

Astérisque

ALCIDES LINS NETO

Curvature of pencils of foliations

Astérisque, tome 296 (2004), p. 167-190

[<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AST_2004__296__167_0>](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AST_2004__296__167_0)

© Société mathématique de France, 2004, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la collection « Astérisque » (<http://smf4.emath.fr/Publications/Asterisque/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
<http://www.numdam.org/>

CURVATURE OF PENCILS OF FOLIATIONS

by

Alcides Lins Neto

Dedicated to J.-P. Ramis in his 60th birthday

Abstract. — Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two distinct singular holomorphic foliations on a compact complex surface M , in the same class, that is $N_{\mathcal{F}} = N_{\mathcal{G}}$. In this case, we can define the pencil $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ of foliations generated by $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$. We can associate to a pencil $\mathcal{P}$ a meromorphic 2-form $\Theta = \Theta(\mathcal{P})$, the form of curvature of the pencil, which is in fact the Chern curvature (cf. [Ch]). When $\Theta(\mathcal{P}) \equiv 0$ we will say that the pencil is *flat*. In this paper we give some sufficient conditions for a pencil to be flat. (Theorem 2). We will see also how the flatness reflects in the pseudo-group of holonomy of the foliations of $\mathcal{P}$. In particular, we will study the set $\{\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{H} \text{ has a first integral}\}$ in some cases (Theorem 1).

Résumé (Courbure de pinceaux de feuilletages). — Nous nous intéressons au *pinceau de feuilletages* $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ engendré par deux feuilletages $\mathcal{F}$ et $\mathcal{G}$ holomorphes singuliers distincts sur une surface complexe compacte M et appartenant à la même classe, *i.e.*, $N_{\mathcal{F}} = N_{\mathcal{G}}$. La forme de courbure du pinceau $\mathcal{P}$ est une 2-forme $\Theta = \Theta(\mathcal{P})$ qui coïncide avec la courbure de Chern (cf. [Ch]); lorsque $\Theta(\mathcal{P}) \equiv 0$ on dit que le pinceau est *plat*. Dans cet article, nous donnons des conditions suffisantes de platitude d'un pinceau (Théorème 2). Nous regardons comment se traduit la platitude dans le pseudo-groupe d'holonomie des feuilletages de $\mathcal{P}$ et, en particulier, nous étudions dans certains cas l'ensemble $\{\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{H} \text{ admet une intégrale première}\}$ (Théorème 1).

1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two distinct singular holomorphic foliations on a compact complex surface M , with isolated singularities, in the same class, that is $N_{\mathcal{F}} = N_{\mathcal{G}}$. This means that there exists a Leray covering $(U_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in A}$ of M by open sets, and collections $(\omega_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in A}$, $(\eta_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in A}$ and $(g_{\alpha\beta})_{U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset}$, $U_{\alpha\beta} = U_{\alpha} \cap U_{\beta}$, such that

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. — Primary 37F75; Secondary 32S65.
Key words and phrases. — Holomorphic foliations, curvature, flat pencils.

This research was partially supported by Pronex.

(I) ω_α and η_α are holomorphic 1-forms on U_α which represent the foliations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, respectively. This means that $\mathcal{F}|_{U_\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{G}|_{U_\alpha}$ are defined by the differential equations $\omega_\alpha = 0$ and $\eta_\alpha = 0$, respectively. Since the singularities of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are isolated, we have $\text{cod}_{\mathbb{C}}(\omega_\alpha = 0) \geq 2$ and $\text{cod}_{\mathbb{C}}(\eta_\alpha = 0) \geq 2$ for every $\alpha \in A$.

(II) If $U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset$ then $g_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathcal{O}^*(U_{\alpha\beta})$, $\omega_\alpha = g_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \omega_\beta$ and $\eta_\alpha = g_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \eta_\beta$ on $U_{\alpha\beta}$.

The class of the multiplicative cocycle $(g_{\alpha\beta})_{U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset}$ in $\text{Pic}(M)$ defines $N_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $N_{\mathcal{G}}$, so that $N_{\mathcal{F}} = N_{\mathcal{G}}$. The pencil generated by $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is the family $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{F}_T)_{T \in \mathbb{C}}$, where

(III) $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \mathcal{G}$ and if $T \in \mathbb{C}$, then $\mathcal{F}_T$ is represented on U_α by the form $\omega_\alpha^T := \omega_\alpha + T \cdot \eta_\alpha$.

The singular set of $\mathcal{F}_T$ is defined by $\text{sing}(\mathcal{F}_T) \cap U_\alpha = \{\omega_\alpha^T = 0\}$. The tangency divisor of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is defined by $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \cap U_\alpha = \{\omega_\alpha \wedge \eta_\alpha = 0\}$. Note that $\text{sing}(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ are analytic subsets of M and that $\text{sing}(\mathcal{F}_T) \subset |\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})|$ for all $T \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $\mathcal{F} \neq \mathcal{G}$, $|\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})|$ is a proper analytic subset of pure dimension one. Let $W = M \setminus |\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})|$ and $W_\alpha = W \cap U_\alpha$. Since $\omega_\alpha \wedge \eta_\alpha(p) \neq 0$ for all $p \in W_\alpha$, there exists a unique holomorphic 1-form θ_α on W_α such that

$$(*) \quad d\omega_\alpha = \theta_\alpha \wedge \omega_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad d\eta_\alpha = \theta_\alpha \wedge \eta_\alpha$$

for all $\alpha \in A$. It follows from (*), (II) and $\omega_\alpha \wedge \eta_\alpha \neq 0$ that, if $W_{\alpha\beta} := W_\alpha \cap W_\beta \neq \emptyset$ then, $\theta_\alpha = \theta_\beta + dg_{\alpha\beta}/g_{\alpha\beta}$ on $W_{\alpha\beta}$. Hence $d\theta_\alpha = d\theta_\beta$ on $W_{\alpha\beta}$ and we can define a holomorphic 2-form Θ on W by

$$(**) \quad \Theta|_{U_\alpha} := d\theta_\alpha$$

It can be proved that the form Θ can be extended meromorphically to $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ (see §2). This extension will be called the *curvature of the pencil* $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$. We will say that the pencil is *flat* if $\Theta = 0$. Let us see some examples of flat pencils.

Example 1. — Let ω and η be two meromorphic closed 1-forms on some compact complex surface M , such that $\omega \wedge \eta \neq 0$ and the divisors of poles and zeroes of ω and η coincide. Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be the foliations generated by ω and η , respectively. It is known that $N_{\mathcal{F}} = N_{\mathcal{G}}$ in this case (cf. [Br]). Moreover, the pencil generated by $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, say $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$, is defined by the pencil of forms $\omega_T = \eta + T \cdot \omega$. Therefore, it is flat. We will call a pencil like this a *pencil of closed forms*.

A particular case is given by some families of logarithmic forms in $\mathbb{C}P(2)$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_k$, $k \geq 3$, be irreducible homogeneous polynomials of three variables such that $df_i \wedge df_j \neq 0$ if $i \neq j$. Given $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \cdot dg(f_j) = 0$, set $\omega_\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \cdot df_j/f_j$. The closed form ω_λ can be considered as meromorphic form on $\mathbb{C}P(2)$, so that the family $(\omega_\lambda)_\lambda$ generates a family of foliations $(\mathcal{F}_\lambda)_\lambda$ on $\mathbb{C}P(2)$. It can be checked that any pencil contained in this family is flat.

Another particular case, is the following: let M be the complex two torus $\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma$, where $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z} \cdot v_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z} \cdot v_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z} \cdot v_3 \oplus \mathbb{Z} \cdot v_4$ is some lattice in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and $\pi: \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma$ be

the canonical projection. Consider an affine coordinate system (z, w) on $\mathbb{C}^2$ and let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be the foliations generated by the closed forms ω and η such that $\pi^*(\omega) = dz$ and $\pi^*(\eta) = dw$, respectively.

Example 2. — The pull-back of a flat pencil is a flat pencil. More precisely, let M and N be complex surfaces and $f: M \rightarrow N$ be a meromorphic map. If $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is a pencil of foliations on N , then we can define the pencil $f^*(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{P}(f^*(\mathcal{F}), f^*(\mathcal{G}))$ on M . It is not difficult to prove that, if $\mathcal{P}$ is flat then $f^*(\mathcal{P})$ is also flat.

Example 3. — Suppose that the pencil $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is defined by $\omega + T \cdot \eta$, where ω and η are meromorphic 1-forms, and there exists a closed meromorphic 1-form θ such that $d\omega = \theta \wedge \omega$ and $d\eta = \theta \wedge \eta$. Then the pencil $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is flat. Of course, the pencils of Example 1 are of this kind, because the forms ω and η are closed. However, the reader can find some examples in [LN] or [LN-1] which are not generated by closed forms. One example of this kind is the pencil $\mathcal{P}_1$ of foliations of degree two on $\mathbb{C}P(2)$ defined in some affine coordinate system $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \subset \mathbb{C}P(2)$ by the the forms (see §2.4 of [LN]):

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} \omega_1 = (4x - 9x^2 + y^2)dy - 6y(1 - 2x)dx \\ \eta_1 = 2y(1 - 2x)dy - 3(x^2 - y^2)dx. \end{cases}$$

A straightforward computation gives $d\omega_1 = \frac{5}{6} \frac{dP}{P} \wedge \omega_1$ and $d\eta_1 = \frac{5}{6} \frac{dP}{P} \wedge \eta_1$, where $P(x, y) = -4y^2 + 4x^3 + 12xy^2 - 9x^4 - 6x^2y^2 - y^4$. The other examples of [LN] can be obtained from the above one by pulling-back $\mathcal{P}_1$ by a meromorphic map $f: \mathbb{C}P(2) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P(2)$.

Another example is the pencil $\mathcal{P}_2$ of degree three generated by

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} \omega_2 = y(x^2 - y^2)dy - 2x(y^2 - 1)dx \\ \eta_2 = (4x - x^3 - x^2y - 3xy^2 + y^3)dy + 2(x + y)(y^2 - 1)dx. \end{cases}$$

In this case, we have $d\omega_2 = \frac{3}{4} \frac{dQ}{Q} \wedge \omega_2$ and $d\eta_2 = \frac{3}{4} \frac{dQ}{Q} \wedge \eta_2$, where $Q(x, y) = (y^2 - 1)(x^2 + y^2 - 2x)(x^2 + y^2 + 2x)$.

We would like to observe that both pencils $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ are exceptional families of foliations in the sense of [LN-1]. This means the following: Let $\mathcal{F}_T^j$, $T \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, be the foliation defined in $\mathbb{C}^2 \subset \mathbb{C}P(2)$ by the form $\omega_j + T \cdot \eta_j$ ($\mathcal{F}_\infty^j$ defined by η_j), where ω_j and η_j are as in (j), $j = 1, 2$, of example 3. Then, for $j = 1, 2$, we have:

(a) The singularities of $\mathcal{F}_T^j$ are of constant analytic type. In other words, there is a finite subset $F_j \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ such that if $T_1, T_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus F_j$ then every singularity of $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}^j$ is locally analytically equivalent to some singularity of $\mathcal{F}_{T_2}^j$.

