

EVERY ALGEBRAIC KUMMER SURFACE IS THE K3-COVER OF AN ENRIQUES SURFACE

JONG HAE KEUM

Introduction

A *Kummer surface* is the minimal desingularization of the surface T/i , where T is a complex torus of dimension 2 and i the involution automorphism on T . T is an abelian surface if and only if its associated Kummer surface is algebraic. Kummer surfaces are among classical examples of K3-surfaces (which are simply-connected smooth surfaces with a nowhere-vanishing holomorphic 2-form), and play a crucial role in the theory of K3-surfaces. In a sense, all Kummer surfaces (resp. algebraic Kummer surfaces) form a 4 (resp. 3)-dimensional subset in the 20 (resp. 19)-dimensional family of K3-surfaces (resp. algebraic K3 surfaces).

An *Enriques surface* is a smooth projective surface Y with $2K_Y = 0$, $H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = H^2(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = 0$. The unramified double cover of Y defined by the torsion class K_Y is an algebraic K3-surface. Conversely, if an algebraic K3-surface X admits a fixed-point-free involution τ , then the quotient surface X/τ is an Enriques surface. It is known that all Enriques surfaces form a 10-dimensional moduli space.

Let X be a surface. The *Picard number* of X , denoted by $\rho(X)$, is the rank of the *Néron-Severi group* $\text{NS}(X)$, the sublattice of $H^2(X, \mathbf{Z})$ generated by algebraic cycles. The *transcendental lattice* T_X of X is the orthogonal complement of $\text{NS}(X)$ in $H^2(X, \mathbf{Z})$. If X is a K3-surface, then $0 \leq \rho(X) \leq 20$. If X is the K3-cover of an Enriques surface, then $\rho(X) \geq 10$.

Let L be a lattice, i.e. a free \mathbf{Z} -module of finite rank together with a \mathbf{Z} -valued symmetric bilinear form. For every integer m we denote by $L(m)$ the lattice obtained from L by multiplying the values of its bilinear form by m . The *length* of L , denoted by $l(L)$, is the minimum number of generators of $L^*/j(L)$, where $j: L \rightarrow L^* = \text{Hom}(L, \mathbf{Z})$ is the natural

Received November 28, 1988.

homomorphism.

Let U and E_8 denote the even unimodular lattices of signature $(1, 1)$ and $(0, 8)$ respectively.

THEOREM 1. (Criterion for a K3-surface to cover an Enriques surface).

Let X be an algebraic K3-surface.

Assume that $l(T_X) + 2 \leq \rho(X)$. (This is true if $\rho(X) \geq 12$.)

Then the following are equivalent.

- (i) X admits a fixed-point-free involution.
- (ii) There exists a primitive embedding of T_X into $\Lambda^- = U \oplus U(2) \oplus E_8(2)$ such that the orthogonal complement of T_X in Λ^- contains no vectors of self-intersection -2 .

Remark. The assumption that $l(T_X) + 2 \leq \rho(X)$ is needed only for the part (ii) \Rightarrow (i).

Theorem 1 is a consequence of the uniqueness theorem on embeddings of even lattices [Nik 2] and the “surjectivity of the period map for Enriques surfaces” [Ho 2]. Making use of Theorem 1 and the criterion, due to Nikulin, for a K3-surface to be Kummer ([Nik 1] & [Mor]) we can prove the following result:

THEOREM 2. Every algebraic Kummer surface is the K3-cover of some Enriques surface.

§ 0. Preliminaries

(0.1) **DEFINITION.** A \mathbf{Z} -module isomorphism of lattices preserving the bilinear form is called an *isometry*. The group of self-isometries of a lattice L , denoted by $O(L)$, is called the orthogonal group of L (or the group of units).

A lattice is *even* if the associated quadratic form takes on only even integer values, and is *odd* if the quadratic form takes on some odd value.

