

The L^1 - L^∞ -geometry of Teichmüller space
– Second order infinitesimal structures –

Hideki Miyachi

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND EN-
GINEERING, KANAZAWA UNIVERSITY, KAKUMA-MACHI, KANAZAWA, ISHIKAWA,
920-1192, JAPAN

Email address: miyachi@se.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* primary: 32G05, 32G15, 53G60, 58A05, 58A30. Secondary: 32U15, 57M50, 53B05, 32Q45, 32V20

Key words and phrases. Teichmüller space, Teichmüller metric, Extremal quasiconformal mappings, Kodaira-Spencer theory, Double tangent space, Second order infinitesimal structure

This work is partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 20H01800, 20K20519, 22H01125.

Contents

Abstract	5
Chapter 1. Introduction	7
1.1. The L^1 - L^∞ -geometry	7
1.2. Results	9
1.3. Future	11
1.4. Organization of the paper	13
Acknowledgements	15
Chapter 2. Second order infinitesimal spaces on complex manifolds	17
2.1. Summary : Second order infinitesimal spaces and Relations	17
2.2. Tangent and cotangent bundles	17
2.3. Double tangent space	19
2.4. Cotangent spaces to the tangent bundle	22
2.5. Tangent spaces and cotangent spaces to the cotangent bundle	23
2.6. Flip, Switch, and Dualization	24
2.7. Derivative of the Pairing function	27
2.8. Intrinsic characterization of Pairing on TM	28
Chapter 3. Teichmüller theory	31
3.1. Teichmüller space and Bers embedding	31
3.2. Infinitesimal theory	33
3.3. Kodaira-Spencer theory	35
3.4. Stratification of the space of quadratic differentials	37
Chapter 4. Teichmüller space of tori	39
4.1. Teichmüller space of tori	39
4.2. Tangent and cotangent bundles	39
4.3. Second order infinitesimal spaces and Infinitesimal Duality	40
4.4. Levi convexities and CR structures of the unit sphere bundles	41
Chapter 5. Models of Spaces and Pairings	43
5.1. Model of second order infinitesimal spaces	43
5.2. Lie bracket and Lie derivative	44
5.3. Model spaces of $T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g$	45
5.4. Dolbeaut type presentation of Double tangent spaces	49
5.5. Model of $T_{[Y]}^*T\mathcal{T}_g$ and Model of the pairing	55
5.6. Model space of $T_{q_0}\mathcal{Q}_g$	61
5.7. The model space of $T_{q_0}^*\mathcal{Q}_g$ and Models of the pairing and the holomorphic symplectic form	65

5.8. Remarks on regularity of cochains in the formulae of pairings	67
Chapter 6. Trivializations of Models of Spaces and Pairings	69
6.1. Guiding frame, Good section for the coboundary operator	69
6.2. Trivialization of model spaces of $T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g$	71
6.3. Trivialization of the model space of $T_{[Y]}^*T\mathcal{T}_g$	75
6.4. Presentations of the pairings under trivializations	76
6.5. Trivialization of the model space of $T_{q_0}T^*\mathcal{T}_g$ and $T_{q_0}^*T^*\mathcal{T}_g$, and the Pairing under the trivializations	77
6.6. Dualities in model spaces	79
Chapter 7. Direct limits	81
7.1. Direct limit of the model space $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$	81
7.2. Direct limit of $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger$ for $[Y] \in H^0(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$	86
Chapter 8. Double tangent spaces to Teichmüller space	87
8.1. Holomorphic families, charts and cochains	87
8.2. Double tangent space over Teichmüller space	91
8.3. Summary	95
Chapter 9. Variational formula of the pairing function	97
9.1. Variations of 2 forms	97
9.2. Variation of the pairing function	99
9.3. Models are models of the second order infinitesimal spaces	102
Chapter 10. Flip, Switch, Dualization and Lie bracket	105
10.1. Model spaces over underlying manifolds	105
10.2. Flip	105
10.3. Dualization, Pairing and Symplectic form	108
10.4. Switch	109
10.5. Lie bracket between vector fields	110
10.6. Lie bracket via the Dolbeaut presentation	111
Chapter 11. Variational formulae of L^1 -Norm function and Teichmüller metric	113
11.1. L^1 -norm for holomorphic quadratic differentials	113
11.2. Royden's theorem revisited	117
11.3. Teichmüller metric	119
11.4. Infinitesimal Duality	121
Chapter 12. Teichmüller Beltrami differentials	123
12.1. Teichmüller Beltrami maps are real-analytic on strata	123
12.2. Teichmüller Beltrami map is diffeomorphic on strata	124
12.3. Conjectural picture on CR-structures on unit sphere bundles	127
Chapter 13. Appendices	129
13.1. Appendix 1 : Kodaira-Spencer theory and Teichmüller theory	129
13.2. Appendix 2 : Regularity of the operators	129
13.3. Appendix 3 : Royden's regularity criterion on the dual metric	130
Bibliography	137

Abstract

The L^1 - L^∞ geometry is the Finsler geometry of the Teichmüller space by the Teichmüller metric and the L^1 -norm function of holomorphic quadratic differentials. In this paper, aiming to develop the L^1 - L^∞ -geometry and the differential geometry on the Teichmüller space, we formulate the second order infinitesimal structures (the infinitesimal structures on the (co)tangent bundles) over the Teichmüller space. We will give model spaces of the second order infinitesimal spaces.

By applying our formulation, we give affirmative answers to two folklore. We first show that the map from the space of holomorphic quadratic differentials to the tangent bundle defined by Teichmüller Beltrami differentials is a real-analytic diffeomorphism on every stratum in the space of holomorphic quadratic differentials. Second, we show that the Teichmüller metric is real-analytic on the image of each stratum. We also observe a new duality between the Teichmüller metric and the L^1 -norm function at the infinitesimal level.

Introduction

The *Teichmüller space* \mathcal{T}_g of Riemann surfaces of genus g (≥ 2) is a deformation space of marked Riemann surfaces of genus g . The Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g is an infinite branched covering space of the Riemann moduli space of Riemann surfaces of genus g , and the orbifold covering group is essentially identified with the mapping class group of an orientable closed surface of genus g . It was shown by Teichmüller [74] that the Teichmüller space is homeomorphic to the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{6g-6} of dimension $6g - 6$. The Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g admits a natural complex structure, and is known to be biholomorphically equivalent to a bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^{3g-3} .

1.1. The L^1 - L^∞ -geometry

1.1.1. Background. In the Teichmüller theory, the infinitesimal deformation of a Riemann surface M_0 is formulated by differentiating the family of quasiconformal mappings. Hence, the holomorphic tangent space at $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ is described as the quotient space of the space $L^\infty_{(-1,1)}(M_0)$ of L^∞ -measurable $(-1, 1)$ forms on M_0 with L^∞ -norm (for the notation, see Chapter 3). The holomorphic cotangent space at $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ is canonically identified with the space $\mathcal{Q}_{x_0} = \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$ of holomorphic quadratic differentials on M_0 with the L^1 -norm function:

$$\mathbf{n}(q) = \|q\| = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} |q(z)| d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

for $q = q(z)dz^2 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$. The identification comes from the natural pairing

$$(1.1.1) \quad \langle\langle \mu, q \rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} \mu(z)q(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

for $\mu = \mu(z)d\bar{z}/dz \in L^\infty_{(-1,1)}(M_0)$ and $q = q(z)dz^2 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$. In fact, the equivalence relation for defining the the holomorphic tangent space is given by the pairing, which is known as Teichmüller's theorem.

The *Teichmüller metric* τ on \mathcal{T}_g is a Finsler metric on the (holomorphic) tangent bundle $T\mathcal{T}_g$ which is defined as the dual metric of the L^1 -norm function on the space \mathcal{Q}_g of holomorphic quadratic differentials (the holomorphic cotangent bundle) via the above pairing:

$$(1.1.2) \quad \tau(x_0, v) = \sup\{\operatorname{Re}\langle\langle \mu, q \rangle\rangle \mid q \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}, \mathbf{n}(q) = 1\},$$

where $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$, $v \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ and $\mu \in L^\infty_{(-1,1)}(M_0)$ presents the tangent vector v . The L^1 -norm is *reflexively dual* in the sense that

$$(1.1.3) \quad \mathbf{n}(q) = \sup\{\operatorname{Re}\langle\langle \mu, q \rangle\rangle \mid v = [\mu] \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g, \tau(x_0, v) = 1\}$$

for $q \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ (see §13.3.2).

The phrase “the L^1 - L^∞ -geometry” in the title is derived from the situation. Namely, it means the geometry of Teichmüller space in terms of the L^1 -norm on

the holomorphic quadratic differentials (cotangent bundles), and the Teichmüller metric (L^∞ -norm) of the tangent bundles via the duality by the pairing, which is given from the duality between the L^1 -space and the L^∞ -space. Incidentally, the Weil-Petersson geometry stands for the L^2 -geometry on the Teichmüller space in this framework.

Royden gives important contributions to the L^1 - L^∞ -geometry that the L^1 -norm function and the Teichmüller metrics are of class C^1 on the complement of the zero sections, and that the Teichmüller metric coincides with the Kobayashi metric under the canonical complex structure (cf. [67]. See also [40]). The length metric of the Teichmüller metric is called the *Teichmüller distance*. The characterization of the Teichmüller distance by the Kobayashi distance provides interactions between Complex geometry and the Teichmüller geometry (Extremal length geometry) (e.g. [2], [30], [31], [46], [56], [57], [59], and [60]). There are enormous researches on the geometry of the Teichmüller distance from several points of view. See [52] for instance.

The space $\mathcal{Q}_g = \cup_{x \in \mathcal{T}_g} \mathcal{Q}_x$ of holomorphic quadratic differentials has interesting properties in other aspects as well. The space \mathcal{Q}_g admits a natural stratification defined from the data of zeros of holomorphic quadratic differentials (cf. §3.4). The Teichmüller Beltrami differentials (1.1.4) are the directions of geodesics and induce a natural flow action on \mathcal{Q}_g preserving the stratified structure, which called the *Teichmüller geodesic flow*. The dynamics of the Teichmüller geodesic flow presents the affine deformations of (singular) flat structures on a surface, and it is recently applied for several fields and for attacking and solving important problems (e.g. [8], [9], [10], [11], [17], [45], [50], [54], [76], and [77]).

1.1.2. Teichmüller Beltrami differentials. In the L^1 - L^∞ -geometry, the following $(-1, 1)$ form

$$(1.1.4) \quad k \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} = k \frac{\overline{q(z)} d\bar{z}}{|q(z)| dz} \quad (k \geq 0, q \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} - \{0\})$$

plays an important and fundamental role. Such $(-1, 1)$ -forms are called the (*formal*) *Teichmüller Beltrami differentials* ([74]). The Teichmüller Beltrami differential is real-analytic except at the zeroes of the quadratic differential, and has no continuous-limit at each zero.

The Teichmüller Beltrami differentials are extremal in the two situations. When $0 < k < 1$, the quasiconformal mapping g whose Beltrami differential is equal to (1.1.4) has a unique extremal in terms of the maximal dilatation in its homotopy class. This fact is recently known as Teichmüller's uniqueness theorem (e.g. [32, Theorem 5.9]). The unique extremality of the differentials (1.1.4) shows that \mathcal{T}_g is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{6g-6} , and makes the Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g to be a unique geodesic metric in terms of the Teichmüller distance.

When $v \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$ is presented by the Teichmüller Beltrami differential (1.1.4), it is unique *infinitesimally extremal* in the sense that

$$\tau(x_0, v) = k = \left\| k \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \right\|_\infty = \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left\langle k \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|}, \frac{q}{\|q\|} \right\rangle \right\rangle,$$

and, in addition, when a $(-1, 1)$ -form μ on M_0 presents v , $\|\mu\|_\infty \geq k$, and the equality holds only if $\mu = k\bar{q}/|q|$ almost everywhere on M_0 . This is also known as

Teichmüller's theorem (e.g. [27, Corollary 1], [70] and [71]). The unique infinitesimally extremality of the differential (1.1.4) gives a bijection

$$T_{x_0}^* \mathcal{T}_g = \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \ni q \mapsto \left[\|q\| \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \right] \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$$

between the (holomorphic) cotangent space and the (holomorphic) tangent space (preserving the zero sections), where the bracket $[\cdot]$ means the infinitesimal equivalence class (cf. §3.2). Actually, the correspondence extends as a fiber bundle (not vector-bundle)-isomorphism between the (holomorphic) cotangent bundle to the (holomorphic) tangent bundle over the Teichmüller space.

It is known as that the importance of the differential (1.1.4) goes back to Herbert Grötzsch's works on extremal problems of conformal mappings from 1928 in which contain a powerful technique "the length-area method" and an important observation on the (unique) extremality of affine mappings. See Alberge-Papadopoulos [7] and fruitful commentaries on Grötzsch's works and the history of the theory of quasiconformal mappings and the Teichmüller theory in the same volume.

1.2. Results

The purpose of this paper is to develop the L^1 - L^∞ -geometry on the Teichmüller space. We will face two kinds of results in this paper. First, we formulate and develop the theory on the second order infinitesimal structures on the Teichmüller space. We mean by the *second order infinitesimal structures* on the Teichmüller space the (co)tangent structures on the (co)tangent bundle over \mathcal{T}_g . These are stages for discussing the differential geometry (Connections and Finsler geometry etc.). See §1.3 below.

Next, applying our formulations of the second order infinitesimal structures, we will give affirmative answers to (or concrete proofs of) two folklore.

1.2.1. Two folklore. The first folklore which we deal with is as follows:

THEOREM A (Teichmüller Beltrami map is diffeomorphic). The Teichmüller Beltrami map

$$\mathcal{TB}: \mathcal{Q}_g^\times \ni q \mapsto \left[\|q\| \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \right] \in T^\times \mathcal{T}_g$$

is a real-analytic diffeomorphism onto its image on any stratum in \mathcal{Q}_g , where the symbol \times means the complement of the zero section from each space.

The proof appears in Chapter 12. To this end, we first check that the Teichmüller Beltrami maps are real-analytic on each stratum (§12.1). However, we confess that the real-analyticity itself is seemed to be well-known to experts. Indeed, our strategy is to show the following commutative diagram:

$$(1.2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & T\mathcal{Q}_g & \\ & \uparrow & \searrow D\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger \\ -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{X}_n^2 & & \\ & \mathcal{Q}_g^\times & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{TB}} T\mathcal{T}_g \end{array}$$

where $D\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger$ is the differential of the projection $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger: \mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2}$ is the Hamiltonian vector field of the square \mathbf{n}^2 of the L^1 -norm function on \mathcal{Q}_g in terms of a canonical holomorphic symplectic structure on \mathcal{Q}_g (cf. §2.6.4 and §12.1). Though the commutative diagram may also be known to experts (cf. [51]), we confirm the diagram from the variational formula of the L^1 -norm function (Corollary 11.4.1). The constant $-1/2$ at the head of the Hamiltonian vector field in the diagram may depend on the convention. The real-analyticity discussed here cannot be straightforwardly improved in the sense that there is $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g$ such that the Teichmüller Beltrami map is not differentiable in some direction at q_0 (cf. [67] and [29, Proposition 7.5.5]).

After verifying the real-analyticity, we give a variational formula of the Teichmüller Beltrami maps (in our setting) to prove the non-degeneracy of the differential of the Teichmüller Beltrami map \mathcal{TB} (cf. Proposition 12.2.1 and §12.2.2).

Following Theorem A, we define a subset $T\mathcal{T}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ in $T\mathcal{T}_g$ by

$$T\mathcal{T}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon) = \left\{ v = \left[\|q\| \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \right] \in T\mathcal{T}_g \mid q \in \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon) \right\}$$

for $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_1 + \dots + k_n = 4g - 4$ and $\epsilon = \pm 1$, where $\mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ is the stratum with data (k_1, \dots, k_n) and ϵ . From Theorem A, the Teichmüller Beltrami map

$$\mathcal{TB}: \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon) \rightarrow T\mathcal{T}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$$

is a real-analytic diffeomorphism, and hence, the collection $\{T\mathcal{T}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)\}$ defines a stratification in the (holomorphic) tangent bundle $T\mathcal{T}_g$ by real-analytic submanifolds. The L^1 -norm function \mathbf{n} is real-analytic on each stratum in \mathcal{Q}_g (e.g. §3.4). The (unique) infinitesimal extremality deduces the *duality* between the Teichmüller metric and the L^1 -norm function:

$$(1.2.2) \quad \tau(\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g} \circ \mathcal{TB}(q), \mathcal{TB}(q)) = \mathbf{n}(q) = \|q\|$$

for $q \in \mathcal{Q}_g^\times$ (where $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}: T\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ is the projection). Thus, Theorem A gives an affirmative answer to the following second folklore.

THEOREM B (Teichmüller metric is real-analytic). The Teichmüller metric is real-analytic on each stratum in $T\mathcal{T}_g$.

1.2.2. Infinitesimal Duality. The duality (1.2.2) between the L^1 -norm function and the Teichmüller metric described by the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Q}_g = T^*\mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{n}} & \mathbb{R} \\ \Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger \downarrow & \searrow \mathcal{TB} & \uparrow \tau \\ \mathcal{T}_g & \xleftarrow{\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}} & T\mathcal{T}_g \end{array}$$

We will also obtain variational formulae of the L^1 -norm function of holomorphic quadratic differentials and the Teichmüller metric in our setting (cf. Theorem 11.1.1 and Theorem 11.3.1). From our variational formulae, we obtain another duality property, called the *infinitesimal duality* by checking the the following commutative

diagram:

$$(1.2.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} T^* \mathcal{Q}_g = T^* T^* \mathcal{T}_g & \xleftarrow{\mathbf{dual}_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger} & T \mathcal{Q}_g = T T^* \mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Sw}h_{\mathcal{T}_g}} & T^* T \mathcal{T}_g \\ & \searrow^{-\partial \mathbf{n}^2} & \uparrow^{-\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2}} & & \uparrow^{\partial \tau^2} \\ & & \mathcal{Q}_g^\times = (T^*)^\times \mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{FB}} & T^* \mathcal{T}_g \\ & \swarrow^{\Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_g}^\dagger} & & & \searrow^{\Pi_{T \mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger} \end{array}$$

(cf. §11.4). The infinitesimal duality implies that the Teichmüller metric and the L^1 -norm function are also in a dual relationship in the infinitesimal sense. The maps $\mathbf{Sw}h_{\mathcal{T}_g}: T \mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow T^* T \mathcal{T}_g$ and $\mathbf{dual}_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger: T \mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow T^* \mathcal{Q}_g$ appearing in the diagram are biholomorphisms, which called the *switch* and the *dualization*, defined on the tangent bundle $T \mathcal{Q}_g$ over \mathcal{Q}_g (cf. §11.4). As we discuss later, such maps are defined canonically in a general situation (cf. Chapter 2).

It is possible that the infinitesimal duality holds for dual Finsler metrics under a general setting. In fact, a reasonable conjecture is that the reflexive duality like as (1.1.2) and (1.1.3) is sufficient (cf. §13.3.2).

1.2.3. Cases of Riemann surfaces of analytically finite type. For the simplicity of the notation, in this paper, we discuss mainly the Teichmüller space of closed Riemann surface of genus g (≥ 2).

Our second order infinitesimal structures are formulated from both the Teichmüller theory (quasiconformal deformations), and the Kodaira-Spencer theory (sheaf cohomologies). After setting an appropriate situation (for instance, we think $\Theta_M(-D)$ and $\Omega_M^{\otimes 2}(D)$ (D is the divisor of the marked points) instead of Θ_M and $\Omega_M^{\otimes 2}$), we can check that our results here also naturally hold in the case of the Teichmüller space of Riemann surfaces of analytically finite type with negative Euler characteristic, where $\Theta_M(-D)$ and $\Omega_M^{\otimes 2}(D)$ are the sheaf of holomorphic tangent vectors with zeroes at the support of D , and the sheaf of holomorphic quadratic differentials with at most simple poles at the support of D . When $D = 0$ as a divisor we write $\Theta_M(0) = \Theta_M$ and $\Omega_M^{\otimes 2}(D) = \Omega_M^{\otimes 2}$ here (e.g. [35]).

1.3. Future

Our formulations of the second order infinitesimal spaces over the Teichmüller space, and our results, Theorem A, Theorem B, and the infinitesimal duality (1.2.3), give an interactive communication between the L^1 -geometry on \mathcal{Q}_g and the L^∞ -geometry on $T \mathcal{T}_g$ in the infinitesimal level.

1.3.1. The L^1 - L^∞ -geometry is thought of as a (complex) Finsler geometry with the Teichmüller metric (the L^∞ -norm), and also recognized as the (complex) Hamiltonian-Lagrange geometry with the L^1 -norm function. These geometries are the infinitesimal geometries on the (holomorphic) tangent bundle $T \mathcal{T}_g$ and the holomorphic cotangent bundles $T^* \mathcal{T}_g = \mathcal{Q}_g$. Our formulation of second order infinitesimal spaces will help the study of the complex Finsler geometry on the Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g from a higher perspective. In this paper, a *complex Finsler metric* $F = F(x, \xi)$ is by definition, a continuous function on the complex (holomorphic) tangent bundle TM over a complex manifold M with the following three properties:

- (1) (Complex homogeneity) $F(x, \alpha\xi) = |\alpha|F(x, \xi)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, $x \in M$, and $\xi \in T_xM$;
- (2) (Non negativity) $F(x, \xi) \geq 0$ for $x \in M$ and $\xi \in T_xM$; and
- (3) (Triangle inequality) $F(x, \xi_1 + \xi_2) \leq F(x, \xi_1) + F(x, \xi_2)$ for $x \in M$, ξ_1 and $\xi_2 \in T_xM$

(cf. [66]). Several versions of the definition of complex Finsler metrics are known. For instance, in [38], complex Finsler metrics (structures) are defined with the condition (1), the positivity and the smoothness except for the zero-section (see also [65] and [68]). Sometimes, the following pseudoconvexity condition (3') is adopted instead of the condition (3):

- (3') (Pseudoconvexity) the complex Hessian $\left[\frac{\partial^2 F^2}{\partial \xi_i \partial \bar{\xi}_j} \right]$ of the square of F is positive definite on $TM - \{0\}$.

(cf. [1] and [62]). The regularity of F or F^2 is dependent on the situation (cf. [1], [62], [55] and [66]).

A strategy in the complex Finsler geometry is to study the Hermitian metric defined by the complex Hessian (the Levi form) of the square F^2 or F itself on TM or the tautological line bundle of TM . Indeed, it is known that for a complex vector bundle E over M , there is one to one correspondence between the set of Hermitian structures on the tautological line bundle of E and the Finsler structures on E (cf. [6] and [38, §4]).

In any case, the complex Finsler geometry is a complex differential geometry on the holomorphic tangent bundle TM and the holomorphic cotangent space T^*M with a Finsler metric F . The infinitesimal calculations (linear and non-linear connections, curvatures, sprays, etc.) of Finsler metrics are carried out on the second order (or more higher order) infinitesimal spaces ([1], [6], [20], [38], [39], and [62]). Further, Finsler manifolds are also studied with linear and homogeneous nonlinear connections and nonhomogeneous nonlinear ones with a canonical vector field (the complex Liouville vector field) in TTM , and it also constructed a conservative connection for a mechanical system (complex Hamiltonian-Lagrange geometry) ([24], [25], [26] and [36]).

1.3.2. After formulating the second order infinitesimal structures on the Teichmüller space, it is natural to ask the existence of natural Finsler structures on the second order infinitesimal spaces to discuss the L^1 - L^∞ -geometry. The infinitesimal duality given here is a gift from the (original) duality between the L^1 -norm function and the Teichmüller metric. If natural L^1 - L^∞ structures on the second order (or more higher order) infinitesimal spaces exist, it may yield more detailed dualities between the L^1 -norm function and the Teichmüller metric in the second order (or more higher order) level.

1.3.3. Our models of second order infinitesimal spaces will be also naturally used for understanding and formulating (*linear or non-linear connections*) on $T\mathcal{T}_g$ and $T^*\mathcal{T}_g = \mathcal{Q}_g$ from a bird's-eye view (cf. [82]). In fact, it is known that in the case of real differentiable manifold M , any (linear) connection ∇ on TM is presented as $\nabla_X Y = K(DY(X))$ for $X \in T_pM$ and a C^1 -vector field Y around $p \in M$ by a C^∞ map $K: TTM \rightarrow TM$ with suitable properties (cf. [69, Proposition 4.1]. See also §2.3.4). The same kind of formulation can be considered similar for the connections of the (holomorphic) tangent bundle over a complex manifold. Recently, there are

already many calculations (descriptions) and important estimates of the Levi-Civita connection and the curvature tensors of the Weil-Petersson metrics (e.g. [4], [5], [75],[78], [79], [80]). We hope our formulation helps not only the study on the Weil-Petersson geometry (the L^2 -geometry) but on the studies of general (Riemannian, Hermitian, Kähler) metrics.

1.3.4. The second order infinitesimal (cone) structures are also naturally discussed for the Deligne-Mumford compactification of the moduli space of Riemann surfaces of genus g (Riemann surfaces of analytically finite type). There are many researches of the asymptotic behavior of tensors defined from the Weil-Petersson metric (e.g. [49] and [80]). The formulation of the second order infinitesimal spaces or cones on the Deligne-Mumford compactification will provide a systematic formulation for studying the asymptotic behaviors of the tensors defined not only from the Weil-Petersson metric but from general (Riemannian, Hermitian, Kähler) metrics.

Further, as we see in §2.3.3, a second order tangent vectors on the Teichmüller space presents an infinitesimal deformation defined from the holomorphic family of Riemann surfaces over a 2-dimensional polydisk. The degenerating families over a 2-dimensional polydisk are studied deeply by Takamura, and he discusses splitting phenomena of the central fiber and barking deformations, and classifies the atomic fibrations (cf. [72] and [73]). A second order tangent vector at the boundary of the moduli space is (possibly) thought of as an infinitesimal version of the splitting deformation.

1.4. Organization of the paper

The Teichmüller metric, the L^1 -norm function, and the Teichmüller Beltrami map are functions defined on the holomorphic tangent bundle $T\mathcal{T}_g$ and holomorphic cotangent bundles $T^*\mathcal{T}_g = \mathcal{Q}_g$ over the Teichmüller space. Hence, to study such functions in the infinitesimal level, we need to formulate the second order infinitesimal spaces over the Teichmüller space.

To this end, in Chapter 2, we recall and give fundamental properties of the second order infinitesimal structures on complex manifolds. Indeed, in the chapter we will introduce (recall) three canonical biholomorphic mappings

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_M: TTM &\rightarrow TTM \\ \mathbf{Sw}_M: TT^*M &\rightarrow T^*TM \\ \mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger: TT^*M &\rightarrow T^*T^*M\end{aligned}$$

which are called the *flip*, the *switch*, and *dualization*, respectively, where $TTM = T(TM)$, $T^*TM = T^*(TM)$, $TT^*M = T(T^*M)$ and $T^*T^*M = T^*(T^*M)$. These mappings satisfy several relations. See Figure 1 in §2.2. In this paper, we sometime denote by \mathcal{P}_M the natural pairing between holomorphic tangent and cotangent bundles TM and T^*M in thinking of the pairing function as a holomorphic function on the Whitney sum $TM \oplus T^*M$. We call TTM the *double tangent bundle* in this paper. The reason for “double” is that “ TT ” (double T) appears in the symbol. The space TTM is also called the *second order tangent bundle* ([18]) and the *second tangent bundle* ([58]) for example.

In Chapter 3, we shall recall basic notion and results in the Teichmüller theory, and the Kodaira-Spencer theory. We also recall the stratified structure of the space of holomorphic quadratic differentials.

In Chapter 4, we discuss our results in the most simplest case. Indeed, we deal with the Teichmüller \mathcal{T}_1 of tori. Under a canonical complex structure on \mathcal{T}_1 , the Teichmüller metric is the Poincaré metric of curvature -4 . We will see the infinitesimal duality holds in this case.

In Chapter 5, we will introduce the model spaces of the second order infinitesimal spaces over the holomorphic tangent and cotangent spaces over \mathcal{T}_g . These spaces consist of $TT\mathcal{T}_g$, $T^*T\mathcal{T}_g$, $TT^*\mathcal{T}_g = T\mathcal{Q}_g$ and $T^*T^*\mathcal{T}_g = T^*\mathcal{Q}_g$. The model space of the holomorphic tangent space $TT^*\mathcal{T}_g = T\mathcal{Q}_g$ over \mathcal{Q}_g is already given by Hubbard and Masur [28], and we will recall their construction. We also give the models $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}}$ and \mathcal{P}^\dagger of the pairings $\mathcal{P}_{T\mathcal{T}_g}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Q}_g}$ between the holomorphic tangent and holomorphic cotangent spaces over $T\mathcal{T}_g$ and \mathcal{Q}_g . We also discuss the holomorphic symplectic structure on \mathcal{Q}_g following Kawai's formula [34].

In Chapter 6 and Chapter 7, we discuss the trivializations and the direct limits of the model spaces. In Chapter 8, we will confirm that our model space of the double tangent space $TT\mathcal{T}_g$ is an actual model. Namely, we will check that when we identify the Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g as a bounded domain (the Bers slice) via the Bers embedding, our model of the double tangent space $TT\mathcal{T}_g$ actually coincides with the double tangent space over the bounded domain.

From Chapter 9 to Chapter 12, we will apply our model spaces for studying the structures of $T\mathcal{T}_g$ and \mathcal{Q}_g . We will give a variational formula of the pairing function on the Whitney sum $T\mathcal{T}_g \oplus \mathcal{Q}_g$ in Chapter 9. By applying the variational formula, we check that our models of $T^*T\mathcal{T}_g$, $TT^*\mathcal{T}_g$, and $T^*T^*\mathcal{T}_g$ are naturally recognized as actual models. In Chapter 10, we describe the flip, switch, dualization and Lie bracket under our models.

In Chapter 11, we give variational formulae of the L^1 -norm function and the Teichmüller metric, and prove the infinitesimal duality theorem. In the chapter, we also give a proof of Royden's results on the regularity of the L^1 -norm function under our setting, recall Royden's regularity criterion of the dual Finsler metric to check the C^1 -regularity of the Teichmüller metric. For reader's convenience, we will give a proof of the criterion in §13.3. We also discuss the infinitesimal structure of the unit sphere (ball) bundle in \mathcal{Q}_g . After confirming that the unit ball bundle in \mathcal{Q}_g is strictly $(3g-2)$ -convex at every generic boundary point, we pose conjectures on the negative directions of the Levi form of the L^1 -norm function and on the plurisubharmonicity of the Teichmüller metric. In Chapter 12, we will prove Theorem A, and discuss a conjectural picture on CR-structures on the unit sphere bundles.

In the last chapter Chapter 13, as appendices, we discuss three subjects. First, we confirm the correspondence between the (infinitesimal) Teichmüller theory and the Kodaira-Spencer theory. Second, we confirm the regularity of the integral operators which we use in this paper. The proof of the regularity given here is due to Professor Hiroshi Yanagihara. Third, we will discuss Royden's criterion on the regularity of the dual Finsler metric. The proof is mostly same as that given in Gardiner's book [21]. However, we give a complete proof of Royden's criterion here because of the difficulty to access the source at present.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Professor Athanase Papadopoulos and Professor Ken'ichi Ohshika for warm encouragement and discussions. Actually, casual discussions with them provide motivations of author's works. The author thanks Professor Norbert A'Campo for fascinating discussions. The author also thanks Professor Hiroshi Yanagihara for useful comments to the author's question and allowing him to give his proof in this paper, and Professor Tadashi Ashikaga for helpful discussions.

A part of this work is announced in the annual report of a scientific program "Teichmüller Theory: Classical, Higher, Super and Quantum" in 2023 at the Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach (MFO) organized by Professor Ken'ichi Ohshika, Professor Athanase Papadopoulos, Professor Robert C. Penner, and Professor Anna Wienhard, and in the proceedings of the 14th MSJ- Seasonal Institute "New Aspects of Teichmüller theory" in 2022 and 2023 at Gakusyuin university and the university of Tokyo organized by Professor Ken'ichi Ohshika, Professor Sumio Yamada, Professor Nariya Kawazumi, Professor Takuya Sakasai, and Professor Tsukasa Ishibashi. The author thanks the organizers, and the staffs of the venues, Gakusyuin university, the university of Tokyo, and MFO, for their warm hospitalities.

CHAPTER 2

Second order infinitesimal spaces on complex manifolds

In this chapter, we will discuss the tangent and cotangent bundles over the tangent and cotangent bundles over a complex manifold M . We call such spaces the *second order infinitesimal spaces*. We have four second order infinitesimal spaces TTM , T^*TM (over TM) and TT^*M , T^*T^*M (over T^*M). We recall and give elementary properties these four spaces and basic maps between two of them as described in Figure 1. We use the dagger “†” to describe the notion in the cotangent bundle. For a general properties of complex manifolds, see [42]. Especially, for double (holomorphic) tangent spaces, see Abate-Patrizio [1], Aikou [6], Fisher-Turner [18], Fukui [20], Konieczna-Urbański [44], Michor [58], Munteanu [62], Pradines [64], or Sakai [69] for instance.

We only focus on complex manifolds in this paper, but almost results given here on second order infinitesimal spaces hold for differentiable manifolds.

2.1. Summary : Second order infinitesimal spaces and Relations

Before discussing the details on second order infinitesimal spaces, we first summarize the relations of the spaces.

There are four second order infinitesimal spaces for complex manifolds, TTM , T^*TM , TT^*M and T^*T^*M . We will define a self map called *flip* α_M on TTM , the map called the *switch* $\mathbf{Swh}_M: TT^*M \rightarrow T^*TM$ and the map called the *dualization* $\mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger: TT^*M \rightarrow T^*T^*M$, which satisfy the commutative diagrams in Figure 1.

NOTATION 1. For a subset $E \subset M$, we define the fiber over E by

$$\begin{aligned} (TT)_E(M) &= (\Pi_M \circ \Pi_{TM})^{-1}(E), & (T^*T)_E(M) &= (\Pi_M \circ \Pi_{TM}^\dagger)^{-1}(E) \\ (TT^*)_E(M) &= (\Pi_M^\dagger \circ \Pi_{T^*M})^{-1}(E), & (T^*T^*)_E(M) &= (\Pi_M^\dagger \circ \Pi_{T^*M}^\dagger)^{-1}(E). \end{aligned}$$

For $p \in M$, we denote by $(TT)_p(M)$, $(T^*T)_p(M)$, $(TT^*)_E(M)$ and $(T^*T^*)_p(M)$ when $E = \{p\}$. Each maps mentioned above preserve for the fibers over a point on M .

2.2. Tangent and cotangent bundles

Let M be a complex manifold of dimension n . M is a real dimensional real analytic manifold of (real) dimension $2n$. The complexification of the real tangent space $\tilde{T}M \otimes \mathbb{C}$ of M is a complex vector bundle of (complex) rank $2n$ and is canonically splitted as the Whitney sum (direct sum) $T^{1,0}M \oplus T^{0,1}M$ of the holomorphic vector bundles of rank n . The spaces $T^{1,0}M$ and $T^{0,1}M$ are eigen spaces of the action of the complex structure on M for the eigen values i and $-i$ respectively (cf. [42, Chapter IX]). We call $T^{1,0}M$ and $T^{0,1}M$ the *holomorphic and*




FIGURE 1. Commutative diagrams : Second order infinitesimal spaces

anti-holomorphic tangent bundle of M . By definition, any complexified tangent vector v is uniquely represented as the sum $v = v^{10} + v^{01}$ of vectors $v^{10} \in T^{1,0}M$ and $v^{01} \in T^{0,1}M$. We call v^{pq} the (p, q) -part of v for $(p, q) = (1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$. We denote by $\mathbf{pr}^{pq}: \tilde{T}M \otimes \mathbb{C} \rightarrow T^{p,q}M$ the projection.

For instance, suppose $M = \mathbb{C}^n$ and let $z_k = x_k + iy_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then, the underlying real manifold of \mathbb{C}^n is the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{2n} with coordinates x_k, y_k ($1 \leq k \leq n$). Any complexified tangent vector in $\tilde{T}\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ satisfies

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k \partial_{x_k} + \beta_k \partial_{y_k}) = \sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k + i\beta_k) \partial_{z_k} + \sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k - i\beta_k) \partial_{\bar{z}_k}$$

with

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k + i\beta_k) \partial_{z_k} \in T^{1,0}\mathbb{C}^n, \quad \sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k - i\beta_k) \partial_{\bar{z}_k} \in T^{0,1}\mathbb{C}^n,$$

where $\alpha_k, \beta_k \in \mathbb{C}$, and $\partial_{z_k} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_{x_k} - i\partial_{y_k})$ and $\partial_{\bar{z}_k} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_{x_k} + i\partial_{y_k})$. Then,

$$\partial_{z_1}, \dots, \partial_{z_n}$$

consists of the (standard) basis of on the holomorphic tangent space around $p \in M$, and

$$(2.2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} z(U) \times \mathbb{C}^n &\longrightarrow (\Pi_M)^{-1}(U) \subset T^{1,0}M \\ (z, \eta) &\longrightarrow \eta = \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j \partial_{z_j} \end{aligned}$$

is a local chart of $T^{1,0}M$.

CONVENTION 1. We adopt the following notation:

- We denote by TM and T_pM the holomorphic tangent bundle of M , and the holomorphic tangent space at $p \in M$, for the simplicity.
- As we mentioned above, for the basis of the tangent space on TM in the coordinates, we abbreviate $\partial_{z_i}, \partial_{\eta_i}$ to $\partial_{z_i}, \partial_{\eta_i}$, etc.

We can easily check that for any $p \in M$ and $v \in T_p M = T_p^{1,0} M$, there is a holomorphic map $f: \{t \in \mathbb{C} \mid |t| < \epsilon\} \rightarrow M$ (for sufficiently small ϵ) such that $f(0) = p$ and $Df|_0[(\partial/\partial t)|_{t=0}] = v$, and vice versa.

The (holomorphic) *cotangent bundle* $T^*M = (T^*)^{1,0}M$ is the dual bundle of the (holomorphic) tangent bundle. As in the above case, it is formally defined as the $(1,0)$ -part of the complexification $\tilde{T}^*M \otimes \mathbb{C}$ of the (real) cotangent bundle \tilde{T}^*M of M . Let $\Pi_M^\dagger: T^*M \rightarrow M$ be the projection. Let $(U, z = (z_1, \dots, z_n))$ be a local chart of M at $p \in U \subset M$. Then,

$$dz_1 = dx_1 + idy_1, \dots, dz_n = dx_n + idy_n$$

consists of the (standard) basis of on the cotangent space around $p \in M$, where $z_j = x_j + iy_j (j = 1, \dots, n)$, and

$$(2.2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} z(U) \times \mathbb{C}^n &\longrightarrow (\Pi_M^\dagger)^{-1}(U) \subset T^*M \\ (z, \omega) &\longrightarrow \omega = \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j dz_j \end{aligned}$$

is a local chart of T^*M . The duality between TM and T^*M is given by the *pairing*

$$\mathcal{P}_M: TM \oplus T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

defined by

$$(2.2.3) \quad \mathcal{P}_M \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j \partial_{z_j}, \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j dz_j \right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j \omega_j$$

for $p \in M$. The pairing is a holomorphic function on the Whitney sum $TM \oplus T^*M$.

2.3. Double tangent space

2.3.1. Double tangent space. The (holomorphic) *double tangent bundle* $\pi_{TM}: TTM \rightarrow TM$ is the (holomorphic) tangent bundle $TTM = T(TM)$ of TM . The double tangent space TTM is a complex manifold of dimension $4n$. With the local chart (2.2.1), the double tangent space is trivialized as

$$(2.3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi_{TM}^{-1}(\Pi_M^{-1}(U)) &\longrightarrow (z(U) \times \mathbb{C}^n) \times (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n) \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j (\partial_{z_j})_\eta + \sum_{j=1}^n \zeta_j (\partial_{\eta_j})_\eta &\longrightarrow (z, \eta, \xi, \zeta). \end{aligned}$$

Under the local coordinates, the projection Π_{TM} is described as

$$\begin{aligned} TTM &\xrightarrow{\Pi_{TM}} TM \\ (z, \eta, \xi, \zeta) &\longrightarrow (z, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

2.3.2. Transition functions. Let $(w_1, \dots, w_n, H_1, \dots, H_n)$ be another local chart around $\eta \in TM$. When

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j (\partial_{z_j})_p &= \sum_{j=1}^n H_j (\partial_{w_j})_p \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j (\partial_{z_j})_\eta + \sum_{j=1}^n \zeta_j (\partial_{\eta_j})_\eta &= \sum_{j=1}^n \Xi_j (\partial_{w_j})_\eta + \sum_{j=1}^n Z_j (\partial_{H_j})_\eta \end{aligned}$$

in TTM , the relation of the coefficients is given by

$$(2.3.2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} H_1 \\ \vdots \\ H_n \\ \Xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Xi_n \\ Z_1 \\ \vdots \\ Z_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (w_1)_{z_1} & \cdots & (w_1)_{z_n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (w_n)_{z_1} & \cdots & (w_n)_{z_n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & (w_1)_{z_1} & \cdots & (w_1)_{z_n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & (w_n)_{z_1} & \cdots & (w_n)_{z_n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \Gamma_{11} & \cdots & \Gamma_{1n} & (w_1)_{z_1} & \cdots & (w_1)_{z_n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \Gamma_{n1} & \cdots & \Gamma_{nn} & (w_n)_{z_1} & \cdots & (w_n)_{z_n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \eta_n \\ \xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_n \\ \zeta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \zeta_n \end{bmatrix},$$

where $(w_i)_{z_j} = \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial z_j}$ and

$$\Gamma_{ij}(\eta) = \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k \left(\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial z_j} \right)_{z_k} = \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k \frac{\partial^2 w_i}{\partial z_j \partial z_k}.$$

REMARK 2.3.1 (Convention). Henceforth, we abbreviate (2.3.2) to

$$\begin{bmatrix} H \\ \Xi \\ Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & J & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma(\eta) & J \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ \xi \\ \zeta \end{bmatrix}$$

for short, where $J = [(w_i)_{z_j}]$ and $\Gamma(\eta) = [\Gamma_{ij}(\eta)]$ (this means that the (i, j) -component of J and $\Gamma(\eta)$ are $(w_i)_{z_j}$ and $\Gamma_{ij}(\eta)$, respectively). In the following argument, we will discuss the change of the coefficients of the vectors (covectors) with respect to the change of local charts, and use this notation in the discussion.

2.3.3. Geometry of second order tangent vectors. The second derivative of holomorphic maps, which is often called a 2 -jet from a small disk to M , can be described in the (holomorphic) double tangent space. Let $f: \{|t| < \epsilon\} \rightarrow M$ be a holomorphic map with $f(0) = p$ and $Df(\partial/\partial t|_{t=0}) = u \in T_p M$. Set $F(t) = (F_1(t), \dots, F_n(z)) = z \circ f(t)$. Then,

$$V_f = \sum_{j=1}^n (F_j)'(0) (\partial_{z_i})_u + \sum_{j=1}^n (F_j)''(0) (\partial_{\eta_i})_u = u + \sum_{j=1}^n (F_j)''(0) (\partial_{\eta_i})_u$$

is a well-defined tangent vector in $T_u T M$. Since $u = D\Pi_M(V_f) = \Pi_{TM}(V_f)$, in general, some vector in TTM cannot be represented as the second derivative of any holomorphic map from the unit disk. In fact, one can easily see that for any $u \in T_p M$ and $V \in T_u T M$, there is a holomorphic map $f: \{|t| < \epsilon\} \times \{|s| < \epsilon\} \rightarrow M$ such that

$$(2.3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} u &= Df_{(0,0)} (\partial_s|_{s=0}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial s}(0,0) (\partial_{z_i})_p \\ V &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial t}(0,0) (\partial_{z_i})_u + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 f_j}{\partial t \partial s}(0,0) (\partial_{\eta_i})_u \end{aligned}$$

in the coordinates (2.3.1) around $u = \Pi_{TM}(V) \in TM$, where $z \circ f(t, s) = (f_1(t, s), \dots, f_n(t, s))$. See Figure 2.3.3. Thus, the 2 -jet space (i.e. the space of germs of holomorphic maps from a small disk to M) is a subspace of TTM described by

$$\{V \in TTM \mid \Pi_{TM}(V) = D\Pi_M(V)\}.$$




FIGURE 2. Vectors in the (holomorphic) double tangent space are presented by the second derivatives of holomorphic maps from a 2-dimensional polydisk. To be more precise, assume $M = \mathbb{C}^n$. Let $u \in TM$ and $\{|t|, |s| < \epsilon\} \rightarrow M$ be a holomorphic map with $u = \frac{\partial f}{\partial s}(0,0)$. Then, $\{u_t\}_{|t|<\epsilon} = \left\{ \frac{\partial f}{\partial s}(t,0) \right\}_{|t|<\epsilon}$ is a path through $u_0 = u$ in TM . Vectors (2.3.3) in $T_u TM$ consists of two components. One which measures the difference between $u = u_0$ and u_t appears in the second term of (2.3.3). The other term $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(0,0)$ records how the base points of the vectors u_t approach to that of u at $t = 0$.

In the case of real differentiable manifolds, Yano and Ishihara call this subbundle the *tangent bundle of order 2* in [82, Chapter X].

2.3.4. Horizontal projection and Vertical space. Let $u \in TM$ and $p = \Pi_M(\eta)$. The *horizontal projection* is the differential $(D\Pi_M)_\eta$ of the projection $\Pi_M: TM \rightarrow M$ at η which is a surjective linear map from $T_\eta TM$ to $T_p M$:

$$T_\eta TM \ni \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j (\partial_{z_i})_\eta + \sum_{j=1}^n \zeta_j (\partial_{\eta_i})_\eta \xrightarrow{(D\Pi_M)_\eta} \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j (\partial_{z_i})_p \in T_p M.$$

The *vertical space* $T_\eta^V TM = T_\eta T_p M$ is the kernel $\ker(D\Pi_M)|_\eta$ of the differential $(D\Pi_M)|_\eta: T_\eta TM \rightarrow T_p M$. The vertical space is presented as

$$T_\eta^V TM = T_\eta T_p M = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \zeta_j (\partial_{\eta_i})_\eta \mid \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n \right\}.$$

Since $T_p M$ is a vector space, $T_\eta T_p M$ is naturally identified with $T_p M$ by the *vertical inclusion*:

$$(2.3.4) \quad T_p M \ni \sum_{j=1}^n \zeta_j (\partial_{z_i})_p \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vi}_M: \eta} \sum_{j=1}^n \zeta_j (\partial_{\eta_i})_\eta \in \ker(D\Pi_M)|_\eta \subset T_\eta TM.$$

Under the local coordinates (2.3.1), the vertical inclusion and the horizontal projection are presented by

$$\begin{aligned} T_p M &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{vi}_{M;\eta}} T_\eta TM \xrightarrow{D\Pi_M} T_p M \\ (z, \zeta) &\longrightarrow (z, \eta, 0, \zeta) \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad (z, \eta, \xi, \zeta) \longrightarrow (z, \xi). \end{aligned}$$

2.4. Cotangent spaces to the tangent bundle

The (holomorphic) cotangent space is the dual bundle to the tangent bundle. With the local chart (2.2.1), the cotangent space is trivialized as

$$(2.4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} (\pi_{TM}^\dagger)^{-1}(\pi_M^{-1}(U)) &\longrightarrow (z(U) \times \mathbb{C}^n) \times (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n) \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j (dz_j)_\eta + \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j (d\eta_j)_\eta &\longrightarrow (z, \eta, \lambda, \mu). \end{aligned}$$

A cotangent vector in $T_\eta^* TM$ is presented as

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j dz_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j d\eta_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda_j dw_j + \sum_{j=1}^n M_j dH_j$$

in two different charts if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} H \\ \Lambda \\ M \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & J^\dagger & \Gamma'(H) \\ 0 & 0 & J^\dagger \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ \lambda \\ \mu \end{bmatrix},$$

where $J^\dagger = [(z_j)_{w_i}]$ and $\Gamma'(H) = [\Gamma'_{ij}(H)]$ with

$$\Gamma'_{ij}(H) = \sum_{l=1}^n H_l \left(\frac{\partial z_j}{\partial w_i} \right)_{w_l} = \sum_{l=1}^n H_l \frac{\partial^2 z_j}{\partial w_i \partial w_l}.$$

The pull-back map $(\Pi_M)^*: T_p^* M \rightarrow T_\eta^* TM$ defined from the projection $\Pi_M: TM \rightarrow M$ is the inclusion

$$T_p^* M \ni \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j (dz_j)_p \xrightarrow{(\Pi_M^\dagger)^*} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j (dz_j)_\eta \in T_\eta^* TM.$$

The projection

$$T_\eta^* TM \ni \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j (dz_j)_\eta + \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j (d\eta_j)_\eta \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vp}_{M;\eta}} \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j (dz_j)_p \in T_p^* M$$

is canonically defined. We call the projection the *vertical projection*. Under the chart defined above, the projection for the vertical space is presented as

$$\begin{aligned} T_p^* M &\xrightarrow{(\Pi_M^\dagger)^*} T_\eta^* TM \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vp}_{M;\eta}} T_p^* M \\ (z, \lambda) &\longrightarrow (z, \eta, \lambda, 0) \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad (z, \eta, \lambda, \mu) \longrightarrow (z, \mu). \end{aligned}$$

2.5. Tangent spaces and cotangent spaces to the cotangent bundle

2.5.1. Tangent space. With the local chart (2.2.2), the tangent space TT^*M is trivialized as

$$(2.5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi_{T^*M}^{-1}((\Pi_M^\dagger)^{-1}(U)) &\longrightarrow (z(U) \times \mathbb{C}^n) \times (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n) \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j (\partial_{z_i})_\omega + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j (\partial_{\omega_i})_\omega &\longrightarrow (z, \omega, \alpha, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

For two presentations of tangent vectors to the cotangent bundle under the above two local charts,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \partial_{z_i} + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \partial_{\omega_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \partial_{w_i} + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \partial_{\Omega_i}$$

if and only if

$$(2.5.2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Omega \\ A \\ B \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J^\dagger & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & J & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma''(\omega) & J^\dagger \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \omega \\ \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\Gamma''(\omega) = [\Gamma''_{ij}(\omega)]$ and

$$(2.5.3) \quad \Gamma''_{ij}(\omega) = \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \left(\frac{\partial z_k}{\partial w_i} \right)_{z_j}.$$

Then, the differential $D\Pi_M^\dagger$ of the projection $\Pi_M^\dagger: T^*M \rightarrow M$ is the *horizontal projection*

$$D\Pi_M^\dagger: TT^*M \ni \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \partial_{z_i} + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \partial_{\omega_i} \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \partial_{z_i} \in TM.$$

The kernel of the differential of the projection $T^*M \rightarrow M$, called the *vertical space*, is naturally identified with the cotangent bundle via the inclusion

$$T_p^*M \ni \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i dz_i \xrightarrow{\mathbf{v}_i^\dagger_{M:u}} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \partial_{\omega_i} \in T_\omega T^*M.$$

Under the coordinate defined above, the vertical inclusion is presented by

$$\begin{aligned} T_p^*M &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{v}_i^\dagger_{M:\omega}} T_\omega T^*M \xrightarrow{D\Pi_M^\dagger} T_p M \\ (z, \beta) &\longrightarrow (z, \omega, 0, \beta) \\ &\longrightarrow (z, \omega, \alpha, \beta) \longrightarrow (z, \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

The image of $\mathbf{v}_i^\dagger_{M:\omega}$ is called the *vertical space* in $T_\omega T^*M$.

2.5.2. Cotangent space. With the local chart (2.2.2), the tangent space TT^*M is trivialized as

$$(2.5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (\Pi_{T^*M}^\dagger)^{-1}((\Pi_M^\dagger)^{-1}(U)) &\longrightarrow (z(U) \times \mathbb{C}^n) \times (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n) \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \nu_j (dz_i)_\omega + \sum_{j=1}^n \tau_j (d\omega_i)_\omega &\longrightarrow (z, \omega, \nu, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

For two presentations of cotangent vectors to the cotangent bundle under the above two local charts, we can see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i dz_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i d\omega_i = \sum_{i=1}^n N_i dw_i + \sum_{i=1}^n T_i d\Omega_i$$

if and only if

$$(2.5.5) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Omega \\ N \\ T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J^\dagger & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & J^\dagger & -\Gamma''(\omega) \\ 0 & 0 & J \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \omega \\ \nu \\ \tau \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\Gamma''(\omega)$ is defined in (2.5.3). The pull-back map $(\Pi_M^\dagger)^*: T_p^*M \rightarrow T_\omega^*T^*M$ defined from the projection $\Pi_M^\dagger: T^*M \rightarrow M$ is the inclusion

$$T_p^*M \ni \sum_{j=1}^n \nu_j (dz_j)_p \xrightarrow{(\Pi_M^\dagger)^*} \sum_{j=1}^n \nu_j (dz_j)_\omega \in T_\omega^*T^*M.$$

The projection

$$T_\eta^*T^*M \ni \sum_{j=1}^n \nu_j (dz_j)_\omega + \sum_{j=1}^n \tau_j (d\omega_j)_\omega \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vp}^\dagger_{M:\omega}} \sum_{j=1}^n \tau_j (\partial_{z_j})_p \in T_pM$$

is canonically defined. We call the projection the *vertical projection*. Under the coordinate defined above, the vertical projection is presented by

$$\begin{aligned} T_p^*M &\xrightarrow{(\Pi_M^\dagger)^*} T_\omega^*T^*M \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vp}^\dagger_{M:\omega}} T_pM \\ (z, \nu) &\longrightarrow (z, \omega, \nu, 0) \\ &\longrightarrow (z, \omega, \lambda, \tau) \longrightarrow (z, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

2.6. Flip, Switch, and Dualization

2.6.1. Flip. On the double tangent space TTM , there is a natural holomorphic involution

$$\alpha_M: TTM \rightarrow TTM$$

called the *flip* defined by

$$\alpha_M: (TT)_{UM} \ni (z, \eta, \xi, \zeta) \mapsto (z, \xi, \eta, \zeta) \in (TT)_{UM}$$

under the local coordinates defined in (2.3.1). When a second order tangent vector is prescribed by a holomorphic map from a 2-dimensional polydisk as §2.3.3, it is merely a changing the orders of variables. The flip is not a fiber-bundle isomorphism over TM but a bundle-isomorphism of the fibration $\Pi_M \circ \Pi_{TM}: TTM \rightarrow M$ via the double projection.

