

ON DEGENERATIONS OF SURFACES

A. CALABRI, C. CILIBERTO, F. FLAMINI, R. MIRANDA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study in detail some properties of reducible surfaces, in particular of unions of planes. When, in particular, the surface is the central fibre of an embedded flat degeneration of surfaces in a projective space, we deduce some properties of the smooth surface which is the general fibre of the degeneration from some combinatorial properties of the central fibre. In particular we show that there are strong constraints on the invariants of a smooth surface which degenerates to configurations of planes with global normal crossings or other mild singularities.

We then consider several examples of embedded degenerations of smooth surfaces to unions of planes.

Our interest in these problems has been raised by a series of interesting articles by Guido Zappa in 1950's.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Reducible curves and associated graphs	6
3. Zappatic surfaces and associated graphs	9
4. Dualizing sheaf of seminormal curves	18
5. Dualizing sheaf of good Zappatic surfaces	22
6. The genus of a good Zappatic surface	26
7. Zappatic degenerations	33
8. Minimal and quasi-minimal singularities	35
9. Resolution of singularities of the total space of a good Zappatic degeneration	44
10. The geometric genus in good Zappatic degenerations	49
11. Combinatorial computation of K^2	53
12. The Multiple Point Formula	63
13. On some results of Zappa	69
14. Examples of Zappatic degenerations	73
Appendix A. Normal, Cohen-Macaulay and Gorenstein properties	80
References	86

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study in detail several properties of flat degenerations of surfaces whose general fibre is a smooth projective algebraic surface and whose central fibre is a reduced, connected surface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$, $r \geq 3$, which will be usually assumed to be a *union of planes*.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 14J17, 14D06, 14N20; (Secondary) 14B07, 14N10.

The first two authors are partially supported by E.C. project EAGER, contract n. HPRN-CT-2000-00099.

As a first application of this approach, we shall see that there are strong constraints on the invariants of a smooth projective surface which degenerates to configurations of planes with global normal crossings or other mild singularities (cf. § 13).

Our results include formulas on the basic invariants of smoothable surfaces (see e.g. Theorems 6.12, 10.10 and 11.1). These formulas are useful in studying a wide range of open problems, as it happens in the curve case, where one considers *stick curves*, i.e. unions of lines with only nodes as singularities. Indeed, as stick curves are used to study moduli spaces of smooth curves and are strictly related to fundamental problems as the *Zeuthen problem* (cf. [24] and [42]), degenerations of surfaces to unions of planes naturally arise in several important instances, like toric geometry (cf. e.g. [4], [17] and [38]) and the study of the behaviour of components of moduli spaces of smooth surfaces and their compactifications. For example, see the recent paper [31], where the abelian surface case is considered, or several papers related to the $K3$ surface case (see, e.g. [8], [9] and [15]).

Using the techniques developed here, we are able to extend some results of topological nature of Clemens-Schmid (see Theorem 10.10 and cf. e.g. [36]) and to prove a Miyaoka-Yau type inequality (see Theorem 13.4 and Proposition 13.16).

In general, we expect that degenerations of surfaces to unions of planes will find many applications. These include the systematic classification of surfaces with low invariants (p_g and K^2), and especially a classification of possible boundary components to moduli spaces.

It is an open problem to understand when a family of surfaces may degenerate to a union of planes, and in some sense this is one of the most interesting questions in the subject. The techniques we develop here in some cases allow us to conclude that this is not possible. When it is possible, we obtain restrictions on the invariants which may lead to further theorems on classification, for example, the problem of bounding the irregularity of surfaces in \mathbb{P}^4 .

Other applications include the possibility of performing braid monodromy computations (see [10], [34], [35], [44]). We hope that future work will include an analysis of higher-dimensional analogues to the constructions and computations, leading for example to interesting degenerations of Calabi-Yau manifolds.

Our interest in degenerations to union of planes has been stimulated by a series of papers by Guido Zappa appeared in the 1940–50’s regarding in particular: (1) degenerations of scrolls to unions of planes and (2) the computation of bounds for the topological invariants of an arbitrary smooth projective surface which degenerates to a union of planes (see [47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53]).

In this paper we shall consider a reduced, connected, projective surface X which is a union of planes — or more generally a union of smooth surfaces — whose singularities are:

- in codimension one, double curves which are smooth and irreducible, along which two surfaces meet transversally;
- multiple points, which are locally analytically isomorphic to the vertex of a cone over a stick curve with arithmetic genus either zero or one and which is projectively normal in the projective space it spans.

These multiple points will be called *Zappatic singularities* and X will be called a *Zappatic surface*. If moreover $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$, for some positive r , and if all its irreducible components are planes, then X is called a *planar Zappatic surface*.

We will mainly concentrate on the so called *good Zappatic surfaces*, i.e. Zappatic surfaces having only Zappatic singularities whose associated stick curve has one of the following dual graphs (cf. Examples 2.7 and 2.8, Definition 3.5, Figures 2 and 4):

- R_n : a chain of length n , with $n \geq 3$;
- S_n : a fork with $n - 1$ teeth, with $n \geq 4$;
- E_n : a cycle of order n , with $n \geq 3$.

Let us call R_n -, S_n -, E_n -*point* the corresponding multiple point of the Zappatic surface X .

We first study some combinatorial properties of a Zappatic surface X (cf. § 3). We then focus on the case in which X is the central fibre of an embedded flat degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$, where Δ is the complex unit disk and where $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \Delta \times \mathbb{P}^r$, $r \geq 3$, is a closed subscheme of relative dimension two. In this case, we deduce some properties of the general fibre \mathcal{X}_t , $t \neq 0$, of the degeneration from the aforementioned properties of the central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$ (see §'s 7, 10, 11, 12 and 13).

A first instance of this approach can be found in [7], where we gave some partial results on the computation of $h^0(X, \omega_X)$, when X is a Zappatic surface with global normal crossings, i.e. with only E_3 -points, and where ω_X is its dualizing sheaf (see Theorem 4.15 in [7]). In the particular case in which X is smoothable, namely if X is the central fibre of a flat degeneration, we recalled that the formula for $h^0(X, \omega_X)$ can be also deduced from the well-known Clemens-Schmid exact sequence (cf. also e.g. [36]).

In this paper we address three main problems.

We will first extend the computation of $h^0(X, \omega_X)$ to the more general case in which X - considered as a reduced, connected surface on its own - has R_n -, S_n - and E_n -points, for $n \geq 3$, as Zappatic singularities. Indeed, given X a good Zappatic surface and ω_X its dualizing sheaf, we define

$$p_\omega(X) := h^0(X, \omega_X)$$

to be the ω -genus of X (see Definition 6.1 and Remark 6.3). When X is the central fibre of a good (planar) Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ (i.e. a flat degeneration with central fibre a good (planar) Zappatic surface), we then relate the ω -genus of the central fibre to the *geometric genus* of the general one (see Theorem 10.10).

As a second main result, we will compute the K^2 of the general fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ (see § 11).

We will then prove a basic inequality, called the *Multiple Point Formula* (cf. Theorem 12.2), which can be viewed as a generalization, for good Zappatic singularities, of the well-known Triple Point Formula (see Lemma 12.7 and cf. [14]).

All these results follow from a detailed analysis of local properties of the total space \mathcal{X} of the degeneration at a good Zappatic singularity of the central fibre X (cf. § 8 and 9).

Furthermore, we apply the computation of K^2 and the Multiple Point Formula to prove several results concerning degenerations of surfaces. In particular, we are able to prove that if $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a good planar Zappatic degeneration, where the central fibre X has at most R_3 -, E_3 -, E_4 - and E_5 -points, then

$$K^2 \leq 8\chi + 1 - g,$$

where χ is the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of the structure sheaf, K^2 the self-intersection of the canonical divisor and g the sectional genus of the general fibre. We also characterize the case in which $K^2 = 8\chi + 1 - g$ (see Sections 12 and 13). This improves the main result of Zappa in [52].

Let us describe in more detail the contents of the paper. Section 2 contains some basic results on reducible curves and their dual graphs.

In Section 3, we give the definition of Zappatic singularities and of (planar, good) Zappatic surfaces. We associate to a good Zappatic surface X a graph G_X which encodes the configuration of the irreducible components of X as well as of its Zappatic singularities (see Definition 3.6).

Then we compute from the combinatorial invariants of the associated graph G_X some of the invariants of X , e.g. the Euler-Poincaré characteristic $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X)$, and — when $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$, $r \geq 3$ — the degree $d = \deg(X)$, the sectional genus g , and so on. These computations will be frequently used in later sections, e.g. § 13.

In Sections 4 and 5, we collect some fundamental definitions and results related to the dualizing sheaf of a *seminormal curve* and of a good, Zappatic surface. These results are frequently used in the following sections.

In Section 6 we address the problem of computing the ω -genus of a good Zappatic surface X . Indeed, if G_X denotes the associated graph to the good Zappatic surface X and $b_2(G_X) = h_2(G_X, \mathbb{C})$, we prove the following:

Theorem 1. (cf. Theorem 6.12) *Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be a good Zappatic surface and let G_X be its associated graph. Consider the natural map:*

$$\Phi : \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^1(X_i, \mathcal{O}_{X_i}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} H^1(C_{ij}, \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}}),$$

where $C_{ij} = X_i \cap X_j$ are smooth, for $1 \leq i < j \leq v$ such that $C_{ij} \neq \emptyset$ (cf. formula (5.9)). Then:

$$(1.1) \quad p_\omega(X) = b_2(G_X) + \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) + \dim(\text{coker}(\Phi)).$$

In particular, we have:

Corollary. *Let X be a good planar Zappatic surface. Then,*

$$p_\omega(X) = b_2(G_X).$$

In Section 7 we introduce the definition of *good Zappatic degenerations*.

In Section 8 we recall the notions of *minimal singularity* and *quasi-minimal singularity*, which are needed to study the singularities of the total space \mathcal{X} of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ at a good Zappatic singularity of its central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$, which is a good Zappatic surface (cf also [27] and [28]).

Section 9 is devoted to studying (partial and total) resolutions of the singularities that the total space \mathcal{X} of a good Zappatic degeneration has at the Zappatic singularities of its central fibre X .

In Section 10, we apply the result in § 6 on the ω -genus (i.e. Theorem 1 above) to the case of X the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration. Precisely, with the same hypotheses of Theorem 1, we prove:

Theorem 2. (cf. Theorem 10.10) *Let $X = \mathcal{X}_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be a good Zappatic surface, whose double curves $C_{ij} = X_i \cap X_j$ are smooth. Assume that X is the central fibre of a good Zappatic*

degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. Then

$$(1.2) \quad p_g(\mathcal{X}_t) = p_\omega(X) = b_2(G_X) + \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) + \dim(\operatorname{coker}(\Phi)),$$

for any $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$. In particular, the geometric genus of the smooth fibres of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is constant.

Remark 1. Recall that, when X has only E_3 -points as Zappatic singularities and it is smoothable, with smooth total space \mathcal{X} , (i.e. X is the central fibre of a *semistable degeneration*), it is well-known that (1.2) holds. This has been proved via the *Clemens-Schmid exact sequence* approach, which relates the mixed Hodge theory of the central fibre X to that of the general one \mathcal{X}_t , $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$, by means of the monodromy of the total space \mathcal{X} (cf. e.g. [36] for details).

We remark that Theorems 1 and 2 above not only show that (1.2) more generally holds for a smoothable good Zappatic surface, i.e. with R_n -, S_n - and E_n -points, $n \geq 3$, as Zappatic singularities and with (possibly) singular total space \mathcal{X} , but mainly they extend the Clemens-Schmid approach since the computation of $p_\omega(X)$ is independent of the fact that X is the central fibre of a degeneration. Indeed, (1.1) will be shown to be equivalent to the surjectivity of a certain map of evaluation of Poincaré residues at the Zappatic singularities of suitable meromorphic 2-forms on X (cf. the proof of Theorem 6.12). This surjectivity follows, in turn, from an interesting result concerning the restriction of holomorphic 1-forms to a curve on an irregular surface (cf. Theorem 6.6).

The above considerations, in particular the relation with the Clemens-Schmid results, underline the *topological meaning* of the ω -genus.

The local analysis of minimal and quasi-minimal singularities of \mathcal{X} is fundamental also in § 11, where we compute $K_{\mathcal{X}_t}^2$, for $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$, when \mathcal{X} is a good Zappatic degeneration. More precisely, we prove the following main result (see Theorem 11.1):

Theorem 3. *Let \mathcal{X} be a good Zappatic degeneration and $X = \mathcal{X}_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be its central fibre. Let $C_{ij} := X_i \cap X_j$ be a smooth (possibly reducible) curve of the double locus of X , considered as a curve on X_i , and let g_{ij} be its geometric genus, $1 \leq i \neq j \leq v$.*

Let v and e be the number of vertices and edges of the graph G_X associated to X . Let f_n , r_n , s_n be the number of E_n -, R_n -, S_n -points of X , respectively. If $K^2 := K_{\mathcal{X}_t}^2$, for $t \neq 0$, then:

$$(1.3) \quad K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^v (K_{X_i}^2 + (\sum_{j \neq i} (4g_{ij} - C_{ij}^2))) - 8e + \sum_{n \geq 3} 2nf_n + r_3 + k,$$

where k depends only on the presence of R_n - and S_n -points, for $n \geq 4$, and precisely:

$$(1.4) \quad \sum_{n \geq 4} (n-2)(r_n + s_n) \leq k \leq \sum_{n \geq 4} \left((2n-5)r_n + \binom{n-1}{2} s_n \right).$$

In the case of good planar Zappatic degeneration we have the following:

Corollary. (cf. Corollary 11.4) *Let \mathcal{X} be a good planar Zappatic degeneration and $X = \mathcal{X}_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^v \Pi_i$ be its central fibre. Then:*

$$(1.5) \quad K^2 = 9v - 10e + \sum_{n \geq 3} 2nf_n + r_3 + k$$

where k is as in (1.4) and depends only on the presence of R_n - and S_n -points, for $n \geq 4$.

The inequalities in Theorem 3 and in its corollary reflect deep geometric properties of the degeneration. For example, if $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a good, planar Zappatic degeneration with central fibre X a union of planes having only a R_4 -point, Theorem 3 states that $8 \leq K^2 \leq 9$. The two values of K^2 correspond to the fact that the cone over a stick curve C_{R_4} (cf. Example 2.7) can be smoothed either to the Veronese surface, which has $K^2 = 9$, or to a rational normal quartic scroll in \mathbb{P}^5 , which has $K^2 = 8$ (cf. Remark 11.22). This in turn corresponds to different local structures of the total space of the deformation at the R_4 -point. Moreover, the local deformation space of a R_4 -point is reducible.

Section 12 is devoted to the *Multiple Point Formula* (1.6) below (see Theorem 12.2):

Theorem 4. *Let X be a good Zappatic surface which is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. Let $\gamma = X_1 \cap X_2$ be the intersection of two irreducible components X_1, X_2 of X . Denote by $f_n(\gamma)$ [$r_n(\gamma)$ and $s_n(\gamma)$, respectively] the number of E_n -points [R_n -points and S_n -points, respectively] of X along γ . Denote by d_γ the number of double points of the total space \mathcal{X} along γ . Then:*

$$(1.6) \quad \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + f_3(\gamma) - r_3(\gamma) - \sum_{n \geq 4} (r_n(\gamma) + s_n(\gamma) + f_n(\gamma)) \geq d_\gamma \geq 0.$$

In particular, if X is also planar, then:

$$(1.7) \quad 2 + f_3(\gamma) - r_3(\gamma) - \sum_{n \geq 4} (r_n(\gamma) + s_n(\gamma) + f_n(\gamma)) \geq d_\gamma \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, if $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ denotes the total number of double points of \mathcal{X} , then:

$$(1.8) \quad 2e + 3f_3 - 2r_3 - \sum_{n \geq 4} n f_n - \sum_{n \geq 3} (n-1)(r_n + s_n) \geq d_{\mathcal{X}} \geq 0.$$

In § 13 we apply Theorem 3 and 4 above to prove several generalizations of statements given by Zappa. For example we show that worse singularities than normal crossings are needed in order to degenerate as many surfaces as possible to unions of planes.

In the last section we exhibit several examples of good Zappatic degenerations, in particular with the central fibre having only R_3 -, E_n -, $3 \leq n \leq 6$, points.

We conclude the paper with Appendix A, where we collect several definitions and well-known results concerning connections between commutative homological Algebra and projective Geometry.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank L. Badescu, J. Kollár, for fundamental discussions and references, and A. Beauville, for having pointed out Theorem 6.6.

2. REDUCIBLE CURVES AND ASSOCIATED GRAPHS

Let C be a projective curve and let $C_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, be its irreducible components. We will assume that:

- C is connected and reduced;
- C has at most nodes as singularities;
- the curves $C_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, are smooth.

If two components C_i, C_j , $i < j$, intersect at m_{ij} points, we will denote by P_{ij}^h , $h = 1, \dots, m_{ij}$, the corresponding nodes of C .

We can associate to this situation a simple (i.e. with no loops), connected graph G_C :

- whose vertices v_1, \dots, v_n , correspond to the components C_1, \dots, C_n ;
- whose edges η_{ij}^h , $i < j$, $h = 1, \dots, m_{ij}$, joining the vertices v_i and v_j , correspond to the nodes P_{ij}^h of C .

We will assume the graph to be *lexicographically oriented*, i.e. each edge is assumed to be oriented from the vertex with lower index to the one with higher.

We will use the following notation:

- v is the number of vertices of G_C , i.e. $v = n$;
- e is the number of edges of G_C ;
- g_i is the genus of the curve C_i , which we consider as the *weight* of the vertex v_i ;
- $\chi(G_C) = v - e$ is the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of G_C ;
- $h^1(G_C) = 1 - \chi(G_C)$ is the first Betti number of G_C .

Notice that conversely, given any simple, connected, weighted (oriented) graph G , there is some curve C such that $G = G_C$.

One has the following basic result:

Theorem 2.1. *In the above situation*

$$(2.2) \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_C) = \chi(G_C) - \sum_{i=1}^v g_i = v - e - \sum_{i=1}^v g_i.$$

Proof. Let $\nu : \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ be the normalization morphism; this defines the exact sequence of sheaves on C :

$$(2.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\underline{\mathcal{I}}$ is a skyscraper sheaf supported on $\text{Sing}(C)$. Since the singularities of C are only nodes, one easily determines $H^0(C, \underline{\mathcal{I}}) \cong \mathbb{C}^e$. Therefore, by the exact sequence (2.3), one gets

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) = \chi(\nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}})) - e.$$

By the Leray isomorphism and by the fact that ν is finite, one has $\chi(\nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}})) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}})$. Since \tilde{C} is a disjoint union of the $v = n$ irreducible components of C , one has $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}) = v - \sum_{i=1}^v g_i$, which proves (2.2). (Cf. also [2] for another proof.) \square

We remark that formula (2.2) is equivalent to:

$$(2.4) \quad p_a(C) = h^1(G_C) + \sum_{i=1}^v g_i$$

(cf. Proposition 3.14.)

Notice that C is Gorenstein, i.e. the dualizing sheaf ω_C is invertible. One defines the ω -genus of C to be

$$(2.5) \quad p_\omega(C) := h^0(C, \omega_C).$$

Observe that, when C is smooth, the ω -genus coincides with the geometric genus of C .

In general, by the Riemann-Roch theorem, one has

$$(2.6) \quad p_\omega(C) = p_a(C) = h^1(G_C) + \sum_{i=1}^v g_i = e - v + 1 + \sum_{i=1}^v g_i.$$

If we have a flat family $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \Delta$ over a disc Δ with general fibre \mathcal{C}_t smooth and irreducible of genus g and special fibre $\mathcal{C}_0 = C$, then we can combinatorially compute g via the formula:

$$g = p_a(C) = h^1(G_C) + \sum_{i=1}^v g_i.$$

Often we will consider C as above embedded in a projective space \mathbb{P}^r . In this situation each curve C_i will have a certain degree d_i , and we will consider the graph G_C as *doubly weighted*, by attributing to each vertex the pair of weights (g_i, d_i) . Moreover we will attribute to the graph a further marking number, i.e. r the embedding dimension of C .

The total degree of C is

$$d = \sum_{i=1}^v d_i$$

which is also invariant by flat degeneration.

More often we will consider the case in which each curve C_i is a line. The corresponding curve C is called a *stick curve*. In this case the double weighting is $(0, 1)$ for each vertex, and it will be omitted if no confusion arises.

It should be stressed that it is not true that for any simple, connected, double weighted graph G there is a curve C in a projective space such that $G_C = G$. For example there is no stick curve corresponding to the graph of Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Dual graph of an “impossible” stick curve.

We now give two examples of stick curves which will be frequently used in this paper.

Example 2.7. Let T_n be any connected tree with $n \geq 3$ vertices. This corresponds to a non-degenerate stick curve of degree n in \mathbb{P}^n , which we denote by C_{T_n} . Indeed one can check that, taking a general point p_i on each component of C_{T_n} , the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{C_{T_n}}(p_1 + \cdots + p_n)$ is very ample. Of course C_{T_n} has arithmetic genus 0 and is a flat limit of rational normal curves in \mathbb{P}^n .

We will often consider two particular kinds of trees T_n : a chain R_n of length n and the fork S_n with $n - 1$ teeth, i.e. a tree consisting of $n - 1$ vertices joining a further vertex (see Figures 2.(a) and (b)). The curve C_{R_n} is the union of n lines l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n spanning \mathbb{P}^n , such that $l_i \cap l_j = \emptyset$ if and only if $1 < |i - j|$. The curve C_{S_n} is the union of n lines l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n spanning \mathbb{P}^n , such that l_1, \dots, l_{n-1} all intersect l_n at distinct points (see Figure 3).

Example 2.8. Let Z_n be any simple, connected graph with $n \geq 3$ vertices and $h^1(Z_n, \mathbb{C}) = 1$. This corresponds to an arithmetically normal stick curve of degree n in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} , which we denote




FIGURE 2. Examples of dual graphs.

by C_{Z_n} (as in Example 2.7). The curve C_{Z_n} has arithmetic genus 1 and it is a flat limit of elliptic normal curves in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} .

We will often consider the particular case of a cycle E_n of order n (see Figure 2.c). The curve C_{E_n} is the union of n lines l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n spanning \mathbb{P}^{n-1} , such that $l_i \cap l_j = \emptyset$ if and only if $1 < |i - j| < n - 1$ (see Figure 3).

We remark that C_{E_n} is Projectively Gorenstein (i.e. it is Projectively Cohen-Macaulay and sub-canonical, cf. Proposition A.50 in Appendix A), because $\omega_{C_{E_n}}$ is trivial, since there is an everywhere non-zero global section of $\omega_{C_{E_n}}$, given by the meromorphic 1-form on each component with residues 1 and -1 at the nodes (in a suitable order).

All the other C_{Z_n} 's, instead, are not Gorenstein because $\omega_{C_{Z_n}}$, although of degree zero, is not trivial. Indeed a graph Z_n , different from E_n , certainly has a vertex with valence 1. This corresponds to a line l such that $\omega_{C_{Z_n}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_l$ is not trivial.




FIGURE 3. Examples of stick curves.

3. ZAPPATIC SURFACES AND ASSOCIATED GRAPHS

We will now parallel, for surfaces, the case of curves recalled in the previous section. Before doing this, we need to introduce the singularities we will allow.

Definition 3.1 (Zappatic singularity). Let X be a surface and let $x \in X$ be a point. We will say that x is a *Zappatic singularity* for X if (X, x) is locally analytically isomorphic to a pair (Y, y) where Y is the cone over either a curve C_{T_n} or a curve C_{Z_n} , $n \geq 3$, and y is the vertex of the cone. Accordingly we will say that x is either a T_n - or a Z_n -point for X .

Observe that either T_n - or Z_n -points are not classified by n , unless $n = 3$.

We will consider the following situation.

Definition 3.2 (Zappatic surface). Let X be a projective surface with its irreducible components X_1, \dots, X_v . We will assume that X has the following properties:

- X is reduced and connected in codimension one;
- X_1, \dots, X_v are smooth;
- the singularities in codimension one of X are at most double curves which are smooth and irreducible along which two surfaces meet transversally;
- the further singularities of X are Zappatic singularities.

A surface like X will be called a *Zappatic surface*. If moreover X is embedded in a projective space \mathbb{P}^r and all of its irreducible components are planes, we will say that X is a *planar Zappatic surface*. In this case, the irreducible components of X will sometimes be denoted by Π_i instead of X_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$.

Notation 3.3. Let X be a Zappatic surface. Let us denote by:

- X_i : an irreducible component of X , $1 \leq i \leq v$;
- $C_{ij} := X_i \cap X_j$, $1 \leq i \neq j \leq v$, if X_i and X_j meet along a curve, otherwise set $C_{ij} = \emptyset$. We assume that each C_{ij} is smooth but not necessarily irreducible;
- g_{ij} : the geometric genus of C_{ij} , $1 \leq i \neq j \leq v$; i.e. g_{ij} is the sum of the geometric genera of the irreducible (equiv., connected) components of C_{ij} ;
- $C := \text{Sing}(X) = \cup_{i < j} C_{ij}$: the union of all the double curves of X ;
- $\Sigma_{ijk} := X_i \cap X_j \cap X_k$, $1 \leq i \neq j \neq k \leq v$, if $X_i \cap X_j \cap X_k \neq \emptyset$, otherwise $\Sigma_{ijk} = \emptyset$;
- m_{ijk} : the cardinality of the set Σ_{ijk} ;
- P_{ijk}^h : the Zappatic singular point belonging to Σ_{ijk} , for $h = 1, \dots, m_{ijk}$.

Furthermore, if $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$, for some r , we denote by

- $d = \deg(X)$: the degree of X ;
- $d_i = \deg(X_i)$: the degree of X_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$;
- $c_{ij} = \deg(C_{ij})$: the degree of C_{ij} , $1 \leq i \neq j \leq v$;
- D : a general hyperplane section of X ;
- g : the arithmetic genus of D ;
- D_i : the (smooth) irreducible component of D lying in X_i , which is a general hyperplane section of X_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$;
- g_i : the genus of D_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$.

Notice that if X is a planar Zappatic surface, then each C_{ij} , when not empty, is a line and each non-empty set Σ_{ijk} is a singleton.

Remark 3.4. A Zappatic surface X is Cohen-Macaulay. More precisely, X has global normal crossings except at points T_n , $n \geq 3$, and Z_m , $m \geq 4$. Thus the dualizing sheaf ω_X is well-defined. If X has only E_n -points as Zappatic singularities, then X is Gorenstein, hence ω_X is an invertible sheaf.

Definition 3.5 (Good Zappatic surface). The *good Zappatic singularities* are the

- R_n -points, for $n \geq 3$,
- S_n -points, for $n \geq 4$,
- E_n -points, for $n \geq 3$,

which are the Zappatic singularities whose associated stick curves are respectively C_{R_n} , C_{S_n} , C_{E_n} (see Examples 2.7 and 2.8, Figures 2, 3 and 4).

A *good Zappatic surface* is a Zappatic surface with only good Zappatic singularities.

To a good Zappatic surface X we can associate an oriented complex G_X , which we will also briefly call the *associated graph* to X .




FIGURE 4. Examples of good Zappatic singularities.

Definition 3.6 (The associated graph to X). Let X be a good Zappatic surface with Notation 3.3. The graph G_X associated to X is defined as follows (cf. Figure 5):

- each surface X_i corresponds to a vertex v_i ;
- each irreducible component of the double curve $C_{ij} = C_{ij}^1 \cup \dots \cup C_{ij}^{h_{ij}}$ corresponds to an edge e_{ij}^t , $1 \leq t \leq h_{ij}$, joining v_i and v_j . The edge e_{ij}^t , $i < j$, is oriented from the vertex v_i to the one v_j . The union of all the edges e_{ij}^t joining v_i and v_j is denoted by \tilde{e}_{ij} , which corresponds to the double curve C_{ij} ;
- each E_n -point P of X is a face of the graph whose n edges correspond to the double curves concurring at P . This is called a *n-face* of the graph;
- for each R_n -point P , with $n \geq 3$, if $P \in X_{i_1} \cap X_{i_2} \cap \dots \cap X_{i_n}$, where X_{i_j} meets X_{i_k} along a curve $C_{i_j i_k}$ only if $1 = |j - k|$, we add in the graph a *dashed edge* joining the vertices corresponding to X_{i_1} and X_{i_n} . The dashed edge e_{i_1, i_n} , together with the other $n - 1$ edges $e_{i_j, i_{j+1}}$, $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$, bound an *open n-face* of the graph;
- for each S_n -point P , with $n \geq 4$, if $P \in X_{i_1} \cap X_{i_2} \cap \dots \cap X_{i_n}$, where $X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{n-1}}$ all meet X_{i_n} along curves $C_{i_j i_n}$, $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$, concurring at P , we mark this in the graph by an *angle* spanned by the edges corresponding to the curves $C_{i_j i_n}$, $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$.

In the sequel, when we speak of *faces* of G_X we always mean closed faces. Of course each vertex v_i is weighted with the relevant invariants of the corresponding surface X_i . We will usually omit these weights if X is planar, i.e. if all the X_i 's are planes.

Since each R_n^- , S_n^- , E_n^- -point is an element of some set of points Σ_{ijk} (cf. Notation 3.3), we remark that there can be different faces (as well as open faces and angles) of G_X which are incident on the same set of vertices and edges. However this cannot occur if X is planar.




FIGURE 5. Associated graphs of R_3^- , E_3^- , R_4^- and S_4^- -points (cf. Figure 4).

Consider three vertices v_i, v_j, v_k of G_X in such a way that v_i is joint with v_j and v_k . Assume for simplicity that the double curves C_{ij} , $1 \leq i < j \leq v$, are irreducible. Then, any point in $C_{ij} \cap C_{ik}$ is either a R_n^- , or a S_n^- , or an E_n^- -point, and the curves C_{ij} and C_{ik} intersect transversally, by definition of Zappatic singularities. Hence we can compute the intersection number $C_{ij} \cdot C_{ik}$ by adding the number of closed and open faces and of angles involving the edges e_{ij}, e_{ik} . In particular, if X is planar, for every pair of adjacent edges only one of the following possibilities occur: either they belong to an open face, or to a closed one, or to an angle. Therefore for good, planar Zappatic surfaces we can avoid marking open 3-faces without losing any information (see Figures 5 and 6).




FIGURE 6. Associated graph of a R_3^- -point in a good, planar Zappatic surface.

As for stick curves, if G is a given graph as above, it does not necessarily exist a good planar Zappatic surface X such that its associated graph is $G = G_X$.

