UNIVERSITÄT KAISERSLAUTERN

Determinantal Rational Surface Singularities

Theo de Jong

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK

Determinantal Rational Surface Singularities

Theo de Jong

Abstract

In this paper we give explicit equations for determinantal rational surface singularities and prove dimension formulas for the T^1 and T^2 for those singularities.

Introduction

Let (X, x) be a germ of a normal surface singularity of embedding dimension e. Then the local ring $\mathcal{O}_X$ of X can be given as $\mathcal{O}_X = P/I$, where P is a power series ring in e indeterminates. One says that X is *determinantal* if the ideal I can be generated by the $t \times t$ minors of an $r \times s$ matrix with entries in P, with the condition that the codimension $e - 2$ is equal to the "expected" codimension $(r - t + 1)(s - t + 1)$.

We consider *rational surface singularities*. For those we know that the multiplicity m is equal to $e - 1$ [1]. Wahl proved [12] that a *rational* surface singularity of embedding dimension e can be given by $\frac{m(m-1)}{2}$ equations with *linear independent quadratic terms*. Using this, it is not hard to show:

Proposition [12] (3.2)
Let X be a rational determinantal surface singularity of multiplicity $m \geq 3$. Then equations for X can be given by the 2×2 minors of a $2 \times m$ matrix.

Wahl also remarked that few rational surface singularities are determinantal:

Theorem [12] (3.4) *Let (X, x) be a determinantal rational surface of multiplicity $m \geq 3$, and $(\tilde{X}, E) \to (X, x)$ be the minimal resolution. Then E consists of one $(-m)$ curve and (possibly) some (-2) curves.*

The $(-m)$ curve we call the *central curve* from now on. The proof Wahl gives is not difficult. Let (X, x) be a determinantal rational surface singularity,

1

given by the 2×2 minors of a matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_1 & \cdots & f_m \\ g_1 & \cdots & g_m \end{pmatrix}$$

One has a rational map $(g_i : f_i) : X \to \mathbb{P}^1$. (This is independent of i.) One can define a modification $(\overline{X}, E_0) \to (X, x)$ (called the *Tjurina modification* by Van Straten [10]) by taking $\overline{X}$ the closure of the graph of this rational map. This $\overline{X}$ is then given by the following equations: $((s : t)$ are homogeneous coordinates):

$$sf_1 = tg_1$$

$$\cdot$$
$$\cdot$$

$$sf_m = tg_m$$

There is an exceptional $\mathbb{P}^1$ in $\overline{X}$, given by the ideal generated by the f's and the g's. Then Wahl shows that $\overline{X}$ can only have rational double point singularities, and that the central curve has coefficient one in the fundamental cycle, from which he is able to deduce the Theorem.

Wahl also expected that the converse of this Theorem is true, and wrote down determinantal equations for some determinantal rational surface singularities with reduced fundamental cycle. (The proof of [12] 3.6 is incomplete, however.) The converse was shown by Röhr [9], as a special case of a much more general Theorem on *formats*. The purpose of this paper is to give eplicit equations for determinantal rational surface singularities, thereby also showing the converse of Wahl's Theorem. Using these equations, we are able to get dimension formulae for the T^1 and T^2 of a rational surface singularity, which are similar to the formulae for these modules for rational surface singularities with reduced fundamental cycle [6].

Wahl's Theorem restricts very much the shape of the resolution graph of a determinantal rational surface singularity: One has one $(-m)$ curve, with rational double point configurations (RDP-configurations) attached to it. Applying a rationality criterium (using a computation sequence for the fundamental cycle) one gets a list of how which RDP-configurations can be attached to the central curve. This is all well-known (and easy) and the list is written down in the first section.

Given a resolution graph of a rational determinantal singularity Γ one can try to write down (determinantal) equations, which define a singularity with resolution graph Γ. If one has those equations, it is relatively easy to check that the resolution graph is indeed Γ, using the Tjurina modification (remember the easy equations above for the Tjurina modification). This is done in section two.

The problem is that surface singularities in general are *not* determined by the analytic type of the resolution graph. (Laufer [7] wrote down all for which they do determine the singularity.) So, we do not know whether *all* rational surface singularities of multiplicity m and with one $(-m)$ curve in the minimal resolution has equations as given in section two (although this turns out to be the case). In section three we will resolve this problem. We will construct divisors on the minimal resolution of our singularity. Then we invoke Artin's Theorem, saying that if one has a divisor on the minimal resolution of a rational surface singularity, which intersects every exceptional curve trivial, then this divisor is principal, so of the form (f). (Given a divisor, the choice of f is determined up to a unit.) By constructing enough divisors, we get plenty of functions on X. Using then *additive* relations between the divisors, one gets *multiplicative* relations between the corresponding functions by choosing the functions, given their divisors, smart enough. So, then one has still to check whether there are additive relations between the functions. We will show that the relations between those functions generate the equations for the singularities. This all will be quite technical, but not difficult, and will be done in the third section.

Certainly our result is not the best possible, in the sense that some terms in the equations can be disposed of after coordinate transformations. To have this sorted out however, seems to require much more work.

In the fourth section we will give dimension formulas for the T^1 and T^2 for determinantal rational surface singularities. The formulas are similar to those in [6].

It is a future project to get similar results for *quasideterminantal* rational surface singularities. These singularities were also characterized (in terms of their resolutions graph) by Röhr.

§1 Rational double point configurations

Let (X, x) be a normal surface singularity with minimal resolution $(\tilde{X}, E) \to (X, x)$. Let $E = \cup E_i$ be the irreducible decomposition of E. The fundamental cycle Z by definition is the *minimal* positive cycle with support on E subject to the condition that $Z \cdot E_i \leq 0$ for all exceptional divisors E_i. The fundamental cycle can be computed by means of a computation sequence:

- Let $Z_0 := E$

- Given Z_k, there are two possibilities:
  A. There is an exceptional curve F with $Z_k \cdot F > 0$ Then define $Z_{k+1} := Z_k + F$.
  B. There is no such curve as in A. Then one has that the fundamental cycle Z is equal to Z_k.

The above proces stops. Computation sequences are useful not only for computing Z, but also because of the following

Rationality Criterium (1.1): *(X, x) is rational iff the following two conditions hold:*

- *Every exceptional curve is a $\mathbb{P}^1$.*

- *In any computation sequence one has that if $Z_k \cdot F > 0$ then $Z_k \cdot F = 1$ for all k.*

For a rational surface singularity the fundamental cycle also gives information about the multiplicity m and embedding dimension e: one has $-Z^2 = m = e - 1$, see [1].

From now on we will assume that (X, x) is rational of multiplicity m and that there is one exceptional curve, say E_0, on the minimal resolution which has selfintersection $(-m)$. For convenience, we ocassionaly call such a singularity determinantal rational (although we have not proved yet that such a singularity is determinantal). The curve E_0 we call the *central* curve. Although the following proposition is well-known, we include a proof.

Proposition (1.2): *Let (X, x) be a rational surface singularity of multiplicity m with one $(-m)$ curve E_0 on the minimal resolution. Then:*

4

- *All other exceptional curves have selfintersection -2*

- *The coefficient of the fundamental cycle Z at the central curve E_0 is one.*

proof: Let K be the canonical divisor on the minimal resolution. Then one has the adjunction formulas:

- $E_i \cdot K = -2 - E_i^2$ for all i. Note that this number is always nonnegative, because we work on the minimal resolution. In particular we have $E_0 \cdot K = m - 2$

- $Z \cdot K = -2 - Z^2 = m - 2$

Now write $Z = \sum a_i E_i$ with $a_i > 0$ and compute:

$$(m - 2) = ZK = a_0 E_0 K + \sum_{i \neq 0} a_i E_i K = a_0(m - 2) + \sum_{i \neq 0} a_i(-2 - E_i^2)$$

Because $a_i > 0$ for all i it follows that $a_0 = 1$ and $E_i^2 = -2$ for all $i \neq 0$. $\square$

As any subconfiguration of the minimal resolution of a rational surface singularity contracts itself to a rational surface singularity, the structure of the resolution graph of a determinantal rational surface singularity is quite simple: one has a central $(-m)$ curve and rational double point configurations (RDP-configurations) intersecting this central curve in different points. The list of rational double points of course is very well known, the famous A, D, E list:

Of course, a dot denotes a (-2) curve.

