

PETROV TYPES FOR THE WEYL TENSOR VIA THE RIEMANNIAN-TO-LORENTZIAN BRIDGE

AMIR BABAK AAZAMI

ABSTRACT. We analyze oriented Riemannian 4-manifolds whose Weyl tensors W satisfy the conformally invariant condition $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some nonzero vector T . While this can be algebraically classified via W 's normal form, we find a further geometric classification by deforming the metric into a Lorentzian one via T . We show that such a W will have the analogue of Petrov Types from general relativity, that only Types I and D can occur, and that each is completely determined by the number of critical points of W 's associated Lorentzian quadratic form. A similar result holds for the Lorentzian version of this question, with T timelike.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Weyl curvature tensor W of an oriented Riemannian 4-manifold, being trace-free, is well known to possess a *normal form*: Relative to any orthonormal basis, the linear endomorphism of W on Λ^2 always has the block form $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B & A \end{bmatrix}$. The 3×3 matrices A, B are symmetric, and by the classical work of [Ber61; ST69], there exist bases relative to which A, B are diagonal and completely determined by just the critical points and values of W 's associated quadratic form on Λ^2 . (If the metric was Einstein, then this would be true with the full curvature 4-tensor in place of W , and the quadratic form would be the sectional curvature.) Given this normal form for W , it is thus natural to investigate additional forms of symmetry. One may, e.g., analyze the case when $A = \pm B$, and this is well known to occur if and only if the 4-manifold is *self-dual* or *anti-self-dual*. There are many such 4-manifolds (see, e.g., [LeB91; Tau92]), and anti-self-dual 4-manifolds in particular are related to R. Penrose's twistor program [Bes07; LeB04].

Here we analyze another condition on W 's normal form, namely, the condition that $A = O$ in at least one orthonormal basis. Denoting that ordered basis by $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$, that $A = O$ in this basis is equivalent to $W(e_1, \cdot, \cdot, e_1) = 0$, which is conformally invariant. After providing some examples and non-examples of such 4-manifolds, we proceed to classifying them. To begin with, in any basis $\{e_i\}$, if some $T = \sum_i c_i e_i$ satisfies $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$, then the equations $W(T, e_j, e_k, T) = 0$ yield an overdetermined system for the c_i 's. If one takes $\{e_i\}$ to be a basis that diagonalizes W à la [Ber61; ST69], then these equations become more tractable (Theorem 1), and certain consequences can be drawn. However, to approach

this problem in a more geometric, basis-independent manner, it is best to first change the metric. Namely, if $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some metric g and unit-length vector field T , then W will also be trace-free with respect to the Lorentzian metric $g_L := g - 2T^{\flat} \otimes T^{\flat}$. If one then considers W 's g_L -induced endomorphism on Λ^2 , then it will have g_L -normal forms, analogous to the Petrov Types of general relativity [Pet69; O'N95; Ste+09]. Indeed, just as [Tho69a] showed how the five possible Petrov Types are determined by the number of critical points of the spacetime's sectional curvature function, in Theorems 2 and 3 we prove something similar: W can have only two g_L -normal forms, and they are determined by the number of critical points of its associated g_L -quadratic form:

Theorem. *Let (M, g) be an oriented Riemannian 4-manifold whose Weyl tensor W satisfies $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some unit-length vector field T on M . Set $g_L := g - 2T^{\flat} \otimes T^{\flat}$ and let $\hat{W}^g: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ denote the linear endomorphism of W defined via the g_L -induced Lorentzian inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{g_L}$ on Λ^2 :*

$$\langle \hat{W}^g(v \wedge w), x \wedge y \rangle_{g_L} := W(v, w, x, y) \quad \text{for all } v, w, x, y \in T_p M.$$

Then at each $p \in M$, the g_L -quadratic form of W given by (25) always has either 3 or ∞ critical points, which number completely determines its two possible g_L -normal forms (Petrov Types) as defined in Definition 1.

In other words, there is basis-independent geometry in the condition $A = O$ that began our inquiry — though we point out that, unlike in the Riemannian case, the critical points and values here do not determine the invariants of W 's g_L -normal form (i.e., the analogues of the entries in A, B); for that, one would also need the Hessian of (25). Also, T needn't be unique here, either. Nevertheless, Theorems 2 and 3 show the continued presence of normal forms in dimension four, a presence that is already rich: From their use in the proof of the Hitchin-Thorpe inequality [Tho69b; Hit74]), to their relation to the Petrov Types of general relativity, and more recently to extensions of the curvature tensor, e.g., in gradient Ricci solitons [CT16].

Finally, we reverse the roles of g and g_L , by considering when the Weyl tensor W_L of an oriented Lorentzian 4-manifold (M, g_L) satisfies $W_L(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some unit-length *timelike* T . By passing over to the Riemannian metric $g := g_L + 2T^{\flat} \otimes T^{\flat}$, we use [Ber61; ST69] to prove in Theorem 5 the following:

Theorem. *Let (M, g_L) be an oriented Lorentzian 4-manifold whose Weyl tensor W_L satisfies $W_L(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some unit-length timelike vector field T on M . Then (M, g_L) cannot have Petrov Types II, N, or III. Set $g := g_L + 2T^{\flat} \otimes T^{\flat}$ and let $\hat{W}_L^g: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ denote the linear endomorphism of W_L defined via the g -induced Riemannian inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ on Λ^2 :*

$$\langle \hat{W}_L^g(v \wedge w), x \wedge y \rangle_g := W_L(v, w, x, y) \quad \text{for all } v, w, x, y \in T_p M.$$

Then at each $p \in M$, W_L is completely determined by the critical points and values of W_L 's g -quadratic form $P \mapsto \langle \hat{W}_L^g P, P \rangle_g$, defined for all 2-planes P .

In contrast to the Petrov Types of general relativity, whose invariants cannot be determined by just the first derivatives of their quadratic forms (see [Tho69a]; their Hessian is also needed), Theorem 5 shows that those Weyl tensors that satisfy $W_L(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ can be determined by just the first derivatives — of a g -induced quadratic form. Finally, we remark that the proofs of Theorems 2 and 5 are completely classical; indeed, they follow those of [Tho69a; ST69] step-by-step — but with one important difference: The Weyl endomorphism originates from g , whereas the Hodge star operator with which it commutes originates from g_L , and vice versa. As such, this article follows an ongoing line of inquiry begun in [Aaz23], namely, that of studying the commutativity of curvature operators and Hodge stars arising from *different* metrics over the same 4-manifold M .

