

**BERNDTSSON-LEMPERT-SZŐKE FIELDS
ASSOCIATED TO
PROPER HOLOMORPHIC FAMILIES OF VECTOR BUNDLES**

DROR VAROLIN

Dedicated to Bo Berndtsson and Laszlo Lempert

ABSTRACT. Drawing on work of Berndtsson and of Lempert and Szőke, we define a kind of complex analytic structure for families of (possibly finite-dimensional) Hilbert spaces that might not fit together to form a holomorphic vector bundle but nevertheless have a reasonable definition of curvature that agrees with the curvature of the Chern connection when the family of Hilbert spaces is locally trivial. We thus obtain a new proof of a celebrated theorem of Berndtsson on the curvature of direct images of semi-positively twisted relative canonical bundles (i.e., adjoint bundles), and of its higher-rank generalization due to Liu and Yang. Our results go beyond the locally trivial setting.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a proper holomorphic submersion of a complex manifold X of dimension $m + n$ onto a complex manifold B of dimension n , and let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle with smooth Hermitian metric h . We study the family of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ whose fiber over $t \in B$ is

$$\mathcal{H}_t := \left\{ f \in H^0(X_t, \mathcal{O}_{X_t}(K_{X_t} \otimes E|_{X_t})) \right\},$$

where $X_t := p^{-1}(t)$, and whose Hermitian metric on the fiber \mathcal{H}_t is

$$(1) \quad (f_1, f_2)_t := \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle f_1 \wedge \bar{f}_2, h \rangle.$$

The study of such families of Hilbert spaces was initiated in [B-2009] by Berndtsson, who considered the case in which E is a line bundle. Berndtsson gave such families of Hilbert spaces a sort of complex geometric structure by defining notions of smooth and holomorphic sections of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$, and he noted that in general such structures do not yield vector bundles. (Some natural examples are discussed in Paragraph 5.3.) However, even in the non-locally trivial case $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ resembles a holomorphic Hermitian vector bundle in certain ways.

We propose a general definition of the curvature endomorphism of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$; a definition that agrees with the usual definition in the locally trivial case (Definition 4.18). In terms of this curvature, our first result is the following theorem.

THEOREM 1. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a proper Kähler family of Hermitian holomorphic vector bundles and let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. If the metric h is k -non-negatively curved (resp. k -positively curved) in the sense of Demailly then $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is k -non-negatively curved (resp. k -positively curved) in the sense of Demailly.*

Metrics are 1-positively curved if and only if they are positively curved in the sense of Griffiths, while metrics are k -positively curved for every k if and only if they are positively curved in the sense of Nakano. Notions of positivity are recalled in Paragraph 2.12.

We do not know if the hypotheses of Theorem 1 imply that $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is a holomorphic vector bundle. At present the main tool for local triviality is the L^2 Extension package of Ohsawa-Takegoshi type. (See Paragraph 5.1.) If $E \rightarrow X$ has a metric with non-negative curvature in the sense of Nakano then $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ has the structure of a holomorphic vector bundle. Under the hypotheses of the next two corollaries, one has such metrics.

The first corollary of Theorem 1 is the following celebrated theorem of Berndtsson.

COROLLARY 1.1 ([B-2009, Theorem 1.2]). *Let $(E, e^{-\varphi}) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a Kähler family of holomorphic Hermitian line bundles. If the curvature of $(E, e^{-\varphi}) \rightarrow X$ is non-negative (resp. positive) then $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is a holomorphic vector bundle and the curvature of the Chern connection of the L^2 metric (1) is non-negative (resp. positive) in the sense of Nakano.*

The next corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 1, and local triviality holds because if the metric h is Nakano positive on fibers then for a sufficiently plurisubharmonic function ψ locally on the base B the metric $e^{-p^*\psi}h$ for $E \rightarrow X$ has Nakano-positive curvature.

COROLLARY 1.2. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a proper Kähler family of holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles and let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. Assume that for all $t \in B$ the metrics $h_t = h|_{X_t}$ are Nakano-positive, and that the metric h is k -non-negatively curved (resp. k -positively curved) in the sense of Demailly. Then the holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is k -non-negatively curved (resp. k -positively curved) in the sense of Demailly.*

Theorem 1 can be strengthened. Indeed, there is always a non-negative contribution to the curvature of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ from the deformation-theoretic properties of the proper holomorphic family $p : X \rightarrow B$, and this contribution can be positive when the family is not locally trivial. That this is so was already observed by Berndtsson in [B-2011], and later by Liu and Yang in [LY-2014], who were the first to consider the case of higher rank E . In all cases the extra positivity is a consequence of formulas for the curvature of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. (Liu and Yang also obtained a number of other equivalent curvature formulas and discussed several interesting applications of these formulas.)

In [B-2011] and [LY-2014] the curvature formula is obtained under the assumption of local triviality of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$, which makes the computation more manageable. In the non-locally trivial case the derivation of the curvature formula is necessarily more complicated. To make its meaning maximally clear, the curvature formula is obtained in a pair of theorems. To state the first curvature theorem, we need some notation.

- i. A *horizontal distribution* for $p : X \rightarrow B$ is a (not necessarily integrable!) subbundle $\theta \subset T_X$ such that $dp|_{\theta} : \theta \rightarrow T_B$ is a vector bundle isomorphism. Such distributions θ are in one-to-one correspondence with *horizontal lifts*, i.e., linear maps that assign to a $(1, 0)$ -vector $\tau \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}$ a $(1, 0)$ -vector field $\xi_{\tau}^{\theta} \in \Gamma(X_t, T_{X_t}^{1,0})$ such that $dp\xi_{\tau}^{\theta} = \tau$. (See Paragraph 3.3.)
- ii. Let $t \in B$ be fixed. For $\tau \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}$ we define

$$\kappa_{\tau}^{\theta} : \mathcal{H}_t \rightarrow H^0(X_t, \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Lambda_{X_t}^{n-1,1} \otimes E|_{X_t})) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{\Pi}_{\tau}^{\theta} : \mathcal{H}_t \rightarrow H^0(X_t, \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Lambda_{X_t}^{n,0} \otimes E|_{X_t}))$$

by

$$\kappa_\tau^\theta f := \iota_{X_t}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{\Pi}_\tau^\theta f := P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* (L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} u),$$

where $u \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ is any section such that $\iota_{X_t}^* u = f$ and $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u \equiv 0$. Here $P_t^\perp : H^0(X_t, L_{loc}^2(K_{X_t} \otimes E|_{X_t})) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection and

$$L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} \alpha := \nabla^{1,0}(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \alpha) + \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \alpha,$$

is the *twisted Lie derivative* of an E -valued differential form α associated to the Chern connection $\nabla = \nabla^{1,0} + \bar{\partial}$ for $(E, h) \rightarrow X$. (See paragraph 3.2.) As we will see later, these definitions are independent of the choice of u .

THEOREM 2. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a proper Kähler family holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles. Then the curvature $\Theta^\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is given by*

$$(2) \quad \mathfrak{h}(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^\mathcal{H} f_1, f_2) = \left(\Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} f_1, f_2 \right) - \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle \kappa_\sigma^\theta f_1 \wedge \overline{\kappa_\tau^\theta f_2}, h \rangle - \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle \mathbf{\Pi}_\sigma^\theta f_1 \wedge \overline{\mathbf{\Pi}_\tau^\theta f_2}, h \rangle,$$

where θ is any horizontal distribution, $t \in B$, $\sigma, \tau \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}$, $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_t$, $\Theta(h)$ is the curvature of $(E, h) \rightarrow X$ and (\cdot, \cdot) is the inner product (1).

We emphasize that the curvature $\Theta^\mathcal{H}$ is independent of the choice of θ .

REMARK 1.3. Each of the three terms on the right hand side of Formula (2), while dependent on the choice of horizontal distribution θ , is independent of the way in which the $(1, 0)$ -vectors σ and τ are extended to $(1, 0)$ -vector fields. We therefore adopt the inessential but simplifying convention that these vectors are extended holomorphically, i.e., $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{O}(T_B^{1,0})_t$. \diamond

The precise definition of the curvature $\Theta^\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ requires some technology that we collect and develop in Sections 2, 3 and 4. But with Theorem 2 stated we can explain the basic idea behind the definition of $\Theta^\mathcal{H}$. Consider the map $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ defined by taking the fiber over $t \in B$ to be the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{L}_t := \left\{ f \in H^0(X_t, L_{loc}^2(K_{X_t} \otimes E|_{X_t})) \right\},$$

with the same inner product (1). It turns out that the curvature of \mathcal{L} can be defined because \mathcal{L} is reasonably well-behaved: it is a smooth Hilbert field in the sense of Lempert-Szőke.

Evidently the fibers of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ are subspaces of the fibers of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$. Each horizontal distribution θ defines an operator $\bar{\partial}^\theta$ on smooth sections of \mathcal{L} (Definition 4.11). Remarkably, for every θ the operator $\bar{\partial}^\theta$, when restricted to sections of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$, agrees with the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ introduced by Berndtsson, which we describe in slightly different form (Definition 4.4). Therefore $(\mathcal{H}, \bar{\partial})$ is a ‘holomorphic sub-field’ of $(\mathcal{L}, \bar{\partial}^\theta)$.

REMARK 1.4. While Berndtsson’s $\bar{\partial}$ -operator satisfies $\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial} = 0$, the operator $\bar{\partial}^\theta$ satisfies $\bar{\partial}^\theta \bar{\partial}^\theta = 0$ if and only if the horizontal distribution θ is Frobenius-integrable. Thus $(\mathcal{L}, \bar{\partial}^\theta)$ is a sort of ‘almost holomorphic’ Hilbert field. Like holomorphic Hilbert fields, almost holomorphic Hilbert fields have at most one Chern connection, but the curvature of this Chern connection is not a $(1, 1)$ -form if $\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial} \neq 0$. As we shall see, the non-integrability does not cause any problems. \diamond

If $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is locally trivial then a Gauss-Griffiths-type formula links the curvature of \mathcal{H} , the curvature of $(\mathcal{L}, \bar{\partial}^\theta)$ restricted to \mathcal{H} , and the second fundamental form of $\mathcal{H} \subset (\mathcal{L}, \bar{\partial}^\theta)$ (Proposition 2.30).

One can also define the second fundamental form in \mathcal{H} even when \mathcal{H} is not locally trivial. Therefore while in the case in which \mathcal{H} is locally trivial the aforementioned Gauss-Griffiths formula is a theorem, in the non-locally trivial case one uses this formula as the definition of the curvature of \mathcal{H} . This definition yields the curvature as an endomorphism of \mathcal{H} viewed as a \mathcal{C}_B^∞ -module. However, one wants to know whether this endomorphism is represented by a map of Hilbert fields, i.e., a pointwise object, in some sense. To do so, one must be able to extend a dense subset of every fiber \mathcal{H} to sections of \mathcal{L} with particular special properties. The details are described abstractly, i.e., for general Hilbert fields, in Paragraph 2.11, and then more concretely in Theorem 4.16 for $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}$.

From the Gauss Formula perspective the sum of the first two terms on the right hand side of the identity (2) is precisely the restriction to \mathcal{H} of the curvature of $(\mathcal{L}, \bar{\partial}^\theta)$ (Theorem 8.5), while the last term on the right hand side of (2) is the negative of the ‘square of the second fundamental form’.

REMARK 1.5. By Ehresmann’s Theorem the properness of the holomorphic family $p : X \rightarrow B$ implies that the field of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ has a natural structure of a smooth Hilbert bundle, i.e., it is locally trivial. The smooth structure agrees with the notion of smooth structure introduced by Lempert and Szőke in [LS-2014], as they point out.

Here we are more concerned with the complex structure, which is required for any notion of Chern connection. From this perspective, we have not addressed here the interesting question of whether for *any* horizontal distribution θ the field of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ has the structure of an almost holomorphic vector bundle whose $\bar{\partial}$ -operator is $\bar{\partial}^\theta$.

Instead we circumvent this question by introducing the notion of Berndtsson-Lempert-Szőke (BLS) fields. This notion combines Berndtsson’s complex structures with the notion of smooth structure introduced by Lempert and Szőke.

Our setup is general beyond the case of proper holomorphic families. One can use the setup to give meaning to curvature in the setting of families of complex manifolds-with-boundary, which have recently been considered by Upadrashta [U-2021], and which give an alternate explanation and significant generalization of interesting results of X. Wang [Wang-2017]. \diamond

Theorem 2 can be used in a direct proof of Corollary 1.2, i.e., without using Theorem 1. To complete such a proof one must estimate the second and third terms on the right hand side of the curvature formula (2). The third term can be estimated using basic inequalities and a direct computation that is independent of the horizontal distribution θ , but the second term requires a good choice of θ , or equivalently, a good choice of almost holomorphic structure for $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$. Such a choice is provided by the following theorem.

THEOREM 3. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a Kähler family of holomorphic vector bundles. Let ω be a relative Kähler form on X . Then for each $t \in B$ there exists a smooth horizontal lift θ with the following property: for every $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_t$ one has*

$$(3) \quad - \int_{X_t} (-1)^{\frac{n^2}{2}} \left\langle \kappa_\sigma^\theta f_1 \wedge \overline{\kappa_\tau^\theta f_2}, h \right\rangle = \left(\kappa_\sigma^\theta f_1, \kappa_\tau^\theta f_2 \right),$$

where the right hand side is the inner product induced on E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -forms on X_t by the metric h and any Kähler metric on the fiber X_t . Moreover, if $\dim H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,2}(X_t)$ is independent of $t \in B$ then one can choose θ independent of t .

We emphasize that the horizontal lift of Theorem 3 is defined for the entire family $X \rightarrow B$, but that, unless the Dolbeault numbers $\dim H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,2}(X_t)$ are independent of $t \in B$, the identity (3) only holds at one $t \in B$.

The equality (3) of these two types of pairings of (p, q) -forms with $p + q \leq n$ holds if one of these forms is primitive in the Hodge-Theoretic sense. This equality is (a twisted version of) a special case of the so-called Hodge-Riemann Bilinear Relations (Proposition 6.10). Theorem 3 is then a consequence of Theorem 7.3, which in turn relies heavily on the Hodge Theorem.

Theorem 3, while handy for a proof of Corollary 1.2 and of interest in its own right, is not required in our proof of Theorem 1. In its stead, one uses the Hodge Theorem in a different way to compute an exact formula for the square of the second fundamental form, i.e., the third term on the right hand side of (2). The statement is as follows.

THEOREM 4. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a Kähler family of holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles, let θ be a smooth horizontal distribution, let $t \in B$ and let ω_t be a Kähler form on X_t . Then for every $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_t$ there exist smooth section $u_1, u_2 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$, depending on θ and ω_t and satisfying $\iota_{X_t}^* u_i = f_i$ and $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, such that*

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle \mathbf{\Pi}_\sigma^\theta f_1 \wedge \overline{\mathbf{\Pi}_\tau^\theta f_2}, h \rangle &= - \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle \kappa_\sigma^\theta f_1 \wedge \overline{\kappa_\tau^\theta f_2}, h \rangle - (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u_1, \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u_2) \\ &- (\Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h)) f_1, \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2) - (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1, \Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h)) f_2) \\ &+ ([\sqrt{-1} \Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t}] (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1), (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\sigma, \tau \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}$. The pairings (\cdot, \cdot) in the last four terms on the right hand side of (4) are the L^2 inner products induced on $E|_{X_t}$ -valued forms by the Hermitian metric h_t and the Kähler metric ω_t .

The aforementioned use of the Hodge Theorem in the proof of Theorem 4 is equivalent to a construction of Berndtsson, formalized here as Theorem 9.2. With Theorem 9.2 in hand, the rest of the proof of Theorem 4 is a somewhat involved integration-by-parts argument.

Finally, Theorem 1 is a consequence of Theorems 2 and 4 because

$$\begin{aligned} p_* \left(\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle (\Theta(h) u_1 \wedge \bar{u}_2, h) \rangle (\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta) \right) \\ = (\Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} f_1, f_2) + (\Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h)) f_1, \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2) + (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1, \Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h)) f_2) \\ - ([\sqrt{-1} \Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t}] (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1), (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)) \end{aligned}$$

(Proposition 9.3). Indeed, together with Theorems 2 and 4, the latter identity yields

$$(5) \quad \mathfrak{h}(\Theta_{\sigma\tau}^\theta f_1, f_2) = p_* \left(\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle (\Theta(h) u_1 \wedge \bar{u}_2, h) \rangle (\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta) + (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u_1, \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u_2) \right).$$

If \mathcal{H} is locally trivial Formula (5) is due to Berndtsson [B-2011, Section 2] if $\text{Rank}(E) = 1$ and to Liu-Yang [LY-2014, Theorem 1.6] in the higher rank case. The term

$$\left(\xi_{\sigma}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u_1, \xi_{\tau}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u_2\right)$$

on the right hand side of (5) gives the extra positivity for the improvement of Theorem 1 mentioned after the statement of Corollary 1.2. This term and the term $\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle \kappa_{\sigma}^{\theta} f_1 \wedge \overline{\kappa_{\tau}^{\theta} f_2}, h \rangle$ are related to deformation theory of compact complex manifolds, and more specifically to the Kodaira-Spencer map, which captures the first obstruction to local triviality of holomorphic families. (See Section 7 for more detail.)

We end this introduction with an explanation one of our initial motivations. If the family $X \rightarrow B$ is trivial then Corollary 1.1 has a considerably simpler proof. In fact, this same simplified proof yields a significantly more general result, stated as [B-2009, Theorem 1.1]. By our reading of [B-2009], there is a problem implicitly stated in the second-to-last paragraph of the introduction to [B-2009]: whether one can prove [B-2009, Theorem 1.2] (i.e. Corollary 1.1 above) in a manner similar to the proof of [B-2009, Theorem 1.1]. Berndtsson states there that he was not “... able to find a natural complex structure on the space of all (not necessarily holomorphic) $(n, 0)$ forms, extending the complex structure on $[\mathcal{H}]$.” In fact, there are infinitely many consistent ways to extend the complex structure of \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{L} , each one corresponding to a choice of horizontal lift θ . (As mentioned in Remark 1.4, most of these extensions of the complex structure of \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{L} are not integrable, but non-integrability presents no problems.)

And aside from a solution of Berndtsson’s implicit problem, we obtain a somewhat different geometric perspective. In the same penultimate paragraph of the introduction of [B-2009] it is mentioned that the Kodaira-Spencer class of $p : X \rightarrow B$ “plays somewhat the role of another second fundamental form,...”. It seems that this informal explanation of the extra positivity as a second fundamental form is not quite the same as the explanation coming from BLS geometry. In BLS geometry the Kodaira-Spencer class affects both the curvature of \mathcal{L} and the second fundamental form of \mathcal{H} in \mathcal{L} . In the curvature of \mathcal{L} one sees the Hodge-Riemann ‘square’

$$- \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle \kappa_{\sigma}^{\theta} f_1 \wedge \overline{\kappa_{\tau}^{\theta} f_2}, h \rangle$$

of a certain representative $\kappa_{\sigma}^{\theta} f$ of the action on E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms of of the Kodaira-Spencer map of $p : X \rightarrow B$ that depends only on the choice of complex structure $\bar{\partial}^{\theta}$ for \mathcal{L} , while in the second fundamental form of \mathcal{H} in \mathcal{L} one sees the “difference of squares”

$$- \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle \kappa_{\sigma}^{\theta} f_1 \wedge \overline{\kappa_{\tau}^{\theta} f_2}, h \rangle - \left(\xi_{\sigma}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u_1, \xi_{\tau}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u_2\right)$$

of two representatives of the Kodaira-Spencer map. The first of these is the term appearing in the curvature of \mathcal{L} , and as already mentioned it depends only on the choice of complex structure for \mathcal{L} . On the other hand, the other representative

$$\iota_{X_t}^* \xi_{\sigma}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u = \kappa_{\sigma}^{\theta} f - \bar{\partial} \left(\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\sigma}^{\theta} u) \right)$$

of the action of the Kodaira-Spencer map depends on the choice of how elements $f \in \mathcal{H}_t$ are extended to sections u of \mathcal{L} . Only the term $\left(\xi_{\sigma}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u_1, \xi_{\tau}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u_2\right)$, which is positive because of the deep insight of Berndtsson (Theorem 9.2) to use Hodge Theory to select the best representative, survives in the formula (5) for $\Theta^{\mathcal{H}}$.

Acknowledgements. This article could not have been written without the discussions and conversations I've had with Roberto Albesiano and Pranav Upadrashta, and I thank them both. Seb Boucksom has given me invaluable advice about the content and presentation of the article, and I happily thank him for it, as should the reader. I'm grateful to Mihnea Popa and Mihai Păun for stimulating feedback. Bo Berndtsson and Laszlo Lempert have provided important comments and suggestions, but most of all their work has inspired and directly affected my research, not only in this article, but throughout my career.

2. BERNDTSSON-LEMPERT-SZŐKE FIELDS

In this section we discuss the general geometric structure with which \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{L} are eventually endowed. We start with a slight reorganization and minor refinement of ideas introduced by Lempert and Szőke in [LS-2014], and then we introduce definitions that are already suggested or implied in [LS-2014]. For example, in [LS-2014] the introduction of a $\bar{\partial}$ -operator to define the holomorphic structure of a smooth (quasi)-Hilbert field is not abstracted, but introduced in the 'direct image' constructions of [LS-2014, Part II] for the bundle of holomorphic sections. And the discussion of subfields is not as explicit, but many of the elements are hinted at in both [LS-2014]. In [B-2009] subfields are considered in the case of trivial families of complex manifolds.

2.1. Quasi-Hilbert fields.

DEFINITION 2.1. A quasi-Hilbert field is a map $\pi : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ whose fibers are topological vector spaces each of which is isomorphic to a Hilbert space. \diamond

That is to say, for each $t \in B$ there is a Hilbert space H_t such that the fiber $\mathfrak{H}_t := \pi^{-1}(t)$ is isomorphic, as a topological vector space, to H_t , but \mathfrak{H}_t does not have a canonical inner product. The name is inspired by the fact that a linear isomorphism of two Hilbert spaces is a quasi-isometry. We shall say that the Hilbert space H_t is quasi-isometric to \mathfrak{H}_t , even though the latter does not have a canonical inner product.

REMARK 2.2. Even if the Hilbert space fibers of a quasi-Hilbert field are finite-dimensional, one does not want all of them to be isomorphic to a single vector space. Indeed, in our setting of a holomorphic family $E \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ in which p is proper, the field of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ has constant fiber dimension if and only if it is locally trivial. \diamond

DEFINITION 2.3. The dual of a quasi-Hilbert field $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is the quasi-Hilbert field $\mathfrak{H}^* \rightarrow B$ such that for each $t \in B$ the fiber \mathfrak{H}_t^* is the topological dual of \mathfrak{H}_t , i.e., the set of bounded linear functionals on \mathfrak{H}_t . \diamond

By the Riesz Representation Theorem each fiber \mathfrak{H}_t^* of the dual quasi-Hilbert field \mathfrak{H}^* is isometric to the dual fiber \mathfrak{H}_t . Therefore at the level of quasi-Hilbert fields the Hilbert fields \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{H}^* are isomorphic.

2.2. Smooth structures on quasi-Hilbert fields. We denote by $\Gamma(U, \mathfrak{H})$ the set of sections (i.e. right inverses) of $\pi : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ over $U \subset B$.

DEFINITION 2.4. Let B be a smooth manifold and let $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ be a quasi-Hilbert field.

- i. A smooth structure for a quasi-Hilbert field $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is a sheaf $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}) \rightarrow B$ of \mathcal{C}^∞ -modules on B , whose elements are germs of sections of $\pi : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$, such that for each $t \in B$ the stalk $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})_t$ is mapped by the evaluation-at- t map to a dense subspace of the Hilbert space \mathfrak{H}_t . The associated presheaf assigns to an open set $U \subset B$ a set of sections of $\pi : \pi^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$ denoted $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}))$, whose members are called *smooth sections over U* .
- ii. The smooth structure for $\mathfrak{H}^* \rightarrow B$ dual to the smooth structure of $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is the sheaf $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}^*) \rightarrow B$ associated to the presheaf whose groups $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}^*))$ are defined as follows: $\phi \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}^*))$ if and only if for every $f \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}))$ the function $\langle \phi, f \rangle \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(U)$. \diamond

REMARK. Since, by definition, $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})$ is a sheaf of \mathcal{C}^∞ -modules, the sheaf-theoretic aspects of Definition 2.4 are not terribly important; the point is just to succinctly say that smoothness is a local property. \diamond

PROPOSITION 2.5. *If a quasi-Hilbert field $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ with finite-dimensional fibers admits a smooth structure then the function*

$$B \ni t \mapsto \dim \mathfrak{H}_t$$

is lower semi-continuous.

Proof. Since the smooth sections of \mathfrak{H} restrict to dense subsets of the fiber, one can find a basis for any \mathfrak{H}_t whose elements are smooth sections of \mathfrak{H} evaluated at t . By the continuity inherent in sheaves and the quasi-isometric invariance of linear independence, at all t' sufficiently close to t the restriction of these sections to $\mathfrak{H}_{t'}$ forms an independent set of vectors, and hence $\dim \mathfrak{H}_{t'} \geq \dim \mathfrak{H}_t$. \square

2.3. **Maps.** We shall often encounter maps between (smooth) quasi-Hilbert fields.

DEFINITION 2.6. Let $\mathfrak{H}^1, \mathfrak{H}^2 \rightarrow B$ be quasi-Hilbert fields.

- a. A map $F : \mathfrak{H}^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}^2$ is said to be a *map of quasi-Hilbert fields* if it is fiber-preserving, i.e.,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{H}^1 & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathfrak{H}^2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ B & \xrightarrow{\text{Id}} & B, \end{array}$$

and linear on fibers. We write

$$F \in \text{Lin}(\mathfrak{H}^1, \mathfrak{H}^2).$$

(As is common in the study of linear transformations of Hilbert spaces, the fiber restrictions need not be bounded or even everywhere defined.) If the fiber restrictions are defined on dense subsets of the fibers we will say that F is *densely-defined*.

- b. A map of quasi-Hilbert fields $F : \mathfrak{H}^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}^2$ is called a *morphism* if the restrictions to fibers are bounded. In this case we write $F \in \text{Hom}(\mathfrak{H}^1, \mathfrak{H}^2)$.
- c. Suppose moreover that $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_2)$ are smooth structures for \mathfrak{H}_1 and \mathfrak{H}_2 respectively. A map $F \in \text{Lin}(\mathfrak{H}^1, \mathfrak{H}^2)$ is said to be *smooth* if it maps $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}^1)$ to $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}^2)$, i.e., if for each $t \in B$ one has $Ff \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}^2)_t$ for every $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}^1)_t$.

Thus a smooth map is densely-defined. However, a smooth map need not be a morphism, and a morphism need not be smooth.

One often also encounters smooth-section maps.

DEFINITION 2.7. Let $\mathfrak{H}^1, \mathfrak{H}^2 \rightarrow B$ be quasi-Hilbert fields with smooth structures $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_2)$.

a. A map of sheaves $\mathbf{L} : \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_2)$ is said to be \mathcal{C}^∞ -linear if

$$\mathbf{L}(f\mathfrak{f}) = f\mathbf{L}\mathfrak{f}$$

for each $t \in B$, all $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_1)_t$ and all $f \in \mathcal{C}_{B,t}^\infty$.

b. A \mathcal{C}^∞ -linear \mathbf{L} is said to be *tensorial at $t \in B$* if

$$\mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_1)_t \text{ and } \mathfrak{f}(t) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\mathbf{L}\mathfrak{f})(t) = 0.$$

We say \mathbf{L} is *tensorial* if \mathbf{L} is tensorial at every point of B .

Note that a tensorial \mathcal{C}^∞ -linear map determines a smooth map of quasi-Hilbert fields in the sense of Definition 2.6.a. (The converse is obvious.) Indeed, if \mathbf{L} is a tensorial \mathcal{C}^∞ -linear map then one can define the map of quasi-Hilbert fields L by

$$L\mathfrak{f}(t) := (\mathbf{L}\mathfrak{f})(t), \quad \mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})_t,$$

and the tensorial condition means L is well-defined.