Because of the rationality condition however, the central curve cannot intersect an arbitrary curve of a RDP-configuration. Below we list the possibilities of intersections of the central curves with the different RDP-configurations.

Proposition/Definition (1.3): *Rational double point configurations can intersect the central curve only as in one of the following cases:*

$$
A_k^q \qquad
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & q & q & & 2 & 1 \\
\blacksquare & \bullet & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \bullet \\
& | \\
& \bullet & q-1 \\
& \vdots \\
& \bullet & 2 \\
& \bullet & 1
\end{array}
\qquad\qquad
D_k^I \qquad
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 2 & & 2 & 1 \\
\blacksquare & \bullet & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \bullet \\
& & & & | \\
& & & & \bullet & 1
\end{array}
$$

$$
D_{2k}^{II} \qquad
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & k & 2k-2 & & 2 & 1 \\
\blacksquare & \bullet & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \bullet \\
& & | \\
& & \bullet & k-1
\end{array}
\qquad\qquad
D_{2k+1}^{II} \qquad
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & k & 2k-1 & & 2 & 1 \\
\blacksquare & \bullet & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \bullet \\
& & | \\
& & \bullet & k
\end{array}
$$

$$
E_6 \qquad
\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\
\blacksquare & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
& & & | \\
& & & \bullet & 2
\end{array}
\qquad\qquad
E_7 \qquad
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 4 & 2 \\
\blacksquare & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
& & & & | \\
& & & & \bullet & 3
\end{array}
$$

The box denotes the central curve. All other curves are (-2) curves. The number of them is $k + q - 1$ in case A_k^q, otherwise it is the suffix. The number written at each vertex is the coefficient of the corresponding curve in the fundamental cycle. For each rational double point configuration R_a we define the *multiplicity* $m(a)$ as the coefficient of the fundamental cycle at the unique curve of the rational double point configuration intersecting the central curve. So, we assumed implicitly that the selfintersection of the central curve is at most minus the coefficient of the fundamental cycle of the curve adjacent to it. In case $Z \cdot E_0 < 0$ we will say that there are $-Z \cdot E_0$ A_0^1 rational double point configurations. This done formally, the number of rational double point configurations is exactly the number of irreducible components of a generic hyperplane section of the surface singularity. In fact, sometimes we will identify an A_0^1 with a smooth non-compact curve,

which intersects the central curve transversally on the minimal resolution.

sketch of proof: We try to attach the central curve to one of the rational double point configurations. From the rationality criterium it follows that there cannot be two vertices of valence three in the resolution graph. So except for the case A_k^q one has to attach the central curve to an endpoint of the D, E configuration. Using the rationality criterium it is tedious to check that one is left with the possibilities as written down in the list. $\square$

§2 Equations for Determinantal Rational Surface Singularities

We consider arbitrary rational double point configurations which we denote by R_a, $0 \leq a \leq t$. (Recall our convention on A_0^1 rational double point configurations.) The multiplicity of R_a we denote by $m(a)$.
We will write down equations for all determinantal rational surface singularities with these given rational double point configurations.
This will be done in the following two definitions.

Definition (2.1): *Let x be an independent variable, and for each rational double point configuration consider variables y_{ia}, $0 \leq i \leq m(a) - 1$.*
For each rational double point configuration R_a consider matrices M_a (For simplicity we will not write the suffix a in the variables y_{ia}):

- A_0^1 :

$$M_a = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 \\ x \end{pmatrix}$$

- A_k^q : *Define numbers r and p by cf [10] (1.3.12):*

$$k = qr - p; \quad 0 \leq p \leq q - 1$$

$$M_a = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 & \cdots & y_{p-1} & w & y_{p+1} & \cdots & y_{q-2} & y_{q-1} \\ y_1 & \cdots & y_p & y_{p+1} & y_{p+2} & \cdots & y_{q-1} & xy_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$w = y_p + x^r + Rest;$$

$$Rest \in (xy_0, \ldots xy_{p-1}, y_{p+1}, \ldots, y_{q-1})$$

7

- D_k^I :

$$M_a = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 & y_1 \\ y_1 & w \end{pmatrix}$$

$$w = x^2 + y_0^{k-1} + \lambda x y_0^q \text{ for some constant } \lambda$$

and q is the integral part of $\frac{k+1}{2}$.

- D_{2k}^{II} :

$$M_a = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 & y_1 & \cdots & y_{k-2} & w \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_{k-1} & x^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$w = y_{k-1} + y_0^2 + Rest;$$

$$Rest \in (y_0 y_1, \ldots, y_0 y_{k-2}, x y_0, \ldots, x y_{k-2})$$

- D_{2k+1}^{II} :

$$M_a = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 & y_1 & \cdots & y_{k-2} & w \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_{k-1} & y_0^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$w = y_{k-1} + x^2 + Rest;$$

$$Rest \in (x y_0, \ldots, x y_{k-2}, y_0^2, \ldots, y_0 y_{k-2})$$

- E_6 :

$$M_a = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 & y_1 \\ y_1 & w \end{pmatrix}$$

$$w = y_0^2 + x^3 + \lambda x^2 y_0 \text{ for some constant } \lambda$$

- E_7 :

$$M_a = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 & y_1 & y_2 \\ y_1 & y_2 & w \end{pmatrix}$$

$$w = y_0^3 + x^2 + Rest;$$

$$Rest \in (x y_1, y_1^2, x y_0^2, y_0^2 y_1, x y_2)$$

Definition (2.2): *Fix a double point configuration, say R_0. For all other rational double point configuration R_a, $1 \le a \le t$ consider units u_a and v_a in $\mathbb{C}\{x, y_{ia}\}$. Suppose that for $a \ne b$ the constants $u_a(0)$ and $u_b(0)$ are not equal. Consider the matrix*

$$N_a = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ u_a & v_a \end{pmatrix} M_a$$

So to get N_a from M_a we multiply the second row of M_a by the unit v_a, and then we add u_a times the first row to the second row. Moreover we put $N_0 = M_0$. We then put:

$$N = (N_0 \; N_1 \; \ldots \; N_t)$$

Theorem (2.3): *Fix rational double point configurations, $R_0 \ldots R_t$, and let N be a matrix defined as above. For every choice for w_a, u_a and v_a (with the restrictions as above) the 2×2 minors of the matrix N define a rational surface singularity X of multiplicity $m = \sum_{a=0}^{t} m(a)$, having rational double point configurations $R_0, \ldots R_t$. Moreover on the minimal resolution of X there is a $(-m)$ curve.*

Conversely any rational surface singularity X with a $(-m)$ curve on the minimal resolution, and rational double point configurations $R_0 \ldots R_t$ can be defined by the 2×2 of a matrix N as defined above, for suitable choices of w_a, u_a and v_a.

proof: Here we only prove the first statement. The proof of the converse will take the whole of the next section.