2. BRIEF REVIEW OF THE WEYL TENSOR

In this section we briefly review the Weyl tensor and establish our notation. Let (M, g) be an oriented Riemannian 4-manifold, with Riemann curvature 4-tensor $\text{Rm}(v, w, x, y) = g(\nabla_v \nabla_w x - \nabla_w \nabla_v x - \nabla_{[v, w]} x, y)$. Recall that g 's curvature operator $\hat{R}: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ is the linear endomorphism defined by

$$\langle \hat{R}(v \wedge w), x \wedge y \rangle_g := \text{Rm}(v, w, x, y) \quad \text{for all } v, w, x, y \in T_p M, \quad (1)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ is the g -induced inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ on Λ^2 :

$$\langle v \wedge w, x \wedge y \rangle_g := \det \begin{bmatrix} g(v, x) & g(v, y) \\ g(w, x) & g(w, y) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

(If (1) is defined with a minus sign, then $\langle \hat{R}(v \wedge w), v \wedge w \rangle_g = \text{Rm}(v, w, w, v)$ would be the sectional curvature of the 2-plane spanned by the orthonormal pair v, w ; [Tho69a; ST69] define it as we have.) Note that the pairwise symmetry $\text{Rm}_{ijkl} = \text{Rm}_{klij}$ ensures that \hat{R} is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ -self-adjoint. Now, any orthonormal basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} \subseteq T_p M$ lifts to a $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ -orthonormal basis

$$\{e_1 \wedge e_2, e_1 \wedge e_3, e_1 \wedge e_4, e_3 \wedge e_4, e_4 \wedge e_2, e_2 \wedge e_3\} \subseteq \Lambda^2. \quad (3)$$

Relative to this basis, and writing $\text{Rm}(e_i, e_j, e_k, e_l) := R_{ijkl}$, the curvature operator (1) takes the block form

$$\hat{R} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{1212} & R_{1312} & R_{1412} & R_{3412} & R_{4212} & R_{2312} \\ R_{1213} & R_{1313} & R_{1413} & R_{3413} & R_{4213} & R_{2313} \\ R_{1214} & R_{1314} & R_{1414} & R_{3414} & R_{4214} & R_{2314} \\ R_{1234} & R_{1334} & R_{1434} & R_{3434} & R_{4234} & R_{2334} \\ R_{1242} & R_{1342} & R_{1442} & R_{3442} & R_{4242} & R_{2342} \\ R_{1223} & R_{1323} & R_{1423} & R_{3423} & R_{4223} & R_{2323} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^t & D \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

with A and D symmetric 3×3 matrices and B^t the transpose of the 3×3 matrix B , which is not symmetric in general. The second linear operator we shall need is the *Hodge star operator* $*$: $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$, defined via

$$\xi \wedge * \eta := \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_g dV \quad , \quad \xi, \eta \in \Lambda^2,$$

where $dV \in \Lambda^4$ is the orientation form. The action of $*$ on the basis (3) is given by

$$\begin{cases} *(e_1 \wedge e_2) = e_3 \wedge e_4, \\ *(e_1 \wedge e_3) = e_4 \wedge e_2, \\ *(e_1 \wedge e_4) = e_2 \wedge e_3, \end{cases}, \quad \begin{cases} *(e_3 \wedge e_4) = e_1 \wedge e_2, \\ *(e_4 \wedge e_2) = e_1 \wedge e_3, \\ *(e_2 \wedge e_3) = e_1 \wedge e_4, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

or in block matrix form,

$$* = \begin{bmatrix} O & I \\ I & O \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where O and I are the 3×3 zero and identity matrices, respectively. Observe that $*$ has the eigenvalues ± 1 , whose eigenbases Λ^\pm , which decompose Λ^2 into the direct sum $\Lambda^2 = \Lambda^+ \oplus \Lambda^-$, are given in terms of (3) by

$$\Lambda^\pm := \text{span} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \wedge e_2 \pm e_3 \wedge e_4), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \wedge e_3 \pm e_4 \wedge e_2), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \wedge e_4 \pm e_2 \wedge e_3) \right\}.$$

Eigenvectors $\xi \in \Lambda^+$ are called *self-dual* ($*\xi = +\xi$), while $\xi \in \Lambda^-$ are *anti-self-dual* ($*\xi = -\xi$). We now briefly present the *Weyl curvature tensor* of a Riemannian 4-manifold (M, g) . It is defined by

$$W := \text{Rm} - \frac{1}{2} \text{Ric} \otimes g + \frac{\text{scal}_g}{12} g \otimes g, \quad (7)$$

where \otimes is the Kulkarni-Nomizu product (see [Lee18, p. 213]), Ric is the Ricci tensor of g , and scal_g its scalar curvature. The most important facts about W is that it is trace-free and that it is the conformally invariant part of the Riemann curvature 4-tensor. The latter means that for any metric $\tilde{g} := e^{2f}g$ in the conformal class of g , its Weyl tensor \tilde{W} scales as $\tilde{W} = e^{2f}W$, and furthermore that $W = 0$ is precisely the condition required for g to be locally conformally flat. Just as with (1), W also has a corresponding linear endomorphism $\hat{W}: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$, defined by

$$\langle \hat{W}(v \wedge w), x \wedge y \rangle_g := W(v, w, x, y) \quad \text{for all } v, w, x, y \in T_p M. \quad (8)$$

Because W is trace-free and otherwise satisfies the same symmetry properties as the Riemann curvature 4-tensor, relative to any $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ -orthonormal basis of the form (3) for Λ^2 , \hat{W} has the block form

$$\hat{W} = \begin{bmatrix} W_{1212} & W_{1312} & W_{1412} & W_{3412} & W_{4212} & W_{2312} \\ W_{1213} & W_{1313} & W_{1413} & W_{3413} & W_{4213} & W_{2313} \\ W_{1214} & W_{1314} & W_{1414} & W_{3414} & W_{4214} & W_{2314} \\ W_{1234} & W_{1334} & W_{1434} & W_{3434} & W_{4234} & W_{2334} \\ W_{1242} & W_{1342} & W_{1442} & W_{3442} & W_{4242} & W_{2342} \\ W_{1223} & W_{1323} & W_{1423} & W_{3423} & W_{4223} & W_{2323} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B & A \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

(I.e., $W_{1212} = W_{3434}$, etc.) A glance at (6) shows that, as a consequence of being trace-free, \hat{W} commutes with $*$, an important fact to which we shall

return in Section 3 below. In terms of \hat{R} and $*$, \hat{W} can also be expressed as

$$\hat{W} = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{R} + * \circ \hat{R} \circ *) + \frac{\text{scal}_g}{12}I, \quad (10)$$

where $I: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ is the identity operator. Using (10) and the fact that $*$ is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ -self-adjoint, it follows easily that the eigenspaces Λ^\pm are \hat{W} -invariant. Thus, along with $\Lambda^2 = \Lambda^+ \oplus \Lambda^-$, there is a decomposition $\hat{W} = W^+ \oplus W^-$ into endomorphisms $W^\pm: \Lambda^\pm \rightarrow \Lambda^\pm$, respectively. An oriented Riemannian 4-manifold is said to be *self-dual* if $W^- = 0$ and *anti-self-dual* if $W^+ = 0$. In terms of (9), $W^\pm = 0 \iff A = \pm B$ (see (14)-(15) below), which, recalling $\widetilde{W} = e^{2f}W$, makes it clear that these are conformally invariant conditions. The final map that we will need is W 's associated quadratic form. To define it, let $G_p \subseteq \Lambda^2$ denote the set of decomposable 2-vectors of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ -length 1; i.e., all 2-vectors $\xi \in \Lambda^2$ of the form $\xi = v \wedge w$ for some $v, w \in T_pM$, with $\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_g = 1$; these are also called *2-planes at T_pM* . These, too, can be characterized by $*$ in dimension four: $G_p = \{\xi^+ + \xi^- : \xi^\pm \in \Lambda^\pm, \langle \xi^\pm, \xi^\pm \rangle_g = 1/2\}$; see, e.g., [ST69]. The quadratic form of \hat{W} is then the map defined by

$$P \mapsto \langle \hat{W}P, P \rangle_g \quad , \quad P \in G_p. \quad (11)$$

(Notice its relation to (8), exactly as sectional curvature related to the curvature operator (1).) This map, and its Lorentzian analogue in [Tho69a] (a variant of which will appear in Definition 2 below), will play a fundamental role in our study of the condition $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$, to which we now turn.

