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#### Abstract

Using the theory of the universal torsor, we prove that two rational points on a smooth projective toric variety over an infinite field that are rationally equivalent can in fact be connected by a very free rational curve. We also show a similar result over del Pezzo surfaces of degree 5 .


## Introduction

Let $X$ be a smooth projective variety over an infinite field $k$, and assume that $X$ is (geometrically) separably rationally connected, meaning that, over the algebraic closure $\bar{k}$, there exists an $f: \mathbb{P}_{\bar{k}}^{1} \rightarrow X_{\bar{k}}$ which is "very free" in the sense that $f^{*} T_{X}$ is ample (in other words, $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{P}^{1},\left(f^{*} T_{X}\right)(-2)\right)=0$ ). If $x$ and $y$ are two $k$-rational points of $X$ (assuming there are any) which are "Requivalent", that is, which can be joined by a chain of rational curves on $X$ (each defined over $k$ ), we can ask ourselves whether there exists $f: \mathbb{P}_{k}^{1} \rightarrow X$ defined over $k$ such that $f(0)=x$, and $f(\infty)=y$ and $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{P}^{1},\left(f^{*} T_{X}\right)(-2)\right)=$ 0 : if such is the case, we say that $x$ and $y$ are R-equivalent by a single very free rational curve.

It is true over $k$ algebraically closed that any two points on a smooth projective separably rationally connected variety $X$ are in fact joined by a single very free rational curve (see [7] for a proof of this fact as well as all introductory material on rationally connected varieties).

[^0]In the case where $k$ is no longer algebraically closed but "large", meaning that every irreducible variety that has a smooth $k$-point has a Zariski dense subset of them, for example when $k$ is a local field, then the answer is again affirmative: this is the result of a recent work by Kollár ([8], theorem 23)any two points (on a smooth projective rationally connected variety) which are R-equivalent are so by a single very free rational curve.

For other fields $k$, however, the answer to the question is unknown, even in some simple cases.

When $X$ is a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 4 over $k$, for example, it is known that every universal torsor over $X$ (a term which we will define below) having a $k$-point is $k$-rational (see [3]), so two rationally equivalent points on $X$ are R-equivalent, but it is not known whether they can be joined by a single very free rational curve. Perhaps more to the point, it can be shown, using the technique of the present paper, that, for every R-equivalence class $\alpha$ of $X(k)$, there is a nonempty Zariski open set $U_{\alpha}$ of $X$ such that if $P$ and $Q$ are in $\alpha$ and in $U_{\alpha}$ then they are joined by a single very free rational curve - but it remains unknown whether, in fact, $U_{\alpha}$ can be taken to be $X$.

A positive answer to the question in full generality (for any infinite field $k$ and any separably rationally connected variety $X$ ) is conceivable, but seems out of reach with present techniques.

In this article we prove a positive result when $X$ is a toric model (i.e., a smooth equivariant compactification of a torus) over an infinite field $k$ : this is possible because a universal torsor can be explicitly constructed, and because rational curves can be moved thanks to the action of the torus. In the next section, we also prove a positive result in the case where $X$ is a del Pezzo surface of degree 5 (another case in which the universal torsor is well controlled). We start with some general remarks on very free R-equivalence.

## 1 General framework

We introduce a notation: if $k$ is a field and $X$ an irreducible variety over $k$, and if $x, y \in X(k)$, let $x \stackrel{X}{\leftrightarrow} y$ stand for the following statement: there exists an irreducible variety $M$ over $k$ such that $M(k)$ is Zariski-dense in $M$, and a dominant and separable rational map $F: M \times \mathbb{P}^{1} \rightarrow X$ such that $F$ restricted to $M \times\{0\}$ is constant equal to $x$ and $F$ restricted to $M \times\{\infty\}$ is constant equal to $y$.

