Geometry of intersections of some secant varieties to algebraic curves

Mara Ungureanu

Abstract

For a smooth projective curve, the cycles of subordinate or, more generally, secant divisors to a given linear series are among some of the most studied objects in classical enumerative geometry. We consider the intersection of two such cycles corresponding to secant divisors of two different linear series on the same curve and investigate the validity of the enumerative formulas counting the number of divisors in the intersection. We study some interesting cases, with unexpected transversality properties, and establish a general method to verify when this intersection is empty.

1 Introduction

One of the most basic questions in the enumerative geometry of curves is to determine the number of singularities that occur for the embedding of a curve in projective space. An elementary example thereof is the calculation of the number of double points of a curve $C$ contained in the quadric surface $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Assuming the curve $C$ has arithmetic genus $g$ and bidegree $(d_1, d_2)$, the adjunction formula tells us that there are exactly

$$\nu = (d_1 - 1)(d_2 - 1) - g$$

ordinary double points.

We can reformulate this problem from the point of view of intersections of incidence varieties as follows: the embedding

$$C \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$$

is given by a pair of pencils $l_1 = g_{d_1}^1$ and $l_2 = g_{d_2}^1$ on $C$ and the double points correspond to pairs of points $(p_1, p_2)$ common to both linear series, i.e. a divisor $D = p_1 + p_2 \in C_2$ such that

$$\dim(l_1 - D) \geq 0,$$
$$\dim(l_2 - D) \geq 0.$$  

The enumerative problem becomes that of counting the number of divisors of degree two on the curve that are common to the two pencils, or more precisely the number of divisors in the intersection of the two incidence varieties corresponding to the series $l_1$ and $l_2$.

The purpose of this paper is to study the geometry of such intersections of incidence (or more generally secant) varieties to algebraic curves, with a focus on issues of transversality of intersection.
Before stating the precise results, we introduce some terminology. Let $C$ be a general curve of genus $g$ equipped with a linear series $l = (L, V) = g_d^r$ such that the Brill-Noether number $\rho(g, r, d)$ is non-negative. Let $e \leq d$ be a positive integer and denote by $C_e$ the $e$-th symmetric product of the curve. We set

$$
\Gamma_e(l) := \{ D \in C_e \mid D' - D \geq 0 \text{ for some } D' \in l \} \subset C_e
$$

to be the incidence variety of all effective divisors of degree $e$ that are subordinate to the linear series $l$.

As a subspace of $C_e$, the space $\Gamma_e(l)$ has the structure of a degeneracy locus so it is indeed a variety and it is easy to see that it has expected dimension $r$. We explain this in more detail in Section 2.

Consider the following setup: equip the smooth general curve $C$ of genus $g$ with two complete linear series $l_1 = g_{d_1}^r$ and $l_2 = g_{d_2}^r$ with positive Brill-Noether numbers $\rho(g, r_1, d_1)$ and $\rho(g, r_2, d_2)$.

Let

$$
\Gamma_e(l_1) = \{ D \in C_e \mid l_1 - D \geq 0 \},
\Gamma_e(l_2) = \{ D \in C_e \mid l_2 - D \geq 0 \},
$$

be the respective incidence varieties. We therefore expect to have finitely many divisors $D$ in the intersection $\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2)$ if

$$
\dim \Gamma_e(l_1) + \dim \Gamma_e(l_2) = r_1 + r_2 = e.
$$

In fact, in Chapter VIII, §3 of [ACGH85], a class computation shows that in this case, the number is expected to be the coefficient of the monomial $t_1^{e-r_1} t_2^{e-r_2}$ in

$$
(1 + t_1)^{d_1 - g - r_1}(1 + t_2)^{d_2 - g - r_2}(1 + t_1 + t_2)^g.
$$

Using this formula we immediately recover the number of double points of a curve $C$ of genus $g$ and bidegree $(d_1, d_2)$ contained in the quadric surface $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Indeed, in this case $r_1 = r_2 = 1$ and $e = 2$. Thus, according to formula (1), the number we are after is the coefficient of $t_1 t_2$ in

$$
(1 + t_1)^{d_1 - g - 1}(1 + t_2)^{d_2 - g - 1}(1 + t_1 + t_2)^g.
$$

But this is exactly $(d_1 - 1)(d_2 - 2) - g$, i.e. the same count obtained by geometric methods.

Unfortunately, formula (1) yields unexpected zero counts that correspond to the case when the intersection

$$
\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2)
$$

is not transverse. We study this behaviour in Section 3 and, using the dimension and smoothness theorems for de Jonquières divisors (Theorems 1.1 and 1.4 of [Ung]), we obtain in Section 3 some examples where this intersection is actually empty. Using a tangent space computation, we prove in Section 3.2 our main non-transversality result:

**Theorem 1.1.** Consider a general curve $C$ of genus $g$ equipped with arbitrary linear series $l_1 = g_{d_1}^r$ and $l_2 = g_{d_2}^r = K_C - l_1$ such that $\rho(g, r_1, d_1)$ is non-negative. If non-empty, the intersection $\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2)$ is not transverse for any integer $e \leq d$. 
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Another related direction of study is to consider a generalisation of the notion of incidence varieties, namely that of secant varieties: if \( C \) is a general curve of genus \( g \) endowed with a linear series \( l \) of type \( g^r_d \) and if \( e \) and \( f \) are positive integers such that \( 0 \leq f < e \leq d \), then let

\[
V_{e-f}^{e-f}(l) = \{ D \in C_e \mid \dim(l-D) \geq r - e + f \}
\]

be the secant variety of effective divisors of degree \( e \) which impose at most \( e-f \) independent conditions on \( l \). Equivalently, this space parametrises the \( e \)-secant \((e-f-1)\)-planes to the curve \( C \) embedded in \( \mathbb{P}^r \) via \( l \).

The cycle \( V_{e-f}^{e-f}(l) \) of \( C_e \) is also endowed with a degeneracy locus structure (so it is an actual variety) and it was proven by Farkas [Far08] that, if non-empty, it does indeed have expected dimension

\[
\dim V_{e-f}^{e-f}(l) = e - f(r + 1 - e + f),
\]

for a general curve \( C \) with a general series \( l \) of type \( g^r_d \). We remark here that incidence varieties are special cases of secant varieties, namely \( \Gamma_e(l) = V_{e}^{e}(l) \) and \( f = e - r \).

Furthermore, secant varieties are interesting objects not just from the point of view of classical algebraic geometry, but also from a modern perspective. For example, one may generalise the notion of secant varieties to nonsingular projective surfaces \( S \) with a line bundle \( L \). If \( |L| \) is a linear system of dimension \( 3m - 2 \) inducing a map \( S \to \mathbb{P}^{3m-2} \), then the number of \( m \)-chords of dimension \( m - 2 \) to the image of \( S \) (so the cardinality of the secant variety \( V_{m}^{m-1}(|L|) \)) is given by the integral of the top Segre class

\[
\int_{S^{[m]}} s_{2m}(H^{[m]}),
\]

where \( S^{[m]} \) is the Hilbert scheme of points of \( S \) carrying a tautological rank-\( m \) bundle \( H^{[m]} \). Such Segre classes play a basic role in the Donaldson-Thomas counting of sheaves and appeared first in the algebraic study of Donaldson invariants via the moduli space of rank-2 bundles on \( S \) [Tv93]. The exact result of the integral is the subject of Lehnn’s conjecture [Leh99] that states that it can be expressed as a polynomial of degree \( m \) in the four variables

\[
H^2, \ H \cdot K_S, \ K^2_S, \ c_2(S).
\]

For a proof of this conjecture, see [Tik94] and for a generalisation to K3 surfaces see [MOP17].