Example 3.7. Consider the graph G of Figure 7. If G were the associated graph of a good planar Zappatic surface X , then X should be a global normal crossing union of 4 planes with 5 double lines and two E_3 points, P_{123} and P_{134} , both lying on the double line C_{13} . Since the lines C_{23} and C_{34} (resp. C_{14} and C_{12}) both lie on the plane X_3 (resp. X_1), they should intersect. This means that the planes X_2, X_4 also should intersect along a line, therefore the edge e_{24} should appear in the graph.

Analogously to Example 3.7, one can easily see that, if the 1-skeleton of G is E_3 or E_4 , then in order to have a planar Zappatic surface X such that $G_X = G$, the 2-skeleton of G has to consist of the face bounded by the 1-skeleton.

Let us see two more examples of planar Zappatic surfaces.

Example 3.8. In \mathbb{P}^4 , with homogeneous coordinates x_0, \dots, x_4 , consider the good planar Zappatic surface X which is union of the five planes

$$X_0 = \{x_4 = x_0 = 0\}, \quad X_i = \{x_i = x_{i-1} = 0\}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$




FIGURE 7. Graph associated to an impossible planar Zappatic surface.

The associated graph is a cycle E_5 with no closed faces and the singular points are five R_3 -points, which, according to the previous remark, we do not mark with open 3-faces.

Example 3.9. In \mathbb{P}^5 , with affine coordinates x_1, \dots, x_5 , the planar Zappatic surface X , which is the union of the five planes

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= \{x_4 = x_5 = x_1 = 0\}, & X_2 &= \{x_5 = x_1 = x_2 = 0\}, \\ X_i &= \{x_{i-2} = x_{i-1} = x_i = 0\}, & i &= 3, 4, 5, \end{aligned}$$

has an E_5 -point at $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. The associated graph is again a cycle E_5 but with a closed 5-face.

It would be interesting to characterize all the graphs which can be associated to a good Zappatic surface.

Let us see easy examples of a good, non-planar, Zappatic surface.

Example 3.10. Consider $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ the union of two general quadrics X_1 and X_2 and a general plane X_3 . Then, $C_{12} = C_{21}$ is a smooth elliptic quartic in \mathbb{P}^3 whereas $C_{13} = C_{31}$ and $C_{23} = C_{32}$ are smooth conics; moreover,

$$X_1 \cap X_2 \cap X_3 = \Sigma_{123} = \Sigma_{213} = \dots = \Sigma_{321}$$

consists of four distinct points. Hence, G_X has three vertices, three edges (in a cycle) and four triangles (i.e. 3-faces) which are incident on the same set of vertices (equiv. edges).

We can also consider an example of a good Zappatic surface with reducible double curves.

Example 3.11. Consider D_1 and D_2 two general plane curves of degree m and n , respectively. Therefore, they are smooth, irreducible and they transversally intersect each other in mn points. Consider the surfaces:

$$X_1 = D_1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \quad \text{and} \quad X_2 = D_2 \times \mathbb{P}^1.$$

The union of these two surfaces, together with the plane $\mathbb{P}^2 = X_3$ containing the two curves, determines a good Zappatic surface X with only E_3 -points as Zappatic singularities.

More precisely, by using Notation 3.3, we have:

- $C_{13} = X_1 \cap X_3 = D_1$, $C_{23} = X_2 \cap X_3 = D_2$, $C_{12} = X_1 \cap X_2 = \sum_{k=1}^{mn} F_k$, where each F_k is a fibre isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 ;
- $\Sigma_{123} = X_1 \cap X_2 \cap X_3$ consists of the mn points of the intersection of D_1 and D_2 in X_3 .

Observe that C_{23} is smooth but not irreducible. Therefore, the associated graph to X , i.e. G_X , consists of 3 vertices, $mn + 2$ edges and mn triangles incident on them.

In order to combinatorially compute some of the invariants of a good Zappatic surface, we need some notation.

Notation 3.12. Let X be a good Zappatic surface (with invariants as in Notation 3.3) and let $G = G_X$ be its associated graph. We denote by

- V : the (indexed) set of vertices of G ;
- v : the cardinality of V , i.e. the number of irreducible components of X ;
- E : the set of edges of G ; this is indexed by the ordered triples $(i, j, t) \in V \times V \times \mathbb{N}$, where $i < j$ and $1 \leq t \leq h_{ij}$, such that the corresponding surfaces X_i, X_j meet along the curve $C_{ij} = C_{ji} = C_{ij}^1 \cup \dots \cup C_{ij}^{h_{ij}}$;
- e : the cardinality of E , i.e. the number of irreducible components of double curves in X ;
- \tilde{E} : the set of double curves C_{ij} of X ; this is indexed by the ordered pairs $(i, j) \in V \times V$, where $i < j$, such that the corresponding surfaces X_i, X_j meet along the curve $C_{ij} = C_{ji}$;
- \tilde{e} : the cardinality of \tilde{E} , i.e. the pairs of vertices of G_X which are joint by at least one edge;
- f_n : the number of n -faces of G , i.e. the number of E_n -points of X , for $n \geq 3$;
- $f := \sum_{n \geq 3} f_n$, the number of faces of G , i.e. the total number of E_n -points of X , for all $n \geq 3$;
- r_n : the number of open n -faces of G , i.e. the number of R_n -points of X , for $n \geq 3$;
- $r := \sum_{n \geq 3} r_n$, the total number of R_n -points of X , for all $n \geq 3$;
- s_n : the number of n -angles of G , i.e. the number of S_n -points of X , for $n \geq 4$;
- $s := \sum_{n \geq 4} s_n$: the total number of S_n -points of X , for all $n \geq 4$;
- $\rho_n := s_n + r_n$, for $n \geq 4$, and $\rho_3 = r_3$;
- $\rho := s + r = \sum_{n \geq 3} \rho_n$;
- $\tau := \rho + f$, the total number of good Zappatic singularities;
- w_i : the valence of the i^{th} vertex v_i of G , i.e. the number of irreducible double curves lying on X_i ;
- $\chi(G) := v - e + f$, i.e. the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of G ;
- $G^{(1)}$: the 1-skeleton of G , i.e. the graph obtained from G by forgetting all the faces, dashed edges and angles;
- $\chi(G^{(1)}) = v - e$, i.e. the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of $G^{(1)}$.

Remark 3.13. Observe that, when X is a good, planar Zappatic surface, $E = \tilde{E}$ and the 1-skeleton $G_X^{(1)}$ of G_X coincides with the dual graph G_D of the general hyperplane section D of X .

Now we can compute some of the invariants of good Zappatic surfaces.

Proposition 3.14. Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a good Zappatic surface and let $G = G_X$ be its associated graph. Let C be the double locus of X , i.e. the union of the double curves of X , $C_{ij} = C_{ji} = X_i \cap X_j$ and let $c_{ij} = \deg(C_{ij})$. Let D_i be a general hyperplane section of X_i , and denote by g_i its genus. Then the arithmetic genus of a general hyperplane section D of X is:

$$(3.15) \quad g = \sum_{i=1}^v g_i + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} c_{ij} - v + 1.$$

In particular, when X is a good, planar Zappatic surface, then

$$(3.16) \quad g = e - v + 1 = 1 - \chi(G^{(1)}).$$

Proof. Denote by d_i the degree of X_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$. Then, D is the union of the v irreducible components D_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$, such that $\deg(D_i) = d_i$ and $d := \deg(D) = \sum_{i=1}^v d_i$. Consider its associated graph G_D , defined as in § 2.

Take G , whose indexed set of edges is denoted by E , and consider an edge $e_{ij}^t \in E$ joining its vertices v_i and v_j , $i < j$, which correspond to the irreducible components X_i and X_j , respectively. The edge e_{ij}^t in G corresponds to an irreducible component C_{ij}^t of the double curve C_{ij} , $1 \leq t \leq h_{ij}$; its degree is denoted by c_{ij}^t , so that $c_{ij} = \sum_{t=1}^{h_{ij}} c_{ij}^t$.

Thus, we have exactly c_{ij} oriented edges in the graph G_D joining its vertices v_i and v_j , which now correspond to the irreducible components of D , D_i and D_j , respectively. These c_{ij} oriented edges correspond to the c_{ij} nodes of the reducible curve $D_i \cup D_j$, which is part of the hyperplane section D .

Now, recall that the Hilbert polynomial of D is, with our notation, $P_D(t) = dt + 1 - g$. On the other hand, $P_D(t)$ equals the number of independent conditions imposed on hypersurfaces \mathcal{H} of degree $t \gg 0$ to contain D .

From what observed above on G_D , it follows that the number of singular points of D is $\sum_{\tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij}$. These points impose independent conditions on hypersurfaces \mathcal{H} of degree $t \gg 0$.

Since $t \gg 0$ by assumption, we get that the map

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(t)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_{D_i}(t))$$

is surjective and that the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{D_i}(t)$ is non-special on D_i , for each $1 \leq i \leq v$. Thus, in order for \mathcal{H} to contain D_i we have to impose $d_i t - g_i + 1 - \sum_{j \text{ s.t. } \tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij}$ conditions. Therefore the total number of conditions for \mathcal{H} to contain D is:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^v \left(d_i t - g_i + 1 - \sum_{j, \tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij} \right) &= \sum_{\tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij} + dt - \sum_{i=1}^v g_i + v - \sum_{i=1}^v \sum_{j, \tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij} = \\ &= dt + v - \sum_{i=1}^v g_i - \sum_{\tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{i=1}^v \sum_{j, \tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij} = 2 \sum_{\tilde{e}_{ij} \in \tilde{E}} c_{ij}$. This proves (3.15) (cf. formula (2.6)).

The second part of the statement directly follows from the above computations and from the fact that, in the good planar Zappatic case $g_i = 0$ and $c_{ij} = 1$, for each $i < j$, i.e. G_D coincides with $G^{(1)}$ (cf. Remark 3.13). \square

By recalling Notation 3.12, one also has:

Proposition 3.17. *Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be a good Zappatic surface and G_X be its associated graph, whose number of faces is f . Let C be the double locus of X , which is the union of the curves $C_{ij} = X_i \cap X_j$. Then:*

$$(3.18) \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = \sum_{i=1}^v \chi(\mathcal{O}_{X_i}) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}}) + f.$$

In particular, when X is a good, planar Zappatic surface, then

$$(3.19) \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = \chi(G_X) = v - e + f.$$

Proof. We can consider the sheaf morphism:

$$(3.20) \quad \bigoplus_{i=1}^v \mathcal{O}_{X_i} \xrightarrow{\lambda} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}},$$

defined in the following way: if

$$\pi_{ij} : \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}}$$

denotes the projection on the $(ij)^{\text{th}}$ -summand, then

$$(\pi_{ij} \circ \lambda)(h_1, \dots, h_v) := h_i - h_j.$$

Notice that the definition of λ is consistent with the lexicographic order of the indices and with the lexicographic orientation of the edges of the graph G_X .

Observe that, if \tilde{X} denotes the minimal desingularization of X , then \tilde{X} is isomorphic to the disjoint union of the smooth, irreducible components X_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$, of X . Therefore, by the very definition of \mathcal{O}_X , we see that

$$\ker(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{O}_X.$$

We claim that the morphism λ is not surjective and that its cokernel is a sky-scraper sheaf supported at the E_n -points of X , for $n \geq 3$. To show this, we focus on any irreducible component of $C = \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} C_{ij}$, the double locus of X . For simplicity, we shall assume that each curve C_{ij} is irreducible; one can easily extend the same computations to the general case.

Fix any index pair (i, j) , with $i < j$, and consider the generator

$$(3.21) \quad (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \bigoplus_{1 \leq l < m \leq v} \mathcal{O}_{C_{lm}},$$

where $1 \in \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}}$, the $(ij)^{\text{th}}$ -summand. The obstructions to lift up this element to an element of $\bigoplus_{1 \leq t \leq v} \mathcal{O}_{X_t}$ are given by the presence of good Zappatic singularities of X along C_{ij} .

For what concerns the irreducible components of X which are not involved in the intersection determining a good Zappatic singularity on C_{ij} , the element in (3.21) trivially lifts-up to 0 on each of them. Thus, in the sequel, we shall focus only on the irreducible components involved in the Zappatic singularity, which will be denoted by X_i, X_j, X_{l_t} , for $1 \leq t \leq n-2$.

We have to consider different cases, according to the good Zappatic singularity type lying on the curve $C_{ij} = X_i \cap X_j$.

- Suppose that C_{ij} passes through a R_n -point P of X , for some n ; we have two different possibilities. Indeed:

(a) let X_i be an “external” surface for P — i.e. X_i corresponds to a vertex of the associated graph of P which has valence 1. Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \bullet & \text{---} & \bullet & \text{---} & \bullet & \cdots & \text{---} & \bullet & \text{---} & \bullet \\ X_i & & X_j & & X_{l_1} & & & X_{l_{n-3}} & & X_{l_{n-2}} \end{array}$$

In this situation, the element in (3.21) lifts up to

$$(1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{O}_{X_i} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{X_j} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq t \leq n-2} \mathcal{O}_{X_{l_t}}.$$

(b) let X_i be an “internal” surface for P — i.e. X_i corresponds to a vertex of the associated graph to P which has valence 2. Thus, we have a picture like:



In this case, the element in (3.21) lifts up to the n -tuple having components:

$$1 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_i},$$


$$0 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_j},$$

$$1 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_{l_t}}, \text{ for those } X_{l_t} \text{'s corresponding to vertices in the graph associated to } P \text{ which are on the left of } X_i \text{ and,}$$

$$0 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_{l_k}} \text{ for those } X_{l_k} \text{'s corresponding to vertices in the graph associated to } P \text{ which are on the right of } X_j.$$

- Suppose that C_{ij} passes through a S_n -point P of X , for any n ; as before, we have two different possibilities. Indeed:

(a) let X_i correspond to the vertex of valence $n - 1$ in the associated graph to P , i.e.




In this situation, the element in (3.21) lifts up to the n -tuple having components:

$$1 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_i},$$

$$0 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_j},$$

$$1 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_{l_t}}, \text{ for all } 1 \leq t \leq n - 2.$$

(b) let X_i correspond to a vertex of valence 1 in the associated graph to P . Since $C_{ij} \neq \emptyset$ by assumption, then X_j has to be the vertex of valence $n - 1$, i.e. we have the following picture:



Thus, the element in (3.21) lifts up to the n -tuple having components

$$1 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_i},$$

$$0 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_j},$$

$$0 \in \mathcal{O}_{X_{l_t}}, \text{ for all } 1 \leq t \leq n - 2.$$

- Suppose that C_{ij} passes through an E_n -point P for X . Then, each vertex of the associated graph to P has valence 2. Since such a graph is a cycle, it is clear that no lifting of (3.21) can be done.

To sum up, we see that $\text{coker}(\lambda)$ is supported at the E_n -points of X . Furthermore, if we consider

$$\bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_P} \mathcal{O}_P = \mathbb{C}_P, \quad \oplus f_{ij} \mapsto \sum f_{ij}(P)$$

it is clear that, if P is an E_n -point then

$$\text{ev}_P \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}} / \text{Im}(\lambda) \right) \cong \mathbb{C}_P.$$

This means that

$$\operatorname{coker}(\lambda) \cong \underline{\mathbb{C}}^f.$$

By the exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq v} \mathcal{O}_{X_i} \rightarrow \operatorname{Im}(\lambda) \rightarrow 0, \quad 0 \rightarrow \operatorname{Im}(\lambda) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathbb{C}}^f \rightarrow 0,$$

we get (3.18). \square

To conclude this section, we observe that in the particular case of good, planar Zappatic surface one can determine a simple relation among the numbers of Zappatic singularities, as the next lemma shows.

Lemma 3.22. *Let G be the associated graph to a good, planar Zappatic surface $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$. Then, with Notation (3.12), we have*

$$(3.23) \quad \sum_{i=1}^v \frac{w_i(w_i - 1)}{2} = \sum_{n \geq 3} (nf_n + (n - 2)r_n) + \sum_{n \geq 4} \binom{n-1}{2} s_n.$$

Proof. The associated graph to three planes which form a R_3 -point consists of two adjacent edges (cf. Figure 6). The total number of two adjacent edges in G is the left hand side member of (3.23) by definition of valence w_i . On the other hand, a n -face (resp. an open n -face, resp. a n -angle) clearly contains exactly n (resp. $n - 2$, resp. $\binom{n-1}{2}$) pairs of adjacent edges. \square

4. DUALIZING SHEAF OF SEMINORMAL CURVES

Here we want to collect some fundamental definitions and results, which will be used in the sequel.

All schemes will be considered as schemes over \mathbb{C} . Recall that, given Y a proper scheme of dimension n , a *dualizing sheaf* for Y is a coherent sheaf, denoted by ω_Y , together with a trace morphism $t : H^n(Y, \omega_Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that, for all coherent sheaves \mathcal{F} on Y , the natural pairing

$$\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_Y) \times H^n(Y, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^n(Y, \omega_Y)$$

followed by t gives an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_Y) \cong H^n(Y, \mathcal{F})^\vee$$

(cf. [23], III.7). It is well-known that if Y is projective, then there always exists a unique dualizing sheaf for Y (cf. Propositions 7.2 and 7.5 in [23]). More precisely, if Y is a closed subscheme of codimension r in some projective space \mathbb{P}^N , then

$$(4.1) \quad \omega_Y \cong \underline{\operatorname{Ext}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}}^r(\mathcal{O}_Y, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^N})$$

(cf. [23], Lemma 7.4).

Remark 4.2. Recall that, by the definition and the uniqueness of the dualizing sheaf, ω_Y is torsion-free.

In particular, when Y is smooth, ω_Y coincides with the *canonical bundle* of Y .

We now focus on the curve case; we first recall some useful definitions and results.

Definition 4.3. Let T be a smooth surface and C be a smooth, irreducible curve on T . Let α be a global meromorphic 2-form on T whose polar locus contains C . We may assume that x, y are local coordinates on T in an analytic neighbourhood of a point of C in such a way that $y = 0$ is the local equation defining C . Then, the *Poincaré residue map* (or *adjunction map*)

$$\omega_T \otimes \mathcal{O}_T(C) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}_C} \omega_C$$

is locally defined by:

$$\alpha = \frac{f(x, y)}{y} dx \wedge dy \mapsto -f(x, 0) dx$$

and $-f(x, 0) dx$ is called the (*Poincaré*) *residue* of the 2-form α along C (see [20, p. 147]).

Recall, now, that C is a *seminormal curve* if C is a non-degenerate cone in \mathbb{P}^n with vertex a point P over n independent points, for some n . Let

$$\nu : \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$$

be the normalization morphism, so that $\nu^{-1}(P) = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$.

Remark 4.4. Observe that seminormal curves, as well as plane curves which are union of lines concurring at a given point, are strictly related to good, Zappatic surfaces. Indeed, let X be a good, Zappatic surface and $P \in X$ be a Zappatic singularity. By using Notation 3.3 and 3.12, we have:

- (i) if P is an E_n -point then, around P , (X, P) is locally analytically isomorphic to a cone in \mathbb{P}^n over the stick curve C_{E_n} whereas (C, P) , which is determined by the n irreducible components of $C = \text{Sing}(X)$ concurring at P , is locally analytically isomorphic to a seminormal curve which is a cone of degree n in \mathbb{P}^n over n independent points and with vertex at P ;
- (ii) if P is a R_n -point then, around P , (X, P) is locally analytically isomorphic to a cone in \mathbb{P}^{n+1} over the stick curve C_{R_n} whereas (C, P) , which is determined by the $n - 1$ irreducible components of $C = \text{Sing}(X)$ concurring at P , is locally analytically isomorphic to a seminormal curve which is a cone of degree $n - 1$ in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} over $n - 1$ independent points and with vertex at P ;
- (iii) On the contrary, if P is a S_n -point then, around P , (X, P) is locally analytically isomorphic to a cone in \mathbb{P}^{n+1} over the stick curve C_{S_n} whereas (C, P) , which is determined by the $n - 1$ irreducible components of $C = \text{Sing}(X)$ concurring at P , is locally analytically isomorphic to a plane curve of degree $n - 1$ formed by $n - 1$ lines passing through P .

Proposition 4.5. *Let C be either*

- *a seminormal curve of vertex P , or*
- *a plane curve which is a union of lines concurring at a point P .*

Let $\nu : \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ be its normalization and let $\nu^{-1}(P) = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$. Let ω_C be the dualizing sheaf of C and $\omega_{\tilde{C}}$ be the canonical sheaf of \tilde{C} .

Then, one has:

$$(4.6) \quad 0 \rightarrow \omega_C \rightarrow \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}(p_1 + \dots + p_n)) \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathcal{T} \rightarrow 0,$$

where

- i) ρ is given by the sum of residues of meromorphic forms on \tilde{C} having poles at the p_i 's, $1 \leq i \leq n$,
- ii) $\mathcal{T} \cong \mathbb{C}$ is a sky-scraper sheaf supported at $P = \text{Sing}(C)$.

Proof. We consider the case of C a seminormal curve, since the plane case is similar.

Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a seminormal curve with vertex $P = \text{Sing}(C)$. Then, if we consider the evaluation map:

$$\mathcal{O}_C \xrightarrow{ev_P} \mathcal{O}_P \rightarrow 0,$$

its kernel is $\ker(ev_P) \cong \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}(-\sum_{i=1}^n p_i))$. This directly follows by the exact diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 \rightarrow & \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}(-p_1 - \cdots - p_n)) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}(-p_1 - \cdots - p_n)) & \rightarrow & 0 & \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_C & \rightarrow & \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \mathbb{C}^{n-1} & \rightarrow 0 \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 \rightarrow & \mathbb{C} & \rightarrow & \mathbb{C}^n & \rightarrow & \mathbb{C}^{n-1} & \rightarrow 0, \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 & 0 & & 0 & & 0 &
 \end{array}$$

where

$$\alpha(f) := (f(p_1) - f(p_2), \dots, f(p_1) - f(p_n)).$$

Therefore, one has the exact sequence

$$(4.7) \quad 0 \rightarrow \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}(-p_1 - \cdots - p_n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_P \rightarrow 0.$$

If we apply the functor $\underline{\mathcal{H}om}(-, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-n-1))$ to (4.7), since

$$\text{codim}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(P) = \text{codim}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(C) + 1 = n,$$

by Lemma III.7.3 and by Propositions III.6.8, 6.10.A and 6.12.A in [23], we get:

$$\underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^{n-1}(\mathcal{O}_P, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-n-1)) = \underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^n(\mathcal{O}_C, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-n-1)) = 0.$$

Therefore, from (4.7), we get:

$$0 \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^{n-1}(\mathcal{O}_C, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^{n-1}(\nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}(-p_1 - \cdots - p_n)), \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^n(\mathcal{O}_P, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow 0;$$

by the definition of dualizing sheaf (4.1), this equals

$$(4.8) \quad 0 \rightarrow \omega_C \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^{n-1}(\nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}(-p_1 - \cdots - p_n)), \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_P \rightarrow 0.$$

Observe also that

$$(4.9) \quad \underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^{n-1}(\nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}(-p_1 - \cdots - p_n)), \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \cong \underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^{n-1}(\nu_*(\oplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}_{C_i}(-p_i)), \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}).$$

Since $\nu|_{C_i}$ isomorphically embeds each irreducible component of \tilde{C} in \mathbb{P}^n , then by (4.9) we get

$$(4.10) \quad \underline{\mathcal{E}xt}^{n-1}(\nu_*(\oplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}_{C_i}(-p_i)), \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \cong \nu_*(\oplus_{i=1}^n \omega_{C_i}(p_i)) = \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i)).$$

Observe that, on each irreducible component, the map

$$\omega_{C_i}(p_i) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{p_i}$$

is exactly the evaluation of residues at p_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$. If one extends by linearity to each irreducible component, it immediately follows that ρ is the sum of all these residues, which proves (i).

Finally, one concludes by plugging (4.10) in (4.8). \square

Remark 4.11. From the above result, the global sections of ω_C can be viewed as meromorphic forms on the normalization \tilde{C} having poles only at the p_i 's, $1 \leq i \leq n$, and whose sum of residues is zero. Therefore, the dualizing sheaf ω_C of a seminormal curve has rank $n - 1$ at P , which exactly is the *Cohen-Macaulay type* of the singularity (C, P) .

Assume that C is a reduced (possibly reducible) divisor on a smooth surface T ; suppose that C has only nodes as singularities. Then, around each node, C is locally isomorphic to a seminormal curve. Take local coordinates on T in an analytic neighbourhood of a node of C in such a way that $xy = 0$ is its local defining equation. If

$$\alpha = \frac{f(x, y)}{xy} dx \wedge dy,$$

then, as in Definition 4.3, one determines the Poincaré residue map by considering

$$(4.12) \quad \mathcal{R}_C(\alpha) \in H^0(C, \omega_C)$$

defined as the pair of forms:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad \alpha_x &= -\frac{f(x, 0)}{x} dx \text{ on the branch } y = 0, \\ \text{(ii)} \quad \alpha_y &= \frac{f(0, y)}{y} dy \text{ on the branch } x = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.13. If $\mathcal{R}_0(\alpha_x)$ denotes the usual Poincaré residue at the point $x = 0$ of the meromorphic 1-form α_x on the (smooth) branch $y = 0$, observe that

$$(4.14) \quad \mathcal{R}_0(\alpha_y) = -\mathcal{R}_0(\alpha_x).$$

This is consistent with the definition of $H^0(C, \omega_C)$. Indeed, assume that C has only m nodes; then, if $\nu : \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ is the normalization morphism and if $\{q_1, q'_1\}, \{q_2, q'_2\}, \dots, \{q_m, q'_m\}$ are the pre-images in \tilde{C} of the m nodes of C , then ω_C is the invertible subsheaf

$$\omega_C \subset \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}(\sum_{i=1}^m (q_i + q'_i)))$$

such that a section σ of $\nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}(\sum_{i=1}^m (q_i + q'_i)))$, viewed as a section of $\omega_{\tilde{C}}(\sum_{i=1}^m (q_i + q'_i))$, is a section of ω_C if and only if

$$\mathcal{R}_{q_i}(\sigma) + \mathcal{R}_{q'_i}(\sigma) = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

Let C be a seminormal curve such that the Cohen-Macaulay type of (C, P) is $n - 1$. Let \tilde{C} be its normalization; then, on \tilde{C} , we have the exact sequence:

$$(4.15) \quad 0 \rightarrow \omega_{\tilde{C}} \rightarrow \omega_{\tilde{C}}(p_1 + \dots + p_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i} \rightarrow 0.$$

From (4.15) and from the fact that $R^1(\nu_*\omega_{\tilde{C}}) = 0$, it follows that

$$(4.16) \quad 0 \rightarrow \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}) \rightarrow \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}(p_1 + \dots + p_n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathcal{S} \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ is supported at P .

If we consider (4.6) and (4.16), we can state the following:

Proposition 4.17. *With notation as above, we have the exact diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& 0 & & 0 & & 0 & \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
0 \rightarrow & \omega_C \otimes m_P & \longrightarrow & \omega_C & \rightarrow & \mathcal{R} & \rightarrow 0 \\
& \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
0 \rightarrow & \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}) & \rightarrow & \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i)) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{S} & \rightarrow 0 \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow^\alpha & \\
& 0 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{T} & = & \mathcal{T} & \rightarrow 0, \\
& & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
& & & 0 & & 0 &
\end{array}$$

where $m_P \subset \mathcal{O}_{C,P}$ denotes the maximal ideal of P and where

$$\mathcal{R} \cong \mathbb{C}^{n-1}, \mathcal{S} \cong \mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{T} \cong \mathbb{C}$$

are sky-scraper sheaves supported at P and where $\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$.

In particular, one has the isomorphism

$$(4.18) \quad \omega_C \otimes m_P \cong \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}).$$

Proof. The only thing we have to prove is (4.18). From (4.6), we have that $\nu^*(\omega_C)(-\sum_{i=1}^n p_i) \cong \omega_{\tilde{C}}$, i.e.

$$\nu^*(\omega_C) \cong \omega_{\tilde{C}}(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i).$$

Therefore,

$$\nu^*(\omega_C \otimes m_P) \cong \omega_{\tilde{C}}$$

which gives

$$(4.19) \quad \nu_*(\omega_{\tilde{C}}) \cong \nu_*(\nu^*(\omega_C \otimes m_P)) \cong \omega_C \otimes m_P \otimes \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}).$$

From

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} \rightarrow \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ is supported at P , it follows that

$$m_P \xrightarrow{\cong} m_P \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}) \cong m_P \otimes \nu_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}).$$

Therefore, from (4.19), we get (4.18). □

5. DUALIZING SHEAF OF GOOD ZAPPATIC SURFACES

We want to parallel the above consideration in the surface case.

Precisely, let X be a good, Zappatic surface and let

$$\pi : S \rightarrow X$$

be its minimal desingularization. Our aim is to give a description of the dualizing sheaf ω_X as done in Propositions 4.5 and 4.17 for seminormal curves.

Proposition 5.1. *Let X be a good, Zappatic surface and let $\pi : S \rightarrow X$ be its minimal desingularization. Let $C = \text{Sing}(X)$ be its double locus. Let $C_i \subset X_i$ be the double locus of X contained in the irreducible component X_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$ - i.e. $C_i = \sum_{j \neq i} C_{ij}$. Then, we have*

$$(5.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow \pi_*(\oplus_{i=1}^v \mathcal{O}_{X_i}(-C_i)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. S is a disjoint union of smooth surfaces; take $R := \sum_{i=1}^v C_i$ as a divisor on S . By the standard exact sequence of R on S and by the fact that π is a finite morphism, we deduce:

$$0 \rightarrow \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S(-R)) \rightarrow \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S) \rightarrow \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_R) \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, consider the natural restriction map

$$\mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{r_C} \mathcal{O}_C.$$

We claim the existence of the following exact diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 \rightarrow & \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S(-R)) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S(-R)) & \rightarrow & 0 & \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X & \rightarrow & \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{L} & \rightarrow 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_C & \rightarrow & \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_R) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{G} & \rightarrow 0, \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & \end{array}$$

where \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{G} are the cokernels of the row maps, respectively.

To show this, we have to prove that

$$(5.3) \quad \text{Ker}(r_C) \cong \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S(-R)).$$

Outside the singular locus of X , (5.3) trivially holds.

