordinary blowup of \mathcal{V}_2 along Σ . This is the desired semistable model $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$. Its central fiber $\mathcal{V}_3(0)$ is as always the pullback of $s = 0$, and consists of the proper transforms V''' , E_1'' and E_2' , and the exceptional divisor E_3 . Of course, σ acts on \mathcal{V}_0 by $z \rightarrow \omega z$. Since it preserves \mathcal{J} , it acts on \mathcal{V}_1 , and similarly for \mathcal{V}_2 and \mathcal{V}_3 .

Theorem 5.3. *$\mathcal{V}_3 \rightarrow \Delta$ is a semistable model for the family $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Delta$.*

The rest of this subsection is devoted to proving this theorem and describing the various varieties in enough detail for the cohomology calculations in subsection 5.4. We will discuss weighted blowups and give two lemmas, and then construct and study the three blowups. We provide more computational detail than we would if our blowups were just ordinary blowups.

We describe weighted blowups as follows. Let $P(a) = P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be the weighted projective space with weights $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. The *weighted blowup* of \mathbb{C}^n with weights a is the closure of the graph of the rational map $f : \mathbb{C}^n \dashrightarrow P(a)$, where $f(z_1, \dots, z_n) = [z_1 : \dots : z_n]$ is the natural projection.

One can write down orbifold coordinate charts for the weighted blowup as in [17, pp. 166–167]. However, note that the definition of weighted blowup on p. 166 of that reference contains a misprint. The map f used to define the graph should be the one we are using, not $f(z_1, \dots, z_n) = [z_1^{a_1} : \dots : z_n^{a_n}]$.

Weighted blowups are a special case of blowups of \mathbb{C}^n at an ideal supported at the origin. Suppose given weights (a_1, \dots, a_n) . Let d be the least common multiple of the weights. Let $h(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be the vector of monomials of weight d in some order, considered as a rational map from \mathbb{C}^n to P^{N-1} , where N the number of monomials. Let Γ_h be the closure of the graph of h . By the naturality of blowups, Γ is the blowup of \mathbb{C}^n along the ideal generated by the monomials of weight d . Let $v(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be the same vector of monomials regarded as a map from $P(a)$ to P^{N-1} . This “Veronese map” is well-defined, and it embeds $P(a)$ in P^{N-1} . Finally, let f be the natural quotient (rational) map from \mathbb{C}^n to $P(a)$, and let Γ_f be the closure of its graph. Then $v \circ f = h$. Since v is an embedding, it induces an isomorphism $\Gamma_f \cong \Gamma_g$. To summarize:

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose given weights (a_1, \dots, a_n) . Let d be their least common multiple, and let \mathcal{J} be the ideal generated by the monomials of weight d . Then the blowup of \mathbb{C}^n at the origin with weights (a_1, \dots, a_n) is isomorphic to the blowup of \mathbb{C}^n along \mathcal{J} . \square*

Let $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be an analytic hypersurface with equation $f_d(z) + f_{d+1}(z) + \cdots$, where f_k has weight k and $d > 1$. Then the proper transform \hat{X} of X under the weighted blowup is obtained as follows: delete the origin and replace it by the hypersurface in $P(a)$ defined by $f_d(z) = 0$. That is, replace the origin by the weighted projectivization of the weighted tangent cone of X . We call \hat{X} the weighted blowup of X at the point corresponding to the origin.

Next we give a local equation for the chordal cubic at a point of its singular locus.

Lemma 5.5. *Let T be the chordal cubic, R its rational normal curve, and P a point of R . Then there are local analytic coordinates x, u, v, w on a neighborhood of P in P^4 , in which R is defined by $u = v = w = 0$ and T by*

$$(5.9) \quad u^2 + v^2 + w^2 = 0.$$

Proof. A hyperplane H transverse to R at P meets T in a cubic surface with a node at P . Consequently there are analytic coordinates u, v, w on H near P such that the equation for $T \cap H$ is $u^2 + v^2 + w^2 = 0$. Now, there exists a 1-parameter subgroup X of $\text{Aut } T = \text{PGL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ that moves P along R , and we take x as a coordinate on X . The natural map $T \times X \rightarrow P^4$ gives the claimed local analytic coordinates. \square

Remark. If H is a hyperplane in P^4 with a point of contact of order 4 with R , then there exist global algebraic coordinates on $P^4 - H$ such that $T - H$ is given by (5.9). The proof is an unenlightening sequence of coordinate transformations.

First blowup. One checks that $\mathcal{V}_0 \subseteq P^5 \times \Delta$ is smooth away from R and transverse to $\{s = 0\}$ away from R . To study \mathcal{V}_0 near a point P of R , introduce local analytic coordinates x, u, v, w, z, s around P as follows. Begin with affine coordinates x, u, v, w around P in P^4 , as in Lemma 5.9. Let z and s be the same z and s used above. Then a neighborhood of P in \mathcal{V}_0 is

$$\{(x, u, v, w, z, s) \in (\text{some open set in } \mathbb{C}^6) \mid \\ u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + s^6 G(x, u, v, w) + z^3 = 0\}.$$

If $P \in B$ then we may use the transversality of R and $\{G = 0\}$ to change coordinates by $x \rightarrow x + (\text{a function of } u, v, w)$, so that $\{G = 0\}$ is the same set as $\{x = 0\}$. That is, G is x times a nonvanishing function. Absorb a sixth root of this nonvanishing function into s .

This yields a neighborhood of P of the form

$$(5.10) \quad \left\{ (x, u, v, w, z, s) \in (\text{some open set in } \mathbb{C}^6) \mid \right. \\ \left. u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + s^6 x + z^3 = 0 \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{I} = \langle u, v, w \rangle$ and σ acts by $z \rightarrow \omega z$. If $P \notin B$ then the same analysis leads to (5.10), but with the $s^6 x$ term replaced by s^6 . We will not discuss this case, because it is implicitly treated in the $P \in B$ case (by looking at points of R near points of B).

We defined the ideal sheaf \mathcal{J} in (5.8), defined $\widehat{P^5 \times \Delta}$ as the blowup of $P^5 \times \Delta$ along \mathcal{J} , and \mathcal{V}_1 as the proper transform of \mathcal{V}_0 . To understand its geometry, we write down generators for \mathcal{J} in our local coordinates and recognize $\widehat{P^5 \times \Delta}$ as a weighted blowup along R . Since $\mathcal{I} = \langle u, v, w \rangle$, \mathcal{J} is generated by the monomials of weight six, where we give the variables u, v, w, z, s the weights 3, 3, 3, 2, 1. By lemma 5.4, \mathcal{V}_1 is the weighted blowup of \mathcal{V}_0 along the x -axis. By the discussion following that lemma, above a neighborhood of P , the exceptional divisor E_1 is

$$(5.11) \quad \left\{ (x, [u:v:w:z:s]) \in (\text{an open set in } \mathbb{C}) \times P(3, 3, 3, 2, 1) \mid \right. \\ \left. u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + z^3 + xs^6 = 0 \right\}.$$

That is, over $R - B$, E_1 is a smooth fibration with fiber isomorphic to the hypersurface in $P(3, 3, 3, 2, 1)$ defined by

$$(5.12) \quad u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + z^3 + s^6 = 0.$$

The special fibers lie above the points of $B \subset R$ and are copies of the weighted homogeneous hypersurface with equation $u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + z^3 = 0$.

The method we use for our detailed coordinate computations follows [17, pp. 166–167]. The blowup is covered by open sets B_u, B_v, B_w, B_z and B_s , each the quotient of an open set A_u, \dots, A_s of \mathbb{C}^6 by a group of order 3, 3, 3, 2 or 1. We will treat $A_u \rightarrow B_u \subseteq \widehat{P^5 \times \Delta}$ in some detail; the treatment of v and w is the same, and we will only briefly comment on B_z and B_s . One may take coordinates $x, \dot{u}, \dot{v}, \dot{w}, \dot{z}, \dot{s}$ on A_u , with $B_u = A_u / \langle \eta \rangle$, where η is the transformation $\dot{u} \rightarrow \omega \dot{u}$, $\dot{z} \rightarrow \omega \dot{z}$, $\dot{s} \rightarrow \bar{\omega} \dot{s}$. The map $A_u \rightarrow P^5 \times \Delta$ is given by $u = \dot{u}^3$, $v = \dot{v} \dot{u}^3$, $w = \dot{w} \dot{u}^3$, $z = \dot{z} \dot{u}^2$ and $s = \dot{s} \dot{u}$; these functions of \dot{u}, \dots, \dot{s} are η -invariant, so they define a map $B_u \rightarrow P^5 \times \Delta$. The preimage in A_u of the exceptional divisor of $\widehat{P^5 \times \Delta} \rightarrow P^5 \times \Delta$ is $\{\dot{u} = 0\}$. The pullback to A_u of the defining equation of \mathcal{V}_0 is $\dot{u}^6(1 + \dot{v}^2 + \dot{w}^2 + \dot{s}^6 x + \dot{z}^3) = 0$, so the preimage in A_u of the proper transform \mathcal{V}_1 is the hypersurface H given by $1 + \dot{v}^2 + \dot{w}^2 + \dot{s}^6 x + \dot{z}^3 = 0$. One checks that this is a smooth hypersurface. Also, the pullback to A_u of the central fiber

$s = 0$ is $\dot{s}\dot{u} = 0$, and one checks that H meets $\{\dot{u} = 0\}$, $\{\dot{s} = 0\}$ and $\{\dot{u} = \dot{s} = 0\}$ transversely. Therefore $s = 0$ defines a NCD in H with smooth components of multiplicity one. The one complication is that $\mathcal{V}_1 \cap B_u$ is $H/\langle\eta\rangle$ rather than H itself. Since η has fixed points in H , \mathcal{V}_1 turns out to be singular. We will resolve these singularities after discussing B_z and B_s .