(b) If we set

$$E_j = \{T \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \mid \mathcal{F}_T^j \text{ has a meromorphic first integral}\},$$

then E_j is countable and dense in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$.

(c) Given $T \in E_j$ denote by $d_j(T)$ the degree of the generic level of the first integral of $\mathcal{F}_T^j$. Then, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the set $\{T \in E_j \mid d_j(T) \leq m\}$ is finite. In particular, in both families, there are foliations with first integrals of arbitrarily large degrees.

Concerning the exceptional pencils above, we have the following result:

Theorem 1. — *Let E_j , $j = 1, 2$, be as in (b). Then*

$$\begin{cases} E_1 = \mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, e^{2\pi i/3} \rangle \cup \{\infty\} \\ E_2 = \mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, i \rangle \cup \{\infty\}. \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle a, b \rangle = \{q_1 \cdot a + q_2 \cdot b \mid q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}\}$.

In our last result we will give some sufficient conditions for the flatness of a pencil $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ in terms of the singularities of the foliations in $\mathcal{P}$ and the components of the divisor of tangencies. In order to state it, let us consider the singularities of $\mathcal{F}_T$, $T \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Without loss of generality, we will suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ have isolated singularities. This implies that the set $NI := \{T \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \mid \mathcal{F}_T \text{ has non-isolated singularities}\}$ is finite. Set $IS := \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus NI$ and for each $T \in IS$, set $n(T) := \#(\text{sing}(\mathcal{F}_T))$. Note that, if $T \in IS$ then $N_{\mathcal{F}_T} = N_{\mathcal{F}}$. It is well known that the number of singularities of $\mathcal{F}_T$, counted with multiplicities, is given by (cf. [Br]):

$$m(\mathcal{F}) = m(\mathcal{F}_T) = N_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + N_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot K_M + c_2(M)$$

where K_M is the canonical bundle of M . Hence $n(T) \leq m(\mathcal{F})$ for all $T \in IS$. Let $n_0 = \max\{n(T) \mid T \in IS\}$ and $GP = \{T \in IS \mid n(T) = n_0\}$. We need a fact.

Lemma 1. — *$\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus GP$ is finite. Moreover, there exist holomorphic maps $p_j: GP \rightarrow M$, $j = 1, \dots, n_0$, such that $\text{sing}(\mathcal{F}_T) = \{p_1(T), \dots, p_{n_0}(T)\}$ for all $T \in GP$.*

The proof of Lemma 1 is left for the reader.

Definition 1. — We say that the singularity p_j is *fixed* if the map $p_j: GP \rightarrow M$ is constant. Otherwise, we say that p_j is *movable*. For instance, if p is a singularity of the curve $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ then p is a singularity of all foliations of the pencil and it is a fixed singularity of the pencil.

Note that, for any movable singularity p_j of the pencil, the image $p_j(GP)$ is contained in some irreducible component C of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$. In this case we will say that p_j is *contained in C* .

Let $C \subset \text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be an irreducible component. We have two possibilities:

(A) C is invariant for both foliations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$. In this case, C is invariant for all foliations $\mathcal{F}_T$ in the pencil and we will say that C is *invariant for the pencil*.

(B) C is not invariant for the pencil. In this case, the set $IN(C) = \{T \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \mid C \text{ is invariant for } \mathcal{F}_T\}$ is finite.

Remark 1. — Given an irreducible component C of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$, we have two possibilities: either C contains a movable singularity, or C does not contain movable singularities. In the second case, we will call C a *NI-component*. The reason is the following: let $(U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ be a covering of M by open sets and $(\omega_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$, $(\eta_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ be collections of holomorphic 1-forms such that the foliations in the pencil are defined on U_α by $\omega_\alpha^T := \omega_\alpha + T \cdot \eta_\alpha$, $T \in \mathbb{C}$. Given $p \in U_\alpha \cap C \setminus (\text{sing}(\mathcal{F}) \cup \text{sing}(\mathcal{G}))$, there exists a unique T_o such that $\omega_\alpha(p) + T_o \cdot \eta_\alpha(p) = 0$, because $\omega_\alpha(p)$ and $\eta_\alpha(p)$ are linearly dependent. However, since C does not contain movable singularities and $p \notin \text{sing}(\mathcal{F}) \cup \text{sing}(\mathcal{G})$, the unique possibility is that $\omega_\alpha(q) + T_o \cdot \eta_\alpha(q) = 0$ for all $q \in C \cap U_\alpha$. Hence, $T_o \in NI$ and the component C is contained in $\text{sing}(\mathcal{F}_{T_o})$. Note that T_o depends only on C . We will use the notation $T_o = T(C)$. This happens for instance in the case of the Logarithmic forms (see Example 1).

The *divided foliation* associated to $T(C)$ is defined as follows: for each $\alpha \in A$, let $(f_\alpha = 0)$ be a reduced equation of $C \cap U_\alpha$. Since $\omega_\alpha^{T(C)}|_{C \cap U_\alpha} \equiv 0$, we can write $\omega_\alpha^{T(C)} = f_\alpha^\ell \cdot \tilde{\omega}_\alpha$, where $\tilde{\omega}_\alpha$ has isolated singularities and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, does not depend on α . The divided foliation, denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{T(C)}$, is defined by the collection $(\tilde{\omega}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$. Note that $N_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{T(C)}} = N_{\mathcal{F}_{T(C)}} \otimes C^{-\ell}$.

Definition 2. — We say that an irreducible component C of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is *nice*, if one of the following conditions hold:

- (a) C is invariant for the pencil and contains a movable singularity $p_j(T)$ such that the function $T \in GP \mapsto BB(p_j(T), \mathcal{F}_T)$ is constant, where $BB(p_j(T), \mathcal{F}_T)$ denotes the Baum-Bott index of the singularity (cf. [Br]).
- (b) C is an *NI-component*, invariant for the pencil.
- (c) C is non-invariant for the pencil and C contains a movable singularity, say $p_j(T)$, such that $BB(p_j(T), \mathcal{F}_T) = 0$ for all $T \in GP$.
- (d) C is an *NI-component*, non-invariant for the pencil. In this case, we ask that C is invariant for the divided foliation associated to $T(C)$.

The last result, characterizes when the pencil is flat, if we assume that the components of the divisor of tangencies have multiplicity one.

Theorem 2. — Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two holomorphic foliations on a compact complex surface, such that $N_{\mathcal{F}} = N_{\mathcal{G}}$, and let Θ be the curvature of the pencil generated by them. Suppose that all components of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ have multiplicity one. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) The pencil is flat.
- (b) All components of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ are nice.
- (c) Θ is holomorphic.

Let us state one consequence.

Corollary. — *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two holomorphic foliations on a compact complex surface M . Suppose that $N_{\mathcal{F}} = N_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \emptyset$. Then the pencil generated by them is flat. Moreover, M is a complex 2-torus and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ are linear foliations.*

We observe that this corollary is a consequence of Theorem 2 and the classification of complex compact surfaces (see [BPV]). We would like to pose the following problems:

Problem 1. — Given a flat pencil $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$, describe the set

$$E(\mathcal{P}) = \{\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\alpha} \text{ has a first integral}\}.$$

Problem 2. — Give necessary and sufficient conditions for a pencil to be flat, like in Theorem 2. Recall that Theorem 2 is true only in the case that all components of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ have multiplicity one.

Problem 3. — Give necessary and sufficient conditions for a flat pencil to be a pencil of closed 1-forms. We observe that the pencils defined by logarithmic forms satisfy the following properties, when all components of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ have multiplicity one:

- (a) All invariant components of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ are NI -components.
- (b) All non-invariant components of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ are nice.

We note that the above conditions are necessary in the case that all components of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ have multiplicity one. It seems that they are also sufficient in some cases.

2. Proofs

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1. — We will use the notation $\mathcal{F}_T^j$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_{\infty}^j$) to denote the foliation defined by $\omega_j + T \cdot \eta_j$, $T \in \mathbb{C}$ (resp. η_j), where ω_j and η_j are as in (j) of example 3, $j = 1, 2$. First of all, we observe that, in both cases, it is easy to see that some foliations in the pencils have first integrals. Given $\alpha \in E_j$ we will call g_{α}^j the first integral of $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha}^j$. For the pencil $\mathcal{P}_1$ we have:

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} g_{\infty}^1(x, y) = P(x, y)/(2x - 1)^3 \\ g_1^1(x, y) = P(x, y)/(y - x)^3 \\ g_{-1}^1(x, y) = P(x, y)/(y + x)^3 \end{cases}$$

where, $P(x, y) = -4y^2 + 4x^3 + 12xy^2 - 9x^4 - 6x^2y^2 - y^4$.

In particular, $1, -1, \infty \in E_1$. On the other hand, for the pencil $\mathcal{P}_2$ we have

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} g_0^2(x, y) = C_1(x, y) \cdot C_{-1}(x, y)/4L_1(y) \cdot L_{-1}(y) \\ g_{\infty}^2(x, y) = L_{-1}(y) \cdot C_1(x, y)/L_1(y) \cdot C_{-1}(x, y) \\ g_{1/2}^2(x, y) = L_1(y) \cdot C_1(x, y)/L_{-1}(y) \cdot C_{-1}(x, y) \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} C_1(x, y) = x^2 + y^2 - 2x \\ C_{-1}(x, y) = x^2 + y^2 + 2x \\ L_1(y) = y - 1 \\ L_{-1}(y) = y + 1 \end{cases}$$

In particular, $0, \infty, 1/2 \in E_2$.

Note that, in all above cases, the generic level curves of g_α^j are elliptic curves. There is a difference between the two cases: for $j = 1$ the level curves, after normalization, are of the form $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, e^{2\pi i/3} \rangle$, whereas for $j = 2$ they are of the form $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, i \rangle$. In the case $j = 1$, the proof can be found in § 2.4 of [LN]. In the case $j = 2$, the fact that the level curves are elliptic can be proved by using the genus formula. For instance, in the case of g_∞^2 , the level curve $L_c := (g_\infty^2 = c)$, for generic $c \in \mathbb{C}$, has degree three and no singularities. Hence, $g(L_c) = (3 - 1)(3 - 2)/2 = 1$. The proof that the normalization L_c is $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, i \rangle$ will be sketched next.

Let us give an idea of the proof that the pencil $\mathcal{P}_2$ is exceptional. This proof was done in § 2.2 of [LN] for another pencil (of degree four), but the idea is the same. First of all, the divisor of tangency of $\mathcal{F}_0^2$ and $\mathcal{F}_\infty^2$ is

$$Tg := \text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_0^2, \mathcal{F}_\infty^2) = C_1 + C_{-1} + L_1 + L_{-1} + L_\infty,$$

where L_∞ is the line at infinity of $\mathbb{C}^2 \subset \mathbb{C}P(2)$. The singular set of Tg , which are the fixed singularities of the pencil, is (in homogeneous coordinates)

(I) $\text{Fix} := \{O := (0 : 0 : 1), A := (-1 : 1 : 1), B := (1 : 1 : 1), C := (1 : -1 : 1), D := (-1 : -1 : 1), E := (1 : i : 0), F := (1 : -i : 0), G := (1 : 0 : 0)\}$. For $T \notin \{1, -1, i, -i, \infty\}$ the points E, F, G are radial singularities for the foliation $\mathcal{F}_T^2$ (of type $1 : 1$), whereas the points A, B, C, D and O are singularities of type $2 : 1$. We say that a singularity is of type $p : q$ if the foliation has a local first integral of the form u^p/v^q , in some local coordinate system (u, v) .

