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#### Abstract

Let $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ be the product of the projective spaces $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{1}$, i.e. the semilinear space whose point set is the product of the point sets of $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{1}$, and whose lines are all products of the kind $\left\{P_{0}\right\} \times g_{1}$ or $g_{0} \times\left\{P_{1}\right\}$, where $P_{0}, P_{1}$ are points and $g_{0}, g_{1}$ are lines. An embedding $\chi: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ is an injective mapping which maps the lines of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ onto (whole) lines of $\Pi^{\prime}$. The classical embedding is the Segre embedding, $\gamma_{0}: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$. For each embedding $\chi$, there exist an automorphism $\alpha$ of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ and a linear morphism $\psi: \bar{\Pi} \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ (i.e. a composition of a projection with a collineation) such that $\chi=\alpha \gamma_{0} \psi$. (Here $\alpha \gamma_{0} \psi$ maps $P$ onto $\psi\left(\gamma_{0}(\alpha(P))\right)=: P \alpha \gamma_{0} \psi$.) As a consequence, every $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ which is embedded in a projective space is, up to projections, a Segre variety.


## 1 Introduction

Most classical varieties represent as points of a projective space some geometric objects. So such varieties are (projective) embeddings, which are somewhat canonical. For instance, take an $h$-flat ${ }^{h} U$ (i.e. a subspace of dimension $h$ ) of an $n$-dimensional projective space $\Pi$ over a commutative field $F$. ${ }^{h} U$ can be associated with $\binom{n+1}{h+1}$ coordinates, the so-called Plücker coordinates, or Grassmann coordinates. They are defined up to a factor. So ${ }^{h} U$ can be represented as a point of a $\left(\binom{n+1}{h+1}-1\right)$ dimensional projective space. We call Plücker map this representation. The image of
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the Plücker map, i.e. the set of the points related to all $h$-flats in $\Pi$, is a Grassmann variety.

In 1981, H. HAVLICEK [3] investigated the embeddings of the Grassmann spaces. An embedding of the Grassmann space $\Gamma^{h}(\Pi)$ represents injectively the $h$-flats of the projective space $\Pi$ as points of another projective space $\bar{\Pi}$ and maps a pencil of $h$-flats onto a line of $\bar{\Pi}$, where a pencil is the set of all $h$-flats which contain a given ${ }^{h-1} U$ and are contained in a given ${ }^{h+1} U$.

HAVLICEK proved that each such embedding is the composition of the Plücker map, described above, with a linear morphism (in German: "lineare Abbildung") of projective spaces. This linear morphism is related to a (possibly singular) semilinear transformation between the underlying vector spaces. By this property, the Plücker map is called a universal embedding. He actually showed a more general result: The Plücker map with domain $\Gamma$ is a universal element of the covariant functor $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma,-)$, that maps a projective space $\Pi$ onto the set of all linear morphisms of $\Gamma$ in $\Pi$. Its action on the morphisms is defined by $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma, \psi)(\chi):=\chi \psi$.

The purpose of our work is to deal with the analogous question which concerns the product spaces and the related Corrado Segre embedding. The product of two projective spaces is defined to be a particular semilinear space (see the definition in the abstract). The word "semilinear" means that any two distinct points are joined by at most one line. The Segre embedding does not have strong universal properties like the Plücker map. In general (cf. theorem 1) an embedding of a product space $\mathcal{S}$ is the composition of three maps: (i) an automorphism of $\mathcal{S}$, (ii) the Segre embedding, and (iii) a linear morphism between projective spaces. For particular product spaces it is possible to take the first map equal to the identity map (theorem 2), so, in such cases, the Segre embedding is a universal embedding.

As a consequence of the previous results, we will establish a relationship with the notion of a regular pseudoproduct space, which has been given by N. MELONE and D. OLANDA [4]. A regular pseudoproduct space is a semilinear space which satisfies some intrinsic incidence-geometric axioms, and turns out to be isomorphic to a product space. In theorem 3, we will prove that every regular pseudoproduct space which is embedded in a projective space is, up to projections, a Segre variety.

A similar result holds for the Grassmann varieties [3][7].
b. A semilinear space is a pair $\Sigma=(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a set, whose elements are called points, and $\mathcal{R} \subset 2^{\mathcal{U}}$. (In this note " $A \subset B$ " just means that $x \in A$ implies $x \in B$.) The elements of $\mathcal{R}$ are lines. The axioms which define a semilinear space are the following: (i) $|g| \geq 2$ for every $g \in \mathcal{R}$, (ii) $\cup_{g \in \mathcal{R}} g=\mathcal{U}$, (iii) $g, h \in \mathcal{R}, g \neq h$ $\Rightarrow|g \cap h| \leq 1$. Two points $P, Q \in \mathcal{U}$ are collinear, $P \sim Q$, if a line $g$ exists such that $P, Q \in g$ (for $P \neq Q$ we will also write $P Q:=g$ ); otherwise, $P$ and $Q$ are not collinear, $P \nsim Q$. An isomorphism between the semilinear spaces $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ and $\left(\mathcal{U}^{\prime}, \mathcal{R}^{\prime}\right)$ is a bijection $\alpha: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^{\prime}$ such that both $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ map lines onto lines.

The join of $\mathcal{M}_{1}, \mathcal{M}_{2} \subset \mathcal{U}$ is:

$$
\mathcal{M}_{1} \vee \mathcal{M}_{2}:=\mathcal{M}_{1} \cup \mathcal{M}_{2} \cup\left(\bigcup_{\substack{P_{i} \in \mathcal{M}_{i} \\ P_{1} \sim P_{2}, P_{1} \neq P_{2}}} P_{1} P_{2}\right)
$$

A subspace of $\Sigma$ is a set $\mathcal{U}^{\prime} \subset \mathcal{U}$ which fulfills

$$
P_{1}, P_{2} \in \mathcal{U}^{\prime} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad\left\{P_{1}\right\} \vee\left\{P_{2}\right\} \subset \mathcal{U}^{\prime}
$$

A subspace $\mathcal{U}^{\prime}$ such that $P_{1} \sim P_{2}$ for all $P_{1}, P_{2} \in \mathcal{U}^{\prime}$ is called a singular subspace of $\Sigma$.

Let $\Pi^{\prime}=\left(\mathcal{P}^{\prime}, \mathcal{G}^{\prime}\right)$ be a projective space. A linear morphism $\psi: \Sigma \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ consists of: the domain $\mathbf{D}(\psi) \subset \mathcal{U}$; the exceptional set $\mathbf{A}(\psi):=\mathcal{U} \backslash \mathbf{D}(\psi)$; a mapping $\psi^{\prime}: \mathbf{D}(\psi) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\prime}$ and the related mapping

$$
\psi^{\prime \prime}: 2^{\mathcal{U}} \longrightarrow 2^{\mathcal{P}^{\prime}}: \mathcal{M} \longmapsto(\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{D}(\psi)) \psi^{\prime}
$$

We will abuse notation and write $\psi$ to denote also the maps $\psi^{\prime}$ and $\psi^{\prime \prime}$. This $\psi$ must fulfill the following axioms [3]:

$$
\begin{gather*}
(\{X\} \vee\{Y\}) \psi=\{X\} \psi \vee\{Y\} \psi \text { for } X, Y \in \mathcal{U}, X \sim Y ;  \tag{L1}\\
\{X\} \psi=\{Y\} \psi, X, Y \in \mathcal{U}, X \neq Y, X \sim Y \quad \Longrightarrow \\
\Longrightarrow \exists A \in X Y \text { such that }\{A\} \psi=\emptyset .
\end{gather*}
$$

$\psi$ is said to be global when $\mathbf{D}(\psi)=\mathcal{U}$; is called embedding if it is global and injective. If $\psi$ is an embedding, then $\operatorname{im}(\psi):=\mathcal{U} \psi$ is an embedded semilinear space. The rank of $\psi$ is:

$$
\operatorname{rk} \psi:=\operatorname{dim} \Pi([\operatorname{im}(\psi)]) .
$$

Here the square brackets denote projective closure in the projective space $\Pi^{\prime}$, and, for any subspace $U, \quad \Pi(U)$ is $U$ meant as a projective space.