The analysis of $\mathcal{V}_1 \cap B_s$ is easy, since $B_s = A_s$. One writes down the equation for $\mathcal{V}_1 \cap A_s$, and checks smoothness and transversality to $\{s = 0\}$. In fact, A_s meets only one component of the central fiber, E_1 . The analysis of $\mathcal{V}_1 \cap B_z$ is only slightly more complicated. We have $B_z = A_z/(\mathbb{Z}/2)$. One writes down the equation for the preimage of \mathcal{V}_1 in A_z , and checks its smoothness and that $s = 0$ defines a NCD with smooth components. Then one observes that this hypersurface misses the fixed points of $\mathbb{Z}/2$ in A_z , so that the same conclusions apply to $\mathcal{V}_1 \cap B_z$.

Now we return to $\mathcal{V}_1 \cap B_u$. It is convenient to make the coordinate change $\dot{v} \rightarrow (\dot{v} + \dot{w})/2$, $\dot{w} \rightarrow (\dot{v} - \dot{w})/2i$ on A_u , so that $\dot{v}^2 + \dot{w}^2$ is replaced by $\dot{v}\dot{w}$. Then the fixed-point set of η in $H \subseteq A_u$ is $\{(x, 0, \dot{v}, \dot{w}, 0, 0) | 1 + \dot{v}\dot{w} = 0\}$. Therefore every fixed point has $\dot{v} \neq 0$, and we can use $1 + \dot{v}\dot{w} + \dot{s}^6x + \dot{z}^3 = 0$ to solve for \dot{w} in terms of the other variables. The result is that there is an open set W in \mathbb{C}^5 , with coordinates $x, \dot{u}, \dot{v}, \dot{z}, \dot{s}$, mapping isomorphically onto its image in H , with its image containing all the fixed points of η in H . The induced action of η on W is $(x, \dot{u}, \dot{v}, \dot{z}, \dot{s}) \rightarrow (x, \omega\dot{u}, \dot{v}, \omega\dot{z}, \bar{\omega}\dot{s})$. Therefore, a point on the singular locus of \mathcal{V}_1 has a neighborhood in \mathcal{V}_1 locally modeled on $(W \subseteq \mathbb{C}^5)/\text{diag}[1, \omega, 1, \omega, \bar{\omega}]$. Therefore the singular locus of \mathcal{V}_1 is a smooth surface S . The preimage in W of the central fiber $s = 0$ is $\dot{s}\dot{u} = 0$. Note that this is η -invariant, hence well-defined on $W/\langle\eta\rangle$. The preimage in A_u of the exceptional divisor E_1 is $\dot{u} = 0$ and that of V' is $\dot{s} = 0$. Note that neither \dot{u} nor \dot{s} is η -invariant, so these equations don't make sense on $W/\langle\eta\rangle$. This reflects the fact that neither E_1 nor V' is a Cartier divisor, but their sum is. (It should not alarm the reader that E_1 is not Cartier, even though blowing up an ideal always gives a Cartier divisor; it is $3E_1$ rather than E_1 which is Cartier.) Finally, a lift to W of $\sigma : \mathcal{V}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_1$ is $\dot{z} \rightarrow \omega\dot{z}$. This shows that σ acts trivially on S .

Geometry of the central fiber. The central fiber of V_1 is the variety

$$\mathcal{V}_1(0) = V' \cup E_1,$$

where the exceptional divisor has already been described as a fibration over R . The components have multiplicity one. The first component is a blowup of V along S . The exceptional divisor of $V' \rightarrow V$ is $V' \cap E_1$,

which in coordinates is given by (5.11) with the extra condition $s = 0$. Therefore, $V' \cap E_1$ is a fiber bundle over R with fiber isomorphic to the hypersurface $u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + z^3 = 0$ in $P(3, 3, 3, 2)$. One can check that this hypersurface is a copy of P^2 (by projecting away from $[0:0:0:1]$).

Second blowup. Our aim is now to resolve the singularities of \mathcal{V}_1 . Henceforth, we will work with the local description of \mathcal{V}_1 in terms of $W/\langle\eta\rangle$, rather than regarding \mathcal{V}_1 as a hypersurface in a 6-dimensional space. We will see below (lemma 5.6) that blowing up the ideal sheaf \mathcal{K} to get \mathcal{V}_2 can be described in terms of $W/\langle\eta\rangle$ as follows. Recall that W has coordinates $x, \dot{u}, \dot{v}, \dot{z}, \dot{s}$ with $\eta = \text{diag}[1, \omega, 1, \omega, \bar{\omega}]$. Define \widehat{W} to be the weighted blowup of W along the $x\text{-}\dot{v}$ plane, where \dot{u} and \dot{z} have weight 1 and \dot{s} has weight 2. It is natural to use these weights, because with respect to them, η is weighted-homogeneous, hence fixes the exceptional divisor pointwise. Then the map

$$\left(\text{the preimage of } W/\langle\eta\rangle \subseteq \mathcal{V}_1 \text{ in } \mathcal{V}_2 \right) \rightarrow W/\langle\eta\rangle$$

turns out to be equivalent to $\widehat{W}/\langle\eta\rangle \rightarrow W/\langle\eta\rangle$. This is the content of lemma 5.6. As before, one covers \widehat{W} by open sets $B_{\dot{u}}$, $B_{\dot{z}}$ and $B_{\dot{s}}$, which are quotients of open sets $A_{\dot{u}}$, $A_{\dot{z}}$ and $A_{\dot{s}}$ of \mathbb{C}^5 by cyclic groups of orders 1, 1 and 2. By working in local coordinates, one can check that η acts on $B_{\dot{u}} = A_{\dot{u}}$ by multiplying a single coordinate by ω . Therefore $B_{\dot{u}}/\langle\eta\rangle \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2$ is smooth. One also checks that $s = 0$ defines a NCD with smooth components of multiplicity one. (The multiplicity is three along the preimage of E_2 in $B_{\dot{u}}$, but in $B_{\dot{u}}/\langle\eta\rangle$ the multiplicity is only one.) Exactly the same considerations apply to $B_{\dot{z}}/\langle\eta\rangle \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2$.

A similar analysis leads to the conclusion that $B_{\dot{s}}/\langle\eta\rangle$ is isomorphic to an open set in \mathbb{C}^5 , modulo $\mathbb{Z}/2$, acting by negating three coordinates. Therefore \mathcal{V}_2 is singular along a surface Σ which maps isomorphically to S . (It follows that σ acts trivially on Σ .) Furthermore, at a singular point, \mathcal{V}_2 is locally modeled on

$$\mathbb{C}^2 \times (\text{the cone in } \mathbb{C}^6 \text{ on the Veronese surface } P^2 \subseteq P^5).$$

One checks that away from Σ , the central fiber $\mathcal{V}_2(0)$ in $B_{\dot{s}}/\langle\eta\rangle$ is a NCD with smooth components of multiplicity one.

Geometry of the central fiber. The central fiber of \mathcal{V}_2 is the variety

$$\mathcal{V}_2(0) = V'' \cup E'_1 \cup E_2.$$

One can check the following:

(a) The new exceptional divisor E_2 is a $P(1, 1, 2)$ -bundle over S . Note that $P(1, 1, 2)$ is isomorphic to a cone in P^3 over on a smooth plane conic. The vertices of these cones comprise Σ .

(b) The map $V'' \rightarrow V'$ has exceptional divisor $V'' \cap E_2$, which is a P^1 -bundle over S . (Each fiber P^1 is a smooth section of the quadric cone introduced in (a). In particular, $V'' \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$.)

(c) The map $E'_1 \rightarrow E_1$ has exceptional divisor $E'_1 \cap E_2$, which is a P^1 -bundle over S . (Each fiber P^1 is a line through the vertex of the cone in (a).)

(d) $V'' \cap E'_1$ projects diffeomorphically to $V' \cap E_1$. This is obvious away from S , and is true over S because the fiber of $V'' \cap E'_1$ over a point of S is the intersection of the P^1 's in (b) and (c), which is a point.

(e) The triple intersection $V'' \cap E'_1 \cap E_2$ is isomorphic to S .

Third blowup. The family \mathcal{V}_2 is singular along the surface Σ , where it is locally modeled on $\mathbb{C}^2 \times (\mathbb{C}^3/\{\pm I\})$. A single ordinary blowup along Σ , i.e., blow up along the ideal sheaf of Σ , resolves the singularity, and it is obvious that E_3 is a P^2 -bundle over Σ . One checks that the central fiber is a NCD with smooth components of multiplicity one. A convenient way to do the computations is to take the ordinary blowup of \mathbb{C}^5 along \mathbb{C}^2 , and then quotient by $\mathbb{Z}/2$. (This gives the same blowup.)

Geometry of the central fiber. The central fiber of V_3 is the variety

$$\mathcal{V}_2(0) = V''' \cup E''_1 \cup E'_2 \cup E_3.$$

The components are of multiplicity one and smooth and transverse. We have already observed that E_3 is a P^2 -bundle over Σ . Its intersections with E''_1 and E'_2 are P^1 -bundles over Σ ; in fact the P^1 's are lines in the P^2 's. The triple intersection $E_3 \cap E'_2 \cap E''_1$ projects isomorphically to Σ . E_3 does not meet V''' , so $V''' = V''$ and the intersections of V''' with E''_1 and E'_2 are the same as V'' 's intersections with E'_1 and E_2 , described earlier.