3. THE CONDITION $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$

We now proceed to our objects of study, oriented Riemannian 4-manifolds (M, g) whose Weyl tensors W satisfy the pointwise condition

$$W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0 \quad , \quad \text{some unit } T \in T_pM. \quad (12)$$

This is a conformally invariant condition, trivial g is locally conformally flat. For an example that is not locally conformally flat (or Einstein), consider the metric g defined on $M := \{(r, x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x > 0\}$ by

$$g := (2x)^3(dr)^2 + (dx)^2 + (2x)^{-3}(dy)^2 + (dz)^2.$$

The components of the Weyl tensor of g , relative to the orthonormal basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} := \{\partial_r/\sqrt{8x^3}, \partial_x, \sqrt{8x^3}\partial_y, \partial_z\}$, are given by

$$\hat{W} = \begin{bmatrix} W_{1212} & W_{1312} & W_{1412} & W_{3412} & W_{4212} & W_{2312} \\ W_{1213} & W_{1313} & W_{1413} & W_{3413} & W_{4213} & W_{2313} \\ W_{1214} & W_{1314} & W_{1414} & W_{3414} & W_{4214} & W_{2314} \\ W_{1234} & W_{1334} & W_{1434} & W_{3434} & W_{4234} & W_{2334} \\ W_{1242} & W_{1342} & W_{1442} & W_{3442} & W_{4242} & W_{2342} \\ W_{1223} & W_{1323} & W_{1423} & W_{3423} & W_{4223} & W_{2323} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{3}{2x^2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

It can be verified that $T := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \pm e_2), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_3 \pm e_4)$ all satisfy $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ on M . On the other hand, here are two classes of Riemannian 4-manifolds that are both ‘‘close’’ to being locally conformally flat but which nevertheless do not satisfy (12):

- i. *Products of constant curvature surfaces:* Let $(M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2)$ be two oriented Riemannian 2-manifolds with constant sectional curvatures c_1, c_2 . Then their product $(M_1 \times M_2, g_1 \oplus g_2)$ is an oriented 4-manifold whose Weyl tensor is given by

$$W = \frac{c_1 + c_2}{6} (g_1 \otimes g_1 - g_1 \otimes g_2 + g_2 \otimes g_2)$$

(see [Lee18, p. 261]). If $c_1 \neq -c_2$, then $W \neq 0$. However, for any choice of $T = ax_1 + bx_2$ with $x_1 \in T_{p_1}M_1$ and $x_2 \in T_{p_2}M_2$ vectors of unit length and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} W(T, x_1, x_1, T) &= b^2 W(x_2, x_1, x_1, x_2) = \frac{c_1 + c_2}{6} (-b^2), \\ W(T, x_2, x_2, T) &= a^2 W(x_1, x_2, x_2, x_1) = \frac{c_1 + c_2}{6} (-a^2), \end{aligned}$$

and these vanish if and only if $a = b = 0$. Thus if $W \neq 0$, then (12) cannot be satisfied for any nonzero T .

- ii. *Self-dual/anti-self-dual 4-manifolds:* The easiest way to verify this is to recall that $W^\pm = 0 \iff A = \pm B$, together with the fact that (12) implies that $A = O$ in some orthonormal basis (see (18) below). But let us verify this directly here. Thus, suppose that (12) holds for a self-dual metric ($W^- = 0$), so that $\hat{W}(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \Lambda^-$. Then taking an oriented orthonormal basis of the form $\{T = e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$, and forming the following three eigenvectors of Λ^- ,

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \wedge e_2 - e_3 \wedge e_4), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \wedge e_3 - e_4 \wedge e_2), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \wedge e_4 - e_2 \wedge e_3) \right\},$$

it will be the case that

$$\hat{W}(e_1 \wedge e_2) = \hat{W}(e_3 \wedge e_4), \quad \hat{W}(e_1 \wedge e_3) = \hat{W}(e_4 \wedge e_2), \quad \hat{W}(e_1 \wedge e_4) = \hat{W}(e_2 \wedge e_3).$$

Consider the first of these; because $W_{1212} = W_{1213} = W_{1214} = 0$ by (12), we have

$$\hat{W}(e_1 \wedge e_2) = W_{1234}e_3 \wedge e_4 + W_{1242}e_4 \wedge e_2 + W_{1223}e_2 \wedge e_3. \quad (14)$$

On the other hand, because $W_{3434} = W_{1212} = 0$, $W_{3442} = W_{1312} = 0$, and $W_{3423} = W_{1412} = 0$ (recall (9)), we also have

$$\hat{W}(e_3 \wedge e_4) = W_{3412}e_1 \wedge e_2 + W_{3413}e_1 \wedge e_3 + W_{3414}e_1 \wedge e_4. \quad (15)$$

Thus the only way to satisfy $\hat{W}(e_1 \wedge e_2) = \hat{W}(e_3 \wedge e_4)$ is for both to be zero. Similarly for the other two cases, as well as for the anti-self-dual case ($W^+ = 0$). We thus conclude that any self-dual or anti-self-dual 4-manifold that is not locally conformally flat cannot satisfy (12).

To understand when $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ is satisfied, we now turn to the classical work of [Ber61; ST69] (even more important for us will be its Lorentzian counterpart [Tho69a], in Section 4 below); [Ber61; ST69] showed that, at

each $p \in M$, there is an orthonormal basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} \subseteq T_p M$ relative to which \hat{W} takes the form

$$\hat{W} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & \mu_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 & 0 & \mu_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 & 0 & 0 & \mu_3 \\ \mu_1 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mu_3 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

such that

$$\underbrace{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0}_{\text{because } W \text{ is trace-free}}, \quad \underbrace{\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3 = 0}_{\text{because } W \text{ satisfies the algebraic Bianchi identity}}, \quad (17)$$

and such that the 2-planes $P_1 := e_1 \wedge e_2, P_2 := e_1 \wedge e_3, P_3 := \pm e_1 \wedge e_4$, satisfy $\hat{W}P_i = \lambda_i P_i + \mu_i *P_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, with the λ_i, μ_i being completely determined by the critical points and values of the quadratic form (11); in fact the λ_i 's are (some of) its critical values. (E.g., the Weyl tensor of (13) is in normal form relative to the orthonormal basis $\{\partial_r/\sqrt{8x^3}, \partial_x, \sqrt{8x^3}\partial_y, \partial_z\}$.) The normal form (16) readily yields a pointwise algebraic classification of oriented Riemannian 4-manifolds satisfying (12), given by the following overdetermined system:

