Addendum to Logarithmic geometry and moduli

Lectures at the Sophus Lie Center

Dan Abramovich

Brown University

June 16-17, 2014

Prestable curves

A *prestable n-marked curve C/S* is a flat, proper morphism with connected reduced fibers of dimension 1, along with disjoint sections $s_i : S \to C$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ in the smooth locus of C/S. We require all fibers have at most nodes as singularities.

Prestable curves

A *prestable n-marked curve C/S* is a flat, proper morphism with connected reduced fibers of dimension 1, along with disjoint sections $s_i : S \to C$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ in the smooth locus of C/S. We require all fibers have at most nodes as singularities.
We denote by p_i the images of s_i.

Stable curves

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every geometric fiber the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(C_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is finite.

Stable curves

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every geometric fiber the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(C_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is finite.

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every irreducible component C' of the normalization C^ν of a geometric fiber

Stable curves

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every geometric fiber the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(C_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is finite.

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every irreducible component C' of the normalization C^ν of a geometric fiber

- If $C' \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ then C' contains at least 3 special points.

Stable curves

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every geometric fiber the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(C_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is finite.

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every irreducible component C' of the normalization C^ν of a geometric fiber

- If $C' \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ then C' contains at least 3 special points.
- If $g(C') = 1$ then C' contains at least 1 special point.

Stable curves

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every geometric fiber the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(C_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is finite.

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every irreducible component C' of the normalization C^ν of a geometric fiber

- If $C' \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ then C' contains at least 3 special points.
- If $g(C') = 1$ then C' contains at least 1 special point.

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if $\omega_{C/S}(\sum p_i)$ is π-ample.

Stable curves

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every geometric fiber the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(C_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is finite.

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if for every irreducible component C' of the normalization C^ν of a geometric fiber

- If $C' \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ then C' contains at least 3 special points.
- If $g(C') = 1$ then C' contains at least 1 special point.

Definition

A prestable curve C/S is *stable* if $\omega_{C/S}(\sum p_i)$ is π-ample.

Proposition

All three definitions coincide

Moduli of stable curves

Theorem (Deligne–Mumford–Knudsen)

Stable curves form a proper, smooth Deligne–Mumford stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ with projective coarse moduli space. The universal curve is $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n+1}$.

Stacks

What is a moduli problem?

Stacks

What is a moduli problem?
We all learned about “representable functors”

Stacks

What is a moduli problem?
We all learned about "representable functors"
These work sometimes, but often replaced by "coarse moduli spaces", a compromise

Stacks

What is a moduli problem?
We all learned about “representable functors”
These work sometimes, but often replaced by “coarse moduli spaces”, a compromise
The reason is that moduli functors dance around the problem instead of facing it directly - the problem of automorphisms.

Moduli as Categories

The object of interest are families $X \to S$.

Moduli as Categories

The object of interest are families $X \to S$.
First and foremost: Families can be pulled back.

Moduli as Categories

The object of interest are families $X \to S$.
First and foremost: Families can be pulled back.
So they form a category $\mathcal{M}$, arrows being cartesian diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_1 & \longrightarrow & X_2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ S_1 & \longrightarrow & S_2 \end{array}$$

Moduli as Categories

The object of interest are families $X \to S$.
First and foremost: Families can be pulled back.
So they form a category $\mathcal{M}$, arrows being cartesian diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_1 & \longrightarrow & X_2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ S_1 & \longrightarrow & S_2 \end{array}$$

With the forgetful functor $(X \to S) \mapsto S$ this is a category fibered in groupoids.

Moduli as Stacks

Second, both maps between families in $\mathcal{M}$ and the families themselves can be glued:

Moduli as Stacks

Second, both maps between families in $\mathcal{M}$ and the families themselves can be glued:
If $f_i : C_1|_{U_i} \to C_2|_{U_i}$ are maps between families over S which agree on $U_i \cap U_j$, then there is a glued map f.

Moduli as Stacks

Second, both maps between families in $\mathcal{M}$ and the families themselves can be glued:
If $f_i : C_1|_{U_i} \to C_2|_{U_i}$ are maps between families over S which agree on $U_i \cap U_j$, then there is a glued map f.
If C_i are families over U_i and $\phi_{i,j}$ are isomorphisms of $C_i|_{U_i \cap U_j}$ with $C_j|_{U_i \cap U_j}$ which are compatible on triple intersections then there is a glued family $C \to S$.

Moduli as Stacks

Second, both maps between families in $\mathcal{M}$ and the families themselves can be glued:

If $f_i : C_1|_{U_i} \to C_2|_{U_i}$ are maps between families over S which agree on $U_i \cap U_j$, then there is a glued map f.

If C_i are families over U_i and $\phi_{i,j}$ are isomorphisms of $C_i|_{U_i \cap U_j}$ with $C_j|_{U_i \cap U_j}$ which are compatible on triple intersections then there is a glued family $C \to S$.

This makes the category $\mathcal{M}$ into a stack.

Algebraic stacks

What makes a stack algebraic is that it is approximated by a scheme.