Proposition 1.1 If $\mathcal{M}_{1}, \mathcal{M}_{2} \subset \mathcal{U}$, then

$$
\left(\mathcal{M}_{1} \vee \mathcal{M}_{2}\right) \psi \subset \mathcal{M}_{1} \psi \vee \mathcal{M}_{2} \psi
$$

We now introduce some notation, which will hold in the whole paper:
$\Pi_{0}=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0}, \mathcal{G}_{0}\right), \Pi_{1}=\left(\mathcal{P}_{1}, \mathcal{G}_{1}\right)$ are projective spaces of finite dimensions $n_{0}, n_{1}$, respectively.
${ }^{d} \check{\mathcal{U}}(\Pi)$, or simply ${ }^{d} \check{\mathcal{U}}$, is the set of all $d$-flats of $\Pi$.
${ }^{d} \check{\mathcal{U}}_{i}:={ }^{d} \check{\mathcal{U}}\left(\Pi_{i}\right), i=0,1$.
$\mathcal{U}:=\mathcal{P}_{0} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}$.
$\mathcal{R}:=\left\{\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times g_{1} \mid X_{0} \in \mathcal{P}_{0}, g_{1} \in \mathcal{G}_{1}\right\} \cup\left\{g_{0} \times\left\{X_{1}\right\} \mid g_{0} \in \mathcal{G}_{0}, X_{1} \in \mathcal{P}_{1}\right\}$.
$\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right):=(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$, which is a semilinear space, is the product space of $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{1}$. $\chi: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$, where $\Pi^{\prime}=\left(\mathcal{P}^{\prime}, \mathcal{G}^{\prime}\right)$ is a projective space, is a linear morphism.

Proposition 1.2 rk $\chi \leq n_{0} n_{1}+n_{0}+n_{1}$.
Proof By induction on $n_{1}$. If $n_{1}=1$, then $\mathcal{U}=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\{Q\}\right) \vee\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{Q^{\prime}\right\}\right)$, with $Q, Q^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}_{1}, Q \neq Q^{\prime}$. Prop. 1.1 gives $\operatorname{im}(\chi) \subset\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\{Q\}\right) \chi \vee\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{Q^{\prime}\right\}\right) \chi$. In this case, the statement follows from the representation theorem for the linear morphisms from projective spaces [3] (quoted here: prop. 1.5).

Now assume $n_{1}>1$ and take a hyperplane, say $\mathcal{H}$, in $\Pi_{1}$. If $\left(\mathcal{U}^{\prime}, \mathcal{R}^{\prime}\right):=$ $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi(\mathcal{H})\right)$, then $\chi_{\mathcal{U}^{\prime}}$ is a linear morphism of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi(\mathcal{H})\right)$ into $\Pi^{\prime}$. The inductive assumption gives $\operatorname{rk} \chi_{\mid \mathcal{U}^{\prime}} \leq n_{0} n_{1}+n_{1}-1$. Let $\bar{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{1} \backslash \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{0}^{\prime}:=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\{\bar{P}\}\right) \chi$. Then $\operatorname{dim} \Pi\left(\mathcal{P}_{0}^{\prime}\right) \leq n_{0}$. From $\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{U}^{\prime} \vee\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\{\bar{P}\}\right)$ it follows, by prop 1.1, $\operatorname{im}(\chi) \subset$ $\mathcal{U}^{\prime} \chi \vee \mathcal{P}_{0}^{\prime}$. This proves our proposition.

We say that the linear morphism $\chi$ is regular if $\mathrm{rk} \chi=n_{0} n_{1}+n_{0}+n_{1}=\operatorname{dim} \Pi^{\prime}$. As an example, assume that $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{1}$ are coordinatized by a commutative field $F$. The Corrado Segre embedding $\gamma_{0}: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$, where $\bar{\Pi}$ is the $\left(n_{0} n_{1}+n_{0}+n_{1}\right)$ dimensional projective space coordinatized by $F$, is defined by

$$
\left(\left(x_{0}, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n_{0}}\right) F,\left(y_{0}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n_{1}}\right) F\right) \gamma_{0}:=\left(x_{i} y_{j}\right)_{i=0, \ldots, n_{0} ; j=0, \ldots, n_{1}} F
$$

The Segre embedding turns out to be a regular linear morphism.
The following proposition is contained in the proof of prop. 1.2:
Proposition 1.3 If $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperplane of $\Pi_{1}$ and $X_{1} \in \mathcal{P}_{1} \backslash \mathcal{H}$, then

$$
\operatorname{im}(\chi) \subset\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times \mathcal{H}\right) \chi \vee\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{X_{1}\right\}\right) \chi . \square
$$

Throughout this paper, $\gamma: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$, where $\bar{\Pi}=(\overline{\mathcal{P}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}})$ is a projective space, will denote a regular linear morphism.

Proposition $1.4 \gamma$ is an embedding.
Proof Assume that $\gamma$ is not global; then there exists $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\left\{\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right)\right\} \gamma=\emptyset$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperplane of $\Pi_{1}$ and $X_{1} \notin \mathcal{H}$, then, by prop. 1.2, $\operatorname{rk} \gamma_{\mid \mathcal{P}_{0}} \times \mathcal{H} \leq n_{0} n_{1}+n_{1}-1$. The non-globality assumption implies $\operatorname{dim} \Pi\left(\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.\left\{X_{1}\right\}\right) \gamma\right)<n_{0}$. Then, prop. 1.3 gives $\mathrm{rk} \gamma<n_{0} n_{1}+n_{0}+n_{1}$, a contradiction. So, $\gamma$ is global.

Now assume that $\gamma$ is not injective, i.e. there exist two distinct elements of $\mathcal{U}$, say $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right)$ and $\left(Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right)$, such that $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma=\left(Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right) \gamma$. Since $\gamma$ is global, from (L2) it follows $X_{0} \neq Y_{0}$ and $X_{1} \neq Y_{1}$. Now use prop. 1.3 with $\chi:=\gamma$ and $\mathcal{H}$ such that $Y_{1} \in \mathcal{H}$. The dimension of $\left[\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times \mathcal{H}\right) \gamma\right]$ is at most $n_{0} n_{1}+n_{1}-1$, the dimension of $\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{X_{1}\right\}$ is $n_{0}$ and

$$
\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \in\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times \mathcal{H}\right) \gamma \cap\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{X_{1}\right\}\right) \gamma
$$

This contradicts the hypothesis that $\gamma$ is regular.
Now we quote two known results concerning the linear morphisms from projective spaces.