We shall therefore consider the more general case of the intersection of an incidence variety and a secant variety on a smooth general curve \( C \), namely

\[
\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap V_{e-f}^{e-f}(l_2),
\]

where \( l_1 \) and \( l_2 \) are linear series on \( C \) and \( e \) and \( f \) are integers such that \( 0 \leq f < e \leq d \). Here we investigate the complementary problem to that studied in Theorem 1.1 i.e. the expected emptiness of the intersection when the sum of the dimensions of the two varieties \( \Gamma_e(l_1) \) and \( V_{e-f}^{e-f}(l_2) \) inside \( C_e \) is less than \( e \). As in Theorem 1.1 we again focus on the case \( l_2 = K_C - l_1 \). To get the correct dimensional estimate when we allow for the series \( l_1 \)
to vary in moduli (so we do not consider just the general series of type \( g^r_d \)), consider the correspondence

\[ \Lambda = \{ (D, l_1) \in C_e \times G^r_d(C) \mid D \in \Gamma_e(l_1) \cap V^{e-f}(K_C - l_1) \} \subset C_e \times G^r_d. \]

By construction, \( \Lambda \) has expected dimension

\[ \exp \dim \Lambda = \rho(g, r_1, d_1) + \dim \Gamma_e(l_1) + \dim V^{e-f}(K_C - l_1) - e, \]

so if this number is negative, we expect \( \Lambda \) to be empty. Our main result in this context is:

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \( C \) be a general curve of genus \( g \) equipped with a complete linear series \( l_1 = g^r_d \) such that \( \rho(g, r_1, d_1) \geq 0 \). If \( f = 1 \) and

\[ \dim \Gamma_e(l_1) + \dim V^{e-f}(K_C - l_1) \leq e - \rho(g, r_1, d_1) - 1, \]

then the intersection \( \Gamma_e(l_1) \cap V^{e-f}(K_C - l_1) \) is empty for an arbitrary linear series \( l_1 \in G^r_d(C) \).

Note that if \( f = r_1 + 1 + \rho(g, r_1, d_1) \), then \( V^{e-f}(K_C - l_1) = \Gamma_e(K_C - l_1) \) and we are back to the degenerate case of Theorem 1.1.

We prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 5 by degeneration to a nodal curve using limit linear series and by exploiting an ingenious construction of [Far08]. Furthermore, we provide in fact a method to check the emptiness of such intersections for any \( f \neq r_1 + 1 + \rho(g, r_1, d_1) \), but the case \( f = 1 \) seems to be the one with the most tractable computations.

In the course of the proof of Theorem 1.2 we also find an interesting example that contradicts the expectation of non-emptiness of secant varieties as stated in Theorem 0.5 of [Far08]. We explain this in Remark 5.1.

The paper is organised as follows: in Section 2 we establish some preliminary results on incidence and secant varieties before we prove Theorem 1.1 using a tangent space argument in Section 3. We construct degenerations of secant varieties for families of curves with nodal fibres of compact type using limit linear series in Section 4 and we use them to prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 5.
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**2 Preliminaries on incidence and secant varieties**

As usual, let \( C \) be a general curve of genus \( g \) equipped with a linear series \( l = (L, V) \) of type \( g^r_d \). Let \( e, f \) be integers such that \( 0 \leq f < e \leq d \).

As mentioned in the Introduction, incidence varieties are special cases of secant varieties, namely \( \Gamma_e(l) = V^r_e(l) \).

Secant (and therefore incidence) varieties \( V^{e-f}(l) \) of effective divisors of degree \( e \) imposing at most \( e-f \) conditions on \( l \) have a degeneracy locus structure inside the symmetric
product \( C_e \), obtained as follows: let \( \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{O}_{C_e} \otimes V \) be the trivial vector bundle of rank \( r + 1 \) on \( C_e \) and \( \mathcal{F}_e(L) := \tau_*(\sigma^*L \otimes \mathcal{O}_U) \) be the \( e \)-th secant bundle, where \( U \) is the universal divisor

\[
U = \{(p, D) \mid D \in C_e \text{ and } p \in D\} \subset C \times C_e,
\]
and \( \sigma, \tau \) are the usual projections:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C \times C_e & \supset \mathcal{U} \\
\sigma & \downarrow & \tau \\
C & \rightarrow & C_e
\end{array}
\]

Let \( \Phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \) be the bundle morphism obtained by pushing down to \( C_e \) the restriction \( \sigma^*L \rightarrow \sigma^*L \otimes \mathcal{O}_U \). The space \( V_{e-f}(l) \) is then the \((e-f)\)-th degeneracy locus of \( \Phi \), i.e. where \( \text{rk} \, \Phi \leq e - f \). To see that this is indeed the case, note that fibrewise, the morphism \( \Phi \) is given by the restriction:

\[
\Phi_D : H^0(C, L) \rightarrow H^0(C, L/L(-D)).
\]

Now by definition, \( D \in V_{e-f}(l) \) if and only if \( \dim \ker \Phi_D = h^0(L-D) \geq r + 1 - e + f \), which is equivalent to the aforementioned condition \( \text{rk} \, \Phi \leq e - f \). The dimension estimate for \( V_{e-f}(l) \) follows immediately from its degeneracy locus structure:

\[
\dim V_{e-f}(l) \geq e - (r + 1 - e + f)(e - e + f) = e - f(r + 1 - e + f).
\]

In particular,

\[
\dim \Gamma_{e}(l) \geq r.
\]

On the other hand, since \( D \in \Gamma_{e}(l) \) is equivalent to there existing a divisor \( E \in l \) such that \( E - D \geq 0 \), and since the dimension of the locus of such divisors \( E \) inside \( l \) is at most \( r \), we immediately have that

\[
\dim \Gamma_{e}(l) = r
\]

for any linear series \( l \) of type \( g^d_d \) on \( C \). Using the Porteous formula, one obtains (see for \[ACGH85\] Chapter VIII, Lemma 3.2) that the fundamental class of \( \Gamma_{e}(l) \) is given by

\[
\gamma_{e}(l) = \sum_{j=0}^{e-r} \binom{d-g-r}{j} x^j g^{e-r-j}_{e-r-j} \theta_{e-r-j},
\]

where \( \theta \) is the pullback of the fundamental class of the theta divisor to \( C_d \) and \( x \) is the class of the divisor \( q + C_{d-1} \subset C_d \).

To obtain formula \( \text{(1)} \) giving the number (when expected to be finite) of divisors in the intersection

\[
\Gamma_{e}(l_1) \cap \Gamma_{e}(l_2),
\]

where \( l_1 = g^d_{d_1} \) and \( l_2 = g^d_{d_2} \), one may compute the product

\[
\gamma_{e}(l_1)\gamma_{e}(l_2) \in H^{2e}(C_e, \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \mathbb{Z},
\]

which, as shown in \[ACGH85\] Chapter VIII, Section 8, yields the desired count.
Unfortunately, the situation is not so simple in the general case of secant varieties with $r - e + f > 0$. Indeed, the fundamental class of $V_e^{r-f}(l)$ has been computed by MacDonald and its expression is very complicated and thus of limited practical use, as can be seen in [ACGH85], Chapter VIII, §4. For a study of the dimension theory of secant varieties we refer the reader to [Far08].

In this paper we are concerned instead with the study of intersections of incidence and secant varieties on a given general smooth curve and with the geometric interpretation of some unexpected enumerative results that arise in this context.

3 Intersections of incidence varieties

In this section we investigate the failure of transversality for intersections of incidence varieties in certain interesting cases. We begin in 3.1 by explaining why the enumerative formula (1) yields unexpected zero counts in some situations by making use of the dimension theorem for de Jonquières divisors. By studying the relevant tangent spaces we then prove Theorem 1.1 in 3.2.

3.1 Unexpected zero counts

Recall that for two linear series $l_1 = g_{d_1}^{r_1}$ and $l_2 = g_{d_2}^{r_2}$ on a general curve $C$ and for the positive integer $e = r_1 + r_2$, we expect there to be a finite number of divisors in the intersection $\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2)$ and this number is given by formula (1).