The following proposition summarizes some general facts about this relation:

Proposition 1. Assume $k$ is a field and $X$ is an irreducible variety over $k$. Then:

1. If $U \subseteq X$ is a Zariski open set and $x, y \in U(k)$ then $x \stackrel{X}{\leftrightarrow} y$ if and only if $x \stackrel{U}{\leftrightarrow} y$.
2. If $X=\mathbb{P}_{k}^{n}$ then $x \stackrel{X}{\leftrightarrow} y$ for any two $x, y$.
3. Suppose $p: Z \rightarrow X$ is a dominant and separable rational map with $Z$ an irreducible variety over $k$ : then, for any $x, y \in Z(k)$ at which $p$ is defined, if $x \stackrel{Z}{\longleftrightarrow} y$ then $p(x) \stackrel{X}{\longleftrightarrow} p(y)$.
4. Suppose $X$ is smooth projective: then, for any $x, y \in X(k)$, if $x \stackrel{X}{\leftrightarrow} y$ then $x$ and $y$ are $R$-equivalent by a single very free rational curve.

The first fact is trivial (restrict $F$ to $U$ on the range).
To prove the second, consider $x, y \in \mathbb{P}_{k}^{n}(k)$ and take the family of all smooth conics passing through $x$ and $y$ and parameterize them rationally: obviously we can find an open set $M$ in some affine space over $k$ (so certainly $M(k)$ is dense) and a dominant and separable morphism $F: M \times \mathbb{P}^{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n}$ which takes $M \times\{0\}$ to $x$ and $M \times\{\infty\}$ to $y$.

The third statement is trivial: merely compose $F$ with $p$.
To get the fourth, first notice that when $X$ is projective we can by restricting $M$ assume that $F$ is a morphism; now apply the following geometric result (see, e.g., [7], II.3.10):

Proposition 2. Let $\bar{k}$ be an algebraically closed field, $M$ an irreducible variety over $\bar{k}$, and $X$ a smooth projective variety over $\bar{k}$. Let $x \in X$. Finally, let $F: M \times \mathbb{P}^{1} \rightarrow X$ be a separable and dominant morphism such that $F(M \times\{0\})=\{x\}$. Then there exists a nonempty Zariski open set $M^{0}$ of $M$ such that for all $p \in M^{0}$ the morphism $F_{p}: \mathbb{P}^{1} \rightarrow X$ satisfies the condition that $F_{p}^{*} T_{X}$ be ample.
-and make use of the fact that $M^{0}$ has a point over $k$ by assumption.

## 2 R-equivalence on universal torsors

The goal of this section is to prove the following result:
Proposition 3. Let $T$ be an algebraic torus over an infinite field $k$, and $X$ a smooth equivariant compactification of $T$; then given two $k$-rational points $x, y$ of $X$, if $x$ and $y$ are rationally equivalent, they are $R$-equivalent by a single very free rational curve.

To do this, we use the following result, whose proof will be given in the appendix:

Proposition 4. Let $T$ be an algebraic torus on a field $k$, and $X$ a smooth equivariant compactification of $T$; then there exists a torus $S$ over $k$, a"universal" $S$-torsor $p: \mathscr{T} \rightarrow X$, and an $S$-equivariant open embedding of $\mathscr{T}$ in an affine space on which $S$ acts linearly.
"Universal" is to be taken in the sense of [1], II.C (or [2], example 2.3.3), which we presently recall. Call $H^{1}(X, S)$ the étale cohomology group classifying $S$-torsors on $X$, and [ $\mathscr{T}]$ the class of $p$ in it. Define a map $\chi: H^{1}(X, S) \rightarrow$ $\operatorname{Hom}_{\operatorname{Gal}(\bar{k} / k)}\left(S^{*}, \operatorname{Pic} \bar{X}\right)$ which sends the class of an $S$-torsor on $X$, say $\mathscr{S}$, and a character $\lambda_{-} \in S^{*}=\operatorname{Hom}\left(\bar{S}, \overline{\mathbb{G}}_{m}\right)$ to the class of the $\overline{\mathbb{G}}_{m}$-torsor on $\bar{X}$ deduced from $\overline{\mathscr{S}}$ by $\lambda$. To say that $\mathscr{T}$ is universal means that $S^{*}=\operatorname{Pic} \bar{X}$ and that $\chi([\mathscr{T}])$ is the identity on $\operatorname{Pic} \bar{X}$.

