DEFORMATION OF PAIRS AND SEMIREGULARITY

TAKEO NISHINOU

Abstract. In this paper, we study relative deformations of maps into a family of Kähler manifolds whose images are divisors. We show that if the map satisfies a condition called semiregularity, then it allows relative deformations if and only if the cycle class of the image remains Hodge in the family. This gives a refinement of the so-called variational Hodge conjecture. We also show that the semiregularity of maps is related to classical notions such as Cayley-Bacharach conditions and d-semistability.

1. Introduction

Let $\pi : X \to D$ be a deformation of a compact Kähler manifold $X_0$ of dimension $n \geq 2$ over a disk $D$ in the complex plane. Let $C_0$ be a compact reduced curve (when $n = 2$) or a compact smooth complex manifold of dimension $n - 1$ (when $n > 2$). Let $\varphi_0 : C_0 \to X_0$ be a map which is an immersion, that is, for any $p \in C_0$, there is an open neighborhood $p \in V_p \subset C_0$ such that $\varphi_0|_{V_p}$ is an embedding. Then the image of $\varphi_0$ determines an integral cohomology class $[\varphi_0(C_0)]$ of type $(1, 1)$, that is, a Hodge class which is the Poincaré dual of the cycle $\varphi_0(C_0)$. Note that the class $[\varphi_0(C_0)]$ naturally determines an integral cohomology class of each fiber of $\pi$. Therefore, it makes sense to ask whether this class remains Hodge in these fibers or not. Clearly, the condition that the class $[\varphi_0(C_0)]$ remains Hodge is necessary for the existence of deformations of the map $\varphi_0$ to other fibers.

If we assume that the image is a local complete intersection, we can talk about the semiregularity of the map $\varphi_0$, see Section 2. When $\varphi_0$ is the inclusion, Bloch [2] proved that if $\varphi_0$ is semiregular and the class $[\varphi_0(C_0)]$ remains Hodge, then there is a deformation of $\varphi_0$ (Bloch proved it for local complete intersections of any codimension). In other words, a local complete intersection subvariety which is semiregular satisfies the variational Hodge conjecture. More precisely, the variational Hodge conjecture asks the existence of a family of cycles of the class $[\varphi_0(C_0)]$ which need not restrict to $\varphi_0(C_0)$ on the central fiber. Therefore, Bloch’s theorem in fact shows that the semiregularity gives a result stronger than the variational Hodge conjecture. However, although Bloch’s theorem guarantees the existence of a relative deformation of a cycle on the central fiber $X_0$, it gives little control of the geometry of the deformed cycle.

Our purpose is to show that the semiregularity in fact suffices to control the geometry of the deformed cycles when the cycle is of codimension one.

Theorem 1. Assume that the map $\varphi_0$ is semiregular. If the class $[\varphi_0(C_0)]$ remains Hodge, then the map $\varphi_0$ deforms to other fibers.

For example, if the image $\tilde{\varphi}_0(C_0)$ has normal crossing singularity, then there is a natural map $\tilde{\varphi}_0 : \tilde{C}_0 \to X_0$, where $\tilde{C}_0$ is the normalization of $C_0$ (when $n > 2$, $C_0 = \tilde{C}_0$). Then if $\tilde{\varphi}_0$ is semiregular, Theorem 1 implies that it deforms to a general fiber and the singularity
of the image remains the same (e.g., it gives a relative equigeneric deformation when \( n = 2 \)).

On the other hand, if the image \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) has normal crossing singularity, the semiregularity turns out to be related to some classical notions appeared in different contexts. Namely, we will prove the following (see Corollary 13).

**Theorem 2.** Assume that the subvariety \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is semiregular in the classical sense. That is, the inclusion of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) into \( X_0 \) is semiregular in the sense of Definition 5. Then if the map \( H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), N) \rightarrow H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), S) \) is surjective, the map \( \varphi_0 \) is semiregular. In particular, if the class \([\varphi_0(C_0)]\) remains Hodge on the fibers of \( X \), the map \( \varphi_0 \) can be deformed to general fibers of \( X \).

Here \( S \) is the infinitesimal normal sheaf of the variety \( \varphi_0(C_0) \), see Section 6 for the definition. A variety with normal crossing singularity is called \( d \)-semistable if the infinitesimal normal sheaf is trivial, see [4]. The notion of \( d \)-semistability is known to be related to the existence of log-smooth deformations (see [6, 7]). By the above theorem, it turns out that it is also related to deformations of pairs, see Corollary 15.

In the case where \( n = 2 \), Theorem 31 in [10] combined with Theorem 1 above implies the following. Let \( \varphi_0: C_0 \rightarrow X_0 \) be an immersion where \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is a reduced nodal curve. Let \( p: C_0 \rightarrow \varphi_0(C_0) \) be the natural map (which is a partial normalization of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \)) and \( P = \{ p_i \} \) be the set of nodes of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) whose inverse image by \( p \) consists of two points.

**Theorem 3.** Assume that \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is semiregular in the classical sense and the class \([\varphi_0(C_0)]\) remains Hodge on the fibers of \( X \). Then the map \( \varphi_0 \) deforms to general fibers of \( X \) if for each \( p_i \in P \), there is a first order deformation of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) which smoothes \( p_i \), but does not smooth the other fibers of \( P \).

This is related (in a sense opposite) to the classical Cayley-Bacharach condition, see [11], which requires that if a first order deformation does not smooth the nodes \( P \setminus \{ p_i \} \), then it does not smooth \( p_i \), either. Using this, we can also deduce a geometric criterion for the existence of deformations of pairs, see Corollary 17.

Finally, based on a similar idea, we will prove that any projective variety can be swept by nodal curves with very large number of nodes. Namely, we will prove the following (see Corollary 20).

**Theorem 4.** Let \( Y \) be a projective variety of dimension \( n \geq 2 \). Then for any positive number \( \varepsilon \), there is an \((n-1)\)-dimensional family \( C \rightarrow B \) of irreducible nodal curves whose fibers satisfy \( \delta > g^{2-\varepsilon} \), and a map \( p: C \rightarrow Y \) which dominates \( Y \). Here \( \delta \) is the number of nodes of a fiber of \( C \) and \( g \) is the geometric genus of it.