We write

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 & \cdots & f_m \\ g_1 & \cdots & g_m \end{pmatrix}$$

and we consider the Tjurina modification

$$p : (\overline{X}, E_0) \to (X, x)$$

defined by the equations

$$s f_1 = t g_1; \ldots; s f_m = t g_m$$

9

This map is well-defined, precisely because X is defined by the 2×2 minors of N. The $(s : t)$ are homogeneous coordinates on E_0, which is a $\mathbb{P}^1$. The curve E_0 is mapped by p to the singular point of X. Let c_a be the constant term of u_a for all rational double point configurations. Then:

Claim: In the equations, given above of the Tjurina modification $\overline{X}$ one can, away from the point $(c_a : 1)$, eliminate the variables y_{ib}; $b \neq a$. (i.e. locally they occur with independent linear terms.)

We will look away from the point $(1 : 0)$. The investigation locally at the point $(1 : 0)$ is left to the reader. In the first row of M_a there is always a linear part of type:

$$(y_{0a} \ldots y_{m(a)a})$$

We denote the second row of M_a by:

$$(h_{0a} \ldots h_{m(a)a})$$

Then one notes (case by case check) that h_{ia} does not contain the terms y_{ja} for $j \leq i$, and also not linear terms of type y_{ib} for $b \neq a$. Also the term x never occurs in the second row. We have the following equation for $\overline{X}$ in the chart $t = 1$:

$$sy_{ia} - (u_a y_{ia} + v_a h_{ia}) = 0$$

Because v_a is a unit and h_{ia} does not contain the linear terms mentioned above, we can successively eliminate $y_{0a} \ldots y_{m(a)a}$ away from $s = u_a(0) = c_a$. This proves the claim, and more. It also shows that away from the points

$$(0 : 1), (c_1 : 1), \ldots, (c_t : 1)$$

on E_0 the Tjurina modification is smooth. In fact, away from those points one can eliminate all y_{ia}, leaving us with the variables s, x. The Tjurina modification is given by m equations, and we have $m + 2$ variables locally. We conclude that $\overline{X}$ is smooth with parameters s, x away from the points $(0 : 1), (c_1 : 1), \ldots (c_t : 1)$ on E_0. Moreover it follows that the (lift of the) function x vanishes with order one on the curve E_0.

We now investigate the singularities at the points $(c_{ia} : 1)$ for all rational double point configurations R_a. As mentioned above, all other y_{ib} for $b \neq a$ can be eliminated. So we are left then with the equations for the Tjurina

modification coming from the part N_a. But by doing the coordinate transformation: $s \mapsto s + u_a$, and after that, multiplying s by the unit v_a, we just might consider the matrix M_a. Therefore, we have to investigate the Tjurina modification for every matrix M_a at the point $(0 : 1) \in E_0$. We claim that for each M_a we have the rational double point configuration R_a. This is a case by case check. We omit the suffix a in doing this check.

1. A_0^1

   We write $y = y_0$. The Tjurina modification has equation:

   $$sy = x^{k+1}$$

   In case $k > 0$ we have an A_k singularity, which upon resolving, gives a chain of (-2) curves. It is well-known that he lift of the curve given by $x = y = 0$ to this resolution intesects one of the end-curves of the A_k singularity.

   In case $k = 0$ the Tjurina modification is smooth, with local equation $sy = x$. Parameters here are s and y. The space $x = 0$ on the Tjurina modification is given locally by the exceptional curve E_0 plus a non-compact part (given locally by $s = 0$.) So here we indeed have an A_0^1 singularity, according to our convention.

2. A_k^q (cf. [10] (1.3.12)). The Tjurina modification has equations:

   $$sy_0 = y_1; \ \ldots; \ sy_{p-1} = y_p$$

   $$sw = y_{p+1}; \ sy_{p+1} = y_{p+2} : \ldots; sy_{q-1} = xy_0$$

   We get $y_i = s^i y_0$ for $1 \le i \le p$. Similarly we can eliminate $y_{p+1}, \ldots, y_{q-1}$ $(y_{p+i} = s^i w)$, and we get

   $$xy_0 = s^{q-p} w$$

   We know that

   $$w = y_p + x^r + Rest; \ Rest \in (xy_0, \ldots xy_{p-1}, y_{p+1}, \ldots, y_{q-1})$$

   We now eliminate the variables. After done that, we have $Rest \in (xy_0)$. Therefore:

   $$xy_0 = s^q y_0 + s^{q-p} x^r + Rest; \ Rest \in (s^{q-p} xy_0)$$

We claim that this is an A_{k+q-1} singularity, and that the lift of the curve $x = y_0 = 0$ to the minimal resolution of the A_{k+q-1} intersects the $q - th$ curve, in the chain of exceptional (-2) curves. We use the coordinate transformation $\bar{x} = x - s$. Then we have $\bar{x}y_0 = s^{q(r+1)-p} + \bar{x}g$ for some g in the maximal ideal. Because $k = qr - p$, this is indeed an A_{k+q-1}. If we resolve this singularity, we get a chain of (-2) curves of length $k + q - 1$.

To see which curve of this chain the central curve E_0 intersects, we blow up. We look in the $s-$ chart and plug in (sx, sy_0, s) for (x, y_0, s). The exceptional locus consist of two exceptional curves (the tangent cone). At the intersection point of these curves, the strict transform of the A_{k+q-1} singularity has equation:

$$xy_0 = s^{q-1}y_0 + s^{q-p+r-2}x^r + Rest; \quad Rest \in (s^{q-p}xy_0)$$

The strict transform of E_0 is still given by $x = y_0 = 0$ So we have an inductive procedure here. After q blow-ups we introduced two chains of q exceptional curves. The strict transform has equation:

$$xy_0 = y_0 + s^{q-p+q(r-2)}x^r + Rest; \quad Rest \in (s^{q-p}xy_0)$$

If one blows up again, the singularity in the point $(1,0,0)$. The strict transform of E_0 given by $x = y_0 = 0$ only intersects the exceptional curve $s = y_0 = 0$ which is the $q'th$ in the chain of (-2) curves.

3. D_k^I We write $y_0 = y$ and $y_1 = z$. The equations for the Tjurina modification are $sy = z$; $sz = w$. We eliminate z and get:

$$s^2 y = x^2 + y^{k-1} + \lambda xy^q.$$

This indeed is a D_k singularity. To see where the central curve E_0, which is given by $x = y = 0$, intersects the D_k configuration, we blow-up. We look at the $s-$chart. So again we replace (x, y, s) by (sx, sy, s). The strict transform has equation:

$$sy + x^2 + s^{k-3}y^{k-1} + \lambda s^{q-1}xy^q$$

and the exceptional locus is given by $s = x^2 = 0$. So the strict transform has an A_1 singularity at $(0,0,0)$, and the strict transform of E_0, which still is given by $x = y = 0$ goes through it. Now it is well known, and easy to check that the utmost left curve in the D_k configuration:

12

is obtained by resolving the A_1 singularity of the strict transform, and indeed the central curve intersects it.

4. D_{2k}^{II} Equations for the Tjurina modification are:

$$sy_0 = y_1; \ldots; sw = x^2.$$

We get $y_i = s^i y_0$, and we eleminate $y_1, \ldots y_{k-1}$. Moreover for simplicity we write $y = y_0$. The result is:

$$s^k y + sy^2 + Rest = x^2; \ Rest \in (s^2 y^2, sxy)$$

It is not so difficult to check that this indeed is an D_{2k} singularity, but we still have to see through which exceptional curve of this D_{2k} singularity the central curve E_0 (given by $x = y = 0$) passes. We blow up and look in the $s - chart$. The strict transform has equation:

$$s^{k-1} y = sy^2 + Rest = x^2; \ Rest \in (s^2 y^2, sxy)$$

and the strict transform of E_0 goes through it. In $(0,0,0)$ this is a D_{2k-2} singularity. The exceptional locus is a $\mathbb{P}^1$. The strict transform also has an A_1 singularity, which upon resolving gives another exceptional curve. After k_1 blow ups we introduced a chain of (-2) curves of lengt $2k - 2$. The strict transform then has equation:

$$sy = sy^2 + x^2 + Rest$$

This is an A_1 singularity, and the strict transform of E_0 goes through it. After resolving this A_1 singularity we get the exceptional curve in the D_k configuration:

which is on the left. The central curve therefore intersects this curve.