Theorem 1. *Let (M, g) be an oriented Riemannian 4-manifold whose Weyl tensor W has normal form (16) at $p \in M$. Then*

$$W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0 \quad \text{for } T := \sum_i c_i e_i \in T_p M$$

if and only if the following ten equations hold for the c_i :

$$\begin{array}{l} \underbrace{c_2^2 \lambda_1 + c_3^2 \lambda_2 + c_4^2 \lambda_3 = 0}_{W(v, e_1, e_1, v) = 0}, \quad \underbrace{c_1 c_2 \lambda_1 + c_3 c_4 (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 0}_{W(v, e_1, e_2, v) = 0}, \\ \underbrace{c_1 c_3 \lambda_2 + c_2 c_4 (-\mu_1 + \mu_3) = 0}_{W(v, e_1, e_3, v) = 0}, \quad \underbrace{c_1 c_4 \lambda_3 + c_2 c_3 (\mu_1 - \mu_2) = 0}_{W(v, e_1, e_4, v) = 0}, \\ \underbrace{c_1^2 \lambda_1 + c_4^2 \lambda_2 + c_3^2 \lambda_3 = 0}_{W(v, e_2, e_2, v) = 0}, \quad \underbrace{c_2 c_3 \lambda_3 + c_1 c_4 (\mu_1 - \mu_2) = 0}_{W(v, e_2, e_3, v) = 0}, \\ \underbrace{c_2 c_4 \lambda_2 + c_1 c_3 (-\mu_1 + \mu_3) = 0}_{W(v, e_2, e_4, v) = 0}, \quad \underbrace{c_4^2 \lambda_1 + c_1^2 \lambda_2 + c_2^2 \lambda_3 = 0}_{W(v, e_3, e_3, v) = 0}, \\ \underbrace{c_3 c_4 \lambda_1 + c_1 c_2 (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 0}_{W(v, e_3, e_4, v) = 0}, \quad \underbrace{c_3^2 \lambda_1 + c_2^2 \lambda_2 + c_1^2 \lambda_3 = 0}_{W(v, e_4, e_4, v) = 0}. \end{array}$$

Proof. All of these follow from expanding

$$W(T, e_j, e_k, T) = \sum_{i,l} c_i c_l W_{ijkl}$$

and using (9) and (16). □

More important for us will be the ‘‘Lorentzian’’ version of these equations in Theorem 3, but let us use Theorem 1 now to verify that nontrivial solutions do exist, and that, as we saw in (13), they are not, in general, unique:

Corollary 1. *Assume that the Weyl tensor is nonzero in Theorem 1. Then the vector $T = e_1 + e_2 + e_3 + e_4$ satisfies $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ if and only if $\lambda_1 = -\mu_1 - 2\mu_2$ and $\lambda_2 = 2\mu_1 + \mu_2$. If so, then so do the vectors $-e_1 - e_2 + e_3 + e_4$, $-e_1 + e_2 - e_3 + e_4$, and $-e_1 + e_2 + e_3 - e_4$. On the other hand, if $\mu_2 = \mu_3$ and $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 \neq 0$, then the only solution is $T = 0$.*

Proof. With $c_1 = c_2 = c_3 = c_4 = 1$, and recalling (17), the proofs of the first two statements follow easily from inspection of the equations above. Regarding the final statement, we must have $\lambda_1 = -2\lambda_2 \neq 0$; by the second equation, we have $c_1 = 0$ or $c_2 = 0$. On the other hand, the second-to-last equation yields $c_3 = 0$ or $c_4 = 0$. Any of these pairings, when inserted into the remaining equations, will yield $T = 0$. \square

In Corollary 1, if $\lambda_2 \neq \lambda_3$ then the last statement no longer holds, in that nontrivial solutions may exist; indeed, this was the case in (13).

4. INTRODUCING A LORENTZIAN METRIC

What Theorem 1 does not address is what further *geometry*, if any, lies behind $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$. As we now show, there is further geometry, if one is prepared to change the signature of g , to that of *Lorentzian* metric. To see how, let us start with the observation that, in the basis (3) with $T = e_1$, and recalling (9),

$$W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0 \iff \hat{W} = \begin{bmatrix} O & B \\ B & O \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

As we now show, (18) ensures that W is also trace-free with respect to *another* metric — and that as a consequence it will commute with that metric’s Hodge star operator:

Proposition 1. *Let (M, g) be an oriented Riemannian 4-manifold with Weyl tensor W and let T be a unit-length vector field on M . With respect to the Lorentzian metric $g_L := g - 2T^{\flat} \otimes T^{\flat}$, the linear endomorphism $\hat{W}^{g_L}: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ defined by*

$$\langle \hat{W}^{g_L}(v \wedge w), x \wedge y \rangle_{g_L} := W(v, w, x, y) \quad \text{for all } v, w, x, y \in T_p M \quad (19)$$

*commutes with the Hodge star $*_L: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ of $g_L \iff W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$. If so, then \hat{W}^{g_L} is a complex-linear map on the three-dimensional complex vector space $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ defined via $i\xi := *_L \xi$ for all $\xi \in \Lambda^2$.*

Before beginning the proof, note that \hat{W}^{g_L} is merely the endomorphism of W induced via $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{g_L}$ in place of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$; by construction, it is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{g_L}$ -self-adjoint

and satisfies the algebraic Bianchi identity with respect to it. In terms of a g_L - and g -orthonormal basis $\{T = e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$, \hat{W}^{g_L} takes the form

$$\hat{W}^{g_L} = \begin{bmatrix} -W_{1212} & -W_{1312} & -W_{1412} & -W_{3412} & -W_{4212} & -W_{2312} \\ -W_{1213} & -W_{1313} & -W_{1413} & -W_{3413} & -W_{4213} & -W_{2313} \\ -W_{1214} & -W_{1314} & -W_{1414} & -W_{3414} & -W_{4214} & -W_{2314} \\ W_{1234} & W_{1334} & W_{1434} & W_{3434} & W_{4234} & W_{2334} \\ W_{1242} & W_{1342} & W_{1442} & W_{3442} & W_{4242} & W_{2342} \\ W_{1223} & W_{1323} & W_{1423} & W_{3423} & W_{4223} & W_{2323} \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} -A & -B \\ B & A \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

What accounts for this difference with (9) is that $g_L(e_1, e_1) = -1$, so that

$$\langle e_1 \wedge e_i, e_1 \wedge e_i \rangle_{g_L} = -1 \quad , \quad i = 2, 3, 4.$$

Another difference is that g_L 's Hodge star operator $*_L: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} *_L(e_1 \wedge e_2) = -e_3 \wedge e_4, \\ *_L(e_1 \wedge e_3) = -e_4 \wedge e_2, \\ *_L(e_1 \wedge e_4) = -e_2 \wedge e_3, \end{cases} \quad , \quad \begin{cases} *_L(e_3 \wedge e_4) = e_1 \wedge e_2, \\ *_L(e_4 \wedge e_2) = e_1 \wedge e_3, \\ *_L(e_2 \wedge e_3) = e_1 \wedge e_4 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