In general, it would be difficult to improve the exponent \( 2 - \varepsilon \) further. For example, if we can prove the existence of a nodal curve of large degree which satisfies the estimate \( \delta > g^{2+\varepsilon} \) when \( Y \) is a Fano manifold, such a curve has many deformations enough to carry out Mori’s famous bend-and-break procedure [9].

2. **Semiregularity for local embeddings**

Let \( n \) and \( p \) be positive integers with \( p < n \). Let \( M \) be a complex variety (not necessarily smooth or reduced) of dimension \( n - p \) and \( X \) a compact Kähler manifold of dimension
Let $\varphi: M \to X$ be a map which is an immersion, that is, for any $p \in M$, there is an open neighborhood $p \in U_p \subset M$ such that $\varphi|_{U_p}$ is an embedding. We assume that the image is a local complete intersection. Then, the normal sheaf $N_\varphi$ is locally free of rank $p$. Define the locally free sheaves $K_\varphi$ and $\omega_M$ on $M$ by

$$K_\varphi = \wedge^p N_\varphi$$

and

$$\omega_M = K_\varphi^\vee \otimes \varphi^* K_X,$$

where $K_X$ is the canonical sheaf of $X$.

When $\varphi$ is an inclusion, the natural inclusion

$$\varepsilon: N_\varphi^\vee \to \varphi^* \Omega_X^1$$

gives rise to an element

$$\wedge^{p-1} \varepsilon \in Hom_{\mathcal{O}_M} \left( \wedge^{p-1} N_\varphi^\vee, \varphi^* \Omega_X^{p-1} \right) = \Gamma \left( M, \left( \varphi^* \Omega_X^{n-p+1} \right)^\vee \otimes \varphi^* K_X \otimes K_\varphi^\vee \otimes N_\varphi^\vee \right) = Hom_{\mathcal{O}_X} \left( \Omega_X^{n-p+1}, \omega_M \otimes N_\varphi^\vee \right).$$

This induces a map on cohomology

$$\wedge^{p-1} \varepsilon: H^{n-p-1}(X, \Omega_X^{n-p+1}) \to H^{n-p-1}(M, \omega_M \otimes N_\varphi^\vee).$$

When $\varphi$ is not an inclusion, then $\Gamma \left( M, \left( \varphi^* \Omega_X^{n-p+1} \right)^\vee \otimes \varphi^* K_X \otimes K_\varphi^\vee \otimes N_\varphi^\vee \right)$ is not necessarily isomorphic to $Hom_{\mathcal{O}_X} \left( \Omega_X^{n-p+1}, \omega_M \otimes N_\varphi^\vee \right)$, but the map $\wedge^{p-1} \varepsilon: H^{n-p-1}(X, \Omega_X^{n-p+1}) \to H^{n-p-1}(M, \omega_M \otimes N_\varphi^\vee)$ is still defined.

**Definition 5.** We call $\varphi$ semiregular if the natural map $\wedge^{p-1} \varepsilon$ is surjective.

In this paper, we are interested in the case where $p = 1$ and $M$ is reduced when $n = 2$, and $M$ is smooth when $n > 2$. In this case, we have $\omega_M \otimes N_\varphi^\vee \cong \varphi^* K_X$ and the map $\wedge^{p-1} \varepsilon$ will be

$$H^{n-2}(X, K_X) \to H^{n-2}(M, \varphi^* K_X).$$

3. LOCAL CALCULATION

Let $\pi: \mathfrak{X} \to D$ be a deformation of a compact Kähler manifold $X_0$ of dimension $n \geq 2$. Here $D$ is a disk on the complex plane centered at the origin. Let

$$\{(U_i, (x_{i,1}, \ldots, x_{i,n}))\}$$

be a coordinate system of $X_0$. Taking $D$ small enough, the sets

$$(\mathfrak{U}_i = U_i \times D, (x_{i,1}, \ldots, x_{i,n}, t))$$

gives a coordinate system of $\mathfrak{X}$. Precisely, we fix an isomorphism between $\mathfrak{U}_i$ and a suitable open subset of $\mathfrak{X}$ which is compatible with $\pi$ and the inclusion $U_i \to X_0$. Here $t$ is a coordinate on $D$ pulled back to $\mathfrak{U}_i$. The functions $x_{i,t}$ are also pulled back to $\mathfrak{U}_i$ from $U_i$ by the natural projection.

Take coordinate neighborhoods $\mathfrak{U}_i$, $\mathfrak{U}_j$, and $\mathfrak{U}_k$. On the intersections of these open subsets, the coordinate functions on one of them can be written in terms of another. We write this as follows. Namely, on $\mathfrak{U}_i \cap \mathfrak{U}_j$, $x_{i,t}$ can be written as $x_{i,t}(\mathfrak{x}_j, t)$, here we write

$$\mathfrak{x}_j = (x_{j,1}, \ldots, x_{j,n}).$$
Similarly, on $\mathcal{U}_j \cap \mathcal{U}_k$, we have $x_{j,l} = x_{j,l}(x_k, t)$. Then, on $\mathcal{U}_l \cap \mathcal{U}_k$, we have

$$x_{i,l} = x_{i,l}(x_k, t) = x_{i,l}(x_j(x_k, t), t).$$

Let $X_t = \pi^{-1}(t)$ be the fiber of the family $\pi$ over $t \in D$. Assume that there is a map

$$\varphi_0: C_0 \to X_0$$

from a variety $C_0$ of dimension $n - 1$ to $X_0$, which is an immersion.