The *discriminant* of a lattice L , written $\text{discr}(L)$, is the determinant of the matrix of its bilinear form. A lattice is *non-degenerate* if its discriminant is non-zero, and *unimodular* if its discriminant is ± 1 . If L is a non-degenerate lattice, the *signature* of L is a pair (t_+, t_-) , where t_{\pm} denotes the multiplicity of the eigenvalue ± 1 for the quadratic form on $L \otimes \mathbf{R}$. A lattice is *indefinite* if the associated quadratic form takes on both positive and negative values. An indefinite lattice L of signature $(1, t_-)$ or $(t_+, 1)$ is called a *hyperbolic lattice*.

An embedding $L \rightarrow M$ is *primitive* if M/L is torsion free.

(0.2) **EXAMPLES.** (i) By A_n, D_n, E_n we denote the even negative definite lattices defined by the matrix equal to the Cartan matrix of an irreducible root system of type A_n, D_n, E_n respectively [Bour; Chap. VI]. For example, the bilinear form on E_8 is given by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

E_8 is the only unimodular lattice among A_n, D_n, E_n 's.

(ii) U denotes the hyperbolic lattice of rank 2 defined by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is an even unimodular lattice; note that $U(-m) \cong U(m)$ for any integer m .

(iii) For any integer n we denote by $\langle n \rangle$ the lattice $\mathbb{Z}e$ with $\langle e, e \rangle = n$.

(0.3) **THEOREM** [Nik 2; Corollary 1.12.3 & Theorem 1.14.4]. *A primitive embedding of an even non-degenerate lattice L of signature (s_+, s_-) into an even unimodular lattice M of signature (t_+, t_-) exists provided that*

$$s_+ \leq t_+, \quad s_- \leq t_-, \quad \text{and} \quad l(L) + 1 \leq \text{rank}(M) - \text{rank}(L).$$

Furthermore, if the three inequalities are all strict, then the primitive embedding is unique.

The following corollaries will be used later.

(0.3.1) **COROLLARY.** *There is a primitive embedding of $\langle -2 \rangle \oplus \langle -2m \rangle$ into the even unimodular lattice E_8 for any positive integer m .*

Proof. Note that $\text{sign}(E_8) = (0, 8)$, $\text{sign}(\langle -2 \rangle \oplus \langle -2m \rangle) = (0, 2)$, and $l(\langle -2 \rangle \oplus \langle -2m \rangle) = 2$. The corollary follows from (0.3). Q.E.D.

(0.3.2) COROLLARY. *There is a primitive embedding of $\langle -2m \rangle$ into E_8 for any positive integer m .*

(0.4) Let X be a K3-surface. It is known (see [B-P-V; Chap. VIII]) that $H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ (with its intersection pairing) is isomorphic as an abstract lattice to the lattice, called the *K3-lattice*,

$$\Lambda = U \oplus U \oplus U \oplus E_8 \oplus E_8.$$

(0.5) DEFINITION. Let T be a complex torus of dimension two. The involution automorphism $i: T \rightarrow T, i(x) = -x$, has sixteen fixed points, namely the points of order 2 on T . The quotient surface T/i has sixteen ordinary double points (i.e. singular points of type A_1). Resolving the double points we obtain a smooth surface X , called the *Kummer surface* of T . X has sixteen exceptional curves of self-intersection -2 arising from the resolution of singularities. Note that T is an abelian surface if and only if its associated Kummer surface is an algebraic K3-surface.

(0.6) THEOREM [Nik 1]. *There is an even, negative definite lattice Π of rank 16, called the Kummer lattice, with the following properties:*

(i) *Π admits a unique primitive embedding into the K3 lattice Λ and its orthogonal complement in Λ is isomorphic to $U(2)^3$.*

(ii) *If X is a Kummer surface, then the minimal primitive sublattice of $H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ containing the classes of the sixteen exceptional curves on X is isomorphic to Π .*

(iii) *A K3-surface X is Kummer if and only if there is a primitive embedding of Π into the Néron-Severi group $NS(X)$.*

The following criterion is an alternative to (0.6) (iii).