($*_L$ is defined via $\xi \wedge *_L \eta := \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_{g_L} dV$), or in block matrix form,

$$*_L = \begin{bmatrix} O & I \\ -I & O \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

With these established, the proof of Proposition 1 is now an easy matter:

Proof. Set $\{T := e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$. If $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$, then by (18) and (21),

$$\hat{W}^{g_L} = \begin{bmatrix} O & -B \\ B & O \end{bmatrix},$$

which is precisely the condition needed to commute with (23):

$$\begin{bmatrix} -A & -B \\ B & A \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} O & I \\ -I & O \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} O & I \\ -I & O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -A & -B \\ B & A \end{bmatrix} \iff A = O. \quad (24)$$

The remainder of Proposition 1 now follows from the fact that $*_L^2 = -\text{id}$. \square

Being g_L -trace-free, and commuting with $*_L$, are equivalent for \hat{W}^{g_L} — and the point of Proposition 1 is that they are guaranteed by the condition $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$. It is also a concrete geometric realization of the general notion of “ $*_L$ -Einstein metric” formulated in [Aaz23, Definition 3]. In any case, with this Lorentzian structure in hand, we now turn to classifying these metrics using the technique of [Tho69a]. As in the latter, the key will be the eigenstructure of the (now) complex-linear map $\hat{W}^{g_L}: \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$:

Definition 1 (Petrov Type). *Let (M, g) be an oriented Riemannian 4-manifold whose Weyl tensor W satisfies $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some unit-length vector field T on M . Then (M, g) has Petrov Type I, D, II, N, or III at each $p \in M$ if the complex-linear map $\hat{W}^{g_i}: \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ has 3 (I, D), 2 (II, N), or 1 (III) linearly independent complex eigenvectors at p , respectively, with I and D having 3 and 2 distinct complex eigenvalues, respectively, and II and N having 2 and 1 distinct complex eigenvalues, respectively.*

(If (M, g) has only 1 distinct complex eigenvalue, then that eigenvalue is necessarily 0 because W , hence \hat{W}^{g_i} , is g_i -trace-free; note that we ignore the $W = 0$ case in Definition 1.) For the next definition, recall that an oriented 2-dimensional subspace $P \subseteq T_p M$ is *nondegenerate* if the restriction of g_i to P is nondegenerate. The *sign* of P , denoted $\epsilon_L(P) = \pm 1$, is defined to be -1 if this restriction has Lorentzian signature and $+1$ if it is positive-definite. The 2-plane g_i -orthogonal to P is $*_L P$, since $\langle P, *_L P \rangle_{g_i} = 0$. Finally, following [Tho69a], let $G_{\pm}(p) \subseteq \Lambda^2(T_p M)$ denote the set of all oriented, nondegenerate 2-dimensional subspaces of $T_p M$ with signs ± 1 , respectively. Note that $\epsilon_L(P) = \langle P, P \rangle_{g_i}$ for any $P \in G_{\pm}(p)$.

Definition 2 (g_i -quadratic form of W). *Assume the hypotheses of Definition 1. Then the function $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_i}}$, defined on each $G_+(p) \cup G_-(p) \subseteq T_p M$ by*

$$\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_i}}(P) := \epsilon_L(P) \langle \hat{W}^{g_i} P, P \rangle_{g_i}, \quad (25)$$

with \hat{W}^{g_i} given by (19), is the g_i -quadratic form of the Weyl tensor W of g .

Because \hat{W}^{g_i} is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{g_i}$ -self-adjoint, its Petrov Types are related to the critical points of $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_i}}$ by exactly the same method of proof as in [Tho69a]:

Theorem 2 (Classification of Petrov Types). *Assume the hypotheses of Definition 1. Then at each $p \in M$, g has*

1. *Petrov Type I $\iff \text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_i}}$ has $n = 3$ spacelike critical points.*
2. *Petrov Types D or N $\iff \text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_i}}$ has $n = \infty$ spacelike critical points.*
3. *Petrov Type II $\iff \text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_i}}$ has $n = 1$ spacelike critical point.*
4. *Petrov Type III $\iff \text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_i}}$ has $n = 0$ spacelike critical points.*

Proof. Notice the slight difference from [Tho69a]; see the Appendix. \square

There always exists a g_i -orthonormal basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} \subseteq T_p M$ — with e_1 timelike but not necessarily equal to T — relative to which $\hat{W}^{g_i}: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ (i.e., as a real, not complex map) takes one of the following forms:

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & \mu_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 & 0 & \mu_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 & 0 & 0 & \mu_3 \\ -\mu_1 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mu_2 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu_3 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{Petrov Types I or D (if D, then } \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 \text{ and } \mu_2 = \mu_3); \sum_i \lambda_i = \sum_i \mu_i = 0}, \quad (26)$$

Petrov Types I or D (if D, then $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_3$); $\sum_i \lambda_i = \sum_i \mu_i = 0$

or

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} -2\lambda & 0 & 0 & -2\mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda - \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \mu & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda + \frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & \mu \\ 2\mu & 0 & 0 & -2\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mu & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \lambda - \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & -\mu & 0 & 0 & \lambda + \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{Petrov Types II or N (if N, then } \lambda = \mu = 0\text{)}}, \quad (27)$$

or

$$\underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{Petrov Type III}}. \quad (28)$$

This follows by Jordan-normal form theory; cf. [Tho69a, pp. 3-4] (note that the timelike vector there is e_4 , not e_1) and [O’N95, pp. 314 & 324]. However, in contrast to the Riemannian case, here the λ_i, μ_i ’s cannot be determined by just the first derivatives (i.e., critical points and values) of the quadratic form — the second derivatives of $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$ (i.e., its Hessian) are needed, too; see [Tho69a, Footnote 10]. Nevertheless, we have at the moment two “nice” bases: A g -orthonormal basis à la [Ber61; ST69] giving the normal form (16) for \hat{W} , and a g_L -orthonormal (Jordan) basis à la [Tho69a] giving one of the normal forms (26)-(28) for \hat{W}^g . Generally speaking, we would not expect the g -basis to contain T , hence we have no reason to expect that basis to be g_L -orthonormal also. At the same time, e_1 need not equal T in the g_L -Jordan basis, either (if we could ensure that $e_1 = T$, then we could immediately rule out Types II, N, and III, because $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ would force $A = O$). Therefore, it is not clear at the moment what possible Petrov Types \hat{W}^g can actually have. We answer this question now:

Theorem 3. *Let (M, g) be an oriented Riemannian 4-manifold whose Weyl tensor W satisfies $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some unit-length vector field T on M . Then (M, g) can only have Petrov Types I or D. Thus its Petrov Type is completely determined by whether $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$ has 3 or ∞ critical points.*