Proposition 1.5 [2][3] Every linear morphism $\psi: \Pi \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ is the product of a projection with center $\mathbf{A}(\psi)$ onto a complementary subspace in $\Pi$, say $\mathcal{P}^{*}$, and a collineation between $\mathcal{P}^{*}$ and $\mathrm{im}(\psi)$.

Proposition $1.6[3]$ Let $\Pi=(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{G})$ be a Pappian projective space, $\mathcal{P}_{1}^{*}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{2}^{*}$ two complementary subspaces of $\Pi$, and $\Pi^{\prime}=\left(\mathcal{P}^{\prime}, \mathcal{G}^{\prime}\right)$ a projective space. Let $\psi_{i}$ : $\mathcal{P}_{i}^{*} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\prime}, i=1,2$, be linear morphisms, and assume that the following condition is satisfied:
(V4) $\mathrm{rk} \psi_{1} \geq 1$ and $\mathrm{rk} \psi_{2} \geq 2$. Furthermore, there exist two lines $g_{i} \subset \mathbf{D}\left(\psi_{i}\right)$ $(i=1,2)$, and a projectivity $\sigma^{\prime}: g_{1} \psi_{1} \rightarrow g_{2} \psi_{2}$ such that the mapping

$$
\sigma:=\left(\psi_{1} \mid g_{1}\right) \sigma^{\prime}\left(\psi_{2} \mid g_{2}\right)^{-1}
$$

is a projectivity.
Then there exists a linear morphism $\psi: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\prime}$ such that $\psi_{\mathcal{P}_{i}^{*}}=\psi_{i}, i=1,2$. व

## 2 Basic properties of the embeddings of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$

Proposition 2.1 If $\chi: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ is an embedding, then $\Pi^{\prime}$ is Pappian.
Proof Since $\operatorname{dim}\left(\Pi^{\prime}\right) \geq 3, \quad \Pi^{\prime}$ is Desarguesian. Let $g_{i} \in \mathcal{G}_{i}, i=0,1$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{0}:=\left\{\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times g_{1}\right) \chi \mid X_{0} \in g_{0}\right\}, \\
& S_{1}:=\left\{\left(g_{0} \times\left\{X_{1}\right\}\right) \chi \mid X_{1} \in g_{1}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

For $i=0,1, \quad S_{i}$ is a regulus in $\Pi^{\prime}$, and every line of $S_{i}$ meets every line of $S_{1-i}$ in exactly one point. It is well-known [5] that such a configuration can occur only in Pappian projective spaces.

A frame of an $n$-dimensional projective space is a set of $n+2$ points, no $n+1$ of which lie on a hyperplane. We recall that $\gamma: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$ denotes a regular linear morphism.

Proposition 2.2 Assume that

$$
\left\{X_{i 0}, X_{i 1}, \ldots, X_{i, n_{i}+1}\right\}
$$

is a frame of $\Pi_{i}, i=0,1$. Let

$$
\bar{P}_{j h}:=\left(X_{0 j}, X_{1 h}\right) \gamma, \quad j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0}+1, \quad h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}+1 .
$$

Then

$$
\mathcal{E}:=\left\{\bar{P}_{j h} \mid j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0}, h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}\right\} \cup\left\{\bar{P}_{n_{0}+1, n_{1}+1}\right\}
$$

is a frame of $\bar{\Pi}$.
Proof Let
${ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{h}:=\left[\left\{\bar{P}_{0 h}, \bar{P}_{1 h}, \ldots, \bar{P}_{n_{0} h}\right\}\right]=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{X_{1 h}\right\}\right) \gamma \in{ }^{n_{0}} \check{\mathcal{U}}(\bar{\Pi}), \quad h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$.
We shall prove that if $Q \in \mathcal{E}$, then $[\mathcal{E} \backslash\{Q\}] \supset \operatorname{im}(\gamma)$.
If $Q=\bar{P}_{n_{0}+1, n_{1}+1}$, then $[\mathcal{E} \backslash\{Q\}] \supset{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{h}$ for $h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$. Furthermore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma & \in\left[\left\{\left(X_{0}, X_{10}\right),\left(X_{0}, X_{11}\right), \ldots,\left(X_{0}, X_{1 n_{1}}\right)\right\} \gamma\right] \subset \\
& \subset\left[{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{0} \cup \cup^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{1} \cup \ldots \cup^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{n_{1}}\right] \subset[\mathcal{E} \backslash\{Q\}]
\end{aligned}
$$

for any $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{U}$.
Now assume $Q=\bar{P}_{\bar{j} h} \neq \bar{P}_{n_{0}+1, n_{1}+1}$. From ${ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{h} \subset[\mathcal{E} \backslash\{Q\}]$ for $h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$, $h \neq \bar{h}$, it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\{\bar{P}_{n_{0}+1,0}\right. & \left., \bar{P}_{n_{0}+1,1}, \ldots, \bar{P}_{n_{0}+1, n_{1}+1}\right\} \backslash\left\{\bar{P}_{n_{0}+1, \bar{h}}\right\} \subset[\mathcal{E} \backslash\{Q\}] \\
& \Longrightarrow\left(\left\{X_{0, n_{0}+1}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma \subset[\mathcal{E} \backslash\{Q\}] \\
& \Longrightarrow \bar{P}_{n_{0}+1, \bar{h}} \in[\mathcal{E} \backslash\{Q\}] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since ${ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{\bar{h}}=\left[\left\{\bar{P}_{0 \bar{h}}, \bar{P}_{1 \bar{h}}, \ldots, \bar{P}_{n_{0}+1, \bar{h}}\right\} \backslash\{Q\}\right]$, we have ${ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{\bar{h}} \subset[\mathcal{E} \backslash\{Q\}]$. Our assertion can now be proven as in the previous case.

Proposition 2.3 If a line $g$ of $\bar{\Pi}$ is contained in $\operatorname{im}(\gamma)$, then there is an $h \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $g=h \gamma$.

Proof Let $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma,\left(X_{0}^{\prime}, X_{1}^{\prime}\right) \gamma$ and $\left(X_{0}^{\prime \prime}, X_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right) \gamma$ be three distinct points of $g$.
If $X_{0}=X_{0}^{\prime}$, then $g=\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times X_{1} X_{1}^{\prime}\right) \gamma$ and the assertion is proven. The same argument applies to the cases $X_{0}=X_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ and $X_{0}^{\prime}=X_{0}^{\prime \prime}$. So suppose that $X_{0}, X_{0}^{\prime}$ and $X_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ are three distinct points. Take in $\Pi_{0}$ a hyperplane $\mathcal{H}$ such that $X_{0} \notin \mathcal{H}$, $X_{0}^{\prime} \in \mathcal{H}$. Since

$$
\operatorname{im}(\gamma) \subset\left[\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma \cup\left(\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma\right]
$$

the regularity of $\gamma$ and prop. 1.2 give

$$
\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma \cap\left[\left(\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma\right]=\emptyset
$$

We have $\left(X_{0}^{\prime \prime}, X_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right) \gamma \notin\left[\left(\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma\right]$ (because $g \not \subset\left[\left(\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma\right]$ ), whence $g$ is the unique line of $\bar{\Pi}$ which contains $\left(X_{0}^{\prime \prime}, X_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right) \gamma$ and meets the subspaces $\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma$ and $\left[\left(\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma\right]$. We conclude that $g=\left(X_{0} X_{0}^{\prime \prime} \times\left\{X_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right\}\right) \gamma$.

