

ON THE IMAGE OF THE CANONICAL
MAP OF A STABLE POINTED CURVE

E. Ballico

Department of Mathematics

University of Trento

380 50 Povo (Trento) - Via Sommarive, 14, ITALY

e-mail: ballico@science.unitn.it

Abstract: Here we describe (in some particular cases) the canonical model of a 2-connected, but not 3-connected, pointed stable curve.

AMS Subject Classification: 14H10, 14H50

Key Words: stable curve, pointed curve, nodal curve, canonical map, canonical image

1. Introduction

Fix any pointed nodal curve $Y = (X; P_1, \dots, P_n) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ with $g + n \geq 2$ and $n \geq 3$ if $g = 0$. X is a nodal and connected projective curve, $p_a(X) = g$, P_1, \dots, P_n are distinct points of X_{reg} and each smooth and rational irreducible component of X contains at least 3 among the points in $\text{Sing}(X) \cup \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$. The canonical line bundle ω_Y of the pointed curve Y is the line bundle $\omega_X(P_1 + \dots + P_n)$. There is a non-empty maximal open subset U_Y of X such that the complete linear system $|\omega_X(P_1 + \dots + P_n)|$ induces a morphism $\phi_Y : U_Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^x$, where $x = g - 1$ if $n = 0$ and $x = g + n - 2$ if $n > 0$. In many cases (even with large g and $n = 0$ or with any g and large n) U_Y is not Zariski dense in X . Let Y_ω be the closure of $\phi_Y(U_Y)$ in \mathbb{P}^x . The curve Y_ω may be called the *canonical image* of the pointed curve Y . The quasi-projective algebraic set $\phi_Y(U_Y)$ is called the *effective canonical image* of Y . A. Artamkin gave a necessary and sufficient condition for the equality $U_Y = X$ and a necessary and sufficient condition of the very ampleness (up to a few classified “honestly hyperelliptic pointed curves”) of ω_Y ([1], Theorem 1.2; see [3], Theorems 3.3 and 3.6, for

the case $n = 0$). From [1] it only remains to describe Y_ω when Y is not 3-connected. First assume Y not 2-connected, i.e. ω_Y not spanned. In [2] we described U_Y and proved that Y_ω is the image of a disconnected pointed curve $Y' = \sqcup_i Y_i$ in which each Y_i is a semistable pointed curve with ω_{Y_i} spanned. Taking the stable reduction of each Y_i we see that to describe (in principle) the canonical image of any stable pointed curve it would be sufficient to describe the canonical images of all 2-connected pointed curves. By [1], Theorem 1.2, we know the canonical image of any 3-connected pointed curve. Hence from now on we fix a stable pointed curve $Y = (X; P_1, \dots, P_n)$ which is 2-connected, but not 3 connected. Let $\mathbb{B}(Y)$ denote the set of all sets $\{P, Q\}$ formed by 2 distinct points of X such that $X \setminus \{P, Q\}$ is not connected and (if $n > 0$) one of the connected components of $X \setminus \{P, Q\}$ contains all marked points P_1, \dots, P_n . The 2-connectedness of X implies $n \neq 1$.

For any subscheme A of a projective space, let $\langle A \rangle$ denote the linear span of A .

Theorem 1. *Assume $n > 0$, Y 2-connected, $\sharp(\mathbb{B}(Y)) = 1$, say $\mathbb{B}(Y) = \{P, Q\}$, and that $\{P, Q\} \cap \{P_1, \dots, P_n\} = \emptyset$. Let B_1 and B_2 be the closures in X of the 2 connected components of $X \setminus \{P, Q\}$. One of these components, say B_2 , contains all points P_1, \dots, P_n . The line bundle ω_Y is spanned. Let $h_{\omega_Y} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^x$ be the morphism induced by the spanned line bundle ω_Y . Set $f_i := h_{\omega_Y}(B_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Then:*