On the other hand, each component of Tg contains exactly one movable singularity of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha^2$, $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$:

(II) The points $P_{-1}(\alpha) := (\alpha, -1) \in L_{-1}$, $P_1(\alpha) := (-\alpha, 1) \in L_1$, $Q_{-1}(\alpha) := (-2/(1 + \alpha^2), 2\alpha/(1 + \alpha^2)) \in C_{-1}$ and $Q_1(\alpha) := (2/(1 + \alpha^2), -2\alpha/(1 + \alpha^2)) \in C_1$. These singularities are of the type $1 : -4$ (with local first integral of the type $u \cdot v^4$).

(III) The point $P_\infty(\alpha) := [\alpha : 1 : 0] \in L_\infty$. This singularity is of the type $1 : -2$.

The next step is to reduce the fixed singularities (which are dicritical) by blowing-ups. This can be done for all foliations in the pencil simultaneously by doing one blowing-up at each radial singularity and two at each singularity of the type $2 : 1$. After this procedure, we find a rational surface M and a bimeromorphism $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P(2)$. We will use the notation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha = \pi^*(\mathcal{F}_\alpha^2)$, $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, and $\mathcal{P}$ for the pencil in M so obtained. The pencil $\mathcal{P}$ has ten invariant curves (rational): five of them are the strict

transforms of the components of Tg and the other five are the divisors introduced in the first blowing-up at the singularities of the type $2 : 1$ (A, B, C, D, O). For each $\alpha \in E_2$, the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$, which corresponds to the first integral g_α^2 , has also a first integral $g_\alpha := g_\alpha^2 \circ \pi$. We observe that g_α is holomorphic, because the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ has no dicritical singularities. In fact, for any $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ has ten singularities, one in each invariant curve, which are the following: four of the type $1 : -4$, which come from the singularities $P_1(\alpha)$, $P_{-1}(\alpha)$, $Q_1(\alpha)$ and $Q_{-1}(\alpha)$, and six of the type $1 : -2$. One of these six singularities come from $P_\infty(\alpha)$ and the other five are contained in the five invariant divisors introduced in the blowing-up procedure. We leave the details of the proof of these facts for the reader.

Let us describe briefly the (singular) fibration g_∞ . We will denote by T_c the level curve $g_\infty^{-1}(c) \subset M$. It has three critical levels: T_0, T_1 and T_∞ . If we call $U = M \setminus (T_0 \cup T_1 \cup T_\infty)$, then $f := g_\infty|_U : U \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\} := W$ is a (regular) elliptic fibration. The main fact is the following

Lemma 2.1.1. — *If $\alpha \neq \infty$ then $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is transverse to the fibers of f in all points of the set U .*

Proof. — Since the divisors introduced by π are contained in $T_0 \cup T_1 \cup T_\infty$, it is sufficient to prove that the foliations $\mathcal{F}_\infty^2$ and $\mathcal{F}_\alpha^2$ are transverse outside Tg , because $\pi|_U : U \rightarrow \pi(U) = \mathbb{CP}(2) \setminus Tg$ is a biholomorphism. On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\omega_2 + \alpha \cdot \eta_2) \wedge \eta_2 &= 2(x^2 + y^2 - 2x)(x^2 + y^2 + 2x)(y - 1)(y + 1)dx \wedge dy \\ &= 2C_1 \cdot C_{-1} \cdot L_1 \cdot L_{-1} dx \wedge dy. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathcal{F}_\alpha^2$ and $\mathcal{F}_\infty^2$ are transverse outside Tg , which implies the lemma. $\square$

Now, we use Ehresmann's theory of foliations transverse to a fibration (cf. [E-R]). According to this theory, if L is a leaf of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_U$ then $f|_L : L \rightarrow W$ is a covering map. Moreover, if we fix a (regular) fiber T_c and a closed curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow W = \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$ with $\gamma(0) = \gamma(1) = c$, then we can define an automorphism $H_{\gamma, \alpha} : T_c \rightarrow T_c$, as follows: given $p \in T_c$, let $L_\alpha(p)$ be the leaf of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ through p . Since $f|_{L_\alpha(p)} : L_\alpha(p) \rightarrow W$ is a covering map, there exists an unique curve $\hat{\gamma}$ on $L_\alpha(p)$ such that $f \circ \hat{\gamma} = \gamma$ and $\hat{\gamma}(0) = p$. The automorphism is defined by $H_{\gamma, \alpha}(p) = \hat{\gamma}(1)$. It is called the *global holonomy transformation* associated to γ . We will use the following facts:

(i) For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ the automorphism $H_{\gamma, \alpha}$ is holomorphic and depends only of the the class of γ in $\Pi_1(W, c)$. This follows from Ehresmann's theory and the fact that the foliations are holomorphic.

(ii) If $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Pi_1(W, c)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ then $H_{\gamma_1 * \gamma_2, \alpha} = H_{\gamma_1, \alpha} \circ H_{\gamma_2, \alpha}$. In particular, for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, we can define an action $H_\alpha : \Pi_1(W, c) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(T_c)$ by $H_\alpha(\gamma) = H_{\gamma, \alpha}$, called the *holonomy representation*. The image $H_\alpha(\Pi_1(W, c)) := G(\alpha, c)$ is called the *global holonomy group* of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$.

(iii) For each fixed $\gamma \in \Pi_1(W, c)$, the map $H_\gamma: \mathbb{C} \times T_c \rightarrow T_c$ defined by $H_\gamma(\alpha, p) = H_{\gamma, \alpha}(p)$ is holomorphic. This follows from the theorem of holomorphic dependency of the solutions with respect to initial conditions and parameters and the fact that $H_{\gamma, \alpha}$ can be found by integrating the equation $\omega_2 + \alpha \cdot \eta_2 = 0$.

(iv) For any $p \in T_c$, the orbit of p by H_α coincides with the intersection of the leaf $L_\alpha(p)$ with the fiber T_c .

(v) If c_1 is another point of W and γ_1 is a curve in W connecting c_1 to c , then, for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ it can be defined a biholomorphism $F_\alpha: T_{c_1} \rightarrow T_c$ (by lifting γ_1 to leaves of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$) such that

$$H_\alpha(\gamma_1^{-1} * \gamma * \gamma_1) = F^{-1} \circ H_\alpha(\gamma) \circ F.$$

In particular, the holonomy representations are conjugated and the fibration f is isotrivial, that is, all regular fibers are biholomorphic.

Now, consider the two closed curves $\gamma_0, \gamma_1: [0, 1] \rightarrow W$, where $\gamma_k(0) = \gamma_k(1) = c$, $k = 0, 1$, γ_0 goes around 0 once and γ_1 goes around ∞ once. It is known that γ_0, γ_1 generate $\Pi_1(W, c)$. We will call $f_{1, \alpha} = H_\alpha(\gamma_0)$ and $g_{1, \alpha} = H_\alpha(\gamma_1)$. Fix a holomorphic universal covering $P: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow T_c$ and let $f_\alpha, g_\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ be coverings of $f_{1, \alpha}$ and $g_{1, \alpha}$, respectively ($P \circ f_\alpha = f_{1, \alpha} \circ P$ and $P \circ g_\alpha = g_{1, \alpha} \circ P$).

Lemma 2.1.2. – *If we choose well the orientation of the curves γ_0 and γ_1 , then for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ we have $f_\alpha(z) = i \cdot z + A(\alpha)$ and $g_\alpha(z) = i \cdot z + B(\alpha)$, where $A, B: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are holomorphic.*

Idea of the proof. – The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 4 of §2.2 of [LN], and so we will give only an idea. Let us consider the case of f_α . The critical fiber $T_0 := f^{-1}(0)$ of the fibration f contains the strict transforms, by $\pi: M \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}(2)$, of the curves C_1 and L_{-1} , which we call C and L , respectively. On the other hand, C_1 and L_{-1} contain the movable singularities $Q_1(\alpha)$ and $P_{-1}(\alpha)$ of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha^2$, which are of the type $1 : -4$. These singularities give origin to movable singularities of the pencil $\mathcal{P}$, $Q(\alpha) := \pi^{-1}(Q_1(\alpha)) \in C$ and $P(\alpha) = \pi^{-1}(P_{-1}(\alpha)) \in L$, which are also of the type $1 : -4$. Since $Q(\alpha)$ is the unique singularity of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ on C and C is a rational curve, $Q(\alpha)$ is linearizable for the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ (because the holonomy of C is trivial, and so linearizable). The same argument applies to $P(\alpha)$, which is the unique singularity of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ on L . On the other hand, the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ has an unique local smooth separatrix, say $S(\alpha)$, which is transversal to C . Since the quotient of the eigenvalues is $-1/4$, the holonomy of $S(\alpha)$, in a suitable coordinate system u of a transversal Σ , is linear of the form $u \mapsto e^{-2\pi i/4} \cdot u = -i \cdot u$. If we choose c near 0 then the separatrix $S(\alpha)$ cuts the fiber T_c in an unique point, say $p(\alpha)$. It can be checked that $f|_{S(\alpha)}: S(\alpha) \rightarrow D := f(S(\alpha))$ is a bijection. If we choose the curve γ_0 as a small circle surrounding 0 contained in D , then when we go around γ_0 in order to evaluate $f_{1, \alpha}$ we see that $p(\alpha)$ is a fixed point of $f_{1, \alpha}$. Moreover, the section Σ can be choosed to be contained in T_c . This implies that $f_{1, \alpha}$ is locally conjugated to $u \mapsto \pm i \cdot u$. The

sign $\pm$ depends on the orientation of γ_0 . We choose this orientation in such a way that $f_{1,\alpha}$ is locally conjugated to $u \mapsto i \cdot u$. This implies that $f_{1,\alpha}$ has period four and that $f_\alpha(z) = i \cdot z + A(\alpha)$. Analogously, we can choose the orientation of γ_1 in such a way that $g_\alpha(z) = i \cdot z + B(\alpha)$. The maps $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \mapsto A(\alpha), B(\alpha)$ are holomorphic by (iii). $\square$

As a consequence of Lemma 2.1.2, we obtain that T_c is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, i \rangle$. This implies that all regular fibers of f are biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, i \rangle$, because the fibration is isotrivial. We will fix an universal covering $P: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow T_c$ such that the associated lattice is $\langle 1, i \rangle$. The crucial result is the following:

Lemma 2.1.3. — *$A(\alpha)$ and $B(\alpha)$ are affine, that is, $A(\alpha) = a_1 \cdot \alpha + a_0$ and $B(\alpha) = b_1 \cdot \alpha + b_0$, where $a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1 \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Proof. — We need another lemma.