5. D_{2k+1}^{II} Left to the reader.

13

6. E_6 Also left to the reader.

7. E_7 In the Tjurina modification we eliminate the variables y_1 and y_2. After writing $y_0 = y$ the singularity on the Tjurina modification has the equation:

$$s^3 y = y^3 + x^2 + Rest; \ Rest \in (sxy, s^2 y^2, sy^3)$$

This indeed is an E_7 singularity. The central curve is given by $x = y = 0$. We blow up and look in the $s - chart$. The strict transform is given by:

$$s^2 y = sy^3 + x^2 + Rest; \ Rest \in (sxy, s^2 y^2, sy^3)$$

and the exceptional locus is the $\mathbb{P}^1$ given by $s = x^2 = 0$. In the E_7 configuration:

it is the utmost right curve. The strict transform has a singularity of type D_6 in $(0,0,0)$. and the strict transform of E_0 goes through it. Now the proof goes on as in the D_k^I case, and we conclude that the curve E_0 goes through the utmost left curve of the D_6 configuration, which together with the curve $x^2 = 0$ gives the E_7 configuration.

Let us recapitulate what we proved by now. On the minimal resolution of our singularity we have the central curve E_0 and rational double point configurations $R_0, \ldots, R_t$. All exceptional curves are $\mathbb{P}^1$'s, and only the central curve might not be a (-2) curve. What we are left to show is that the central curve has selfintersection $-m = \sum m(a)$. This can be done directly, by calculating the vanishing order of the function x on every exceptional curve. But we can also argue as follows. The vanishing order of x along the exceptional curve of R_a intersecting the central curve must be at least $m(a)$. This is because the maximal ideal cycle is at least the fundamental cycle Z. As the vanishing order of x along the central curve is one, we deduce that $E_0^2 \leq -m$. Using the rationality criterium, one sees that X is rational of multiplicity $-E_0^2$. But our singularity is given by $\frac{m(m-1)}{2}$ equations with lineair independent quadratic part (a tedious check). Therefore, by Wahl's

14

structure Theorem for equations of rational surface singularities, we deduce $m = -E_0^2$. □

§3 Divisors on the minimal resolution

We consider a rational surface singularity (X, x) of multiplicity m, with a $(-m)$ curve on the minimal resolution $(\tilde{X}, E)$. Rather we consider good representatives for those. We will embed X in complex space. For this, we need functions on X, which generate the maximal ideal of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_X$. To obtain equations, one has to determine the relations between these functions. The fundamental tool in constructing functions on rational surface singularities given in the following Theorem of Artin:

Theorem (3.1): ([1], proof of Theorem 4) *Let $\pi : (\tilde{X}, E) \to (X, x)$ be the (minimal) resolution of a rational surface singularity X. Let Y be a Weil-divisor on $\tilde{X}$ with the condition that $Y \cdot E_i = 0$ for all irreducible components E_i of E. Then Y is a principal divisor, i.e. $Y = (y\pi)$ for some $y \in \mathcal{O}_X$.*

Of course, a function y as in the Theorem is determined up to a unit in $\mathcal{O}_X$ by the divisor Y.

Moreover we will need the following Theorem of Artin, which he did not formulate either. A proof is contained in loc. cit.

Theorem (3.2): [1] (proof of Theorem 4) *Let X be a rational surface singularity, $\pi : (\tilde{X}, E) \to (X, x)$ be the minimal resolution. Write the fundamental cycle Z as $Z = \sum r_i E_i$. Let H be a divisor on $\tilde{X}$ with $d_i := H \cdot E_i \le 0$ for all i. Let $\mathcal{O}(-H) = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_X : (f\pi) \ge H\}$. Then the number of generators of the ideal $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ is equal to $1 + \sum_i d_i r_i$.*

Our first job in this section is to write down divisors on the minimal resolution of a determinantal surface singularity. Such a divisor Y on $\tilde{X}$ can be decomposed as $Y = C + N$. Here C is a compact divisor, and therefore has support on the exceptional divisor E, and N is a non-compact divisor, i.e. a divisor whose support has discrete intersection with the exceptional divisor consist of a finite number of points. *In this paper we only consider divisors on $\tilde{X}$, for which each irreducible component of the support of the non-compact part N intersects exactly one exceptional divisor transversally.* So such a divisor therefore does not pass through an intersection point of

15

two exceptional divisors.

For the compact part C of Y we use the dual graph notation; writing $C = \sum a_i E_i$ we put the number a_i at the vertex in the dual graph which corresponds to the exceptional curve E_i. For the non-compact part N, write $N = \sum b_j N_j$. Then for all j we draw an arrow through the unique vertex on the dual graph, which corresponds to the curve the N_j intersects. Moreover we will write the number b_j near this arrow.

In the example:

the non-compact part consist of a smooth branch on $\tilde{X}$ with multiplicity one. (Of course, its image on X is not smooth.) This divisor satisfies the condition of Artin's Theorem, i.e. intersects every exceptional divisor trivially. As it is usually a very easy excercise to check that the conditions of Artin's Theorem are satisfied, we immediately will write $Y = (y)$, indicating that the divisor is principal.

We begin with writing down the divisor (x) of a function x. We write down the restrictions to each RDP-configuration and the central curve. The divisor (x)) contains all A_0^1 singularities (which by our convention are non-compact branches intersecting the central curve E_0) with multiplicity one. For the other RDP-configurations we define:

So Artin's Theorem gives us a function x. This function x is fixed *once and for all.* Remark that x is in the maximal ideal, but not in the square of the maximal ideal, because the divisor (x) is strictly less than $2Z$. For every rational double point configuration R_a we will now define certain divisors (y_{ia}) and (w_a) of functions on the minimal resolution. We will only write down the *restriction* to the rational double point configuration R_a, and the coefficient at the central curve E_0. Those restrictions are extended to divisors on the whole minimal resolution by putting on the *complement* of R_a: $(y_{ia}) = c_a \cdot (x)$ where c_a is the coefficient of (y_{ia}) at the central curve E_0. The noncompact divisor which is drawn through the central curve we call P (P for pole divisor). For the moment we will suppress the suffix a for the divisors (y_{ia}) and (w_a). For completeness we rewrite the divisor (x). A remark in advance: If the number of y's is small, we will usually write $y_0 = y$ and $y_1 = z$.

case A_0^1. Let C be the non-compact branch of the A_0^1 configuration. Then we define: $(y) = (x) + P - C$

case A_k^q.

17

We moreover define divisors (y_i) for $1 \le i \le p-1$ by $(y_i) = (y_0) + i \cdot (\alpha)$.


We define the divisors (y_i) for $p+1 \le i \le q-1$ by $(y_i) = (w) + i \cdot (\alpha)$.

Case D_{2q}^I

Case D_{2q+1}^I

18

(x)

(y)

(z)

(w)

Case D_{2k}^{II}

(x)

(y_0)

(α)

(w)

We moreover define divisors (y_i) by setting $(y_i) = (y_0) + i(\alpha)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$.

Case D_{2k+1}^{II}

(x)

(y_0)

(α)

(y_{k-1})

(w)

We moreover define divisors (y_i) by setting $(y_i) = (y_0) + i(\alpha)$ *for* $0 \le i \le k - 2$.