- (i) $h_{\omega_Y}(P) = h_{\omega_Y}(Q)$; and $\langle f_1(B_1) \rangle \cap \langle f_2(B_2) \rangle = \{h_{\omega_Y}(P)\}$.
- (ii) f_1 is induced by the complete linear system $|\omega_{B_1}(P + Q)|$.
- (iii) f_2 is induced by the codimension 1 linear subsystem of $|\omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)|$ which identifies P and Q .
- (iv) If B_1 is 3-connected and $p_a(B_1) \geq 2$, then either f_1 is an embedding or it is a degree 2 finite morphism with as image a rational normal curve of $\langle f_1(B_1) \rangle$. The latter case occurs if and only if there is a degree 2 morphism $\beta : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\{P, Q\}$ is a fiber of β .
- (v) Assume $h^0(B_2, \mathcal{O}_{B_2}(P + Q)) = 1$. $f_2^{-1}(f_2(P)) = \{P, Q\}$ (scheme-theoretically) if and only if there is no length 3 zero-dimensional scheme $E \subset B_2$ such that $\{P, Q\} \subset E$ and $h^0(B_2, \mathcal{O}_{B_2}(E)) \geq 2$ (or, equivalently, $= 2$).
- (vi) Assume $n \geq 3$ and that B_2 is 3-connected. Then f_2 is unramified and $\{P, Q\}$ are the only distinct points of B_2 in one of its fibers.

The second part of (i) in the statement of Theorem 1 means that Y_ω is obtained by gluing together the curves $h_{\omega_Y}(B_1)$ and $h_{\omega_Y}(B_2)$ at a unique point, $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$.

Theorem 2. *Assume $n = 0$, Y 2-connected, and $\sharp(\mathbb{B}(Y)) = 1$, say $\mathbb{B}(Y) =$*

$\{P, Q\}$. Let B_1 and B_2 be the closures in X of the 2 connected components of $X \setminus \{P, Q\}$. Assume that for each index $i \in \{1, 2\}$ B_i is 3-connected and that there is no length 4 zero-dimensional scheme $W_i \subset B_i$ such that $\{P, Q\} \subset W_i$ and $h^0(B_i, \mathcal{O}_{B_i}(W_i)) \geq 2$. Then h_{ω_Y} is unramified outside P and Q , $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_1}$ and $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_2}$ are unramified, P and Q are the only distinct points of X in the same fiber of h_{ω_Y} , $\langle h_{\omega_Y}(B_1) \rangle \cap \langle h_{\omega_Y}(B_2) \rangle = \{h_{\omega_Y}(P)\}$ and $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$ is a seminormal point with multiplicity 4 and hence embedding dimension 4.

Theorem 3. Assume $n > 0$, that Y is 2-connected, and that there is $\{P, Q\} \in \mathbb{B}(Y)$ such that $P \in \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$, say $P = P_1$, and $Q \notin \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$. Let B_1 and B_2 be the closure in X of the 2 connected components of $X \setminus \{P, Q\}$ with, say, $P_1 \in B_1$. Then $P_i \in B_2$ for all $i \geq 2$. We have $h_{\omega_Y}(P) = h_{\omega_Y}(Q)$, $h^0(X, \omega_Y) = h^0(B_1, \omega_Y|_{B_1}) + h^0(B_2, \omega_Y|_{B_2}) - 1$, $\langle h_{\omega_Y}(B_1) \rangle \cap \langle h_{\omega_Y}(B_2) \rangle = \{h_{\omega_Y}(P)\}$, $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_1}$ is induced by the complete linear system $|\omega_{B_1}(P_1 + Q)|$, while $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_2}$ is induced by the complete linear system $|\omega_{B_2}(P_1 + \dots + P_n)|$. Assume that B_2 is 3-connected. The morphism $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_2}$ is either an embedding or a degree 2 finite morphism onto a rational normal curve, the latter being the case if and only if $n = 2$, B_2 has a degree 2 finite morphism $\beta : B_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\{P_1, P_2\}$ is a fiber of β .