REMARK 2.8. If $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}_1)_t$ is generated, as a $\mathcal{C}_{B,t}^\infty$ -module, by germs that do not vanish at p then every \mathcal{C}^∞ -linear map is tensorial at t . This is the situation for smooth finite-rank vector bundles with their usual smooth structure consisting of the sheaf of germs of smooth sections. \diamond

2.4. Smooth metrics.

DEFINITION 2.9. Let $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ be a quasi-Hilbert field.

- i. A metric \mathfrak{h} for $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is an assignment to each fiber \mathfrak{H}_t of a complete inner product \mathfrak{h}_t so that $(\mathfrak{H}_t, \mathfrak{h}_t)$ and \mathfrak{H}_t are quasi-isometric for all $t \in B$.
- ii. If $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}) \rightarrow B$ is a smooth structure for $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ then the metric \mathfrak{h} is *smooth* if

$$\mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) := \langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{f}_1 \otimes \bar{\mathfrak{f}}_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(U)$$

for any smooth sections $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2 \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}))$. \diamond

2.5. Connections and Curvature.

DEFINITION 2.10. Let $\pi : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ be a quasi-Hilbert field with a smooth structure.

- i. A connection for $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is a map

$$\nabla : \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(T_B)) \times \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})) \rightarrow \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}))$$

such that

$$\nabla_{f\xi+\eta} = f\nabla_\xi + \nabla_\eta \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_\xi(f\mathfrak{f}) = (\xi f)\mathfrak{f} + f\nabla_\xi\mathfrak{f}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B)$, $\xi \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(T_B))$ and $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}))$.

- ii. The map $\Theta(\nabla) : \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda^2(T_B))) \times \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})) \rightarrow \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}))$ defined by

$$\langle \Theta(\nabla), (\xi \wedge \eta, \mathfrak{f}) \rangle := \nabla_\xi \nabla_\eta \mathfrak{f} - \nabla_\eta \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{f} - \nabla_{[\xi, \eta]} \mathfrak{f}$$

is called the curvature of ∇ . \diamond

DEFINITION 2.11. Let $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ be a quasi-Hilbert field with smooth structure, and let \mathfrak{h} be a smooth metric for \mathfrak{H} . A connection ∇ for \mathfrak{H} is said to be *compatible with the metric* \mathfrak{h} if

$$\langle d\mathfrak{h}(f_1, f_2), \xi \rangle = \mathfrak{h}(\nabla_\xi f_1, f_2) + \mathfrak{h}(f_1, \nabla_\xi f_2)$$

for all $t \in B$, all $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})_t$ and all $\xi \in T_{B,t}$. \diamond

The difference of two connections and the curvature of a connection are \mathcal{C}^∞ -linear. If the connections are metric compatible then one can say more.

PROPOSITION 2.12. Let $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ be a quasi-Hilbert field with smooth structure, let \mathfrak{h} be a smooth metric for \mathfrak{H} and let $\nabla, \nabla_1, \nabla_2$ be \mathfrak{h} -compatible connections. Then

$$\nabla_2 - \nabla_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta(\nabla)$$

are tensorial.

Proof. Denoting either of these two maps by \mathbf{L} , one has $\mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{L}f, \mathbf{g}) = -\mathfrak{h}(f, \mathbf{L}\mathbf{g})$. If $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})_t$ and $f(t) = 0$ then $\mathfrak{h}((\mathbf{L}f)(t), \mathbf{g}(t)) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})_t$. By density we see that $(\mathbf{L}f)(t) = 0$, i.e., \mathbf{L} is tensorial. \square

2.6. Smooth (quasi-)Hilbert fields.

DEFINITION 2.13. A *smooth quasi-Hilbert field* is a quasi-Hilbert field with a smooth structure and that admits a connection. A *smooth Hilbert field* is a smooth quasi-Hilbert field with a smooth metric. \diamond

A smooth Hilbert field $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{h})$ automatically has a metric compatible connection. Indeed, by hypothesis \mathfrak{H} has some connection ∇ and any other connection is of the form $D_A := \nabla + A$ for some linear operator that maps $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})$ to itself. The connection ∇ induces a connection on smooth metrics by the Leibniz rule-respecting formula

$$(\nabla\mathfrak{h})(f, \mathbf{g}) = d(\mathfrak{h}(f, \mathbf{g})) - \mathfrak{h}(\nabla f, \mathbf{g}) - \mathfrak{h}(f, \nabla\mathbf{g}).$$

By density and the Riesz Representation Theorem there exists a smooth map A such that $(\nabla\mathfrak{h})(f, \mathbf{g}) = \mathfrak{h}(2Af, \mathbf{g})$, and moreover A is unique if it is \mathfrak{h} -Hermitian, which we may assume after replacing A with its Hermitian part $\frac{1}{2}(A + A^\dagger)$. Then D_A satisfies

$$(D_A\mathfrak{h}) = d(\mathfrak{h}(f, \mathbf{g})) - \mathfrak{h}(\nabla f, \mathbf{g}) - \mathfrak{h}(f, \nabla\mathbf{g}) - \mathfrak{h}(Af, \mathbf{g}) - \mathfrak{h}(f, A\mathbf{g}) = (\nabla\mathfrak{h})(f, \mathbf{g}) - \mathfrak{h}(2Af, \mathbf{g}) = 0.$$

2.7. Formulation with differential forms. Though it's largely a matter of taste when the base manifold B is finite-dimensional (which is a standing assumption in the present article), one might sometimes prefer to think of the connection as a total differential, rather than talk about directional derivatives. To do so it is convenient to introduce differential forms with values in \mathfrak{H} .

DEFINITION 2.14. Let $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ be a smooth quasi-Hilbert field. An \mathfrak{H} -valued differential k -form is a section \mathfrak{b} of $\Lambda_B^k \otimes \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$. If $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is a smooth quasi-Hilbert field then we say that \mathfrak{b} is *smooth* if for each k -tuple of vector fields $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(T_B))$ the section $\langle \alpha, \tau_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_k \rangle$ of $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ obtained by contracting in the factor Λ_B^k lies in $\Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}))$. We denote by $\Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^k \otimes \mathfrak{H}))$ the collection of smooth \mathfrak{H} -valued k -forms.

REMARK 2.15. It may very well be that the fibers of $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ are infinite-dimensional. In this case, one often sees the analytic completion $\hat{\otimes}$. Here we assume our \mathfrak{H} -valued k -forms can be written locally as the form $\alpha^1 \otimes \mathfrak{f}_1 + \cdots + \alpha^{m_k} \otimes \mathfrak{f}_{m_k}$, where $m = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} B$ and $m_k = \binom{m}{k}$. The \mathfrak{H} -valued k -form is smooth precisely when the local forms α^i and the local sections \mathfrak{f}_i are smooth. \diamond

REMARK 2.16. Note that since the set of smooth sections restricts to dense subsets of the fibers, the same is automatically true of the set of smooth forms. \diamond

From the ‘forms’ point of view a connection ∇ can be seen as a map

$$\nabla : \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})) \rightarrow \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^1 \otimes \mathfrak{H})),$$

and we can extend ∇ to higher twisted exterior derivatives

$$\nabla : \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^k \otimes \mathfrak{H})) \rightarrow \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{k+1} \otimes \mathfrak{H}))$$

in the usual way. A connection is not $\mathcal{C}^\infty(B)$ -linear, but the difference of two connections is. And if the difference $\nabla_2 - \nabla_1$ is also tensorial then

$$\nabla_2 - \nabla_1 \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^1 \otimes \text{Lin}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}))).$$

Similarly, if the curvature $\nabla \nabla$ of a connection ∇ is tensorial then it can be identified with a 2-form with values in $\text{Lin}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H})$:

$$\Theta(\nabla) \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^2 \otimes \text{Lin}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}))).$$

As noted in Proposition 2.12, this is the case for metric connections.

2.8. Smooth Hilbert subfields.

DEFINITION 2.17. Let $(\mathfrak{L}, \mathfrak{h}^\mathfrak{L}) \rightarrow B$ be a smooth Hilbert field.

a. A smooth Hilbert subfield of $(\mathfrak{L}, \mathfrak{h}^\mathfrak{L})$ is a smooth Hilbert field $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{h}^\mathfrak{H})$ such that

$$\mathfrak{h}^\mathfrak{L}|_{\mathfrak{H}} = \mathfrak{h}^\mathfrak{H} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})) = \{\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{L})) ; \mathfrak{f}(t) \in \mathfrak{H}_t \text{ for all } t \in B\}.$$

b. To any smooth Hilbert subfield $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ there is associated the *orthogonal projector*: the unique morphism $P = P_{\mathfrak{H}} : \mathfrak{L} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ defined by fiberwise orthogonal projection.

c. We say that the smooth Hilbert subfield $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is *regular* if $P_{\mathfrak{H}} : \mathfrak{L} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is smooth.

REMARK 2.18. To any smooth Hilbert subfield $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ one can associate its orthogonal complement \mathfrak{H}^\perp . In general \mathfrak{H}^\perp need not be a smooth Hilbert subfield of \mathfrak{L} , but this is certainly the case if \mathfrak{H} is regular.

One can define the orthogonal projection $P_{\mathfrak{H}^\perp} := \text{Id} - P_{\mathfrak{H}} : \mathfrak{L} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}^\perp$. The reason for the notation $P_{\mathfrak{H}^\perp}$ and not $P_{\mathfrak{H}^\perp}$ is to emphasize that \mathfrak{H}^\perp need not be a smooth Hilbert field. Of course, if $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is regular then \mathfrak{H}^\perp is a smooth Hilbert field and $P_{\mathfrak{H}^\perp} = P_{\mathfrak{H}^\perp}$. \diamond

REMARK 2.19. In the case of our main examples $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}$ discussed in the introduction, if the Hilbert field \mathcal{H} is smooth then it is a regular smooth Hilbert subfield of \mathcal{L} . This fact is a special case of a result of Kodaira and Spencer, to the effect that smoothness of the harmonic projections is equivalent to constancy of the dimensions of the harmonic spaces. The latter in turn means that the harmonic spaces fit together to form a vector bundle, and in the case of harmonic $(p, 0)$ -forms, which are automatically holomorphic, this vector bundle is even holomorphic. Thus for \mathcal{H} , which is the special case $p = n$, Kodaira-Spencer

tells us that if \mathcal{H} is smooth then \mathcal{H} is a holomorphic vector bundle, and then the projection $P_{\mathcal{H}}$ is smooth. \diamond

2.9. Holomorphic Quasi-Hilbert fields and BLS fields. Since we are interested in the situation in which the base is a complex manifold, we consider the obvious complexification of the notion of connection: In Definition 2.10 one allows the functions $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B)$ to be complex valued, and for a complex vector field $\xi \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(T_B \otimes \mathbb{C}))$ one defines

$$\nabla_\xi := \nabla_{\operatorname{Re} \xi} + \sqrt{-1} \nabla_{\operatorname{Im} \xi}.$$

These notions, which just use the natural complex structures of the targets, only require B to be a smooth manifold. But if B is a complex manifold (or more generally an almost complex manifold) then there is a splitting $T_B \otimes \mathbb{C} = T_B^{1,0} \oplus T_B^{0,1}$. Thus one has a decomposition

$$\nabla = \nabla^{1,0} + \nabla^{0,1}$$

induced by the splitting

$$\Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{k+1} \otimes \mathfrak{H})) = \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{1,0} \wedge \Lambda_B^k \otimes \mathfrak{H})) \oplus \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{0,1} \wedge \Lambda_B^k \otimes \mathfrak{H})),$$

and one can talk about \mathfrak{H} -valued (p, q) -forms as sections of $\Lambda_B^{p,q} \otimes \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$. Such forms are smooth if they are smooth as \mathfrak{H} -valued $(p+q)$ -forms. For $0 \leq p, q \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} B$ the set of smooth \mathfrak{H} -valued (p, q) -forms $\Gamma(B, \Lambda_B^{p,q} \otimes \mathfrak{H}) \cap \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{p+q} \otimes \mathfrak{H}))$ shall be denoted $\Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{p,q} \otimes \mathfrak{H}))$.

Next we introduce the notion of a complex structure for a smooth quasi-Hilbert field.

DEFINITION 2.20. Let B be an almost complex manifold and let $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ be a smooth quasi-Hilbert field.

- i. An almost complex structure for $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is a family of linear maps of sheaves

$$\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{p,q} \otimes \mathfrak{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{p,q+1} \otimes \mathfrak{H}), \quad 0 \leq p, q \leq n,$$

compatible with the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator on B in the sense that

$$\bar{\partial}(f\mathfrak{b}) = \bar{\partial}f \wedge \mathfrak{b} + (-1)^{p'+q'} f \wedge \bar{\partial}\mathfrak{b}, \quad f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^{p',q'}).$$

The almost complex structure is *involutive* or *complex* or *integrable* if $\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial} = 0$.

- ii. A smooth section \mathfrak{f} of the smooth quasi-Hilbert field $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ with almost complex structure $\bar{\partial}$ is said to be *holomorphic* on an open subset $U \subset B$ if $\bar{\partial}\mathfrak{f} = 0$ on U . The set of holomorphic sections on U is denoted $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{H}))$.
- iii. An *(almost) holomorphic quasi-Hilbert field* is a smooth quasi-Hilbert field with an (almost) complex structure.
- iv. A *Berndtsson-Lempert-Szöke (BLS) field* is an almost holomorphic quasi-Hilbert field with a smooth metric.
- v. A BLS field is said to be *integrable* if its almost complex structure is integrable.

REMARK 2.21. In Definition 2.20.ii it is not required that for each $t \in B$ the subspace

$$\{\mathfrak{f}_t(t) ; \mathfrak{f}_t \in \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{H})_t\}$$

is dense in \mathfrak{H}_t . This omission of the density of holomorphic sections is important for various reasons. In the present article, the relevant point is that if \mathfrak{H} has finite-dimensional fibers then by Proposition 2.5 the dimensions of these fibers vary lower semi-continuously. On the other hand, in most applications these dimensions are known to vary upper semi-continuously, and

hence the fibers have constant dimension. In these same applications the constancy of the dimensions implies that $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is a vector bundle, which is a consequence we wish to avoid at this general level. \diamond

PROPOSITION 2.22. *On every BLS field $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{h}, \bar{\partial}) \rightarrow B$ there exists a unique connection ∇ , called the BLS Chern connection, or simply the Chern connection, such that*

$$\nabla \mathfrak{h} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^{0,1} = \bar{\partial}.$$

Proof. The $(1,0)$ -part of the connection is given by the formula

$$(6) \quad \mathfrak{h}(\nabla^{1,0} \mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_2) = \partial(\mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_2)) - \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{b}_1, \bar{\partial} \mathfrak{b}_2)$$

on all smooth \mathfrak{H} -valued forms. \square

REMARK 2.23. In view of the uniqueness of the Chern connection, we shall often refer to the BLS field $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{h})$ and omit explicit reference to the connection. Often we even omit reference to the metric when the latter is clear from the context. \diamond

PROPOSITION 2.24. *The curvature $\Theta(\mathfrak{h})$ of the Chern connection of a BLS field $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{h}, \bar{\partial}) \rightarrow B$ is a smooth $\text{Lin}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H})$ -valued 2-form that is \mathfrak{h} -anti-Hermitian. Moreover, if $\bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} = 0$ then the curvature is a $\text{Lin}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H})$ -valued $(1,1)$ -form.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.12 $\Theta(\mathfrak{h})$ is tensorial. If \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 are smooth k -forms then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= dd\mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_2) = d\left(\mathfrak{h}(\nabla \mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_2) + (-1)^k \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{b}_1, \nabla \mathfrak{b}_2)\right) \\ &= \mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\mathfrak{h}) \mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_2) + (-1)^{k+1} \mathfrak{h}(\nabla \mathfrak{b}_1, \nabla \mathfrak{b}_2) + (-1)^k \mathfrak{h}(\nabla \mathfrak{b}_1, \nabla \mathfrak{b}_2) + \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{b}_1, \Theta(\mathfrak{h}) \mathfrak{b}_2) \\ &= \mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\mathfrak{h}) \mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_2) + \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{b}_1, \Theta(\mathfrak{h}) \mathfrak{b}_2), \end{aligned}$$

so every metric-compatible connection has anti-Hermitian curvature. In particular, the $(0,2)$ -component of a metric-compatible connection is the Hermitian conjugate of the $(2,0)$ -component, so if also $\bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} = 0$ then $\nabla^{1,0} \nabla^{1,0} = 0$. \square

2.10. BLS Subfields and the Second Fundamental Form.

DEFINITION 2.25. Let $\mathfrak{L} \rightarrow B, \bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{L}}$ be an almost holomorphic quasi-Hilbert field.

- i. An almost holomorphic quasi-Hilbert field $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B, \bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{H}}$ is said to be a *subfield* of \mathfrak{L} if
 - a) \mathfrak{H}_t is a closed subspace of \mathfrak{L}_t for every $t \in B$, and
 - b) $\bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{L}}|_{\mathfrak{H}} = \bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{H}}$.
- ii. If $(\mathfrak{L}, \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{L}})$ and $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{H}})$ are also smooth Hilbert fields and $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{H}} = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{L}}|_{\mathfrak{H}}$ then $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is said to be a *BLS subfield* of \mathfrak{L} if $P_{\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{L}) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{H}) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{L})$.

REMARK. The inclusions $P_{\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{L}) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{H}) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{L})$ imply that $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is a regular subfield and that $P_{\mathfrak{H}} \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{L}) = \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{H})$. In particular, a smooth section of \mathfrak{L} that takes all its values in \mathfrak{H} is a smooth section of \mathfrak{H} .

Conversely, if \mathfrak{L} is a BLS field and $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is a regular subfield such that the subspace $\{(P_{\mathfrak{H}} \mathfrak{f})(p) ; \mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{L})_p\} \subset \mathfrak{H}_p$ is dense for every $p \in B$ then $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is a BLS subfield. \diamond

PROPOSITION 2.26. *If $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is a BLS subfield then the BLS Chern connection for $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is $\nabla^{\mathfrak{H}} = P_{\mathfrak{H}} \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}|_{\mathfrak{H}}$, where $\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}|_{\mathfrak{H}}$ denotes the restriction of the connection $\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}$ to sections of \mathfrak{H} .*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2 \in \Gamma(B, \mathfrak{H})$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{H}}(\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) - \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{H}}(\mathfrak{f}_1, \bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{H}} \mathfrak{f}_2) &= \partial \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{L}}(\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) - \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{L}}(\mathfrak{f}_1, \bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{L}} \mathfrak{f}_2) \\ &= \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{L}}(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0} \mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{L}}(P_{\mathfrak{H}} \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0} \mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathfrak{H}}(P_{\mathfrak{H}} \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0} \mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2), \end{aligned}$$

and since (6) uniquely determines the Chern connection, the result follows. \square

DEFINITION 2.27. The operator

$$\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}} := \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}|_{\mathfrak{H}} - \nabla^{\mathfrak{H}} : \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{H})) \rightarrow \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Lambda_B^1 \otimes \mathfrak{L}))$$

Is called the *second fundamental map* of \mathfrak{H} in \mathfrak{L} .

PROPOSITION 2.28. Let $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ be a BLS subfield. Then

$$\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}} = P_{\mathfrak{H}}^{\perp} \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0}|_{\mathfrak{H}}.$$

Thus the second fundamental map is linear in $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(B)$ and maps $\Gamma(B, \mathfrak{H})$ into $\Gamma(B, \Lambda_B^{1,0} \otimes \mathfrak{H}^{\perp})$.

Proof. Evidently for any $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(B)$ and $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathfrak{H})$ one has

$$\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}(f\mathfrak{f}) = \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}(f\mathfrak{f}) - \nabla^{\mathfrak{H}}(f\mathfrak{f}) = df \otimes \mathfrak{f} + f\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{f} - (df \otimes \mathfrak{f} + f\nabla^{\mathfrak{H}}\mathfrak{f}) = f\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathfrak{f}.$$

Also, since $\bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{L}}|_{\mathfrak{H}} = \bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{H}}$,

$$\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}} = \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0}|_{\mathfrak{H}} - \nabla^{\mathfrak{H}1,0} = P_{\mathfrak{H}}^{\perp} \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0}|_{\mathfrak{H}}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

PROPOSITION 2.29. Let $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ be a BLS subfield. Then $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}$ is tensorial, i.e., there exists a densely-defined $(1,0)$ -form $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}$ with values in $\text{Lin}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}^{\perp})$ such that

$$(7) \quad (\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathfrak{f})(t) = \mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}(t)\mathfrak{f}(t) \quad \text{for all } \mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{H})_t.$$

Proof. We need to show that for every $t \in B$, if $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{H})_t$ vanishes at t then $(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{f})(t) \in \mathfrak{H}_t$. Since $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is a BLS subfield, it is a regular Hilbert subfield, i.e., the linear map $P_{\mathfrak{H}}$ is smooth. Therefore so is the linear map $P_{\mathfrak{H}}^{\perp} = \text{Id} - P_{\mathfrak{H}}$.

Fix a section $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{H})_t$ such that $\mathfrak{f}(t) = 0$. Let $g \in \mathfrak{H}_t^{\perp}$ and suppose there exists a section $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{L})_t$ such that $\mathfrak{g}(t) = g$. (The set of such g is dense by the definition of smooth structure.) Define $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} := P_{\mathfrak{H}}^{\perp}\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a smooth section of \mathfrak{H}^{\perp} and $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(t) = g$. Thus

$$0 = d(\mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{f}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}))(t) = \mathfrak{h}((\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{f})(t), g) + \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{f}(t), \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) = \mathfrak{h}((\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{f})(t), g).$$

Therefore $(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{f})(t) \in \mathfrak{H}_t$, as required. \square

As an almost immediate corollary one has the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2.30 (Gauss-Griffiths Formula). Let $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ be a BLS subfield. Then

$$(8) \quad \Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})|_{\mathfrak{H}} = \Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{H}}) - (\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}})^{\dagger} \wedge \mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}},$$

i.e.,

$$(9) \quad \mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})(\xi, \bar{\eta})\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) = \mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{H}})(\xi, \bar{\eta})\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) + \mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}(\xi)\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}(\eta)\mathfrak{f}_2)$$

for any smooth sections $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2 \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{H}))$ and any $(1,0)$ -vectors $\xi, \eta \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}$, $t \in B$.

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2 \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H}))$. Then by orthogonality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\nabla^\mathfrak{L})\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2) &= \mathfrak{h}\left(\left((P_{\mathfrak{H}}\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0} + P_{\mathfrak{H}}^\perp\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0})\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}(P_{\mathfrak{H}}\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0} + P_{\mathfrak{H}}^\perp\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0})\right)\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2\right) \\ &= \mathfrak{h}\left((\nabla^{\mathfrak{H}1,0}\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}\nabla^{\mathfrak{H}1,0})\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2\right) + \mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}})\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2 \\ &= \mathfrak{h}\left((\nabla^{\mathfrak{H}1,0}\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}\nabla^{\mathfrak{H}1,0})\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2\right) + \mathfrak{h}(\bar{\partial}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1), \mathbf{f}_2). \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\bar{\partial}\mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2) = \mathfrak{h}(\bar{\partial}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1), \mathbf{f}_2) - \mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1, \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0}\mathbf{f}_2) = \mathfrak{h}(\bar{\partial}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1), \mathbf{f}_2) - \mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1, P_{\mathfrak{H}}^\perp\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0}\mathbf{f}_2)$$

and since $\mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2) = 0$,

$$\mathfrak{h}(\bar{\partial}\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2) = \mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}\mathbf{f}_2).$$

The proof is complete. \square

REMARK 2.31. Note that if $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ has an *integrable* structure, i.e., $\bar{\partial}^\mathfrak{H}\bar{\partial}^\mathfrak{H} = 0$, then the right hand side of (8) is a $(1, 1)$ -form. Thus, even if $\bar{\partial}^\mathfrak{L}\bar{\partial}^\mathfrak{L} \neq 0$, the restriction of the curvature of \mathfrak{L} to an integrable BLS subbundle is a $(1, 1)$ -form. \diamond

2.11. iBLS Fields. Formula (8) is an identity of Hilbert field maps. Equivalently, Formula (9) depends only on the value of the sections $\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2$ at a point, and not on higher derivatives of these sections, provided of course that $\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})_t$. Similarly, the second fundamental form of a BLS subfield is a pointwise object.

If $\mathfrak{L} \rightarrow B$ is a BLS field and $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is a Hilbert subfield that is not necessarily BLS, one might try to use the Gauss-Griffiths Formula (8) to define the curvature of $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$. There are several issues that arise.

First, for the resulting curvature to be a densely-defined operator, one must know that the set of germs of smooth sections of \mathfrak{L} at $t \in B$ whose value at t lies in \mathfrak{H}_t is dense in \mathfrak{H}_t . Secondly, one has to define the second fundamental form in a manner that does not require a connection for \mathfrak{H} . And finally, this second fundamental form should be tensorial.

For each $t \in B$ let

$$(10) \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t} := \{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{L})_t \text{ and } \mathbf{f}(t) \in \mathfrak{H}_t\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{L})_t.$$

The space $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}$ is a \mathbb{C} -vector subspace of the stalk $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{L})_t$. Define the family $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}} \rightarrow B$ whose fiber over t is $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}$.

REMARK. The ‘family’ notation is only introduced for convenience; we give this family no additional structure. In particular, we note that $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ is not a sheaf, since in general there is no notion of a smooth local section of $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$. \diamond

In terms of $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$, the first of the aforementioned issues is settled by assuming that the space

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}(t) := \{\mathbf{f}(t) ; \mathbf{f} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}\}$$

is a dense subspace of \mathfrak{H}_t .

Next we turn to the definition of the second fundamental map of $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$. We use the formula of Proposition 2.28, i.e., we define $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}} : \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{L})$ by

$$\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}} := P_{\mathfrak{H}}^\perp\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}1,0}.$$

PROPOSITION 2.32. *If \mathfrak{L} be a BLS field and $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ a Hilbert subfield then $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}$ is \mathcal{C}^∞ -linear.*

Proof. If $f \in \mathcal{C}_{B,t}^\infty$ and $\mathfrak{f} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \left(P_{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}^\perp \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}^1,0}(f\mathfrak{f}) \right) (t) &= \left(P_{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}^\perp \left(\partial f \otimes \mathfrak{f} + f \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}^1,0} \mathfrak{f} \right) \right) (t) \\ &= \partial f(t) \otimes (P_{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}^\perp(\mathfrak{f}(t)) + f(t) \left(P_{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}^\perp \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}^1,0} \mathfrak{f} \right) (t) = f(t) \left(P_{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}^\perp \nabla^{\mathfrak{L}^1,0} \mathfrak{f} \right) (t), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

Note that $(\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}\mathfrak{f})(t) \in \mathfrak{H}_t^\perp$. However, the map $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$ is *never* tensorial¹; not even if $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is a BLS subbundle.

DEFINITION 2.33. Let $\mathfrak{L} \rightarrow B$ be a BLS field and let $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ be a (not necessarily smooth) Hilbert subfield.

- a. A substalk bundle \mathcal{S} of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{L})$ is a choice of \mathbb{C} -vector subspace $\mathcal{S}_t \subset \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{L})_t$ for each $t \in B$.
- b. The family $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}} \rightarrow B$ of subspaces of the stalks of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{L})$ defined by (10) is called the maximal substalk bundle of $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$.
- c. A substalk bundle $\Sigma \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ is said to *formalize* $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ if
 - i. $\Sigma_t \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}$ is a dense subspace for every t , and
 - ii. for every $t \in B$, if $\mathfrak{f} \in \Sigma_t$ and $\mathfrak{f}(t) = 0$ then $(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}^1,0}\mathfrak{f})(t) \in \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_t$.

We say that $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is *formal* if there is a substalk bundle $\Sigma \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ that formalizes $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$.

EXAMPLE 2.34. If $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ is a BLS subfield of a BLS field \mathfrak{L} then $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is formal. Indeed, the sheaf $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}) \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ formalizes $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$. In fact, Property i of Definition 2.33.c holds because density is part of the BLS hypothesis, and the proof of Proposition 2.29 gives Property ii. \diamond

As Example 2.34 suggests, substalk bundles of $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ that formalize $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ are meant to be ‘non-integrable’ replacements for the non-existent smooth structure $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\tilde{\mathfrak{H}})$ of $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$.