Consider now the singularities of X in codimension one; these are double curves which are locally complete intersection. Take Γ an irreducible component of $C = \text{Sing}(X)$ and let p_Γ be its general point. By definition of Zappatic surface, there exist two irreducible components of X , say X_s and X_t , for some $1 \leq s \neq t \leq v$ dependent on Γ , such that $\Gamma \subseteq X_s \cap X_t$. Denote by Γ_s (resp., Γ_t) the curve in X_s (resp., in X_t) which is isomorphic to a copy of Γ and let $p_{\Gamma,s}$ (resp., $p_{\Gamma,t}$) be its general point. Consider r_Γ the restriction of r_C to Γ , which gives

$$\mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{r_\Gamma} \mathcal{O}_\Gamma.$$

By the very definition of \mathcal{O}_X , the germs of regular functions in \mathcal{O}_{X,p_Γ} are given by pairs of a germ in $\mathcal{O}_{X_s,p_{\Gamma,s}}$ and a germ in $\mathcal{O}_{X_t,p_{\Gamma,t}}$ which have the same values at $p_{\Gamma,s}$ and at $p_{\Gamma,t}$. Therefore, the kernel of r_{Γ,p_Γ} coincides with those pairs vanishing at the points $p_{\Gamma,s}$ and at $p_{\Gamma,t}$, respectively. This shows that (5.3) holds along the codimension one singular locus of X .

We have to consider now the singularities in codimension two, i.e. the Zappatic singularities of X . Observe that, since X is Cohen-Macaulay then it has the property S_2 . Thus, X verifies the *extension property*, i.e. every rational function f defined outside some closed subvariety of codimension greater than or equal to 2 can be extended to an everywhere defined function (see [19], Theorem 3.42 - the integrality assumption is not necessary in this case). Therefore, the isomorphism (5.3) also extends to the Zappatic singularities. \square

By using Proposition 5.1, we can give a complete description of the dualizing sheaf of a good, Zappatic surface.

Theorem 5.4. *Let X be a good, Zappatic surface and let $C = \text{Sing}(X)$ be its double locus. Let $C_i \subset X_i$, $1 \leq i \leq v$, be the union of irreducible components of C lying on X_i . Let $\pi : S \rightarrow X$ be the minimal desingularization of X . Then, we have an exact sequence:*

$$(5.5) \quad 0 \rightarrow \omega_X \rightarrow \pi_*(\omega_S(\sum_{i=1}^v C_i)) \rightarrow \omega_C \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Since the situation is local, we can assume that X has only one Zappatic singularity $p \in X$. From what observed in Remark 4.4, $C = \text{Sing}(X)$ is either a seminormal curve in \mathbb{P}^n with vertex at p , for some n , or a union of $n - 2$ lines in \mathbb{P}^2 passing through the point p , for some n . This is in accordance with the fact that p is either an E_n - (or a R_{n-1} -) point, or a S_{n-1} -point.

Therefore, if $p \in X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ and C is a seminormal curve, we apply the functor $\underline{\text{Hom}}(-, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-n-1))$ to (5.2) and we can argue as in Proposition 4.5. Indeed, by using the fact that $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(X) = \text{codim}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(C) - 1 = n - 2$ and that X is Cohen-Macaulay, we get

$$0 \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}^{n-2}(\mathcal{O}_X, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}^{n-2}(\pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S(-R)), \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}^{n-1}(\mathcal{O}_C, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow 0.$$

This gives

$$0 \rightarrow \omega_X \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}^{n-2}(\pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S(-R)), \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \rightarrow \omega_C \rightarrow 0.$$

One can conclude by observing that

$$\underline{\text{Ext}}^{n-2}(\pi_*(\mathcal{O}_S(-R)), \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \cong \pi_*(\omega_S(R))$$

since, as in Proposition 4.5, $\pi|_{X_i}$ isomorphically embeds X_i in \mathbb{P}^n .

If C is a plane curve, the procedure is similar. Indeed, C can be viewed as a complete intersection in \mathbb{P}^n of type $(1, 1, 1, \dots, 1, n-2)$. Therefore,

$$\underline{\text{Ext}}^{n-1}(\mathcal{O}_C, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}) \cong \underline{\text{Ext}}^1(\mathcal{O}_C, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}) = \omega_C.$$

□

Remark 5.6. The previous result can be used to give a concrete description of the elements in $H^0(X, \omega_X)$. Indeed, a global section α of ω_X is a collection of meromorphic sections of $\omega_S(\sum_i C_i)$, one on each connected component of S , having polar loci along $\sum_i C_i$, whose Poincaré residues (cf. Definition 4.3) are such that:

$$(5.7) \quad \mathcal{R}_{C_{ij}}(\alpha) = -\mathcal{R}_{C_{ji}}(\alpha), \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq v.$$

We conclude the section by observing further useful properties of Zappatic surfaces.

Remark 5.8. Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be a good Zappatic surface; since the intersection $X_i \cap X_j$ — when not-empty — is the double curve $C_{ij} = C_{ji}$, the index pair (i, j) with $i < j$ uniquely determines the double curve C_{ij} .

Observe that, by the connectedness hypothesis of $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$, we get that $C_i \neq \emptyset$, for each $1 \leq i \leq v$. For simplicity of notation, in the sequel we shall always denote by C_{ij} the intersection of X_i and X_j , for any $1 \leq i < j \leq v$, with the obvious further condition that $C_{ij} = C_{ji} = \emptyset$ when there is no edge (v_i, v_j) in the associated graph G_X .

We can define a natural map, which will be used later on. Let

$$(5.9) \quad \Phi : \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^1(X_i, \mathcal{O}_{X_i}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} H^1(C_{ij}, \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}})$$

be defined in the following way: if

$$\pi_{ij} : \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} H^1(C_{ij}, \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}}) \rightarrow H^1(C_{ij}, \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}})$$

denotes the projection on the $(ij)^{\text{th}}$ -summand and if

$$r_{C_{ij}}^{(i)} : H^1(X_i, \mathcal{O}_{X_i}) \rightarrow H^1(C_{ij}, \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}})$$

denotes the natural restriction map to C_{ij} as a divisor in X_i , where $i < j$, then

$$(5.10) \quad (\pi_{ij} \circ \Phi)((a_1, \dots, a_v)) := r_{C_{ij}}^{(i)}(a_i) - r_{C_{ij}}^{(j)}(a_j).$$

Remark 5.11. Observe that the above definition is consistent with the lexicographic order of the indices $1 \leq i \leq v$. In other words, (5.10) means that we consider the curve C_{ij} as a *positive curve* on the surface X_i and as a *negative curve* on the surface X_j , when $i < j$. Furthermore, when the index pair is such that $C_{ij} = \emptyset$, we obviously consider $H^1(C_{ij}, \mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}})$ as the zero-vector space and $\pi_{ij} \circ \Phi$ as the zero-map.

Take an index pair $i < j$ such that $C_{ij} \neq \emptyset$. By the adjunction sequence of C_{ij} on X_i and on X_j , we can consider the two obvious coboundary maps:

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & H^1(X_i, \omega_{X_i}) \\ & \nearrow \delta_i & \\ H^0(C_{ij}, \omega_{C_{ij}}) & & \\ & \searrow \delta_j & \\ & & H^1(X_j, \omega_{X_j}). \end{array}$$

On the other hand, when the index pair $i < j$ is such that $C_{ij} = \emptyset$, then $H^0(C_{ij}, \omega_{C_{ij}})$ is considered as the zero-vector space and (5.12) are the zero-maps. Then, we can define the map

$$(5.13) \quad \Delta : \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} H^0(C_{ij}, \omega_{C_{ij}}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^1(X_i, \omega_{X_i})$$

in the following way: if

$$\iota_{ij} : H^0(C_{ij}, \omega_{C_{ij}}) \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} H^0(C_{ij}, \omega_{C_{ij}})$$

denotes the natural inclusion of the $(ij)^{\text{th}}$ -summand and if $\gamma_{ij} \in H^0(C_{ij}, \omega_{C_{ij}})$, then

$$(5.14) \quad (\Delta \circ \iota_{ij})(\gamma_{ij}) := (0, \dots, 0, \delta_i(\gamma_{ij}), 0, \dots, 0, -\delta_j(\gamma_{ij}), 0, \dots, 0),$$

where $i < j$.

Observe that the definition of Δ is consistent with the lexicographic order of the indices $1 \leq i \leq v$ and with our Remark 5.11.

The following result is an obvious consequence of our definitions.

Proposition 5.15. *With notation as above, we have*

$$\Delta = \Phi^\vee.$$

Proof. The proof directly follows from Serre's duality on each summand and from the fact that the matrix which represents Δ is the transpose of the one representing Φ . \square

6. THE GENUS OF A GOOD ZAPPATIC SURFACE

The main purpose of this section is to compute the *genus* of a projective good Zappatic surface $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$. Precisely, we consider the following:

Definition 6.1. Let X be a good Zappatic surface and let ω_X be its dualizing sheaf. We define the ω -genus of X as

$$(6.2) \quad p_\omega(X) := h^0(X, \omega_X).$$

Remark 6.3. Observe that, if X denotes a reduced, irreducible curve then, by (6.1), the ω -genus coincides with the arithmetic genus of X (cf. (2.6)); on the other hand, if X is a smooth, irreducible surface, the ω -genus coincides with the geometric genus of X . This clarifies the motivation of the new terminology of ω -genus.

Let $\pi : S \rightarrow X$ be the minimal desingularization of X . Observe first that, from Theorem 5.4 and from Remark 5.6, we have a natural inclusion

$$(6.4) \quad \pi_*(\omega_S) \hookrightarrow \omega_X.$$

The injective morphism in (6.4) determines an exact sequence

$$(6.5) \quad 0 \rightarrow \pi_*(\omega_S) \rightarrow \omega_X \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow 0,$$

where \mathcal{Q} is supported along the double locus C of X .

Our aim is to compute $p_\omega(X)$ in terms of the irreducible components of X , the double locus C and the graph G_X . To do this, we shall make use of the following preliminary result:

Theorem 6.6. *Let X be a smooth, irreducible, projective surface and let C be any divisor on X . Denote by*

$$(6.7) \quad \varphi_C : H^0(X, \Omega_X^1) \rightarrow H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)),$$

the map defined by the cup-product given by the $(1, 1)$ -class of C .

Then, the sequence

$$(6.8) \quad H^0(X, \Omega_X^1) \xrightarrow{\varphi_C} H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)) \rightarrow H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + C))$$

is exact.

Proof. Since C is a divisor on X , one has:

$$H^0(C, \omega_C) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)) \rightarrow H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + C)),$$

where δ is the usual coboundary map.

One needs to prove that $\text{Im}(\delta) = \text{Im}(\varphi_C)$. By duality, this is the same as proving that the two maps:

$$(6.9) \quad H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{\varphi_C^*} H^0(X, \Omega_X^1)^*$$

and

$$(6.10) \quad H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{\delta^*} H^1(C, \mathcal{O}_C)$$

have the same kernel.

The map (6.9) is the differential at the origin of the map:

$$t_C : \text{Pic}^0(X) \rightarrow \text{Alb}(X)$$

determined by the class of C , whereas the map (6.10) is the differential at the origin of the pull-back map:

$$r_C : \text{Pic}^0(X) \rightarrow \text{Pic}^0(C).$$

Assume first that C is smooth. Then, we have also the obvious natural map

$$\text{Alb}(C) \rightarrow \text{Alb}(X)$$

which is dual to r_C . Moreover, we have an isomorphism

$$\theta : \text{Pic}^0(C) \rightarrow \text{Alb}(C)$$

given by the principal polarization on $\text{Pic}^0(C)$.

One has

$$r_C^* \circ \theta \circ r_C = t_C.$$

By identifying the tangent spaces at the origin of $\text{Pic}^0(C)$ and of $\text{Alb}(C)$ via the differential of θ , we see that φ_C^* is essentially the composite of δ^* and of its transpose. This proves that the two maps (6.9) and (6.10) have the same kernels.

We now drop the assumption that C is smooth. Let C_0 be the reduced curve which has the same support of C and let $p : C' \rightarrow C_0 \subset X$ be the normalization of C_0 . We have obvious maps

$$p^* : \text{Pic}^0(X) \rightarrow \text{Pic}^0(C')$$

and

$$\nu : \text{Pic}^0(C) \rightarrow \text{Pic}^0(C');$$

it is also clear that $p^* = \nu \circ r_C$. Since $\text{Pic}^0(X)$ is compact, we may safely replace, in the above argument, $\text{Pic}^0(C)$ with $\text{Pic}^0(C')$, and we can conclude as above. \square

Remark 6.11. An interesting consequence of the previous result is the following. Suppose that C is a curve on X which is 1-connected, an assumption which can be easily dropped: we leave this to the reader. Since $H^2(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + C)) = 0$ and $H^2(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)) \simeq H^1(C, \omega_C) \simeq \mathbb{C}$, then the map $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)) \rightarrow H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + C))$ is surjective. On the other hand $\varphi_C \oplus \overline{\varphi}_C$ is nothing but the map $\Phi_C : H^1(X, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^3(X, \mathbb{C})$ given by the cup-product by the class of C . Hence, we see that $\dim(\text{Coker}(\Phi_C)) = 2h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + C))$. In particular Φ_C is an isomorphism, i.e. the *Hard Lefschetz theorem* holds for C , if and only if $h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + C)) = 0$. This for instance holds if C is big and nef (cf. also [18] and [22]).

Turning back to good Zappatic surfaces, by using Proposition 5.15 and Theorem 6.6, we can prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.12. *Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be a good Zappatic surface and let G_X be its associated graph (see Definition 3.6). Let Φ be the map defined in (5.9). Let $p_\omega(X)$ be the ω -genus of X as in Definition 3.4. Then*

$$(6.13) \quad p_\omega(X) = b_2(G_X) + \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) + \dim(\text{coker}(\Phi)),$$

where, as customary, $b_2(G_X)$ is the second Betti number of G_X .

Proof. To prove the theorem, if G_X denotes the associated graph to X , we consider $C_2(G_X, \mathbb{C})$ the module of 2-chains of G_X , i.e. $\sum_i a_i F_{n_i}^i$, where each $F_{n_i}^i$ is a closed n_i -face for G_X , for $n_i \geq 3$; each of these faces corresponds to an E_{n_i} -point of X . Then, one can consider the vector space $H_2(G_X, \mathbb{C})$.

Our aim is to construct a homomorphism

$$(6.14) \quad H^0(X, \omega_X) \xrightarrow{f} H_2(G_X, \mathbb{C})$$

and to show that f is surjective and such that

$$(6.15) \quad \ker(f) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^0(X_i, \omega_{X_i}) \oplus (\text{coker}(\Phi)).$$

To construct f , we make use of Theorem 5.4 and Remark 5.6; indeed, we consider a global section $\omega \in H^0(X, \omega_X)$ as a collection

$$\{\omega_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq v} \in \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq v} H^0(X_i, \omega_{X_i}(C_i)),$$

where each ω_i is a global meromorphic 2-form on the corresponding irreducible component X_i having simple polar locus along the (possibly reducible) curve

$$C_i = X_i \cap \overline{(X \setminus X_i)} = \sum_{j \neq i} C_{ij},$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq v$ (recall that $C_{ij} = C_{ji}$ and that $C_i \neq \emptyset$ for each $1 \leq i \leq v$, because of the connectedness hypothesis of X).

Recall that the edges of G_X are lexicographically oriented, namely an index pair $i < j$, such that $C_{ij} \neq \emptyset$, corresponds to a set of edges \tilde{e}_{ij} in G_X which are assumed to be oriented from i to j .

As in (4.12), take $\mathcal{R}_{C_{ij}}(\omega_i)$ the Poincaré residue of ω_i on C_{ij} and denote it by ω_{ij} . Then, we have

$$(6.16) \quad \omega_{ij} = -\omega_{ji},$$

for each $1 \leq i < j \leq v$ (in the trivial case $C_{ij} = \emptyset$, we have $\omega_{ij} = \omega_{ji} = 0$). Thus, ω_{ij} is a meromorphic 1-form on the curve $C_{ij} \subset X_i$ having simple poles at the Zappatic points of X lying on C_{ij} .

For simplicity of notation, for any index pair $i < j$ we write:

- $P_{ij}^{E_n}$, to denote an E_n -point of X lying on the curve C_{ij} ,
- $P_{ij}^{R_n}$, to denote a R_n -point of X lying on the curve C_{ij} ,
- $P_{ij}^{S_n}$, to denote a S_n -point of X lying on the curve C_{ij} .

Therefore,

$$\omega_{ij} \in H^0\left(C_{ij}, \omega_{C_{ij}}\left(\sum_{n \geq 3} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{f_n^{ij}} P_{ij}^{E_n, h} + \sum_{k=1}^{r_n^{ij}} P_{ij}^{R_n, k} + \sum_{l=1}^{s_n^{ij}} P_{ij}^{S_n, l}\right)\right)\right),$$

where f_n^{ij} (r_n^{ij} , s_n^{ij} , resp.) is the number of Zappatic singularities of X of type E_n (R_n , S_n , resp.) lying on the curve C_{ij} .

In any case, one can compute the Poincaré residues of ω_{ij} at the given points, namely $\mathcal{R}_{P_{ij}^{E_n, h}}(\omega_{ij})$, $\mathcal{R}_{P_{ij}^{R_n, k}}(\omega_{ij})$ and $\mathcal{R}_{P_{ij}^{S_n, l}}(\omega_{ij})$, for any $n \geq 3$, $1 \leq h \leq f_n^{ij}$, $1 \leq k \leq r_n^{ij}$ and $1 \leq l \leq s_n^{ij}$.

First, we want to remark that, for all ω_{ij} ,

$$(6.17) \quad \mathcal{R}_{P_{ij}^{R_n, k}}(\omega_{ij}) = \mathcal{R}_{P_{ij}^{S_n, l}}(\omega_{ij}) = 0,$$

for each $1 \leq i < j \leq v$, $n \geq 3$ and $1 \leq k \leq r_n^{ij}$ and $1 \leq l \leq s_n^{ij}$. Since the situation is local, we may - and will - assume for a moment that

$$X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n$$

is the union of n irreducible components, which has only one Zappatic singular point p .

- (a) Suppose that p is a R_n -point of X and let C_{ij} , $i < j$, be one of the double curves passing through p . By definition (cf. Example 2.7), the point p is either a smooth point or a node for $C_i \subset X_i$, according to the fact that either $i = 1$ or $i > 1$ (equiv. $j = n$ or $j < n$). The first case occurs when X_i (equivalently X_j) is an "external" surface, i.e. it corresponds to a vertex of valence one, so $C_{ij} = C_i$; the latter occurs when it is an "internal" surface, i.e. it corresponds to a vertex of valence two, so $C_{ij} \subset C_i$.

Assume, for simplicity, that $i = 1$, so that $X_i = X_1$ is an external surface and $C_{ij} = C_{12}$. Since p is a regular point for C_{12} , then $\mathcal{R}_P(\omega_{12}) = 0$. From (4.14) and (6.16), it follows that $\mathcal{R}_p(\omega_{t, t+1}) = 0$, for any $1 \leq t \leq n-1$. The case $i > 1$ is similar.

- (b) Assume now that p is a S_n -point. Again, by definition, the point p is an ordinary $(n-1)$ -tuple point for only one of the curves concurring at p , say $C_1 \subset X_1$, and a simple point for all the other curves $C_j \subset X_j$, $2 \leq j \leq n$, each $C_j = C_{1j}$ being smooth and irreducible on X_j . As in (a), one can conclude.

Therefore, from now on we shall focus on closed n -faces of G_X .

Fix an orientation also for the (closed) faces of G_X . Let F be a closed n -face, for some $n \geq 3$. Take C_{ij} , $i < j$, a double curve of X which corresponds to the set of oriented edges \tilde{e}_{ij} between the two vertices i and j of ∂F . Let P^F be the E_n -point of X correspondent to F and which belongs in particular to C_{ij} . Thus, we consider

$$(6.18) \quad \omega_{ij}^F := \epsilon_{ij} \mathcal{R}_{P^F}(\omega_{ij}),$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{P^F}(\omega_{ij})$ denotes the Poincaré residue of ω_{ij} at P^F and where $\epsilon_{ij} = \pm 1$ is the coefficient of the edge (i, j) in the chain ∂F . By using (4.14), Remark 5.11 and (6.16), one immediately sees that the value ω_{ij}^F is independent of the edge $e_{ij} = (i, j)$ of G_X .

To sum up, given $\omega \in H^0(X, \omega_X)$ one can uniquely associate to ω a complex number, say ω^F , for any closed n -face F of G_X , for $n \geq 3$.

Consider the collection of all the Poincaré residues of ω evaluated at any E_n -point of X lying on the given curve C_{ij} , for $n \geq 3$. Since, by assumption, C_{ij} is smooth, from the Residue theorem on C_{ij} it follows that

$$(6.19) \quad \sum_{P^F \in C_{ij}} (\omega_{ij}^F) = 0$$

(if $C_{ij} = \emptyset$, then (6.19) is trivially true, i.e. a sum of zeroes equals zero).

From (6.19) and from the fact that G_X is a 2-dimensional graph, it follows that the above computations determine a 2-cycle $\{\sum \omega^F F\}$ of the graph G_X .

To compute $\ker(f)$, take as above $C_i = X_i \cap \overline{(X \setminus X_i)} = \sum_{j \neq i} C_{ij}$, where we recall that $C_{ij} = C_{ji}$, for $i \neq j$, some — but not all — of them possibly empty. As in formulas (4.12) and (5.12), denote by \mathcal{R}_{C_i} the Poincaré residue map on the reducible, nodal curve $C_i \subset X_i$ and by δ_i the coboundary map on the surface X_i , for $1 \leq i \leq v$. Thus, the first row of the diagram:

$$(6.20) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^0(\omega_{X_i}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^0(\omega_{X_i}(C_i)) & \xrightarrow{\oplus \mathcal{R}_{C_i}} & \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^0(\omega_{C_i}) & \xrightarrow{\oplus \delta_i} & \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^1(\omega_{X_i}) \\ & & \searrow \zeta & & \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \beta & & \nearrow \Delta \\ & & & & \ker(f) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1/2}} & \bigoplus_{i < j} H^0(\omega_{C_{ij}}) & & \end{array}$$

is naturally defined and exact.

We can define the maps ζ , ι , $\sigma_{1/2}$ and β in such a way that the whole diagram commutes and that the subsequence determined by the maps ζ , $\sigma_{1/2}$ and by the map Δ , defined in (5.13), is exact.

Clearly, ζ and ι are natural inclusions by the very definition of $H^0(X, \omega_X)$ (cf. Theorem 5.4 and Remark 5.6). For what concerns the map β , it suffices to define its image in one direct summand, i.e.

$$(\pi_h \circ \beta) : \bigoplus_{i < j} H^0(\omega_{C_{ij}}) \rightarrow H^0(\omega_{C_h}),$$

where π_h is the projection on the h^{th} -summand, for a given $h \in \{1, \dots, v\}$. When $h \neq i, j$, the image is 0, therefore the relevant summands are the following:

$$(6.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \bigoplus_{h < j} H^0(\omega_{C_{hj}}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i < h} H^0(\omega_{C_{ih}}) \longrightarrow H^0(\omega_{C_h}), \\ & \left(\bigoplus_{h < j} \omega_{hj} \quad , \quad \bigoplus_{i < h} \omega_{ih} \right) \mapsto \sum_{h < j} \omega_{hj} - \sum_{i < h} \omega_{ih}, \end{aligned}$$

with the obvious condition that $\omega_{lm} = 0$ when $C_{lm} = \emptyset$. First of all observe that β is well-defined by the definition of $H^0(C_h, \omega_{C_h})$ (see Remark 4.13); moreover, the coefficients ± 1 are uniquely determined by the fact that $C_h \subset X_h$ and by Remark 5.11.

To define $\sigma_{1/2}$, recall that $\ker(f) \subseteq H^0(X, \omega_X) \subset \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^0(\omega_{X_i}(C_i))$; thus, an element in $\ker(f)$ is a collection of v meromorphic 2-forms $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_v) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^v H^0(\omega_{X_i}(C_i))$ such that

$$\gamma_{ij} = -\gamma_{ji}, \text{ for } i < j,$$

and, as in (6.18),

$$\gamma_{ij}^F = 0, \text{ for each } n - \text{face } F.$$

As before, we can limit ourselves to define its image on a given direct summand; therefore, if π_{ij} is the projection on the $(ij)^{\text{th}}$ -summand, with $i < j$, then we have the following equivalent expressions

$$(6.22) \quad (\pi_{ij} \circ \sigma_{1/2})(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_v) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{R}_{C_{ij}}(\gamma_i) - \mathcal{R}_{C_{ij}}(\gamma_j)) = \mathcal{R}_{C_{ij}}(\gamma_i) = -\mathcal{R}_{C_{ij}}(\gamma_j).$$

Observe that $\sigma_{1/2}$ is well-defined since the γ_i 's are in the kernel of f ; furthermore, when $C_{ij} = \emptyset$, the image is obviously 0.

By using the definition of Δ as in (5.14), it is straightforward to check that diagram (6.20) commutes. Furthermore, it is trivial to show that

$$\text{Im}(\zeta) = \ker(\sigma_{1/2}) \text{ and } \text{Im}(\sigma_{1/2}) \subseteq \ker(\Delta).$$

To show the converse, take $\alpha \in \ker(\Delta)$, thus $(\oplus_i \delta_i(\beta(\alpha))) = 0$, i.e. $\beta(\alpha) \in \text{Im}(\oplus_i (\mathcal{R}_{C_i}))$. This implies that $\alpha \in \text{Im}(\sigma_{1/2})$.

From the fact that the subsequence in (6.20) is exact, it follows that

$$\ker(f) \cong \ker(\sigma_{1/2}) \oplus \text{Im}(\sigma_{1/2}) \cong \text{Im}(\zeta) \oplus \ker(\Delta) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^d H^0(\omega_{X_i}) \oplus \ker(\Delta).$$

By Proposition 5.15, it follows that

$$(6.23) \quad \ker(f) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^d H^0(\omega_{X_i}) \oplus \text{coker}(\Phi).$$

This proves (6.13).

To show that the map f is surjective, we have to reconstruct a global section of ω_X once we have an element $\tau \in H_2(G_X, \mathbb{C})$.

Fix two indices $l < m$ in $\{1, \dots, v\}$, such that $C_{lm} \neq \emptyset$ and such that \tilde{e}_{lm} is lexicographically oriented in G_X . We consider the curve C_{lm} as the ambient variety to make our computations.

By definition of $H_2(G_X, \mathbb{C})$, τ is a collection of complex numbers τ_{lm}^F such that

$$\sum_{P^F \in C_{lm}} \tau_{lm}^F = 0.$$

This means that the divisor

$$(6.24) \quad D := \sum_{P^F \in C_{lm}} \tau_{lm}^F P^F \in \text{Div}(C_{lm})$$

is homologous to zero. Since, by assumption, each C_{lm} is smooth and all of its connected components are irreducible components, by the Residue theorem on each irreducible component of C_{lm} , (6.24) implies there exists a global meromorphic 1-form $\tau_{lm} \in H^0(C_{lm}, \omega_{C_{lm}}(D))$ having the given residues at the points in $\text{Supp}(D)$, i.e. such that

$$\mathcal{R}_{P^F}(\tau_{lm}) = \tau_{lm}^F.$$

The above discussion obviously holds for each choice of index pairs $l < m$. Fix now an index $1 \leq h \leq v$ and consider on the surface X_h the reducible nodal curve $C_h = X_h \cap \overline{(X \setminus X_h)}$;

since we are on X_h , by Remark 5.11, we can write

$$C_h = C_h^+ + C_h^-,$$

where

$$C_h^- = \sum_{l < h} C_{lh}, \text{ and } C_h^+ = \sum_{m > h} C_{hm}.$$

Thus, by the above discussion, on each C_{lh} (resp. C_{hm}) we have a meromorphic 1-form $-\tau_{lh}$ (resp. τ_{hm}) inducing the given residues at the given Zappatic points. By Remark 4.13, such forms glue together to determine an element in $H^0(C_h, \omega_{C_h})$. This can be done for each $1 \leq h \leq v$, determining a collection $\{\bar{\tau}_h\} \in \bigoplus_{h=1}^v H^0(\omega_{C_h})$.

If each irreducible component X_h of X is a regular surface, one easily shows that the map f is surjective. Indeed, since $h^1(X_h, \omega_{X_h}) = 0$, for each $1 \leq h \leq v$, by the exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \omega_{X_h} \rightarrow \omega_{X_h}(C_h) \rightarrow \omega_{C_h} \rightarrow 0, \quad 1 \leq h \leq v,$$

the collection of forms $\{\bar{\tau}_h\}$ lifts up to a collection of forms $\{\tau_h\} \in \bigoplus_{h=1}^v H^0(\omega_{X_h}(C_h))$. Take an index pair with $h < k$; since C_{hk} is both a component of C_h^+ on X_h and of C_k^- on X_k , then

$$\mathcal{R}_{C_{hk}}(\tau_k) = -\mathcal{R}_{C_{hk}}(\tau_h).$$

This means that the collection $\{\tau_h\}$ is an element of $H^0(X, \omega_X)$, so the map f is surjective and formula (6.13) is proved.

In the other case, assume that X_j is an irreducible component of X which is assumed to be an irregular surface, for some $1 \leq j \leq v$. Since $C_j \subset X_j$ has global normal crossings on X_j , one has the map

$$(6.25) \quad \text{tr}_{C_j} : H^0(X_j, \Omega_{X_j}^1) \rightarrow H^0(C_j, \omega_{C_j}),$$

where tr_{C_j} is the trace map of holomorphic 1-forms on X_j to holomorphic 1-forms on C_j . By using the same notation as in (6.7), we have the following diagram:

$$(6.26) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} H^0(\omega_{X_j}(C_j)) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}_{C_j}} & H^0(\omega_{C_j}) & \xrightarrow{\delta_j} & H^1(\omega_{X_j}) \\ & & \nwarrow \text{tr}_{C_j} & \nearrow \varphi_{C_j} & \\ & & & & H^0(X_j, \Omega_{X_j}^1) \end{array},$$

where

$$(6.27) \quad \varphi_{C_j} = \delta_j \circ \text{tr}_{C_j}$$

(see [5], Theorem 8.4.1, p. 219, and references therein).

Thus, from Theorem 6.6 and from the existence of the map (6.25), it follows that the element $\tau_j \in H^0(\omega_{C_j})$ of the collection $\{\bar{\tau}_h\} \in \bigoplus_{h=1}^v H^0(\omega_{C_h})$, which was constructed from the given non-zero collection of residues in $H_2(G_X, \mathbb{C})$, is determined via \mathcal{R}_{C_j} by an element in $H^0(\omega_{X_j}(C_j))$, which is necessarily not zero; indeed, the elements of $\text{Im}(\text{tr}_{C_j})$ give zero residues at the Zappatic singularities of X lying on X_j , since such elements are restrictions to C_j of global holomorphic 1-forms of X_j . Then we can conclude as above, proving also in this case the surjectivity of f . \square

When X is, in particular, a good planar Zappatic surface, Theorem 6.12 gives:

Corollary 6.28. *Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v \Pi_i$ be a good planar Zappatic surface. Then,*

$$(6.29) \quad p_g(X) = b_2(G_X),$$

$$(6.30) \quad q(X) = b_1(G_X).$$

Proof. Formula (6.29) follows from Theorem 6.12. Formula (6.30) follows from (6.29) and the fact that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = \chi(G_X)$ as in (3.19). \square

In Sections 7 and 10 we shall apply Propositions 3.14, 3.17, Theorem 6.12 and their corollaries to the case of a good Zappatic surface X which is smoothable, i.e. the central fibre of a degeneration.