Consider the linear series $l_1 = g_{d_1}^{r_1}$, the pencil $l_2 = g_{d_2}^{1}$, and $e = r_1 + 1$. Formula (II) gives that the number of divisors $D \in C_{r_1+1}$ common to both $l_1$ and $l_2$ is

\[(d_1 - r_1) \binom{d_2 - 1}{r_1} - g \binom{d_2 - 2}{r_1 - 1}.\] (2)

This number was first computed by Severi in the context of the theory of correspondences and coincidences on curves (see Section 74 of [SL21]).

> From our point of view, this choice of parameters provides an interesting example of a zero count when $d_2 = r_1 + 2$ and $\rho(g, r_1, d_1) = 0$, because now

\[(d_1 - r_1) \binom{d_2 - 1}{r_1} - g \binom{d_2 - 2}{r_1 - 1} = \rho(g, r_1, d_1) = 0.\]

Thus we expect this intersection not to be well-behaved in the case of vanishing $\rho(g, r_1, d_1)$. Indeed, we have:

**Proposition 3.1.** In the above setting, if $d_2 = r_1 + 2$ and $\rho(g, r_1, d_1) = 0$ there are three possibilities for the intersection $\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2)$:

(i) it is empty if $l_1 = K_C$ and $l_2$ is base point free;

(ii) it is strictly positive-dimensional if $l_1 = K_C$ and $l_2$ is not base point free;

(iii) it is empty if $l_1 \neq K_C$. 
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Proof. Let $D \in \Gamma_{r_1+1}(l_1) \cap \Gamma_{r_1+1}(l_2)$ and let $s_1 := g - d_1 + r_1$ be the index of speciality of the linear series $l_1$. Since $\rho(g, r_1, d_1) = 0$, it immediately follows that:

$$
d_1 = r_1(s_1 + 1),
$$
$$
g = s_1(r_1 + 1).
$$

Since the curve $C$ is general, the Brill-Noether number corresponding to the pencil $l_2$

$$
\rho(g, 1, r_1 + 2) = s_1(r_1 + 1) - 2(s_1 - 1)(r_1 + 1) = (r_1 + 1)(2 - s_1)
$$

must be non-negative. This is only possible if $s_1 = 1$ or $s_1 = 2$.

Assume first that $s_1 = 1$, so that $l_1 = K_C$. Then $K_C - D \geq 0$ for all $D \in C_{r_1+1} = C_{g}$ satisfying $g - (r_1 + 1) + \dim |D| = \dim |D| > 0$. Hence $D \in \Gamma_g(K_C)$ if and only if $|D| = g_{r_1+1}^1$. If $l_2$ is base point free, then the intersection $\Gamma_g(K_C) \cap \Gamma_g(l_2)$ is empty. Otherwise, the intersection $\Gamma_g(K_C) \cap \Gamma_g(l_2)$ is at least 1-dimensional, hence not a finite, discrete set.

If $s_1 = 2$, then $l_1 = g_{2r_1+1}^1$ and $l_2 = g_{r_1+2}^1$. Note that in this case $l_1 = K_C - l_2$. By our assumption, there exists an effective divisor $E_1$ of degree $2r_1 - 1$ such that

$$
|D + E_1| = l_1
$$

and an effective divisor $E_2$ of degree 1 such that

$$
|D + E_2| = l_2.
$$

Therefore

$$
K_C = |2D + E_1 + E_2|.
$$

Since in this case $g = 2r_1 + 2$, we have $K_C = g_{2r_1+1}^{2r_1+1}$. Applying the dimension theorem for de Jonquières divisors (Theorem 1.1 of [Ung]), we conclude that the locus of triples $(D, E_1, E_2)$ inside $C_{r_1+1} \times C_{2r_1-1} \times C$ has dimension

$$(r_1 + 1 + 2r_1 - 1 + 1) - (4r_1 + 2) + (2r_1 + 1) = r_1.$$}

Since $l_1$ has Brill-Noether number equal to zero, it follows that it is general and hence base point free. This implies further that

$$
\dim(l_1 - D) = \dim(|E_1|) \leq r_1 - 1.
$$

Moreover, $E_2$ is simply a point on $C$, which means that $\dim(|E_2|) = 0$. Putting everything together, we conclude that $\dim(|D|) \geq 1$. Since $D \in l_2$, we finally get that $|D| = g_{r_1+1}^1$. This is then equivalent to the statement

$$
E_1 \in V_{2r_1-1}^{r_1-1}(l_1).
$$

However, on easily checks that

$$
\rho(g, r_1, 3r_1) + \dim V_{2r_1-1}^{r_1-1}(l_1) = -1,
$$

from which we conclude, using Corollary 0.2 of [Far08], that $V_{2r_1-1}^{r_1-1}(l_1) = \emptyset$. Hence in this case, the intersection $\Gamma_{r_1+1}(l_1) \cap \Gamma_{r_1+1}(l_2)$ is empty.

\qed
Using similar methods, we obtain a more general version of Proposition 3.1.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let $C$ be a general curve of genus $g$ equipped with two complete linear series $l_1 = g_{d_1}^r$ and $l_2 = g_{d_2}^r$ such that

$$r_1 > 1, \ r_2 > r_1, \ g - d_1 + r_1 > 0 \text{ and } l_2 = K_C - l_1.$$  

Then the intersection $\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2)$ is not transverse.

**Proof.** By assumption, $l_2 = g_{2g-2-d_1}^{g-d_1+r_1-1}$. Let $D \in \Gamma_e(l_1)$. Then there exists an effective divisor $E_1 \in C_{d_1-e}$ such that $|D + E_1| = l_1$. Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$\dim |2D + E_1| \geq d_1 + e - g.$$  

If $\dim |2D + E_1| = d_1 + e - g$, then $|2D + E_1|$ is a non-special linear series of degree $d_1 + e$ and from the transversality of de Jonquières divisors (Theorem 1.4 of [Ung]), the dimension of the space of pairs $(D, E_1)$ with this property is

$$d_1 - (d_1 + e) + (d_1 + e - g) = d_1 - g < r_1.$$  

Therefore there is at most a $(r_1 - 1)$-dimensional family of divisors $D \in \Gamma_e(l_1)$ satisfying $|2D + E_1| = d_1 + e - g$ while the remainder of the divisors $D$ in $\Gamma_e(l_1)$ are such that $\dim |2D + E_1| > d_1 + e - g$.

Now, if $D \in \Gamma_e(l_1)$ satisfies $\dim |2D + E_1| > d_1 + e - g$, then, by residuation, there exists an effective divisor $E_2$ such that

$$K_C = |2D + E_1 + E_2|.$$  

Moreover, $l_2 = K_C - l_1 = |K_C - D - E_1| = |D + E_2|$, hence $\dim (l_2 - D) \geq 0$, i.e. $D \in \Gamma_e(l_2)$ for all $D \in \Gamma_e(l_1)$. Hence the intersection $\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2)$ is not transverse.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Notice that we have almost proved Theorem 1.1 which states that, if non-empty, the intersection $\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(K_C - l_1)$ is never transverse for any complete linear series $l_1$. In order to extend the result of Proposition 3.2 and obtain Theorem 1.1 we change point of view to the tangent spaces of incidence varieties. We recall here the most important facts:

(i) The tangent space $T_{DC_d} = H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_D(D))$ and its dual is

$$T^*_{DC_d} = H^0(C, K_C/K_C - D),$$

with the pairing given by the residue.

(ii) The tangent space at a point of a linear series $|D| \subset C^r_d$ is $T_D|D| = \ker \delta$, where

$$\delta : \text{im}(\alpha \mu_0)^0 \to \text{im}(\mu_0)^0.$$
is the differential of the Abel-Jacobi map \( u : C'_q \to W'_d(C) \) while
\[
\alpha : H^0(C, K_C) \to H^0(C, K_C \otimes O_D)
\]
is the restriction mapping and
\[
\mu_0 : H^0(C, K_C - D) \otimes H^0(C, O_C(D)) \to H^0(C, K_C)
\]
the cup-product mapping.