PROPOSITION 2.35. *If \mathfrak{L} be a BLS field and $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ a formal Hilbert subfield then for any $\Sigma \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ that formalizes $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ there exists a $(1,0)$ -form $\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}} = \mathbf{II}_\Sigma^{\mathfrak{L}/\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}$ with values in $\text{Lin}(\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}^\perp)$ such that*

$$(11) \quad (\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}\mathfrak{f})(t) = \mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}(t)\mathfrak{f}(t)$$

for all $t \in B$ and all $\mathfrak{f} \in \Sigma_t$.

Proof. The formality of Σ implies that $\mathbf{II}^{\mathfrak{L}/\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}(t)$ is well-defined by (11). \square

REMARK 2.36. The name *formal* is a play on words: if $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is formal then its second fundamental map is tensorial, and hence defined by a *form*. \diamond

Finally, we can define *infinitesimal BLS* fields, or iBLS fields, as follows.

DEFINITION 2.37. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} \rightarrow B$ be an almost holomorphic Hilbert field. An iBLS field is a triple $(\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}, \mathfrak{L}, \Sigma)$ where $\mathfrak{L} \rightarrow B$ is a BLS field, called the *ambient* BLS field (for $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$), and $\Sigma \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ is a substalk bundle, called the *formalizing* substalk bundle, such that

- (a) $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ is an almost holomorphic Hilbert subfield of \mathfrak{L} , and
- (b) for every $t \in B$ the subspace $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}(t) := \{\mathfrak{f}(t) ; \mathfrak{f} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}\}$ is dense, and

¹We are slightly abusing language here, since there is no sheaf $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ whose stalk at every $t \in B$ is $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}$. However, $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}$ is a $\mathcal{C}_{B,t}^\infty$ -module, so \mathcal{C}^∞ -linear means $\mathcal{C}_{B,t}^\infty$ -linear, and by *tensorial* we mean that if $\mathfrak{f} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}_{\mathfrak{L},t}$ and $\mathfrak{f}(t) = 0$ then $(\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{L}/\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}}\mathfrak{f})(t) = 0$.

(c) $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{L}$ is formalized by Σ .

If moreover $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ is a holomorphic Hilbert field we shall say that $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{L}, \Sigma)$ is an *integrable* iBLS field.

We shall often abuse notation by repressing the triple $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{L}, \Sigma)$ and referring only to \mathfrak{H} as an iBLS field. If we need to refer to the ambient BLS field then we will say that \mathfrak{H} is an iBLS subfield of \mathfrak{L} .

DEFINITION 2.38. Let \mathfrak{H} be an iBLS subfield of a BLS field \mathfrak{L} .

- i. The second fundamental form of \mathfrak{H} in \mathfrak{L} is the form $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}$ defined by Proposition 2.35.
- ii. The curvature of the iBLS subfield \mathfrak{H} relative to \mathfrak{L} is

$$\Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathfrak{L})}(\mathfrak{H}) := \Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})|_{\mathfrak{H}} + (\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}})^\dagger \wedge \mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}},$$

or equivalently, for any $t \in B$

$$\mathfrak{h}(\Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathfrak{L})}(\mathfrak{H})(\xi, \eta)\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) = \mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})(\xi, \eta)\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) - \mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}(\xi)\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}(\eta)\mathfrak{f}_2)$$

for all $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathfrak{H})_t$ and all $(1, 0)$ -vectors $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{C} \otimes T_{B_t}$.

PROPOSITION 2.39. If \mathfrak{H} is an iBLS subfield of a BLS field \mathfrak{L} and \mathfrak{H} is integrable, i.e., $\bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{H}}\bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{H}} = 0$ then $\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})|_{\mathfrak{H}}$ has $(1, 1)$ -coefficients. More precisely, for each $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2 \in \mathfrak{H}_t$ and each $\xi, \eta \in T_{B_t}^{1,0}$ one has $\mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})(\xi, \eta)\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) = \mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) = 0$. Consequently, if \mathfrak{H} is integrable then $\Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathfrak{L})}(\mathfrak{H})$ has $(1, 1)$ -coefficients, i.e.,

$$\Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathfrak{L})}(\mathfrak{H})(\xi, \eta) = \Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathfrak{L})}(\mathfrak{H})(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}) = 0$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}$.

Proof. The statement about $\Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathfrak{L})}(\mathfrak{H})$ follows from the statement about $\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})|_{\mathfrak{H}}$ and the fact that $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{H}}$ has $(1, 0)$ -form coefficients. Finally, since $\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})$ is Hermitian, it suffices to show that $\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})^{0,2}\mathfrak{f} = 0$ for any $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{H}$. The latter holds because $\Theta(\nabla^{\mathfrak{L}})^{0,2}\mathfrak{f} = \bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{H}}\bar{\partial}^{\mathfrak{H}}\mathfrak{f} = 0$ for all $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{H}$. \square

A definition of the curvature of an iBLS subfield that depends heavily on the ambient BLS field is rather undesirable, but we have not found a reasonable way to overcome this issue. On the other hand, the iBLS field $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$, which is our main concern, has the interesting property that it has uncountably many (and much more than that, in a sense) natural ambient BLS fields \mathcal{L}^θ , where θ is the parameter ‘enumerating’ these BLS fields, such that

- (i) $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}^\theta)$ is independent of θ ,
- (ii) $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}^\theta$ is formal for every θ (and the formalizing substack bundle Σ is independent of θ), and
- (iii) the curvature $\Theta^{\text{rel } \mathcal{L}^\theta}(\mathcal{H})$ is independent of θ .

We will use these properties to define the curvature of the iBLS field $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$.

2.12. **Positivity.** All of the definitions of positivity of holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles have direct analogues in the setting of BLS fields and iBLS fields. For simplicity we shall state the definitions of positivity only for BLS fields; the corresponding definitions for iBLS fields are the obvious generalization.

Let $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B, \mathfrak{h}$ be a BLS field. Using the metric \mathfrak{h} , one defines Hermitian forms $\{ \cdot, \cdot \}_{\mathfrak{h}, \Theta(\mathfrak{h})}$ on the fibers of $T_B^{1,0} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ by

$$\{\tau_1 \otimes \mathfrak{f}_1, \tau_2 \otimes \mathfrak{f}_2\}_{\mathfrak{h}, \Theta(\mathfrak{h})} := \mathfrak{h}(\Theta(\mathfrak{h})_{\tau_1, \bar{\tau}_2} \mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2)$$

for indecomposable tensors in $T_{B,t}^{1,0} \otimes \mathfrak{H}_t$, and extending sesqui-linearly on each fiber.

DEFINITION 2.40. Let $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ be a BLS field with smooth Hermitian metric \mathfrak{h} , and fix a smooth Hermitian metric g on B .

- (i) We say that \mathfrak{h} has positive curvature in the sense of Griffiths at a point $t \in B$ if there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\{\tau \otimes \mathfrak{f}, \tau \otimes \mathfrak{f}\}_{\mathfrak{h}, \Theta(\mathfrak{h})} \geq c \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{f}) g(\tau, \tau)$$

for all $\tau \otimes \mathfrak{f} \in T_{B,t}^{1,0} \otimes \mathfrak{H}_t$.

- (ii) We say that \mathfrak{h} has positive curvature in the sense of Nakano at a point $t \in B$ if there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \tau_j \otimes \mathfrak{f}_j, \sum_{k=1}^n \tau_k \otimes \mathfrak{f}_k \right\}_{\mathfrak{h}, \Theta(\mathfrak{h})} \geq c \sum_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{f}_j, \mathfrak{f}_j) g(\tau_j, \tau_j)$$

for all $\tau_1 \otimes \mathfrak{f}_1, \dots, \tau_n \otimes \mathfrak{f}_n \in T_{B,t}^{1,0} \otimes \mathfrak{H}_t$, where $n = \min(\dim_{\mathbb{C}} B, \text{Rank}(\mathfrak{H}_t))$.

- (iii) Let k be an integer between 1 and $\min(\dim_{\mathbb{C}} B, \text{Rank}(\mathfrak{H}_t))$. We say that \mathfrak{h} has k -positive curvature in the sense of Demailly at a point $t \in B$ if there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \tau_j \otimes \mathfrak{f}_j, \sum_{k=1}^n \tau_k \otimes \mathfrak{f}_k \right\}_{\mathfrak{h}, \Theta(\mathfrak{h})} \geq c \sum_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{h}(\mathfrak{f}_j, \mathfrak{f}_j) g(\tau_j, \tau_j)$$

for all $\tau_1 \otimes \mathfrak{f}_1, \dots, \tau_k \otimes \mathfrak{f}_k \in T_{B,t}^{1,0} \otimes \mathfrak{H}_t$ ◇

Clearly these notions of positivity do not depend on the choice of the metric g . Note furthermore that 1-positivity is just Griffiths positivity, that n -positivity is just Nakano positivity, and that m -positivity implies k -positivity if $m \geq k$.

There are also corresponding notions of nonnegative curvature (one takes c nonnegative) and negative curvature (one reverses the inequalities and takes $c < 0$).

3. RELATIVE CANONICAL BUNDLE, LIE DERIVATIVES AND HORIZONTAL LIFTS

The present section introduces the basic definitions and tools needed to to define our Hilbert fields of interest and to carry out computation of the various geometric objects on them that were discussed more abstractly in the previous section.

3.1. Families of twisted canonical sections. Fix a proper holomorphic family of vector bundles $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$. In the Introduction we defined

$$\mathcal{H}_t := H^0(X_t, \mathcal{O}_{X_t}(K_{X_t} \otimes E)) \quad \text{and} \quad (f_1, f_2)_t := (-1)^{\frac{n^2}{2}} \int_{X_t} \langle f_1 \wedge \bar{f}_2, h \rangle,$$

the fibers and the metric of Berndtsson's Hilbert field $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. In the next section we shall present Berndtsson's smooth and holomorphic structure for $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. To do so, one must have a way to vary E -valued canonical sections on X_t with respect to t .

Berndtsson defines the sections of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ to be (fiberwise-holomorphic) sections of $K_{X/B} \otimes E \rightarrow X$, where $K_{X/B}$ denotes the relative canonical bundle. Since $p : X \rightarrow B$ is a submersion there are two equivalent ways of defining the relative canonical bundle. The first is as a quotient

$$K_{X/B} := K_X \otimes p^* K_B^*$$

of the canonical bundle of X by the pullback of the canonical bundle of B , and the second is by equivalence classes of E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms.

3.1.1. Representation of twisted relative canonical sections as twisted canonical sections. Given a point $t \in B$ and a coordinate system $s = (s^1, \dots, s^m)$ in an open set U containing t , the restricted projection map $p : X_U \rightarrow U$, where $X_U := p^{-1}(U)$, can be expressed in terms of coordinates as $p = (p^1, \dots, p^m)$ for global holomorphic functions $p^i \in \mathcal{O}(X_U)$. The submersive property of p means that $dp^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dp^m$ is nowhere-zero on X_U , and therefore any section F of $K_X|_{X_t} \rightarrow X_t$ can be written uniquely as $F = f \wedge dp^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dp^m$ for some section f of $K_{X_t} \rightarrow X_t$. This first perspective on the relative canonical bundle is well-suited to extension of canonical sections from a the fiber X_t to X . But for the purpose of differentiating sections of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ the 'canonical sections' approach has drawbacks. Therefore, we will not be using this point of view except when we discuss the question of local triviality of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ in Section 5.

3.1.2. Representation by equivalence classes of relative top-forms. Consider the holomorphic vector bundle $\Lambda_X^{n,0} \rightarrow X$ whose local sections are $(n, 0)$ -forms on X , and the subbundle $Z(p)^{n,0} \rightarrow X$ whose fiber at $x \in X$ is defined by

$$Z(p)_x^{n,0} = \left\{ f \in \Lambda_{X,x}^{n,0} ; \langle f, \xi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_n \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } \xi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_n \in \Lambda^n(\text{Kernel}(dp(x))) \right\}.$$

Thus $Z(p)^{n,0} \rightarrow X$ is the annihilator of $\Lambda^n T_{X/B}^{1,0}$, where $T_{X/B}^{1,0} := \text{kernel}(dp)$ is the so-called *vertical* $(1, 0)$ -*tangent bundle* of $p : X \rightarrow B$. As p is a submersion, $T_{X/B}^{1,0}$ is a holomorphic vector bundle of rank n , and thus $\Lambda^n T_{X/B}^{1,0}$ has rank 1. Therefore there is a line bundle L such that

$$0 \rightarrow Z(p)^{n,0} \rightarrow \Lambda_X^{n,0} \rightarrow L \rightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence of vector bundles, and the line bundle L is precisely $K_{X/B}$. From this perspective a section of $K_{X/B} \otimes E \rightarrow X$ is an equivalence class of sections of $\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E \rightarrow X$, where two sections are equivalent if their difference is a section of $Z(p)^{n,0} \otimes E \rightarrow X$. We note also that a section u of $\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E \rightarrow X$ is a section of $Z(p)^{n,0} \otimes E \rightarrow X$ if and only if $\iota_{X_t}^* u = 0$ for every $t \in B$.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a proper holomorphic submersion of complex manifolds. For each $t \in B$ there is an isomorphism*

$$\iota_t : (K_{X/B} \otimes E)|_{X_t} \rightarrow K_{X_t} \otimes E|_{X_t}$$

such that, with $\iota_{X_t} : X_t \hookrightarrow X$ denoting the natural inclusion of the fiber,

$$\iota_t(f) = \iota_{X_t}^* u$$

for any $(n, 0)$ -form u representing a section f of $K_{X/B} \otimes E$ over an open subset U of t .

REMARK 3.2. In computation one often works locally on the base B , in some coordinate chart U with local coordinates $s = (s^1, \dots, s^m)$. In terms of these coordinates the projection p of the holomorphic family has the expression $p = (p^1, \dots, p^m)$. The functions p^i are of course constant on the fibers of p , and their differentials dp^i and $d\bar{p}^i$ are global forms on $p^{-1}(U)$. Every section of $Z(p)^{n,0}|_U$ is of the form $dp^1 \wedge v_1 + \dots + dp^m \wedge v_m$. Indeed, this is clearly true locally on X (but with the global forms dp^1, \dots, dp^m) and one can then patch together the local data using partitions of unity. Thus two sections u_1, u_2 of $\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E|_U$ define the same E -valued relative canonical section over U if and only if there exist smooth E -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -forms $v_1, \dots, v_m \in \Gamma(p^{-1}(U), \mathcal{C}_X^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n-1,0} \otimes E))$ such that

$$u_2 - u_1 = dp^1 \wedge v_1 + \dots + dp^m \wedge v_m,$$

or equivalently $u_1 \wedge dp^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dp^m = u_2 \wedge dp^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dp^m$. \diamond

3.2. Lie derivatives of twisted forms. We shall need to compute derivatives of integrals of the form (1). The usual tool for taking the derivative ‘through the integral’ is the Lie derivative. When the objects being differentiated have natural action by diffeomorphisms, the Lie derivative has a very natural definition, namely differentiation of the pullback by the flow of the vector field along which one is computing derivatives. For example differential forms, vector fields and the tensors one can construct from these behave well with respect to this definition.

In the twisted setting, i.e., when one looks at differential forms with values in a vector bundle, one can still make use of the classical Lie derivative by working in locally trivial open sets, but many formulas become local and keeping track of these local formulas can be cumbersome. It is better to confirm that certain combinations of terms have a global nature, and to work with those combinations of terms as the basic objects. In this paragraph we identify the basic actors and establish a few results that will be useful in computations.

DEFINITION 3.3. Let X be a complex manifold, let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle with connection ∇ , let u be an E -valued (p, q) -form and let ξ be a complex vector field on X , i.e., a section of $T_X \otimes \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$.

- i. The Lie derivative along ξ , which acts on complex-valued forms, is defined by

$$L_\xi := L_{\text{Re } \xi} + \sqrt{-1}L_{\text{Im } \xi},$$

where L on the right-hand side denotes the real Lie derivative.

- ii. The twisted Lie derivative of an E -valued (p, q) -form u along ξ is

$$L_\xi^\nabla u = L_\xi u := \nabla(\xi \lrcorner u) + \xi \lrcorner \nabla u,$$

REMARK 3.4. In the untwisted case, i.e., when the underlying vector bundle E is the trivial line bundle and the connection ∇ is the usual exterior derivative, Definition 3.3.ii agrees with the aforementioned definition of Lie derivative because of the well-known formula

$$L_\xi u = d(\xi \lrcorner u) + \xi \lrcorner (du)$$

of H. Cartan. \diamond

Via the splitting $\nabla = \nabla^{1,0} + \nabla^{0,1}$ one can define the $(1,0)$ - and $(0,1)$ -Lie derivative of a (p,q) -form u with values in a holomorphic vector bundle along a complex vector field ξ by

$$L_\xi^{1,0} u := L_\xi^{\nabla^{1,0}} u = \nabla^{1,0}(\xi \lrcorner u) + \xi \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u \quad \text{and} \quad L_\xi^{0,1} u := L_\xi^{\nabla^{0,1}} u = \nabla^{0,1}(\xi \lrcorner u) + \xi \lrcorner \nabla^{0,1} u.$$

REMARK 3.5. Note that $L_\xi^{1,0}$ (resp. $L_\xi^{0,1}$) preserves the bi-degree (p,q) if and only if ξ is a $(1,0)$ (resp. $(0,1)$) vector field or $q=0$ (resp. $p=0$). \diamond

REMARK 3.6. One can also define $L_\xi^{0,1} u := \xi \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u + \bar{\partial}(\xi \lrcorner u)$. In the present article these two meanings of $L_\xi^{0,1}$ do not conflict because we only use connections ∇ satisfying $\nabla^{0,1} = \bar{\partial}$. \diamond

PROPOSITION 3.7. *Let X be a Kähler manifold of dimension $n+m$, let $Z \subset X$ be an n -dimensional submanifold, let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle with Hermitian metric h and its Chern connection, and let u, u' be E -valued $(n,0)$ -forms on X . If ξ is a $(1,0)$ -vector field on X then*

$$\iota_Z^* L_\xi \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle = \iota_Z^* \langle (L_\xi^{1,0} u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \iota_Z^* \langle u \wedge \overline{L_\xi^{0,1} u'}, h \rangle$$

and

$$\iota_Z^* L_{\bar{\xi}} \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle = \iota_Z^* \langle (L_{\bar{\xi}}^{0,1} u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \iota_Z^* \langle u \wedge \overline{L_{\bar{\xi}}^{1,0} u'}, h \rangle.$$

Proof. We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} & L_\xi \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle \\ &= d(\xi \lrcorner \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle) + \xi \lrcorner d \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle \\ &= d \left(\langle (\xi \lrcorner u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + (-1)^n \langle u \wedge \overline{(\xi \lrcorner u')}, h \rangle \right) + \xi \lrcorner \left(\langle \nabla u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + (-1)^n \langle u \wedge \overline{\nabla u'}, h \rangle \right) \\ &= \langle \nabla(\xi \lrcorner u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + (-1)^{n-1} \langle (\xi \lrcorner u) \wedge \overline{\nabla u'}, h \rangle + (-1)^n \langle \nabla u \wedge \overline{(\xi \lrcorner u')}, h \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle u \wedge \overline{\nabla(\xi \lrcorner u')}, h \rangle + \langle (\xi \lrcorner(\nabla u)) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + (-1)^{n+1} \langle \nabla u \wedge \overline{(\xi \lrcorner u')}, h \rangle \\ &\quad + (-1)^n \langle \xi \lrcorner u \wedge \overline{\nabla u'}, h \rangle + \langle u, \overline{(\xi \lrcorner(\nabla u'))}, h \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla(\xi \lrcorner u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \langle u \wedge \overline{\nabla(\xi \lrcorner u')}, h \rangle + \langle (\xi \lrcorner(\nabla u)) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \langle u, \overline{(\xi \lrcorner(\nabla u'))}, h \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla(\xi \lrcorner u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \langle (\xi \lrcorner(\nabla u)) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \langle u \wedge \overline{(\xi \lrcorner(\nabla u'))}, h \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because $\bar{\xi} \lrcorner u' = 0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_Z^* L_\xi \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle &= \iota_Z^* \langle \nabla(\xi \lrcorner u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \iota_Z^* \langle (\xi \lrcorner(\nabla u)) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \iota_Z^* \langle u, \overline{(\xi \lrcorner(\nabla u'))}, h \rangle \\ &= \iota_Z^* \langle \nabla^{1,0}(\xi \lrcorner u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \iota_Z^* \langle (\xi \lrcorner(\nabla^{1,0} u)) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \iota_Z^* \langle u, \overline{(\xi \lrcorner(\bar{\partial} u'))}, h \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

the last equality being a consequence of the fact that upon restriction to Z all of the forms whose bidegree is not (n,n) must vanish. \square

LEMMA 3.8. Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a proper holomorphic family, let $E \rightarrow X, h$ be a Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle equipped with its Chern connection and let u and u' be E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms on X . If τ is a $(1, 0)$ -vector field on B and ξ_τ is a $(1, 0)$ -vector field on X such that $dp\xi_\tau = \tau$ then

$$\tau \int_{X_t} \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle = \int_{X_t} \langle L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \int_{X_t} \langle u \wedge \overline{L_{\xi_\tau}^{0,1} u'}, h \rangle,$$

where $X_t := p^{-1}(t)$.

Proof. Write $\tau = \tau_1 + \sqrt{-1}\tau_2$ in terms of its real and imaginary parts, and similarly write $\xi_\tau = \xi_1 + \sqrt{-1}\xi_2$. Since p is holomorphic, $dp\xi_i = \tau_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i \int_{X_t} \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle &= \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \Big|_{r=0} \int_{\Phi_{\xi_i}^r(X_t)} \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \Big|_{r=0} \int_{X_t} (\Phi_{\xi_i}^r)^* \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle \\ &= \int_{X_t} L_{\xi_i} \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

so the lemma follows from Definition 3.3 and Proposition 3.7. \square

Similarly one has the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.9. Let X, Z, E and h be as in Proposition 3.7, let α and β be E -valued forms of bidegree $(n, 1)$ and $(n-1, 0)$ respectively. If ξ is a $(1, 0)$ -vector field on X then

$$L_\xi^{1,0} \langle \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle = \langle (L_\xi^{1,0} \alpha) \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + \langle \alpha \wedge \overline{L_\xi^{0,1} \beta}, h \rangle,$$

and hence

$$\int_Z L_\xi^{1,0} \langle \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle = \int_Z \langle (L_\xi^{1,0} \alpha) \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + \int_Z \langle \alpha \wedge \overline{L_\xi^{0,1} \beta}, h \rangle.$$

Proof. We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} L_\xi^{1,0} \langle \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle &= \xi \lrcorner \partial \langle \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + \partial (\xi \lrcorner \langle \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle) \\ &= \xi \lrcorner \langle \nabla^{1,0} \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + (-1)^{n+1} \xi \lrcorner \langle \alpha \wedge \overline{\partial \beta}, h \rangle + \partial \langle \xi \lrcorner \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle \\ &= \langle (\xi \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \alpha) \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + (-1)^{n+1} \langle (\xi \lrcorner \alpha) \wedge \overline{\partial \beta}, h \rangle + \langle \alpha \wedge \overline{\xi \lrcorner \partial \beta}, h \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla^{1,0} (\xi \lrcorner \alpha) \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + (-1)^n \langle \xi \lrcorner \alpha \wedge \overline{\partial \beta}, h \rangle \\ &= \langle (\xi \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \alpha) \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + \langle \nabla^{1,0} (\xi \lrcorner \alpha) \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + \langle \alpha \wedge \overline{\xi \lrcorner \partial \beta}, h \rangle \\ &= \langle (L_\xi^{0,1} \alpha) \wedge \bar{\beta}, h \rangle + \langle \alpha \wedge \overline{L_\xi^{0,1} \beta}, h \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed by integrating over Z . \square

PROPOSITION 3.10. Let X, Z, E and h be as in Proposition 3.7, let u and u' be E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms on X and let γ be an E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -form on X . If ξ is a $(1, 0)$ -vector field on X then

$$(12) \quad L_\xi^{1,0} \langle \gamma \wedge \bar{u}, h \rangle = \langle L_\xi^{1,0} \gamma \wedge \bar{u}, h \rangle + \langle \gamma \wedge \overline{L_\xi^{0,1} u}, h \rangle$$

and

$$(13) \quad L_\xi^{0,1} \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle = \langle (L_\xi^{0,1} u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle.$$

In particular,

$$(14) \quad \iota_Z^* L_{\bar{\xi}} \langle \gamma \wedge \bar{u}, h \rangle = \iota_Z^* \langle L_{\bar{\xi}}^{1,0} \gamma \wedge \bar{u}, h \rangle + \iota_Z^* \langle \gamma \wedge \overline{L_{\bar{\xi}}^{0,1} u}, h \rangle$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.7 we have

$$L_{\bar{\xi}} \langle \gamma \wedge \bar{u}, h \rangle = \langle \nabla(\bar{\xi} \lrcorner \gamma) \wedge \bar{u}, h \rangle + \langle (\bar{\xi} \lrcorner (\nabla \gamma)) \wedge \bar{u}, h \rangle + \langle \gamma \wedge \overline{\nabla(\bar{\xi} \lrcorner u)}, h \rangle + \langle \gamma \wedge \overline{(\bar{\xi} \lrcorner (\nabla u))}, h \rangle$$

and

$$L_{\xi} \langle u \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle = \langle \nabla(\xi \lrcorner u) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \langle (\xi \lrcorner (\nabla u)) \wedge \bar{u}', h \rangle + \langle u \wedge \overline{\nabla(\bar{\xi} \lrcorner u')}, h \rangle + \langle u \wedge \overline{(\bar{\xi} \lrcorner (\nabla u'))}, h \rangle.$$

Taking the (n, n) -components of both sides of the first identity yields (12), and taking the $(n-1, n+1)$ -parts of the second identity yields (13). Finally, since $L_{\bar{\xi}}^{0,1} \langle \gamma \wedge \bar{u}, h \rangle$ is of bidegree $(n-1, n+1)$, (14) follows from (12) \square

LEMMA 3.11. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a holomorphic family of Hermitian holomorphic vector bundles, let τ be a holomorphic vector field on B , let ξ_τ be a lift of τ to X , and let u be an E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form on X . Then with respect to the Chern connection of (E, h)*

$$\bar{\partial}_{X_t}^* (L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u) = \iota_{X_t}^* \left(-(\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h))u - \nabla^{1,0}((\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner u) + L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u \right),$$

where the $(n, 1)$ -form $\iota_{X_t}^*((\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h))u)$ is defined by

$$\bar{\zeta} \lrcorner \left(\iota_{X_t}^*((\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h))u) \right) := \iota_{X_t}^* \left(\Theta(h)_{\xi_\tau \bar{\zeta}} u \right).$$

Proof. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_{X_t} \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u &= \iota_{X_t}^* \bar{\partial} L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u = \iota_{X_t}^* \left(\bar{\partial} \nabla^{1,0}(\xi_\tau \lrcorner u) + \bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u) \right) \\ &= \iota_{X_t}^* \left(\bar{\partial} \nabla^{1,0}(\xi_\tau \lrcorner u) - \xi_\tau \lrcorner \bar{\partial} \nabla^{1,0} u + (\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u \right) \\ &= \iota_{X_t}^* \left(\Theta(h)(\xi_\tau \lrcorner u) - \nabla^{1,0} \bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau \lrcorner u) - (\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h))u + \xi_\tau \lrcorner (\nabla^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u) + (\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u \right) \\ &= \iota_{X_t}^* \left(-(\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h))u - (\nabla^{1,0} \bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau \lrcorner u) - \xi_\tau \lrcorner (\nabla^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u)) + (\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u \right) \\ &= \iota_{X_t}^* \left(-(\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h))u - \nabla^{1,0}((\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner u) + \nabla^{1,0}(\xi_\tau \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u) + \xi_\tau \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u + (\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u \right) \\ &= \iota_{X_t}^* \left(-(\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h))u - \nabla^{1,0}((\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner u) + L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u + (\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u \right) \\ &= \iota_{X_t}^* \left(-(\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h))u - \nabla^{1,0}((\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner u) + L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u \right). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, $(\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u = 0$, because $\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau$ is vertical, and $\nabla^{1,0} u$ has bidegree $(n+1, 0)$. \square

PROPOSITION 3.12. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a holomorphic family of holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles, let $t \in B$ and let $\tau \in H^0(B, \mathcal{O}(T_B^{1,0}))$. Let ξ_τ be a lift of τ , i.e., a $(1, 0)$ -vector field ξ_τ on X such that $dp\xi_\tau = \tau$. Then with respect to the Chern connection for (E, h) , one has the following statements.*

- a. *If $u, \tilde{u} \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ agree on the fibers of $X \rightarrow B$, i.e., they represent the same smooth section $[u] = [\tilde{u}]$ of $K_{X/B} \otimes E \rightarrow X$, then*

$$\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u = \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \tilde{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} \tilde{u}.$$

b. If moreover $\iota_{X_t}^* u \in \mathcal{H}_t$ then

$$\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u$$

for any other lift $\tilde{\xi}_\tau$ of τ .

c. Finally, if $\iota_{X_t}^* u = 0$ and $L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = 0$ then $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u \in \mathcal{H}_t$.