Case E_6

(x)

(z)

(y)

(w)

Case E_7

(x)

(y_0)

(y_2)

Proposition (3.3): *The functions x and y_{ia} where R_a run over all rational double configurations generate the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_X$.*

proof: The number of y_{ia} is exactly the multiplicity m of the singularity. Suppose that:

$$cx + \sum c_{ia} y_{ia} \in \mathfrak{m}_X^2$$

for some $c, c_{ia} \in \mathbb{C}$. We will show that the coefficients c, c_{ia} are zero. As by Artin one knows that the number of generators of the maximal ideal is $m + 1$, this suffices to prove the Proposition. Of course it suffices to prove that the c_{ia} are zero, as assuming this, $c = 0$ follows immediately from the fact that x is not in the square of the maximal ideal. We first consider the ideal $J := (x, y_{ia} : R_a \text{ is not an } A_0^1 \text{ } configuration)$. The strict transform of the zero set of J on the minimal resolution consist exactly of the non-compact part C of (x) passing through the central curve. The number of irreducible components of those is exactly the number of A_0^1 singularities. For every R_a, which is an A_0^1 singularity, the function y_{0a} vanishes identically on all but one of the irreducible components of C, and is a parameter on the irreducible component belonging to R_a. Now it follows immediately that $c_{ia} = 0$ for all A_0^1 configurations R_a.

So we may suppose that the above sum is only over all non-A_0^1 configurations. We now look at a fixed rational double point configuration R_a which is not an A_0^1 configuration. There is exactly one irreducible component C_a of (x) passing through an exceptional curve of R_a. (This is by construction of the divisor (x).) We put $x' = x + \epsilon \cdot y_{0a}$, which is a small peturbation of our function x. For ϵ general enough, a case by case check shows that the unigue irreducible component C_a' of $(x'\pi)$ passing through an exceptional curve E_a of R_a is smooth and *reduced*. The minimal vanishing order of a function in $\mathfrak{m}_X$ along E_a is $m(a)$, the coefficient of the fundamental cycle at the curve E_a. As we already know $c_{ia} = 0$ for R_a not an A_0^1 configuration, it follows that the y_{ib} for $b \neq a$ vanishes with order at least $2m(a)$ along E_a, as do all functions in the square of the maximal ideal. As by construction the function y_{ia} vanishes with order $m(a) + i$ along E_a, it follows that the classes of y_{ia} ($i \leq m(a) - 1$) in the local ring of C_a' generate its maximal ideal. Thus, we conclude that $c_{0a} - c \cdot \epsilon, c_{1a}, \dots$ are zero. As this is true for

21

all small ϵ, also $c_{0a} = 0$. □

Note that in all cases, (except in case A_k^1) we also wrote down the divisor of a function w. From the proposition it follows that w must be expressible in the y_{ia} and the function x. We will make this somewhat more explicit, in the following proposition:

Proposition (3.4): *One can choose w and the y_{ia} such that in $\mathcal{O}_X$ the 2×2 minors of the matrix M_a of Definition (2.1) are identically zero. In particular, one can express the function $w_a \in \mathcal{O}_X$ as done in Definition (2.1).*

proof: This is a case by case check, and will take some pages. In all cases we will choose functions y_{ia} with given divisors y_{ia}. Similar for w. In the course of the proof, we sometimes will change this choice by multiplying a function y_{ia} or w_a by a unit. In particular, the divisors then do not change. Also in this proof we will for every rational double point configuration a rational function $\alpha = \alpha_a$.

Case A_k^q, $q \geq 2$

Look at the divisor $H = (w) - qP$ on the minimal resolution. By Artin's Theorem $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ has $l + 1$ generators. Obviously $w \in \mathcal{O}(-H)$.

Claim: For some constant c one has $y_p - cx^r \in \mathcal{O}(-H)$
By construction $(y_p - x^r) \geq H - E_0$. If we show that for some constant c the function $y_p - cx^r$ has vanishing order $r + 1$ along E_O then we proved the claim. It is immediate that the rational function $\frac{y_p}{x^r}$ has no zeroes on the central curve, hence must be a constant function c. So $\frac{y_p - cx^r}{x^r}$ vanishes along E_0, and therefore $y_p - cx^r$ vanishes with order $r + 1$ along E_0. By making a different choice for y_p, we may assume that $c = -1$.

Claim: $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ is generated by $xy_0, \ldots xy_p, y_{p+1}, \ldots, y_{q-1}$ and $y_p + x^r$. Suppose

$$c_0 xy_0 + \ldots + c_{q-1}y_{q-1} + c(y_p + x^r) \in \mathfrak{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$$

We calculate modulo $\mathfrak{m}^2$ first. Because the y_i are part of the generating set of the maximal ideal, we immediate conclude that $c_{p+1} = \ldots = c_{q-1} = c = 0$ The rest is divisible by x, and using the fact that the y_i are part of the generating set of the maximal ideal again, it is not difficult to see that also

22

$$c_0 = \ldots = c_p = 0.$$

Therefore, w can be expressed as a combination of $xy_0, \ldots xy_p, y_{p+1}, \ldots, y_{q-1}$ and $y_p + x^r$. In the expression for w the $y_p + x^r$ must occur, as this is the only function with vanishing order p along the non-compact branch of the divisor x through the rational double point configuration we are considering. After redefining w by multiplying it by a constant, we may assume that the term $y_p + x^r$ comes with coefficient one. The term xy_p can be disposed of, by taking a different choice for y_p (i.e. multiply y_p by a unit).

We define the rational function $\alpha = \alpha_a := \frac{y_{p+1}}{w}$. We moreover put:

$$y_i = y_p \alpha^{i-p}; \; i \leq p-1$$

$$y_i = y_{p+1} \alpha^{i-p-1}; \; i \geq p+1$$

Then obviously the 2×2 minors of the matrix M_a are identically zero on X.

Case D_{2k}^{II} $k \geq 2$

We look at the divisor H, which is given by the left hand side of the following picture. For convenience of the reader, we also rewrite the coefficient of the fundamental cycle on this rational double point configuration (which is also the maximal ideal cycle, as we have a rational surface singularity).

We give some of the exceptional curves names, as indicated by the above picture.

Claim: Generators for $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ are

$$y_{k-1}, y_0^2, \ldots, y_0, y_{k-1}, xy_0, \ldots, xy_{k-2}$$

By Artin's Theorem, the number of generators of $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ is $2k - 1$. The given elements are in $\mathcal{O}(-H)$. Suppose:

$$ay_{k-1} + \sum a_i y_0 y_I + \sum b_i x y_i \in \mathfrak{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$$

23

for constants a, a_i, b_i.. To prove the claim, we have to show that they are all zero. The vanishing order of y_{k-1} along A is $2k - 1$. All other functions in our list have higher vanishing order along this curve. As an element in $m\mathcal{O}(-H)$ has vanishing order at least $3k - 1$ along A it follows that $a = 0$. Elements in $m\mathcal{O}(-H)$ have vanishing order at least $6k - 4$ along the curve F. The vanishing orders of

$$y_0^2, \ldots, y_0, y_{k-2}, xy_1, \ldots, xy_{k-2}$$

along F are repectively:

$$4k - 2, 4k, \ldots, 6k - 6, 4k - 1, \ldots, 6k - 5, 6k - 5$$

Every order o with $4k - 2 \le o \le 6k - 6$ occur exactly once. It follows that a_i and b_i are all zero.

In the expression for w as element of $\mathcal{O}(-H)$, both the terms y_{k-1} and y_0^2 occur. For y_{k-1} look at the vanishing order along A: y_{k-1} is the only one in the list vanishing with order $2k-1$ there; the other vanish with higher order. For y_0^2, look at non-compact curve intersecting the utmost right exceptional curve. The function y_0^2 is the only one in the list not vanishing there. As w by construction does not vanish there either, the term y_0^2 must occur. After multiplying y_0, y_{k-1} and w by units if necessary, we get the expression for w we want. We define the rational function $\alpha = \alpha_a$ by $\alpha = \frac{x^2}{w}$. Finally define $y_i = \alpha^i y_0$ for $1 \le i \le k - 1$. Then, obviously the 2×2 minors of M_a are identically zero in $\mathcal{O}_X$.