By definition,

$$(2.6.1) \quad \Pi_{TM} \circ \alpha_M = D\Pi_M$$

$$(2.6.2) \quad \alpha_M \circ \alpha_M = id_{TTM}$$

$$(2.6.3) \quad \alpha_M(V + \mathbf{vi}_{M:\eta}(\beta)) = \alpha_M(V) + \mathbf{vi}_{M:D\Pi_M(V)}(\beta)$$

for $\eta, \beta \in T_pM$ and $V \in T_\eta TTM$. See [37, §4 of Chapter I].

For readers, we check the well-definedness. Let $V = (z, \eta, \xi, \zeta) \in (TT)_{UM}$. Let (w, H, Ξ, Z) be another presentation of V with the local chart (w, H) . Let $J = ((w_i)_{z_j})$ and $\Gamma(\eta) = (\Gamma_{ij}(\eta))$ as Remark 2.3.1. From the above discussion, $H = J\eta$, $\Xi = J\xi$ and $Z = \Gamma(\eta)\xi + J\zeta$. The i -th coordinate of $\Gamma(\eta)\xi$ satisfies

$$\sum_{l=1}^n \Gamma_{il}(\eta)\xi_l = \sum_{l=1}^n \xi_l \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k \left(\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial z_l} \right)_{z_k} \right) = \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k \left(\sum_{l=1}^n \xi_l \left(\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial z_k} \right)_{z_l} \right) = \sum_{k=1}^n \Gamma_{ik}(\xi)\eta_k$$

which coincides with the i -th coordinate of $\Gamma(\xi)\eta$. Therefore, the change of the coordinates presentations of tangent vectors is obtained as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Xi \\ H \\ Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J\xi \\ J\eta \\ \Gamma(\xi)\eta + J\zeta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & J & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma(\xi) & J \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \\ \zeta \end{bmatrix},$$

which means (z, ξ, η, ζ) is thought of as an element of TTM .

REMARK 2.6.1. In [37], Kobayashi calls α_M the *involutive automorphism*. Here, it is named according to Sakai [69].

Lie bracket. The *Lie bracket* is an anti-symmetric product on the Lie algebra of the space of differentiable sections of the complexified tangent bundle $\tilde{T}M \otimes \mathbb{C}$. The subbundles $T^{1,0}M$ and $T^{0,1}M$ are closed under the operations of the Lie bracket (cf. [42, Theorem 2.8 in Chapter IX]). We denote by $[X, Y]$ the Lie bracket between sections X and Y of $\tilde{T}M \otimes \mathbb{C}$.

The following formula follows from the straight-forward calculation with the notation (2.3.1). We give a proof for completeness (cf. (4.3) in [69, II §4]).

PROPOSITION 2.6.1 (Lie bracket). Let $p \in M$. For C^1 -vector fields X and Y of type $(1, 0)$ around p , we have

$$(\mathbf{vi}_{M: X_p})^{-1} \left((\alpha_M(\mathbf{pr}^{10}(DY(X)_{Y_p}))) - \mathbf{pr}^{10}(DX(Y)_{X_p}) \right) = [X, Y]_p.$$

PROOF. We may assume that M is a neighborhood U of $p \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i(z) \partial_{z_i}$ and $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(z) \partial_{z_i}$. Then, for $z \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_M((DY(X)_{Y_z})^{10}) &= Y_z + \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i(z) \frac{\partial Y_j}{\partial z_i}(z) \right) \partial_{\eta_j} \Big|_{X_z} \\ (DX(Y)_{X_z})^{10} &= Y_z + \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(z) \frac{\partial X_j}{\partial z_i}(z) \right) \partial_{\eta_j} \Big|_{X_z}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the difference

$$\alpha_M((DY(X)_{Y_z})^{10}) - (DX(Y)_{X_z})^{10}$$

is in the vertical space and

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{vi}_{M: X_z})^{-1} \left(\alpha_M((DY(X)_{Y_z})^{10}) - (DX(Y)_{X_z})^{10} \right) \\ &= (\mathbf{vi}_{M: X_z})^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i(z) \frac{\partial Y_j}{\partial z_i}(z) - \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(z) \frac{\partial X_j}{\partial z_i}(z) \right) \partial_{\eta_j} \Big|_{X_z} \right) \\ &= [X, Y]_z, \end{aligned}$$

and we have done. \square

2.6.2. Switch from T^*TM to TT^*M .

We claim

PROPOSITION 2.6.2 (Switch). With the local charts (2.4.1) and (2.5.1), the correspondence

$$\mathbf{Sw}_{h_M}: TT^*M \rightarrow T^*TM$$

defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (TT^*)_UM &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{Sw}_M} (T^*T)_UM \\ (z, \omega, \alpha, \beta) &\longrightarrow (z, \alpha, \beta, \omega) \end{aligned}$$

is a well-defined biholomorphism, which satisfies

$$\Pi_{TM}^\dagger \circ \mathbf{Sw}_M = D\Pi_M^\dagger.$$

We call the biholomorphism \mathbf{Sw}_M the *switch* from T^*TM to TT^*M .

PROOF. We only check the well-definedness. We use the notation in §§2.4,2.5 frequently. Let $V = (z, \omega, \alpha, \beta) \in TT^*M$ and (w, Ω, A, B) the presentation of V in the coordinates (w, b) . Then, $b = J^\dagger a$, $A = J\alpha$ and $B = \Gamma''(\omega)\alpha + J^\dagger\beta$. Then, the i -th coordinate of $\Gamma''(\omega)\alpha$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^n \Gamma''_{il}(\omega)\alpha_l &= \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \alpha_l \left(\frac{\partial z_k}{\partial w_i} \right)_{z_l} = \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \left(\sum_{s=1}^n A_s \frac{\partial z_l}{\partial w_s} \right) \left(\frac{\partial z_k}{\partial w_i} \right)_{z_l} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^n a_k A_s \sum_{l=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z_k}{\partial w_i} \right)_{z_l} \frac{\partial z_l}{\partial w_s} = \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \sum_{s=1}^n A_s \left(\frac{\partial z_k}{\partial w_i} \right)_{w_s} \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^n \Gamma'_{il}(A)\omega_l, \end{aligned}$$

and it is nothing but the i -th coordinate of $\Gamma'(A)a$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} A \\ B \\ \Omega \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J\alpha \\ J^\dagger\beta + \Gamma'(A)\omega \\ J^\dagger\omega \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & J^\dagger & \Gamma'(A) \\ 0 & 0 & J^\dagger \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \omega \end{bmatrix},$$

which implies that $(z, \alpha, \beta, \omega)$ is thought of an element in $(T^*T)_UM$. \square

2.6.3. Dualization. From the transitions (2.5.2) and (2.5.5), under the local charts (2.5.1) and (2.5.4), we have a bundle isomorphism

$$\mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger: TT^*M \rightarrow T^*T^*M$$

defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (TT^*)_UM &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger} (T^*T^*)_UM \\ (z, \omega, \alpha, \beta) &\longrightarrow (z, \omega, \beta, -\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

which satisfies

$$\mathbf{vp}_{M:\omega}^\dagger \circ \mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger = -D\Pi_M^\dagger.$$

We call the isomorphism \mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger the *dualization*. The isomorphism \mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger is derived from the canonical holomorphic symplectic structure on T^*M (e.g. [14, Chapter 2]): Indeed, the cotangent bundle T^*M has a natural holomorphic symplectic form defined by

$$\omega_M = \sum_{j=1}^n dw_j \wedge dz_j = d \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j dz_j \right)$$

under the coordinates discussed above. The holomorphic symplectic structure leads a canonical isomorphism

$$(2.6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} TT^*M &\longrightarrow T^*T^*M \\ X &\longrightarrow [Y \mapsto 2\omega_M(X, Y)] \end{aligned}$$

which is nothing but the dualization discussed above, where “2” at the head of ω_M in the linear map (2.6.4) comes from the convention of the exterior derivative:

$$d\omega_j \wedge dz_j(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2}(d\omega_j(X)dz_j(Y) - d\omega_j(Y)dz_j(X))$$

(cf. [41, p.35]). For the adjustment to our description of the holomorphic symplectic form on \mathcal{Q}_g given in Proposition 5.7.2 later, we notice that this convention is also used in Kawai’s calculation (cf. [34, (3.1)]. See also §5.7.3). (2.6.4) follows from the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2.6.3. The dualization \mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger satisfies the following condition:

$$\mathcal{P}_{T^*M}(V, \mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger(W)) = 2\omega_M(W, V)$$

for all $V, W \in T_\omega T^*M$ and $\omega \in T^*M$.

Indeed, let $V = \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i \partial_{z_i} + b_i \partial_{\omega_i})$ and $W = \sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_i \partial_{z_i} + \beta_i \partial_{\omega_i})$. Then

$$\mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger(W) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_i dz_i - \alpha_i d\omega_i)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{T^*M}(V, \mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger(W)) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i \beta_i - b_i \alpha_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n (dz_i(V) d\omega_i(W) - dz_i(W) d\omega_i(V)) \\ &= 2\omega_M(W, V). \end{aligned}$$

2.6.4. Hamiltonian vector field. By mimicking the real case (cf. [14, §18]), we define the *Hamiltonian vector field* \mathcal{X}_H for a C^1 -function H on T^*M to be a $(1, 0)$ -vector-field \mathcal{X}_H on T^*M by

$$\iota_{\mathcal{X}_H} \omega_M = \partial H.$$

Namely, \mathcal{X}_H is defined by the following equation:

$$\omega_M((\mathcal{X}_H)_\omega, V) = \partial H|_\omega(V) = \mathcal{P}_{T^*M}(V, \partial H|_v)$$

for all $V \in T_\omega^{1,0} T^*M$ and $\omega \in T^*M$. If $W \in T_\omega T^*M$ satisfies $\mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger(W) = \partial H|_\omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_M((\mathcal{X}_H)_\omega, V) &= \mathcal{P}_{T^*M}(V, \partial H|_\omega) = \mathcal{P}_{T^*M}(V, \mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger(W)) \\ &= 2\omega_M(W, V). \end{aligned}$$

For the record, we summarize as follows.

PROPOSITION 2.6.4. Under the above notation, $\mathcal{X}_H = 2(\mathbf{dual}_M^\dagger)^{-1}(\partial H)$.

2.7. Derivative of the Pairing function

As noticed in §2.2, the pairing between TM and T^*M is a holomorphic function on the Whitney sum. By definition,

$$TM \oplus T^*M = \{(v, \omega) \in TM \times T^*M \mid \Pi_M(v) = \Pi_M^\dagger(\omega)\}.$$

Hence,

$$T_{(v, \omega)}(TM \oplus T^*M) = \{(V_1, V_2) \in T_v TM \times T_\omega T^*M \mid D\Pi_M|_v[V_1] = D\Pi_M^\dagger|_\omega[V_2]\}.$$

We claim:

PROPOSITION 2.7.1 (Derivative of the pairing, Flip and Switch). Let $v \in TM$ and $\omega \in T^*M$. For $V_1 \in T_v TM$ and $V_2 \in T_\omega T^*M$ with $D\Pi_M|_v[V_1] = D\Pi_M^\dagger|_\omega[V_2]$,

$$D\mathcal{P}_M|_{(v,\omega)}[V_1, V_2] = \mathcal{P}_{TM}|_{D\Pi_M|_v[V_1]}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(V_1), \mathbf{Swh}_M(V_2)).$$

PROOF. We may assume that M is a domain in \mathbb{C}^n , $TM = \{(z, \eta) \in U \times \mathbb{C}^n\}$ and $T^*M = \{(z, a) \in U \times \mathbb{C}^n\}$. Suppose $v = ((z_i), (\eta_i))$, $\omega = ((z_i), (a_i))$, $V_1 = ((z_i), (\eta_i), (\alpha_i), (\beta_i))$ and $V_2 = ((z_i), (a_i), (A_i), (B_i))$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Notice from the assumption that

$$\begin{aligned} (z, \alpha) &= \Pi_{TM}(z, \alpha, \eta, \beta) \\ &= \Pi_{TM}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(V_1)) = D\Pi_{TM}|_v[V_1] \\ &= D\Pi^\dagger|_\omega[V_2] = \Pi_{TM}^\dagger(\mathbf{Swh}_M(V_2)) \\ &= D\Pi^\dagger|_\omega(z, A, B, a) = (z, A) \end{aligned}$$

and $\alpha = A$. Since the pairing is presented as $\mathcal{P}_M((z, \eta), (z, a)) = \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j a_j$, we obtain

$$D\mathcal{P}_M = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j d\eta_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j da_j$$

and

$$D\mathcal{P}_M|_{(v,\omega)}[V_1, V_2] = \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j B_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j a_j = \mathcal{P}_{TM}|_{D\Pi_M|_v[V_1]}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(V_1), \mathbf{Swh}_M(V_2)),$$

which implies what we wanted. \square

2.8. Intrinsic characterization of Pairing on TM

Let $p \in M$. In the following statement, we identify T_p^*M as a subspace in $T_u^*TM \subset (T^*T)_pM$ via the horizontal inclusions and T_pM as the vertical space in $T_uTM \subset (TT)_pM$ for each $u \in T_pM$. We claim

PROPOSITION 2.8.1 (Intrinsic characterization of the pairing \mathcal{P}_{TM}). For any $u \in T_pM$ and $\zeta \in T_p^*M$, the pairing $\mathcal{P}_{TM}|_u$ on $T_uTM \oplus T_u^*TM$ satisfies

$$(2.8.1) \quad \mathcal{P}_{TM}|_u(V, \omega) = \mathcal{P}_M|_p(D\Pi_M(V), \omega) \quad (V \in T_uTM, \omega \in T_p^*M)$$

$$(2.8.2) \quad \mathcal{P}_{TM}|_u(v, \Omega) = \mathcal{P}_M|_p(v, \Omega') \quad (v \in T_pM, \Omega \in T_u^*TM)$$

$$(2.8.3) \quad D\mathcal{P}_M|_{(u,\zeta)}[V, W] = \mathcal{P}_{TM}|_{D\Pi_M(V)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(V), \mathbf{Swh}_M(W)) \\ (V \in T_uTM, W \in T_\zeta T^*M)$$

with $D\Pi_{TM}^\dagger[W] = D\Pi_{TM}[V] \in T_pM$, where $\Omega' \in T_p^*M$ is the image of vertical projection of Ω .

Conversely, if a function \mathcal{P}' on $(TT)_pM \oplus (T^*T)_pM$ which defines a \mathbb{C} -bilinear map $\mathcal{P}': T_uTM \oplus V \in T_u^*TM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on each $u \in T_pM$ satisfies the above three equations for all $u \in T_pM$ and $\zeta \in T_p^*M$, then $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{P}_{TM}$ on \mathcal{P}' on $(TT)_pM \oplus (T^*T)_pM$.

PROOF. Since the statement is a local property, we may assume that M is a domain in \mathbb{C}^n , $TM = M \times \mathbb{C}^n$ and $T^*M = M \times \mathbb{C}^n$ are domains in \mathbb{C}^{2n} with the

coordinate functions $((z_i), (\eta_i)) \in TM$ and $((z_i), (a_i)) \in T^*M$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j (\partial_{z_j})_{((z_i), (\eta_i))} + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j (\partial_{\eta_j})_{((z_i), (\eta_i))} \\ \Omega &= \sum_{j=1}^n A_j (dz_j)_{((z_i), (\eta_i))} + \sum_{j=1}^n B_j (d\eta_j)_{((z_i), (\eta_i))} \\ W &= \sum_{j=1}^n X_j (\partial_{z_j})_{((z_i), (a_i))} + \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j (\partial_{a_j})_{((z_i), (a_i))}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $D\Pi_{TM}^\dagger[W] = D\Pi_{TM}[V]$,

$$((z_i), (X_i)) = D\Pi_{TM}^\dagger[W] = D\Pi_{TM}[V] = ((z_i), (\alpha_i)).$$

Under the notation, the pairing \mathcal{P}_{TM} is described as

$$\mathcal{P}_{TM}(V, \Omega) = \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j A_j + \beta_j B_j).$$

From the assumption, $D\Pi_M(V) \in T_p M$, $v \in T_p M \subset T_u TM$, $\omega \in T_p^* M \subset T_u^* TM$ and $\Omega' \in T_p^* M$ are presented as

$$\begin{aligned} D\Pi_M(V) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j (\partial_{z_j})_{(z_i)}, \quad v = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \partial_{\eta_j}, \\ \omega &= \sum_{j=1}^n A_j (dz_j)_{(z_i)}, \quad \Omega' = \sum_{j=1}^n B_j (dz_j)_{(z_i)}. \\ \alpha_M(V) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j (\partial_{z_j})_{((z_i), (\alpha_i))} + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j (\partial_{\eta_j})_{((z_i), (\alpha_i))} \\ \mathbf{Swh}_M(W) &= \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j (dz_j)_{((z_i), (\alpha_i))} + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j (d\eta_j)_{((z_i), (\alpha_i))}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can easily see that \mathcal{P}_{TM} satisfies (2.8.1) and (2.8.2). From Proposition 2.7.1, \mathcal{P}_{TM} satisfies (2.8.3).

Suppose that for any $u \in T_p M$, a \mathbb{C} -bilinear map $\mathcal{P}'|_u: T_u TM \oplus V \in T_u^* TM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfies (2.8.1), (2.8.2) and (2.8.3). Define K_{ij}^k ($1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq 4$) by

$$\mathcal{P}'|_u(V, \Omega) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n (K_{ij}^1(u) \alpha_i A_j + K_{ij}^2(u) \alpha_i B_j + K_{ij}^3(u) \beta_i A_j + K_{ij}^4(u) \beta_i B_j).$$

Notice for the above expression that each K_{ij}^k may depend on $u \in T_p M$ in general (but not from the calculation below by the three equations in the end).

From (2.8.1),

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n (K_{ij}^1(u) \alpha_i A_j + K_{ij}^3(u) \beta_i A_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j A_j.$$

Since the right-hand side is independent of the choice of u , α , β and A , we have $K_{ij}^1(u) = \delta_{ij}$ (Kronecker's delta), and $K_{ij}^3(u) = 0$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $u \in T_p M$. From (2.8.2)

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n (K_{ij}^3(u) \beta_i A_j + K_{ij}^4(u) \beta_i B_j) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n K_{ij}^4(u) \beta_i B_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j B_j.$$

which means $K_{ij}^4(u) = \delta_{ij}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $u \in T_p M$. From (2.8.3), and the proof of Proposition 2.7.1,

$$D\mathcal{P}_M|_{(u, \zeta)} [V, W] = \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j \beta_j + \eta_j Y_j)$$

$$\mathcal{P}'|_{D\Pi_M(V)}(\alpha_M(V), \mathbf{Swh}_M(W)) = \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j \beta_j + \eta_j Y_j) + \sum_{i,j=1}^n K_{ij}^2(D\Pi_M(V)) \eta_i a_j.$$

From the assumption, $\Pi_{TM}(V) = \Pi_{TM}^\dagger(\Omega) = u = ((z_i), (\eta_i))$ and $\Pi_{T^*M}(W) = \zeta = ((z_i), (a_i))$ can be taken arbitrary in $T_p M$ and $T_p^* M$ respectively with fixing $((z_i), (\alpha_i)) = D\Pi_M[V] \in T_p M$, we have $K_{ij}^2 = 0$ on $T_p(M)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Therefore, we conclude that $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{P}_{TM}$. \square

Teichmüller theory

3.1. Teichmüller space and Bers embedding

For the contents of this section, readers can refer to the books [21], [32], [43], and [63] for instance.

3.1.1. Teichmüller space. Let Σ_g be an orientable closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$. A *marked Riemann surface* (X, f) of genus g is a pair of a closed Riemann surface X of genus g and an orientation preserving homeomorphism $f: \Sigma_g \rightarrow X$. Two marked Riemann surfaces (X_1, f_1) and (X_2, f_2) are said to be *Teichmüller equivalent* if there is a biholomorphism $h: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ such that $h \circ f_1$ is homotopic to f_2 . The set \mathcal{T}_g of equivalence classes is called the *Teichmüller space of closed Riemann surfaces of genus g* .

3.1.2. Teichmüller space as a bounded domain.

3.1.2.1. *Automorphic forms on Riemann surfaces.* Let $\{(U_i, z_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be an analytic coordinate chart of a Riemann surface M_0 . For $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$, a (p, q) -form $\varphi = \varphi(z) dz^p d\bar{z}^q$ is an assignment of a function $\varphi_i(z)$ on $z_i(U_i)$ for each $i \in I$ with

$$\varphi_j(z_{ij}(z)) \left(\frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right)^p \overline{\left(\frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right)^q} = \varphi_i(z)$$

for $z \in z_i(U_i \cap U_j)$, where $z_{ij} = z_j \circ z_i^{-1}: z_i(U_i \cap U_j) \rightarrow z_j(U_i \cap U_j)$. Notice that for a (p, q) -form φ_1 and an (r, s) -form φ_2 , the product

$$\varphi_1 \varphi_2 = \varphi_1(z) \varphi_2(z) dz^{p+r} d\bar{z}^{q+s}$$

is a $(p+r, q+s)$ -form.

We call a (p, q) -form φ to be *measurable, bounded (measurable), smooth, holomorphic, meromorphic* if so is each φ_i on $z_i(U_i)$ for $i \in I$. For simplicity, $(p, 0)$ -forms is called *p-forms*. From historical reasons, 2-forms, $(0, 1)$ -forms, and $(1, 1)$ -forms are called *quadratic differentials, vector fields, and area forms*, respectively. For instance for a quadratic differential Q and a vector field ξ , the product $\xi Q = Q\xi$ is a 1-form.

3.1.2.2. *Automorphic forms on domains.* Let D be a domain in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D$ contains at least three points, and let Γ be a subgroup of the group of biholomorphisms on D . Let $L^\infty(D, \Gamma)$ is the set of bounded measurable functions μ on D satisfying $\mu(\gamma(z))(\overline{\gamma'(z)})/\gamma'(z) = \mu(z)$ for $z \in D$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. $L^\infty(D, \Gamma)$ is a complex Banach space with the essential supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Let $B_2(D, \Gamma)$ be the set of holomorphic functions φ on D with $\varphi(\gamma(z))\overline{\gamma'(z)}^2 = \varphi(z)$ for $z \in D$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. $B_2(D, \Gamma)$ is also a complex Banach space with the sup norm

$$\|\varphi\|_\infty = \sup_{z \in D} \lambda_D(z)^{-2} |\varphi(z)|,$$




FIGURE 1. Bers projection, Bers embedding, and the Ahlfors-Weill section. The dotted arrow means the Ahlfors-Weill section is defined locally.

where $\lambda_D = \lambda_D(z)|dz|$ is the Poincare metric on D of curvature -4 .

Suppose that $M = D/\Gamma$ is a closed surface of genus g . Then, $L^\infty(D, \Gamma)$ and $B_2(D, \Gamma)$ are canonically identified with the complex Banach spaces $L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M)$ of bounded measurable $(-1, 1)$ -forms and \mathcal{Q}_M of holomorphic quadratic differentials on M , respectively. There is a canonical pairing

$$(3.1.1) \quad L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M) \times \mathcal{Q}_M \ni (\mu, q) \mapsto \langle \mu, q \rangle := \iint_M \mu(z)q(z)dxdy \\ = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_M \mu(z)q(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

3.1.3. Bers projection and Bers embedding. We fix $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ and the Fuchsian group Γ_0 acting on the unit disk $\mathbb{D} = \{|z| < 1\}$ with $\mathbb{D}/\Gamma_0 = M_0$.

Let $\mathbb{D}^* = \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \bar{\mathbb{D}}$. For simplicity, we write $L^\infty = L^\infty(\mathbb{D}, \Gamma_0)$ and $B_2 = B_2(\mathbb{D}^*, \Gamma_0)$. Let $(L^\infty)_1$ be the unit ball of L^∞ with center at the origin. Elements in $(L^\infty)_1$ are called *Beltrami differentials*. For any $\mu \in (L^\infty)_1$, we consider a unique quasiconformal mapping W_μ on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ satisfying

$$(W_\mu)_{\bar{z}} = \begin{cases} \mu(W_\mu)_z & (z \in \mathbb{D}) \\ 0 & (z \in \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathbb{D}), \end{cases}$$

and $W_\mu(z) = z + o(1)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. Then W_μ descends to a quasiconformal mapping w_μ from M_0 to $M_\mu := W_\mu(\mathbb{D})/W_\mu\Gamma(W_\mu)^{-1}$ and the map

$$(3.1.2) \quad \mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B: (L^\infty)_1 \ni \mu \mapsto (M_\mu, w_\mu) \in \mathcal{T}_g$$

is well-defined and surjective. We call the map $\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B$ the *Bers projection*.

We also define a holomorphic map

$$(L^\infty)_1 \ni \mu \mapsto \left(\frac{W_\mu'''}{W_\mu'} - \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{W_\mu''}{W_\mu'} \right)^2 \right) \Big|_{\mathbb{D}^*} \in B_2$$

which descends to an injective map $\mathcal{B}_{x_0}: \mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow B_2$ via the Bers projection. The image $\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ of \mathcal{B}_{x_0} is a bounded domain in B_2 containing the origin, and the origin of B_2 corresponds to $x_0 \in \mathcal{T}_g$. We call \mathcal{B}_{x_0} the *Bers embedding* of \mathcal{T}_g with base point x_0 . The Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g admits a (unique) complex structure which makes $\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B$ and \mathcal{B}_{x_0} holomorphic (cf. Figure 1).

We define $\mathcal{A}_{x_0}: B_2 \rightarrow L^\infty$ by

$$(3.1.3) \quad \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\varphi)(z) = -\frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\mathbb{D}}(z) \varphi(1/\bar{z})(1/\bar{z})^4 = -\frac{1}{2\bar{z}^4} (|z|^2 - 1)^2 \varphi(1/\bar{z}) \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}).$$

The restriction of \mathcal{A}_{x_0} to the open ball in B_2 of radius 2 with center the origin is a holomorphic local right-inverse of $\mathcal{B}_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B$. Namely

$$(3.1.4) \quad \mathcal{B}_{x_0} \circ (\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B \circ \mathcal{A}_{x_0}) = id$$

on the open ball. We call \mathcal{A}_{x_0} the *Ahlfors-Weill* section for $\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B$. In particular, the Bers projection is a holomorphic submersion.

3.2. Infinitesimal theory

3.2.1. Tangent spaces and Cotangent spaces. Let $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$. As above-mentioned, via the universal covering $\mathbb{H} \rightarrow M_0$, there is a natural isometric isomorphism $L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{D}, \Gamma_0)$.

Let $L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)_1$ be the open unit ball in $L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$. For $\mu \in L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)_1$, there is a quasiconformal mapping $g^\mu: M_0 \rightarrow M_\mu$ whose complex dilatation is equal to μ . Then, the Bers projection (3.1.2) is presented as

$$L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)_1 \ni \mu \rightarrow (M_\mu, g^\mu \circ f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$$

under the situation. Hence the (holomorphic) tangent space at x_0 is presented as the quotient space of $L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$ by the kernel of the differential of the Bers projection. Indeed, the Teichmüller lemma asserts that the tangent space $T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ is represented as the quotient space

$$(3.2.1) \quad T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \cong L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0) / \{\mu \in L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0) \mid \langle\langle \mu, q \rangle\rangle = 0, q \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}\}.$$

Hence, the pairing (3.1.1) descends to the non-degenerate pairing

$$(3.2.2) \quad T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \times \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \ni ([\mu], q) \mapsto \langle [\mu], q \rangle := \langle\langle \mu, q \rangle\rangle.$$

From (3.2.2), the space $\mathcal{Q}_{x_0} = \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$ is canonically recognized as the (holomorphic) cotangent space $T_{x_0}^*\mathcal{T}_g$ of \mathcal{T}_g at $x_0 = (M_0, f_0)$.

REMARK 3.2.1. After identifying $\mathcal{Q}_g = \cup_{x \in \mathcal{T}_g} \mathcal{Q}_x$ with the cotangent bundle of \mathcal{T}_g , when we use the notation defined at (2.2.3),

$$(3.2.3) \quad \langle v, q \rangle = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_g}(v, q)$$

holds for $v \in T\mathcal{T}_g$ and $q \in \mathcal{Q}_g = T^*\mathcal{T}_g$. We will use the both notations appropriately, since the right-hand side of (3.2.2) seems not to be familiar with readers (or Teichmüller theorists).

Strict convexity of \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} . The \mathbb{C} -vector space \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} is a complex Banach space with the L^1 -norm

$$\mathbf{n}(q) = \|q\| = \iint_{M_0} |q(z)| dx dy = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} |q(z)| d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

The L^1 -norm function \mathbf{n} on \mathcal{Q}_g is of class C^1 except for the zero section (cf. [67, Lemma 3]). We will discuss the regularity of the L^1 -norm function in §11.2.

The following is well-known. However, we give a brief proof for the sake of readers.

PROPOSITION 3.2.1 (Strictly convexity). The L^1 -norm on \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} is *strictly convex* in the sense that for $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$ with $q_1 \neq q_2$ and $\|q_1\| = \|q_2\| = 1$, $\|q_1 + q_2\| < 2$.

PROOF. To this end, we first claim that for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$ with $\alpha \neq 0$, $\|\beta\| = 1$,

$$\operatorname{Re} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{|\alpha|} \beta = 1$$

if and only if $\alpha = t\beta$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t \neq 0$. We only check the “only if”-part. Since $\operatorname{Re}(\bar{\alpha}\beta/|\alpha\beta|) \leq 1$ on M_0 except for finite points (zeroes of α and β), we have

$$0 \leq \iint_{M_0} \left(1 - \operatorname{Re} \frac{\overline{\alpha(z)\beta(z)}}{|\alpha(z)\beta(z)|} \right) |\beta(z)| dx dy = 1 - \operatorname{Re} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{|\alpha|} \beta = 0$$

from the assumption. Since $|\beta| > 0$ and $\bar{\alpha}\beta/|\alpha\beta| = |\alpha|\beta/|\beta|\alpha$ almost everywhere on M_0 , the imaginary part of a meromorphic function β/α vanishes almost everywhere on M_0 . From the identity theorem, we obtain $\alpha = t\beta$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t \neq 0$.

Let us return to the proof of the proposition. Let $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$ with $\|q_1\| = \|q_2\| = 1$. When $\|q_1 + q_2\| = 2$, $q_1 + q_2 \neq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 2 = \|q_1 + q_2\| &= \operatorname{Re} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{q_1 + q_2}}{|q_1 + q_2|} (q_1 + q_2) \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{q_1 + q_2}}{|q_1 + q_2|} q_1 + \operatorname{Re} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{q_1 + q_2}}{|q_1 + q_2|} q_2 \leq \|q_1\| + \|q_2\| = 2. \end{aligned}$$

From the above argument, we deduce that $t_1 q_1 = q_1 + q_2 = t_2 q_2$ for some $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t_1 \neq 0$ and $t_2 \neq 0$. Since $\|q_1\| = \|q_2\| = 1$ and $q_1 + q_2 \neq 0$, we obtain $q_1 = q_2$. \square

3.2.2. Trivializations of tangent bundle and cotangent bundle. Since the Teichmüller space is biholomorphic to a bounded domain in $B_2 = B_2(\mathbb{D}^*, \Gamma_0)$ (with the notation in §3.1.3), the (holomorphic) tangent bundle $T\mathcal{T}_g$ is naturally identified with the trivial bundle $\mathcal{T}_g \times B_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$.

A basis $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{3g-3} \in B_2$ of B_2 gives a global (holomorphic) trivialization of $\mathcal{Q}_g = T^*\mathcal{T}_g$ defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}_g \ni q \mapsto (x, (\langle D(\mathcal{B}_{x_0}^{-1})|_x[\varphi_1], q \rangle, \dots, \langle D(\mathcal{B}_{x_0}^{-1})|_x[\varphi_{3g-3}], q \rangle)) \in \mathcal{T}_g \times \mathbb{C}^{3g-3},$$

where $x \in \mathcal{T}_g$ with $q \in \mathcal{Q}_x$, and $D(\mathcal{B}_{x_0}^{-1})$ is the differential of the inverse of the Bers embedding. Since \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} is the dual of B_2 , for any $q \in \mathcal{Q}_g$, there is a unique $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ such that

$$(3.2.4) \quad \langle (D(\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_x)^{-1}[\varphi_k], q) \rangle = \langle (D(\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0})^{-1}[\varphi_k], Q) \rangle = \langle [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\varphi_k)], Q \rangle$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, 3g-3$. Therefore, we obtain a natural holomorphic identification

$$(3.2.5) \quad T^*\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathcal{Q}_g \ni q \rightarrow (x, Q) \in \mathcal{T}_g \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}.$$

We can easily check that the identification (3.2.5) is independent of the choice of the frame $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{3g-3}\}$ of B_2 .

3.2.3. Teichmüller Beltrami differentials. The *Teichmüller Beltrami differential* on M_0 is a $(-1, 1)$ -bounded measurable form of the form

$$k \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} = k \frac{\overline{q(z)} d\bar{z}}{|q(z)| dz}.$$

for $q \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$ and $k > 0$ (e.g. [3, p.29]). The Teichmüller Beltrami differential have an extremal property, called the infinitesimal unique extremal property. Namely, when $\mu \in L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$ satisfies

$$\langle \mu, \varphi \rangle = \langle \bar{q}/|q|, \varphi \rangle$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$, then $\|\mu\|_\infty \geq 1$, and the equality holds only if $\mu = \bar{q}/|q|$ almost everywhere on M_0 (cf. [22, §4.10, Corollary 2] and the discussion below). Furthermore, each tangent vector $v \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ admits a unique Teichmüller Beltrami differential as a representative.

The quasiconformal mapping defined from the Teichmüller Beltrami differential $k\bar{q}/|q|$ with $0 < k < 1$ is called the *formal Teichmüller map* (cf. [32, §5.2.2]). A formal Teichmüller map defined from a pair (k, q) with $k = \|q\|$ is called the *Teichmüller map*. Formal Teichmüller maps have an extremal property. Namely, any formal Teichmüller map f on M_0 is uniquely extremal in the sense that the maximal dilatation of f attains minimal only at f among all quasiconformal mappings on M_0 homotopic to f (e.g. [22, §4.7, Corollary 1] and [32, Theorem 5.9]).

3.2.4. Teichmüller metric. For $x = (M, f) \in \mathcal{T}_g$, the *Teichmüller metric* τ is a Finsler metric on \mathcal{T}_g defined by

$$(3.2.6) \quad \tau(x, v) = \sup \{ \operatorname{Re} \langle v, q \rangle \mid \|q\| = 1, q \in \mathcal{Q}_M \}$$

for $v \in T_x\mathcal{T}_g$. By definition, the Teichmüller metric on $T\mathcal{T}_g$ is thought of as the dual (Finsler) metric to the L^1 -norm on $\mathcal{Q}_g \cong T^*\mathcal{T}_g$ (cf. [67, §2]).

Royden shows that the Teichmüller metric coincides with the Kobayashi metric on \mathcal{T}_g , and that the Teichmüller metric is of class C^1 on the tangent bundle except for the zero section (cf. [67, Lemma 3, Theorem 3]). We will deal with the regularity of the Teichmüller metric in §11.2.

The length distance with respect to the Teichmüller metric on \mathcal{T}_g is called the *Teichmüller distance* on \mathcal{T}_g . The Teichmüller space with the Teichmüller distance is a unique geodesic and complete metric space which is deduced from the Teichmüller uniqueness theorem and the compactness of the family of quasiconformal mappings with uniformly bounded maximal dilatation.

3.3. Kodaira-Spencer theory

3.3.1. Notation on the sheaf cohomology. We first fix notations. For a sheaf \mathcal{S} over a topological space M and an open set $U \subset M$, we denote by $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{S})$ the set of sections of \mathcal{S} over U . Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a locally finite covering of M . For a k -chain $\sigma \in C^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$, we denote by $\sigma_{i_0 \dots i_k} \in \Gamma(I_{i_0} \cap \dots \cap U_{i_k}, \mathcal{S})$ the $(i_0 \dots i_k)$ -component of σ .

Let $\delta: C^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow C^{k+1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ denote the coboundary operator. Let $Z^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ and $B^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ be the spaces of cocycles and coboundaries, and $H^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ the k -th cohomology group with coefficient \mathcal{S} . For instance, $H^0(M, \mathcal{S}) = \Gamma(M, \mathcal{S})$. It is known that when a covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies $H^1(U_i, \mathcal{S}) = 0$ for $i \in I$, the natural inclusion

$$H^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow H^1(M, \mathcal{S})$$

defined from the direct limit is isomorphic and

$$H^2(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow H^2(M, \mathcal{S})$$

is injective (cf. [43, Theorems 3.4 and 3.5]).

Let M be a Riemann surface. Let Θ_M and Ω_M be the sheaves of germs of holomorphic vector fields and holomorphic 1-forms on M , respectively. For $p, q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \Theta_M$ or Ω_M , we denote by $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes r})$ the *sheaf of germs of C^∞ - (p, q) -forms with coefficients in $\mathcal{S}^{\otimes r}$* . For instance, a section of $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}(\Omega_M^{\otimes r})$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}(\Theta_M^{\otimes r})$) on a domain $V \subset M$ is a smooth $(p+r, q)$ -form on V (resp. smooth $(p-r, q)$ -forms),

respectively. Therefore, there are natural identifications $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}(\Omega_M^{\otimes r}) = \mathcal{A}^{0,q}(\Omega_M^{\otimes(p+r)})$ and $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}(\Theta_M^{\otimes r}) = \mathcal{A}^{0,q}(\Omega_M^{\otimes(p-r)})$. For instance, $\mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Omega_{M_0})$ is the sheaf of germs of smooth area forms on M_0 .

Let $\mathcal{U} = \{(U_i, z_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite analytic chart of M . For $\mathcal{S} = \Theta_M$ or Ω_M , the anti-holomorphic derivative $\bar{\partial}$ defines a sheaf homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} C^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{p,0}(\mathcal{S})) &\xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} C^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{p,1}(\mathcal{S})) \\ \sigma = \{\sigma_{i_0 \dots i_k}\}_{i_0, \dots, i_k \in I} &\longrightarrow \bar{\partial}\sigma = \{(\sigma_{i_0 \dots i_k})_{\bar{z}}\}_{i_0, \dots, i_k \in I} \end{aligned}$$

3.3.2. The first cohomology group as the tangent space. The following exact sequence

$$(3.3.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \Theta_{M_0} \xrightarrow{\text{inc}} \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}) \xrightarrow{-\bar{\partial}} \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where ‘‘inc’’ means the inclusion, leads the Dolbeault theorem

$$(3.3.2) \quad H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0})) / \bar{\partial}\Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$$

(cf. [43, Theorem 3.13]). The canonical isomorphism $H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ follows from the coincidence of the right-hand sides of (3.2.1) and (3.3.2), which is verified from the Serre duality theorem (or the non-degeneracy of the Serre pairing defined by the residue map). See [32, Theorem 7.9] and [19, §17]. See also §13.1 for the discussion on the sign of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator in (3.3.1).

For reader’s convenience, we shall give an explicit correspondence. We fix a covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 with $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$. For $X \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, take $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_0))$ such that $\delta\xi = X$. Then $\mu = -\bar{\partial}\xi_i$ on U_i is naturally thought of as an element in $\Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0})) \subset L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$, and

$$(3.3.3) \quad H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \ni [X] \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{x_0}} [\mu] = [-\bar{\partial}\xi_i] \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$$

is a \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism. See the discussion in [43, Theorem 5.4].

3.3.3. Presentation of the pairing by the residue. The exact sequence of sheaves

$$(3.3.4) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{M_0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Omega_{M_0}) \longrightarrow 0$$

leads the isomorphism

$$(3.3.5) \quad H^1(M_0, \Omega_{M_0}) \cong H^0(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Omega_{M_0})) / dH^0(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0})).$$

This yields the residue map

$$\text{Res}: H^1(M_0, \Omega_{M_0}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

defined by

$$(3.3.6) \quad \text{Res}([\omega]) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{M_0} \Omega(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

for $[\omega] \in H^1(M_0, \Omega_{M_0})$, where $\Omega \in H^0(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ is the corresponding area form via the isomorphism (3.3.5). Namelly, there is $\Omega' \in C^0(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ such that $d\Omega' = \bar{\partial}\Omega' = \Omega$ and $\delta\Omega' = \omega$ (cf. [19, §17.1]).

CONVENTION 2. As (3.3.6), in this paper, we adopt $d\bar{z} \wedge dz$ as the basis of 2-forms. The reason why we use $d\bar{z} \wedge dz$ as a basis of 2-forms comes from the exact sequence (3.3.4). Namelly, for $\omega = \omega(z)dz$, $d\omega = \omega_{\bar{z}}(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz$. See [19, (c) in §15.9].

The pairing (3.2.2) is presented with the residue as

$$(3.3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} (v, q) &= \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (-\xi_i)_{\bar{z}} q d\bar{z} \wedge dz = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} d(\xi_i q dz) \\ &= -\pi \operatorname{Res}([Xq]) \end{aligned}$$

since $\delta(\{\xi_i q\}_{i \in I}) = Xq = \{X_{ij} q\}_{i, j \in I} \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0})$, where $v = [X] = [\{X_{ij}\}_{i, j \in I}] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$, and $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ with $\delta\xi = X$. In particular, when $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$, the residue pairing

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ ([X], q) &\longrightarrow -\pi \operatorname{Res}([Xq]) \end{aligned}$$

is non-degenerate.

3.4. Stratification of the space of quadratic differentials

Let Z be a manifold. A *stratification* of Z is a locally finite collection of locally closed submanifolds $\{Z_j\}_{j \in J}$ of Z , the *strata*, indexed by a set J such that

- (1) $Z = \cup_{j \in J} Z_j$; and
- (2) $Z_j \cap \overline{Z_k} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $Z_j \subset \overline{Z_k}$.

(cf. [15]). The conditions induce a partial order on J , where $j \leq k$ if $Z_j \subset \overline{Z_k}$.

Each $q \in \mathcal{Q}_g$ determines a topological data $(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ where k_1, \dots, k_n are the orders of zeroes: $\epsilon = +1$ if q is the square of an abelian differential $\epsilon = -1$ otherwise. A stratum $\mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ consists all quadratic differentials determining the data $(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$. The principal stratum \mathcal{Q}_1 corresponds to $(1, \dots, 1; -1)$. The principal stratum \mathcal{Q}_1 is open and generic, and each stratum is a complex submanifold of \mathcal{Q}_g (cf. [77]). See also [15]). The index of the stratum satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^n k_i = 4g - 4$. In general, some data $(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ cannot be realized by a holomorphic quadratic differential. See Masur-Smillie [53].

Any point in each stratum admits a local complex chart defined by the relative period of the abelian differentials defined from the square roots of the differential. Hence, the L^1 -norm function is real analytic on each stratum because the L^1 -norm is written as the quadratic form of the period.

For the record, we summary as follows.

PROPOSITION 3.4.1. The L^1 -norm function on \mathcal{Q}_g is real-analytic on each stratum

Teichmüller space of tori

In this chapter, we devote to discuss the model case (the most simplest case) of our results. We treat the Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_1 of tori. The case of once punctured tori is treated in the same way as that in the case of flat tori. Indeed, the canonical completion at the puncture gives an isomorphism between the Teichmüller space of once punctured tori and that of flat tori. The case of four puncture sphere is treated in a similar way.

4.1. Teichmüller space of tori

The Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_1 of tori is the space of the Teichmüller equivalence classes of marked complex tori of dimension 1, where a *complex torus* of dimension 1 is a Riemann surface homeomorphic to a torus. For $\tau \in \mathbb{H} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Im}(\tau) > 0\}$, let $\Gamma_\tau = \langle 1, \tau \rangle$ be a \mathbb{Z} lattice in \mathbb{C} generated by 1 and τ , and set $M_\tau = \mathbb{C}/\Gamma_\tau$. Let $\Sigma_1 = M_i$ (i is the imaginary unit). Let $f_\tau: \Sigma_1 \rightarrow M_\tau$ be a homeomorphism with $(f_\tau)_*(1) = 1$ and $(f_\tau)_*(i) = \tau$. Then, (M_τ, f_τ) is a marked complex torus, and

$$\mathbb{H} \ni \tau \mapsto (M_\tau, f_\tau) \in \mathcal{T}_1$$

is bijective. It is well-known that this identification become a biholomorphic under a canonical complex structure on \mathcal{T}_1 .

4.2. Tangent and cotangent bundles

For $(M_\tau, f_\tau) \in \mathcal{T}_1$, the space \mathcal{Q}_τ of holomorphic quadratic differentials on M_τ is described by

$$\mathcal{Q}_\tau = \{q = q dz^2 \mid q \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

where the coordinate z is induced from \mathbb{C} via the projection $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow M_\tau = \mathbb{C}/\Gamma_\tau$ since any Γ_τ -periodic holomorphic function on \mathbb{C} is constant. We identify the space \mathcal{Q}_1 of holomorphic quadratic differentials with $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$ by

$$(4.2.1) \quad \mathcal{Q}_1 \ni ((M_\tau, f_\tau), -2iq dz^2) \mapsto (\tau, q) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}.$$

The constant “ $-2i$ ” in the trivialization (4.2.1) is a regulation which makes the pairing between $T\mathcal{T}_1$ and \mathcal{Q}_1 to be the ordinary complex Euclidean pairing as we see at (4.2.4). The L^1 -norm function \mathbf{n} on \mathcal{Q}_1 is given by

$$\mathbf{n}(\tau, q) = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_\tau} |-2iq| d\bar{z} \wedge dz = 2|q| \text{Im}(\tau).$$

The $L^\infty_{(-1,1)}(M_\tau)$ consists of bounded measurable $(-1, 1)$ -form $\mu' = \mu'(z) d\bar{z}/dz$ such that $\mu'(z)$ is periodic in terms of the action of the lattice Γ_τ . Then, μ' is infinitesimally equivalent to a unique constant $(-1, 1)$ -form $(\mu/\text{Im}(\tau)) d\bar{z}/dz$ with

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_\tau} \mu'(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

We notice that the Beltrami differential $\mu(t)$ of the quasiconformal (affine) deformation from M_τ to $M_{\tau+t\mu}$ ($\mu \in \mathbb{C}$) behaves

$$(4.2.2) \quad \mu(t) = t \frac{i\mu}{2\text{Im}(\tau)} \frac{d\bar{z}}{dz} + o(t)$$

as $t \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we define a trivialization of $T\mathcal{T}_1$ by

$$(4.2.3) \quad T\mathcal{T}_1 \ni \left((M_\tau, f_\tau), \left[\frac{i\mu}{2\text{Im}(\tau)} \frac{d\bar{z}}{dz} \right] \right) \mapsto (\tau, \mu) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$$

Under the coordinates of $T\mathcal{T}_g$ and \mathcal{Q}_1 , the pairing function is

$$(4.2.4) \quad \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_1}((\tau, \mu), (\tau, q)) = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_\tau} \frac{i\mu}{2\text{Im}(\tau)} (-2iq) d\bar{z} \wedge dz = \mu q.$$

Therefore, the Teichmüller metric on \mathcal{T}_1 , which is the dual Finsler metric with respect to the L^1 -norm function, is obtained by

$$\tau(\tau, \mu) = \sup \{ \text{Re}(\mu q) \mid \mathbf{n}(\tau, q) = 1 \} = \frac{|\mu|}{2\text{Im}(\tau)},$$

which implies that the Teichmüller metric on \mathcal{T}_1 is nothing but the Poincaré metric on the upper-half plane \mathbb{H} with curvature -4 (cf. [29, Theorem 6.6.5] and [40, Chapter IV, Proposition 1.3]).

The Teichmüller Beltrami map $\mathcal{TB}: \mathcal{Q}_1 \rightarrow T\mathcal{T}_1$ is presented by

$$\mathcal{TB}(\tau, q) = \left((M_\tau, f_\tau), \left[2i \text{Im}(\tau) \bar{q} \frac{d\bar{z}}{dz} \right] \right) = (\tau, 4\bar{q}\text{Im}(\tau)^2).$$

In this case, it is immediately checked that the Teichmüller Beltrami map is a real-analytic diffeomorphism from \mathcal{Q}_1 to $T\mathcal{T}_1$.

4.3. Second order infinitesimal spaces and Infinitesimal Duality

All the second order infinitesimal spaces of \mathcal{T}_1 are holomorphically trivial to $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$. We identify

$$\begin{aligned} TT\mathcal{T}_1 &\ni \xi \partial_\tau|_{(\tau, \mu)} + \zeta \partial_\mu|_{(\tau, \mu)} \mapsto (\tau, \mu, \xi, \zeta) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \\ T^*T\mathcal{T}_1 &\ni \kappa d\tau|_{(\tau, \mu)} + \lambda d\mu|_{(\tau, \mu)} \mapsto (\tau, \mu, \kappa, \lambda) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \\ T\mathcal{Q}_1 &\ni \alpha \partial_\tau|_{(\tau, q)} + \beta \partial_q|_{(\tau, q)} \mapsto (\tau, q, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \\ T^*\mathcal{Q}_1 &\ni \gamma d\tau|_{(\tau, q)} + \eta dq|_{(\tau, q)} \mapsto (\tau, q, \gamma, \eta) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}. \end{aligned}$$

The flip, the switch, and the dualization are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\tau, \mu, \xi, \zeta) &= (\tau, \xi, \mu, \zeta) \\ \mathbf{Sw}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\tau, q, \alpha, \beta) &= (\tau, \alpha, \beta, q) \\ \mathbf{dual}_{\mathcal{T}_1}^\dagger(\tau, q, \alpha, \beta) &= (\tau, q, \beta, -\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

From (4.2.4), Proposition 2.7.1 and Proposition 2.8.1, the pairing functions and the holomorphic symplectic form are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{T\mathcal{T}_1}((\tau, \mu, \xi, \zeta), (\tau, \mu, \kappa, \lambda)) &= \xi\kappa + \zeta\lambda \\ \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Q}_1}((\tau, q, \alpha, \beta), (\tau, q, \gamma, \eta)) &= \alpha\gamma + \beta\eta \\ \omega_{\mathcal{T}_1}((\tau, q, \alpha_1, \beta_1), (\tau, q, \alpha_2, \beta_2)) &= -\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_1\beta_2 - \beta_1\alpha_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the pairings are presented as those in the case of trivial bundles. This is caused from the regulation of the trivializations of $T\mathcal{T}_1$ and \mathcal{Q}_1 so that the pairing between $T\mathcal{T}_1$ and \mathcal{Q}_1 is presented as the ordinary Euclidean case as (4.2.4).