If in the statement of Theorem 3 $h_{\omega_Y}(B_1)$ has an ordinary node at $h_{\omega_Y}(Q)$ (see Lemmas 1 and 3 for conditions assuring it) and $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_2}$ is an embedding (see Lemmas 2, 3 or 4 for conditions assuring it) $h_{\omega_Y}(Q)$ is a seminormal point of Y_ω with multiplicity 3 and hence embedding dimension 3.

Theorem 4. Assume $g \geq 3$, X 3-connected, but Y not 3-connected. Then $n = 2$ and $\mathbb{B}(Y) = \{P_1, P_2\}$. Either h_{ω_Y} is unramified and $\{P, Q\}$ are the only distinct points of X in one of its fibers or it is a degree 2 finite morphism with as image a rational normal curve. The latter case occurs if and only if there is a degree 2 morphism $\beta : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\{P, Q\}$ is a fiber of β .

2. The Proofs

Fix a nodal curve X , an integer $s \geq 2$, and $A_i \in X_{reg}$, $1 \leq i \leq s$. Set $A := \{A_1, \dots, A_s\}$. For any zero-dimensional scheme $W \subset X$ let $\text{Res}_A(W)$ denote the residual of W with respect to the effective Cartier divisor A of X , i.e. the closed subscheme of X with $\mathcal{I}_W : \mathcal{I}_A$ as its ideal sheaf. Since A is a Cartier divisor, we have $\text{length}(W) = \text{length}(W \cap A) + \text{length}(\text{Res}_A(W))$. We will often use without further mention that the 2-connectedness of Y is equivalent to the spannedness of ω_Y ([1], part I of Theorem 1.2). Any of these

two conditions immediately gives $n \neq 1$, i.e. either $n = 0$ or $n \geq 2$.

The proofs of the following two lemmas are elementary and omitted (the assumption “ ω_X very ample” implies that X 3-connected; see step (i) of the proof of Lemma 3 for the use of the 3-connectedness).

Lemma 1. *Let X be a stable curve such that ω_X is very ample. Fix $P, Q \in X_{reg}$ such that $P \neq Q$. Set $L := \omega_X(P + Q)$. Then L is spanned, the morphism $h_L : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^g$, $g := p_a(X)$, induced by $|L|$ is unramified and P, Q are the only different points of X in the same fiber of h_L .*

Lemma 2. *Let X be a stable curve such that ω_X is very ample. Fix an integer $m \geq 3$ and $P_i \in X_{reg}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $\omega_X(P_1 + \cdots + P_m)$ is very ample.*

Lemma 3. *Let X be a 3-connected stable curve such that ω_X is spanned and the canonical map $h_{\omega_X} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{g-1}$, $g := p_a(X)$, has degree 2 onto its image, which is a rational normal curve. Fix $P, Q \in X_{reg}$ such that $P \neq Q$ and set $L := \omega_X(P + Q)$. Then L is spanned and the morphism $h_L : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^g$ induced by $|L|$ is described in the following way:*

(a) *If $h_{\omega_X}(P) \neq h_{\omega_X}(Q)$, then h_L is unramified and P, Q are the only different points of X in the same fiber of h_L .*

(b) *Assume $h_{\omega_X}(P) = h_{\omega_X}(Q)$. Then h_L has degree 2 onto its image, which is a rational normal curve. The fibers of h_L are the same as the fibers of h_{ω_X} .*

Proof. The value of $h^0(X, L)$ and the fact that $h_L(P) = h_L(Q)$ is obvious, by Riemann-Roch and the 3-connectedness of X . Fix $O, A \in X$, such that $O \neq A$ and $\{O, A\} \cap \{P, Q\} = \emptyset$. Since $|\omega_X| + P + Q \subset |L|$, if $h_{\omega_X}(O) \neq h_{\omega_X}(A)$, then $h_L(O) \neq h_L(A)$ and if h_{ω_X} is unramified at O , then h_L is unramified at A .

