

NOTETAKER CHECKLIST FORM

(Complete one for each talk.)

Name: Tony Feng Email/Phone: tonyfeng@stanford.edu

Speaker's Name: Janos Kollar

Talk Title: Moduli of canonical models

Date: 2 / 1 / 19 Time: 2 : 00 am / pm (circle one)

Please summarize the lecture in 5 or fewer sentences: _____

CHECK LIST

(This is **NOT** optional, we will **not pay** for **incomplete** forms)

- Introduce yourself to the speaker prior to the talk. Tell them that you will be the note taker, and that you will need to make copies of their notes and materials, if any.
- Obtain ALL presentation materials from speaker. This can be done before the talk is to begin or after the talk; please make arrangements with the speaker as to when you can do this. You may scan and send materials as a .pdf to yourself using the scanner on the 3rd floor.
 - **Computer Presentations:** Obtain a copy of their presentation
 - **Overhead:** Obtain a copy or use the originals and scan them
 - **Blackboard:** Take blackboard notes in black or blue **PEN**. We will **NOT** accept notes in pencil or in colored ink other than black or blue.
 - **Handouts:** Obtain copies of and scan all handouts
- For each talk, all materials must be saved in a single .pdf and named according to the naming convention on the "Materials Received" check list. To do this, compile all materials for a specific talk into one stack with this completed sheet on top and insert face up into the tray on the top of the scanner. Proceed to scan and email the file to yourself. Do this for the materials from each talk.
- When you have emailed all files to yourself, please save and re-name each file according to the naming convention listed below the talk title on the "Materials Received" check list.
(YYYY.MM.DD.TIME.SpeakerLastName)
- Email the re-named files to notes@msri.org with the workshop name and your name in the subject line.

Moduli spaces of algebraic varieties II

János Kollár

Princeton University

January, 2019

Deligne–Mumford compactification \bar{M}_g

Stable curves:

Projective, connected, reduced curves C such that:

Local: at worst nodes: $(xy = 0)$ (locally analytically)

Global: ω_C is ample.

What is ω_C ?

– smooth curve: $\omega_C = \Omega_C = T_C^* = \mathcal{O}_C(K_C)$.

– for any plane curve, Poincaré residue map

$$\mathfrak{R} : \omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(C)|_C \cong \omega_C$$

– if $C = \cup_i C_i$ and $P_i \subset C_i$ are the nodes then

$$\omega_C|_{C_i} = \omega_{C_i}(P_i).$$

Higher dimension, basic questions

What are the correct analogs of
smooth, projective curves of genus ≥ 2 ?

What are the correct analogs of stable curves?

Usually:

EASY: make it work for an **open** moduli space.

HARD: make it work for a **compact** moduli space.

Canonical models 0

X^n smooth projective variety, floating around.

To get our hands on it, want an embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$.

This needs a holomorphic line bundle L on X with sections $s_0, \dots, s_N \in H^0(X, L)$.

Meta claim I

The only vector bundle one can write down on a manifold/variety is the **tangent bundle** T_X
(and its descendants)

Meta Corollary: The only line bundles are
 $\omega_X = \Omega_X^n = (\det T_X)^*$ (and its powers).

Example 1: (Franchetta conjecture) If $C \mapsto L_C$ is
holomorphic then $L_C = \omega_C^m$ for some m .
(Harer, Arbarello-Cornalba, Mestrano, Kouvidakis)

Example 2: X smooth, L sufficiently ample.

The only holomorphic

$H^0(X, L) \ni s \mapsto$ (line bundle on $(s = 0)$) is:

restrict a line bundle from X to $(s = 0)$. (M. Wolf)

Example 3: (Babylonian towers) The only vector bundles on \mathbb{P}^∞ are sums of line bundles. (Tyurin, Barth)

Non-example: If X is projective and ω_X is the **only** line bundle then ω_X is ample, so minimal model program says $X = X$.

Meta claim II: On an interesting variety there are many line bundles, but we have to work hard to find them.

Canonical models 1

Take any ω_X^m for $m \geq 1$.

Take any basis $s_0, \dots, s_{N(m)} \in H^0(X, \omega_X^m)$.

Get a map $\phi_m : X \dashrightarrow X_m \subset \mathbb{P}^{N(m)}$.

Theorem (Canonical models)

The closed images X_m are isomorphic to each other for $1 \parallel m$.

Get X^{can} , the *canonical model* of X .

- $\dim X = 2$: Castelnuovo, Enriques (+ Mumford)
- $\dim X = 3$: Mori (+ Kawamata, Kollár, Reid, Shokurov)
- $\dim X \geq 4$: Hacon–McKernan
(+ Birkar, Cascini, Corti, Shokurov)
(+ Fujino–Mori)

ω on a singular variety I.

Recipe: (if X is normal)

Take smooth locus $X^0 \subset X$

$\omega_{X^0} = \Omega_{X^0}^n = (\det T_{X^0})^*$, then extend it to X .