Lemma 2.1.4. — *Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a flat pencil on a surface M . Given $p \in M \setminus \text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$, there exists a local coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$, $p \in U$, $(x, y): U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$, such that the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ of the pencil, $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, is defined on U by $dy + \alpha \cdot dx = 0$. Moreover, if $(V, (u, v))$ is another coordinate system such that $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$ is connected and $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_V$ is defined by $dv + \alpha \cdot du = 0$, $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, then $du = \lambda \cdot dx$ and $dv = \lambda \cdot dy$ on $U \cap V$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$.*

Proof. — Let $W \subset M \setminus \text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a small simply connected open neighborhood of p and ω, η be holomorphic 1-forms such that the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_W$ is defined by $\omega + \alpha \cdot \eta = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \mathcal{G}$ are defined on W by $\omega = 0$ and $\eta = 0$, respectively. Since $W \cap \text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \emptyset$, we have $\omega \wedge \eta \neq 0$ on W . Hence, we can write $d\omega = \theta \wedge \omega$ and $d\eta = \theta \wedge \eta$, where θ is holomorphic on W . Since the pencil is flat, θ is closed. Therefore, there exists $h \in \mathcal{O}(W)$ such that $\theta = dh$. If we set $f = \exp(h)$ then we get

$$d\omega = \frac{df}{f} \wedge \omega \quad \text{and} \quad d\eta = \frac{df}{f} \wedge \eta \quad \implies \quad d\left(\frac{\omega}{f}\right) = d\left(\frac{\eta}{f}\right) = 0.$$

Again, since W is simply connected, there exist $x, y \in \mathcal{O}(W)$ such that $dy = \omega/f$ and $dx = \eta/f$. The foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is defined on W by $dy + \alpha \cdot dx = \frac{1}{f}(\omega + \alpha \cdot \eta) = 0$. Note that $dx \wedge dy \neq 0$ on W . It follows that $(x, y): W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ is an immersion. This implies that we can take a smaller neighborhood $U \subset W$ of p such that $(x, y)|_U$ is a biholomorphism from U to an open set of $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Let $(V, (u, v))$ be another coordinate system such that $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$ is connected and $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_V$ is defined by $dv + \alpha \cdot du = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{F}|_V$ and $\mathcal{G}|_V$ are defined by $dv = 0$ and $du = 0$, respectively. Since $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_{U \cap V}$ is defined by $dy + \alpha \cdot dx$ and $du + \alpha \cdot dv = 0$, we get

$$(*) \quad dv + \alpha \cdot du = h(x, y, \alpha)(dy + \alpha \cdot dx)$$

where h is holomorphic. Differentiating both members of $(*)$ with respect to α , we get

$$du = \frac{\partial h}{\partial \alpha}(dy + \alpha \cdot dx) + h \cdot dx \implies \frac{\partial h}{\partial \alpha} \equiv 0,$$

because du is a multiple of dx on $U \cap V$. Hence, $h(x, y, \alpha) = h(x, y)$, does not depend on α . Therefore, $du = h \cdot dx$ and $dv = h \cdot dy$ on $U \cap V$. This implies that $dh \wedge dy = dh \wedge dx = 0$ and $h \in \mathbb{C}^*$, is a constant. This finishes the proof of lemma 2.1.4. $\square$

Let us finish the proof of Lemma 2.1.3. Fix $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $p \in T_c$. Set $q = f_{1, \alpha_0}(p) \in T_c$. Denote by $L_\alpha(p)$ the leaf of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ through p . Let $\gamma_p: [0, 1] \rightarrow L_{\alpha_0}(p)$ be the lifting of γ_0 on the leaf $L_{\alpha_0}(p)$ through the fibration f . Note that $\gamma_p(0) = p$ and $\gamma_p(1) = q$. Let $(U_n)_{1 \leq n \leq m}$ be a covering of $\gamma_p[0, 1]$ by open sets as in Lemma 2.1.4. For each $n = 1, \dots, m$ there exists a coordinate system (x_n, y_n) on U_n such $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_{U_n}$ is defined by $dy_n + \alpha \cdot dx_n = 0$. We can choose the enumeration in such a way that there is a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m = 1$ of $[0, 1]$ such that $\gamma_p[t_{n-1}, t_n] \subset U_n$, for all $n = 1, \dots, m$. We can suppose that $U_n \cap U_{n+1}$ is connected for every $n = 1, \dots, m-1$. It follows from Lema 2.1.4 that there exist constants $\lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}^*$ such that $dx_{n+1} = \lambda_n \cdot dx_n$ and $dy_{n+1} = \lambda_n \cdot dy_n$, $n = 1, \dots, m-1$. Hence,

(i) $y_{n+1} = \lambda_n \cdot y_n + a_n$, where $a_n \in \mathbb{C}$, $n = 1, \dots, m-1$.

Fix transversal sections to the foliation $\mathcal{F}_0, \Sigma_0, \dots, \Sigma_m$, such that:

(ii) $\gamma_p(t_n) \in \Sigma_n$, $n = 0, 1, \dots, m$.

(iii) $\Sigma_n \subset (x_n = ct)$, that is Σ_n is contained in a leaf of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$. Note that $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_m \subset T_c$.

Since $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is defined by $dy_n + \alpha \cdot dx_n = 0$ on U_n , the holonomy transformation of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$, α near α_0 , from the section $\Sigma_{n-1} \subset (x_n = c_1)$ to the section $\Sigma_n \subset (x_n = c_2)$, in terms of the parameter y_n is of the form $y_n \mapsto H_n(y_n, \alpha) = y_n - \alpha \cdot b_n$, $b_n = c_2 - c_1$. It follows from (i) that, in the section Σ_n , we have $y_{n+1} = \lambda_n \cdot y_n + a_n$, and so the holonomy transformation H_n , can be written in terms of the parameter y_{n+1} (in the image) as $y_{n+1}(y_n, \alpha) = \lambda_n \cdot H_n(y_n) + a_n = \lambda_n \cdot y_n - \alpha \cdot \lambda_n \cdot b_n + a_n$. As the reader can check, this implies that the holonomy transformation from the section $\Sigma_0 \subset U_1 \cap T_c$ to the section $\Sigma_m \subset U_M \cap T_c$, which is the composition of the intermediate holonomies, is of the form

$$y_m = H(y_1, \alpha) = \mu \cdot y_1 + \alpha \cdot b + c, \quad \text{where } \mu \in \mathbb{C}^*, b, c \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Now, let us relate the parameters $y_1 \in \Sigma_1$ and $y_m \in \Sigma_m$ with the parametrization which comes from the universal covering $P: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow T_c$. Since $\mathcal{F}_0$ is transverse to T_c , there exists a neighborhood V of T_c such that

(iv) $f|_V: V \rightarrow D := f(V)$ is a trivial fibration. In particular, $V \simeq D \times T_c$, where $f|_V = \pi_1$, the first projection, and the fibers of the second projection $\pi_2: V \rightarrow T_c$ are the leaves of $\mathcal{F}_0|_V$.

Let τ be a non-vanishing 1-form on T_c such that $P^*(\tau) = dz$.

Claim. — *There exist constants $k_1, k_m \in \mathbb{C}^*$ such that $dy_1|_{\Sigma_1} = k_1 \cdot \tau|_{\Sigma_1}$ and $dy_m|_{\Sigma_m} = k_m \cdot \tau|_{\Sigma_m}$.*

Proof. — Set $\omega = \pi_2^*(\tau)$. Note that $\omega(p) \neq 0$, for all $p \in V$, and that the foliation $\mathcal{F}_0|_V$ is defined by $\omega = 0$. We can suppose that $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ and consider $x := f|_V: V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. This implies that $\mathcal{F}_\infty|_V$ is defined by $dx = 0$. We assert that there exists $g \in \mathcal{O}^*(D)$ such that the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_V$ is defined by $\omega + \alpha \cdot g(x) \cdot dx = 0$.

In fact, since ω and dx are linearly independent on V , the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_V$ is defined by a 1-form of the type $\omega_\alpha = \omega + g_\alpha \cdot dx$, where $g_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}^*(V)$. Since the fiber $T_x = f^{-1}(x)$ is compact, the function $g_\alpha|_{T_x}$ is constant. Hence, we can write $g_\alpha = g_\alpha(x)$ and $\omega_\alpha = \omega + g_\alpha(x) \cdot dx$. Fix a point $q \in V$ and a coordinate system $(U_q, (x_q, y_q))$ such that $U_q \subset V$ and $\mathcal{F}_\alpha|_{U_q}$ is defined by $dy_q + \alpha \cdot dx_q = 0$. It follows that $dy_q + \alpha \cdot dx_q = h_\alpha(\omega + g_\alpha(x) \cdot dx)$ on U_q , where $h_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}^*(U_q)$. Differentiating twice both members with respect to α and by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 2.1.4, we get $\partial h_\alpha / \partial \alpha = 0$ and $\partial^2 g_\alpha / \partial \alpha^2 = 0$. This implies that $g_\alpha(x) = \alpha \cdot g(x)$, where $g \in \mathcal{O}^*(V)$.

Since ω and $g(x)dx$ are closed, they are locally exact and we can apply Lemma 2.1.4 to them and the forms dy_1 and dx_1 . It follows that $dy_1 = k_1 \cdot \omega|_{U_1}$, $k_1 \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Similarly, $dy_m = k_m \cdot \omega|_{U_m}$, $k_m \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Hence, $dy_j|_{\Sigma_j} = k_j \cdot \tau|_{\Sigma_j}$, $j = 1, m$. $\square$

Now, fix a disk $D_1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $\phi_1 := P|_{D_1}: D_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ is a biholomorphism. The claim implies that $\phi_1^*(dy_1) = k_1 \cdot dz$. Therefore, $y_1 \circ \phi_1(z) = k_1 \cdot z + d_1$, $d_1 \in \mathbb{C}$. Similarly, $y_m \circ \phi_m(z) = k_m \cdot z + d_m$, $d_m \in \mathbb{C}$ ($\phi_m = P|_{D_m}$). It follows that the holonomy transformation f_α can be written, in terms of the parameter $z \in \mathbb{C}$, as

$$f_\alpha(z) = k_m^{-1} \cdot H(y_1 \circ \phi_1(z), \alpha) - k_m^{-1} \cdot d_m = i \cdot z + a_1 \cdot \alpha + a_0,$$

where $a_1 = k_m^{-1} \cdot b$ and $a_0 = k_m^{-1}(c - d_m) + \mu \cdot d_1$. Hence, $A(\alpha) = a_1 \cdot \alpha + a_0$, where $a_1, a_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Similarly, $B(\alpha) = b_1 \cdot \alpha + b_0$. $\square$

Now, the point $z_0 = A(\alpha)/(1 - i)$ is a fixed point of f_α . Let $Q_\alpha(z) = z - z_0$. The global holonomy group $G(\alpha, c)$ (viewed in the universal covering) is conjugated to the group generated by $F_\alpha(z) = Q_\alpha \circ f_\alpha \circ Q_\alpha^{-1}(z) = i \cdot z$ and $G_\alpha(z) = Q_\alpha \circ g_\alpha \circ Q_\alpha^{-1}(z) = i \cdot z + C(\alpha)$, where $C(\alpha) = B(\alpha) - A(\alpha) = a \cdot \alpha + b$, $a = b_1 - a_1$ and $b = b_0 - a_0$. Let us finish the proof of Theorem 1. We need two more results. We will give only an idea of the proof of these results (see Proposition 5 and its corollary in [LN]).