We will need the following fact:
Lemma 5. Let $T$ and $X$ be as in proposition 3, and let $p: \mathscr{T} \rightarrow X$ be a universal torsor on $X$. Then there exists a point $z \in T(k)$ such that the class $\left[\mathscr{T} \times_{X} \operatorname{Spec} k_{z}\right] \in H^{1}(k, S)$ of the fiber of $\mathscr{T}$ over $z$ is trivial, i.e. $\mathscr{T}$ has a $k$-point over $z$.

Proof. Let $\alpha=\left[\mathscr{T} \times{ }_{X}\right.$ Spec $\left.k_{o}\right] \in H^{1}(k, S)$ be the class of the fiber of $\mathscr{T}$ over the origin $o \in T(k)$. Let $\mathscr{T}^{o}$ be the torsor defined by $\left[\mathscr{T}^{o}\right]=[\mathscr{T}]-\alpha$ : then $\mathscr{T}^{o}$ is the universal torsor that is trivial ${ }^{1}$ above $o$, and, from the discussion in [1], III (see also [2], 2.4.4), the map $T(k) \rightarrow H^{1}(k, S), z \mapsto\left[\mathscr{T}^{o} \times_{X} \operatorname{Spec} k_{z}\right]$ is surjective. In particular, there exists $z$ such that $\left[\mathscr{T}^{o} \times_{X} \operatorname{Spec} k_{z}\right]=-\alpha$, so $\left[\mathscr{T} \times{ }_{X} \operatorname{Spec} k_{z}\right]-\alpha=-\alpha$, which proves that $\left[\mathscr{T} \times_{X} \operatorname{Spec} k_{z}\right]$ is nil, what we wanted.

[^1]Now apply lemma 5 to the universal torsor $\mathscr{T}$ given by proposition 4 : we see that there exists $z^{\prime} \in T(k)$ such that the fiber of $\mathscr{T}$ over $z^{\prime}$ is trivial. Apply now the same lemma to the universal torsor $\mathscr{T}^{x}$ with trivial fiber over $x$ (in other words the torsor given by $\left[\mathscr{T}^{x}\right]=[\mathscr{T}]-\left[\mathscr{T} \times{ }_{X} \operatorname{Spec} k_{x}\right]$ ): so there exists $z \in T(k)$ such that the fiber of $\mathscr{T}^{x}$ over $z$ is trivial. Let $\tau_{z^{\prime}-z}: X \rightarrow X$ be the translation by $z^{\prime}-z$ : the torsor $\tau_{z^{\prime}-z}^{*} \mathscr{T}$ is still universal (since $\tau_{z^{\prime}-z}$ acts trivially on $\operatorname{Pic} \bar{X}$ ) and it is trivial over $z$-therefore it is isomorphic to $\mathscr{T}^{x}$ (which has the same property).

Let $x^{\prime}=\tau_{z^{\prime}-z}(x)$ and $y^{\prime}=\tau_{z^{\prime}-z}(y)$. Since $\mathscr{T}^{x} \cong \tau_{z^{\prime}-z}^{*} \mathscr{T}$ is trivial over $x$, it follows that $\mathscr{T}$ is trivial over $x^{\prime}$. But, since $y$ is rationally equivalent to $x$ by [1], II.B, proposition $1, \mathscr{T}^{x}$ is also trivial over $y$, and therefore so is $\mathscr{T}$ over $y^{\prime}$. So there exist points $P$ and $Q$ of $\mathscr{T}(k)$ over $x^{\prime}$ and $y^{\prime}$ respectively, and proposition 4 shows that $P$ and $Q$ live inside an open set of an affine space $\mathbb{A}$ over $k$.

Finally, using the general facts laid out in proposition $1(1-4)$, we have $P \stackrel{\mathbb{A}}{\leftrightarrow} Q$ (use facts $1-2$ ) so $P \stackrel{\mathscr{T}}{\leftrightarrow} Q$ (fact 1 again) and therefore $x^{\prime} \stackrel{X}{\leftrightarrow} y^{\prime}$ (fact 3: compose with $p$ ) so $x \stackrel{X}{\longleftrightarrow} y$ (compose with $\tau_{z-z^{\prime}}$ ) which gives the desired conclusion (from fact 4).

