

# Lecture 23-24: The moduli of curves

## 1 The functor of genus $g$ curves

First try: ( $g \geq 2$  morphisms are automatically projective)

**Definition 1.** A smooth curve over  $S$  is a flat and proper morphism  $f : X \rightarrow S$  with smooth geometrically connected 1-dimensional fibers. The genus of  $X \rightarrow S$  is the genus of a geometric fiber.<sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 \mathcal{M}_g &: \text{Sch}_{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \text{Set} \\ S &\rightarrow \{f : X \rightarrow S \text{ a smooth curve of genus } g\} / \sim \end{aligned}$$

$\pi_0 \mathcal{M}_g$  is not representable.

**Example 1.**  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \text{node}$ .

Fix, upgrade the functor to a pseudofunctor

$$\mathcal{M}_g : \text{Sch}_S \rightarrow \text{Gpd}$$

Define groupoids + Stacks = pseudofunctors to groupoid + sheaf.

Diagram relating all notions. Explain notation  $\pi_0 \mathcal{M}_g$ .

## 2 Stacks

**Definition 2.** Category fibered in groupoids (CFG)  $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  such that blah. If  $f : T' \rightarrow T$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and  $E$  an object over  $T$ , then there exists a  $E'$  unique up to unique isom and a map  $E' \rightarrow E$  lying over  $f$ .

Denote  $E' = f^*E$ .  $p^{-1}(T) :=$  objects over  $T$  + morphisms over  $id_T$ . Makes precise the idea of a "pseudofunctor" to groupoids.  $T \mapsto p^{-1}(T)$  which is a groupoid. We will denote  $p^{-1}(T)$  by  $\mathcal{X}_T$ . Presheaves are CFG by viewing a set as a category with only identities. Objects  $S$  may be identified with the category  $\mathcal{C}/S$  (equivalent to the data of the functor of points of  $S$ ) and maps  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  identified with objects of  $\mathcal{X}_S$  by where  $id : S \rightarrow S$  maps. There is a 2-categorical Yoneda lemma.

**Example 2.**  $BG_m, BGL_n, \text{quotient stack, Picard stack, } \mathcal{M}_g$  as a CFG.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note this is constant over connected components of  $S$  by flatness.

**Fact 1.** Fiber products of CFGs exist. I'll let you work out the details of the definition.

Consider  $Sch_S$  with a Grothendieck topology  $\mathcal{T} = (\text{Zariski, étale, fppf, fpqc, etc.})$ .

**Definition 3.** A  $\mathcal{T}$ -stack is a category  $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow Sch_S$  over  $Sch_S$  such that

- (1)  $p$  is a CFG,
- (2) for each scheme  $T \rightarrow S$  and each pair of objects  $\xi, \psi \in \mathcal{X}_T$ , the functor  $Sch_T \rightarrow Set$  given by  $f : V \rightarrow T$  maps to

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}_V}(f^*\xi, f^*\psi)$$

is a  $\mathcal{T}$ -sheaf, and

- (3) objects of  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfy effective  $\mathcal{T}$ -descent.

**Example 3.** All examples above are fppf stacks (and thus also Zariski and étale) (need  $g \neq 1$ ).

A morphism of stacks is representable by schemes if the usual thing. Can define all properties  $\mathcal{P}$  for representable morphisms.<sup>2</sup>

### 3 Algebraic stacks

From now on work with étale or fppf topology, won't make a difference which.

**Lemma 1.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a stack over  $Sch_S$ . Then the diagonal map

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times_S \mathcal{X}$$

is representable by schemes if and only if for all schemes  $T_1, T_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ , the fiber product  $T_1 \times_{\mathcal{X}} T_2$  is a scheme.

That is, the diagonal is representable by schemes if and only if for any morphism  $T \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  from a scheme is representable. For a stack  $\mathcal{X}$  with representable diagonal, we can define all the usual separation axioms.

**Remark 1.** How do we check if  $\Delta$  is representable? We need to show that for any  $T \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times_S \mathcal{X}$ , the pullback  $T \times_{\mathcal{X} \times_S \mathcal{X}} \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$  is a scheme.  $T \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times_S \mathcal{X}$  corresponds to a pair of objects  $\xi, \psi \in \mathcal{X}(T)$  over  $T$  as well as an isomorphism  $\xi \rightarrow \psi$ , that is, an element of  $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{X}(T)}(\xi, \psi) = \text{Isom}_T(\xi, \psi)$ . By definition of a stack, the functor sending a  $T' \rightarrow T$  to  $\text{Isom}_{T'}(\xi_{T'}, \psi_{T'})$  is a sheaf which is isomorphic to the pullback

$$T \times_{\mathcal{X} \times_S \mathcal{X}} \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Thus the condition that the diagonal is representable is the condition that for any  $T$  and any objects  $\xi, \psi$  over  $T$ , the isom sheaf is representable by a scheme.

**Definition 4.** A stack  $\mathcal{X}$  is an algebraic stack (resp. Deligne-Mumford stack) if

- (1) the diagonal  $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$  is representable\*\*, and
- (2) there exists a scheme  $U$  and a smooth (resp. étale) surjection  $U \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ .

<sup>2</sup>something about representable = representable by spaces

**Remark 2.** (A remark on algebraic spaces) If  $\mathcal{X}$  is a stack where the groupoids are sets, that is,  $\mathcal{X}$  is simply a sheaf, that satisfies the conditions of the above theorem, then we say that the sheaf  $\mathcal{X}$  is an algebraic space. In this case,  $\mathcal{X}$  is the quotient in the category of sheaves of the equivalence relation

$$U \times_{\mathcal{X}} U \rightrightarrows U$$

of schemes. Once one develops the theory of algebraic spaces, then the right notion of a representable map of stacks is one that is representable by algebraic spaces, rather than representable by schemes.

**Remark 3.** Let us unravel the definition, we need  $\mathcal{X}$  to be a sheaf so that we can do geometry locally, we need representability of the diagonal to make sense of the having a smooth or étale cover by a scheme, and then we can use descent by this cover to “do geometry” on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Algebraic stacks have a Zariski topology generated by morphisms that are representable by open immersions, and an underlying topological space  $|\mathcal{X}|$  given by equivalence classes of  $K$ -points for fields  $K$  and the Zariski topology. Universally closed makes sense with the usual definition that for any  $\mathcal{Z}$ , the map  $|\mathcal{X} \times_S \mathcal{Z}| \rightarrow |\mathcal{Y} \times_S \mathcal{Z}|$  is closed.

**Theorem 1.** (Valuative criterion for properness) Proper = universally closed + separated by definition. Diagram... Existence + uniqueness separate.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  is a quasi-separated algebraic stack such that  $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$  is unramified. Then  $\mathcal{X}$  is a Deligne-Mumford stack.

Definition of coarse moduli space... unique up to unique iso. Example...

**Theorem 3.** (Keel-Mori) Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  is a proper Deligne-Mumford stack over  $S$ . Then there exists a proper coarse moduli space  $X \rightarrow S$ .

The CFG of stable curves  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$

**Theorem 4.** (Deligne-Mumford)  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$  for  $g \geq 2$  is a smooth and proper Deligne-Mumford stack of dimension  $3g - 3$  with projective coarse moduli space  $\overline{M}_g$ .