Lemma 2.1.5. — *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (a) *The group $G(\alpha, c)$ is finite.*
- (b) *$G(\alpha, c)$ has a finite orbit in T_c .*
- (c) *There exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \cdot C(\alpha) \in \langle 1, i \rangle$.*
- (d) *$\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ has a first integral. In particular, $\alpha \in E_2$.*

Idea of the proof. – The proof of the equivalences (a) $\iff$ (b) $\iff$ (c) is based in the fact that the group generated by F_α and G_α is

$$G = \{z \mapsto c \cdot z + d \cdot C(\alpha) \mid c \in \{1, -1, i, -i\} \text{ and } d \in \langle 1, i \rangle\}.$$

This is done in Proposition 5 of [LN] in another case, but the proof is similar for the above case. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ has a first integral, then all leaves of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ are algebraic and cut T_c in a finite number of points. Hence, (d) $\implies$ (b). Finally, if the group $G(\alpha, c)$ is finite, say $\#G(\alpha, c) = m$, then each leaf of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ cut each fiber $T_x = f^{-1}(x)$ in m points. This implies that all leaves $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ are algebraic. There is a delicate point here, which involves the fact that the leaves of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ cut transversely the components of the critical fibers of f which are not invariant for $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$. We have not proved this fact here, but the proof can be done by studying carefully the blowing-up process π . We leave the details for the reader. Now, we can use Darboux's theorem which asserts that if all leaves of a foliation are algebraic then the foliation has a first integral. Therefore, (a) $\implies$ (d). $\square$

Lemma 2.1.6. *The map $\alpha \mapsto C(\alpha)$ is non-constant. In particular, $a \neq 0$.*

Idea of the proof. – If $\alpha \mapsto C(\alpha)$ were constant then all holonomy groups $G(\alpha, c)$ would be isomorphic. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that there are $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in E_2$ such that $\#(G(\alpha_0, c)) \neq \#(G(\alpha_1, c))$. In the case of this pencil, we have $0, 1/2 \in E_2$ and the first integrals g_0^2 and $g_{1/2}^2$ given in (4). It can be checked by using Bézout's theorem and the explicit expressions for g_∞^2 , g_0^2 and $g_{1/2}^2$ that the generic leaf of $\mathcal{F}_0$ cuts T_c in eight points, whereas the generic leaf of $\mathcal{F}_{1/2}$ cuts T_c in four points. This implies that $\#(G(0, c)) = 8$ and $\#(G(1/2, c)) = 4$. Therefore, $\alpha \mapsto C(\alpha)$ is not constant. $\square$

End of the proof of Theorem 1. – We have seen that $C(\alpha) = a \cdot \alpha + b$, where $a \neq 0$. On the other hand, $0, 1/2 \in E_2$, which implies that there exist $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m_0, n_0, m_1, n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$m \cdot b = m_0 + n_0 \cdot i \quad \text{and} \quad n \left(\frac{a}{2} + b \right) = m_1 + n_1 \cdot i \quad \implies \quad a, b \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, i \rangle.$$

Since $\mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, i \rangle$ is a field, we get

$$m(a \cdot \alpha + b) \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, i \rangle, \quad m \in \mathbb{N} \quad \iff \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, i \rangle.$$

This finishes the proof in the case of the pencil $\mathcal{P}_2$.

In the case of the pencil $\mathcal{P}_1$ the proof is similar. In this case, the non-singular fibers of f are biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, k \rangle$ ($k = e^{\pi i/3}$) and the holonomy group of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is isomorphic to the group generated by the transformations $F_\alpha(z) = k \cdot z$ and $G_\alpha(z) = k^2 \cdot z + C(\alpha)$ (in the universal covering), where $C(\alpha) = a \cdot \alpha + b$, $a \neq 0$. This group is

$$G = \{z \mapsto c \cdot z + d \cdot C(\alpha) \mid c \in \{1, k, k^2, k^3, k^4, k^5\} \text{ and } d \in \langle 1, k \rangle\}.$$

By the analogous of Lemma 2.1.5 we have that $\alpha \in E_1$ if, and only if, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \cdot C(\alpha) \in \langle 1, k \rangle$. On the other hand, we know that $1, -1 \in E_1$, because we have the explicit first integrals g_1^1 and g_{-1}^1 (see (3)). Therefore, there exist $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m_0, n_0, m_1, n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$m(a+b) = m_0 + n_0 \cdot k \text{ and } n(-a+b) = m_1 + n_1 \cdot k \implies a, b \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, k \rangle.$$

Since $\mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, k \rangle$ is a field, we get

$$m(a \cdot \alpha + b) \in \langle 1, k \rangle, m \in \mathbb{N} \iff \alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \langle 1, k \rangle.$$

This finishes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

2.2. Proof of Theorem 2. — Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a pencil of foliations on the compact complex surface M .

Definition 3. — Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are defined on an open set $U \subset M$ by $\omega = 0$ and $\eta = 0$, where ω and η are holomorphic 1-forms on U . We will say that (U, ω, η) are *compatible with the pencil* if the foliation $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is defined on U by $\omega + \alpha \cdot \eta = 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.

We need a Lemma.

Lemma 2.2.1. — Let C be an irreducible component of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ of multiplicity $k \geq 1$. There exists a finite set $F \subset |C|$ such that if $p \in |C| \setminus F$ then there is a holomorphic coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$ with $p \in U$, $x(p) = y(p) = 0$, $|C| \cap U = (y = 0)$, and holomorphic 1-forms ω and η , representing $\mathcal{F}|_U$ and $\mathcal{G}|_U$ respectively, such that (U, ω, η) is compatible with the pencil and

(a) If C is invariant for the pencil then

$$\begin{cases} \omega = dy \\ \eta = P(x, y) dy - y^k dx \end{cases}$$

where $P \in \mathcal{O}(U)$. If θ is such that $d\omega = \theta \wedge \omega$ and $d\eta = \theta \wedge \eta$, then

$$\theta = \left(\frac{P_x}{y^k} + \frac{k}{y} \right) dy$$

In particular, $\Theta|_U = y^{-k} P_{xx}(x, y) dx \wedge dy$ in these coordinates.

(b) If C is non-invariant for $\mathcal{F}$ (and so for the pencil) then

$$\begin{cases} \omega = dx \\ \eta = y^k dy - Q(x, y) dx \end{cases}$$

where $Q \in \mathcal{O}(U)$. If θ is such that $d\omega = \theta \wedge \omega$ and $d\eta = \theta \wedge \eta$, then

$$\theta = \frac{Q_y}{y^k} dx$$

In particular $\Theta|_U = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(y^{-k} Q_y) dx \wedge dy$ in these coordinates.

Proof. — Consider a covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ of M by open sets and collections $\Omega = (\omega_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$, $\Xi = (\eta_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ and $\Lambda = (g_{\alpha\beta})_{U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset}$, such that $(U_\alpha, \omega_\alpha, \eta_\alpha)$ is compatible with the pencil for every $\alpha \in A$ and, if $U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset$ then $\omega_\alpha = g_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \omega_\beta$ and $\eta_\alpha = g_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \eta_\beta$ on $U_{\alpha\beta} = U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$. Let $F_1 = |C| \cap \text{sing}(\mathcal{F})$. Given $p \in |C| \setminus F_1$, let $(V, (u, v))$ be a holomorphic coordinate system around p such that $u(p) = v(p) = 0$ and $V \cap |C| = (v = 0)$. We can suppose that $V \subset U_\alpha$, for some $\alpha \in A$. Suppose first that C is invariant for the pencil. Since $p \notin \text{sing}(\mathcal{F})$ and C is invariant for $\mathcal{F}$, by taking a smaller V if necessary, we can suppose that the leaves of $\mathcal{F}|_C$ are the level curves of v , so that $\omega_\alpha|_V = f \cdot dv$, where $f \in \mathcal{O}^*(V)$. Set $\omega = f^{-1} \cdot \omega_\alpha = dv$ and $\eta = f^{-1} \cdot \eta_\alpha$. Note that (V, ω, η) is compatible with the pencil. Let $\eta = A(u, v)dv - B(u, v)du$. Since $\omega \wedge \eta = B(u, v)du \wedge dv$ and the multiplicity of C in $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is k , then $B(u, v) = v^k \cdot b(u, v)$, where $b \in \mathcal{O}(V)$ and $b(u, 0) \neq 0$. Let $F_V = \{(u, 0) \in |C| \cap V : b(u, 0) = 0\}$ and $F = \cup_V F_V \cup F_1$. We leave for the reader the proof that F is finite. If $p \in |C| \setminus F$ then, in the above coordinate system we have $b(0, 0) \neq 0$. Therefore, there exists a neighborhood U of p , with $U \subset\subset V$, and a function $x \in \mathcal{O}(U)$ such that $x(p) = 0$, $\partial x / \partial u = b$ and $\Phi(u, v) = (x(u, v), v)$ is biholomorphism onto $\Phi(U) \subset \mathbb{C}^2$. In the coordinate system $(x, y) := (x, v)$, we have $\omega = dy$ and

$$\eta = A dv - v^k b du = A dy - y^k \left(dx - \frac{\partial x}{\partial v} dy \right) = \left(A + y^k \frac{\partial x}{\partial v} \right) dy - y^k dx := P dy - y^k dx$$

Let us compute $\Theta|_U$. If θ is such that $d\omega = \theta \wedge \omega$ and $d\eta = \theta \wedge \eta$ then $\theta = \phi \cdot dy$, because $\omega = dy$ and $d\omega = 0$. Since

$$d\eta = (P_x + k y^{k-1}) dx \wedge dy = \left(\frac{P_x}{y^k} + \frac{k}{y} \right) dy \wedge \eta$$

we get that

$$\theta = \left(\frac{P_x}{y^k} + \frac{k}{y} \right) dy \implies \Theta|_U = d\theta = \frac{P_{xx}}{y^k} dx \wedge dy$$