(0.6.1) COROLLARY [Mor; Cor. 4.4]. *Let X be an algebraic K3-surface.*

(i) *If $\rho(X) = 19$ or 20 , then X is a Kummer surface if and only if there is an even lattice T' with $T_X \cong T'(2)$.*

(ii) *If $\rho(X) = 18$, then X is a Kummer surface if and only if there is an even lattice T' with $T_X \cong U(2) \oplus T'(2)$.*

(iii) *If $\rho(X) = 17$, then X is a Kummer surface if and only if there is an even lattice T' with $T_X \cong U(2)^2 \oplus T'(2)$.*

(iv) *If $\rho(X) \leq 16$, then X is not a Kummer surface.*

§1. Proof of Theorem 1

(1.1) Let X be a K3 surface. Since $p_g(X) = 1$, the choice of an

isometry $\phi: H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \Lambda$ determines a line in $\Lambda_{\mathbf{C}} = \Lambda \otimes \mathbf{C}$ spanned by the $\phi_{\mathbf{C}}$ -image of a nowhere vanishing holomorphic 2-form ω_X . The point $[\omega_X] \in \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_{\mathbf{C}})$ is called *the period point* of the *marked K3-surface* (X, ϕ) .

The following theorem goes by the name “(weak) Torelli theorem for K3 surfaces”.

(1.2) **THEOREM** ([P-S], [B-R], [B-P-V]). *Two K3 surfaces are isomorphic if and only if there are markings for them, such that the corresponding period points are the same.*

(1.3) Let Y be an Enriques surface. It is known (see [B-P-V; Chap. VIII]) that

$$\text{Pic}(Y) \cong \text{NS}(Y) \cong H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z}) \cong \mathbf{Z}^{10} \oplus \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$$

and that the lattice $H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z})_f$, the torsion-free-part of $H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z})$, is isomorphic to the even unimodular lattice $U \oplus E_8$ of signature (1,9). If X is the K3-cover of Y , then $\text{Pic}(X)$ contains $p^*(\text{Pic}(Y)) \cong U(2) \oplus E_8(2)$ as a primitive sublattice, where $p: X \rightarrow Y$ is the covering projection. In particular, $\rho(X) \geq 10$.

(1.4) Let Λ be the K3-lattice, that is,

$$\Lambda = U \oplus U \oplus U \oplus E_8 \oplus E_8.$$

We fix a basis of Λ of the form $v_1, v_2, v'_1, v'_2, v''_1, v''_2, e'_1, \dots, e'_8, e''_1, \dots, e''_8$, where the first three pairs are the standard bases of U and the remaining two octuples are the standard bases of E_8 .

Let $\theta: \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ be the involution given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(v_i) &= -v_i, & \theta(v'_i) &= v''_i, & \theta(v''_i) &= v'_i, & i &= 1, 2, \\ \theta(e'_i) &= e''_i, & \theta(e''_i) &= e'_i, & i &= 1, \dots, 8. \end{aligned}$$

Then the θ -invariant sublattice, denoted by Λ^+ , is

$$\Lambda^+ = \mathbf{Z}y_1 \oplus \mathbf{Z}y_2 \oplus \mathbf{Z}e_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{Z}e_8,$$

where $y_i = v'_i + v''_i$, $i = 1, 2$ and $e_i = e'_i + e''_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$.

The θ -anti-invariant sublattice, denoted by Λ^- , is

$$\Lambda^- = \mathbf{Z}\bar{y}_1 \oplus \mathbf{Z}\bar{y}_2 \oplus \mathbf{Z}\bar{e}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{Z}\bar{e}_8 \oplus \mathbf{Z}u_1 \oplus \mathbf{Z}u_2,$$

where $\bar{y}_i = v'_i - v''_i$, $i = 1, 2$, $\bar{e}_i = e'_i - e''_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$.

It is easy to see that

$$\Lambda^+ \cong U(2) \oplus E_8(2), \quad \Lambda^- \cong U(2) \oplus E_8(2) \oplus U, \quad (\Lambda^+)^{\perp} = \Lambda^-,$$

and that both Λ^+ and Λ^- are primitive sublattices of Λ .