(i) Assume $h_{\omega_X}(P) \neq h_{\omega_X}(Q)$. By Riemann-Roch to check part (a) it is sufficient to prove that $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \omega_X(P + Q)) = 0$ for every zero-dimensional scheme $Z \subset X$ such that $\text{length}(Z) = 2$ and $Z \neq \{P, Q\}$. Fix any such Z . By Serre duality it is sufficient to prove $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_Z(P + Q)) = 0$. Assume that this is not true and take any nonzero $\sigma \in H^0(X, \mathcal{I}_Z(P + Q))$. Since $p_a(X) > 0$, σ vanishes identically on a proper subcurve of X . Call D the maximal such subcurve and set $B := \overline{X \setminus D}$. Since X is 3-connected, $\#(D \cap B) \geq 3$. Thus $\sigma|_B$ is a section of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(P + Q)|_B$ with at least 3 zeroes, but only finitely many zeroes, contradiction.

(ii) Assume $h_{\omega_X}(P) = h_{\omega_X}(Q)$. Notice that $L \cong f^*(L_g)$, where L_g is the degree g line bundle on the rational normal curve of \mathbb{P}^{g-1} . Then use that $h^0(X, L) = g$ and the universal property of a projective space. \square

Lemma 4. *Let X be a 3-connected stable curve. Fix an integer $n \geq 3$ and*

$P_i \in X_{reg}, 1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $P_i \neq P_j$ for all $i \neq j$. Then $\omega_X(P_1 + \dots + P_n)$ is very ample.

Proof. Since X is 3-connected, ω_X is spanned and the canonical morphism h_{ω_X} is either an embedding or a degree 2 finite morphism onto a smooth rational curve ([1], Theorem 1.2, or [3], Theorem 3.6). In the first case use Lemma 2. In the second case use Lemma 3 and that at most 2 among the points P_1, \dots, P_n are in the same fiber of h_{ω_X} . \square

Lemma 5. *Let X be a 3-connected stable curve such that its canonical morphism $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{g-1}, g := p_a(X) = g$, is an embedding. Fix $P, Q \in X_{reg}$ such that $P \neq Q$. Set $D := \langle \{h(P), h(Q)\} \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^{g-1}$. For any $O \in D \setminus D \cap h(X)$ let $h_O : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{g-2}$ be the composition of h with the linear projection from O .*

(a) *Assume the non-existence of a zero-dimensional scheme W such that $\{P, Q\} \subset W$, $\text{length}(W) = 4$ and $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(W)) \geq 2$. Then $D \cap h(X) = \{h(P), h(Q)\}$. For every $O \in D \setminus \{P, Q\}$ the morphism h_O is unramified and P, Q is the only pair of distinct points in a fiber of h_O .*

(b) *Assume $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(P + Q)) = 1$. There is a zero-dimensional scheme $E \subset X$ such that $\{P, Q\} \subset E$, $\text{length}(E) = 3$ and $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(E)) \geq 2$ if and only if $h^{-1}(D) \neq \{P, Q\}$ (scheme-theoretically). In this case for each $O \in D \setminus D \cap h(X)$ the scheme E is contained in the fiber $h_O^{-1}(h_O(P))$.*

(c) *Assume the existence of a zero-dimensional scheme $W \subset X$ such that $\{P, Q\} \subset W$, $\text{length}(W) = 4$ and $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(W)) \geq 2$, but the non-existence of a zero-dimensional scheme $E \subset X$ such that $\{P, Q\} \subset E$, $\text{length}(E) = 3$ and $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(E)) \geq 2$. Then $h^{-1}(D) = \{P, Q\}$ (scheme-theoretically) and there is $O \in D \setminus \{h(P), h(Q)\}$ such that the morphism h_O is either ramified or contains a pair distinct points in a fiber of h_O different from the pair (P, Q) .*