Now, suppose that C is non-invariant for $\mathcal{F}$. Let

$$F_1 = \{p \in |C| : \mathcal{F} \text{ is tangent to } |C| \text{ at } p\}.$$

Clearly F_1 is finite and if $p \in |C| \setminus F_1$ then there exists a holomorphic coordinate system $(V, (u, v))$ around p such that $V \subset U_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in A$, $u(p) = v(p) = 0$, $|C| \cap V = (v = 0)$ and the leaves of $\mathcal{F}|_V$ are the level curves of u . In this case, $\omega_\alpha|_V = f \cdot du$ where $f \in \mathcal{O}^*(V)$. Set $\omega := du = f^{-1} \omega_\alpha|_V$ and $\eta = f^{-1} \cdot \eta_\alpha|_V$. Note that (V, ω, η) is compatible with the pencil. Let $\eta = A dv - B du$, where $A, B \in \mathcal{O}(U)$. Since $\omega \wedge \eta = A du \wedge dv$ and C is a component of multiplicity k , we can write $A = v^k \cdot a$, where $a(u, 0) \neq 0$. Let $F_V = \{(u, 0) \in |C| \cap V : a(u, 0) = 0\}$ and set $F = \cup_V F_V \cup F_1$. We leave for the reader the proof that F is finite. If $p \in |C| \setminus F$ then in the above coordinate system we have $a(0, 0) \neq 0$. We assert that there exists a coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$ around p such that $U \subset V$, $u = x$, $y = v \cdot \phi(u, v)$ and

$$(*) \quad \frac{\partial y^{k+1}}{\partial v} = (k+1) v^k a(u, v)$$

In fact, in a neighborhood of $p = (0, 0) \in V$, we can write $(k+1)v^k a(u, v) = \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} a_j(u) v^j$, where $a_k(0) = (k+1)a(0, 0) \neq 0$. Let

$$\phi(u, v) = \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j} a_{j-1}(u) v^j := v^{k+1} \cdot b(u, v).$$

Note that $b(0, 0) = a(0, 0) \neq 0$ and $\partial\phi/\partial v = (k+1)v^k a(u, v)$. Let $U_1 \subset V$ be a simply connected open neighborhood of $(0, 0)$ such that $b \in \mathcal{O}^*(U_1)$. Let $c \in \mathcal{O}^*(U_1)$ be such that $c^{k+1} = b$ and $y \in \mathcal{O}(U_1)$ be defined by $y(u, v) = v \cdot c(u, v)$. Note that $y^{k+1} = \phi$ and the map $\Phi(u, v) = (u, y(u, v)) = (x, y)$ is a biholomorphism from some open neighborhood $U \subset U_1$ onto an open subset of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Clearly, the coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$ satisfies $(*)$. In these coordinates, we have $\omega = dx$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= v^k a(u, v) dv - B(u, v) du = \frac{1}{k+1} \frac{\partial y^{k+1}}{\partial v} dv - B(u, v) du \\ &= y^k dy - \left(\frac{1}{k+1} \frac{\partial y^{k+1}}{\partial u} + B(u, v) \right) du := y^k dy - Q(x, y) dx \end{aligned}$$

If θ is such that $d\omega = \theta \wedge \omega$ and $d\eta = \theta \wedge \eta$ then $\theta = \psi \cdot dx$, because $\omega = dx$ and $d\omega = 0$. Since

$$d\eta = Q_y dx \wedge dy = \frac{Q_y}{y^k} dx \wedge \eta$$

we get that

$$\theta = \frac{Q_y}{y^k} dx \implies \Theta = d\theta = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{Q_y}{y^k} \right) dx \wedge dy$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.2.1. $\square$

From now on, in this section, we will suppose that all irreducible components of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ have multiplicity one.

2.2.2. (b) $\implies$ (c). Denote by D_∞ the divisor of poles of Θ . Let C be a component of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$. Suppose first that C is invariant for the pencil. Since the multiplicity of C in $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is one, by Lemma 2.2.1, we can choose a coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$ such that $U \cap C = (y = 0)$, $p = (0, 0) \in U$ and

$$(5) \quad \begin{cases} \omega = dy \\ \eta = P(x, y) dy - y dx \end{cases}$$

Let $P(x, y) = p_0(x) + yp(x, y)$, where $p \in \mathcal{O}(U)$ and $p_0(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j x^j$. Since $\Theta = h \cdot dx \wedge dy$, where $h = y^{-1} P_{x,x} = y^{-1} p_0''(x) + p_{x,x}(x, y)$, then $C \not\subset D_\infty$ if, and only if, $p_0(x) = a_0 + a_1 x$. Note that the foliation $\mathcal{F}_T$ associated to $\eta_T = \eta + T \cdot \omega = (T + P(x, y))dy - y dx$, is defined on U by the vector field

$$X_T(x, y) = (T + p_0(x) + yp(x, y)) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + y \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$$

Hence, the singularities of $\mathcal{F}_T$ on U are given by $y = T + p_0(x) = 0$.

We have two possibilities: either p_0 is a constant ($p_0(x) = a_0$), or p_0 is not a constant. In the first case, we get that $\eta_{-a_0} = y(pdy - dx)$. In this case, $-a_0 \in NI$ and there is no movable singularity on C . Moreover $\Theta = p_{xx} dx \wedge dy$, which implies that $C \not\subset D_\infty$. In the second case, there is a movable singularity on C : if $x(T)$ is such that $T + p_0(x(T)) = 0$ and $-T$ is a regular value of p_0 then $x(T)$ is a movable singularity of $\mathcal{P}$ and $T \in GP = \{T \in IS \mid n(T) = n_0\}$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that this singularity satisfies (a) of Definition 2. This singularity is non-degenerate, in the sense that zero is not an eigenvalue of $DX_T(q(T))$, where $q(T) = (x(T), 0)$. In this case, the Baum-Bott index of $\mathcal{F}_T$ at $p(T)$ is given by (cf. [Br]):

$$\begin{aligned} B(T) &:= BB(q(T), \mathcal{F}_T) = \frac{\text{tr}^2(DX_T(q(T)))}{\det(DX_T(q(T)))} = \frac{(p'_0(x(T)) + 1)^2}{p'_0(x(T))} \\ (6) \quad &= p'_0(x(T)) + \frac{1}{p'_0(x(T))} + 2 \end{aligned}$$

Since C is nice, we have $B'(T) \equiv 0$. As the reader can check, this condition is equivalent to

$$p''_0(x(T)) \left(1 - \frac{1}{(p'_0(x(T)))^2}\right) x'(T) \equiv 0$$

Since $q(T)$ is a movable singularity, we have $x'(T) \neq 0$. Therefore, $p''_0(x(T)) \equiv 0$, which implies that $p''_0 \equiv 0$ and $p_0(x) = a_0 + a_1 x$ (note that $p'_0(x(T)) = \pm 1$ implies also that $p''_0 = 0$). Therefore, $C \not\subset D_\infty$.

Suppose now that C is non-invariant for $\mathcal{P}$. Consider a coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$ such that $U \cap C = (y = 0)$, $p = (0, 0) \in U$ and

$$(7) \quad \begin{cases} \omega = dx \\ \eta = y dy - Q(x, y) dx \end{cases}$$

where $Q(x, y) = q_0(x) + q_1(x)y + y^2 q(x, y)$, where q_0 , q_1 and q are holomorphic. Since $\Theta = -(y^{-1} Q_y)_y dx \wedge dy$, then $C \not\subset D_\infty$ if, and only if, $q_1(x) \equiv 0$. Note that the foliation $\mathcal{F}_T$ associated to $\eta_T = \eta + T \cdot \omega = y dy + (T - Q(x, y)) dx$, is defined on U by the vector field

$$X_T(x, y) = y \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + (q_0(x) + q_1(x)y + y^2 q(x, y) - T) \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$$

Hence, the singularities of $\mathcal{F}_T$ on U are given by $y = q_0(x) - T = 0$.

We have two possibilities: either q_0 is a constant, or q_0 is not a constant. In the first case, we get $\eta_{q_0} = y[dy - (q_1(x) + y q(x, y))dx]$, and so $q_0 \in NI$ and there is no movable singularity on C . Since C is nice, the curve C is invariant for the divided foliation associated to q_0 , which is defined by $\tilde{\omega} = dy - (q_1(x) + y q(x, y))dx$ on U . But, $C \cap U = (y = 0)$ and this curve is invariant for $\tilde{\omega} = 0$ if, and only if, $q_1 \equiv 0$. Therefore, $C \not\subset D_\infty$. In the second case, there is a movable singularity: $p(T) = (x(T), 0) \in U \cap C$, where $x(T)$ is such that $q_0(x(T)) - T = 0$. Set $q_0(0) = T_0$. If T is a regular value

of q_0 near T_0 , then $T \in GP$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that this singularity satisfies (c) of Definition 2. This singularity is non-degenerate, and so:

$$(8) \quad B(T) := BB(p(T), \mathcal{F}_T) = \frac{\text{tr}^2(DX_T(p(T)))}{\det(DX_T(p(T)))} = \frac{q_1^2(x(T))}{q_0'(x(T))}$$

Since C is nice, we get $B \equiv 0$, and so $q_1 \equiv 0$, which implies that $C \not\subset D_\infty$.

2.2.3. (a) $\implies$ (b). — Suppose first that C is invariant for $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$. Let $(U, (x, y))$ be a coordinate system like in (5), around a point $p = (0, 0) \in U \cap C$. Since $\Theta \equiv 0$, by Lemma 2.2.1, we have $P_{xx} = 0$. This implies that $P(x, y) = p_0(y) + p_1(y)x$, where p_0, p_1 are holomorphic. Hence, the singularities of $\mathcal{F}_T$ on $C \cap U$ are the solutions of $y = T + p_0(0) + p_1(0)x = 0$. We have two possibilities: either $p_1(0) \neq 0$, or $p_1(0) = 0$. If $p_1(0) = 0$, then $T = -p_0(0) \in NI$ and we are in the situation of (b) of Definition 2. Therefore, C is nice. If $p_1(0) \neq 0$, then C contains an unique movable singularity: $q(T) = (x(T), 0)$, where $x(T) = -(T + p_0(0))/p_1(0)$ (clearly $q(T) \in U$ for $|T + p_0(0)|$ small enough). This singularity is non-degenerate, and so by (6) we get:

$$BB(p(T), \mathcal{F}_T) = \frac{\text{tr}^2(DX_T(p(T)))}{\det(DX_T(p(T)))} = \frac{(p_1(0) + 1)^2}{p_1(0)}$$

Hence, C is nice in this case.

Suppose now that C is non-invariant for the pencil. Consider a coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$ around $p = (0, 0) \in U$ as in (7). Since $\Theta \equiv 0$, Lemma 2.2.1 implies that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(y^{-1} Q_y) = 0 \implies Q(x, y) = q_0(x) + q_2(x)y^2$$

This implies that C is nice, as the reader can check by using (8).

2.2.4. (c) $\implies$ (a). — Suppose that Θ is holomorphic. The idea is to use the well-known fact that

$$\Theta \equiv 0 \iff \int_M \Theta \wedge \overline{\Theta} = 0 \iff [\Theta] = 0 \text{ in } H_{DR}^2(M)$$

The proof will be based in the following:

Claim 1. — $\int_M \Theta \wedge \overline{\Theta} = -2\pi i \int_M c_1(N_{\mathcal{F}}) \wedge \overline{\Theta}$, where $c_1(N_{\mathcal{F}})$ is any representative of the first Chern class of $N_{\mathcal{F}}$ in $H_{DR}^2(M)$.