Case D_{2k+1}^{II} $k \ge 2$

We look at H, which is the compact part of the divisor of $w - cx^2$ for c general enough. We write the coefficients of H left, those of Z on the right hand side.

We gave some exceptional curves names again.

Claim: $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ is generated by $y_{k-1}, x^2, xy_0, \ldots, xy_{k-2}, y_0^2, \ldots, y_0 y_{k-2}$

24

By Artin's Theorem, the number of generators of $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ is indeed $2k$, and the listed elements are in it. So suppose:

$$\alpha y_{k-1} + \beta x^2 + \sum a_i x y_i + \sum b_i y_0 y_i \in \mathfrak{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$$

for some constants α, β, a_i and b_i. We look at the vanishing order along A. The function y_{k-1} vanishes with order $2k - 1$ along A, and the others with higher order. The elements in $\mathfrak{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$ vanish with order at least $3k - 1$ along A. Therefore, $\alpha = 0$. The functions

$$x^2, xy_0, xy_1, \ldots, xy_{k-2}, y_0^2, \ldots, y_0 y_{k-2}$$

vanish along F respectively with order:

$$4k - 2, 4k - 1, 4k + 1, \ldots, 6k - 5, 4k, \ldots, 6k - 4$$

Every order o with $4k - 2 \leq o \leq 6k - 4$ occur exactly once. Functions in $\mathfrak{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$ vanish with order at least $6k - 3$. We conclude therefore the constants β, a_i and b_i are zero.

Obviously $w - cx^2 \in \mathcal{O}(-H)$. In the expression for $w - cx^2$ as element of $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ the function y_{k-1} occurs. (Look at the vanishing order along A.) Also x^2 must occur. (Look at the vanishing along B.) After redefining y_{k-1} and w if necessary, we get the wanted expression for w. The rational function α in this case is defined by the condition:

$$\alpha^{2k-1} = \frac{y_{k-1}^2}{w}$$

Such an α exist. Just take α' which has divisor $(\alpha') = \frac{1}{2k-1}(2(y_{k-1}) - (w))$. Then $\alpha'^{2k-1} = u\frac{y_{k-1}^2}{w}$ for some unit u. Now take for $\alpha = u^{1/2k-1}\alpha'$ for some $2k - 1'th$ root of u.

We now put:

$$y_i = \alpha^{i-k+1} y_{k-1}$$

for $0 \leq i \leq k - 2$. Remark then that $\frac{y_0^2}{w}$ is indeed α. This gives the proposition in this case.

Case D_k^I

We just do the case $k = 2q$ even. The odd case is similar. This time we take

take H to be the compact part of (w). Left are the coefficients of H, on the right those of Z.

and we gave some exceptional curves names.

Claim: $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ has generators $x^2, y^{k-1}, zx, zy^{q-1}$ and xy^q.

By Artin $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ has five generators. Suppose:

$$ax^2 + by^{k-1} + czx + dzy^{q-1} + exy^q \in \mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(H)$$

x^2 is the only function of the above vanishing with order two along the central curve. Elements in $\mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(H)$ vanish with order at least three there. Therefore $a = 0$. We now look at the the curve B. The functions zx vanishes with order four there, the others left with higher order, and functions in $\mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(H)$ with at least order six. Therefore $c = 0$. We now look at the curve A. The function zy^{q-1} vanishes with order $4q - 3$, xy^q and y^{k-1} with order $4q - 2$. Also elements in $\mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(H)$ vanish with at least order $4q$. Therefore $d = 0$. Looking now at the curve F, we see that $b = 0$. By looking at the utmost right curve, we deduce finally that $e = 0$.

In the expression for w the term x^2 must occur (because of the vanishing at the central curve, and one of the terms zy^{q-1} or y^{k-1} must occur. (Look at the utmost right curve.) Because $2(z) = (y) + (w)$, one can take w such that $z^2 = yw$. After a coordinate transformation of type $z \mapsto z - \beta\frac{1}{2}y^q$ for some β we see that we do not need the term zy^{q-1}. For a similar reason we do not need the term zx. The rational function α in this case we define by $\alpha = \frac{w}{z}$.

$Case\,E_6$
We take H the compact part of the divisor of (w). The coefficients of H are on the left, those of Z on the right.

```
     3   6   9  12   8   4            1   2   3   4   3   2
     ■───●───●───●───●───●            ■───●───●───●───●───●
                 │F                               │
              A ●7                              ●2
```

Claim: For some constant $c \neq 0$ the function $y^2 + cx^3$ is in $\mathcal{O}(-H)$.
Obviously one has the inequality between divisors $(y^2 + cx^3) \geq H - A$ for all c. We will show that for some c the vanishing order of $y^2 + cx^3$ along A is at least seven, thereby proving the claim. Indeed, the rational function $\frac{y^2}{x^3}$ has no zeroes and poles along A, and must therefore be a constant $-c$. This c will do the job. After redefining y we may assume that $c = 1$.

Claim: $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ is generated by $y^2 + x^3, zx, zy, x^2y, xy^2$.
By Artin's Theorem the number of generators of $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ is five. Suppose

$$a(y^2 + x^3) + bzx + czy + dx^2y + exy^2 \in \mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$$

All functions expect $y^2 + x^3$ vanish with order at least four along the central curve. Also functions in $\mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$ vanish with order at least four along $E - 0$. As the function $(y^2 + x^3)$ vanish with order three along the central curve, we conclude that $a = 0$. The vanishing order of the functions along zx, zy, x^2y, xy^2 F is respectively $13, 15, 14, 16$. Functions in $\mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$ vanish with order at least 16 along F. Therefore we conclude that $b = c = d = 0$. We are left to show that $xy^2 \notin \mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$. To see this, look at the vanishing order along A. Of course $w \in \mathcal{O}(-H)$. In the expression for w the term $y^2 + x^3$ must occur, as it is the only function vanishing with order two along the central curve. Because one has the equality of divisors $2(z) = (y) + (w)$ one can argue as in the D_k^I case that, after a coordinate transformation one does not need the terms zx and zy in the expression for w. Also the term xy^2 can be taken care of by multiplying y by a suitable unit. Again we define $\alpha = \frac{w}{z}$.

Case E_7

We take H to be the compact part of the divisor of $w - cx^2$ for c general enough. Again left we have H, and right we have Z:

```
    2   6  10  14  18  12   6           1   3   4   5   6   4   2
    ■───●───●───●───●───●───●           ■───●───●───●───●───●───●
                │F                                   │
             A ●9                                  ●3
```

Claim: $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ has generators $x^2, y_0^3, xy_1, y_1^2, xy_0^2, y_0^2y_1, xy_2,$

27

By Artin's Theorem the number of generators of $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ is seven. So suppose that:

$$ax^2 + by_0^3 + cxy_1 + dy_1^2 + exy_0^2 + fy_0^2 y + gxy_2 \in \mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$$

for some constants $a, \ldots, g$. An element of $\mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$ vanishes with order at least three along the central curve. The function x^2 is the only one vanishing with order two along the central curve. Therefore $a = 0$. The vanishing orders of the functions $y_0^3, xy_1, y_1^2, xy_0^2, y_0^2 y_1, xy_2$ along F are $18, \ldots, 23$. An element in $\mathsf{m}\mathcal{O}(-H)$ has vanishing order 24 along F. Therefore, $b = \ldots = g = 0$. In the expression for $w - cx^2$ as element of $\mathcal{O}(-H)$ the term x^2 must occur, because x^2 is the only function vanishing with order 2 along the central curve. Similarly, the term y_0^3 must occur, as it vanishes with order 9 along A, and all other functions vanish with order at least 10 along A. By multiplying y_0 and w by units if necessary we wanted expression for w. The rational function α now is defined by the condition that $\alpha^3 = \frac{w}{y_0}$. We moreover put $y_i = \alpha^i y_0$. The 2×2 minors of M_a are identically zero in $\mathcal{O}_X$. $\square$