Proof. Since P, Q are smooth points of X , taking the residual with respect to $\{P, Q\}$ induces a bijection between the set of all length 4 (resp. 3) zero-dimensional schemes containing $\{P, Q\}$ and the length 2 zero-dimensional schemes (resp. the points of X). Fix any length 2 zero-dimensional scheme Z and any $O \in D \setminus \{h(P), h(Q)\}$. Fix any length 2 zero-dimensional scheme Z and any $O \in D \setminus \{h(P), h(Q)\}$. Let W be the only length 4 zero-dimensional scheme $W \subset X$ with Z as its residual with respect to $\{P, Q\}$. The linear projection from O does not send isomorphically Z into \mathbb{P}^{g-1} if and only if $O \in \langle h(Z) \rangle$. We have $f(P) \in \langle Z \rangle$ with $P \notin Z_{reg}$ if and only if $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(Z + P)) \geq 2$; here $\mathcal{O}_X(Z + P)$ is a coherent sheaf on X with depth 1, pure rank 1 and degree 3. A similar statement holds for Q . In this way we get part (b) and that $h^{-1}(D) = \{P, Q\}$ (scheme-theoretically) in part (c). We immediately get parts (a) and (c). \square

Lemma 6. *Assume $n \geq 5$ and that X is 3-connected. Then h_{ω_Y} is an embedding and for each point $O \in \langle h_{\omega_Y}(P_1), h_{\omega_Y}(P_2) \rangle \setminus \{h_{\omega_Y}(P_1), h_{\omega_Y}(P_2)\}$ the composition of h_{ω_Y} with the linear projection from O is unramified and P_1, P_2 are the only distinct points of X contained in the same fiber of ψ .*

Proof. Lemma 4 gives that h_{ω_Y} is an embedding. As in the proof of Lemma 5 it is sufficient to show the non-existence of a length 4 zero-dimensional scheme $W \subset X$ such that $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_W \otimes \omega_X(P_1 + \dots + P_n)) > 0$, i.e. (talking the residual with respect to the effective Cartier divisor $\{P_1, P_2\}$) the non-existence of a length 2 zero-dimensional scheme $Z \subset X$ such that $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \omega_X(P_3 + \dots + P_n)) > 0$. Apply Lemma 4 to the pointed curve $(X; P_3, \dots, P_n)$. \square

Example 1. Assume $n = 0$ and $\sharp(\mathbb{B}(Y)) = 1$, say $\mathbb{B}(Y) = \{P, Q\}$. Let B_1 and B_2 be the closure in X of the 2 connected components of $X \setminus \{P, Q\}$. Assume ω_{B_2} very ample and the existence of a length 3 scheme $E \subset B_2$ such that $\{P, Q\} \subset E$ and $h^0(B_2, \mathcal{O}_{B_2}(ZE)) \geq 2$ (in a certain sense B_2 is trigonal and P, Q are in the same effective divisor of a trigonal pencil). Both condition may be satisfied taking as B_2 a smooth and connected curve of arbitrary genus. Then h_{ω_Y} contract the scheme Z to the point $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$. Obviously, also the curve $h_{\omega_Y}(B_1)$ contains $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$. Similarly, if $p_a(B_2) \geq 5$, it is easy to give examples with B_2 without E and satisfying or not satisfying (c) of Lemma 5

Proof of Theorem 1. Recall that $n \neq 1$ and that ω_Y is spanned.

