## A simple proof of the projectivity of Kontsevich's space of maps

Maurizio Cornalba ${ }^{1}$

Sunto: Si dà una semplice dimostrazione della proiettività della compattificazione dello spazio delle mappe da curve algebriche a spazi proiettivi recentemente introdotta da Kontsevich.

The stacks of stable maps from curves to projective space have been introduced by Kontsevich [5][6]. It has been observed by several people that the underlying algebraic spaces are in fact projective. A proof can be found in [7]. Here we wish to present a simple proof based on the methods of [1]. We work over $\mathbb{C}$ throughout.

Consider a complete, connected, reduced curve $C$ whose singularities are at worst nodes, $n$ smooth numbered points $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ on $C$, and a morphism $\mu: C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{r}$. According to Kontsevich, one says that the datum of $C, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$, and $\mu$ is a stable map if the following condition is satisfied. Let $E$ be a smooth component of $C$ such that $\mu(E)$ is a point; if the genus of $E$ is zero (resp., one) then $E$ contains at least three (resp., one) points which are among the $x_{i}$ or are singular in $C$ but not in $E$. An isomorphism between stable maps $\left(C, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, \mu\right)$ and ( $\left.C^{\prime}, x_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{n}^{\prime}, \mu^{\prime}\right)$ is an isomorphism $\varphi: C \rightarrow C^{\prime}$ such that $\varphi\left(x_{i}\right)=x_{i}^{\prime}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$ and $\mu^{\prime} \varphi=\mu$. A family of stable maps is a flat proper morphism $f: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow S$ together with $n$ sections $\sigma_{i}: S \rightarrow \mathcal{C}, i=1, \ldots, n$ and a morphism $\mu: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{r}$ such that, for every $s \in S,\left(f^{-1}(s), \sigma_{1}(s), \ldots, \sigma_{n}(s), \mu_{f^{-1}(s)}\right)$ is a stable map. One has obvious notions of pullback and of isomorphism between families of stable maps.

Let $F=\left(C, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, \mu\right)$ be a stable map of degree $d$. If $Q$ is a sufficiently general member of $\left|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r}}(3)\right|$, then $\mu^{*}(Q)=\sum p_{i}$ is a divisor consisting of $3 d$ smooth points of $C$, each occurring with multiplicity one. Furthermore, $\Gamma=\left(C, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, p_{1}, \ldots, p_{3 d}\right)$ is a stable $(n+3 d)$-pointed curve. We then have an exact sequence of groups

$$
1 \rightarrow G \rightarrow \operatorname{Aut}(F) \rightarrow G^{\prime}
$$

where $G=\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma) \cap \operatorname{Aut}(F)$ and $G^{\prime}$ is the group of permutations of $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{3 d}$. This shows that there is an upper bound for the order of $\operatorname{Aut}(F)$ which depends only on $d, n$, and the genus $g$ of $C$. The fact that $\Gamma$ is stable also implies that the number of singular points of $C$ is bounded by $3 g-3+n+3 d$.

Fix non-negative integers $g, n, r, d$. Then the functor

$$
\mathcal{F}(S)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\text { families of stable maps of degree } d \\
\text { from } n \text {-pointed genus } g \text { curves to } \mathbb{P}^{r}
\end{array}\right\} / \text { isomorphisms }
$$

is coarsely represented by a complete separated algebraic space $\bar{M}_{g, n}(r, d)$ (cf. [5][7]). Clearly, $\bar{M}_{g, n}(r, d)$ is non-empty if and only if $2 g-2+n+3 d>0$, and $d=0$ for

[^0]$r=0$. We wish to show that $\bar{M}_{g, n}(r, d)$ is projective. This is clear if $d=0$. In fact, $\bar{M}_{g, n}(r, 0)=\bar{M}_{g, n} \times \mathbb{P}^{r}$, where $\bar{M}_{g, n}$ is the usual moduli space of stable $n$-pointed genus $g$ curves, and we know that $\bar{M}_{g, n}$ is projective.