All that remains for the proof of theorem 5.3 is to explain why blowing up the ideal sheaf \mathcal{K} coincides with our description $\widehat{W}/\langle\eta\rangle \rightarrow W/\langle\eta\rangle$ of the second blowup. We formalize this as a lemma:

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose W is an open set in \mathbb{C}^5 , with coordinates x, u, v, z and s , and is invariant under $\eta = \text{diag}[1, \omega, 1, \omega, \bar{\omega}]$. Suppose $V' \subseteq W/\langle\eta\rangle$ is the image of $\{s = 0\} \subseteq W$, and let \mathcal{K} be the ideal sheaf on $W/\langle\eta\rangle$ generated by the regular functions vanishing to order 3 at a generic point of V' and the regular functions vanishing to order 2 along the singular locus S of $W/\langle\eta\rangle$. Let \widehat{W} be the weighted blowup of W along $u = z = s = 0$, with u and z having weight 1 and s having weight 2. Then $W \rightarrow W/\langle\eta\rangle$ induces an isomorphism from $\widehat{W}/\langle\eta\rangle$ to the blowup of $W/\langle\eta\rangle$ along \mathcal{K} .*

Proof. We begin by observing that the nine monomials $x, \dot{v}, \dot{u}^3, \dot{u}^2\dot{z}, \dot{u}\dot{z}^2, \dot{z}^3, \dot{u}\dot{s}, \dot{z}\dot{s}$ and \dot{s}^3 generate the invariant ring of η , so that evaluating them embeds $W/\langle\eta\rangle$ in \mathbb{C}^9 . It is easy to see that \mathcal{K} is the ideal generated by (i) the quadratic monomials in $\dot{u}^3, \dot{u}^2\dot{z}, \dots, \dot{s}^3$, and (ii) the linear function \dot{s}^3 . (We remark that the function \dot{s}^3 vanishes to order 3 along V' , at a generic point of V' , and generates the ideal of such functions. However, even though S lies in V' , \dot{s}^3 only vanishes to order one at a point of S , because \dot{s}^3 is one of the coordinate functions on \mathbb{C}^9 . This is related to the fact that V' is not a Cartier divisor, but $3V'$ is.) Therefore, blowing up \mathcal{K} amounts to defining $\widehat{\mathbb{C}^9}$ as the weighted blowup of \mathbb{C}^9 along the $x\text{-}\dot{v}$ plane, with weights $1, \dots, 1, 2$, and taking the proper transform therein of $W/\langle\eta\rangle$. One can cover \widehat{W} and $\widehat{\mathbb{C}^9}$ by open sets, write down the rational map from \widehat{W} to $\widehat{\mathbb{C}^9}$ explicitly, and check that it is regular and induces an embedding $\widehat{W}/\langle\eta\rangle \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}^9}$. \square

Remark. The proof conceals the origin of the choice of \mathcal{K} . We found it as follows. We knew we wanted to take the $(1, 1, 2)$ weighted blowup of W , which is to say, blow up the ideal $\langle\dot{u}^2, \dot{u}\dot{z}, \dot{z}^2, \dot{s}\rangle$. The problem is that its generators are not η -invariant, so they do not define functions on $W/\langle\eta\rangle$. The solution was to blow up the cube of this ideal rather than the ideal itself. We wrote down the generators of the cube, and expressed them in terms of the generators for the invariant ring of η . Every generator of the ideal was a quadratic monomial in the generating invariants, except for \dot{s}^3 , which was itself one of the generating invariants. This suggested that our weighted blowup of \mathbb{C}^9 would give the desired blowup $\widehat{W}/\langle\eta\rangle \rightarrow W/\langle\eta\rangle$. Then we just checked the construction.

5.4. Cohomology computations. In this subsection we describe the 3-part of the middle cohomology of the central fiber \hat{V} of the semistable model \mathcal{V}_3 , in a sequence of lemmas.

Lemma 5.7. *Let M' and M be algebraic varieties on which an automorphism σ of finite order acts. Let $f : M' \rightarrow M$ be a morphism with connected fibers which is equivariant with respect to this action. Suppose $S \subset M$ is a subspace, let $D = f^{-1}(S)$, and assume that (a) $f : M' - D \rightarrow M - S$ is an isomorphism, (b) $f : D \rightarrow S$ is a fiber bundle, and (c) σ acts trivially on S and trivially on the rational cohomology of the fiber. Then the map of characteristic subspaces*

$$H_{(k)}^*(M; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_{(k)}^*(M'; \mathbb{Q})$$

is an isomorphism for each $k \neq 1$.

Proof. Consider the Leray spectral sequence for the map $f : M' \rightarrow M$. Its abutment is the cohomology of M' . Its E_1 terms are of the form $E_1^{p,q} = H^p(M, R^q f_* \mathbb{Q})$. The automorphism σ acts on M , M' , and the spectral sequence. Thus we can speak of the spectral sequence for the k -part of the cohomology of M' . Because f is an isomorphism over $M - S$ and has connected fibers over S , there are two kinds of terms of the spectral sequence. For the first, the support of the coefficient sheaf is all of M . These are the terms $H^p(M, (f_* \mathbb{Q})_{(k)})$, which are isomorphic to $H_{(k)}^p(M, \mathbb{Q})$. For the other terms the support of the coefficient sheaf is S . These are the terms $H^p(S, (R^q f_* \mathbb{Q})_{(k)})$ with $q > 1$. However, since the action on the cohomology of the fibers is trivial, these spaces are zero. Therefore the spectral sequence degenerates and we have the isomorphism

$$H_{(k)}^*(M, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_{(k)}^*(M, f_* \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_{(k)}^*(M', \mathbb{Q}).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.8. *The 3-part of the middle cohomology of the central fiber of \mathcal{V}_3 , with \mathbb{Q} coefficients, is*

$$H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_{(3)}^4(V; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H_{(3)}^4(E_1; \mathbb{Q}).$$

Proof. First, if A is an intersection of two or more components of \hat{V} , then $H_{(3)}^4(A; \mathbb{Q}) = 0$. One sees this by using lemma 5.7 and the explicit descriptions of the intersections, given in subsection 5.3. That is, each of $E_3 \cap E'_2$ and $E_3 \cap E''_1$ is a P^1 -bundle over Σ , and σ acts trivially on Σ . Also, $E_3 \cap E'_2 \cap E''_1$ projects isomorphically to Σ . Finally, the nonempty intersections involving V''' are $V''' \cap E'_1$, $V''' \cap E'_2$ and $V''' \cap E'_1 \cap E'_2$, to which essentially the same argument applies. Then the Mayer-Vietoris spectral sequence implies that with \mathbb{Q} coefficients we have

$$H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}) = H_{(3)}^3(V''') \oplus H_{(3)}^3(E''_1) \oplus H_{(3)}^3(E'_2) \oplus H_{(3)}^3(E_3).$$

We continue to use lemma 5.7. E_3 is a P^2 -bundle over Σ , so the last term vanishes. Also, $E'_2 \rightarrow E_2$ induces an isomorphism on $H_{(3)}^4(\cdot; \mathbb{Q})$, and similarly for $E''_1 \rightarrow E'_1 \rightarrow E_1$ and $V''' = V'' \rightarrow V' \rightarrow V$. Finally, E_2 is a $P(1, 1, 2)$ -bundle over S , and σ acts trivially on S , so $H_{(3)}^4(E_2; \mathbb{Q}) = 0$ and the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 5.9. *There is an isomorphism*

$$H_{(3)}^4(V) \cong \mathcal{E},$$

where \mathcal{E} is the rank one free Eisenstein module of type $(2, 2)$.

Proof. By Morse theory, P^5 is obtained from a neighborhood of V by attaching cells of dimension five and larger. Thus the cohomology of V is the same as that of P^5 in dimensions less than four. It is known that V is a topological manifold (it follows from lemma 5.9 that near R , V is modeled on a sum of three squares and a cube; apply the first example of §9 of [23]). Therefore Poincaré duality implies that $H^4(V)$ is torsion-free and that V 's cohomology in all dimensions except four is that of P^4 .

A chordal cubic T has three natural strata: (i) R itself, (ii) the union of the tangent lines to R , minus their points of tangency, and (iii) the union of the secant lines, minus the points in which they cut the R . These strata are a P^1 , a \mathbb{C} bundle over P^1 , and a \mathbb{C}^* -bundle over P^1 . Adding the Euler characteristics of the strata, we find that $\chi(T) = 4$. Therefore the Euler characteristic of V , a three-sheeted cover of P^4 branched along T , is seven. It follows that $H^4(V)$ is free of rank three. Since any σ -invariant cohomology pulls back from P^4 , we conclude that $H_{(3)}^4(V)$ has rank two. It is therefore a one-dimensional Eisenstein module, necessarily of type $(2, 2)$. \square

Note. Suppose that ω_t is a family of classes in $H^{3,1}(V_t)_{\bar{\omega}}$. Let δ_t be a family of homology classes whose limit as t approaches zero is a generator of the Eisenstein factor in the above decomposition. Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\delta_t} \omega_t = 0,$$

since the \mathcal{E} -component of the limit of ω_t has type $(2, 2)$. Thus the linear equation

$$\int_{\delta} \omega = 0$$

is the condition for a period vector to represent a chordal cubic. In other words, the limiting periods for degenerations to chordal cubics near V lie in the hyperplanes δ^\perp .

Our final lemma treats the “interesting” part of the Hodge structure of the central fiber, describing it in terms of that of the curve C from (5.4).

Lemma 5.10. *There is an isogeny*

$$H_{(3)}^4(E_1) \rightarrow H_{(6)}^1(C)$$

of Eisenstein Hodge structures, of weight $(-2, -1)$.

Proof. It suffices to exhibit an isomorphism

$$(5.13) \quad H_{(3)}^4(E_1, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_{(6)}^1(C; \mathbb{Q})$$

that carries each component $H_{(3)}^{p,q}(E_1)$ of the Hodge decomposition, $p+q=4$, to $H_{(3)}^{p-2,q-1}(C)$. The proof uses the following idea. There are maps $p : E_1 \rightarrow R$ and $p' : C \rightarrow R$. Thus we can compute the 3-parts of the cohomology of the varieties in question by using the Leray spectral sequence. The only relevant initial terms of the spectral sequences are $H_{(3)}^1(R, R^3p_*\mathbb{Q})$ and $H_{(6)}^1(R, p'_*\mathbb{Q})$, respectively. The coefficient sheaves are isomorphic, and this leads to the isomorphism (5.13).