Proposition: *Let R_a and R_b be two rational double point configurations, and α_a and α_b the corresponding rational functions as defined in the previous proof. Then there exist units $u, v \in \mathcal{O}_X$ such that:*

$$\alpha_a - v\alpha_b = u.$$

proof: The pole divisor of both α_a and α_b on the minimal resolution consist of the *same* branch P intersecting the central curve transversally. The image of P on X is *smooth*, as the generic hyperplane section vanishes with multiplicity one on the central curve, hence has vanishing order one on P. The image of P on X we also denote by P. Consider a function ϕ in $\mathcal{O}_X$ whose non-compact divisor on the minimal resolution is equal to P + $REST$, where $REST$ has no points in common with P, and is reduced. Using Artin's Theorem, such functions are easy to construct. Consider the functions $\phi, \alpha_a\phi, \alpha_b\phi$. Because the pole divisor of α_a is just P, and the rational function α_a has degree one (hence does not vanish) on the central curve, the vanishing order on P of the function $\alpha_a\phi$ is exactly the vanishing order of ϕ along the central curve. Moreover the function $\alpha_a\phi$ vanishes on $REST$. as the same statements hold for $\alpha_b\phi$, it follows that modulo ϕ one has an equality:

$$\alpha_a\phi = u\alpha_b \text{ for some unit } u \in \mathcal{O}_X$$

We therefore have an equality:

$$\alpha_a \phi - u \alpha_b \phi = v \phi$$

for some $v \in \mathcal{O}_X$. We divide by ϕ:

$$\alpha_a - u \alpha_b = v$$

Because the zero divisor of α_a and α_b are completely different, even if restricted to the central curve, if follows that v is a unit. □

proof of the second statement of Theorem (2.3): We fix a rational double point configuration R_0. For every other rational double point configuration R_a we have, by Proposition (3.5) units u_a and v_a in $\mathcal{O}_X$ such that:

$$\alpha_0 = u_a + v_a \alpha_a.$$

Therefore, the 2×2 minors of the matrix N of Definition (2.2) are identically zero as elements of $\mathcal{O}_X$.

By abuse of notation we consider the x, y_{ia} as variables, so are parameters for the embedding space of X. Take lifts u_a, v_a in $\mathbb{C}\{x, y_{ia}\}$ which are also units. Then the 2×2 minors of N are in the ideal defining our sinuglarity X. We claim that they generate the ideal defining X. Suppose the contrary, i.e. there is a function f which vanishes identically on X but which is not in the ideal generated by the 2×2 minors of N. But in the previous section we saw that the space X' defined by the 2×2 minors of N define a rational surface singularity, in particular it is a normal surface singularity. But X is contained in the zero locus of f on X', which then is a (maybe non-reduced) curve singularity. But this is a contradiction, because we assumed that X is a rational *surface* singularity. □

§4 The T^1 and T^2 of a determinantal rational surface singularity

Let X be a determinantal rational surface singularity. In this section we give formulas for T^1_X and T^2_X. In obtaining the results of this section, experiments with the computer algebra system Singular [5] were helpful. Basic for us is the following result:

Theorem (4.1): [2] (5.1.1) *Let X be a rational surface singularity of multiplicity m. Then the number of generators of T_X^2 is $(m-1)(m-3)$.*

Behnke and Christophersen in their paper gave examples of rational surface singularities where the dimension of T^2 is exactly $(m-1)(m-3)$. Further investigations on the dimension of T^2 for rational surface singularities were carried out in [6]. Although formulated differently in loc.cit., their result can be stated as:

Theorem, (4.2): [6] (3.16 B) and (1.10) *Let X be a rational surface singularity with reduced fundamental cycle, of multiplicity $m \geq 3$. Let $\hat{X}$ be obtained from X by blowing-up the singular point. Then:*

$$dim(T_X^2) = (m-1)(m-3) + \sum_{p \in \hat{X}} dim(T_{\hat{X},p}^2)$$

The usefulness of this Theorem lies in the fact that the right hand side can be computed by a inductive procedure. Indeed, one has the following result of Tjurina:

Theorem (4.3): [11] *Let $\hat{X} \to X$ be the blow-up of X at the singular point of a rational surface singularity. Let X' be the space obtained from the minimal resolution of X by contracting all exceptional curves which intersects the fundamental cycle trivially. Then X' is isomorphic to $\hat{X}$.*

For a general rational surface singularity, the inequality:

$$dim(T_X^2) \geq (m-1)(m-3) + \sum_{p \in \hat{X}} dim(T_{\hat{X},p}^2)$$

has been proved recently by Christophersen and Gustavsen [3]. One cannot expect equality in general however, a counterexample is given in [2].
In order to investigate T^2 for rational determinantal singularities we recall the following result of Behnke and Christophersen:

Proposition (4.4): [2] (2.1.1) *Let $f_1, \ldots f_n, g_1, \ldots g_n$ be elements of the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{C}\{x_1, \ldots, x_e\}$. Let X be a Cohen-Macaulay singularity defined by the 2×2-minors of*

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_1 & f_2 & \cdots & f_n \\ g_1 & g_2 & \cdots & g_n \end{pmatrix}$$

30

Then the $\mathcal{O}_X$-module T_X^2 is annihilated by the ideal $(f_1, \ldots, f_n, g_1, \ldots, g_n)$.

Before applying this proposition, we do one small coordinate change in the equations for rational determinantal singularities; In case we have an A_k^q singularity for wich $p = 0$ (i.e. an A_{rq}^q singularity), we do the coordinate change:

$$y_0 \mapsto y_0 - x^r$$

Apart from this coordinate change, we assume that rational determinantal singularities are given by the equations of §2. We immediately deduce from these equations of determinantal rational surface singularities and the proposition of Behnke and Christophersen:

Proposition/Definition (4.5): *Let X be a rational determinantal surface singularity. We may assume that X is given by the equations of (?.?). Then the module T_X^2 is annihilated by all y_{ia}. Moreover T_X^2 is annihilated by x^ϕ, where $\phi = \phi(X)$ is given by the minimum over ϕ_a for all rational double point configurations. R_a. These ϕ_a are given by the following:*

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
A_1^0 & \phi_a = 1 & \\
A_{rq}^q & \phi_a = r + 1 & \\
A_k^q & \phi_a = r & k = lr - p \;\; 0 < p \le l - 1
\end{array}
$$

For all other rational double point configurations, one has $\phi_a = 2$.

Proposition (4.6): *Let X be a rational determinantal surface singularity. Then there exist a one paramater deformation $X_T \to T$ of X with on the general fibre ϕ_X rational surface singularities of multiplicity m, the multiplicity of X. This deformation occurs on the Artin component. By openness of versality, one might even assume that these singularities are all cones over rational normal curves of degree m.*

proof: Look at the equations of a determinantal rational surface singularity. (Note the coordinate change in case A_{rq}^q we did above). We are going to peturb the matrix which give the equations for the determinantal rational surface singularities. Then deform the singularity by taking the 2×2 minors of the peturbed matrix. This deformation then occurs on the Artin component, by a result of Wahl [13], (3.2). In the submatrix belonging to a rational double point configuration, there is a term x^{ϕ_a} occuring (with coefficient 1). We are going to peturb the matrix by just peturbing these terms. Fix pairwise different numbers $c_1, \ldots c_\phi$, which are all different from

31

1. Then peturb the term x^{ϕ_a} by $(x - c_1 t) \cdots (x - c_\phi)(x^{\phi - \phi_a} - t)$. For $t \neq 0$ we are getting singularities at $y_{ia} = 0$ and $x = c_i t$, for $i = 1, \ldots, \phi$. A tedious check shows that at these points, the singularity has multiplicity m.