Proof. Since $v := \tilde{\xi}_\tau - \xi_\tau$ is tangent to the fibers of p ,

$$\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\tilde{\xi}_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u_1 - \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u_1 = \iota_{X_t}^* L_{v_t}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = L_{v_t}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} \iota_{X_t}^* u = 0,$$

where $v_t := v|_{X_t}$. Thus (b) is proved.

To prove (a) it suffices to show that if $u \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ restricts to 0 on fibers then $L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u$ and $L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u$ restrict to 0 on fibers. Now, using coordinates $s = (s^1, \dots, s^m)$ on the base, in terms of which we write $p = (p^1, \dots, p^m)$ and $\tau = \tau^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial s^\mu}$ (see Remark 3.2), the section u vanishes on fibers if and only if locally in the base one has

$$u = dp^\mu \wedge v_\mu$$

for some E -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -forms v_1, \dots, v_m . But then

$$L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u = L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} dp^\mu \wedge v_\mu = (p^* \partial \tau^\mu \wedge v_\mu) + dp^\mu \wedge \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} v_\mu = dp^\mu \wedge \left(p^* \left(\frac{\partial \tau^\nu}{\partial s^\mu} \right) v_\nu + L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} v_\mu \right)$$

and

$$-L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} dp^\mu \wedge \bar{\partial} v_\mu = (p^* \partial \tau^\mu \wedge \bar{\partial} v_\mu) + dp^\mu \wedge \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} v_\mu = dp^\mu \wedge \left(p^* \left(\frac{\partial \tau^\nu}{\partial s^\mu} \right) \bar{\partial} v_\nu + L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} v_\mu \right),$$

so that $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u = 0$ and $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = 0$ for all $t \in B$.

Finally, if τ is a holomorphic vector field, $\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau$ is a $(0, 1)$ -form with values in the vertical bundle $T_{X/B}^{1,0}$. Therefore if $\iota_{X_t}^* u = 0$ then $\iota_{X_t}^* \left(\nabla^{1,0} (\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau) \lrcorner u \right) = 0$ and $\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u$. If also $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = 0$ then by Lemma 3.11 $\bar{\partial} \iota_{X_t}^* \left(L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0} u \right) = 0$, which proves (c). \square

3.3. Horizontal lifts. In differentiating sections of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ one must make a choice of *horizontal* lifts of $(1, 0)$ -vector fields from B to X .

DEFINITION 3.13. A horizontal distribution for the smooth family $p : X \rightarrow B$ is a distribution $H \subset T_X$ such that $dp|_H : H \rightarrow T_B$ is an isomorphism of vector bundles. Equivalently, there is a morphism of vector bundles $\theta : T_B \rightarrow T_X$ such that $dp\theta(\tau) = \tau$. \diamond

We shall abuse notation and write θ instead of H for the horizontal distribution. Thus θ is both a subbundle of T_X and a right inverse to $dp : T_X \rightarrow T_B$.

In our situation the total space X and base manifold B are complex manifolds and $p : X \rightarrow B$ is holomorphic, i.e., that $dpJ = Jdp$, where J denotes the almost complex structures. Regardless of whether J is integrable, there is a map that assigns to any horizontal distribution $\theta \subset T_X$ a unique horizontal $(1, 0)$ -distribution $\theta^{1,0} \subset T_X^{1,0}$, defined as $\theta^{1,0} = s^{1,0}\theta$, where

$$s^{1,0} : T_X \ni \xi \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(\xi - \sqrt{-1}J\xi) \in T_X^{1,0}.$$

The correspondence $\theta \leftrightarrow \theta^{1,0}$ is bijective, and since $p : X \rightarrow B$ is holomorphic,

$$dp\theta^{1,0} \cong T_B^{1,0} \quad \text{and} \quad dp\theta^{0,1} \cong T_B^{0,1},$$

where $\theta^{0,1} := \overline{\theta^{1,0}}$.

To slightly shrink the sizes of many already-too-large formulas we shall write

$$\xi_\tau^\theta := \theta^{1,0}(\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta := \theta^{0,1}(\bar{\tau}) = \overline{\theta^{1,0}(\tau)}, \quad \tau \in T_B^{1,0}.$$

4. HILBERT FIELDS OF SECTIONS

In this section we recall Berndtsson's smooth and holomorphic structures for the field of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$, which we state in accordance with the language of Section 2. We also construct the L^2 ambient BLS fields mentioned in the introduction and prove that the Berndtsson Hilbert field is an iBLS subfield.

4.1. Berndtsson's holomorphic Hilbert field. Let us recall (and slightly reformulate) Berndtsson's definition of the complex analytic structure of the Hilbert field $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. We begin with a discussion of the smooth structure and then define the holomorphic structure.

4.1.1. Smooth and holomorphic sections of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. We begin with Berndtsson's definition of sections of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. However, we phrase the definition in terms of sections of the relative canonical bundle, and for the moment repress the fact that these sections are equivalence classes of twisted $(n, 0)$ -forms.

DEFINITION 4.1. A section \mathfrak{f} of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is a section $f \in \Gamma(X, K_{X/B} \otimes E)$ such that for each $t \in B$ $\iota_t f \in \mathcal{H}_t = H^0(X_t, \mathcal{O}(K_{X_t} \otimes E|_{X_t}))$ (c.f. Proposition 3.1). We write

$$\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{H}).$$

We also use the notation

$$\mathfrak{f} = \mathbf{i}(f) \quad \text{and} \quad f = \mathbf{a}(\mathfrak{f}),$$

and say that $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{H})$ is induced by f , and that $f \in \Gamma(X, K_{X/B} \otimes E)$ is associated to \mathfrak{f} . We say $\mathfrak{f} : B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is holomorphic (resp. \mathcal{C}^r , measurable, etc.) if $\mathbf{a}(\mathfrak{f})$ is holomorphic (resp. \mathcal{C}^r , measurable, etc.). We denote by $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{H}))$ and $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}))$ the set of smooth and holomorphic sections over an open set $U \subset B$. \diamond

REMARK 4.2. We emphasize that there may well exist $t \in B$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}_t$ such that there is no *smooth* (or even continuous) section \mathfrak{f} of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ satisfying $\mathfrak{f}(t) = f$. This is the case precisely when $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is not locally trivial near $t \in B$. \diamond

4.1.2. Holomorphic structure of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. Let us now turn to the definition of the $\bar{\partial}$ operator for $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. We begin with the following simple but important fact.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Let u be an E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form on the total space of the family $X \rightarrow B$, let $t \in B$, and suppose that $\iota_{X_t}^* u \in \mathcal{H}_t$. Then for any lifts ξ_τ^1 and ξ_τ^2 of the $(1, 0)$ -vector $\tau \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}$ one has*

$$\bar{\xi}_\tau^1 \bar{\partial} u = \bar{\xi}_\tau^2 \bar{\partial} u$$

as E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms on X along X_t .

Proof. The proposition is equivalent to the requirement that $\bar{\eta} \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u = 0$ for any $\eta \in T_{X_t}^{1,0}$. Since η is tangent to X_t , $\bar{\eta} \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u = 0$ if and only if $\bar{\eta} \lrcorner \bar{\partial} \iota_{X_t}^* u = 0$, and the latter holds because $\iota_{X_t}^* u$ is holomorphic. \square

By Proposition 4.3 if $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{H})$ then the associated section $f := \mathbf{a}(\mathfrak{f})$ satisfies

$$(15) \quad \bar{\partial}f(\bar{\zeta}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in T_{X/B}^{1,0},$$

where $T_{X/B}^{1,0} := \text{kernel}(dp) \cap T_X^{1,0} \subset T_X^{1,0}$ is the vertical holomorphic tangent bundle. One has an exact sequence of anti-holomorphic vector bundles

$$0 \rightarrow T_{X/B}^{0,1} \rightarrow T_X^{0,1} \rightarrow p^*T_B^{0,1} \rightarrow 0,$$

and therefore $\bar{\partial}f$ induces a unique section $\bar{\partial}f \in \Gamma(X, p^*T_B^{*0,1} \otimes K_{X/B} \otimes E)$ defined by

$$\bar{\partial}f((x, \bar{\tau})) = \bar{\partial}f(x)(\bar{\xi}_\tau) \quad \text{for any } \xi_\tau \in T_{X,x}^{1,0} \text{ such that } dp(x)\xi_\tau = \tau \in T_{B,p(x)}^{1,0}.$$

We therefore obtain the following definition, which is equivalent to the definition of $\bar{\partial}$ for $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ given in [B-2009].

DEFINITION 4.4 ($\bar{\partial}$ -operator for \mathcal{H}). The operator $\bar{\partial} : \Gamma(B, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \Gamma(B, \Lambda_B^{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\bar{\partial}\mathfrak{f} := \iota(\bar{\partial}\mathbf{a}(\mathfrak{f}))$$

is the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator for $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$.

REMARK 4.5. Evidently $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}))$ in the sense of Definition 4.1 if and only if $\bar{\partial}\mathfrak{f} = 0$, i.e., if and only if $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}))$ in the sense of Definition 2.20. \diamond

REMARK 4.6. For higher-order forms \mathfrak{b} , expressed in terms of a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed local frame $\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^N$ for $\Lambda_B^{p,q}$ as $\mathfrak{b} = \alpha^i \otimes \mathfrak{b}_i$, the operator $\bar{\partial}$ is therefore given by

$$\bar{\partial}\mathfrak{b} = \alpha^i \otimes \bar{\partial}\mathfrak{b}_i,$$

and therefore $\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial} = 0$. Thus $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is a holomorphic Hilbert field. \diamond

DEFINITION 4.7. The Hilbert field $(\mathcal{H}, \bar{\partial}) \rightarrow B$ with its L^2 -inner product (1) is called the *holomorphic Hilbert field of the family* $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$. \diamond

Unfortunately, with the smooth structure just described, $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ need not be a smooth Hilbert field. In fact, we have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 4.8. *The holomorphic Hilbert field $(\mathcal{H}, \bar{\partial})$ is a smooth Hilbert field if and only if it is a holomorphic vector bundle.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is locally trivial then the smooth sections clearly form a dense subset on every fiber; in fact, every element of every fiber is the evaluation of a smooth (and even holomorphic) section. Conversely, if $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ has a smooth structure then $t \mapsto \dim \mathcal{H}_t$ is lower semi-continuous by Proposition 2.5. On the other hand, a standard argument using Montel's Theorem shows that $t \mapsto \dim \mathcal{H}_t$ is upper semi-continuous. Therefore the rank of the fibers of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is constant, and thus $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is a holomorphic vector bundle. \square

REMARK 4.9. At first glance, the definition of the $\bar{\partial}$ operator for \mathcal{H} appearing in [B-2009] might look somewhat different than the definition we presented here. Here we have used the representation of sections of \mathcal{H} as relative canonical sections $f \in p_*\mathcal{O}_X(K_{X/B} \otimes E)_t$, whereas in Berndtsson's approach one chooses an E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form $u \in p_*\mathcal{O}_X(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E)$ representing f . Since f is holomorphic on fibers, the section $\bar{\partial}f$ of $\Lambda_X^{0,1} \otimes K_{X/B} \otimes E$ vanishes on the vertical bundle $T_{X/B}^{0,1}$. In terms of the representative u of f , $\bar{\partial}u$, which is a section of

$\Lambda_X^{n,1} \otimes E$, need not vanish on $T_{X/B}^{0,1}$, but the restriction of $\bar{\partial}u$ to every fiber of p must vanish. Therefore, if ξ_τ is any lift of τ to X one has

$$\iota_t(\bar{\xi}_\tau \lrcorner \bar{\partial}f) = \iota_{X_t}^*(\bar{\xi}_\tau \lrcorner \bar{\partial}u),$$

where ι_t is the isomorphism of Proposition 3.1.

In terms of the local coordinates discussed in Remark 3.2, there exist $(n, 0)$ -forms β_1, \dots, β_m and $(n-1, 1)$ -forms $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ such that

$$\bar{\partial}u = dp^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu + d\bar{p}^\nu \wedge \beta_\nu.$$

If \tilde{u} is another representative of f then $\tilde{u} - u = dt^\mu \wedge \gamma_\mu$ for some $(n-1, 0)$ -forms $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$, so

$$\bar{\partial}\tilde{u} = dp^\mu \wedge (\alpha_\mu - \bar{\partial}\gamma_\mu) + d\bar{p}^\nu \wedge \beta_\nu.$$

Therefore the section $\bar{\partial}f$ is

$$\bar{\partial}f = p^* d\bar{s}^\mu \otimes [\beta_\mu],$$

where $[\beta]$ means the relative canonical form represented by the $(n, 0)$ -form β . The right-hand side of the latter identity is Berndtsson's definition of $\bar{\partial}$ [B-2009, page 544]. \diamond

4.2. The L^2 BLS fields. We shall now construct a large collection of BLS fields each of which contains the holomorphic Hilbert field $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ of the family $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ as a subfield, and which makes $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ into an iBLS field. The underlying smooth structure of all of these BLS fields is the same, and it is the complex structure that changes.

4.2.1. The smooth structure. The fibers of the underlying Hilbert field are the L^2 -spaces

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \left\{ \text{measurable sections } f \in \Gamma(X_t, K_{X_t} \otimes E|_{X_t}) ; (-1)^{\frac{n^2}{2}} \int_{X_t} \langle f \wedge \bar{f}, h \rangle < +\infty \right\}.$$

Of course, the Hermitian metric is just the L^2 -metric. Next we define the smooth sections.

DEFINITION 4.10. A smooth section \mathfrak{f} of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ is a section $f \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(K_{X/B} \otimes E))$. We write $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}))$.

As with the field $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$, we write $f = \mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{f})$ and $\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{i}(f)$ to distinguish between the sections of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ and the sections of $K_{X/B} \otimes E \rightarrow X$.

Differential k -forms and (p, q) -forms \mathfrak{b} with values in \mathcal{L} have already been defined as sections of $\Lambda_B^k \otimes \mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ and $\Lambda_B^{p,q} \otimes \mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ respectively, and can be respectively identified with sections of the vector bundles $p^* \Lambda_B^k \otimes K_{X/B} \otimes E \rightarrow X$ and $p^* \Lambda_B^{p,q} \otimes K_{X/B} \otimes E \rightarrow X$. The discussion is analogous to the case of the holomorphic field \mathcal{H} .

It is clear that (i) the collection of smooth members of \mathcal{L}_t is dense and (ii) that every smooth member of \mathcal{L}_t has a smooth extension to a section of $K_{X/B} \otimes E \rightarrow X$. Thus \mathcal{L} is a smooth Hilbert field. (In fact, as mentioned in Remark 1.5 $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ is even locally trivial, i.e., it is a smooth Hilbert bundle.)

4.2.2. The almost holomorphic structures.

DEFINITION 4.11. Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a proper holomorphic family. For a horizontal distribution $\theta \subset T_X$ and a smooth section $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}))$ define

$$\bar{\partial}_\tau^\theta \mathfrak{f} := \mathfrak{i} \left(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\xi}_\tau} \mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{f}) \right), \quad \tau \in T_B^{1,0}.$$

The operator $\bar{\partial}^\theta$ is extended to \mathcal{L} -valued differential forms in the obvious way.

PROPOSITION 4.12. *Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a proper holomorphic submersion and let $\theta \subset T_X$ be a horizontal distribution. Then the following are equivalent.*

- a. *The almost complex structure $\bar{\partial}^\theta$ is a complex structure, i.e., $\bar{\partial}^\theta \bar{\partial}^\theta = 0$.*
- b. *The distribution θ is integrable, or equivalently, $[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \xi_\tau^\theta] = \xi_{[\sigma, \tau]}^\theta$ for all smooth $(1, 0)$ -vector fields σ, τ on B .*

Proof. We compute that

$$\left(\bar{\partial}_\sigma^\theta \bar{\partial}_\tau^\theta - \bar{\partial}_\tau^\theta \bar{\partial}_\sigma^\theta - \bar{\partial}_{[\sigma, \tau]}^\theta \right) \mathfrak{f} = \mathbf{i} \left(\left(\bar{\partial}_{\xi_\sigma^\theta} \bar{\partial}_{\xi_\tau^\theta} - \bar{\partial}_{\xi_\tau^\theta} \bar{\partial}_{\xi_\sigma^\theta} - \bar{\partial}_{\xi_{[\sigma, \tau]}^\theta} \right) \mathbf{a}(\mathfrak{f}) \right)$$

for any $(1, 0)$ -vector fields σ, τ on B . Now, on any complex manifold one has

$$\bar{\partial}_{\xi_1} \bar{\partial}_{\xi_2} - \bar{\partial}_{\xi_2} \bar{\partial}_{\xi_1} - \bar{\partial}_{[\xi_1, \xi_2]} = 0$$

for any $(1, 0)$ -vector fields ξ_1, ξ_2 . Since we are acting on sections of a holomorphic vector bundle, the first two terms are always well-defined, and the third term is well-defined because $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ is also a $(1, 0)$ -vector field. Therefore

$$\left(\bar{\partial}_\sigma^\theta \bar{\partial}_\tau^\theta - \bar{\partial}_\tau^\theta \bar{\partial}_\sigma^\theta - \bar{\partial}_{[\sigma, \tau]}^\theta \right) \mathfrak{f} = \mathbf{i} \left(\left(\bar{\partial}_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \xi_\tau^\theta]} - \bar{\partial}_{\xi_{[\sigma, \tau]}^\theta} \right) \mathbf{a}(\mathfrak{f}) \right),$$

and the right hand side vanishes on all smooth sections if and only if θ is integrable. \square

DEFINITION 4.13. The BLS field $(\mathcal{L}, \mathfrak{h}, \bar{\partial}^\theta) \rightarrow B$ is called the L^2 BLS field of the family $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ associated to the horizontal distribution $\theta \subset T_X$.

In the previous paragraph we defined the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator for $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ by

$$\bar{\partial}_\tau \mathfrak{f} := \mathbf{i}(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} \mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{f})), \quad \tau \in T_B^{1,0},$$

and observed (Proposition 4.3) that the right hand side is independent of the choice of lift. Thus we have the following trivial but fundamental observation.

PROPOSITION 4.14. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a holomorphic family of Hermitian vector bundles. Then for any distribution $\theta \subset T_X$ the operator $\bar{\partial}^\theta|_{\mathcal{H}}$ agrees with the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator for \mathcal{H} given in Definition 4.4. Thus \mathcal{H} is a holomorphic subfield of $(\mathcal{L}, \bar{\partial}^\theta)$.*

The notation $(\mathcal{L}, \mathfrak{h}, \bar{\partial}^\theta)$ for the BLS field of the family $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ can become cumbersome. Since for a family $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ (which is seen as fixed from the outset, and has already been suppressed from the notation) this BLS structure is completely determined by θ , we shall simply denote it \mathcal{L}^θ .

PROPOSITION 4.15. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a holomorphic family of Hermitian vector bundles, fix $t_o \in B$, and let $\theta \subset T_X$ be any horizontal distribution. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_{t_o}$ there exists a smooth section $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}^\theta))$ such that if $u \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ represents $\mathbf{a}(\mathfrak{f})$ then*

$$\iota_{X_{t_o}}^* u = f \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_{X_{t_o}}^* (L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathcal{O}(T_B^{1,0})_{t_o}.$$

Proof. First note that by Proposition 3.12 $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u$ is independent of the choice of representative u and the horizontal lift ξ_τ^θ .

By [Vo-2007, Proposition 9.5] there exists an open set $U \subset B$ containing t_o and diffeomorphism $F := (\psi, p) : p^{-1}(U) \rightarrow X_{t_o} \times U$ that is tangent to the identity along t_o , such that for

each $x \in X_{t_o}$ the submanifold $U_x := F^{-1}(\{x\} \times U) \subset p^{-1}(U)$ is complex and $p|_{U_x} : U_x \rightarrow U$ is biholomorphic. And though it's not part of the statement in [Vo-2007, Proposition 9.5], F is holomorphic at the fiber X_{t_o} , i.e., if $x \in X_{t_o}$ and $h \in \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ then $\bar{\partial}(F^*h)((x, t_o)) = 0$. (Indeed, vanishing in the directions of $F^{-1}(\{x\} \times U)$ follows from the construction, while in the vertical directions the map is the identity.) Let θ be the integrable distribution on $p^{-1}(U)$ obtained from that tangent bundles T_{V_x} , $x \in X_{t_o}$, via the diffeomorphism F . We set $\Phi := F^{-1}$.

We show now that there is a smooth vector bundle isomorphism $\Psi : \Phi^*E \rightarrow p_1^*E_{t_o}$ such that $d\Psi(x)\bar{\xi}_r^\theta(x) = 0$ for all $x \in X_{t_o}$. The idea is similar to the proof of Ehresmann's Theorem: one defines vector fields on the total space of Φ^*E that project to constant vector fields on U . In order to get a vector bundle map, which is linear on fibers, one constructs vector fields that are linear on fibers. Fortunately the flows of vector fields that are linear on fibers cannot acquire enough vertical velocity to escape to infinity in finite time in the vertical direction. Thus lifts of constant vector fields (locally) on the base to vector fields on the vector bundle that are linear along fibers have flows by diffeomorphisms. The precise construction is as follows.

Fix a sufficiently small coordinate chart $U \subset B$ and holomorphic coordinates t on U such that t_o is the origin. Choose a finite open cover $\{O_1, \dots, O_N\}$ of X_{t_o} by open sets on which $p_1^*E_{t_o}$ is trivial, where $p_1 : X_t \times U \rightarrow X_t$ is the projection to the first factor, and let $U_i = O_i \times U$. Let $\{\chi_1, \dots, \chi_N\}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to $\{O_1, \dots, O_N\}$. We will not need local coordinates on X_{t_o} , but we take coordinates on the fibers by fixing trivializing frames for $p_1^*E_{t_o}$ over each U_j ; if U is small enough then such frames exist. We write $v_j = (v_j^1, \dots, v_j^r)$ for the components of a vector $v \in \Phi^*E$ in terms of these frames. We let $t_j = (t_j^1, \dots, t_j^m)$ be coordinates in the horizontal direction; they are the global coordinates t coming from the base U , but we keep the index because the corresponding constant vector fields $\frac{\partial}{\partial v_j^\nu}$ on the trivial vector bundle over the chart U_j depend on j . The transition functions for these coordinates on the total space of Φ^*E are

$$(x, t_j, v_j) = (x, t_k, F_{jk}(x, t_k)v_k),$$

where $F_{jk}(x, t_k)$ are invertible linear transformations that depend smoothly on x and t_k , and satisfy

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_k^\nu} F_{jk}(x, t_k) = 0$$

for all $1 \leq \nu \leq m$ and $x \in O_k$. Now define the vector fields

$$\xi_\nu^{(j)}(x, t_j, v_j) := \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j^\nu}.$$

Then on the fibers over $U_j \cap U_k$ one has

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_k^\nu} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j^\nu} + \frac{\partial(F_{jk}(x, t_k)v_k)^\mu}{\partial t_j^\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_j^\mu} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j^\nu} + \left(\frac{\partial F_{jk}(x, t_k)}{\partial t_j^\nu} F_{kj}(x, t_j)v_j \right)^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial v_j^\mu}.$$

Therefore on fibers over $U_j \cap U_k$ the difference of vector fields

$$\xi_\nu^{(k)}(x, t, F_{j,k}(x, t)v_j) - \xi_\nu^{(j)}(x, t, v_j)$$

is linear in v_j and holomorphic in t . It follows that the vector fields

$$\eta_\nu(v) := \sum_j \chi_j(x) \xi_\nu^{(j)}(x, t_j, v_j)$$

depend holomorphically on t and vary linearly in v in the fiber directions. By construction, these vector fields project onto the coordinate vector fields, and by integrating these vector fields we therefore get diffeomorphisms $\Psi_\nu^s \in \text{Diff}((\Phi^{-1})^*E)$ that are linear on fibers and that preserve the trivial family $X \times U \rightarrow U$. In fact, if $\phi : \Phi^*E \rightarrow X \times U$ is the vector bundle projection then $\phi\Psi_\nu^s(x, t, v) = (x, t + s)$. Consider the diffeomorphism $\Psi : p_1^*E_t \rightarrow (\Phi^{-1})^*E$ defined by

$$\Psi(v_o, t) := \Psi_1^{t_1} \circ \dots \circ \Psi_m^{t_m}(v_o)$$

yields a diffeomorphism that evidently satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\nu} \Psi(v_o, t) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu} \Psi(v_o, t) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\nu} \left(\prod_{\lambda=1}^{\nu-1} d\Psi^{t^\lambda} (\Psi_{\lambda+1}^{t^{\lambda+1}} \circ \dots \circ \Psi_m^{t^m}(v_o)) \right) \eta_\mu(\Psi_\mu^{t^\mu} \circ \dots \circ \Psi_m^{t^m}(v_o)), \end{aligned}$$

and since $\Psi_j^0 = \text{Id}$ we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\nu} \Psi(v_o, t) \right|_{t=0} = 0.$$

Finally, to get the desired section u , we take the constant extension of f in the trivial family and pull it back to an E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form via the diffeomorphisms Ψ and F . We need to check that $L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = 0$. Writing $u_o(x, t) := f(x)$ for the trivial extension of f , so that $u = F^* \Psi^* u_o$, our construction yields $\iota_{X_{t_o}}^* u = f$ and, at the points of X_{t_o} ,

$$L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} F^* \Psi^* \bar{\partial} u_o = F^* \Psi^* L_{\tau^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u_o = 0.$$

The proof is complete. \square

We can now collect all we have done into the following simple but important theorem. (See Definitions 2.33 and 2.37.i.)

THEOREM 4.16. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a proper holomorphic family of Hermitian holomorphic vector bundles and let $\theta \subset T_X$ be any horizontal distribution. Define the substalk bundle $\Sigma \subset \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{L}^\theta}$ by*

$$\Sigma_t := \left\{ \mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}) ; \iota_{X_t}^* u \in \mathcal{H}_t \text{ and } L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u = 0 \text{ for any } u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E)_t \text{ representing } \mathfrak{f} \right\}.$$

Then Σ is independent of θ and $(\mathcal{H}, \Sigma, \mathcal{L}^\theta)$ is an integrable iBLS field.

Proof. By Proposition 3.12.a Σ is well-defined and by Proposition 3.12.b Σ is independent of θ . By Proposition 4.14 $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}^\theta$ is a holomorphic subfield. By Proposition 4.15, every $f \in \mathcal{H}_t$ extends to a smooth section of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ that is holomorphic to second order at t . Therefore, by Proposition 3.12.c Σ formalizes $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}^\theta$. \square

4.3. Lift-independence of the relative curvature. For a choice of horizontal lift θ the curvature of the BLS field \mathcal{L}^θ is

$$\Theta^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} = \nabla^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} \nabla^{\mathcal{L}^\theta},$$

where $\nabla^{\mathcal{L}^\theta}$ denotes the Chern connection of \mathcal{L}^θ . One then has the relative curvature $\Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathcal{L}^\theta)}(\mathcal{H})$ (see Definition 2.37.iii) given by

$$\left(\Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathcal{L}^\theta)}(\mathcal{H})_{\sigma\bar{\tau}} f_1, f_2\right) := \left(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} f_1, f_2\right) - \left(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta/\mathcal{H}}(\sigma) f_1, \mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta/\mathcal{H}}(\tau) f_2\right), \quad t \in B, f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_t.$$

The next result is key to a natural definition of the curvature of the iBLS field $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$.

THEOREM 4.17. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a holomorphic family of vector bundles. If θ_1 and θ_2 are two horizontal lifts for p then*

$$\Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathcal{L}^{\theta_1})}(\mathcal{H}) = \Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathcal{L}^{\theta_2})}(\mathcal{H}).$$

The proof of Theorem 4.17 is given in Section 8, after an explicit formula for the Chern connection of \mathcal{L}^θ is obtained.