We can take an open covering $\{V_i\}$ of $C_0$ such that the restriction of $\varphi_0$ to $V_i$ is an embedding, the image $\varphi_0(V_i)$ is contained in $U_i$ and is defined by an equation $f_{i,0} = 0$ for some holomorphic function $f_{i,0}$. Let $\text{Spec} \mathbb{C}[t]/t^{m+1}$ be the $m$-th order infinitesimal neighborhood fo the origin of $D$. Note that

$$\{U_{i,m} = \mathcal{U}_i \times_D \text{Spec} \mathbb{C}[t]/t^{m+1}\}$$

gives a covering by coordinate neighborhoods of $X_m = \mathfrak{X} \times_D \text{Spec} \mathbb{C}[t]/t^{m+1}$. We write by $x_{i,l,m}$ the restriction of $x_{i,l}$ to $U_{i,m}$. Let us write

$$x_{i,m} = \{x_{i,1,m}, \ldots, x_{i,n,m}\}.$$

Assume we have constructed an $m$-th order deformation $\varphi_m: C_m \to X_m$ of $\varphi_0$. Here $m$ is a positive integer and $C_m$ is an $m$-th order deformation of $C_0$. Let $V_{i,m}$ be the ringed space obtained by restricting $C_m$ to $V_i$.

Let $\{f_{i,m}(x_{i,m}, t)\}$ be the set of local defining functions of $\varphi_m(V_{i,m})$ in $U_{i,m}$. We will often write $f_{i,m}(x_{i,m}, t)$ as $f_{i,m}(x_{i,m})$ for notational simplicity. In particular, on the intersection $U_{i,m} \cap U_{j,m}$, there is an invertible function $g_{i,j,m}$ which satisfies

$$f_{i,m}(x_{i,m}(x_{j,m}, t), t) = g_{i,j,m}(x_{j,m}, t)f_{j,m}(x_{j,m}, t) \pmod{t^{m+1}}.$$

Define a holomorphic function $\nu_{i,j,m}$ on $V_i \cap V_j$ by

$$t^{m+1} \nu_{i,j,m}(x_{j,m+1}) = t^{m+1} \nu_{i,j,m}(x_{j,0}) = f_{i,m}(x_{i,m+1}(x_{j,m+1})) - g_{i,j,m}(x_{j,m+1})f_{j,m}(x_{j,m+1}),$$

which is an equality over $\mathbb{C}[t]/t^{m+2}$.

**Proposition 6.** The set of local sections $\{\nu_{i,j,m}\}$ gives a Čech 1-cocycle with values in $\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}$ on $C_0$. Here $\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}$ is the normal sheaf of the map $\varphi_0$ on $C_0$.

**Remark 7.** The cohomology class of the cocycle $\{\nu_{i,j,m}\}$ represents the obstruction to deforming the map $\varphi_m$ one step further.

**Proof.** Note that $\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}$ is an invertible sheaf and the functions $g_{i,j,0}$ gives the transition functions of it. Therefore, we need to check the identities

$$\nu_{i,k,m}(x_{k,m+1}) = \nu_{i,j,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) + g_{i,j,0}(x_{j,0}(x_{k,0}))\nu_{j,k,m}(x_{k,m+1})$$

and

$$\nu_{i,j,m} = -g_{i,j,0}\nu_{j,i,m}$$

on $C_0$.

Note that

$$x_{i,m+1}(x_{k,m+1}) \equiv x_{i,m+1}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) \pmod{t^{m+2}}.$$
Then, 
\[
t^{m+1} \nu_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1}) = f_{i,m}(x_{i,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) - g_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1}) f_{k,m}(x_{k,m+1}) \\
= f_{i,m}(x_{i,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) - g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) f_{j,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) \\
\quad + g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) f_{j,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) - g_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1}) f_{k,m}(x_{k,m+1}) \\
= t^{m+1} \nu_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) + g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) f_{j,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) \\
\quad - g_{jk,m}(x_{j,m+1}) f_{k,m}(x_{k,m+1}) + g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) g_{jk,m}(x_{j,m+1}) f_{k,m}(x_{k,m+1}) \\
\quad - g_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1}) f_{k,m}(x_{k,m+1}) = t^{m+1} \nu_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) + t^{m+1} g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) \nu_{jk,m}(x_{j,m+1}) \\
\quad + (g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) g_{jk,m}(x_{j,m+1}) - g_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1})) f_{k,m}(x_{k,m+1}).
\]

Since 
\[
(g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) g_{jk,m}(x_{k,m+1}) - g_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1})) f_{k,m}(x_{k,m+1}) \equiv 0 \mod t^{m+1},
\]
we have 
\[
g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) g_{jk,m}(x_{k,m+1}) \equiv g_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1}) \mod t^{m+1}
\]
Therefore, we have 
\[
(g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) g_{jk,m}(x_{k,m+1}) - g_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1})) f_{k,m}(x_{k,m+1}) \equiv (g_{ij,m}(x_{j,m+1}(x_{k,m+1})) g_{jk,m}(x_{j,m+1}) - g_{ik,m}(x_{k,m+1})) f_{k,0}(x_{k,m+1}) \mod t^{m+2}.
\]
Since \(f_{k,0}(x_{k}) = 0\) on \(C_{0}\), we have the first identity. The second identity follows from this by taking \(k = i\).

4. EXPLICIT DESCRIPTION OF THE KODAIRA-SPENCER CLASS

Let \(\pi : \mathcal{X} \to D\) be a deformation of a smooth manifold \(X_{0}\) as before. We have the exact sequence
\[
0 \to \pi^{*}\Omega_{D}^{1} \to \Omega_{\mathcal{X}}^{1} / \Omega_{\mathcal{X}/D}^{1} \to 0
\]
The Kodaira-Spencer class is, by definition, the corresponding class in \(\mu \in \operatorname{Ext}^{1}(\Omega_{\mathcal{X}/D}^{1}, \pi^{*}\Omega_{D}^{1})\).

**Lemma 8.** The class \(\mu\) is represented by the Čech 1-cocycle \(\mu_{ij} = \sum_{l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial x_{i,l}(x_{j},t)}{\partial t} \partial x_{i,l} \omega_{l} dt\).

**Proof.** See [3], Section II.1. □

From now on, we drop \(dt\) from these expressions since it plays no role below. Restricting this to a presentation over \(\mathbb{C}[t]/t^{m+1}\), we obtain the Kodaira-Spencer class for the deformation \(X_{m+1} := \mathcal{X} \times_{D} \operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{C}[t]/t^{m+2}\). We denote this class by \(\mu_{m}\).