7. ZAPPATIC DEGENERATIONS

In this section we will focus on flat degenerations of smooth surfaces to Zappatic ones.

Definition 7.1. Let Δ be the spectrum of a DVR (equiv. the complex unit disk). Then, a *degeneration* (of relative dimension n) is a proper and flat morphism

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{X} \\ \downarrow \pi \\ \Delta \end{array}$$

such that $\mathcal{X}_t = \pi^{-1}(t)$ is a smooth, irreducible, n -dimensional projective variety, for $t \neq 0$.

If Y is a smooth, projective variety, the degeneration

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{X} \subseteq \Delta \times Y \\ \downarrow \pi \\ \Delta \end{array}$$

is said to be an *embedded degeneration* in Y of relative dimension n . When it is clear from the context, we will omit the term *embedded*.

A degeneration (equiv. an embedded degeneration) is said to be *semistable* (see, e.g., [36]) if the total space \mathcal{X} is smooth and if the central fibre \mathcal{X}_0 (where 0 is the closed point of Δ) is a divisor in \mathcal{X} with global normal crossings, i.e. $\mathcal{X}_0 = \sum V_i$ is a sum of smooth, irreducible components V_i 's which meet transversally so that locally analytically the morphism π is defined by

$$(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \xrightarrow{\pi} x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k = t \in \Delta, \quad k \leq n+1.$$

Given an arbitrary degeneration $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$, the well-known Semistable Reduction Theorem (see [26]) states that there exists a base change $\beta : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ (defined by $\beta(t) = t^m$, for some m), a semistable degeneration $\psi : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \Delta$ and a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{Z} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{X}_\beta & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X} \\ & \searrow \psi & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & \Delta & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \Delta \end{array}$$

such that the square is Cartesian and f is a birational map obtained by blowing-up and blowing-down subvarieties of the central fibre. Therefore, statements about degenerations which are invariant under blowing-ups, blowing-downs and base-changes can be proved by directly considering the special case of semistable degenerations.

From now on, we will be concerned with degenerations of relative dimension two, namely degenerations of smooth, projective surfaces.

Definition 7.2. Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a degeneration (equiv. an embedded degeneration) of surfaces. Denote by \mathcal{X}_t the general fibre, which is by definition a smooth, irreducible and projective surface; let $X = \mathcal{X}_0$ denote the central fibre. We will say that the degeneration is *Zappatic* if X is a Zappatic surface and \mathcal{X} is smooth except for:

- ordinary double points at points of the double locus of X , which are not the Zappatic singularities of X ;
- further singular points at the Zappatic singularities of X of type T_n , for $n \geq 3$, and Z_n , for $n \geq 4$.

A Zappatic degeneration will be called *good* if the central fibre is moreover a good Zappatic surface. Similarly, an embedded degeneration will be called a *planar Zappatic degeneration* if its central fibre is a planar Zappatic surface.

Notice that we require the total space \mathcal{X} to be smooth at E_3 -points of X .

If $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a good Zappatic degeneration, the singularities that \mathcal{X} has at the Zappatic singularities of the central fibre X are explicitly described in section 8.

Notation 7.3. Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a degeneration of surfaces and let \mathcal{X}_t be the general fibre, which is by definition a smooth, irreducible and projective surface. Then, we consider some of the intrinsic invariants of \mathcal{X}_t :

- $\chi := \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_t})$;
- $K^2 := K_{\mathcal{X}_t}^2$;
- $p_g := p_g(\mathcal{X}_t)$;
- $q := q(\mathcal{X}_t)$;

If the degeneration is assumed to be embedded in \mathbb{P}^r , for some r , then we also have:

- $d := \deg(\mathcal{X}_t)$;
- $g := (K + H)H/2 + 1$, the sectional genus of \mathcal{X}_t .

We will be mainly interested in computing these invariants in terms of the central fibre X . For some of them, this is quite simple. For instance, when $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is an embedded degeneration in \mathbb{P}^r , for some r , and if the central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0 = X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$, where the X_i 's are smooth, irreducible surfaces of degree d_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$, then by the flatness of the family we have

$$d = \sum_{i=1}^v d_i.$$

When $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a good Zappatic degeneration (in particular a good, planar Zappatic degeneration), we can easily compute some of the above invariants by using our results of § 3. Indeed, by using our Notation 3.12 and Propositions 3.14, 3.17, we get the following results.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good Zappatic degeneration embedded in \mathbb{P}^r . Let $\mathcal{X}_0 = X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be the central fibre and let $G = G_X$ be its associated graph. Let C be the double locus of X , i.e. the union of the double curves of X , $C_{ij} = C_{ji} = X_i \cap X_j$ and let $c_{ij} = \deg(C_{ij})$. Let D be a general hyperplane section of X and let D_i be the i^{th} -smooth, irreducible component of D , which is a general hyperplane section of X_i , and let g_i be its*

genus. Then:

$$(7.5) \quad g = \sum_{i=1}^v g_i + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} c_{ij} - v + 1.$$

When X is a good, planar Zappatic surface, if $G^{(1)}$ denotes the 1-skeleton of G and e the number of edges of G , then:

$$(7.6) \quad g = 1 - \chi(G^{(1)}) = e - v + 1.$$

Proof. It directly follows from our computations in Proposition 3.14 and from the flatness of the family of hyperplane sectional curves of the degeneration (cf. formula (2.6)). \square

Proposition 7.7. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good Zappatic degeneration and let $\mathcal{X}_0 = X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be its central fibre. Let $G = G_X$ be its associated graph (cf. Notation 3.12). Let f be the number (closed) faces of G . Let C be the double locus of X , which is the union of the double curves $C_{ij} = X_i \cap X_j$. Then*

$$(7.8) \quad \chi = \sum_{i=1}^v \chi(\mathcal{O}_{X_i}) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}}) + f.$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a good, planar Zappatic degeneration, then

$$(7.9) \quad \chi = \chi(G) = v - e + f,$$

where e denotes the number of edges of G .

Proof. It clearly follows from Proposition 3.17 and from the invariance of χ under flat degeneration. \square

In the particular case that $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a semistable Zappatic degeneration, i.e. if X has only E_3 -points as Zappatic singularities and the total space \mathcal{X} is smooth, then χ can be computed also in a different way by topological methods (cf. e.g. [36]).

The above results are indeed more general: X is allowed to have any good Zappatic singularity, namely R_n -, S_n - and E_n -points, for any $n \geq 3$, the total space \mathcal{X} is possibly singular and, moreover, our computations do not depend on the fact that X is smoothable, i.e. that X is the central fibre of a degeneration. Notice also that a good Zappatic degeneration is not semistable in general.

For what concerns the computation of other invariants, like p_g and K^2 , we shall see that one requires further analysis and results.

8. MINIMAL AND QUASI-MINIMAL SINGULARITIES

In this section we shall describe the singularities of the total space of a Zappatic degeneration at the Zappatic singularities of the central fibre. We need to recall a few general facts about reduced Cohen-Macaulay singularities and two fundamental concepts introduced and studied by Kollár in [27] and [28].

Recall that $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$, a reduced, equidimensional and non-degenerate scheme is said to be *connected in codimension one* if it is possible to arrange its irreducible components V_1, \dots, V_r in such a way that

$$\text{codim}_{V_j} V_j \cap (V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_{j-1}) = 1, \text{ for } 2 \leq j \leq r.$$

Remark 8.1. Let X be a surface in \mathbb{P}^r and C be a hyperplane section of X . If C is a Projectively Cohen-Macaulay curve, then X is connected in codimension one. This immediately follows from the fact that X is Projectively Cohen-Macaulay (cf. Appendix A).

Given Y an arbitrary algebraic variety, if $y \in Y$ is a reduced, Cohen-Macaulay singularity then

$$(8.2) \quad \text{emdim}_y(Y) \leq \text{mult}_y(Y) + \dim_y(Y) - 1,$$

where $\text{emdim}_y(Y) = \dim(\mathfrak{m}_{Y,y}/\mathfrak{m}_{Y,y}^2)$ is the *embedding dimension* of Y at the point y , where $\mathfrak{m}_{Y,y} \subset \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$ denotes the maximal ideal of y in Y (see, e.g., [27]).

We will set

$$(8.3) \quad \delta_y(Y) = \text{mult}_y(Y) + \dim_y(Y) - \text{emdim}_y(Y) - 1$$

and notice that $\delta_y(Y) \geq 0$.

Let Y and $y \in Y$ be as above. Let H be any effective Cartier divisor of Y containing y . Of course one has

$$\text{mult}_y(H) \geq \text{mult}_y(Y).$$

Lemma 8.4. *In the above setting, if $\text{emdim}_y(Y) = \text{emdim}_y(H)$, then $\text{mult}_y(H) > \text{mult}_y(Y)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$ be a local equation defining H around y . If $f \in \mathfrak{m}_{Y,y} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{Y,y}^2$ (non zero), then f determines a non-trivial linear functional on the Zariski tangent space $T_y(Y) \cong (\mathfrak{m}_{Y,y}/\mathfrak{m}_{Y,y}^2)^\vee$. By the definition of $\text{emdim}_y(H)$ and the fact that $f \in \mathfrak{m}_{Y,y} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{Y,y}^2$, it follows that $\text{emdim}_y(H) = \text{emdim}_y(Y) - 1$. Thus, if $\text{emdim}_y(Y) = \text{emdim}_y(H)$, then $f \in \mathfrak{m}_{Y,y}^h$, for some $h \geq 2$. Therefore, $\text{mult}_y(H) \geq h \text{mult}_y(Y) > \text{mult}_y(Y)$. \square

We let

$$(8.5) \quad \nu := \nu_y(H) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid f \in \mathfrak{m}_{Y,y}^n\}.$$

Notice that:

$$(8.6) \quad \text{mult}_y(H) \geq \nu \text{mult}_y(Y), \quad \text{emdim}_y(H) = \begin{cases} \text{emdim}_y(Y) & \text{if } \nu > 1, \\ \text{emdim}_y(Y) - 1 & \text{if } \nu = 1. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 8.7. *One has*

$$\delta_y(H) \geq \delta_y(Y).$$

Furthermore:

(i) *if the equality holds, then either*

- (1) $\text{mult}_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(Y)$, $\text{emdim}_y(H) = \text{emdim}_y(Y) - 1$ and $\nu_y(H) = 1$, or
- (2) $\text{mult}_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(Y) + 1$, $\text{emdim}_y(H) = \text{emdim}_y(Y)$, in which case $\nu_y(H) = 2$ and $\text{mult}_y(Y) = 1$;

(ii) *if $\delta_y(H) = \delta_y(Y) + 1$, then either*

- (1) $\text{mult}_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(Y) + 1$, $\text{emdim}_y(H) = \text{emdim}_y(Y) - 1$, in which case $\nu_y(H) = 1$, or
- (2) $\text{mult}_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(Y) + 2$ and $\text{emdim}_y(H) = \text{emdim}_y(Y)$, in which case either
 - (a) $2 \leq \nu_y(H) \leq 3$ and $\text{mult}_y(Y) = 1$, or
 - (b) $\nu_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(Y) = 2$.

Proof. It is a straightforward consequence of (8.3), of Lemma 8.4 and of (8.6). \square

We will say that H has *general behaviour* at y if

$$(8.8) \quad \text{mult}_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(Y).$$

We will say that H has *good behaviour* at y if instead

$$(8.9) \quad \delta_y(H) = \delta_y(Y).$$

Notice that if H is a general hyperplane section through y , then H has both general and good behaviour.

We want to discuss in more details the relations between the two notions. We notice the following facts:

Lemma 8.10. *In the above setting:*

- (i) *if H has general behaviour at y , then it has also good behaviour at y ;*
- (ii) *if H has good behaviour at y , then either*
 - (1) *H has also general behaviour and $\text{emdim}_y(Y) = \text{emdim}_y(H) + 1$, or*
 - (2) *$\text{emdim}_y(Y) = \text{emdim}_y(H)$, in which case $\text{mult}_y(Y) = 1$ and $\nu_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(H) = 2$.*

Proof. The first assertion is a trivial consequence of Lemma 8.4.

If H has good behaviour and $\text{mult}_y(Y) = \text{mult}_y(H)$, then it is clear that $\text{emdim}_y(Y) = \text{emdim}_y(H) + 1$. Otherwise, if $\text{mult}_y(Y) \neq \text{mult}_y(H)$, then $\text{mult}_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(Y) + 1$ and $\text{emdim}_y(Y) = \text{emdim}_y(H)$. By Lemma 8.7, (i), we have the second assertion. \square

As mentioned above, we can now give two fundamental definitions (cf. [27] and [28]):

Definition 8.11. Let Y be an algebraic variety. An isolated, reduced, Cohen-Macaulay singularity $y \in Y$ is called *minimal* if the tangent cone of Y at y is geometrically reduced and $\delta_y(Y) = 0$.

Remark 8.12. Notice that if y is a smooth point for Y , then $\delta_y(Y) = 0$ and we are in the minimal case.

Definition 8.13. Let Y be an algebraic variety. An isolated, reduced Cohen-Macaulay singularity $y \in Y$ is called *quasi-minimal* if the tangent cone of Y at y is geometrically reduced and $\delta_y(Y) = 1$.

It is important to notice the following fact:

Proposition 8.14. *Let Y be a projective threefold and $y \in Y$ a point. Let H be an effective Cartier divisor of Y passing through y .*

- (i) *If H has a minimal singularity at y , then Y has also a minimal singularity at y . Furthermore H has general behaviour at y , unless Y is smooth at y and $\nu_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(H) = 2$.*
- (ii) *If H has a quasi-minimal singularity at y , then Y has also a quasi-minimal singularity at y and H has general behaviour at y , unless Y is minimal at y and precisely either:*
 - (1) *Y is smooth and $\text{mult}_y(H) = 3$; or*
 - (2) *$\text{emdim}_y(Y) = 4$, $\text{mult}_y(Y) = 2$ and $\text{emdim}_y(H) = \text{mult}_y(H) = 4$.*

Proof. Since $y \in H$ is a minimal [resp. quasi-minimal] singularity, then the singularity $y \in Y$ is reduced, Cohen-Macaulay and the tangent cone of Y at y is geometrically reduced.

Assume that $y \in H$ is a minimal singularity, i.e. $\delta_y(H) = 0$. By the first part of Lemma 8.7 and by the fact that $\delta_y(Y)$ is always non-negative, one has $\delta_y(Y) = 0$. In particular, H has good behaviour at y . The assertion then follows by Lemma 8.10, (ii).

Assume that $y \in H$ is a quasi-minimal singularity, namely $\delta_y(H) = 1$. By the first part of Lemma 8.7 then either $\delta_y(Y) = 1$ or $\delta_y(Y) = 0$.

In the former case, by Lemma 8.7, (i), H has general behaviour, unless Y is smooth at y and $\text{mult}_y(H) = 2$. But in this case we would have $\delta_y(H) = 0$, against the assumption.

If $\delta_y(Y) = 0$, by Lemma 8.7, we have the possibilities listed there in part (ii) of the Lemma. In the first case, by [27, Lemma 3.4.3, ii, (a)], the possibility $\nu_y(H) = 1$ has to be ruled out because it does not give rise to a quasi-minimal singularity for H . Analogously, the possibility $\nu_y(H) = 2$ and $\text{mult}_y(Y) = 1$ in case 2 (a) is also ruled out. The other possibilities give rise to the two cases listed in the statement. \square

Remark 8.15. From an analytic viewpoint, case (1) in Proposition 8.14 (ii) can be thought of as $Y = \mathbb{P}^3$ and H a cubic surface with a triple point at y .

On the other hand, case (2) can be thought of as Y being a quadric cone in \mathbb{P}^4 with vertex at y and as H being cut out by another quadric cone with vertex at y . The resulting singularity is therefore the cone over a quartic curve Γ in \mathbb{P}^3 with arithmetic genus 1, which is the complete intersection of two quadrics.

Now we describe the relation between minimal and quasi-minimal singularities and Zappatic singularities. First we need the following straightforward remark:

Lemma 8.16. *Any T_n -point [resp. Z_n -point] is a minimal [resp. quasi-minimal] surface singularity.* \square

The following direct consequence of Proposition 8.14 will be important for us:

Proposition 8.17. *Let X be a surface with a Zappatic singularity at a point $x \in X$ and let \mathcal{X} be a threefold containing X as a Cartier divisor and having an isolated singularity at x .*

- *If x is a T_n -point for X , then x is a minimal singularity for \mathcal{X} and X has general behaviour at x ;*
- *If x is a Z_n -point for X , then \mathcal{X} has a quasi-minimal singularity at x and X has general behaviour at x , unless \mathcal{X} is minimal at x and precisely:*
 - (i) \mathcal{X} is smooth and $\text{mult}_x(X) = 3$;
 - (ii) $\text{emdim}_x(\mathcal{X}) = 4, \text{mult}_x(\mathcal{X}) = 2$ and $\text{emdim}_x(X) = \text{mult}_x(X) = 4$.

\square

In the sequel, we will need a description of a surface having as a hyperplane section a stick curve of type C_{S_n} , C_{R_n} , and C_{E_n} (cf. Examples 2.7 and 2.8).

First of all, we recall some well-known results about *minimal degree surfaces* (cf. [20], page 525).

Theorem 8.18 (Del Pezzo). *Let X be an irreducible, non-degenerate surface of minimal degree in \mathbb{P}^r , $r \geq 3$. Then X has degree $r - 1$ and is one of the following:*

- (i) *a rational normal scroll;*
- (ii) *the Veronese surface, if $r = 5$.*

Next we recall the result of Xambó concerning reducible minimal degree surfaces (see [45]).

Theorem 8.19 (Xambó). *Let X be a non-degenerate surface which is connected in codimension one and of minimal degree in \mathbb{P}^r , $r \geq 3$. Then, X has degree $r - 1$, any irreducible component of X is a minimal degree surface in a suitable projective space and any two components intersect along a line.*

In what follows, we shall frequently refer to Appendix A. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be an irreducible, non-degenerate, Projectively Cohen-Macaulay surface with canonical singularities, i.e. with Du Val singularities. We recall that X is called a *Del Pezzo surface* if $\mathcal{O}_X(-1) \simeq \omega_X$. We notice that a Del Pezzo surface is Projectively Gorenstein (cf. Definition A.49 in Appendix A).

Theorem 8.20 (Del Pezzo, [11]). *Let X be an irreducible, non-degenerate, linearly normal surface of degree r in \mathbb{P}^r . Then one of the following occurs:*

- (i) *one has $3 \leq r \leq 9$ and X is either*
 - a. *the image of the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 at $9 - r$ suitable points, mapped to \mathbb{P}^r via the linear system of cubics through the $9 - r$ points, or*
 - b. *the 2-Veronese image in \mathbb{P}^8 of a quadric in \mathbb{P}^3 .*

In each case, X is a Del Pezzo surface.

- (ii) *X is a cone over a smooth elliptic normal curve of degree r in \mathbb{P}^{r-1} .*

Proof. Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a minimal desingularization of X . Let H be a general hyperplane section of X and let $C := f^*(H)$. One has $0 \leq p_a(H) \leq 1$. On the other hand, C is smooth and irreducible (by Bertini's theorem) of genus $g \leq p_a(H)$. By the linear normality, one has $g = 1$ and, therefore, also $p_a(H) = g = 1$. So H is smooth and irreducible, which means that X has isolated singularities.

Assume that X is not a scroll. If $r \geq 5$, Reider's Theorem states that $K_Y + C$ is b.p.f. on Y . Thus, $(K_Y + C)^2 \geq 0$. On the other hand, $(K_Y + C)C = 0$. Then, the Index Theorem implies that K_Y is numerically equivalent to $-C$. Therefore, $H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y)) = (0)$ and so Y is rational and K_Y is linearly equivalent to $-C$.

By the adjunction formula, the above relation is trivially true also if $r = 3$ and $r = 4$.

Now, $r = C^2 = K_Y^2 \leq 9$. If $r = 9$, then $Y = \mathbb{P}^2$ and $C \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3)|$. If Y has no (-1) -curve, the only other possibility is $r = K_Y^2 = 8$ which leads right away to case (i) - b.

Suppose now that E is a (-1) -curve in Y , then $CE = 1$. We claim that $|C + E|$ is b.p.f., it contracts E and maps Y to a surface of degree $r + 1$ in \mathbb{P}^{r+1} . Then, the assertion immediately follows by the description of the cases $r = 8$ and 9 . To prove the claim, consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(C + E) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_E \rightarrow 0$$

and remark that $h^1(\mathcal{O}_Y(C)) = h^1(\mathcal{O}_Y(-2C)) = 0$.

Now suppose that X is a scroll which is not a cone. Note that Y is an elliptic ruled surface. Let R be the pull-back via f of a line L . We claim that all curves in the algebraic system $\{R\}$ are irreducible. Otherwise, we would have some (-1) -curve on Y contracted by f , against the minimality assumption. Therefore Y is a minimal, elliptic ruled surface. Moreover, $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is finite since f cannot contract any curve transversal to R , otherwise X would be a cone, and cannot contract any curve R .

Now, $Y = \mathbb{P}_E(\mathcal{E})$, where E is an elliptic curve and \mathcal{E} is a rank-two vector bundle on E . If \mathcal{E} is indecomposable, then the e -invariant of the scroll is either $e = 0$ or $e = -1$ (cf. Theorem

2.15, page 377 in [23]). Let C_0 be a section of the ruling with $C_0^2 = e$. Then, $C \equiv C_0 + \alpha R$, with $\alpha \geq 2$.

More precisely, we have $\alpha \geq 3$. Otherwise, we would have $r = C_0^2 + 4 \leq 4$, then the hyperplane section H of X would be a complete intersection so X would be a complete intersection hence a cone. Furthermore, when $\alpha = 3$ then $e = 0$. Indeed, assume $e = -1$ and $\alpha = 3$, so $C_0 C = 2$. This would imply that X is a surface of degree 5 in \mathbb{P}^5 with a double line (which is the image of C_0). If we project X from this line, we have a curve of degree 3 in \mathbb{P}^3 which contradicts that Y is an elliptic scroll.

Notice that $K_Y \equiv -2C_0 - eR$ and therefore $K_Y - C \equiv -3C_0 - (e + \alpha)R$. Since $(C - K_Y)C_0 = \alpha + 4e$, from what observed above, in any case $(C - K_Y)C_0 > 0$. Since $(C - K_Y)^2 = 6\alpha + 15e > 0$, we have that $C - K_Y$ is big and nef. Therefore, $h^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(C)) = h^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - C)) = 0$. Look now at the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(C) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $h^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = 1$, then the restriction map

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(C)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_C(C))$$

is not surjective, against the hypothesis that X is a surface of degree r in \mathbb{P}^r .

Finally, assume that \mathcal{E} is decomposable. Then, $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \mathcal{L}_2$, where \mathcal{L}_i is a line bundle of degree d_i on E , $1 \leq i \leq 2$. Observe that $d_1 + d_2 = r$; furthermore, since X is not a cone, then $h^0(E, \mathcal{L}_i) \geq 2$, for each $1 \leq i \leq 2$, hence $d_i \geq 2$, for $1 \leq i \leq 2$. Thus, $h^0(E, \mathcal{E}) = h^0(E, \mathcal{L}_1) + h^0(E, \mathcal{L}_2) = d_1 + d_2 = r$, a contradiction. \square

Since cones as in (ii) above are Projectively Gorenstein surfaces (see Appendix A), the surfaces listed in Theorem 8.20 will be called *minimal Gorenstein surfaces*.

We shall make use of the following easy result.

Lemma 8.21. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a reduced (possibly reducible), non-degenerate and linearly normal curve of degree $r + d$ in \mathbb{P}^r , with $0 \leq d < r$. Then $p_a(D) = d$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{O}_D(H)$ be the hyperplane line bundle on D . By assumption $h^0(D, \mathcal{O}_D(H)) = r + 1$ and $\deg(\mathcal{O}_D(H)) = r + d$. Riemann-Roch Theorem then gives:

$$(8.22) \quad p_a(D) = h^1(D, \mathcal{O}_D(H)) + d = h^0(D, \omega_D \otimes \mathcal{O}_D(-H)) + d,$$

where ω_D denotes the dualizing sheaf. Suppose that $h^0(\omega_D \otimes \mathcal{O}_D(-H)) > 0$. Thus, the effectiveness of $\mathcal{O}_D(H)$ and $\omega_D \otimes \mathcal{O}_D(-H)$ would imply that:

$$p_a(D) = h^0(D, \omega_D) \geq h^0(\mathcal{O}_D(H)) + h^0(\omega_D \otimes \mathcal{O}_D(-H)) - 1 = r + h^0(\omega_D \otimes \mathcal{O}_D(-H)),$$

which contradicts (8.22), since $d < r$ by hypothesis. \square

Theorem 8.23. *Let X be a non-degenerate, Projectively Cohen-Macaulay surface of degree r in \mathbb{P}^r , $r \geq 3$, which is connected in codimension one. Then, any irreducible component of X is either*

- (i) *a minimal Gorenstein surface, and there is at most one such component, or*
- (ii) *a minimal degree surface.*

If there is a component of type (i), then the intersection in codimension one of any two distinct components can be only a line.

If there is no component of type (i), then the intersection in codimension one of any two distinct components is either a line or a (possibly reducible) conic. Moreover, if two components meet along a conic, all the other intersections are lines.

Furthermore, X is Projectively Gorenstein if and only if either X consists of only two components meeting along a conic or the associated graph G_X to X is a cycle E_ν , with $\nu \leq n$.

Proof. Consider D a general hyperplane section of X . Since X is Projectively Cohen Macaulay, so it is Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay (cf. Proposition A.30). This implies that D is an Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay (equiv. arithmetically normal) curve (cf. Theorem A.31 in Appendix A). By Lemma 8.21, $p_a(D) = 1$. Therefore, for each connected subcurve D' of D , one has $0 \leq p_a(D') \leq 1$ and there is at most one irreducible component D'' with $p_a(D'') = 1$. In particular two connected subcurves of D can meet at most in two points. This implies that two irreducible components of X meet either along a line or along a conic. The linear normality of X immediately implies that each irreducible component is linearly normal too. As a consequence of Theorem 8.20 and of Lemma 8.21, all this proves the statement about the components of X and their intersection in codimension one.

It remains to prove the final part of the statement.

Suppose that all the intersections in codimension one of the distinct components are lines. If G_X is a cycle, then the general hyperplane section, being isomorphic to C_{E_ν} , for some $\nu \leq n$ (cf. Example 2.8), is Projectively Gorenstein. Then X is Projectively Gorenstein too (cf. Proposition A.53 in Appendix A). By contrast, if G_X is not a cycle, it has a vertex of valence 1. Therefore, its general hyperplane section cannot be Gorenstein (cf. Example 2.8).

Suppose that X consists of two irreducible components meeting along a conic. The general hyperplane section D consists of two rational normal curves meeting at two points; thus the dualizing sheaf ω_D is trivial, i.e. D is projectively Gorenstein and Gorenstein therefore X also is Projectively Gorenstein (cf. Proposition A.53 in Appendix A).

Conversely let us suppose that X is Projectively Gorenstein and there are two irreducible components X_1 and X_2 meeting along a conic. If there are other components, then there is a component X' meeting all the rest along a line. Thus, the hyperplane section contains a rational curve meeting all the rest at a point. Therefore the dualizing sheaf of D is not trivial, hence D is not Gorenstein, thus X is not Gorenstein. \square

By using Theorems 8.18, 8.19 and 8.20, we can prove the following result:

Proposition 8.24. *Let X be a non-degenerate surface in \mathbb{P}^r and let $n \geq 2$ be an integer.*

- (i) *If $r = n + 1$ and if a hyperplane section of X is C_{R_n} then either:*
 - a. *X is a smooth rational cubic scroll, possible only if $n = 3$, or*
 - b. *the irreducible components of X are ν smooth surfaces of degree $d_i \leq 2$, $1 \leq i \leq \nu$, and the Zappatic singularities of X are $h \geq 1$ points of type R_{m_i} , $i = 1, \dots, h$, such that*

$$(8.25) \quad \sum_{i=1}^h (m_i - 2) = \nu - 2.$$

In particular X has global normal crossings if and only if $\nu = 2$, i.e. if and only if either $n = 3$ and X consists of a plane and a quadric meeting along a line, or $n = 4$ and X consists of two quadrics meeting along a line.

(ii) *If $r = n + 1$ and if a hyperplane section of X is C_{S_n} then either:*

- a. *X is the union of a smooth rational normal scroll $X_1 = S(1, d - 1)$ of degree d , $2 \leq d \leq n$, and of $n - d$ disjoint planes each meeting X_1 along different lines of the same ruling, in which case X has global normal crossings; or*
- b. *X is the union of planes and the Zappatic singularities of X are $h \geq 1$ points of type S_{m_i} , $i = 1, \dots, h$, such that*

$$(8.26) \quad \sum_{i=1}^h \binom{m_i - 1}{2} = \binom{n - 1}{2}.$$

(iii) *If $r = n$, $n \geq 3$, and if a hyperplane section of X is C_{E_n} then either:*

- a. *X is an irreducible Del Pezzo surface of degree n in \mathbb{P}^n , possible only if $n \leq 6$; in particular X is smooth if $n = 6$; or*
- b. *X has two irreducible components, one of which is a smooth rational cubic scroll, the other is either a plane or a smooth quadric or a smooth rational cubic scroll, and the two components intersect along an irreducible conic (in this case X has global normal crossings); or*
- c. *the irreducible components X_1, \dots, X_ν of X are either planes or smooth quadrics forming an E_ν -point, and no other Zappatic singularity, the singularities in codimension one being lines.*

Proof. (i) According to Remark 8.1 and Theorem 8.19, X is connected in codimension one and is a union of minimal degree surfaces meeting along lines. Since a hyperplane section is a C_{R_n} , then every component has to contain some line and therefore it is a rational normal scroll, or a plane. Furthermore any such component Y has a hyperplane section which is a connected subcurve of C_{R_n} . It is then clear that Y is either a plane, or a smooth quadric or a smooth rational normal cubic scroll. In the latter case, one moment of reflection shows that there is no other component, i.e. $Y = X$.