The differentials of the L^1 -norm function \mathbf{n} on \mathcal{Q}_1 and the Teichmüller metric $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ on $T\mathcal{T}_1$ are obtained by

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\mathbf{n}|_{(\tau,q)} &= -i|q|d\tau + \operatorname{Im}(\tau)\frac{\bar{q}}{|q|}dq = \left(\tau, q, -|q|, \operatorname{Im}(\tau)\frac{\bar{q}}{|q|}\right) \\ \partial\boldsymbol{\tau}|_{(\tau,\mu)} &= -\frac{|\mu|}{4i\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2}d\tau + \frac{\bar{\mu}}{4|\mu|\operatorname{Im}(\tau)}d\mu = \left(\tau, \mu, -\frac{|\mu|}{4i\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2}, \frac{\bar{\mu}}{4|\mu|\operatorname{Im}(\tau)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we see that the L^1 -norm function and the Teichmüller metric are of class C^1 except for the zero sections. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\mathbf{n}^2|_{(\tau,q)} &= -4i|q|^2\operatorname{Im}(\tau)d\tau + 4\bar{q}\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2dq = (\tau, q, -4i|q|^2\operatorname{Im}(\tau), 4\bar{q}\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2) \\ \partial\boldsymbol{\tau}^2|_{(\tau,\mu)} &= -\frac{|\mu|^2}{4i\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^3}d\tau + \frac{\bar{\mu}}{4\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2}d\mu = \left(\tau, \mu, -\frac{|\mu|^2}{4i\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^3}, \frac{\bar{\mu}}{4\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, at $(\tau, q) = -2iq dz^2 \in \mathcal{Q}_\tau$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Swh}_{\mathcal{T}_1} \circ (\mathbf{dual}_{\mathcal{T}_1}^\dagger)^{-1}(-\partial\mathbf{n}^2|_{(\tau,q)}) &= \mathbf{Swh}_{\mathcal{T}_1} \circ (\mathbf{dual}_{\mathcal{T}_1}^\dagger)^{-1}(\tau, q, 4i|q|^2\operatorname{Im}(\tau), -4\bar{q}\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2) \\ &= \mathbf{Swh}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\tau, q, 4\bar{q}\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2, 4i|q|^2\operatorname{Im}(\tau)) \\ &= (\tau, 4\bar{q}\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2, 4i|q|^2\operatorname{Im}(\tau), q) \\ \partial\boldsymbol{\tau}^2|_{\mathcal{TB}(\tau,q)} &= \partial\boldsymbol{\tau}^2|_{(\tau, 4\bar{q}\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2)} \\ &= (\tau, 4\bar{q}\operatorname{Im}(\tau)^2, 4i|q|^2\operatorname{Im}(\tau), q).\end{aligned}$$

This coincidence implies that the infinitesimal duality holds in this model case. We will discuss in §11.4 for general cases.

4.4. Levi convexities and CR structures of the unit sphere bundles

We will discuss in §11.1.3 the structure of the (real) tangent space of the unit sphere bundle

$$\mathcal{SQ}_g = \{q \in \mathcal{Q}_g \mid \mathbf{n}(q) = 1\}$$

in \mathcal{Q}_g . Here we deal with the simplest case $g = 1$.

The real tangent space $T_q^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{SQ}_1$ at $q \in \mathcal{SQ}_1$ is presented as

$$T_q^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{SQ}_1 = \{V \in T_q\mathcal{Q}_1 \mid \operatorname{Re}(\partial\mathbf{n}|_q(V)) = 0\}.$$

It is easy to see that $i\partial_q = (0, i) \in T_q\mathcal{Q}_1$ is in the real tangent space $T_q^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{SQ}_1$. In this case, the horizontal subspace $T_q^H\mathcal{SQ}_1$ coincides with the maximal complex subspace of the (real) tangent space $T_q^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{SQ}_1$ and

$$T_q^H\mathcal{SQ}_1 = \{a(\operatorname{Im}(\tau), iq) \mid a \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

and

$$T_q^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{SQ}_1 = T_q^H\mathcal{SQ}_1 \oplus \{t(0, i) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

4.4.1. Sign of the Levi form. For making a conjectural picture of the structure of the sphere bundle, we continue to discuss with this simplest case (cf. Conjecture 11.1.1). The complex Hessian (Levi matrix) of the L^1 -norm function is

$$\text{Levi}(\mathbf{n})|_q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i\frac{q}{2|q|} \\ i\frac{\bar{q}}{2|q|} & \frac{\text{Im}(\tau)}{2|q|} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2|q|} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -iq \\ i\bar{q} & \text{Im}(\tau) \end{bmatrix}.$$

This defines the Hermitian form on $T_q\mathcal{Q}_1$. Notice that

$$(0, i)\text{Levi}(\mathbf{n})|_q \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -i \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\text{Im}(\tau)}{2|q|} > 0$$

$$(\text{Im}(\tau), iq)\text{Levi}(\mathbf{n})|_q \begin{pmatrix} \text{Im}(\tau) \\ -i\bar{q} \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{|q|}{2}\text{Im}(\tau) < 0.$$

Thus, the Levi form of \mathbf{n} is negative on the horizontal subspace $T_q^H\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_1$ and positive on the vertical space. We notice that the eigenvalues of the Levi form is $\lambda_{\pm} = (\text{Im}(\tau) \pm \sqrt{\text{Im}(\tau)^2 + 4|q|^2})/2$, and the corresponding eigenspaces are spanned by

$$V_{\pm} = \begin{pmatrix} -2iq \\ \text{Im}(\tau)^2 \pm 4|q|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In particular, the eigenspace for the negative eigenvalue is not a subspace in the real tangent space to the unit sphere bundle.

On the other hand, the complex Hessian (Levi matrix) of the Teichmüller metric τ is

$$\text{Levi}(\boldsymbol{\tau})|_{(\tau, \mu)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{|\mu|}{4\text{Im}(\tau)^3} & \frac{i\mu}{8|\mu|\text{Im}(\tau)^2} \\ -\frac{i\mu}{8|\mu|\text{Im}(\tau)^2} & \frac{1}{8|\mu|\text{Im}(\tau)} \end{bmatrix}$$

which is positive definite. Hence, the Teichmüller metric is strictly plurisubharmonic on $T\mathcal{T}_1^x = T\mathcal{T}_1 - \{0\}$, and the unit sphere bundle $\mathcal{S}T\mathcal{T}_1$ is pseudoconvex at every point.

4.4.2. CR structures on the unit tangent bundles. If we restrict the differential of the Teichmüller Beltrami map $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{B}_0$ to the horizontal subspace $T_q^H\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_1$,

$$D\mathcal{T}\mathcal{B}_0|_{q_0}(\text{Im}(\tau)\partial_{\tau} + iq\partial_q) = \text{Im}(\tau)\partial_{\tau} + (-4i\bar{q}\text{Im}(\tau)^2)\partial_{\mu}.$$

This means that the restriction of $D\mathcal{T}\mathcal{B}_0|_{q_0}$ is \mathbb{C} -linear (compare with Proposition 12.3.1), and the image of $T_q^H\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_1$ coincides with the maximal complex subspace in the real tangent space $T_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{B}_0(q)}^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{S}T\mathcal{T}_1$ of the unit sphere bundle with respect to the Teichmüller metric. Thus, the subbundle

$$\cup_{q \in \mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_1} T_q^H\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_1$$

defines an (abstract) CR structure on $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_1$ and the Teichmüller Beltrami map $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{B}_0$ is a CR-isomorphism between unit sphere bundles (cf. [13, §9]). See Problem 1 in §12.3.

Models of Spaces and Pairings

5.1. Model of second order infinitesimal spaces

One of the purpose of this paper is to give models of second order infinitesimal spaces of the Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g in view of the theory of moduli of Riemann surfaces. To this end, we first formulate the model of the second order infinitesimal spaces.

Let M be a complex manifold of dimension n . Let $p \in M$. In this paper, a *model of the second order infinitesimal spaces of M at $p \in M$* consisting of

- collections of complex vector spaces of dimension $2n$:

$$\{V_v\}_{v \in T_p M}, \{V_v^*\}_{v \in T_p M}, \{W_\omega\}_{\omega \in T_p^* M}, \{W_\omega^*\}_{\omega \in T_p^* M},$$

where V_v^* and W_ω^* are dual spaces of V_v and W_ω , respectively;

- cor $\omega \in T_p^* M$, each W_ω admits a complex symplectic form Ω_ω ;
- maps : the filp $A_p: V_p \rightarrow V_p$, the switch $B_p: W_p \rightarrow V_p^*$, and the dualization $C_\omega: W_\omega \rightarrow W_\omega^*$, where

$$\begin{aligned} V_p &= \{(v, X) \mid v \in T_p M, X \in V_v\}, \\ V_p^* &= \{(v, Z) \mid v \in T_p M, Z \in V_v^*\}, \\ W_p &= \{(\omega, \Omega) \mid \omega \in T_p^* M, \Omega \in W_\omega\}; \end{aligned}$$

- Commutative diagrams. In each diagram, horizontal lines are all exact. :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T_p M & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vi}_M: v} & T_v T M & \xrightarrow{D\Pi_M} & T_p M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \Phi_v \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_p M & \xrightarrow{vi_v} & V_v & \xrightarrow{Dpr_v} & T_p M \longrightarrow 0 \\ \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_p^* M & \xrightarrow{(\Pi_M^\dagger)^*} & T_v^* T M & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vp}_M: v} & T_p^* M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \Phi_v^\dagger \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_p^* M & \xrightarrow{pr_v^*} & V_v^* & \xrightarrow{vp_v} & T_p^* M \longrightarrow 0 \\ \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_p^* M & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vi}_M^\dagger: \omega} & T_\omega T^* M & \xrightarrow{D\Pi_M^\dagger} & T_p M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \Psi_\omega \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_p^* M & \xrightarrow{vi_\omega^\dagger} & W_\omega & \xrightarrow{Dpr_\omega^\dagger} & T_p M \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & T_p^* M & \xrightarrow{(\Pi_M^\dagger)^*} & T_\omega^* T^* M & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{v}P^\dagger_{M;\omega}} & T_p M \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \parallel & & \Psi_\omega^\dagger \downarrow & & \parallel \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_p^* M & \xrightarrow{pr_\omega^\dagger, * } & W_\omega^* & \xrightarrow{vp_\omega^\dagger} & T_p M \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

(Notice that in each commutative diagram, the vertical map in the middle is (automatically) an isomorphism).

with the properties that

- (1) Φ_v^\dagger and Ψ_ω^\dagger are duals of Φ_v and Ψ_ω , respectively. Namely,

$$\mathcal{P}_{TM}(V_1, V_2) = \mathcal{P}_{V_v}(\Phi_v(V_1), \Phi_v^\dagger(V_2))$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{T^*M}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \mathcal{P}_{W_\omega}(\Psi_\omega(\Omega_1), \Psi_\omega^\dagger(\Omega_2))$$

for $V_1 \in T_v TM$, $V_2 \in T_v^* TM$, $\Omega_1 \in T_\omega T^* M$ and $\Omega_2 \in T_\omega^* T^* M$, where \mathcal{P}_{V_v} (resp. \mathcal{P}_{W_ω}) is the dual pairing between V_v and V_v^* (resp. W_ω and W_ω^*);

- (2) $A_p \circ A_p = id_{V_p}$;
(3) for $V \in V_v$. if $u = Dpr_v(V)$, $A_p(V) \in V_u$ and $Dpr_u \circ A_p(V) = v$;
(4) let $v \in T_p M$ and $V \in V_v$. Set $u = Dpr_v(V)$. For any surjective \mathbb{C} -linear mappings $L_u: V_u \rightarrow T_p M$ and $L_v: V_v \rightarrow T_p M$ with $L_u \circ vi_u = L_v \circ vi_v = id_{T_p M}$, $L_u \circ A_p(V) = L_v(V)$;
(5) when p varies, the derivative of the pairing function \mathcal{P}_M on $TM \oplus T^*M$ in the direction $(V_1, V_2) \in T_v TTM \oplus T_\omega T^*M$ at $(v, \omega) \in TM \oplus T^*M$ satisfies

$$D\mathcal{P}_M|_{(v,\omega)}[V_1, V_2] = \mathcal{P}_{V_u}(A_p(V_1), B_p(V_2))$$

where $u = Dpr_v(V_1) = Dpr_\omega^\dagger(V_2)$; and

- (6) for $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in T_\omega T^*M$,

$$\mathcal{P}_{W_\omega}(\Psi_\omega(\Omega_1), C_\omega(\Psi_\omega(\Omega_2))) = 2\Omega_\omega(\Psi_\omega(\Omega_2), \Psi_\omega(\Omega_1)).$$

In our case, $M = \mathcal{T}_g$ and we will denote the model spaces by

$$V_v = \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] = \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] = \mathbb{T}_{[\nu]}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$$

$$V_v^* = \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$$

$$W_\omega = \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$$

$$W_\omega^* = \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$$

for $p = x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$, $v = [Y] = [\nu] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) = T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$, $\omega = q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ and an appropriate covering \mathcal{U} of M_0 , defined at Definition 3, Definition 6, Definition 7, §5.5, §5.6, and §5.7 later. Models of pairings $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and \mathcal{P}^\dagger are defined in §5.5.1 and §5.7.2. The model of the holomorphic symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}$ is given in §5.7.3 by reformulating Kawai's symplectic form ([34]) in our setting.

5.2. Lie bracket and Lie derivative

Let (U, z) be an analytic coordinate chart of M_0 and $p, q \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For $\xi \in H^0(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,p}(\Theta_{M_0}))$, $\eta \in H^0(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,q}(\Theta_{M_0}))$, we define the *Lie bracket* of ξ_1 and ξ_2 by

$$(5.2.1) \quad [\xi, \eta] = (\xi(z)\eta_z(z) - \xi_z(z)\eta(z)) d\bar{z}^{p+q} \otimes \partial_z \in H^0(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,p+q}(\Theta_{M_0}))$$

(cf. [43, p.265]). For $\xi, \eta \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$, we can see that

$$\bar{\partial}[\xi, \eta] = [\bar{\partial}\xi, \eta] + [\xi, \bar{\partial}\eta] \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0})).$$

For $p \geq 0$ and $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define the *Lie derivative*

$$L_\cdot(\cdot): \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,r}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes p})) \oplus \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,s}(\Theta_{M_0})) \rightarrow \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,r+s}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes p}))$$

by

$$(5.2.2) \quad L_\xi(\omega)(z)dz^p d\bar{z}^{r+s} = (\xi(z)\omega_z(z) + p\xi_z(z)\omega(z))dz^p d\bar{z}^{r+s},$$

where $\omega = \omega(z)dz^p d\bar{z}^r$ and $\xi = \xi(z)\frac{dz}{d\bar{z}}^s$. We often use the following formula in the following argument: For $Q \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}))$ and $\xi, \eta \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$,

$$(5.2.3) \quad \bar{\partial}L_\xi(Q) = L_{\bar{\partial}\xi}(Q) + L_\xi(\bar{\partial}Q)$$

$$(5.2.4) \quad L_\xi(\eta Q) = L_\eta(\xi Q) = \partial(\xi\eta Q)$$

$$(5.2.5) \quad L_\xi(\eta Q) - \xi L_\eta(Q) + [\xi, \eta]Q = 0$$

$$(5.2.6) \quad L_\xi(L_\eta(Q)) - L_\eta(L_\xi(Q)) = L_{[\xi, \eta]}(Q).$$

CONVENTION 3. As discussed in Convention 2, for $\mu \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_M))$ and $Q \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_M^{\otimes 2}))$, we set

$$\mu Q = \mu(z)Q(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

For $\xi, \eta \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_M))$, $\mu \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_M))$ and $Q \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_M^{\otimes 2}))$, $\xi Q = \xi(z)Q(z)dz \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_M))$ and

$$\xi\mu Q = \mu\xi Q = \xi(z)\mu(z)Q(z)d\bar{z} \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}).$$

Hence

$$(5.2.7) \quad d(\xi Q) = \bar{\partial}(\xi Q) = (\xi_{\bar{z}}(z)Q(z) + \xi Q_{\bar{z}}(z))d\bar{z} \wedge dz = (\bar{\partial}\xi)Q + \xi(\bar{\partial}Q)$$

$$(5.2.8) \quad d(\xi\mu Q) = \partial(\xi\mu Q) = (\xi_z\mu Q + \xi\mu_z Q + \xi\mu Q_z)dz \wedge d\bar{z} = -L_\xi(\mu Q)$$

$$(5.2.9) \quad L_\xi(\mu Q) - \mu L_\xi(Q) + [\mu, \xi]Q = 0$$

5.3. Model spaces of $T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g$

Let M_0 be a closed Riemann surface of genus g . In this section, we fix a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 .

5.3.1. Operators. For $X = \{X_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}$, $Y = \{Y_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I} \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, we define (the bilinarization of) the *primary obstruction* $\zeta(X, Y) \in Z^2(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ for X and Y by

$$\zeta(X, Y)_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2}([X_{ij}, Y_{jk}] + [Y_{ij}, X_{jk}])$$

on $U_i \cap U_j \cap U_k$ (cf. [43, §5.1]). By definition,

$$\zeta(X, Y) = \zeta(Y, X)$$

for $X, Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. We also define

$$S: C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \oplus Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$$

$$K, K': C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \oplus Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} S(\xi, Y)_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2}[\xi_i + \xi_j, Y_{ij}] \\ K(\alpha, Y)_{ij} &= [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}] \\ K'(\alpha, Y)_{ij} &= [\alpha_j, Y_{ij}]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$,

$$(5.3.1) \quad \delta(S(\alpha, Y)) = \zeta(\delta\alpha, Y) = \zeta(Y, \delta\alpha)$$

$$(5.3.2) \quad K(\alpha, Y) = -\frac{1}{2}[\partial\alpha, Y] + S(\alpha, Y).$$

$$(5.3.3) \quad K'(\alpha, Y) = \frac{1}{2}[\partial\alpha, Y] + S(\alpha, Y).$$

(cf. [43, §5.1]). For $X = \{X_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I} \in C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, we set

$$(5.3.4) \quad X^* = \{X_{ji}\}_{i,j \in I}.$$

5.3.2. Model spaces $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ for $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Henceforth, we fix a 1-cocycle $Y = \{Y_{ij}\} \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. We consider the following \mathbb{C} -linear maps

$$(5.3.5) \quad D_0^Y: C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2} \rightarrow Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$$

$$(5.3.6) \quad D_1^Y: Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^2(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$$

defined by

$$(5.3.7) \quad D_0^Y(\alpha, \beta) = (\delta\alpha, \delta\beta + K(\alpha, Y))$$

$$(5.3.8) \quad D_1^Y(X, \dot{Y}) = \left(\dot{Y} + \dot{Y}^* + [X, Y], \delta \left(\dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] \right) - \zeta(X, Y) \right),$$

where $\alpha = \{\alpha_i\}_i, \beta = \{\beta_i\}_i \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, $X = \{X_{ij}\}, Y = \{Y_{ij}\} \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, $\dot{Y} = \{\dot{Y}_{ij}\}_{i,j} \in C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and

$$[X, Y] = \{[X_{ij}, Y_{ij}]\}_{i,j} \in C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}).$$

We claim

$$\text{LEMMA 5.3.1. } D_1^Y \circ D_0^Y = 0.$$

PROOF. Let $\alpha = \{\alpha_i\}_i, \beta = \{\beta_i\}_i \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. The (i, j) -component of the first coordinate of $D_1^Y \circ D_0^Y(\alpha, \beta)$ satisfies

$$(\beta_j - \beta_i) + [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}] + (\beta_i - \beta_j) + [\alpha_j, Y_{ji}] + [\alpha_j - \alpha_i, Y_{ij}] = 0.$$

From (b) of Proposition 6.1.1 and (5.3.1), the (i, j, k) -component of the second coordinate of $D_1^Y \circ D_0^Y(\alpha, \beta)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}] + [\alpha_j, Y_{jk}] + [\alpha_k, Y_{ki}] \\ & + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_j - \alpha_i, Y_{ij}] + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_k - \alpha_j, Y_{jk}] + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_i - \alpha_k, Y_{ki}] - \zeta(\delta\alpha, Y) \\ & = S(\alpha, Y)_{ij} + S(\alpha, Y)_{jk} + S(\alpha, Y)_{ki} - \delta(S(\alpha, Y))_{ijk} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

which implies what we wanted. \square

DEFINITION 1 (Model spaces for cocycles). The *model space of the double tangent space for a cocycle* $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ by

$$\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] = \ker(D_1^Y)/\text{Im}(D_0^Y).$$

We denote by $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$ the equivalence class of $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ in $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$.

5.3.3. Vertical spaces in the model space. We discuss the vertical spaces in the model space.

DEFINITION 2 (Vertical spaces). The *vertical spaces* $\mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}]$ in $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ is defined by

$$(5.3.9) \quad \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}] = \{ \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y \mid [X] = 0 \text{ in } H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \}$$

PROPOSITION 5.3.1 (Vertical space). The vertical space $\mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}]$ is canonically isomorphic to $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Indeed,

$$(5.3.10) \quad \mathbf{vi}_Y^\mathbb{T}: \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}] \ni \llbracket \delta\alpha, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \mapsto [\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y)] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$$

is a well-defined \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism, where $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

PROOF. We will show that Let $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}]$. Let $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ be a representative of $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$. By definition, $X = \delta\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Hence,

$$0 = \delta(\dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y]) - \zeta(X, Y) = \delta(\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y))_{ji} &= \dot{Y}_{ji} - [\alpha_j, Y_{ji}] = -\dot{Y}_{ij} - [\delta\alpha, Y_{ij}] + [\alpha_j, Y_{ij}] \\ &= -(\dot{Y}_{ij} - [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}]) = -(\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y))_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y) \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

Let $(\delta\alpha', \dot{Y}') \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ be another representative of $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$. Since $(\delta\alpha - \delta\alpha', \dot{Y} - \dot{Y}')$ is trivial in $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$, from the definition of the model space, there are $\beta, \gamma \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that $\delta\alpha - \delta\alpha' = \delta\gamma$ and $\dot{Y} - \dot{Y}' = \delta\beta + K(\gamma, Y)$. Since M_0 admits no non-trivial holomorphic vector field, $\gamma = \alpha - \alpha'$. Hence $\dot{Y} - \dot{Y}' = \delta\beta + K(\alpha - \alpha', Y)$, which is equivalent to

$$(\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y)) - (\dot{Y}' - K(\alpha', Y)) = \delta\beta.$$

This means that the map (5.3.10) is well-defined.

Suppose $\llbracket \delta\alpha, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$ is in the kernel of $\mathbf{vi}_Y^\mathbb{T}$. Then, $\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y) = \delta\beta$ for some β , and

$$(\delta\alpha, \dot{Y}) = (\delta\alpha, \delta\beta + K(\alpha, Y)) = D_0^Y(\alpha, \beta).$$

Therefore $\llbracket \delta\alpha, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y = 0$ in $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$. Hence $\mathbf{vi}_Y^\mathbb{T}$ is injective.

For $[W] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, $(0, W) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ and $\mathbf{vi}_Y^\mathbb{T}(\llbracket 0, W \rrbracket_Y) = [W]$. Therefore, $\mathbf{vi}_Y^\mathbb{T}$ is a \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism. \square

5.3.4. Model space $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ for $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. We shall check the following.

PROPOSITION 5.3.2. For $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, a linear isomorphism on $Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ defined by

$$(5.3.11) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y}(X, \dot{Y}) = (X, \dot{Y} + K'(\beta, X))$$

descends to an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y}$ from $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}[\mathcal{U}]$. Furthermore, the isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y}$ maps $\mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}]$ onto $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^V[\mathcal{U}]$.

PROOF. From the definition, if $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y}$ descends to the linear map from $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}[\mathcal{U}]$, the linear map sends the vertical space in $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ to that in $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}[\mathcal{U}]$. Hence, we only check the descendant of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y}$.

Let $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\dot{Y}_{ij} + [\beta_j, X_{ij}]) + (\dot{Y}_{ji} + [\beta_i, X_{ji}]) + [X_{ij}, Y_{ij} + \delta\beta] \\ &= \dot{Y}_{ij} + [\beta_j, X_{ij}] + \dot{Y}_{ji} - [\beta_i, X_{ij}] + [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] + [X_{ij}, \beta_j - \beta_i] \\ &= \dot{Y}_{ij} + \dot{Y}_{ji} + [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j \in I$. From (5.3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\left(\frac{1}{2}[X, \delta\beta]\right) - \zeta(X, \delta\beta) &= \delta\left(\frac{1}{2}[X, \delta\beta] - S(\beta, X)\right) = -\delta\left(\frac{1}{2}[\delta\beta, X] + S(\beta, X)\right) \\ &= -\delta K'(\beta, Y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta\left(\dot{Y} + K'(\beta, Y) + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y + \delta\beta]\right) - \zeta(X, Y + \delta\beta) \\ &= \delta\left(\dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y]\right) - \zeta(X, Y) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y}(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^{Y+\delta\beta})$.

Assume $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \text{Im}(D_0^Y)$. Then, $X = \delta\alpha$ and $\dot{Y} = \delta\gamma + K(\alpha, Y)$ for some $\alpha, \gamma \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{Y} + K'(\beta, X))_{ij} &= \gamma_j - \gamma_i + [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}] + [\beta_j, \alpha_j - \alpha_i] \\ &= \gamma_j - \gamma_i + [\alpha_i, Y_{ij} + \beta_j - \beta_i] + [\beta_j, \alpha_j] - [\beta_i, \alpha_i] \\ &= (\gamma_j + [\beta_j, \alpha_j]) - (\gamma_i + [\beta_i, \alpha_i]) + [\alpha_i, Y_{ij} + \beta_j - \beta_i]. \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\dot{Y} + K'(\beta, Y) = \delta(\gamma + [\beta, \alpha]) + K(\alpha, Y + \delta\beta),$$

which means $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y}(X, \dot{Y}) \in \text{Im}(D_0^{Y+\delta\beta})$. Therefore, the map (5.3.11) descends to a \mathbb{C} -linear map $\mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y}$ from $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}[\mathcal{U}]$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{-\beta;Y} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y} = id$, $\mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y}$ is isomorphic. \square

DEFINITION 3 (Model space and Vertical space for cohomology classes). For $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, we identify $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}[\mathcal{U}]$ by $\mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y}$. This identification is well-defined since $\mathcal{L}_{\beta';Y+\delta\beta} \circ \mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y} = \mathcal{L}_{\beta'+\beta;Y}$ for $\beta, \beta' \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. This procedure makes a \mathbb{C} -vector space $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$. We call the space $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ the *model space of the double tangent space at $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$* . We also define the *vertical space* $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V[\mathcal{U}]$ in the same manner.

We denote by $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ the equivalence class of $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$. In §8.2, we will show that $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ are naturally identified with the tangent space to the tangent bundle over \mathcal{T}_g at the tangent vector $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

REMARK 5.3.1 (Sum on the model). From the definition, for the additive operation on $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$,

$$a \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} + b \llbracket X', \dot{Y}' \rrbracket_{[Y]} = \llbracket Z, \dot{W} \rrbracket_{[Y]}$$

if $Z = aX + bX'$ and $\dot{W} = a\dot{Y} + b\dot{Y}'$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$, $(X, \dot{Y}), (X', \dot{Y}') \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ are representatives of $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$ and $\llbracket X', \dot{Y}' \rrbracket_Y$ for fixed $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, respectively.

5.3.5. Vertical space and Cohomology group. Since

$$\begin{aligned} ((\dot{Y} + K'(\beta, \delta\alpha) - K(\alpha, Y + \delta\beta))_{ij}) &= \dot{Y} + [\beta_j, \alpha_j - \alpha_i] - [\alpha_i, Y] - [\alpha_i, \beta_j - \beta_i] \\ &= (\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y)) + \delta(\{[\beta_i, \alpha_i]\}_{i \in I}) \end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, from Propositions 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, we obtain a \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism

$$(5.3.12) \quad \mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V[\mathcal{U}] \ni \llbracket \delta\alpha, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} \mapsto [\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y)] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$$

which satisfies the following commutative diagram:

$$(5.3.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vi}_Y^{\mathbb{T}}} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \\ \cong \downarrow & & \parallel \\ \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}), \end{array}$$

where the left vertical arrow is the natural identification in Definition 3. The inverse of the map $\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}$ is

$$(5.3.14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V[\mathcal{U}] \\ [\dot{Y}] & \longrightarrow & \llbracket 0, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}. \end{array}$$

5.4. Dolbeaut type presentation of Double tangent spaces

Throughout this section, we assume that a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for all $i \in I$. In this case

$$C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \xrightarrow{-\bar{\partial}} C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$$

is surjective (cf. [43, Theorem 3.13]). This section deals with two presentations of the double tangent spaces by complex $(-1, 1)$ -forms. The first presentation is defined with respecting to the cohomology presentations of the basepoint. The second is defined with the presentation by the Beltrami differential of the basepoint. The first presentation is a mediator for connecting between the space $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ and the second presentation.

5.4.1. Dolbeault type presentations for cocycles. In the following diagram, we abbreviate $C^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$, $Z^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$, Θ_{M_0} and $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}(\Theta_{M_0})$ to $C^k(\mathcal{S})$, $Z^k(\mathcal{S})$, Θ and $\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{p,q}$ for simplicity. The exact sequence (3.3.1) leads the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
C^0(\Theta)^{\oplus 2} & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\Theta^\iota}} & C^0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,0})^{\oplus 2} & \xrightarrow{(-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})} & C^0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,1})^{\oplus 2} \\
D_0^Y \downarrow & & D_0^{Y;0} \downarrow & & D_0^{Y;1} \downarrow \\
Z^1(\Theta) \oplus C^1(\Theta) & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\Theta^\iota}} & Z^1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,0}) \oplus C^1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,0}) & \xrightarrow{(-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})} & Z^1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,1}) \oplus C^1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,1}) \\
D_1^Y \downarrow & & D_1^{Y;0} \downarrow & & \\
C^1(\Theta) \oplus C^2(\Theta) & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\Theta^\iota}} & C^1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,0}) \oplus C^2(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,0}), & &
\end{array}$$

where the \mathbb{C} -linear maps $D_0^{Y;0}$, $D_1^{Y;0}$, and $D_0^{Y;1}$ are natural extensions of D_0^Y and D_1^Y (defined in (5.3.7) and (5.3.8)) with notation in §5.2:

$$(5.4.1) \quad D_0^{Y;0}(\alpha, \beta) = (\delta\alpha, \delta\beta + K(\alpha, Y))$$

$$(5.4.2) \quad D_1^{Y;0}(\xi, \eta) = \left(\eta + \eta^* + [\xi, Y], \delta \left(\eta + \frac{1}{2}[\xi, Y] \right) - \zeta(\xi, Y) \right),$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$, $\xi \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and $\eta \in C^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$. Since the map $(-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})$ at the right in the first line of the diagram is surjective, we have an exact sequence

$$(5.4.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \ker(D_0^{Y;0}) & \xrightarrow{(-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})} & \ker(D_0^{Y;1}) \\ \mathcal{D}_0 \searrow & \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \xrightarrow{\iota_{\Theta^\iota}} & \ker(D_1^{Y;0})/\text{Im}(D_0^{Y;0}), \end{array}$$

where \mathcal{D}_0 is the connecting homomorphism. We claim

$$\text{LEMMA 5.4.1. } \ker(D_1^{Y;0})/\text{Im}(D_0^{Y;0}) = \{0\}.$$

PROOF. Let $(\Xi, H) \in \ker(D_1^{Y;0})$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{ij} + H_{ji} + [\Xi_{ij}, Y_{ij}] &= 0 \\
\delta \left(H + \frac{1}{2}[\Xi, Y] \right) - \zeta(\Xi, Y) &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

for $i, j \in I$. Let $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,0})$ with $\delta\xi = \Xi$. Since $\zeta(\Xi, Y) = \delta(S(\xi, Y))$, from (5.3.1) and (5.3.2), the above two equations imply that $H - K(\xi, Y) \in Z^1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,0})$. Take $\xi' \in C^0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,0})$ with $\delta\xi' = H - K(\xi, Y)$. Then,

$$D_0^{Y;0}(\xi, \xi') = (\delta\xi, \delta\xi' + K(\xi, Y)) = (\Xi, H),$$

which means $(\Xi, H) \in \text{Im}(D_0^{Y;0})$. \square

DEFINITION 4 (Dolbeault type presentation for cocycle). We call the quotient space

$$(5.4.4) \quad \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] = \ker(D_0^{Y;1})/(-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})(\ker(D_0^{Y;0})).$$

the *Dolbeault type presentation of the model space for cocycle Y*.

REMARK 5.4.1. Though the connecting homomorphism \mathcal{D}_0 might not be defined for arbitrary coverings, we also define

$$\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] = \ker(D_0^{Y;1})/(-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})(\ker(D_0^{Y;0}))$$

for an (arbitrary) locally finite covering on M_0 .

From (5.4.3) and Lemma 5.4.1, we obtain the following (cf. (3.3.2)).

THEOREM 5.4.1 (Dolbeault type presentation of model space). Under the above notation, the connecting homomorphism \mathcal{D}_0 leads the isomorphism from $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ onto $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$.

For $(\mu, \dot{\nu}) \in \ker(D_0^{Y;1})$, we denote by $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl}$ the equivalence class of $(\mu, \dot{\nu})$ in $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$.

For the record, we notice the following:

- The kernels $\ker(D_1'')$ and $\ker(D_0')$ are

$$\ker(D_0^{Y;1}) = \{(\mu, \dot{\nu}) \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0})) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0})) \mid \delta\dot{\nu} + [\mu, Y] = 0\}$$

$$\ker(D_0^{Y;0}) = \{(\xi, \dot{\eta}) \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \mid \delta\dot{\eta} + [\xi, Y] = 0\},$$

where $[\mu, Y] = \{[\mu, Y_{ij}]\}_{i,j \in I}$ and $[\xi, Y] = \{[\xi, Y_{ij}]\}_{i,j \in I}$.

- $\mathcal{D}_0(\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl}) = \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$ if and only if there are $\xi, \dot{\eta} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that

$$(\mu, \dot{\nu}) = (-\bar{\partial}\xi, -\bar{\partial}\dot{\eta})$$

$$(X, \dot{Y}) = (\delta\xi, \delta\dot{\eta} + K(\xi, Y)).$$

We notice the following.

PROPOSITION 5.4.1. Fix $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\eta = Y$. For $(\mu_1, \dot{\nu}_1), (\mu_2, \dot{\nu}_2) \in \ker(D_0^{Y;1})$, $(\mu_1, \dot{\nu}_1)$ and $(\mu_2, \dot{\nu}_2)$ are equivalent in the quotient space $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ if and only if there is $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that

- (1) $\mu_1 = \mu_2 - \bar{\partial}\alpha$; and
- (2) $(\dot{\nu}_1)_i = (\dot{\nu}_2)_i + \bar{\partial}[\alpha, \eta_i] + \bar{\partial}\beta$ on U_i for $i \in I$.

PROOF. Suppose (1) and (2) hold. Since

$$([\alpha, \eta_j] + \beta) - ([\alpha, \eta_i] + \beta) + [-\alpha, Y_{ij}] = 0$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$, $(-\alpha, \{[\alpha, \eta_i] + \beta\}_{i \in I}) \in \ker(D_0^{Y;0})$. Therefore, $(\mu_1, \dot{\nu}_1)$ and $(\mu_2, \dot{\nu}_2)$ are equivalent in $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$.

Suppose $(\mu_1, \dot{\nu}_1)$ and $(\mu_2, \dot{\nu}_2)$ are equivalent in $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$. Then, there are $\alpha \in \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and $\gamma \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that $\mu_1 = \mu_2 - \bar{\partial}\alpha$, $\dot{\nu}_1 = \dot{\nu}_2 - \bar{\partial}\gamma$ and

$$(5.4.5) \quad \delta\gamma + K(\alpha, Y) = 0.$$

Since $\delta\eta = Y$,

$$0 = \gamma_j - \gamma_i + [\alpha, \eta_j] - [\alpha, \eta_i]$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$. This means that

$$\beta = -\gamma_i - [\alpha, \eta_i]$$

on U_i becomes a global smooth vector field on M_0 and satisfies

$$\bar{\partial}\beta = (\dot{\nu}_1)_i - (\dot{\nu}_2)_i - \bar{\partial}[\alpha, \eta_i]$$

on U_i . □

5.4.2. Vertical spaces in the Dolbeaut type presentation for cocycle.

We discuss the Dolbeaut type presentation of the vertical space of the model space.

DEFINITION 5 (Vertical spaces in the Dolbeaut type presentation). The *vertical spaces* $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}]$ in $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ is defined by

$$(5.4.6) \quad \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}] = \{ \langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol} \mid [\mu] = 0 \text{ in } T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g \}.$$

PROPOSITION 5.4.2 (Connecting isomorphism and vertical spaces). Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering of M_0 with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. Then, the connecting isomorphism

$$\mathcal{D}_0: \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$$

induces an isomorphism between the vertical spaces.

PROOF. Let $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$. Suppose $\mathcal{D}_0(\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl}) = \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y$. By the definition of the connecting homomorphism, there are $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that $\partial\alpha_i = -\mu, \bar{\partial}\beta_i = -\dot{\nu}_i$ for $i \in I$, $\delta\alpha = X$ and $\delta\beta + K(\alpha, Y) = \dot{Y}$.

Assume first that $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}]$. Since $[\mu] = 0$, there is a section $\gamma \in \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that $\bar{\partial}\gamma = -\mu$. We define $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ by $\xi_i = \alpha_i - \gamma$ on U_i for $i \in I$. Then, $\delta\xi = X$, and hence $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}]$.

Conversely, suppose $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}]$. Then, there is $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that $\delta\xi = X$. Hence, $\gamma = \alpha - \xi$ defines a global smooth vector field on M_0 with $\bar{\partial}\gamma = -\mu$. This means that $[\mu] = 0$ and $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}]$.

Thus we conclude that $\mathcal{D}_0(\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}]) = \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}]$, and the vertical spaces are isomorphic via the connecting isomorphism \mathcal{D}_0 . \square

5.4.3. Dolbeaut type presentations for cohomology classes. We start with the following lemma.

LEMMA 5.4.2. For $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, a linear isomorphism on $C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,1})^{\oplus 2}$ defined by

$$(5.4.7) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y}^{Dol}(\mu, \dot{\nu}) = (\mu, \dot{\nu} - [\mu, \beta])$$

descends to an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y}^{Dol}$ from $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ to $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$. Furthermore, if a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 satisfies $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. Then, $\mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y}^{Dol}$ preserves the vertical spaces, and satisfies the following commutative diagram:

$$(5.4.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_0} & \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \\ \mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y}^{Dol} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{L}_{\beta;Y} \\ \mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_0} & \mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}[\mathcal{U}] \end{array}$$

PROOF. First we check $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y}^{Dol}$ descends to a map from $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ to $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$. Let $(\mu, \dot{\nu}) \in \ker(D_0^{Y;1})$ and $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta;Y}^{Dol}(\mu, \dot{\nu})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nu}_j - \tilde{\nu}_i + [\tilde{\mu}, Y_{ij} + \beta_j - \beta_i] &= (\dot{\nu}_j + \partial[\xi_j, \beta_j]) - (\dot{\nu}_i + \partial[\xi_i, \beta_i]) + [\mu, Y_{ij}] + [\mu, \beta_j] - [\mu, \beta_i] \\ &= -[\mu, \beta_j] + [\mu, \beta_i] + [\mu, \beta_j] - [\mu, \beta_i] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) \in \ker(D_0^{Y+\delta\beta;1})$.

Suppose that $(\mu, \nu) \in \text{Im}((-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial}))$. There are $\xi \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that $\mu_i = -\bar{\partial}\xi_i$, $\nu_i = -\bar{\partial}\eta_i$ and

$$\dot{\eta}_j - \dot{\eta}_i + [\xi, Y_{ij}] = 0$$

for $i, j \in I$. Let $\tilde{\xi} = \xi$ and $\tilde{\eta} = \eta - [\xi, \beta]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_j - \tilde{\eta}_i + [\tilde{\xi}, Y_{ij} + \beta_j - \beta_i] &= (\dot{\eta}_j - [\xi_j, \beta_j]) - (\dot{\eta}_i - [\xi_i, \beta_i]) + [\xi, Y_{ij} + \beta_j - \beta_i] = 0 \\ (-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})_i &= (-\bar{\partial}\tilde{\xi}_i, -\bar{\partial}\tilde{\eta}_i) = (-\bar{\partial}\xi_i, -\bar{\partial}\eta_i - [-\bar{\partial}\xi_i, \beta_i]) \\ &= (\mu_i, \nu_i - [\mu, \beta_i]) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}(\mu, \nu)_i \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in I$. Hence $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}(\mu, \nu) \in \text{Im}((-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial}))$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{-\beta; Y+\delta\beta}^{Dol} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}$ is the identity map, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}$ descends a \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}: \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$.

Next, we check the diagram (5.4.8) is commute in the case where $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. Let $(\mu, \nu) \in \ker(D_0^{Y;1})$, and $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y = \mathcal{D}_0(\langle \mu, \nu \rangle_Y^{cycl})$. Then, there are $\xi, \dot{\eta} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_i, \dot{\nu}_i) &= (-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})(\xi, \dot{\eta})_i = (-\bar{\partial}\xi_i, -\bar{\partial}\dot{\eta}_i) \\ X_{ij} &= \xi_j - \xi_i \\ \dot{Y}_{ij} &= \dot{\eta}_j - \dot{\eta}_i + [\xi_i, Y_{ij}] \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j \in I$. Let $\tilde{\xi} = \xi$ and $\tilde{\eta} = \dot{\eta} - [\xi, \beta]$. Then, for $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} (-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})_i &= (-\bar{\partial}\tilde{\xi}_i, -\bar{\partial}\tilde{\eta}_i) = (\mu_i, \dot{\nu}_i - [\mu_i, \beta_i]) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}(\mu, \nu)_i \\ \tilde{\xi}_j - \tilde{\xi}_i &= \xi_j - \xi_i = X_{ij} \\ \tilde{\eta}_j - \tilde{\eta}_i + [\tilde{\xi}_i, Y_{ij} + \beta_j - \beta_i] &= (\dot{\eta}_j - [\xi_j, \beta_j]) - (\dot{\eta}_i - [\xi_i, \beta_i]) + [\xi_i, Y_{ij} + \beta_j - \beta_i] \\ &= \dot{\eta}_j - \dot{\eta}_i + [\xi_i, Y_{ij}] - [\xi_j, \beta_j] + [\xi_i, \beta_j] \\ &= \dot{Y}_{ij} + K'(\beta, X)_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the connecting homomorphism \mathcal{D}_0 sends the equivalence class of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}(\mu, \nu)$ in $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ to that of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}(X, \dot{Y})$ in $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}[\mathcal{U}]$. This means that the diagram (5.4.8) is commute. From Proposition 5.4.2, the isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}$ preserves the vertical spaces. \square

DEFINITION 6 (Model space and Vertical space for cohomology classes). For $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, we identify $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ by $\mathcal{L}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}$. The identified \mathbb{C} -vector space $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ is called the *Dolbeault type presentation of the model space of the double tangent space at $[Y] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong \mathcal{T}_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$* . We also define the *vertical space* $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol, V}[\mathcal{U}]$ in the same manner.

From Lemma 5.4.2, we have

COROLLARY 5.4.1. The connecting homomorphism \mathcal{D}_0 induces an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{D}_0: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$$

which respects the vertical spaces.

5.4.4. Vertical spaces and Tangent spaces. Fix $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\eta = Y$. From Proposition 5.4.1 and Lemma 5.4.2,

$$(5.4.9) \quad \mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}] \ni \langle -\bar{\partial}\alpha, \dot{\nu} \rangle_{[Y]}^{cycl} \mapsto [\{\dot{\nu}_i - \bar{\partial}[\alpha, \eta_i]\}_{i \in I}] \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$$

is a well-defined \mathbb{C} -linear mapping which satisfies the following diagram:

$$(5.4.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vi}_Y^{\mathbb{T}}} & T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g \\ \cong \downarrow & & \parallel \\ \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}} & T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g, \end{array}$$

since $\delta(\eta + \beta) = Y + \delta\beta$ for $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. The inverse of the map $\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}$ is

$$(5.4.11) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V[\mathcal{U}] \\ \langle \dot{\nu} \rangle & \longrightarrow & \langle 0, \dot{\nu} \rangle_{[Y]}^{cycl}. \end{array}$$

5.4.5. Dolbeaut type presentation in terms of Beltrami differentials.

In this section, we discuss the presentation of the double tangent space in terms of Beltrami differentials. The construction is almost same as that of the Dolbeaut presentation for cohomology classes.

Let $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. For $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\eta = Y$, we set

$$\mathbb{Z}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] = \{(\mu, \dot{\nu}) \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0})) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0})) \mid \delta(\dot{\nu} + [\mu, \eta]) = 0\}$$

$$\mathbb{B}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] = \{(\xi, \zeta) \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \mid \delta(\zeta + [\xi, \eta]) = 0\},$$

where $[\mu, \eta] = \{[\mu, \eta_i]\}_{i \in I}$ and $[\xi, \eta] = \{[\xi, \eta_i]\}_{i \in I}$. We notice that as subspaces of $H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0})) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and $H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$, the above spaces $\mathbb{Z}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{B}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$ coincide with the spaces $\ker(D_0^Y:1)$ and $\ker(D_0^Y:0)$ defined in §5.4.1, respectively.

The linear map

$$(-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial}): \mathbb{B}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$$

is well-defined. Indeed, for $(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathbb{B}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$, let $(\mu, \dot{\nu}) = (-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial})(\xi, \zeta) = (-\bar{\partial}\xi, -\bar{\partial}\zeta)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\dot{\nu} + [\mu, \eta])_{ij} &= (\dot{\nu}_j + [\mu, \eta_j]) - (\dot{\nu}_i + [\mu, \eta_i]) \\ &= -\bar{\partial}(\xi_j - \xi_i) - [\bar{\partial}\xi, \eta_j - \eta_i] = -\bar{\partial}((\xi_j - \xi_i) + [\xi, Y_{ij}]) \\ &= -\bar{\partial}((\xi_j + [\xi, \eta_j]) - (\xi_i + [\xi, \eta_i])) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j \in I$. We define

$$(5.4.12) \quad \mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] = \mathbb{Z}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] / ((-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial}))(\mathbb{B}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]).$$

We denote by $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_\eta \in \mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$ the equivalence class of $(\mu, \dot{\nu}) \in \mathbb{Z}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$. By definition, there is a canonical identification

$$(5.4.13) \quad \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] \ni \langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl} \mapsto \langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_\eta \in \mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$$

since $\delta\eta = Y$.

The presentation $\mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$ depends on the choice of η with $\delta\eta = Y$. Indeed, let $\eta' \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\eta' = Y$. Then, the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{B}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{(\xi, \zeta) \mapsto (\xi, \zeta + [\xi, \eta - \eta'])} & \mathbb{B}_{\eta'}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] \\ (-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial}) \downarrow & & \downarrow (-\bar{\partial}) \oplus (-\bar{\partial}) \\ \mathbb{Z}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{(\xi, \zeta) \mapsto (\mu, \dot{\nu} + [\mu, \eta - \eta'])} & \mathbb{Z}_{\eta'}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]. \end{array}$$

In the diagram, we notice that $\eta - \eta'$ defines a global vector field on M_0 and $\bar{\partial}(\delta\eta) = \bar{\partial}(\delta\eta') = 0$. Therefore, we obtain a canonical isomorphism

$$(5.4.14) \quad \mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] \ni \langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_\eta \mapsto \langle \mu, \dot{\nu} + [\mu, \eta - \eta'] \rangle_{\eta'} \in \mathbb{T}_{\eta'}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}].$$

By applying the above discussion, for $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, we can check that the linear map $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}^{Dol}$ on $C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}_\Theta^{0,1})^{\oplus 2}$ defined in (5.4.7) sends $\mathbb{Z}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$ onto $\mathbb{Z}_{\eta+\beta}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$, and descend to an isomorphism

$$(5.4.15) \quad \mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] \ni \langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_\eta \mapsto \langle \mu, \dot{\nu} - [\mu, \beta] \rangle_{\eta+\beta} \in \mathbb{T}_{\eta+\beta}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}].$$

DEFINITION 7 (Dolbeaut presentation in terms of Beltrami differentials). Let $[\nu] \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$. We define the *Dolbeaut presentation of the model space in terms of Beltrami differentials* $\mathbb{T}_{[\nu]}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ as the isomorphism class of the vector spaces $\{\mathbb{T}_\eta[[\mathcal{U}]]_\eta\}$ via (5.4.14) and (5.4.15), where η runs all cochain $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $[-\bar{\partial}\eta] = [\nu]$. For $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_\eta \in \mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$, we denote by $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_{[\nu]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[\nu]}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$ the equivalence class of $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_\eta$.

Let $[Y] \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ with $\mathcal{I}_{x_0}([Y]) = [\nu]$. We notice the following.

- Two spaces $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[\nu]}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ are naturally isomorphic by a canonical identification (5.4.13).
- The connecting homomorphism $\mathcal{D}_0: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ discussed in Proposition 5.4.2 is naturally thought of as an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{D}_0: \mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$$

when $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ satisfies $\delta\eta = Y$.

- The vertical space in $\mathbb{T}_{[\nu]}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$ is also described by the same argument as that in §5.4.2 and (5.4.9).

5.5. Model of $T_{[Y]}^*T\mathcal{T}_g$ and Model of the pairing

Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering on M_0 . Let $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ and $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. We define the linear maps

$$D_1^{Y, \dagger}: C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})^{\oplus 2} \rightarrow C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})^{\oplus 2}$$

by

$$D_1^{Y, \dagger}(\psi, q) = (\delta\psi - L_Y(q), \delta q)$$

where $L_Y(q)_{ij} = L_{Y_{i,j}}(q_0)$ for $i, j \in I$. We call

$$\mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] = \ker(D_1^{Y, \dagger})$$

the *model space of the cotangent space to the tangent bundle for a cocycle* $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Notice that the inclusion on the first coordinate

$$T_{x_0}^* \mathcal{T}_g = \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} = H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \ni \psi \mapsto (\psi, 0) \in \mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$$

is well-defined. We call this map the *horizontal inclusion*. The projection, which we call the *vertical projection*, on the second coordinate

$$\mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \ni (\psi, q) \mapsto q \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} = T_{x_0}^* \mathcal{T}_g$$

leads the identification between the cokernel of the horizontal inclusion and \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} . Thus, we have the following exact sequence

$$(5.5.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) & \rightarrow & \mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] & \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \psi & & \rightarrow & & (\psi, 0) \\ & & & & & & (\psi, q) \rightarrow & q \end{array}$$

In particular, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] = 6g-6$ when $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$ (cf. Theorem 6.4.1 later).

To define the *model space* $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$ of the cotangent space to the tangent bundle for $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, we identify two spaces $\mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$ for $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ via the \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism

$$(5.5.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\beta; Y}^\dagger: \mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \ni (\psi, q) \rightarrow (\psi + L_\beta(q), q) \in \mathbb{T}_{Y+\delta\beta}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}].$$

We denote by $[[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$ the corresponding element to $(\psi, q) \in \mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$. From the definition, $\mathcal{L}_{\beta; Y}^\dagger$ commutes the horizontal inclusion. Thus, the diagram (5.5.1) leads the following exact sequence:

$$(5.5.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) & \rightarrow & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] & \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \psi & & \rightarrow & & [[\psi, 0]]_{[Y]}^\dagger \\ & & & & & & [[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger \rightarrow & q. \end{array}$$

5.5.1. Model of Pairing between $TT\mathcal{T}_g$ and $T^*T\mathcal{T}_g$. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering. Let $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. To define the *pairing* between $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_Y^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$, we start with the following lemma.

LEMMA 5.5.1. For $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$, $(\psi, q) \in \ker(D_1^{Y, \dagger})$, and $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{ij} &= X_{ij}\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) \\ &= X_{ij}\psi_i + (\dot{Y}_{ij} + [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}])q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q). \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\{\omega_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I} \in C^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ satisfies the following

- (1) $\omega = \{\omega_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I} \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$.
- (2) Let $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ with $\delta A = \omega$, and $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\eta = Y$. Then, $\bar{\partial}A - L_\eta(d(\xi q)) = \{(A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}} q)\}_{i \in I}$ defines an area element on M_0 .

(3) Under the notation in (2), the integral

$$(5.5.4) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{TT}}((X, \dot{Y}), (\psi, q)) = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

is independent of the choice of the representatives Y of $[Y]$, (X, \dot{Y}) in $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$ and $(\psi, q) \in \ker(D_1^Y, \dagger)$ in $\llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}$.

PROOF. (1) From the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.3.1 and (5.2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta\omega)_{ijk} &= (X_{ij}\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_jq)) + (X_{jk}\psi_j - \dot{Y}_{kj}q + L_{Y_{jk}}(\xi_kq)) \\ &\quad + (X_{ki}\psi_k - \dot{Y}_{ik}q + L_{Y_{ki}}(\xi_iq)) \\ &= \xi_i(\psi_k - \psi_i) + \xi_j(\psi_i - \psi_j) + \xi_k(\psi_j - \psi_k) \\ &\quad - ([\xi_j, Y_{ji}] + [\xi_k, Y_{kj}] + [\xi_i, Y_{ik}])q \\ &\quad + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_jq) + L_{Y_{jk}}(\xi_kq) + L_{Y_{ki}}(\xi_iq) \\ &= \xi_i L_{Y_{ik}}(q) + \xi_j L_{Y_{ji}}(q) + \xi_k L_{Y_{kj}}(q) \\ &\quad - ([\xi_j, Y_{ji}] + [\xi_k, Y_{kj}] + [\xi_i, Y_{ik}])q \\ &\quad - L_{Y_{ji}}(\xi_jq) - L_{Y_{kj}}(\xi_kq) - L_{Y_{ik}}(\xi_iq) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j, k \in I$.