(a) The definition of $\mathbb{B}(Y)$ gives that $X \setminus \{P, Q\}$ has two connected components and that one of them contains all marked points P_1, \dots, P_n . We have $\omega_Y|_{B_1} \cong \omega_{B_1}(P + Q)$ and $\omega_Y|_{B_2} \cong \omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)$. Both $\omega_Y|_{B_1}$ and $\omega_Y|_{B_2}$ are spanned. Since the morphism induced by $|\omega_Y|_{B_1}|$ sends P and Q into the same point, the same is done by the canonical map h_{ω_Y} . Look at the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \omega_Y \rightarrow \omega_{B_1}(P + Q) \oplus \omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n) \rightarrow \omega_Y|_{\{P, Q\}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (1)$$

Since $n > 0$, $h^1(B_2, \omega_{B_2}(P_1 + \dots + P_n)) = 0$. Hence the restriction map $H^0(B_2, \omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)) \rightarrow H^0(\{P, Q\}, \omega_Y|_{\{P, Q\}})$ is surjective. Hence the restriction map $\rho_1 : H^0(X, \omega_Y) \rightarrow H^0(B_1, \omega_Y|_{B_1})$ is surjective. Hence the linear system $|\omega_{B_1}(P + Q)|$ describes $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_1}$. Since $n \geq 2$ and B_2 is 3-connected, either $\omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)$ is very ample or $n = 2$, $h_{\omega_{B_2}}$ is a degree 2 morphism onto a rational normal curve and P, Q are in the same fiber of B_2 is $h_{\omega_{B_2}}$ (Lemmas 2, 3 and 4). In this case $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_2}$ is induced by the subsystem of $|\omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)|$ which identifies P and Q . Γ is a hyperplane of $|\omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)|$ and it corresponds to a linear projection from a point (neither $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$ nor $h_{\omega_Y}(Q)$) from the line

of \mathbb{P}^x , $x = g + n - 2$, spanned by $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$ and $h_{\omega_Y}(Q)$. Let $f : B_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^y$, $y := p_a(B_2) + n$, be the morphism induced by $|\omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)|$ and $f' := h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_2} : B_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{y-1}$ the morphism induced by Γ . Let $D \subset \mathbb{P}^y$ be the line spanned by $f(P)$ and $f(Q)$.

(b) Consider the following set \diamond of conditions:

\diamond : “ $f_1|_{B_2 \setminus \{P, Q\}}$ is injective, $f^{-1}(f(\{P, Q\})) = \{P, Q\}$ and f_1 is unramified at P and Q .”

Since f_2 is obtained from the embedding f taking a linear projection from a point of $D \setminus \{f(P), f(Q)\}$, all these condition are true if and only if $\{P, Q\}$ is the scheme-theoretic counterimage $f_2^{-1}(f_2(P))$. Hence one of these conditions fails if and only there is a length 3 zero-dimensional scheme $A \subset B_2$ such that $\{P, Q\} \subset A$ and $h^1(B_2, \mathcal{I}_A \otimes \omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)) > 0$. Since P and Q are Cartier divisors of B_2 there is A as above if and only if $h^1(B_2, \mathcal{I}_O \otimes \omega_{B_2}(P_1 + \dots + P_n)) > 0$ for some $O \in B_2$. Assume the existence of such a point O . Duality gives $h^0(X, Hom(\mathcal{I}_{\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}}, \mathcal{I}_O)) > 0$. Fix $b \in H^0(X, Hom(\mathcal{I}_{\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}}, \mathcal{I}_O))$ such that $b \neq 0$. Since $n \geq 2$, there is a maximal proper subcurve C of B_2 , $C \neq \emptyset$, such that $b|_C \equiv 0$. Set $C' := \overline{B_2 \setminus C}$. Obviously, $b|_{C'}$ vanishes at at least $n \geq 2$ points, but it has only finitely many zeroes, contradiction.