## 3 Del Pezzo surfaces of degree 5

We now turn to the case where $X$ is a del Pezzo surface of degree 5 over $k$. Then it is known that there is a unique universal torsor $p: \mathscr{T} \rightarrow X$ on $X$ ("unique" up to non-unique isomorphism), trivial over every point, and that it is an open set of the Grassmanian variety $\operatorname{Gr}(2,5)$ of lines in $\mathbb{P}^{4}$ (Skorobogatov, [11], theorem 3.1.4).

If now $x$ and $y$ are two arbitrary $k$-rational points on $X$, pick $k$-rational points in $p^{-1}(x)$ and $p^{-1}(y)$ (which exist because $\mathscr{T}$ is trivial over $x$ and $y$ ), corresponding to two lines $\Delta$ and $\Lambda$ in $\mathbb{P}^{4}$. Now let $\Pi$ and $\Pi^{\prime}$ be two hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^{4}$ neither of which contains either $\Delta$ or $\Lambda$ and such that the intersection points $P, P^{\prime}$ of $\Pi, \Pi^{\prime}$ with $\Delta$ are distinct and similarly for the intersection points $Q, Q^{\prime}$ of $\Pi, \Pi^{\prime}$ with $\Lambda$. Then we have a rational map $\Pi \times \Pi^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathscr{T} \rightarrow X$ taking a point on $\Pi$ and one on $\Pi^{\prime}$ to the line they define (in general) and then to the image point by $p$ in $X$. Again by the general facts laid out in proposition 1 , since $\left(P, P^{\prime}\right) \stackrel{\Pi \times \Pi^{\prime}}{\leftrightarrow}\left(Q, Q^{\prime}\right)$, we get $x \stackrel{X}{\leftrightarrow} y$ and consequently $x$ and $y$ are R-equivalent by a single very free rational curve.

Thus, we have shown:
Proposition 6. Let $X$ be a del Pezzo surface of degree 5 over an infinite field $k$; then given any two $k$-rational points $x, y$ of $X$, there exists $f: \mathbb{P}_{k}^{1} \rightarrow X$ such that $f(0)=x$ and $f(\infty)=y$ with, further, $f^{*} T_{X}$ ample.

## Appendix: Explicit construction of a universal torsor over a toric variety

Proposition 4 remains to be settled. A proof can be found in [10] (proposition 8.5), but the one we give below, for the reader's convenience, seems much more straightforward.

Historical remark: The construction described here was introduced in [5] and [4]. Here we give a presentation similar to the one contained in [9], although universality of the torsor is not shown there.

Let $T^{*}=\operatorname{Hom}_{\bar{k}}\left(\bar{T}, \overline{\mathbb{G}}_{m}\right)$ be the lattice of characters of the torus $T$, and $T_{*}=\operatorname{Hom}_{\bar{k}}\left(\overline{\mathbb{G}}_{m}, \bar{T}\right)$ the lattice, dual to the former, of cocharacters. One and the other are endowed with an action of the Galois group $\Gamma=\operatorname{Gal}(\bar{k} / k)$. We write $T_{\mathbb{R}}^{*}=T^{*} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ for the real vector space in which $T^{*}$ lives, and $T_{* \mathbb{R}}=T_{*} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ for the real vector space, dual to the former, in which $T_{*}$ lives. The general theory of toric varieties (cf. [6], in particular §2.3) allows us to describe $X$ by means of a fan $\Sigma$ of strongly convex rational polyhedral cones in $T_{* \mathbb{R}}$. The fact that $X$ is smooth means (cf. [6], §2.1) that every cone $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is spanned by part of a basis of $T_{*}$, determined uniquely by $\sigma$ : call $B_{\sigma}$ the part in question, and let $P=\bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} B_{\sigma}$ be the union of the $B_{\sigma}$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Then $P$ is a finite part of $T_{*}$ which spans the latter and is stable under the action of $\Gamma$. For every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we have $B_{\sigma}=\sigma \cap P$, and $\sigma$ is spanned by $\sigma \cap P$.