Consider $(p'_*\mathbb{Z})_{(6)}$. It is clear that its restriction to $R - B$ is a local system of abelian groups isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^2 . This becomes a local system of 1-dimensional \mathcal{E} -modules under our definition of the action of $-\bar{\omega} \in \mathcal{E}$ as ζ^* , where ζ is from (5.5). If γ is a loop in $R - B$ encircling a single point of B once positively, then one can work out monodromy of γ on the local system by the method used for lemma 2.3. The degeneration around the point of B is described by $z^6 = t$, and we will use the Sebastiani-Thom argument, as in the proof of lemma 2.3. The result is that the vanishing cycles are the 6-tuples summing to zero, indexed by the 6th roots of unity, and the monodromy permuting these roots by multiplication by $-\omega$. (Of course, the 3-part is a 2-dimensional subspace.) On the other hand, the action of $-\bar{\omega} \in \mathcal{E}$ is defined to be that of ζ^* . Since the monodromy is the same as $(\zeta^*)^{-1}$, it acts on the stalks by the \mathcal{E} -module action of $(-\bar{\omega})^{-1} = -\omega$. This implies that the local system is supported away from B . Passing to rational coefficients, we obtain the local system $(p'_*\mathbb{Q})_{(6)}$ of 1-dimensional vector spaces over $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

Now consider $(R^3p_*\mathbb{Q})_{(3)}$. Each fiber of $E_1 \rightarrow R$ is a copy of the hypersurface (5.12) in $P(3, 3, 3, 2, 1)$, whose middle cohomology can be worked out by the Griffiths residue calculus [33]. The result is that it is 2-dimensional over \mathbb{Q} . We defined the action of $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$ to be that of σ , which acts on $P(3, 3, 3, 2, 1)$ by $[u:v:w:z:s] \mapsto [u:v:w:\omega z:s]$. This makes $(R^3p_*\mathbb{Q})_{(6)}$ into a local system of 1-dimensional vector spaces over $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Taking γ as above, one can work out its monodromy by the same method, with the result that it acts by $-1 \otimes -1 \otimes -1 \otimes \omega$ in the notation used in the proof of lemma 2.3, while σ acts by $1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \omega$, which is to say, by the \mathcal{E} -module action of $-\omega$. Therefore the monodromy is by $-\omega$. This shows that the local system is supported away from B , and that the two local systems are isomorphic.

We claim next that the isomorphism (5.13) underlies an isomorphism of complex Hodge structures. A Hodge structure is defined via a theory of differential forms and a harmonic theory. These exist both for cohomology with coefficients in the complex numbers \mathbb{C} and with coefficients in a local system, provided that the local system is unitary. This is the case for the eigensystems of the local systems considered above. Consider the local system $R^3p_*\mathbb{Z}$. There is a decomposition

$$(5.14) \quad R^3p_*\mathbb{Z} \otimes \mathbb{C} = (R^3p_*\mathbb{C})_\omega \oplus (R^3p_*\mathbb{C})_{\bar{\omega}}$$

into eigenspaces of the deck transformation σ . Each of the local systems on the right is unitary. Moreover, each has a Hodge type inherited from the Hodge structure on the cohomology of the fiber. To determine the relation between the types and the eigenvalues, consider the cohomology of a generic fiber V with equation $u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + z^3 + s^6 = 0$. The differential form

$$\Phi = \frac{\Omega(u, v, w, z)}{(u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + z^3)^{11/6}}.$$

is homogeneous of weight zero relative to the \mathbb{C}^* action, and it generates $H^{2,1}(V)$. It is clear that it is an eigenvector of σ with eigenvalue ω . Thus

$$(R^3p_*\mathbb{C})_\omega = (R^3p_*\mathbb{C})_\omega^{2,1}.$$

Consequently $H^1(R - B, (R^3p_*\mathbb{C})_\omega)$ carries a complex Hodge structure with types $(3, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$, and there is an isomorphism of complex Hodge structures

$$H^4(E_1, \mathbb{C})_\omega \cong H^1(R - B, (R^3p_*\mathbb{C})_\omega^{2,1}).$$

Similar considerations yield an isomorphism

$$H_{(6),\omega}^1(C) \cong H_{(6),\omega}^1(R - B, (q_*\mathbb{C})),$$

where the decomposition is relative to the action of ζ^2 and the local system can be considered as a local system of Hodge structures of type $(0, 0)$. Finally, the isomorphism

$$(R^3p_*\mathbb{C})_\omega^{2,1} \cong (q_*\mathbb{C})_{(6),\omega}$$

of unitary systems of complex Hodge structures gives an isomorphism of complex Hodge structures

$$H_\omega^4(E_1, \mathbb{C}) \cong H_{(6),\omega}^1(C).$$

The proof is now complete. \square

Remark. Another possible approach to the Hodge structure of E_1 is the following. One can show that E_1 is birational to the hypersurface Z in $P(1, 1, 6, 6, 6, 4)$ given by the equation

$$f(x, y) + u^2 + v^2 + w^2 + z^3 = 0.$$

(This is plausible because the projection $(x, y, u, v, w, z) \mapsto (x, y)$ blows up Z along $\{x = y = 0\}$, yielding \hat{Z} . And \hat{Z} fibers over P^1 with the same generic fiber and same special fibers as in the fibration of E_1 over R .) Presumably, $E_1 \dashrightarrow Z$ induces an isogeny of Hodge structures. Standard calculations with the Griffiths Jacobian calculus yields the Hodge numbers $(0, 1, 9, 0, 0)$ for $H^4(Z)_\omega$, with the period map having 9-dimensional image.

6. DEGENERATION TO A NODAL CUBIC

The goal of this section is to identify the limit Hodge structure for the degeneration of cyclic cubic fourfolds associated to a generic nodal degeneration of cubic threefolds. It is very similar to the previous section, so we will be more brief. The result of this section that is used in the proof of the main theorem of the paper (theorem 7.1) is the following:

Theorem 6.1. *The period map $g : \widehat{PC}_{ss} \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ carries the discriminant locus onto a divisor.*

One should expect such a result, because at a node of a cubic threefold T , the tangent cone is a cone over $P^1 \times P^1$, and the lines on T through the node sweep out a $(3, 3)$ curve in the $P^1 \times P^1$. The generic genus 4 curve arises this way, providing 9 moduli. Our approach is to show that the interesting part of the limiting Hodge structure is that of the K3 surface K which is the 3-fold cover of $P^1 \times P^1$ branched over this curve. This Hodge structure is the same as the one studied by Kondō in his work on moduli of genus four curves [19].

Suppose T is a generic nodal cubic threefold; we choose homogeneous coordinates x_0, \dots, x_4 such that the node is at $[1:0:\dots:0] \in P^4$ and T has defining equation

$$F(x_0, \dots, x_4) = x_0(x_1x_2 + x_3x_4) + f(x_1, \dots, x_4) = 0,$$

where f is a homogeneous cubic. Then $V \subseteq P^5$ is defined by $F + x_5^3 = 0$, and we will project V away from $P = [1:0:0:0:0]$ to the P^4 with homogeneous coordinates x_1, \dots, x_5 . Every reference to P^4 will be to this P^4 . We may suppose by genericity that the intersection K of $x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 = 0$ and $f(x_1, \dots, x_4) + x_5^3 = 0$ in P^4 is smooth. The

importance of this surface is that projection away from the cusp of V at $P = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ is a local diffeomorphism on $V - \{P\}$, except over K , where it is a \mathbb{C} -bundle. The notation reflects the fact that K is a K3 surface, since it is a smooth $(2, 3)$ -intersection in P^4 . We will write Q for the quadric $x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 = 0$ in P^4 . The vertex of Q is not in K , because K is smooth.

By scaling the variables, we may suppose that $F + tx_0^3$ defines a smooth threefold for all $t \in \Delta - \{0\}$. This pencil of threefolds is well-suited to our coordinates, but any pencil gives the same limiting Hodge structure, provided that its generic member is smooth. As in section 5 we will write \mathcal{V} for the associated family of cubic fourfolds:

$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{ ([x_0 : \dots : x_5], t) \in P^5 \times \Delta \mid \right. \\ \left. x_0(x_1x_2 + x_3x_4) + f(x_1, \dots, x_4) + x_5^3 + tx_0^3 = 0 \right\}.$$

One checks that \mathcal{V} is smooth away from the cusp P of the central fiber, and of course the central fiber itself is smooth away from P . We let \mathcal{V}_0 be the degree six base extension, got by setting $t = s^6$. Since the monodromy of \mathcal{V} on H^4 over $\Delta - \{0\}$ has order 3, the monodromy of \mathcal{V}_0 is trivial. Below, we will define \mathcal{V}_1 , \mathcal{V}_2 and \mathcal{V}_3 by repeated blowups. The last blowup \mathcal{V}_3 turns out to be a semistable model for the degeneration. The reason we take six rather than three as the degree of the base extension is that this choice makes the multiplicities of the components of the central fiber of \mathcal{V}_3 all be 1.