Powers: $\omega_X^{[m]} :=$ extension of $\omega_{X^0}^m$.

Exercise: A holomorphic line bundle L^0 on X^0 has at most 1 extension to a holomorphic line bundle L on X , but it may have infinitely many extensions as a topological line bundle.

ω on a singular variety II.

- Hypersurfaces: $(g = 0) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Generator of ω :

$$(-1)^i \frac{dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n}{\partial g / \partial x_i}$$

- Quotients: $\mathbb{C}^n / (\text{finite group } G)$. Generator of ω^m :

$$(dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n)^{\otimes m}$$

where $m = |G/G \cap \text{SL}_n|$.

Canonical models: internal definition

Canonical singularity: One can pull back pluricanonical forms: $p : Y \rightarrow X$ resolution, then we have

$$p^* \omega_X^{[m]} \rightarrow \omega_Y^{[m]}.$$

Canonical model: normal, projective,
– X has canonical singularities and
– ω_X is ample.

Moduli and compactification: using GIT directly

Mumford (1965): M_g using GIT,

Mumford, Gieseker (1974–80) \bar{M}_g using GIT.

Gieseker (1977): moduli of surfaces using GIT, for high enough pluricanonical embedding,

Viehweg (1989–95): higher dimensional canonical models, with well chosen polarization,

Chenyang Xu – Xiaowei Wang (2012) GIT compactification of the moduli of surfaces **forever depends** on the pluricanonical embedding, (both Chow and Hilbert versions).

Compactification 2: Memento Mori

Lemma. B smooth curve, $B^0 = B \setminus \{0\}$

$f^0 : Y^0 \rightarrow B^0$ a family of canonical models.

There is at most 1 extension to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y^0 & \subset & Y \\ f^0 \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ B^0 & \subset & B \end{array}$$

such that

- Y has canonical singularities and
- ω_Y (rather $\omega_{Y/B}$) is ample on every fiber.

KSB approach

B smooth curve, $B^0 = B \setminus \{0\}$

$f^0 : Y^0 \rightarrow B^0$ a flat family of canonical models.

- Take any extension $f_1 : Y^1 \rightarrow B$.
- Resolve singularities $f_2 : Y^2 \rightarrow B$, write $Y_0^2 = \sum m_i D_i$.
- Take base change $C \rightarrow B$, ramification order a multiple of the m_i . Get $f_3 : Y^3 \rightarrow C$. Now $Y_0^3 = \sum D'_i$.
- Take canonical model to get $f : Y \rightarrow C$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Y^0 & \leftarrow & Y_C^0 & \subset & Y \\ f^0 \downarrow & & f_C^0 \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ B^0 & \leftarrow & C^0 & \subset & C. \end{array}$$

In order to apply this we need

- special Y_0 should have ???? singularities

Curve case: $(xy = 0)$ is not canonical but
 $(xy + t^n = 0)$ is canonical.

Needed in general case: $0 \in D \subset X$, Cartier divisor.

Assume $X \setminus D$ has canonical sings and D has ????
 $\Rightarrow X$ has canonical sings.

Definition: ???? = semi-log-canonical.

What is semi-log-canonical?

What is a node?

What is a node?

$$C = (xy = 0) \subset \mathbb{C}^2.$$

generating section σ of ω_C

$$\sigma = \frac{dx}{x} \text{ on } x\text{-axis}, \quad \sigma = -\frac{dy}{y} \text{ on } y\text{-axis}.$$

Characterizations of nodes:

Using resolutions: $p: D \rightarrow C$ then $p^*\sigma$ has only simple poles.

Using local volume: Although the local volume is

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{dx}{x} \wedge \frac{d\bar{x}}{\bar{x}} = \infty,$$

it has only logarithmic growth:

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{|x| \leq 1} |x|^\epsilon \frac{dx}{x} \wedge \frac{d\bar{x}}{\bar{x}} < \infty \quad \text{for } \epsilon > 0.$$

What is semi-log-canonical?

Take a resolution $f : Y \rightarrow X$. Write

$$K_Y = f^*K_X + J \text{ and } f^*D = D_Y + E.$$

- $J \geq 0$ iff X has canonical singularities and
- Mumford's semi-stable reduction: may assume that all coefficients in E equal 1.

Adjunction formula: $K_{D_Y} =$

$$(K_Y + D_Y)|_{D_Y} = (f^*(K_X + D) + J - E)|_{D_Y} = f^*K_D + (J - E)|_{D_Y}$$

Suggests: $J \geq 0 \iff (J - E)|_{D_Y} \geq -1.$

Almost what we want, but no information on exceptional divisors that are disjoint from D_Y .

Convexity of the coefficients of J settles the rest.

(Shokurov, Kollár, Kawakita, de Fernex-Kollár-Xu)

Definition of semi-log-canonical

X only nodes in codimension 1. So ω_X makes sense and $\omega_X^{[m]}$ is locally free for some $m > 0$.