(1.5) LEMMA [Ho 1; Theorem 5.1]. *Let X be the K3-cover of an Enriques surface Y , and let $\tau: X \rightarrow X$ be the covering involution. Then there exists an isometry*

$$\phi: H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}) \longrightarrow \Lambda$$

such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}) & \xrightarrow{\tau^*} & H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}) \\ \phi \downarrow & & \phi \downarrow \\ \Lambda & \xrightarrow{\theta} & \Lambda \end{array}$$

commutes.

In particular, ϕ induces an isomorphism

$$\bar{\phi}: H^2(X, \mathbf{Z})^{\tau^*} = p^*H^2(Y, \mathbf{Z}) = p^* \text{Pic}(Y) \longrightarrow \Lambda^+,$$

where $p: X \rightarrow Y$ is the covering projection.

(1.6) Remark. The choice of ϕ as in Lemma (1.5) is unique up to

$$\Gamma = \{g \in O(\Lambda): g \circ \theta = \theta \circ g\}.$$

(1.7) A marked Enriques surface is a pair (Y, ϕ) with Y an Enriques surface and $\phi: H^2(X, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \Lambda$ an isometry satisfying $\phi \circ \tau^* = \theta \circ \phi$, as in Lemma (1.5). Since $\tau^*\omega_X = -\omega_X$ (there is no holomorphic 2-form on Y), the period point $[\omega_X]$, called the *period point* of (Y, ϕ) , of the marked K3 surface (X, ϕ) belongs to the set

$$\Omega^- = \{[\omega] \in \mathbf{P}(\Lambda^- \otimes \mathbf{C}): \langle \omega, \omega \rangle = 0, \langle \omega, \bar{\omega} \rangle > 0\}.$$

By Remark (1.6), the assignment

$$Y: \longrightarrow [\omega_X] \in \Omega^- / \Gamma_r,$$

where $\Gamma_r = \{g|_{\Lambda^-}: g \in \Gamma\}$, is well defined and called the *period map for Enriques surfaces*.

Global Torelli theorem for Enriques surfaces [Ho 1] says that this period map is injective.

(1.8) NOTATION.

$$\Omega_0^- = \{[\omega] \in \Omega^- : \langle \omega, \delta \rangle \neq 0 \text{ for any } \delta \in \Lambda^-, \langle \delta, \delta \rangle = -2\}$$

$$D_0 = \Omega_0^- / \Gamma_\tau.$$

The next theorem, which is due to Horikawa, goes by the name “the surjectivity of the period map for Enriques surfaces”.

(1.9) **THEOREM** ([Ho 2] & [B-P-V]). *Every point of D_0 is the period point of an Enriques surface. In other words, every point of Ω_0^- is the period point of some marked Enriques surface.*

(1.10) **LEMMA.** *Let X be a K3 surface, and let d be a divisor on X of self-intersection ≥ -2 . Then either d or $-d$ is effective.*

Proof. Riemann-Roch yields the inequality

$$h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(d)) + h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(-d)) = \frac{1}{2} \langle d, d \rangle + 2 + h^1(\mathcal{O}_X(-d)) \geq 1,$$

and hence $\mathcal{O}_X(d)$ or $\mathcal{O}_X(-d)$ has a non-trivial section. Q.E.D.

(1.11) *Proof of Theorem 1.*

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $p: X \rightarrow Y$ be the unramified covering of an Enriques surface Y , and let τ, ϕ be the same as in (1.5).

Then, $\phi(\text{Pic}(X)) \supseteq \phi(p^*(\text{Pic}(Y))) = \Lambda^+$, so we have $\phi(T_X) \subseteq \Lambda^-$. This embedding is primitive, for an isometry preserves primitivity. Now suppose that Λ^- contains a vector v with $v^2 = -2$, $v_\perp \phi(T)$. Then the class $d = \phi^{-1}(v)$ belongs to $\text{Pic}(X)$ and, by (1.10), d or $-d$ is effective. But no effective class can be τ^* -anti-invariant as is $\pm d$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $\psi_1: T_X \rightarrow \Lambda^-$ be a primitive embedding such that no (-2) -vector in Λ^- is orthogonal to $\psi_1(T_X)$.

Claim. ψ_1 extends to an isometry $\psi: H^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \Lambda$.