Assume that we have constructed an \(m\)-th order deformation \(\varphi_{m} : C_{m} \to X_{m}\). Let \(N_{m/D}\) be the relative normal sheaf of \(\varphi_{m}\) and
\[
p_{m} : \varphi_{m}^{*}T_{X_{m}/D} \to N_{m/D}
\]
be the natural projection, where \(T_{X_{m}/D}\) is the relative tangent sheaf of \(X_{m}\). Pulling \(\mu_{m}\) back to \(C_{m}\) and taking the image by \(p_{m}\), we obtain a class \(\overline{\mu}_{m} \in H^{1}(C_{m}, N_{m/D})\).

As before, let \(\{f_{i,m}(x_{i,m}, t)\}\) be the set of local defining functions of \(\varphi_{m}(V_{i,m})\) on \(U_{i,m}\).

**Lemma 9.** The class \(\overline{\mu}_{m}\) is represented by the pull back of
\[
\eta_{ij,m} = \sum_{l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial x_{i,l}(x_{j}, t)}{\partial t} \partial x_{i,l} f_{i,m}(x_{i}, t)
\]
to \(C_{m}\).
Proof. We check the cocycle condition. Namely, we have

\[ \eta_{j,m} - \eta_{i,m} - g_{ij,m} \eta_{jk,m} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial x_{i,j}(x_{i,j}, t)}{\partial t} \partial x_{i,j} f_{i,m}(x_{i}, t) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial x_{i,l}(x_{i,l}, t)}{\partial t} \partial x_{i,l} f_{j,m}(x_{i}, t) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial x_{i,l}(x_{i,l}, t)}{\partial t} \partial x_{i,j} f_{i,m}(x_{i}, t) - g_{ij,m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial x_{i,j}(x_{i,j}, t)}{\partial t} \partial x_{i,j} f_{i,m}(x_{i}, t) \]

Since \( f_{i,m}(x_{i}(x_{j}, t), t) \) is zero on the image of \( \varphi_{m} \), we see that \( \eta_{jk,m} = \eta_{ij,m} + g_{ij,m} \eta_{jk,m} \) on \( C_{m} \). Also, note that \( g_{ij,m} \) is the transition function of the normal sheaf \( \mathcal{N}_{m/D} \). Then it is clear that \( \eta_{jk,m} \) represents the class \( \overline{\mu}_{m} \).

Recall that an analytic cycle of codimension \( r \) in a Kähler manifold determines a cohomology class of type \( (r, r) \), which is the Poincaré dual of the homology class of the cycle. Let \( \zeta_{C_{0}} \in H^{1}(X_{0}, \Omega^{1}_{X_{0}/D}) \) be the class corresponding to the image of \( \varphi_{0} \). Note that since the family \( X \) is differentially geometrically trivial, the class \( \zeta_{C_{0}} \) determines a cohomology class in \( H^{2}(X, \mathbb{C}) \). We denote it by \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}} \). Then we have the following.

Lemma 10. When \( \varphi_{0} \) is semiregular, the class \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}} \) remains Hodge in \( X_{m+1} \) if and only if the class \( \overline{\mu}_{m} \) is zero.

Proof. Since we are assuming we have constructed \( \varphi_{m} : C_{m} \to X_{m} \), the class \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}} \) is Hodge on \( X_{m} \). That is, \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}}|_{X_{m}} \in H^{1}(X_{m}, \Omega^{1}_{X_{m}/D}) \). In [2, Proposition 4.2], Bloch shows that \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}} \) remains Hodge on \( X_{m+1} \) if and only if the cup product \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}}|_{X_{m}} \cup \mu_{m} \in H^{2}(X_{m}, \mathcal{O}_{X_{m}}) \) is zero. This is the same as the claim that the cup product \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}}|_{X_{m}} \cup \mu_{m} \cup \alpha \) is zero for any \( \alpha \in H^{2n-2}(X_{m}, \mathbb{C}) \). On the other hand, we have the following.

Claim 11. The cup product \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}}|_{X_{m}} \cup \mu_{m} \cup \alpha \) is zero for any \( \alpha \in H^{2n-2}(X_{m}, \mathbb{C}) \) if and only if the cup product \( \overline{\mu}_{m} \cup \varphi_{m}^{*}\alpha \) is zero on \( C_{m} \).

Proof of the claim. By the definition of \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}}|_{X_{m}} \), the class \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}}|_{X_{m}} \cup \mu_{m} \cup \alpha \) is zero if and only if the class \( \varphi_{m}^{*}\mu_{m} \cup \varphi_{m}^{*}\alpha \) is zero. Note that the cohomology group \( H^{2n-2}(X_{m}, \mathbb{C}) \) decomposes as

\[ H^{2n-2}(X_{m}, \mathbb{C}) \cong H^{n}(X_{m}, \Omega^{n-2}_{X_{m}/D}) \oplus H^{n-1}(X_{m}, \Omega^{n-1}_{X_{m}/D}) \oplus H^{n-2}(X_{m}, \mathcal{K}_{X_{m}/D}). \]

By dimensional reason, the cup product between \( \varphi_{m}^{*}\mu_{m} \) and the pull back of the classes in \( H^{n}(X_{m}, \Omega^{n-2}_{X_{m}/D}) \oplus H^{n-1}(X_{m}, \Omega^{n-1}_{X_{m}/D}) \) is zero. Therefore, we can assume that \( \alpha \) belongs to \( H^{n-2}(X_{m}, \mathcal{K}_{X_{m}/D}) \), and so the class \( \varphi_{m}^{*}\alpha \) belongs to \( H^{n-2}(C_{m}, \varphi_{m}^{*}\mathcal{K}_{X_{m}/D}) \). On the other hand, \( \varphi_{m}^{*}\mu_{m} \) belongs to \( H^{1}(C_{m}, \varphi_{m}^{*}\mathcal{T}_{X_{m}/D}) \) and we have the natural map

\[ H^{1}(C_{m}, \varphi_{m}^{*}\mathcal{T}_{X_{m}/D}) \to H^{1}(C_{m}, \mathcal{N}_{m/D}). \]