(c) Here we assume the that \diamond is true and that there is of a plane N such that $D \subset N \subset \mathbb{P}^y$ and $\text{length}(f^{-1}(N) \cap B_2) \geq 4$, i.e. we assume the existence of a length 4 zero-dimensional subscheme W of B_2 containing $\{P, Q\}$ and such that $h^1(B_2, \mathcal{I}_W \otimes \omega_{B_2}(P + Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)) > 0$, i.e. (remember that P and Q are smooth points of B_2) the existence of a zero-dimensional scheme $Z \subset B_2$ such that $\text{length}(Z) = 2$ and $h^0(X, Hom(\mathcal{I}_{\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}}, \mathcal{I}_Z)) > 0$. Take $b \in H^0(X, Hom(\mathcal{I}_{\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}}, \mathcal{I}_Z))$ such that $b \neq 0$. Now (as in part (vi) of Theorem 1) we assume $n \geq 3$. Since $n > \text{length}(Z)$, there is a maximal proper subcurve C of B_2 , $C \neq \emptyset$, such that $b|_C \equiv 0$. Set $C' := \overline{B_2 \setminus C}$. Obviously, $b|_{C'}$ vanishes at at least $n \geq 3$ points, but it has only finitely many zeroes. Since B_2 is 3-connected, $\#(C' \cap C) \geq 3 > \text{length}(Z)$, contradiction. Hence if $n \geq 3$, then no plane N as above exists.

(c) Here we assume the non-existence of a plane N such that $D \subset N \subset \mathbb{P}^y$ and $\text{length}(f^{-1}(N) \cap B_2) \geq 4$. The non-existence of N gives that $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_2}$ is unramified and that $\{P, Q\}$ are the only distinct points in a fiber of it. Hence in this case $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_2}$ is as described in the statement of Theorem 1.

Now assume $P_i \notin \langle Z \rangle$, $i = 1, 2$. Riemann-Roch gives that $\langle Z \cup \{P_1, P_2\} \rangle$ is a plane. Hence $\langle D \rangle \neq \emptyset$. Since we assumed $P_i \notin \langle Z \rangle$ for all i , $D \cap \langle Z \rangle$ is a unique point, O , and $O \notin \{P, Q\}$. $f'|_Z$ is not an isomorphism if and only if f' is the composition of f with the linear projection from O . $h_{\omega_Y}(P) = h_{\omega_Y}(Q)$, $\langle h_{\omega_Y}(B_1) \rangle \cap \langle h_{\omega_Y}(B_2) \rangle = \{h_{\omega_Y}(P)\}$ and $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_1}$ is induced by the complete

linear system $|\omega_{B_1}(P + Q)|$. Hence (i) and (ii) are true, (iii) follows from (a), while (iv) follows from Lemmas 1 and 3. We checked (v) in (b). Set $Z = (B_2; P, Q, P_1, \dots, P_n)$. Applying Lemma 6 to Z we get (vi). \square

Proof of Theorem 2. We have $\omega_Y|_{B_1} \cong \omega_{B_1}(P + Q)$ and $\omega_Y|_{B_2} \cong \omega_{B_2}(P + Q)$. Since ω_Y is spanned, the line bundles $\omega_Y|_{B_1}$ and $\omega_Y|_{B_2}$ are spanned. Set $f_i := h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_i}$. Since the morphism induced by $|\omega_Y|_{B_1}|$ sends P and Q into the same point, the same is done by the canonical map h_{ω_Y} . Look at the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence (1) with $n = 0$. From it we get $H^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{\{P, Q\}} \otimes \omega_X) = H^0(B_1, \omega_{B_1}) \oplus H^0(B_2, \omega_{B_2})$ and that $h^0(X, \omega_X) = h^0(B_1, \omega|_{B_1}) + h^0(B_2, \omega_X|_{B_2}) - 1$ (for the \leq inequality in the last assertion use the first equality, for the \geq inequality in the last assertion use that ω_Y is spanned). Since $h_{\omega_Y}(P) = h_{\omega_Y}(Q)$, the restriction map $H^0(X, \omega_X) \rightarrow H^0(B_i, \omega_X|_{B_i})$ is surjective, and $\langle f_1(B_1) \rangle \cap \langle f_2(B_2) \rangle = \{h_{\omega_X}(P)\}$. We just saw that $\dim(\langle f_i(B_i) \rangle) = p_a(B_i) - 2$ and that $\{h_{\omega_Y}(P)\} = \langle f_1(B_1) \rangle \cap \langle f_1(B_1) \rangle$. Hence to describe Y_ω it is sufficient to describe $f_1(B_1)$ and $f_2(B_2)$ and then glue these curves at $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$. For instance, Y_ω has a seminormal point with multiplicity 4 at $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$ if and only if each $f_i(B_i)$ has an ordinary node at $h_{\omega_Y}(P)$. In the set-up of Theorem 2 the non-existence of the scheme W_i implies the very ampleness of ω_{B_i} . Apply Lemma 5 to B_1 and to B_2 and conclude. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. The definition of $\mathbb{B}(Y)$ gives that Q is a disconnecting node of X . We have $P_i \in B_2$ for all $i \geq 2$ by the definition of $\mathbb{B}(Y)$. We have $\omega_Y|_{B_1} \cong \omega_{B_1}(Q + P_1)$ and $\omega_Y|_{B_2} \cong \omega_{B_2}(Q + P_2 + \dots + P_n)$. Since ω_Y is locally free, we have the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence on X :