Proof of the claim. Fix an isometry $\psi_2: H^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \Lambda$.

Then we have two embeddings of $T = T_X$ into Λ , namely,

$$\psi_1: T \longrightarrow \Lambda^- \subseteq \Lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_2|_T: T \longrightarrow \Lambda.$$

Since T has signature $(2, 20 - \rho)$ and since $l(T) + 2 \leq \rho(X) = \text{rank}(\Lambda) - \text{rank}(T)$, by (0.3), there exists $\nu \in O(\Lambda)$ such that $\psi_1 = \nu \circ \psi_2|_T$. We take $\psi = \nu \circ \psi_2$ and the claim is proved. Now, since $\omega_x \in T \otimes \mathbb{C} \subseteq H^2(X, \mathbb{C})$, the period point $[\omega_x]$ of the marked K3-surface (X, ψ) belongs to Ω_0^- . By (1.9), there exists a marked Enriques surface (Y, ϕ) whose period point is equal to $[\omega_x]$. But then, by (1.2), the K3-cover X' of Y is isomorphic

to X , and the covering involution on X' lifts to a fixed-point-free involution on X . Q.E.D.

§ 2. Proof of Theorem 2

By Theorem 1, it suffices to prove that there exists a primitive embedding of T_x into Λ^- with no (-2) -vectors in the orthogonal complement. We split the proof into four cases.

Case 1. $\rho(X) = 17$.

By (0.6.1) (iii), $T_x = U(2) \oplus U(2) \oplus \langle -4m \rangle$ for some positive integer m . There exists such a primitive embedding $T_x \rightarrow \Lambda^- = U(2) \oplus U \oplus E_8(2)$ if there exists a primitive embedding $U(2) \oplus \langle -4m \rangle \rightarrow U \oplus E_8(2)$ with no (-2) -vectors in the orthogonal complement.

Let $\{x, y, t\}$ be a standard basis of $U(2) \oplus \langle -4m \rangle$, that is

$$x^2 = y^2 = \langle x, t \rangle = \langle y, t \rangle = 0, \quad \langle x, y \rangle = 2, \quad t^2 = -4m,$$

and let $\{e, f\}$ be a standard basis of U ,

$$e^2 = f^2 = 0, \quad \langle e, f \rangle = 1,$$

By (0.3.1), we can pick up two elements w_1 and w_2 of $E_8(2)$ which generate a primitive sublattice of $E_8(2)$ isomorphic to $\langle -4 \rangle \oplus \langle -4m \rangle$. Define a map $\phi: U(2) \oplus \langle -4m \rangle \rightarrow U \oplus E_8(2)$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) &= e, \\ \phi(y) &= e + 2f + w_1, \\ \phi(t) &= w_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\phi(x)^2 = \phi(y)^2 = \langle \phi(x), \phi(t) \rangle = \langle \phi(y), \phi(t) \rangle = 0$,

$$\langle \phi(x), \phi(y) \rangle = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(t)^2 = -4m.$$

So, ϕ is an embedding.

If $kd, d \in U \oplus E_8(2)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, belongs to $\text{im } \phi$, then $kd = he + i(e + 2f + w_1) + jw_2$ for some $h, i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Write $d = u + w$, $u \in U$, $w \in E_8(2)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} ku &= (h + i)e + 2if, \\ kw &= iw_1 + jw_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{w_1, w_2\}$ generates a primitive sublattice of $E_8(2)$, k divides both i and j and hence h . Thus $d \in \text{im } \phi$. This proves that ϕ is primitive.

If $\mathbf{d} \in U \oplus E_8(2)$ is orthogonal to $\text{im } \phi$, then \mathbf{d} has to be of the form

$$\mathbf{d} = k\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{w}, \quad k \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad \mathbf{w} \in E_8(2).$$

But then $\mathbf{d}^2 = \mathbf{w}^2 \neq -2$, for E_8 is even. Therefore, the orthogonal complement of $\text{im } \phi$ contains no (-2) -vectors.

Case 2. $\rho(X) = 18$.