Here \( \overline{\mu}_{m} \) is the image of \( \varphi_{m}^{*}\mu_{m} \) by this map. Recall that the dual of \( H^{1}(C_{m}, \mathcal{N}_{m/D}) \) is given by \( H^{n-2}(C_{m}, \varphi_{m}^{*}\mathcal{K}_{X_{m}/D}) \). Therefore, it follows that the cup product \( \varphi_{m}^{*}\mu_{m} \cup \varphi_{m}^{*}\alpha \) reduces to \( \overline{\mu}_{m} \cup \varphi_{m}^{*}\alpha \). This proves the claim.

\[ \square \]

It immediately follows that if \( \overline{\mu}_{m} \) is zero, then \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}} \) remains Hodge in \( X_{m+1} \). For the converse, assume that \( \tilde{\zeta}_{C_{0}} \) remains Hodge in \( X_{m+1} \). There is a natural map

\[ t : H^{2n-2}(X_{m}, \mathbb{C}) \to H^{1}(C_{m}, \mathcal{N}_{m/D}). \]
as in the proof of the claim. Namely, for a class $\alpha$ of $H^{2n-2}(X_m, \mathbb{C}) = H^n(X_m, \Omega^{n-2}_{X_m/D}) \oplus H^{n-1}(\Omega^{n-1}_{X_m/D}) \oplus H^{n-2}(\Omega^n_{X_m/D})$ and $\beta \in H^1(C_m, \mathcal{N}_m/D)$, let $\iota(\alpha)(\beta)$ be the cup product $\beta \cup \varphi^\alpha_m$ composed with the trace map $H^{n-1}(C_m, \omega_{\mathbb{C}^m}) \to \mathbb{C}$.

The restriction of this map to $X_0$ is a surjection by the semiregularity of $\varphi_0$. Since the surjectivity is an open condition, $t$ is also a surjection. This shows that $\overline{\partial}_m \cup \varphi^\alpha_m$ is zero for any $\alpha \in H^{2n-2}(X_m, \mathbb{C})$ is equivalent to the claim that $\overline{\partial}_m$ is zero. □

Thus, in this case we can write $\overline{\partial}_m$ as the coboundary of a Čech 0-cochain with values in $\mathcal{N}_{m/D}$ on $C_m$. We choose one such representative $\{\delta_i\}$ where $\delta_i \in \Gamma(V_{i,m}, \mathcal{N}_{m/D})$. Also note that by the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{U_{i,m}} \to \mathcal{O}_{U_{i,m}}(\varphi_m(V_{i,m})) \to \mathcal{N}_{m/D} \big|_{V_{i,m}} \to 0,$$

there is a section $\tilde{\delta}_i$ of $\mathcal{O}_{U_{i,m}}(\varphi_m(V_{i,m}))$ which maps to $\delta_i$. Explicitly, putting $\tilde{\eta}_{i,j,m} = \tilde{\delta}_i(x_i(x_j, t), t) - g_{i,j,m}(x_j, t)\tilde{\delta}_j(x_j, t)$, it coincides with $\delta_{i,j,m}$ when restricted to $V_{i,m}$.

### 5. Proof of the theorem

Recall that the obstruction to deforming $\varphi_m$ is given by a cocycle $\nu_{i,j,m}$ on $C_0$ defined by $t^{m+1}\nu_{i,j,m}(x_j) = f_{i,m}(x_i x_j, t) - g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t)f_{j,m}(x_j, t)$. Differentiating this with respect to $t$, we have

$$(m + 1)t^m \nu_{i,j,m}(x_j) = \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} + \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{\partial x_{i,l}(t)}{\partial t} \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} - g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t) \frac{\partial f_{j,m}(x_j, t)}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t)}{\partial t} f_{j,m}(x_j, t)$$

$$= \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} - g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t) \frac{\partial f_{j,m}(x_j, t)}{\partial t} + \eta_{i,j,m} - \frac{\partial g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t)}{\partial t} f_{j,m}(x_j, t).$$

Since $f_{j,m}$ is zero on $C_m$, we can ignore the last term. By the same reason, we can replace $\eta_{i,j,m}$ by $\tilde{\eta}_{i,j,m}$.

Dividing this by $f_{i,m}(x_i, t)$, we have

$$(m + 1)t^m \frac{\nu_{i,j,m}(x_j)}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} = \frac{1}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} - \frac{g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t)}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{j,m}(x_j, t)}{\partial t} + \eta_{i,j,m} - \frac{\partial g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t)}{\partial t} \frac{\partial f_{j,m}(x_j, t)}{\partial t} f_{j,m}(x_j, t)$$

$$= \frac{1}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} - \frac{g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t)}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{j,m}(x_j, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\eta_{i,j,m}}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} - \frac{\partial g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t)}{\partial t} \frac{\partial f_{j,m}(x_j, t)}{\partial t} f_{j,m}(x_j, t)$$

modulo functions holomorphic on $C_m$. Note that this is an equation over $\mathbb{C}[t]/t^{m+1}$, and so we have $\frac{\partial g_{i,j,m}(x_i x_j, t)}{\partial t} f_{j,m}(x_j, t) = 1$. Let $\frac{1}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} \tilde{\delta}_i$ be the coefficient of $t^m$ in $\frac{1}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} + \tilde{\delta}_i$. Note that the above equation still holds when we replace $\frac{1}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} \tilde{\delta}_i$ and $\frac{1}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{j,m}(x_j, t)}{\partial t} \tilde{\delta}_j$ by $\frac{1}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} \tilde{\delta}_i$ and $\frac{1}{f_{j,m}(x_j, t)} \frac{\partial f_{j,m}(x_j, t)}{\partial t} \tilde{\delta}_j$, respectively. Also, we can think $\frac{1}{f_{i,m}(x_i, t)} \frac{\partial f_{i,m}(x_i, t)}{\partial t} \tilde{\delta}_i$ as a function on $U_i$ by forgetting $t^m$.