Consider G_X the associated graph to X . Then the 1-skeleton $G_X^{(1)}$ is a chain of length ν . Any connecting edge corresponds to a double line of X . This immediately implies that the Zappatic singularities are only of type R_m , with $m \leq \nu$. Suppose they are points x_1, \dots, x_h of type R_{m_1}, \dots, R_{m_h} . Notice that two double lines of X lying on the same irreducible component have to meet in a point, because they are either lines in the plane or fibres of different rulings on the quadric.




FIGURE 8. The points x_i and x_{i+1} share a common edge in the associated graph G_X .

So the graph G_X consists of h open faces corresponding to the points x_i , $1 \leq i \leq h$, and two contiguous open faces must share a common edge, as shown in Figure 8. Thus, both formula (8.25) and the last part of statement b. immediately follow.

(ii) Like in proof of (i), any irreducible component Y of X can only be either a plane, or a quadric or a smooth rational normal scroll with a line as a directrix. If Y is a rational scroll $S(1, d-1)$ of degree $d > 2$, the subgraph of S_n corresponding to the hyperplane section of Y is S_d . Then a . follows in this case.

If Y is a quadric, the same argument shows that all the other components of X are planes meeting Y along lines. This proves that Y is smooth and that these lines belong to the same ruling of Y .

Suppose now that X is a union of planes. Then X consists of a plane Π and of $n-1$ more planes meeting Π along distinct lines. The Zappatic singularities lie at the intersection points of these lines and therefore are of type S_{m_i} , $i = 1, \dots, h$. This corresponds to the fact that m_i-1 lines pass through the same point $P_i \in \Pi$. Formula (8.26) follows by suitably counting the number of pairs of lines in the configuration.

(iii) If X is irreducible, then a . holds by elementary properties of lines on a Del Pezzo surface.

Suppose that X is reducible. Every irreducible component Y of X has a hyperplane section which is a stick curve strictly contained in C_{E_n} . By an argument we already used in part (i), then Y is either a plane, or a smooth quadric or a smooth rational normal cubic scroll. In the latter case, the surface $Y' = \overline{X \setminus Y}$ intersects Y along an irreducible conic, and b . follows.

Now assume that all the irreducible components of X are either planes or quadrics. The 1-skeleton of the associated graph G_X is a cycle of length ν and each edge correspond to a double line. Since X is Projectively Gorenstein (cf. Theorem 8.23), it has only Gorenstein singularities, in particular R_m -points are excluded. Thus, the only singularity compatible with the above graph is a E_ν -point. \square

Remark 8.27. At the end of the proof of part (iii), instead of using the Gorenstein property, one can prove by a direct computation that a surface X of degree n , which is union of planes and smooth quadrics, without a E_ν -point but whose associated graph G_X has the 1-skeleton $G_X^{(1)}$ which is a cycle of length ν , does not span a \mathbb{P}^n but a lower dimensional space (cf. Example 3.8).

Corollary 8.28. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a Zappatic degeneration and denote by X its central fibre. Let $x \in X$ be a T_n -point. Let \mathcal{X}' be the blow-up of \mathcal{X} at x . Let E be the exceptional divisor, let X' be the proper transform of X , $\Gamma = C_{T_n}$ be the intersection curve of E and X' . Then E is a minimal degree surface of degree n in $\mathbb{P}^{n+1} = \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathcal{X},x})$, and Γ is one of its hyperplane sections.*

In particular, if x is either a R_n - or a S_n -point, then E is as described in Proposition 8.24.

Proof. The first part of the statement directly follows from Lemma 8.16, Proposition 8.17 and Theorem 8.19. \square

We close this section by stating a result which will be useful in the sequel:

Corollary 8.29. *Let y be a point of a projective threefold Y . Let H be an effective Cartier divisor on Y passing through y . If H has an E_n -point at y , then Y is Gorenstein at y .*

Proof. By Proposition 8.14, we may assume that H has general behaviour at y . Indeed, in cases (ii.1) and (ii.2), Y is clearly Gorenstein at y . Since the problem is local, we may also suppose that H is very ample. By assumption, H is Gorenstein at y , therefore also Y must be Gorenstein at y (cf. Theorem A.48 in Appendix A). \square

9. RESOLUTION OF SINGULARITIES OF THE TOTAL SPACE OF A GOOD ZAPPATIC DEGENERATION

Given $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ a good Zappatic degeneration, the aim of this section is to describe partial and total desingularizations of the total space \mathcal{X} of the degeneration. These will be fundamental tools in Section 10, where we shall compute the *geometric genus* of the smooth fibres of \mathcal{X} (cf. Theorem 10.10), as well as in Sections 11 and 12, where we shall combinatorially compute the K^2 of the smooth fibres of \mathcal{X} (cf. Theorem 11.1) and prove the *Multiple Point formula* (cf. Theorem 12.2), respectively.

Recall that, by Definition 7.2 and by what proved in § 8, if $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a good Zappatic degeneration whose central fibre is denoted by X , then \mathcal{X} is assumed to be smooth except for:

- ordinary double points at points of the double locus of X , which are not Zappatic singularities of X ;
- minimal singularities at the R_n - and S_n -points of X , for $n \geq 3$;
- quasi-minimal singularities at the E_n -points of X , for $n \geq 4$.

In particular, \mathcal{X} is smooth at the E_3 -points of X .

As recalled in Remark 3.4, a good Zappatic surface X is Gorenstein only at the E_n -points, for $n \geq 3$. Therefore, when X is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$, one can consider a partial resolution of \mathcal{X} at the R_n - and S_n -points, for $n \geq 3$, in order to make the central fibre Gorenstein.

We now describe a minimal algorithm which produces a birational model of \mathcal{X} , denoted by

$$(9.1) \quad \mathcal{X}^G \rightarrow \Delta,$$

such that:

- (i) \mathcal{X}^G is isomorphic to \mathcal{X} off the central fibre;
- (ii) \mathcal{X}^G is Gorenstein;
- (iii) for each irreducible component X_i of the central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$ of \mathcal{X} there is some irreducible component of the central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0^G = X^G$ of \mathcal{X}^G which dominates X_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$.

As it will be clear from Algorithm 9.3, X^G is a good Zappatic surface having only E_n -points as Zappatic singularities. Therefore \mathcal{X}^G is smooth except for:

- ordinary double points at points of the double locus of X^G , which are not Zappatic singularities of X^G ;
- quasi-minimal singularities at the E_n -points of X^G , for $n \geq 4$.

In particular, both the dualizing sheaves $\omega_{\mathcal{X}^G}$ and ω_{X^G} are invertible.

We sometimes need to completely resolve the total space of the degeneration. In this case, as it will be shown in Algorithm 9.3, one can push the previous analysis forward to get a *normal crossing reduction* of \mathcal{X} , say \mathcal{X}^s , such that:

- (i) \mathcal{X}^s is smooth and it is isomorphic to \mathcal{X} off the central fibre;
- (ii) its central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0^s = X^s$ is a Zappatic surface with global normal crossings, i.e. with only E_3 -points as Zappatic singularities;
- (iii) for each irreducible component X_i of the central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$ of \mathcal{X} there is some irreducible component of the central fibre X^s which dominates X_i , $1 \leq i \leq v$.

This also produces a semistable degeneration

$$(9.2) \quad \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \Delta$$

(in the sense of Definition 7.1 - see also e.g. [36]) which is associated to $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$.

Algorithm 9.3. *Given $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ a good Zappatic degeneration, the algorithm described below produces degenerations as in (9.1) and in (9.2).*

We start by focusing on the first part of the algorithm, which gives the total space \mathcal{X}^G as in (9.1). Since the problem is local, we may (and will) assume that \mathcal{X} is Gorenstein, except at a point x , and that each irreducible component X_i of X passing through x is a plane, denoted by Π_i .

Case (G1): First we will deal with the case $n = 3$, i.e. x is a R_3 -point for X . Let us blow-up the point $x \in \mathcal{X}$, as in Corollary 8.28. We get a new total space \mathcal{X}' .




FIGURE 9. Blowing-up a R_3 -point x .

We denote by E the exceptional divisor, by Π'_i the proper transform of Π_i and by $X' = \cup \Pi'_i$ the proper transform of X , as in Figure 9. We remark that the three planes Π_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, concurring at x , are blown-up in this process, whereas the remaining planes stay untouched. We call E_i the exceptional divisor on the blown-up plane Π_i . Let $\Gamma = E_1 + E_2 + E_3$ be the intersection curve of E and X' . By Corollary 8.28, E is a non-degenerate surface of degree 3 in \mathbb{P}^4 , with Γ as a hyperplane section.

(i) Suppose first that E is irreducible. Then \mathcal{X}' is Gorenstein and we are done.

(ii) Suppose now that E is reducible. If \mathcal{X}' is Gorenstein, we are done. In such a case, E is as described in Proposition 8.24 (i)-b and in Corollary 8.28 (e.g., see Figure 10, i.e. E consists of a plane and a quadric).




FIGURE 10. E splits in a plane and a quadric.

On the other hand, if \mathcal{X}' is not Gorenstein, then E consists of a cone over a C_{R_3} with vertex x' , hence x' is again a R_3 -point. Therefore we have to repeat the process by blowing-up x' . After finitely many steps this procedure stops.

Case (G2): Consider now the case that $n = 4$ and x is a R_4 -point. As before, we blow-up the point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and let E be the exceptional divisor and \mathcal{X}' the new total space. By Corollary 8.28, E is a non-degenerate surface of minimal degree in \mathbb{P}^5 with $\Gamma = E_1 + E_2 + E_3 + E_4$ as a hyperplane section. By Proposition 8.24, E is reducible and the following cases may occur:

- (i) E has global normal crossings, in which case E consists of two quadrics Q_1, Q_2 meeting along a line (see Figure 11);




FIGURE 11. The exceptional divisor E has global normal crossings.

- (ii) E has one R_3 -point x' , in which case E consists of a quadric Q and two planes P_1, P_2 (see Figure 12);





FIGURE 12. E consists of a quadric and two planes and has a R_3 -point x' .

- (iii) E has two R_3 -points x', x'' , in which case E consists of four planes P_1, \dots, P_4 , i.e. a planar Zappatic surface whose associated graph is the tree R_4 (see Figure 13);
- (iv) E has one R_4 -point x' , in which case E consists of four planes, i.e. a planar Zappatic surface whose associated graph is an open 4-face (cf. Figures 4, 5 and 14).


In case (i), \mathcal{X}' is Gorenstein and we are done.

In case (ii), there are two possibilities corresponding to cases (a) and (b) of Figure 12. Both these possibilities can be treated as in Case (1).

Case (iii) follows as case (ii).

FIGURE 13. E consists of four planes and has two R_3 -points x', x'' .

In case (iv), we have to repeat the process by blowing-up x' , see Figure 14. After finitely many steps, this procedure stops in the sense that the exceptional divisor will be as in case (i), (ii) or (iii).

FIGURE 14. Blowing-up a R_4 -point x' infinitely near to x .

Case (G3): Consider now the case that x is a R_n -point. The cases $n = 3$ and 4 have already been proved, so we assume $n \geq 5$ and proceed by induction on n . As usual, we blow-up the point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and we get a new total space \mathcal{X}' . By Corollary 8.28, the exceptional divisor E is a non-degenerate surface of minimal degree in \mathbb{P}^{n+1} with $\Gamma = E_1 + \dots + E_n$ as a hyperplane section. By Proposition 8.24, E is reducible and the following cases may occur:

- (i) E consists of $\nu \geq 3$ irreducible components P_1, \dots, P_ν , which are either planes or smooth quadrics, and E has h Zappatic singular points x_1, \dots, x_h of type R_{m_1}, \dots, R_{m_h} such that $m_i < n$, $i = 1, \dots, h$;
- (ii) E has one R_n -point x' , in which case E consists of n planes, i.e. a planar Zappatic surface whose associated graph is an open n -face.

In case (ii), one has to repeat the process by blowing-up x' . After finitely many steps, the exceptional divisor will necessarily be as in case (i).

So it suffices to consider case (i). Notice that \mathcal{X}' is not Gorenstein, but since each m_i is strictly less than n , by induction, we conclude after finitely many steps.

Case (G4): Finally, consider the case that x is of type S_n . Notice that $S_3 = R_3$, so we assume $n \geq 4$. Blow-up x , as usual, and let E be the exceptional divisor and \mathcal{X}' the new total space. By Proposition 8.24, three cases may occur: either

- (i) E has global normal crossings, i.e. E is the union of a smooth rational normal scroll $X_1 = S(1, d-1)$ of degree d , $2 \leq d \leq n$, and of $n-d$ disjoint planes P_1, \dots, P_{n-d} , each meeting X_1 along different lines of the same ruling; or
- (ii) E is a union of n planes P_1, \dots, P_n with h Zappatic singular points x_1, \dots, x_h of type S_{m_1}, \dots, S_{m_h} such that $3 \leq m_i < n$, $i = 1, \dots, h$, and (8.26) holds; or
- (iii) E is a union of n planes with one S_n -point x' .

In case (iii), one has to repeat the process by blowing-up x' . After finitely many steps, the exceptional divisor will necessarily be as in cases either (i) or (ii).

Thus, it suffices to consider the first two cases (i) and (ii).

In case (i), since E has global normal crossings, then \mathcal{X}' is Gorenstein and we are done.

In case (ii), E is not Gorenstein, but we can conclude by induction since each $m_i < n$.

Now we focus on the case of the normal crossing reduction of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. By the first part of the algorithm, we may (and will) assume that \mathcal{X} is smooth except for:

- ordinary double points along the double locus of the central fibre X , which are not the Zappatic singularities of X ;
- quasi-minimal singularities at the E_n -points of X , for $n \geq 4$.

Since the computations are of local nature, we can focus on the case of \mathcal{X} having only one singular point p .

Case (S1): We first assume that p is an ordinary double point. We blow-up p in \mathcal{X} to get a new total space \mathcal{X}' , which is smooth. Notice that, according to our hypotheses, the exceptional divisor $E := E_{\mathcal{X},p} = \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathcal{X},p})$ is isomorphic to a smooth quadric in \mathbb{P}^3 (see Figure 15), where the proper transform of X is denoted by $X' = X'_1 + X'_2 + Y'$, such that X'_1, X'_2 are the proper transforms of X_1, X_2 , respectively.





FIGURE 15. Blowing-up an ordinary double point of \mathcal{X}

On the other hand, the central fibre does not have global normal crossings, since it contains E with multiplicity 2. Nonetheless, we can blow-down E along one of the two rulings and get a new total space \mathcal{X}'' which is still smooth and whose central fibre has now global normal crossings (see Figure 16). The composition of the blow-up and the blow-down is a birational map $\mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}''$ which produces a normal crossing reduction of \mathcal{X} .

Case (S2): Let $p \in X$ be an E_n -point. Recall that, if $n = 3$, then \mathcal{X} is smooth at p . Thus we assume $n \geq 4$. As proved in Proposition 8.17, p is a quasi-minimal singularity for \mathcal{X} . Let us blow-up \mathcal{X} at p and let E be the exceptional divisor. Since a hyperplane section of E is C_{E_n} , then either E is irreducible, or E is reducible with global normal crossings or E is

FIGURE 16. Blowing down E along a ruling

reducible and it has one point p' of type E_m , with $m \leq n$, and no other Zappatic singularity (cf. § 8). In the former case - i.e. E irreducible - then E is either smooth or E has Du Val singularities (where we may assume that the total space of the degeneration is smooth). In the latter case, we blow up p' . The exceptional divisor will be as E above. Therefore, after finitely many blow-ups, we will get exceptional divisors with no Zappatic singularities.

Note that, even after the first blow up, there can be either E_3 -points or E_4 -points along the intersection of E with the proper transform of the irreducible components X_i of X . The total space of the degeneration is singular at the E_4 -points and can be singular even at the E_3 -points. In both cases we proceed by blowing up such points. After finitely many blowing-ups of points in the central fibre, we eventually get a smooth total space of the degeneration.

10. THE GEOMETRIC GENUS IN GOOD ZAPPATIC DEGENERATIONS

In this section we want to investigate on the behaviour of the geometric genus of the smooth fibres of a good Zappatic degeneration, in terms of the ω -genus of the central fibre as defined in Definition 6.1.

As stated in Notation 7.3, if $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a degeneration of surfaces, whose general fibre \mathcal{X}_t is by definition a smooth, irreducible and projective surface, then we set

$$(10.1) \quad p_g := p_g(\mathcal{X}_t).$$

Assume now — unless otherwise stated — that the Zappatic surface $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$.

After possibly shrinking the base, we may assume that the total space \mathcal{X} is fibered over a closed disk Δ . Therefore, since \mathcal{X} is proper, we can consider its dualizing sheaf $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$. We can embed $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ in some \mathbb{P}^N .

By definition of dualizing sheaf, $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ is torsion-free as an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -module (cf. Remark 4.2). Since we have the injection

$$\mathcal{O}_{\Delta} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}},$$

we conclude that $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ is torsion-free over Δ . Therefore, for all integer $h \gg 0$, the sheaf $\pi_*(\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(h))$ is a coherent, torsion-free sheaf of finite rank over Δ . Since Δ is a smooth, projective curve, then $\pi_*(\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(h))$ is locally free. This implies that $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ is flat over Δ (see. e.g. Proposition 5.1, in [43]).

Therefore, Theorem 6.12 and the flatness of the dualizing sheaf $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ imply the following:

Proposition 10.2. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good Zappatic degeneration and $\mathcal{X}_0 = X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be its central fibre. Let G_X be the associated graph to X . Let Φ be the map defined in (5.9).*

Then, for any $t \in \Delta$,

$$(10.3) \quad p_g(\mathcal{X}_t) \leq p_\omega(X) = b_2(G_X) + \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) + \dim(\operatorname{coker}(\Phi)).$$

Proof. By the flatness of the dualizing sheaf and by semi-continuity, we have $p_g(\mathcal{X}_t) \leq p_\omega(\mathcal{X}_0) = p_\omega(X)$. One concludes by using formula (6.13). \square

The main result of this section shows that equality holds in (10.3) (cf. Theorem 10.10). To prove this, we need some preliminary results.

Lemma 10.4. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good Zappatic degeneration and $\mathcal{X}_0 = X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ its central fibre. Let $\mathcal{X}^G \rightarrow \Delta$ be as in (9.1) and $\mathcal{X}_0^G = X^G$ its central fibre. Let G_X (G_{X^G} , resp.) be the associated graph to X (X^G , resp.).*

Then, G_X is a deformation retract of G_{X^G} as topological spaces. In particular,

$$(10.5) \quad b_2(G_X) = b_2(G_{X^G}).$$

Proof. From Algorithm 9.3, we recall that \mathcal{X}^G is obtained from \mathcal{X} by a sequence of blowing-ups as in cases (G1) - (G4); in particular, \mathcal{X}^G dominates \mathcal{X} . Denote by $\sigma : \mathcal{X}^G \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ the composition of these blowing-ups.

Since the problem is local, consider an open n -face (resp. a n -angle) G_x of G_X , namely G_x is the subgraph with n vertices corresponding to n irreducible components, say X_1, \dots, X_n , of X forming a R_n -point (resp. a S_n -point) x . Let G'_x be the subgraph of G_{X^G} containing the vertices corresponding to the proper transforms X'_1, \dots, X'_n of X_1, \dots, X_n and the exceptional divisors contained in $\sigma^{-1}(x)$. The description of blowing-ups in cases (G1) - (G4) of Algorithm 9.3 implies that the subgraph G_x is a deformation retract of G_x^s , as topological spaces.

This can be easily proved by induction on the number of blowing-ups. We limit ourselves to show this with an example and we leave the details of the general case to the reader.

For instance suppose that we start with a R_4 -point x . The associated graph G_x of the four irreducible components passing through x is shown in Figure 17 (cf. § 9)





FIGURE 17. Associated graph G to a R_4 -point x

After the first blow-up, denoting by E the exceptional divisor, there are five different possible configurations (cf. Algorithm 9.3, Case (G2)):

- (i) E has global normal crossings;
- (ii.a) and (ii.b) E has a R_3 -point x' ;
- (iii) E has two R_3 -points x', x'' ;
- (iv) E has a R_4 -point x' .

FIGURE 18. After blowing-up a R_4 -point x , there are five possibilities

The corresponding associated graphs G'_x are illustrated in Figure 18. It is clear from the pictures that, in each case, G_x is a deformation retract of G'_x .

Globally speaking, it follows that the graph G_X and G_{X^G} are homotopically equivalent, hence they have the same homological invariants. Thus (10.5) holds. \square

Lemma 10.6. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good Zappatic degeneration. Let $\mathcal{X}^G \rightarrow \Delta$ be as in (9.1) and $\mathcal{X}_0^G = X^G$ its central fibre. Let $\mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \Delta$ be a normal crossing reduction of \mathcal{X} (which is obtained from \mathcal{X}^G as in Algorithm 9.3) and let X^s be its central fibre. Let G_{X^G} (G_{X^s} , resp.) be the graph associated to X^G (X^s , resp.).*

Then, G_{X^s} is a triangulation of G_{X^G} as topological spaces. In particular,

$$(10.7) \quad b_2(G_{X^G}) = b_2(G_{X^s}).$$

Proof. From Algorithm 9.3, we know that \mathcal{X}^s is obtained from \mathcal{X}^G by applying the procedure as in cases (S1) and (S2). We recall that, in order to have global normal crossings, for each ordinary double point $p \in \mathcal{X}^G$ we first blow-up p ; then, since the exceptional divisor E_p is a smooth quadric, we blow-down E_p along one of its two rulings (cf. Case (S1)).

However, the composition of this blow-up and this blow-down does not affect the graph G_{X^G} , for each ordinary double point off the Zappatic singularities of X^G .

Therefore, we may (and will) assume that \mathcal{X}^G has only quasi-minimal singularities (cf. Definition 8.13 and Lemma 8.16) at the Zappatic singularities of X^G , which are only E_n -points by definition of \mathcal{X}^G , for $n \geq 4$. In this case, from Algorithm 9.3, it follows that \mathcal{X}^s is obtained from \mathcal{X}^G by a sequence of blowing-ups as in (S2). Denote by $\sigma : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^G$ the compositions of these blowing-ups.

As in Lemma 10.6, the situation is local. If G'_x is a closed n -face of G_{X^G} (i.e. a subgraph with n vertices corresponding to n irreducible components, say X'_1, \dots, X'_n , of X^G forming an E_n -point x), then the description of blowing-ups as in (S2) shows that the subgraph G_x^s of G_{X^s} containing the vertices corresponding to the proper transforms X_1^s, \dots, X_n^s of X'_1, \dots, X'_n and the exceptional divisors contained in $\sigma^{-1}(x)$ is a triangulation of G_x .

Globally speaking, it follows that the graphs G_{X^G} and G_{X^s} are homotopy equivalent, hence they have the same homological invariants; thus (10.7) holds. \square

After this, we have to remind some general facts concerning semistable degenerations, i.e. degenerations $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ such that \mathcal{X} is smooth and the central fibre is a reduced, connected union of smooth irreducible components having global normal crossing singularities. Indeed,

when $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is a semistable degeneration (thus, the central fibre has only E_3 -points as singular points), $p_g(\mathcal{X}_t)$ can be also computed by using the *Clemens-Schmid exact sequence* which relates the mixed Hodge theory of the central fibre X to that of \mathcal{X}_t by means of the monodromy of the total space \mathcal{X} (see [36] for definitions and statements).

In particular, one has:

Proposition 10.8. *(cf. e.g. Corollary 5.15 in [7]) Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be the central fibre of a semistable Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. Then, with same notation as in Proposition 10.2, for every $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$, we have*

$$(10.9) \quad p_g(\mathcal{X}_t) = p_\omega(X) = b_2(G_X) + \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) + \dim(\text{coker}(\Phi)).$$

In particular, the geometric genus of the smooth fibres of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is constant.

By using Lemmata 10.4 and 10.6, we can completely generalize the previous result to the more general situation of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. Precisely, we have:

Theorem 10.10. *Let $X = \mathcal{X}_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be a good Zappatic surface. Assume that X is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. Let G_X be the graph associated to X and Φ the map defined in (5.9), for each $1 \leq i < j \leq v$ such that $C_{ij} \neq \emptyset$. Then*

$$(10.11) \quad p_g(\mathcal{X}_t) = p_\omega(X) = b_2(G_X) + \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) + \dim(\text{coker}(\Phi)),$$

for any $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$. In particular, the geometric genus of the smooth fibres of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is constant.

Proof. By Algorithm 9.3, we know how to get a normal crossing reduction $\mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \Delta$ of the given Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. The central fibre $X^s = \mathcal{X}_0^s$ is a Zappatic surface with global normal crossings. Thus, ω_{X^s} is invertible on X^s . Denote by $\sigma : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ the birational morphism.

By what recalled in Proposition 10.8, we have:

$$(10.12) \quad p_g(\mathcal{X}_t^s) = p_\omega(X^s) = b_2(G_{X^s}) + \sum_{i=1}^w p_g(X_i^s) + \dim(\text{coker}(\Phi^s)),$$

where Φ^s is defined similarly as in (5.9) and X_1^s, \dots, X_w^s , with $w \geq v$, are the irreducible components of X^s . After ordering the indexes, we may assume that X_1^s, \dots, X_v^s are the proper transform of the irreducible components X_1, \dots, X_v of X , whereas X_{v+1}^s, \dots, X_w^s are new irreducible components which are rational surfaces, because they are (proper transforms of) exceptional divisors. Furthermore, from our analysis in § 8, we deduce that the new irreducible components X_{v+1}^s, \dots, X_w^s meet the other components along rational curves. Note that the Zappatic singularities of X are smooth points for the double curves C_{ij} , thus a normal crossing reduction does not affect these double curves. Therefore

$$(10.13) \quad \sum_{i=1}^w p_g(X_i^s) = \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{coker}(\Phi^s) \cong \text{coker}(\Phi).$$

Furthermore, from (10.5) and (10.7), we have

$$(10.14) \quad b_2(G_X) = b_2(G_{X^s}).$$

Thus, from (10.12), (10.13) and (10.14), we get:

$$(10.15) \quad p_g(\mathcal{X}_t^s) = p_\omega(X^s) = b_2(G_X) + \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) + \dim(\text{coker}(\Phi)).$$

On the other hand, since a normal crossing reduction of \mathcal{X} only involves the central fibre \mathcal{X}_0 , then

$$(10.16) \quad p_g(\mathcal{X}_t) = p_g(\mathcal{X}_t^s), \quad \forall t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}.$$

Therefore, putting together (10.3), (10.15) and (10.16), we get (10.11). \square

In particular, from the proof of Theorem 10.10, we also deduce:

Corollary 10.17. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good Zappatic degeneration and $\mathcal{X}_0 = X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ its central fibre. Let $\mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \Delta$ be a normal crossing reduction of \mathcal{X} and X^s its central fibre. Then:*

$$(10.18) \quad p_\omega(X^s) = p_\omega(X) = b_2(G_X) + \sum_{i=1}^v p_g(X_i) + \dim(\text{coker}(\Phi)).$$

As observed in Remark 1 in the Introduction, Theorem 10.10 completely generalizes the Clemens-Schmid approach for semistable degenerations.

11. COMBINATORIAL COMPUTATION OF K^2

The results contained in § 8 and in § 9 will be used in this section to prove combinatorial formulas for $K^2 := K_{\mathcal{X}_t}^2$, where \mathcal{X}_t is the general fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration, i.e. \mathcal{X}_t is a smooth surface which degenerates to a good Zappatic surface $\mathcal{X}_0 = X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ (see Notation 7.3).

Indeed, by using the combinatorial data associated to X and G_X (cf. Definition 3.6 and Notation 3.12), we shall prove the following main result:

Theorem 11.1. *Let \mathcal{X} be a good Zappatic degeneration and $X = \mathcal{X}_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ be its central fibre. Let $C_{ij} = X_i \cap X_j$ be a double curve of X , which is considered as a curve on X_i , for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq v$.*

If $K^2 := K_{\mathcal{X}_t}^2$, for $t \neq 0$, then (cf. Notation 3.12):

$$(11.2) \quad K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^v (K_{X_i}^2 + (\sum_{j \neq i} (4g_{ij} - C_{ij}^2))) - 8e + \sum_{n \geq 3} 2nf_n + r_3 + k,$$

where k depends only on the presence of R_n - and S_n -points, for $n \geq 4$, and precisely:

$$(11.3) \quad \sum_{n \geq 4} (n-2)(r_n + s_n) \leq k \leq \sum_{n \geq 4} \left((2n-5)r_n + \binom{n-1}{2} s_n \right).$$

In case of good planar Zappatic degeneration, we have the following:

Corollary 11.4. *Let \mathcal{X} be a good planar Zappatic degeneration and $X = \mathcal{X}_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^v \Pi_i$ its central fibre. Then:*

$$(11.5) \quad K^2 = 9v - 10e + \sum_{n \geq 3} 2nf_n + r_3 + k$$

where k is as in (11.3) and depends only on the presence of R_n - and S_n -points, for $n \geq 4$.

Proof. Clearly $g_{ij} = 0$, for each $1 \leq i \neq j \leq v$, whereas $C_{ij}^2 = 1$, for each pair (i, j) s.t. $e_{ij} \in E$, otherwise $C_{ij}^2 = 0$. \square

The proof of Theorem 11.1 will be done in several steps. The first one is to compute K^2 when X has only E_n -points. In this case, and only in this case, K_X is a Cartier divisor.

Theorem 11.6. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 11.1, if $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ has only E_n -points, for $n \geq 3$, then:*

$$(11.7) \quad K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^v (K_{X_i}^2 + (\sum_{j \neq i} (4g_{ij} - C_{ij}^2))) - 8e + \sum_{n \geq 3} 2nf_n.$$

Proof. By Corollary 8.29, the total space \mathcal{X} is Gorenstein, so $K_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a Cartier divisor on \mathcal{X} . Therefore K_X is also Cartier and it makes sense to consider K_X^2 and the adjunction formula states $K_X = (K_{\mathcal{X}} + X)|_X$.