By (0.6.1) (ii), $T_x \cong U(2) \oplus T'(2)$ for some even lattice T' of signature $(1, 1)$. Since $T'(2)$ is indefinite, there is a primitive element \mathbf{y} of $T'(2)$, $\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y} \rangle < 0$. Extend $\{\mathbf{y}\}$ to a basis $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\}$ of $T'(2)$. Then $\mathbf{x}^2 = 4a$, $\mathbf{y}^2 = 4c$, $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle = 2b$ for some integers a, b and $c, c < 0$.

By (0.3.2), one can pick up a primitive element $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^2 = 4c$, of $E_8(2)$. Define a map $\psi: T'(2) \rightarrow U \oplus E_8(2)$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{e} + 2a\mathbf{f} \\ \psi(\mathbf{y}) &= 2b\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{w}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f}\}$ is the standard basis of U . Then ψ is an embedding.

If $k\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \in U, \mathbf{v} \in E_8(2), k \in \mathbf{Z}$, belongs to $\text{im } \psi$, then

$$k\mathbf{d} = k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) = i(\mathbf{e} + 2a\mathbf{f}) + j(2b\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{w}).$$

Comparing both sides, we get

$$\begin{aligned} k\mathbf{u} &= i\mathbf{e} + (2ai + 2bj)\mathbf{f}, \\ k\mathbf{v} &= j\mathbf{w}. \end{aligned}$$

The primitivity of \mathbf{w} implies that k divides j , and hence i . But then $\mathbf{d} \in \text{im } \psi$. So, ψ is primitive.

If $\mathbf{d} = m\mathbf{e} + n\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{v}, m, n \in \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{v} \in E_8(2)$, is orthogonal to $\text{im } \psi$, then $0 = \langle \mathbf{d}, \psi(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = 2am + n$, so n is an even integer. Since E_8 is even, $\mathbf{d}^2 = 2mn + \mathbf{v}^2 \neq -2$. This proves that no (-2) -vector lies in the orthogonal complement of $\text{im } \psi$.

Case 3. $\rho(X) = 19$.

By (0.6.1) (i),

$$T_x \cong \begin{pmatrix} 4a & 2d & 2e \\ 2d & 4b & 2f \\ 2e & 2f & 4c \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e., there exists a basis $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}\}$ of T_x such that

$$x^2 = 4a, \quad y^2 = 4b, \quad z^2 = 4c, \quad \langle x, y \rangle = 2d, \dots, \text{etc.}$$

Since T_x is indefinite, we may assume $c < 0$.

Let $\{e, f\}$ and $\{h, k\}$ be the standard bases of U and $U(2)$, respectively. Let w be the same as in Case 2, that is, w is a primitive element of $E_8(2)$ with $w^2 = 4c$.

Define $\eta: T_x \rightarrow U \oplus U(2) \oplus E_8(2)$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(x) &= e + 2af \\ \eta(y) &= 2df + h + bk \\ \eta(z) &= 2ef + fk + w. \end{aligned}$$

Then η is an embedding.

By the same argument as in Case 1 & 2, the primitivities of w, h, e imply the primitivity of η .

If $d = ie + jk + kh + mk + v, i, j, k, m \in \mathbb{Z}, v \in E_8(2)$, belongs to the orthogonal complement of $\eta(T_x)$, then $0 = \langle d, \eta(x) \rangle = 2ai + j$, so j is an even integer. But then $d^2 = 2ij + 4km + v^2 \neq -2$. This proves the case 3.

Case 4. $\rho(X) = 20$.

Again, by (0.6.1) (i), T_x has a basis $\{x, y\}$ with

$$x^2 = 4a, \quad y^2 = 4c, \quad \langle x, y \rangle = 2b.$$

Define $\nu: T_x \rightarrow U \oplus U(2) \oplus E_8(2)$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(x) &= e + 2af \\ \nu(y) &= 2bf + h + ck, \end{aligned}$$

where, again, $\{e, f\}$ and $\{h, k\}$ are the standard bases of U and $U(2)$, respectively. Then it is easy to see that ν is a primitive embedding. It is also easy, by the same argument as in Case 3, to see that there are no (-2) -vectors in the orthogonal complement. Q.E.D.