(iii) Suppose \( D \) and \( D' \) are effective divisors of degree \( d \) and \( d' \) respectively, then the tangent spaces \( T_{D+D'}C_{d+d'} \) and \( T_DC_d \) are related via
\[
H^0(C, O_{D+D'}(D + D')) = H^0(C, O_D(D)) \oplus H^0(C, O_C(D + D')/ O_C(D)).
\]
This follows from the exact sequence
\[
0 \to O_C(D)/ O_C \to O_C(D + D')/ O_C \to O_C(D + D')/ O_C(D) \to 0.
\]
We remark here that the projection from \( H^0(C, O_{D+D'}(D + D')) \) onto \( H^0(C, O_D(D)) \) is nothing but the truncation map for Laurent tails.

The transversality condition for the intersection of the incidence varieties \( \Gamma_e(l_1) \) and \( \Gamma_e(l_2) \), where as usual \( l_2 = K_C - l_1 \), is:
\[
T_DC_e = T_D\Gamma_e(l_1) + T_D\Gamma_e(l_2).
\]
or equivalently
\[
T_D\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap T_D\Gamma_e(l_2) = (0),
\]
for some \( D \in \Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2) \). Let \( D_i \in l_i \), for \( i = 1, 2 \) such that \( D \leq D_i \) and \( E_i \in C_{d_i - d} \) such that \( D + E_i = D_i \).

Let \( \delta_i, \alpha_i, \mu_{0,i} \) denote the differential, restriction, and cup-product mapping corresponding to each of the divisors \( D_i \), for \( i = 1, 2 \). With this notation, the tangent space to the incidence varieties is, for \( i = 1, 2 \):
\[
T_D\Gamma_e(l_i) = \ker \delta_i \cap H^0(C, O_D(D)).
\]
Thus the transversality condition (3) becomes
\[
\ker \delta_1 \cap \ker \delta_2 \cap H^0(C, O_D(D)) = (0).
\]
By construction, the restrictions of \( \delta_1 \) and \( \delta_2 \) to the space \( H^0(C, O_D(D)) \) coincide and are both equal to the differential \( \delta \) corresponding to \( D \). Finally, recall that \( \eta \in \ker \delta_i \) if and only if \( \langle \delta_i \eta, \omega \rangle = 0 \) for all \( \omega \in \text{coker } \mu_{0,i} \).

Returning now to the case of a linear series \( l_1 \) and its residual \( l_2 = K_C - l_1 \), we immediately see that \( \mu_{0,1} \) and \( \mu_{0,2} \) are the same multiplication map
\[
\mu := \mu_{0,1} = \mu_{0,2} : H^0(C, D + E_1) \otimes H^0(C, D + E_2) \to H^0(C, 2D + E_1 + E_2).
\]
Thus, \( \eta \in \ker \delta_1 \cap \ker \delta_2 \cap H^0(C, O_D(D)) \) if and only if \( \langle \delta \eta, \omega \rangle = 0 \), for all \( \omega \in \text{coker } \mu \). But this condition is satisfied by any \( \eta \) in the kernels of both \( \delta_1 \) and \( \delta_2 \), so that the transversality condition (4) cannot be satisfied and this gives the proof of Theorem 1.1.
4 Degenerations of secant varieties

In this section we construct a space of degenerations of secant varieties for families of curves of compact type using limit linear series and the same idea of degeneracy loci.

Before doing so, we recall some well-known fact about limit linear series. Consider a smooth 1-parameter family \( \pi : \mathcal{X} \to \Delta \) of curves of genus \( g \) over the disk \( \Delta \) such that the fibres over the punctured disk \( \Delta^* = \Delta \setminus \{0\} \) are smooth curves, while the special fibre is given by a nodal curve of compact type \( \mathcal{X}_0 \). Furthermore, let \( \mathcal{X}^* \) be the restriction of the family \( \mathcal{X} \) to \( \Delta^* \) and let \( \mathcal{L}^* \) be a line bundle on \( \mathcal{X}^* \) such that the restriction \( \mathcal{L}_t \) to each fibre \( \mathcal{X}_t \) is of degree \( d \) for all \( t \in \Delta^* \). We can then extend \( \mathcal{L}^* \) to a limit line bundle \( \mathcal{L} \) over the whole family \( \mathcal{X} \).

For such a line bundle \( \mathcal{L}^* \) on \( \mathcal{X}^* \), we fix for each \( t \in \Delta^* \) a non-zero subvector space \( V_t \subset H^0(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t) \) of dimension \( r + 1 \). For a given extension \( \mathcal{L} \) of \( \mathcal{L}^* \) to the whole of \( \mathcal{X} \), let \( \mathcal{V} \) be a free module of rank \( r + 1 \) over \( \Delta \) satisfying:

\[
\mathcal{V}_t := V_t \cap H^0(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t) \quad \text{with} \quad t \in \Delta,
\]

where the intersection is taken inside \( H^0(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t) \). We denote by \( \mathcal{V}^* \) the corresponding module over \( \Delta^* \) and we observe that the induced homomorphism

\[
\mathcal{V}_0 \to (\pi_*\mathcal{L})_0 \to H^0(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)
\]

is injective. To summarise, the pair \( (\mathcal{V}^*, \mathcal{V}) \) is called a linear series on \( \mathcal{X}^* \). Given a limit line bundle \( \mathcal{L} \) on \( \mathcal{X} \), \( \mathcal{L}^* \) extends to a linear series \( \mathcal{L} := (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{V}) \) on \( \mathcal{X} \) and its restriction \( \mathcal{L}_0 = (\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{V}_0) \) to \( \mathcal{X}_0 \) is a linear series of degree \( d \) and dimension \( r \) on the central fibre.

In [EH86], the authors explain that in order to get the most information about the behaviour of the linear series on the central fibre we should only focus on some particular extensions of the corresponding line bundle. More precisely, for each component \( Y \) of \( \mathcal{X}_0 \), denote by \( \mathcal{L}_Y \) the unique extension of the line bundle \( \mathcal{L}^* \) that has degree \( d \) on \( Y \) and degree 0 on all other components of \( \mathcal{X}_0 \) and by \( \mathcal{V}_Y \) the corresponding free module of rank \( r + 1 \) over \( \Delta \) defined as above. The advantage of this is that the sections belonging to \( (\mathcal{V}_Y)_0 \) vanish on all components of \( \mathcal{X}_0 \) except for \( Y \). Hence each \( \mathcal{L}_Y = (\mathcal{L}_Y, \mathcal{V}_Y) \) induces on the component \( Y \) a linear series \( l_Y \) of type \( g^d_d \), which is called an aspect of \( \mathcal{L}^* \).

The relationship between the various aspects of \( \mathcal{L}^* \) is described in terms of the vanishing sequence at the point \( p \in Y \)

\[
0 \leq a_0(l_Y, p) < a_1(l_Y, p) < \cdots < a_r(l_Y, p) \leq d,
\]

where the \( a_i(l_Y, p) \) are the orders with which non-zero sections of \( l_Y \) vanish at \( p \). If \( Z \) is another component of \( \mathcal{X}_0 \) with \( Y \cap Z = p \), then for all \( i = 0, \ldots, r \),

\[
a_i(l_Y, p) + a_{r-i}(l_Z, p) \geq d - r. \tag{5}
\]

To summarise, a collection of aspects of \( \mathcal{L}^* \) satisfying (5) is called a limit linear series and it was proved in [EH86] that it indeed arises as a limit of ordinary linear series on smooth curves.

Recall also the definition of the ramification sequence at the point \( p \in Y \):

\[
0 \leq a_0(l_Y, p) < a_1(l_Y, p) < \cdots < a_r(l_Y, p) \leq d,
\]
where \( \alpha_i(ly, p) = a_i(ly, p) - i \).