Algebraic stacks

What makes a stack algebraic is that it is approximated by a scheme.
A scheme Z defines a stack which is the category $\mathfrak{Sch}/Z$.

Algebraic stacks

What makes a stack algebraic is that it is approximated by a scheme.
A scheme Z defines a stack which is the category $\mathfrak{Sch}/Z$.
A map $Z \to \mathcal{M}$ is smooth if it provides geometric objects of $\mathcal{M}$ with versal deformation spaces

Algebraic stacks

What makes a stack algebraic is that it is approximated by a scheme.
A scheme Z defines a stack which is the category $\mathfrak{Sch}/Z$.
A map $Z \to \mathcal{M}$ is smooth if it provides geometric objects of $\mathcal{M}$ with versal deformation spaces
A stack is algebraic essentially if it admits a smooth map from a scheme.

Algebraic stacks

What makes a stack algebraic is that it is approximated by a scheme.
A scheme Z defines a stack which is the category $\mathfrak{Sch}/Z$.
A map $Z \to \mathcal{M}$ is smooth if it provides geometric objects of $\mathcal{M}$ with versal deformation spaces
A stack is algebraic essentially if it admits a smooth map from a scheme.
For instance, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ is an algebraic stack since it has a smooth map from the Hilbert scheme of 3-canonically embedded stable curve.

Artin's criteria

Michael Artin listed criteria for a moduli problem to be an algebraic stack

Artin's criteria

Michael Artin listed criteria for a moduli problem to be an algebraic stack
Most of them often apply by general nonsense (though I have met surprises!)

Artin's criteria

Michael Artin listed criteria for a moduli problem to be an algebraic stack
Most of them often apply by general nonsense (though I have met surprises!)
Often the crucial criterion is the existence of versal deformation spaces.

Stable maps

A **stable map** is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ {\scriptstyle s_i}\uparrow\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \\ S & & \end{array}$$

Stable maps

A **stable map** is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ {\scriptstyle s_i}\uparrow\downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \\ S & & \end{array}$$

where

- $(C/S, s_i)$ is a prestable curve,

Stable maps

A **stable map** is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ {\scriptstyle s_i}\uparrow\downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \\ S & & \end{array}$$

where

- $(C/S, s_i)$ is a prestable curve, and
- in fibers $\mathrm{Aut}(C_s \to X, s_i)$ is finite.

Gromov–Witten theory

We want to count curves on X of class $\beta \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ meeting cycles $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_n$ corresponding to cohomology classes γ_i. For instance: lines through p_1, p_2.

Gromov–Witten theory

We want to count curves on X of class $\beta \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ meeting cycles $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_n$ corresponding to cohomology classes γ_i. For instance: lines through p_1, p_2.
Kontsevich's method: the moduli of stable maps $M := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n,\beta}(X)$ is a Deligne–Mumford stack with projective coarse moduli space.

Gromov–Witten theory

We want to count curves on X of class $\beta \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ meeting cycles $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_n$ corresponding to cohomology classes γ_i. For instance: lines through p_1, p_2.
Kontsevich's method: the moduli of stable maps $M := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n,\beta}(X)$ is a Deligne–Mumford stack with projective coarse moduli space.
There are evaluation maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \stackrel{e_i}{\to} & X \\ (C/S, p_i) & \mapsto & f(p_i) \end{array}$$

Gromov–Witten theory

We want to count curves on X of class $\beta \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ meeting cycles $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_n$ corresponding to cohomology classes γ_i. For instance: lines through p_1, p_2.
Kontsevich's method: the moduli of stable maps $M := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n,\beta}(X)$ is a Deligne–Mumford stack with projective coarse moduli space.
There are evaluation maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \stackrel{e_i}{\to} & X \\ (C/S, p_i) & \mapsto & f(p_i) \end{array}$$

and one defines the *Gromov–Witten invariants*

$$\langle \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_n \rangle^X_{g,\beta} = \int_{[M]^{\mathrm{vir}}} e_1^* \gamma_1 \cdots e_n^* \gamma_n.$$

Gromov–Witten theory (continued)

The mysterious part is $[M]^{\mathrm{vir}}$. This is there to make this a homological and deformation invariant.

Gromov–Witten theory (continued)

The mysterious part is $[M]^{\text{vir}}$. This is there to make this a homological and deformation invariant.
This is akin to the fact that the number of lines through p_1, p_2, namely the intersection number of the locus of lines through p_1 with the locus of lines through p_2, is 1, whether or not $p_1 = p_2$.

Gromov–Witten theory (continued)

The mysterious part is $[M]^{\text{vir}}$. This is there to make this a homological and deformation invariant.

This is akin to the fact that the number of lines through p_1, p_2, namely the intersection number of the locus of lines through p_1 with the locus of lines through p_2, is 1, whether or not $p_1 = p_2$.

In order to define this one uses a *perfect obstruction theory*. In this case it is given by $R^\bullet \pi_* f^* T_X$, represented by a 2-term complex on S.