Regarding x_1, \dots, x_5 as affine coordinates on $\mathbb{C}^5 = \{x_0 \neq 0\} \subseteq P^5$, we have

$$\mathcal{V}_0 \cap (\mathbb{C}^5 \times \Delta) = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_5, s) \in \mathbb{C}^5 \times \Delta \mid \right. \\ \left. x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 + f(x_1, \dots, x_4) + x_5^3 + s^6 = 0 \right\}.$$

By the Morse lemma, there is a neighborhood W of the origin in \mathbb{C}^4 with analytic coordinates y_1, \dots, y_4 , such that the x_i and y_i agree to first order, and

$$x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 + f(x_1, \dots, x_4) = y_1y_2 + y_3y_4.$$

To emphasize the analogy with the chordal case, we will write z for x_5 . Then

$$\mathcal{V}_0 \cap (W \times \mathbb{C} \times \Delta) = \left\{ (y_1, \dots, y_4, z, s) \in W \times \mathbb{C} \times \Delta \mid \right. \\ \left. y_1y_2 + y_3y_4 + z^3 + s^6 = 0 \right\}.$$

The obvious thing to do is blow up the origin with weights $(3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1)$. To describe this intrinsically, we define \mathcal{I} to be the ideal sheaf on

$P^5 \times \Delta$ defining the subvariety

$$(\text{the line in } P^5 \text{ joining } [1:0:0:0:0] \text{ and } [0:0:0:0:1]) \times \Delta ,$$

and we define \mathcal{J} as in (5.8). We define $\widehat{P^5 \times \Delta}$ as the blowup of $P^5 \times \Delta$ along \mathcal{J} , and \mathcal{V}_1 as the proper transform of \mathcal{V}_0 . The exceptional divisor in $\widehat{P^5 \times \Delta}$ is a copy of $P(3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1)$, and the exceptional divisor E_1 of $\mathcal{V}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ is the hypersurface in $P(3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1)$ defined by

$$(6.1) \quad y_1 y_2 + y_3 y_4 + z^3 + s^6 = 0 .$$

As in section 5, we will use primes to indicate proper transforms of V and the various exceptional divisors. The exceptional divisor of $V' \rightarrow V$ is the hypersurface in $P(3, 3, 3, 3, 2)$ defined by (6.1) and $s = 0$. This lets one see that σ acts trivially on $V' \cap E_1$, because $\sigma = \text{diag}[1, 1, 1, 1, \omega]$ acts on $P(3, 3, 3, 3, 2)$ in the same way as the quasihomogeneous scaling by $\bar{\omega}$, which of course acts trivially. Finally, calculations strictly analogous to those of section 5 show that \mathcal{V}_1 is smooth away from the surface S in $P(3, 3, 3, 3) \cong P^3$ defined by (6.1) and $s = z = 0$. S is a smooth quadric surface. Furthermore, any point of S admits a neighborhood in \mathcal{V}_1 isomorphic to a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{C}^5 , modulo $\eta = \text{diag}[\omega, 1, 1, \omega, \bar{\omega}]$. This is exactly the same as the local model near the singular set of section 5's \mathcal{V}_1 .

The second blowup \mathcal{V}_2 is the blowup of \mathcal{V}_1 along the ideal sheaf \mathcal{K} , where \mathcal{K} is defined exactly as in section 5: it is generated by the regular functions which either vanish to order 2 along S , or vanish to order 3 at a generic point of V' . Then the exceptional divisor E_2 is a $P(1, 1, 2)$ -bundle over S . Now, $P(1, 1, 2)$ is isomorphic to a cone in P^3 over a smooth plane conic, so each fiber has a singular point. These turn out to be singular in \mathcal{V}_2 as well, and constitute the entire singular locus Σ of \mathcal{V}_2 , so Σ is a copy of S . Furthermore, near Σ , \mathcal{V}_2 is locally modeled on $\mathbb{C}^2 \times (\mathbb{C}^3 / \{\pm I\})$, just as in section 5. It turns out, also as in section 5, that $V'' \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$. Finally, we define \mathcal{V}_3 as the ordinary blowup of \mathcal{V}_2 along Σ . Then E_3 is a P^2 -bundle over Σ . One can check that \mathcal{V}_3 is smooth, and that the central fiber is a normal crossing divisor with smooth components V''' , E_1'' , E_2' and E_3 of multiplicity one.

Now we will study the central fiber of \mathcal{V}_3 , in order to determine the limiting Hodge structure. The first step is to rid ourselves of most of the complication introduced by our blowups. Then we will study what remains, the Hodge structures of V'' and E_1 .

Lemma 6.2. $H_{(3)}^4(V''' \cup E_1'' \cup E_2' \cup E_3; \mathbb{Q}) = H_{(3)}^4(V''; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H_{(3)}^4(E_1; \mathbb{Q})$.

Proof. This is analogous to lemma 5.8. We use cohomology with rational coefficients throughout the proof. For the first step, the essential facts are the following. (i) The restriction of the projection $\mathcal{V}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_2$ to the central fiber is an isomorphism to $V'' \cup E'_1 \cup E_2$, except over Σ . (ii) Over Σ , it is a P^2 -bundle. (iii) σ fixes Σ pointwise. Then lemma 5.7 implies

$$H_{(3)}^4(V''' \cup E'' \cup E'_1 \cup E_2) = H_{(3)}^4(V'' \cup E'_1 \cup E_2) .$$

For the second step, the essential facts are (iv) E_2 is a $P(1, 1, 2)$ -bundle over S , (v) $E_2 \cap E'_1$ and $E_2 \cap V''$ are P^1 -bundles over S , (vi) $E_2 \cap E'_1 \cap V''$ projects isomorphically to S , and (vii) σ fixes S pointwise. Then Mayer-Vietoris implies

$$H_{(3)}^4(V'' \cup E'_1 \cup E_2) = H_{(3)}^4(V'' \cup E'_1) .$$

For the third step, the essential fact is (viii) σ acts trivially on $V' \cap E_1$. One can check that $V'' \cap E'_1$ is the proper transform of $V' \cap E_1$, so σ acts trivially on $V'' \cap E'_1$. Then Mayer-Vietoris implies

$$H_{(3)}^4(V'' \cup E'_1) = H_{(3)}^4(V'') \oplus H_{(3)}^4(E'_1) .$$

For the final step, the essential facts are (ix) $E'_1 \cap E_2$ is a P^1 -bundle over S , so $E'_1 \rightarrow E_1$ is a diffeomorphism except over S , over which it is a P^1 -bundle, and (x) σ acts trivially on S . Then lemma 5.7 implies $H_{(3)}^4(E'_1) = H_{(3)}^4(E_1)$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.3. $H_{(3)}^4(E_1; \mathbb{Q})$ is 2-dimensional, of type $(2, 2)$.

Proof. We regard E_1 as a hypersurface in $P(3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1)$ as in (6.1). According to the Griffiths residue calculus [33], the primitive cohomology of E_1 in dimension four is obtained as follows. Set $F = y_1 y_2 + y_3 y_4 + z^3 + s^6$. Let

$$\eta = y_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} + \cdots + y_4 \frac{\partial}{\partial y_4} + z \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + s \frac{\partial}{\partial s}$$

be the Euler vector field, and let Ω be the contraction of η with $dy_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dy_4 \wedge dz \wedge ds$. Consider rational differential forms $A\Omega/F^k$ where the weight of the numerator polynomial A is chosen so that the rational differential has weight zero. Because Ω has weight fifteen, the nonzero rational differentials with numerator polynomial of lowest degree are those with $k = 3$ and $A = c_1 z s + c_2 s^3 + (\text{terms in the } y_i)$. Let $\text{res}(A\Omega/F^k)$ be the Poincaré residue. Such residues span the primitive cohomology in Hodge level $4 - k + 1$. The Hodge level is greater than $4 - k + 1$ if and only if A lies in the Jacobian ideal of F ; that is, the ideal generated by the partial derivatives of F . In the case at hand,

we find that the primitive part of H^4 is spanned by $\text{res}(sz\Omega/F^3)$ and $\text{res}(s^3\Omega/F^3)$. The automorphism σ acts on these by multiplication by ω^2 and ω , respectively. Therefore $H_{(3)}^4(E_1; \mathbb{Q})$ is 2-dimensional. It clearly has type $(2, 2)$. \square

Lemma 6.4. *V'' admits a morphism to P^4 which is an isomorphism except over the K3 surface K and the vertex v of the quadric cone Q . Over K , V'' is a smooth P^1 -bundle, and the preimage of v is $E'_1 \cap V''$.*

Proof. Let ϕ be the rational map $V \dashrightarrow P^4$ given by projection away from the cusp P . Then ϕ induces rational maps $\phi' : V' \dashrightarrow P^4$ and $\phi'' : V'' \dashrightarrow P^4$. One can check by lengthy local coordinate calculations that ϕ'' is a morphism, not just a rational map, and has the properties claimed in the lemma. We just give a summary.

Consider a line ℓ in P^5 through P . If ℓ lies in V then $\phi(\ell - \{P\})$ lies in K . We write D for the union of the lines on V through P . If ℓ makes contact of order only 2 with V at P , then it meets V at exactly one further point, and does so transversely. If it makes contact of order exactly 3, then ℓ meets V only at P , and the corresponding point of P^4 is in Q but not in $\phi(V - \{P\})$. We conclude that ϕ identifies $V - D$ with $P^4 - Q$, and realizes $D - \{P\}$ as a \mathbb{C} -bundle over $K \subseteq Q$. We write D'' for the proper transform of D in V'' .

In this proof we only care about divisors in V'' , not in \mathcal{V}_2 , so we will write e_1 for $V' \cap E_1$, e'_1 for $V'' \cap E'_1$ and e_2 for $V'' \cap E_2$. One can check that e'_1 is the proper transform of e_1 .

Local calculations show that ϕ' is regular except along S , and carries $e_1 - S$ to v . Further calculations show that ϕ'' is regular on all of V'' , and therefore ϕ'' carries e'_1 to v . The behavior of ϕ'' on e_2 is easy to understand. We know that e_2 is a P^1 -bundle over the smooth quadric surface S , and that Q is a cone over a smooth quadric surface. Therefore it is not surprising that (i) ϕ'' carries each fiber P^1 of e_2 isomorphically onto a line in Q through v , and (ii) the only points of e_2 that ϕ'' carries to v are in $e_2 \cap e'_1$. It follows from (ii) that the fiber of ϕ'' over v is exactly e'_1 .