We claim that

$$(11.8) \quad K_{X|X_i} = (K_{\mathcal{X}} + X)|_{X_i} = K_{X_i} + C_i,$$

where $C_i = \sum_{j \neq i} C_{ij}$ is the union of the double curves of X lying on the irreducible component X_i , for each $1 \leq i \leq v$. Since $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X)$ is invertible, it suffices to prove (11.8) off the E_n -points. In other words, we can consider the surfaces X_i as if they were Cartier divisors on \mathcal{X} . Then, we have:

$$(11.9) \quad K_{X|X_i} = (K_{\mathcal{X}} + X)|_{X_i} = (K_{\mathcal{X}} + X_i + \sum_{j \neq i} X_j)|_{X_i} = K_{X_i} + C_i,$$

as we had to show. Furthermore:

$$\begin{aligned} K^2 &= (K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{X}_t)^2 \cdot \mathcal{X}_t = (K_{\mathcal{X}} + X)^2 \cdot X = (K_{\mathcal{X}} + X)^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^v X_i = \sum_{i=1}^v ((K_{\mathcal{X}} + X)|_{X_i})^2 = \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^v (K_{X_i}^2 + 2C_i K_{X_i} + C_i^2) = \sum_{i=1}^v K_{X_i}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^v C_i K_{X_i} + \sum_{i=1}^v C_i(C_i + K_{X_i}) = \\ (11.10) \quad &= \sum_{i=1}^v K_{X_i}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^v (\sum_{j \neq i} C_{ij}) K_{X_i} + \sum_{i=1}^v 2(p_a(C_i) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

As in Notation 3.12, $C_{ij} = \sum_{t=1}^{h_{ij}} C_{ij}^t$ is the sum of its disjoint, smooth, irreducible components, where h_{ij} is the number of these components. Thus,

$$C_{ij} K_{X_i} = \sum_{t=1}^{h_{ij}} (C_{ij}^t K_{X_i}),$$

for each $1 \leq i \neq j \leq v$. If we denote by g_{ij}^t the geometric genus of the smooth, irreducible curve C_{ij}^t , by the adjunction formula on each C_{ij}^t , we have the following intersection number on the surface X_i :

$$C_{ij} K_{X_i} = \sum_{t=1}^{h_{ij}} (2g_{ij}^t - 2 - (C_{ij}^t)^2) = 2g_{ij} - 2h_{ij} - C_{ij}^2,$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of geometric genus of C_{ij} and the fact that $C_{ij}^s C_{ij}^t = 0$, for any $1 \leq t \neq s \leq h_{ij}$.

Therefore, by the distributivity of the intersection form and by (11.10), we get:

$$(11.11) \quad K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^v K_{X_i}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^v \left(\sum_{j \neq i} (2g_{ij} - 2h_{ij}) - C_{ij}^2 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^v 2(p_a(C_i) - 1).$$

For each index i , consider now the normalization $\nu_i : \tilde{C}_i \rightarrow C_i$ of the curve C_i lying on X_i ; this determines the short exact sequence:

$$(11.12) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_i} \rightarrow (\nu_i)_*(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}_i}) \rightarrow \underline{t}_i \rightarrow 0,$$

where \underline{t}_i is a sky-scraper sheaf supported on $\text{Sing}(C_i)$, as a curve in X_i . By using Notation 3.12, the long exact sequence in cohomology induced by (11.12) gives that:

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}) + h^0(\underline{t}_i) = \sum_{j \neq i} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{h_{ij}} \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_{ij}^t}) \right) = \sum_{j \neq i} (h_{ij} - g_{ij}).$$

Since $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}) = 1 - p_a(C_i)$, we get

$$(11.13) \quad p_a(C_i) - 1 = \sum_{j \neq i} (g_{ij} - h_{ij}) + h^0(\underline{t}_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq v.$$

By plugging formula (11.13) in (11.11), we get:

$$(11.14) \quad K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^v (K_{X_i}^2 + \left(\sum_{j \neq i} (4g_{ij} - C_{ij}^2) \right)) - 8e + 2 \sum_{i=1}^v h^0(\underline{t}_i).$$

To complete the proof, we need to compute $h^0(\underline{t}_i)$. By definition of \underline{t}_i , this computation is a local problem. Suppose that p is an E_n -point of X lying on X_i , for some i . By the very definition of E_n -point (cf. Definition 3.1 and Example 2.8), p is a node for the curve $C_i \subset X_i$; therefore $h^0(\underline{t}_{i|p}) = 1$. The same holds on each of the other $n - 1$ curves $C_j \subset X_j$, $1 \leq j \neq i \leq n$, concurring at the E_n -point p . Therefore, by (11.14), we get (11.7). \square

Proof of Theorem 11.1. The previous argument proves that, in this more general case, one has:

$$(11.15) \quad K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^v (K_{X_i}^2 + \left(\sum_{j \neq i} (4g_{ij} - C_{ij}^2) \right)) - 8e + 2 \sum_{i=1}^v h^0(\underline{t}_i) - c$$

where c is a positive correction term which depends only on the points where \mathfrak{X} is not Gorenstein, i.e. at the R_n - and S_n -points of its central fibre X .

To prove the statement, we have to compute:

- (i) the contribution of $h^0(\underline{t}_i)$ given by the R_n - and the S_n -points of X , for each $1 \leq i \leq v$;
- (ii) the correction term c .

For what concerns (i), suppose first that p is a R_n -point of X and let C_i be one of the curves passing through p . By definition (cf. Example 2.7), the point p is either a smooth point or a node for $C_i \subset X_i$. In the first case we have $h^0(\underline{t}_i|_p) = 0$ whereas, in the latter, $h^0(\underline{t}_i|_p) = 1$. More precisely, among the n indexes involved in the R_n -point there are exactly two indexes, say i_1 and i_n , such that C_{i_j} is smooth at p , for $j = 1$ and $j = n$, and $n - 2$ indexes such that C_{i_j} has a node at p , for $2 \leq j \leq n - 1$. On the other hand, if we assume that p is a S_n -point, then p is an ordinary $(n - 1)$ -tuple point for only one of the curves concurring at p , say $C_i \subset X_i$, and a simple point for all the other curves $C_j \subset X_j$, $1 \leq j \neq i \leq n$. Recall that an ordinary $(n - 1)$ -tuple point contributes $\binom{n-1}{2}$ to $h^0(\underline{t}_i)$.

Therefore, from (11.15), we have:

$$K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^v (K_{X_i}^2 + (\sum_{j \neq i} (4g_{ij} - C_{ij}^2))) - 8e + \sum_{n \geq 3} 2nf_n + \sum_{n \geq 3} 2(n-2)r_n + \sum_{n \geq 4} (n-1)(n-2)s_n - c.$$

In order to compute the correction term c , we have to perform a partial resolution of \mathcal{X} at the R_n - and S_n -points of X , which makes the total space Gorenstein (cf. Algorithm 9.3). This will give us (11.2), i.e.

$$K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^v (K_{X_i}^2 + (\sum_{j \neq i} (4g_{ij} - C_{ij}^2))) - 8e + \sum_{n \geq 3} 2nf_n + r_3 + k,$$

where

$$k := \sum_{n \geq 3} 2(n-2)r_n - r_3 + \sum_{n \geq 4} (n-1)(n-2)s_n - c.$$

It is clear that the contribution to c of each such point is purely local. In other words,

$$c = \sum_x c_x$$

where x varies in the set of R_n - and S_n -points of X and where c_x is the contribution at x to the computation of K^2 as above.

In the next Proposition 11.16, we shall compute such local contributions. This result, together with Theorem 11.6, will conclude the proof. \square

Proposition 11.16. *In the hypothesis of Theorem 11.1, if $x \in X$ is a R_n -point then:*

$$n - 2 \geq c_x \geq 1,$$

whereas if $x \in X$ is a S_n -point then:

$$(n - 2)^2 \geq c_x \geq \binom{n-1}{2}.$$

Proof. Since the problem is local, we may (and will) assume that \mathcal{X} is Gorenstein, except at x , and that each irreducible component X_i of X passing through x is a plane, denoted by Π_i .

First we will deal with the case $n = 3$.

Claim 11.17. *If x is a R_3 -point, then*

$$c_x = 1.$$

Proof of the claim. We refer to Algorithm 9.3, Case (G1). By recalling Figure 9 and its notation:

- in case (i) we had E irreducible and \mathcal{X}' Gorenstein. Then, by adjunction formula we have:

$$(11.18) \quad K^2 = (K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2 + (K_E + \Gamma)^2.$$

Since E is a rational normal cubic scroll in \mathbb{P}^4 , then:

$$(11.19) \quad (K_E + \Gamma)^2 = 1,$$

whereas the other term is:

$$(K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2 = \sum_i (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + \Gamma_{\Pi'_i})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^3 (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 + \sum_{j \geq 4} K_{X'|\Pi'_j}^2.$$

Reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 11.6, one sees that

$$\sum_{j \geq 4} K_{X'|\Pi'_j}^2 = \sum_{j \geq 4} (w_j - 3)^2.$$

On the other hand, one has

$$(K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 = (w_i - 3)^2 - 1, \quad i = 1, 3, \quad (K_{X'|\Pi'_2} + E_2)^2 = (w_2 - 3)^2.$$

Putting all together, it follows that $c_x = 1$.

- In case (ii) we had E reducible and \mathcal{X}' still Gorenstein. In this case E is as described in Proposition 8.24 (i)-b and in Corollary 8.28 and the proof proceeds as above, once one remarks that (11.19) holds. This can be left to the reader to verify (e.g., see Figure 10 if E consists of a plane and a quadric).
- In case (iii) we had E reducible and \mathcal{X}' is not Gorenstein; we concluded that E consists of a cone over a C_{R_3} with vertex x' , hence x' is again a R_3 -point. Therefore we have to repeat the process by blowing-up x' . After finitely many steps this procedure stops.

In order to conclude the proof in this case, one has simply to remark that no contribution to K^2 comes from the surfaces created in the intermediate steps.




FIGURE 19. blowing-up a R_3 -point x' infinitely near to the R_3 -point x

To see this, it suffices to make this computation when only two blow-ups are needed. This is the situation showed in Figure 19 where:

- $\mathcal{X}'' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ is the blow-up at x' ,
- $X' = \sum \Pi'_i$ the proper transform of X' on \mathcal{X}'' ,
- $E' = P'_1 + P'_2 + P'_3$ is the strict transform of $E = P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ on \mathcal{X}'' ,

- E'' is the exceptional divisor of the blow-up.

We remark that P'_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, is the blow-up of the plane P_i . We denote by Λ_i the pullback to P'_i of a line, and by A_i the exceptional divisor of P'_i . Then their contributions to the computation of K^2 are:

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{P'_i} + \Lambda_i + (\Lambda_i - A_i) + A_i)^2 &= (-\Lambda_i + A_i)^2 = 0, \quad i = 1, 3, \\ (K_{P'_2} + \Lambda_2 + 2(\Lambda_2 - A_2) + A_2)^2 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of Claim 11.17. □

Consider now the case that $n = 4$ and x is a R_4 -point.

Claim 11.20. *If x is a R_4 -point, then*

$$2 \geq c_x \geq 1.$$

Proof of the claim. Here we refer to Algorithm 9.3, Case (G2).

- Recall that in case (i) we had E with global normal crossings as in Figure 11 and \mathcal{X}' Gorenstein. In this case, we can compute K^2 as we did in the proof of Claim 11.17. Formula (11.18) still holds and one has $(K_E + \Gamma)^2 = 0$, whereas:

$$(11.21) \quad (K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2 = \sum_i (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + \Gamma_{\Pi'_i})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^4 (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 + \sum_{j \geq 4} K_{X'|\Pi'_j}^2 = \sum_{j \geq 1} (w_j - 3)^2 - 2,$$

because the computations on the blown-up planes Π'_1, \dots, Π'_4 give:

$$(K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 = (w_i - 3)^2 - 1, \quad i = 1, 4, \quad (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 = (w_i - 3)^2, \quad i = 2, 3.$$

This proves that $c_x = 2$ in this case.

- In case (ii), we had that E has one R_3 -point x' , in which case E consists of a quadric Q and two planes P_1, P_2 (cf. Figure 12). Two possibilities can occur as in cases (a) and (b) of Figure 12.

Let us first consider the former possibility. By Claim 11.17, in order to compute K^2 we have to add up three quantities:

- the contribution of $(K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2$, which is computed in (11.21);
- the contribution to K^2 of E , as if E had only global normal crossings, i.e.:

$$(K_{P_1} + A_1 + E_1)^2 + (K_{P_2} + A_2 + E_4)^2 + (K_Q + A_1 + A_2 + E_2 + E_3)^2 = 2$$

- the contribution of the R_3 -point x' , which is $c_{x'} = 1$ by Claim 11.17.

Putting all this together, it follows that $c_x = 1$ in this case.

Consider now the latter possibility, i.e. suppose that the quadric meets only one plane. We can compute the three contributions to K^2 as above: the contribution of $(K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2$ and of the R_3 -point x' do not change, whereas the contribution to K^2 of E , as if E had only global normal crossings, is:

$$(K_Q + A_1 + E_1 + E_2)^2 + (K_{P_1} + A_1 + A_2 + E_3)^2 + (K_{P_4} + A_3 + E_4)^2 = 1,$$

therefore we find that $c_x = 2$, which concludes the proof for case (ii).

- In case (iii), E has two R_3 -points x', x'' , so that E consists of four planes P_1, \dots, P_4 , i.e. a planar Zappatic surface whose associated graph is the tree R_4 (cf. Figure 13). In this case, we use the same strategy as in case (ii), namely we add up $(K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2$, the contribution to K^2 of E , as if E had only global normal crossings, which turns out to be 2, and then subtract 2, because of the contribution of the two R_3 -points x', x'' . Summing up, one finds $c_x = 2$ in this case.
- In case (iv), E has one R_4 -point x' , so it consists of four planes, i.e. a planar Zappatic surface whose associated graph is an open 4-face (cf. Figures 4, 5 and 14). Thus, we have to repeat the process by blowing-up x' , see Figure 14. After finitely many steps, this procedure stops in the sense that the exceptional divisor will be as in case (i), (ii) or (iii).

In order to conclude the proof of Claim 11.20, one has to remark that no contribution to K^2 comes from the surfaces created in the intermediate steps (e.g. the blown-up planes P'_i in Figure 14). This can be done exactly in the same way as we did in the proof of Claim 11.17. \square

Remark 11.22. The proof of Claim 11.20 is purely combinatorial. However there is a nice geometric motivation for the two cases $c_x = 2$ and $c_x = 1$, when x is a R_4 -point, which resides in the fact that the local deformation space of a R_4 -point is reducible. This corresponds to the fact that the cone over C_{R_4} can be smoothed in both a Veronese surface and a rational normal quartic scroll, which have $K^2 = 9$ and $K^2 = 8$, respectively.

Consider now the case that x is a R_n -point.

Claim 11.23. *If x is a R_n -point, then*

$$(11.24) \quad n - 2 \geq c_x \geq 1.$$

Proof of the claim. The claim for $n = 3, 4$ has already been proved, so we assume $n \geq 5$ and proceed by induction on n . As in Algorithm 9.3, Case (G3), we have the two possibilities (i) and (ii) listed there.

In case (ii), one has to repeat the process by blowing-up x' . After finitely many steps, the exceptional divisor will necessarily be as in case (i). We remark that no contribution to K^2 comes from the surfaces created in the intermediate steps, as one can prove exactly in the same way as we did in the proof of Claim 11.17.

Thus, it suffices to prove the statement for the case (i). Notice that \mathcal{X}' is not Gorenstein, nonetheless we can compute K^2 since we know (the upper and lower bounds of) the contribution of x_i by induction. We can indeed proceed as in case (ii) of the proof of Claim 11.20, namely, we have to add up three quantities:

- the contribution of $(K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2$;
- the contribution to K^2 of E , as if E had only global normal crossings;
- the contributions of the points x_i which is known by induction.

Let us compute these contributions. As for the first one, one has:

$$(K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 + \sum_{j \geq n} K_{X'|\Pi'_j}^2 = \sum_{j \geq 1} (w_j - 3)^2 - 2,$$

since the computations on the blown-up planes Π'_1, \dots, Π'_n give:

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 &= (w_i - 3)^2 - 1, \quad i = 1, n, \\ (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 &= (w_i - 3)^2, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n-1. \end{aligned}$$

In order to compute the second contribution, one has to introduce some notation, precisely we let:

- P_1, \dots, P_ν be the irreducible components of E , which are either planes or smooth quadrics, ordered in such a way that the intersections in codimension one are as follows: P_i meets P_{i+1} , $i = 1, \dots, \nu - 1$, along a line;
- A_i be the line which is the intersection of P_i and P_{i+1} ;
- $\varepsilon_i = \deg(P_i) - 1$, which is 0 if P_i is a plane and 1 if P_i is a quadric;
- $j(i) = i + \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \varepsilon_k$. With this notation, if P_i is a plane, it meets the blown-up plane $\Pi'_{j(i)}$ along $E_{j(i)}$, whereas if P_i is a quadric, it meets the blown-up planes $\Pi'_{j(i)}$ and $\Pi'_{j(i)+1}$ along $E_{j(i)}$ and $E_{j(i)+1}$, respectively.

Then the contribution to K^2 of E , as if E had only global normal crossings, is:

$$\begin{aligned} & (K_{P_1} + A_1 + E_1 + \varepsilon_1 E_2)^2 + (K_{P_\nu} + A_{\nu-1} + \varepsilon_\nu E_{n-1} + E_n)^2 + \\ & + \sum_{i=2}^{\nu-1} (K_{P_i} + A_{i-1} + A_i + E_{j(i)} + \varepsilon_i E_{j(i)+1})^2 = 2 - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by induction, the contribution $\sum_{i=1}^h c_{x_i}$ of the points x_i is such that:

$$\nu - 2 = \sum_{i=1}^h (m_i - 2) \geq \sum_{i=1}^h c_{x_i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^h 1 = h,$$

where the first equality is just (8.25).

Putting all this together, it follows that:

$$c_x = \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_\nu + \sum_{i=1}^h c_{x_i},$$

hence an upper bound for c_x is

$$c_x \leq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_\nu + \nu - 2 \leq n - 2,$$

because $n = \nu + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \varepsilon_i$, whereas a lower bound is

$$(11.25) \quad c_x \geq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_\nu + h \geq h \geq 1,$$

which concludes the proof of Claim 11.23. \square

Remark 11.26. If $c_x = 1$, then in (11.25) all inequalities must be equalities, thus $h = 1$ and $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_\nu = 0$. This means that there is only one point x_1 infinitely near to x , of type R_ν , and that the external irreducible components of E , i.e. P_1 and P_ν , are planes. There is no combinatorial obstruction to this situation.

For example, let x be a R_n -point such that the exceptional divisor E consists of $\nu = n - 1$ irreducible components, namely $n - 2$ planes and a quadric adjacent to two planes, forming a R_{n-1} -point x' . By the proof of Claim 11.23 (case (ii), former possibility), it follows that $c_x = c_{x'}$. Since, as we saw, the contribution of an R_4 -point can be 1, by induction we may have that also a R_n -point contributes by 1.

From the proof of Claim 11.23, it follows that the upper bound $c_x = n - 2$ is attained when for example the exceptional divisor E consists of n planes forming $n - 2$ points of type R_3 .

More generally, one can see that there is no combinatorial obstruction for c_x to attain any possible value between the upper and lower bounds in (11.24).

Finally, consider the case that x is of type S_n .

Claim 11.27. *If x is a S_n -point, then*

$$(11.28) \quad (n - 2)^2 \geq c_x \geq \binom{n - 1}{2}.$$

Proof. Notice that $S_3 = R_3$ and, for $n = 3$, formula (11.28) trivially follows from Claim 11.17. So we assume $n \geq 4$. As in Algorithm 9.3, Case (G4), we have the possibilities (i), (ii) and (iii) to consider.

In case (iii), one has to repeat the process by blowing-up x' . After finitely many steps, the exceptional divisor will necessarily be as in cases either (i) or (ii). We remark that no contribution to K^2 comes from the surfaces created in the intermediate steps. Indeed, by using the same notation of the R_n -case in Claim 11.17, if x is a S_n point and if Π_1 is the plane corresponding to the vertex of valence $n - 1$ in the associated graph, we have (cf. Figure 20):

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{P'_1} + \Lambda_1 + A_1 + (n - 1)(\Lambda_1 - A_1))^2 &= (n - 3)^2 - (n - 3)^2 = 0, \\ (K_{P'_i} + \Lambda_i + A_i + (\Lambda_i - A_i))^2 &= 1 - 1 = 0, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 20. Blowing-up a S_5 -point x' infinitely near to a S_5 -point x

Thus, it suffices to prove the statement for the first two cases (i) and (ii).

Consider the case (i), namely E has global normal crossings and \mathcal{X}' is Gorenstein. We may compute K^2 as in (11.18). The contribution of the blown-up planes Π'_1, \dots, Π'_n (choosing again the indexes in such a way that Π'_1 meets Π'_2, \dots, Π'_n in a line) is:

$$(11.29) \quad \begin{aligned} (K_{X'|\Pi'_i} + E_i)^2 &= (w_i - 3)^2 - 1, \quad i = 2, \dots, n, \\ (K_{X'|\Pi'_1} + E_1)^2 &= (w_1 - 3)^2 - (n - 3)^2, \end{aligned}$$

whereas the contribution of E turns out to be:

$$(11.30) \quad (K_E + \Gamma)^2 = 4 - n.$$

Indeed, one finds that:

$$\begin{aligned} ((K_E + \Gamma)|_{X_1})^2 &= (-A + (n - d - 1)F)^2 = d + 4 - 2n, \\ ((K_E + \Gamma)|_{P_i})^2 &= 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n - d, \end{aligned}$$

where A is the linear directrix of X_1 and F is its fibre, therefore (11.30) holds. Summing up, it follows that

$$(11.31) \quad c_x = n - 4 + (n - 1) + (n - 3)^2 = (n - 2)^2,$$

which proves (11.28) in this case (i).

In case (ii), E is not Gorenstein, nonetheless we can compute K^2 since we know (the upper and lower bounds of) the contribution of x_i by induction. We can indeed proceed as in case (ii) of the proof of Claim 11.20, namely, we have to add up three quantities:

- the contribution of $(K_{X'} + \Gamma)^2$, which has been computed in (11.29);
- the contribution to K^2 of E , as if E had only global normal crossings, which is:

$$\left(K_{P_1} + E_1 + \sum_{i=2}^n A_i\right)^2 + \sum_{i=2}^n (K_{P_i} + E_i + A_i)^2 = (n - 3)^2 + n - 1,$$

where Π'_1 is the blown-up plane meeting all the other blown-up planes in a line, E_i is the exceptional curve on Π'_i and A_i is the double line intersection of P_1 with P_i ;

- the contribution $\sum_{i=1}^h c_{x_i}$ of the points x_i , which by induction, is such that:

$$(11.32) \quad \sum_{i=1}^h (m_i - 2)^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^h c_{x_i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^h \binom{m_i - 1}{2} = \binom{n - 1}{2},$$

where the last equality is just (8.26).

Putting all together, one sees that

$$c_x = \sum_{i=1}^h c_{x_i},$$

hence (11.32) gives the claimed lower bound, as for the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} c_x &\leq \sum_{i=1}^h (m_i - 2)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^h (m_i - 1)(m_i - 2) - \sum_{i=1}^h (m_i - 2) \stackrel{(*)}{=} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} (n - 1)(n - 2) - \sum_{i=1}^h (m_i - 2) \leq (n - 1)(n - 2) - (n - 2) = (n - 2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality $(*)$ follows from (8.26). This completes the proof of Claim 11.27. \square

The above Claims 11.23 and 11.27 prove Proposition 11.16 and, so, Theorem 11.1. \square

Remark 11.33. Notice that the upper bound $c_x = (n - 2)^2$ is attained when for example the exceptional divisor E has global normal crossings (cf. case (i) in Claim 11.27). The lower bound $c_x = \binom{n-1}{2}$ can be attained if the exceptional divisor E consists of n planes forming $\binom{n-1}{2}$ points of type $S_3 = R_3$.

Contrary to what happens for the R_n -points, not all the values between the upper and the lower bound are realised by c_x , for a S_n -point x . Indeed they are not even combinatorially possible. For example, there are combinatorial obstructions for a S_6 -point x to have $c_x = 15$.

12. THE MULTIPLE POINT FORMULA

The aim of this section is to prove a fundamental inequality, which involves the Zappatic singularities of a given good Zappatic surface X (see Theorem 12.2), under the hypothesis that X is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration. This inequality can be viewed as an extension of the well-known Triple Point Formula (see Lemma 12.7 and cf. [14]). As corollaries, we will obtain, among other things, the main result contained in Zappa's paper [52] (cf. Section 13).

Let us introduce some notation.

Notation 12.1. Let X be a good Zappatic surface. We denote by:

- $\gamma = X_1 \cap X_2$ the intersection of two irreducible components X_1, X_2 of X ;
- F_γ the divisor on γ consisting of the E_3 -points of X along γ ;
- $f_n(\gamma)$ the number of E_n -points of X along γ ; in particular, $f_3(\gamma) = \deg(F_\gamma)$;
- $r_n(\gamma)$ the number of R_n -points of X along γ ;
- $s_n(\gamma)$ the number of S_n -points of X along γ ;
- $\rho_n(\gamma) := r_n(\gamma) + s_n(\gamma)$, for $n \geq 4$, and $\rho_3(\gamma) = r_3(\gamma)$.

If X is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$, we denote by:

- D_γ the divisor of γ consisting of the the double points of \mathcal{X} along γ ;
- $d_\gamma = \deg(D_\gamma)$;
- $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ the total number of double points of \mathcal{X} .

The main result of this section is the following (cf. Definition 7.2):

Theorem 12.2 (Multiple Point Formula). *Let X be a surface which is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. Let $\gamma = X_1 \cap X_2$ be the intersection of two irreducible components X_1, X_2 of X . Then*

$$(12.3) \quad \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + f_3(\gamma) - r_3(\gamma) - \sum_{n \geq 4} (\rho_n(\gamma) + f_n(\gamma)) \geq d_\gamma \geq 0.$$

In the planar case, one has:

Corollary 12.4. *Let X be a surface which is the central fibre of a good, planar Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. Let γ be a double line of X . Then*

$$(12.5) \quad 2 + f_3(\gamma) - r_3(\gamma) - \sum_{n \geq 4} (\rho_n(\gamma) + f_n(\gamma)) \geq d_\gamma \geq 0.$$

Therefore:

$$(12.6) \quad 2e + 3f_3 - 2r_3 - \sum_{n \geq 4} n f_n - \sum_{n \geq 4} (n-1) \rho_n \geq d_{\mathcal{X}} \geq 0.$$

As for Theorem 11.1, the proof of Theorem 12.2 will be done in several steps, the first of which is the classical:

Lemma 12.7. [Triple Point Formula] *Let X be a good Zappatic surface with global normal crossings, which is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration with smooth total space \mathcal{X} . Let $\gamma = X_1 \cap X_2$, where X_1 and X_2 are irreducible components of X . Then:*

$$(12.8) \quad \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1} \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2} \otimes \mathcal{O}_\gamma(F_\gamma) \cong \mathcal{O}_\gamma.$$

In particular,

$$(12.9) \quad \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + f_3(\gamma) = 0.$$

Proof. By Definition 7.2, since the total space \mathcal{X} is assumed to be smooth, the Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ is semistable. Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$. Since X is a Cartier divisor in \mathcal{X} which is a fibre of the morphism $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$, then

$$\mathcal{O}_X(X) \cong \mathcal{O}_X.$$

Tensoring by \mathcal{O}_γ gives:

$$\mathcal{O}_\gamma(X) \cong \mathcal{O}_\gamma.$$

Thus,

$$(12.10) \quad \mathcal{O}_\gamma \cong \mathcal{O}_\gamma(X_1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\gamma(X_2) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\gamma(Y),$$

where $Y = \bigcup_{i=3}^v X_i$. One concludes by observing that in (12.10) one has $\mathcal{O}_\gamma(X_i) \cong \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_{3-i}}$, $1 \leq i \leq 2$, and $\mathcal{O}_\gamma(Y) \cong \mathcal{O}_\gamma(F_\gamma)$. \square

It is useful to consider the following slightly more general situation. Let X be a union of surfaces such that X_{red} is a good Zappatic surface with global normal crossings. Then $X_{\text{red}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^v X_i$ and let m_i be the multiplicity of X_i in X , $i = 1, \dots, v$. Let $\gamma = X_1 \cap X_2$ be the intersection of two irreducible components of X . For every point p of γ , we define the weight $w(p)$ of p as the multiplicity m_i of the component X_i such that $p \in \gamma \cap X_i$.

Of course $w(p) \neq 0$ only for E_3 -points of X_{red} on γ . Then we define the divisor F_γ on γ as

$$F_\gamma := \sum_p w(p)p.$$

The same proof of Lemma 12.7 shows the following:

Lemma 12.11 (Generalized Triple Point Formula). *Let X be a surface such that $X_{\text{red}} = \bigcup_i X_i$ is a good Zappatic surface with global normal crossings. Let m_i be the multiplicity of X_i in X . Assume that X is the central fibre of a degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ with smooth total space \mathcal{X} . Let $\gamma = X_1 \cap X_2$, where X_1 and X_2 are irreducible components of X_{red} . Then:*

$$(12.12) \quad \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}^{\otimes m_2} \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}^{\otimes m_1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_\gamma(F_\gamma) \cong \mathcal{O}_\gamma.$$

In particular,

$$(12.13) \quad m_2 \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + m_1 \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + \deg(F_\gamma) = 0.$$

The second step is given by the following result:

Proposition 12.14. *Let X be a good Zappatic surface with global normal crossings, which is the central fibre of a good Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$. Let $\gamma = X_1 \cap X_2$, where X_1 and X_2 are irreducible components of X . Then:*

$$(12.15) \quad \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1} \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2} \otimes \mathcal{O}_\gamma(F_\gamma) \cong \mathcal{O}_\gamma(D_\gamma).$$

In particular,

$$(12.16) \quad \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + f_3(\gamma) = d_\gamma.$$

Proof. By the very definition of good Zappatic degeneration, the total space \mathcal{X} is smooth except for ordinary double points along the double locus of X , which are not the E_3 -points of X . We can modify the total space \mathcal{X} and make it smooth by blowing-up its double points.

Since the computations are of local nature, we can focus on the case of \mathcal{X} having only one double point p on γ . Therefore, one can proceed as in the proof of Algorithm 9.3, Case (S1). Indeed, if we blow-up the point p in \mathcal{X} , the exceptional divisor E is isomorphic to a smooth quadric in \mathbb{P}^3 (see Figure 15); the proper transform of X is:

$$X' = X'_1 + X'_2 + Y'$$

where X'_1, X'_2 are the proper transforms of X_1, X_2 , respectively. Let γ' be the intersection of X'_1 and X'_2 , which is clearly isomorphic to γ . Let p_1 be the intersection of γ' with E .

Since \mathcal{X}' is smooth, we can apply Lemma 12.11 to γ' .