§ 3. Examples

(3.1) (Lieberman). Let A be the product of two elliptic curves E_1 and E_2 and let $(e_1, e_2), e_i \in E_i, e_i \neq 0, i = 1, 2$, be a 2-torsion point of A . Then the endomorphism $\sigma: A \rightarrow A$ given by the formula

$$\sigma(z_1, z_2) = (-z_1 + e_1, z_2 + e_2), \quad (z_1, z_2) \in A = E_1 \times E_2,$$

induces a fixed-point-free involution on the Kummer surface $\text{Km}(A)$.

(3.2) *Remark.* Let A be an abelian surface.

If A splits, i.e., $A = E_1 \times E_2$, a product of two elliptic curves, then $\rho(\text{Km}(A)) \geq 18$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(A) &= 4 \text{ if } E_1 \text{ is isogeneous to } E_2 \text{ and has a complex multiplication,} \\ &= 3 \text{ if } E_1 \text{ is isogeneous to } E_2 \text{ but does not have a complex multipli-} \\ &\quad \text{cation,} \\ &= 2 \text{ if } E_1 \text{ is not isogeneous to } E_2 \text{ (cf. [Mum]).} \end{aligned}$$

If $\rho(A) = 4$ (i.e. $\rho(\text{Km}(A)) = 20$), then A always splits [S-M].

If $\rho(A) \leq 3$, then A may not.

(3.3) Let A be a principally polarized abelian surface which does not split. Then A is the Jacobian $J(C)$ of some curve C of genus 2 and $\text{Km}(A)$ is isomorphic to the resolution of a quartic surface F in \mathbf{P}^3 with sixteen nodes. The equation of F referred to a Göpel tetrad of nodes has the form

$$\begin{aligned} A(x^2t^2 + y^2z^2) + B(y^2t^2 + z^2x^2) + C(z^2t^2 + x^2y^2) \\ = Dxyzt + F(yt + zx)(zt + xy) + G(zt + xy)(xt + yz) \\ + H(xt + yz)(yt + zx) = 0 \quad [\text{Hut}]. \end{aligned}$$

For a generic choice of coefficients, the standard Cremona transformation acts freely.

REFERENCES

- [Bour] Bourbaki, N., Groupes et Algèbres de Lie, Chap. IV, V, VI., Paris, Hermann, 1968.
- [B-P-V] Barth, W., Peters, C., Van de Ven, A., Compact Complex Surfaces, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1984.
- [B-R] Burns, D., Rapoport, M., On the Torelli problem for Kählerian K3-surfaces, Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup., **8** (1975), 235–274.
- [Ho 1 & 2] Horikawa, E., On the periods of Enriques surfaces. I, II, Math. Ann., **234** (1978), 73–88; **235** (1978), 217–246.
- [Hut] Hutchinson, J. I., On some birational transformations of the Kummer surface into itself, A.M.S. Bulletin, **7** (1901), 211–217.
- [Mor] Morrison, D. R., On K3-surfaces with large Picard number, Invent. Math., **75** (1984), 105–121.
- [Mum] Mumford, D., Abelian Varieties, Oxford U. Press, Oxford, 1970.
- [Nik 1] Nikulin, V., On Kummer surfaces, Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, **39** (1975), 278–293; Math. USSR Izvestija, **9** (1975), 261–275.
- [Nik 2] Nikulin, V., Integral quadratic bilinear forms and some of their applications, Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, **43**, No. 1 (1979), 111–177; Math. USSR Izv., **14**, No. 1 (1980), 103–167.

- [P-S] Piateckii-Shapiro, I., Shafarevich, I. R., A Torelli theorem for algebraic surfaces of type K3, *Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR*, **35** (1971), 530–572; *Math. USSR Izv.*, **5** (1971), 547–587.
- [S-M] Shioda, T., Mitani, N., Singular abelian surfaces and binary quadratic forms, in “Classification of algebraic varieties and compact complex manifolds”, *Spr. Lec. Notes*, No. 412, 1974.

Department of Mathematics
University of Utah
Salt Lake City
UT 84112, USA