(2) The existence of such an $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ follows from the fact that the sheaf $\mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0})$ is fine (e.g. [43, §3.4]). Since $(\xi_j)_{\bar{z}} = (\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}$ on $U_i \cap U_j$, for $z \in z_j(U_i \cap U_j)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (A_j)_{\bar{z}}(z) - (A_i)_{\bar{z}}(z_{ij}(z)) \left| \frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right|^2 &= \left(A_j(z) - A_i(z_{ij}(z)) \frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right)_{\bar{z}} \\ &= \left((X_{ij}(z)\psi_i(z_{ij}(z)) - \dot{Y}_{ji}(z)q_i(z_{ij}(z)) + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_jq_j)(z_{ij}(z))) \frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right)_{\bar{z}} \\ &= L_{Y_{ij}}((\xi_j)_{\bar{z}}q_j)(z_{ij}(z)) \left| \frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right|^2 \\ &= L_{\eta_j}((\xi_j)_{\bar{z}}q_j)(z) - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}q_i)(z_{ij}(z)) \left| \frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $q = \{q_i\}_{i \in I} \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) = \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$. This implies what we wanted.

(3) We will show that the integral is independent of the choices of

- (i) $A \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ with $\delta A = \omega$;
- (ii) $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\eta = Y$;
- (iii) $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\xi = X$;
- (iv) representations $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ in $[Y]$; and
- (v) representations $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ of $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$.

(i) **The choice of A :** Let $A' = \{A'_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ with $\delta A' = \omega$. Then, $A - A' = (A(z) - A'(z))dz$ is a smooth 1-form on M_0 and

$$\begin{aligned} &\iint_{M_0} ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz - \iint_{M_0} ((A'_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= \iint_{M_0} \bar{\partial}(A_i - A'_i) d\bar{z} \wedge dz = \iint_{M_0} d(A_i dz - A'_i dz) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

from the Stokes theorem.

(ii) **The choice of η :** Let $\eta' \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\eta' = Y$. Then $H = \eta' - \eta \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$. Since $\mu = \bar{\partial}\xi \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and $H\mu q = H(z)\mu(z)q(z)d\bar{z}$ is a global $(0,1)$ -form on M_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{M_0} ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}(\mu q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz - \iint_{M_0} ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta'_i}(\mu q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= \iint_{M_0} L_H(\mu q) d\bar{z} \wedge dz = \iint_{M_0} (H\mu q)_z(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= - \iint_{M_0} d((H\mu q) d\bar{z}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) **The choice of ξ :** Let $\xi' \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi' = X$. Take $A' = \{A'_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ satisfying

$$A'_j dz - A'_i dz = (X_{ij}\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi'_j q)) dz$$

for $i, j \in I$. Then, $\Xi = \xi' - \xi$ defines a smooth vector field on M_0 . Let $\nu = \bar{\partial}\eta \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$. Define $B = \{B_i dz\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ by

$$B_i dz = (A'_i - A_i - L_{\eta_i}(\Xi q)) dz.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta B)_{ij} &= B_j dz - B_i dz \\ &= L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi'_j q) dz - L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) dz - (L_{\eta_j}(\Xi q) - L_{\eta_i}(\Xi q)) dz \\ &= L_{Y_{ij}}(\Xi q) dz - L_{\eta_j - \eta_i}(\Xi q) dz = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, B defines a global 1-form on M_0 . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} d(L_{\eta_i}(\Xi q) dz) &= d((\eta_i \Xi q)_z dz) = ((\eta_i \Xi q)_{z\bar{z}}) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= (-\nu \Xi q)_z + (\eta_i \Xi_{\bar{z}} q)_z d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= (-\nu \Xi q)_z + L_{\eta_i}(\Xi_{\bar{z}} q) d\bar{z} \wedge dz. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(B_i dz) &= d((A'_i - A_i - L_{\eta_i}(\Xi q)) dz) \\ &= ((A'_i)_{\bar{z}} - (A_i)_{\bar{z}} + (\nu \Xi q)_z - L_{\eta_i}(\Xi_{\bar{z}} q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= ((A'_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi'_i)_{\bar{z}} q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz - ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}} q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz + (\nu \Xi q)_z d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= ((A'_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi'_i)_{\bar{z}} q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz - ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}} q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz - d((\nu \Xi q) d\bar{z}) \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in I$. This means that

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{M_0} ((A'_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi'_i)_{\bar{z}} q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz - \iint_{M_0} ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}} q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= \iint_{M_0} d(B_i dz + (\nu \Xi q) d\bar{z}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

(iv) **The choice of Y in $[Y]$:** Take $A \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and the cocycle ω for Y as the statement. Let $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. From Proposition 5.3.2 and (5.5.2), for $Y + \delta\beta$, the representatives of $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]}$ and $[[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger$ are $(X, \dot{Y} + K'(\beta, X))$ and

$(\psi + L_\beta(q), q)$ respectively. Hence, from (5.2.4) and (5.2.5), the cocycle ω' which we consider here should be

$$\begin{aligned}\omega'_{ij}dz &= X_{ij}(\psi_i + L_{\beta_i}(q))dz - (\dot{Y}_{ji} + [\beta_i, X_{ji}])qdz + L_{Y_{ij}+\beta_j-\beta_i}(\xi_j q)dz \\ &= (X_{ij}\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) + X_{ij}L_{\beta_i}(q) - [\beta_i, X_{ji}]q + L_{\beta_j-\beta_i}(\xi_j q))dz \\ &= (X_{ij}\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) + L_{\beta_j}(\xi_j q) - L_{\beta_i}(\xi_i q))dz.\end{aligned}$$

From (i) and (ii), we may take $A' = \{A'_i dz\}_{i \in I} = \{A_i dz + L_{\beta_i}(\xi_i q) dz\}_{i \in I}$. In this case, the integrand becomes

$$\begin{aligned}((A'_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i+\beta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}q))d\bar{z} \wedge dz &= ((A_i + L_{\beta_i}(\xi_i q))_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i+\beta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}q))d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}q))d\bar{z} \wedge dz,\end{aligned}$$

which implies the integral does not change.

(v) The choice of (X, \dot{Y}) in $\ker(D_1^Y)$: Take $A \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and the cocycle ω for Y as the statement. Let $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. We consider $(X', \dot{Y}') = (X, \dot{Y}) + D_0^Y(\alpha, \beta)$. In this case, the cocycle ω' which we consider here is

$$\begin{aligned}\omega'_{ij}dz &= (X_{ij} + \alpha_j - \alpha_i)\psi_i dz - (\dot{Y}_{ji} + \beta_j - \beta_j + [\alpha_j, Y_{ji}])qdz + L_{Y_{ij}}((\xi_j + \alpha_j)q)dz \\ &= (X_{ij}\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) + (\alpha_j\psi_j - \alpha_i\psi_i + \beta_j q - \beta_j q \\ &\quad - \alpha_j L_{Y_{ij}}(q) - [\alpha_j, Y_{ij}]qdz + L_{Y_{ij}}(\alpha_j q))dz \\ &= (X_{ij}\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q))dz + (\alpha_j\psi_j - \beta_j q)dz - (\alpha_i\psi_i - \beta_i q)dz\end{aligned}$$

from (5.2.5). Therefore, from (i) and (ii), we may take $A' = \{A'_i\}_{i \in I}$ defined by

$$A'_i dz = A_i dz + (\alpha_i\psi_i - \beta_i q)dz$$

for $i \in I$. Then, $\delta A' = \omega'$ and the integrand satisfies

$$((A'_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_j + \alpha_j)_{\bar{z}}q))d\bar{z} \wedge dz = (A_i - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}q))d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

and the integral does not change. \square

DEFINITION 8 (Model of the pairing). Let $[Y] \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. The *model of the pairing*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \oplus \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

is defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}\left(\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}, \llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger\right) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{TT}}((X, \dot{Y}), (\psi, q)).$$

Notice in the calculation that we first fix a representative Y in $[Y]$, and take representatives $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ of $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}$ and $(\psi, q) \in \ker(D_1^{Y, \dagger})$ of $\llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger$.

We claim the non-degeneracy of the model of the pairing. It can be also deduced from the presentation of the model of the pairing under the trivialization (cf. Theorem 6.4.1).

PROPOSITION 5.5.1. When the locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$, the model of the pairing \mathcal{P}_{TT} is non-degenerate.

PROOF. Let $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$. Suppose

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}\left(\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}, \llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger\right) = 0$$

for all $[[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$. We will conclude $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]} = 0$.

Let $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ be a representative of $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]}$ and a representative $(\psi, q) \in \ker(D_1^{Y, \dagger})$ of $[[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger$. We take ξ, η, A , and ω as Lemma 5.5.1.

When $q = 0$, from the definition, $\psi = \{\psi_i\}_{i \in I} \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})$ and

$$(5.5.5) \quad \omega_{ij} = X_{ij}\psi$$

for $i, j \in I$. This means that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}\left(\left[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]}, [[\psi, 0]]_{[Y]}^\dagger\right) = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (A_i)_{\bar{z}}(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= -\pi \text{Res}(\{[X_{ij}\psi]_{i,j \in I}\}) \end{aligned}$$

(cf. §3.3.3). Since the residue defines a non-degenerate pairing, we have $[X] = 0$ in $H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Therefore, there is $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ with $\delta\alpha = X$. In this case, we may assume $\xi = \alpha$ from (3) of Lemma 5.5.1. From (5.2.5) and (5.3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} (5.5.6) \quad \omega_{ij} &= (\alpha_j - \alpha_i)\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\alpha_j q) \\ &= (\alpha_j - \alpha_i)\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji}q + \alpha_j L_{Y_{ij}}(q) - [\alpha_j, Y_{ij}]q \\ &= \alpha_j(\psi_i + L_{Y_{ij}}(q)) - \alpha_i\psi_i - (\dot{Y}_{ji} - [\alpha_j, Y_{ji}])q \\ &= \alpha_j\psi_j - \alpha_i\psi_i - (\dot{Y}_{ji} - [\alpha_j, Y_{ji}])q \\ &= \alpha_j\psi_j - \alpha_i\psi_i + (\dot{Y}_{ij} - [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}])q. \end{aligned}$$

Notice from Proposition 5.3.1, $\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y) = \{\dot{Y}_{ij} - [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}]\}_{i,j \in I} \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Therefore, in this case, the pairing satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}\left(\left[[\delta\alpha, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]}, [[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger\right) = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (A_i)_{\bar{z}}(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= -\pi \text{Res}(\{(\dot{Y}_{ij} - [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}])q\}_{i,j \in I}). \end{aligned}$$

Since (ψ, q) is taken arbitrary in $\ker(D_1^{Y, \dagger})$, we have $\dot{Y} - K(\alpha, Y) = \delta\beta$ for some $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Thus, we obtain

$$(X, \dot{Y}) = (\delta\alpha, \delta\beta + K(\alpha, Y)) = D_0^Y(\alpha, \beta),$$

and $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]} = 0$.

Next, let $[[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$. Suppose that

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}\left(\left[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]}, [[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger\right) = 0$$

for all $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$.

As the above discussion, we fix $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ be a representative of $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]}$ and a representative $(\psi, q) \in \ker(D_1^{Y, \dagger})$ of $[[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger$, and take ξ, η, A , and ω as Lemma 5.5.1.

Suppose first that $[X] = 0$. Then, there is $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that $\delta\alpha = X$. From the discussion around (5.5.6), the cocycle ω satisfies

$$\omega_{ij} = \alpha_j\psi_j - \alpha_i\psi_i + (\dot{Y}_{ij} - [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}])q.$$

Hence,

$$0 = \mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}\left(\left[[\delta\alpha, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]}, [[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger\right) = -\pi \text{Res}(\{(\dot{Y}_{ij} - [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}])q\}).$$

Since $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$, from Proposition 5.3.1, the totality of $[(\dot{Y}_{ij} - [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}])]$ fills $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) = H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$. Therefore, the non-degeneracy of the residue implies that $q = 0$. Thus, from the discussion around (5.5.5), ψ satisfies

$$0 = \mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}} \left(\left[[\delta\alpha, \dot{Y}] \right]_{[\mathcal{Y}]}, \left[[\psi, 0] \right]_{[\mathcal{Y}]}^\dagger \right) = -\pi \text{Res}(\left[\{X_{ij}\psi_i\}_{i,j \in I} \right]).$$

From the non-degeneracy of the residue again, we obtain $\psi = 0$. Thus, we conclude $\left[[\psi, q] \right]_{[\mathcal{Y}]}^\dagger = 0$. \square

5.5.2. Dolbeaut presentation and Pairing. We claim

LEMMA 5.5.2. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering of M_0 with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. Let $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ and $(\psi, q) \in \ker(D_1^{Y, \dagger})$. Let $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i \in I}$, $\dot{\eta} = \{\dot{\eta}_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$ and $\dot{Y} = \delta\dot{\eta} + K(\xi, Y)$. Then

$$(\xi_j \psi_j + \dot{\eta}_j q) - (\xi_i \psi_i + \dot{\eta}_i q) = X_{ij} \psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji} q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q)$$

PROOF. Indeed, from (5.2.4) and (5.2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} & X_{ij} \psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ji} q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) \\ &= (\xi_j - \xi_i) \psi_i - (\dot{\eta}_i - \dot{\eta}_j + [\xi_j, Y_{ji}]) q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) \\ &= \xi_j \psi_i - \xi_i \psi_i - \dot{\eta}_i q + \dot{\eta}_j q - [\xi_j, Y_{ji}] q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) \\ &= \xi_j (\psi_j - L_{Y_{ij}}(q)) - \xi_i \psi_i - \dot{\eta}_i q + \dot{\eta}_j q + [\xi_j, Y_{ij}] q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) \\ &= (\xi_j \psi_j + \dot{\eta}_j q) - (\xi_i \psi_i + \dot{\eta}_i q) - \xi_j L_{Y_{ij}}(q) + [\xi_j, Y_{ij}] q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) \\ &= (\xi_j \psi_j + \dot{\eta}_j q) - (\xi_i \psi_i + \dot{\eta}_i q) - L_{\xi_j}(Y_{ij} q) + L_{Y_{ij}}(\xi_j q) \\ &= (\xi_j \psi_j + \dot{\eta}_j q) - (\xi_i \psi_i + \dot{\eta}_i q), \end{aligned}$$

which implies what we wanted. \square

THEOREM 5.5.1 (Dolbeaut presentation and Pairing). Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering of M_0 with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. Let $\left[[X, \dot{Y}] \right]_{\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{Y}}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\left[[\psi, q] \right]_{\mathcal{Y}}^\dagger \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{Y}}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$. Let $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\eta = Y$ and

$$\mathcal{D}_0^{-1}(\left[[X, \dot{Y}] \right]_{\mathcal{Y}}) = \langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_\eta \in \mathbb{T}_\eta[\mathcal{U}].$$

Then,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}(\left[[X, \dot{Y}] \right]_{[\mathcal{Y}]}, \left[[\psi, q] \right]_{[\mathcal{Y}]}^\dagger) = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} ((\mu\psi_i + \dot{\nu}_i q) - L_{\eta_i}(\mu q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

PROOF. Under the notation in Lemma 5.5.2, let $\mu = -\bar{\partial}\xi_i$ and $\dot{\nu} = -\bar{\partial}\dot{\eta}_i$. When we set $A_i dz = (\xi_i \psi_i + \dot{\eta}_i q) dz$,

$$((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\eta_i}((\xi_i)_{\bar{z}} q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz = -(\mu\psi_i + \dot{\nu} q - L_{\eta_i}(\mu q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

Hence, the formula follows from the definition of the pairing. \square

5.6. Model space of $T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$

Let \mathcal{Q}_g be the vector bundle of holomorphic quadratic differentials over \mathcal{T}_g . Let $\Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_g}: \mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ is the projection. As discussed in §3.2, the bundle \mathcal{Q}_g is canonically identified with the cotangent bundle $T^*\mathcal{T}_g$ over \mathcal{T}_g . In this section, we review Hubbard and Masur's description of the holomorphic tangent space to \mathcal{Q}_g given in [28].

5.6.1. Tangent space. The tangent space $T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$ of \mathcal{Q}_g at a holomorphic quadratic differential $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} = H^1(M_0, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})$ is described as the first hypercohomology group of the complex of sheaves \mathbb{L}_{q_0} :

$$(5.6.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \Theta_{M_0} \xrightarrow{L \cdot (q_0)} \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $L \cdot (q_0)$ is the Lie derivative along a vector field given at (5.2.2) (cf. [28, Proposition 3.1]).

Fix a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 . Then, the tangent space $T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$ is the first cohomology group $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ of the following double complex:

$$(5.6.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & 0 & & \\ & & \uparrow & & \\ & & C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \\ & & \uparrow L \cdot q_0 & & \uparrow -L \cdot q_0 \\ C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & C^2(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}). \end{array}$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{Z}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) = \{(X, \varphi) \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \mid \delta\varphi - L_X(q_0) = 0\}$$

$$\mathbf{B}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) = \{(\delta\alpha, \{L_{\alpha_i}(q_0)\}_i) \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \mid \alpha = \{\alpha_i\}_i \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})\}$$

and

$$\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) = \mathbf{Z}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) / \mathbf{B}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}).$$

The first *hyper-cohomology group* $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ is defined by taking the direct limit of $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ in terms of the refinement of (locally finite) coverings. We denote by $[X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ the cohomology class of $(X, \varphi) \in \mathbf{Z}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$.

The following proposition might be well-known. Indeed, Hubbard and Masur deal with the case of the direct limits in [28, Proposition 4.5]. However, they do not indicate conditions of the covering in the statement (but, it is implicitly given). Hence, we give a proof for completeness and for confirmation, although the idea here is the same as that given by Hubbard and Masur.

PROPOSITION 5.6.1. When a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies that $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for all $i \in I$, $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$. In particular, $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ is isomorphic to $T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$.

PROOF. We consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & 0 & \rightarrow & C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xrightarrow{id} & C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \delta \oplus L \cdot (q_0) \downarrow & & \downarrow \delta_2 \\ 0 & \rightarrow & C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) & \xrightarrow{inc} & C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) & \xrightarrow{pr_1} & C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \delta_1 \downarrow & & \delta_2 \oplus (\delta_1 - L \cdot (q_0)) \downarrow & & \downarrow \delta_2 \\ 0 & \rightarrow & C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) & \xrightarrow{inc} & C^2(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) & \xrightarrow{pr_1} & C^2(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

where, in the above diagram, δ_1 and δ_2 are coboundary map for cochains of sheaves $\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}$ and Θ_{M_0} , *inc* means the inclusion to the second coordinate, and *pr*₁ is the

projection on the first coordinate (cf. the diagram in [28, p.264]). This diagram leads the exact sequence

$$H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}).$$

Since M_0 does not admit a (global) holomorphic vector field, we have $H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$. Let (q_0) be the divisor of q_0 . The sheaf $\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}$ is naturally isomorphic to the sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{M_0}((q_0))$ of meromorphic functions on M_0 which is multiples of the divisor (q_0) , where a section on $U \subset M_0$ is a meromorphic function on U satisfying $(f) + D \geq 0$ (e.g. [19, §16.4, §17.4]). From the Serre duality,

$$H^1(M_0, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \cong H^1(M_0, \mathcal{O}_{M_0}((q_0))) \cong H^0(M_0, \Omega_{M_0}(-q_0))^*.$$

An element in $H^0(M_0, \Omega_{M_0}(-q_0))$ is a holomorphic 1-form ω on M_0 with $(\omega) - (q_0) \geq 0$, and $2g - 2 = \deg((\omega)) \geq \deg((q_0)) = 4g - 4$. Therefore, $H^1(M_0, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) = 0$ if $g \geq 2$. Since the canonical map $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \rightarrow H^1(M_0, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})$ is injective, we conclude that $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) = 0$. Thus, when $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for all $i \in I$, we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \cong H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \rightarrow H_1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow 0,$$

which canonically represents the fibration $Q_{M_0} \rightarrow T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$ via the isomorphism $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$ (cf. [28, Proposition 4.5]). \square

REMARK 5.6.1. From the above discussion, the map

$$T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g \cong \mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \ni [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \rightarrow [X] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$$

is the horizontal projection (cf. §2.5), which presents the differential

$$D\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger = D\Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_g}|_{q_0}: T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$$

of the projection $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger = \Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_g}: T^* \mathcal{T}_g = \mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$, where $x_0 = \Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_g}(q_0)$. As discussed in the proof of Proposition 5.6.1, the kernel, which is nothing but the vertical space, is isomorphic to $T_{x_0}^* \mathcal{T}_g \cong H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})$.

5.6.2. Description with holomorphic families. Let B be a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{C} . Let (\mathcal{M}, π, B) be a holomorphic family of compact Riemann surfaces of genus g . For $t \in B$, set $M_t = \pi^{-1}(t)$. By taking B sufficiently small, we identify \mathcal{M} with the product $M_0 \times B$ via the local trivialization as C^∞ -manifolds (cf. [43, Theorem 2.4]). By the implicit mapping theorem, when B is taken sufficiently small if necessary again, there is a covering $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 and an injective holomorphic map $Z_i: U_i \times B_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \times B_0$ such that $z_i^t = Z_i|_{U_i \times \{t\}}: U_i \times \{t\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ($i \in I$) make an analytic chart of M_t for all $t \in B$. We identify $U_i \times \{t\}$ with U_i and define $z_{ij}^t = z_i^t \circ (z_j^t)^{-1}$ on $U_i \cap U_j$. Let $\{q_t\}_{t \in B}$ be a holomorphic family of holomorphic quadratic differentials with $q_t \in M_t$. Suppose that q_t is presented as $q_t^t(z) dz^2$ on $z_i^0(U_i)$. Set

$$X_{ij}(z) = \left. \frac{\partial z_{ij}^t}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} \circ (z_{ij}^0)^{-1}(z) \quad (z \in z_i^0(U_i \cap U_j))$$

$$\varphi_i(z) = \left. \frac{\partial q_i^t}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} (z) \quad (z \in z_i^0(U_i))$$

(cf. §8.1.2). Then, $(X, \varphi) = (\{X_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}, \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in I}) \in \mathbf{Z}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and it represents the tangent vector of the family $\{q_t\}_{t \in B}$ at $t = 0$. Indeed, since

$$z_{ij}^t(z) = z_{ij}^0(z) + tX_{ij}(z_{ij}(z)) + o(t),$$

for $z \in z_j(U_i \cap U_j)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & q_i^t(z_{ij}^t(z)) \frac{dz_{ij}^t}{dz}(z)^2 \\ &= q_i^t(z_{ij}^0(z) + tX_{ij}(z_{ij}^0(z)) + o(t)) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z)^2 \left(1 + tX'_{ij}(z_{ij}^0(z)) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z) + o(t)\right)^2 \\ &= q_0(z_{ij}^0(z)) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z)^2 + t(\varphi_i(z_{ij}^0(z)) + L_{X_{ij}}(q_0)(z_{ij}^0(z))) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z)^2 + o(t) \end{aligned}$$

$$q_j^t(z) = q_0(z) + t\varphi_j(z) + o(t)$$

as $t \rightarrow 0$. This means that

$$\varphi_j(z) - \varphi_i(z_{ij}^0(z)) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z)^2 = L_{X_{ij}}(q_0)(z_{ij}^0(z)) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z)^2$$

for $z \in z_j(U_i \cap U_j)$, which is written as

$$\varphi_j - \varphi_i = L_{X_{ij}}(q_0) \quad (i, j \in I)$$

or $\delta\varphi = L_X(q_0)$ for short.

5.6.3. Tangent spaces to strata. The following is essentially due to Hubbard-Masur [28] and Dumas [15]. For the sake of completeness, we give a brief proof.

PROPOSITION 5.6.2 (Tangent space to the strata). Let $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering of M_0 such that each U_i contains at most 1 zero of q_0 , and $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. A tangent vector $[X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$ is in $T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ if and only if for any $i \in I$, a meromorphic function φ_i/q_0 has at most simple poles.

PROOF. The following argument is a modification of that given by Dumas [15, Lemma 5.2].

As we discussed in §5.6.2, each φ_i is appeared by differentiating a holomorphic family $\{q_t\}_{|t| < \epsilon}$ of holomorphic quadratic differentials on a local chart (U_i, z_i) . For the simplicity of the argument, we may assume that $z_i^t(z_0) = 0$ and $q_0 = z^k dz^2$ on $z_i(U_i)$, where k is the order of zero at z_0 of q_0 . Since q_t has the same symbol as q_0 , we can write

$$q_t = \alpha_t^*(z^k dz^2)$$

for $|t| < \epsilon$ and some holomorphic function α_t which depends holomorphically in t and $\alpha_0(z) = z$. Then,

$$\varphi_i = z^{k-1}(k\alpha' + 2z\alpha') dz^2$$

and φ_i has a zero of order at least $k-1$ at z_0 . Hence φ_i/q_0 has at most simple poles on U_i . \square

5.7. The model space of $T_{q_0}^* \mathcal{Q}_g$ and Models of the pairing and the holomorphic symplectic form

5.7.1. Model space. We set

$$\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) = \{[\Phi, Y]_{q_0}^\dagger \mid [-Y, \Phi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})\}.$$

and $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ as its direct limit. We will adopt the space $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ as the *model space* of the cotangent space $T_{q_0}^* \mathcal{Q}_g$ to \mathcal{Q}_g at $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g$. A representative (Φ, Y) of $[\Phi, Y]_{q_0}^\dagger \in \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ satisfies

$$\Phi_j - \Phi_i = -L_{Y_{i,j}}(q_0)$$

for $i, j \in I$.

5.7.2. Model of pairing. Let \mathcal{U} be a locally finite covering of M_0 . We define the *pairing* between $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ by

$$(5.7.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathcal{P}^\dagger([X, \varphi]_{q_0}, [\Phi, Y]_{q_0}^\dagger) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (\xi_i)_{\bar{z}} ((\Phi_i + L_{\eta_i}(q_0)) + (\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}(\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0))) d\bar{z} \wedge dz, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi, \eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$ and $\delta\eta = Y$. We check the pairing (5.7.1) is well-defined.

We first check that the integral in (5.7.1) is independent of the choices of ξ and η . Let $\xi' = \{\xi'_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi' = X$. Then, $\Xi = \xi_i - \xi'_i$ on U_i defines a global vector field on M_0 . The difference between the integrals in the right-hand side (5.7.1) defined from ξ and ξ' is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (\Xi_{\bar{z}}(\Phi_i + L_{\eta_i}(q_0)) - (\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} L_{\Xi}(q_0)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} d(\Xi(\Phi_i + L_{\eta_i}(q_0))) dz + 2(q_0 \Xi(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}) d\bar{z} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since the one form

$$\Xi(\Phi_i + L_{\eta_i}(q_0)) dz + 2q_0 \Xi(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} d\bar{z}$$

in the integral is the global one form on M_0 . The well-definedness for η is treated by the same argument.

We next check that the integral in (5.7.1) is independent of the choices of the cocycles. The cohomology class for the cocycle (X, φ) consists of $(X + \delta\alpha, \varphi + L_\alpha(q_0))$ for $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Let $\xi' \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi' = X + \delta\alpha$. Since $\delta(\xi' - \alpha) = X$, from the previous discussion, the integrand in the right-hand side of (5.7.1) is

$$\begin{aligned} & (\xi'_i)_{\bar{z}}(\Phi_i + L_{\eta_i}(q_0)) + (\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}(\varphi_i + L_{\alpha_i}(q_0) - L_{\xi'_i}(q_0)) \\ & (\xi'_i - \alpha_i)_{\bar{z}}(\Phi_i + L_{\eta_i}(q_0)) + (\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}(\varphi_i - L_{\xi'_i - \alpha_i}(q_0)) \\ &= (\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}(\Phi_i + L_{\eta_i}(q_0)) + (\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}(\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)). \end{aligned}$$

The case for $[\Phi, Y] \in \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ follows from the same argument.

For two locally finite coverings \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} . Suppose that \mathcal{V} is a refinement of \mathcal{U} . Since the natural maps $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{V}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ are defined by the restriction, for the pairing (5.7.1) descends to the pairing on $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \times \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$.

PROPOSITION 5.7.1 (Non-degenerate). When a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$, the pairing (5.7.1) is non-degenerate.

PROOF. Let $[X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$. Suppose that

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger([X, \phi]_{q_0}, [\Phi, Y]_{q_0}^\dagger) = 0$$

for all $[\Phi, Y]_{q_0}^\dagger \in \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$. Let $\Psi \in \mathcal{Q}_g$. Since $[\Psi, 0]_{q_0}^\dagger \in \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$,

$$0 = \mathcal{P}^\dagger([X, \phi], [\Psi, 0]) = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}(z) \Psi(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

From the assumption of the covering, $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$. Therefore, $[X] = 0$ in $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ (cf. §3.3.2). Therefore, there is $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that $\delta\alpha = X$. We may adopt α as ξ in the formula (5.7.1) of the pairing and

$$0 = \mathcal{P}^\dagger([\delta\alpha, \varphi]_{q_0}, [\Phi, Y]_{q_0}^\dagger) = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}(\varphi_i(z) - L_{\alpha_i}(q_0)(z)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

Since $\{\varphi_i - L_{\alpha_i}(q_0)\}_{i \in I}$ defines a (global) holomorphic quadratic differential on M_0 , we get $\varphi_i - L_{\alpha_i}(q_0) = 0$ for all i , since the pairing (3.1.1) is non-degenerate. Thus, we get $[X, \varphi]_{q_0} = [\delta\alpha, L_\alpha(q_0)]_{q_0}^\dagger = 0$. The remaining case is dealt with the same argument. \square

5.7.3. Kawai's description of the holomorphic symplectic form.

In this section, following Kawai [34], we recall the holomorphic symplectic form on the tangent space of the space of holomorphic quadratic differentials, and rewrite Kawai's symplectic form under our setting.

First we recall Kawai's description. Let M_0 be a closed Riemann surface of genus g . Let $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$. Let Γ_0 be a cocompact Fuchsian group acting on the upper-half plane \mathbb{H} with $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_0 = M_0$. In the following discussion, we identify differentials on a Riemann surface with automorphic forms on its universal covering space.

Let μ_j ($j = 1, \dots, 3g-3$) be a system of smooth $(-1, 1)$ -automorphic forms whose Teichmüller equivalence classes span the tangent space at $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$. In [34], Kawai takes such a basis from the space of harmonic Beltrami differentials. We can check that his calculation is valid for a system of $3g-3$ smooth $(-1, 1)$ -forms which form a basis on the tangent space to the Teichmüller space at x_0 .

Let q_s^α ($\alpha = 1, 2, |s| < \epsilon$) be a holomorphic family of quadratic differentials with $q_0^1 = q_0^2 = q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$. Suppose $q_s^\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_s^\alpha}$ and $x_s^\alpha = (M_s^\alpha, f_s^\alpha)$ with $x_0^1 = x_0^2 = x_0$. Suppose that the Beltrami differential of $f_s^\alpha: M_0 \rightarrow M_s^\alpha$ is equal to $\nu_\alpha(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{3g-3} \epsilon_j^\alpha(s) \mu_j$ for some holomorphic functions ϵ_j^α ($\alpha = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, \dots, 3g-3$). Let $w^{\nu_\alpha(s)}$ be the normalized quasiconformal mapping on \mathbb{H} satisfying the Beltrami equation $(w^{\nu_\alpha(s)})_{\bar{z}} = \nu_\alpha(s) (w^{\nu_\alpha(s)})_z$, $w^{\nu_\alpha(s)}(0) = w^{\nu_\alpha(s)}(1) - 1 = 0$ and $w^{\nu_\alpha(s)}(\infty) = \infty$. Then, Kawai describes the holomorphic symplectic form on \mathcal{Q}_g as

$$(5.7.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}(t_1, t_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{3g-3} \left\{ \left(\iint_{\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_0} [\dot{q}_0^1(z) + (q_0^1)'(z) \dot{w}^{\nu_1(0)}(z) + 2q_0^1(z) (\dot{w}^{\nu_1(0)})_z(z)] \mu_j(z) dx dy \right) \dot{\epsilon}_j^2(0) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\iint_{\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_0} [\dot{q}_0^2(z) + (q_0^2)'(z) \dot{w}^{\nu_2(0)}(z) + 2q_0^2(z) (\dot{w}^{\nu_2(0)})_z(z)] \mu_j(z) dx dy \right) \dot{\epsilon}_j^1(0) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $t_\alpha \in T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$ is tangent to the family $\{q_s^\alpha\}_{|s|<1}$ at $s = 0$. See [34, (3.4)].

We claim

PROPOSITION 5.7.2 (Holomorphic symplectic form). Fix a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. The holomorphic symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}$ on \mathcal{Q}_g is described on the model space $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ of $T_{q_0}\mathcal{Q}_g$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}([X^1, \varphi^1]_{q_0}, [X^2, \varphi^2]_{q_0}) \\ &= \frac{1}{4i} \left(\iint_{M_0} (\xi_i^1)_{\bar{z}} (\varphi_i^2 - L_{\xi_i^2}(q_0)) - \iint_{M_0} (\xi_i^2)_{\bar{z}} (\varphi_i^1 - L_{\xi_i^1}(q_0)) \right) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \end{aligned}$$

for $[X^\alpha, \varphi^\alpha]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $\xi^\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $[\delta\xi^\alpha] = [X^\alpha]$ ($\alpha = 1, 2$).

PROOF. As we mentioned above, we rewrite Kawai's holomorphic symplectic form under our setting. Fix a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$. Suppose that for $\alpha = 1, 2$, $t_\alpha = [X^\alpha, \varphi^\alpha]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0}\mathcal{Q}_g$. The restriction ξ_i^α of the minus of the derivative $-\dot{w}^{\nu_i(0)}$ (in Kawai's formula) to U_i defines a cochain $\xi^\alpha = \{\xi_i^\alpha\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $[\delta\xi^\alpha] = [X^\alpha]$ (cf. §13.1). Notice that

$$(\xi^\alpha)_{\bar{z}} = -\nu_i(0)|_{U_i} = - \sum_{j=1}^{3g-3} \epsilon_j^\alpha(0) \mu_j|_{U_i}$$

for $\alpha = 1, 2$ and $i \in I$. From (5.7.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}(t_1, t_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(- \iint_{M_0} [\varphi_i^1(z) - L_{\xi_i^1}(q_0)(z)] (\xi_i^2)_{\bar{z}}(z) dx dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \iint_{M_0} [\varphi_i^2(z) - L_{\xi_i^2}(q_0)(z)] (\xi_i^1)_{\bar{z}}(z) dx dy \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies what we wanted. \square

5.8. Remarks on regularity of cochains in the formulae of pairings

All 0-chains in the formulae of the pairings in Lemma 5.5.1, Theorem 5.5.1, §5.7.2, and Proposition 5.7.2 are assumed to be smooth. However, for the application, we may need to think of such 0-chains with weaker regularity conditions.

Henceforth, let $\mathcal{C}^{k,s}(D)$ be the function space consisting of continuous functions all of whose s -th derivatives are in L^s for all $s \leq k$. By definition, $\mathcal{C}^{0,s}(D) = L^s(D)$.

For a Riemann surface M and a , let $\mathcal{C}^{k,s;p,q}(\mathcal{S})$ be the sheaf of germs of (p, q) -forms of class $\mathcal{C}^{k,s}$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{S} = \Theta_M$ or Ω_M . It is known that the Green formula holds for differentials of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$. For instance, see [47, p.150 (6.17)]. Therefore, in Lemma 5.5.1 and Theorem 5.5.1, we can check that the proofs of the formulae work with

- $\xi, \eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1;0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$,
 - $A \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1;0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$,
 - $\mu \in L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$ with $-\bar{\partial}\xi = \mu$ for some $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1;0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$,
 - $\dot{\nu} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{0,\infty;0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $-\bar{\partial}\dot{\eta} = \dot{\nu}$ for some $\dot{\eta} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1;0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$
- which satisfies

$$\delta\dot{\eta} + K(\xi, \delta\eta) = 0.$$

For the formulae of the pairing and the symplectic form in Lemma 5.5.1 and Theorem 5.5.1, we can also check that the proofs work with $\xi, \eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$.

Indeed, the invariance of the pairing represented with Dolbeaut presentations in Theorem 5.5.1 follows from the discussion in Lemma 5.5.1 for

$$A_i = \xi_i \psi_i + \dot{\eta}_i q.$$

The other case can be similarly checked.

In general, we need such smoothness of cochains to the validity of the formulae and the invariance in terms of the representatives, since we apply the Green theorem in checking the invariance. However, in some case, the formulae also valid with the slightly weaker assumption.

Indeed, the Dolbeaut presentations in Theorem 5.5.1 also holds with cochains ξ and η such that $-\bar{\partial}\xi$ and $-\bar{\partial}\eta$ are Teichmüller Beltrami differentials (cf. §3.2.3). A Teichmüller Beltrami differential on M_0 , by definition, forms $\bar{\varphi}/|\varphi|$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$. Hence, it is real analytic except for the zeroes of φ , but not continuous on whole M_0 , which means that such ξ and η are not in $C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1;0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$. However, in general, for a holomorphic function f on a domain D ,

$$\left(\frac{\bar{f}}{|f|}\right)_z = -\frac{(\bar{f})^2}{2|f|^3}f', \quad \left(\frac{\bar{f}}{|f|}\right)_{\bar{z}} = \frac{\bar{f}'}{2|f|} \in L^1_{loc}(D)$$

since zeroes of a holomorphic function are discrete. Hence, for any relatively compact simply conneted subdomain D' in D , we can construct $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}(D' - \text{Zero}(f))$ such that $\eta_{\bar{z}} = -\bar{f}/|f| \in L^\infty(D)$ (cf. [32, Proposition 4.19]). The discussion with the Green theorem works for such differentials by applying the Royden-type argument given in [67] (cf. §11.1.1). Namely, we first take a smooth exhaustion of the complement of the zeroes of the quadratic differntials (which defines the Teichmüller Beltrami differential), apply the Green theorem for such domain in the exhaustion, and take the limit.

Trivializations of Models of Spaces and Pairings

6.1. Guiding frame, Good section for the coboundary operator

Henceforth, for discussing trivializations, we fix a \mathbb{C} -linear map, which we call a *guiding frame*, $\mathbf{gf}: H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$ such that

- (i) for $X \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, $\mathbf{gf}([X])$ represents $[X] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$. Namely $\mathcal{T}_{x_0}([X]) = [\mathbf{gf}([X])]$ in $T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$; and
- (ii) for $[X] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, each $\mathbf{gf}([X])$ is a smooth Beltrami differential. Namely, $\mathbf{gf}([X]) \in \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$.

EXAMPLE 6.1.1 (Ahlfors-Weill guiding frame). Since the Ahlfors-Weill section \mathcal{A}_{x_0} is \mathbb{C} -linear, the differential $D\mathcal{A}_{x_0}|_{x_0}$ from $T_0\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = B_2(\mathbb{D}^*, \Gamma_0)$ to $T_0L^\infty(\mathbb{D}, \Gamma_0) = L^\infty(\mathbb{D}, \Gamma_0)$ coincides with \mathcal{A}_{x_0} . Hence,

$$(6.1.1) \quad \mathbf{gf} = \mathcal{A}_{x_0} \circ D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}: H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{D}, \Gamma_0) \cong L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$$

is a guiding frame, where $D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0}: T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow T_0\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = B_2(\mathbb{D}^*, \Gamma_0)$ is the differential of the Bers embedding \mathcal{B}_{x_0} at $x_0 \in \mathcal{T}_g$ (cf. §3.1.3). We call such guiding frame the *Ahlfors-Weill guiding frame*.

Indeed, let $[X] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. each $\mathbf{gf}([X])$ is a smooth Beltrami differential. Since

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{gf}([X])] &= D\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B|_0 \circ \mathbf{gf}([X]) = D\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B|_0 \circ \mathcal{A}_{x_0} \circ D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}([X]) \\ &= D(\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B \circ \mathcal{A}_{x_0})_0 \circ D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}([X]) \\ &= (D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0})^{-1} \circ D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}([X]) = \mathcal{T}_{x_0}([X]) \end{aligned}$$

from (3.1.4), $\mathbf{gf}([X])$ represents $[X]$.

PROPOSITION 6.1.1 (Good section for δ). For a guiding frame \mathbf{gf} , there is a \mathbb{C} -linear map $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}^{\mathbf{gf}}$ from $Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ to $C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that

- (a) $\delta \circ \mathfrak{L}(X) = X$ for $X \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$; and
- (b) $\mathfrak{L} \circ \delta(\alpha) = \alpha$ for $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

Especially, the linear map \mathfrak{L} is uniquely determined from the guiding frame \mathbf{gf} with the above condition (a) and the following condition (c):

$$(c) \quad \bar{\partial}\mathfrak{L}(X)_i = -\mathbf{gf}([X]) \text{ on } U_i \text{ for } i \in I.$$

Actually, the condition (b) follows from the conditions (a) and (c).

PROOF. Let $X = \{X_{ij}\}_{i,j} \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. For an index j , we take $\xi_j \in \Gamma(U_j, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ which satisfies $\bar{\partial}\xi_j = -\mathbf{gf}([X])$ on U_i . By the assumption, there is an $\{\alpha_j\}_j \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that

$$(6.1.2) \quad \xi_j - \xi_i = X_{ij} + (\alpha_j - \alpha_i)$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$ for all indices $i, j \in I$ (cf. §3.3).

We claim that the difference $\xi_j - \alpha_j \in \Gamma(U_j, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ is independent of the choice of ξ_j 's. Indeed, take $\xi_j' \in \Gamma(U_j, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and $\alpha_j' \in \Gamma(U_j, \Theta_{M_0})$ satisfying $\bar{\partial}\xi_j' = -\mathfrak{g}f([X])$ on U_i and

$$\xi_j' - \xi_i' = X_{ij} + (\alpha_j' - \alpha_i')$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$ for all $i, j \in I$. Then,

$$\xi_j' - \xi_i' - (\alpha_j' - \alpha_i') = X_{ij} = \xi_j - \xi_i + (\alpha_j - \alpha_i)$$

and

$$(\xi_j - \alpha_j) - (\xi_j' - \alpha_j') = (\xi_i - \alpha_i) - (\xi_i' - \alpha_i')$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$ for all i, j . Since $\bar{\partial}\xi_j = \bar{\partial}\xi_j' = -\mathfrak{g}f([X])|_{U_j}$,

$$\xi = (\xi_j - \alpha_j) - (\xi_j' - \alpha_j')$$

on U_j defines a holomorphic vector field on M . Since $\chi(M) < 0$, M has no non-trivial holomorphic vector field. Therefore

$$\xi_j - \alpha_j = \xi_j' - \alpha_j'$$

for all j , and we confirm the claim.

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 6.1.1. We define a \mathbb{C} -linear map $\mathfrak{L}: Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ by

$$\mathfrak{L}(X) = \{\xi_j - \alpha_j\}_j.$$

We check that \mathfrak{L} satisfies the desired conditions. Indeed, from (6.1.2), \mathfrak{L} satisfies the condition (a). We check that the condition (b) follows from the conditions (a) and (c). Let $\alpha = \{\alpha_j\}_j \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Since $\mathfrak{g}f([\delta\alpha]) = \mathfrak{g}f(0) = 0$, the condition (c) implies that $\mathfrak{L}(\delta\alpha)_i \in \Gamma(U_i, \Theta_{M_0})$ for each $i \in I$. From the condition (a), $\delta \circ \mathfrak{L}(\delta\alpha) = \delta\alpha$. Hence

$$\xi = \mathfrak{L}(\delta\alpha)_i - \alpha_i$$

on U_i defines a holomorphic vector field on M_0 , and $\mathfrak{L}(\delta\alpha) = \alpha$. Therefore, \mathfrak{L} satisfies the condition (b).

We check the uniqueness. Suppose \mathfrak{L}' satisfies the conditions (a) and (c). Consider $\mathfrak{L}'': Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ defined by $\mathfrak{L}''(X) = \mathfrak{L}(X) - \mathfrak{L}'(X)$. From the condition (c), $\mathfrak{L}''(X)_i \in \Gamma(U_i, \Theta_{M_0})$ for $i \in I$. From the condition (a),

$$\delta \circ \mathfrak{L}''(X) = \delta \circ \mathfrak{L}(X) - \delta \circ \mathfrak{L}'(X) = X - X = 0.$$

Hence $\mathfrak{L}''(X)$ defines a global holomorphic vector field on M_0 . Hence $\mathfrak{L}''(X) = 0$ for all $X \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. \square

As (5.3.1), we have

$$(6.1.3) \quad \delta(S(\mathfrak{L}(X), Y)) = \zeta(X, Y)$$

for $X, Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

6.2. Trivialization of model spaces of $T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g$

In the following three sections, we assume that a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for all $i \in I$. In this section, we will show that the model spaces $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ defined in Definitions 1 and 3 are isomorphic to the product space $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{O}_{M_0})^{\oplus 2} \cong H^1(M_0, \mathcal{O}_{M_0})^{\oplus 2}$. In particular, in this case,

$$(6.2.1) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] = 6g - 6$$

for $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ (cf. Theorem 6.2.1).

Let

$$\Pi: C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) / \delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$$

be the projection. Since $\delta \circ \delta = 0$, the coboundary operator $\delta: C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow Z^2(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ descends to a \mathbb{C} -linear map

$$\delta: C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) / \delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow Z^2(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}).$$

The existence in the following lemma is trivial since $H^2(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$. We give and fix a concrete construction of the coboundary.

LEMMA 6.2.1 (Coboundary of the primary obstruction). There is a \mathbb{C} -linear map

$$E: Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2} \rightarrow C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) / \delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$$

such that

- (a) $\delta \circ E(X, Y) = \zeta(X, Y)$ for $X, Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$;
- (b) For $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, $\Pi \circ S(\alpha, Y) = E(\delta\alpha, Y)$; and
- (c) For $X \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$,

$$K'(\beta, X) + \frac{1}{2}[X, \delta\beta] - E(X, \delta\beta) = 0$$

modulo $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

- (d) For $X, Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, $E(X, Y) = E(Y, X)$ in $C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) / \delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{L}: Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ be a linear map defined in Proposition 6.1.1. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial} S(\mathfrak{L}(X), Y)_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2} \bar{\partial} [\mathfrak{L}(X)_i + \mathfrak{L}(X)_j, Y_{ij}] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [\bar{\partial} \mathfrak{L}(X)_i + \bar{\partial} \mathfrak{L}(X)_j, Y_{ij}] \\ &= -[\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}([X]), Y_{ij}] \\ &= -[\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j] - [\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]. \end{aligned}$$

Take $\sigma_j \in \Gamma(U_j, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\bar{\partial} \sigma_i = -[\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}([X])|_{U_i}, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]$ on U_i . We define

$$(6.2.2) \quad E_{ij}(X, Y) = S(\mathfrak{L}(X), Y)_{ij} - (\sigma_j - \sigma_i) \in \Gamma(U_i \cap U_j, \Theta_{M_0})$$

for $X, Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Then, $E(X, Y) = \{E_{ij}(X, Y)\}_{i,j}$ is determined up to coboundaries in $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ (which is caused only from the choice of $\sigma = \{\sigma_i\}_i \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$). From the linearity of \mathfrak{L} , E defines a \mathbb{C} -linear map

$$E: Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2} \rightarrow C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) / \delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}).$$

We check that the map E satisfies the desired conditions. Indeed, from (6.1.3),

$$\delta \circ E(X, Y) = \delta \circ T(X, Y) = \delta \circ S(\mathfrak{L}(X), Y) = \zeta(X, Y).$$

Hence E satisfies the condition (a).

Let $\alpha = \{\alpha_j\}_j \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Since $\mathfrak{gf}([\delta\alpha]) = \mathfrak{gf}(0) = 0$ and $\bar{\partial}\sigma_j = -[\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j] = 0$ on U_j , the vector field σ_j in (6.2.2) is a holomorphic vector field on U_j for all j . From Proposition 6.1.1 and (6.2.2),

$$E(\delta\alpha, Y) \equiv T(\delta\alpha, Y) = S(\mathfrak{L}(\delta\alpha), Y) = S(\alpha, Y)$$

modulo $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Therefore, E satisfies the condition (b).

We check (c). Indeed, from the definition of E and (b) of Proposition 6.1.1,

$$(6.2.3) \quad E_{ij}(X, \delta\beta) = S(\mathfrak{L}(X), \delta\beta)_{ij} - (\sigma'_j - \sigma'_i)$$

where $\bar{\partial}\sigma'_j = -[\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \beta_j]$ on U_j . By (a) of Proposition 6.1.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & K'(\beta, X)_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}[X, \delta\beta]_{ij} - S(\mathfrak{L}(X), \delta\beta)_{ij} + (\sigma'_j - \sigma'_i) \\ &= [\beta_j, \mathfrak{L}(X)_j - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i] + \frac{1}{2}[\mathfrak{L}(X)_j - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i, \beta_j - \beta_i] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}[\mathfrak{L}(X)_i + \mathfrak{L}(X)_j, \beta_j - \beta_i] + (\sigma'_j - \sigma'_i) \\ &= ([\beta_j, \mathfrak{L}(X)_j] + \sigma'_j) - ([\beta_i, \mathfrak{L}(X)_i] + \sigma'_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since $[\beta_i, \mathfrak{L}(X)_i] + \sigma'_i \in \Gamma(U_i, \Theta_{M_0})$ for $i \in I$, we have done.

Finally we check (d). Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that $\bar{\partial}\sigma_i = -[\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]$ and $\bar{\partial}\sigma'_i = -[\mathfrak{gf}([Y]), \mathfrak{L}(X)_i]$ on U_i . From the definition (6.2.2) of E ,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ij}(X, Y) - E_{ij}(Y, X) &= S(\mathfrak{L}(X), Y) - S(\mathfrak{L}(Y), X) - (\sigma_j - \sigma'_j) + (\sigma_i - \sigma'_i) \\ &= ([\mathfrak{L}(X)_j, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j] - (\sigma_j - \sigma'_j)) \\ &\quad - ([\mathfrak{L}(X)_i, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] - (\sigma_i - \sigma'_i)). \end{aligned}$$

Since for $i \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}([\mathfrak{L}(X)_i, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] - (\sigma_i - \sigma'_i)) &= -[\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] - [\mathfrak{L}(X)_i, \mathfrak{gf}([Y])] \\ &\quad - (-[\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] + [\mathfrak{gf}([Y]), \mathfrak{L}(X)_i]) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$E(X, Y) - E(Y, X) \equiv 0$ modulo $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. \square

We claim the following:

THEOREM 6.2.1 (Trivialization of model spaces). Let E be the map defined in Lemma 6.2.1. Then, the \mathbb{C} -linear map $\mathcal{S}_Y: \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2}$ defined by

$$(6.2.4) \quad \mathcal{S}_Y([\![X, \dot{Y}]\!]_Y) = \left([X], \left[\dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] - E(X, Y) \right] \right)$$

is an isomorphism which satisfies

$$(6.2.5) \quad \mathcal{S}_{Y+\delta\beta} \circ \mathcal{L}_{\beta; Y} = \mathcal{S}_Y$$

for all $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. In particular, the isomorphism \mathcal{S}_Y descends to the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}_{[Y]}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2}.$$

PROOF. We first check that the map (6.2.1) is well-defined. From Lemma 6.2.1, the cochain in the bracket in the second coordinate of the map (6.2.1) is cocycle.

We check that the restriction of the \mathbb{C} -linear map $Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ defined by

$$(X, \dot{Y}) \mapsto \left([X], \left[\dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] - E(X, Y) \right] \right)$$

to the image of D_0^Y (defined in (5.3.7)) is trivial. Let $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. The first coordinate of the image of $D_0^Y(\alpha, \beta)$ under the above map is trivial because of the definition of the cohomology group $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. For the second coordinate,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\delta\beta + K(\alpha, Y) + \frac{1}{2}[\delta\alpha, Y] - E(\delta\alpha, Y) \right)_{ij} \\ & \equiv \beta_j - \beta_i + [\alpha_i, Y_{ij}] + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_j - \alpha_i, Y_{ij}] - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_i + \alpha_j, Y_{ij}] = \beta_j - \beta_i \equiv 0 \end{aligned}$$

modulo $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Hence, (6.2.4) is well-defined.

We construct the inverse of the map (6.2.1). For $X, W \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, we define

$$\dot{W} = W - \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] + E(X, Y).$$

Then, from Lemma 6.2.1,

$$\delta \left(\dot{W} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] \right) - \zeta(X, Y) = \delta(W + E(X, Y)) - \zeta(X, Y) = 0.$$

Hence we have a well-defined \mathbb{C} -linear map

$$(6.2.6) \quad (X, W) \mapsto \left[X, W - \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] + E(X, Y) \right]_Y$$

from $Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ to \mathbb{T}_Y . We check that the image of the direct sum of two copies of $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ under (6.2.6) is trivial. Let $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. When we substitute $\delta\alpha$ and $\delta\beta$ to X and W in (6.2.6), the ij -component of the second coordinate is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_j - \beta_i - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_j - \alpha_i, Y_{ij}] + E(\delta\alpha, Y)_{ij} \\ & \equiv \beta_j - \beta_i - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_j - \alpha_i, Y] + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_i + \alpha_j, Y_{ij}] = \beta_j - \beta_i + K(\alpha, Y)_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

modulo $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, which implies that the image of $(\delta\alpha, \delta\beta)$ under the map (6.2.6) is zero in \mathbb{T}_Y . Hence, the map (6.2.6) descends to the \mathbb{C} -linear map from $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2}$ to \mathbb{T}_Y . From the definition, this map is the inverse of (6.2.1).