Now let $V_{*}$ be the (free) lattice with basis $P$ (with the obvious action of $\Gamma$ making it a permutation lattice), and $V^{*}$ the dual lattice, and $V_{* \mathbb{R}}$ and $V_{\mathbb{R}}^{*}$ the real vector spaces in which they respectively live. We call $V$ the dual torus to $V^{*}$ (i.e. the torus of which $V^{*}$ is the character lattice), so $\bar{V}=\operatorname{Spec} \bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*}\right]:$ since $V^{*}$ is a permutation lattice, $V$ is a quasi-trivial torus. And let A be the affine space defined by the cone of $V_{* \mathbb{R}}$ spanned by the elements of $P$. Since $P$ spans $T_{*}$, we have a surjective morphism $V_{*} \rightarrow T_{*}$ and thus an injection $T^{*} \rightarrow V^{*}$.

From the description in [6], §3.3, the lattice $V^{*}$ is precisely the group $\operatorname{Div}_{\bar{X} \backslash \bar{T}} \bar{X}$ of $\bar{T}$-invariant divisors of $\bar{X}$, by the arrow which sends a $u \in V^{*}$ to $\sum_{p \in P} u(p) D_{p}$ (where $D_{p}$ is the closure of the orbit of $\bar{T}$ acting on $\bar{X}$ associated to the ray spanned by $p$ in $V_{* \mathbb{R}}$ ). With this identification, $T^{*} \rightarrow V^{*}$ sends a $u \in T^{*}$ to the principal divisor $\operatorname{div}\left(t^{u}\right)$, and its cokernel ([6], §3.4) is the Picard group of $\bar{X}$, which is itself a lattice, say $S^{*}$, dual to a torus $S$. We therefore have the short exact sequence of lattices $0 \rightarrow T^{*} \rightarrow V^{*} \rightarrow S^{*} \rightarrow 0$, equal to $0 \rightarrow \bar{k}[\bar{T}]^{\times} / \bar{k}^{\times} \rightarrow \operatorname{Div}_{\bar{X} \backslash \bar{T}} \bar{X} \rightarrow \operatorname{Pic} \bar{X} \rightarrow 0$, and the dual short exact sequence of tori $1 \rightarrow S \rightarrow V \rightarrow T \rightarrow 1$.

For every cone $\sigma \in \Sigma$, let $\sigma^{\vee}=\left\{u \in T_{\mathbb{R}}^{*}:(\forall v \in \sigma)(\langle u, v\rangle \geq 0)\right\}$ denote the dual cone, and let $\bar{X}(\sigma)=\operatorname{Spec} \bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]$ be the spectrum of the semigroup algebra of $T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}$ : thus, $\bar{X}$ is obtained precisely by gluing the $\bar{X}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma$ (identifying the open set $\bar{X}\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{\prime}\right)$ in $\bar{X}(\sigma)$ and $\left.\bar{X}\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)\right)$. Similarly, given a cone $\sigma \in \Sigma$, which is, therefore, spanned by a finite set (called $B_{\sigma}$ ) of elements of $P$, we can consider the cone $\tilde{\sigma}$ in $V_{* \mathbb{R}}$ spanned by the same elements of $P$, and its dual $\tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}$, a cone in $V_{\mathbb{R}}^{*}$ : let us call $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma)=$ Spec $\bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right]$ the spectrum of the corresponding semigroup algebra. Thus $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma)$ is an open set in $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$, containing $\bar{V}$. Furthermore, the inclusion $T^{*} \rightarrow V^{*}$, which manifestly sends $T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}$ inside $V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}$, defines a morphism $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{X}(\sigma)$.

To make the situation clearer, let us presently prove the following lemma (lemma 5.1 of [9]):

Lemma 7. Let $\delta \in S^{*}$ and let $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Then there exists a $u_{\delta} \in V^{*}$ (not necessarily unique) which maps to $\delta \in S^{*}$ (by the arrow $V^{*} \rightarrow S^{*}$ defined above) and such that $\left\langle u_{\delta}, p\right\rangle=0$ for all $p \in B_{\sigma}$ (in other words $u_{\delta} \in V^{*} \cap$ $\left.\tilde{\sigma}^{\vee} \cap\left(-\tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right)\right)$.