For $d>0$ we argue as follows. For any family

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{c}
\underset{d_{\|}}{\mathcal{C}} \xrightarrow{\mu} \mathbb{P}^{r} \\
f \sigma_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n
\end{array} \\
& S
\end{aligned}
$$

of stable maps of degree $d$ from $n$-pointed curves of genus $g$ to $\mathbb{P}^{r}$, which we denote by $F$, set

$$
L_{F}=\omega_{f}\left(\sum D_{i}\right) \otimes \mu^{*} \mathcal{O}(3)
$$

where $\omega_{f}=\omega_{\mathcal{C} / S}$ is the relative dualizing sheaf and $D_{i}=\sigma_{i}(S)$. We also set

$$
\mathcal{L}_{F}=\left\langle L_{F}, L_{F}\right\rangle,
$$

where $\langle$,$\rangle is Deligne's bilinear symbol (cf. [2][3]); \mathcal{L}_{F}$ is a line bundle on $S$ which behaves nicely under base change. Therefore this construction defines a line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on the moduli stack of stable maps of degree $d$ from $n$-pointed curves of genus $g$ to $\mathbb{P}^{r}$. Since, as we observed, the orders of the automorphisms groups of such maps are bounded, $\mathcal{L}$ can be viewed as a fractional line bundle on $\bar{M}_{g, n}(r, d)$. We shall prove the following result.
THEOREM 1. For any choice of non-negative integers $g, n, r$, and $d$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2 g-2+n+3 d>0 \\
& d>0 \text { if } r>0
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathcal{L}$ is ample on $\bar{M}_{g, n}(r, d)$.
Notice that, for $r=d=0$, the theorem reduces to the well-known statement that Mumford's class $\kappa_{1}$ is ample on $\bar{M}_{g, n}$ (cf. [1], for instance). The first step in the proof is to observe that there is a family $G$ of stable maps of degree $d$ from $n$-pointed curves of genus $g$ to $\mathbb{P}^{r}$ parametrized by a scheme $Z$ such that the corresponding moduli map

$$
\nu: Z \rightarrow \bar{M}_{g, n}(r, d)
$$

is finite. A proof of this is sketched for instance in [7], based on a modification of a construction of Kollàr [4]. To show that $\mathcal{L}$ is ample it suffices to show that $\nu^{*}(\mathcal{L})=\mathcal{L}_{G}$ is ample on $Z$. In order to prove this we shall use Seshadri's criterion. In other terms, we shall show that there is a positive constant $\alpha$ such that, for any integral complete curve $\Gamma$ in $Z$, one has

$$
\left(\mathcal{L}_{G} \cdot \Gamma\right) \geq \alpha m(\Gamma)
$$

where $m(\Gamma)$ stands for the maximum multiplicity of points of $\Gamma$. Since the intersection number $\left(\mathcal{L}_{G} \cdot \Gamma\right)$ is the degree of $\mathcal{L}_{G^{\prime}}$, where $G^{\prime}$ is the pullback of $G$ via the inclusion $\Gamma \subset Z$, we will be done if we can show that there is a positive constant $\alpha$ such that $\operatorname{deg} \mathcal{L}_{F} \geq \alpha m(S)$ for any non-isotrivial family $F$ of stable maps of degree $d$ from $n$-pointed genus $g$ curves to $\mathbb{P}^{r}$ parametrized by an integral complete curve $S$. Here non-isotrivial means that the moduli map $S \rightarrow \bar{M}_{g, n}(r, d)$ does not send $S$ to a point. Taking into account the definition of $\mathcal{L}_{F}$, what needs to be proved is

Lemma 2. If $2 g-2+n+3 d>0$ and $d>0$ or $r=d=0$, there is a positive constant $\alpha=\alpha(g, n, r, d)$ such that, for any non-isotrivial family $F$ of degree $d$ stable maps from $n$-pointed genus $g$ curves to $\mathbb{P}^{r}$ over an integral complete curve $S$,

$$
\left(L_{F} \cdot L_{F}\right) \geq \alpha m(S)
$$

The proof is essentially by reduction to the known case $r=d=0$. From now on we assume that $d>0$. Let the family $F$ be given by maps $f: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow S, \mu: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{r}$ and sections $\sigma_{i}: S \rightarrow \mathcal{C}, i=1, \ldots, n$. We begin by reducing to the case when the general fiber of $f$ is smooth. Denote by $\Sigma(F)$ the union of all one-dimensional components of the locus of nodes in the fibers of $f$, and by $\pi_{F}: N(F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ the normalization of $\mathcal{C}$ along $\Sigma(F)$. Let $\psi: S^{\prime} \rightarrow S$ be a finite unramified base change, and let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\mathcal{C}^{\prime}}{\mathcal{C}^{\prime}} \xrightarrow{f^{\prime}} \mathbb{P}^{r} \\
& \|_{S^{\prime}}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