Therefore, by (12.8), we get

$$\mathcal{O}_{\gamma'} \cong \mathcal{N}_{\gamma'|X'_1} \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\gamma'|X'_2} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\gamma'}(F_{\gamma'}).$$

In the isomorphism between γ' and γ , one has:

$$\mathcal{O}_{\gamma'}(F_{\gamma'} - p_1) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\gamma}(F_{\gamma}), \quad \mathcal{N}_{\gamma'|X'_i} \cong \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_i} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\gamma}(-p), \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2.$$

Putting all this together, one has the result. \square

Taking into account Lemma 12.11, the same proof of Proposition 12.14 gives the following result:

Corollary 12.17. *Let X be a surface such that $X_{\text{red}} = \cup_i X_i$ is a good Zappatic surface with global normal crossings. Let m_i be the multiplicity of X_i in X . Assume X is the central fibre of a degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ with total space \mathcal{X} having at most ordinary double points outside the Zappatic singularities of X_{red} .*

Let $\gamma = X_1 \cap X_2$, where X_1 and X_2 are irreducible components of X_{red} . Then:

$$(12.18) \quad \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}^{\otimes m_2} \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}^{\otimes m_1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\gamma}(F_{\gamma}) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\gamma}(D_{\gamma})^{\otimes (m_1+m_2)}.$$

In particular,

$$(12.19) \quad m_2 \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + m_1 \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + \deg(F_{\gamma}) = (m_1 + m_2)d_{\gamma}.$$


Now we can come to the proof of Theorem 12.2.

Proof. We can apply Proposition 12.14 after having resolved the Zappatic singularities of the total space \mathcal{X} (i.e. the singularities of \mathcal{X} at the R_n -points of X , for $n \geq 3$, and at the E_n - and S_n -points of X , for $n \geq 4$). Therefore, all the computations are of local nature. Hence we may assume that X has a single Zappatic singularity p , which is not an E_3 -point. We will prove the theorem in this case. The general formula will follow by iterating these considerations for each Zappatic singularity of \mathcal{X} .

Let X_1, X_2 be irreducible components of X containing p and let γ be their intersection. Let us blow-up \mathcal{X} at p . We obtain a new total space \mathcal{X}' , with the exceptional divisor $E' := E_{\mathcal{X},p} = \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathcal{X},p})$ and the proper transform X'_1, X'_2 of X_1, X_2 . Let γ' be the intersection of X'_1, X'_2 . We remark that $\gamma' \cong \gamma$ (see Figure 21).

Notice that \mathcal{X}' might have Zappatic singularities off γ' . These will not affect our considerations. Therefore, we can assume that there are no singularities of \mathcal{X}' of this sort. Thus, the only point of \mathcal{X}' we have to take care of is $p_1 := E' \cap \gamma'$.

There are three cases to be considered:

FIGURE 21. Blowing-up \mathcal{X} at p

- (i) p_1 is smooth for \mathcal{X}' , hence E' is smooth at p_1 ;
- (ii) p_1 is singular for \mathcal{X}' , but E' is smooth at p_1 ;
- (iii) p_1 is singular for both \mathcal{X}' and E' .

In case (i), the central fibre of \mathcal{X}' is $X' = X'_1 \cup X'_2 \cup Y'$ and we are in position to use the enumerative information (12.8) from Proposition 12.14 which reads:

$$\deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma'|X'_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma'|X'_2}) + f_3(\gamma') = d_{\gamma'}.$$

Observe that $f_3(\gamma')$ is the number of E_3 -points of the central fibre of \mathcal{X}' (i.e. $X' \cup E'$) along γ' , therefore

$$f_3(\gamma') = f_3(\gamma) + 1.$$

On the other hand:

$$\deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma'|X'_i}) = \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_i}) - 1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2.$$

Finally,

$$d_\gamma = d_{\gamma'}$$

and therefore we have

$$(12.20) \quad \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + f_3(\gamma) - 1 = d_\gamma$$

which proves the theorem in this case.

In case (ii), p_1 is necessarily a triple point for \mathcal{X}' (cf. Proposition 8.17). Blow-up again \mathcal{X}' at p_1 (cf. Figure 22). We obtain a new total space \mathcal{X}'' , with the exceptional divisor $E'' := E_{\mathcal{X}', p_1} = \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathcal{X}', p_1})$ and the proper transform X''_1 , X''_2 and F' of X_1 , X_2 and E' , respectively. Let γ'' be the intersection of X''_1 , X''_2 and let $p_2 := E'' \cap \gamma''$. Observe that, $\gamma'' \cong \gamma$. As above, we may assume that E'' has no singularities off the point p_2 .

We have the following possibilities:

- (a) p_2 is smooth for both E'' and \mathcal{X}'' . In such a case we can apply Proposition 12.14. Indeed, from (12.8), we get


$$\deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma''|X''_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma''|X''_2}) + f_3(\gamma'') = d_{\gamma''}.$$

Observe that $f_3(\gamma'')$ is the number of E_3 -points of the central fibre of \mathcal{X}'' (i.e. $X'' \cup E'' \cup F'$, where $X'' = X''_1 \cup X''_2 \cup Y''$) along γ'' , therefore

$$f_3(\gamma'') = f_3(\gamma) + 1.$$

On the other hand:

$$\deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma''|X''_i}) = \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_i}) - 2, \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2.$$

FIGURE 22. Blowing-up \mathcal{X}' at p_1 when E' is smooth at p_1

Finally,

$$d_\gamma = d_{\gamma''}$$

and therefore we have

$$\deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) - 4 + f_3(\gamma) + 1 = d_\gamma$$

i.e.

$$(12.21) \quad \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + f_3(\gamma) - 1 = d_\gamma + 2 > d_\gamma,$$


which proves the assertion in this case.

- (b) p_2 is smooth for E'' but not for \mathcal{X}'' . Thus, also p_2 is necessarily a triple point for \mathcal{X}'' (cf. Proposition 8.17). In this case, we iterate the blowing-up procedure. The singularities which may appear can only be triple points. After finitely many steps, we get rid of them and each step improves the inequality that we have to prove.
- (c) p_2 is not smooth for both E'' and \mathcal{X}'' . In this case, according to Proposition 8.17, p_2 can either be a double point or a four-tuple point for \mathcal{X}'' . Since p_2 is infinitely near to p_1 , which is a triple point, only the former possibility can happen.

If p_2 is an ordinary double point, we blow-up p_2 and we get a new total space \mathcal{X}''' . The proper transform of X'' is:

$$X''' = X_1''' + X_2''' + Y''',$$

where X_1''' , X_2''' are the proper transforms of X_1'' , X_2'' , respectively. Let γ''' be the intersection of X_1''' and X_2''' , which is isomorphic to γ . Notice that \mathcal{X}''' is smooth and the exceptional divisor E''' is a smooth quadric (see Figure 23).

FIGURE 23. Blowing-up \mathcal{X}'' at p_2 when p_2 is an ordinary double point

We remark that the central fibre of \mathcal{X}''' is now non-reduced, since it contains E''' with multiplicity 2. Nonetheless we can apply Corollary 12.17 and we get

$$\mathcal{O}_{\gamma'''} \cong \mathcal{N}_{\gamma'''|X_1'''} \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\gamma'''|X_2'''} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\gamma'''}(F_{\gamma'''}).$$

Since,

$$\deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma'''|X_1'''}) = \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_i}) - 2, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \deg F_{\gamma'''} = f_3(\gamma) + 2,$$

then,

$$(12.22) \quad \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + f_3(\gamma) - 1 = d_\gamma + 1 > d_\gamma.$$

If the point p_2 is not an ordinary double point, we again blow-up p_2 as above. Now the exceptional divisor E''' of \mathcal{X}''' is a singular quadric in \mathbb{P}^3 and it has to consist of two distinct planes E_1''' , E_2''' , because E''' has to contain a curve C_{E_4} .

Let $p_3 = E''' \cap \gamma'''$. Let λ be the line intersection of E_1''' and E_2''' . If p_3 does not belong to λ (see Figure 24), then p_3 has to be a smooth point of the total space \mathcal{X}''' by Proposition 8.17, therefore we can apply Corollary 12.17 and we get again formula 12.22.




FIGURE 24. E''' splits in two planes E_1''' , E_2''' and $p_3 \notin E_1''' \cap E_2'''$

If p_3 lies on λ , then p_3 is a double point for the total space \mathcal{X}''' (see Figure 25). We can thus iterate the above procedure until the process terminates by getting rid of the singularities which are infinitely near to p along γ . Each step improves the inequality that we have to prove.




FIGURE 25. E''' splits in two planes E_1''' , E_2''' and $p_3 \in E_1''' \cap E_2'''$

In case (iii), according to Proposition 8.17, p_1 can either be:

- (a) a double point for \mathcal{X}' , or
- (b) a 4-tuple point for \mathcal{X}' .

In case (a), one can proceed as in case (ii)-c) above.

In case (b), we blow-up p_1 and we get a new total space \mathcal{X}'' . If \mathcal{X}'' is smooth we conclude as in case (i). More precisely, arguing as in case (i), we see that formula (12.21) holds. If \mathcal{X}'' is not smooth, one iterates the blowing-up procedure till one gets a total space which is either smooth or it has a double or a triple point infinitely near to p along γ , cases which we already know how to treat, and again each step improves the inequality that we have to prove. \square

Remark 12.23. We observe that the proof of Theorem 12.2 proves a stronger result than what we stated in (12.3).

Indeed, the idea of the proof is that we blow-up the total space \mathcal{X} at each Zappatic singularity p of multiplicity μ_0 in a sequence of singular points $p_0 = p, p_1, \dots, p_n$, $n := n(p)$, which are infinitely near one to the other along γ . Let μ_i be the multiplicity of the total space at p_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$.

The proof of Theorem 12.2 shows that the first inequality in (12.3) is an equality if and only if each Zappatic singularity of \mathcal{X} has no infinitely near singular points.

For each point p , one has of course

$$\mu_0 \geq \mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_n > \mu_{n+1} := 1.$$

Let $h := h_p$ be the integer such that $\mu_h > 2$ and $\mu_{h+1} \leq 2$ (possibly $h = n$). Formulas (12.20) and (12.21) show that

$$\deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_1}) + \deg(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma|X_2}) + f_3(\gamma) - r_3(\gamma) - \sum_{n \geq 4} (\rho_n(\gamma) + f_n(\gamma)) = d_\gamma + \sum_{p \in \gamma} (h_p + n_p).$$

In other words, as natural, every infinitely near double point along γ counts as a double point of the original total space along γ , whereas an infinitely near triple or quadruple point counts twice as much.

13. ON SOME RESULTS OF ZAPPA

In [47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53], Zappa considered degenerations of projective surfaces to a planar Zappatic surface with only R_3 -, S_4 - and E_3 -points. One of the results of Zappa's analysis is that the invariants of a surface admitting a good planar Zappatic degeneration with mild singularities are severely restricted. In fact, translated in modern terms, his main result in [52] is as follows:

Theorem 13.1 (Zappa). *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good, planar Zappatic degeneration, where the central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$ has at most R_3 - and E_3 -points. Then, if $K^2 := K_{\mathcal{X}_t}^2$, for $t \neq 0$, one has*

$$(13.2) \quad K^2 \leq 8\chi + 1 - g,$$

where $\chi = \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_t})$ and g is the sectional genus of \mathcal{X}_t .

Theorem 13.1 has the following interesting consequence:

Corollary 13.3 (Zappa). *If \mathcal{X} is a good, planar Zappatic degeneration of a scroll \mathcal{X}_t of sectional genus $g \geq 2$ to $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$, then X has worse singularities than R_3 - and E_3 -points.*

Proof. For a scroll of genus g one has $8\chi + 1 - g - K^2 = 1 - g$. \square

Actually Zappa conjectured that for most of the surfaces the inequality $K^2 \leq 8\chi + 1$ should hold and even proposed a plausibility argument for this. As well-known, the correct bound for all the surfaces is $K^2 \leq 9\chi$, proved by Miyaoka and Yau (see [33, 46]) several decades after Zappa.

We will see in a moment that Theorem 13.1 can be proved as consequence of the computation of K^2 (see Theorem 11.1) and the Multiple Point Formula (see Theorem 12.2).

Actually, Theorems 11.1 and 12.2 can be used to prove a stronger result than Theorem 13.1; indeed:

Theorem 13.4. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good, planar Zappatic degeneration, where the central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$ has at most R_3 -, E_3 -, E_4 - and E_5 -points. Then*

$$(13.5) \quad K^2 \leq 8\chi + 1 - g.$$

Moreover, the equality holds in (13.5) if and only if \mathcal{X}_t is either the Veronese surface in \mathbb{P}^5 degenerating to 4 planes with associated graph S_4 (i.e. with three R_3 -points, see Figure 26.a), or an elliptic scroll of degree $n \geq 5$ in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} degenerating to n planes with associated graph a cycle E_n (see Figure 26.b, cf. Example 3.8).

Furthermore, if \mathcal{X}_t is a surface of general type, then

$$(13.6) \quad K^2 < 8\chi - g.$$




FIGURE 26

Proof. Notice that if X has at most R_3 -, E_3 -, E_4 - and E_5 -points, then formulas (11.3) and (11.5) give $K^2 = 9v - 10e + 6f_3 + 8f_4 + 10f_5 + r_3$. Thus, by (3.16) and (3.19), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} 8\chi + 1 - g - K^2 &= 8v - 8e + 8f_3 + 8f_4 + 8f_5 + 1 - (e - v + 1) - K^2 = e - r_3 + 2f_3 - 2f_5 = \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(2e - 2r_3 + 3f_3 - 4f_4 - 5f_5) + \frac{1}{2}f_3 + 2f_4 + \frac{1}{2}f_5 \stackrel{(*)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2}f_3 + 2f_4 + \frac{1}{2}f_5 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality $(*)$ follows from (12.6). This proves formula (13.5) (and Theorem 13.1).

If $K^2 = 8\chi + 1 - g$, then $(*)$ is an equality, hence $f_3 = f_4 = f_5 = 0$ and $e = r_3$. Therefore, by formula (3.23), we get

$$(13.7) \quad \sum_i w_i(w_i - 1) = 2r_3 = 2e,$$

where w_i denotes the valence of the vertex v_i in the graph G_X . By definition of valence, the right-hand-side of (13.7) equals $\sum_i w_i$. Therefore, we get

$$(13.8) \quad \sum_i w_i(w_i - 2) = 0.$$

If $w_i \geq 2$, for each $1 \leq i \leq v$, one easily shows that only the cycle as in Figure 26 (b) is possible. This gives

$$\chi = 0, K^2 = 0, g = 1,$$

which implies that \mathcal{X}_t is an elliptic scroll.

Easy combinatorial computations show that, if there is a vertex with valence $w_i \neq 2$, then there is exactly one vertex with valence 3 and three vertex of valence 1. Such a graph, with v vertices, is associated to a planar Zappatic surface of degree v in \mathbb{P}^{v+1} with

$$\chi = 0, p_g = 0, g = 0.$$

Thus, by hypothesis, $K^2 = 9$ and, by properties of projective surfaces, the only possibility is that $v = 4$, G_X is as in Figure 26 (a) and \mathcal{X}_t is the Veronese surface in \mathbb{P}^5 .

Suppose now that \mathcal{X}_t is of general type. Then $\chi \geq 1$ and $v = \deg(\mathcal{X}_t) < 2g - 2$. Formulas (3.16) and (3.19) imply that $\chi = f - g + 1 \geq 1$, thus $f \geq g > v/2 + 1$. Clearly $v \geq 4$, hence $f \geq 3$. Proceeding as at the beginning of the proof, we have that:

$$8\chi - g - K^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}f_3 + 2f_4 + \frac{1}{2}f_5 - 1 \geq \frac{1}{2}f - 1 > 0,$$

or equivalently $K^2 < 8\chi - g$. □

Remark 13.9. By following the same argument of the proof of Theorem 13.4, one can list all the graphs and the corresponding smooth projective surfaces in the degeneration, for which $K^2 = 8\chi - g$. For example, one can find \mathcal{X}_t as a rational normal scroll of degree n in \mathbb{P}^{n+1}




FIGURE 27

degenerating to n planes with associated graph a chain R_n (see Figure 27). On the other hand, one can also have a Del Pezzo surface of degree 7 in \mathbb{P}^7 .

Let us state some applications of Theorem 13.4.

Corollary 13.10. *If \mathcal{X} is a good, planar Zappatic degeneration of a scroll \mathcal{X}_t of sectional genus $g \geq 2$ to $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$, then X has worse singularities than R_3 -, E_3 -, E_4 - and E_5 -points.*

Corollary 13.11. *If \mathcal{X} is a good, planar Zappatic degeneration of a Del Pezzo surface \mathcal{X}_t of degree 8 in \mathbb{P}^8 to $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$, then X has worse singularities than R_3 -, E_3 -, E_4 - and E_5 -points.*

Proof. Just note that $K^2 = 8$ and $\chi = g = 1$, thus \mathcal{X}_t satisfies the equality in (13.5). □

Corollary 13.12. *If \mathcal{X} is a good, planar Zappatic degeneration of a minimal surface of general type \mathcal{X}_t to $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$ with at most R_3 -, E_3 -, E_4 - and E_5 -points, then*

$$g \leq 6\chi + 5.$$

Proof. It directly follows from (13.6) and Noether's inequality, i.e. $K^2 \geq 2\chi - 6$. □

Corollary 13.13. *If \mathcal{X} is a good planar Zappatic degeneration of a m -canonical surface of general type \mathcal{X}_t to $\mathcal{X}_0 = X$ with at most R_3 -, E_3 -, E_4 - and E_5 -points, then*

- (i) $m \leq 6$;
- (ii) if $m = 5, 6$, then $\chi = 3$, $K^2 = 1$;
- (iii) if $m = 4$, then $\chi \leq 4$, $8\chi \geq 11K^2 + 2$;
- (iv) if $m = 3$, then $\chi \leq 6$, $8\chi \geq 7K^2 + 2$;
- (v) if $m = 2$, then $K^2 \leq 2\chi - 1$;
- (vi) if $m = 1$, then $K^2 \leq 4\chi - 1$.

Proof. Take $\mathcal{X}_t = S$ to be m -canonical. First of all, by Corollary 13.12, we immediately get (i). Then, by formula (13.6), we get

$$8\chi - 2 \geq \frac{(m^2 + m + 2)}{2} K^2.$$

Thus, if m equals either 1 or 2, we find statements (v) and (vi).

Since S is of general type, by Noether's inequality we get

$$8\chi - 2 \geq (2\chi - 6) \frac{(m^2 + m + 2)}{2}.$$

This gives, for $m \geq 3$,

$$\chi \leq 3 + \frac{22}{(m^2 + m - 6)}$$

which, together with the above inequality, gives the other cases of the statement. \square

It would be interesting to see whether the numerical cases listed in the above corollary can actually occur.

We remark that Corollary 13.10 implies in particular that one cannot hope to degenerate all surfaces to unions of planes with only global normal crossings, namely double lines and E_3 -points; indeed, one needs at least E_n -points, for $n \geq 6$, or R_m -, S_m -points, for $m \geq 4$.

From this point of view, another important result of Zappa is the following:

Theorem 13.14 (Zappa). *For every $g \geq 2$ there are families of scrolls of sectional genus g with general moduli having a planar Zappatic degeneration with at most R_3 -, S_4 - and E_3 -points.*

One of the key steps in Zappa's argument for the proof of Theorem 13.14 is the following nice result:

Proposition 13.15 (Zappa). *Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a general element of the Severi variety $V_{d,g}$ of irreducible curves of degree d and geometric genus g , with $d \geq 2g + 2$. Then C is the plane section of a scroll $S \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ which is not a cone.*

It is a natural question to ask which Zappatic singularities are needed in order to Zappatically degenerate as many smooth, projective surfaces as possible. Note that there are some examples (cf. § 14) of smooth projective surfaces S which certainly cannot be degenerated to Zappatic surfaces with E_n -, R_n -, or S_n -points, unless n is large enough.

However, given such a S , the next result - i.e. Proposition 13.16 - suggests that there might be a birational model of S which can be Zappatically degenerated to a surface with only R_3 - and E_n -points, for $n \leq 6$.

Proposition 13.16. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good planar Zappatic degeneration and assume that the central fibre X has at most R_3 - and E_m -points, for $m \leq 6$. Then*

$$K^2 \leq 9\chi.$$

Proof. The bounds for K^2 in Theorem 11.1 give $9\chi - K^2 = 9v - 9e + \sum_{m=3}^6 9f_m - K^2$. Therefore, we get:

$$(13.17) \quad 2(9\chi - K^2) \geq 2e + 6f_3 + 2f_4 - 2f_5 - 6f_6 - 2r_3$$

If we plug (12.6) in (13.17), we get

$$2(9\chi - K^2) \geq (2e + 3f_3 - 4f_4 - 5f_5 - 6f_6 - 2r_3) + (3f_3 + 6f_4 + 3f_5),$$

where both summands on the right-hand-side are non-negative. \square

In other words, Proposition 13.16 states that the Miyaoka-Yau inequality holds for a smooth projective surface S which can degenerate to a good planar Zappatic surface with at most R_3 - and E_n -, $3 \leq n \leq 6$, points.

Another interesting application of the Multiple Point Formula is given by the following remark.

Remark 13.18. Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ be a good, planar Zappatic degeneration. Denote by δ the *class* of the general fibre \mathcal{X}_t of \mathcal{X} , $t \neq 0$. By definition, δ is the degree of the dual variety of \mathcal{X}_t , $t \neq 0$. From Zeuthen-Segre (cf. [13] and [25]) and Noether's formula (cf. [20], page 600), it follows that:

$$(13.19) \quad \delta = \chi_{\text{top}} + \deg(\mathcal{X}_t) + 4(g - 1) = (9\chi - K^2) + 3f + e.$$

Therefore, (12.6) implies that:

$$\delta \geq 3f_3 + \sum_{n=4}^6 (12 - n)f_n + \sum_n \rho_n.$$

In particular, if X is assumed to have at most R_3 - and E_3 -points, then (13.19) becomes

$$\delta = (2e + 3f_3 + 2r_3) + (3f_3 + r_3),$$

where the first summand in the right-hand side is non-negative by the Multiple Point Formula; therefore, one gets

$$\delta \geq 3f_3 + r_3.$$

Zappa's original approach, indeed, was to compute δ and then to deduce formula (13.2) (and Theorem 13.1) from this (cf. [47]).

14. EXAMPLES OF ZAPPATIC DEGENERATIONS

The aim of this section is to illustrate some interesting examples of planar Zappatic degenerations.

Product of curves (Zappa). Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ and $C' \subset \mathbb{P}^{m-1}$ be general enough curves. Consider the smooth surface

$$S = C \times C' \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{m-1} \subset \mathbb{P}^{nm-1}.$$

If C and C' can degenerate to stick curves, say to C_0 and C'_0 respectively, then the surface S degenerates to a union of quadrics Y with only double lines as singularities in codimension one and with Zappatic singularities.

If we could (independently) further degenerate each quadric of Y to the union of two planes, then we would be able to get a planar Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$ with general fibre $\mathcal{X}_t \cong S = C \times C'$ and central fibre a union of planes $\mathcal{X}_0 \cong X$. This certainly happens if each quadric of Y meets the other quadrics of Y along a union of lines of type (a, b) , with $a, b \leq 2$ (see Figure 28).




FIGURE 28. A quadric degenerating to the union of two planes

For example $S = C \times C'$ can be degenerated to a planar Zappatic degeneration if C and C' are either rational or elliptic normal curves and we degenerate them to stick curves C_{R_n} and C_{E_n} , respectively.

Let us see some of these cases in detail.

- (a) *Rational normal scrolls.* Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a rational normal curve of degree n . Since C can degenerate to a stick curve C_{R_n} , the surface $S = C \times \mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}^{2n+1}$ can degenerate to a chain of n quadrics as in Figure 29.







FIGURE 29. Union of n quadrics with a chain as associated graph

As we remarked above, the chain of quadrics can further degenerate to a planar Zappatic surface X which is the union of $2n$ -planes (see Figure 30). Note that the surface X has only R_3 -points as Zappatic singularities and its associated graph G_X is a chain R_{2n} . In this way, one gets a planar Zappatic degeneration of a rational normal scroll with only R_3 -points in the central fibre.

- (b) *Ruled surfaces.* Let now $C \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ be a normal elliptic curve of degree n . Since C can degenerate to a stick curve C_{E_n} , the surface $S = C \times \mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}^{2n-1}$ can degenerate to a cycle of n quadrics (see Figure 31).

As before, such a cycle of quadrics can degenerate to a planar Zappatic surface X which is a union of $2n$ planes with only R_3 -points and whose associated graph corresponds to the cycle graph E_{2n+2} (see figure 32).



FIGURE 30. Union of $2n$ -planes with a chain as associated graphFIGURE 31. A cycle of n quadricsFIGURE 32. A union of $2n$ planes with a cycle as associated graph

- (c) *Abelian surfaces.* Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ and $C' \subset \mathbb{P}^{m-1}$ be normal elliptic curves of degree respectively n and m . Since C and C' can degenerate to the stick curves C_{E_n} and C_{E_m} respectively, the surface $S = C \times C' \subset \mathbb{P}^{nm-1}$ degenerates to a union of nm quadrics which is a good Zappatic surface with only E_4 -points as Zappatic singularities (see Figure 33). Note that, as indicated in the picture, the top edges have to be identified with the bottom ones, similarly the left edges have to be identified with the right ones. Thus the top quadrics meet the bottom quadrics and the quadrics on the left meet the quadrics on the right.

As before, such a union of quadrics degenerates to the union of $2nm$ planes which is a good planar Zappatic surface with only E_6 -points. In this way, one gets a degeneration of an abelian surface with a polarization of type (n, m) to a good planar Zappatic surface with only E_6 -points.

Concerning the general case, suppose that either C or C' has genus greater than 1. If C and C' degenerate to stick curves, then the surface $S = C \times C'$ degenerates to a union of quadrics. Unfortunately the quadrics in general cannot be degenerated to unions of planes.

Degeneration to cones. Recall the following result of Pinkham:

FIGURE 33. A union of nm quadrics with only E_4 -pointsFIGURE 34. A union of $2nm$ planes with only E_6 -points

Theorem 14.1 (Pinkham [40, 41]). *Let $S \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a smooth, irreducible and projectively Cohen-Macaulay surface. Then S degenerates to the cone over a hyperplane section of S .*

Let C be the hyperplane section of S . Suppose that C can be degenerated to a stick curve C_0 . In this case, S can be degenerated to the cone X over the stick curve C_0 . By definition, X is a Zappatic surface only if C has genus either 0 or 1. Therefore:


Corollary 14.2. (i) *Any surface S of minimal degree (i.e. of degree n) in \mathbb{P}^{n+1} can be Zappatically degenerated to the cone over the stick curve C_{T_n} , for any tree T_n with n vertices (cf. Example 2.7).*

(ii) *Any del Pezzo surface S of degree n in \mathbb{P}^n , $n \leq 9$, can be Zappatically degenerated to the cone over the stick curve C_{Z_n} , for any connected graph with $n \geq 3$ vertices and $h^1(Z_n, \mathbb{C}) = 1$ (cf. Example 2.8).*

For $n = 4$, recall that the surfaces of minimal degree in \mathbb{P}^5 are either the Veronese surface (which has $K^2 = 9$) or a rational normal scroll (which has $K^2 = 8$). Therefore:

Corollary 14.3 (Pinkham). *The local deformation space of a T_4 -singularity is reducible.*

Veronese surfaces (Moishezon-Teicher). Consider $V_d \subset \mathbb{P}^{d(d+3)/2}$ be the d -Veronese surface, namely the embedding of \mathbb{P}^2 via the linear system $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(d)|$. In [35], Moishezon and

FIGURE 35. Degeneration of the d -Veronese surface.

Teicher described a “triangular” degeneration of V_d such that the central fibre is a union of d^2 planes with only R_3 - and E_6 -points as Zappatic singularities (see Figure 35).

Let us explain how to get such a degeneration. Consider the trivial family $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{P}^2 \times \Delta$, where Δ is a complex disk. Let $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ be a line bundle on \mathcal{X} . If we blow-up a point in the central fibre of \mathcal{X} , the new central fibre becomes as the left-hand-side picture in Figure 36, where E is the exceptional divisor, $\Pi = \mathbb{P}^2$ and \mathbb{F}_1 is the Hirzebruch surface.

FIGURE 36. Degenerating the d -Veronese surface V_d

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ be the blown-up family and let $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ be the line bundle on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ given by the pull-back of \mathcal{L} twisted by the divisor $-(d-1)\Pi$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ restricts to $dH - (d-1)E$ on the surface \mathbb{F}_1 and to $(d-1)L$ on the plane Π , respectively.

These line bundles embed, respectively, \mathbb{F}_1 as a rational normal scroll S_{2d-1} of degree $2d-1$ and Π as the $(d-1)$ -Veronese surface V_{d-1} meeting along a rational normal curve of degree $d-1$ (see the right-hand-side picture of Figure 36). One can independently Zappatically degenerate V_{d-1} , by induction on d (getting the left most bottom triangle in figure 35) and the rational normal scroll S_{2d-1} as we saw before (getting the top strip in the triangle in figure 35).

K3 surfaces. In the paper [9], the authors construct a specific projective degeneration of a $K3$ surface of degree $2g-2$ in \mathbb{P}^g to a planar Zappatic surface which is a union of $2g-2$ planes, which meet in such a way that the graph of the configuration of planes is a triangulation of the 2-sphere.

In the previous paper [8], planar Zappatic degenerations of $K3$ surfaces were constructed in such a way that the general member of the degeneration was embedded by a primitive

line bundle. In [9] the general member of the degeneration is embedded by a multiple of a primitive line bundle class (for details, the reader is referred to the original articles).


Let X denote a Zappatic degeneration of a $K3$ -surface $S \subset \mathbb{P}^g$ of genus g and let G be the associated graph to X . Then, G is planar, because $p_g(S) = 1$, and 3-valent (see [8]). By using Notation 3.12, we get

$$(14.4) \quad v = 2g - 2, \quad e = 3g - 3, \quad f = g + 1.$$

Conversely, by starting from a planar graph G with invariants as in (14.4), one can find a Zappatic numerical $K3$ surface X whose associated graph is G . Such a X is called a *graph surface*. Smoothable graph surfaces are exhibited in [8] and [9].

The specific degenerations constructed in [9] depend on two parameters and can be viewed as two rectangular arrays of planes, joined along their boundary. For this reason, these are called *pillow degenerations*.

Take two integers a and b greater than or equal to two and set $g = 2ab + 1$. The number of planes in the pillow degeneration is then $2g - 2 = 4ab$. The projective space \mathbb{P}^g has $g + 1 = 2ab + 2$ coordinate points, and each of the $4ab$ planes is obtained as the span of three of these. These sets of three points are indicated in Figure 37, which describes the bottom part of the “pillow” and the top part of the “pillow”, which are identified along the boundaries of the two configurations. The reader will see that the boundary is a cycle of $2a + 2b$ lines.