Equation (6.2.5) follows from (c) of Lemma 6.2.1. \square

6.2.1. Trivialization for Dolbeault type presentation. We continue to use the linear maps \mathfrak{gf} , \mathfrak{L} and E in Proposition 6.1.1 and Lemma 6.2.1. Let $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. We define a \mathbb{C} -linear map $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Y^D: \ker(D_0^{Y,1}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))^{\oplus 2}$ by

$$(6.2.7) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Y^D(\mu, \hat{\nu}) = (\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \hat{\nu})$$

where $[X] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ with $[\mathfrak{gf}([X])] = [\mu]$ (cf. (3.2.1)) and the differential $\hat{\nu} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ in (6.2.7) is defined by

$$(6.2.8) \quad \hat{\nu} = (\hat{\nu}_i - \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]) + [\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]$$

on U_i where $\chi \in \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\bar{\partial}\chi = \mathfrak{gf}([X]) - \mu$. Since

$$[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j] - [\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] + [-\chi, Y_{ij}] = 0$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$, from Proposition 5.4.1, (μ, ν) and $(\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \{\dot{\nu}_i - \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]\}_{i \in I})$ are equivalent in $\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$. We claim

THEOREM 6.2.2 (Trivialization for Dolbeault type presentation). The map $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_Y^D$ descends to a \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism $\mathcal{J}_Y^D: \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol} \rightarrow (T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g)^{\oplus 2}$ which commutes the following diagram

$$(6.2.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] & \xleftarrow{\mathcal{D}_0} & \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] \\ \mathcal{J}_Y \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{J}_Y^D \\ H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{T}_{x_0}} & (T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g)^{\oplus 2}, \end{array}$$

where \mathcal{D}_0 is the connecting homomorphism defined at (5.4.3), and \mathcal{T}_{x_0} is the isomorphism defined at (3.3.3). Furthermore, in the commutative diagram (6.2.9), the vertical spaces satisfy

$$(6.2.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}] & \xleftarrow{\mathcal{D}_0|_{\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol,V}}} & \mathbb{T}^{Dol,V}[\mathcal{U}]_Y \\ \mathcal{J}_Y|_{\mathbb{T}_Y^V} = \{[0]\} \oplus \mathfrak{vi}_Y^{\bar{\tau}}: \mathcal{U} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{J}_Y^D|_{\mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}} \\ \{[0]\} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{T}_{x_0}} & \{[0]\} \oplus T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g. \end{array}$$

PROOF. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j] - \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] &= \bar{\partial}[\chi, Y_{ij}] = [\bar{\partial}\chi, Y_{ij}] \\ &= [\mathfrak{gf}([X]) - \mu, Y_{ij}] \end{aligned}$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \dot{\nu}_j - \dot{\nu}_i + [\mu, Y_{ij}] \\ &= (\dot{\nu}_j - \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j]) - (\dot{\nu}_i - \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]) + [\mathfrak{gf}([X]), Y_{ij}] \end{aligned}$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$ for $i, j \in I$. Let $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $-\bar{\partial}\beta_i = \dot{\nu}_i - \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]$ on U_i , and $\dot{Y} = \delta\beta + K(\mathfrak{L}(X), Y)$. Then,

$$\mathcal{D}_0((\mu, \dot{\nu})_Y^{cycl}) = \mathcal{D}_0\left(\left(\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \{\dot{\nu}_i - \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]\}_{i \in I}\right)_Y^{cycl}\right) = \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$$

from the definition of the connecting homomorphism. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} &\dot{Y}_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] - E(X, Y)_{ij} \\ &= \beta_j - \beta_i + [\mathfrak{L}(X)_i, Y_{ij}] + \frac{1}{2}[\mathfrak{L}(X)_j - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j - \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}[\mathfrak{L}(X)_j + \mathfrak{L}(X)_i, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j - \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] + \sigma_j - \sigma_i \\ &= (\beta_j + \sigma_j) - (\beta_i + \sigma_i) \end{aligned}$$

modulo $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, where $\sigma_i \in \Gamma(U_i, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ satisfies $-\bar{\partial}\sigma_i = [\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]$ (cf. (6.2.2)). Since

$$-\bar{\partial}(\beta_i + \sigma_i) = (\dot{\nu}_i - \bar{\partial}[\chi, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]) + [\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] = \dot{\nu}_i$$

on U_i ,

$$\mathcal{T}_{x_0}\left(\left[\dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] - E(X, Y)\right]\right) = [\dot{\nu}] \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g.$$

As a consequence, $(\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{T}_{x_0}) \circ \mathcal{S}_Y \circ \mathcal{D}_0(\langle \mu, \nu \rangle_Y^{cycl}) = ([\mu], [\nu])$, which is nothing but the equivalence class of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^D_Y(\mu, \nu)$ in $T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \oplus T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$.

The commutative diagram (6.2.10) follows from the diagram (6.2.9), the definition of E ((5.3.2), (6.2.3)), the definitions of the vertical spaces (Definitions 2 and 5), and Proposition 5.4.2. \square

REMARK 6.2.1. The map E defined in Lemma 6.2.1 are dependent on the choices of the linear map $\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}: H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$. Therefore, so are the trivializations in Theorems 6.2.1 and 6.2.2.

6.3. Trivialization of the model space of $T_{[Y]}^*T\mathcal{T}_g$

Fix a guiding frame $\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}: H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$ and take $\mathfrak{L}: Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_0) \rightarrow C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ defined in Proposition 6.1.1.

Let $[[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$. Let $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and $(\psi, q) = (\{\psi_i\}_{i \in I}, q) \in \ker(D_1^{Y,\dagger})$ be representatives of $[Y]$ and $[[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger$ respectively. Since

$$\psi_j - \psi_i = L_{Y_{ij}}(q) = L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_j}(q) - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q)$$

for $i, j \in I$, $\psi - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)}(q) = \{\psi_i - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q)\}_{i \in I} \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}))$.

The exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2} \xrightarrow{inc} \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \longrightarrow 0$$

leads an exact sequence

$$(6.3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) &\rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})) \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})) \\ &\rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)}(q) = L_Y(q) \in C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})$, $\bar{\partial} L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)}(q) \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}))$. Since $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) = 0$, there is a unique smooth quadratic differential $Q = \{Q_i\}_{i \in I} \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}))$ which satisfies

$$(6.3.2) \quad \bar{\partial} Q_i = \bar{\partial} L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q)$$

for $i \in I$, and the *uniqueness condition*

$$(6.3.3) \quad \iint_{M_0} \mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}([Z])Q = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} \mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}([Z])(z)Q(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz = 0$$

for all $[Z] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$. The uniqueness of such Q follows from the fact that \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} is the dual of $T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ and

$$T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \ni [Z] \mapsto \iint_{M_0} \mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}([Z])Q \in \mathbb{C}$$

is a \mathbb{C} -linear functional. We claim:

THEOREM 6.3.1 (Trivialization). Under the above notation,

$$(6.3.4) \quad \mathcal{S}_{[Y]}^\dagger: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \ni [[\psi, q]]_{[Y]}^\dagger \mapsto (\{\psi_i - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + Q\}_{i \in I}, q) \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$$

is a \mathbb{C} -isomorphism.

PROOF. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{\dagger}[\mathcal{U}] = 2 \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} = 6g - 6$, it suffices to show that the map (6.3.4) is injective.

Suppose that $[\psi, q]_{[Y]}^{\dagger}$ is in the kernel of the map (6.3.4). Let $(\psi, q) \in \ker(D_1^{Y, \dagger})$ be the representative of $[\psi, q]_{[Y]}^{\dagger}$. From the second coordinate, we have $q = 0$. From (6.3.2), $\bar{\partial}Q = \bar{\partial}\psi = 0$. Hence, Q is holomorphic. However, from the uniqueness condition (6.3.3), we have $Q = 0$, and hence $\psi = 0$. As a conclusion, we obtain $[\psi, q]_{[Y]}^{\dagger} = 0$. \square

6.4. Presentations of the pairings under trivializations

Let $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ and $[Y] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering of M_0 with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. Fix a guiding frame $\mathfrak{gf}: H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow L_{(-1,1)}^{\infty}(M_0)$ and the good section $\mathfrak{L}: Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ in Proposition 6.1.1. Consider the trivializations $\mathcal{S}_{[Y]}$ on $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ in Theorem 6.2.1 and $\mathcal{S}_{[Y]}^{\dagger}$ on $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{\dagger}[\mathcal{U}]$ in Theorem 6.3.1 defined from the guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} and the good section \mathfrak{L} .

Let $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ and $[\psi, q]_{[Y]}^{\dagger} \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{\dagger}[\mathcal{U}]$. Let (X, \dot{Y}) and (ψ, q) be the representatives. We continue to use the notation in §6.2 and §6.3 frequently. In the following discussion, we notice that though $E(X, Y)$ is determined up to $C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, the ambiguity does not affect in the calculation.

For $i, j \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} & X_{ij}(\psi_i - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + Q) + \left(\dot{Y}_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] - E(X, Y)_{ij} \right) q \\ &= X_{ij}\psi_i - \dot{Y}_{ij}q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q) \\ &\quad - X_{ij}L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + X_{ij}Q - \frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ij}]q - E(X, Y)_{ij}q - L_{Y_{ij}}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q) \end{aligned}$$

and the last five terms become

$$\begin{aligned} & -X_{ij}L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + X_{ij}Q - \frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ij}]q - E(X, Y)_{ij}q - L_{Y_{ij}}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q) \\ &= -(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i)L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + (\mathfrak{L}(X)_j - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i)Q \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}[\mathfrak{L}(X)_j - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j - \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]q - \frac{1}{2}[\mathfrak{L}(X)_j + \mathfrak{L}(X)_i, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j - \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]q \\ &\quad + (\sigma_j - \sigma_i)q - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_j - \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q) \\ &= -\mathfrak{L}(X)_j L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + \mathfrak{L}(X)_i L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + \mathfrak{L}(X)_j Q - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i Q \\ &\quad - [\mathfrak{L}(X)_j, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j]q + [\mathfrak{L}(X)_j, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]q \\ &\quad + (\sigma_j q - \sigma_i q - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_j}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q) - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q) \\ &= (\mathfrak{L}(X)_j Q + \sigma_j q - \mathfrak{L}(X)_j L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_j}(q)) - (\mathfrak{L}(X)_i Q + \sigma_i q - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q)) \\ &\quad - \mathfrak{L}(X)_j L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + [\mathfrak{L}(X)_j, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i]q + L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q) \\ &\quad + \mathfrak{L}(X)_j L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_j}(q) - [\mathfrak{L}(X)_j, \mathfrak{L}(Y)_j]q - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_j}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q) \\ &= (\mathfrak{L}(X)_j Q + \sigma_j q - \mathfrak{L}(X)_j L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_j}(q)) - (\mathfrak{L}(X)_i Q + \sigma_i q - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q)) \end{aligned}$$

from (5.2.5) since Q and q are global sections on M_0 . Hence, for $\Omega = \{\Omega_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ with

$$\Omega_j - \Omega_i = X_{ij}(\psi_i - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + Q) + \left(\dot{Y}_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] - E(X, Y)_{ij} \right) q,$$

we define $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ by

$$A_i = \Omega_i + (-\mathfrak{L}(X)_i Q - \sigma_i q + \mathfrak{L}(X)_i L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q)).$$

on U_i . Then, $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies

$$A_j - A_i = X_{ij} \psi_i - \dot{Y}_{j,i} q + L_{Y_{ij}}(\mathfrak{L}(X)_j q)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\partial} A_i - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}((\mathfrak{L}(X)_i)_{\bar{z}} q) \\ &= \bar{\partial} \Omega_i + \mathfrak{gf}([X]) Q - \mathfrak{L}(X)_i \bar{\partial}(L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q)) - [\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] q \\ & \quad + \mathfrak{gf}([X]) L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q) + \mathfrak{L}(X)_i \bar{\partial}(L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q)) - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(\mathfrak{gf}([X]) q) \\ &= \bar{\partial} \Omega_i + \mathfrak{gf}([X]) Q. \end{aligned}$$

from (5.2.9). Therefore, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} ((A_i)_{\bar{z}}(z) - L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}((\mathfrak{L}(X)_i)_{\bar{z}} q)(z)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} ((\Omega_i)_{\bar{z}}(z) + \mathfrak{gf}([X])(z) Q(z)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} d\Omega_i \end{aligned}$$

from the uniqueness condition (6.3.3) of Q . Thus, from (3.3.7), we obtain the following.

THEOREM 6.4.1 (Trivialization and Pairing). Under the above notation, for $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{[Y]}(\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y) &= ([X], [Z]) \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2} \\ (\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{T}_{x_0})((\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y)) &= ([\mu], [\hat{\nu}]) \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g \oplus T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g \\ \mathcal{S}_{[Y]}^\dagger(\llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger) &= (\varphi, q) \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\text{TT}}(\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}, \llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger) &= -\pi(\text{Res}(\llbracket X_{ij} \varphi \rrbracket_{i,j \in I}) + \text{Res}(\llbracket Z_{ij} q \rrbracket_{i,j \in I})) \\ &= \langle [\mu], \varphi \rangle + \langle [\hat{\nu}], q \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

6.5. Trivialization of the model space of $T_{q_0} T^* \mathcal{T}_g$ and $T_{q_0}^* T^* \mathcal{T}_g$, and the Pairing under the trivializations

As well as the previous sections, we fix a guiding frame $\mathfrak{gf}: H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0)$, and take \mathfrak{L} as Proposition 6.1.1. For $[X, \varphi] \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $[\Phi, Y] \in \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$, we take $Q, Q' \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}))$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial} Q_i &= \bar{\partial}(\varphi - L_{\mathfrak{L}(X)_i}(q_0)) = \bar{\partial}(L_{\mathfrak{L}(X)_i}(q_0)) \\ \bar{\partial} Q'_i &= \bar{\partial}(\Phi_i + L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q_0)) = -\bar{\partial}(L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q_0)) \end{aligned}$$

on U_i and

$$\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} \mathfrak{gf}([Z]) Q d\bar{z} \wedge dz = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} \mathfrak{gf}([Z]) Q' d\bar{z} \wedge dz = 0$$

for all $[Z] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$ as §6.3. We claim

THEOREM 6.5.1 (Trivialization). Under the above notation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{q_0}^* : \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \ni [X, \varphi]_{q_0} &\mapsto ([X], \{\varphi_i - L_{\mathfrak{L}(X)}(q_0) + Q\}_{i \in I}) \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \\ \mathcal{I}_{q_0}^{*\dagger} : \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \ni [\Phi, Y]_{q_0} &\mapsto (\Phi + L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)}(q_0) + Q', [Y]) \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \end{aligned}$$

are \mathbb{C} -isomorphisms.

PROOF. We only check that $\mathcal{I}_{q_0}^*$ is \mathbb{C} -isomorphic. Since the dimensions of the both sides are same, it suffices to show that the map is injective. Suppose that $[X, \varphi]_{q_0}$ is in the kernel of the map. Since $[X] = 0$, $X = \delta\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. From Proposition 6.1.1, $\mathfrak{L}(X) = \mathfrak{L}(\delta\alpha) = \alpha$. Thus,

$$\bar{\partial}Q = -\bar{\partial}(\psi - L_\alpha(q_0)) = 0$$

and hence $Q = 0$ and $\varphi = L_\alpha(q_0)$. Thus, we obtain

$$[X, \varphi]_{q_0} = [\delta\alpha, L_\alpha(q_0)]_{q_0} = 0$$

and we have done. \square

We define the pairing \mathcal{P}^\dagger between models $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$, and the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}$ on the model $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ at (5.7.1) and Proposition 5.7.2. We claim

THEOREM 6.5.2 (Pairing and Symplectic form under the trivializations). Under the above notation, for $[X, \varphi]_{q_0}, [X', \varphi']_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $[\Phi, Y]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{q_0}^*([X, \varphi]_{q_0}) &= ([X], \psi) = (\{\{X_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}\}, \{\psi_i\}_{i \in I}) \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \\ \mathcal{I}_{q_0}^*([X', \varphi']_{q_0}) &= ([X'], \psi') = (\{\{X'_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}\}, \{\psi'_i\}_{i \in I}) \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \\ \mathcal{I}_{q_0}^{*\dagger}([\Phi, Y]_{q_0}) &= (\Psi, [Y]) = (\{\Psi_i\}_{i \in I}, [\{Y_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}]) \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{T}_{x_0}([X]) = [\mu]$, $\mathcal{T}_{x_0}([X']) = [\mu']$, $\mathcal{T}_{x_0}([Y]) = [\nu] \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^\dagger([X, \varphi], [\Phi, Y]) &= -\pi(\text{Res}(\{\{X_{ij}\Psi_i\}_{i,j \in I}\}) + \text{Res}(\{\{Y_{ij}\psi_i\}_{i,j \in I}\})) \\ &= \langle [\mu], \Psi \rangle + \langle [\nu], \psi \rangle \\ \omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}([X, \varphi], [X', \varphi']) &= \frac{\pi}{2}(\text{Res}(\{\{X_{ij}\psi'_i\}_{i,j \in I}\}) - \text{Res}(\{\{X'_{ij}\psi_i\}_{i,j \in I}\})) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}(\langle [\mu], \psi' \rangle - \langle [\mu'], \psi \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. We only check the formula for the pairing. The formula for the symplectic form is also deduced by the similar argument. We use the notation given above frequently.

We define $\{\Omega_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ by

$$\Omega_i = \mathfrak{L}(X)_i \Psi_i + \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i \psi_i.$$

Then,

$$\Omega_j - \Omega_i = X_{ij} \Psi_i + Y_{ij} \psi_i$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\pi (\text{Res}([\{X_{ij}\Psi_i\}_{i,j \in I}]) + \text{Res}([\{Y_{ij}\psi_i\}_{i,j \in I}])) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} d\Omega_i = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (\mathfrak{gf}([X])\Psi_i + \mathfrak{gf}([Y])\psi_i) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (\mathfrak{gf}([X])(\Phi_i + L_{\mathfrak{L}(Y)_i}(q_0) + Q') + \mathfrak{gf}([Y])(\varphi_i - L_{\mathfrak{L}(X)_i}(q_0) + Q)) \\
&= \mathcal{P}^\dagger([X, \varphi], [\Phi, Y])
\end{aligned}$$

from the uniqueness condition for Q and Q' . \square

6.6. Dualities in model spaces

As we discussed in §3.2 and §3.3.3, the pairing defined by the residue

$$H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \ni ([X], \varphi) \mapsto -\pi \text{Res}([\{X_{ij}\varphi\}_{i,j \in I}]) \in \mathbb{C}$$

is non-degenerate, and gives a duality between $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} . Under the identification $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ with the tangent space $T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$, the duality gives a recognition of \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} as the cotangent space $T_{x_0}^*\mathcal{T}_g$.

Let $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$. As we observed that the models of pairings $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}}$ between $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$, and \mathcal{P}^\dagger between $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ are non-degenerate. Hence, these pairing makes $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ as the dual spaces of $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$, respectively.

Recall from Linear algebra, for vector spaces V and W , a natural isomorphism $(V \oplus W)^* \cong V^* \oplus W^*$ of the dual spaces of the direct sum is induced by the pairing

$$(V \oplus W) \times (V^* \oplus W^*) \ni ((v, w), (v^*, w^*)) \mapsto v^*(v) + w^*(w)$$

(e.g. [16, II.5, p.90]).

We now fix a guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} . Then we obtain the isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \\
\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}
\end{aligned}$$

via the trivializations defined from the guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} . From Theorem 6.4.1 and Theorem 6.5.2, the trivializations of the model spaces are natural in terms of the pairings.

As a consequence, the trivializations for $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ defined in Theorem 6.3.1 and Theorem 6.5.1 defined from the guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} naturally coincide with the isomorphisms of the dual spaces

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} = (H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}))^* \\
\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) = (H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0})^*
\end{aligned}$$

via the pairings.

Direct limits

In this section, we define \mathbb{C} -vector spaces $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger$ for a cohomology class $[Y] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$ by taking the direct limits, in a similar manner as the definition of the cohomologies of sheaves on spaces (cf. [19, §12.5] or [43, §3.3]). This spaces $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger$ are thought of the (ideal) model spaces of the double tangent space and the cotangent space at $[Y] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$ defined independently of the choice of locally finite coverings.

As we already discussed in §5.6.1, the direct limit $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ of the model of the tangent space $T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$ is already discussed by Hubbard and Masur in [28]. The direct limit $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ of the model of the cotangent space $T_{q_0}^* \mathcal{Q}_g$ is also treated in the same way. Moreover, by the standard argument, we see that the pairing and the holomorphic symplectic forms also descends to the direct limits (cf. §7.2). Hence, we treat only here the infinitesimal spaces over $T\overline{\mathcal{T}}_g$.

7.1. Direct limit of the model space $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$

7.1.1. Refinements and induced homomorphisms. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering on M_0 and $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a refinement of \mathcal{U} . In this case, we denote by $\mathcal{V} < \mathcal{U}$. For a sheaf \mathcal{S} on M_0 , let $\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}: C^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow C^k(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{S})$ be the homomorphism induced by the restriction (cf. [43, §3.3, Lemma 3.2]). The map is defined with a *refining map* $k: \Lambda \rightarrow I$ between indices with $V_\lambda \subset U_{k(\lambda)}$, and by restricting sections on $U_{k(\lambda)}$ to V_λ . The map $\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ is extended to a homomorphism between products of the groups of cochains and the cohomology groups. For the simplicity of the notation, we use the same symbol to denote the extension and the induced homomorphism between cohomology groups. One can easily check that

$$D_q^Y \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} \circ D_q^Y, \quad D_q^{Y;s} \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} \circ D_q^{Y;s}$$

for $s, q = 0, 1$. We first claim

LEMMA 7.1.1. The map $\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ induces a canonical homomorphism $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}[\mathcal{V}]$, which are uniquely defined by \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} .

PROOF. Since the map $\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ is defined by restricting, if the refining map $k: \Lambda \rightarrow I$ is fixed, the map $\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ (defined by k) defines well-defined linear maps

$$(7.1.1) \quad \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}[\mathcal{V}], \quad \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}[\mathcal{V}].$$

Let $k, j: \Lambda \rightarrow I$ be maps with $V_\lambda \subset U_{k(\lambda)} \cap U_{j(\lambda)}$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Let $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$. We define $Z, Z', W, W' \in C^1(\mathcal{V}, \Theta_{M_0})$, $\dot{W}, \dot{W}' \in C^1(\mathcal{V}, \Theta_{M_0})$, $\alpha, \beta, \dot{\gamma} \in C^0(\mathcal{V}, \Theta_{M_0})$ by

- $Z_{\lambda\mu} = X_{k(\lambda)k(\mu)}|_{V_\lambda \cap V_\mu}$, $Z'_{\lambda\mu} = X_{j(\lambda)j(\mu)}|_{V_\lambda \cap V_\mu}$,
- $W_{\lambda\mu} = Y_{k(\lambda)k(\mu)}|_{V_\lambda \cap V_\mu}$, $W'_{\lambda\mu} = Y_{j(\lambda)j(\mu)}|_{V_\lambda \cap V_\mu}$,

- $\dot{W}_{\lambda\mu} = \dot{Y}_{k(\lambda)k(\mu)}|_{V_\lambda \cap V_\mu}$, $\dot{W}'_{\lambda\mu} = \dot{Y}'_{j(\lambda)j(\mu)}|_{V_\lambda \cap V_\mu}$,
- $\alpha_\lambda = X_{k(\lambda)j(\lambda)}|_{V_\lambda}$, $\beta_\lambda = Y_{k(\lambda)j(\lambda)}|_{V_\lambda}$,
- $\dot{\gamma}_\lambda = \dot{Y}_{k(\lambda)j(\lambda)}|_{V_\lambda}$, and $\dot{\gamma}'_\lambda = \dot{Y}'_{j(\lambda)k(\lambda)}|_{V_\lambda}$

for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. Then, it is easy to see that $(Z, \dot{W}) \in \ker(D_1^W)$ and $(Z', \dot{W}') \in \ker(D_1^{W'})$. It is known that $[W] = [W'] = [\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]$ in $H^1(\mathcal{V}, \Theta_{M_0})$ (cf. [43, Lemma 3.2]).

We will show

$$(7.1.2) \quad \begin{cases} Z' = Z + \delta\alpha, & W' = W + \delta\beta \\ \dot{W}' = (\dot{W} + K'(\beta, Z)) + \delta\dot{\gamma} + K(\alpha, W'). \end{cases}$$

Indeed, (7.1.2) is equivalent to

$$(Z', \dot{W}') = \tilde{L}_{-\beta; W}(Z, \dot{W}) + D_0^{W'}(\alpha, \dot{\gamma})$$

and hence $[(Z', \dot{W}')]_{W'}$ is equivalent to $[(Z, \dot{W})]_W$ in $\mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}[\mathcal{V}]$ by Proposition 5.3.2. As a consequence, the induced linear map $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}[\mathcal{V}]$ is independent of the choice of the map $k: \Lambda \rightarrow I$ with $V_\lambda \subset U_{k(\lambda)}$.

We proceed to the proof of (7.1.2). Since X and Y are cocycles,

$$Z' = Z + \delta\alpha, \quad W' = W + \delta\beta.$$

Since $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$, (Z, \dot{W}) and (Z', \dot{W}') satisfy

$$(7.1.3) \quad \dot{\gamma}_\lambda + \dot{\gamma}'_\lambda + [\alpha_\lambda, \beta_\lambda] = 0$$

and

$$(7.1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{W}_{\lambda\mu} + \dot{Y}_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)} + \dot{\gamma}'_\lambda + \frac{1}{2}[Z_{\lambda\mu}, W_{\lambda\mu}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)}, Y_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)}] + \frac{1}{2}[-\alpha_\lambda, -\beta_\lambda] \\ - \frac{1}{2}[Z_{\lambda\mu}, Y_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)}] - \frac{1}{2}[W_{\lambda\mu}, X_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)}] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

(7.1.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma}'_\mu + \dot{Y}_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)} + \dot{W}'_{\lambda\mu} + \frac{1}{2}[-\alpha_\mu, -\beta_\mu] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)}, Y_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)}] + \frac{1}{2}[Z'_{\lambda\mu}, W'_{\lambda\mu}] \\ - \frac{1}{2}[-\alpha_\mu, Y_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)}] - \frac{1}{2}[-\beta_\mu, X_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)}] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} X_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)} &= \alpha_\mu - Z'_{\lambda\mu} = \alpha_\lambda - Z_{\lambda\mu} \\ Y_{k(\mu)j(\lambda)} &= \beta_\mu - W'_{\lambda\mu} = \beta_\lambda - W_{\lambda\mu}, \end{aligned}$$

by subtracting (7.1.5) from (7.1.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \dot{W}_{\lambda\mu} - \dot{W}'_{\lambda\mu} + \left(\dot{\gamma}'_\lambda + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\lambda, \beta_\lambda] \right) - \left(\dot{\gamma}'_\mu + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu] \right) + \frac{1}{2}[Z_{\lambda\mu}, W_{\lambda\mu}] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}[Z'_{\lambda\mu}, W'_{\lambda\mu}] + \frac{1}{2}[\beta_\lambda, Z_{\lambda\mu}] + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\lambda, W_{\lambda\mu}] + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\mu, W'_{\lambda\mu}] + \frac{1}{2}[\beta_\mu, Z'_{\lambda\mu}]. \end{aligned}$$

The last six terms of the right-hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &- [Z_{\lambda\mu}, \beta_\mu] + [\alpha_\lambda, W'_{\lambda\mu}] - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu] + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\lambda, \beta_\lambda] \\ &= K'(\beta, Z)_{\lambda\mu} + K(\alpha, W')_{\lambda\mu} - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu] + \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\lambda, \beta_\lambda]. \end{aligned}$$

From (7.1.3), we obtain (7.1.2). \square

We claim the following (Compare [43, Theorem 3.4]).

LEMMA 7.1.2. Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} be locally finite coverings of M_0 with $\mathcal{V} < \mathcal{U}$. Let $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}[\mathcal{V}]$ be the induced homomorphism. Then

- (a) $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ maps $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V[\mathcal{U}]$ to $\mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}^V[\mathcal{V}]$; and
- (b) $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ is injective.

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. We denote by $k: \Lambda \rightarrow I$ the map defining the induced map $\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$. Let $W = \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)$.

(a) Let $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_Y \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V[\mathcal{U}]$. There is an $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that $X = \delta\alpha$. Then, $\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(X) = \delta(\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha))$ and hence

$$[[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(X), \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(\dot{Y})]]_Y = [[\delta(\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha)), \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(\dot{Y})]]_Y \in \mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}^V[\mathcal{V}].$$

(b) Let $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ with $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}([[X, \dot{Y}]]_{[Y]}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{T}_{[\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}[\mathcal{V}]$. Take $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(\mathcal{V}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(X) = \delta\alpha, \quad \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(\dot{Y}) = \delta\beta + K(\alpha, W).$$

For $i \in I$,

$$X_{k(\lambda)i} + X_{ik(\mu)} = X_{k(\lambda)k(\mu)} = \alpha_\mu - \alpha_\lambda$$

and $X_{k(\lambda)i} + \alpha_\lambda = X_{k(\mu)i} + \alpha_\mu$ on $U_i \cap V_\lambda \cap V_\mu$. Hence $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ is defined by

$$A_i = X_{k(\lambda)i} + \alpha_\lambda$$

on $U_i \cap V_\lambda$ for $i \in I$. The cochain A satisfies

$$A_j - A_i = (X_{k(\lambda)j} + \alpha_\lambda) - (X_{k(\lambda)i} + \alpha_\lambda) = X_{ij}$$

on $U_i \cap U_j \cap V_\lambda$ for $i, j \in I$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. This mean that $\delta A = X$. Notice from the definition that $A_{k(\lambda)} = X_{k(\lambda)k(\lambda)} + \alpha_\lambda = \alpha_\lambda$ on $V_\lambda = U_{k(\lambda)} \cap V_\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

Since $\delta A = X$, from the definition of D_1^W (see (5.3.8)) and (5.3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \dot{Y}_{k(\lambda)i} + \dot{Y}_{ik(\lambda)} + [X_{ik(\lambda)}, Y_{ik(\lambda)}] \\ &= (\dot{Y}_{k(\lambda)i} - [A_{k(\lambda)}, Y_{k(\lambda)i}]) + (\dot{Y}_{ik(\lambda)} - [A_i, Y_{ik(\lambda)}]) \\ 0 &= \left(\delta \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(\dot{Y}) + \frac{1}{2} [\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(X), \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)] \right) - \zeta(\Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(X), \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)) \right)_{ik(\lambda)k(\mu)} \\ &= \dot{Y}_{ik(\lambda)} + \dot{Y}_{k(\lambda)k(\mu)} + \dot{Y}_{k(\mu)i} - [A_i, Y_{ik(\lambda)}] - [A_{k(\lambda)}, Y_{k(\lambda)k(\mu)}] - [A_{k(\mu)}, Y_{k(\mu)i}] \\ &= (\dot{Y}_{ik(\lambda)} - [A_i, Y_{ik(\lambda)}]) + (\beta_\mu - \beta_\lambda + [A_{k(\lambda)}, Y_{k(\lambda)k(\mu)}]) - (\dot{Y}_{ik(\mu)} - [A_i, Y_{ik(\mu)}]) \\ &\quad - [A_{k(\lambda)}, Y_{k(\lambda)k(\mu)}] \\ &= (\dot{Y}_{ik(\lambda)} - [A_i, Y_{ik(\lambda)}] - \beta_\lambda) - (\dot{Y}_{ik(\mu)} - [A_i, Y_{ik(\mu)}] - \beta_\mu). \end{aligned}$$

on $U_i \cap V_\lambda \cap V_\mu$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ and $i \in I$. Therefore, $B = \{B_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ is defined by

$$B_i = -\dot{Y}_{ik(\lambda)} + [A_i, Y_{ik(\lambda)}] + \beta_\lambda$$

on $U_i \cap V_\lambda$, and the cochain B satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta B)_{ij} &= -(\dot{Y}_{jk(\lambda)} - [A_j, Y_{jk(\lambda)}] - \beta_\lambda) + (\dot{Y}_{ik(\lambda)} - [A_i, Y_{ik(\lambda)}] - \beta_\lambda) \\ &= (\dot{Y}_{k(\lambda)j} - [A_{k(\lambda)}, Y_{jk(\lambda)}]) + (\dot{Y}_{ik(\lambda)} - [A_i, Y_{ik(\lambda)}]) \\ &= -(\dot{Y}_{ji} - [A_j, Y_{ji}]) = \dot{Y}_{ij} - [A_i, Y_{ij}]. \end{aligned}$$

on $U_i \cap U_j \cap V_\lambda$. Therefore

$$\dot{Y} = \delta B + K(A, Y),$$

and $D_0^Y(A, B) = (X, \dot{Y})$. Thus, we obtain $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} = 0$ in $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$. \square

7.1.2. The direct limit $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}$ for $[Y] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$. It is known that a canonical homomorphism $\Pi^{\mathcal{U}}: H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \rightarrow H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$ defined from the direct limit via refinements is injective (cf. [43, Theorem 3.4]). For the simplicity of notation, for a cocycle $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, we denote by $[Y]$ the cohomology class of Y in both $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and $H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$.

Let \mathcal{U} , \mathcal{V} , and \mathcal{W} be locally finite coverings of M_0 with $\mathcal{W} < \mathcal{V} < \mathcal{U}$. It is easy to see that the homomorphism $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ in Lemma 7.1.1 satisfies that $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\mathcal{U}} = id$ and

$$\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathcal{V}} \circ \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} = \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathcal{U}}.$$

Therefore, the *direct limit*

$$\mathbb{T}_{[Y]} = \varinjlim_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$$

is well-defined (in this case, the totality of the locally finite coverings of M_0 is thought of as a directed set such that \mathcal{U} precedes \mathcal{V} if \mathcal{V} is a refinement of \mathcal{U}). From Lemma 7.1.2, the induced homomorphism

$$\check{\Pi}^{\mathcal{U}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}$$

is injective (cf. [33, II, Proposition 0.3]).

7.1.3. Structure of the direct limit $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}$. From Proposition 5.3.1, (5.3.2), (b) of Lemma 6.2.1, Theorem 6.2.1, we notice the following.

PROPOSITION 7.1.1. Let $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Then,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \\ & & [W] & \longrightarrow & \llbracket \delta\alpha, W + K(\alpha, Y) \rrbracket_Y & & \\ & & & & \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y & \longrightarrow & [X] \end{array}$$

is exact. In particular, the dimension of $\mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ is at most the twice of that of $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. In addition, when $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for all i ,

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \longrightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact.

We discuss the exact sequences in Proposition 7.1.1 for various locally finite coverings. Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are locally finite coverings with $\mathcal{V} < \mathcal{U}$. From (a) of Lemma 7.1.2, the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{\mathcal{V}}[\mathcal{U}] & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \longrightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \\ & & \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} \downarrow & & \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} \downarrow & & \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} \downarrow & & \Pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{V}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{\mathcal{V}}[\mathcal{V}] & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{V}] \longrightarrow H^1(\mathcal{V}, \Theta_{M_0}). \end{array}$$

Therefore, there is a \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism

$$\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\mathbb{T}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$$

and the following diagram is commute:

$$(7.1.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol, V}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{inc} & \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{onto} & T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g \\ \mathcal{T}_{x_0} \uparrow & & \mathcal{D}_0 \downarrow & & \mathcal{D}_0 \downarrow & & \mathcal{T}_{x_0} \uparrow \\ H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{inc} & \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{onto} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}), \end{array}$$

where the first horizontal line is the exact sequence (7.1.7) and “inc” means the inclusion.

7.2. Direct limit of $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger$ for $[Y] \in H^0(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$

For locally finite coverings \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} of M_0 with $\mathcal{V} < \mathcal{U}$, we can see that the refinement $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ commutes $D_1^{Y, \dagger}$ and $\check{L}_{\beta, Y}^\dagger$ on $C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})^{\oplus 2}$ for $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Therefore, we have a well-defined map

$$\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}}(Y)]}^\dagger[\mathcal{V}].$$

and $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathcal{V}} \circ \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{U}} = \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathcal{U}}$ for locally finite coverings $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$ with $\mathcal{W} < \mathcal{V} < \mathcal{U}$. Therefore, the direct limit

$$\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger = \varinjlim_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}]$$

exists. The isomorphism

$$\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$$

given in Theorem 6.3.1 naturally induces a \mathbb{C} -isomorphism

$$\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$$

which commutes the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \\ \check{\Pi}^{\mathcal{U}} \downarrow & & \parallel \\ \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}. \end{array}$$

We can also check that the pairing

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \oplus \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

defined at Definition 8 also descends to the non-degenerate pairing $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}}$ between the direct limits $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]} \oplus \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger$ (cf. Proposition 5.5.1).

Double tangent spaces to Teichmüller space

One of the main purpose of this chapter is to show Theorem 8.3.1, which says that the direct limit $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}$ of the model space for $[Y] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$ defined in §7.1.2 naturally stands for the double tangent space $T_v T \mathcal{T}_g$ of \mathcal{T}_g at the tangent vector $v \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$ corresponding to $[Y]$.

8.1. Holomorphic families, charts and cochains

In this section, we shall discuss the cocycles for the double tangent space defined from holomorphic families of Riemann surfaces. We will see that the maps D_0^Y and D_1^Y defined in §5.3.2 naturally appear in the calculation. Moreover, the calculations given in this section will be used in §8.2 to show that the model spaces discussed in §5.3 and §5.4 are exactly the models of the double tangent space.

8.1.1. Families and charts. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $D = \{(t, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid |t|, |s| < \epsilon_0\}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow D$ be a holomorphic family of Riemann surfaces of genus g with the fiber at $(0, 0) \in D$ is biholomorphically equivalent to M_0 . Let $M_{t,s}$ be the fiber over $(t, s) \in D$. After a trivialization (as the differential family) $\mathcal{M}_0 \cong M_0 \times D$, when we take $\epsilon_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, there is a complex analytic chart $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 and a family of diffeomorphisms $U_i \times D_i \ni (p, t, s) \mapsto \hat{z}_i(p, t, s) := (z_i^{t,s}(p), t, s) \in \mathbb{C} \times D$ (onto its image) such that the chart $\{(U_i \times D, \hat{z}_i)\}_{i \in I}$ makes $M_0 \times D$ the total space of holomorphic family of Riemann surfaces of genus g which is isomorphic to \mathcal{M}_0 with fixing the parameter space D . For $(t, s) \in D$, the analytic coordinate chart $\mathcal{U}^{t,s} = \{(U_i, z_i^{t,s})\}_{i \in I}$ on M_0 makes a base surface of M_0 a Riemann surface conformally equivalent to $M_{t,s}$. We may assume that $z_i^{0,0}(U_i) = \mathbb{D}$ for each $i \in I$. We fix a notation:

$$\begin{aligned} W_i^{t,s}(z) &= z_i^{t,s} \circ z_i^{0,0}(z) \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}) \\ U_i^{t,s} &= z_i^{t,s}(U_i) \\ U_{ij}^{t,s} &= z_i^{t,s}(U_i \cap U_j) \\ z_{ij}^{t,s} &= z_i^{t,s} \circ (z_j^{t,s})^{-1}: U_{ji}^{t,s} \rightarrow U_{ij}^{t,s}. \end{aligned}$$

When $s = 0$, we set $z_i^t = z_i^{t,0}$, $U_i^t = U_i^{t,0}$, $U_{ij}^t = U_{ij}^{t,0}$, and $z_{ij}^t = z_{ij}^{t,0}$ for simplicity.

8.1.2. Cochains. For $i, j \in I$ with $i \neq j$ and $U_i \cap U_j \neq \emptyset$, let

$$\tilde{U}_{ij} = \{((t, s), z) \in D \times \mathbb{C} \mid z \in U_{ij}^{t,s}\}.$$

Then \tilde{U}_{ij} is a domain in \mathbb{C}^3 . From the assumption,

$$\tilde{U}_{ji} \ni ((t, s), z) \mapsto ((t, s), z_{ij}^{t,s}(z)) \in \tilde{U}_{ij}$$

is a biholomorphism. For $t \in D$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} X_{ij}^t &= \frac{\partial z_{ij}^t}{\partial t} \circ z_{ji}^t(z) \partial_{z_i^t} \in \Gamma(U_{ij}^t, \Theta_{M_0}) \\ Y_{ij}^t &= \left. \frac{\partial z_{ij}^{t,s}}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} \circ z_{ji}^t(z) \partial_{z_i^t} \in \Gamma(U_{ij}^t, \Theta_{M_0}) \\ \dot{Y}_{ij} &= \left. \frac{\partial Y_{ij}^t}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} (z) \partial_{z_i^0} \in \Gamma(U_{ij}^0, \Theta_{M_0}). \end{aligned}$$

We set $\dot{Y}_{ii} = 0$, $X_{ij} = X_{ij}^0$, $Y_{ij} = Y_{ij}^0$. Then

$$(8.1.1) \quad X = \{X_{ij}\}_{i,j}, Y = \{Y_{ij}\}_{i,j} \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}), \dot{Y} = \{\dot{Y}_{ij}\}_{i,j} \in C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}).$$

From (3.3.3), the cohomology classes $[X], [Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ are corresponds to $\dot{\varphi}$, $\psi_0 \in B_2 = T_0 \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ via the natural identification $T_0 \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

8.1.3. Relations between cochains. The following proposition implies that $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$ for X and \dot{Y} defined in (8.1.1).

PROPOSITION 8.1.1. Under the above notation, \dot{Y} satisfies

- (a) $\dot{Y}_{ij} + \dot{Y}_{ji} + [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] = 0$ for $i, j \in I$; and
- (b) Let $Z_{ij} = \dot{Y}_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ij}]$. Then

$$(8.1.2) \quad Z_{ij} + Z_{ji} = 0$$

$$(8.1.3) \quad Z_{ij} + Z_{jk} + Z_{ki} - \zeta(X, Y)_{ijk} = 0$$

for $i, j, k \in I$.

PROOF. (a) From the definition, for $z \in U_{ij}^0 = z_i^0(U_i \cap U_j)$, $z \in U_{ij}^t$ for sufficiently small $t \in D$ and

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{ji}^t(z_{ji}^t(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^t)'(z)} &= Y_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} \\ &+ t(\dot{Y}_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) + Y_{ji}'(z_{ji}^0(z))X_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) - Y_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z))X_{ji}'(z_{ji}^0(z))) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} \\ &+ o(|t|) \\ &= Y_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} + t(\dot{Y}_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) + [X_{ji}, Y_{ji}](z_{ji}^0(z))) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} \\ &+ o(|t|) \\ Y_{ij}^t(z) &= Y_{ij}(z) + t\dot{Y}_{ij}(z) + o(|t|). \end{aligned}$$

Since $Y_{ij}^t(\partial/\partial z_i^0) + Y_{ji}^t(\partial/\partial z_j^0) = 0$ for $t \in D$, we obtain

$$\dot{Y}_{ij}(z) + (\dot{Y}_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) + [X_{ji}, Y_{ji}](z_{ji}^0(z))) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} = 0,$$

which implies what we wanted.

(b) (8.1.2) follows from (a) since

$$[X_{ji}, Y_{ji}] = [-X_{ij}, -Y_{ij}] = [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}].$$

We shall check (8.1.3). Let $z \in z_i^0(U_i \cap U_j \cap U_k)$. Since $\{Y_{ij}^t\}_{i,j}$ is a 1-cocycle for $t \in D$, $Y_{ij}^t + Y_{jk}^t + Y_{ki}^t = 0$, which is equivalent to

$$Y_{ij}^t(z) + Y_{jk}(z_{ji}^t(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^t)'(z)} + Y_{ki}^t(z_{ki}^t(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ki}^t)'(z)} = 0.$$

From the calculation, we can see

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{ij}^t(z) &= Y_{ij}(z) + t\dot{Y}_{ij}(z) + o(|t|) \\ Y_{jk}(z_{ji}^t(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^t)'(z)} &= Y_{jk}(z_{ji}^0(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} \\ &\quad + t(\dot{Y}_{jk}(z_{ji}^0(z)) + [X_{ji}, Y_{jk}](z_{ji}^0(z))) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} + o(|t|) \\ Y_{ki}^t(z_{ki}^t(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ki}^t)'(z)} &= Y_{ki}(z_{ki}^0(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ki}^0)'(z)} \\ &\quad + t(\dot{Y}_{ki}(z_{ki}^0(z)) + [X_{ki}, Y_{ki}](z_{ki}^0(z))) \frac{1}{(z_{ki}^0)'(z)} + o(|t|) \end{aligned}$$

as $t \rightarrow 0$. Therefore,

$$(8.1.4) \quad \dot{Y}_{ij} + \dot{Y}_{jk} + \dot{Y}_{ki} + [X_{ji}, Y_{jk}] + [X_{ki}, Y_{ki}] = 0.$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{jk}, Y_{jk}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{ki}, Y_{ki}] - \frac{1}{2}([X_{ij}, Y_{jk}] + [Y_{ij}, X_{jk}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ik} + Y_{kj}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{jk}, Y_{ji} + Y_{ik}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{ki}, Y_{ki}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{ji}, Y_{jk}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{jk}, Y_{ij}] \\ &= [X_{ji}, Y_{jk}] + [Y_{ki}, Y_{ki}] - \frac{1}{2}[X_{ki}, Y_{ki}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{ij}, Y_{ik}] + \frac{1}{2}[X_{jk}, Y_{ik}] \\ &= [X_{ji}, Y_{jk}] + [Y_{ki}, Y_{ki}], \end{aligned}$$

(8.1.4) is equivalent to (8.1.3). \square

8.1.4. Connection to Dolbeaut presentation. We continue to use the symbols defined and discussed in the previous sections. For $(t, s) \in D$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i^s &= - \left. \frac{\partial W_i^{t,s}}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} \circ (W_i^{0,s})^{-1}(z) \partial_{z_i^{0,s}} \in \Gamma(U_i^{0,s}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \\ \eta_i^t &= - \left. \frac{\partial W_i^{t,s}}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} \circ (W_i^{t,0})^{-1}(z) \partial_{z_i^t} \in \Gamma(U_i^t, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \\ \dot{\xi}_i &= \left. \frac{\partial \xi_i^s}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} (z) \partial_{z_i^0}, \quad \dot{\xi}_i^* = \left. \frac{\partial \xi_i^s}{\partial \bar{s}} \right|_{s=0} (z) \partial_{z_i^0} \in \Gamma(U_i^0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \\ \dot{\eta}_i &= \left. \frac{\partial \eta_i^t}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} (z) \partial_{z_i^0}, \quad \dot{\eta}_i^* = \left. \frac{\partial \eta_i^t}{\partial \bar{t}} \right|_{t=0} (z) \partial_{z_i^0} \in \Gamma(U_i^0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0})) \\ X_{ij}^s &= \left. \frac{\partial z_{ij}^{t,s}}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} \circ z_{ji}^{0,s}(z) \partial_{z_i^{0,s}} \in \Gamma(U_{ij}^{0,s}, \Theta_{M_0}) \\ \dot{X}_{ij} &= \left. \frac{\partial X_{ij}^s}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} (z) \partial_{z_i^0} \in \Gamma(U_{ij}^0, \Theta_{M_0}). \end{aligned}$$

For signs of ξ_i^s and η_i^s , see §13.1. We set $\dot{X}_{ii} = 0$ and $\dot{X} = \{\dot{X}_{ij}\}_{i,j} \in C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta)$. From the definition,

$$\xi_j^s - \xi_i^s = X_{ij}^s, \quad \eta_j^t - \eta_i^t = Y_{ij}^t.$$

REMARK 8.1.1. ξ_i^s and η_i^t may not depend holomorphically in s, t in general. For instance, see Masumoto's example in [81, §3].

PROPOSITION 8.1.2. Under the above notation, \dot{X} and \dot{Y} satisfy the following.

$$(8.1.5) \quad \dot{Y}_{ij} = \dot{\eta}_j - \dot{\eta}_i - [\eta_j^0, X_{ji}] = \dot{\eta}_j - \dot{\eta}_i + [\eta_j^0, X_{ij}]$$

$$(8.1.6) \quad \dot{X}_{ij} = \dot{\xi}_j - \dot{\xi}_i - [\xi_j^0, Y_{ji}] = \dot{\xi}_j - \dot{\xi}_i + [\xi_j^0, Y_{ij}]$$

$$(8.1.7) \quad \dot{\eta}_j^* - \dot{\eta}_i^* = (\eta_i^0)_{\bar{z}} \overline{X_{ij}}$$

$$(8.1.8) \quad \dot{\xi}_j^* - \dot{\xi}_i^* = (\xi_i^0)_{\bar{z}} \overline{Y_{ij}}$$

$$(8.1.9) \quad \dot{X}_{ij} - \dot{Y}_{ij} = [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}].$$

In particular,

$$(8.1.10) \quad \dot{Y}_{ij} = \dot{\xi}_j - \dot{\xi}_i + [\xi_i^0, Y_{ij}]$$

$$(8.1.11) \quad \dot{\eta}_i = \dot{\xi}_i + [\xi_i, \eta_i] + \chi,$$

where χ is a (global) vector field on M_0 .

PROOF. For $z \in U_{ij}^0$, $z \in U_{ij}^{t,s}$ for sufficiently small $(t, s) \in D$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_j^t(z_{ji}^t(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^t)'(z)} &= \eta_j^0(z_{ji}^0(z)) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} \\ &+ t \left(\dot{\eta}_j(z_{ji}(z)) + (\eta_j^0)_z(z_{ji}(z)) X_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) - \eta_j^0(z_{ji}^0(z)) X'_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) \right) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} \\ &+ \bar{t} \left(\dot{\eta}_j^*(z_{ji}(z)) + (\eta_j^0)_{\bar{z}}(z_{ji}(z)) \overline{X_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z))} \right) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} + o(|t|) \\ \eta_i^t(z) &= \eta_i^0(z) + t \dot{\eta}_i(z) + \bar{t} \dot{\eta}_i^*(z) + o(|t|) \\ Y_{ij}^t(z) &= Y_{ij}(z) + t \dot{Y}_{ij}(z) + o(|t|). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the relation $\eta_j^t - \eta_i^t = Y_{ij}^t$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{Y}_{ij}(z) &= \left(\dot{\eta}_j(z_{ji}^0(z)) + [X_{ji}, \eta_j^0](z_{ji}^0(z)) \right) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} - \dot{\eta}_i(z) \\ 0 &= \left(\dot{\eta}_j^*(z_{ji}(z)) + (\eta_j^0)_{\bar{z}}(z_{ji}(z)) \overline{X_{ji}(z)} \right) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} - \dot{\eta}_i^*(z), \end{aligned}$$

which are equivalent to (8.1.5) and (8.1.7). By the same calculation, we also have (8.1.6) and (8.1.8).

Next we prove (8.1.9). As the discussion above, for $z \in U_{ij}^0$, $z \in U_{ij}^{t,s}$ for sufficiently small $(t, s) \in D$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{Y}_{ij}(z) &= \frac{\partial Y_{ij}^t}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0} (z) = \partial_t \left(\frac{\partial z_{ij}^{t,s}}{\partial s} \Big|_{s=0} \circ z_{ji}^{t,0}(z) \right) \Big|_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{\partial^2 z_{ij}^{t,s}}{\partial s \partial t} \Big|_{((t,s)=(0,0))} \circ z_{ji}^0(z) + Y_{ij}'(z) \frac{1}{(z_{ji}^0)'(z)} \cdot X_{ji}(z_{ji}^0(z)) \\ &= \frac{\partial^2 z_{ij}^{t,s}}{\partial s \partial t} \Big|_{((t,s)=(0,0))} \circ z_{ji}^0(z) - Y_{ij}'(z) X_{ij}(z) \\ \dot{X}_{ij}(z) &= \frac{\partial^2 z_{ij}^{t,s}}{\partial t \partial s} \Big|_{((t,s)=(0,0))} \circ z_{ji}^0(z) - X_{ij}'(z) Y_{ij}(z), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (8.1.9). (8.1.10) follows from (8.1.6) and (8.1.9). (8.1.11) is deduced from (8.1.5) and (8.1.6). \square

REMARK 8.1.2. Equation (8.1.9) leads the formulation of the flip on $TT\mathcal{T}_g$ (cf. Theorem 10.2.1). Equation (8.1.10) means that \dot{Y} is in the image of the connection homomorphism \mathcal{D}_0 which is discussed in §5.4.1.

8.2. Double tangent space over Teichmüller space

In this section, we will show that the model space $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ for $[Y] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$ defined in Definition 3 is naturally regarded as the double tangent space $T_v T\mathcal{T}_g$ of \mathcal{T}_g for $v \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$ corresponding to $[Y]$, when the covering \mathcal{U} satisfies an appropriate condition. Namely, throughout this section, we assume that a locally covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 satisfies that for each $i \in I$, \bar{U}_i is an embedded closed topological disk in M_0 with smooth boundary. In this case, $H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ since $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for all $i \in I$.