It remains to show that ϕ'' is a diffeomorphism over $P^4 - (K \cup \{v\})$ and a smooth P^1 -bundle over K . Because ϕ'' maps V'' onto P^4 , the image of e_2 must contain $Q - (K \cup \{v\})$ and hence be equal to Q . Since P^4 is smooth and D'' and e'_1 are the only divisors in V'' that ϕ'' can crush to lower-dimensional varieties, Zariski's main theorem implies that ϕ'' is a diffeomorphism except over the image $K \cup \{v\}$ of $D'' \cup e'_1$. So all that remains is to show that $\phi''^{-1}(K)$ is a smooth P^1 -bundle over K . First, by (i) above, each point of K has only one preimage

in e_2 , so each point of k has preimage $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\text{point}\}$ in V'' . It follows that D'' is the full preimage of K . Also, ϕ'' restricts to an isomorphism $e_2 - e'_1 \rightarrow Q - \{v\}$. This implies that $\phi''^{-1}(K) \cap e_2$ is a copy of K .

D'' is obviously smooth away from e_2 . To show it is smooth at a point d of $D'' \cap e_2$, it suffices to exhibit a smooth curve in V'' through d that is transverse to D'' . Since $\phi''^{-1}(K)$ is a copy of K , we can just take a curve in e_2 transverse to this copy of K . Since $e_2 - e'_1$ maps isomorphically to its image, the image curve is transverse to K , so the original curve must be transverse to D'' . To show that D'' is a fibration over K , we will show that the rank of $\phi''|_{D''}$ is 2 everywhere. This clearly holds at every point of $D'' - e_2$. If the rank were < 2 at a point d of $D'' \cap e_2$, then the rank of $\phi'' : V'' \rightarrow P^4$ at d would be < 3 , which is impossible since $\phi''|_{e_2}$ is a local diffeomorphism at d . \square

Lemma 6.5. *The map $\phi'' : V'' \rightarrow P^4$ of lemma 6.4 induces an isomorphism*

$$H_{(3)}^4(V''; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_{(3)}^2(K; \mathbb{Q}).$$

Proof. From Lemma 6.4, one knows that

- (i) if $x \in P^4 - (K \cup \{v\})$, then $\phi''^{-1}(x)$ is a point;
- (ii) The part of V'' over K is a P^1 -bundle;
- (iii) $\phi''^{-1}(v) = E'_1 \cap V''$ is a copy of the hypersurface $y_1y_2 + y_3y_4 + z^3$ in $P(3, 3, 3, 3, 2)$; by projecting away from $[0 : \dots : 0 : 1]$, one checks that this is a copy of P^3 . We saw above that σ acts trivially on it.

It follows that the only terms of the Leray spectral sequence which can contribute to $H_{(3)}^4(V'')$ are

- (i') $H_{(3)}^4(P^4, \phi''_*\mathbb{Q})$,
- (ii') $H_{(3)}^2(K, R^2\phi''_*\mathbb{Q})$,
- (iii') $H_{(3)}^0(v, R^4\phi''_*\mathbb{Q})$.

Only the middle term (ii') is nonzero, and it is $H_{(3)}^2(K; \mathbb{Q})$. The lemma follows. \square

Lemma 6.6. *There is an isogeny of Eisenstein Hodge structures*

$$H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}) \rightarrow H_{(3)}^2(K) \oplus \mathcal{E}$$

of weight $(-1, -1)$, where \mathcal{E} indicates the 1-dimensional Eisenstein lattice with Hodge structure pure of type $(1, 1)$.

Proof. This follows from the isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}; \mathbb{Q}) &\cong H_{(3)}^4(V''; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H_{(3)}^4(E_1; \mathbb{Q}) \\ &\cong H_{(3)}^2(K; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{Q}^2 \end{aligned}$$

of lemmas 6.2, 6.3 and 6.5, together with the fact that the isomorphism $H_{(3)}^4(V'') \rightarrow H_{(3)}^2(K; \mathbb{Q})$ is a map of Hodge structures of weight $(-1, -1)$. The latter fact comes from the fact that the restriction of $V'' \rightarrow P^4$ to the preimage of K is a P^1 -bundle over K . \square

Now, K lies in the quadric cone Q , and projection away from the vertex realizes K as a 3-fold cover of $P^1 \times P^1$ branched over a $(3, 3)$ curve C . This curve has genus 4, and the generic genus 4 curve arises this way. Kondō [19] showed that $H_{(3)}^2(K; \mathbb{Q})$ has dimension 20, and that the Hodge structure of K contains enough information to recover C , up to an automorphism of $P^1 \times P^1$. Therefore, as C varies over the $(3, 3)$ curves in $P^1 \times P^1$, the associated K3 surfaces provide a 9-dimensional family of Hodge structures.

Proof of theorem 6.1: This is essentially the same as theorem 5.1. The previous lemma and the exactness of the 3-part of the Clemens-Schmid sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow H_{(3)}^4(\mathcal{V}_3, \mathcal{V}_3^*; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} H_{(3)}^4(\hat{V}_s; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow 0$$

imply that the limit Eisenstein Hodge structure is isogenous to that of K (plus a 1-dimensional summand). Then Kondō's work shows that the Eisenstein Hodge structures form a 9-dimensional family. \square

7. THE MAIN THEOREM

Recall that \mathcal{M}_0^f and \mathcal{M}_0 are the moduli spaces of framed and unframed smooth cubic threefolds. We also define \mathcal{M}_{ss} as the GIT moduli quotient $PC_{ss}/\mathrm{SL}(5, \mathbb{C})$, and \mathcal{M}_s as the corresponding stable locus. Since we needed to blow up PC before extending the period map, we also define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f &= P\mathcal{F}_s/P\mathcal{G} \\ \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s &= \widehat{PC}_s/P\mathcal{G} \\ \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss} &= \widehat{PC}_{ss}/\mathrm{SL}(5, \mathbb{C}) . \end{aligned}$$

These moduli spaces fit into the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{M}_0^f & \longrightarrow & \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ \mathcal{M}_0 & \longrightarrow & \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s & \longrightarrow & \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss} \end{array}$$

We saw in lemma 2.7 that \mathcal{M}_0^f is a complex manifold. Since PG acts properly on \widehat{PC}_s , we see that \mathcal{M}_0 , $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s$ are analytic spaces. We will see below that \mathcal{M}_s^f is smooth. As a GIT quotient, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$ is a compact algebraic variety.

The period maps $P\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ and $\widehat{PC}_{ss} \rightarrow \overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$ are PG -invariant, and hence induce maps on $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$. The main theorem of the paper, theorem 7.1, says that the first of these maps is an isomorphism and that the second is almost an isomorphism. For the statement of the theorem, it is convenient to refer to the discriminant locus of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f$, by which we mean the image of the discriminant locus of $P\mathcal{F}_s$, and similarly for the chordal locus. Let \mathcal{H}_Δ (resp. \mathcal{H}_c) be the union of the discriminant (resp. chordal) hyperplanes in $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$ (defined just before theorem 4.7), and let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_\Delta \cup \mathcal{H}_c$.

Theorem 7.1. *The period map $g : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is an isomorphism. It identifies the discriminant (resp. chordal) locus of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f$ with \mathcal{H}_Δ (resp. \mathcal{H}_c), and \mathcal{M}_0^f with $\mathbb{C}H^{10} - \mathcal{H}$. The induced map $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss} \rightarrow \overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$ is an isomorphism except over the A_5 cusp, whose preimage is a rational curve. Finally, this map induces an isomorphism of \mathcal{M}_s with $P\Gamma \backslash (\mathbb{C}H^{10} - \mathcal{H}_c)$.*

Proof of theorem 7.1: Since $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$ is compact and the period map carries $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss} - \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s$ to the boundary of $\overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s \rightarrow P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is proper. It follows that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is proper. The discriminant locus is carried into \mathcal{H}_Δ by theorem 4.7, and has image a divisor by theorem 6.1. Therefore its image is a union of discriminant hyperplanes. By lemma 7.2 below, all discriminant hyperplanes are $P\Gamma$ -equivalent, so the discriminant locus has image exactly \mathcal{H}_Δ . The same argument, using theorem 5.1, shows that the chordal locus has image \mathcal{H}_c .

Now we claim that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is a local isomorphism. Since its restriction to the preimage of $\mathbb{C}H^{10} - \mathcal{H}$ is an isomorphism, $g : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is a proper modification of $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$. (See [15, pp. 214–215].) Since $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is smooth, g is a local isomorphism at a point x of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f$ unless it crushes some divisor passing through x to a variety of

lower dimension. Since \mathcal{M}_0^f maps isomorphically to its image, and the discriminant and chordal loci are mapped onto divisors, no divisors are crushed. Therefore the period map is everywhere a local isomorphism. Since it is a generic isomorphism, it is an isomorphism. It follows that it identifies \mathcal{M}_0^f with $\mathbb{C}H^{10} - \mathcal{H}$.

(One can avoid the machinery of proper modifications by applying Zariski's main theorem to

$$(7.1) \quad P\Gamma' \backslash \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f \rightarrow P\Gamma' \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10},$$

where $P\Gamma'$ is a torsion-free finite index subgroup of $P\Gamma$. Because this is a birational isomorphism of algebraic varieties, and the target space is smooth, one can apply a version of Zariski's main theorem, theorem 3.20 of [25], to deduce that (7.1) is a local isomorphism, hence an isomorphism. That $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ is an isomorphism follows.)