DEFINITION 4.18. The curvature of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ with its L^2 metric is

$$\Theta^{\mathcal{H}} := \Theta^{(\text{rel } \mathcal{L}^\theta)}(\mathcal{H}),$$

where θ is any horizontal lift for $p : X \rightarrow B$.

4.4. Positivity of curvature for section fields. In this section we import from [Va-2021] some multilinear algebra useful in the study of the curvature of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$.

4.4.1. Quadratic forms on 2-tensors. Positivity of the curvature $\Theta(\mathfrak{h})$ of a holomorphic vector bundle $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow B$ with metric \mathfrak{h} is a positivity property of the Hermitian form $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{\mathfrak{h}, \Theta(\mathfrak{h})}$ on the vector bundle $T_B^{1,0} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ defined in Paragraph 2.12. One can generalize the latter notion of positivity to any Hermitian quadratic form A on a tensor product of vector spaces $M \otimes F$. (We use the letters M and F to indicate that the first and second factors correspond respectively to vectors in the manifold and fiber.) The elements of $M \otimes F$ can be thought of as linear maps $M^* \rightarrow F$ (or $F^* \rightarrow M$), and as such have a well-defined notion of rank. One can then write $M \otimes F$ as an increasing union of subvarieties

$$\{0\} =: D_0(M \otimes F) \subset D_1(M \otimes F) \subset \dots \subset D_k(M \otimes F) \subset \dots,$$

where $D_k(M \otimes F)$ denotes the set of tensor of rank $\leq k$. Since the rank is at most $\min\{\dim M, \dim F\}$, the subvarieties $D_k(M \otimes F)$ stabilize. The sub-linearity of the rank also implies that

$$D_k(M \otimes F) + D_{k'}(M \otimes F) \subset D_{k+k'}(M \otimes F).$$

The subvarieties $D_k(M \otimes F)$ are cones, that are non-linear if $k \neq 0$ or $\min(\dim M, \dim F)$. Moreover, the generic element of $M \otimes F$ has maximal rank, i.e., $D_{\min(\dim M, \dim F)}(M \otimes F)$ is Zariski open.

DEFINITION 4.19. Let M and F be finite-dimensional vector spaces and suppose F is equipped with a Hermitian metric ϕ .

- a. A Hermitian quadratic form A on $M \times F$ is said to be k -positive if it is positive on $D_k(M \otimes F)$, i.e.,

$$D_k(M \otimes F) \ni \xi \mapsto A(\xi, \xi) \geq 0,$$

with equality if and only if $\xi = 0$. (If the latter is omitted, we say A is k -nonnegative.)

- b. A tensor $Q \in \text{Hom}(F, F) \otimes M \wedge \bar{M}$ is said to be Hermitian for ϕ if for all $\xi, \eta \in M$ the endomorphism $Q_{\xi\bar{\eta}} := \langle Q, \xi \otimes \bar{\eta} \rangle$ satisfies

$$\phi(Q_{\xi\bar{\eta}}v, w) = \phi(v, Q_{\xi\bar{\eta}}w).$$

- c. A Hermitian tensor $Q \in \text{Hom}(F, F) \otimes M \wedge \bar{M}$ is said to be k -positive in the sense of Demailly if the Hermitian quadratic form

$$(M \otimes F) \otimes (\bar{M} \otimes \bar{F}) \ni (\xi \otimes v, \bar{\eta} \otimes \bar{w}) \mapsto \{(\xi \otimes v, \bar{\eta} \otimes \bar{w})\}_{Q, \phi} := \phi(Q_{\xi\bar{\eta}}v, w)$$

is k -positive.

- d. A 1-positive Hermitian form is also called Griffiths-positive, and a Hermitian form that is k -positive for every $k \geq 1$ is also called Nakano-positive.

Thus the vector bundle $(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{h}) \rightarrow B$ has k -positive curvature in the sense of Demailly (Definition 2.40) if and only if its curvature $\Theta(\mathfrak{h})$ is k -positive in the sense of Demailly if and only if $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{\mathfrak{h}, \Theta(\mathfrak{h})}$ is k -positive.

These definitions can be extended to the infinite-rank case, but doing so requires some care. We shall not use these ideas in the infinite rank case.

4.4.2. Positivity for Schur complements. We wish to consider the situation in which the subspace M has a direct sum decomposition $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$. In this ‘split’ context we shall need a positivity statement that is best expressed in terms of the inertia map.

Recall that for a Hermitian vector space W with Hermitian metric h , one can associated to a Hermitian form Φ its *inertia endomorphism* $\mathfrak{I}(\Phi) = \mathfrak{I}_h(\Phi)$ defined by

$$h(\mathfrak{I}(\Phi)v, w) = \Phi(v, w).$$

The *inertia map* \mathfrak{I}_h is an isomorphism from the set of quadratic Hermitian forms on W onto the set of h -Hermitian endomorphisms of W .

We take the vector space W to be $M \otimes F$, where $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$. Suppose F has a Hermitian inner product ϕ as before, and assume M is equipped with a Hermitian inner product g such that M_1 and M_2 are g -orthogonal. (Write $g_i := g|_{M_i}$.) We equip $M \otimes F$ with the product metric $g \boxtimes \phi$. Then the inertia map $\mathfrak{I} = \mathfrak{I}_{g \boxtimes \phi}$ decomposes into four maps \mathfrak{I}_{ij} , $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$, such that for any Hermitian quadratic form Φ the maps

$$\mathfrak{I}_{ij}(\Phi) : M_i \otimes F \rightarrow M_j \otimes F$$

satisfy $\mathfrak{I}_{ij}(\Phi)^\dagger = \mathfrak{I}_{ji}(\Phi)$, where \dagger denotes Hermitian conjugation with respect to the relevant Hermitian metrics).

DEFINITION 4.20. The Schur complement of $(\Phi, M_1 \otimes F)$ is the Hermitian form on $M_1 \otimes F$ whose inertia map with respect to the metric $g_1 \boxtimes \phi$ is

$$\mathfrak{I}_{11}(\Phi) - \mathfrak{I}_{12}(\Phi)\mathfrak{I}_{22}(\Phi)^{-1}\mathfrak{I}_{21}(\Phi) : M_1 \otimes F \rightarrow M_1 \otimes F.$$

PROPOSITION 4.21. *Let Φ be a Demailly m -positive Hermitian form on $(M_1 \oplus M_2) \otimes F$ such that $\Phi|_{M_2 \otimes F}$ is Nakano-positive. Then the Schur complement of $(\Phi, M_1 \otimes F)$ is Demailly m -positive.*

Proof. Choose $f_i, f_j \in F$, and define $f_j^\dagger \in F^*$ by $f_j^\dagger f = \phi(f, f_j)$ for all $f \in F$. Also for $\xi \in M$ define $\xi^\dagger \in M^*$ by $\xi^\dagger \eta = g(\eta, \xi)$ for all $\eta \in M$. For $\xi_k = (\tau_k, w_k), \xi_\ell = (\tau_\ell, w_\ell) \in M = M_1 \oplus M_2$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(\xi_k \otimes f_i, \xi_\ell \otimes f_j) &= \tau_\ell^\dagger \left(f_j^\dagger \mathfrak{J}_{11} f_i \right) \tau_k + w_\ell^\dagger \left(f_j^\dagger \mathfrak{J}_{12} f_i \right) \tau_k + \tau_\ell^\dagger \left(f_j^\dagger \mathfrak{J}_{21} f_i \right) w_k + w_\ell^\dagger \left(f_j^\dagger \mathfrak{J}_{22} f_i \right) w_k \\ &= \tau_\ell^\dagger \left(f_j^\dagger \mathfrak{J}_{11} f_i \right) \tau_k + w_\ell^\dagger \left(f_j^\dagger \mathfrak{J}_{12} f_i \right) \tau_k + \tau_\ell^\dagger \left(f_j^\dagger \mathfrak{J}_{12}^\dagger f_i \right) w_k + w_\ell^\dagger \left(f_j^\dagger \mathfrak{J}_{22} f_i \right) w_k,\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds because $\mathfrak{J}(\Phi)$ is Hermitian. We can therefore define the $(1, 1)$ -form (a.k.a. sesquilinear form)

$$\Phi_{i\bar{j}}(\xi_k, \bar{\xi}_\ell) := \Phi(\xi_k \otimes f_i, \xi_\ell \otimes f_j)$$

Now let us take $w_k := -\mathfrak{J}_{22}(\Phi)^{-1} \mathfrak{J}_{21}(\Phi) \tau_k$, $1 \leq k \leq m$. Then

$$\Phi_{i\bar{j}}(\xi_k, \xi_\ell) = \tau_\ell^\dagger \otimes f_j^\dagger \left(\mathfrak{J}_{11}(\Phi) - \mathfrak{J}_{12}(\Phi) \mathfrak{J}_{22}^{-1}(\Phi) \mathfrak{J}_{21}(\Phi) \right) f_i \otimes \tau_k.$$

Setting $k = i$ and $\ell = j$, and then summing, we obtain

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^m \Phi_{i\bar{j}}(\xi_i, \bar{\xi}_j) = \sum_{i,j=1}^m \tau_j^\dagger \otimes f_j^\dagger \left(\mathfrak{J}_{11}(\Phi) - \mathfrak{J}_{12}(\Phi) \mathfrak{J}_{22}^{-1}(\Phi) \mathfrak{J}_{21}(\Phi) \right) f_i \otimes \tau_i,$$

and the result follows. \square

4.5. Semi-local descriptions of sections and representatives. For later computation it is useful to describe the actions of $\nabla^{1,0}$ and $\bar{\partial}^\theta$ in terms of the description of smooth sections of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$, locally over the base, as E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms on the total space X . We fix a local coordinate chart $U \subset B$ and write $p = (p^1, \dots, p^m)$ as in Remark 3.2. Fix a representative E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form u of a smooth section \mathfrak{f} of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$. Then $\nabla^{1,0}$ is an E -valued $(n+1, 0)$ -form, so there exist global $(n, 0)$ -forms ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_m in $p^{-1}(U)$ such that

$$(16) \quad \nabla^{1,0} u = dp^1 \wedge \phi_1 + \dots + dp^m \wedge \phi_m.$$

The forms ϕ_μ depend on the representative u , but their restrictions to the fibers, i.e.,

$$\iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu, \quad \mu = 1, \dots, m, \quad t \in U,$$

are uniquely determined by \mathfrak{f} , i.e., they are independent of the representative u of \mathfrak{f} .

For $\bar{\partial}$ the situation is just slightly more subtle. One has

$$(17) \quad \bar{\partial} u = \psi + dp^1 \wedge \alpha_1 + \dots + dp^m \wedge \alpha_m + d\bar{p}^1 \wedge \beta_{\bar{1}} + \dots + d\bar{p}^m \wedge \beta_{\bar{m}}$$

for some E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -forms $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ and E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms $\beta_{\bar{1}}, \dots, \beta_{\bar{m}}$ (that depend on the choice of local coordinates in B around t) and some $(n, 1)$ -form ψ . The forms $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \beta_{\bar{1}}, \dots, \beta_{\bar{m}}$ and ψ are not unique, but for each $t \in U$ the forms

$$\iota_{X_t}^* \left(\alpha_\mu + \xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \psi \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_{X_t}^* \left(\beta_{\bar{\mu}} + \bar{\xi}_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \psi \right), \quad \mu = 1, \dots, m,$$

are uniquely determined.

The expression for $\bar{\partial}$ gets slightly simpler if one is looking at sections of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$. (The case of sections of \mathcal{H} was explained in Remark 4.9, but we collect it here again for convenience.)

PROPOSITION 4.22. *Let $E \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a holomorphic family of holomorphic vector bundles and let $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{L})$. Let $u \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ be a representative of \mathfrak{f} . Fix a coordinate neighborhood $U \subset B$ and write $p = (p^1, \dots, p^m)$ in these coordinates.*

- a. *For some $t \in U$ one has $\mathfrak{f}(t) \in \mathcal{H}_t$ if and only if $\iota_{X_t}^* \psi = 0$ in (17).*

- b. The section \mathfrak{f} of \mathcal{L} restricts to a section of \mathcal{H} over U if and only if for any (and hence every) representative u one has (17) with $\psi \equiv 0$.
- c. The section \mathfrak{f} of \mathcal{L} is a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{H}|_U$ if and only if for any (and hence every) representative u one has (17) with $\psi \equiv 0$, $\beta_{\bar{\nu}} \equiv 0$, $1 \leq \nu \leq m$.

Proof. Since $\iota_{X_t}^* \psi = \iota_{X_t}^* \bar{\partial}u = \bar{\partial}\iota_{X_t}^* u$, (a) follows. From (a) we see that \mathfrak{f} restricts to a section of \mathcal{H} over U if and only if $\iota_{X_t}^* \psi = 0$ for every $t \in U$. We claim that the latter holds if and only if $\psi = dp^\mu \wedge \alpha'_\mu + d\bar{p}^\nu \wedge \beta'_\nu$ for some E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -forms α'_μ and E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms β'_ν , $1 \leq \mu, \nu \leq m$. Indeed, this is clearly true locally (but with the global forms dp^μ and $d\bar{p}^\nu$, $1 \leq \mu, \nu \leq m$), and the local coefficient forms may be patched together using a partition of unity. This proves (b). Finally, suppose \mathfrak{f} is a section of \mathcal{H} over U . By (b) we can write $\bar{\partial}u = dp^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu + d\bar{p}^\nu \wedge \beta_\nu$. Then \mathfrak{f} is a holomorphic section if and only if for each $1 \leq \mu \leq m$ and every lift ξ_μ of the $(1, 0)$ -vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}$ on U one has

$$0 = \bar{\xi}_\mu \lrcorner \bar{\partial}u = \beta_{\bar{\mu}} - d\bar{p}^\nu \wedge (\bar{\xi}_\mu \lrcorner \beta_{\bar{\nu}}).$$

Thus $\iota_{X_t}^* \beta_{\bar{\mu}} \equiv 0$ for all $t \in U$. But for an $(n, 0)$ -form we already know that this condition is equivalent to the existence of a decomposition $\beta_{\bar{\mu}} = dt^\nu \wedge \gamma_{\nu\bar{\mu}}$, which proves (c). \square

We emphasize that the forms ϕ_μ associated to $\nabla^{1,0}u$ and $\alpha_\mu, \beta_{\bar{\mu}}$, and ψ associated to $\bar{\partial}u$ are *global* on the preimage $p^{-1}(U)$ of the coordinate chart U .

5. LOCAL TRIVIALITY

5.1. L^2 Extension. The question of local triviality of vector bundles like $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ has been of interest since the beginning of the theory of deformations of complex manifolds introduced by Kodaira and Spencer. The traditional approach is based on the observation that if the dimensions of the fibers are constant then the fibration is locally trivial.

While this perspective is broad in its scope, its application can be very difficult in most cases. But a new approach has become very popular in the past two decades or so. It is well-known that the dimensions of the fibers of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ vary upper semi-continuously with the point of the base B . Thus to prove local triviality, one need only prove lower semi-continuity of these dimensions. The latter is a consequence of the existence of linear extension operators. A powerful tool that has many other applications is the Ohsawa-Takegoshi Theory of L^2 -Extension. This theory consists of a huge and growing collection of extension theorems obtained by L^2 methods of one kind or another. For applications in the present article the following result can be used.

THEOREM 5.1. *Let Y be a weakly pseudoconvex Kähler manifold of complex dimension N , let $Z \subset Y$ be a closed complex submanifold of codimension 1, and let $E \rightarrow Y$ be a holomorphic vector bundle. Assume there exist smooth Hermitian metrics h for E and $e^{-\lambda}$ for the line bundle $L_Z \rightarrow Y$ associated to Z , a holomorphic section $T \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}(L_Z))$ whose zero divisor is Z counting multiplicity, and a number $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_Y |T|^2 e^\lambda \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{-1}\Theta(h) \geq \delta \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\lambda \otimes \text{Id}_E \geq 0.$$

Then for every holomorphic section $f \in H^0(Z, \mathcal{O}(K_Z \otimes E|_Z))$ such that

$$\int_Z \sqrt{-1}^{(N-1)^2} \langle f \wedge \bar{f}, h \rangle < +\infty$$

there exists $F \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}(K_Y \otimes E \otimes L_Z))$ such that

$$F|_Z = f \wedge dT \quad \text{and} \quad \int_Y \sqrt{-1}^{N^2} \langle F \wedge \bar{F}, h \otimes e^{-\lambda} \rangle \leq C_\delta \int_Z \sqrt{-1}^{(N-1)^2} \langle f \wedge \bar{f}, h \rangle.$$

If the manifold Y in Theorem 5.1 is compact Kähler then perhaps the shortest proof of Theorem 5.1 is via Berndtsson's method of currents; see the appendix of [B-2009] in the case in which E has rank 1. A proof in the higher rank case can be found in [R-2014]. A different proof, based on a beautiful and slightly more recent construction of Berndtsson and Lempert [BL-2016], can be found in [Va-2021].

5.2. Sufficient conditions for local triviality. We start with Berndtsson's local triviality result mentioned in the introduction.

PROPOSITION 5.2. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a proper Kähler family of holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles. If the metric h has non-negative curvature in the sense of Nakano then \mathcal{H} is a holomorphic vector bundle.*

Proof. Any of the L^2 extension theorems mentioned in the previous paragraph imply that the dimensions of the fibers \mathcal{H}_t vary lower semicontinuously with t . Upper semicontinuity, which holds for all smooth metrics h regardless of their curvature, is a consequence of Montel's Theorem. \square

COROLLARY 5.3. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a proper Kähler family of holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles. If for each $t \in B$ the restriction metric h_t for $E|_{X_t}$ has positive curvature in the sense of Nakano then \mathcal{H} is a holomorphic vector bundle.*

Proof. We may assume that the base B is the unit ball and that the metric h is defined up to the boundary of X . Then for $M \gg 0$ the metric $h_M := e^{-M|t|^2} h$ for $E \rightarrow X$ has Nakano-positive curvature, and hence by Proposition 5.2 the associated Hilbert field $\mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow B$ is locally trivial. But the underlying vector bundles for \mathcal{H}_M and \mathcal{H} are the same. \square

5.3. Examples of Non-locally trivial \mathcal{H} . There are many examples of smooth proper holomorphic families $E \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ for which $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is not locally trivial.

Trivial family of manifolds. The simplest examples come from trivial holomorphic families $p : X_o \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ with X_o a compact Riemann surface of genus $g \geq 1$ together with a non-trivial family of holomorphic line bundles $E \rightarrow X_o \times \mathbb{D}$, where \mathbb{D} denotes the unit disk. The examples are based on the following simple

Fact: *There is no meromorphic function on X_o with exactly one pole, whose order is 1.*

Indeed, since the number of preimages of any point under a holomorphic map of compact Riemann surfaces is independent of the point, the existence of such a meromorphic function would yield an isomorphism $X_o \cong \mathbb{P}_1$, which is impossible.

It follows that the line bundle L_D associated to the divisor $D = p - q$ is either trivial, i.e., $p = q$, in which case $H^0(X_o, \mathcal{O}(L_D)) = \mathbb{C}$, or else $p \neq q$, in which case $H^0(X_o, \mathcal{O}_{X_o}(L_D)) = \{0\}$. Indeed, suppose $p \neq q$ and $s \in H^0(X_o, \mathcal{O}(L_D))$. Let s_D be a meromorphic section with divisor D . If s does not vanish at p then the function s/s_D is meromorphic with exactly one pole, which is impossible. Therefore s vanishes at p , in which case s/s_D is holomorphic, hence constant. But s/s_D vanishes at q , so $s/s_D \equiv 0$. Hence $s = 0$ as claimed.

Now let $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow X_o$ be an injective holomorphic map with $f(0) = p$ and consider the holomorphic family of line bundles $E_f \rightarrow X_o \times \mathbb{D}$ defined by

$$E_f := K_{X_o \times \mathbb{D}}^* \otimes L_{D_f},$$

where D_f is the divisor on $X_o \times \mathbb{D}$ defined by

$$D_f := \{p\} \times \mathbb{D} - \{(f(t), t) ; t \in \mathbb{D}\}$$

and $p_1 : X_o \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow X_o$ is the Cartesian projection. Then

$$\mathcal{H}_t = H^0(X_o, \mathcal{O}(L_{p-f(t)})) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & , t = 0 \\ \{0\} & , t \in \mathbb{D} - \{0\} \end{cases} .$$

Thus $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ is not locally trivial.

Nontrivial families of manifolds. Another very simple example is constructed as follows. Let $\mathbf{H} \subset \mathbb{C}$ denote the (open) upper half plane and consider the family of tori

$$X := (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbf{H}) / \sim,$$

where $(z, t) \sim (\zeta, \tau) \iff t = \tau$ and $\zeta = m + nt$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Of course $p : X \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ is the map induced by the projection $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$. The fibers X_t are of course tori, which we identify with the quotient $\mathbb{C}/(\mathbb{Z} + t\mathbb{Z})$.

Let D_a denote the smooth hypersurface on X obtained from $\{a\} \times \mathbf{H} \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbf{H}$ after passing to the quotient. We take E to be the line bundle associated to the divisor $D := D_0 - D_{\sqrt{-1}}$. The two smooth hypersurfaces D_0 and $D_{\sqrt{-1}}$ intersect at the points $[(0, t)] \in X$ whenever $m + nt = \sqrt{-1}$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (such t form a closed discrete subset of \mathbf{H}), but are otherwise disjoint. Denote by $B \subset \mathbf{H}$ the set of such t . Then the divisors $\Delta_t := D \cap X_t$ are trivial if $t \in B$, and otherwise are $[0] - [t]$.

Since the canonical bundle of any torus is trivial, we see that

$$\mathcal{H}_t = H^0(X_t, \mathcal{O}(E_t)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & , t \in B \\ \{0\} & , t \in \mathbf{H} \setminus B \end{cases} .$$

6. ELEMENTS OF HODGE THEORY

The twisted Laplace Beltrami operator for a Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle (E, h) on a Hermitian manifold (X, g) is

$$\square := \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial};$$

while the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator depends only on X and E , and not on the metrics, the formal adjoint $\bar{\partial}^*$ does carry information about the metrics g and h . In particular, the Kernel

$$\text{Harm}(g, h) = \bigoplus_{0 \leq p, q \leq n} \text{Harm}^{p, q}(g, h)$$

depends on these metrics.

6.1. The Hodge Theorem. The Hodge Theorem can be stated as follows.

THEOREM 6.1 (Hodge Theorem for Vector Bundle-valued Forms). *Let (X, g) be a compact complex Hermitian manifold and let $(E, h) \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic Hermitian vector bundle. Then the vector spaces $\text{Harm}^{p,q}(g, h)$ are finite dimensional and consist of smooth E -valued (p, q) -forms. Moreover, with*

$$\wp_{p,q} : L_{p,q}^2(g, h) \rightarrow \text{Harm}^{p,q}(g, h)$$

denoting the orthogonal projection, there exists a compact self-adjoint collection of operators

$$G_{p,q} : L_{p,q}^2(g, h) \rightarrow L_{p,q}^2(g, h), \quad 0 \leq p, q \leq n,$$

called the Green operator, such that

- (a) $G_{p,q} W_{p,q}^{s,2}(X) \subset W_{p,q}^{s+2,2}(X)$ for all $s \geq 0$,
- (b) $G_{p,q} \text{Harm}^{p,q}(g, h) = 0$, $[G, \bar{\partial}] = [G, \bar{\partial}^*] = 0$ and $\|G_{p,q}\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{p,q}^1}$, where $\lambda_{p,q}^1$ is the smallest positive eigenvalue of \square in $L_{p,q}^2(g, h)$, and
- (c) one has the orthogonal decomposition $\text{Id} = \wp_{p,q} + \square G_{p,q}$ on $L_{p,q}^2(g, h)$.

The most well-known application of the Hodge Theorem is the following theorem.

THEOREM 6.2 (Fundamental Theorem of Hodge Theory). *Let X be a compact complex manifold equipped with a smooth Hermitian metric g and let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle equipped with a smooth Hermitian metric h . Each cohomology class $\mathbf{a} \in H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X, E)$ contains exactly one harmonic form, i.e., $\mathbf{a} \cap \text{Harm}^{p,q}(g, h)$ consists of exactly one element.*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathbf{a}$ be a smooth $\bar{\partial}$ -closed E -valued (p, q) -form. Then $\alpha_{\perp} := \alpha - \wp_{p,q} \alpha$ is smooth and $\bar{\partial}$ -closed, and moreover $\alpha_{\perp} \perp \text{Harm}^{p,q}(g, h)$. By Theorem 6.1 the form $\beta := G_{p,q} \alpha_{\perp}$ satisfies $\square \beta = \alpha_{\perp}$. But then

$$0 = (\bar{\partial} \alpha_{\perp}, \bar{\partial} \beta) = (\bar{\partial} \square \beta, \bar{\partial} \beta) = (\bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \beta, \bar{\partial} \beta) = \|\bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \beta\|^2 = 0,$$

so that $\alpha_{\perp} = \bar{\partial}(\bar{\partial}^* \beta)$. In particular, α_{\perp} is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact, and hence $\wp_{p,q} \alpha$ is a harmonic representative in \mathbf{a} . If $\eta \in \mathbf{a}$ is another harmonic form then $\theta := \eta - \wp_{p,q} \alpha$ is harmonic and $\bar{\partial}$ -exact, say $\theta = \bar{\partial} \mu$. But then $0 = (\bar{\partial}^* \theta, \mu) = (\bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \mu, \mu) = \|\bar{\partial} \mu\|^2$, and hence $\eta = \wp_{p,q} \alpha$. \square

From the Chern connection $\nabla = \nabla^{1,0} + \bar{\partial}$ one defines the $\nabla^{1,0}$ -Laplacian

$$\square^{1,0} := \nabla^{1,0} \nabla^{1,0*} + \nabla^{1,0*} \nabla^{1,0}$$

and its associated Green operator $G^{1,0}$ (whose action on (p, q) -forms will be unfortunately denoted $G_{p,q}^{1,0}$; we shall eliminate the subscript whenever there is no confusion). An analogous Hodge Theorem holds for $\square^{1,0}$.

6.2. Kähler manifolds. Suppose X is a Kähler manifold and ω is a Kähler form on X . Let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle. An E -valued (p, q) -forms may also be seen as a section of the vector bundle $\Lambda_X^{p,q} \otimes E \rightarrow X$. The latter vector bundle is not holomorphic unless $q = 0$, but there is a smooth isomorphism

$$\Lambda_X^{p,q} \otimes E \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\omega}} \Lambda_X^{p,0} \otimes \Lambda^q(T_X^{1,0}) \otimes E$$

obtained from the identification of $(1, 0)$ -vectors and $(0, 1)$ -forms via the Kähler metric, given by $T_X^{1,0} \ni v \mapsto v \lrcorner \omega \in T_X^{*,0,1}$. Then one defines

$$\bar{\mathfrak{d}} := \Phi_{\omega}^{-1} \bar{\partial} \Phi_{\omega} : \Gamma(X, \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Lambda_X^{p,q} \otimes E)) \rightarrow \Gamma(X, \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Lambda_X^{0,1} \otimes \Lambda_X^{p,q} \otimes E))$$

and with the induced L^2 inner products one defines the formal adjoint $\bar{\partial}^*$, and consequently the Bochner-Kodaira Laplacian $\bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}$ (also called the *rough Laplacian* in differential geometry circles). So far nothing about the Kähler nature of X has been used, but the next identity relies heavily on the Kähler assumption.

THEOREM 6.3 (Bochner-Kodaira Identity). *Let X be a Kähler manifold with Kähler metric g and let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle with Hermitian metric h . One has the identity*

$$\square = \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} + \Theta(h \otimes g^{(p)} \otimes \det g)^\sharp \lrcorner,$$

where $g^{(p)}$ and $\det(g)$ are the metrics induced on $\Lambda_X^{p,0}$ and K_X^* respectively, and for a vector-bundle-valued $(1,1)$ -form $A \in \Gamma(X, \Lambda_X^{1,1} \otimes \text{Hom}(F, F))$ we denote by A^\sharp the $T_X^{1,0} \otimes \text{Hom}(F, F)$ -valued $(1,0)$ -form obtained by raising with respect to the Kähler metric.