Proof. — Let $\mathcal{U} = (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ be a covering of M by open sets, $\Omega = (\omega_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$, $\Xi = (\eta_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ and $\Lambda = (g_{\alpha\beta})_{U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset}$ be as in (I), (II) and (III) of §1. Let $(\theta_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ be a collection of 1-forms, where θ_α is meromorphic on U_α , $d\omega_\alpha = \theta_\alpha \wedge \omega_\alpha$ and $d\eta_\alpha = \theta_\alpha \wedge \eta_\alpha$. Recall that, if $U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset$ then $\theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta = dg_{\alpha\beta}/g_{\alpha\beta}$. On the other hand, by taking a C^∞ resolution of the additive cocycle $(dg_{\alpha\beta}/g_{\alpha\beta})_{U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset}$, we can write $dg_{\alpha\beta}/g_{\alpha\beta} = \mu_\alpha - \mu_\beta$, where the closed 2-form Λ defined by $\Lambda|_{U_\alpha} = \frac{i}{2\pi} d\mu_\alpha$, represents $c_1(N_{\mathcal{F}})$ on $H_{DR}^2(M)$ (cf. [G-H], p. 141). If $U_{\alpha\beta} \neq \emptyset$, then $dg_{\alpha\beta}/g_{\alpha\beta} = \theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta = \mu_\alpha - \mu_\beta$. Hence, we can

define a C^∞ 1-form φ on $W := M \setminus \text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ by $\varphi|_{U_\alpha \cap W} = \frac{i}{2\pi}(\theta_\alpha - \mu_\alpha)$. Note that $d\varphi = \frac{i}{2\pi}\Theta - \Lambda$. This implies that $d\varphi$ extends to a C^∞ form in M . Moreover,

$$(9) \quad \int_M \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\Theta - \Lambda \right) \wedge \bar{\Theta} = \int_M d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta}.$$

The idea is to prove that $\int_M d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} = 0$. Let us study the behavior of φ near an irreducible component of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$. Set $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \sum_{j=1}^k C_j + \sum_{i=1}^\ell D_i$, where C_j is invariant for the pencil, $j = 1, \dots, k$, and D_i is non-invariant, $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Consider first the non-invariant case. Let $p \in |D_i| \cap U_\alpha$ be a point such that we have a normal form like in (b) of Lemma 2.2.1, in a coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$, where $U \subset U_\alpha$. As we have seen, $\omega_\alpha|_U = f\omega$ and $\eta_\alpha|_U = f\eta$, where $f \in \mathcal{O}^*(U)$, $\omega = dx$ and $\eta = ydy - Q(x, y)dx$, $Q(x, y) = q_0(x) + q_1(x)y + y^2q(x, y)$. This implies that $\theta_\alpha = \theta + df/f$, where $\theta = \frac{Q_y}{y}dx$. Note that Θ is holomorphic in U if, and only if, Q_y/y is holomorphic, which implies that θ_α is holomorphic in U and φ is C^∞ in U . This implies that φ is C^∞ on $M \setminus |C|$, where $C = \sum_j C_j$ and $|C| = \cup_j |C_j|$.

Consider now a point $p \in |C|$. Let $(f_1 \cdots f_k = 0)$ be a (reduced) equation of C in a small Stein neighborhood U of p . We assert that there exist $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{C}$ and a C^∞ 1-form ν such that

$$(10) \quad \varphi|_U = \sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j \frac{df_j}{f_j} + \nu.$$

In fact, suppose first that p belongs to an invariant component C_j and we have a normal form like in (a) of Lemma 2.2.1 on a coordinate system $(U, (x, y))$, where $U \subset U_\alpha$, for some $\alpha \in A$. As before, we have $\omega_\alpha|_U = f \cdot \omega = f \cdot dy$ and $\eta_\alpha|_U = f \cdot \eta$, where $f \in \mathcal{O}^*(U)$ and $\eta = P(x, y)dy - ydx$. From the first part of the proof and the fact that Θ is holomorphic, we get

$$(*) \quad \theta_\alpha = \theta + \frac{df}{f} = \frac{1 + P_x}{y}dy + \frac{df}{f} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \lambda_U \frac{dy}{y} + \varsigma_U,$$

where $\lambda_U \in \mathbb{C}$ and ς_U is a holomorphic 1-form. This implies that $\varphi|_U = \lambda_U \frac{dy}{y} + \nu_U$, where ν_U is a C^∞ 1-form.

Let us prove that λ_U depends only of C_j . It follows from (*) that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \lambda_U = \text{Res}(\theta_\alpha, C_j) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma \theta_\alpha,$$

where γ is a small circle surrounding C_j . If $\beta \in A$ is such that $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \cap C_j \neq \emptyset$ then $\theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta = dg_{\alpha\beta}/g_{\alpha\beta}$. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma \theta_\alpha = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma \theta_\beta,$$

if $\gamma \subset U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$. This proves that λ_U depends only of C_j . Set $\lambda_U = \lambda_j$.

Note that λ_j satisfies the following property

(A) Let $(f_{j\alpha} = 0)$ be a reduced equation of $C_j \cap U_\alpha$. Then $\theta_\alpha - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \lambda_j df_{j\alpha}/f_{j\alpha}$ has no poles along $C_j \cap U_\alpha$.

We leave the proof of (A) for the reader. Let $p \in |C| \cap U_\alpha$ and $(f_{j\alpha} = 0)$ be a reduced equation of C_j on U_α . It follows from (A) that $\theta_\alpha - \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{2\pi i} \lambda_j df_{j\alpha}/f_{j\alpha}$ is holomorphic on U_α . Hence, $\nu = \varphi|_{U_\alpha} - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j df_{j\alpha}/f_{j\alpha}$ is C^∞ . This proves (10).

Let us prove that $\int_M d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} = 0$. We will consider two cases:

First case. — All the singularities of C are nodes. In this case, we can find a finite open covering $\mathcal{V} = (V_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ of M with the following properties:

(i) For every $\alpha \in A$, V_α is a domain of a coordinate system $\psi_\alpha = (x_\alpha, y_\alpha): U_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $\psi_\alpha(U_\alpha) = D_2 \times D_2$, where $D_r = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| < r\}$.

(ii) If $U_\alpha = \psi_\alpha^{-1}(D_1 \times D_1)$ then $\cup_\alpha U_\alpha = M$.

(iii) If $|C| \cap V_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ is smooth then $(y_\alpha = 0)$ is an equation of $C \cap V_\alpha$. In particular, $\varphi|_{V_\alpha} = \lambda \frac{dy_\alpha}{y_\alpha} + \nu$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and ν is C^∞ .

(iv) If $|C| \cap V_\alpha$ has a singularity in V_α then $(x_\alpha \cdot y_\alpha = 0)$ is an equation of $C \cap V_\alpha$. In particular, $\varphi|_{V_\alpha} = \lambda_a \frac{dx_\alpha}{x_\alpha} + \lambda_b \frac{dy_\alpha}{y_\alpha} + \nu$, where $\lambda_a, \lambda_b \in \mathbb{C}$ and ν is C^∞ .

In general, let $(f_\alpha = 0)$ be an equation of $C \cap V_\alpha$. Let $(\varphi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ be a C^∞ partition of the unity such that $\text{supp}(\varphi_\alpha) \subset V_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in A$ and set $f = \exp(\sum_\alpha \varphi_\alpha \cdot \ln |f_\alpha|)$. If $\beta \in A$ is fixed, then

$$\begin{aligned} f|_{V_\beta} &= \exp \left(\sum_{\alpha, V_{\alpha,\beta} \neq \emptyset} \varphi_\alpha \cdot \ln |f_\alpha| \right) \cdot \exp \left(\sum_{\alpha, V_{\alpha,\beta} = \emptyset} \varphi_\alpha \cdot \ln |f_\alpha| \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\sum_{\alpha, V_{\alpha,\beta} \neq \emptyset} \varphi_\alpha \cdot \ln |g_{\alpha\beta} f_\beta| \right) \cdot \exp \left(\sum_{\alpha, V_{\alpha,\beta} = \emptyset} \varphi_\alpha \cdot \ln |f_\alpha| \right) = |f_\beta| \cdot g_\beta \end{aligned}$$

where $g_\beta: V_\beta \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ is C^∞ .

(v) $f|_{V_\alpha} = |f_\alpha| \cdot g_\alpha$, where $g_\alpha \in C^\infty(V_\alpha)$. In particular, f can be extended continually to M as $f|_{|C|} \equiv 0$.

(vi) $f > 0$ on $M \setminus |C|$ and $f^{-1}(0) = |C|$.

Set $M_\varepsilon = \{p \in M \mid f(p) \geq \varepsilon\}$ and $C_\varepsilon = \{p \in M \mid f(p) \leq \varepsilon\}$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} &= \int_{M_\varepsilon} d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} + \int_{C_\varepsilon} d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} = \int_{M_\varepsilon} d(\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta}) + \int_{C_\varepsilon} d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} \\ &= \int_{\partial M_\varepsilon} \varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} + \int_{C_\varepsilon} d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{C_\varepsilon} d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} \right)$, we get

$$(vii) \quad \int_M d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{\partial M_\varepsilon} \varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} \right).$$

It is enough to prove that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{\partial M_\varepsilon} \varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} \right) = 0$. In order to prove this fact, consider a covering $\{V_1 := V_{\alpha_1}, \dots, V_n := V_{\alpha_n}\}$ of $|C|$ by sets of $\mathcal{V}$, such that $\{U_j := U_{\alpha_j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ is still a covering of $|C|$. If $U = \cup_{j=1}^n U_j$ then there

exists ε_0 such that, if $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ then $\partial M_\varepsilon \subset V$. Hence, if $S_j(\varepsilon) = \partial M_\varepsilon \cap \overline{U}_\varepsilon$ and $I_j(\varepsilon) = \int_{S_j(\varepsilon)} |\varphi \wedge \overline{\Theta}|$, we get that

$$\left| \int_{\partial M_\varepsilon} \varphi \wedge \overline{\Theta} \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n I_j(\varepsilon), \quad \text{if } \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$$

It follows that, it is sufficient to prove that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_j(\varepsilon) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. We will prove this fact in the case where V_j is like in (iv) and leave the other case for the reader.