Proof. The morphism $V^{*} \rightarrow S^{*}$ being surjective, there exists $v \in V^{*}$ which maps to $\delta \in S^{*}$. Since $B_{\sigma}$ is a subset of a basis of $T_{*}$, there exists $\tilde{v} \in T^{*}$ such that $\langle\tilde{v}, p\rangle=\langle v, p\rangle$ for all $p \in B_{\sigma}$. We then take $u_{\delta}=v-\tilde{v}$.

A $u_{\delta}$ as given by the previous lemma defines a $z^{u_{\delta}} \in \bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right]$ which is invertible in this algebra, since $-u_{\delta}$ manifestly also belongs to $\tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}$. We deduce the following description:
Fact 8. $\bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right]$, seen as a module over $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]$, is free and a basis is formed by invertible elements $z^{u_{\delta}}$, one for each $\delta$ in $S^{*}$; the free sub-module of rank 1 corresponding to $a \delta$ in $S^{*}$ is precisely the set of linear combinations of the $z^{u}$ for those $u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}$ for which $\left.u\right|_{S_{*}}$ (that is,
the image of $u$ by $V^{*} \rightarrow S^{*}$ ) is $\delta$. This can also be expressed by saying that $\bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right]$ is graded by $S^{*}$ as an algebra over $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]$, each graded component containing an invertible element.

In particular, we see that if $\sigma^{\prime} \subseteq \sigma$ in $\Sigma$, the tensor product of $k\left[z^{u}: u \in\right.$ $\left.V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right]$ with $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\prime \vee}\right]$ over $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]$ is $k\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\prime \vee}\right]$, which means that the inverse image by $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{X}(\sigma)$ of $\bar{X}\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)$ is $\overline{\mathbf{A}}\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)$, and, more precisely, that the morphism $\overline{\mathbf{A}}\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow \bar{X}\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)$ is exactly the restriction of $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{X}(\sigma)$ to $\bar{X}\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)$. The union of the $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma$, which we call $\overline{\mathscr{T}}$, comes from a variety $\mathscr{T}$ defined over $k$ and open in $\mathbf{A}$, and by gluing we have a morphism $\mathscr{T} \rightarrow X$.

We also see that $\bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right]$ is faithfully flat over $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]$. Thus, the morphism $\mathscr{T} \rightarrow X$ is faithfully flat. We get an action of $V$ on $\mathscr{T}$ because $\mathscr{T}$ has been constructed as a toric variety (with cones $\tilde{\sigma} \subseteq V_{* \mathbb{R}}$ ); therefore, by restriction, we get an action of $S$ on $\mathscr{T}$, which by construction leaves $X$ invariant. To see that this gives us a torsor under $S$, it is enough to see that each $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{X}(\sigma)$ is a torsor under $\bar{S}$. In other words, we must show that the morphism

$$
\theta: \bar{S} \times \overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma) \times_{\bar{X}(\sigma)} \overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma), \quad(s, a) \mapsto(s \cdot a, a)
$$

is an isomorphism. But the (co)morphism of the associated algebras from which it comes is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \theta^{*}: \bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right] \otimes_{\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]} \bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right] \\
& \rightarrow \bar{k}\left[\chi^{\lambda}: \lambda \in S^{*}\right] \otimes_{\bar{k}} \bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right] \\
& z^{u} \otimes z^{u^{\prime}} \mapsto \chi^{u \mid S_{S_{*}}} \otimes z^{u+u^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

To see that this is indeed an isomorphism, notice that according to fact 8 , the left-hand side has a basis over $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]$ formed by the $z^{u_{\delta}} \otimes z^{u_{\delta^{\prime}}}$ with $u_{\delta}$ as given in lemma 7, and the right-hand side has a basis formed by the $\chi^{\lambda} \otimes z^{u_{\delta^{\prime \prime}}}$. And on these two bases, the homomorphism in question is represented by a diagonal matrix whose coefficients are $t^{u_{\delta}+u_{\delta^{\prime}}-u_{\delta^{\prime \prime}}}$ (for $\delta^{\prime \prime}=\delta+\delta^{\prime}$ and $\lambda=\delta$ ), which are invertible in $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]$.