We also have the Plücker formula for limit linear series (cf. Proposition 1.1 of [EH86]) which states the following: if \( X \) is a genus \( g \) curve of compact type and \( l \) is a limit linear series of type \( g_d^r \) on \( X \), then

\[
\sum_{q \text{ smooth point of } X} \left( \sum_{i=0}^r \alpha^i(q) \right) = (r+1)d + \binom{r+1}{2}(2g-2). \tag{6}
\]

An alternative description for limit linear series is provided by Osserman in [Oss] and we use it in our construction of degenerations of secant varieties to a family of nodal curves of compact type. For a summary of the most important facts, see [Ung].

**Proposition 4.1.** Fix a proper, flat family of curves \( \mathcal{X} \to B \) over a scheme \( B \) equipped with a linear series \( \ell \) of type \( g_d^r \). There exists a scheme \( \mathcal{V}_{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell) \) proper over \( B \), compatible with base change, whose point over every \( t \in B \) parametrises pairs \([\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{D}_t]\) of curves and divisors such that \( \mathcal{D}_t \) is an \((e-f)\)-th secant divisor of \( \ell_t \). Furthermore, every irreducible component of \( \mathcal{V}_{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell) \) has dimension at least \( \dim B - f(r+1-e+f) \).

**Proof.** We construct the functor \( \mathcal{V}_{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell) \) as a subfunctor of the functor of points of the fibre product \( \mathcal{X} \times B \) over \( B \). It is representable by a scheme that is proper over \( B \) and which we also denote by \( \mathcal{V}_{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell) \).

Let \( T \to B \) be a scheme over \( B \). Suppose first that all the fibres of the family are nonsingular. In this case, from Definition 4.2.1 of [Oss], \( \ell = g_d^r \) on \( \mathcal{X}/B \) is given by a pair \( (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{V}) \), where \( \mathcal{L} \) is a line bundle of degree \( d \) on \( \mathcal{X} \times_B T \) and \( \mathcal{V} \subseteq \pi_2^*\mathcal{L} \) is a vector bundle of rank \( r+1 \) on \( B \), where \( \pi_2 \) is the second projection from the fibre product. Then the \( T \)-valued point \([\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}]\) belongs to \( \mathcal{V}_{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell)(T) \) if the \((e-f)\)-th degeneracy locus of the map

\[
\mathcal{V} \to \pi_2^*\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{D}}
\]

is the whole of \( T \). By construction \( \mathcal{V}_{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell) \) is compatible with base change, so it is a functor, and it has the structure of a closed subscheme, hence it is representable and the associated scheme is proper.

Now suppose that some of the fibres have nodes (that may or may not be smoothed by \( \mathcal{X} \)). As we have seen already, a \( g_d^r \) on \( \mathcal{X} \) is a tuple

\[
(\mathcal{L}, (\mathcal{V}^v)_{v \in V(\Gamma_0)}),
\]

where \( \Gamma_0 \) is the dual graph of the unique maximally degenerate fibre of the family, with a fixed vertex \( v_0 \), \( \mathcal{L} \) is a line bundle of multidegree \( d_0 \) (i.e. it has degree \( d \) on the component corresponding to \( v_0 \) and degree 0 otherwise) on \( \mathcal{X} \times_B T \), and for each \( v \in V(\Gamma_0) \), the \( \mathcal{V}^v \) are subbundles of rank \( r+1 \) of the twists \( \pi_2^*\mathcal{L}^{d_0} \). Let \( v_i \in \Gamma_0 \) be the vertex corresponding to the component containing a point \( p_i \) in the support of \( D \). Then the \( T \)-valued point \([\mathcal{X}, D]\) belongs to \( \mathcal{V}_{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell)(T) \) if, for all \( i \), the \((e-f)\)-th degeneracy locus of the map

\[
\mathcal{V}^{v_i} \to \pi_2^*\mathcal{L}^{d_0}|_{p_i}
\]

is the whole of \( T \). Checking for compatibility with base change (and hence functoriality) is more delicate than in the previous case because the base change may change the graph
However, arguing like in the proof of Proposition 4.5.6 in loc.cit. yields the desired property. Representability and properness then follow analogously.

The dimension bound follows from the degeneracy locus construction of $V^{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell)$. \hfill $\square$

For a linear series $\ell_1$ of type $g_{d_1}$ on $X$, denote by $\Gamma_e(\mathcal{X}, \ell_1)$ the relative secant variety $V^{e-f}(X, \ell_1)$. Thus in this paper we are interested in the intersection $\Gamma_e(\mathcal{X}, \ell_1) \cap V^{e-f}(\mathcal{X}, \ell_2)$, as we shall see explicitly in what follows.

5 Intersections of incidence and secant varieties

In this section we give a proof of Theorem 1.2. We recall the setup: consider a complete linear series $l_1 = g_{d_1}$ on a general curve of genus $g$ with $g > d_1$. We study the intersection of $\Gamma_e(l_1)$ and $V^{e-f}(l_2)$, where $l_2 = g_{d_2} = K_C - l_1$ is the residual linear series to $l_1$ and in the case when

$$\dim \Gamma_e(l_1) + \dim V^{e-f}(l_2) \leq e - \rho(g, r_1, d_1) - 1.$$  \hfill (7)

We prove that the intersection is empty for an arbitrary linear series $l_1 \in G^{g_{d_1}}_d(C)$ when $f = 1$.

5.1 The case of minimal pencils

Before proving Theorem 1.2 in general we first focus on the case of minimal pencils. This will serve as a prototypical example of the strategy we develop in Section 5.2 to check the emptiness of the intersection of incidence and secant varieties

$$\Gamma_e(l_1) \cap V^{e-f}(K_C - l_1)$$

when condition (7) is satisfied.

Let $l_1 = g_{d_1}$ be a minimal pencil, i.e. such that the Brill-Noether number

$$\rho(g, 1, d_1) = 1.$$  

It follows that

$$g = 2d_1 - 3.$$  \hfill (8)

Let $l_2 = g_{d_2} = K_C - l_1 = g_{3d_1-3}$. Then $\dim \Gamma_e(l_1) = 1$ and the expected dimension of $V^{e-f}(K_C - l_1)$ is, as mentioned in the Introduction:

$$e - f(r_2 + 1 - e + f).$$

Thus the non-existence condition (7) of Theorem 1.2 becomes

$$1 + e - f(r_2 + 1 - e + f) \leq e - 2.$$  

To ease the computation and presentation, we deal here with the particular case

$$1 + e - f(r_2 + 1 - e + f) = e - 2.$$  \hfill (9)
We show that if (9) is satisfied, then the intersection

\[ \Gamma_e(l_1) \cap V_{e-f}^e(l_2) \]

is empty. Condition (9) is equivalent to

\[ f(r_2 + 1 - e + f) = 3 \]

and we distinguish two possibilities:

I. If \( f = 3 \), then \( r_2 - e + f = 0 \) and \( V_{e-f}^e(l_2) = \Gamma_e(l_2) \). Moreover,

\[ e = r_2 + f = (d_1 - 3) + 3 = d_1. \] (10)

Thus, as expected from the discussion in Section 3, we are in a degenerate situation and we are in fact looking at the inclusion of \( l_1 = g_1^{d_1} \) inside \( l_2 = K_C - l_1 = g_{3d_1-8}^{d_1-3} \). More precisely, suppose there exists a divisor \( D \in C \) such that

\[ D \in \Gamma_e(l_1) \cap \Gamma_e(l_2). \]

Thus, from (10) we have that \(|D| = l_1 \) and, as we have seen in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we have that

\[ |2D + D'| = K_C \]

for some effective divisor \( D' \) of the correct degree. More precisely, the condition that \( D \in \Gamma_e(l_2) \) is equivalent to

\[ \dim(l_2 - D) = \dim(K_C - l_1) - D = \dim|D'| \geq 0. \] (11)

Since the curve is general, the Petri map

\[ \mu_0 : H^0(C, D) \otimes H^0(C, K_C - D) \to H^0(C, K_C) \]

is injective. Combining this with the base-point-free pencil trick, we get that

\[ H^0(C, K_C - 2D) = H^0(C, D') = 0. \]

This then yields a contradiction with condition (11). Hence the intersection \( \Gamma_e(l_1) \cap V_{e-f}^e(K_C - l_1) \) is empty in this case.