To prove the claim about $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$, it suffices to examine the cusps of $P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$. The D_4 cusp is the image of just one point of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{ss}$, so the period map is finite there. Since the Baily-Borel compactification is a normal analytic space, it is an isomorphism there. The preimage of the A_5 cusp consists of the (classes of the) threefolds $T_{A,B}$ from theorem 4.2(iii), together with their limiting point, the (class of the) points from theorem 4.2(vi). These form a rational curve because they are parameterized by $4A/B^2$.

For the last claim, we observe that \mathcal{M}_s is $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s$ minus the chordal locus. This follows from a comparison of the GIT analyses in theorem 4.2 and [2]. This makes the last claim obvious. \square

We used the following lemma in the proof of the theorem.

Lemma 7.2. *Any two discriminant (resp. chordal) hyperplanes in $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$ are $P\Gamma$ -equivalent.*

Proof. Suppose $r \in \Lambda$ is a chordal root. Since $\langle r|r \rangle = 3$ and $\langle r|\Lambda \rangle = 3\mathcal{E}$, $\langle r \rangle$ is a summand of Λ . Its orthogonal complement therefore has the same determinant as $\Lambda_{10} = E_8^{\mathcal{E}} \oplus E_8^{\mathcal{E}} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta \\ \theta & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, namely 3^5 . Also, $\theta(r^\perp)^* = r^\perp$, since $r^\perp \subseteq \Lambda$. There is a unique \mathcal{E} -lattice L of determinant 3^5 and signature $(9, 1)$ satisfying $L \subseteq \theta L^*$, by lemma 2.6 of [6]. (The proof given in [6] uses the uniqueness of unimodular \mathcal{E} -lattices with given indefinite signature, which is theorem 7.1 of [1].) Therefore $r^\perp \cong \Lambda_{10}$. If s is another chordal root then the same argument shows that $\Lambda = \langle s \rangle \oplus \Lambda_{10}$. So there is an isometry of Λ carrying r to s . This proves transitivity on chordal roots.

We will prove three claims below. (i) Any two index 3 sublattices of Λ_{10} are isometric; we write Λ'_{10} for such a lattice. (ii) For any nodal root $r \in \Lambda$, $r^\perp \cong \Lambda'_{10}$. (iii) There are exactly two enlargements of $r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle$ to a copy of Λ in which r is a nodal root, and these are exchanged by negating r^\perp while leaving r fixed. Given the claims, a standard argument shows that r can be carried to any other nodal root s by an element of Γ . Namely, by (ii), there is an isometry $r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle \rightarrow s^\perp \oplus \langle s \rangle$ carrying r to s . This isometry carries the enlargement Λ of $r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle$ to an enlargement M of $s^\perp \oplus \langle s \rangle$. By (iii), M is either Λ itself or else is carried to Λ by negating s^\perp . The result is an isometry of Λ carrying r to s .

Now we prove (i). We will even show that $\text{Aut } \Lambda_{10}$ acts transitively on the index 3 sublattices of Λ_{10} . The key ingredient is a symplectic form on $\Lambda_{10}/\theta\Lambda_{10}$. For any \mathcal{E} -lattice L satisfying $L \subseteq \theta L^*$, the \mathbb{F}_3 -vector space $L/\theta L$ admits an antisymmetric pairing, defined as follows: if $v, w \in L$ have images $\bar{v}, \bar{w} \in L/\theta L$, then $(\bar{v}, \bar{w}) \in \mathbb{F}_3$ is the reduction of $\frac{1}{\theta} \langle v|w \rangle$ modulo θ . It is easy to check that if $v \in L$ has norm 3 and has inner product θ with some element of L , then \bar{v} does not lie in the kernel of (\cdot, \cdot) , and the triflections in v act on $L/\theta L$ as the transvections in \bar{v} . Since $\Lambda_{10} = \theta\Lambda_{10}^*$, the pairing on $\Lambda_{10}/\theta\Lambda_{10}$ is nondegenerate. Index 3 sublattices of Λ_{10} correspond to hyperplanes in the \mathbb{F}_3 -vector space, so to prove transitivity of $\text{Aut } \Lambda_{10}$ on such subspaces, it suffices to show that it acts as $\text{Sp}(10, \mathbb{F}_3)$. This is easy, since every root of Λ_{10} gives a transvection.

Before proving (ii), we prove the weaker claim that for any nodal root $r \in \Lambda$,

$$r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle \cong \Lambda'_{10} \oplus (3) \cong (3) \oplus E_8^\mathcal{E} \oplus E_8^\mathcal{E} \oplus (-3) \oplus (3).$$

Because $\langle r|\Lambda \rangle = \theta\mathcal{E}$, $r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle$ has index 3 in Λ and contains $\theta\Lambda$. Therefore it is completely determined by its image S in $W = \Lambda/\theta\Lambda$, which is \bar{r}^\perp . The kernel of the pairing is 1-dimensional, coming from the first summand of (2.8), and \bar{r} is not in this kernel. Therefore \bar{r}^\perp is the preimage under $W \rightarrow W/\ker W$ of a hyperplane in $W/\ker W$. As we saw above, $\text{Aut } \Lambda_{10} \subseteq \Gamma$ acts on $W/\ker W = \Lambda_{10}/\theta\Lambda_{10}$ as $\text{Sp}(10, \mathbb{F}_3)$, so it acts transitively on hyperplanes in $W/\ker W$. It follows that the isomorphism class of $r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle$ is independent of r , so it can be described by working a single example. We take $r = (0, \dots, 0, 1, \omega)$ in the coordinates of (2.8), and write a for $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and b for $(0, \dots, 0, 1, \bar{\omega})$. Then r^\perp is $(3) \oplus E_8^\mathcal{E} \oplus E_8^\mathcal{E} \oplus (-3)$, with a spanning the first summand and b spanning the last.

Now we prove (ii). It suffices to prove that if s is a norm 3 vector of $N = \Lambda'_{10} \oplus (3)$, such that $\langle s \rangle$ is a summand, then $s^\perp \cong \Lambda'_{10}$. In order to do this we need to refer to the \mathbb{F}_3 -valued symmetric bilinear form on $\theta N^*/N$, got by reducing inner products modulo θ . Because $\theta(E_8^\mathcal{E})^* = E_8^\mathcal{E}$, $\theta N^*/N \cong \mathbb{F}_3^3$, with a basis consisting of \bar{a} , \bar{b} and \bar{r} , which are the reductions modulo N of a/θ , b/θ and r/θ . The norms of \bar{a} , \bar{b} and \bar{r} are 1, -1 and 1. Since $\langle s \rangle$ is a summand of N , $\langle s|N \rangle = 3\mathcal{E}$, so $s/\theta \in \theta N^*$. We write \bar{s} for the image of s/θ in $\theta N^*/N$, and observe that $\bar{s}^2 = \langle s/\theta|s/\theta \rangle = 1$. Enumerating the elements of $\theta N^*/N$ of norm 1, we find that \bar{s} is one of $\pm\bar{a}$, $\pm\bar{r}$, or $\pm\bar{a} \pm \bar{b} \pm \bar{r}$. In every case there is a 1-dimensional isotropic subspace S of $\theta N^*/N$ orthogonal to \bar{s} . Two examples: if $\bar{s} = \bar{a}$ then we can take S to be the span of $\bar{b} + \bar{r}$, and if $\bar{s} = \bar{a} + \bar{b} + \bar{r}$ then we can take S to be the span of $\bar{a} + \bar{b}$. We define N^+ to be the preimage of S in θN^* . This is spanned by N and a vector of norm divisible by 3, whose inner products with elements of N are divisible by θ . Therefore $\theta(N^+)^* \subseteq N^+$. Now, the determinant of Λ is 3^6 , so the index 3 lattice N has determinant 3^7 , so N 's index 3 superlattice N^+ has determinant 3^6 . Also, $\langle s|N^+ \rangle = 3$, because $S \perp \bar{s}$. Therefore $\langle s \rangle$ is a summand of N^+ , so its complement in N^+ has determinant 3^5 and is therefore a copy of Λ_{10} . Since the complement of s in N has index three in the complement in N^+ , it is Λ'_{10} by (i), proving (ii).

Finally we prove (iii). Using N , \bar{a} , \bar{b} and \bar{r} as above, we must determine the enlargements M of $\Lambda'_{10} \oplus \langle r \rangle$ that are copies of Λ in which r is a nodal root. Such an M must satisfy $M \subseteq \theta M^*$ and contain a vector having inner product θ with r . Such an M is the preimage of an isotropic line in $\theta N^*/N$ which is not orthogonal to \bar{r} . There are just two such subspaces, the spans of $\bar{r} - \bar{b}$ and $\bar{r} + \bar{b}$. The first enlargement is Λ itself. The two enlargements are exchanged by negating r^\perp . This proves (iii). \square

8. THE MONODROMY GROUP AND THE HYPERPLANE ARRANGEMENT

We have already discussed several facets of the action of Γ on various objects associated to Λ . Theorem 4.10 shows that Γ acts with two orbits on primitive null vectors, corresponding to the two boundary points of $\overline{P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}}$, and lemma 7.2 shows that Γ acts with two orbits on roots of Λ , corresponding to discriminant and chordal hyperplanes. In this section, we gather a few more results of this flavor, and determine the image of the monodromy representation.

Theorem 8.1. *For $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$, the monodromy representation $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0, F) \rightarrow \Gamma(V)$ has image consisting of all isometries of $\Lambda(V)$ with determinant a cube root of unity.*

Proof. We first show that the image of $P\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0, F)) \subseteq P\Gamma(V)$ is all of $P\Gamma(V)$. This amounts to the connectedness of \mathcal{F}_0 , which is the same as the connectedness of $P\mathcal{F}_0$, which is the same as the connectedness of $P\mathcal{F}_s$, which is the same as the connectedness of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s^f$, which by theorem 7.1 is the same as the connectedness of $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$, which is obvious.