One can also carry out the same procedure for the $(1,0)$ -Laplacian

$$\square^{1,0} := \nabla^{1,0} \nabla^{1,0*} + \nabla^{1,0*} \nabla^{1,0},$$

and define the operator $\mathfrak{d} = \Phi_\omega^{-1} \nabla^{1,0} \Phi_\omega$. The corresponding identity is

$$\square^{1,0} = \mathfrak{d}^*\mathfrak{d} + \Theta(h \otimes g^{(p)} \otimes \det g)^\sharp \lrcorner,$$

where \sharp corresponds to the raising of a $(1,0)$ -form to a $(0,1)$ -vector field. One can then show [Si-1982] that

$$(18) \quad \square - \square^{1,0} = [\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h), \Lambda_\omega],$$

where Λ_ω is the L^2 -adjoint of the so-called *Lefschetz operator*

$$L_\omega : \alpha \mapsto \omega \wedge \alpha.$$

Alternatively, one can arrive at (18) by using the (twisted) *Hodge identities*

$$[\bar{\partial}^*, L_\omega] = \sqrt{-1}\nabla^{1,0} \quad \text{and} \quad [\nabla^{1,0*}, L_\omega] = -\sqrt{-1}\bar{\partial},$$

and their adjoints

$$[\Lambda_\omega, \bar{\partial}] = -\sqrt{-1}\nabla^{1,0*} \quad \text{and} \quad [\Lambda_\omega, \nabla^{1,0}] = \sqrt{-1}\bar{\partial}^*.$$

REMARK. If $\Theta(h) = 0$ or $(p, q) = (n, 0)$ then by (18) one has $\square = \square^{1,0}$ and $G_{p,q} = G_{p,q}^{1,0}$. \diamond

6.3. Pointwise Lefschetz Theory. In the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4 primitive twisted forms play a central role. In the present paragraph we recall some basic facts about these forms, and the general Lefschetz Theory.

6.3.1. Classical, untwisted case. The properties of the Lefschetz operator have a profound role in the study of Kähler manifolds. We summarize a few of these features here, but these can be found in many texts; a few excellent sources are [GH-1978], [H-2005] and [Vo-2007].

The starting point is the commutation relation

$$(19) \quad [L_\omega, \Lambda_\omega]u = (p + q - n)u, \quad u \in \Gamma(X, \Lambda_X^{p,q}).$$

Thus $[[L_\omega, \Lambda_\omega], L_\omega] = 2L_\omega$ and $[[L_\omega, \Lambda_\omega], \Lambda_\omega] = -2\Lambda_\omega$. Consequently for any point $x \in X$ the operators $X := L_\omega$, $Y := \Lambda_\omega$ and $H := [L_\omega, \Lambda_\omega]$ form a representation of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ on $\Lambda_{X,x}^{p,q}$. The theory of finite-dimensional representations of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is relatively simple, and a central result is that in every finite-dimensional irreducible representation the Kernel of Y is 1-dimensional and the representation is spanned by the images of this kernel under X^k , $k = 0, 1, \dots$. A

non-zero vector in the kernel of Y is called a *lowest weight vector*, or a *primitive* vector. One shows that if $u \in \Gamma(X, \Lambda_X^{p,q})$ and $\Lambda_\omega u = 0$ then $L_\omega^{n+1-(p+q)}u = 0$. All of this leads to the so-called Lefschetz decomposition of forms:

PROPOSITION 6.4 (Lefschetz Decomposition). *Let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold and let $k \in \{0, \dots, 2n\}$. For every k -form α on X there exist unique primitive $(k - 2j)$ -forms α_j , $\max(0, n - k) \leq j \leq k$, such that*

$$\alpha = \sum_j L_\omega^j \alpha_j.$$

Moreover, the summands are pointwise pairwise orthogonal.

The metric induced on $(k, 0)$ -forms by the Kähler form has a particularly simple form: one has the identity

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \frac{\omega^n}{n!} = \sqrt{-1}^{k^2} \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta} \wedge \frac{\omega^{n-k}}{(n-k)!}.$$

This identity does not persist for k forms, $k \leq n$, of more general bi-degree, but remarkably it *almost* holds for primitive forms: the right hand side is either equal to the left hand side or to its negative. The result is known as the Hodge-Riemann Bilinear Relations.

THEOREM 6.5 (Hodge-Riemann Bilinear Relations). *Let (X, ω) be a Kähler manifold of complex dimension n . If α is a (p, q) -form with $p + q \leq n$ and $\Lambda_\omega \alpha = 0$ then*

$$\sqrt{-1}^{(p+q)^2} \alpha \wedge \bar{\alpha} \wedge \frac{\omega^{n-(p+q)}}{(n-(p+q))!} = (-1)^q \langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle \frac{\omega^n}{n!}.$$

REMARK. Of greatest interest to us is the case $(p, q) = (n - 1, 1)$, in which the pairing

$$\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta} = - \langle \alpha, \bar{\beta} \rangle \frac{\omega^n}{n!}$$

is negative definite on primitive $(n - 1, 1)$ -forms. \diamond

A form ω is a Kähler form if and only if it is real and commutes with the Lefschetz operator. Thus on a Kähler manifold the Lefschetz operator induces a well-defined map on Dolbeault cohomology.

But in addition, the observation that on a Kähler manifold the Lefschetz operator L_ω and the $\bar{\partial}$ -Laplacian \square commute yields profound cohomological consequences. Indeed, L_ω preserves the harmonic spaces, so by focusing on the primitive harmonic forms one can extend the pointwise Lefschetz theory just discussed to the setting of cohomology via the Fundamental Theorem of Hodge Theory: one says that a Dolbeault class ϕ is *primitive* if its unique harmonic representative is a primitive form.

Though it seems to be less commonly done in the algebraic geometry literature, one may also describe primitive Dolbeault cohomology classes in more Dolbeault-cohomological terms, i.e., without reference to harmonic forms. In fact, since ω commutes with $\bar{\partial}$, a Dolbeault (p, q) -class ϕ is primitive if and only if for any $\alpha \in \phi$ the form $\omega^{n+1-(p+q)} \wedge \alpha$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. It is this equivalent way of defining primitive cohomology that allows the definition to extend to the twisted setting. Indeed, in the twisted setting a primitive harmonic form always defines a primitive cohomology class: if $k \leq n$ and α is a primitive harmonic k -form then $\omega^{n+1-k} \wedge (\alpha + \bar{\partial}\beta) = \bar{\partial}(\omega^{n-k+1} \wedge \beta)$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. However, in the twisted setting the harmonic representative of a primitive Dolbeault class is not a primitive form. (See Remark 6.8.)

REMARK 6.6. One can define the pointwise *Hodge-Riemann pairing*

$$Q(\alpha, \beta) := \frac{1}{(n-k)!} \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \omega^{n-k}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \Lambda_X^k$$

and its integrated version

$$\mathcal{Q}(\alpha, \beta) := \frac{1}{(n-k)!} \int_X \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \omega^{n-k}.$$

The (integrated) Hodge-Riemann pairing $\mathcal{Q}(\alpha, \beta)$ depends only on the $\bar{\partial}$ -cohomology classes $[\alpha]$ and $[\beta]$, and at the level of Dolbeault cohomology this intersection form is nondegenerate.

The Hodge Index Theorem determines the index of the bilinear form \mathcal{Q} on the cohomology of X . This index can be computed by exploiting the Lefschetz Decomposition and the Hodge-Riemann Bilinear Relations. But in using the latter one has to exercise some caution: while $\mathcal{Q}(\alpha, \beta)$ is well-defined on Dolbeault cohomology, $\mathcal{Q}(\alpha, \bar{\beta})$ is not. However, if one chooses the *harmonic* representative then things work out well, which might explain why most algebraic geometry references focus on harmonic primitive forms rather than primitive Dolbeault classes. \diamond

6.3.2. Twisted case. Now consider the twisted setting of forms with values in a holomorphic Hermitian vector bundle $E \rightarrow X$ with Hermitian metric h . Because twisted forms are sections of $\Lambda_X^* \otimes E \rightarrow X$ and the Lefschetz operator acts only on the first factor, one can define primitive forms in exactly the same way as in the flat, or untwisted, case.

DEFINITION 6.7. Let (X, ω) be a Kähler manifold of complex dimension n , let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle, and fix integers $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $p + q \leq n$.

- a. A Dolbeault class $C \in H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X, E)$ is *primitive* if for every $\alpha \in C$ the E -valued $(n+1-q, n+1-p)$ -form $\alpha \wedge \omega^{n+1-(p+q)}$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.
- b. An E -valued form α of degree $k \leq n$ is *primitive* if $\alpha \wedge \omega^{n+1-k} = 0$, or equivalently if $\Lambda_g \alpha = 0$.

REMARK 6.8. In the untwisted case, if C is a primitive Dolbeault class then its harmonic representative is necessarily primitive. Indeed, if $\alpha_o \in C$ is harmonic then $\alpha_o \wedge \omega^{n+1-k}$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact and harmonic, and must therefore vanish. Thus an untwisted Dolbeault class is primitive if and only if it contains a primitive form.

In the twisted setting the harmonic representative of a primitive Dolbeault class C need no longer be primitive. The argument above breaks down because

$$L_\omega \square = \square L_\omega + \Theta(h),$$

so the Lefschetz operator no longer preserves harmonicity. Nevertheless there does exist at least one primitive form in C . The argument is not difficult, but for maximum simplicity (and since it is the only case we use) we present it in the case where C is of bidegree $(n-1, 1)$. If $u_o \in C$ then one has $\omega \wedge u_o = \bar{\partial}\phi$. Now, ϕ has bidegree $(n, 1)$, and thus there exists a twisted $(n-1, 0)$ -form ψ such that $\omega \wedge \psi = \phi$. Indeed, one can take $\psi = -\Lambda_\omega \phi$ and use (19). Now simply take $u = u_o - \bar{\partial}\psi$. Then $\omega \wedge u = \bar{\partial}\phi - \omega \wedge \bar{\partial}\psi = 0$ because L_ω commutes with $\bar{\partial}$.

For forms of degree $k < n$ the argument is similar, but in order to solve the equation $\omega^{n+1-k} \wedge u_o = \bar{\partial}\phi$ one must use the commutation relation (19) in a more clever way. \diamond

The Lefschetz Decomposition Theorem 6.4 immediately extends to twisted forms.

PROPOSITION 6.9 (Twisted Lefschetz Decomposition). *Let (X, ω) be a Kähler manifold and let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle. Let $k \in \{0, \dots, 2n\}$. For every E -valued k -form α on X there exist unique primitive $(k - 2j)$ -forms α_j , $\max(0, n - k) \leq j \leq k$, such that*

$$\alpha = \sum_j \omega^j \wedge \alpha_j.$$

Moreover, the summands are pointwise pairwise orthogonal.

There is also a version of the pointwise Hodge-Riemann Bilinear Relations.

PROPOSITION 6.10. *Let $E \rightarrow X, h$ be a Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle on a compact Kähler manifold (X, ω) . If an E -valued (p, q) -form α is primitive then*

$$\frac{\sqrt{-1}^{(p+q)^2}}{(n - (p + q))!} \langle \alpha \wedge \bar{\alpha} \wedge \omega^{n-(p+q)}, h \rangle = \sqrt{-1}^{p-q} |\alpha|_{g,h}^2 dV_\omega.$$

Partial proof. We prove the result in the simplest special case $(p, q) = (n - 1, 1)$. The simplest proof we know uses Kähler coordinates vanishing at a point $x \in X$: in these coordinates

$$\omega(x) = \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} |z|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(x) = \alpha_{i\bar{j}}(x) dz^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{dz^i} \wedge \dots \wedge dz^n \wedge d\bar{z}^j$$

for some $\alpha_{i\bar{j}}(x) \in E_x$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Then α is primitive if and only if $\alpha_{i\bar{j}}(x) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \alpha \wedge \bar{\alpha}, h \rangle &= h(\alpha_{i\bar{i}}(x), \alpha_{j\bar{j}}(x)) dz^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{dz^i} \wedge \dots \wedge dz^n \wedge d\bar{z}^i \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{d\bar{z}^j} \wedge \dots \wedge d\bar{z}^n \wedge dz^j \\ &= \delta^{i\bar{j}} h(\alpha_{i\bar{i}}(x), \alpha_{j\bar{j}}(x)) \frac{dV(z)}{\sqrt{-1}^n (-1)^{n(n+1)/2}} = -\delta^{i\bar{j}} h(\alpha_{i\bar{i}}(x), \alpha_{j\bar{j}}(x)) \frac{dV(z)}{\sqrt{-1}^{n^2}}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle \alpha \wedge \bar{\alpha}, h \rangle = -|\alpha|_{g,h}^2 dV_\omega$, as claimed. \square

REMARK. The general case is proved using Weil's Formula for the Hodge star operator. See [Vo-2007, Proposition 6.29]. \diamond

REMARK. In the twisted setting the pointwise Hodge-Riemann pairing $Q(\alpha, \beta)$ is an $E \otimes E$ -valued (n, n) -form, so the integrated form of the Hodge-Riemann pairing \mathcal{Q} no longer makes sense. To the best of our knowledge there is no obvious twisted analogue of the Hodge Index Theorem. \diamond

6.4. Solutions of the $\bar{\partial}$ Equation with minimal L^2 -norm. The Hodge Theorem yields solutions of the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation with estimates. The statement is the following.

PROPOSITION 6.11. *Let X be a compact complex manifold equipped with a smooth Hermitian metric g , let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle equipped with a smooth Hermitian metric h , and let $q \geq 1$. For every $\bar{\partial}$ -closed E -valued (p, q) -form α such that $\wp_{p,q} \alpha = 0$ there exists a unique E -valued $(p, q - 1)$ -form u_o such that*

$$(20) \quad \bar{\partial} u_o = \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_o\|^2 = \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{p,q} \otimes E))} \frac{|(\alpha, \gamma)|^2}{\|\bar{\partial} \gamma\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^* \gamma\|^2}.$$

The L^2 -norm of any other solution u of the equation $\bar{\partial} u = \alpha$ is larger.

Proof. Let H_o be the collection of smooth E -valued (p, q) -forms that are orthogonal to $\text{Kernel}(\square)$ and let H be the Hilbert space closure of H_o with respect to the norm

$$\|\gamma\|_H^2 := \|\bar{\partial}\gamma\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*\gamma\|^2.$$

The latter is a norm because by the Hodge Theorem there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $(\square\gamma, \gamma) \geq c\|\gamma\|^2$ for all $\gamma \in H$. Let $\lambda(\gamma) := (\alpha, \gamma)$. Then $\lambda \in H^*$ and

$$\|\lambda\|_{H^*}^2 = C := \sup_{\gamma \in H_o} \frac{|(\alpha, \gamma)|^2}{\|\bar{\partial}\gamma\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*\gamma\|^2}.$$

By the Riesz Representation Theorem there exists $\beta \in H$ such that $\|\beta\|_H = \|\lambda\|_{H^*}$ and $\lambda(\gamma) = (\beta, \gamma)_H$. The latter means precisely that $\square\beta = \alpha$ (in the weak sense). Since $\bar{\partial}\alpha = 0$,

$$0 = (\bar{\partial}\square\beta, \bar{\partial}\beta) = (\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}\beta, \bar{\partial}\beta) = \|\bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}\beta\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 = (\bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}\beta, \beta) = \|\bar{\partial}\beta\|^2,$$

so $\square\beta = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*\beta$. Therefore $u_o := \bar{\partial}^*\beta$ solves the equation $\bar{\partial}u_o = \alpha$, and $\|u_o\|^2 = \|\beta\|_H^2 = C$. Finally, since $u_o = \bar{\partial}^*\beta$, u_o is orthogonal to the kernel of $\bar{\partial}$, and hence is the unique solution of minimal norm. The proof is complete. \square

COROLLARY 6.12. *Let X, E, g, h and α be as in Proposition 6.11.*

i. *There exists a solution u of the equation $\bar{\partial}u = \alpha$ such that*

$$\|u\|^2 \leq (\lambda_{p,q}^1)^{-1} \|\alpha\|^2,$$

where $\lambda_{p,q}^1$ is the smallest positive eigenvalue of $\square : L_{p,q}^2(g, h) \rightarrow L_{p,q}^2(g, h)$.

ii. *Moreover, if the metric g is Kähler and the endomorphism*

$$A := \Theta(h \otimes g^{(p)} \otimes \det(g))^\sharp \lrcorner$$

(c.f. Theorem 6.3) is positive semi-definite, $\alpha \perp \text{Kernel}(A)$ almost everywhere on the support of α , and $(A^{-1}\alpha, \alpha) < +\infty$ then there exists an E -valued $(p, q - 1)$ -form u satisfying the Demailly-Skoda-Hörmander Estimate

$$\|u\|^2 \leq (A^{-1}\alpha, \alpha)$$

such that $\bar{\partial}u = \alpha$. Consequently

$$(G\alpha, \alpha) \leq (A^{-1}\alpha, \alpha).$$

Proof. By Proposition 6.11 the Hodge Theorem and the minimal solution is $u_o = G\bar{\partial}^*\alpha$. Then

$$\|u_o\|^2 = (G\bar{\partial}^*\alpha, G\bar{\partial}^*\alpha) = (G\alpha, \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*G\alpha) = (G\alpha, \alpha).$$

Thus i follows because $G = (\square|_{\text{Harm}^\perp})^{-1}$, and ii follows from the existence of a solution u with the estimate $\|u\|^2 \leq (A^{-1}\alpha, \alpha)$; a consequence of Skoda's and Demailly's modifications of Hörmander's L^2 estimate. \square

6.5. The Bergman projection and the Neumann operator. For a general family $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$, i.e., not necessarily proper, with h smooth (also not necessary, but some regularity may be required) the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_t are closed Hilbert subspaces of \mathcal{L}_t . (In our proper setting of a proper holomorphic family the spaces $\mathcal{H}_t = \text{Harm}_{n,0}(g_t, h_t)$ are finite dimensional, so closedness is automatic.) The corresponding bounded orthogonal projection

$$P_t : \mathcal{L}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t$$

is called the *Bergman projection*.

From a section $f \in \Gamma(X, K_{X/B} \otimes E)$ that is smooth (or even just L^2) on the fibers of p one has a section $\mathcal{P}f \in \Gamma(X, K_{X/B} \otimes E)$ defined by

$$\iota_t \mathcal{P}f := P_t \iota_t f$$

where ι_t is defined by Proposition 3.1. Thus $P_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$P_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{i}(\mathcal{P}\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})).$$

The orthogonal projection $P_t^\perp : \mathcal{L}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t^\perp$ onto the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{H}_t in \mathcal{L}_t is also important in complex analysis, where it is often called the *Neumann operator*. If one is given a $K_{X_t} \otimes E|_{X_t}$ -valued, $\bar{\partial}$ -exact $(0, 1)$ -form α then any two solutions $u_o, u_1 \in \mathcal{L}_t$ of the equation $\bar{\partial}u = \alpha$ differ by an element of \mathcal{H}_t . Thus if $u \in \mathcal{L}_t$ satisfies $\bar{\partial}u = \alpha$ then so does $P_t^\perp u$, and the latter has minimal \mathcal{L}_t -norm.

On a compact complex manifold the Hodge Theorem computes P_t and P_t^\perp . Indeed, by the Hodge Theorem every $\bar{\partial}_{X_t}$ -exact form is orthogonal to the harmonic forms, and, as we saw in the proof of Theorem 6.2, if $\alpha = \square_{X_t} u$ is $\bar{\partial}_{X_t}$ -closed then $\alpha = \bar{\partial}_{X_t} \bar{\partial}_{X_t}^* u$. Thus $\wp(\bar{\partial}_{X_t} f) = 0$ (i.e., $\bar{\partial}_{X_t} f$ has no harmonic part) and $\bar{\partial}_{X_t} f = \bar{\partial}_{X_t} \bar{\partial}_{X_t}^* G_t \bar{\partial}_{X_t} f$. Since $f - \bar{\partial}_{X_t}^* G_t \bar{\partial}_{X_t} f$ is holomorphic and $(\bar{\partial}_{X_t}^* G_t \bar{\partial}_{X_t} f, f_o) = (G_t \bar{\partial}_{X_t} f, \bar{\partial}_{X_t} f_o) = 0$ for any $f_o \in \mathcal{H}_t$, we see that

$$(21) \quad P_t f = f - \bar{\partial}_{X_t}^* G_t \bar{\partial}_{X_t} f \quad \text{and thus} \quad P_t^\perp f = \bar{\partial}_{X_t}^* G_t \bar{\partial}_{X_t} f.$$

REMARK 6.13. It is natural to ask whether \mathcal{P} (and hence $\mathcal{P}^\perp = \text{Id} - \mathcal{P}$) is a smooth operator. In view of (21) it suffices to decide when the Green operator G_t varies smoothly with t . The latter question was answered by Kodaira and Spencer: if the rank of the harmonic spaces is constant then G_t varies smoothly with t (and hence \mathcal{P}^\perp and \mathcal{P} are smooth operators). See [K-1986, Theorem 7.6, page 344]. And though it is not stated explicitly in the latter reference, the converse is also true: if the Green operator G_t varies smoothly with t then the dimensions of the harmonic spaces are locally constant.

Thus, in the sense of Definition 2.17.c, $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}$ is regular if and only if $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is a vector bundle. \diamond

7. THE KODAIRA-SPENCER MAP OF A PROPER HOLOMORPHIC FAMILY

The Kodaira-Spencer map of a germ at $o \in B$ of a proper holomorphic family $X \rightarrow B$ assigns to a tangent vector $\tau \in T_{B,o}^{1,0}$ a Dolbeault cohomology class $\kappa_o^p(\tau) \in H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,1}(X_o, T_{X_o}^{1,0})$ on the central fiber of that germ. Any representative of the map acts by on possibly twisted (p, q) -forms to produce a $(p-1, q+1)$ -form. The square norm of this action appears in the formulas of both the curvature of \mathcal{L}^θ and the second fundamental form of \mathcal{H} in \mathcal{L}^θ . We begin by reviewing the definition of the Kodaira-Spencer map, and then discuss how it acts on sections of the BLS field $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$.

7.1. Definition of the Kodaira-Spencer Map. Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a holomorphic family over a domain $B \in \mathbb{C}^m$ containing the origin. Let us recall the definition of the Kodaira-Spencer map

$$K_o^p : T_{B,o}^{1,0} \rightarrow H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,1}(X_o, T_{X_o}^{1,0}).$$

There are some aspects of the construction that can be confusing when first learning the subject, so let us be temporarily overly pedantic with the notation, and denote by $\bar{\partial}_E$ the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator of the holomorphic vector bundle E . Fix a $(1, 0)$ vector $\tau \in T_{B,o}^{1,0}$, extended to a holomorphic $(1, 0)$ -vector field on a neighborhood of o in B with the same notation τ . Choose a lift ξ_τ of τ , i.e., a $(1, 0)$ -vector field on X such that $dp(\xi_\tau) = \tau$. Since p is holomorphic,

$$dp(\bar{\partial}_{T_X^{1,0}} \xi_\tau) = \bar{\partial}_{T_B^{1,0}} dp(\xi_\tau) = \bar{\partial}_{T_B^{1,0}} \tau = 0,$$

and therefore $\bar{\partial}_{T_X^{1,0}} \xi_\tau$ is a $(0, 1)$ -form with values in the vertical vector bundle $T_{X/B}^{1,0}$. Now, $\bar{\partial}_{T_X^{1,0}} \xi_\tau$ is $\bar{\partial}_{T_X^{1,0}}$ -exact, but in general it is not $\bar{\partial}_{T_{X/B}^{1,0}}$ -exact. Remarkably, however, $\bar{\partial}_{T_X^{1,0}} \xi_\tau$ is $\bar{\partial}_{T_{X/B}^{1,0}}$ -closed. This closedness is seen in local coordinates as follows. We take a coordinate chart $s = (s^1, \dots, s^m)$ on a neighborhood of o in B , and in terms of this coordinate chart we write $p = (p^1, \dots, p^m)$. By the inverse function theorem we can choose local coordinates (z, t) in $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^m$ with $t^\mu = p^\mu = p^* s^\mu$, $\mu = 1, \dots, m$. In terms of these coordinates we write $\tau = \tau^i(s) \frac{\partial}{\partial s^i}$ and $\xi_\tau = F^j(z, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} + \tau^i(t) \frac{\partial}{\partial t^i}$. Since the functions τ^i are holomorphic,

$$\bar{\partial}_{T_X^{1,0}} \xi_\tau = (\bar{\partial}_{z,t} F^j) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} = \left(\frac{\partial F^j}{\partial \bar{z}^k} dz^k + \frac{\partial F^j}{\partial \bar{t}^\ell} dt^\ell \right) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j}.$$

From the formula

$$\bar{\partial}_{T_{X/B}^{1,0}} H^j \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} = (\bar{\partial}_{z,t} H^j) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j}$$

we see that

$$\bar{\partial}_{T_{X/B}^{1,0}} \bar{\partial}_{T_X^{1,0}} \xi_\tau = 0.$$

To simplify notation, from here on we shall simply write $\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau$ for the $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $T_{X/B}^{1,0}$ -valued $(0, 1)$ -form obtained by applying $\bar{\partial}_{T_X^{1,0}}$ to the lift ξ_τ of the holomorphic $(1, 0)$ -vector field τ .

We claim that the Dolbeault class of $\iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau$ in $H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,1}(X_o, T_{X_o}^{1,0})$ depends only on τ , and not on the lift ξ_τ . Indeed, suppose $\tilde{\xi}_\tau$ is another lift. Then the global section η of $T_{X/B}^{1,0} \rightarrow X$ defined by $\eta = \xi_\tau - \tilde{\xi}_\tau$ satisfies

$$\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau = \bar{\partial} \tilde{\xi}_\tau + \bar{\partial} \eta,$$

and restriction to X_o shows that $[\iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau] = [\iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \tilde{\xi}_\tau]$ in $H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,1}(X_o, T_{X_o}^{1,0})$.

In fact, one can go further, and show that $[\iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau]$ depends only on $\tau(o)$. Indeed, while $\xi_{f\tau} \neq p^* f \cdot \xi_\tau$ for all $f \in \mathcal{O}(B)$, the difference $\xi_{f\tau} - p^* f \cdot \xi_\tau$ is a section of $T_{X/B}^{1,0}$. Similarly $\xi_{\tau_1 + \tau_2} - \xi_{\tau_1} - \xi_{\tau_2}$ is a section of $T_{X/B}^{1,0}$. These facts imply that the class $[\iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau]$ is independent of the choice of holomorphic extension of τ , and also that the dependence on τ is linear.

REMARK. If we chose our lift ξ_τ so that it comes from a horizontal distribution then the linearity follows more easily, since in that case $\xi_{f\tau + \sigma} = p^* f \cdot \xi_\tau + \xi_\sigma$. In fact, in this case the linearity holds at the level of the forms $\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau$, even before restrictions to the fibers of p . \diamond

REMARK. The choice of a *holomorphic* extension of the vector τ is made for convenience, and is not required. Indeed, one can see from the local formula that for the lift ξ_τ for each t the section $\iota_{X_t}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau$ is a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $T_{X_t}^{1,0}$ -valued $(0, 1)$ -form. Again the class $[\iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau]$ depends only on $\tau(o)$, but this time for slightly different reasons: the difference of two lifts $\zeta := \xi_\tau - \tilde{\xi}_\tau$ is vertical at o , and one checks that

$$\iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau - \iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \tilde{\xi}_\tau = \bar{\partial}_{T_{X_o}^{1,0}}(\zeta|_{X_o})$$

by using a local computation as above. \diamond

DEFINITION 7.1. The linear map

$$(22) \quad K_o^p : T_{B,o}^{1,0} \ni \tau \mapsto [\iota_{X_o}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau] \in H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,1}(X_o, T_{X_o}^{1,0})$$

is called the Kodaira-Spencer map of the holomorphic family $p : X \rightarrow B$ at $o \in B$.