It remains to see that this torsor $p: \mathscr{T} \rightarrow X$ is indeed universal.
If $\sigma \in \Sigma$, since $\bar{X}(\sigma)$ is smooth, it is abstractly isomorphic to $\overline{\mathbb{A}}^{d} \times \overline{\mathbb{G}}_{m}^{n-d}$ (where $d$, say, is the dimension of $\sigma$ and $n$ that of $T$ ). In particular we have $\operatorname{Pic} \bar{X}(\sigma)=0$; and furthermore $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]^{\times}=\left\{t^{u}: u \in\right.$
$\left.T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee} \cap\left(-\sigma^{\vee}\right)\right\}$. The general exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \bar{k}[\bar{U}]^{\times} / \bar{k}^{\times} \rightarrow \operatorname{Div}_{\bar{X} \backslash \bar{U}} \bar{X} \rightarrow$ $\operatorname{Pic} \bar{X} \rightarrow 0$ (cf. [2], (2.3.10)) when $\operatorname{Pic} \bar{U}=0$ becomes, for $\bar{U}=\bar{X}(\sigma)$,

$$
0 \rightarrow T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee} \cap\left(-\sigma^{\vee}\right) \rightarrow V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee} \cap\left(-\tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right) \rightarrow S^{*} \rightarrow 0
$$

The dual short exact sequence of tori is $1 \rightarrow \bar{S} \rightarrow \bar{M}_{\sigma} \rightarrow \bar{R}_{\sigma} \rightarrow 1$, where $\bar{R}_{\sigma}$ and $\bar{M}_{\sigma}$ are quotients of $\bar{T}$ and $\bar{V}$ respectively. Furthermore, the quotient morphism $\bar{T} \rightarrow \bar{R}_{\sigma}$ extends to $\bar{X}(\sigma)$ (of which $\bar{T}$ is an open set): precisely, the morphisms $\bar{T} \rightarrow \bar{X}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{R}_{\sigma}$ give, on the associated algebras,

$$
\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee} \cap\left(-\sigma^{\vee}\right)\right] \rightarrow \bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right] \rightarrow \bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*}\right]
$$

By corollary 2.3.4 of [2], it is now sufficient to prove that $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{X}(\sigma)$ is obtained as the pullback of $\bar{M}_{\sigma} \rightarrow \bar{R}_{\sigma}$ by the arrow $\bar{X}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{R}_{\sigma}$, moreover in a way compatible with the restrictions when $\sigma^{\prime} \subseteq \sigma$. In other words, we are to determine (in a natural way) the fiber product $\bar{M}_{\sigma} \times_{\bar{R}_{\sigma}} \bar{X}(\sigma)$; this is the affine scheme whose algebra is the tensor product

$$
\bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee} \cap\left(-\tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right)\right] \otimes_{\bar{k}\left[t t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee} \cap\left(-\sigma^{\vee}\right)\right]} \bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]
$$

But (from fact 8) $\bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right]$ is free over $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee}\right]$ with basis $\left\{z^{u_{\delta}}\right\}$ for $\delta \in S^{*}$; and for precisely the same reasons, $\bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in\right.$ $\left.V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee} \cap\left(-\tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right)\right]$ is free over $\bar{k}\left[t^{u}: u \in T^{*} \cap \sigma^{\vee} \cap\left(-\sigma^{\vee}\right)\right]$ with the same basis. That is to say that the above tensor product is (by the natural map) $\bar{k}\left[z^{u}: u \in V^{*} \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee}\right]$, in other words that $\bar{M}_{\sigma} \times_{\bar{R}_{\sigma}} \bar{X}(\sigma)=\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma)$ (naturally).

This shows that the torsor $p: \mathscr{T} \rightarrow X$, obtained by gluing these different $\overline{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma) \rightarrow \bar{X}(\sigma)$, is indeed universal.
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[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ In fact, if the torsor $\mathscr{T}$ is that which we shall construct in the appendix, it is easy to see that it is already the universal torsor trivial over $o$; however, we shall not use this fact, which only very slightly simplifies the proof.