Now it suffices to show that $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0, F))$ contains $\bar{\omega}I$ and does not contain $-I$. To see the latter, observe that $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0)$ is generated by meridians, which ρ maps to ω -reflections, so every element of $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0)$ acts on $\Lambda(V)$ by an isometry with determinant a cube root of 1. (Another way to see that $-I$ is not in the monodromy group is to use the ideas of the proof of theorem 2.8: the negation map of $H_0^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ does not extend to an isometry of $H^4(V; \mathbb{Z})$ fixing $\eta(V)$.)

Now we prove that $\bar{\omega}I$ lies in the monodromy group. Consider the cubic threefold T defined by

$$F = x_0x_3^2 - x_0x_2x_4 + x_1^2x_4 + x_2^2x_3.$$

By the method of [2, §2], it has an A_7 singularity at $[1:0:0:0:0]$, an A_4 singularity at $[0:0:0:0:1]$, and no other singularities. Using lemmas 2.3 and 2.5 shows that $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_0, F))$ contains an image of the product $B_8 \times B_5$ of the 8-strand and 5-strand braid groups, with standard generators a_1, \dots, a_7 and b_1, \dots, b_4 mapping to the ω -reflections in roots r_1, \dots, r_7 and s_1, \dots, s_4 of $\Lambda(V)$, no two of which are proportional. The method described before theorem 4.4 shows that the r_i (resp. s_i) span a nondegenerate \mathcal{E} -lattice R (resp. S) of dimension 7 (resp. 4). Since R and S are orthogonal and nondegenerate, they meet only at 0, so $\Lambda(V) = R \oplus S$ up to finite index. A generator c_8 (resp. c_5) for the center of B_8 (resp. B_5) is $(a_1 \dots a_7)^8$ (resp. $(b_1 \dots b_4)^5$), so it acts on R (resp. S) as a scalar of determinant ω^{56} (resp. ω^{20}), i.e., as the scalar $\bar{\omega}$ (resp. $\bar{\omega}$). Therefore c_5c_8 acts on $\Lambda(V)$ by $\bar{\omega}I$. \square

Theorem 8.2. *(i) No two chordal hyperplanes meet in $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$. (ii) If a discriminant hyperplane and a chordal hyperplane meet in $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$, then they are orthogonal.*

Proof. If r and s are a nodal and a chordal root, then $s^2 = r^2 = 3$ and $\langle r|s \rangle$ is divisible by 3. If $\langle r|s \rangle = 0$ then they are orthogonal, and otherwise the span of r and s has inner product matrix which is not positive-definite. In this case, r^\perp and s^\perp do not meet in $\mathbb{C}H^{10}$. This proves (ii).

Now we prove (i). Suppose r and s are non-proportional chordal roots. By the argument for (ii), if r^\perp and s^\perp meet, then $r \perp s$. So we must show that $r \perp s$ is impossible. By lemma 7.2, we may take s to be $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$ in the coordinates of (2.8). If $r \perp s$ then r lies in Λ_{10} . Now, r is primitive because its norm is 3, and by $\theta\Lambda_{10}^* = \Lambda_{10}$, r makes inner product θ with some element of Λ_{10} . Therefore r cannot be a chordal root. \square

Theorem 8.3. *The discriminant and chordal loci of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s$ have finite branched covers which are isomorphic.*

Proof. Consider the nodal root $r = (0, \dots, 0, 1, \omega)$ and chordal root $s = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, in the notation of (2.8). The discriminant (resp. chordal) locus of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_s$ is the image in $P\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ of r^\perp (resp. s^\perp). We have

$$r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle = \langle s \rangle \oplus E_8^\mathcal{E} \oplus E_8^\mathcal{E} \oplus (-3) \oplus \langle r \rangle.$$

Let Γ' be the subgroup of Γ preserving the sublattice $r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle$, which has index $(3^{10} - 1)/2 = 29524$ in Γ . The images of r^\perp and s^\perp in $P\Gamma' \backslash \mathbb{C}H^{10}$ are isomorphic because $r^\perp \oplus \langle r \rangle$ admits an isometry exchanging r and s . \square

Remark. The same argument proves theorem 3 in Kondō's work [19] on genus 4 curves, and a similar result relating nodal and hyperelliptic hyperplanes in his uniformization of the moduli space of genus 3 curves by the 6-ball.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Allcock, New complex- and quaternion-hyperbolic reflection groups, *Duke Math. J.* **103** (2000) 303-333. [arXiv:math.GR/9907193](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9907193). Available at <http://www.math.utexas.edu/~allcock>.
- [2] D. Allcock, The moduli space of cubic threefolds, *J. Alg. Geom.* **12** (2003) 201-223. Available at <http://www.math.utexas.edu/~allcock>.
- [3] D. Allcock, The Leech lattice and complex hyperbolic reflections *Invent. Math.* **140** (2000) 283-301. Available at <http://www.math.utexas.edu/~allcock>.
- [4] D. Allcock, J. Carlson, and D. Toledo, The complex hyperbolic geometry of the moduli space of cubic surfaces, *J. Alg. Geom.* **11** (2002) 659-724. [arXiv:math.AG/0007048](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0007048). Available at <http://www.math.utexas.edu/~allcock>.
- [5] V. I. Arnold, V. V. Goryunov, O. V. Lyashko and V. A. Vasil'ev, *Singularity Theory I*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [6] T. Basak, The complex Lorentzian Leech lattice and the bimonster, to appear in *J. Alg.*, [arXiv:math.GR/0508228](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0508228).
- [7] E. Brieskorn, Singular elements of semi-simple algebraic groups, *Actes du Congrès International des Mathématiciens (Nice, 1970)*, Tome 2, pp. 279-284. Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1971.

- [8] E. Brieskorn, Die Fundamentalgruppe des Raumes der regulären Orbits einer endlichen komplexen Spiegelungsgruppe, *Invent. Math.* **12** (1971) 57–61.
- [9] C. H. Clemens and P. A. Griffiths, The intermediate Jacobian of the cubic threefold, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **95** (1972), 281–356.
- [10] C.H. Clemens, Degeneration of Kähler manifolds. *Duke Math. J.* **44** (1977), 215–290.
- [11] H. S. M. Coxeter, Factor groups of the braid group, *Proceedings of the Fourth Canadian Mathematical Congress, Banff, 1957*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1959, pp. 95–122.
- [12] P. Deligne and G. D. Mostow, Monodromy of hypergeometric functions and non-lattice integral monodromy, *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **63** (1986) 5–89.
- [13] R. H. Fox, Covering spaces with singularities, in *Algebraic Geometry and Topology; A symposium in honor of S. Lefschetz*, Princeton University Press, 1957, 243–257.
- [14] Bert van Geemen, Half twists of Hodge Structures of CM type, *Math. Soc. Of Japan* **53** (2001) 813–833. math.AG/000076.
- [15] H. Grauert and R. Remmert, *Coherent Analytic Sheaves*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 265. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [16] P. Griffiths and J. Harris, *Principles of algebraic geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1994.
- [17] J. Kollár, K. Smith and A. Corti, *Rational and Nearly Rational Varieties*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 92. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [18] S. Kondō, A complex hyperbolic structure for the moduli space of curves of genus three. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **525** (2000) 219–232.
- [19] S. Kondō, The moduli space of curves of genus 4 and Deligne-Mostow’s complex reflection groups. Algebraic geometry 2000, Azumino (Hotaka), 383–400, *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, **36**, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2002.
- [20] E. Looijenga and R. Swierstra, On period maps that are open embeddings, [arXiv:math.AG/0512489](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0512489).
- [21] E. Looijenga and R. Swierstra, The period map for cubic threefolds, to be posted on the Mathematics ArXiv.
- [22] MAPLE version 10, Waterloo Maple Inc.
- [23] J. Milnor, *Singular points of complex hypersurfaces*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, Princeton University Press 1968.
- [24] Mostow, G. D., Generalized Picard lattices arising from half-integral conditions. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **63** (1986), 91–106.
- [25] D. Mumford, *Algebraic Geometry. I. Complex Projective Varieties*, in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [26] P. Orlik and L. Solomon, Discriminants in the invariant theory of reflection groups, *Nagoya Math. J.* **109** (1988), 23–45.
- [27] PARI/GP, version 2.1.6, Bordeaux, 2005, <http://pari.math.u-bordeaux.fr/>
- [28] A. A. du Plessis and C. T. C. Wall, Singular hypersurfaces, versality and Gorenstein algebras, *J. Algebra. Geom.* **9** (2000) 309–322.
- [29] Z. Reichstein, Stability and equivariant maps, *Invent. Math.* **96** (1989) 349–383.
- [30] M. Sebastiani and R. Thom, Un résultat sur la monodromie, *Invent. Math.* **13** (1971) 90–96.

- [31] G. C. Shephard and J. A. Todd, Finite unitary reflection groups, *Canadian J. Math.* **6** (1954) 274–304.
- [32] K. Timmerscheidt, Mixed Hodge theory for unitary local systems, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **379** (1987), 152–171.
- [33] L. Tu, Macaulay’s theorem and local Torelli for weighted hypersurfaces, *Compositio Math.* **60** (1986) 33–44.
- [34] C. Voisin, Théorème de Torelli pour les cubiques de P^5 . *Invent. Math.* **86** (1986) 577–601.
- [35] M. Yokoyama, Stability of cubic 3-folds, *Tokyo J. Math.* **25** (2002), 85–105.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, AUSTIN, TX 78712

E-mail address: allcock@math.utexas.edu

URL: <http://www.math.utexas.edu/~allcock>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112; CLAY MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE, ONE BOW STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

E-mail address: carlson@math.utah.edu; carlson@claymath.org

URL: <http://www.math.utah.edu/~carlson>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112

E-mail address: toledo@math.utah.edu

URL: <http://www.math.utah.edu/~toledo>