Remark 5.1. This actually provides an interesting example that contradicts the expectation of non-emptiness of secant varieties (see Theorem 0.5 in [Far08]). The inclusion of \( l_1 = g_1^{d_1} \) in \( l_2 = g_2^{d_2} = g_{3d_1-8}^{d_1-3} \) can be reformulated from the point of view of secant varieties as follows: there should exist an effective divisor \( D' \in C_{2d_1-8} \) such that \( g_1^{d_1} + D' = g_{3d_1-8}^{d_1-3} \). In other words, the secant variety \( V_{e-f}^e(l_2) \), where \( e = 2d_1 - 8 \) and \( f = d_1 - 4 \) should be non-empty and this is indeed the expectation from dimensional considerations as:

\[ e - (r_2 + 1 - e + f) = 0. \]

However, as we saw above, there are no such effective divisors \( D' \).
II. If \( f = 1 \), then \( e = d_1 - 4 \) and \( r_2 - e + f = 2 \). Assume towards a contradiction that there exists a divisor

\[
D \in \Gamma_e(l_1) \cap V_e^{e-f}(l_2).
\]

Hence there exists an effective divisor \( E \in C_4 \) such that \( D + E = l_1 \). Moreover

\[
l_2 - D = K_C - l_1 - D = g_{2d_1-4}^{r_2-e+f} = g_{2d_1-4}^2.
\]

Taking the residue yields

\[
l_1 + D = g_{2d_1-4}^2.
\]

We have therefore obtained a “system” of equations for a pair of effective divisors \((D, E) \in C_{d_1-4} \times C_4:\)

\[
\begin{align*}
|D + E| &= g_{d_1}^1 \\
|2D + E| &= g_{2d_1-4}^2.
\end{align*}
\]  (12)

By our assumption, a solution for this system exists. Consider all flag curve degenerations \( j : \overline{M}_{0,g} \to \overline{M}_g \) and let \( Z := \overline{M}_{0,g} \times_{\overline{M}_g} C_g \), where \( C_g = \overline{M}_{g,1} \). Denote by \( q_1, \ldots, q_g \) the points of attachment of the elliptic tails to the rational spine. Let \( X \subset Z \) be the closure of the divisors \( D \) and \( E \) satisfying (12) on all curves from \( \text{im}(j) \subseteq \overline{M}_g \). Since, by assumption, \( X \) dominates \( \overline{M}_{0,g} \), then \( \dim X \geq g - 3 \). Applying Proposition 2.2 of [Far08], there exists a point \( [\tilde{R} := R \cup E_1 \cup \ldots \cup E_g, y_1, \ldots, y_{d_1}] \in X \), where \( R \) is a rational spine (not necessarily smooth) and the \( E_i \) are elliptic tails such that either:

(i) \( y_1 = \ldots = y_{d_1} \), or else

(ii) \( y_1, \ldots, y_{d_1} \) lie on a connected subcurve \( Y \) of \( \tilde{R} \) of arithmetic genus \( p_u(Y) = d_1 \) and \( |Y \cap (R \setminus Y)| = 1 \). Since \( g = 2d_1 - 3 \), it means that \( g > d_1 \) for \( d \geq 2 \) so that we may indeed find such a subcurve \( Y \).

Case (i) is immediately dismissed via a short computation using the Plücker formula.

We focus on case (ii). By the assumption on \( \tilde{R} \), there exists a flat, proper morphism \( \phi : \mathcal{X} \to B \) such that \( \mathcal{X} \) is a smooth surface and \( B \) is a smooth affine curve. Let \( 0 \in B \) be a point such that the fibre \( \mathcal{X}_0 := \phi^{-1}(0) \) is a curve stably equivalent to \( \tilde{R} \) and the other fibres \( \mathcal{X}_t := \phi^{-1}(t) \) are smooth projective curves of genus \( g \) for \( t \neq 0 \). Moreover there are \( e \) sections \( \sigma_i : B \to \mathcal{X} \) such that the \( \sigma_i(0) = y_i \) are smooth points of \( \mathcal{X}_0 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq e \). As before, let \( \mathcal{X}^* = \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 \). There exists a line bundle \( \mathcal{L}^* \) of degree \( 2d_1 - 4 \) on \( \mathcal{X}^* \) and a subbundle \( \mathcal{Y}^* \subset \phi_* \mathcal{L}^* \) of rank 2, such that for all \( t \neq 0 \),

\[
\dim \mathcal{Y}_t \cap H^0(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t(-\sum_{j=1}^e \sigma_j(t))) = 2.
\]

Then, after possibly making a base change and resolving any resulting singularities, the pair \((\mathcal{L}^*, \mathcal{Y}^*)\) induces a refined limit linear series of type \( g_{2d_1-4}^2 \) on \( \tilde{R} \), which we denote by \( \tilde{l} \). Moreover, the vector bundle

\[
\mathcal{Y}^* \cap \phi_* (\mathcal{L}^* \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^*}(-\sum_{j=1}^e \sigma_j(B \setminus \{0\})))
\]

induces a limit linear series \( l_1 = g_{d_1}^1 \) on \( \mathcal{X}_0 \).
For a component $X$ of $\mathcal{F}_0$, denote by $(\mathcal{L}_X, \mathcal{Y}_X) \in G^3_{2d_1 - 4}(X)$ the $X$-aspect of $\tilde{l}$. There exists therefore a unique effective divisor $D_X$ of degree $e$ supported only at the points of $(X \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^e \sigma_j(B)) \cup (X \cap \mathcal{F}_0 \setminus X)$ such that the $X$-aspect of $l_1$ is of the form

$$l_{1,X} = (\mathcal{L}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-D_X), w_X \subset \mathcal{Y}_X \cap H^0(X, \mathcal{L}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-D_X)) \in G^1_{d_1}(X).$$

The collection of aspects \{l_{1,X}\}_{X \subset \mathcal{Y}}\), which we will also denote by $l_1$, forms a limit $g_{d_1}^1$ on $Y$ with a vanishing sequence that is a subsequence of the vanishing sequence of $\tilde{l}$. Moreover, the collection of aspects of $l_1$ on $Z$ also yield a limit linear $g_{d_1}^1$ on $Z$ whose vanishing sequence at $p$ is a subsequence of the one of $\tilde{l}$.

Let $p = Y \cap (\mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{Y})$ and let $Z := \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{Y}$ and let $R_Y$, $R_Z$ denote the rational spines corresponding to $Y$ and $Z$, respectively. An easy argument shows that, without loss of generality, we may assume that all the points in the support of $D + E$ specialise on $R_Y$. Furthermore, arguing like above, we obtain limits $l_1$ and $\tilde{l}$ on both $R_Y$ and $R_Z$.

To reach the desired contradiction, we obtain various bounds for the ramification sequences of the series $l_1$ and $\tilde{l}$ and show that they cannot be simultaneously satisfied.