8.2.1. Double tangent spaces on domains revisited. Suppose M is a domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Let (z^1, \dots, z^n) be the standard coordinates of \mathbb{C}^n . Then, TM is biholomorphic to $M \times \mathbb{C}^n$ by

$$M \times \mathbb{C}^n \ni (p, \eta) \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^n \eta^k (\partial_{z^k})_p \in TM$$

TTM is biholomorphic to $(M \times \mathbb{C}^n) \times (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n)$ by

$$(8.2.1) \quad (M \times \mathbb{C}^n) \times (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n) \ni (p, \eta, \alpha, \beta) \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha^k (\partial_{z^k})_u + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta^k (\partial_{\eta^k})_u \in TTM$$

for $u = \sum_{k=1}^n \eta^k (\partial_{z^k})_p \in TM$. Namely, in the trivialization (8.2.1), a tangent vector $(p, \eta, \alpha, \beta) \in TTM = (M \times \mathbb{C}^n) \times (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n)$ is represented by a holomorphic disk

$$\{|t| < \epsilon\} \ni t \mapsto (\chi_1(t), \chi_2(t)) = (p + t\alpha + o(|t|), \eta + t\beta + o(|t|)) \quad (t \rightarrow 0).$$

in $TM = M \times \mathbb{C}^n$. Under these notation, a holomorphic polydisk

$$\begin{aligned} \{|t| < \epsilon\} \times \{|s| < \epsilon\} \in (t, s) &\mapsto \chi(t, s) = \chi_1(t) + s\chi_2(t) \\ &= p + t\alpha + s(\eta + t\beta) + \beta' t^2 + \beta'' s^2 + o((|t| + |s|)^2) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\beta', \beta'' \in \mathbb{C}^n$ as $t, s \rightarrow 0$ in M satisfies that the partial derivative $\frac{\partial \chi}{\partial s}(t, 0)$ at $(t, 0)$ represents the tangent vector $\chi_2(t)$ at $\chi_1(t) \in M$.

8.2.2. Double tangent spaces over Teichmüller spaces. We use symbols defined in §3.1.3 frequently. As §3.1.3, we fix $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$, the Fuchsian group Γ_0 acting on \mathbb{D} with $\mathbb{D}/\Gamma_0 = M_0$.

We identify the Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g with a bounded domain $\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \subset B_2$ via the Bers embedding \mathcal{B}_{x_0} . The tangent bundle $T\mathcal{T}_g$ of \mathcal{T}_g is (holomorphically) isomorphic to a trivial holomorphic vector bundle $T\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \times B_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ as we already discussed in §3.2.2. Since the Ahlfors-Weill section \mathcal{A}_{x_0} defined in (3.1.3) is \mathbb{C} -linear, after identifying $L_{(-1,1)}^\infty(M_0) \cong L^\infty(\mathbb{D}, \Gamma_0)$,

$$(8.2.2) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{x_0}: T_0\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = B_2 \ni \psi \mapsto [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi)] = D\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B|_0 \circ \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi) \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$$

is the inverse of the differential $D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0}: T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow T_0\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ of the Bers embedding \mathcal{B}_{x_0} at $x_0 \in \mathcal{T}_g$.

Since $\mathcal{B}_{x_0}: \mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ is biholomorphic, the double tangent space $TT\mathcal{T}_g$ is also a trivial holomorphic vector bundle which is isomorphic to the product spaces $TT\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = (\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \times B_2) \times (B_2 \times B_2)$.

Let

$$(8.2.3) \quad (0, \psi_0, \dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi}) \in TT\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = (\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \times B_2) \times (B_2 \times B_2),$$

where $(0, \psi_0) \in T_0\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ and $(\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi}) \in T_{(0, \psi_0)}TT\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ and $\dot{\varphi} \in T_0\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$.

8.2.3. Holomorphic families. Consider a holomorphic map $\chi(t) = (\varphi_t, \psi_t)$ from $D_1 = \{|t| < \epsilon_0\}$ to $T\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \times B_2$ such that

$$(8.2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi_t = t\dot{\varphi} + o(|t|) \\ \psi_t = \psi_0 + t\dot{\psi} + o(|t|) \end{cases}$$

as $t \rightarrow 0$. The map χ is a holomorphic disk tangent to $(\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi}) \in T_{(0, \psi_0)}TT\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ at the origin $0 \in D_1$.

Let $D_2 = \{|s| < \epsilon_0\}$. For $(t, s) \in D = D_1 \times D_2$,

$$(8.2.5) \quad \mu(t, s)(z) = \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\varphi_t + s\psi_t) = -\frac{1}{2\bar{z}^4}(|z|^2 - 1)^2(\varphi_t(1/\bar{z}) + s\psi_t(1/\bar{z}))$$

is regarded as a (real analytic) $(-1, 1)$ -form on M_0 (cf. (3.1.3)). When ϵ_0 is sufficiently small, $\|\mu(t, s)\|_\infty < 1$ for $(t, s) \in D$. Hence, the bundle $\mathcal{M} = \cup_{(t,s)} M_{t,s}$ of the $\mu(t, s)$ -quasiconformal deformations $M_{t,s}$ of M_0 defines a holomorphic family $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow D$ of Riemann surfaces of genus g .

For $(t, s) \in D$, let $\mu_i(t, s) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ be the representation of $\mu(t, s)$ via the chart (U_i, z_i^0) . Let $W_i^{t,s}$ be a quasiconformal mapping on $z_i^0(U_i) = \mathbb{D}$ such that

- (i) $\bar{\partial}W_i^{t,s} = \mu_i(t, s)\partial W_i^{t,s}$ on \mathbb{D} ; and
- (ii) each $W_i^{t,s}$ ($i \in I, (t, s) \in D$) is normalized in the sense that $W_i^{t,s}$ is extended to a quasiconformal mapping on \mathbb{C} with $W_i^{t,s}(z) = z + o(1)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$.

We shrink U_i so that each $\mu_i(t, s)$ is smooth on the closure of \mathbb{D} . Let $z_i^{t,s} = W_i^{t,s} \circ z_i^0$ and define $\hat{z}_i: U_i \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \times D$ by $\hat{z}_i(0, t, s) = (z_i^{t,s}(p), t, s)$. Then, $\{U_i \times D, \hat{z}_i\}$ is a complex analytic chart on $M_0 \times D$, which is total space of the holomorphic family of Riemann surfaces of genus g which isomorphic to $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow D$ (cf. [12]).

8.2.4. Double tangent space and its model. From the discussion in §8.1.2, we define the cochains X^t, Y^s, \dot{Y} and $\xi^0, \eta^0, \dot{\xi} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ from the coordinate system defined in the previous section. By definition

$$\delta\xi^0 = X \quad \text{and} \quad \delta\eta^0 = Y.$$

Notice from (3.3.3) that $[X], [Y] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$ naturally correspond to $\dot{\varphi}, \psi_0 \in B_2$ under the isomorphism $B_2 = T_0\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$.

THEOREM 8.2.1 (Double tangent space and its model). Under the above symbols, the map

$$(8.2.6) \quad \mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}: T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g \cong T_{(0, \psi_0)}T\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = B_2 \times B_2 \ni (\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi}) \mapsto \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}]$$

is a \mathbb{C} -linear isomorphism.

Furthermore, when we choose the Ahlfors-Weill guiding frame $\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f} = \mathcal{A}_{x_0} \circ D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{I}_{x_0}$ (discussed in (6.1.1)) as the guiding frame for the trivializations, the isomorphism $\mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}$ satisfies the following commutative diagram:

$$(8.2.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} T_{(0, \psi_0)}T\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}} & \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] & \xleftarrow{\mathcal{D}_0} & \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol} \\ \downarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{x_0} \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{x_0} & & \downarrow \mathcal{I}_Y & & \downarrow \mathcal{I}_Y^D \\ (T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g)^{\oplus 2} & \xleftarrow{\mathcal{I}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{I}_{x_0}} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{I}_{x_0}} & (T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g)^{\oplus 2} \end{array}$$

(cf. See Remark 6.2.1).

PROOF. We set

$$\mu_i(t, s) = t\mu_i^1 + s\mu_i^2 + ts\mu_i^3 + t^2\mu_i^4 + s^2\mu_i^5 + o((|t| + |s|)^2)$$

as $|t| + |s| \rightarrow 0$, where μ_i^1, μ_i^2 and μ_i^3 are the presentations in the coordinate chart (U_i, z_i^0) of $\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\varphi}), \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_0)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\psi})$. μ_i^4 and μ_i^5 are some smooth Beltrami differentials.

From the condition (ii) of $W_i^{t,s}$,

$$(8.2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} W_i^{t,s}(z) &= z + T(\mu_i(t, s)) + T(\mu_i(t, s)H(\mu_i(t, s))) + o((|t| + |s|)^2) \\ &= z + tT(\mu_i^1) + sT(\mu_i^2) + t^2(T(\mu_i^4) + T(\mu_i^1H(\mu_i^1))) \\ &\quad + ts(T(\mu_i^3) + T(\mu_i^1H(\mu_i^2)) + T(\mu_i^2H(\mu_i^1))) \\ &\quad + s^2(T(\mu_i^5) + T(\mu_i^2H(\mu_i^2))) + o((|t| + |s|)^2) \end{aligned}$$

as $|t| + |s| \rightarrow 0$, where T and H are defined by

$$(8.2.9) \quad T(\omega)(z) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{\omega(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} \frac{i}{2} d\zeta \wedge d\bar{\zeta}$$

$$(8.2.10) \quad H(\omega)(z) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{\omega(\zeta)}{(\zeta - z)^2} \frac{i}{2} d\zeta \wedge d\bar{\zeta}$$

for $\omega \in L^p(\mathbb{C})$ ($1 < p < \infty$) on \mathbb{C} (cf. [48, Theorem 4.3]), and $H(\omega)$ is defined as the Cauchy principal value. It is known that for a C^∞ -function ω on the closure of a bounded domain D with smooth boundary (and set $\omega \equiv 0$ for $\mathbb{C} \setminus \bar{D}$), $T(\omega)$ and $H(\omega)$ are C^∞ on D and satisfy

$$(8.2.11) \quad T(\omega)_{\bar{z}} = \omega, \quad T(\omega)_z = H(\omega), \quad \text{and} \quad H(\omega)_{\bar{z}} = \omega_z$$

(see §13.2. See also [48, p.26], [47, p.160]).

In our case,

$$(8.2.12) \quad \xi_i^0 = -T(\mu_i^1) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_i^0 = -T(\mu_i^2)$$

on U_i^0 for $i \in I$ from (8.2.8).

From the definition (cf. §8.1.4), $\xi_i^s \circ W_i^{0,s} = -\frac{\partial W_i^{t,s}}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 W_i^{t,s}}{\partial s \partial t} \Big|_{t=0, s=0} (z) &= -\dot{\xi}_i(z) + (T(\mu_i^1))_z(z)T(\mu_i^2)(z) \\ &= -\dot{\xi}_i(z) + H(\mu_i^1)(z)T(\mu_i^2)(z) \end{aligned}$$

for $z \in U_i^0$ since $W_i^{t,s}(z)$ varies holomorphically in t, s when $z \in U_i^0$ is fixed. Hence, from (8.2.8),

$$\dot{\xi}_i = -(T(\mu_i^3) + T(\mu_i^1 H(\mu_i^2)) + T(\mu_i^2 H(\mu_i^1)) - H(\mu_i^1)T(\mu_i^2))$$

on U_i^0 . From Proposition 8.1.1 and (8.1.10),

$$T_{(0, \psi_i)} T\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = B_2 \oplus B_2 \ni (\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi}) \mapsto (X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$$

is a \mathbb{C} -linear which descends to $\mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}$ in (8.2.6), and hence the map $\mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}$ is also \mathbb{C} -linear.

We will show that (8.2.6) is an isomorphism. We use the Dolbeault type presentation, and continue to discuss with the notation given above. Suppose $\mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}(\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi}) = 0$ in \mathbb{T}_Y . From Theorem 6.2.2,

$$(8.2.13) \quad \mathcal{D}_0^{-1} \circ \mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}(\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi}) = \langle -\bar{\partial}\xi, -\bar{\partial}\dot{\xi} \rangle_Y^{cycl}$$

is trivial. Since $\eta_i^0 = -T(\mu_i^2)$ for $i \in I$ and $\delta\eta^0 = Y$, from Proposition 5.4.1, there are $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that

$$(8.2.14) \quad \bar{\partial}\xi_i = \bar{\partial}\alpha$$

$$(8.2.15) \quad \bar{\partial}\dot{\xi}_i = -\bar{\partial}[\alpha, \eta_i^0] - \bar{\partial}\beta,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (8.2.16) \quad \bar{\partial}\dot{\xi}_i &= -\bar{\partial}(T(\mu_i^3) + T(\mu_i^1 H(\mu_i^2)) + T(\mu_i^2 H(\mu_i^1)) - H(\mu_i^1)T(\mu_i^2)) \\ &= -\mu_i^3 - \mu_i^1 (T(\mu_i^2))_z - \mu_i^2 H(\mu_i^1) + (\mu_i^1)_z T(\mu_i^2) + H(\mu_i^1)\mu_i^2 \\ &= -\mu_i^3 + [\mu_i^1, T(\mu_i^2)] \end{aligned}$$

on U_i (cf. (8.2.11)).

From (8.2.12), (8.2.14) implies that $\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\varphi}) = -\bar{\partial}\alpha$, which means that $\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\varphi})$ is infinitesimally trivial by (3.3.2). Since $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{x_0}$ in (8.2.2) is isomorphism, we obtain $\dot{\varphi} = 0$ (and hence $\mu_i^1 = 0$ for all $i \in I$). Therefore, $\bar{\partial}\alpha = 0$, that is, α is a holomorphic vector field on M_0 , which also implies that $\alpha = 0$. Thus, (8.2.15) and (8.2.16) lead

$$\mu_i^3 = \bar{\partial}\beta$$

on U_i^0 . Since μ_i^3 is the presentation of $\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\psi})$ on U_i , applying the above discussion, we deduce that $\dot{\psi} = 0$. As a consequence, $\mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}$ is injective. Since the dimensions of $T_{(0, \psi_0)} T\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ and \mathbb{T}_Y are equal, $\mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}$ is an isomorphism.

Next, we will show that the diagram commutes. To show this, we shall check that

$$(8.2.17) \quad \mathcal{I}_Y^D \circ \mathcal{D}_0^{-1} \circ \mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0} = \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{x_0} \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{x_0}$$

on $T_{(0, \psi_0)} T\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B = B_2 \oplus B^2$ since $\mathcal{I}_Y^D \circ \mathcal{D}_0^{-1} = (\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{T}_{x_0}) \circ \mathcal{I}_Y$ from Theorem 6.2.2.

Let \mathfrak{L} be the good section for the coboundary operator δ defined from the Ahlfors-Weill guiding frame $\mathfrak{gf} = \mathcal{A}_{x_0} \circ D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}$ (cf. Proposition 6.1.1). From the definition,

$$\mathfrak{L}(X)_i = -T(\mathfrak{gf}([X])) + \alpha_i$$

for $X \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and some $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ (depending on X). Since $X = \delta\xi^0$, $Y = \delta\eta^0$, $\mathfrak{gf}([X]) = \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\varphi})$ and $\mathfrak{gf}([Y]) = \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_0)$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}(X)_i &= \xi_i^0 = -T(\mu_i^1) \\ \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i &= \eta_i^0 = -T(\mu_i^2) \end{aligned}$$

on U_i . From the definition of \mathcal{I}_Y^D in (6.2.7) and (8.2.13), the Beltrami differential in the first coordinate of $\mathcal{I}_Y^D \circ \mathcal{D}_0^{-1} \circ \mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}(\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi})$ satisfies

$$\bar{\partial}\mathfrak{L}(X)_i = -\mu_i^1$$

on U_i , which implies that the first coordinate is equal to $\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\varphi})$.

Notice that the first coordinate of $\mathcal{I}_Y^D \circ \mathcal{D}_0^{-1} \circ \mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}(\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi})$ satisfies $\mathfrak{gf}([X]) = \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\varphi})$. Hence, from (6.2.8), the second coordinate $\hat{\nu}$ of $\mathcal{I}_Y^D \circ \mathcal{D}_0^{-1} \circ \mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}(\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi})$ is defined by

$$(8.2.18) \quad \hat{\nu} = -\bar{\partial}\dot{\xi}_i + [\mathfrak{gf}([X]), \mathfrak{L}(Y)_i] = \mu_i^3 - [\mu_i^1, T(\mu_i^2)] + [\mu_i^1, T(\mu_i^2)] = \mu_i^3$$

on U_i . This means that the second coordinate $\hat{\nu}$ is equal to $\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\psi})$. Thus (8.2.17) is confirmed. \square

8.3. Summary

Suppose a locally finite covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 satisfies that each U_i is the interior of closed topological disk with smooth boundary. Since $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for all $i \in I$, from the discussion in §7.1.3,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{T}_{[Y]} = 6g - 6,$$

and the last arrows in the two horizontal sequences in (7.1.6) are surjective. Hence, the isomorphism $\mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0}: T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g \cong B_2 \times B_2 \rightarrow T_Y[\mathcal{U}]$ given in Theorem 8.2.1 induces a linear isomorphism

$$\check{\mathcal{K}}_{[Y]}^{x_0}: T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}.$$

In summary, we conclude the following.

THEOREM 8.3.1 (Double tangent space and its models). Under the above notation, the following diagram is commutative and all horizontal sequences of the

diagram are exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_Y^\top} & \mathbb{T}_Y^V[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{inc} & \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{onto} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \\
\parallel & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \parallel \\
H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^\top} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{inc} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{onto} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \\
(8.3.1) \quad \Pi^\mathcal{U} \downarrow \cong & & \tilde{\Pi}^\mathcal{U} \downarrow \cong & & \tilde{\Pi}^\mathcal{U} \downarrow \cong & & \Pi^\mathcal{U} \downarrow \cong \\
H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^\top} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V & \xrightarrow{inc} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]} & \xrightarrow{onto} & H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \\
\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \downarrow \cong & & & & \mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0} \uparrow \cong & & \mathcal{T}_{x_0} \downarrow \cong \\
T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^\top} & T_{[Y]} T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{inc} & T_{[Y]} T \mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{onto} & T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g,
\end{array}$$

where $\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^\top$ is the vertical projection (cf. (2.3.4)), and “inc” means the inclusion.

The first horizontal sequence in (8.3.1) follows from (5.3.13). From Theorem 7.1.1 and (7.1.8), we also have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^{\top, Dol}} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol, V} & \xrightarrow{inc} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^{Dol} & \xrightarrow{onto} & T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g \\
\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \uparrow \cong & & \mathcal{D}_0 \downarrow \cong & & \mathcal{D}_0 \downarrow \cong & & \mathcal{T}_{x_0} \uparrow \cong \\
(8.3.2) \quad H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^\top} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^V & \xrightarrow{inc} & \mathbb{T}_{[Y]} & \xrightarrow{onto} & H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \\
\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \downarrow \cong & & & & \mathcal{K}_{[Y]}^{x_0} \uparrow \cong & & \mathcal{T}_{x_0} \downarrow \cong \\
T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\mathbf{vi}_{[Y]}^\top} & T_{[Y]} T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{inc} & T_{[Y]} T \mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{onto} & T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g,
\end{array}$$

where each horizontal line is exact. We also obtain the same diagram for $\mathbb{T}_{[\nu]}^{Bel}$.

Variational formula of the pairing function

In this chapter, we shall give a variational formula for the pairing between $T\mathcal{T}_g$ and $T^*\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathcal{Q}_g$. As given in §3.2.2, the pairing

$$(9.0.1) \quad T\mathcal{T}_g \oplus \mathcal{Q}_g \ni (v, q) \mapsto \mathcal{P}(v, q) := \langle v, q \rangle$$

is a canonical pairing defined on the total space of the Whitney sum

$$T\mathcal{T}_g \oplus \mathcal{Q}_g = T\mathcal{T}_g \oplus T^*\mathcal{T}_g = \{(v, q) \in T\mathcal{T}_g \times T^*\mathcal{T}_g \mid \pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}(v) = \pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^*(q)\}$$

of the (holomorphic) tangent bundle and the (holomorphic) cotangent bundle of the Teichmüller space, where $\pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^*: \mathcal{Q}_g \cong T^*\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ is the projection. Notice that the total space of the Whitney sum is a complex submanifold of the product manifold $T\mathcal{T}_g \times T^*\mathcal{T}_g$, since the projections are submersions. The pairing defines a holomorphic function on $T\mathcal{T}_g \oplus T^*\mathcal{T}_g$.

To this end, we first give a variational formula of the pairing function and a presentation of the variational formula by the model of the pairing in §9.2. Then, using the variational formula, we will conclude that our model spaces are actually models of the second order infinitesimal spaces over the Teichmüller space in §9.3.

9.1. Variations of 2 forms

A family $\{E_j\}_{j \in J}$ of subsets of M_0 is called a *reasonable decomposition* of M_0 if each E_j is the closure of a (topological) disk in M_0 , the interiors of E_{j_1} and E_{j_2} are disjoint for distinct $j_1, j_2 \in J$, $\cup_{j \in J} E_j = M_0$, and $M_0 \setminus \cup_{j \in J} \text{Int}(E_j)$ has measure zero. By definition, for any 2-form $\Omega = \Omega(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz$ on M_0 ,

$$\iint_{M_0} \Omega = \sum_{j \in J} \iint_{E_j} \Omega(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

By the Lebesgue theorem, for any covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 , there is a reasonable decomposition $\{E_j\}_{j \in J}$ of M_0 such that $E_j \subset U_{i(j)}$ for all $j \in J$ and some $i(j) \in I$.

From §5.2, the Lie derivative of a smooth 2-form $\Omega = \Omega(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz$ along a smooth vector field $X = X(z)\partial_z$ is given by

$$L_X \Omega = (\Omega_z(z)X(z) + \Omega(z)X_z(z)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

9.1.1. First derivative. We use the notation on holomorphic families, families of local coordinates, and cocycles given in §5.6.2 frequently. Let $\Omega^t = \{\Omega_i^t\}_{i \in I}$ be a smooth family of 2-forms where Ω^t is a 2-form on M_t . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i(z) &= - \left. \frac{\partial z_i^t}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} \circ (z_i^0)^{-1}(z) \\ \Omega_i^t(z) &= \Omega_i^0(z) + t\dot{\Omega}_i(z) + \bar{t}\bar{\dot{\Omega}}_i^*(z) + o(t) \end{aligned}$$

for $z \in z_i^0(U_i)$. We can check that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\Omega}_j(z_{ij}(z)) \left| \frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right|^2 - \dot{\Omega}_i(z) &= L_{X_{ij}}(\Omega_i^0)(z) \\ \dot{\Omega}_j^*(z_{ij}(z)) \left| \frac{dz_{ij}}{dz}(z) \right|^2 - \dot{\Omega}_i^*(z) &= \overline{L_{X_{ij}}(\overline{\Omega_i^0})}(z)\end{aligned}$$

for $z \in z_i^0(U_i \cap U_j)$. Therefore,

$$\dot{\Omega}_i - L_{\xi_i}(\Omega_i^0), \quad \dot{\Omega}_i^* - \overline{L_{\xi_i}(\overline{\Omega_i^0})}$$

on $z_i(U_i)$ define well-defined 2-forms on M_0 . The following is well-known. However, we give a proof for completeness.

PROPOSITION 9.1.1. Under the above notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \left(\iint_{M_t} \Omega_t \right) \Big|_{t=0} &= \iint_{M_0} (\dot{\Omega}_i(z) - L_{\xi_i}(\Omega_i^0)(z)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ \partial_{\bar{t}} \left(\iint_{M_t} \Omega_t \right) \Big|_{t=0} &= \iint_{M_0} (\dot{\Omega}_i^*(z) - \overline{L_{\xi_i}(\overline{\Omega_i^0})}(z)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.\end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Let $\{E_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a reasonable decomposition of M_0 such that for each $j \in J$ there is an $i(j) \in I$ with $E_j \subset U_{i(j)}$. Let $W_i^t(z) = z_i^t \circ (z_i^0)^{-1}(z) = z - t\xi_i(z) + o(t)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Since W_i^t defines a holomorphic motion, W_i^t is a quasiconformal mapping. Hence, $\{W_{i(j)}^t(E_j)\}_{j \in J}$ is a reasonable decomposition on M_t for sufficiently small t . Therefore,

$$\iint_{M_t} \Omega_t = \sum_{j \in J} \iint_{W_{i(j)}^t(E_j)} \Omega_{i(j)}^t(w) d\bar{w} \wedge dw$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}& \iint_{W_{i(j)}^t(E_j)} \Omega_{i(j)}^t(w) d\bar{w} \wedge dw \\ &= \iint_{E_j} \Omega^t(W_{i(j)}^t(z)) (|(W_{i(j)}^t)_z|^2 - |(W_{i(j)}^t)_{\bar{z}}|^2) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &= \iint_{E_j} \Omega_{i(j)}^0(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &\quad + t \iint_{E_j} (\dot{\Omega}_{i(j)}(z) - L_{\xi_i}(\Omega_{i(j)}^0)(z)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\ &\quad + \bar{t} \iint_{E_j} \left(\dot{\Omega}_{i(j)}^*(z) - \overline{L_{\xi_i}(\overline{\Omega_{i(j)}^0})}(z) \right) d\bar{z} \wedge dz + o(t),\end{aligned}$$

which implies what we wanted. \square

9.1.2. Notation. Let F a differentiable mapping on a complex manifold M around $p_0 \in M$. Let $V \in T_{p_0}^{1,0}M$ and $\{p(t)\}_{|t|<\epsilon}$ be an analytic (holomorphic) disk in M with $p(0) = p_0$. We denote by

$$\begin{aligned}DF|_{p_0}[V] &= \frac{\partial F \circ p}{\partial t}(0) \\ \overline{DF}|_{p_0}[V] &= \frac{\partial F \circ p}{\partial \bar{t}}(0).\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is well-known. However, we give a proof for a completeness.

LEMMA 9.1.1. For a differentiable mapping $F: M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, The differential of F at $p_0 \in M$ (as a real manifold) is non-generate if and only if $DF|_{p_0}[V] + \overline{DF}|_{p_0}[V] = 0$ implies $V = 0$ for $V \in T_{p_0}^{1,0}M$.

PROOF. We may assume that $M = \mathbb{C}^m$. Let $z_k = x_k + iy_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, m$ and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$. Set $F = u + iv$, $F = (F_1, \dots, F_n)$ and $F_s = u_s + iv_s$ for $s = 1, \dots, n$. Let $V = V_1 + iV_2$. Let JF be the Jacobi matrix of F at p_0 after identifying $\mathbb{C}^m \ni z \mapsto (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$. Then, $JF \begin{bmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0$ means

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^m \left(\frac{\partial u_s}{\partial x_k} (V_1)_k + \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial y_k} (V_2)_k \right) &= 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^m \left(\frac{\partial v_s}{\partial x_k} (V_1)_k + \frac{\partial v_s}{\partial y_k} (V_2)_k \right) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $s = 1, \dots, n$. This is equivalent to

$$0 = \sum_{k=1}^m \left(\frac{\partial F_s}{\partial x_k} (V_1)_k + \frac{\partial F_s}{\partial y_k} (V_2)_k \right) = \sum_{k=1}^m \left(\frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z_k} V_k + \frac{\partial F_s}{\partial \bar{z}_k} \bar{V}_k \right) = DF|_{p_0}[V] + \overline{DF}|_{p_0}[V]$$

for $s = 1, \dots, n$. □

9.2. Variation of the pairing function

In the following theorem, we assume that $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a locally finite covering of M_0 such that $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$.

THEOREM 9.2.1 (Variational formula). Let $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$. Let $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$ and $q_0 \in Q_{M_0} \cong T_{x_0}^* \mathcal{T}_g$. Let $V_1 = \llbracket X, Y \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \cong T_{[Y]} T \mathcal{T}_g$ and $V_2 = \llbracket X, \varphi \rrbracket_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$. Then, the differential of the pairing (9.0.1) is given by

$$(9.2.1) \quad D\mathcal{P}|_{([Y], q_0)} [V_1, V_2] = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (dA_i - L_{\xi_i}((\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} q_0)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz,$$

where

- $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ and $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$ and $\delta\eta = Y$;
- $q_0 = \{q_0\}_{i \in I}$ and $\eta_i q_0 = \eta_i(z) q_0(z) dz$; and
- $A_i = A_i(z) dz$ satisfies $A_i(z) \in W^{1,1}(U_i)$ and

$$(9.2.2) \quad A_i(z_{ij}^0(z)) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z) - A_j(z) = \dot{Y}_{ji}(z) q_0(z) + Y_{ji}(z) \varphi_j(z) + L_{X_{ji}}(\eta_i q_0)(z)$$

for $z \in z_j^0(U_i \cap U_j)$ and $i, j \in I$, where $\varphi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in I}$.

The proof of Theorem 9.2.1 is given in §9.2.2.

Suppose $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (9.2.2). Since $dA_i = (A_i)_{\bar{z}}(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz$, X_{ji} is holomorphic, and $(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} = (\eta_j)_{\bar{z}}$ on $U_i \cap U_j$,

$$(A_i)_{\bar{z}}(z_{ij}^0(z)) \left| \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z) \right|^2 - (A_j)_{\bar{z}}(z) = (L_{X_{ji}}(\eta_i q_0))_{\bar{z}} = L_{X_{ji}}((\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} q_0)$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$. Hence, the integrand in the integral at the right-hand side of (9.2.1) is an 2-form on M_0 .

9.2.1. Well-definedness of the integral. Since the tangent vectors are defined as the equivalence classes, before proving Theorem 9.2.1, we shall check that the integral in the right-hand side of (9.2.1) is independent of the choices of the representatives.

9.2.1.1. The choice of $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$. When $B = \{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (9.2.2) instead of $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$. Then, $\Omega_i = A_i - B_i$ defines a $(1, 0)$ -form $\Omega = \Omega(z)dz$ on M_0 with $\Omega_i(z) \in W^{1,1}(U_i)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (dA_i - L_{\xi_i}((\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}q_0)) - \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (dB_i - L_{\xi_i}((\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}q_0)) = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} d\Omega = 0.$$

by the Green formula for $W^{1,1}$ -forms. See §5.8.

9.2.1.2. The choices of ξ and η . We first check that the integral is independent of the choice of $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i \in I}$. Take $\Xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\Xi = X$. Then, $\xi - \Xi$ defines a global $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ -vector field \mathcal{X} on M_0 . Since the integrand in this case is $\{dA_i - L_{\Xi_i}(d(\eta_i q_0))\}_{i \in I}$ and $\nu = -(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} = -\bar{\partial}\eta_i$ is a global $(-1, 1)$ -form on M_0 , the difference of the integrands satisfies

$$(dA_i - L_{\xi_i}((\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}q_0)) - (dA_i - L_{\Xi_i}((\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}q_0)) = -L_{\mathcal{X}}((\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}q_0) = d(\nu q_0 \mathcal{X} d\bar{z}).$$

Therefore, we obtain the difference of their integrals vanishes.

We shall check that the integral is independent of the choice of $\eta = \{\eta_i\}_{i \in I}$. Let $H = \{H_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta H = Y$. Take $B = \{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfying (9.2.2) when we consider H instead of η . Notice that $\mathcal{Y} = \eta - H$ defines a global vector field on M_0 . Set $\Omega_i = A_i - B_i$ for $i \in I$. From (9.2.2), the difference of the integrands in (9.2.1) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} d\Omega_i - L_{\xi_i}(\mathcal{Y}_{\bar{z}}q_0) &= d\Omega_i - L_{\xi_i}((\mathcal{Y}q_0)_{\bar{w}}d\bar{w} \wedge dw) \\ &= d(\Omega_i(w)dw + \mathcal{Y}_{\bar{w}}(w)q_0(w)\xi_i(w)d\bar{w}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (d\Omega_i(z_{ij}^0(z)) - L_{\xi_i}(\mathcal{Y}_{\bar{z}}q_0)(z_{ij}^0(z))) \left| \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z) \right|^2 &- (d\Omega_j(z) - L_{\xi_j}(\mathcal{Y}_{\bar{z}}q_0)(z)) \\ &= dL_{X_{j_i}}(\mathcal{Y}q_0)(z) - L_{X_{j_i}}(\mathcal{Y}_{\bar{z}}q_0)(z) \\ &= L_{\mathcal{Y}}((X_{j_i}q_0)_{\bar{z}}) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $z \in z_j^0(U_i \cap U_j)$ and $w \in z_i^0(U_i)$ since $X_{j_i}q_0$ is a holomorphic 1-form on $z_j^0(U_i \cap U_j)$. Therefore, the difference of the integrands is an exact 2-form on M_0 , and hence the integral of the difference vanishes.

9.2.1.3. The representative of $[Y]$. Let $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. From Proposition 5.3.2, we consider $\tilde{L}_\beta(X, \dot{Y}) = (X, \dot{Y} + K'(\beta, X)) \in \ker(D_1^{Y+\delta\beta})$ instead of $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$, the right-hand side of (9.2.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &(\dot{Y}_{j_i} + [\beta_i, X_{j_i}])q_0 + (Y_{j_i} + (\beta_i - \beta_j))\varphi_j + L_{X_{j_i}}((\eta_i + \beta_i)q_0) \\ &= (\dot{Y}_{j_i}q_0 + Y_{j_i}\varphi_j + L_{X_{j_i}}(\eta_i q_0)) + ([\beta_i, X_{j_i}]q_0 + (\beta_i - \beta_j)\varphi_j + L_{X_{j_i}}(\beta_i q_0)) \\ &= (\dot{Y}_{j_i}q_0 + Y_{j_i}\varphi_j + L_{X_{j_i}}(\eta_i q_0)) + (\beta_i\varphi_i - \beta_j\varphi_j). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the integral in (9.2.1) in this case satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (d(A_i + \beta_i\varphi_i) - L_{\xi_i}(d(\eta_i q_0))) = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (dA_i - L_{\xi_i}(d(\eta_i q_0))).$$

9.2.1.4. **The representatives of $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}$ and $[X, \varphi]_{q_0}$.** Take two cochains $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. From the definitions of $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and \mathbb{T}_Y , we choose $(X + \delta\alpha, \dot{Y} + \delta\beta + K(\alpha, Y))$ and $(\varphi + L_\alpha(q_0), X + \delta\alpha)$ as the representatives in stead of $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_0^Y)$ and $(\varphi, X) \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) \oplus C^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. In this case, the right-hand side of (9.2.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & (\dot{Y}_{ji} + \beta_i - \beta_j + [\alpha_j, Y_{ji}])q_0 + Y_{ji}(\varphi_j + L_{\alpha_j}(q_0)) + L_{X_{ji} + \alpha_i - \alpha_j}(\eta_i q_0) \\ &= (\dot{Y}_{ji}q_0 + Y_{ji}\varphi_j + L_{X_{ji}}(\eta_i q_0)) \\ & \quad + (\beta_i - \beta_j + [\alpha_j, Y_{ji}])q_0 + Y_{ji}L_{\alpha_j}(q_0) + L_{\alpha_i}(\eta_i q_0) - L_{\alpha_j}(\eta_j q_0) \\ &= (\dot{Y}_{ji}q_0 + Y_{ji}\varphi_j + L_{X_{ji}}(\eta_i q_0)) + (\beta_i q_0 + L_{\alpha_i}(\eta_i q_0)) - (\beta_j q_0 + L_{\alpha_j}(\eta_j q_0)) \end{aligned}$$

on $z_j^0(U_i \cap U_j)$. Hence, the integrand in (9.2.1) in this case satisfies

$$d(A_i + \beta_i q_0 + L_{\alpha_i}(\eta_i q_0)) - L_{\xi_i + \alpha_i}(\eta_i q_0) = dA_i - L_{\xi_i}(\eta_i q_0)$$

since $\beta_i q_0 = \beta_i(z)q_0(z)dz$ is holomorphic on U_i . This implies that the integral in (9.2.1) is independent of the choices of representatives.

9.2.2. Proof of Theorem 9.2.1. We use the symbols defined from §8.1.1 to §8.1.4, frequently. Let $M_t = M_{t,0}$ for $|t| < \epsilon_0$. Let $\{|t| < \epsilon_0\} \rightarrow x_t \in \mathcal{T}_g$ be the representation of the holomorphic family. Let $q^t = \{q_i^t\}_{i \in I}$ be a holomorphic family of holomorphic quadratic differentials such that $q^t \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_t}$. Let $v_t = [\{Y_{ij}^t\}_{i,j \in I}] \in H^1(M_t, \Theta_{M_t}) \cong T_{x_t} \mathcal{T}_g$. Then, from (3.3.7),

$$\langle v_t, q_t \rangle = -\pi \text{Res}([Y_{ij}^t q_t]) = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_t} d(\eta_i^t q_t dz).$$

Since

$$\eta_i^t(z)q_t(z) = \eta_i^0(z)q_0(z) + tA_i(z) + \bar{t}B_i(z) + o(t)$$

on $z_i^0(U_i)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ where B is some function on $z_i^0(U_i)$, and

$$(9.2.3) \quad A_i(z) = \dot{\eta}_i(z)q_0(z) + \eta_i^0(z)\varphi_i(z).$$

By Proposition 8.1.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & A_i(z_{ij}^0(z)) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z) - A_j(z) \\ &= (\dot{\eta}_i(z_{ij}^0(z))q_0(z_{ij}^0(z)) + \eta_i^0(z_{ij}^0(z))\varphi_i(z_{ij}^0(z))) \frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z) \\ & \quad - (\dot{\eta}_j(z)q_0(z) + \eta_j^0(z)\varphi_j(z)) \\ &= \left(\dot{\eta}_i(z_{ij}^0(z)) \left(\frac{dz_{ij}^0}{dz}(z) \right)^{-1} - \dot{\eta}_j(z) \right) q_0(z) \\ & \quad + \dot{\eta}_j^0(z)L_{X_{ji}}(q_0) + Y_{ji}(z)\varphi_j(z) + Y_{ji}(z)L_{X_{ji}}(q_0)(z) \\ &= \dot{Y}_{ji}(z)q_0(z) + Y_{ji}(z)\varphi_j(z) - [\eta_i^0, X_{ji}](z)q_0(z) + \eta_j^0(z)L_{X_{ji}}(q_0) + Y_{ji}(z)L_{X_{ji}}(q_0)(z) \\ &= \dot{Y}_{ji}(z)q_0(z) + Y_{ji}(z)\varphi_j(z) + L_{X_{ji}}(\eta_j^0 q_0)(z) + L_{X_{ji}}(Y_{ji}q_0) \\ &= \dot{Y}_{ji}(z)q_0(z) + Y_{ji}(z)\varphi_j(z) + L_{X_{ji}}(\eta_i^0 q_0)(z), \end{aligned}$$

which means $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (9.2.2). From Proposition 9.1.1 and the discussion in §9.2.1, we obtain the formula (9.2.1).

9.2.3. Variational formula with the Dolbeault representation. From Theorem 5.4.1 and (9.2.3), we obtain the following.

COROLLARY 9.2.1. Under the assumption and the notation in Theorem 5.4.1, let $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ with $\mathcal{D}_0(\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl}) = \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$, $\mu_i = -(\xi_i)_{\bar{z}}$, $\nu_i = -(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}$ and $\dot{\nu}_i = -(\dot{\eta}_i)_{\bar{z}}$ for $i \in I$. Then,

$$D\mathcal{P}|_{([Y], q_0)}[V_1, V_2] = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} ((\dot{\nu}_i - [\xi_i, \eta_i]_{\bar{z}})q_0 + \nu_i \varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(\nu_i q_0)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz,$$

where \mathcal{D}_0 is the connecting homomorphism (cf. Proposition 5.4.2 and Proposition 8.1.2).

REMARK 9.2.1. From the discussion in §9.2.1, when $[X] = 0$, ξ may be assumed to be $\xi = 0$. In this case, in the formula in Corollary 9.2.1, $\dot{\nu}_i$ and φ_i can be assumed to be a globally defined on M_0 , and the formula becomes

$$(9.2.4) \quad D\mathcal{P}|_{([Y], q_0)}[V_1, V_2] = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} (\dot{\nu}_i q_0 + \nu_i \varphi_i) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

9.2.4. Variation of Pairing and Pairing on second order infinitesimal space. The following formula will be applied in defining the model map of the switch later (cf. Proposition 2.7.1 and Proposition 10.4.1).

PROPOSITION 9.2.1 (A formula of the variation of Pairing). The variational formula for the pairing is presented by

$$(9.2.5) \quad D\mathcal{P}|_{([Y], q)} \left[\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}, [X, \varphi]_q \right] = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}|_{[X]}} \left(\llbracket Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y] \rrbracket_{[X]}, [\varphi, q]_{[X]}^\dagger \right)$$

for $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \cong T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g$, $[X, \varphi]_q \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_q) \cong T_q\mathcal{Q}_g$, $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ and $q \in Q_{M_0} \cong T_{x_0}^*\mathcal{T}_g$.

PROOF. From (5.5.4), the right-hand side of (9.2.5) is equal to

$$-\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} ((A_i)_{\bar{z}} - L_{\xi_i}((\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}q)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz,$$

where $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\eta = \{\eta_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$ and $\delta\eta = Y$, and $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ with

$$\begin{aligned} A_j - A_i &= Y_{ij}\varphi_i - (\dot{Y}_{ji} + [X_{ji}, Y_{ji}])q + L_{X_{ij}}(\eta_j q) \\ &= Y_{ij}\varphi_i + \dot{Y}_{ij}q + L_{X_{ij}}(\eta_j q). \end{aligned}$$

From (9.2.2), we have the equality (9.2.5). \square

9.3. Models are models of the second order infinitesimal spaces

In this section, we fix $x_0 \in \mathcal{T}_g$ and identify the Teichmüller space \mathcal{T}_g with the image of the Bers embedding with basepoint x_0 , and hence it is a bounded domain in $B_2 = B_2(\mathbb{D}^*, \Gamma_0)$. Hence, the holomorphic tangent bundle $T\mathcal{T}_g$ is naturally identified with the trivial bundle $\mathcal{T}_g \times B_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ via the Bers embedding.

Let $\mathfrak{gf} = \mathcal{A}_{x_0} \circ D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}$ be the Ahlfors-Weill guiding frame, and \mathfrak{L} is a good section defined from \mathfrak{gf} . Let

$$\mathcal{S}_{[Y]}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2}$$

be the trivialization defined from the Ahlfors-Weill guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} . Since the differential $D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0}: T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow B_2$ is the inverse of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{x_0} = D\mathcal{P}_{x_0}^B|_0 \circ \mathcal{A}_{x_0}$ (cf. (8.2.2)), from the left square of the commutative diagram (8.2.7), the map

$$(9.3.1) \quad (D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0})^{\oplus 2} \circ (\mathcal{T}_{x_0})^{\oplus 2} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[Y]}: \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow B_2 \times B_2$$

coincides with the the trivialization (identification) $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g \cong B_2 \times B_2$ via the Bers embedding.

The purpose of this section is to observe that when we choose the trivializations defined in Theorem 6.2.1, Theorem 6.3.1 and Theorem 6.5.1 are natural in the sense that when we choose the Ahlfors-Weill guiding frame, these trivializations for the second order infinitesimal spaces are naturally thought of as the trivialization via the Bers embedding.

In the following discussion, we notice that B_2 and \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} have a natural non-degenerate pairing:

$$B_2 \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \ni (\varphi, q) \mapsto \langle [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\varphi)], q \rangle.$$

9.3.1. Models of the tangent space to $T^*\mathcal{T}_g = \mathcal{Q}_g$. In §3.2.2, we discuss the trivialization of the cotangent bundle $\mathcal{Q}_g \cong T^*\mathcal{T}_g$ as $T^*\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathcal{T}_g \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$.

Let $(\varphi_t, q_t) = (t\dot{\varphi}, q_0 + t\dot{q}) + o(t) \in \mathcal{T}_g \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \subset B_2 \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ and $(\varphi_t, \psi_t) = (t\dot{\varphi}, \psi_0 + t\dot{\psi}) + o(t) \in \mathcal{T}_g \times B_2 \subset B_2 \times B_2$ be holomorphic curves. Suppose that $[X, \Phi]_{q_0} \in H_1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ be the tangent vectors of the holomorphic curves at $t = 0$. By definition, $D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}([X]) = \dot{\varphi}$ and $D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}([Y]) = \psi_0$.

From the trivializations $T\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathcal{T}_g \times B_2$ and $T^*\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathcal{T}_g \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ discussed in §3.2.2, we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_{T\mathcal{T}_g}|_{\varphi_t}((\varphi_t, \psi_t), (\varphi_t, q_t)) = \langle [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_t)], q_t \rangle.$$

From Theorem 9.2.1,

$$(9.3.2) \quad D\mathcal{P}|_{([Y], q_0)} \left[\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}, [X, \Phi]_{q_0} \right] = \langle [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_0)], \dot{q} \rangle + \langle [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\psi})], q_0 \rangle.$$

Since $\mathfrak{gf}([X]) = \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\varphi})$ and $\mathfrak{gf}([Y]) = \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_0)$, from Theorem 6.4.1 and Proposition 9.2.1, the left-hand side of (9.3.2) is equal to

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}|_{[X]}} \left(\llbracket Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y] \rrbracket_{[X]}, \llbracket \Phi, q_0 \rrbracket_{[X]}^\dagger \right) = \langle [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_0)], \dot{Q} \rangle + \langle [\dot{\psi}], q_0 \rangle$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{T}_{x_0}) \circ \mathcal{I}_{[X]} \left(\llbracket Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y] \rrbracket_{[X]} \right) &= ([\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_0)], [\dot{\psi}]) \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \oplus T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \\ \mathcal{I}_{[X]}^\dagger \left(\llbracket \Phi, q_0 \rrbracket_{[X]}^\dagger \right) &= (\dot{Q}, q_0) \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \end{aligned}$$

and these trivializations are defined with the guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} . Notice from the discussion around (8.2.18) that $\dot{\psi} = \mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\dot{\psi})$. Therefore, we conclude

$$\langle [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_0)], \dot{q} \rangle = \langle [\mathcal{A}_{x_0}(\psi_0)], \dot{Q} \rangle$$

and $\dot{Q} = \dot{q}$ since we can choose ψ_0 arbitrarily.

We summarize the above discussion as follows.

PROPOSITION 9.3.1. Under the trivialization $T^*\mathcal{Q}_g \cong \mathcal{T}_g \times \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ defined in §3.2.2, the tangent space $H^1(M_0, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ at $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \subset \mathcal{Q}_g$ is trivialized by the trivialization in Theorem 6.5.1 induced by the guiding frame $\mathfrak{gf} = \mathcal{A}_{x_0} \circ D\mathcal{B}_{x_0}|_{x_0} \circ \mathcal{T}_{x_0}$ defined from the Ahlfors-Weill section.

9.3.2. Models of cotangent spaces. As we discussed in §6.6, the trivializations of $\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ ($[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$) defined in Theorem 6.3.1 and Theorem 6.5.1 are thought of as the isomorphisms between the dual spaces. Namely, the trivializations are natural in terms of the pairings. For the record, we summarize the following.

PROPOSITION 9.3.2 (Models of duals are models of cotangent spaces). The trivializations defined by the Ahlfors-Weill guiding frames gives natural identifications

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow T_{[Y]}^* T\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \\ \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) &\rightarrow T_{q_0}^* T^* \mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}).\end{aligned}$$

Flip, Switch, Dualization and Lie bracket

The purpose of this chapter is to define the models of the flip, the switch, and the dualization for the models of the second order infinitesimal spaces. We also give a presentation of the Lie bracket for C^1 -vector fields of type $(1,0)$ on the Teichmüller space.

10.1. Model spaces over underlying manifolds

For a complex manifold M , the flip on TTM , the switch from TT^*M to T^*TM , and the dualization between T^*T^*M and TT^*M preserves the fibers over points of M . From this observation, we define

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &= \left\{ \left([Y], \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} \right) \mid [Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}), \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \right\} \\ (\mathbb{T}^\dagger\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &= \left\{ \left([Y], \llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger \right) \mid [Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}), \llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \right\} \\ (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^\dagger)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &= \left\{ (q, [X, \varphi]_q) \mid q \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}, [X, \varphi]_q \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_q) \right\} \\ (\mathbb{T}^\dagger\mathbb{T}^\dagger)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &= \left\{ (q, [\Phi, Y]_q) \mid q \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}, [\Phi, Y]_q \in \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_q) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

where $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ and \mathcal{U} be a locally finite covering of M_0 with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$.

Throughout this chapter, we fix a guiding frame $\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{f}$ and the good section \mathfrak{L} for trivializations (cf. §6.1 and Theorem 6.2.1). From Theorem 6.2.1, Theorem 6.3.1, and Theorem 6.5.1, we have the following bijections:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{T}}: (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 3} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{T}^\dagger}^\dagger: (\mathbb{T}^\dagger\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{T}}^*: (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^\dagger)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{T}^\dagger}^{*\dagger}: (\mathbb{T}^\dagger\mathbb{T}^\dagger)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \end{aligned}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{T}}([Y], \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}) &= ([Y], \mathcal{S}_{[Y]}(\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]})) \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{T}^\dagger}^\dagger([Y], \llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger) &= ([Y], \mathcal{S}_{[Y]}^\dagger(\llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger)) \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{T}}^*(q, [X, \varphi]_q) &= (q, \mathcal{S}_q^*([X, \varphi]_q)) \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{T}^\dagger}^{*\dagger}(q, [\Phi, Y]_q) &= (q, \mathcal{S}_q^{*\dagger}([\Phi, Y]_q)). \end{aligned}$$

10.2. Flip

In this section, we discuss the flip on the double tangent space.

10.2.1. Action on the model spaces. We define

$$(\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] = \{(Y, (X, \dot{Y})) \mid Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}), (X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)\},$$

where D_1^Y is a linear map defined in §5.3.2. We claim

PROPOSITION 10.2.1. Let \mathcal{U} be a locally finite covering of M_0 . We define $\alpha_{\mathbb{Z}, x_0}: (\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\alpha_{\mathbb{T}, x_0}: (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] \rightarrow (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$ by

$$(10.2.1) \quad \alpha_{\mathbb{Z}, x_0}(Y, (X, \dot{Y})) = (X, (Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y]))$$

$$(10.2.2) \quad \alpha_{\mathbb{T}, x_0}([Y], \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}) = ([X], \llbracket Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y] \rrbracket_{[X]}).$$

Then, $\alpha_{\mathbb{Z}, x_0}$ and $\alpha_{\mathbb{T}, x_0}$ are well-defined self-maps on $(\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $(\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$ satisfying the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathbb{Z}}} & (\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathbb{T}}} & (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}], \end{array}$$

where vertical arrows mean the natural projection.

PROOF. We need to check that $\alpha_{\mathbb{Z}, x_0}$ and $\alpha_{\mathbb{T}, x_0}$ are well-defined.

Let $(X, \dot{Y}) \in \ker(D_1^Y)$. For $i, j \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\dot{Y}_{ij} + [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}]) + (\dot{Y}_{ij} + [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}]) + [Y_{ij}, X_{ij}] = \dot{Y}_{ij} + \dot{Y}_{ji} + [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] = 0. \\ & \delta\left((\dot{Y} + [X, Y]) + \frac{1}{2}[Y, X]\right) - \zeta(Y, X) = \delta\left((\dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y]) - \zeta(X, Y)\right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which means that $(Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y]) \in \ker(D_1^X)$. Therefore, $\alpha_{\mathbb{Z}, x_0}$ is well-defined.

Next, we check $\alpha_{\mathbb{T}, x_0}$ is well-defined. For $\alpha, \beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, the second coordinate of $\alpha_{\mathbb{Z}}(Y, (X, \dot{Y}) + D_0^Y(\alpha, \beta))$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} (Y, \dot{Y} + \delta\beta + K(\alpha, Y) + [X + \delta\alpha, Y]) &= (Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y] + K'(\alpha, Y) + (0, \delta\beta)) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha; X}(Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y]) + D_0^{X+\delta\alpha}(0, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha; X}(Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y]) \in \ker(D_1^{Y+\delta\alpha})$, from Proposition 5.3.2 and Definition 3, the equivalence class $\llbracket Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y] \rrbracket_{[X]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[X]}$ is well-defined from $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y$.

Notice that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\beta; Y}(X, \dot{Y}) = (X, \dot{Y} + K'(\beta, X)) \in \ker(D_1^{Y+\delta\beta})$ corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} (Y + \delta\beta, \dot{Y} + K'(\beta, X) + [X, Y + \delta\beta]) &= (Y + \delta\beta, \dot{Y} + [\beta_i, X] + [X, Y]) \\ &= (Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y]) + D_0^X(\beta, 0). \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, for $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]} \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}$, the equivalence class $\llbracket Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y] \rrbracket_{[X]}$ is well-defined in $\mathbb{T}_{[X]}$. \square

10.2.2. The action of the Flip $\alpha_{\mathcal{T}_g}$. We define a self-map $\alpha_{\mathbb{T}, x_0}^{triv}$ of $(\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$ by

$$\alpha_{\mathbb{T}, x_0}^{triv}([Y], [X], [W]) = ([X], [Y], [W]),$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{[Y]}$ is the trivialization defined in Theorem 6.2.1. We define $\mathcal{K}_{x_0}: (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ by

$$\mathcal{K}_{x_0}(v) = \left(\mathcal{F}_{x_0}^{-1}(\Pi_{T\mathcal{T}_g}(v)), \mathcal{K}_{\Pi_{T\mathcal{T}_g}(v)}^{\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}(\Pi_{T\mathcal{T}_g}(v))}(v) \right),$$

where \mathcal{K} is the isomorphism defined in Theorem 8.2.1.