$$0 \rightarrow \omega_Y \rightarrow \omega_{B_1}(P + Q) \oplus \omega_{B_2}(Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n) \rightarrow \omega_Y|_{\{Q\}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (2)$$

Since both $\omega_{B_1}(P + Q)$ and $\omega_{B_2}(Q + P_1 + \dots + P_n)$ are spanned at Q , (2) gives the surjectivity of the restriction maps $\rho_i : H^0(X, \omega_Y) \rightarrow H^0(B_i, \omega_Y|_{B_i})$, $i = 1, 2$. Hence Y_ω and the morphism induced by $|\omega_Y|$ is described in the following way. Fix $O \in \mathbb{P}^x$, $x = g + n - 2$, and two linear subspaces M_i , $i = 1, 2$, of \mathbb{P}^x such that $\dim(M_1) = p_a(B_1)$, $\dim(B_2) = p_a(B_2) + n - 2$ and $M_1 \cap M_2 = \{O\}$. Since $p_a(X) = p_a(B_1) + p_a(B_2)$, $M_1 \cup M_2$ spans \mathbb{P}^x . Notice that $\dim(M_i) = h^0(B_i, \omega_Y|_{B_i})$, $i = 1, 2$. Up to a projective transformation we may assume that the morphisms $h_i : B_i \rightarrow M_i$ induced by the complete linear system $|\omega_Y|_{B_i}|$ satisfies $h_i(Q) = O$. The surjectivity of ρ_i is equivalent to $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_i} = h_i$ (up to a projective transformation). With this convention the canonical morphism h_{ω_Y} is uniquely determined by the rule $h_{\omega_Y}|_{B_i} = h_i$, $i = 1, 2$. For the structure of the morphism h_1 , see Lemmas 1 and 3. For the structure of h_2 see Lemmas 1 and 3 (case $n = 2$) and Lemma 4 (case $n \geq 3$). \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Since X is connected, the definition of $\mathbb{B}(Y)$ gives $n = 2$

and $\mathbb{B}(Y) = \{P_1, P_2\}$. Since X is 3-connected, we may quote [1], Theorem 1.2, or [3], Theorem 3.6, and then apply Lemmas 1 and 2. \square

Acknowledgements

The author was partially supported by MIUR and GNSAGA of INdAM (Italy).

References

- [1] I.V. Artamkin, Canonical maps of pointed nodal curves, *Sb. Math.*, **195**, No. 5 (2004), 615-642.
- [2] E. Ballico, On the domain and the image of the canonical map of a stable pointed curve, *Preprint*.
- [3] F. Catanese, M. Franciosi, K. Hulek, M. Reid, Embeddings of curves and surfaces, *Nagoya Math. J.*, **154** (1999), 185-220.