Using resolutions: $f : Y \rightarrow X$ with reduced exceptional divisor E , then we have pull-backs

$$f^*(\omega_X^{[r]}) \rightarrow \omega_Y^{[r]}(rE) \quad \forall r.$$

Using local volume: σ^m : generating section of $\omega_X^{[m]}$.

Although the local volume is $\int \sigma \wedge \bar{\sigma} = \infty$, it has only logarithmic growth:

$$(i^?) \cdot \int |g|^\epsilon \cdot \sigma \wedge \bar{\sigma} < \infty$$

for every g vanishing on $\text{Sing } X$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

Examples of semi-log-canonical singularities

- dim=2: canonical = smooth + Du Val
($xy + z^n = 0, \dots, x^2 + y^3 + z^5 = 0$)
- dim=2: log terminal = $\mathbb{C}^2 / (\text{finite group})$
- dim=n examples:
 - cone over $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is lc (or slc) iff X is lc (or slc)
and $-K_X \sim rH$ for some $r \geq 0$.
 - cone over $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is canonical iff X is canonical
and $-K_X \sim rH$ for some $r \geq 1$.

Stable curves \rightarrow Stable varieties

X : projective, connected

Local condition: semi-log-canonical singularities

Global condition: ω_X is ample.

What are stable families?

Wrong answer:

Flat, projective morphisms with stable fibers.

Example I

Family of varieties in $\mathbb{P}_x^5 \times \mathbb{A}_{st}^2$:

$$X := \left(\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 + sx_4 & x_2 + tx_5 & x_3 \end{pmatrix} \leq 1 \right).$$

Claim: the following are equivalent:

- X_{st} is semi-log-canonical (in fact klt)
- $3K_{X_{st}}$ is Cartier
- either $(s, t) = (0, 0)$ or $st \neq 0$.

Being stable is not a locally closed condition.

Case 1: $st \neq 0$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 + sx_4 & x_2 + tx_5 & x_3 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_4 & x_5 & x_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

This is $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, hence even smooth.

Case 2: $s = t = 0$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 + sx_4 & x_2 + tx_5 & x_3 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

This is the 2-cone over $\mathbb{P}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$.

The singularity is locally like $\mathbb{C}^3 / \frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 0)$:

$\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ acts with $(\epsilon, \epsilon, 1)$.

Case 3: $s = 0, t \neq 0$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 + sx_4 & x_2 + tx_5 & x_3 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 & x_5 & x_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

This is the cone over $F_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^4$.

F_1 is Fano but its anticanonical embedding is into \mathbb{P}^7 .

Here $-K_{F_1}$ is not proportional to $H \cap F_1$.

Example II – with ample K

Let $Y_m \subset \mathbb{P}_x^6 \times \mathbb{C}_t^1$ be the family

$$\sum x_i^m = 0 \text{ and } \text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 + tx_4 & x_2 + tx_5 & x_3 \end{pmatrix} \leq 1.$$

- $Y_m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_t^1$ is flat, projective
- stable fibers for $m \geq 5$,
- $(K_{Y_{m,t}}^3)$ is not locally constant.

Stable families

Theorem (K. 2015) Let $X \rightarrow S$ be a flat, projective morphisms with stable fibers, S reduced. Equivalent:

- 1 The volume of the fibers $s \mapsto (K_{X_s}^n)$ is locally constant.
- 2 The plurigenera $s \mapsto h^0(X_s, \omega_{X_s}^{[m]})$ are locally constant.
- 3 $\omega_{X/S}^{[m]}$ is flat and commutes with base change $\forall m$.

Definition of stable families

S any Noetherian scheme.

A morphism $f : X \rightarrow S$ is **stable** iff

- 1 f is flat, projective with stable fibers and
- 2 $\omega_{X/S}^{[m]}$ is flat and commutes with base change $\forall m$.

Stability is representable

- $f : X \rightarrow S$: flat family, projective of pure relative dim n
- fibers at worst nodal in codim 1.

Theorem

In characteristic 0, there is a monomorphism

$$i_S : S^{\text{stable}} \rightarrow S$$

such that, for every $g : T \rightarrow S$, the following are equiv.

- 1 The pull-back $f_T : X_T \rightarrow T$ is stable.
- 2 g factors through i_S .

Main existence theorem

Fix positive n, d .

There is a projective coarse moduli space $\bar{M}_{n,d}$ parametrizing stable varieties X of dimension n such that $(K_X^n) = d$.

- moduli properties as good as for \bar{M}_g ,
- as a scheme, much more complicated.

(Note: Proofs are complete in characteristic 0 only.)

History of the proof

Surfaces:

- (background) MMP for 3-folds, Mori
- (existence) K–Shepherd-Barron
- (finite type) Alexeev
- (projectivity) K
- (local structure) arbitrarily bad, Vakil

Higher dimensions

- (background) MMP: Hacon–McKernan + H–M–Xu
- (existence) K
- (finite type) Karu, Hacon–McKernan–Xu
- (projectivity) Fujino, Kovács–Patakfalvi