Theorem (4.7): *Let X be a determinantal rational surface singularity of multiplicity $m \geq 3$. Then:*

$$dim(T_X^2) = (m-1)(m-3) + \sum_{p \in \hat{X}} dim(T_{\hat{X},p}^2)$$

proof: As remarked before, the inequality $\geq$ is a general result by Christophersen and Gustavsen, but in our case it can also be deduced quite elementary: It is well-known that the dimension of T_X^2 for a rational surface singularity of multiplicity m ($m \geq 3$) is at least $(m-1)(m-3)$. Use the above deformation into ϕ rational surface singularities of multiplicity m (the multiplicity of X) and semicontinuity of the dimension of T^2 to get the inequality $\geq$. Now we turn our attention to the other inequality. The number of generators of T_X^2 is $(m-1)(m-3)$. Using our knowlegde on annihilation of T_X^2 by the functions y_{ia} and x^ϕ, we deduce that $dim(T_X^2) \leq (m-1)(m-3)\phi$. We claim that

$$(m-1)(m-3)\phi = (m-1)(m-3) + \sum_{p \in \hat{X}} dim(T_{\hat{X},p}^2)$$

This is just an investigation of the blow-up of a rational determinantal surface singularity, using the result of Tjurina. From Wahl's result on the structure of the resolution of a rational determinantal surface singularities, and Tjurina's result on the blow-up of we deduce that we have the following two possibilities:

1. The fundamental cycle Z intersects the central curve strictly negative, i.e. we have an A_1^0 singularity. Then $\phi = 1$, and on the first blow up $\hat{X}$ we just have rational double points. So $\sum_{p \in \hat{X}} dim(T_{\hat{X},p}^2) = 0$, which proves the theorem in this case.

2. Z intersects the central curve trivially. Then on $\hat{X}$ we have, apart from rational double points, just one rational determinantal surface singularity, say X'. We claim that $\phi(X') = \phi(X) - 1$. This just a case by case check, using Tjurina's description and the computation sequence for the fundamental cycle Z. For instance suppose that one

32

has a E_6, E_7 or D_k^I configuration for X, then X' has an A_1^0 singularity, as the fundamental cycle for X' now will intersect the central curve negatively. So we just have to investigate the A_k^l case, which is easy, either using the resolution and Tjurina's result, or using the equations and the definition of ϕ immediately. This proves the claim. As after a finite number of steps we get the first case, we are done proving the inequality $\leq$. □

As a corollary of the result of T_X^2, and the existence of the special one parameter deformation, one also gets a result on the dimension of T_X^1, and on the surjectivity of the obstruction map:

Corollary (4.8): *Let X be a determinantal rational surface singularity, of multiplicity m and let $\phi = \phi(X)$. Let $(\tilde{X}, E) \to (X, x)$ be the minimal resolution. Let $\Theta_{\tilde{X}}$ be the tangent sheaf of $\tilde{X}$. Then:*

$$dim(T_X^1) = (m-3)\phi + dim(H^1(\Theta_{\tilde{X}}))$$

proof: We look at the one parameter deformation X_T of X which has ϕ cones over the rational normal curve of degree m on the general fibre. Look at the associated long exact sequence of cotangent modules:

$$\ldots \to T_{X_T/T}^1 \overset{\cdot t}{\to} T_{X_T/T}^1 \overset{\alpha}{\to} T_X^1 \to T_{X_T/T}^2 \overset{\cdot t}{\to} T_{X_T/T}^2 \overset{\beta}{\to} T_X^2 \ldots$$

The dimension of T^2 for a cone over the rational normal curve of degree m is $(m-1)(m-3)$, so the $\mathbb{C}\{t\}$-module $T_{X_T/T}^2$ has rank at least $\phi(m-1)(m-3)$. Hence the image of β has at least dimension $\phi(m-1)(m-3)$, which we just proved to be the dimension of T_X^2. Therefore β is *surjective*, and it follows that there are no other singularities on a general fibre, apart maybe from rational double and triple points. As a finitely generated $\mathbb{C}\{t\}$-module, the rank of $T_{X_T/T}^2$ is $dim(coker(\cdot t)) - dim(ker(\cdot t))$. Thereforem multiplication by t is injective on $T_{X_T/T}^2$. From the exact sequence it follows that α is *surjective* too. The proof now literally goes as in [6], proof of (3.16 A), which we repeat here. One knows that $dim(H^1(\Theta_{\tilde{X}}))$ is the dimension of the Artin component, which is well-known to be smooth. We denote by $cod(X)$ the codimension of the Artin component in T_X^1. The statement of the Theorem simply is:

$$cod(X) = (m-3)\phi$$

33

By Greuel and Looijenga [4] the dimension of the image of α (so in our case $dim(T_X^1)$) is the dimension of the Zariski-tangent space at a general point of $j(T)$, where $j(T) \to$ the base space of a semi-universal deformation of X, is a map, inducing by base change the given one parameter deformation $X_T \to T$. Now $j(T)$ lies on the Artin component, which is smooth. Openness of versality gives that codimension of the Artin component is additive. The codimension of the Artin component of the cone of the rational normal curve of degree m is $m - 3$ [8], and one has ϕ on those on the general fibre, the result follows. $\qquad\square$

Corollary (4.9): *The "obstruction map" for a determinantal rational surface singularity is surjective, i.e. the minimal number of equations to describe the base space of a semiuniversal deformation of a determinantal rational surface singularity X is the dimension of T_X^2*

Just repeat the argument of [6] (4.2).

References

[1] M. Artin: *On isolated rational singularities of surfaces*, Am. J. Math. **88** (1966), 129-136.

[2] K. Behnke and J.A. Christophersen: *Hypersurface sections and obstructions (rational surface singularities)*, Comp. Math. **77** (1991), 233-268.

[3] Jan Christophersen and Trond Stølen Gustavsen: *Dimension formulas for T^1 and T^2 of rational singularities*, in preparation.

[4] G.-M. Greuel and E. Looijenga: *The dimension of smoothing components*, Duke Math. J. **52** (1985), 263-272.

[5] G.-M. Greuel, G. Pfister and H. Schönemann: *Singular*, ftp: helios@mathematik.uni-kl.de

[6] T. de Jong and D. van Straten: *On the deformation theory of rational surface singularities with reduced fundamental cycle*, J. Alg. Geom. **3** (1994), 117-172.

[7] H. Laufer: *Taut two-dimensional singularities*, Math. An.. **205** (1973), 131-164.

[8] H. Pinkham: *Deformations of singularities with $\mathbb{G}_m$-action*, Astérisque **20**, Paris 1974.

[9] A. Röhr: *Formate rationaler Flächensingularitäten*, Thesis Hamburg, 1992.

[10] D. van Straten: *Weakly normal surface singularities and their improvements*, Thesis Leiden, 1987.

[11] G.-N. Tjurina: *Absolute isolatedness of rational singularities and triple rational points*, Func. Anal. Appl. **2** (1968), 324-332.

[12] J.M. Wahl: *Equations defining rational singularities*, Ann. Sci. É cole Norm. Sup (4) **10** (1977) 231-264.

[13] J.M. Wahl: *Simultaneous resolution of rational singularities*, Comp. Math. **38** (1979), 43-54.