In particular, if we choose any horizontal distribution $\theta \subset T_X$ then the maps

$$\kappa_t^\theta : T_{B,t}^{1,0} \ni \tau \mapsto \iota_{X_t}^* \bar{\partial} \xi_\tau^\theta \in \Gamma(X_t, \mathcal{C}^\infty(K_{X_t})),$$

(see page 25 for the notation ξ_τ^θ) represent the maps

$$K_t^p : T_{B,t}^{1,0} \rightarrow H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,1}(X_t, T_{X_t}^{1,0})$$

in the sense of Dolbeault cohomology. In the proof of Theorem 2 these representatives will make another appearance, and it will be particularly important to choose the right horizontal lift. The next paragraph is concerned with the construction of this special horizontal lift.

7.2. Action on the fibers of \mathcal{H} . So far in this section we have been dealing with general holomorphic families $p : X \rightarrow B$. In the present paragraph we shall assume that the family $p : X \rightarrow B$ is Kähler, i.e., is equipped with a *relative Kähler form*: a closed $(1, 1)$ -form ω on X such that for each $t \in B$ the restriction $\iota_{X_t}^* \omega$ is a Kähler form on X_t .

The contraction of E -valued holomorphic $(n, 0)$ -forms on the fiber X_t of p with any representative of the Kodaira-Spencer class $K_t^p(\tau)$ produces a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -form on X_t whose Dolbeault class is independent of the choice of representative of $K_t^p(\tau)$. Moreover, one has the following remarkable proposition.

PROPOSITION 7.2. *For a point $t \in B$ and any holomorphic E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form f on X_t the Dolbeault cohomology class $K_t^p(\tau) \lrcorner f \in H_{\bar{\partial}}^{n-1,1}(X_t, E)$ is primitive with respect to the Kähler form $\omega_t := \iota_{X_t}^* \omega$.*

Proposition 7.2 is a special case of our next result, Theorem 7.3, but we can outline the proof here. The idea is the following. A $\bar{\partial}$ -closed E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -form γ represents a primitive Dolbeault cohomology class if and only if its wedge product with the Kähler form is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. Now,

$$\omega_t \wedge (K_t^p(\tau) \lrcorner f) = K_t^p(\tau) \lrcorner (\omega_t \wedge f) - (K_t^p(\tau) \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f = -(K_t^p(\tau) \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f,$$

where the last equality holds because $\omega_t \wedge f$, being an E -valued $(n+1, 1)$ -form on an n -dimensional manifold, must vanish identically. But while the $T_{X/B}^{1,0}$ -valued $(0, 1)$ -form $K_t^p(\tau)$ is only $\bar{\partial}$ -closed, the $(0, 2)$ -form $K_t^p(\tau) \lrcorner \omega_t$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. (Again we have abusively used $K_t^p(\tau)$ to denote any representative of $K_t^p(\tau)$.)

Proposition 7.2 can be significantly improved. The Kodaira-Spencer map can be represented by forms in such a way that the action on a fiberwise holomorphic top-form is not

just a primitive class, but a primitive form. The representative can be chosen independent of the holomorphic top-form, and even more: for each $t \in B$ there is a horizontal lift that achieves all these properties at X_t . The precise statement is as follows.

THEOREM 7.3. *Let $(E, h) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p} B$ be a holomorphic family and let ω be a relative Kähler form on X . Then for each $t \in B$ there exists a horizontal distribution $\theta \subset T_X$ such that for every holomorphic E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form f on X_t and every local holomorphic vector field τ on a neighborhood of t in B the E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -form $(\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner f$ satisfies*

$$\omega_t \wedge \left((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner f \right) = 0,$$

i.e., $(\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner f$ is primitive on (X_t, ω_t) . Moreover, if $\dim H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,2}(X_t)$ is independent of t then one can choose θ independently of t .

Proof. Let us fix a point $t \in B$ and section $f \in \mathcal{H}_t$. Choose any initial smooth horizontal distribution $\theta_o \subset T_X$. We shall modify this distribution to achieve the required properties.

First notice that $\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner (\omega_t \wedge f) = (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f + \omega_t \wedge (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner f)$. Since $\omega_t \wedge f$ is of bidegree $(n+1, 1)$ on the n -dimensional manifold X_t the left hand side vanishes, and hence

$$\omega_t \wedge (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner f) = -(\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f.$$

We claim that the right hand side is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact on X_t . Indeed, $\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega$ is a $(0, 1)$ -form on X and $\bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega) = (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}) \lrcorner \omega$. Since τ is holomorphic, $\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}$ is vertical, so $\iota_{X_t}^*((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}) \lrcorner \omega) = (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}) \lrcorner \omega_t$. Therefore $\bar{\partial}(\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega)) = (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}) \lrcorner \omega_t$, and since f is holomorphic on X_t ,

$$(\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f = \bar{\partial}(\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega)) \wedge f$$

which proves the claim. Incidentally, Proposition 7.2 is now also proved.

Now, the $(0, 2)$ -form $\iota_{X_t}^*(\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega) = \bar{\partial}_{X_t}(\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega))$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact on X_t , and therefore orthogonal to the ω_t -harmonic $(0, 2)$ -forms. By the Hodge Theorem there exists a $(0, 2)$ -form $u(\tau)_t$ such that

$$\square_t u(\tau)_t = \iota_{X_t}^*(\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o} \lrcorner \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\partial}_{X_t} u(\tau)_t = 0.$$

Indeed, one takes $u(\tau)_t = G_t((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}) \lrcorner \omega_t)$. Since the lift $\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}$ comes from the distribution θ_o , it is linear in τ , and therefore the same is true of $u(\tau)_t$, and thus also of the $(0, 1)$ -form $\zeta(\tau)_t := \bar{\partial}^* u(\tau)_t$. Define the $(1, 0)$ -vector field $\eta(\tau)_t := \zeta(\tau)_t^\sharp$, i.e., by the relation

$$\zeta(\tau)_t = \eta(\tau)_t \lrcorner \omega_t.$$

Then $\eta(\tau)_t$ also depends linearly on τ . Moreover, by regularity theory of families of elliptic operators, if the integers $d_t := \dim H_{\bar{\partial}}^{0,2}(X_t)$ do not depend on t then the fiberwise sections $\eta(\tau)_t$ glue together to yield a smooth section $\eta(\tau)$ of the vertical bundle $T_{X/B}^{1,0} \rightarrow B$. (Again, see [K-1986, Theorem 7.6].) But otherwise one may extend $\eta(\tau)_t$ smoothly from a fixed X_t to the family. The extension might not be linear in τ , so we will have to modify things a little more in the end. At any rate,

$$\theta^{1,0}(\tau) := \theta_o^{1,0}(\tau) - \eta(\tau)$$

defines a horizontal distribution. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_t \wedge ((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner f) &= -((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f = (\bar{\partial}\eta(\tau)_t \lrcorner \omega_t - (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}) \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f \\ &= (\bar{\partial}\zeta(\tau)_t - (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}) \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f = (\square_t u(\tau)_t - (\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^{\theta_o}) \lrcorner \omega_t) \wedge f = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -form $(\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner f$ is primitive on X_t .

Finally, since the computation of primitivity is done on the fiber over t , a partition of unity argument can be used to extend the restriction $\theta|_{X_t} \subset T_X|_{X_t}$ to all of X . This completes the proof. \square

DEFINITION 7.4. A horizontal distribution $\theta \subset T_X$ for $p : X \rightarrow B$ with the properties of Theorem 7.3 is said to be a *primitive horizontal distribution* at $t \in B$. Its associated lift ξ_τ^θ is said to be a *primitive horizontal lift* of the holomorphic $(1, 0)$ -vector field τ at t . \diamond

Theorem 3 now follows from Theorem 7.3 and Proposition 6.10. \square

8. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2

From this point on in the article, we shall make use of an abuse of notation that will make formulas much more compact. As discussed in Section 3, there are two equivalent ways to realize the sections of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$. One of them is as sections of $K_{X/B} \otimes E \rightarrow X$ and the other is as equivalence classes of sections of $\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E \rightarrow B$. When applying the twisted Lie derivatives, we shall always use the second description. But we will abuse notation and write

$$L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})$$

to mean the section represented by the E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form $L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} u$ for any u representing the section $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})$. Note that by Proposition 3.12.a the resulting sections are independent of the choice of representatives.

8.1. Formula for the Chern connections of \mathcal{L}^θ .

PROPOSITION 8.1. *Let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle with Hermitian metric h . The BLS-Chern connection $\nabla^{\mathcal{L}^\theta}$ for \mathcal{L}^θ is given by the formula*

$$\nabla_\tau^{\mathcal{L}^\theta, 1,0} \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{i} \left(L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) \right), \quad \tau \in T_{B,t}^{1,0},$$

where the Lie derivative is the one associated to the Chern connection for $(E, h) \rightarrow X$ via Definition 3.3.

Proposition 8.1 will be proved momentarily.

There are many connections compatible, in the sense of Definition 2.10, with the smooth structure of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$, including connections compatible with the almost holomorphic structures defined in Paragraph 4.2, i.e., connections ∇ such that $\nabla^{0,1} = \bar{\partial}^\theta$. We restrict ourselves to such $\bar{\partial}^\theta$ -compatible connections, since it is among these that we shall find our Chern connections.

For every p -horizontal distribution $\theta \subset T_X$ and every connection D for $E \rightarrow X$ such that $D^{0,1} = \bar{\partial}$ there is a connection $\nabla^{D,\theta} : \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L})) \rightarrow \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_B^1 \otimes \mathcal{L}))$ defined as follows. Given a section $\mathbf{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}))$, for each $\tau = \tau^{1,0} + \tau^{0,1} \in T_B \otimes \mathbb{C} = T_B^{1,0} \oplus T_B^{0,1}$ the connection

$$\nabla_\tau^{D,\theta} \mathbf{f} := \mathbf{i} \left(L_{\xi_{\tau^{1,0}}}^{D,1,0} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) \right) + \bar{\partial}_{\tau^{0,1}}^\theta \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{i} \left(L_{\xi_{\tau^{1,0}}}^{D,1,0} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) + L_{\xi_{\tau^{0,1}}}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) \right)$$

is compatible with the smooth structure of $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$.

PROPOSITION 8.2. *Let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle with Hermitian metric h . If D is a smooth connection for $E \rightarrow X$ and θ is a smooth horizontal lift then the induced connection $\nabla^{D,\theta}$ is a connection for $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$ in the sense of Definition 2.10. Moreover, if $Dh = 0$ then $\nabla^{D,\theta}\mathfrak{h} = 0$, where \mathfrak{h} is the L^2 metric for $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow B$.*

Proof. The smoothness assertion is evident, and Lemma 3.8 shows that if D is the Chern connection for E then $\nabla^{D,\theta}$ is the BLS-Chern connection. \square

Proposition 8.2 immediately imply Proposition 8.1. \square

REMARK 8.3 (Chern connection for \mathcal{H} when \mathcal{H} is locally trivial). We have not defined the Chern connection for $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ when the latter is not locally trivial and we do not intend to do so. Of course, when $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is locally trivial, it has a well-defined Chern connection. Though we do not need the Chern connection for \mathcal{H} in our approach, we can now easily compute it from the Chern connection of the ambient BLS bundles $\mathcal{L}^\theta \rightarrow B$. Indeed, by Proposition 2.26, Proposition 4.14 and Remark 6.13 one has the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 8.4. *If $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ is locally trivial then the Chern connection $\nabla^{\mathcal{H}}$ of \mathcal{H} is smooth, and is given by $\nabla_\tau^{\mathcal{H}}\mathfrak{f} = \nabla_\tau^{\mathcal{H},1,0}\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{i}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(L_{\xi_\tau}^{1,0}\mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{f})\right)\right)$ for any $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{H}))$ and $\tau \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}$, where \mathcal{P} is the fiberwise Bergman projection operator defined in Paragraph 6.5 and ξ_τ is any lift of τ to a $(1,0)$ -vector field on X_t .*

In [B-2009] the formula for $\nabla^{\mathcal{H}}$ was derived directly using the definition of Chern connection. We note also that the formula for $\nabla^{\mathcal{H}}$ makes sense for smooth sections of \mathcal{H} even when \mathcal{H} is not locally trivial. \diamond

8.2. The $(1,1)$ -component of curvature of \mathcal{L}^θ . By Proposition 2.39 and Remark 4.6 the restriction to \mathcal{H} of the curvature of \mathcal{L}^θ has $(1,1)$ -form coefficients. Since our interest is mainly in $\Theta^{\mathcal{H}}$, we shall only compute the $(1,1)$ -component of $\Theta^{\mathcal{L}^\theta}$.

The $(1,1)$ -component of curvature of \mathcal{L}^θ is by definition

$$(23) \quad \Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} = \nabla_\sigma^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} \nabla_{\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} - \nabla_{\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} \nabla_\sigma^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} - \nabla_{[\sigma,\bar{\tau}]}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta}, \quad \sigma, \tau \in T_{B,t}^{1,0}, \quad t \in B.$$

In the latter formula, one may take any extension of σ and τ to $(1,0)$ -vector fields, and taking holomorphic extensions eliminates the last term on the right hand side of (23). Therefore for smooth sections $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2$ of \mathcal{L}^θ we have $\mathfrak{a}\left(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta}\mathfrak{f}_1\right) = \left(L_{\xi_\sigma}^{1,0}L_{\xi_\tau}^{0,1} - L_{\xi_\tau}^{0,1}L_{\xi_\sigma}^{1,0}\right)\mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{f}_1)$ and

$$(24) \quad \left(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta}\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2\right) = \left(L_{\xi_\sigma}^{1,0}L_{\xi_\tau}^{0,1}u_1, u_2\right) - \left(L_{\xi_\tau}^{0,1}L_{\xi_\sigma}^{1,0}u_1, u_2\right),$$

where u_i are E -valued $(n,0)$ -forms on X representing \mathfrak{f}_i . Using (24) we can finally give the proof of Theorem 4.17.

Proof of Theorem 4.17. Fix $t \in B$ and smooth sections $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2 \in \Sigma_t$, i.e., $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L})_t$ such that $\mathfrak{f}_1(t), \mathfrak{f}_2(t) \in \mathcal{H}_t$ and $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\sigma}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u_i = 0$, where $u_i \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ represents \mathfrak{f}_i .

Defining the vertical vector field $v_\sigma := \xi_\sigma^{\theta_1} - \xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta_1}} \mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2) - (\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta_2}} \mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2) \\
&= \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(\left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) \right) \\
&= \left(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) + \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) \\
&\quad - \left(\left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) \right) \\
&= \left(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) \\
&\quad - \left(\left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) \right) \\
&= \left(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) + \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{v}_\tau}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) + \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, one computes that

$$L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{v}_\tau}^{0,1} u_1 = L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} (\bar{v}_\tau \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u_1) = \bar{v}_\tau \lrcorner (L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u_1) + \left(\overline{\xi_\tau^{\theta_1} \lrcorner \bar{\partial} v_\tau} \right) \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u_1.$$

The first term on the right hand side vanishes because $\mathbf{f}_1 \in \Sigma_t$, and the second term vanishes because $\overline{\xi_\tau^{\theta_1} \lrcorner \bar{\partial} v_\tau}$ is a vertical $(0, 1)$ -vector field. Next, by Lemma 3.8 and the holomorphicity of u_i along X_t one has

$$\left(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} u_1, u_2 \right) = - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} u_1, L_{v_\sigma}^{0,1} u_2 \right) = 0.$$

Therefore

$$(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta_1}} \mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2) - (\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta_2}} \mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2) = \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) \\
&= - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) + \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,1}}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) \\
&= - \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) - \left(L_{\bar{v}_\tau}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) \\
&= -\bar{\tau} \left(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, u_2 \right) + \left(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2 \right) + \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, L_{v_\tau}^{1,0} u_2 \right) \\
&= \bar{\tau} \left(u_1, L_{\bar{v}_\sigma}^{0,1} u_2 \right) + \left(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2 \right) + \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, L_{v_\tau}^{1,0} u_2 \right) \\
&= \left(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2 \right) + \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, L_{v_\tau}^{1,0} u_2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because $\bar{\tau} \left(u_1, L_{\bar{v}_\sigma}^{0,1} u_2 \right) = \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{0,1} u_1, L_{\bar{v}_\sigma}^{0,1} u_2 \right) + \left(u_1, L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^{0,2}}^{1,0} L_{\bar{v}_\sigma}^{0,1} u_2 \right) = 0$.

Now, since v_σ is vertical

$$\iota_{X_t}^* L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1 = \iota_{X_t}^* (\nabla^{1,0} (v_\sigma \lrcorner u_1)) + v_\sigma \lrcorner (\nabla^{1,0} u_1) = \iota_{X_t}^* (\nabla^{1,0} (v_\sigma \lrcorner u_1)),$$

and hence $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1 \perp \text{Kernel}(\square^{1,0}) = \text{Kernel}(\square) = \text{kernel}(\bar{\partial})$, with the last two equalities holding because $\nabla^{1,0}(v_\sigma \lrcorner u_1)$ is an E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form. Therefore

$$(L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2) = (P_t^\perp L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2) = (P_t^\perp L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2),$$

and similarly $(L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, L_{v_\tau}^{1,0} u_2) = (P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{v_\tau}^{1,0} u_2)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2) + (L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, L_{v_\tau}^{1,0} u_2) &= (P_t^\perp L_{v_\sigma}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2) + (P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{v_\tau}^{1,0} u_2) \\ &= (P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2) - (P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2) \\ &\quad + \left((P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_2) - (P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2) \right) \\ &= (P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_1}}^{1,0} u_2) - (P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_1, P_t^\perp L_{\xi_\tau^{\theta_2}}^{1,0} u_2) \\ &= (\mathbf{\Pi}^{\theta_1} f_1, \mathbf{\Pi}^{\theta_1} f_2) - (\mathbf{\Pi}^{\theta_2} f_1, \mathbf{\Pi}^{\theta_2} f_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta_1}} f_1, f_2) - (\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta_2}} f_1, f_2) = (\mathbf{\Pi}^{\theta_1} f_1, \mathbf{\Pi}^{\theta_1} f_2) - (\mathbf{\Pi}^{\theta_2} f_1, \mathbf{\Pi}^{\theta_2} f_2)$, as required. \square

THEOREM 8.5. *For any $t \in B$ and any smooth $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{L}_t$ one has the formula*

$$(25) \quad (\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta}} f_1, f_2)_t = \int_{X_t} \langle \Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta} \bar{\xi}_\tau^{\theta}} f_1 \wedge \bar{f}_2, h \rangle - \int_{X_t} \langle (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^{\theta}) \lrcorner f_1 \wedge \overline{(\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau^{\theta}) \lrcorner f_2}, h \rangle \\ + \int_{X_t} \langle L_{[\xi_\sigma^{\theta}, \bar{\xi}_\tau^{\theta}]^{0,1}} f_1 \wedge \bar{f}_2, h \rangle + \int_{X_t} \langle f_1 \wedge \overline{L_{[\xi_\sigma^{\theta}, \bar{\xi}_\tau^{\theta}]^{0,1}} f_2}, h \rangle.$$

for the $(1, 1)$ -component of $\Theta^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta}}$. In particular, if $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_t$ then

$$(26) \quad (\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^{\theta}} f_1, f_2)_t = \int_{X_t} \langle \Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^{\theta} \bar{\xi}_\tau^{\theta}} f_1 \wedge \bar{f}_2, h \rangle - \int_{X_t} \langle (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^{\theta}) \lrcorner f_1 \wedge \overline{(\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau^{\theta}) \lrcorner f_2}, h \rangle.$$

In the proof of Theorem 8.5 the following lemma is convenient.

LEMMA 8.6. *Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a holomorphic submersion, let $v \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ be a smooth E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form, let σ be a holomorphic vector fields on a coordinate neighborhood U in B with coordinates $s = (s^1, \dots, s^m)$, and let $p = (p^1, \dots, p^m)$ in these coordinates. Choose local holomorphic coordinates (z, t) on an open set in $p^{-1}(U)$ such that $t^i = p^i$ and, with $d\bar{z} := dz^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz^n$, write*

$$v = v_o d\bar{z} + dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu$$

for some local section v_o of E and local E -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -forms $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$. Then

$$L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} v = (\nabla_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} v_o) d\bar{z} + v_o \bar{\partial} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) + \partial \sigma^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu + dt^\mu \wedge L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} \alpha_\mu.$$

Proof. We calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} v &= \nabla^{1,0} (v_o (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) + \sigma^\mu \alpha_\mu - dt^\mu \wedge (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \alpha_\mu)) + \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner (\nabla^{1,0} v_o \wedge d\bar{z} - dt^\mu \wedge \nabla^{1,0} \alpha_\mu) \\ &= (\nabla^{1,0} v_o) \wedge (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) + v_o \bar{\partial} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) + \partial \sigma^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu + \sigma^\mu \nabla^{1,0} \alpha_\mu + dt^\mu \wedge \nabla^{1,0} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \alpha_\mu) \\ &\quad + (\nabla_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} v_o) d\bar{z} - \nabla^{1,0} v_o \wedge (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) - \sigma^\mu \nabla^{1,0} \alpha_\mu + dt^\mu \wedge (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \alpha_\mu) \\ &= (\nabla_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} v_o) d\bar{z} + v_o \bar{\partial} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) + \partial \sigma^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu + dt^\mu \wedge L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} \alpha_\mu, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.5. Fix a section $\mathbf{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}))$. Fix an E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form u representing $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})$, and locally write $u = u_o d\bar{z} + dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu$ in the coordinates of Lemma 8.6. If σ and τ are holomorphic vector fields on an open subset of B then an application of $L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{0,1}$ to the formula for $L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{1,0} u$ from Lemma 8.6 gives

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{0,1} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{1,0} u &= \left(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma} \nabla_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{1,0} u_o \right) d\bar{z} + \left(\bar{\partial} u_o(\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta) \right) \partial \left(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z} \right) - u_o \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \left(\partial \left(\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \partial \sigma^\mu \wedge \left(\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} \alpha_\mu \right) + dt^\mu \wedge L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{0,1} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{1,0} \alpha_\mu, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third term on the right hand side of the equality we have used the identity $\bar{\partial} \partial = -\partial \bar{\partial}$. Applying Lemma 8.6 to $v = L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{0,1} u = \left(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\xi}_\tau} u_o \right) d\bar{z} + dt^\mu \wedge L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{0,1} \alpha_\mu$ then yields

$$L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{0,1} u = \left(\nabla_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\xi}_\tau} u_o \right) d\bar{z} + \left(\bar{\partial} u_o(\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta) \right) \partial \left(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z} \right) + \partial \sigma^\mu \wedge L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{0,1} \alpha_\mu + dt^\mu \wedge L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{0,1} \alpha_\mu.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a} \left(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} \mathbf{f} \right) &= \left(\nabla_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\xi}_\tau} - \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma} \nabla_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{1,0} \right) u_o d\bar{z} + \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (u_o \partial (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z})) + dt^\mu \wedge \left(L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{0,1} - L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{0,1} L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} \right) \alpha_\mu \\ &= \Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} u_o d\bar{z} + \nabla_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} u_o d\bar{z} + u_o (\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \partial (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z})) + dt^\mu \wedge \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{0,1} - L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} \right) \alpha_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Keeping in mind that $[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]$ is a vertical vector field, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} &L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} (u_o d\bar{z} + dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu) \\ &= [\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta] \lrcorner \nabla (u_o d\bar{z} + dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu) + \nabla ([\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta] \lrcorner (u_o d\bar{z} + dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu)) \\ &= [\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta] \lrcorner (\nabla u_o \wedge d\bar{z} - dt^\mu \wedge \nabla \alpha_\mu) + \nabla (u_o ([\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta] \lrcorner d\bar{z}) - dt^\mu \wedge [\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta] \lrcorner \alpha_\mu) \\ &= \nabla_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} u_o d\bar{z} + u_o \partial ([\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta] \lrcorner d\bar{z}) + dt^\mu \wedge L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} \alpha_\mu \\ &= \nabla_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} u_o d\bar{z} - u_o \partial (\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z})) + dt^\mu \wedge L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} \alpha_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) = u_o d\bar{z} + dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a} \left(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} \mathbf{f} \right) &= \Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} u_o d\bar{z} + L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) + u_o \left(\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \partial (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) + \partial (\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z})) \right) \\ &\quad + dt^\mu \wedge \left(L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{0,1} - L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{0,1} L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} - L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} \right) \alpha_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} \left(u_o (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) \right) &= \nabla^{1,0} \left(u_o \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) \right) + \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \left(u_o \bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z} \right) \\ &= (\nabla^{1,0} u_o) \wedge \left(\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) \right) + u_o \partial \left(\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) \right) \\ &\quad + \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \left(\nabla^{1,0} u_o \wedge (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) + u_o \partial (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) \right) \\ &= (\nabla_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{1,0} u_o) \left(\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z} \right) + u_o \partial \left(\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) \right) + u_o \partial (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) \\ &= u_o \partial \left(\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}) \right) + u_o \partial (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner d\bar{z}), \\ &L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} (dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu) = dt^\mu \wedge L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{1,0} \alpha_\mu \end{aligned}$$

and

$$L_{\bar{\xi}_\sigma}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) = \bar{\partial} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})) + \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) = (\bar{\partial} \xi_\sigma^\theta) \lrcorner \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}).$$

Since $L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau}^{1,0} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) = \nabla^{1,0}(\bar{\xi}_\tau \lrcorner \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})) + \bar{\xi}_\tau \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) = 0$ because $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})$ and $\nabla^{1,0} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})$ are of bi-degree $(n, 0)$ and $(n+1, 0)$, we have established the following formula.

$$(27) \quad \iota_{X_t}^* \Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} \mathbf{f} = \iota_{X_t}^* \left(\Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) - [L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1}, L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{1,0}] \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}) \right) + L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f})$$

for sections $\mathbf{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}))$.

Since $[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]$ is vertical, if \mathbf{f}_1 and \mathbf{f}_2 are holomorphic on fibers then $L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]^{0,1}} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) = 0$, and similarly $L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]^{0,1}} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2) = 0$. Thus (26) follows from (25), to which proof we now turn.

By Formula (27) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} \mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2)_t &= \int_{X_t} \left\langle \left(\Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \right) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle + \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Observing that $L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1)$ is an E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -form, by Proposition 3.10 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{X_t} L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} \left\langle L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle - \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle \\ &= \bar{\tau} \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle - \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle \\ &= - \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{L_{\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

the last equality being a consequence of the fact that $\left\langle L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{0,1} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle$ is an $(n-1, n+1)$ -form, and thus integrates to 0 on X_t . Finally, for reasons of bi-degree

$$\int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle = \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]^{0,1}} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle + \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]^{1,0}} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle,$$

and by Lemma 3.8 and the fact that, since σ and τ are holomorphic, $[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]$ is vertical

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X_t} \left\langle L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]^{1,0}} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle &= - \int_{X_t} \left\langle \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]^{1,0}} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{X_t} \left\langle \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_1) \wedge \overline{L_{[\xi_\sigma^\theta, \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta]^{0,1}} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{f}_2)}, h \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 2 now follows from Theorem 8.5, Proposition 8.1, Definition 2.38.ii and Proposition 2.39. \square

9. THE SECOND FUNDAMENTAL FORM OF $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}^\theta$

We now turn our attention to the proof of Theorem 4.

Let $\theta \subset T_X$ be a smooth horizontal distribution. In the most general setting one cannot assume that $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}^\theta$ is regular. Thus our second fundamental form, which by Definition 2.37.ii is

$$\mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta / \mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}}^\perp \nabla^{\mathcal{L}^\theta} \mathbf{1},$$

does not depend smoothly on $t \in B$. The only term that is not smooth in t is the Bergman projection P_t , so while differentiation in the vertical directions is legitimate, we must be careful not to differentiate this projection with respect to t .

9.1. A first formula for the second fundamental form. Our first result on the second fundamental form is useful in obtaining a more crude estimate for the curvature of $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow B$ under the assumption that the metric h for $E \rightarrow X$ is Nakano-positive along the fibers X_t .

PROPOSITION 9.1. *For every $t \in B$, $\mathfrak{f} \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}))$ satisfying $\mathfrak{f}(t) \in \mathcal{H}_t$, and $\tau \in \mathcal{O}(B)_t$ one has*

$$\iota_t \mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta / \mathcal{H}}(\tau) \mathfrak{f} = -G_t \bar{\partial}_{X_t}^* \left(\iota_{X_t}^* \left((\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) \alpha \right) + \left(\nabla^{1,0} \left(\bar{\partial}_{\xi_\tau^\theta} \lrcorner \alpha \right) \right) + L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} \alpha \right),$$

where α is any E -valued $(n, 0)$ -form representing $\mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{f})$.