The following result is a corollary of prop. 2.3:
Proposition 2.4 Let $U$ be a subspace of $\bar{\Pi}$, contained in $\operatorname{im}(\gamma)$. Then there exists a singular subspace $\mathcal{U}^{\prime}$ of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ such that $U=\mathcal{U}^{\prime} \gamma$.

Prop. 2.4 could be connected with the following:
Proposition 2.5 Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the collection of all singular subspaces of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$, and $\check{\mathcal{U}}_{i}:=\bigcup_{d=-1}^{n_{i}}{ }^{d} \check{\mathcal{U}}_{i}$ for $i=0,1$. Then

$$
\mathcal{F}=\left\{\left\{P_{0}\right\} \times U_{1} \mid P_{0} \in \mathcal{P}_{0}, U_{1} \in \check{\mathscr{U}}_{1}\right\} \cup\left\{U_{0} \times\left\{P_{1}\right\} \mid P_{1} \in \mathcal{P}_{1}, U_{0} \in \check{\mathcal{U}}_{0}\right\} . \square
$$

Proposition 2.6 Let $\gamma^{\prime}: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$ be a linear morphism. Assume that $\left\{X_{i 0}, X_{i 1}, \ldots, X_{i, n_{i}+1}\right\}$ is a frame of $\Pi_{i}, i=0,1$, and let

$$
P_{j h}:=\left(X_{0 j}, X_{1 h}\right), j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0}+1, h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}+1 .
$$

If

$$
P_{j h} \gamma=P_{j h} \gamma^{\prime}, \quad j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0}, h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}, \quad \text { and }
$$

$$
P_{n_{0}+1, n_{1}+1} \gamma=P_{n_{0}+1, n_{1}+1} \gamma^{\prime},
$$

then $\operatorname{im}(\gamma)=\operatorname{im}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)$.
Proof By prop. 2.2, $\gamma^{\prime}$ is regular. Write

$$
{ }^{n_{1}} \bar{Z}_{j}:=\left[\left\{P_{j 0} \gamma, P_{j 1} \gamma, \ldots, P_{j n_{1}} \gamma\right\}\right], \quad j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0} .
$$

For every $j$, we have ${ }^{n_{1}} \bar{Z}_{j}=\left(\left\{X_{0 j}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma=\left(\left\{X_{0 j}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma^{\prime}$.
The point $P_{n_{0}+1, n_{1}+1} \gamma$ belongs to exactly one $n_{0}$-flat ${ }^{n_{0}} U$ which meets all the flats ${ }^{n_{1}} \bar{Z}_{j}, j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0}$, since

$$
\operatorname{dim} \Pi\left(\left[{ }^{n_{1}} \bar{Z}_{0} \cup{ }^{n_{1}} \bar{Z}_{1} \cup \ldots \cup^{n_{1}} \bar{Z}_{n_{0}}\right]\right)=\operatorname{dim} \Pi([\operatorname{im}(\gamma)])=n_{0} n_{1}+n_{0}+n_{1} .
$$

Such an $n_{0}$-flat is necessarily

$$
{ }^{n_{0}} U=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{X_{1, n_{1}+1}\right\}\right) \gamma=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{X_{1, n_{1}+1}\right\}\right) \gamma^{\prime} .
$$

Now let

$$
{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{h}:=\left[\left\{P_{0 h} \gamma, P_{1 h} \gamma, \ldots, P_{n_{0} h} \gamma\right\}\right], \quad h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}+1 .
$$

By the assumptions, for $h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$, and the above arguments, for $h=n_{1}+1$,

$$
{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{h}=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{X_{1 h}\right\}\right) \gamma=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{X_{1 h}\right\}\right) \gamma^{\prime} \quad \text { for } h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}+1 .
$$

For any $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{U}$, the point $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma$ belongs to $\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma$, which is the unique $n_{1}$-flat of $\bar{\Pi}$ that contains $\left(X_{0}, X_{1, n_{1}+1}\right) \gamma \in{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{n_{1}+1}$ and meets every ${ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{h}$, $h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$. So, both $\operatorname{im}(\gamma)$ and $\operatorname{im}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)$ are the union of all the $n_{1}$-flats of $\bar{\Pi}$ which meet ${ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{0},{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{1}, \ldots,{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{n_{1}+1}$.

## 3 On the automorphism group of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$

The automorphism group Aut $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ has been studied in [4]; here we give some further results.

Let $\mathrm{P} Г \mathrm{~L}(\Pi)$ be the collineation group of $\Pi$. If $\Pi$ has dimension one, then we consider every bijective transformation of the point set of $\Pi$ as a collineation.

Proposition $3.1[4] \quad \mathrm{P} \Gamma \mathrm{L}\left(\Pi_{0}\right) \times \operatorname{P\Gamma L}\left(\Pi_{1}\right)$ is a normal subgroup of Aut $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$. If $\mathrm{P} \Gamma \mathrm{L}\left(\Pi_{0}\right) \times \mathrm{P} \Gamma \mathrm{L}\left(\Pi_{1}\right)$ does not coincide with Aut $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$, then its index in Aut $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ is two.

Proposition 3.2 Aut $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \neq \mathrm{P} \Gamma \mathrm{L}\left(\Pi_{0}\right) \times \operatorname{P\Gamma L}\left(\Pi_{1}\right)$ if, and only if, there exists a collineation $\delta: \Pi_{0} \rightarrow \Pi_{1}$. In this case, write

$$
\Delta: \mathcal{U} \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}:\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \longmapsto\left(X_{1} \delta^{-1}, X_{0} \delta\right)
$$

Then Aut $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ is the semidirect product of $\mathrm{P} \Gamma \mathrm{L}\left(\Pi_{0}\right) \times \operatorname{P\Gamma L}\left(\Pi_{1}\right)$ and $\{\mathbf{1}, \Delta\}$.
Proof The first assertion has been proven in [4] and the second one is a corollary of prop. 3.1.

We now characterize the automorphisms of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ which are related to the collineations of $\bar{\Pi}$, with respect to the regular linear morphism $\gamma: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$.

Proposition 3.3 Assume: $n_{0}>1, \alpha \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right), P_{i} \in \mathcal{P}_{i}, g_{i} \in \mathcal{G}_{i}, i=0,1$, $h_{0}:=\left(\left\{P_{0}\right\} \times g_{1}\right) \gamma, h_{1}:=\left(g_{0} \times\left\{P_{1}\right\}\right) \gamma, \tilde{\alpha}:=\gamma^{-1} \alpha \gamma$. (So $\tilde{\alpha}$ is a bijection of $\operatorname{im}(\gamma)$ ). The following are equivalent:
(i) There is a projectivity $\zeta: h_{0} \rightarrow h_{1}$ such that the mapping $\zeta^{\prime}: h_{0} \tilde{\alpha} \rightarrow h_{1} \tilde{\alpha}$, which is defined by $P \zeta^{\prime}:=P \tilde{\alpha}^{-1} \zeta \tilde{\alpha}$ for all $P \in h_{0} \tilde{\alpha}$, is a projectivity.
(ii) There is a collineation $\kappa$ of $\bar{\Pi}$ such that $\kappa_{\mid \operatorname{im}(\gamma)}=\tilde{\alpha}$.