Now we proceed as in [10] to produce a family of local $C^\infty$ differential forms on $C_0$ which represent the obstruction class $\{\nu_{i,j,m}\}$. Namely, introduce any Hermitian metric on $X_0$. For each $V_i$, the unit normal bundle of the image $\varphi_0(V_i)$ of radius $r$ gives a circle bundle on it. Here $r$ is a small positive real number and when $C_0$ is a singular curve, then we construct the bundle only away from a small neighborhood of singular points. These local circle bundles glue and give a global circle bundle on $C_0$ (away from singular points).
Note that the class $[\nu_{ij,m}]$ is zero if and only if the pairing of it with any class in $H^{n-2}(C_0, \varphi^*K_{X_0})$ is zero. By semiregularity, any class in $H^{n-2}(C_0, \varphi^*K_{X_0})$ is a restriction of an element of $H^{n-2}(X_0, K_{X_0})$. Let $\Theta$ be any closed $C^\infty (2n-2)$-form on $X_0$. In particular, $\Theta$ represents a class in

$$H^{2n-2}(X_0) = H^{n-2}(X_0, K_{X_0}) \oplus H^{n-1}(X_0, \Omega^{n-1}_{X_0}) \oplus H^n(X_0, \Omega^{n-2}_{X_0}).$$

Here $\Omega^{n}_{X_0}$ is the sheaf of holomorphic $n$-forms on $X_0$. Integrating the restriction of the singular $(2n-2)$-form $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \omega^{n-2} \partial_{\bar{\partial}} \omega^{n-2}$ to the circle bundle along the fibers, we obtain a set of local closed $(2n-3)$-forms $\gamma_i$ on $V_i$. As the radius $r$ goes to zero, the Čech 1-cocycle obtained as the differences of $\{\gamma_i\}$ converges to the obstruction class $[\nu_{ij,m}]$ paired with the pull back of $\Theta$ by $\varphi_0$.

The argument in [10] proves the following:

1. The class obtained from $\{\gamma_i\}$ does not depend on the radius $r$.
2. Thus, if $C_0$ is nonsingular, then since $\{\gamma_i\}$ is defined on an open covering of $C_0$, the class determined by $\{\gamma_i\}$ is zero by definition for any $\Theta$. This implies that $[\nu_{ij,m}] \in H^1(C_0, \mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0})$ is zero, too.
3. If $C_0$ has singular points, $\{\gamma_i\}$ is defined only on away from the singular points, so one cannot immediately conclude that the class $[\nu_{ij,m}]$ is zero. However, we can identify the class determined by $\{\gamma_i\}$ by local calculation at singular points, and Stokes’ theorem shows each of these local contributions is zero, which implies the class $[\nu_{ij,m}] \in H^1(C_0, \mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0})$ is again zero.

This finishes the proof of the theorem. □

6. Criterion for semiregularity

In this section, we give necessary conditions for a map $\varphi_0: C_0 \to X_0$ to be semiregular. It turns out that some classical notions which appeared in different contexts such as Cayley-Bacharach condition and d-semistability are related to relative deformations of maps.

6.1. The case $n > 2$. First we consider the case $n > 2$. Let $\pi: \mathcal{X} \to D$ be a family of $n$-dimensional Kähler manifolds. Let $\varphi_0: C_0 \to X_0$ be a map from a compact smooth complex manifold of dimension $n - 1$ which is an immersion. We also assume that the image $\varphi_0(C_0)$ has normal crossing singularity.

Consider the exact sequence on $\varphi_0(C_0)$ given by

$$0 \to \iota^*K_{X_0} \to p_*\varphi_0^*K_{X_0} \to \mathcal{Q} \to 0,$$

where $\iota: \varphi_0(C_0) \to X_0$ is the inclusion, and $p: C_0 \to \varphi_0(C_0)$ is the normalization. The sheaf $\mathcal{Q}$ is defined by this sequence. It is supported on the singular locus $\text{sing}(\varphi_0(C_0))$ of $\varphi_0(C_0)$. We have an associated exact sequence of cohomology groups

$$\cdots \to H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), \iota^*K_{X_0}) \to H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\varphi_0^*K_{X_0}) \to H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{Q}) \to H^{n-1}(\varphi_0(C_0), \iota^*K_{X_0}) \to H^{n-1}(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\varphi_0^*K_{X_0}) \to H^{n-1}(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{Q}).$$

By dimensional reason, we have $H^{n-1}(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{Q}) = 0$. Also, note that

$$H^i(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\varphi_0^*K_{X_0}) \cong H^i(C_0, \varphi_0^*K_{X_0}).$$
for $i = n - 2, n - 1$, by the Leray’s spectral sequence. Therefore, if $\varphi_0(C_0)$ is semiregular in the classical sense, that is, the natural map $H^{n-2}(X_0, K_{X_0}) \to H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), \iota^*K_{X_0})$ is surjective, then the map $\varphi_0$ is semiregular if and only if the map $H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), \iota^*K_{X_0}) \to H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\varphi_0^*K_{X_0})$ is surjective.

**Corollary 12.** Assume that $\varphi_0(C_0)$ is semiregular in the classical sense and the class $[\varphi_0(C_0)]$ remains Hodge on the fibers of $X$. Then if the map $H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), \iota^*K_{X_0}) \to H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\varphi_0^*K_{X_0})$ is surjective, $\varphi_0$ can be deformed to general fibers of $X$. □

On the other hand, consider the exact sequence

$$0 \to p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0} \to \mathcal{N}_i \to \mathcal{S} \to 0,$$

of sheaves on $\varphi_0(C_0)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is defined by this sequence. The associated exact sequence of cohomology groups is

$$0 \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{S}) \to H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}) \to H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to \cdots$$

We have $H^i(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}) \cong H^i(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0})$ again by the Leray’s spectral sequence. Note that the group $H^i(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0})$ is isomorphic to the dual of $H^{n-1-i}(C_0, \varphi_0^*K_{X_0})$, $i = 0, 1$. Similarly, the group $H^i(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i)$ is isomorphic to the dual of $H^{n-1-i}(\varphi_0(C_0), \iota^*K_{X_0})$, $i = 0, 1$.

Comparing the dual of the previous cohomology exact sequence with the latter, we obtain $H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{S})^\vee \cong H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{S})$. In particular, we can restate Corollary 12 as follows.