Note that the points of attachment $q_1, \ldots, q_g$ of the elliptic tails to the rational spine are all cusps, hence for $j = 1, \ldots, g$,

$$ \alpha((l_1)_{R_Y}, q_j) \geq (0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha((l_1)_{R_Z}, q_j) \geq (0, 1), \quad (13)$$

$$ \alpha(\tilde{l}_{R_Y}, q_j) \geq (0, 1, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(\tilde{l}_{R_Z}, q_j) \geq (0, 1, 1). \quad (14)$$

Moreover, using the Plücker formula [13] on $R_Y$ we have

$$ \text{for } l_1 = g_{d_1}^1: \sum_{q \text{ smooth point}} (\alpha_0((l_1)_{R_Y}, q) + \alpha_1((l_1)_{R_Y}, q)) = 2d_1 - 2, \quad (15)$$

$$ \text{for } \tilde{l} = g_{2d_1 - 4}^2: \sum_{q \text{ smooth point}} (\alpha_0(\tilde{l}_{R_Y}, q) + \alpha_1(\tilde{l}_{R_Y}, q)) = 6d_1 - 18. \quad (16)$$

Combining (13), (15), and (16) we obtain that on $R_Y$ the ramification at $p$ is at most

$$ \text{for } l_1: \alpha_0((l_1)_{R_Y}, p) + \alpha_1((l_1)_{R_Y}, p) \leq d_1 - 2, \quad (17)$$

$$ \text{for } \tilde{l}: \sum_{i=0}^{2} \alpha_i(\tilde{l}_{R_Y}, p) \leq 4d_1 - 18, \quad (18)$$

while on $R_Z$ we have the upper bounds

$$ \text{for } l_1: \alpha_0((l_1)_{R_Z}, p) + \alpha_1((l_1)_{R_Z}, p) \leq d_1 + 1, \quad (19)$$

$$ \text{for } \tilde{l}: \sum_{i=0}^{2} \alpha_i(\tilde{l}_{R_Z}, p) \leq 4d_1 - 12. \quad (20)$$

A further constraint for the ramification sequence at $p$ is given by applying Lemma 3.4 of [13] to the current situation and we obtain the following:

- If $\{\sigma_C \mid C \subset R_Y \text{ irreducible component}\}$ is the set of compatible sections corresponding to the divisor $D + E$ and if $q \in C$, then $\text{ord}_q(\sigma_C) = 0$. 
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Similarly, the compatible sections \( \{ \sigma_C \mid C \subseteq R_Y \text{ irreducible component} \} \) corresponding to the divisor \( 2D + E \) also have the property that, if \( q \in C \), then \( \text{ord}_q(\sigma_C) = 0 \).

The important observation in both cases is that the support of \( D + E \) and of \( 2D + E \) are contained in \( Y \) and that \( \text{deg}(D + E) = d_1 \) and \( \text{deg}(2D + E) = 2d_1 - 4 \). Concretely, this means that both the vanishing sequence of \((l_1)_R \) and that of \( \tilde{l}_R \) must have 0 as their first entry.

Combining this with the compatibility conditions for the vanishing of the sections \( l \) and the fact that vanishing sequence at \( p \) of \( l \) is a subsequence of the one of \( \tilde{l} \) we see that the only possibility for the vanishing sequences at \( p \) of \( l_1 \) is

\[
a((l_1)_R, p) = (0, d_1 - 4) \quad \text{and} \quad a((l_1)_R, p) = (4, d_1)
\]

and for the vanishing sequence of \( \tilde{l} \) at \( p \) is

\[
a(\tilde{l}_R, p) = (0, d_1 - 4, 2d_1 - 8) \quad \text{and} \quad a(\tilde{l}_R, p) = (4, d_1, 2d_1 - 4).
\]

However the ramification sequence corresponding to the vanishing sequence

\[
a((l_1)_R, p) = (4, d_1)
\]

is

\[
a((l_1)_R, p) = (4, d_1 - 1),
\]

which certainly breaks the upper bound in \( (19) \) and we have obtained the desired contradiction.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

This section is dedicated to proving Theorem 1.2, which states that for any linear series \( l \) on a general curve \( C \) there are no divisors \( D \in C \) in the intersection

\[
\Gamma_e(l) \cap V^e(\Gamma_C - l)
\]

whenever \( f = 1, g > d_1 \), and

\[
\dim \Gamma_e(l) + \dim V^{e-f}(l_2) \leq e - \rho(g, r_1, d_1) - 1.
\]

In fact we give a general method to check this non-existence statement and apply it to the case \( f = 1 \) where the computations are most tractable.

For the linear series \( l_1 = g_{d_1} \) on a general curve \( C \) of genus \( g \), set

\[
\rho := \rho(g, r_1, d_1).
\]

Then we have an expression of the genus \( g \) in terms of \( \rho \):

\[
g = \frac{(r_1 + 1)d_1 - \rho}{r_1} - r_1 - 1. \tag{21}
\]
Moreover, an easy computation shows that the residual linear series to \(l_1\) is \(l_2 = g_{d_2}r_2\) where
\[
\begin{align*}
    r_2 &= \frac{d_1 - \rho}{r_1} - 2, \\
    d_2 &= \frac{r_1 + d_1 - 2\rho}{r_1} - 2r_1 - 4.
\end{align*}
\] (22) (23)
The non-existence condition in the statement of the theorem is
\[
r_1 + e - f(r_2 + 1 - e + f) \leq e - 1 - \rho,
\]
or equivalently
\[
f(r_2 + 1 - e + f) \geq r_1 + 1 + \rho. \quad (24)
\]
Assume towards a contradiction that there exists a divisor \(D \in C_e\) such that
\[
D \in \Gamma_e(l_1) \cap V^{e-f}(l_2).
\]
It follows that we also have a divisor \(E = l_1 - D \in C_{d_1-e}\). Then
\[
l_2 - D = K_C - l_1 - D
\]
is a linear series of dimension
\[
r_2 - e + f
\]
and degree
\[
\frac{r_1 + d_1 - 2\rho}{r_1} - 2r_1 - 4 - e.
\]
By residuation we conclude that
\[
l_1 + D = g_{d_1+e}^{r_1+f}. \quad (25)
\]
We have therefore obtained a “system” of equations for two divisors \((D, E) \in C_e \times C_{d_1-e}\):
\[
|D + E| = g_{d_1}^{r_1}, \quad |2D + E| = g_{d_1+e}^{r_1+f}, \quad (26)
\]
and by assumption a solution should exist.

**Remark 5.2.** We may view the condition \(|2D + E| = g_{d_1+e}^{r_1+f}\) from the point of view of de Jonquières divisors: the dimension of the space of pairs \((D, E)\) satisfying this is
\[
d_1 - (d_1 + e) + (r_1 + f) = r_1 - e + f \geq 0.
\]
Hence so far there is no reason to expect there not to be such \((D, E)\) satisfying the system \((26)\).

By assumption, there exists therefore a pair of divisors \((D, E) \in C_e \times C_{d_1-e}\) satisfying the system \((26)\). Assume furthermore that \(g > d_1\) (we shall see later that in the case \(f = 1\) this assumption does not lead to any loss of generality). We consider again all flag curve degenerations as in the case of minimal pencils. Applying Proposition 2.2 of [Far08], there exists a point \([\tilde{R} := R \cup E_1 \cup \ldots \cup E_g, y_1, \ldots, y_{d_1}] \in X\), where \(R\) is a rational spine (not necessarily smooth) and the \(E_i\) are elliptic tails such that either:
(i) \( y_1 = \ldots = y_{d_1} \), or else

(ii) \( y_1, \ldots, y_{d_1} \) lie on a connected subcurve \( Y \) of \( R \) of arithmetic genus \( p_a(Y) = d_1 \) and \( |Y \cap (R \setminus Y)| = 1 \). This is possible since we have taken \( g > d_1 \).

Case (i) is again immediately dismissed via a short computation using the Plücker formula.

We focus on case (ii). Let \( p = Y \cap (R \setminus Y) \) and let \( Z := R \setminus Y \) and let \( R_Y, R_Z \) denote the rational spines corresponding to \( Y \) and \( Z \), respectively. Just as in the case of minimal pencils, we have limits \( l_1 \) and \( \tilde{l} \) on both \( R_Y \) and \( R_Z \) and we may assume that all points in the support of \( D + E \) specialise on \( R_Y \).