Proof (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). For $i=0,1$ take a frame of $\Pi_{i}$, say

$$
\left\{X_{i 0}, X_{i 1}, \ldots, X_{i, n_{i}+1}\right\}
$$

such that $X_{10}=P_{1}, X_{00}=P_{0}$ and $g_{1}$ contains two elements of a frame, say $X_{1 h^{\prime}}$ and $X_{1 h^{\prime \prime}}$. Let

$$
\bar{P}_{j h}:=\left(X_{0 j}, X_{1 h}\right) \gamma, \quad j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0}+1, h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}+1 .
$$

Then, by prop. 2.2,

$$
\mathcal{E}:=\left\{\bar{P}_{j h} \mid j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0} ; h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}\right\} \cup\left\{\bar{P}_{n_{0}+1, n_{1}+1}\right\}
$$

is a frame of $\bar{\Pi}$.
$\alpha \gamma$ is a regular linear morphism, thus $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}:=\mathcal{E} \tilde{\alpha}$ is a frame of $\bar{\Pi}$. The map $\tilde{\alpha}_{\mid\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{P_{1}\right\}\right) \gamma}$ is a collineation; let $\kappa$ be the unique collineation of $\bar{\Pi}$ that coincides with $\tilde{\alpha}$ on $\mathcal{E} \cup\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{P_{1}\right\}\right) \gamma$. The existence of $\kappa$ follows from $n_{0}>1$. Since $h_{0}$ contains $\bar{P}_{0 h^{\prime}}, \bar{P}_{0 h^{\prime \prime}} \in \mathcal{E}$, we have $h_{0} \tilde{\alpha}=\left(\left\{P_{0}\right\} \times g_{1}\right) \kappa$. If $X \in g_{1}$, then $\left(P_{0}, X\right) \gamma \zeta \in$ $h_{1} \subset\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{P_{1}\right\}\right) \gamma$. Therefore:

$$
\left(P_{0}, X\right) \gamma \tilde{\alpha}=\left(P_{0}, X\right) \gamma \zeta \tilde{\alpha}\left(\zeta^{\prime}\right)^{-1}=\left(P_{0}, X\right) \gamma \zeta \kappa\left(\zeta^{\prime}\right)^{-1}
$$

hence $\tilde{\alpha}_{\mid h_{0}}=\zeta \kappa\left(\zeta^{\prime}\right)^{-1} \mid h_{0}$. Since $h_{0}=\bar{P}_{0 h^{\prime}} \bar{P}_{0 h^{\prime \prime}}$, the mappings $\kappa$ and $\zeta \kappa\left(\zeta^{\prime}\right)^{-1}$ coincide on $\bar{P}_{0 h^{\prime}}, \bar{P}_{0 h^{\prime \prime}}, h_{0} \cap\left[\mathcal{E} \backslash\left\{\bar{P}_{0 h^{\prime}}, \bar{P}_{0 h^{\prime \prime}}\right\}\right]$ and are related to the same automorphism of the field underlying $\bar{\Pi}$. It follows that $\kappa_{\mid h_{0}}=\tilde{\alpha}_{\mid h_{0}}$ and

$$
\kappa_{\mid\left(\left\{P_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma}=\tilde{\alpha}_{\mid\left(\left\{P_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma} .
$$

Now consider the regular linear morphisms $\alpha \gamma=\gamma \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\gamma \kappa$. They coincide on

$$
\left\{\left(X_{0 j}, X_{1 h}\right) \mid j=0,1, \ldots, n_{0} ; h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}\right\} \cup\left\{\left(X_{0, n_{0}+1}, X_{1, n_{1}+1}\right)\right\}
$$

then (cf. prop. 2.6) $\mathrm{im}(\gamma)=\operatorname{im}(\gamma \tilde{\alpha})=\operatorname{im}(\gamma \kappa)$.
By previous arguments, if $X_{0}=P_{0}$ or $X_{1}=P_{1}$, then $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \tilde{\alpha}=\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \kappa$. Then assume $X_{0} \neq P_{0}$ and $X_{1} \neq P_{1}$. By prop. 2.3, every line of $\bar{\Pi}$ which is contained in im $(\gamma)$ is the image, through $\gamma$ and also through $\gamma \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\gamma \kappa$, of an element of $\mathcal{R}$.

So there is exactly one point $P^{*} \in \operatorname{im}(\gamma)$, other than $\left(P_{0}, P_{1}\right) \gamma \tilde{\alpha}$, which is joined to the points

$$
\left(X_{0}, P_{1}\right) \gamma \tilde{\alpha}=\left(X_{0}, P_{1}\right) \gamma \kappa \quad \text { and } \quad\left(P_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \tilde{\alpha}=\left(P_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \kappa,
$$

by some line contained in im $(\gamma)$. We conclude that $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \tilde{\alpha}=\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \kappa=P^{*}$. Thus we proved that (i) implies (ii).
(ii) $\Rightarrow($ i). Let $\zeta$ be a projectivity between the given lines. Then it is straightforward that also $\zeta^{\prime}=\left(\kappa^{-1} \zeta \kappa\right) \mid h_{0} \alpha$ is a projectivity.

The hypothesis " $n_{0}>1$ " has been used only to prove (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). It is possible to give examples which show that such a hypothesis cannot be deleted.

We conclude this section by giving a characterization of the automorphisms of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$.

Proposition 3.4 If $\alpha: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is a bijection and $g \alpha \in \mathcal{R}$ for each $g \in \mathcal{R}$, then $\alpha \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$.

Proof We shall prove that if $g \in \mathcal{R}$, then $g \alpha^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}$. We assume, without loss of generality, that $g=\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times g_{1}, X_{0} \in \mathcal{P}_{0}, g_{1} \in \mathcal{G}_{1}$. In addition, let $P$ and $Q$ be two distinct points on $g_{1}$.

Assume $\left(X_{0}, P\right) \alpha^{-1} \nsim\left(X_{0}, Q\right) \alpha^{-1}$ and let $\left(Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right):=\left(X_{0}, P\right) \alpha^{-1},\left(Z_{0}, Z_{1}\right):=$ $\left(X_{0}, Q\right) \alpha^{-1}$. Then $Y_{0} \neq Z_{0}$ and $Y_{1} \neq Z_{1}$. Take into account the following singular subspaces of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ :

$$
U_{0}:=\left(\left\{Y_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \alpha, \quad U_{1}:=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{Z_{1}\right\}\right) \alpha .
$$

It holds:

$$
\left(X_{0}, P\right) \in U_{0} \backslash U_{1}, \quad\left(X_{0}, Q\right) \in U_{1} \backslash U_{0}, \quad\left|U_{0} \cap U_{1}\right|=1
$$

Since the dimensions of $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{1}$ are finite, $U_{0}$ and $U_{1}$ are exactly the two maximal singular subspaces containing the singleton $U_{0} \cap U_{1}$; this contradicts $\left(X_{0}, P\right) \sim$ $\left(X_{0}, Q\right)$. As a consequence, $\left(X_{0}, P\right) \alpha^{-1} \sim\left(X_{0}, Q\right) \alpha^{-1}$, hence

$$
g \alpha^{-1}=\left\{\left(X_{0}, P\right) \alpha^{-1}\right\} \vee\left\{\left(X_{0}, Q\right) \alpha^{-1}\right\} . \square
$$

## 4 Main results

We quote a result from [1] (prop. 3):
Proposition 4.1 Assume that $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{1}$ are coordinatized by the same commutative field $F,|F|>3$, and that at least one of the following is satisfied:
(i) $\min \left\{n_{0}, n_{1}\right\}=1$; (ii) Aut $F \neq\{\mathbf{1}\}$.