be the pullback family, which we call $F^{\prime}$. We can choose $\psi$ in such a way that $\pi_{F^{\prime}}^{-1}\left(\Sigma\left(F^{\prime}\right)\right)$ is a disjoint union of sections of $N\left(F^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow S^{\prime}$. Moreover, since the number of singular points in the fibers of $f$ is bounded independently of $F$, the degree of $\psi$ can also be chosen to be bounded. Thus, in proving Lemma 2, we may assume that $\pi_{F}^{-1}(\Sigma(F))$ is a disjoint union of sections of $N(F) \rightarrow S$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{1}, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_{h}$ be the connected components of $N(F)$, set $\pi_{i}=\pi_{F} \mathcal{C}_{i}, f_{i}=f \pi_{i}, \mu_{i}=\mu \pi_{i}$. Let $\sigma_{i, 1}, \ldots, \sigma_{i, n_{i}}$ be the sections of $f_{i}$ that come from components of $\pi_{F}^{-1}(\Sigma(F))$ lying on $\mathcal{C}_{i}$ or from sections $\sigma_{j}$ such that $\sigma_{j}(S)$ lies on $\pi_{F}\left(\mathcal{C}_{i}\right)$. Then the datum of $f_{i}: \mathcal{C}_{i} \rightarrow S, \mu_{i}: \mathcal{C}_{i} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{r}$, and $\sigma_{i, 1}, \ldots, \sigma_{i, n_{i}}$ is a family of stable maps of degree $d_{i}$ with the property that the general fiber of $f_{i}$ is smooth of genus $g_{i}$. It is clear from the definitions that

$$
L_{F_{i}}=\pi_{i}^{*}\left(L_{F}\right),
$$

so that

$$
\left(L_{F} \cdot L_{F}\right)=\sum\left(L_{F_{i}} \cdot L_{F_{i}}\right) .
$$

Moreover the invariants $g_{i}, n_{i}, d_{i}$ satisfy the inequalities

$$
g_{i} \leq g, \quad d_{i} \leq d, \quad n_{i} \leq n+2(3 g-3+n+3 d) .
$$

This shows that it suffices to prove Lemma 2 for families whose general fiber is smooth; in fact, the possible objection that some of the families $F_{i}$ might be such that $d_{i}=0$, so that Lemma 2 is false for them if $r \neq 0$, may be countered as follows. Suppose all the $F_{i}$ with $d_{i} \neq 0$ are isotrivial, but $F_{j}$ is not. Then $\mu_{j}\left(\mathcal{C}_{j}\right)$ is a single point, so $f_{j}: \mathcal{C}_{j} \rightarrow S$ is non-isotrivial as a family of stable curves, and one can apply to it Lemma 2 with $r=d=0$.