**Corollary 13.** Assume that $\varphi_0(C_0)$ is semiregular in the classical sense and the class $[\varphi_0(C_0)]$ remains Hodge on the fibers of $X$. Then if the map $H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{S})$ is surjective, $\varphi_0$ can be deformed to general fibers of $X$. □

The sheaf $\mathcal{S}$ is the infinitesimal normal sheaf of the singular locus of $\varphi_0(C_0)$, as we will see below. Recall that we assume that the image $\varphi_0(C_0)$ has normal crossing singularity. Then, for any point $p \in \varphi_0(C_0)$, we can take a coordinate system $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ on a neighborhood $U$ of $p$ in $X_0$ so that $U \cap \varphi_0(C_0)$ is given by $x_1 \cdots x_k = 0, 1 \leq k \leq n$. Let $\mathcal{I}_j$ be the ideal of $\mathcal{O}_U$ generated by $x_j$ and let $\mathcal{I}$ be the ideal defining $\varphi_0(C_0) \cap U$ in $U$. Then

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}_1/\mathcal{I}_1\mathcal{I} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{I}_k/\mathcal{I}_k\mathcal{I}}{\mathcal{I}_1/\mathcal{I}_1\mathcal{I} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{I}_k/\mathcal{I}_k\mathcal{I}}$$

gives an invertible sheaf on the singular locus of $\varphi_0(C_0) \cap U$. Globalizing this construction, we obtain an invertible sheaf on the singular locus of $\varphi_0(C_0)$. Then the dual invertible sheaf of this is called the infinitesimal normal sheaf of the singular locus of $\varphi_0(C_0)$, see [4].

**Lemma 14.** The sheaf $\mathcal{S}$ is isomorphic to the infinitesimal normal sheaf.

**Proof.** Note that the sheaf $\mathcal{I}_1/\mathcal{I}_1\mathcal{I} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{I}_k/\mathcal{I}_k\mathcal{I}$ is generated by the element $x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k$. The sheaf $p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}$ is given by $\mathcal{E} \otimes H^0 \otimes H^0 \otimes H^0$. The sheaf $\mathcal{N}_i$ is an invertible sheaf and generated by the morphism which maps $x_1 \cdots x_k$ to $1 \in \mathcal{O}_U$. In particular, by multiplying any $x_1 \cdots x_k$, the generator is mapped into the image of $p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0} \to \mathcal{N}_i$, namely, the image of the generator of $H^0(\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}_1^2, \mathcal{O}_U)$. Also note that the ideal of the singular locus of $\varphi_0(C_0)$ is generated by $x_1 \cdots x_k, i = 1, \ldots, k$. From these, it is easy to see that the cokernel of the map
Recall that the infinitesimal normal sheaf is related to deformations of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) which smooth the singular locus, see \([3]\). In particular, \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is called \( d\text{-semistable} \) if the infinitesimal normal sheaf is trivial, and \( d\text{-semistable} \) variety carries a log structure log smooth over a standard log point, so that one can study its deformations via log smooth deformation theory \([3, 4, 5]\).

By Corollary \([13]\), the infinitesimal normal sheaf plays a crucial in the deformation theory even if it is not \( d\text{-semistable} \). On the other hand, the notion of \( d\text{-semistability} \) gives a sufficient condition for the existence of deformations in this situation, too, as follows.

**Corollary 15.** Assume that the image \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is very ample and \( H^1(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(\varphi_0(C_0))) = 0 \). Assume also that \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is \( d\text{-semistable} \) and the singular locus of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is connected. Then the map \( \varphi_0 \) is semiregular.

**Proof.** First, the subvariety \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is semiregular in the classical sense. Namely, consider the cohomology exact sequence

\[
\cdots \to H^1(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(\varphi_0(C_0))) \to H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^2(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}) \to \cdots,
\]

here \( \iota : \varphi_0(C_0) \to X_0 \) is the inclusion. When \( H^1(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(\varphi_0(C_0))) = 0 \), the map \( H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^2(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}) \) is injective. Since this map is the dual of the semiregularity map \( H^{n-2}(X_0, \mathcal{K}_{X_0}) \to H^{n-2}(\varphi_0(C_0), \iota^*\mathcal{K}_{X_0}) \), it follows that \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is semiregular.

To prove that \( \varphi_0 \) is semiregular, it suffices to show the map \( H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{S}) \) is surjective. When \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is \( d\text{-semistable} \), the sheaf \( \mathcal{S} \) is the trivial line bundle on the singular locus of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \). Since we assume that the singular locus is connected, it suffices to show that the map \( H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{S}) \) is not the zero map. This in turn is equivalent to the claim that the injection \( H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \) is not an isomorphism. Since \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is very ample, there is a section \( s \) of \( \mathcal{O}_X(\varphi_0(C_0)) \) which does not entirely vanish on the singular locus of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \). Then if \( \sigma \) is a section of \( \mathcal{O}_X(\varphi_0(C_0)) \) defining \( \varphi_0(C_0) \), the sections \( \sigma + \tau s \), where \( \tau \in \mathbb{C} \) is a parameter, deforms \( \varphi_0(C_0) \), and the non-vanishing of \( s \) on the singular locus of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) implies that this smooths a part of the singular locus of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \). Since the sections of \( H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}) \) give first order deformations which does not smooth the singular locus, it follows that the map \( H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \) is not an isomorphism. This proves the claim.

### 6.2. The case \( n = 2 \)

Now let us consider the case \( n = 2 \). Although we can work in a more general situation, we assume \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is a reduced nodal curve for simplicity. However \( C_0 \) need not be smooth. Let \( p : C_0 \to \varphi_0(C_0) \) be the natural map, which is a partial normalization. In this case, we can deduce very explicit criterion for the semiregularity. Again, we have the exact sequence

\[
0 \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{S}) \to H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\mathcal{N}_{\varphi_0}) \to H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to \cdots,
\]

and if \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) is semiregular in the classical sense, then \( \varphi_0 \) is semiregular if and only if the map \( H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{S}) \) is surjective. Let \( P = \{ p_i \} \) be the set of nodes of \( \varphi_0(C_0) \) whose inverse image by \( p \) consists of two points. Then the sheaf \( \mathcal{S} \) is isomorphic
to \(\oplus_i C_{p_i}\), where \(C_{p_i}\) is the skyscraper sheaf at \(p_i\). By an argument similar to the one in the previous subsection, we proved the following in [10].