We discuss the flip on the double tangent space on Teichmüller space. For $x_0 \in \mathcal{T}_g$, let $\mathcal{B}_{x_0}: \mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow B_2$ be the Bers embedding and $\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ the image (§3.1.3). Then the twice differentials of the Bers embedding \mathcal{B}_{x_0} induces the canonical isomorphism

$$TT\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \times B_2 \times B_2 \times B_2$$

since $\mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B$ is a domain in B_2 ($\cong \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$). Under the identification, the action of the flip $\alpha_{\mathcal{T}_g}$ on $TT\mathcal{T}_g$ is presented by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \times B_2 \times B_2 \times B_2 &\xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathcal{T}_g}} \mathcal{T}_{x_0}^B \times B_2 \times B_2 \times B_2 \\ (x, \psi_0, \dot{\varphi}, \dot{\psi}) &\longrightarrow (x, \dot{\varphi}, \psi_0, \dot{\psi}) \end{aligned}$$

from the definition of the flip (cf. §2.6.1).

Our model of the flip (10.2.2) presents the action of the flip on the double tangent space. Actually we have the following.

THEOREM 10.2.1 (Flip). The flip $\alpha_{\mathbb{T}}$ on $(\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$ satisfying the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (TT)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}_{x_0}} & (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{T}}} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 3} \\ \alpha_{\mathcal{T}_g} \downarrow & & \alpha_{\mathbb{T}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_{\mathbb{T}}^{triv} \\ (TT)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}_{x_0}} & (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{T}}} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 3}, \end{array}$$

where $\alpha_{\mathcal{T}_g}$ is the flip on $TT\mathcal{T}_g$.

PROOF. From Theorem 8.2.1, the commutativity of the left-square of the diagram follows from that of the right-square by applying a special guiding frame defined in (6.1.1). Hence, we only check the commutativity of the right-square.

Let $([X], [W]) \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})^{\oplus 2}$ and $[[X, \dot{Y}]]_{\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{Y}}[\mathcal{U}]$ with $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{Y}}([[X, \dot{Y}]]_{\mathcal{Y}}) = ([X], [W])$. Suppose $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}([[Y, \dot{Y} + [X, Y]]]_{\mathcal{X}}) = ([Y], [W'])$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] - E(X, Y) \\ W' &= \dot{Y} + [X, Y] + \frac{1}{2}[Y, X] - E(Y, X) = \dot{Y} + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] - E(Y, X) \end{aligned}$$

modulo $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$, where \mathcal{U} is an appropriate covering on M . From (d) of Lemma 6.2.1,

$$W - W' = E(X, Y) - E(Y, X) \equiv 0$$

modulo $\delta C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Hence $[W] = [W']$ in $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. \square

10.2.3. Flip via Dolbeaut presentations. From the (8.1.11) and Corollary 9.2.1, it is natural to define, in the cocycle level, the flip under the two Doubeaut-type presentations (given in §5.4) for $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_{\eta} \in \mathbb{T}_{\eta}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\mathbb{T}}^{Dol}(\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}^{cycl}) &= \langle -\bar{\partial}\eta, \dot{\nu} - \bar{\partial}[\xi, \eta] \rangle_{\mathcal{X}}^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X}}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] \\ \alpha_{\mathbb{T}}^{Bel}(\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_{\eta}) &= \langle -\bar{\partial}\eta, \dot{\nu} - \bar{\partial}[\xi, \eta] \rangle_{\xi} \in \mathbb{T}_{\xi}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] \end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $\mathbb{T}_{\eta}^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]$, after fixing cochains $\xi, \eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$, $-\bar{\partial}\xi = \mu$, and $\delta\eta = Y$, where $[\xi, \eta] = \{[\xi_i, \eta_i]\}_{i \in I}$.

Indeed, take a cochain $\dot{\eta}$ with $-\bar{\partial}\dot{\eta} = \dot{\nu}$. Let $\dot{Y} = \delta\dot{\eta} + K(\xi, Y)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{Y} + [X, Y] &= \delta\dot{\eta} + (K'(\xi, Y) - K(\eta, X)) + K(\eta, X) \\ &= \delta\dot{\eta} + ([\xi_j, \eta_j] - [\xi_j, \eta_i] - [\eta_i, \xi_j] + [\eta_i, \xi_i]) + K(\eta, X) \\ &= \delta(\dot{\eta} + [\xi, \eta]) + K(\eta, X). \end{aligned}$$

From (10.2.2), we deduce

$$-\bar{\partial}(\dot{\eta} + [\xi, \eta]) = \dot{\nu} - \bar{\partial}[\xi, \eta]$$

is the second coordinate of $\alpha_{\mathbb{T}}^{Dol}(\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl})$ (and hence, of $\alpha_{\mathbb{T}}^{Bel}(\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_{\eta})$). The commutative diagrams like as those given in Proposition 10.2.1 and Theorem 10.2.1 also hold in the Dolbeaut-type representations from above observations.

10.3. Dualization, Pairing and Symplectic form

10.3.1. Trivialization. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. We define the model of the *dualization* by

$$\mathbf{dual}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\dagger}: \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \ni [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \rightarrow [\varphi, -X]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^{1, \dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}).$$

We already discussed the model \mathcal{P}^{\dagger} of the pairing between $T_{q_0}T^*\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ and $T_{q_0}^*T^*\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathbf{H}^{1, \dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$, and the model $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}$ of the symplectic form on $T_{q_0}T^*\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ in Section 5.7.

We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{dual}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\dagger}: (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^{\dagger})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] &\rightarrow (\mathbb{T}^{\dagger}\mathbb{T}^{\dagger})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] \\ \mathbf{dual}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\dagger \text{triv}}: \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \end{aligned}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{dual}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\dagger}(q, [X, \varphi]_q) &= (q, [\varphi, -X]_q) \\ \mathbf{dual}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\dagger \text{triv}}(q, [X, \varphi]_q) &= (q, \varphi, -[X]). \end{aligned}$$

We can easily check that these maps are well-defined. From the definitions and Theorem 6.5.2, we deduce the following (cf. Proposition 2.6.3).

THEOREM 10.3.1 (Dualization, Pairing and Symplectic form). The diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^{\dagger})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^*} & \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \\ \mathbf{dual}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\dagger} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{dual}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\dagger \text{triv}} \\ (\mathbb{T}^{\dagger}\mathbb{T}^{\dagger})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{*\dagger}} & \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \end{array}$$

is commutative. Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{P}^{\dagger}([X, \varphi]_q, \mathbf{dual}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\dagger}([X', \varphi']_q)) = 2\omega_{\mathcal{Q}_g}([X', \varphi']_q, [X, \varphi]_q)$$

holds for $[X, \varphi]_q, [X', \varphi']_q \in (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^{\dagger})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$.

10.4. Switch

10.4.1. Action on the model spaces. We check the following (cf. Proposition 2.7.1)

PROPOSITION 10.4.1 (Switch). The mapping

$$\mathbf{Swh}_{\mathbb{T}}: (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^\dagger)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] \ni (q, [X, \varphi]_q) \mapsto ([X], \llbracket \varphi, q \rrbracket_{[X]}^\dagger) \in (\mathbb{T}^\dagger\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$$

is a well-defined bijection, and satisfies the following with the differential of the pairing:

$$(10.4.1) \quad D\mathcal{P}|_{(v,q)}[V_1, V_2] = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}|_{[X]}}(\alpha_{\mathbb{T}}(V_1), \mathbf{Swh}_{\mathbb{T}}(V_2))$$

for $V_1 = \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \cong T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g$, $V_2 = [\varphi, X] \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0}\mathcal{Q}_g$, $[Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ and $q \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} \cong T_{x_0}^*\mathcal{T}_g$.

PROOF. We only check the well-definedness of the map $\mathbf{Swh}_{\mathbb{T}}$. The relation (10.4.1) follows from Proposition 9.2.1.

Let (X, φ) and (X', φ') be two representatives of $[X, \varphi]_q \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_q)$. There is an $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that $X' = X + \delta\alpha$, $\delta\varphi = L_X(q)$, and $\varphi' = \varphi + L_\alpha(q)$. Therefore, $(\varphi, q) \in \ker(D_1^{X, \dagger})$, $(\varphi', q) \in \ker(D_1^{X', \dagger})$, and

$$(\varphi', q) = (\varphi + L_\alpha(q), q) = \mathcal{L}_{\alpha; X}^\dagger(\varphi, q)$$

and hence $\llbracket \varphi, q \rrbracket_{[X]}^\dagger$ is well-defined in $\mathbb{T}^\dagger_{[X]}[\mathcal{U}]$. The bijectivity follows from the definition. \square

We define the map $\mathbf{Swh}_{\mathbb{T}}^{triv}$ by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Swh}_{\mathbb{T}}^{triv}} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \\ (q, [X], \psi) & \longrightarrow & ([X], \psi, q). \end{array}$$

From the definition of the switch, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^\dagger)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{T}}^*} & \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \\ \mathbf{Swh}_{\mathbb{T}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{Swh}_{\mathbb{T}}^{triv} \\ (\mathbb{T}^\dagger\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{T}}^\dagger} & H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \oplus \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \end{array},$$

where the trivializations in the vertical directions of the diagram can be chosen arbitrarily.

10.4.2. Maps on the second order infinitesimal spaces. As noticed in §9.3, our model spaces $(\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$ and $(\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^*)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$ are thought of as a model of $(TT)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ and $(TT^*)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$, respectively, via the Bers embedding (or the Ahlfors-Weill section). We denote by $\mathcal{K}_{x_0}^\dagger$ the natural identification from $(TT^*)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ to $(\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^*)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}]$. As discussed in §9.3.2, there are natural bijections

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{x_0}^* &: (T^*T)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow (\mathbb{T}^*\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] \\ \mathcal{K}_{x_0}^{*\dagger} &: (T^*T^*)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow (\mathbb{T}^*\mathbb{T}^*)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] \end{aligned}$$

defined from the dual isomorphisms.

From Proposition 10.4.1, we have the following commutative diagram for the switch between $T^*T\mathcal{T}_g$ and $TT^*\mathcal{T}_g$:

$$(10.4.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (T^*T)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Swh}_{\mathcal{T}_g}} & (TT^*)_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \\ \cong \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow \\ (\mathbb{T}^\dagger\mathbb{T})_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Swh}_{\mathbb{T}}} & (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^\dagger)_{x_0}[\mathcal{U}] \end{array}$$

where two vertical arrows are canonical identification (cf. §2.6.2 and §9.3).

REMARK 10.4.1. For the record, we notice the following: In the correspondence (10.4.2) that for $([X], \llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[X]}^\dagger)$ in the left-hand side, we first choose X of a representative of $[X]$ and the representative $(\psi, q) \in \ker(D_1^{X, \dagger})$ of $\llbracket \psi, q \rrbracket_{[X]}^\dagger$. Then, (X, ψ) is a cocycle in $Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_q)$.

10.5. Lie bracket between vector fields

Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be C^1 -vector fields of type $(1, 0)$ defined around x_0 . We think of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} as smooth maps from a neighborhood of x_0 in \mathcal{T}_g to $T\mathcal{T}_g$.

THEOREM 10.5.1 (Lie bracket). Let \mathcal{U} be a locally finite covering of M satisfying that each U_i is an embedded closed disk with smooth boundary. Under the above notation, let $\mathcal{X}_{x_0} = [X]$ and $\mathcal{Y}_{x_0} = [Y] \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \cong H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} (D\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{Y})_{[X]})^{10} &= \llbracket Y, \dot{X} \rrbracket_X \in \mathbb{T}_X[\mathcal{U}] \cong \mathbb{T}_{[X]}[\mathcal{U}] \cong T_{[X]}T\mathcal{T}_g \\ (D\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X})_{[Y]})^{01} &= \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \cong \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}[\mathcal{U}] \cong T_{[Y]}T\mathcal{T}_g. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the Lie bracket of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} at x is represented by

$$(10.5.1) \quad [\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}]_{x_0} = [\dot{Y} - \dot{X} + [X, Y]] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0}).$$

In particular, $[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}]_{x_0} = 0$ if and only if

$$\dot{X} - \dot{Y} = [X, Y] + \delta\beta$$

for some $\beta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

PROOF. From Proposition 10.2.1,

$$\alpha_{\mathbb{Z}}(Y, (X, \dot{Y})) - (X, (Y, \dot{X})) = (X, (0, \dot{Y} - \dot{X} + [X, Y]))$$

is a lift of

$$\alpha_{\mathbb{T}}\left([Y], \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}\right) - \left([X], \llbracket Y, \dot{X} \rrbracket_{[X]}\right),$$

and its vertical projection is presented as $[\dot{Y} - \dot{X} + [X, Y]] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$ (cf. Proposition 5.3.1 and Remark 5.3.1). The formula (10.5.1) follows from Proposition 2.6.1. \square

REMARK 10.5.1. Since $\dot{Y}^* = -\dot{Y} - [X, Y]$, (10.5.1) is restated as

$$(10.5.2) \quad [\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}]_{x_0} = [\dot{Y}^* + \dot{X}] \in H^1(M_0, \Theta_{M_0})$$

where $*$ means the flip of subscripts defined in (5.3.4).

10.6. Lie bracket via the Dolbeaut presentation

We rephrase Theorem 10.5.1 under the Dolbeaut presentations. Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} as above. Fix cochains $\xi, \eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$ and $\delta\eta = Y$. Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} (D\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{Y})_{[X]})^{10} &= \langle -\partial\eta, \dot{\nu} \rangle_X^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_X^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] \\ &= \langle -\partial\eta, \dot{\nu} \rangle_\xi \in \mathbb{T}_\xi^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}] \\ (D\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{X})_{[Y]})^{01} &= \langle -\partial\xi, \dot{\mu} \rangle_Y^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}] \\ &= \langle -\partial\xi, \dot{\mu} \rangle_\eta \in \mathbb{T}_\eta^{Bel}[\mathcal{U}]. \end{aligned}$$

From the discussion in §10.2.3, we have

$$[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}]_{x_0} = [\dot{\nu} - \dot{\mu} + \bar{\partial}[\xi, \eta]] \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g,$$

which implies that

$$\langle [\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}]_{x_0}, q \rangle = \iint_{M_0} (\dot{\nu}_i - \dot{\mu}_i + [\xi_i, \eta_i]_{\bar{z}}) q$$

for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} = T_{x_0}^* \mathcal{T}_g$. Thus, $[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}]_{x_0} = 0$ if and only if there is a global vector field $\chi \in \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ such that

$$\dot{\nu} - \dot{\mu} + \bar{\partial}[\xi, \eta] = -\bar{\partial}\chi.$$

Variational formulae of L^1 -Norm function and Teichmüller metric

11.1. L^1 -norm for holomorphic quadratic differentials

In this section, we discuss the variational formula of the L^1 -norm for holomorphic quadratic differentials

$$T^*\mathcal{T}_g \cong \mathcal{Q}_g \ni q \mapsto \mathbf{n}(q) := \|q\|$$

on the cotangent bundle. It is known that the L^1 -norm function \mathbf{n} is of class C^1 on the cotangent bundle except for the zero section (cf. [67, Lemma 2]). For reader's convenience, we summarize Royden's argument briefly.

Let $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$. Fix a symplectic basis $\{A_k, B_k\}_{k=1}^g$ of $H_1(M_0, \mathbb{Z})$. Let w_0 be an Abelian differential on M_0 with simple zeroes. For $x = (M, f) \in \mathcal{T}_g$, we denote by w_0^x the Abelian differential on M with same A -periods as w_0 . Take a small neighborhood U of x_0 so that each zero of w_0^x for $x \in U$ are simple. We label the zeroes of w_0^x . Let w_i^x be the normalized Abelian differential on M whose A_k -period is δ_{ik} for $k = 1, \dots, g$. For $i = g+1, \dots, 3g-3$, let γ_i^x be the Abelian differential of the third kind which has simple pole of residue 1 at the $(i-g)$ -th zero of w_0^x , and a simple pole of residue -1 at the $2g-2$ -nd zero of w_0^x . Then,

$$U \times \mathbb{C} \mapsto (x, (t_1, \dots, t_{3g-3})) \mapsto \left(\sum_{i=1}^g t_i w_i^x + \sum_{i=g+1}^{3g-3} t_j \gamma_j^x \right) w_0^x \in \mathcal{Q}_g$$

gives a differentiable (holomorphic) local trivialization. We can check that the differential in the right of the above equation is differentiable (cf. Lemma 1 in [67]). Hence, the norm function varies as a function of C^1 . We apply (a part of) Royden's argument to obtain our variational formula and present the variational formula in our own setting.

11.1.1. Variational formula derived from Royden's calculation. The calculation here almost follows from that by Royden in [67]. We start with the following lemma.

LEMMA 11.1.1 (Lemma 1 in [67]). Let q_0 be a holomorphic quadratic differential on a Riemann surface W , and φ a smooth (not necessarily holomorphic) quadratic differential. Let K be a compact set in W . Then the function

$$f(t) = \iint_K |q_0(z) + t\varphi(z)| dx dy$$

is differentiable as a function of t , and satisfies

$$f(t) = f(0) + \frac{t}{2} \iint_K \frac{\overline{q_0} \varphi}{|q_0|} dx dy + \frac{\bar{t}}{2} \iint_K \frac{q_0 \overline{\varphi}}{|q_0|} dx dy + o(t).$$

In the proof of Lemma 11.1.1, Royden first discusses the variation

$$|q_0 + t\varphi| = |q_0| + t \frac{\overline{q_0}}{2|q_0|} \varphi + \bar{t} \frac{q_0}{2|q_0|} \overline{\varphi} + o(t)$$

on a compact set on which $|q_0| > 0$, and take the limit via the exhaustion of K by relatively compact domains of $K \cap \{|q_0| > 0\}$. By applying Royden's argument and Proposition 9.1.1, we also prove the following (see also the proof of [15, Theorem 5.3]).

THEOREM 11.1.1 (Variation of L^1 -norm). Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering of M_0 with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for all $i \in I$. For $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0} T^* \mathcal{T}_g$, we have

$$(11.1.1) \quad D\mathbf{n}|_{q_0}[V] = \frac{1}{4i} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{q_0}}{|q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz,$$

where $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ and $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$.

We notice the following.

- (1) Since the zeroes of q_0 is discrete, the integral (11.1.1) makes sense.
- (2) In the calculation of the formula (11.1.1), the following observation may be useful : For a differentiable vector field $X = X(z)\partial_z$ on U_i ,

$$L_X(|q_0|) = \left(\frac{\overline{q_0}}{2|q_0|} (q_0)' X + |q_0| X_z \right) d\bar{z} \wedge dz = \frac{\overline{q_0}}{2|q_0|} L_X(q_0)$$

on $z_i^0(U_i) \cap \{|q_0| > 0\}$.

- (3) The formula (11.1.1) is independent of the choice of ξ . Indeed, take $\Xi = \{\Xi_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\Xi = X$. Then $\mathcal{X} = \xi - \Xi$ is a global $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ -vector field on M_0 . In this case

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{q_0}}{|q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\Xi_i}(q_0)) - \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{q_0}}{|q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)) \\ &= \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{q_0}}{|q_0|} L_{\mathcal{X}}(q_0) = -2 \iint_{M_0} d(\mathcal{X}|q_0|d\bar{z}) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by the Green theorem.

- (4) The formula (11.1.1) is independent of the choice of the representative of $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0}$. Let $\alpha \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. We now choose $(X + \delta\alpha, \varphi + L_\alpha(q_0))$ as the representative of $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0}$. In this case, we may think $\xi + \alpha$ instead of ξ , and the inside of the parentheses of the integrand in (11.1.1) becomes

$$\varphi_i + L_{\alpha_i}(q_0) - L_{\xi_i + \alpha_i}(q_0) = \varphi - L_{\xi_i}(q_0).$$

This means that the integral is invariant.

- (5) The formula (11.1.1) recovers Royden's formula in Lemma 11.1.1. Indeed, when $[X] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ is trivial, from the above observation, we may assume that $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Hence, $\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)$ in the integrand of the right-hand side of (11.1.1) is defined from a (global) holomorphic quadratic differential on M_0 .

From the definition of the pairing (5.7.1), we conclude the following:

COROLLARY 11.1.1 (∂ -derivative of L^1 -norm). Let $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g$. Then,

$$\partial \mathbf{n}|_{q_0} = \frac{1}{2}[-L_\eta(q_0), Y]_{q_0}^\dagger = -\frac{1}{2}[L_\eta(q_0), -Y]_{q_0}^\dagger \in \mathbf{H}^{1,\dagger}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0}^* \mathcal{Q}_g$$

where $L_\eta(q_0) = \{L_{\eta_i}(q_0)\}_{i \in I}$, $\eta_i = \{\eta_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} = -\bar{q}_0/|q_0|$ for $i \in I$ and $Y = \delta\eta \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$.

Namely, Corollary 11.1.1 implies

$$\partial \mathbf{n}([X, \varphi]_{q_0}) = \mathcal{P}^\dagger \left([X, \varphi]_{q_0}, -\frac{1}{2}[L_\eta(q_0), -Y]_{q_0}^\dagger \right)$$

for $[X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$ and $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g$.

REMARK 11.1.1. Under the notation in the above discussion, we notice that $L_{\eta_i}(q_0)$ is holomorphic on U_i for all $i \in I$ and satisfies $L_{\eta_j}(q_0) - L_{\eta_i}(q_0) = L_{Y_{i,j}}(q_0)$ for $i, j \in I$. Indeed,

$$L_{\eta_i}(q_0)_{\bar{z}} = (q_0)'(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} + 2q_0(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}z} = -(q_0)' \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} + 2q_0 \frac{\bar{q}_0^2 (q_0)'}{2|q_0|^3} = 0$$

on $U_i - \text{Zero}(q_0)$. Since $\bar{q}_0/|q_0| \in L^\infty(U_i)$, we may think that η_i is Hölder continuous with exponent $1 - (2/p)$ and $(\eta_i)_z \in L^p(U_i)$ for arbitrary $p > 2$ by applying Calderón-Zygmund's theorem after identifying U_i with a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} (e.g. [32, Lemma 4.20, Proposition 4.23]). In particular, we have $L_{\eta_i}(q_0) \in L_{loc}^2(U_i)$ under the chart of U_i . Therefore, the Riemann removable singularity theorem (or the Weyl lemma) asserts that $L_{\eta_i}(q_0)$ is holomorphic on U_i .

11.1.2. Variational formula from the universal deformation. In [28], Hubbard and Masur discuss the representation of the tangent vectors at $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g$ adapted to the condition of critical points of q_0 . In this section, we restate the differential formula in this setting. The subject of this subsection is not needed for further development in this paper. However, it is interesting by itself.

Let $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$ and $[X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$, where $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a locally finite covering with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. Let $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i \in I}$ with $\delta\xi = X$. We consider the reasonable decomposition $\{R_j\}_{j \in J}$ of M_0 such that

- each R_j contains at most one zero of q_0 in its interior, and $|q_0| > 0$ on ∂R_j ; and
- each R_j is contained in $U_{i(j)}$ for some $i(j) \in I$.

Let J be the set of indices $j \in J$ such that the interior of R_j contains a zero $p_j \in M_0$ of q_0 . For $j \in J \setminus J_0$, we fix $p_j \in \text{Int}(R_j)$. We also assume

- for $j \in J_0$, there is a local chart (V_j, w_j) around p_j such that $\bar{R}_j \subset V_j$, $w_j(p_j) = 0$, and $q_0 = w^{k_j} dw^2$ under the coordinate (V_j, w_j) .

For $j \in J \setminus J_0$, we set $k_j = 0$. For $k \geq 0$, we define

$$P_k = \{(a_0 + a_1 w + \cdots + a_{k-2} w^{k-2}) dw^2 \mid a_i \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

for $k \geq 2$, and $P_k = \{0\}$ for $k = 0, 1$. From the universal deformation theorem by Hubbard and Masur, each $\varphi_{i(j)}$ is represented as

$$\varphi_{i(j)} = \mathfrak{p}_{\varphi;j} + L_{Z_j}(q_0)$$

on R_j , where $\mathfrak{p}_{\varphi;j} \in P_{k_j}$ and Z_j is a (bounded) holomorphic vector field on V_j (cf. [28, Proposition 3.1]).

Under the above notation, the formula (11.1.1) is rewritten as

$$(11.1.2) \quad Dn|_{q_0}[V] = \frac{1}{4i} \sum_{j \in J} \iint_{R_j} \left(\frac{\bar{w}}{|w|} \right)^{k_j} (\mathfrak{p}_{\varphi;j} - L_{\xi_i(j)-Z_j}(w^{k_j} dw^2)) d\bar{w} \wedge dw.$$

11.1.3. Tangent space to the unit sphere bundle. In this section, we summarize the structure of the real and complex tangent spaces to the unit tangent bundle in \mathcal{Q}_g . As Royden observed that the L^1 -norm function is of class C^1 on $\mathcal{Q}_g^\times = \mathcal{Q}_g - \{0\}$ (“0” means the zero section), See §11.2 for detail.

Let

$$\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_g = \{q \in \mathcal{Q}_g \mid \|q\| = 1\}.$$

The bundle $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ is the unit sphere bundle over \mathcal{T}_g . Let $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ and $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$. From Theorem 11.1.1, the real tangent space to $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_g$ at q_0 is described by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{q_0}^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_g &= \{V \in T_{q_0}\mathcal{Q}_g \mid \operatorname{Re}(\partial n(V)) = 0\} \\ &= \left\{ [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in T_{q_0}\mathcal{Q}_g \mid \operatorname{Re} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{2|q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)) = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$ and $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a locally finite covering with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. In the following argument we identify \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} with the vertical space of $T_{q_0}\mathcal{Q}_g = \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$. Namely,

$$\mathcal{Q}_{x_0} \ni \psi \xrightarrow{\cong} [0, \psi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}).$$

(cf. Remark 5.6.1). Let

$$(\mathcal{Q}_{x_0})_{q_0}^\perp = \left\{ [0, \psi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}, \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \psi = 0 \right\}.$$

Take $[X_{q_0}] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ such that the tangent vector corresponding to $[X_{q_0}]$ is presented by $\bar{q}_0/|q_0|$. Fix a guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} such that $\mathfrak{gf}([X_{q_0}]) = \bar{q}_0/|q_0|$. Take \mathfrak{L} as Proposition 6.1.1 for \mathfrak{gf} . In Proposition 6.1.1, we assume that all $\mathfrak{gf}([X])$ is smooth. However, we can treat this case in similar way.

We define a *horizontal lift* of $[X] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ by

$$[X, L_{\mathfrak{L}(X)_i}(q_0) - Q]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}),$$

where $Q \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Omega_{M_0})^{\otimes 2})$ with

$$\bar{\partial}Q = \bar{\partial}L_{\mathfrak{L}(X)_i}(q_0).$$

and

$$\iint_{M_0} \mathfrak{gf}([Z])Q = 0$$

for all $[Z] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. Then,

$$T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g \ni H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \ni [X] \mapsto [X, L_{\mathfrak{L}(X)_i}(q_0) - Q]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2})$$

is an injective \mathbb{C} -linear map. Let $T_{q_0}^H\mathcal{Q}_g$ be the image of the \mathbb{C} -linear map. We claim

PROPOSITION 11.1.1. The maximal complex subspace $T_{q_0}^{1,0}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_g$ of $T_{q_0}^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_g$ satisfies

$$(11.1.3) \quad T_{q_0}^{1,0}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q}_g = T_{q_0}^H\mathcal{Q}_g \oplus (\mathcal{Q}_{x_0})_{q_0}^\perp.$$

In particular,

$$T_{q_0}^{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{Q}_g = T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g \oplus (\mathcal{Q}_{x_0})_{q_0}^\perp \oplus \langle [0, iq_0]_{q_0} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

PROOF. The horizontal lift $T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$ and $(\mathcal{Q}_{x_0})_{q_0}^\perp$ are linearly independent since $(\mathcal{Q}_{x_0})_{q_0}^\perp$ is contained in the kernel of the differential of the projection $D\Pi_{T_g}^\dagger: T\mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow T\mathcal{T}_g$. Therefore, the dimension of the right-hand side of (11.1.3) is $3g - 3 + 3g - 4 = 6g - 7$. For a horizontal lift $V = [X, L_{\mathcal{L}(X)_i}(q_0) - Q]_{q_0} \in T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$, from Theorem 11.1.1,

$$D\mathbf{n}|_{q_0}[V] = \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{q_0}}{2|q_0|} (L_{\mathcal{L}(X)_i}(q_0) - Q - L_{\mathcal{L}(X)_i}(q_0)) = -\frac{1}{2} \iint_{M_0} \mathfrak{gf}([X_{q_0}])Q = 0.$$

Therefore, $T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$ is a subspace of $T_{q_0}^{1,0} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{Q}_g$. Since the dimension of $T_{q_0}^{1,0} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{Q}_g$ is $6g - 7$, (11.1.3) holds. We can easily check the decomposition of $T_{q_0}^{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{Q}_g$. \square

REMARK 11.1.2. The horizontal lift $T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$ is dependent of the choice of the guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} . In fact, the dependence is caused from an observation that the differential Q in the definition of the horizontal lift determined up to $(\mathcal{Q}_{x_0})_{q_0}^\perp$ when the guiding frame changes.

11.1.4. Conjectures on Levi convexity of unit ball bundles. Suppose q_0 is generic, that is, q_0 is in the principal stratum. Under the period coordinates $z = (z_1, \dots, z_{6g-6})$ via the double (branched) covering around q_0 , the L^1 -norm is presented as

$$\mathbf{n}(z) = i \sum_{j=1}^{3g-3} (z_j \overline{z_{g+j}} - z_{g+j} \overline{z_j})$$

after fixing a symplectic basis on the covering surface. Since the period coordinates via the double covering is a complex analytic chart, the Levi form of \mathbf{n} has exactly $3g - 3$ positive (negative) eigenvalues (cf. [50], [77]. See also [15, §5.4]).

Recall that a C^2 function on a complex manifold of dimension n is said to be *strictly k -pseudoconvex* if its Levi form has at least $n - k + 1$ positive eigenvalues. A domain D in a complex manifold is called *k -convex* at $x \in \partial D$ if there is a neighborhood U of x and a strictly k -pseudoconvex function φ on U such that $D \cap U = \{\varphi(x) < \varphi(x)\}$ (cf. [23, §2.2]). In this sense, the L^1 -norm function is strictly $(3g - 2)$ -pseudoconvex on the principal stratum and the unit ball bundle $\mathcal{Q}_g^1 = \{q \in \mathcal{Q}_g \mid \mathbf{n}(q) < 1\}$ is $(3g - 2)$ -convex at each generic boundary point.

Dumas [15] observes that the complex Hessian (Levi form) of the L^1 -norm function is positive definite at q_0 along \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} . From an observation in the simplest case given in §4.4.1, we pose the following conjecture:

CONJECTURE 11.1.1. When $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g$ is generic, the Levi form of the L^1 -norm function is negative on a horizontal lift $T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$.

CONJECTURE 11.1.2. The Teichmüller metric is (strictly) plurisubharmonic on $T\mathcal{T}_g$.

Conjecture 11.1.1 is possibly rephrased for general $q \in \mathcal{Q}_g$.

11.2. Royden's theorem revisited

We first discuss the regularity of the L^1 -norm function with our formula. Namely, the continuity of the total differential $d\mathbf{n}$ is derived from the presentation (11.1.1) as follows.

Let $\{[X_n, \varphi_n]_{q_n}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in $T\mathcal{Q}_g$ converges to $[X_0, \varphi_0]_{q_0}$ with $q_0 \neq 0$. from the definition of the tangent vectors to \mathcal{Q}_g (§5.6.2), we can take an appropriate cochain ξ_n with $\delta\xi_n = X_n$ ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) such that $(\varphi_n)_i$ and $(\xi_n)_i$ and their derivatives converge to $(\varphi_0)_i$ on $(\xi_0)_i$ and their derivatives uniformly on any compact sets on U_i with suitable covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ after trivializing locally the universal family over the Teichmüller space (see the discussion in §8.1.1). Therefore, $D\mathbf{n}([X_n, \varphi_n]_{q_n})$ tends to $D\mathbf{n}([X_0, \varphi_0]_{q_0})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by Lebesgue theorem. This implies the continuity of $D\mathbf{n}$ on $T\mathcal{Q}_g$.

The derivative $D\mathbf{n}$ presents the ∂ -derivative of the L^1 -norm function (see Corollary 11.1.1). Since the L^1 -norm function \mathbf{n} is real-valued, $\bar{\partial}\mathbf{n} = \overline{\partial\mathbf{n}}$ holds as the identify for sections to the complexified cotangent space

$$(T^*)^{\mathbb{C}}\mathcal{Q}_g = (T^*)^{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{Q}_g \otimes \mathbb{C} = (T^*)^{1,0}\mathcal{Q}_g \oplus (T^*)^{0,1}\mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_g^{\times} = \mathcal{Q}_g - \{0\},$$

where “0” means the zero section of the bundle $\mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$. As a consequence, we conclude that the total differential $d\mathbf{n} = \partial\mathbf{n} + \bar{\partial}\mathbf{n}$ is a continuous section on \mathcal{Q}_g^{\times} .

For the record, by combining with Proposition 3.2.1, we summarize as follows (cf. [67, Lemma 2]).

COROLLARY 11.2.1 (Royden). The L^1 -norm function \mathbf{n} on $\mathcal{Q}_g^{\times} = \mathcal{Q}_g - \{0\}$ is strictly convex and of class C^1 .

As noted by Royden in [67], the regularity of the Teichmüller metric follows from the regularity of the L^1 -norm and the following criterion (cf. [67, Lemma]). For the convenience of readers, we give a proof of the criterion at §13.3.

We recall that a function G on \mathbb{C}^n is said to be *complex homogeneous* if $G(\alpha\eta) = |\alpha|G(\eta)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ (See §1).

PROPOSITION 11.2.1 (Royden). Let U be an open subset of \mathbb{C}^m and $G(x, \eta)$ a continuous function on $U \times \mathbb{C}^n$, which for each x is a positive convex, and complex homogeneous function in $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Define $F(x, \xi)$ on $U \times \mathbb{C}^n$ by

$$F(x, \xi) = \sup\{\operatorname{Re}(\eta(\xi)) \mid G(x, \eta) = 1\}$$

where $\eta(\xi)$ denotes the \mathbb{C} -bilinear pairing

$$\eta(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \xi_i.$$

Then, F is continuous on $U \times \mathbb{C}^n$, and $F(x, \cdot)$ is a positive convex complex homogeneous function in $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$ for each $x \in U$. In addition,

- for $x \in U$, if $G(x, \cdot)$ is of class C^1 on $\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\}$, then $F(x, \cdot)$ is strictly convex; and
- if $G(x, \cdot)$ is strictly convex for each $x \in U$, and G is totally differentiable in the variable $x \in U$ and the x -derivative is continuous on $U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$, F is of class C^1 on $U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$. In fact, when

$$G(x + \Delta x, \eta) = G(x, \eta) + A_{x, \eta}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta}(\Delta x)} + o(|\Delta x|)$$

as $|\Delta x| \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x + \Delta x, \xi + \Delta\xi) &= -F(x, \xi)(A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x)}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\eta_{x, \xi}(\Delta\xi) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{\eta_{x, \xi}(\Delta\xi)} + o(|\Delta x| + |\Delta\xi|) \end{aligned}$$

as $|\Delta x| + |\Delta \xi| \rightarrow 0$, where $\eta_{x,\xi} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is a unique vector satisfying $F(x, \xi) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x,\xi}(\xi))$ and $G(x, \eta_{x,\xi}) = 1$.

Actually, Royden stated the proposition for real Finsler metrics. We discuss in complex analytic case for the sake of (more) direct applications to our purpose. However, the proof is essentially same as that of the real case. In summary, we obtain

COROLLARY 11.2.2 (Royden). The Teichmüller metric τ on $T\mathcal{T}_g - \{0\}$ is strictly convex and of class C^1 .

11.3. Teichmüller metric

The Teichmüller metric is thought of as a function on the tangent bundle:

$$T\mathcal{T}_g \ni v \mapsto \tau(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}(v), v)$$

where $\pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}: T\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ is the projection. (cf. §3.2.4). In this section, we compute the differential of the Teichmüller metric on $T\mathcal{T}_g$ under our setting.

11.3.1. Variational formula. We prove the following.

THEOREM 11.3.1 (Derivative of the Teichmüller metric). Let $x_0 = (M_0, f_0) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ and $v_0 \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering of M_0 such that each U_i is a closed (topological) disk with smooth boundary in M_0 . Suppose that v_0 is represented by the Teichmüller differential $\tau(x_0, v_0) \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|}$ for $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{M_0} - \{0\}$. Then, for $V = \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \cong T_{v_0}T\mathcal{T}_g$,

$$D\tau|_{v_0}[V] = \frac{1}{4i\|q_0\|} \iint_{M_0} (\dot{\nu}_i q_0 + \mu L_{\eta_i}(q_0) - L_{\eta_i}(\mu q_0)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.$$

where

- $q_0 \in H^0(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}) = \mathcal{Q}_{M_0}$;
- $Y \in Z^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ with $[Y] = v_0$ in $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$;
- $\xi, \eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$ and $\delta\eta = Y$; and
- $\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl} \in \mathbb{T}_Y^{Dol}[\mathcal{U}]$ with $\mathcal{D}_0(\langle \mu, \dot{\nu} \rangle_Y^{cycl}) = \llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y$ and $\mu = -\bar{\partial}\xi_i$ on U_i .

PROOF. By considering $q_0/\|q_0\|$ instead of q_0 in the statement, we may assume that $\|q_0\| = 1$. From the discussion in §5.8, we may also assume that

$$(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} = -\tau(x_0, v_0) \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|}$$

on U_i . Consider a non-negative C^1 -function

$$(11.3.1) \quad F(v, q) = \tau(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}(v), v) \mathbf{n}(q) - \operatorname{Re}\mathcal{P}(v, q)$$

on the Whitney sum $T\mathcal{T}_g \oplus T^*\mathcal{T}_g$. From the assumption, by the Teichmüller theorem, F attains the minimum $F(v_0, q_0) = 0$ at (v_0, q_0) . For the simplicity we let $\tau_0 = \tau(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}(v_0), v_0)$.

Since F attains the minimum at (v_0, q_0) ($\|q_0\| = 1$) and the pairing function \mathcal{P} is holomorphic,

$$0 = DF[V_1, V_2] = D\tau|_{v_0}[V_1] + \tau_0 D\mathbf{n}|_{q_0}[V_2] - \frac{1}{2} D\mathcal{P}|_{(v_0, q_0)}[V_1, V_2]$$

for all $(V_1, V_2) \in T_{(v_0, q_0)}(T\mathcal{T}_g \oplus T^*\mathcal{T}_g)$. From Corollary 9.2.1 and Theorem 11.1.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
D\tau|_{v_0}[V_1] &= \frac{1}{2} D\mathcal{P}|_{(v_0, q_0)}[V_1, V_2] - \tau_0 D\mathbf{n}|_{q_0}[V_2] \\
&= \frac{1}{4i} \iint_{M_0} \left(\left((\dot{v}_i - [\xi_i, \eta_i]_{\bar{z}})q_0 + \tau_0 \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \varphi_i \right) - L_{\xi_i} \left(\tau_0 \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} q_0 \right) \right) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\
&\quad - \tau_0 \frac{1}{4i} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\
&= \frac{1}{4i} \iint_{M_0} \left(\left((\dot{v}_i - [\xi_i, \eta_i]_{\bar{z}})q_0 + \tau_0 \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \varphi_i \right) - \frac{\tau_0 \bar{q}_0}{2|q_0|} L_{\xi_i}(q_0) \right) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\
&\quad - \tau_0 \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz \\
&= \frac{1}{4i} \iint_{M_0} \left((\dot{v}_i - [\xi_i, \eta_i]_{\bar{z}})q_0 + \frac{\tau_0 \bar{q}_0}{2|q_0|} L_{\xi_i}(q_0) \right) d\bar{z} \wedge dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $[\xi_i, \eta_i]_{\bar{z}} = -[\mu, \eta_i] + [\xi_i, (\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}]$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mu, \eta_i]q_0 &= (\mu(\eta_i)_z - \mu_z \eta_i)q_0 \\
&= \mu(\eta_i)_z q_0 + \mu(\eta_i)_z q_0 + \eta_i \mu(q_0)' - L_{\eta_i}(\mu q_0) \\
&= \mu L_{\eta_i}(q_0) - L_{\eta_i}(\mu q_0) \\
[\xi_i, (\eta_i)_{\bar{z}}]q_0 &= (\xi_i(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}z} - (\xi_i)_z(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}})q_0 \\
&= \xi_i \frac{\tau_0 \bar{q}_0}{2|q_0|}(q_0)' + \tau_0 (\xi_i)_z |q_0| = \frac{\tau_0 \bar{q}_0}{2|q_0|} L_{\xi_i}(q_0),
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$D\tau|_{v_0}[V_1] = \frac{1}{4i} \iint_{M_0} (\dot{v}_i q_0 + \mu L_{\eta_i}(q_0) - L_{\eta_i}(\mu q_0)) d\bar{z} \wedge dz,$$

which is what we wanted. \square

Hence, from Theorem 5.5.1, we conclude the following (cf. Remark 11.1.1).

COROLLARY 11.3.1 (∂ -differential of the Teichmüller metric). Let $v_0 = [Y] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0}) \cong T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$. Suppose that $\tau_0 = \tau(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}(v_0), v_0)$ and v_0 is represented by $\tau_0 \bar{q}_0 / |q_0|$, where $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} - \{0\}$. Then,

$$\partial\tau|_{v_0} = \frac{1}{2\|q_0\|} \llbracket L_{\eta_i}(q_0), q_0 \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger \in \mathbb{T}_{[Y]}^\dagger[\mathcal{U}] \cong T_{v_0}^* T\mathcal{T}_g$$

as a 1-form on $T\mathcal{T}_g$, where $\eta = \{\eta_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1}(\Theta_{M_0 - \text{Zero}(q_0)}))$ with $\delta\eta = Y$ and $(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} = -\tau_0 \bar{q}_0 / |q_0|$.

Corollary 11.1.1 is equivalent to

$$\partial\tau(\langle \mu, \dot{v} \rangle_Y^{cyl}) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}} \left(\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_{[Y]}, \frac{1}{2\|q_0\|} \llbracket L_{\eta_i}(q_0), q_0 \rrbracket_{[Y]}^\dagger \right)$$

for $Y = \delta\eta$, $\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y \in \mathbb{T}_Y[\mathcal{U}] \cong T_{v_0} T\mathcal{T}_g$, $\langle \mu, \dot{v} \rangle_Y^{cyl} = \mathcal{D}_0(\llbracket X, \dot{Y} \rrbracket_Y)$, and $v_0 = \mathcal{T}_{x_0}([Y])$.

REMARK 11.3.1. From Remark 9.2.1 and Remark (5) after the statement of Theorem 11.1.1, when $[X] = 0$, $\dot{\nu} = \dot{\nu}_i$ can be assumed to be a globally defined Beltrami differential on M_0 and the formula (11.3.1) becomes

$$D\tau|_{v_0}[V] = \frac{1}{4i\|q_0\|} \iint_{M_0} \dot{\nu}_i(z)q_0(z)d\bar{z} \wedge dz = \frac{1}{2} \iint_{M_0} \dot{\nu}(z) \frac{q_0(z)}{\|q_0\|} dx dy = \frac{1}{2} \langle \dot{\nu}, q_0/\|q_0\| \rangle.$$

In particular, in this case, we derive the following formula:

$$(11.3.2) \quad \left. \frac{d}{dt} \kappa(x_0, v_0 + tV) \right|_{t=0} = 2\operatorname{Re}(D\tau|_{v_0}[V]) = \operatorname{Re}\langle V, q_0/\|q_0\| \rangle,$$

which is probably well-known to experts (see [61, Lemma 2.1]).

REMARK 11.3.2. In Theorem 11.3.1, the condition of the cochain η can be weakened. Indeed, we may consider the cochain $\eta \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{2,1}(\Omega_{M_0}))$ with only the condition $\delta\eta = Y$ by applying the argument for the independence of choices of representatives for defining the model of pairing given in §5.5.1.

11.4. Infinitesimal Duality

From the definition, the Teichmüller metric is thought of as the dual (Finsler) metric on \mathcal{T}_g to the L^1 -norm on \mathcal{Q}_g (cf. §3.2.4). The above mentioned variational formulae of the L^1 -norm and the Teichmüller metric implies that these also satisfy the following duality in the infinitesimal sense:

THEOREM 11.4.1 (Infinitesimal duality). Let $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ and let $v_0 \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ which is presented by the Teichmüller Beltrami differential $\|q_0\|\bar{q}/|q|$. Then, the ∂ -derivatives of the squares of the L^1 -norm and the Teichmüller metric satisfy

$$(11.4.1) \quad \mathbf{Sw}_{\mathcal{T}_g} \circ (\mathbf{dual}_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger)^{-1}(-\partial\mathbf{n}^2|_{q_0}) = \mathbf{Sw}_{\mathcal{T}_g} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2}|_{q_0} \right) = \partial\tau^2|_{v_0},$$

where $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2}$ is the Hamiltonian vector field of the square \mathbf{n}^2 of the L^1 -norm function.

PROOF. Let $\eta = \{\eta_i\}_{i \in I}$ be the cochain with $(\eta_i)_{\bar{z}} = -\bar{q}_0/|q_0|$. Let $Y = \delta\eta$. Notice that

$$(11.4.2) \quad \tau(x_0, v_0) = \sup_{\|q\|=1, q \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}} \operatorname{Re}(\langle v_0, q \rangle) = \sup_{\|q\|=1, q \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}} \operatorname{Re} \left(\iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} q \right) = \|q_0\|.$$

Since a cochain $\eta' = \|q_0\|\eta$ and $Y' = \|q_0\|Y$ satisfies

$$\delta\eta' = \|q_0\|Y = Y', \quad (\eta'_i)_{\bar{z}} = -\|q_0\| \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} = -\tau(x_0, v_0) \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|},$$

$v_0 \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{T}_g$ is the tangent vector presented by $\tau(x_0, v_0)\bar{q}_0/|q_0|$ and $[Y'] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$. From Corollary 11.1.1 and Corollary 11.3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial\mathbf{n}^2|_{q_0} &= -2\mathbf{n}(q_0)\partial\mathbf{n}|_{q_0} = \|q_0\| [L_\eta(q_0), -Y]_{q_0} \\ &= [L_{\|q_0\|\eta}(q_0), -\|q_0\|Y]_{q_0} \\ &= [L_{\eta'}(q_0), -Y']_{q_0} \\ \partial\tau^2|_{v_0} &= 2\tau(x_0, v_0)\partial\tau|_{v_0} = 2\|q_0\|\partial\tau|_{v_0} \\ &= \llbracket L_{\eta'}(q_0), q_0 \rrbracket_{[Y']}^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

in the models. From Theorem 10.3.1 and Proposition 10.4.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Sw}_\mathbb{T} \circ (\mathbf{dual}_\mathbb{T}^\dagger)^{-1} ([L_{\eta'}(q_0), -Y']_{q_0}) &= \mathbf{Sw}_\mathbb{T} ([Y', L_{\eta'}(q_0)]_{q_0}) \\ &= \llbracket L_{\eta'}(q_0), q_0 \rrbracket_{[Y']}^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 2.6.4,

$$(\mathbf{dual}_\mathbb{T}^\dagger)^{-1} (-\partial \mathbf{n}^2|_{q_0}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{X}_{-\mathbf{n}^2}|_{q_0} = -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2}|_{q_0}.$$

Since the model spaces and the model bundle maps actually describe the actual spaces and the actual bundle maps (cf.§9.3), we obtain the formula which we wanted. \square

From the calculation in the proof of Theorem 11.4.1, we also obtain the following.

COROLLARY 11.4.1 (Canonical sections). We have

$$\begin{aligned} D\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger ((\mathbf{dual}_\mathbb{T}^\dagger)^{-1} (-\partial \mathbf{n}^2|_{q_0})) &= D\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2}|_{q_0} \right) \\ &= \Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g} (\partial \mathcal{T}^2|_{v_0}) \\ &= v_0 = \left[\|q_0\| \frac{\overline{q_0}}{|q_0|} \right] \in T\mathcal{T}_g \end{aligned}$$

for $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g$, where $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}: T\mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger: \mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ are the projections of the bundles, $D\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger: T\mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow T\mathcal{T}_g$ is the differential.

Teichmüller Beltrami differentials

In this chapter, we discuss the maps

$$\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}: \mathcal{Q}_g^\times := \mathcal{Q}_g - \{0\} \ni q \mapsto \|q\| \left[\frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \right] \in T^\times \mathcal{T}_g = T\mathcal{T}_g - \{0\}$$

$$\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}_0: \mathcal{Q}_g^\times \ni q \mapsto \left[\frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \right] \in T^\times \mathcal{T}_g$$

defined by the Teichmüller Beltrami differentials (§3.2.3), where “0” in the equation means the zero sections. We call the maps the *Teichmüller Beltrami maps*. From the Teichmüller theorem, the map $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}_0$ is continuous, and the map $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}$ is a homeomorphism. The Teichmüller Beltrami maps satisfy

$$(12.0.1) \quad \tau \left(\Pi_{T\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger(q_0), \mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}(q_0) \right) = \mathbf{n}(q_0)$$

$$(12.0.2) \quad \mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}_0(q_0) = \mathbf{n}(q_0)^{-1} \mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}(q_0)$$

for $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ (cf. (11.4.2)).

The aim of this chapter is to prove Theorem A.

12.1. Teichmüller Beltrami maps are real-analytic on strata

We first discuss the smoothness of the Teichmüller Beltrami maps $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}_0$. From Corollary 11.4.1, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T\mathcal{Q}_g & \xrightarrow{D\Pi_{T\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger} & T\mathcal{T}_g \\ \uparrow -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2} & \nearrow \mathcal{I}\mathcal{B} & \downarrow \Pi_{T\mathcal{T}_g} \\ \mathcal{Q}_g^\times & \xrightarrow{\Pi_{T\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger} & \mathcal{T}_g \end{array}$$

Notice that $-\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2} = 2\mathit{dual}_{T\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger(-\partial\mathbf{n}^2)$ from Proposition 2.6.4, and the bundle map $\mathit{dual}_{T\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger: T\mathcal{Q}_g \rightarrow T^*\mathcal{Q}_g$ is biholomorphic. Since the L^1 -norm function \mathbf{n} on \mathcal{Q}_g is real-analytic on each stratum of \mathcal{Q}_g , so is $\partial\mathbf{n}^2$ (cf. §3.4). Therefore,

$$\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B} = D\Pi_{T\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger \circ \left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{n}^2} \right)$$

is real-analytic on each stratum. Since $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathbf{n}^{-1} \mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{B}$ is also real-analytic on each stratum. We summarize as follows.

PROPOSITION 12.1.1 (Teichmüller Beltrami maps are real-analytic). The Teichmüller Beltrami maps $\mathcal{TB}, \mathcal{TB}_0: \mathcal{Q}_g^\times \rightarrow T^*\mathcal{T}_g$ are real-analytic on each stratum of \mathcal{Q}_g .

12.2. Teichmüller Beltrami map is diffeomorphic on strata

We deal with the following map defined by the pairing:

$$(12.2.1) \quad \mathcal{Q}_g^* \oplus \mathcal{Q}_g \ni (q, \alpha) \mapsto \mathcal{TB}(q, \alpha) = \|q\| \iint_M \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \alpha = \frac{\|q\|}{2i} \iint_M \frac{\overline{q(z)}}{|q(z)|} \alpha(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

$$(12.2.2) \quad \mathcal{Q}_g^* \oplus \mathcal{Q}_g \ni (q, \alpha) \mapsto \mathcal{TB}_0(q, \alpha) = \iint_M \frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \alpha = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_M \frac{\overline{q(z)}}{|q(z)|} \alpha(z) d\bar{z} \wedge dz,$$

where M is the underlying surface of q (and α). The map (12.2.2) is decomposed into

$$(12.2.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Q}_g^* \oplus \mathcal{Q}_g & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{TB}_0 \oplus id} & T\mathcal{T}_g \oplus \mathcal{Q}_g & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}\tau_g} & \mathbb{C} \\ (q, \alpha) & \longrightarrow & \left(\left[\frac{\bar{q}}{|q|} \right], \alpha \right) & & \\ & & (v, \alpha) & \longrightarrow & \langle v, \alpha \rangle. \end{array}$$

12.2.1. Variational formula. Let $\{(q_t, \alpha_t)\}_{|t|<\epsilon}$ be a holomorphic curve in $\mathcal{Q}_g^* \oplus \mathcal{Q}_g$. Let $V_1 = [X, \varphi]_{q_0}$ and $V_2 = [X, \psi]_{\alpha_0}$ be the tangent vectors in $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0}) \cong T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$ and $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{\alpha_0}) \cong T_{\alpha_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$, where $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a locally finite covering of the underlying surface M_0 of q_0 (and α_0) with $H^1(U_i, \Theta_{M_0}) = 0$ for $i \in I$. Then,

$$\frac{\overline{q_0 + t\varphi + o(t)}}{|q_0 + t\varphi + o(t)|} (\alpha_0 + t\psi + o(t)) = \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \alpha_0 + t \left(-\frac{\bar{q}_0 \alpha_0}{2q_0 |q_0|} \varphi_i + \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \psi_i \right) + \bar{t} \frac{\alpha_0 \bar{\varphi}_i}{2|q_0|} + o(t)$$

on any compact set in U_i ($i \in I$) outside of the zeroes of q_0 , where $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$. From Proposition 5.6.2, the above calculation also works even when the family $\{q_t\}_{|t|<\epsilon}$ is contained in a stratum in \mathcal{Q}_g . Thus, we obtain the following.