From now on we assume that the general fiber of $f: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow S$ is smooth. We set $D_{i}=\sigma_{i}(S)$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. A simple dimension count shows that, if $\mathcal{H}$ is a sufficiently general hyperplane, then
i) $\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{H})$ does not contain components of fibers of $f$;
ii) $\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{H})$ does not contain singular points of fibers of $f$;
iii) $\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{H})$ does not contain points of intersection between one of the $D_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$, and the fibers of $f$ which are singular or lie above singular points of $S$.
iv) $\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{H})$ does not contain $D_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$;
v) $\mu^{-1}(\mathcal{H})$ cuts transversely all the fibers of $f$ which are singular or lie over singular points of $S$.
Let $\mathcal{H}_{1}, \mathcal{H}_{2}$, and $\mathcal{H}_{3}$ be distinct hyperplanes satisfying i), ii), iii), iv) and v). Possibly after a finite base change of bounded degree, $\mu^{-1}\left(\mathcal{H}_{1}+\mathcal{H}_{2}+\mathcal{H}_{3}\right)$ becomes a sum of distinct sections. Moreover, since $\mathcal{H}_{1}, \mathcal{H}_{2}$, and $\mathcal{H}_{3}$ satisfy v), we may choose a base change that does not affect $m(S)$. We may thus assume that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu^{-1}\left(\mathcal{H}_{1}\right)=D_{n+1}+\cdots+D_{n+d} \\
& \mu^{-1}\left(\mathcal{H}_{2}\right)=D_{n+d+1}+\cdots+D_{n+2 d} \\
& \mu^{-1}\left(\mathcal{H}_{3}\right)=D_{n+2 d+1}+\cdots+D_{n+3 d}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $D_{n+1}, \ldots, D_{n+3 d}$ are distinct sections, different from $D_{1}, \ldots, D_{n}$. The family of curves $f: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow S$, together with the sections $D_{1}, \ldots, D_{n+3 d}$, has all the characters of a family of stable $(n+3 d)$-pointed curves, except for the fact that some of the $D_{i}$ may meet; however, by properties ii) and iii), this may occur only on smooth fibers of $f$ not lying above singular points of $S$. To obtain a family ( $f^{\prime \prime}: \mathcal{C}^{\prime \prime} \rightarrow S, D_{1}^{\prime \prime}, \ldots, D_{n+3 d}^{\prime \prime}$ ) of semistable $(n+3 d)$-pointed curves it is necessary to blow up, perhaps repeatedly, the points of intersection of two or more of the $D_{i}$ and possibly, in genus zero, blow down some exceptional curves of the first kind. At each blow-up, the selfintersection of $\omega_{f}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+3 d} D_{i}\right)$ decreases. If $g=0$ and, at any stage of the process, the (proper transforms of the) $D_{i}$ all meet at a point $p$ of a smooth fiber $\Gamma$, the proper transform of $\Gamma$ under the blow-up at $p$ is an exceptional curve of the first kind not meeting sections, which needs to be blown down. The blow-down increases the selfintersection of $\omega_{f}\left(\sum D_{i}\right)$ exactly by one. Thus, in any case

$$
\left(\omega_{f}\left(\sum D_{i}\right) \cdot \omega_{f}\left(\sum D_{i}\right)\right) \geq\left(\omega_{f^{\prime \prime}}\left(\sum D_{i}^{\prime \prime}\right) \cdot \omega_{f^{\prime \prime}}\left(\sum D_{i}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right)
$$

Now, if

$$
F^{\prime}=\left(f^{\prime}: \mathcal{C}^{\prime} \rightarrow S, D_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, D_{n+3 d}^{\prime}\right)
$$

is the stable model of $\left(f^{\prime \prime}: \mathcal{C}^{\prime \prime} \rightarrow S, D_{1}^{\prime \prime}, \ldots, D_{n+3 d}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, we have that

$$
\left(\omega_{f^{\prime}}\left(\sum D_{i}^{\prime}\right) \cdot \omega_{f^{\prime}}\left(\sum D_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right)=\left(\omega_{f^{\prime \prime}}\left(\sum D_{i}^{\prime \prime}\right) \cdot \omega_{f^{\prime \prime}}\left(\sum D_{i}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right)
$$

so we conclude that

$$
\left(L_{F} \cdot L_{F}\right) \geq\left(L_{F^{\prime}} \cdot L_{F^{\prime}}\right)
$$

If $F^{\prime}$ is not isotrivial, we are done, since $\kappa_{1}$ is ample on $\bar{M}_{g, n+3 d}$. From now on, we assume that $F^{\prime}$ is isotrivial. In particular, this implies that all the fibers of $f: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow S$ are smooth. When $g>0, \mathcal{C}^{\prime}$ dominates $\mathcal{C}$, so $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}=\mathcal{C}$ and the $D_{i}$ do not meet. Another consequence is that $\mu(\mathcal{C})$ is a surface. To see it, just combine the non-isotriviality of $F$ with the following result.

Lemma 3. Let $X$ and $Y$ be smooth curves, denote by $p$ the genus of $Y$, let $U$ be a disk, and let $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}$ be distinct points of $Y$. Suppose $2 p-2+h>0$. Let $\Psi: X \times U \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism such that the divisor $\Psi^{-1}\left(\sum y_{i}\right)$ is a sum $\sum\left\{x_{j}\right\} \times U$, where the $x_{j}$ are $k$ distinct points of $X$. Then, for any $x \in X, \Psi(x, u)$ is independent of $u$.