The strategy again is to constrain the vanishing (or, equivalently, ramification) sequence at \( p \) of the limit linear series \( l_1 = g_{d_1}^{r_1} \) and \( \tilde{l} := g_{d_1+e}^{r_1+f} \) on each of the components \( R_Y \) and \( R_Z \). We make use of four important facts:

1. For refined limit linear series, the vanishing sequences at the point \( p \) must satisfy the following equalities:

   \[
   a_i((l_1)_{R_Y}, p) + a_{r_1-i}((l_1)_{R_Z}, p) = d_1 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 0, \ldots, r_1, \\
   a_i((\tilde{l}_{R_Y}, p) + a_{r_1+f-i}((\tilde{l}_{R_Z}, p) = d_1 + e \quad \text{for} \quad i = 0, \ldots, r_1 + f.
   \]

2. The vanishing sequence at \( p \) of \( l_1 = g_{d_1}^{r_1} \) is a subsequence of the one corresponding to \( \tilde{l} = g_{d_1+e}^{r_1+f} \).

3. The Plücker formula (6) applied to both limit linear series on both components. The Plücker formula on \( R_Y \) yields:

   \[
   \sum_{q \text{ smooth point of } R_Y} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{r_1} a_i((l_1)_{R_Y}, q) \right) = (r_1 + 1)(d_1 - r_1) \quad (28)
   \]

   \[
   \sum_{q \text{ smooth point of } R_Y} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{r_1+f} a_i((\tilde{l}_{R_Y}, q) \right) = (r_1 + f + 1)(d_1 + e - f - r_1). \quad (29)
   \]

The curve \( R_Y \) contains the points \( q_1, \ldots, q_{d_1} \), which are all cusps, and therefore have ramification sequences at least \( (0, 1, \ldots, 1) \). Combining this with (28) and (29) we obtain upper bounds for the ramification at \( p \):

   \[
   \sum_{i=0}^{r_1} a_i((l_1)_{R_Y}, p) \leq (r_1 + 1)(d_1 - r_1) - d_1 r_1 \quad (30)
   \]

   \[
   \sum_{i=0}^{r_1+f} a_i((\tilde{l}_{R_Y}, p) \leq (r_1 + f + 1)(d_1 + e - f - r_1) - (f + r_1)d_1. \quad (31)
   \]

Using the same reasoning on \( R_Z \) we obtain the following bounds on the ramification at \( p \):

   \[
   \sum_{i=0}^{r_1} a_i((l_1)_{R_Z}, p) \leq (r_1 + 1)(d_1 - r_1) - (g - d_1)r_1 \quad (32)
   \]

   \[
   \sum_{i=0}^{r_1+f} a_i((\tilde{l}_{R_Z}, p) \leq (r_1 + f + 1)(d_1 + e - f - r_1) - (f + r_1)(g - d_1). \quad (33)
   \]
Since for a linear series $l$ of type $g^r_d$,
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{r} \alpha_i(l, p) = \sum_{i=0}^{r} a_i(l, p) - \frac{r(r + 1)}{2},
\]
the upper bounds for the ramification give equivalently bounds for the vanishing at $p$.

4. The statement of Lemma 3.4 of [Ung] applied to the current situation, as in the case of the minimal pencils. We again obtain that both the vanishing sequence of $(l_1)_{RY}$ and that of $\tilde{l}_{RY}$ must have 0 as their first entry.

Putting everything together, the vanishing sequence at $p$ corresponding to $l_1$ on $RY$ is
\[
a((l_1)_{RY}, p) = (0, x_1, \ldots, x_{r_1}),
\]
for some strictly positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_{r_1}$ smaller than $d_1$, while the sequence on $RZ$ is
\[
a((l_1)_{RZ}, p) = (d_1 - x_{r_1}, \ldots, d_1 - x_1, d_1).
\]

On the other hand, the vanishing sequence at $p$ corresponding to $\tilde{l}$ on $RY$ is
\[
a(\tilde{l}_{RY}, p) = (0, x_1, \ldots, x_{r_1}, x_{r_1+1}, \ldots, x_{r_1+f}),
\]
where the strictly positive integers $x_{r_1+1}, \ldots, x_{r_1+f}$ are all smaller than $d_1 + e$ and exactly one of the $x_i$ is equal to $e$. The sequence on $RZ$ is
\[
a(\tilde{l}_{RZ}, p) = (d_1 + e - x_{r_1+f}, \ldots, d_1, d_1 + e),
\]
which must also contain the terms $d_1 - x_{r_1}, \ldots, d_1 - x_1$.

Let $x = x_1 + \ldots + x_{r_1}$. Using (30), (32), and (34) and the fact that
\[
g - d_1 = \frac{d_1 - \rho}{r_1} - r_1 - 1,
\]
we have that
\[
r_1 \left( \frac{d_1}{r_1} - \frac{r_1 + 1}{2} \right) - \rho \leq x \leq r_1 \left( \frac{d_1}{r_1} - \frac{r_1 + 1}{2} \right).
\]

In order to prove the statement of Theorem 1.2, we find a contradiction to the inequality (35). If $f = 1$, then $\tilde{l} = g^r_{d_1+1}$, and
\[
e \leq r_2 - r_1 - \rho + 1 = \frac{d_1 - (r_1 + 1)\rho}{r_1} - r_1 - 1.
\]

Suppose first that none of the $x_i$ with $i = 1, \ldots, r_1$ is equal to $e$. Thus the vanishing sequence at $p$ corresponding to $\tilde{l}$ on $RY$ is
\[
a(\tilde{l}_{RY}, p) = (0, e, x_1, \ldots, x_{r_1}).
\]

Combining (35) and (34) yields the inequality
\[
(r_1 + 2)(d_1 + e) - e - x - \frac{(r_1 + 1)(r_1 + 2)}{2} \leq (r_1 + 2)(d_1 + e - 1 - r_1)
\]
\[
- (r_1 + 1) \left( \frac{d_1 - \rho}{r_1} - r_1 - 1 \right)
\]
which, after plugging in the expression (36) for $e$, reduces to

$$x \geq \frac{(r_1 + 1)(r_1 + 2)}{2} + (r_1 + 1) \left( \frac{d_1}{r_1} - r_1 - 1 \right).$$

This contradicts the upper bound in (35). Hence this vanishing sequence cannot occur.

One the other hand, if $e$ is one of the $x_i$ with $i = 1, \ldots, r_1$, then the vanishing sequence at $p$ corresponding to $l_1$ on $R_Y$ is

$$a((l_1)_{R_Y}, p) = (0, e, x_1, \ldots, x_{r_1 - 1})$$

and on $R_Z$

$$a((l_1)_{R_Z}, p) = (d_1 - x_{r_1 - 1}, \ldots, d_1 - x_1, d_1 - e, d_1). \quad (37)$$

Moreover, the vanishing sequence at $p$ corresponding to $\tilde{l}$ on $R_Y$ is

$$(0, e, x_1, \ldots, x_{r_1 - 1}, y),$$

for some positive integer $y$, and the one on $R_Z$ is

$$(d_1 + e - y, d_1 + e - x_{r_1 - 1}, \ldots, d_1 + e - x_1, d_1 + e). \quad (38)$$

Since the sequence (37) must be a subsequence of (38), we see that

$$d_1 + e - y = d_1 - x_i,$$

for some index $i$. In other words, $y = e + x_i$. Combining (33) and (34) again yields the inequality

$$(r_1 + 2)(d_1 + e) - e - x_i - x - \frac{(r_1 + 1)(r_1 + 2)}{2} \leq (r_1 + 2)(d_1 + e - 1 - r_1) - (r_1 + 1) \left( \frac{d_1}{r_1} - r_1 - 1 \right).$$

This leads to a contradiction with the upper bound in (35) in the same way as above.

References


Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Mathematisches Institut, Abteilung Reine Mathematik, Ernst-Zermelo-Str 1, 79104 Freiburg

E-mail address: mara.ungureanu@math.uni-freiburg.de