

December 5, 2008

Dear Movasati,

The first sentence of your introduction is ambiguous: on a variety of dimension n , here $n = 1$, canonical bundle often means Ω^n . I hope you mean not Ω^1 of the moduli space, but the bundle ω on the moduli stack of elliptic curves whose fiber at E is $\text{Lie}(E)^\vee$. I guess “tensor product” is a misprint for “tensor power”.

Why do you say “there is no way to generalize the first interpretation” when you essentially do just that? As you tell, an elliptic curve E defines a torsor P under the Borel subgroup B of $\text{SL}(2)$: $(\begin{smallmatrix} * & * \\ 0 & * \end{smallmatrix})$: the space of (ω_1, ω_2) you consider. Any linear representation of B defines a vector bundle on the moduli stack M of elliptic curves, and you show that (forgetting the condition at ∞) quasi-modular forms can be identified with the sections of a vector bundle so constructed (on a covering of M corresponding to Γ). Bundles attached to representations of B should be thought as vector bundles deduced from the vector bundle \mathcal{H} of de Rham cohomology (fiber $H_{\text{DR}}^1(E)$ at E), with the multilinear algebra structures it carries: the cup product, with value in \mathcal{O} , and the Hodge filtration, $F^1 \subset \mathcal{H}$.

The §4 definition of quasi-modular forms tries to hide that they can be viewed as sections of the bundle of n -jets of sections of $\omega^{\otimes(m-2n)}$: the object with a nice transformation law is (f_0, \dots, f_n) , and corresponds point by point to such an n -jet. Near z_0 , one has a local coordinate z , as well as a trivialization of ω , and to an n -jet, viewed as an n -jet of function: $\sum_0^n \varphi_i (z - z_0)^i$, one attaches φ_n (the last coefficient).

For an elliptic curve E , it amounts to the same to deform E , or to move the line F^1 in $H_{\text{DR}}^1(E)$, and if one identifies the moduli space near E with the space of F near $(F^1$ of E), the fiber of ω at F is the line F itself. In algebraic geometry, this remains true for formal deformations, in char.0, and expresses the fact that the Gauss Manin connection induces $F \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathcal{H}/F) \otimes \Omega^1$.

If E is $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, z \rangle$, in $H^1(E, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \mathbb{C}$ and for a natural basis of $H^1(E, \mathbb{Z})$, F is spanned by $(1, z)$ and has a supplement G spanned by $(0, 1)$. Near E , one moves F to the line spanned by $(1, z) + \lambda(0, 1)$. This is the trivialization of ω near E used, and the local coordinate used, to speak of the last coefficient of an n -jet.

What you do is to observe that if one chooses any supplement G to F at E , it again makes sense to take the last coefficient of an n -jet of section of $\omega^{\otimes k}$. It is an element of $\omega^{\otimes(k+2n)}$ depending on G . You tell that one should use all G , rather than at z one adapted to z . The space of all G is an affine line ($\mathbb{P}(H_{\text{DR}}^1(E))$ minus the point “ F ”), and at any point of the moduli stack, functions of G of degree $\leq n$ correspond one to one to n -jets at that point.

Best,

P. Deligne

P.S. Concordance with your notations: the pairs (ω_1, ω_2) you consider are determined by ω_2 alone, subject to $\omega_2 \notin F^1$. Instead of considering $f(G)$ with value in $\omega^{\otimes m}$, you use the $\omega_1 = “1/\omega_2”$ attached to ω_2 and the scalar function $f(\omega_2) := f(\text{line } \langle \omega_2 \rangle) / \omega_1^{\otimes m}$. The condition becomes an homogeneity condition and degree $\leq \dots$ on the affine lines $\omega_2 + F^1$. Your vector field is of course the Gauss Manin connection in disguise: the choice of ω_2 at a point p of the moduli stack defines a tangent vector at p (as $\omega^{\otimes 2} \simeq \Omega^1$), and the Gauss-Manin connection lifts it to a vector at ω_2 on the bundle H_{DR}^1 . So described, the bundle with fiber $H_{\text{DR}}^1 - F^1$ on the moduli stack, and the vector field, make sense in any characteristic — better, over \mathbb{Z} . Only the use of the Weierstrass form creates trouble for $p = 2, 3$. The jet interpretation is another matter: trouble can be expected for n -jets when $n \geq p$.