**Theorem 16.** Assume that \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) is semiregular in the classical sense. Then the map \(\varphi_0\) is semiregular if and only if for each \(p_i \in P\), there is a first order deformation of \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) which smoothes \(p_i\), but does not smooth the other nodes of \(P\). \(\square\)

For applications, it will be convenient to write this in a geometric form. Consider the exact sequence

\[
0 \to \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \to \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(\varphi_0(C_0)) \to \mathcal{N}_i \to 0
\]

of sheaves on \(X_0\) and the associated cohomology sequence

\[
0 \to H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}) \to H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(\varphi_0(C_0))) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^1(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}) \to \cdots.
\]

Let \(V\) be the image of the map \(H^0(\varphi(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^1(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})\). Since we are working in the analytic category, we have the exact sequence

\[
0 \to \mathbb{Z} \to \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \to \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^* \to 0
\]

of sheaves on \(X\). Let \(\tilde{V}\) be the image of \(V\) in \(\text{Pic}^0(X_0) = H^1(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^*)\). In [10], we proved the following.

**Corollary 17.** In the situation of Theorem 14, the map \(\varphi_0\) is unobstructed if for each \(p_i \in P\), there is an effective divisor \(D\) such that \(\mathcal{O}_X(\varphi_0(C_0) - D) \in \tilde{V}\) which avoids \(p_i\) but passes through all points in \(P \setminus \{p_i\}\).

A particularly nice case is when the map \(H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{N}_i) \to H^1(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})\) is surjective. This is the case when \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) is sufficiently ample. Then, if for each \(p_i \in P\) there is an effective divisor \(D\) which is algebraically equivalent to \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) which avoids \(p_i\) but passes through all points in \(P \setminus \{p_i\}\), the map \(\varphi_0\) is semiregular. This is, in a sense, the opposite to the classical Cayley-Bacharach property, see for example [1].

Combined with Theorem 14 we have the following.

**Corollary 18.** Assume that \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) is reduced, nodal and semiregular in the classical sense and the class \([\varphi_0(C_0)]\) remains Hodge on the fibers of \(\mathfrak{X}\). Then the map \(\varphi_0\) deforms to general fibers of \(\mathfrak{X}\) if the condition in Theorem 16 or Corollary 17 is satisfied. \(\square\)

In the case of \(n = 2\), the original exact sequence

\[
\cdots \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), t^*\mathcal{K}_{X_0}) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\varphi_0^*\mathcal{K}_{X_0}) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{Q}) \to H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), t^*\mathcal{K}_{X_0}) \to H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\varphi_0^*\mathcal{K}_{X_0}) \to H^1(\varphi_0(C_0), \mathcal{Q})
\]

before taking the dual is sometimes also useful. In this case, if \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) is semiregular in the classical sense, then \(\varphi_0\) is semiregular if and only if the map

\[
H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), t^*\mathcal{K}_{X_0}) \to H^0(\varphi_0(C_0), p_*\varphi_0^*\mathcal{K}_{X_0}) \cong H^0(C_0, \varphi_0^*\mathcal{K}_X)
\]

is surjective. For example, when the canonical sheaf \(\mathcal{K}_{X_0}\) is trivial, then it is clear that this map is surjective and also \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) is semiregular in the classical sense. In fact, in this case it is not necessary to assume that the image \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) is nodal or reduced, and any immersion \(\varphi_0\) from a reduced curve \(C_0\) is semiregular. It is known that when \(X_0\) is a K3 surface and the image \(\varphi_0(C_0)\) is reduced, then the map \(\varphi_0\) deforms to general fibers if the class \([\varphi_0(C_0)]\) remains Hodge. This claim is proved using the twistor family associated with the hyperkähler structure of K3 surfaces, see for example [3]. Corollary 18 gives a
In [10], we also proved the following.

**Theorem 19.** Let $X$ be a smooth complex projective surface with an effective canonical class. Let $L$ be a very ample class. Then, there is a positive number $A$ which depends on $L$ such that for any positive integer $m$, the numerical class of $mL$ contains an embedded irreducible nodal curve $C$ whose geometric genus is less than $Am$. \(\square\)

Such a curve has very large number of nodes, which is roughly $L^2 m^2$. In particular, for any positive number $\varepsilon$, we can assume $\delta(C) > g(C)^{2-\varepsilon}$ for large $m$, where $\delta(C)$ is the number of nodes of $C$ and $g(C)$ is the geometric genus of $C$. Moreover, the proof in [10] shows that we can take $C$ to be semiregular when it is considered as a map $\varphi: \tilde{C} \to X$ from the normalization $\tilde{C}$, and $\varphi$ has non-trivial deformations on which gives equisingular deformations of $C$ in $X$.

Now let $Y$ be any smooth projective variety of dimension not less than two. Let $X$ be a smooth surface in $Y$ which is a complete intersection of sufficiently high degree. Then by the above theorem there is an embedded irreducible nodal curve $C$ whose geometric genus is less than $Am$ and which deforms equisingularly in $X$. Moreover, by Theorem 1, if we deform $X$ to a smooth surface $X'$ inside $Y$, then the curve $C$ also deforms to $X'$ equisingularly. Since a dense open subset of $Y$ is swept by such surfaces as $X'$, we have the following, which claims that any projective variety can be dominated by an equisingular family of nodal curves which has large number of nodes (and small number of genera).

**Corollary 20.** Let $Y$ be a projective variety of dimension $n \geq 2$. Then for any positive number $\varepsilon$, there is an $(n-1)$-dimensional family $\mathcal{C} \to B$ of irreducible nodal curves whose fibers satisfy $\delta > g^{2-\varepsilon}$, and a map $p: \mathcal{C} \to Y$ which dominates $Y$. Here $\delta$ is the number of nodes of a fiber of $\mathcal{C}$ and $g$ is the geometric genus of it.

**Proof.** This follows from the above argument applied to a desingularization of $Y$. \(\square\)
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