Proof. Since $\iota_t \mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta / \mathcal{H}}(\tau) \mathfrak{f} = P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \alpha$ is orthogonal to $\mathcal{H}_t = \text{Harm}_{n,0}$, the Hodge Theorem implies that

$$\iota_t \mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta / \mathcal{H}}(\tau) \mathfrak{f} = G_t \bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \left(\iota_{X_t}^* \left(L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \alpha \right) \right),$$

and the result follows from Lemma 3.11. \square

9.2. Direct proof of Corollary 1.2. We are now in a position to give the promised proof of Corollary 1.2 that does not pass through Theorem 1.

The hypotheses of Corollary 1.2 provide a metric h for E such that $[\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h), \Lambda_\omega]$ is positive definite for some relative Kähler form ω . Fix $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{H}_t$ and $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k \in \mathcal{O}(T_B^{1,0})_t$ along which we will compute the curvature. Also fix a smooth horizontal distribution θ .

By Corollary 5.3 \mathcal{H} is locally trivial, and hence for every $f \in \mathcal{H}_t$ one can choose smooth sections $\mathfrak{f}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{f}_k$ of \mathcal{H} such that $\mathfrak{f}_i(t) = f_i$. Consequently if u_i are representatives of $\mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{f}_i)$ then $L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u_i \equiv 0$.

Writing $\mathbf{II}_\tau \mathfrak{f}(t) := \mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta / \mathcal{H}}(\tau) \mathfrak{f}(t)$, we have by Lemma 3.11 and Proposition 6.11

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j=1}^k \left(\mathbf{II}_{\tau_i} \mathfrak{f}_i(t), \mathbf{II}_{\tau_j} \mathfrak{f}_j(t) \right) &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{II}_{\tau_i} \mathfrak{f}_i(t) \right\|^2 \\ &= \sup_{\gamma} \frac{1}{(\square \gamma, \gamma)} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \iota_{X_t}^* \left((\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u_i + \nabla^{1,0} \left((\bar{\partial}_{\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta} \lrcorner u_i) \right) \right), \gamma \right) \right|^2 \\ &= \sup_{\gamma} \frac{1}{(\square \gamma, \gamma)} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\iota_{X_t}^* \left(\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h) \right) u_i, \gamma \right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \iota_{X_t}^* \left(\bar{\partial}_{\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta} \lrcorner u_i, \nabla^{1,0*} \gamma \right) \right) \right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is taken over all smooth E -valued $(n, 1)$ -forms γ . Now, for any E -valued $(n, 1)$ -form U and any E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -form V

$$\begin{aligned} |(U, \gamma) + (V, \nabla^{1,0*} \gamma)|^2 &\leq |(U, \gamma)|^2 + |(V, \nabla^{1,0*} \gamma)|^2 + 2|(U, \gamma)| \cdot |(V, \nabla^{1,0*} \gamma)| \\ &\leq ([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega]^{-1} U, U) ([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega] \gamma, \gamma) + \|V\|^2 \|\nabla^{1,0*} \gamma\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega]^{-1} U, U)^{1/2} ([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega] \gamma, \gamma)^{1/2} \|V\| \cdot \|\nabla^{1,0*} \gamma\| \\ &= (([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega]^{-1} U, U) + \|V\|^2) (([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega] \gamma, \gamma) + \|\nabla^{1,0*} \gamma\|^2) \\ &= (([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega]^{-1} U, U) + \|V\|^2) ([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega] + \square^{1,0}) \gamma, \gamma) \\ &= (([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega]^{-1} U, U) + \|V\|^2) (\square \gamma, \gamma), \end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last equality follows because $\square^{1,0} = \nabla^{1,0}\nabla^{1,0*}$ for (n, q) -forms, and the last equality is the Bochner-Kodaira Formula (18). Thus we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j=1}^k \left(\mathbf{\Pi}_{\tau_i} f_i(t), \mathbf{\Pi}_{\tau_j} f_j(t) \right) &\leq \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \iota_{X_t}^* \left((\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u_i + \nabla^{1,0}((\bar{\partial}\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta) \lrcorner u_i) \right), \gamma \right) \right|^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^k [\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega]^{-1} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u_i, \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\tau_j}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u_j \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^k \left(\iota_{X_t}^* (\bar{\partial}\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta) \lrcorner u_i, \iota_{X_t}^* (\bar{\partial}\xi_{\tau_j}^\theta) \lrcorner u_j \right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Theorem 2

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i,j=1}^k (\Theta_{\tau_i \bar{\tau}_j}^{\mathcal{H}} f_i, f_j) \\ &\geq \sum_{i,j=1}^k \left(\Theta(h)_{\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta \bar{\xi}_{\tau_j}^\theta} f_i, f_j \right) - \left([\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega]^{-1} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u_i, \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\tau_j}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u_j \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,j=1}^k \left(\int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle (\bar{\partial}\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta) \lrcorner u_i \wedge \overline{(\bar{\partial}\xi_{\tau_j}^\theta) \lrcorner u_j}, h \rangle + \left(\iota_{X_t}^* (\bar{\partial}\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta) \lrcorner u_i, \iota_{X_t}^* (\bar{\partial}\xi_{\tau_j}^\theta) \lrcorner u_j \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The estimate holds for all smooth horizontal distributions, but if we choose the primitive horizontal lift at t then by Theorem 3 the last line vanishes, and we have the estimate

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^k (\Theta_{\tau_i \bar{\tau}_j}^{\mathcal{H}} f_i, f_j) \geq \sum_{i,j=1}^k \left(\Theta(h)_{\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta \bar{\xi}_{\tau_j}^\theta} f_i, f_j - [\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_\omega]^{-1} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\tau_i}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u_i, \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\tau_j}^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h)) u_j \right).$$

By Proposition 4.21 the right hand side is positive (resp. non-negative) as soon as (E, h) is k -positively (resp. k -non-negatively) curved in the sense of Demailly. Thus Corollary 1.2 is proved. \square

9.3. Berndtsson's Method of Representatives. In this section we present an adaptation of a construction of Berndtsson that is fundamental to the proof of Theorem 4. In the case applicable to [B-2009, Theorem 1.2] Berndtsson integrated his method into the proof, and the crux of the argument is contained in [B-2009, Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4]. The technique was distilled further in [B-2011, Lemma 2.1]. In the case of [B-2011, Theorem 1.2] Berndtsson augments the method in [B-2011, Section 4] in a way that is hard to state in one or two sentences. The next result captures these two ideas of Berndtsson in a single result.

THEOREM 9.2 (Berndtsson's Method). *Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a holomorphic family, let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle with Hermitian metric h , fix $t \in B$ and let ω_t be a Kähler form on X_t . Fix a horizontal lift θ . For any smooth section $f \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(K_{X/B} \otimes E))$ such that $\iota_t^* f \in \mathcal{H}_t$ and any $\ell \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ such that $\iota_{X_t}^* \ell = 0$ and $\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell) \perp \mathcal{H}_t$ for all germs of holomorphic vector fields $\tau \in \mathcal{O}(T_B^{1,0})_t \cong T_{B,t}^{1,0}$ there there exists a representative $u \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ of f (in the sense of Paragraph 3.1.2) with the following properties.*

- a. *The E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -forms $\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u)$ are primitive.*
- b. *$P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u) = \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell)$.*

c. The E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -forms $\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial}u)$ and $\iota_{X_t}^*((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner f)$ are in the same Dolbeault class.

Moreover, if $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial}f = 0$ then $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial}u = 0$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.12 $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial}u$ is independent of the choice of representative u of f , so it suffices to find a representative u with properties a – c.

Let $u^o \in H^0(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ be some initial representative of f . Using local coordinates (t^1, \dots, t^m) near t , we can write

$$\bar{\partial}u^o = \psi + dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu^o + d\bar{t}^\nu \wedge \beta_{\bar{\nu}} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^{1,0}u^o = dt^\mu \wedge \phi_\mu^o,$$

where α_μ^o are E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -forms, $\beta_{\bar{\nu}}$ are E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms, and ψ is an E -valued $(n, 1)$ -form such that $\iota_{X_t}^* \psi = 0$ at t . (See Proposition 4.22.) The latter condition implies that $\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \psi)$ independent of the choice of lift θ . Since the horizontal lift ξ_τ^θ is linear in τ , we may write

$$\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \psi) =: \tau^\mu \gamma_\mu$$

for some E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -forms $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$ on X_t .

Any other representative u is of the form $u = u^o + dt^\mu \wedge v_\mu$ for some E -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -forms v_μ , and thus

$$\bar{\partial}u = \psi + dt^\mu \wedge (\alpha_\mu^o - \bar{\partial}v_\mu) + d\bar{t}^\nu \wedge \beta_{\bar{\nu}} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^{1,0}u = dt^\mu \wedge (\phi_\mu^o - \nabla^{1,0}v_\mu).$$

Therefore we seek v_μ satisfying

$$\omega_t \wedge (\gamma_\mu + \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o - \iota_{X_t}^* \bar{\partial}v_\mu) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^{1,0}v_\mu = P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu^o - \iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell).$$

Note that

$$\bar{\partial}(\omega \wedge u^o) = \omega \wedge \bar{\partial}u^o = \omega \wedge \psi + dt^\mu \wedge \alpha_\mu^o \wedge \omega,$$

and hence

$$\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial}(\omega \wedge u^o)) = \iota_{X_t}^*((\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \omega) \wedge \psi) + \omega_t \wedge (\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \psi) + \tau^\mu \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o) = \tau^\mu \omega_t \wedge (\gamma_\mu + \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o).$$

On the other hand

$$\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial}(\omega \wedge u^o)) = \iota_{X_t}^*((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner (\omega \wedge u^o) - \bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\omega \wedge u^o))) = -\iota_{X_t}^*(\bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\omega \wedge u^o))),$$

where the second equality holds because $\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta$ is vertical and $\omega \wedge u^o$, being of bidegree $(n+1, 1)$, is of the form $\omega \wedge u^o = dt^\mu \wedge c_\mu$, and hence vanishes along fibers. Since $\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta = \tau^\mu \bar{\partial}\xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta$ we see that $\omega_t \wedge (\gamma_\mu + \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o)$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact on X_t . Therefore the $E|_{X_t}$ -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -form

$$V_\mu^1 := \Lambda_{\omega_t} \bar{\partial}^* G_t (\omega_t \wedge (\gamma_\mu + \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o))$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_t \wedge (\bar{\partial}V_\mu^1 - (\gamma_\mu + \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o)) &= \bar{\partial}(\omega_t \wedge V_\mu^1) - \omega_t \wedge (\gamma_\mu + \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o) \\ &= \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* G_t (\omega_t \wedge (\gamma_\mu + \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o)) - \omega_t \wedge (\gamma_\mu + \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows because $[L_{\omega_t}, \Lambda_{\omega_t}] = L_{\omega_t} \Lambda_{\omega_t} = \text{Id}$ on $(E$ -valued) $(n, 1)$ -forms, and in the last equality we have used that $\square = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*$ on $\bar{\partial}$ -closed forms. We note that, by the Hodge identity $\sqrt{-1}[\nabla^{1,0}, \Lambda_{\omega_t}] = \bar{\partial}^*$,

$$\nabla^{1,0}V_\mu^1 = \nabla^{1,0}\Lambda_{\omega_t} \bar{\partial}^* G_t (\omega_t \wedge \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o) = [\nabla^{1,0}, \Lambda_{\omega_t}] \bar{\partial}^* G_t (\omega_t \wedge \iota_{X_t}^* \alpha_\mu^o) = 0.$$

Next, $P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu^o$ is trivially orthogonal to the holomorphic E -valued n -forms, which are precisely the harmonic E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms. By assumption, for every $\mu \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ the twisted form $\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell)$ is orthogonal to the holomorphic E -valued n -forms. Since on E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms $\square = \square' = \nabla^{1,0} \nabla^{1,0*}$ and hence $G' = G$, the E -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -form

$$V_\mu^2 := G_t' \nabla^{1,0*} \left(P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu^o - \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell) \right) = \nabla^{1,0*} G_t' \left(P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu^o - \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell) \right)$$

solves the equation

$$\nabla^{1,0} V_\mu^2 = P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu^o - \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell)$$

and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_t \wedge \bar{\partial} V_\mu^2 &= \bar{\partial} L_{\omega_t} \nabla^{1,0*} G_t \left(P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu^o - \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell) \right) \\ &= \bar{\partial} [L_{\omega_t}, \nabla^{1,0*}] G_t \left(P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu^o - \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell) \right) \\ &= -\sqrt{-1} \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} G_t \left(P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* \phi_\mu^o - \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\mu}}^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} \ell) \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Taking v_μ to be any smooth extension of $V_\mu := V_\mu^1 + V_\mu^2$ to X , we find that the representative $u = u^o + dt^\mu \wedge v_\mu$ satisfies Properties a and b. Finally, for *any* representative u of f one has

$$(28) \quad \bar{\partial} (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u) = (\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner u - \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u,$$

so $(\bar{\partial} \xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner u$ and $\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u$ are $\bar{\partial}$ -cohomologous (on fibers). Thus Property c holds as well. \square

9.4. The Proof of Theorem 4. Let us fix representatives u_i of $\mathbf{a}(f_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, as in Theorem 9.2 with $\ell = 0$. That is to say, u_1 and u_2 have the following properties.

- a. The E -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -forms $\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u_i)$ are primitive.
- b. The $E|_{X_t}$ -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms $\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0} u_i)$ are holomorphic.

Moreover, by an application of Proposition 4.15 we may assume that $\iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\tau^\theta}^{1,0} \bar{\partial} u_i = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta / \mathcal{H}}(\sigma) \mathfrak{f}_1 &= P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0} u_1 = P_t^\perp \iota_{X_t}^* (\nabla^{1,0} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) + \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner (\nabla^{1,0} u_1)) \\ &= P_t^\perp \nabla^{1,0} (\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) = \nabla^{1,0} (\iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)). \end{aligned}$$

The third equality follows from Property b, while the last equality holds because the image of $\nabla^{1,0}$ in $\Gamma(X, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_X^{n,0} \otimes E))$ is orthogonal to the kernel of $\square^{1,0} = \square$, and the latter kernel

consists precisely of holomorphic forms. Similarly $\mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta/\mathcal{H}}(\tau)\mathbf{f}_2 = \nabla^{1,0}(\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2))$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta/\mathcal{H}}(\sigma)\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{II}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta/\mathcal{H}}(\tau)\mathbf{f}_2) &= \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \int_{X_t} \langle \nabla^{1,0}(\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{\nabla^{1,0}(\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2))}, h \rangle \\
&= (-1)^{n+1} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \int_{X_t} \langle \bar{\partial} \nabla^{1,0}(\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)}, h \rangle \\
&= \sqrt{-1}^{n^2-2n+1} \int_{X_t} \langle ((\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t)\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)}), h \rangle \\
&\quad - (-1)^{n+1} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \int_{X_t} \langle \nabla^{1,0} \bar{\partial}(\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)} \rangle \\
&= \sqrt{-1}^{(n-1)^2} \int_{X_t} \langle ((\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t)(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)}), h \rangle \\
&\quad - \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \int_{X_t} \langle ((\bar{\partial}(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{\bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)}), h \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (19) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t)\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) &= [L_{\omega_t}, \Lambda_{\omega_t}]\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t)\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) = L_{\omega_t}\Lambda_{\omega_t}\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t)\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) \\
&= -L_{\omega_t}[\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t}]\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\sqrt{-1}^{(n-1)^2} \int_{X_t} \langle ((\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t)(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)}), h \rangle = - \left([\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t}] \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1, \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2 \right).$$

From the differential identity $\bar{\partial}(\xi \lrcorner u) = (\bar{\partial}\xi) \lrcorner u - \xi \lrcorner \bar{\partial}u$ and the algebraic identity

$$(a - b, a - b) = (a, a) - (b, b) - (a - b, b) - (b, a - b)$$

for a bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{X_t} \langle (\bar{\partial}(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{\bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)}, h \rangle \\
&= \int_{X_t} \langle ((\bar{\partial}\xi_\sigma^\theta) \lrcorner u_1) \wedge \overline{((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner u_2)}, h \rangle - \int_{X_t} \langle \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial}u_1) \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial}u_2)}, h \rangle \\
&\quad - \int_{X_t} \langle (\bar{\partial}(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial}u_2))}, h \rangle - \int_{X_t} \langle (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial}u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2))}, h \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{X_t} \langle (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial}u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\bar{\partial}(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2))}, h \rangle = (-1)^{n-1} \int_{X_t} \langle \nabla^{1,0}(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner (\bar{\partial}u_1)) \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}, h \rangle \\
&= (-1)^n \int_{X_t} \langle (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner (\nabla^{1,0}\bar{\partial}u_1)) \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}, h \rangle - (-1)^n \int_{X_t} \langle (L_{\xi_\sigma^\theta}^{1,0}\bar{\partial}u_1) \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}, h \rangle \\
&= (-1)^n \int_{X_t} \langle (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner (\nabla^{1,0}\bar{\partial}u_1)) \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}, h \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

We claim that $\iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\nabla^{1,0}\bar{\partial}u_1)) = \iota_{X_t}^*(\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\Theta(h)u_1))$. Indeed, since $\nabla^{1,0}u_1 = dt^\mu \wedge \phi_\mu$ with ϕ_μ holomorphic on X_t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\bar{\partial}\nabla^{1,0}u_1) &= (\bar{\partial}\xi_\sigma^\theta) \lrcorner \nabla^{1,0}u_1 - \bar{\partial}(\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta \nabla^{1,0}u_1) \\ &= dt^\mu \wedge ((\bar{\partial}\xi_\sigma^\theta) \lrcorner \phi_\mu) - \bar{\partial}(\sigma^\mu \phi_\mu - dt^\mu \wedge (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta \phi_\mu)) \\ &= -\sigma^\mu \bar{\partial}\phi_\mu + dt^\mu \wedge \left((\bar{\partial}\xi_\sigma^\theta) \lrcorner \phi_\mu - \frac{\partial\sigma^\nu}{\partial t^\mu} \phi_\nu - \xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta \phi_\mu \right). \end{aligned}$$

Both of these terms vanish on X_t , which proves our claim. Therefore

$$\int_{X_t} \langle (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\bar{\partial}u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\bar{\partial}(\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2))}, h \rangle = (-1)^n \int_{X_t} \langle (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\Theta(h)u_1)) \wedge \overline{\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2}, h \rangle.$$

By interchanging $\sigma \leftrightarrow \tau$ and $u_1 \leftrightarrow u_2$ and then taking complex conjugates,

$$\int_{X_t} \langle (\bar{\partial}(\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta(\bar{\partial}u_2))}, h \rangle = (-1)^n \int_{X_t} \langle (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1) \wedge \overline{\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta(\Theta(h)u_2)}, h \rangle$$

Using (19) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(-1)^n \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\Theta(h)u_1)) \wedge \overline{\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2}, h \rangle \\ &= -\sqrt{-1}^{n^2-2n+1} \int_{X_t} \langle \omega_t \wedge \Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h)u_1)) \wedge \overline{\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2}, h \rangle \\ &= -(\Lambda_{\omega_t}(\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h)u_1)), \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2) \\ &= -(\Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta \sqrt{-1}\Theta(h)) u_1, \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2) - (\Lambda_{\omega_t} \sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t)(\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1), \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2) \\ &= -(\Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta \sqrt{-1}\Theta(h)) u_1, \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2) + ([\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t}] (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1), \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2), \end{aligned}$$

Since $[\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t}] = \square - \square^{1,0}$ is Hermitian symmetric for the L^2 -norm, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \int_{X_t} \langle (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\bar{\partial}u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\bar{\partial}(\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2))}, h \rangle + \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \int_{X_t} \langle (\bar{\partial}(\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta(\bar{\partial}u_2))}, h \rangle \\ &= 2 \left([\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t}] (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1), \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2 \right) \\ &\quad - (\Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta \sqrt{-1}\Theta(h)) u_1, \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2) - (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1, \Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta \sqrt{-1}\Theta(h)) u_2). \end{aligned}$$

Adding everything up yields

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta/\mathcal{H}}(\sigma)\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathbf{\Pi}^{\mathcal{L}^\theta/\mathcal{H}}(\tau)\mathfrak{f}_2) \\ &= - \int_{X_t} \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle ((\bar{\partial}\xi_\sigma^\theta) \lrcorner u_1) \wedge \overline{((\bar{\partial}\xi_\tau^\theta) \lrcorner u_2)}, h \rangle - (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta(\bar{\partial}u_1), \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta(\bar{\partial}u_2)) \\ &\quad + ([\sqrt{-1}\Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t}] (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1), \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2) \\ &\quad - ([\Lambda_{\omega_t}, \iota_{X_t}^* ((\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta \sqrt{-1}\Theta(h)))] u_1, \xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta u_2) - (\xi_{\sigma \lrcorner}^\theta u_1, [\Lambda_{\omega_t}, \iota_{X_t}^* ((\xi_{\tau \lrcorner}^\theta \sqrt{-1}\Theta(h)))] u_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus Theorem 4 is proved. \square

9.5. The proof of Theorem 1. We begin with the following computation.

PROPOSITION 9.3. *Let $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2 \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}))$ be represented by E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms u_1 and u_2 respectively. Then the differential $(1, 1)$ -form $\alpha_h(\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2)$ on B defined by*

$$\alpha_h(\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) := p_* \left(\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle (\Theta(h)u_1) \wedge \bar{u}_2, h \rangle \right)$$

is given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \alpha_h(\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2), \sigma \wedge \bar{\tau} \rangle &= \left(\Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} f_1, f_2 \right) - \left(\left[\sqrt{-1} \Theta(h_t), \Lambda_{\omega_t} \right] (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1), (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h)) f_1, \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2 \right) + \left(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1, \Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h)) f_2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any choice of horizontal distribution θ .

Proof. Using a partition of unity and Fubini's Theorem, one sees that

$$\langle \alpha_h(\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2), \sigma \wedge \bar{\tau} \rangle = \int_{X_t} \left\langle \sqrt{-1}^2 \bar{\xi}_\sigma^\theta (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner ((\Theta(h)u_1) \wedge \bar{u}_2)), h \right\rangle$$

for any horizontal distribution θ . We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner ((\Theta(h)u_1) \wedge \bar{u}_2) &= ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_1 \wedge \bar{u}_2) + ((\Theta(h)(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \bar{u}_2) \\ &= ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_1 \wedge \bar{u}_2) - ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) \wedge \overline{\Theta(h)u_2}), \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta \lrcorner (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner ((\Theta(h)u_1) \wedge \bar{u}_2)) \\ &= ((\Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} u_1) \wedge \bar{u}_2) + (-1)^{n-1} ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_1 \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}) \\ &\quad + (-1)^n ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) \wedge \overline{(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_2}) + (-1)^n ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) \wedge \overline{\Theta(h)(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)}) \\ &= ((\Theta(h)_{\xi_\sigma^\theta \bar{\xi}_\tau^\theta} u_1) \wedge \bar{u}_2) + (-1)^{n-1} ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_1 \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}) \\ &\quad + (-1)^n (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1 \wedge \overline{(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_2}) + (-1)^{n-1} (\Theta(h)(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}). \end{aligned}$$

But by (19)

$$\iota_{X_t}^* ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_1) = [L_{\omega_t}, \Lambda_{\omega_t}] \iota_{X_t}^* ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_1) = L_{\omega_t} \Lambda_{\omega_t} \iota_{X_t}^* ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_1),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \left\langle (-1)^{n-1} ((\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_1 \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}), h \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \sqrt{-1}^{(n-1)^2} (\omega_t \wedge \Lambda_{\omega_t} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h))u_1 \wedge \overline{\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2}), h \right\rangle = \left\{ \Lambda_{\omega_t} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h))u_1, \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2 \right\} \frac{\omega_t^n}{n!}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ is the pointwise inner product, on X_t , of E -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -forms induced by h_t and ω_t . Similarly

$$(-1)^n \left\langle \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1) \wedge \overline{(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \Theta(h))u_2}, h \right\rangle = \left\{ \xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1, \Lambda_{\omega_t} (\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h))u_2 \right\} \frac{\omega_t^n}{n!}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{n-1} \left\langle \sqrt{-1}^{n^2} (\Theta(h)(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1)) \wedge \overline{(\xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2)}, h \right\rangle &= \left\{ \Lambda_{\omega_t} \sqrt{-1} \Theta(h)(\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1), \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2 \right\} \frac{\omega_t^n}{n!} \\ &= - \left\{ \left[\sqrt{-1} \Theta(h), \Lambda_{\omega_t} \right] (\xi_\sigma^\theta \lrcorner u_1), \xi_\tau^\theta \lrcorner u_2 \right\} \frac{\omega_t^n}{n!}. \end{aligned}$$

Integration over X_t completes the proof. \square

Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1. Fix a smooth horizontal distribution θ and a point $t \in B$. Let $\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2 \in \Gamma(B, \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{L}))$ be smooth sections such that $\mathbf{f}_i(t) \in \mathcal{H}_t$, $i = 1, 2$, and

take representative E -valued $(n, 0)$ -forms u_1, u_2 of $\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2$ as in Theorem 4. By Theorem 2, Theorem 4 and Proposition 9.3 we obtain

$$(\Theta_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\mathcal{H}} \mathfrak{f}_1(t), \mathfrak{f}_2(t)) = \left(\xi_{\sigma\bar{\tau}}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u_1, \xi_{\tau\bar{\sigma}}^{\theta} \bar{\partial} u_2 \right) + \left\langle p_* \left(\sqrt{-1}^{n^2} \langle (\Theta(h)u_1) \wedge \bar{u}_2, h \rangle \right), \sigma \wedge \bar{\tau} \right\rangle.$$

The first term on the right hand side of this formula defines a Nakano-non-negative form on \mathcal{H}_t , and the second defines a Demailly k -positive (respectively k -non-negative) form if and only if h has Demailly k -positive (respectively k -non-negative) curvature. The proof is complete. \square

REFERENCES

- [B-2009] Berndtsson, B., *Curvature of vector bundles associated to holomorphic fibrations*. Ann. of Math. (2) 169 (2009), no. 2, 531 – 560.
- [B-2011] Berndtsson, B., *Strict and nonstrict positivity of direct image bundles*. Math. Z. 269 (2011), 1201 – 1218.
- [BL-2016] Berndtsson, B.; Lempert, L., *A proof of the Ohsawa-Takegoshi theorem with sharp estimates*. J. Math. Soc. Japan Vol. 68, No. 4 (2016) pp. 1461 – 1472
- [GH-1978] Griffiths, P.; Harris, J., *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*. Wiley University Press, 1978.
- [H-2005] Huybrechts, D., *Complex Geometry. An Introduction*. Universitext series, Springer, 2005.
- [K-1986] Kodaira, K., *Complex Manifolds and Deformation of Complex Structures*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 283. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.
- [LS-2014] Lempert, L.; Szőke, R., *Direct images, fields of Hilbert spaces, and geometric quantization*. Comm. Math. Phys. 327 (2014), no. 1, 49 – 99.
- [LY-2014] Liu, K.; Yang, X., *Curvature of direct image sheaves of vector bundles and applications*. J. Diff. Geom., **98** (2014) 117 – 145.
- [R-2014] Raufi, H., *An extension theorem of Ohsawa-Takegoshi type for sections of a vector bundle*. Preprint, 2014 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.1637v1>
- [Si-1982] Siu, Y.-T., *Complex-analyticity of harmonic maps, vanishing and Lefschetz theorems*. J. Diff. Geom. **17** (1982) 55 – 138.
- [U-2021] Upadrashta, P., . Preprint, 2021.
- [Va-2021] Varolin, D., *Singular Hermitian Metrics for Holomorphic Vector Bundles, Variation of Bergman Spaces of Locally Trivial Families and \mathbf{L}^2 Extension of Holomorphic Sections*. In preparation.
- [Vo-2007] Voisin, C., *Hodge theory and complex algebraic geometry. I and II*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 76 and 77. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [Wang-2017] Wang, X., *A curvature formula associated to a family of pseudoconvex domains*. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 67 (2017), no. 1, 269 – 313.