Then there are a subset $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{U}$, a projective space $\Pi^{\prime}=\left(\mathcal{P}^{\prime}, \mathcal{G}^{\prime}\right)$, and two regular linear morphisms $\gamma_{i}: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}, i=0,1$, such that $\operatorname{im}\left(\gamma_{0}\right)=\operatorname{im}\left(\gamma_{1}\right)$ and that the following is true only for $i=0$ :
$\left(\mathrm{E}_{i}\right) \quad$ There is a hyperplane $\mathcal{H}_{i}$ of $\Pi^{\prime}$ such that $\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{H}_{i} \gamma_{i}^{-1}$.
In the proof of prop. 4.1, assuming $n_{0} \geq n_{1}$, a suitable non-projective collineation $\alpha^{\prime}$ of $\Pi_{1}$ is considered. Then $\gamma_{1}:=\left(\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{P}_{0}}, \alpha^{\prime}\right) \gamma_{0}$, where $\gamma_{0}$ is the Segre embedding.

A universal embedding of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ is an embedding $\rho: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$ such that for each embedding $\chi: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ exactly one linear morphism $\psi: \bar{\Pi} \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ exists such that $\chi=\rho \psi$.

Proposition 4.2 If the assumptions of prop. 4.1 are satisfied, then there is no universal embedding of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$.

Proof Assume that $\rho$ is a universal embedding and take into account the linear morphisms $\gamma_{0}$ and $\gamma_{1}$ of prop. 4.1. The universal property of $\rho$ gives $\operatorname{rk} \rho=n_{0} n_{1}+$ $n_{0}+n_{1}$ (cf. also prop. 1.2). If $\psi_{i}$ is the linear morphism such that $\rho \psi_{i}=\gamma_{i}, i=0,1$, then $\phi:=\psi_{0}^{-1} \psi_{1}$ is a collineation of $\Pi^{\prime} ;$ hence $\mathcal{M} \gamma_{1}=\mathcal{M} \gamma_{0} \phi$. By ( $\mathrm{E}_{0}$ ), prop. 4.1, we obtain $\mathcal{M} \gamma_{0}=\mathcal{H}_{0} \cap \operatorname{im}\left(\gamma_{0}\right)$, whence $\mathcal{M} \gamma_{1}=\mathcal{H}_{0} \phi \cap \operatorname{im}\left(\gamma_{1}\right)$ and so ( $\mathrm{E}_{1}$ ) is true, in contradiction to prop. 4.1.

Theorem 1 Let $\gamma: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}, \quad \bar{\Pi}=(\overline{\mathcal{P}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}})$, be a regular linear morphism, and $\chi: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}, \quad \Pi^{\prime}=\left(\mathcal{P}^{\prime}, \mathcal{G}^{\prime}\right)$, an embedding; $n_{i}:=\operatorname{dim}\left(\Pi_{i}\right), i=0,1$; $1 \leq n_{i}<\infty ; n_{0}>1$.

Then there are a collineation $\alpha^{\prime}$ of $\Pi_{1}$ and a linear morphism $\psi: \bar{\Pi} \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ such that $\chi=\alpha \gamma \psi$, where $\alpha:=\left(\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{P}_{0}}, \alpha^{\prime}\right)$.

Proof All the projective spaces can be coordinatized by the same commutative field (cf. prop. 2.1).

Now take $n_{1}+1$ independent points of $\Pi_{1}: A_{0}, A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n_{1}}$. Then let

$$
{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{h}:=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{A_{h}\right\}\right) \gamma \in{ }^{n_{0}} \check{\mathcal{U}}(\bar{\Pi}), \quad h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1} .
$$

We have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{0}\right.} & \left.\cup{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{1} \cup \ldots \cup \cup^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{n_{1}}\right]=\left[\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{A_{0}, A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n_{1}}\right\}\right) \gamma\right] \supset[\operatorname{im}(\gamma)]= \\
& =\overline{\mathcal{P}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now let, for $t=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$,

$$
U_{t}:=\left[{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{0} \cup{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{1} \cup \ldots \cup \cup^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{t}\right] \in{ }^{t n_{0}+t+n_{0}} \check{\mathcal{U}}(\bar{\Pi}) .
$$

Next we define, recursively on $t=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$, a linear morphism $\psi_{t}: U_{t} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\prime}$ with the property

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\psi_{t}\right|^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{h}=\gamma^{-1} \chi_{\left.\right|^{n_{0}}} \bar{Y}_{h} \quad \text { for } h=0,1, \ldots, t \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The property $(4.1)_{0}$ is already a definition of $\psi_{0}$. Now let $0<t \leq n_{1}$ and assume that there is a linear morphism $\psi_{t-1}: U_{t-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\prime}$ satisfying $(4.1)_{t-1}$.

Since $\gamma$ is regular, $U_{t-1}$ and ${ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{t}$ are complementary subspaces of $U_{t}$. Define

$$
\psi_{t}^{\prime}:{ }^{n_{0}} \bar{Y}_{t} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\prime}: P \longmapsto P \gamma^{-1} \chi
$$

We have $\operatorname{rk} \psi_{t-1}, \operatorname{rk} \psi_{t}^{\prime} \geq n_{0} \geq 2$. Take $h_{0} \in \mathcal{G}_{0}$ and let

$$
g_{1}:=\left(h_{0} \times\left\{A_{0}\right\}\right) \gamma ; \quad g_{2}:=\left(h_{0} \times\left\{A_{t}\right\}\right) \gamma .
$$

Then $g_{1} \subset \mathbf{D}\left(\psi_{t-1}\right)$ and $g_{2} \subset \mathbf{D}\left(\psi_{t}^{\prime}\right)$. Define

$$
\sigma^{\prime}: g_{1} \psi_{t-1} \longrightarrow g_{2} \psi_{t}^{\prime}:\left(X_{0}, A_{0}\right) \chi \longmapsto\left(X_{0}, A_{t}\right) \chi
$$

and, for $A \in A_{0} A_{t} \backslash\left\{A_{0}, A_{t}\right\}$,

$$
g:=\left(h_{0} \times\{A\}\right) \chi \in \mathcal{G}^{\prime} .
$$

Since $\{P\} \sigma^{\prime}=(\{P\} \vee g) \cap g_{2} \psi_{t}^{\prime}$ for all $P \in g_{1} \psi_{t-1}, \quad \sigma^{\prime}$ is a projectivity. Now take into account

$$
\sigma:=\left(\psi_{t-1} \mid g_{1}\right) \sigma^{\prime}\left(\psi_{t \mid g_{2}}^{\prime}\right)^{-1}
$$

Then $\left(X_{0}, A_{0}\right) \gamma \sigma=\left(X_{0}, A_{t}\right) \gamma$ for all $X_{0} \in h_{0}$; hence also $\sigma$ is a projectivity. Thus, by prop. 1.6, there is an extension, say $\psi_{t}$, of $\psi_{t-1}$ and $\psi_{t}^{\prime}$ satisfying (4.1) ${ }_{t}$.