Note that no three of the planes meet along a line. Also note that the set of bottom planes lies in a projective space of dimension $ab + a + b$, as does the set of top planes; these two projective spaces meet exactly along the span of the $2a + 2b$ boundary points, which has dimension $2a + 2b - 1$. Finally note that the four corner points of the pillow degeneration (labelled 1, $a + 1$, $a + b + 1$, and $a + 2b + 1$) are each contained in three distinct planes, whereas all the other points are each contained in six planes. This property, that the number of lines and planes incident on each of the points is bounded is a feature of the pillow degeneration that is not available in other previous degenerations (see [8]). We will call such a configuration of planes a *pillow of bidegree* (a, b) .

Observe that a pillow of bidegree (a, b) is a planar Zappatic surface of degree $2g - 2$, having four R_3 -points and $2ab - 2 = g - 3$ E_6 -points as Zappatic singularities.

Remark 14.5. E_n -points, with $n \geq 6$, are unavoidable for the degeneration of $K3$ surfaces with hyperplane sections of genus g , if $g \geq 12$. Indeed, by using Notation 3.12, formula (14.4) and the fact that G is 3-valent, we get

$$g + 1 = f = \sum_n f_n \quad \text{and} \quad 6(g - 1) = 3v = \sum_n n f_n.$$

These give

$$\sum_n (6 - n) f_n = 12.$$

If we assume that $f_n = 0$, for $n \geq 6$, the last equality gives $2f_4 + f_5 = 12$ and so $10f_4 + 5f_5 = 60$. This equality, together with $4f_4 + 5f_5 = 6g - 6$ gives $g + f_4 = 11$, i.e. $g \leq 11$.

Complete intersections. Consider a surface $S \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ which is a *general* complete intersection of type (d_1, \dots, d_{n-2}) . Namely S is defined as the zero-locus

$$f_1 = \dots = f_{n-2} = 0,$$

where f_i is a general homogeneous polynomial of degree d_i , $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$.

One can degenerate any hypersurface $f_i = 0$ to the union of d_i hyperplanes. This implies that S degenerates to a planar Zappatic surface X with global normal crossings, i.e. with only E_3 -points as Zappatic singularities.

We remark that Zappatic degenerations are possible also when S is projectively Cohen-Macaulay in \mathbb{P}^4 , by some results of Gaeta (see [16]).

Non-smoothable Zappatic surfaces. The results of the previous sections allow us to exhibit simple planar Zappatic surfaces which are not smoothable, i.e. which cannot be the central fibre of a Zappatic degeneration. For example, the planar Zappatic surface X with the graph of Figure 38 as associated graph is not smoothable. Indeed, if X were the central fibre of a Zappatic degeneration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$, then formulas (11.2) and (11.3) would imply

$$9 \leq K^2 \leq 10,$$

which is absurd because of the classification of smooth projective surface of degree 5 in \mathbb{P}^6 (see Theorem 8.18).




FIGURE 38. A non-smoothable planar Zappatic surface

It is an interesting problem to find more examples of smoothable Zappatic surfaces with only R_3 - and E_n -points, $3 \leq n \leq 6$.

E.g., does there exist a Zappatic degeneration with only R_3 and E_n , $3 \leq n \leq 6$ for Enriques' surfaces?

APPENDIX A. NORMAL, COHEN-MACAULAY AND GORENSTEIN PROPERTIES

The aim of this appendix is to briefly recall some well-known terminology and results concerning normal, Cohen-Macaulay and Gorenstein properties for projective varieties. These results are frequently used in Sections 5 and 8. In the sequel, the term variety does not imply that the scheme under consideration is supposed to be irreducible.

First, we focus on "normality" conditions.

Definition A.1. An algebraic scheme X is said to be *normal* if, for each $p \in X$, the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ is an integrally closed domain (cf. [23], pp. 23 and 91).

Recall that if A is a local ring, with maximal ideal m , the *depth* of A is the maximal length of a regular sequence x_1, \dots, x_r with all $x_i \in m$ (cf. [23], page 184).

Recall that, by the theorem of Krull-Serre (see, e.g. [23], Theorem 8.22A, page 185), X is normal at p if, and only if, X is non-singular in codimension one at p and the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ has the S_2 -property, i.e. its depth is greater than or equal to 2.

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a projective variety and let

$$(A.2) \quad I(X) := H_*^0(\mathcal{I}_{X|\mathbb{P}^r}) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} H^0(\mathcal{I}_{X|\mathbb{P}^r}(n))$$

be the saturated ideal associated to X in the homogeneous polynomial ring $S := \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_r]$.

Definition A.3. A projective variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is said to be *projectively normal* (with respect to the given embedding) if its homogeneous coordinate ring

$$(A.4) \quad \Gamma(X) := \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_r]/I(X)$$

is an integrally closed domain (cf. [23], pp. 23 and 126).

Recall that projective normality is a property of the given embedding $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ and not only of X . Observe also that if X is a projectively normal variety, then it is also irreducible and normal (see [23], page 23).

If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is a projective variety, we denote by

$$(A.5) \quad \mathcal{C}(X) \subset \mathbb{A}^{r+1}$$

the affine cone over X having vertex at the origin $\underline{o} \in \mathbb{A}^{r+1}$. Observe that the homogeneous coordinate ring $\Gamma(X)$ in (A.4) coincides with the coordinate ring of the affine cone $\mathcal{C}(X)$.

We can characterize projective normality of a closed projective variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ in terms of its affine cone $\mathcal{C}(X)$.

Proposition A.6. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a projective variety and let $\mathcal{C}(X)$ be its affine cone. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) X is projectively normal;
- (ii) $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is normal;
- (iii) $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is normal at the vertex \underline{o} .

Proof. See [19], Prop. 7.10, page 57, and [23], page 147. □

Remark A.7. The above proposition is an instance of a general philosophy which states that "the properties of the vertex of $\mathcal{C}(X)$ are equivalent to global properties of $\mathcal{C}(X)$ as well as of X " (cf. [19], page 54).

Proposition A.8. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a projective variety and let H be a hyperplane section of X . If H is projectively normal, then X is projectively normal.*

Proof. It is a trivial consequence of Krull-Serre's theorem (see, e.g. [19], Theorem 4.27). \square

Definition A.9. A projective variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is called *arithmetically normal* if the restriction map

$$(A.10) \quad H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(j)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(j))$$

is surjective, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark A.11. The surjectivity of the map in (A.10) is equivalent to

$$(A.12) \quad H^1(\mathcal{I}_{X|\mathbb{P}^r}(j)) = 0, \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

This follows from the sequence:

$$(A.13) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{X|\mathbb{P}^r}(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(j) \rightarrow 0$$

and from the cohomology of projective spaces.

One has the following relationship among the three above notions:

Proposition A.14. *$X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is projectively normal if, and only if, X is normal and arithmetically normal in \mathbb{P}^r (cf. [23], pg. 126, and [54]).*

A fundamental property related to arithmetical normality is the following:

Proposition A.15. *If a hyperplane section H of a projective variety X is arithmetically normal, then X is arithmetically normal.*

Proof. Consider the following commutative diagram with two short exact sequences of sheaves:

$$(A.16) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(j-1) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(j) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_H(j) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(j-1) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(j) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r-1}}(j) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, where the vertical arrows are defined by the usual short exact sequence (A.13). Diagram (A.16) induces in cohomology the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(j)) & \xrightarrow{\gamma_j} & H^0(\mathcal{O}_H(j)) \\ \delta_j \uparrow & & \uparrow \beta_j \\ H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(j)) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_j} & H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r-1}}(j)) \end{array}$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, where α_j is trivially surjective and β_j is surjective by hypothesis. The surjectivity of the composite map $\gamma_j \circ \delta_j = \beta_j \circ \alpha_j$ forces the surjectivity of γ_j , but not yet that of δ_j . However, we have the injection:

$$H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(j-1)) \hookrightarrow H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(j)),$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, which implies

$$(A.17) \quad H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(j)) = 0, \quad \text{for each } j,$$

because $H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(j)) = 0$ for $j \gg 0$ by Serre's Theorem. The long exact sequences in cohomology induced by (A.16) then become:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(j-1)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(j)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_H(j)) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \delta_{j-1} \uparrow & & \delta_j \uparrow & & \beta_j \uparrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(j-1)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(j)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r-1}}(j)) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where we recall that β_j is surjective for all j by hypothesis. The map δ_j is trivially surjective for $j \leq 0$. Since $\delta_{j-1} = \delta_0$ is surjective for $j = 1$, the map $\delta_j = \delta_1$ is surjective too by elementary diagram chase. Hence we conclude by induction on j . \square

We consider now "Cohen-Macaulay" conditions.

Recall that a local ring (A, m) is said to be *Cohen-Macaulay* (CM for short) if $\text{depth}(A) = \dim(A)$ (see [23], page 184). This is equivalent to saying that a zero-dimensional local ring is always CM and, if $\dim(A) > 0$, then A is CM if, and only if, there is a non zero-divisor x in A such that $A/(x)$ is CM. In this case, $A/(x)$ is CM for every non-zero divisor x in A (cf. [12], [30] page 107).

Remark A.18. Let (R, M) be a regular local ring. Let (A, m) be a local R -algebra which is finitely generated as an R -module. Set $c := \text{codim}_R(A)$. One has that (A, m) is CM if, and only if, there is a minimal, free resolution of R -modules

$$(A.19) \quad \mathcal{F} : 0 \rightarrow F_c \rightarrow F_{c-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow R \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0,$$

(cf. Corollary 21.16 and the Auslander-Buchsbaum formula Theorem 19.9 in [12]).

If (A, m) is CM, then one defines

$$(A.20) \quad \omega_A := \text{Ext}_R^c(A, R)$$

to be the *canonical module* of A (cf. Theorem 21.15 in [12]). Then, the resolution (A.19) is such that \mathcal{F}^* is a minimal free resolution of ω_A (cf. Corollary 21.16 [12]).

A finitely generated \mathbb{C} -algebra B is said to be *Cohen-Macaulay* (CM for short) if, and only if, for every prime ideal p of B , B_p is a CM local ring. This is equivalent to saying that B_p is a CM local ring, for every maximal ideal p in B (cf. [12], Prop. 18.8).

Definition A.21. (cf. [23], page 185) An algebraic, equidimensional scheme X is *Cohen-Macaulay at a point* $p \in X$ (CM at p , for short) if $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ is a Cohen-Macaulay, local ring. X is *Cohen-Macaulay* (CM, for short) if X is Cohen-Macaulay at each $p \in X$.

We have the following result:

Theorem A.22. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be an equidimensional projective variety and let p be a point of X . Then, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) X is CM at p ;
- (ii) each equidimensional hyperplane section of X through p is CM at p ;

Proof. It directly follows from the definition of local, CM rings. \square

Definition A.23. A projective, equidimensional variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is said to be *Projectively Cohen-Macaulay* (PCM, for short) if the ring $\Gamma(X)$ as in (A.4) is a Cohen-Macaulay ring.

Definition A.24. A projective and equidimensional variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is said to be *Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay* (ACM, for short), if X is arithmetically normal and moreover

$$(A.25) \quad H^i(\mathcal{O}_X(j)) = 0, \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n-1,$$

where $n = \dim(X)$.

Remark A.26. By standard exact sequences, X is Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay iff

$$(A.27) \quad H^i(\mathcal{J}_{X|\mathbb{P}^r}(j)) = 0, \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Remark A.28. For $n = 1$, Formula (A.25) trivially holds. Thus a curve is Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay if and only if it is arithmetically normal.

As in Proposition A.6, we have:

Proposition A.29. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be an equidimensional variety, $\mathcal{C}(X) \subset \mathbb{A}^{r+1}$ be the affine cone over X and let \underline{o} be its vertex. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) X is PCM;
- (ii) $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is CM;
- (iii) $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is CM at \underline{o} (cf. Remark A.7).

Proof. Take $\Gamma(X)$ as in (A.4). Then, it coincides with the coordinate ring of the affine cone $\mathcal{C}(X) \subset \mathbb{A}^{r+1}$. Thus, the claim follows from Proposition 18.8 and Ex. 19.10 in [12]. \square

Proposition A.30. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be an equidimensional variety. Then:

- (i) X is PCM $\Leftrightarrow X$ is ACM;
- (ii) X is ACM $\Rightarrow X$ is CM.

Proof. (i) From Proposition A.29, X is PCM iff $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is CM at \underline{o} . From [23], page 217, Ex. 3.4 (b), this implies that $H_{\underline{m}}^i(\Gamma(X)) = 0$, for all $i < r - c = n$, where $c = \text{codim}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(X)$, $n = \dim(X)$, \underline{m} is the maximal, homogeneous ideal of $\Gamma(X)$ and, as usual, $H_{\underline{m}}^i(-)$ is the local cohomology (see [23], Ex. 3.3 (a), page 217).

On the other hand, from [12], Theorem A4.1,

$$H_{\underline{m}}^i(\Gamma(X)) \cong \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} H^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X(j)).$$

(ii) Since X is covered by affine open subsets which are hyperplane sections of $\mathcal{C}(X)$, the assertion follows from Theorem A.22. \square

Theorem A.31. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be an equidimensional closed subscheme in \mathbb{P}^r . Then X is ACM if, and only if, any hyperplane section H of X not containing any component of X is ACM.

Proof. It directly follows from Theorem A.22 and Proposition A.29. \square

Proposition A.32. If a curve H , which is a hyperplane section of a projective surface S , is arithmetically normal then S is ACM (equiv., PCM).

Proof. To prove that S is ACM, one has to prove that (A.17) holds (see Remark A.28). This follows by the proof of Proposition A.15. \square

Corollary A.33. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a curve. Then:*

- (i) *X is projectively normal $\Rightarrow X$ is PCM.*
- (ii) *If, furthermore, X is assumed to be smooth, the implication in (i) is an equivalence.*

Proof. By Proposition A.30, X is PCM iff is ACM. On the other hand, since X is a curve, by Remark A.28 X ACM is equivalent to X arithmetically normal. Therefore, the curve X is in particular PCM if, and only if, it is arithmetically normal. Only if X is also smooth, then X is projectively normal, as it follows from Proposition A.14. \square

Proposition A.34. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a projective, equidimensional variety s.t. $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(X) = c$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *X is PCM;*
- (ii) *the projective dimension of $\Gamma(X)$ is equal to $c = \text{codim}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(X)$. In other words, there is a minimal graded free resolution of $\Gamma(X)$,*

$$(A.35) \quad 0 \rightarrow F_c \rightarrow F_{c-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow S \rightarrow \Gamma(X) \rightarrow 0$$

where F_i is a free S -module, for $1 \leq i \leq c$.

Proof. From Proposition A.29, X is PCM if, and only if, $\Gamma(X)$ is CM. Let $S = \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_r]$ be the homogeneous graded polynomial ring which is a finitely generated algebra over \mathbb{C} . Let M be the homogeneous maximal ideal in S . Since $\Gamma(X)$ is a finitely generated graded S module of finite projective dimension, then by the *Auslander-Buchsbaum formula* in the graded case, we have

$$(A.36) \quad \text{pd}_S(\Gamma(X)) = \text{depth}_M(S) - \text{depth}_{M\Gamma(X)}(\Gamma(X)) = r + 1 - \text{depth}_{M\Gamma(X)}(\Gamma(X)),$$

where $\text{pd}_S(\Gamma(X))$ is the projective dimension of $\Gamma(X)$ (cf. [12], Ex. 19.8, page 485).

Thus, if X is PCM, then $\Gamma(X)$ is CM and therefore $\text{depth}_{M\Gamma(X)}(\Gamma(X)) = n+1$ so, by (A.36), $\text{pd}_S(\Gamma(X)) = c = \text{codim}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(X)$. Conversely, if $\text{pd}_S(\Gamma(X)) = c$, then $\text{depth}_{M\Gamma(X)}(\Gamma(X)) = n+1$, hence $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is CM at $\underline{0}$. One concludes by Proposition A.29. \square

Remark A.37. Observe that the ranks of the free modules F_i , $1 \leq i \leq c$, do not depend on the minimal free resolution of $\Gamma(X)$. In particular, the rank of F_c in any minimal free resolution of $\Gamma(X)$ is an invariant of $\Gamma(X)$ called the *Cohen-Macaulay type* of X .

We now focus on "Gorenstein" conditions. First, we recall some standard definitions.

Definition A.38. Let (A, m) be a local, CM ring with residue field K .

If $\dim(A) = 0$, then A is called a *Gorenstein* ring if, and only if,

$$(A.39) \quad A \cong \text{Hom}_K(A, K).$$

If $\dim(A) > 0$, then A is called a *Gorenstein* ring if, and only if, there is a non-zero divisor $x \in A$ s.t. $A/(x)$ is Gorenstein. In this case, for every non-zero divisor $x \in A$, $A/(x)$ is Gorenstein.

Remark A.40. By using (A.20), (A, m) is Gorenstein if, and only if, $\omega_A \cong A$ (cf. [12], Theorem 21.15). As in Remark A.18, this is equivalent to saying that there is a minimal, free resolution of R -modules

$$(A.41) \quad \mathcal{F} : 0 \rightarrow F_c \rightarrow F_{c-1} \rightarrow \cdots F_1 \rightarrow R \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0,$$

which is symmetric in the sense that $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{F}^*$. This, in turn, is equivalent to saying that $F_c \cong R$ (see Corollary 21.16 from [12]).

Observe that, if (A, m) is Gorenstein then, for each prime ideal p in A , (A_p, pA_p) is Gorenstein. This follows by the above remark and by the flatness of localization (see [12], page 66).

Definition A.42. Let K be a field. Let R be a graded, finitely generated K -algebra.

If $\dim(R) = 0$, then R is called a *Gorenstein* graded ring if, and only if, there is an integer δ such that

$$(A.43) \quad R(\delta) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_K(R, K).$$

If $\dim(R) > 0$, then R is called a *Gorenstein* graded ring if, and only if, there is an homogeneous non-zero divisor $x \in R$ such that $R/(x)$ is Gorenstein.

Remark A.44. Let $S = \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_{r+1}]$ be the homogeneous polynomial ring and let I be a homogeneous ideal, such that $A = S/I$ is a CM ring. Set $c = \operatorname{codim}_S(A)$.

Then

$$(A.45) \quad \omega_A := \operatorname{Ext}_S^c(A, S(-r-1))$$

is called the graded *dual module* of A . Then, A is Gorenstein if, and only if, there is an integer δ such that $\omega_A \cong A(\delta)$. This is equivalent to saying that there is a minimal, free graded resolution

$$(A.46) \quad \mathcal{F} : 0 \rightarrow F_c \rightarrow F_{c-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow S \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0,$$

which is symmetric in the sense that $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{F}^*$. This, in turn, is equivalent to saying that there is an integer γ such that $F_c \cong S(\gamma)$ (see the proof of Corollary 21.16 and §21.11 from [12]).

Observe also that, if A as above is Gorenstein then, for every prime ideal P in A , (A_P, PA_P) is a local Gorenstein ring.

In complete analogy with Definition A.21, we have:

Definition A.47. A projective scheme X is *Gorenstein* at a point $p \in X$ if $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ is a Gorenstein, local ring. X is *Gorenstein*, if it is Gorenstein at each point $p \in X$.

Theorem A.48. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be an equidimensional projective variety and let p be a point of X . Then, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) X is Gorenstein at p ;
- (ii) each equidimensional hyperplane section of X through p is Gorenstein.

Proof. It directly follows from the definition of local, Gorenstein rings. \square

Definition A.49. A projective and equidimensional variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is called *Projectively Gorenstein* (PG, for short) if its homogeneous coordinate ring $\Gamma(X)$ is Gorenstein.

In complete analogy with Proposition A.29, we have:

Proposition A.50. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be an equidimensional variety, let $\mathcal{C}(X) \subset \mathbb{A}^{r+1}$ be the affine cone over X and let \underline{o} be its vertex. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) X is PG;
- (ii) $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is Gorenstein;
- (iii) $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is Gorenstein at \underline{o} ;

(iv) X is PCM and the dualizing sheaf

$$(A.51) \quad \omega_X \cong \mathcal{O}_X(a), \quad \text{for some } a \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. We prove the following implications.

- (i) \Rightarrow (ii): it directly follows from what recalled in Remark A.44;
- (ii) \Rightarrow (iii): trivial;
- (iii) \Rightarrow (i): X is PCM from Proposition A.29. Now, let

$$\mathcal{F} : 0 \rightarrow F_c \rightarrow F_{c-1} \rightarrow \dots F_1 \rightarrow S \rightarrow \Gamma(X) \rightarrow 0$$

be a graded, minimal free resolution of $\Gamma(X)$. By localizing \mathcal{F} at the homogeneous maximal ideal M one still obtains a minimal free resolution. The assertion follows by Remarks A.40 and A.44.

- (iv) \Leftrightarrow (i): it directly follows from the definition of dual module (see (A.45)) and the definition of dualizing sheaf.

□

Remark A.52. Observe that, if X is PG then $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is Gorenstein, hence X is Gorenstein, since it is an equidimensional hyperplane section of its affine cone.

Clearly, by adjunction formula and by Theorem A.31 and Proposition A.50, if X is PG, then each hyperplane section H of X not containing any component of X is PG. Conversely:

Proposition A.53. *Let X be an equidimensional, projective variety. If a equidimensional hyperplane section H of a projective variety X is PG, then X is PG too.*

Proof. It directly follows from Theorem A.48 and Proposition A.50.

□

REFERENCES

- [1] Artin, M., Winters, G., Degenerate fibres and stable reduction of curves, *Topology*, **10** (1971), 373-383.
- [2] Bardelli F., Lectures on stable curves, in *Lectures on Riemann surfaces - Proc. on the college on Riemann surfaces, Trieste - 1987*, 648-704. Cornalba, Gomez-Mont, Verjovsky, World Scientific, Singapore, 1988.
- [3] Barth W., Peters C., and Van de Ven A., *Compact Complex Surfaces*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik, 3. Folge, Band 4, Springer, Berlin, 1984.
- [4] Batyrev, V. V., Ciocan-Fontanine, I., Kim, B. & van Straten, D., Mirror symmetry and toric degenerations of partial flag manifolds. *Acta Math.*, **184** (2000), no. 1, 1-39.
- [5] Beltrametti M. C., Sommese A. J., *The adjunction theory of complex projective varieties*, de Gruyter expositions in mathematics, 16, de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 1995.
- [6] Bertini, E., *Introduzione alla geometria proiettiva degli iperspazi*, Messina, 1923.
- [7] Calabri, A., Ciliberto C., Flamini, F., Miranda, R., On the geometric genus of reducible surfaces and degenerations of surfaces to union of planes, *preprint, math.AG/0301227*, to appear on the *Proceedings of the Fano Conference - Turin, October 2002*.
- [8] Ciliberto, C., Lopez, A. F., Miranda, R., Projective degenerations of $K3$ surfaces, Gaussian maps and Fano threefolds, *Inv. Math.*, **114** (1993), 641-667.
- [9] Ciliberto, C., Miranda, R., Teicher, M., Pillow degenerations of $K3$ surfaces, in *Application of Algebraic Geometry to Computation, Physics and Coding Theory*, Nato Science Series II/36, Ciliberto et al. (eds.), , Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- [10] Cohen, D. C., Suciu, A. I., The braid monodromy of plane algebraic curves and hyperplane arrangements, *Comment. Math. Helv.*, **72** (1997), 285-315.

- [11] Del Pezzo, P., Sulle superficie dell' n^{mo} ordine immerse nello spazio a n dimensioni, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo*, **1** (1887), 241–247.
- [12] Eisenbud, D., *Commutative Algebra, with a view toward Algebraic Geometry*, Springer, New York, 1995.
- [13] Enriques, F., *Le superficie algebriche*, Zannichelli, Bologna, 1949.
- [14] Friedman, R., Global smoothings of varieties with normal crossings, *Ann. Math.*, **118** (1983), 75–114.
- [15] Friedman, R., Morrison, D.R., (eds.), *The birational geometry of degenerations*, Progress in Mathematics 29, Birkhauser, Boston, 1982.
- [16] Gaeta, F., Nuove ricerche sulle curve sghembe algebriche di residuale finito e sui gruppi di punti del piano, *An. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) **31**, (1950). 1–64.
- [17] Gonciulea, N., Lakshmibai, V., Schubert varieties, toric varieties, and ladder determinantal varieties. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, **47** (1997), no. 4, 1013–1064.
- [18] Goresky, M., MacPherson, R., *Stratified Morse Theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3), **14**, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
- [19] Greco, S., *Normal varieties*. Notes written with the collaboration of A. Di Sante. *Inst. Math.* **4**, Academic Press, London-New York, 1978.
- [20] Griffiths, P., Harris, J., *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*, Wiley Classics Library, New York, 1978.
- [21] Harris, J., A bound on the geometric genus of projective varieties, *Ann. Scu. Norm. Pisa*, **8** (1981), 35–68.
- [22] Hartshorne, R., On the De Rham cohomology of algebraic varieties, *Inst. Hautes tudes Sci. Publ. Math.*, **45** (1975), 5–99.
- [23] Hartshorne, R., *Algebraic Geometry*, (GTM, No. 52), Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.
- [24] Hartshorne, R., *Families of curves in \mathbb{P}^3 and Zeuthen's problem*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **130** (1997), no. 617.
- [25] Iversen, B., Critical points of an algebraic function, *Invent. Math.*, **12** (1971), 210–224.
- [26] Kempf, G., Knudsen, F.F., Mumford, D., and Saint-Donat, B., Toroidal embeddings. I., *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 339, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1973.
- [27] Kollár, J., Toward moduli of singular varieties, *Compositio Mathematica*, **56** (1985), 369–398.
- [28] Kollár, J., Shepherd-Barron, N.I., Threefolds and deformations of surface singularities, *Invent. math.*, **91** (1988), 299–338.
- [29] MacRae, R.E., On an application of Fitting invariants, *J. Algebra*, **2** (1965), 153–169.
- [30] Matsumura, H., *Commutative Algebra*, Reading Massachussets, B. Cummings Publishing Program, 1980.
- [31] Melliez, F., Ranestad, K., Degenerations of (1,7)-polarized abelian surfaces, *preprint mathAG/0309306 v1 18 Sep 2003*.
- [32] Migliore, J.C., *An introduction to deficiency modules and liaison theory for subschemes of projective space*, *Lecture Notes Series*, **24**. Seoul National University, Research Institute of Mathematics, Global Analysis Research Center, Seoul, 1994
- [33] Miyaoka, Y., On the Chern numbers of surfaces of general type, *Invent. Math.*, **42** (1977), 255–237.
- [34] Moishezon, B., Stable branch curves and braid monodromies, in *Algebraic geometry (Chicago, Ill., 1980)*, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, **862** (1981), Springer, 107–192.
- [35] Moishezon, B., Teicher, M., Braid group techniques in complex geometry III: Projective degeneration of V_3 , in *Classification of Algebraic Varieties, Contemporary Mathematics* **162**, AMS (1994), 313–332.
- [36] Morrison, D.R., The Clemens-Schmid exact sequence and applications, in *Topics in Transcendental Algebraic Geometry, Ann. of Math. Studies*, **106** (1984), 101–119.
- [37] Mumford D., A remark on the paper of M. Schlessinger, *Rice Univ. Studies*, **59/1** (1973), 113–118.
- [38] Namikawa, Y., Toroidal degeneration of abelian varieties. II., *Math. Ann.*, **245** (1979), no. 2, 117–150.
- [39] Persson, U., *On degeneration of algebraic surfaces*, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, **189**, AMS, Providence, 1977.
- [40] Pinkham, H.C., *Deformations of algebraic varieties with \mathbb{G}_m action*, PhD thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachussets, 1974.
- [41] Pinkham, H.C., Deformation of cones with negative grading, *J. Algebra*, **30** (1974), 92–102.
- [42] Severi, F., *Vorlesungen über algebraische Geometrie*, vol. 1, Teubner, Leipzig, 1921.

- [43] Sernesi, E., *Topics on families of projective schemes*, Queen's Papers in Pure and Applied Mathematics, n. **73**, Queen's University Press, Canada, 1986.
- [44] Teicher, M., Hirzebruch surfaces: degenerations, related braid monodromy, Galois covers. in *Algebraic geometry: Hirzebruch 70 (Warsaw, 1998)*, *Contemp. Math.*, **241** (1999), 305–325.
- [45] Xambó, S., On projective varieties of minimal degree, *Collectanea Math.*, **32** (1981), 149–163.
- [46] Yau, S.-T., Calabi's conjecture and some new results in algebraic geometry, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **74** (1977), 1789–1799.
- [47] Zappa, G., Caratterizzazione delle curve di diramazione delle rigate e spezzamento di queste in sistemi di piani, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, **13** (1942), 41–56.
- [48] Zappa, G., Su alcuni contributi alla conoscenza della struttura topologica delle superficie algebriche, dati dal metodo dello spezzamento in sistemi di piani, *Acta Pont. Accad. Sci.*, **7** (1943), 4–8.
- [49] Zappa, G., Applicazione della teoria delle matrici di Veblen e di Poincaré allo studio delle superficie spezzate in sistemi di piani, *Acta Pont. Accad. Sci.*, **7** (1943), 21–25.
- [50] Zappa, G., Sulla degenerazione delle superficie algebriche in sistemi di piani distinti, con applicazioni allo studio delle rigate, *Atti R. Accad. d'Italia, Mem. Cl. Sci. FF., MM. e NN.*, **13** (2) (1943), 989–1021.
- [51] Zappa, G., Invarianti numerici d'una superficie algebrica e deduzione della formula di Picard-Alexander col metodo dello spezzamento in piani, *Rend. di Mat. Roma*, **5** (5) (1946), 121–130.
- [52] Zappa, G., Sopra una probabile disuguaglianza tra i caratteri invariantivi di una superficie algebrica, *Rend. Mat. e Appl.*, **14** (1955), 1–10.
- [53] Zappa, G., Alla ricerca di nuovi significati topologici dei generi geometrico ed aritmetico di una superficie algebrica, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, **30** (4) (1949), 123–146.
- [54] Zariski, O., Normal varieties and birational correspondences, *Bull. Amer Math. Soc.*, **48** (1942), 402–413.
- [55] Zariski, O., *Algebraic surfaces, Second supplemented editions, with Appendices S.S. Abhyankar, J. Lipman and D. Mumford*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.

E-mail address: calabri@dm.unibo.it

Current address: Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Bologna, Piazza di Porta San Donato, 5 - 40126 Bologna, Italy

E-mail address: ciliberto@mat.uniroma2.it

Current address: Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata, Via della Ricerca Scientifica - 00133 Roma, Italy

E-mail address: flamini@matrm3.mat.uniroma3.it

Current address: Dipartimento di Matematica Pura ed Applicata, Università degli Studi di L'Aquila, Via Vetoio, Loc. Coppito - 67100 L'Aquila, Italy

E-mail address: miranda@math.colostate.edu

Current address: Department of Mathematics, 101 Weber Building, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1874, USA