To proof uses elementary deformation theory. Let $\psi: X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism such that $\psi^{-1}\left(\sum y_{i}\right)=\sum x_{j}$. The first order deformations of $\psi$ as a map from the $k$-pointed curve $\left(X, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)$ to $Y$ sending the $x_{j}$ to the $y_{i}$ are classified by $H^{0}(X, \mathcal{F})$, where $\mathcal{F}$ stands for $\psi^{*}\left(T_{Y}\left(-\sum y_{i}\right)\right) / T_{X}\left(-\sum x_{j}\right)$, and those such that the moduli of $\left(X, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)$ do not vary by the image of $H^{0}\left(X, \psi^{*}\left(T_{Y}\left(-\sum y_{i}\right)\right)\right)$ in $H^{0}(X, \mathcal{F})$. The conclusion follows from the fact that the degree of $\psi^{*}\left(T_{Y}\left(-\sum y_{i}\right)\right)$ is a multiple of $2-2 p-h$, and hence negative.

For $g>0$ we reach a contradiction establishing Lemma 2 by noticing that, since $\mu(\mathcal{C})$ is a surface, $\mathcal{H}_{1} \cap \mathcal{H}_{2} \cap \mu(\mathcal{C})$ is non-empty, so the $D_{i}$ cannot be disjoint, contrary to what we established earlier. When $g=0$, we argue somewhat differently. Since $\mu(\mathcal{C})$ is a surface, by choosing $\mathcal{H}_{1}, \mathcal{H}_{2}$, and $\mathcal{H}_{3}$ to be sufficiently general, we may assume that $\mu\left(D_{i}\right)$ is not a point for $i>n$. Thus, if $i>n$ and $p$ is any point of $D_{i}$, there is a hyperplane passing through $\mu(p)$ but not containing $\mu\left(D_{i}\right)$. It follows that

$$
\left(\mu^{*} \mathcal{O}(1) \cdot D_{i}\right) \geq m(S) \quad \text { for any } i>n
$$

Now set

$$
\eta_{h}=\omega_{f}\left(\sum_{i \leq h} D_{i}\right) .
$$

We wish to show that, for any $h \geq 2$ and any section $D$ of $f$,

$$
\left(\eta_{h} \cdot \eta_{h}\right) \geq 0, \quad\left(\eta_{h} \cdot D\right) \geq 0 .
$$

In fact $\eta_{2}=\mathcal{O}\left(\sum a_{i} \Gamma_{i}\right)$, where the $\Gamma_{i}$ are fibers of $f$, so $\sum a_{i}=\left(\eta_{2} \cdot D_{1}\right)=\left(D_{2} \cdot D_{1}\right) \geq 0$ and

$$
\left(\eta_{2} \cdot \eta_{2}\right)=0, \quad\left(\eta_{2} \cdot D\right)=\sum a_{i} \geq 0
$$

In general

$$
\left(\eta_{h} \cdot \eta_{h}\right)=\left(\eta_{2} \cdot \eta_{2}\right)+\sum_{2<i \leq h}\left(D_{i} \cdot \eta_{2}\right)+\sum_{2<j \leq h}\left(D_{j} \cdot \omega_{f}\left(D_{j}\right)\right)+\sum_{\substack{i \leq h, 2<j \leq h \\ i \neq j}}\left(D_{i} \cdot D_{j}\right) \geq 0,
$$

while

$$
\left(\eta_{h} \cdot D\right)=\left(\omega_{f}\left(D_{j}\right) \cdot D_{j}\right)+\sum_{\substack{0<i \leq h \\ i \neq j}}\left(D_{i} \cdot D_{j}\right) \geq 0
$$

if $D=D_{j}$ for some $j \leq h$, and

$$
\left(\eta_{h} \cdot D\right)=\left(\eta_{2} \cdot D\right)+\sum_{2<i \leq h}\left(D_{i} \cdot D\right) \geq 0
$$

otherwise. Thus

$$
\left(L_{F} \cdot L_{F}\right)=\left(\eta_{n+2 d} \cdot \eta_{n+2 d}\right)+2 \sum_{i>n+2 d}\left(D_{i} \cdot \eta_{n+2 d}\right)+\sum_{i>n+2 d}\left(D_{i} \cdot \mu^{*} \mathcal{O}(1)\right) \geq d m(S) .
$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 2, and hence of Theorem 1.
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