Proof. As mentioned above, if the (trace-free) Weyl tensor W has Petrov Type III at $p \in M$, then a g_L -orthonormal basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} \subseteq T_p M$ can be found, with e_1 timelike, such that relative to the corresponding basis (3) for Λ^2 , the real 6×6 matrix of $\hat{W}^g: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ is given by (28). As $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{g_L}$ has index $(---+++)$, the only nonzero components of W in this basis are

$$W_{1213} = -1/\sqrt{2} \quad , \quad W_{1323} = W_{1442} = W_{3442} = 1/\sqrt{2}. \quad (29)$$

We may now repeat the procedure of Theorem 1; i.e., set $T = \sum_i c_i e_i$ and list the equations $W_\iota(T, e_i, e_j, T) = 0$ (though this time $g_{11} = g^{11} = -1$, as e_1 is timelike). But our task is made simpler by the fact that, via (29), the two equations

$$\underbrace{c_3^2 - c_1 c_3 - c_4^2 = 0}_{W(T, e_1, e_2, T) = 0} \quad , \quad \underbrace{c_1^2 - c_1 c_3 + c_4^2 = 0}_{W(T, e_2, e_3, T) = 0}$$

alone yield $(c_1 - c_3)^2 = 0$, hence $c_1 = c_3$. But with e_1 the timelike direction, such a T cannot be timelike. Thus Petrov Type III is excluded. For Petrov Type II, we have instead the matrix (27). This time, the relevant starting equation is $W(T, e_3, e_4, T) = -2c_3 c_4 \lambda = 0$. If $\lambda = 0$, then the equation $W(T, e_3, e_3, T) = 0$ with $\lambda = 0$ yields $(c_1 - c_2)^2 = 0$; but any T with $c_1 = c_2$ cannot be timelike. On the other hand, if $c_3 = 0$, then

$$\underbrace{c_4(c_1 + (2\lambda - 1)c_2) = 0}_{W(T, e_2, e_4, T) = 0} \quad , \quad \underbrace{(c_1 - c_2)((2\lambda + 1)c_1 + (2\lambda - 1)c_2) = 0}_{W(T, e_4, e_4, T) = 0} .$$

Since $c_1 \neq c_2$, the second equation yields $(2\lambda - 1)c_2 = -(2\lambda + 1)c_1$. Inserting this into the first gives $c_1 c_4 \lambda = 0$, hence $c_4 = 0$. Finally, inserting this into $W(T, e_2, e_2, T) = 0$ yields $c_1^2 \lambda = 0$, an impasse once again. Thus the cases $\lambda = 0$ and $c_3 = 0$ in $W(T, e_3, e_4, T) = -2c_3 c_4 \lambda = 0$ have now been established; the $c_4 = 0$ case is similar to $c_3 = 0$ (now with $W(T, e_3, e_3, T)$ and $W(T, e_2, e_3, T)$ replacing $W(T, e_4, e_4, T)$ and $W(T, e_2, e_4, T)$). \square

5. THE LORENTZIAN CASE

We now go in the opposite direction, starting from a Lorentzian 4-manifold (M, g_ι) . Here we shall need T to be timelike from the outset: $g_\iota(T, T) < 0$. Our first task will be to establish the analogue of Proposition 3. To that end, let us briefly define the *Petrov Types* from general relativity. Recall the complex-linear map $\hat{W}_\iota: \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$, defined via $\langle \hat{W}_\iota(v \wedge w), x \wedge y \rangle_{g_\iota} := W_\iota(v, w, x, y)$ and the identification $i\xi = *_\iota \xi$ making Λ^2 into a three-dimensional complex vector space $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ (note that W_ι automatically commutes with $*_\iota$, as the former is g_ι -trace-free). An oriented Lorentzian 4-manifold (M, g_ι) with nonzero Weyl tensor has *Petrov Type I, D, II, N, or III* at $p \in M$ if $\hat{W}_\iota: \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ has 3 (I or D), 2 (II or N), or 1 (III) linearly independent complex eigenvectors at p , with I and D having 3 and 2 distinct complex eigenvalues, respectively, and II and N having 2 and 1 distinct eigenvalues, respectively; see [O'N95, Lemma 5.4.2 p. 313]. (Indeed, Definition 1 above is simply the mirror of this definition, with (M, g, \hat{W}^g) in place of $(M, g_\iota, \hat{W}_\iota)$.) Petrov Type D includes the *Kerr metric* modeling a rotating black hole, while Petrov Type N includes *pp-wave spacetimes* modeling gravitational waves; see [O'N95; Ste+09; Sor+17].

Theorem 4. *If a Lorentzian 4-manifold with nonzero Weyl tensor W_ι satisfies $W_\iota(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for a timelike vector T , then it cannot have Petrov Types II, N, or III.*

Proof. This proof goes through exactly as in Theorem 3, with W_L, \hat{W}_L in place of W, \hat{W}^g , respectively. \square

We now proceed to classifying those Lorentzian 4-manifolds that can satisfy $W_L(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$, by using T to define a Riemannian metric $g := g_L + 2T^\flat \otimes T^\flat$. The first step toward this classification is the analogue of Proposition 1:

Proposition 2. *Let (M, g_L) be an oriented Lorentzian 4-manifold with Weyl tensor W_L and let T be a unit-length timelike vector field on M . With respect to the Riemannian metric $g := g_L + 2T^\flat \otimes T^\flat$, with $T^\flat := g_L(T, \cdot)$, the linear endomorphism $\hat{W}_L^g: \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ defined by*

$$\langle \hat{W}_L^g(v \wedge w), x \wedge y \rangle_g := W_L(v, w, x, y) \quad \text{for all } v, w, x, y \in T_p M \quad (30)$$

commutes with the Hodge star $*$: $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ of $g \iff W_L(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$.

Proof. With respect to a g_L - and g -orthonormal basis $\{T := e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$, and setting $W_{ijkl} := W_L(e_i, e_j, e_k, e_l)$, the operator \hat{W}_L^g is given by

$$\hat{W}_L^g = \begin{bmatrix} W_{1212} & W_{1312} & W_{1412} & W_{3412} & W_{4212} & W_{2312} \\ W_{1213} & W_{1313} & W_{1413} & W_{3413} & W_{4213} & W_{2313} \\ W_{1214} & W_{1314} & W_{1414} & W_{3414} & W_{4214} & W_{2314} \\ W_{1234} & W_{1334} & W_{1434} & W_{3434} & W_{4234} & W_{2334} \\ W_{1242} & W_{1342} & W_{1442} & W_{3442} & W_{4242} & W_{2342} \\ W_{1223} & W_{1323} & W_{1423} & W_{3423} & W_{4223} & W_{2323} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B & -A \end{bmatrix}.$$

(Entry-by-entry, \hat{W}_L has the same appearance as (20), though with W_L in place of W ; since \hat{W}_L (always) commutes with $*_L$, its block form is $\hat{W}_L = \begin{bmatrix} -A & -B \\ B & -A \end{bmatrix}$. As a consequence, \hat{W} takes the block form $\hat{W}_L^g = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B & -A \end{bmatrix}$.) Once again, $A = O$ when $W_L(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$, and this occurs if and only if \hat{W}_L^g commutes with the Hodge star $*$ of g (recall (6)). \square

Definition 3 (g -quadratic form of W_L). *Let (M, g) be an oriented Lorentzian 4-manifold whose Weyl tensor W_L satisfies $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some unit-length timelike vector field T on M . Then the function $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}_L^g}$, defined on each 2-plane $P \subseteq T_p M$ by*

$$\text{sec}_{\hat{W}_L^g}(P) := \langle \hat{W}_L^g P, P \rangle_g, \quad (31)$$

with \hat{W}_L^g given by (30), is the g -quadratic form of the Weyl tensor W_L of g_L .