PROPOSITION 12.2.1 (Differential of Teichmüller Beltrami differentials). Under the above notation, when q_0 and the family $\{q_t\}_{|t|<\epsilon}$ are in a stratum $\mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$,

$$D\mathcal{TB}_0|_{(q_0, \alpha_0)}[V_1, V_2] = -\frac{1}{2i} \iint_{M_0} \left(-\frac{\bar{q}_0 \alpha_0}{2q_0 |q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)) + \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} (\psi_i - L_{\xi_i}(\alpha_0)) \right) d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

$$\bar{D}\mathcal{TB}_0|_{(q_0, \alpha_0)}[V_1, V_2] = -\frac{1}{4i} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\alpha_0}{|q_0|} \overline{(\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0))} d\bar{z} \wedge dz$$

for $V_1 = [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ and $V_2 = [X, \psi]_{\alpha_0} \in T_{\alpha_0} \mathcal{Q}_g$.

Before proving Proposition 12.2.1, we notice that the integrals in Proposition 12.2.1 are independent of the choice of the cochain $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta\xi = X$. From a bit modification of the argument in Remark (3) below Theorem 11.1.1, the independence follows from the following identities:

$$(12.2.4) \quad \left(-\frac{\bar{q}_0 \alpha_0}{2q_0 |q_0|} L_\chi(q_0) + \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} L_\chi(\alpha_0) \right) d\bar{z} \wedge dz = -d \left(\frac{\bar{q}_0 \alpha_0}{|q_0|} \chi d\bar{z} \right)$$

$$(12.2.5) \quad \frac{\bar{\alpha}_0}{|q_0|} L_\chi(q_0) d\bar{z} \wedge dz = -2d \left(\frac{q_0 \bar{\alpha}_0}{|q_0|} \chi d\bar{z} \right)$$

on $M_0 - \text{Zero}(q_0)$ for a global vector field χ on M_0 of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$. We should be careful in the discussion because the $(0,1)$ -differentials in the rights of the above two identities are discontinuous on M_0 . However, as was discussed before, the Green formula varies for such differentials since the differentials are bounded and continuous except for the zeroes of q_0 (cf. §5.8).

The differentiable formulae are obtained by Proposition 9.1.1 with applying the argument in Lemma 11.1.1 and the following identifies

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\xi_i} \left(\frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \alpha_0 \right) &= -\frac{\bar{q}_0 \alpha_0}{2q_0 |q_0|} L_{\xi_i}(q_0) + \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} L_{\xi_i}(\alpha_0) \\ L_{\xi_i} \left(\frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \alpha_0 \right) &= L_{\xi_i} \left(\frac{q_0}{|q_0|} \bar{\alpha}_0 \right) = \frac{\bar{\alpha}_0}{2|q_0|} L_{\xi_i}(q_0) \end{aligned}$$

on U_i for $i \in I$, which are equivalent to (12.2.4) and (12.2.5), respectively.

12.2.2. Proof of Theorem A. From Proposition 12.1.1, we only discuss the regularity of the differentials of the Teichmüller Beltrami map \mathcal{TB} . Let N_0 be a sufficiently small neighborhood of x_0 in \mathcal{T}_g and $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{3g-3}\}$ be a system of holomorphic sections of the bundle $\mathcal{Q}_g|_{N_0} \rightarrow N_0$ such that $\alpha_1(x), \dots, \alpha_{3g-3}(x)$ generate the fiber \mathcal{Q}_x for any $x \in N_0$. Then, the map

$$T\mathcal{T}_g|_{N_0} \ni v \mapsto (x, (\langle v, \alpha_1(x) \rangle, \dots, \langle v, \alpha_{3g-3}(x) \rangle)) \in N_0 \times \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$$

($x \in N_0$ with $v \in T_x \mathcal{T}_g$) is a holomorphic (local) trivialization.

Case : q_0 is generic. We first discuss the case where q_0 is generic, i.e. q_0 is in the principal stratum $\mathcal{Q}_1 = \mathcal{Q}_g(1, \dots, 1; -1)$.

Let $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$. Let $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$. Let $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ with $\delta \xi = X$. Let $\{q_t\}_{|t|<\epsilon}$ be a holomorphic family of holomorphic quadratic differentials which is tangent to V at $t=0$. Let $x(t) \in \mathcal{T}_g$ with $q_t \in \mathcal{Q}_{x(t)}$ ($x(0) = x_0$). Let $\alpha_i = \alpha_i(x_0)$ and $V_k = [X, \psi^k]_{\alpha_k} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{\alpha_k})$ ($k=1, \dots, 3g-3$) the tangent vector to the family $\{\alpha_k(x(t))\}_{|t|<\epsilon}$ at $t=0$.

Suppose $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} D\mathcal{TB}|_{(q_0, \alpha_k)}[V, V_k] + \bar{D}\mathcal{TB}|_{(q_0, \alpha_k)}[V, V_k] \\ = D\mathbf{n}(q_0)|_{q_0}[V] \mathcal{TB}_0(q_0, \alpha_k) + \mathbf{n}(q_0) D\mathcal{TB}_0|_{(q_0, \alpha_k)}[V, V_k] \\ + \overline{D\mathbf{n}(q_0)|_{q_0}[V]} \mathcal{TB}_0(q_0, \alpha_k) + \mathbf{n}(q_0) \bar{D}\mathcal{TB}_0|_{(q_0, \alpha_k)}[V, V_k] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $k=1, \dots, 3g-3$ (cf. Lemma 9.1.1). These equations are equivalent to

(12.2.6)

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0 \alpha_k}{|q_0|} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{2|q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)) + \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0 \alpha_k}{|q_0|} \iint_{M_0} \frac{q_0}{2|q_0|} \overline{(\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0))} \\ = \iint_{M_0} |q_0| \iint_{M_0} \left(-\frac{\bar{q}_0 \alpha_k}{2q_0 |q_0|} (\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0)) + \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} (\psi_i^k - L_{\xi_i}(\alpha_k)) \right) \\ + \iint_{M_0} |q_0| \iint_{M_0} \frac{\alpha_k}{2|q_0|} \overline{(\varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0))} \end{aligned}$$

for $k=1, \dots, 3g-3$, where we omit to write the Euclid measure $d\bar{z} \wedge dz/2i$ in the equation for the simplicity. Since we now discuss about the non-degeneracy of the differential of the Teichmüller Beltrami map, we may further suppose that these equations hold no matter how we choose initially the sections α_k around x_0 .

Suppose to the contrary that $[X] \neq 0$. Take $a \in \mathbb{C}$ arbitrary. By definition, $D\alpha_k|_{x_0}[[X]] = V_k = [X, \psi^k]_{\alpha_k}$. Since $[X, \psi^k + \beta]_{\alpha_k} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{\alpha_k})$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$, by modifying the sections α_k in the vertical direction in the beginning, we may assume that

$$(12.2.7) \quad \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} (\psi_i^k - L_{\xi_i}(\alpha_k)) = a$$

for $k = 1, \dots, 3g-3$. However, this contradicts to (12.2.6) because the terms except for the second in the first term of the right-hand side are independent of $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, $[X] = 0$ and $V_k = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, 3g-3$. Hence, we may also assume that $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and $\psi^k = L_{\xi}(q_0)$.

By substituting $\beta = \varphi_i - L_{\xi_i}(q_0) \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ into (12.2.6), we obtain

$$(12.2.8) \quad \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0 \gamma}{|q_0|} \operatorname{Re} \left(\iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \beta \right) = \iint_{M_0} |q_0| \iint_{M_0} \frac{\gamma}{2|q_0|} \left(\bar{\beta} - \frac{\bar{q}_0}{q_0} \beta \right)$$

for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ since $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{3g-3}$ is a basis of \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} . By substituting $\gamma = q_0$ into (12.2.8), we get

$$(12.2.9) \quad \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{q}_0}{|q_0|} \beta = 0.$$

Suppose to the contrary that $\beta \neq 0$. By substituting $\gamma = \beta$ into (12.2.8), we get

$$0 = \iint_{M_0} \frac{\beta}{|q_0|} \left(\bar{\beta} - \frac{\bar{q}_0}{q_0} \beta \right) = \iint_{M_0} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{q}_0}{q_0} \frac{\beta}{\bar{\beta}} \right) \frac{|\beta|^2}{|q_0|}.$$

Since $\operatorname{Re}(1 - (\bar{q}_0/q_0)(\beta/\bar{\beta})) \geq 0$, we obtain

$$1 - \frac{\bar{q}_0}{q_0} \frac{\beta}{\bar{\beta}} = 0$$

almost everywhere on M_0 . Since q_0 and β are holomorphic quadratic differentials, the equation means that the imaginary part of a meromorphic function β/q_0 vanishes. Therefore, we obtain $\beta = \lambda q_0$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, from (12.2.9), $\lambda = 0$ and $\beta = 0$. This is a contradiction. Thus, we conclude that $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0} = [\delta\xi, L_{\xi}(q_0)]_{q_0} = 0$ in $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{q_0})$.

Case : q_0 is in another stratum. The strategy of the proof of the non-degeneracy is same. We give a sketch by comparing with the discussion of the previous case.

Suppose $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$. We denote by $\mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$ the subspace of \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} consisting of $\psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ such that ψ/q_0 is at most simple poles on M_0 . Dumas [15] shows that $\mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$ is thought of as the tangent space at q_0 to the stratum containing q_0 of a natural stratification on \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} induced from the stratification on \mathcal{Q}_g . Notice that $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$ and hence $\mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$ is not trivial. Dumas also discuss an Hermitian inner product

$$(12.2.10) \quad \iint_{M_0} \frac{\bar{\alpha}\beta}{|q_0|} \quad (\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0))$$

on $\mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$. Let $d_0 = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$.

From the beginning of the proof in the previous discussion, we modify the basis $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{3g-3}$ such that $\alpha_k \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$ for $k = 1, \dots, d_0$. Furthermore, $V_k \in T_{\alpha_k} \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ for $k = 1, \dots, d_0$.

Let $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0} \in T_{q_0} \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$, and suppose

$$D\mathcal{TB}|_{(q_0, \alpha_k)}[V, V_k] + \overline{D}\mathcal{TB}|_{(q_0, \alpha_k)}[V, V_k] = 0$$

for $k = 1, \dots, d_0$. Take an arbitrary $a \in \mathbb{C}$. From Proposition 5.6.2, $[X, \psi^k + \beta]_{\alpha_k} \in T_{\alpha_k} \mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$. Since the stratum $\mathcal{Q}_g(k_1, \dots, k_n; \epsilon)$ is a complex manifold, after modifying the analytic disk $\{\alpha_k(x(t))\}_{|t| < \epsilon}$ in the vertical direction in the stratum, we may assume that (12.2.7) holds for $k = 1, \dots, d_0$. Hence, we get $X = \delta\xi$ for some $\xi \in C^0(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ and $V_k = [X, \psi^k]_{\alpha_k} = 0$ in $\mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{L}_{\alpha_k})$. By thinking the Hermitian product (12.2.10) on $\mathcal{Q}_{x_0}(q_0)$, the rest of the discussion is almost the same as that given in the case where q_0 is generic to obtain $V = [X, \varphi]_{q_0} = 0$.

12.3. Conjectural picture on CR-structures on unit sphere bundles

Notice that the Teichmüller Beltrami map \mathcal{TB}_0 maps the unit sphere bundle \mathcal{SQ}_g to the unit sphere bundle $\mathcal{ST}_g = \{v \in T\mathcal{T}_g \mid \tau(\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}(v), v) = 1\}$. We discuss the Teichmüller Beltrami map \mathcal{TB}_0 in the infinitesimal level. Here, we only treat the map \mathcal{TB}_0 on the generic differentials. The purpose of this section is to make a conjectural picture of the Teichmüller Beltrami map from Complex analysis point of view.

Let $q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_g$ be a generic differential. Let $x_0 = \Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger(q_0)$. As the proof of Theorem A, we consider the map

$$\mathcal{SQ}_g \ni q \mapsto (\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger(q), (\langle \mathcal{TB}_0(q), \alpha_1(\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger(q)) \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathcal{TB}_0(q), \alpha_{3g-3}(\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_g}^\dagger(q)) \rangle))$$

on the unit sphere bundle \mathcal{SQ}_g . Set $\alpha_k = \alpha_k(x_0) \in \mathcal{Q}_{x_0}$ for $k = 1, \dots, 3g-3$. Let $[X_{q_0}] \in H^1(\mathcal{U}, \Theta_{M_0})$ which presents $\overline{q_0}/|q_0|$. Define a guiding frame \mathfrak{gf} by $\mathfrak{gf}([X_{q_0}]) = \overline{q_0}/|q_0|$. Let \mathcal{L} be the good section defined from \mathfrak{gf} . Let $V_k = [X_k, \{L_{\mathcal{L}(X_k)_i}(q_0) - Q_k\}_{i \in I}]_{q_0}$ where $Q_k \in \Gamma(M_0, \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\Omega_{M_0}^{\otimes 2}))$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\partial}Q_k &= \overline{\partial}L_{\mathcal{L}(X_k)_i}(q_0) \quad (\text{on } U_i) \\ \iint_{M_0} \frac{\overline{\alpha_j}}{|q_0|} Q_k &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in I$ and $1 \leq j \leq 3g-3$. Then, V_1, \dots, V_{3g-3} spans the horizontal lift $T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g \subset T_{q_0}^{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{SQ}_g$ of $T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$. We claim

PROPOSITION 12.3.1 (Horizontal lift). The differential of the Teichmüller Beltrami map is \mathbb{C} -linear on $T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$, and the image is the horizontal lift of $T_{x_0} \mathcal{T}_g$ in the holomorphic tangent space to \mathcal{T}_g .

PROOF. Let $W_k^j = D\alpha_j|_{x_0}([X_k])$. From Proposition 12.2.1, for $1 \leq j, k \leq 3g-3$,

$$\overline{D}\mathcal{TB}_0|_{(q_0, \alpha_j)}[V_k, W_k^j] = -\frac{1}{4i} \iint_{M_0} \frac{\alpha_j}{|q_0|} (\overline{L_{\mathcal{L}(X_k)_i}(q_0) - Q_k} - L_{\mathcal{L}(X_k)_i}(q_0)) = 0.$$

Since sections $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^{3g-3}$ gives the complex analytic local trivialization, the differential of \mathcal{TB}_0 on $T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$ is obtained from its ∂ -derivatives, and hence it is complex linear on $T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$. The later claim is trivial because the Teichmüller Beltrami map is a fiber bundle isomorphism. \square

From Proposition 12.3.1, we hope that the Teichmüller Beltrami map is a kind of nice on the horizontal lifts from the complex analysis point of view. For instance,

relating the observation in §4.4.2 and the conjecture given in §11.1.4, we pose the following problem.

PROBLEM 1. Let \mathcal{SQ}_g^0 be a subset of \mathcal{SQ}_g consisting of generic differentials. Does the subbundle of horizontal lifts

$$\cup_{q_0 \in \mathcal{SQ}_g^0} T_{q_0}^H \mathcal{Q}_g$$

in $T\mathcal{Q}_g$ define an (abstract) CR structure on \mathcal{SQ}_g^0 of CR-codimension $6g - 7$? If so, is the Teichmüller Beltrami map a CR isomorphism?

For CR structures, see [13] for instance.

Appendices

13.1. Appendix 1 : Kodaira-Spencer theory and Teichmüller theory

In this section, I summarize the relation between the Kodaira-Spencer theory and the (quasiconformal) Teichmüller theory. Namely, we discuss the correspondence (3.3.3) in view of the holomorphic families.

Let B be a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{C} . Let (\mathcal{M}, π, B) be a holomorphic family of compact Riemann surfaces of genus g . For $t \in B$, set $M_t = \pi^{-1}(t)$. By taking B sufficiently small, we identify \mathcal{M} with the product $M_0 \times B$ via the local trivialization as C^∞ -manifolds (cf. [43, Theorem 2.4]). By the implicit mapping theorem, when B is taken sufficiently small if necessary again, there is a covering $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M_0 and an injective holomorphic map $Z_i: U_i \times B_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \times B_0$ such that $z_i^t = Z_i|_{U_i \times \{t\}}: U_i \times \{t\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ($i \in I$) make an analytic chart of M_t for all $t \in B$. We identify $U_i \times \{t\}$ with U_i and define $z_{ij}^t = z_i^t \circ (z_j^t)^{-1}$ on $U_i \cap U_j$. We set

$$X_{ij}(z) = \left. \frac{\partial z_{ij}^t}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} \circ (z_{ij}^0)^{-1}(z) \quad (z \in z_i^0(U_i \cap U_j)).$$

Then, $\{X_{ij}\}_{i \in I} \in Z^1(\{U_i\}_i, \Theta_{M_0})$. The cohomology class $[\{X_{ij}\}] \in H^1(\{U_i\}_i, \Theta_{M_0})$ defines the infinitesimal deformation at $t = 0$ for the holomorphic family (\mathcal{M}, π, B) in the Kodaira-Spencer theory (cf. [43, §4.2]).

Let

$$X_i(z) = - \left. \frac{\partial z_i^t}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} \circ (z_i^0)^{-1}(z) \quad (z \in z_i^0(U_i)).$$

Since $z_i^t \circ (z_j^0)^{-1} = z_{ij}^t \circ z_j^0 \circ (z_j^0)^{-1}$ on $z_j(U_i \cap U_j)$, $\{X_i\}_{i \in I} \in C^0(\{U_i\}_i, \mathcal{A}^{0,0}(\Theta_{M_0}))$ satisfies

$$X_j - X_i = X_{ij}$$

on $U_i \cap U_j$. Namely, $\xi = \{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies $\delta\xi = \{X_{ij}\}_{i,j}$. By definition,

$$z_i^t \circ (z_i^0)^{-1}(z) = z - tX_i(z) + o(t)$$

for $z \in z_i(U_i)$ and $i \in I$. Therefore,

$$\mu = -(X_i)\bar{z}$$

on U_i is recognized as the infinitesimal Beltrami differential corresponding to the cohomology class $[\{X_{ij}\}] \in H^1(\{U_i\}_i, \Theta_{M_0})$. (Compare [32, §7.2.4]).

13.2. Appendix 2 : Regularity of the operators

In this section, we discuss the regularities of $T(\omega)$ and $H(\omega)$ defined at (8.2.9) and (8.2.10). The following might be well-known. However the author cannot find any suitable reference, and we shall give a proof for completeness. The author

thanks Professor Hiroshi Yanagihara for kindly allowing the author to give his argument for the smoothness here.

In the following, we use the following facts:

- (1) for $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{C})$, $T(\omega)$ and $H(\omega)$ are of class C^∞ on \mathbb{C} and satisfies

$$T(\omega)_z = H(\omega), \quad T(\omega)_{\bar{z}} = \omega, \quad \text{and} \quad H(\omega)_{\bar{z}} = \omega_z$$

on \mathbb{C} ; and

- (2) T and H are extended to for $\omega \in L^p(\mathbb{C})$ with compact support for some $p \geq 2$, $T(\omega)$ and $H(\omega)$ are holomorphic outside the support of ω .

See [47, III §7] for instance.

PROPOSITION 13.2.1. Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Let $\omega \in C^\infty(D) \cap L^p(D)$ for some $p \geq 2$. We extend ω as a function on \mathbb{C} by setting $\omega \equiv 0$ on the complement of D . Then, $T(\omega)$ and $H(\omega)$ are smooth functions on D which satisfy

$$T(\omega)_z = H(\omega), \quad T(\omega)_{\bar{z}} = \omega, \quad \text{and} \quad H(\omega)_{\bar{z}} = \omega_z$$

on D .

PROOF. The following argument is due to Professor Hiroshi Yanagihara.

Let $V \subset D$ be a domain with $\bar{V} \subset D$. Take $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{C})$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ on V , $\chi \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$ and $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$. Then

$$T(\omega) = T(\chi\omega) + T(1-\chi)\omega$$

Since $T((1-\chi)\omega)$ is holomorphic on V and $\chi\omega \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{C})$, $T(\omega)$ is smooth on V . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} T(\omega)_z &= H(\chi\omega) + H((1-\chi)\omega) = H(\omega) \\ T(\omega)_{\bar{z}} &= \chi\omega + (1-\chi)\omega = \omega \end{aligned}$$

on V . Though $(1-\chi)\omega$ is not smooth on \mathbb{C} , we can easily check that the argument [47, III §7.2] is available in our case for proving the above two differential formulae. Since V is taken arbitrary, the above two equations hold on D . By the same argument, it is shown that $H(\omega)$ is also smooth on D , and satisfies

$$H(\omega)_{\bar{z}} = H(\chi\omega)_{\bar{z}} + H((1-\chi)\omega)_{\bar{z}} = \omega_z$$

on V , since $\chi \equiv 1$ on V and $H((1-\chi)\omega)$ is holomorphic on V . Hence, this equation also hold on D . \square

13.3. Appendix 3 : Royden's regularity criterion on the dual metric

In this section, we shall give a proof of the Royden's criterion on the regularity of the dual Finsler metric given in Proposition 11.2.1. The following argument is due to [21, §9.3, Lemma 3].

13.3.1. Proof of Proposition 11.2.1. Let $\mathbb{S}_x = \{\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid G(x, \eta) = 1\}$ for $x \in U$. From the positivity of G , \mathbb{S}_x is compact for each $x \in U$. From the linearity of the pairing, and the complex homogeneity of G , we can easily the positivity and the complex homogeneity of F . For the continuity of F , let $(x_0, \xi_0) \in U \times \mathbb{C}^n - \{0\}$. Take $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{x_0}$ with $F(x_0, \xi_0) = \text{Re}(\eta_0(\xi_0))$. For $(x, \xi) \in U \times \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_0, \xi_0) &= \text{Re}(\eta_0(\xi_0)) = \text{Re}(\eta_0(\xi)) + \text{Re}(\eta_0(\xi_0)) - \text{Re}(\eta_0(\xi)) \\ &\leq F(x, \xi) + \sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{S}_{x_0}} |\text{Re}(\eta(\xi_0)) - \text{Re}(\eta(\xi))|. \end{aligned}$$

From the continuity of G , there is a neighborhood U_1 of x_0 and a relatively compact neighborhood V_1 of \mathbb{S}_{x_0} in $\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\}$ such that $\mathbb{S}_x \subset V_1$ for $x \in U_1$. From the above discussion, we obtain

$$|F(x, \xi) - F(x_0, \xi_0)| \leq \sup_{\eta \in V_1} |\operatorname{Re}(\eta(\xi_0 - \xi))|$$

for $(x, \xi) \in U \times \mathbb{C}^n$ with $x \in U_1$. Therefore, F is continuous. For the convexity of F , let $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. Take $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{S}_x$ and $F(x, \alpha_1\xi_1 + \alpha_2\xi_2) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\alpha_1\xi_1 + \alpha_2\xi_2))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, \alpha_1\xi_1 + \alpha_2\xi_2) &= \operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\alpha_1\xi_1 + \alpha_2\xi_2)) \\ &\leq |\alpha_1|\operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\xi_1)) + |\alpha_2|\operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\xi_2)) \\ &\leq |\alpha_1|F(x, \xi_1) + |\alpha_2|F(x, \xi_2). \end{aligned}$$

We claim

CLAIM 1. Let $x \in U$. When $G(x, \cdot)$ is of class C^1 in the variable η with $\eta \neq 0$, $F(x, \xi)$ is strictly convex in $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

PROOF OF CLAIM 1. Indeed, if $F(x, \xi)$ is not strictly convex in ξ , we find $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2$ and $F(x, \xi_1) = F(x, \xi_2) = F(x, (\xi_1 + \xi_2)/2) = 1$. In particular $\xi_1 + \xi_2 \neq 0$. Take $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{S}_x$ such that $\operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\xi_1 + \xi_2)) = 2$. Since $\operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\xi_j)) \leq F(x, \xi_j) = 1$, $\operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\xi_j)) = 1$ for $j = 1, 2$. Since $G(x, \cdot)$ is of class C^1 and $G(x, t\eta) = tG(x, \eta)$ for $t > 0$, the gradient of $G(x, \cdot)$ at η does not vanish. Therefore, \mathbb{S}_x is a C^1 -submanifold and has a unique tangent plane of (real) dimension $2n - 1$ at η_0 . Since $\operatorname{Re}(\xi_1(\eta)) \leq F(x, \xi_1) = 1$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{S}_x$ and $\xi_1(\eta_0) = 1$, the tangent plane of \mathbb{S}_x at η_0 is described as

$$\{\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \operatorname{Re}(\eta(\xi_1)) = 1\}.$$

Namely, ξ_1 is the normal vector to the tangent plane. By applying the same discussion to ξ_2 , we get $\xi_2 = t\xi_1$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t \neq 0$ from the uniqueness of the tangent plane. Since $F(x, \xi_1) = F(x, \xi_2) = 1$ and $\xi_1 + \xi_2 \neq 0$, $\xi_1 = \xi_2$. This is a contradiction. \square

We next claim the following.

CLAIM 2. Suppose $G(x, \eta)$ is strictly convex in $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ for all $x \in U$. Then,

- (1) $G(x, \eta)$ is uniformly convex in $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ in the sense that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and a compact set $K \subset U$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that for $x \in K$ and $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_x$, $G(x, \eta_1 + \eta_2) \geq 2 - \delta$ implies $G(x, \eta_1 - \eta_2) < \epsilon$;
 - (2) $F(x, \xi)$ is smooth in $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$ in the sense that for $\epsilon > 0$ and a compact set $K \subset U$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that if $F(x, \xi_1 - \xi_2) < \delta$,
- $$(13.3.1) \quad F(x, \xi_1 + \xi_2) \geq F(x, \xi_1) + F(x, \xi_2) - \epsilon F(x, \xi_1 - \xi_2)$$

for $x \in K$ and $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$;

- (3) For any $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n - \{0\}$ and $x \in U$, there is a unique $\eta \in \mathbb{S}_x$ with $F(x, \xi) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta(\xi))$; and
- (4) For $\xi, h \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $F(x, \xi) = 1$, $f(t) = F(x, \xi + th)$ is differentiable at $t = 0$. Furthermore, $f'(0) = \eta_0(h)$, where $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{S}_x$ with $F(x, \xi) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\xi))$.

PROOF OF CLAIM 2. (1) Otherwise, there are $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a compact set $K_0 \subset U$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $x_n \in K_0$ and $\eta_{1,n}, \eta_{2,n} \in \mathbb{S}_{x_n}$ such that $G(x_n, \eta_{1,n} + \eta_{2,n}) > 2 - (1/n)$ and $G(x_n, \eta_{1,n} - \eta_{2,n}) \geq \epsilon_0$. By the compactness of $\cup_{x \in K_0} \mathbb{S}_x$, we

may assume that $x_n \rightarrow x_0 \in K_0$ and $\eta_{j,n} \rightarrow \eta_j \in \mathbb{S}_{x_0}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From the continuity of G , we get $G(x_0, \eta_1 + \eta_2) = 2$ and $G(x_0, \eta_1 - \eta_2) \geq \epsilon_0$. This contradicts to the strictly convexity of G .

(2) For $\epsilon > 0$ and a compact set $K \subset U$, we take $\delta > 0$ for 2ϵ and K as discussed in the uniform convexity of G .

Let $x \in K$, and $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. To prove (13.3.1), we may assume that $F(x, \xi_1) = 1$, $F(x, \xi_2) \leq 1$ and $\xi_1 \neq 0$, $\xi_2 \neq 0$ since the both sides of (13.3.1) is homogeneous by multiplying positive constant.

Let $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_x$ with $F(x, \xi_j) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_j(\xi_j))$ for $j = 1, 2$. Suppose $F(x, \xi_1 - \xi_2) < \delta/2$. Then $\operatorname{Re}(\eta_1(\xi_1)) = F(x, \xi_1) = 1$ and

$$\operatorname{Re}(\eta_2(\xi_2)) = F(x, \xi_2) > F(x, \xi_1) - \delta/2 = 1 - \delta/2.$$

Since $|\operatorname{Re}(\eta_j(\xi_1 - \xi_2))| \leq F(x, \xi_1 - \xi_2) < \delta/2$ for $j = 1, 2$ and $F(x, \xi_1 + \xi_2) \leq F(x, \xi_1) + F(x, \xi_2) \leq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, \eta_1 + \eta_2) &\geq G(x, \eta_1 + \eta_2)F\left(x, \frac{\xi_1 + \xi_2}{2}\right) \geq \operatorname{Re}\left((\eta_1 + \eta_2)\left(\frac{\xi_1 + \xi_2}{2}\right)\right) \\ &= \operatorname{Re}(\eta_1(\xi_1)) + \operatorname{Re}(\eta_2(\xi_2)) + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re}(\eta_1(\xi_2 - \xi_1)) + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re}(\eta_2(\xi_2 - \xi_1)) \\ &> 2 - \delta \end{aligned}$$

From the uniform convexity of G , we have $G(x, \eta_1 - \eta_2) < 2\epsilon$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &F(x, \xi_1) + F(x, \xi_2) - \epsilon F(x, \xi_1 - \xi_2) \\ &F(x, \xi_1) + F(x, \xi_2) - \frac{1}{2}G(x, \eta_1 - \eta_2)F(x, \xi_1 - \xi_2) \\ &\leq \operatorname{Re}(\eta_1(\xi_1)) + \operatorname{Re}(\eta_2(\xi_2)) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re}((\eta_1 - \eta_2)(\xi_1 - \xi_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re}((\eta_1 + \eta_2)(\xi_1 + \xi_2)) \leq F(x, \xi_1 + \xi_2) \end{aligned}$$

since $G(x, \eta_1 + \eta_2)/2 \leq (G(x, \eta_1) + G(x, \eta_2))/2 = 1$.

(3) We may assume that $F(x, \xi) = 1$. The existence is clear. Let $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_x$ with $1 = F(x, \xi) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_1(\xi)) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_2(\xi))$. Then

$$1 \geq G\left(x, \frac{\eta_1 + \eta_2}{2}\right) = G\left(x, \frac{\eta_1 + \eta_2}{2}\right)F(x, \xi) \geq \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\eta_1 + \eta_2}{2}(\xi)\right) = 1.$$

Since $G(x, \cdot)$ is strictly convex, $\eta_1 = \eta_2$.

(4) First we check that $f(t)$ is differentiable at $t = 0$. For $|t_2| > |t_1| > 0$ with $t_1/t_2 > 0$,

$$F(x, \xi + t_1 h) = F\left(x, \frac{t_1}{t_2}(\xi + t_2 h) + \left(1 - \frac{t_1}{t_2}\right)\xi\right) \leq \frac{t_1}{t_2}F(x, \xi + t_2 h) + \left(1 - \frac{t_1}{t_2}\right)F(x, \xi).$$

Hence $f(t) - f(0)/t$ is increasing function in t . Therefore, $f(t)$ has left and right derivatives at $t = 0$. By applying the smoothness discussed in (2) for $\xi_1 = \xi + th$ and $\xi_2 = \xi - th$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that when $|t| < \delta/2F(x, h)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(t) - f(0)}{t} - \frac{f(-t) - f(0)}{-t} &= \frac{F(x, \xi + th) + F(x, \xi - th) - 2F(x, \xi)}{t} \\ &\leq \epsilon \frac{F(x, (\xi + th) - (\xi - th))}{t} = 2\epsilon F(t, h). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the left and right derivatives at $t = 0$ agree. Let $\eta_t \in \mathbb{S}_x$ with $F(x, \xi + th) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_t(\xi + th))$. Then,

$$\frac{f(t) - f(0)}{t} = \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\eta_t(\xi + th) - \eta_0(\xi)}{t} \right) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_t(h)) + \operatorname{Re} \frac{\eta_t(\xi) - \eta_0(\xi)}{t}$$

As $t \rightarrow 0$, the limits of $(f(t) - f(0))/t$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\eta_t(h))$ exist because of the differentiability of $f(t)$ and the uniqueness observed in (3). Therefore,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\eta_t(\xi)) - \operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\xi))}{t}$$

also exists. Since $\operatorname{Re}(\eta_t(\xi)) \leq F(x, \xi) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(\xi))$, the numerator is non-positive, and so is the limit when $t \rightarrow +0$. However as $t \rightarrow -0$, the limit is non-negative. Hence the limit should be zero. Thus we obtain

$$f'(0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{Re}(\eta_t(h)) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_0(h)),$$

which is what we wanted. \square

Finally, we claim

CLAIM 3. If $G(x, \cdot)$ is strictly convex for $x \in U$, and G is totally differentiable in the variable $x \in U$ and the x -derivative is continuous on $U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$, F is of class C^1 on $U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$.

PROOF OF CLAIM 3. From the assumption,

$$(13.3.2) \quad G(x + \Delta x, \eta) = G(x, \eta) + A_{x, \eta}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta}(\Delta x)} + o(|\Delta x|),$$

as $|\Delta x| \rightarrow 0$, where $A_{x, \eta}$ is a \mathbb{C} -linear functional on \mathbb{C} which varies continuously in x and η , and $|\cdot|$ means here the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{C}^n . By the mean value theorem,

$$G(x + \Delta x, \eta) - G(x, \eta) = A_{x+t\Delta x, \eta}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x+t\Delta x, \eta}(\Delta x)}$$

for some $t = t(x, y, \Delta x)$ with $0 < t(x, y, \Delta x) < 1$. Therefore, from the continuity of the x -derivative $A_{x, \eta}$ of G .

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{G(x + \Delta x, \eta) - (G(x, \eta) + A_{x, \eta}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta}(\Delta x)})}{|\Delta x|} \\ &= 2\operatorname{Re} \left((A_{x+t(x, y, \Delta x)\Delta x, \eta} - A_{x, \eta}) \left(\frac{\Delta x}{|\Delta x|} \right) \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $|\Delta x| \rightarrow 0$ whenever (x, η) stays in a compact set in $U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$. Therefore, the term $o(|\Delta x|)$ in (13.3.2) is uniformly small on any compact set of $U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$ in the sense that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and compact sets $K_1 \subset U$ and $K_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^n - \{0\}$, there are $\delta > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$(13.3.3) \quad \left| G(x + \Delta x, \eta) - \left(G(x, \eta) + A_{x, \eta}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta}(\Delta x)} \right) \right| \leq C_0 \epsilon |\Delta x|$$

for $(x, \eta) \in K_1 \times K_2$ and $|\Delta x| < \delta$ with $x + \Delta x \in K_1$.

Let $(x, \xi) \in U \times \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\xi \neq 0$. Let $\eta_{x, \xi} \in \mathbb{S}_x$ with $F(x, \xi) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x, \xi}(\xi))$. From (3) of Claim 2, $\eta_{x, \xi}$ uniquely exists. From the uniqueness discussed in (3), we can check that $\eta_{x, \xi}$ depends continuously in $(x, \xi) \in U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$. From the identity

$$\frac{1}{1+a} = 1 - a + \frac{a^2}{1+a^2}$$

for $|a| < 1$, there is $\delta' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} F(x + \Delta x, \xi) &= \operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}(\xi)) = \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}(\xi))}{G(x + \Delta x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi})} \\ &= \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}(\xi))}{G(x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi})} - \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}(\xi))}{G(x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi})^2} (A_{x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}}(\Delta x)}) + C'_0 \epsilon |\Delta x| \\ &\leq F(x, \xi) - \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}(\xi))}{G(x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi})^2} (A_{x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}}(\Delta x)}) + C'_0 \epsilon |\Delta x| \end{aligned}$$

for some $C'_0 > 0$ when $(x, \xi) \in K_1 \times K_2$ and $|\Delta x| < \delta'$. Since $\eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi} \rightarrow \eta_{x, \xi}$ and $A_{x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}} \rightarrow A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}$ as $|\Delta x| \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\left| \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}(\xi))}{G(x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi})^2} A_{x, \eta_{x+\Delta x, \xi}}(\Delta x) - \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x, \xi}(\xi))}{G(x, \eta_{x, \xi})^2} A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x) \right| = C''_0 \epsilon |\Delta x|$$

for some $C''_0 > 0$, when $(x, \xi) \in K_1 \times K_2$ and $|\Delta x| < \delta''$ for some $\delta'' > 0$ with $x + \Delta x \in K_1$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(x + \Delta x, \xi) &\leq F(x, \xi) - \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x, \xi}(\xi))}{G(x, \eta_{x, \xi})^2} (A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x)}) \\ &\quad + (C'_0 + C''_0) \epsilon |\Delta x| \end{aligned}$$

when $(x, \xi) \in K_1 \times K_2$ and $|\Delta x| < \min(\delta, \delta', \delta'')$ with $x + \Delta x \in K_1$.

Since $\operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x, \xi}(\xi)) = F(x, \xi)$ and $G(x, \eta_{x, \xi}) = 1$, by interchanging x and $x + \Delta x$ in the above inequality, we deduce

$$(13.3.4) \quad F(x + \Delta x, \xi) = F(x, \xi) - F(x, \xi) (A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x)}) + o(|\Delta x|)$$

as $|\Delta x| \rightarrow 0$. Since the term $o(|\Delta x|)$ in (13.3.2) is uniformly small on any compact sets in $U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$, so is the term $o(|\Delta x|)$ in (13.3.4).

Since G is strictly convex, from (4) of Claim 2,

$$F(x, \xi + \Delta \xi) - F(x, \xi) = \operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x, \xi}(\Delta \xi)) + o(|\Delta \xi|)$$

as $|\Delta \xi| \rightarrow 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &F(x + \Delta x, \xi + \Delta \xi) - F(x, \xi) \\ &= F(x + \Delta x, \xi + \Delta \xi) - F(x, \xi + \Delta \xi) + F(x, \xi + \Delta \xi) - F(x, \xi) \\ &= -F(x, \xi + \Delta \xi) (A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi + \Delta \xi}}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi + \Delta \xi}}(\Delta x)}) + o(|\Delta x|) \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x, \xi}(\Delta \xi)) + o(|\Delta \xi|) \\ &= -F(x, \xi) (A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x) + \overline{A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}(\Delta x)}) + \operatorname{Re}(\eta_{x, \xi}(\Delta \xi)) + o(|\Delta x| + |\Delta \xi|) \end{aligned}$$

as $|\Delta x| \rightarrow 0$ and $|\Delta \xi| \rightarrow 0$. Since each partial derivatives $A_{x, \eta_{x, \xi}}$ and $\eta_{x, \xi}$ are continuous in $(x, \xi) \in U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$, we conclude that F is of class C^1 on $U \times (\mathbb{C}^n - \{0\})$. \square

13.3.2. Remark on the reflexive duality. Let $E \rightarrow M$ be a complex vector bundle and $E^* \rightarrow M$ be the dual bundle. Let G be a continuous function on E^* which is positive convex and complex homogeneous on the fibers on E^* . Royden's criterion implies that when $G = G(x, \eta)$ is

- strictly convex;
- of class C^1 in each fiber; and

- totally differentiable in the x -direction and the x -partial derivatives are continuous on the total space,

then the dual metric

$$F(x, \xi) = \sup\{\operatorname{Re}(\eta(\xi)) \mid \eta \in E_x^*, G(x, \eta) = 1\}$$

on E is strictly convex and of class C^1 . It is remarkable that the regularity of the dual metric F is (seemed to be) stronger than that of the initial metric G . Namely, when G , in addition, satisfies the reflexive duality in the sense that

$$G(x, \eta) = \sup\{\operatorname{Re}(\eta(\xi)) \mid \xi \in E_x, F(x, \xi) = 1\},$$

then G gets a better regularity, that is, G was of class C^1 , which is apparently stronger than the initial assumption of G . As noted in §1, the L^1 -norm function and the Teichmüller metric are in this situation. Thus, the reflexive duality is possibly an important condition for the Finsler metrics.

Bibliography

- [1] Marco Abate and Giorgio Patrizio. *Finsler metrics—a global approach*, volume 1591 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. With applications to geometric function theory.
- [2] Marco Abate and Giorgio Patrizio. Isometries of the Teichmüller metric. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 26(3):437–452, 1998.
- [3] William Abikoff. *The real analytic theory of Teichmüller space*, volume 820 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 1980.
- [4] Lars V. Ahlfors. Some remarks on Teichmüller’s space of Riemann surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 74:171–191, 1961.
- [5] Lars V. Ahlfors. Curvature properties of Teichmüller’s space. *J. Analyse Math.*, 9:161–176, 1961/62.
- [6] Tadashi Aikou. On complex Finsler manifolds. *Rep. Fac. Sci. Kagoshima Univ. Math. Phys. Chem.*, (24):9–25, 1991.
- [7] Vincent Alberge and Athanase Papadopoulos. On five papers by Herbert Grötzsch. In *Handbook of Teichmüller theory. Vol. VII*, volume 30 of *IRMA Lect. Math. Theor. Phys.*, pages 393–415. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, [2020] ©2020.
- [8] Jayadev Athreya, Alexander Bufetov, Alex Eskin, and Maryam Mirzakhani. Lattice point asymptotics and volume growth on Teichmüller space. *Duke Math. J.*, 161(6):1055–1111, 2012.
- [9] Artur Avila and Sébastien Gouëzel. Small eigenvalues of the Laplacian for algebraic measures in moduli space, and mixing properties of the Teichmüller flow. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 178(2):385–442, 2013.
- [10] Artur Avila, Sébastien Gouëzel, and Jean-Christophe Yoccoz. Exponential mixing for the Teichmüller flow. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (104):143–211, 2006.
- [11] Artur Avila and Marcelo Viana. Simplicity of Lyapunov spectra: proof of the Zorich-Kontsevich conjecture. *Acta Math.*, 198(1):1–56, 2007.
- [12] Lipman Bers. Fiber spaces over Teichmüller spaces. *Acta Math.*, 130:89–126, 1973.
- [13] Albert Boggess. *CR manifolds and the tangential Cauchy-Riemann complex*. Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1991.
- [14] Ana Cannas da Silva. *Lectures on symplectic geometry*, volume 1764 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [15] David Dumas. Skinning maps are finite-to-one. *Acta Math.*, 215(1):55–126, 2015.
- [16] Nelson Dunford and Jacob T. Schwartz. *Linear operators. Part I*. Wiley Classics Library. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1988. General theory, With the assistance of William G. Bade and Robert G. Bartle, Reprint of the 1958 original, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [17] Alex Eskin, Howard Masur, and Anton Zorich. Moduli spaces of abelian differentials: the principal boundary, counting problems, and the Siegel-Veech constants. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (97):61–179, 2003.
- [18] Robert J. Fisher and H. Turner Laquer. Second order tangent vectors in Riemannian geometry. *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, 36(5):959–1008, 1999.
- [19] Otto Forster. *Lectures on Riemann surfaces*, volume 81 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1981. Translated from the German by Bruce Gilligan.
- [20] Masaki Fukui. Complex Finsler manifolds. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 29(4):609–624, 1989.
- [21] Frederick P. Gardiner. *Teichmüller theory and quadratic differentials*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1987. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.

- [22] Frederick P. Gardiner and Nikola Lakic. *Quasiconformal Teichmüller theory*, volume 76 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [23] H. Grauert. Theory of q -convexity and q -concavity. In *Several complex variables, VII*, volume 74 of *Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.*, pages 259–284. Springer, Berlin, 1994.
- [24] Joseph Grifone. Sur les connexions d’une variété finslérienne et d’un système mécanique. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 272:A1510–A1513, 1971.
- [25] Joseph Grifone. Structure presque-tangente et connexions. I. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 22(1):287–334, 1972.
- [26] Joseph Grifone. Structure presque-tangente et connexions. II. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 22(3):291–338. (loose errata), 1972.
- [27] Richard S. Hamilton. Extremal quasiconformal mappings with prescribed boundary values. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 138:399–406, 1969.
- [28] John Hubbard and Howard Masur. Quadratic differentials and foliations. *Acta Math.*, 142(3–4):221–274, 1979.
- [29] John Hamal Hubbard. *Teichmüller theory and applications to geometry, topology, and dynamics. Vol. 1*. Matrix Editions, Ithaca, NY, 2006. Teichmüller theory, With contributions by Adrien Douady, William Dunbar, Roland Roeder, Sylvain Bonnot, David Brown, Allen Hatcher, Chris Hruska and Sudeb Mitra, With forewords by William Thurston and Clifford Earle.
- [30] Yōichi Iwayoshi. Holomorphic families of Riemann surfaces and Teichmüller spaces. In *Riemann surfaces and related topics: Proceedings of the 1978 Stony Brook Conference (State Univ. New York, Stony Brook, N.Y., 1978)*, volume No. 97 of *Ann. of Math. Stud.*, pages 277–300. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1981.
- [31] Yōichi Iwayoshi and Hiroshige Shiga. A finiteness theorem for holomorphic families of Riemann surfaces. In *Holomorphic functions and moduli, Vol. II (Berkeley, CA, 1986)*, volume 11 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 207–219. Springer, New York, 1988.
- [32] Yoichi Iwayoshi and Masahiko Taniguchi. *An introduction to Teichmüller spaces*. Springer-Verlag, Tokyo, 1992.
- [33] Birger Iversen. *Cohomology of sheaves*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.
- [34] Shingo Kawai. The symplectic nature of the space of projective connections on Riemann surfaces. *Math. Ann.*, 305(1):161–182, 1996.
- [35] Yujiro Kawamata. On deformations of compactifiable complex manifolds. *Math. Ann.*, 235(3):247–265, 1978.
- [36] Joseph Klein and André Voutier. Formes extérieures génératrices de sprays. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 18:241–260, 1968.
- [37] Shoshichi Kobayashi. Theory of connections. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 43:119–194, 1957.
- [38] Shoshichi Kobayashi. Negative vector bundles and complex Finsler structures. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 57:153–166, 1975.
- [39] Shoshichi Kobayashi. Complex Finsler vector bundles. In *Finsler geometry (Seattle, WA, 1995)*, volume 196 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 145–153. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.
- [40] Shoshichi Kobayashi. *Hyperbolic manifolds and holomorphic mappings*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, second edition, 2005. An introduction.
- [41] Shoshichi Kobayashi and Katsumi Nomizu. *Foundations of differential geometry. Vol. I*. Wiley Classics Library. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1996. Reprint of the 1963 original, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [42] Shoshichi Kobayashi and Katsumi Nomizu. *Foundations of differential geometry. Vol. II*. Wiley Classics Library. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1996. Reprint of the 1969 original, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [43] Kunihiko Kodaira. *Complex manifolds and deformation of complex structures*, volume 283 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986. Translated from the Japanese by Kazuo Akao, With an appendix by Daisuke Fujiwara.
- [44] Katarzyna Konieczna and PawełUrbański. Double vector bundles and duality. *Arch. Math. (Brno)*, 35(1):59–95, 1999.
- [45] Maxim Kontsevich and Anton Zorich. Connected components of the moduli spaces of Abelian differentials with prescribed singularities. *Invent. Math.*, 153(3):631–678, 2003.

- [46] Samuel L. Krushkal. The Green function of Teichmüller spaces with applications. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 27(1):143–147, 1992.
- [47] O. Lehto and K. I. Virtanen. *Quasiconformal mappings in the plane*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, second edition, 1973. Translated from the German by K. W. Lucas, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 126.
- [48] Olli Lehto. *Univalent functions and Teichmüller spaces*, volume 109 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.
- [49] Howard Masur. Extension of the Weil-Petersson metric to the boundary of Teichmüller space. *Duke Math. J.*, 43(3):623–635, 1976.
- [50] Howard Masur. Interval exchange transformations and measured foliations. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 115(1):169–200, 1982.
- [51] Howard Masur. The Teichmüller flow is Hamiltonian. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 123(12):3739–3747, 1995.
- [52] Howard Masur. Geometry of Teichmüller space with the Teichmüller metric. In *Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. XIV. Geometry of Riemann surfaces and their moduli spaces*, volume 14 of *Surv. Differ. Geom.*, pages 295–313. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2009.
- [53] Howard Masur and John Smillie. Quadratic differentials with prescribed singularities and pseudo-Anosov diffeomorphisms. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 68(2):289–307, 1993.
- [54] Carlos Matheus Silva Santos. *Dynamical aspects of Teichmüller theory*, volume 7 of *Atlantis Studies in Dynamical Systems*. Atlantis Press, [Paris]; Springer, Cham, 2018. $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -action on moduli spaces of flat surfaces.
- [55] Vladimir S. Matveev and Marc Troyanov. The Binet-Legendre metric in Finsler geometry. *Geom. Topol.*, 16(4):2135–2170, 2012.
- [56] C. McMullen. Iteration on Teichmüller space. *Invent. Math.*, 99(2):425–454, 1990.
- [57] Curtis T. McMullen. Rigidity of Teichmüller curves. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 16(4):647–649, 2009.
- [58] Peter W. Michor. *Topics in differential geometry*, volume 93 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [59] Hideki Miyachi. Pluripotential theory on Teichmüller space I: Pluricomplex Green function. *Conform. Geom. Dyn.*, 23:221–250, 2019.
- [60] Hideki Miyachi. Pluripotential theory on Teichmüller space II—Poisson integral formula. *Adv. Math.*, 432:Paper No. 109265, 64, 2023.
- [61] Hideki Miyachi, Ken’ichi Ohshika, and Athanase Papadopoulos. The Teichmüller-randers metric, To appear in *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*.
- [62] Gheorghe Munteanu. *Complex spaces in Finsler, Lagrange and Hamilton geometries*, volume 141 of *Fundamental Theories of Physics*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2004.
- [63] Subhashis Nag. *The complex analytic theory of Teichmüller spaces*. Canadian Mathematical Society Series of Monographs and Advanced Texts. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1988. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [64] Jean Pradines. Représentation des jets non holonomes par des morphismes vectoriels doubles soudés. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A*, 278:1523–1526, 1974.
- [65] Giovanni Battista Rizza. F -forme quadratique ed hermitiane. *Rend. Mat. e Appl. (5)*, 23:221–249, 1964.
- [66] H. L. Royden. Complex Finsler metrics. In *Complex differential geometry and nonlinear differential equations (Brunswick, Maine, 1984)*, volume 49 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 119–124. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1986.
- [67] Halsey L. Royden. Automorphisms and isometries of Teichmüller space. In *Advances in the Theory of Riemann Surfaces (Proc. Conf., Stony Brook, N.Y., 1969)*, pages 369–383. Ann. of Math. Studies, No. 66. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1971.
- [68] Hanno Rund. Generalized metrics on complex manifolds. *Math. Nachr.*, 34:55–77, 1967.
- [69] Takashi Sakai. *Riemannian geometry*, volume 149 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. Translated from the 1992 Japanese original by the author.
- [70] Kurt Strebel. On the trajectory structure of quadratic differentials. In *Discontinuous groups and Riemann surfaces (Proc. Conf., Univ. Maryland, College Park, Md., 1973)*, volume No. 79 of *Ann. of Math. Stud.*, pages 419–438. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1974.
- [71] Kurt Strebel. On quasiconformal mappings of open Riemann surfaces. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 53(3):301–321, 1978.

- [72] Shigeru Takamura. Towards the classification of atoms of degenerations. I. Splitting criteria via configurations of singular fibers. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 56(1):115–145, 2004.
- [73] Shigeru Takamura. *Splitting deformations of degenerations of complex curves*, volume 1886 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. Towards the classification of atoms of degenerations. III.
- [74] Oswald Teichmüller. Extremale quasikonforme Abbildungen und quadratische Differentiale. *Abh. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Math.-Nat. Kl.*, 1939(22):197, 1940.
- [75] Anthony J. Tromba. *Teichmüller theory in Riemannian geometry*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1992. Lecture notes prepared by Jochen Denzler.
- [76] William A. Veech. The Teichmüller geodesic flow. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 124(3):441–530, 1986.
- [77] William A. Veech. Moduli spaces of quadratic differentials. *J. Analyse Math.*, 55:117–171, 1990.
- [78] Michael Wolf. The Teichmüller theory of harmonic maps. *J. Differential Geom.*, 29(2):449–479, 1989.
- [79] Scott A. Wolpert. Chern forms and the Riemann tensor for the moduli space of curves. *Invent. Math.*, 85(1):119–145, 1986.
- [80] Scott A. Wolpert. *Families of Riemann surfaces and Weil-Petersson geometry*, volume 113 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
- [81] Hiroshi Yanagihara. Variational formula of inverse of quasiconformal mappings. *Complex Variables Theory Appl.*, 17(1-2):73–78, 1991.
- [82] Kentaro Yano and Shigeru Ishihara. *Tangent and cotangent bundles: differential geometry*, volume No. 16 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1973.