Let $\psi:=\psi_{n_{1}}$ and, for $h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$ and $X_{0} \in \mathcal{P}_{0}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
Q_{h}\left(X_{0}\right) & :=\left(X_{0}, A_{h}\right) \gamma \\
T\left(X_{0}\right) & :=\left[\left\{Q_{0}\left(X_{0}\right), Q_{1}\left(X_{0}\right), \ldots, Q_{n_{1}}\left(X_{0}\right)\right\}\right]=\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma . \tag{4.2}
\end{align*}
$$

From $Q_{h}\left(X_{0}\right) \psi=\left(X_{0}, A_{h}\right) \chi$ for all $X_{0} \in \mathcal{P}_{0}$ and $h=0,1, \ldots, n_{1}$, it follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
T\left(X_{0}\right) \psi=\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \chi \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The dimension of $\Pi\left(T\left(X_{0}\right) \psi\right)$ is $n_{1}$, then $\psi_{\mid T\left(X_{0}\right)}$ is global. Hence also $\gamma \psi$ is global.
Now assume $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \psi=\left(Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right) \gamma \psi$ and $\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \neq\left(Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right)$. If $X_{0}=Y_{0}$, then the axiom (L2) for $\gamma \psi$ implies that such a linear morphism is not global. This contradiction gives $X_{0} \neq Y_{0}$. We have

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
T\left(X_{0}\right) \psi=\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \chi, & T\left(Y_{0}\right) \psi=\left(\left\{Y_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \chi, \\
\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \in T\left(X_{0}\right), & \left(Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right) \gamma \in T\left(Y_{0}\right),
\end{array}
$$

hence $\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \chi \cap\left(\left\{Y_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \chi \neq \emptyset$, in contradiction with the assumption that $\chi$ is an embedding. So we have shown that $\gamma \psi$ is injective.
$\alpha:=\chi \psi^{-1} \gamma^{-1}$ is a well-defined mapping and a bijection, since, by (4.2) and (4.3),

$$
\begin{aligned}
P \in \operatorname{im}(\gamma \psi) & \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text { there exists } X_{0} \in \mathcal{P}_{0} \text { such that } P \in T\left(X_{0}\right) \psi \\
& \Longleftrightarrow P \in \operatorname{im}(\chi) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $g \in \mathcal{R}$. Then $g \chi \psi^{-1} \cap \mathrm{im}(\gamma)$ is a line. The lines of $\bar{\Pi}$, which are contained in $\operatorname{im}(\gamma)$, are exactly the images of the lines of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ (cf. prop. 2.3), hence $g \alpha \in \mathcal{R}$. Therefore, by prop. 3.4, $\alpha$ is an automorphism of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$. In addition $\left(\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \alpha \subset\left\{X_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}$; then, by prop. 3.2, we conclude that $\alpha$ is in the form $\left(\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{P}_{0}}, \alpha^{\prime}\right), \quad \alpha^{\prime}$ a collineation of $\Pi_{1}$.

Remarks on theorem 1.

1. Theorem 1 does not hold true for $n_{0}=n_{1}=1$. For instance, if $\alpha^{*}$ is a transformation of $\Pi=\mathrm{PG}(1, \mathbf{R})$ which exchanges two points and is identical on the remaining ones, then $\chi:=\left(\alpha^{*}, \alpha^{*}\right) \gamma$ cannot be represented as desired. However, every embedding of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ is a composition of the kind $\alpha \gamma \psi$, where $\alpha \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$, even if $n_{0}=n_{1}=1$.
2. There are examples of embeddings such that the related linear morphism $\psi$ has a non-empty exceptional set $\mathbf{A}(\psi)$. This is possible only if $n_{0}, n_{1}>1$.
3. Theorem 1 cannot be extended to the case that $\chi$ is a linear morphism. We show an example, assuming $n_{0}, n_{1}>1$. Let $g^{*}$ be a line of $\Pi_{1}$ and $U$ a complementary subspace with respect to $g^{*}$. Let $\sigma: \Pi_{1} \rightarrow \Pi\left(g^{*}\right)$ be the projection from $U$ onto $g^{*}$. Assume that $\alpha^{*}: g^{*} \rightarrow g^{*}$ is a bijective transformation, and that there exists no collineation $\kappa$ of $\Pi_{1}$ such that $\kappa \mid g^{*}=\alpha^{*}$. Clearly, we can choose $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{1}$ so that such an $\alpha^{*}$ and a regular linear morphism $\gamma: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$ exist. Then $\chi:=\left(\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{P}_{0}}, \sigma \alpha^{*}\right) \gamma$ is a linear morphism. Now we assume that there exist $\alpha \in$ Aut $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$ and a linear morphism $\psi: \bar{\Pi} \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi=\alpha \gamma \psi \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to show that (4.4) leads to a contradiction we prove two propositions.
Proposition $4.3[\mathrm{im}(\chi)] \cap \mathrm{im}(\gamma)=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times g^{*}\right) \gamma$.
Proof $\quad$ Since im $(\chi)=\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times g^{*}\right) \gamma$, we have $\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times g^{*}\right) \gamma \subset[\operatorname{im}(\chi)] \cap \operatorname{im}(\gamma)$.
Now suppose there is $\left(X_{0}^{*}, X_{1}^{*}\right) \gamma \in\left[\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times g^{*}\right) \gamma\right]$ such that $X_{1}^{*} \notin g^{*}$. Let $V$ be a subspace of $\Pi_{1}$ with $X_{1}^{*} \in V$ and such that $g^{*}$ and $V$ are complementary subspaces of $\Pi_{1}$. Then

$$
\operatorname{im}(\gamma) \subset\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times V\right) \gamma \vee\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times g^{*}\right) \gamma, \quad \text { and } \quad\left[\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times V\right) \gamma\right] \cap\left[\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times g^{*}\right) \gamma\right] \neq \emptyset
$$

contradict the regularity of $\gamma$.
Take $P_{0}^{*} \in \mathcal{P}_{0}, P_{1}^{*} \in \mathcal{P}_{1} \backslash g^{*}$ and let

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
P:=\left(P_{0}^{*}, P_{1}^{*}\right), & g:=\left\{P_{0}^{*}\right\} \times g^{*}, & \mathcal{E}:=\{P\} \vee g, \\
Q:=P \alpha \gamma & h:=g \alpha \gamma, & \mathcal{F}:=\mathcal{E} \alpha \gamma .
\end{array}
$$

Proposition 4.4 There exist a projection $\pi: \bar{\Pi} \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$ and a collineation $\kappa$ of $\bar{\Pi}$ such that (i) $\psi=\pi \kappa$; (ii) $\psi_{\mid h}=\kappa_{\mid h}$; (iii) $\mathcal{F} \kappa=\mathcal{E} \gamma$.

Proof By prop. 1.5, there are a map $\pi^{\prime}$ and an injective linear morphism $\kappa^{\prime}$ : $\operatorname{im}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $\psi=\pi^{\prime} \kappa^{\prime}$. From $h \pi^{\prime} \kappa^{\prime}=g \gamma$ we have $h \cap \mathbf{A}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)=\emptyset$. Now let $V$ be such that $V$ and $h \pi^{\prime}$ are complementary subspaces of im $\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)$. Let $W:=V \vee h$. Since $\mathbf{A}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right) \vee V \vee h=\overline{\mathcal{P}}$, the projection $\zeta: W \rightarrow \operatorname{im}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)$ from $\mathbf{A}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)$ is a collineation. Let $\pi$ be the projection from $\mathbf{A}(\pi):=\mathbf{A}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)$ onto $W$ and $\kappa^{\prime \prime}:=\zeta \kappa^{\prime}$. Then $\psi=\pi^{\prime} \kappa^{\prime}=\pi \kappa^{\prime \prime}$. Furthermore $\mathcal{F} \pi \kappa^{\prime \prime}=\mathcal{E} \alpha \gamma \psi=g \gamma$, hence $Q \in \mathcal{F} \backslash W$.