Consider a coordinate system (x, y) on V_j as in (iv), that is $|C| \cap V_j = (x \cdot y = 0)$. As we have seen before, $\Theta|_{V_j} = g(x, y) dx \wedge dy$ and $\varphi|_{V_j} = \lambda_a \frac{dx}{x} + \lambda_b \frac{dy}{y} + \nu$, where $g \in \mathcal{O}(V_j)$, $\lambda_a, \lambda_b \in \mathbb{C}$ and ν is C^∞ . Therefore, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that on $\overline{U}_j$ we have

$$|\varphi \wedge \overline{\Theta}| \leq c \left(\left| \frac{dx}{x} \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right| + \left| \frac{dy}{y} \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right| + \left| \nu \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right| \right)$$

If we set

$$A_j(\varepsilon) = \int_{S_j(\varepsilon)} \left| \frac{dx}{x} \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right|.$$

$$B_j(\varepsilon) = \int_{S_j(\varepsilon)} \left| \frac{dy}{y} \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right|$$

$$C_j(\varepsilon) = \int_{S_j(\varepsilon)} \left| \nu \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right|.$$

then $I_j(\varepsilon) \leq c(A_j(\varepsilon) + B_j(\varepsilon) + C_j(\varepsilon))$. Hence, it is sufficient to prove that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} A_j(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} B_j(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} C_j(\varepsilon) = 0$. We will prove that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} A_j(\varepsilon) = 0$ and leave the proof that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} B_j(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} C_j(\varepsilon) = 0$ for the reader (note that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} C_j(\varepsilon) = 0$ because ν is C^∞). Given $0 < a < 1$, define

$$J(a, \varepsilon) = \int_{S_j(\varepsilon) \cap (|x| \geq a)} \left| \frac{dx}{x} \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right| \quad \text{and} \quad K(a, \varepsilon) = \int_{S_j(\varepsilon) \cap (|x| \leq a)} \left| \frac{dx}{x} \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right|$$

so that $A_j(\varepsilon) = J(a, \varepsilon) + K(a, \varepsilon)$. Since $\left| \frac{dx}{x} \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right|$ is C^∞ on $(|x| \geq a)$, we get that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} J(a, \varepsilon) = 0$ for all $a > 0$. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that there exists $0 < a < 1$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} K(a, \varepsilon) = 0$.

Set $x = r e^{i\alpha}$ and $y = s e^{i\beta}$, so that $\left| \frac{dx}{x} \wedge d\overline{x} \wedge d\overline{y} \right| = 2|dr \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\overline{y}|$. In the coordinate system (r, α, y) we have $f(r, \alpha, y) = r \cdot s \cdot g(r, \alpha, y)$ (by (iv)), where $g \in C^\infty$ and $g > 0$. Since $\partial r \cdot g / \partial r(0, \alpha, y) = g(0, \alpha, y) > 0$, there exists $0 < a < 1$ such that the map $\psi(r, \alpha, y) = (r \cdot g(r, \alpha, y), \alpha, y) = (R, \alpha, y)$ is diffeomorphism from a neighborhood W of $(r = 0) \cap (|y| \leq 1)$ onto $W_1 = (R < \delta) \cap (|y| < 1 + \delta)$, where $W \supset (r \leq a) \cap (|y| \leq 1)$. Note that $\psi^{-1}(R, \alpha, y) = (R \cdot h(R, \alpha, y), \alpha, y)$, where h is C^∞ . In the coordinate system (R, α, y) we have

$$S_j(\varepsilon) \cap W_1 = (R \cdot |y| = R \cdot s = \varepsilon) \cap (s \leq 1) := T(\varepsilon) \implies K(a, \varepsilon) = \int_{T(\varepsilon)} 2|d(R \cdot h) \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\overline{y}|$$

if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small. We assert that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $2|d(R \cdot h) \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| \leq c \cdot R|ds \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta|$ on $T(\varepsilon)$, if ε is small (the restriction to $T(\varepsilon)$). In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} 2|d(R \cdot h) \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| &\leq 2R|dh \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| + 2|h||dR \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| \\ &\leq 2R|h_R||dR \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| + 2R|h_y||d\alpha \wedge dy \wedge d\bar{y}| \\ &\quad + 2|h||dR \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| \end{aligned}$$

Since $K := \psi((r \leq a) \cap (|y| \leq 1))$ is compact, $2|h|, 2|h_R|, 2|h_y|, R$ are bounded in K , so that there exists a constants $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 2|d(R \cdot h) \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| &\leq c_1(R|d\alpha \wedge dy \wedge d\bar{y}| + |dR \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}|) \\ &\leq c_1(2R|ds \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta| + |dR \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}|) \end{aligned}$$

on K , because $|d\alpha \wedge dy \wedge d\bar{y}| = 2|ds \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta|$. On the other hand, $\bar{y} = s \cdot e^{-i\beta}$ and $R \cdot s = \varepsilon$ on $T(\varepsilon)$. Hence, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |dR \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| &= |d(R d\bar{y}) \wedge d\alpha| = |d(-R s i e^{-i\beta} d\beta) \wedge d\alpha + d(R e^{-i\beta} ds) \wedge d\alpha| \\ &= |d(-\varepsilon i e^{-i\beta} d\beta) \wedge d\alpha + d(R e^{-i\beta} ds) \wedge d\alpha| \\ &= |d(R e^{-i\beta} ds) \wedge d\alpha| \leq R|ds \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta| + |dR \wedge ds \wedge d\alpha| \\ &= R|ds \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta| \end{aligned}$$

because $dR \wedge ds = 0$ on $T(\varepsilon)$. Therefore, on $T(\varepsilon)$ we have $2|d(R \cdot h) \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\bar{y}| \leq c \cdot R|ds \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta|$, where $c = 3c_1$. From this, we get that

$$K(a, \varepsilon) \leq c \int_{T(\varepsilon)} R|ds \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta| = c\varepsilon \int_{T(\varepsilon)} \left| \frac{ds}{s} \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta \right|.$$

On the other hand, the region $T(\varepsilon)$ in the real hypersurface $R \cdot s = \varepsilon$, is contained in a region of the form

$$T_1(\varepsilon) := \{(R, s, \alpha, \beta) \mid R \cdot s = \varepsilon, \alpha, \beta \in [0, 2\pi], 1 \geq s \geq \varepsilon/R_0\},$$

where $R_0 = \sup\{R(r, \alpha, y) \mid (r, \alpha, y) \in S_j(\varepsilon)\}$. This implies that

$$K(a, \varepsilon) \leq c\varepsilon \int_{T_1(\varepsilon)} \left| \frac{ds}{s} \wedge d\alpha \wedge d\beta \right| = 4\pi^2 c\varepsilon \cdot |\log(\varepsilon/R_0)| \implies \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} K(a, \varepsilon) = 0$$

This finishes the proof of Claim 1 in the first case.

Second case: general case. – Consider a resolution of the curve C by blowing-ups $\pi: \widehat{M} \rightarrow M$ and let $C^* = \pi^{-1}(C)$, $\Theta^* = \pi^*(\Theta)$ and $\varphi^* = \pi^*(\varphi)$. Then $\int_M d\varphi \wedge \bar{\Theta} = 0$ if, and only if, $\int_{\widehat{M}} d\varphi^* \wedge \bar{\Theta}^* = 0$. Note that the singularities of C^* are of nodal type. It is sufficient to prove that $|C^*|$ admits an open covering satisfying (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). Let $p \in \text{sing}(C)$ (which is not a node) and $q \in \pi^{-1}(p)$. Since the singularities of C^* are nodes, we have two possibilities: either q is a smooth point of C^* , or q is in the normal crossing of two local components, say D_1 and D_2 of C^* . Let us consider, for instance, the second case. Let $(W, (x, y))$ be a coordinate system

around p , where $C \cap U$ has a reduced equation ($f_1 \cdots f_k = 0$). As we have seen, we can write $\varphi|_W = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \frac{df_j}{f_j} + \nu$, where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{C}$ and ν is C^∞ . Consider a coordinate system $(V, \phi = (u, v))$ around $q = (0, 0)$ such that $\pi(V) \subset W$, $\phi(V) = \{(u, v) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid |u|, |v| \leq 2\}$, $D_1 \cap V = (u = 0)$ and $D_2 \cap V = (v = 0)$. We have still two possibilities: either $\pi(D_1) = \pi(D_2) = \{p\}$, or $\pi(D_j) = \{p\}$ for just one $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let us consider, for instance, the first case. In this case, if $\hat{f}_j$ is the strict transform of f_j , then $F_j := \hat{f}_j|_V \in \mathcal{O}^*(V)$. On the other hand, $f_j \circ \pi(u, v) = u^{m_j} \cdot v^{n_j} \cdot F_j$. Hence, in the coordinates (u, v) we have, $\pi^*(\varphi) = \lambda_a \frac{du}{u} + \lambda_b \frac{dv}{v} + \nu^*$, where $\lambda_a = \sum_j m_j \cdot \lambda_j$, $\lambda_b = \sum_j n_j \cdot \lambda_j$ and $\nu^* = \pi^*(\nu) + \sum_j \lambda_j dF_j / F_j$. Since $F_j \in \mathcal{O}^*(V)$ for all j , we get that ν^* is C^∞ . We leave the proof of the other cases for the reader. This finishes the proof of Claim 1. $\square$

Let us finish the proof of (c) $\implies$ (a). Suppose by contradiction that Θ is holomorphic and $\Theta \not\equiv 0$. Let $Z := (\Theta)_0$ be the divisor of zeroes of Θ . Given a divisor D on M we will denote by $[D]$ its class in $\text{Pic}(M)$. Since Θ is a non-vanishing section of $\Omega^2(M)$, we have $K_M = [Z]$. On the other hand, it is known that $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = K_M + N_{\mathcal{F}} + N_{\mathcal{G}}$ (cf. [Br]). Since $N_{\mathcal{F}} = N_{\mathcal{G}}$ we get that $2N_{\mathcal{F}} = \text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) - [Z] = \sum_{j=1}^m n_j [D_j]$, where $n_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and D_j is an irreducible component of $\text{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \cup Z$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. It follows from Claim 1 that

$$\int_M \Theta \wedge \bar{\Theta} = \sum_{j=1}^m -i\pi m_j \int_M c_1(D_j) \wedge \bar{\Theta}$$

On the other hand, it is known that (cf. [G-H])

$$\int_M c_1(D_j) \wedge \bar{\Theta} = \int_{D_j} \bar{\Theta} = 0$$

because $\bar{\Theta}$ is a $(0, 2)$ -form. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2. $\square$

References

- [BPV] W. BARTH, C. PETERS & A. VAN DE VEN – *Complex Compact Surfaces*, Springer Verlag, 1984.
- [Br] M. BRUNELLA – *Birational geometry of foliations*, IMPA, 2000, text book for a course in the First Latin American Congress of Mathematics.
- [Ch] S.S. CHERN – “Web Geometry”, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6** (1982), p. 1-8.
- [E-R] C. EHRESMANN – “Les connexions infinitésimales dans un espace fibré différentiable”, in *Colloque de topologie (Bruxelles, 1950)*, Georges Thone, Liège, 1951, p. 29-55.
- [G-H] P.A. GRIFFITHS & J. HARRIS – *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*, John-Wiley and Sons, 1994.
- [LN-1] A. LINS NETO – “Exceptional families of foliations and the Poincaré problem”, Preprint IMPA, 2000.
- [LN] ———, “Some examples for the Poincaré and Painlevé problems”, *Ann. scient. Éc. Norm. Sup. 4^e série* **35** (2002), p. 231-266.

- [Sc2] B. SCÁRDUA – “Transversely affine and transversely projective holomorphic foliations”, *Ann. scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.* 4^e série **30** (1997), p. 169–204.
- [S] M.F. SINGER – “Liouvillian first integrals of differential equations”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **333** (1992), no. 2, p. 673–687.

A. LINS NETO, Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, Estrada Dona Castorina, 110, Horto,
Rio de Janeiro, Brasil • *E-mail* : alcides@impa.br