We now arrive at the analogue of Theorem 2:

Theorem 5. *Let (M, g) be an oriented Lorentzian 4-manifold whose Weyl tensor W_L satisfies $W(T, \cdot, \cdot, T) = 0$ for some unit-length timelike vector field T on M . Then at each $p \in M$, W_L is completely determined by the critical points and values of $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}_L^g}$.*

Proof. The proof is identical to [ST69, Theorems 2.1, 2.2] (recall (16) and (17)), the only difference being that \hat{W}_L^g is not the curvature operator \hat{R} of g used in [ST69]. (The proof in [ST69] still goes through here because \hat{W}_L^g is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ -self-adjoint and commutes with $*$.) \square

APPENDIX: DETAILS OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2

The key ingredients in the proof of Theorem 2 are the following canonical bases associated to each Petrov Type:

Proposition 3. *Let $\hat{W}^g : \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ be the complex-linear map of Definition 1. Then at each $p \in M$, the following is true:*

1. *For Petrov Types I or D, \hat{W}^g has a basis of orthogonal spacelike 2-planes.*
2. *For Petrov Types II or N, \hat{W}^g has one spacelike and one lightlike 2-plane as eigenvectors, orthogonal to each other.*
3. *For Petrov Type III, the one linearly independent eigenvector of \hat{W}^g is necessarily a lightlike 2-plane.*

Proof. (This proof is identical [Tho69a, Theorem, p. 3] (see also [Tho69a, Remark (ii), p. 4]), though we write it out in detail here since our operator \hat{W}^g is not the Lorentzian curvature operator to be found therein, since our presentation differs from [Tho69a] in that we omit the derivation of the Jordan forms (26), and finally, since we have separated Types D and N from I and II, respectively, for the sake of Theorem 2 below.) The key to finding the bases alleged is to work with the following complex scalar product on the three-dimensional complex vector space $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$:

$$\mathbf{g}_L(\xi, \eta) := \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_{g_L} - i \langle \xi, *_L \eta \rangle_{g_L}$$

Note that \hat{W}^g is \mathbf{g}_L -self-adjoint, because it is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{g_L}$ -self-adjoint and commutes with $*_L$. Note also that $\xi \in \Lambda^2$ corresponds to a nondegenerate 2-plane in $T_p M$ if and only if $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi, \xi) = \pm 1$, since

$$\mathbf{g}_L(\xi, \xi) = \pm 1 \iff \langle \xi, \xi \rangle_{g_L} = \pm 1 \text{ and } \langle \xi, *_L \xi \rangle_{g_L} = 0 \iff \xi \in G_{\pm}(p). \quad (32)$$

(For proofs of these facts, consult [O'N95, pp. 306 & 362].)

Petrov Type I or D at p : Let $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\} \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ be a basis of eigenvectors for \hat{W}^g , with corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathbb{C}$. If $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$, then $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_i, \xi_j) = 0$ because \hat{W}^g is \mathbf{g}_L -self-adjoint. This immediately implies that if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are distinct and some $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_j, \xi_j) = 0$, then that ξ_j will be \mathbf{g}_L -orthogonal to *all* 2-vectors in $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ —impossible as \mathbf{g}_L is nondegenerate. Thus each $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_j, \xi_j) \neq 0$ if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are distinct. If the latter is true, then we may choose $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ so that $\mathbf{g}_L(\alpha_j \xi_j, \alpha_j \xi_j) = +1$; i.e., so that each eigenvector is a spacelike 2-plane, by (32). (Such complex scalar multiplication will neither change their status as eigenvectors of \hat{W}^g nor change their eigenvalues.) This takes care of the case when $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are distinct. Suppose now that two of them are equal, say $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 \neq \lambda_3$ (as we are still within the case of Petrov Type I, we still have a basis $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$ of eigenvectors). Then $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_3, \xi_3) \neq 0$, by the same reasoning as above. Consider now the two-dimensional λ_1 -eigenspace; it, too, must be \mathbf{g}_L -nondegenerate, hence must contain a \mathbf{g}_L -orthogonal basis. We thus have a \mathbf{g}_L -orthogonal basis $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$ of eigenvectors of \hat{W}^g , no element of which is \mathbf{g}_L -lightlike;

hence, as before, each can be scaled to be a spacelike 2-plane. Finally, the case when all three eigenvalues are equal, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3$, is trivial because then every 2-vector is an eigenvector of \hat{W}^g .

Petrov Type II or N at p : Given the two linearly independent eigenvectors $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\} \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ with, say, ξ_1 having the larger algebraic multiplicity, there exists a 2-vector η satisfying $(\hat{W}^g - \lambda_1 I)\eta = \xi_1$. Then

$$\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_1, \xi_1) = \mathbf{g}_L((\hat{W}^g - \lambda_1 I)\eta, \xi_1) = \mathbf{g}_L(\eta, (\hat{W}^g - \lambda_1 I)\xi_1) = 0, \quad (33)$$

so that ξ_1 must be \mathbf{g}_L -lightlike. But this is the case if and only if $\langle \xi_1, \xi_1 \rangle_{g_L} = \langle \xi_1, *_L \xi_1 \rangle_{g_L} = 0$, which is the case if and only if ξ_1 is a lightlike 2-plane in $T_p M$; i.e., of the form $\xi_1 = v \wedge w$ and g_L -degenerate. Consider now ξ_2 . We claim that it must be \mathbf{g}_L -orthogonal to ξ_1 . Indeed, if $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, then this follows from the \mathbf{g}_L -self-adjointness of \hat{W}^g ; if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, then

$$\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \mathbf{g}_L((\hat{W}^g - \lambda_1 I)\eta, \xi_2) = \mathbf{g}_L(\eta, (\hat{W}^g - \lambda_1 I)\xi_2) = 0.$$

Now suppose $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_2, \xi_2) = 0$ also, so that ξ_1, ξ_2 are \mathbf{g}_L -orthogonal and lightlike. Because \mathbf{g}_L is nondegenerate and $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \eta\}$ is a basis, each $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_j, \eta) \neq 0$. And yet, because any 2-vector $\beta := \alpha_1 \xi_1 + \alpha_2 \xi_2$ will be \mathbf{g}_L -lightlike and orthogonal to ξ_1, ξ_2 , we may choose $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ so that $\mathbf{g}_L(\beta, \eta) = 0$, contradicting the nondegeneracy of \mathbf{g}_L . Therefore we must have $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_2, \xi_2) \neq 0$, in which case we may scale it to satisfy $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi_2, \xi_2) = +1$.