We have $[\operatorname{im}(\alpha \gamma)]=\overline{\mathcal{P}}$, whence $[\operatorname{im}(\alpha \gamma \pi)]=W$ and $[\operatorname{im}(\chi)]=\left[\operatorname{im}\left(\alpha \gamma \pi \kappa^{\prime \prime}\right)\right]=$ $\operatorname{im}\left(\kappa^{\prime \prime}\right)$. By prop. 4.3, $P \gamma \notin \operatorname{im}\left(\kappa^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Since $\mathrm{rk} \kappa^{\prime \prime} \geq 2$, the collineation $\kappa^{\prime \prime}$ can be
extended to a $\kappa \in \operatorname{P\Gamma L}(\bar{\Pi})$ such that $Q \kappa=P \gamma$. (i) and (ii) are clearly satisfied, and

$$
\mathcal{F} \kappa=\{Q\} \kappa \vee h \kappa=\{P\} \gamma \vee g \gamma=\mathcal{E} \gamma . \square
$$

By prop. 4.4, the following map is a collineation of $\mathcal{E}$ :

$$
\bar{\alpha}: X \longmapsto X \alpha \gamma \kappa \gamma^{-1}
$$

If $X \in g$, then $X \bar{\alpha}=X \alpha \gamma \pi \kappa \gamma^{-1}=X\left(\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{P}_{0}}, \alpha^{*}\right)$, hence $\alpha^{*}$ can be extended to a collineation of the plane $\left\{P_{1}^{*}\right\} \vee g^{*}$ and to a collineation of $\Pi_{1}$. By this contradiction, we conclude that (4.4) is false.

Theorem $2 \quad$ Assume that $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{1}$ are coordinatized by the commutative field $F$ and that both the following conditions are satisfied: (i) $n_{0}, n_{1}>1$; (ii) Aut $F=\{\mathbf{1}\}$. Then every regular linear morphism $\gamma: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}$ is a universal embedding.

Proof Let $\chi$ be an embedding of $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$. By (i) and (ii), the collineation $\alpha^{\prime}$ of theorem 1 is projective.

Now we use prop. 3.3. Let $\zeta: h_{0} \rightarrow h_{1}$ be any projectivity. Then both $\tilde{\alpha}_{\mid h_{1}}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}^{-1} \mid h_{0} \tilde{\alpha}$ are projectivities, because they are restrictions of the projective collineations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\alpha}_{\mid\left(\mathcal{P}_{0} \times\left\{P_{1}\right\}\right) \gamma} & : \quad\left(X_{0}, P_{1}\right) \gamma \longmapsto\left(X_{0}, P_{1} \alpha^{\prime}\right) \gamma, \\
\tilde{\alpha}^{-1} \mid\left(\left\{P_{0}\right\} \times \mathcal{P}_{1}\right) \gamma & : \quad\left(P_{0}, X_{1}\right) \gamma \longmapsto\left(P_{0}, X_{1}\left(\alpha^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\right) \gamma,
\end{aligned}
$$

respectively. Thus $\zeta^{\prime}$ is a projectivity and a collineation $\kappa$ of $\bar{\Pi}$ exists such that $\kappa_{\mid \operatorname{im}(\gamma)}=\tilde{\alpha}$. So $\alpha \gamma=\gamma \kappa$. We conclude that $\chi=\gamma \tilde{\psi}$, with $\tilde{\psi}:=\kappa \psi$.

We now take into account a special family of semilinear spaces. To this end, we need some further notions.

A semilinear space $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ is said to be a projective semilinear space if Veblen's axiom holds:
(V) For any $g, g^{\prime} \in \mathcal{R}, g \cap g^{\prime}=\emptyset, P \in \mathcal{U} \backslash\left(g \cup g^{\prime}\right)$, at most one line exists through $P$ meeting both $g$ and $g^{\prime}$.
It should be noted that the singular subspaces of a projective semilinear space are projective spaces.

A semilinear space $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ is said to be irreducible if any line contains at least three points; if any two points in $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ are collinear, then $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ is a linear space; if this is not the case, $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ is a proper semilinear space.

A regular pseudoproduct space is a semilinear space $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ satisfying the following axioms [4]:
(RP1) $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ is proper, irreducible, projective and contains at least one subspace which properly contains a line.
(RP2) $P, Q \in \mathcal{U}, P \nsim Q$ imply that precisely two points exist, $P^{\prime}$ and $Q^{\prime}$, such that $P \sim P^{\prime} \sim Q$ and $P \sim Q^{\prime} \sim Q$. (We obtain a quadrangle, which
is called the quadrangle with respect to (w.r.t.) $P$ and $Q$, and is denoted by $\left.\left\langle P, Q, P^{\prime}, Q^{\prime}\right\rangle.\right)$
(RP3) If $P \in \mathcal{U}, g \in \mathcal{R}$ and $P \nsim Q$ for all $Q \in g$, then a unique $T_{P, g} \in \mathcal{U}$ exists such that $P \sim T_{P, g} \sim Q$ for all $Q \in g$. Furthermore, let $\left\langle P, Q, T_{P, g}, Q^{\prime}\right\rangle$ be the quadrangle w.r.t. $P, Q$; then $Q^{\prime}$ spans a line as $Q$ ranges on $g$.

Proposition 4.5 [4] A regular pseudoproduct space is isomorphic to a product space $\mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right)$, with max $\left\{\operatorname{dim}\left(\Pi_{0}\right), \operatorname{dim}\left(\Pi_{1}\right)\right\} \geq 2$.

Assume that the projective spaces $\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}, \bar{\Pi}, \Pi^{\prime}$ are coordinatized by the commutative field $F$. We recall (prop. 1.5) that every linear morphism between projective spaces is a composition of a projection and a collineation. Hence, by theorem 1, if $\chi: \mathcal{S}\left(\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{1}\right) \rightarrow \Pi^{\prime}$ is an embedding, then im $(\chi)$ can be obtained from the Segre variety $\operatorname{im}\left(\gamma_{0}\right)$ by operating a projection and a collineation; indeed, $\operatorname{im}(\chi)=\operatorname{im}\left(\gamma_{0}\right) \psi$. (For the case $n_{0}=n_{1}=1$ see remark 1.) So $\psi$ is related to a semilinear transformation $\hat{\psi}$ between vector spaces. $\hat{\psi}$ is related to a field automorphism $\hat{\theta}$, and $\hat{\theta}^{-1} \hat{\psi}$ is a linear transformation. It is clear that the collineation of $\bar{\Pi}$ related to $\hat{\theta}^{-1}$ maps $\operatorname{im}\left(\gamma_{0}\right)$ onto itself. As a consequence, if $\psi^{\prime}$ is the linear morphism that is related to $\hat{\theta}^{-1} \hat{\psi}$, then $\operatorname{im}(\chi)=\operatorname{im}\left(\gamma_{0}\right) \psi^{\prime}$. Now we can summarize:

Theorem 3 Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a regular pseudoproduct space. Assume that $\mathcal{S}$ is embedded in the projective space $\operatorname{PG}(n, F)$. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is, up to projective collineations, a projection of a Segre variety. If, in addition, the embedding is regular, then $\mathcal{S}$ is projectively equivalent to a Segre variety.

In the previous theorem we use the new notion of a regular embedding of $\mathcal{S}$, which is spontaneous (cf. p. 68).
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