Petrov Type III at p : Let $\xi_1 \in \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ denote \hat{W}^g 's lone linearly independent eigenvector, with eigenvalue λ_1 . Once again, there is a 2-vector η satisfying $(\hat{W}^g - \lambda_1 I)\eta = \xi_1$, so that, via (33), ξ_1 is necessarily a lightlike 2-plane. \square

To connect these bases with $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$, we will need to characterize its critical points in terms of \hat{W}^g :

Proposition 4. *Let $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$ be given by (25) of Definition 2. Then at any $p \in M$, a 2-plane $P \in G_{\pm}(p)$ is a critical point of $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$ if and only if*

$$\hat{W}^g P = aP + b(*_L P)$$

for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. This proof follows exactly as in [Tho69a, Lemma, p. 5], except that we are working with \hat{W}^g in place of the Lorentzian curvature operator; see also [Aaz23, Proposition 1] for a more general case. \square

In any case, we now have the ingredients needed to prove Theorem 2:

Theorem (Classification of Petrov Types). *Assume the hypotheses of Definition 1. Then at each $p \in M$, g has*

1. Petrov Type I $\iff \text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$ has $n = 3$ spacelike critical points.
2. Petrov Types D or N $\iff \text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$ has $n = \infty$ spacelike critical points.
3. Petrov Type II $\iff \text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$ has $n = 1$ spacelike critical point.
4. Petrov Type III $\iff \text{sec}_{\hat{W}^g}$ has $n = 0$ spacelike critical points.

Proof. (Our proof differs from [Tho69a, Theorem, p. 5] in step 2, as we discuss below; also, note once again that we are working with \hat{W}^{g_l} , not the Lorentzian curvature operator as in [Tho69a].) By Proposition 1, \hat{W}^{g_l} is a complex-linear map on $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. By Proposition 4, any $P \in G_{\pm}(p)$ will be a critical point of $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_l}}$ if and only if it is a complex eigenvector of \hat{W}^{g_l} :

$$\hat{W}^{g_l}P = (a + ib)P = aP + b *_L P.$$

In particular, if $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_l}}$ has a spacelike critical point P —i.e., $P \in G_+(p)$ —then it has a timelike critical point, namely, $iP = *_L P \in G_-(p)$, since the latter is, of course, an eigenvector of \hat{W}^{g_l} if P was. Thus if $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_l}}$ has, say, no spacelike critical points (hence no timelike critical points, either), then no nondegenerate 2-planes can be eigenvectors of \hat{W}^{g_l} ; i.e., \hat{W}^{g_l} can only have \mathbf{g}_L -lightlike eigenvectors. By Proposition 3, only Petrov Type III satisfies this criterion. Likewise, if $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_l}}$ has precisely one spacelike critical point (hence precisely one timelike critical point), then \hat{W}^{g_l} can only have one eigenvector from $G_+(p) \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. By Proposition 3, only Petrov Type II satisfies this criterion. Similarly, if $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_l}}$ has three spacelike critical points, then \hat{W}^{g_l} must have three spacelike 2-planes as eigenvectors. By Proposition 3, only Petrov Type I satisfies this criterion. Finally, suppose that two eigenvalues of \hat{W}^{g_l} are equal, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 := \lambda$, hence Types D or N. In either case, denote the two \mathbf{g}_L -orthogonal 2-plane eigenvectors, guaranteed by Proposition 3, by $x \wedge y, v \wedge z$. If Type D, then they are spacelike, and any linear combination $\xi := a(x \wedge y) + b(v \wedge z)$ of them with $a^2 + b^2 = 1$ will yield another spacelike 2-plane: $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi, \xi) = +1$ (recall (32)). Hence there will be infinitely many complex eigenvectors of \hat{W}^{g_l} in $G_+(p)$, hence infinitely many critical points of $\text{sec}_{\hat{W}^{g_l}}$, by Proposition 4. But, as seems not to have been noted by [Tho69a], the same is true for Type N: Although one of these 2-plane eigenvectors, say, $v \wedge z$, is now \mathbf{g}_L -lightlike, nevertheless $\mathbf{g}_L(\xi, \xi) = +1$ for all $\xi := x \wedge y + b(v \wedge z)$ with $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, the case of infinitely many critical points determines the Petrov Type only up to D or N. (This would therefore also be the case for the curvature operator of an Einstein metric g_L in the proof of [Tho69a].) \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is dedicated to John A. Thorpe (1936-2021), whose two beautiful papers [Tho69a; ST69] have been a source of inspiration for the author.

REFERENCES

- [Aaz23] Amir Babak Aazami. “On the Petrov Type of a Riemannian 4-manifold”. In: *arXiv:2309.13717* (2023).
- [Ber61] Marcel Berger. “Sur quelques variétés d’Einstein compactes”. In: *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata* 53.1 (1961), pp. 89–95.
- [Bes07] Arthur L. Besse. *Einstein Manifolds*. Springer, 2007.
- [CT16] Xiaodong Cao and Hung Tran. “The Weyl tensor of gradient Ricci solitons”. In: *Geometry & Topology* 20.1 (2016), pp. 389–436.

- [Hit74] Nigel Hitchin. “Compact four-dimensional Einstein manifolds”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 9.3 (1974), pp. 435–441.
- [LeB04] Claude LeBrun. “Geometry of Twistor Spaces”. In: *Simons Workshop Lecture*. 2004.
- [LeB91] Claude LeBrun. “Explicit self-dual metrics on $\mathbb{C}P_2 \# \cdots \# \mathbb{C}P_2$ ”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 34.1 (1991), pp. 223–253.
- [Lee18] John M. Lee. *Introduction to Riemannian manifolds*. 2nd. Springer, 2018.
- [O’N95] Barrett O’Neill. *The Geometry of Kerr Black Holes*. Wellesley, Mass.: AK Peters, 1995.
- [Pet69] A. Z. Petrov. *Einstein spaces*. Pergamon Press, 1969.
- [Sor+17] Christina Sormani, Denson C. Hill, Paweł Nurowski, Lydia Bieri, David Garfinkle, and Nicolás Yunes. “The Mathematics of Gravitational Waves: A Two-Part Feature”. In: *Notices of the AMS* 64.7 (2017), pp. 684–707.
- [ST69] Isadore M. Singer and John A. Thorpe. The curvature of 4-dimensional Einstein spaces. In *Global Analysis: Papers in Honor of K. Kodaira*, pages 355–365. University of Tokyo Press, 1969.
- [Ste+09] Hans Stephani, Dietrich Kramer, Malcolm MacCallum, Cornelius Hoense-laers, and Eduard Herlt. *Exact Solutions of Einstein’s Field Equations*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
- [Tau92] Clifford Henry Taubes. “The existence of anti-self-dual conformal structures”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 36.1 (1992), pp. 163–253.
- [Tho69a] John A. Thorpe. “Curvature and the Petrov canonical forms”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 10.1 (1969), pp. 1–7.
- [Tho69b] John A. Thorpe. “Some remarks on the Gauss-Bonnet integral”. In: *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics* 18.8 (1969), pp. 779–786.

CLARK UNIVERSITY
 WORCESTER, MA 01610
 Email address: aaazami@clarku.edu