

On the intrinsic geometry of a unit vector field*

Yampolsky A.

Abstract

We study the geometrical properties of a unit vector field on a Riemannian 2-manifold, considering the field as a local imbedding of the manifold into its tangent sphere bundle with the Sasaki metric. For the case of constant curvature K , we give a description of the totally geodesic unit vector fields for $K = 0$ and $K = 1$ and prove a non-existence result for $K \neq 0, 1$. We also found a family ξ_ω of vector fields on the hyperbolic 2-plane L^2 of curvature $-c^2$ which generate foliations on T_1L^2 with leaves of constant intrinsic curvature $-c^2$ and of constant extrinsic curvature $-\frac{c^2}{4}$.

Keywords: Sasaki metric, vector field, sectional curvature, totally geodesic submanifolds.

AMS subject class: Primary 53B25, 53C42; Secondary 46E25, 20C20

Introduction

A unit vector field ξ on a Riemannian manifold M is called *holonomic* if ξ is a field of normals of some family of regular hypersurfaces in M and *non-holonomic* otherwise. The geometry of non-holonomic unit vector fields has been developed by A.Voss at the end of the 19-th century. The foundations of this theory can be found in [1]. Recently, the geometry of a unit vector field has been considered from another point of view. Namely, let T_1M be the unit tangent sphere bundle of M endowed with the Sasaki metric [9]. If ξ is a unit vector field on M , then one may consider ξ as a mapping $\xi : M \rightarrow T_1M$ so that the image $\xi(M)$ is a submanifold in T_1M with the metric induced from T_1M . So, one may apply the methods from the study of the geometry of submanifolds to determine geometrical characteristics of a unit vector field. For example, the unit vector field ξ is said to be *minimal* if $\xi(M)$ is of minimal volume with respect to the induced metric [6]. A number of examples of locally minimal vector unit fields has been found (see [2, 3, 7]). On the other hand, using the geometry of submanifolds, we may find the Riemannian, Ricci or scalar curvature of a unit vector field using the second fundamental form of the submanifold $\xi(M) \in T_1M$ found in [11]. In this paper we apply this approach to the simplest case when the base space is 2-dimensional and hence the submanifold $\xi(M) \in T_1M$ is a hypersurface.

*Comment. Mat. Univ. Carolinae 43, 2 (2002), 299-317.

Aknowlegement. The author expresses his thanks to E.Boeckx for valuable remarks and the referee for careful reading and corrections.

1 The results

Let ξ be a given unit vector field. Denote by e_0 a unit vector field such that $\nabla_{e_0}\xi = 0$. Denote by e_1 a unit vector field, orthogonal to e_0 , such that

$$\nabla_{e_1}\xi = \lambda\eta,$$

where η is a unit vector field, orthogonal to ξ . The function λ is a *signed* singular value of a linear operator $\nabla\xi : TM \rightarrow \xi^\perp$ (acting as $(\nabla\xi)X = \nabla_X\xi$). Set

$$\nabla_\xi\xi = k\eta, \quad \nabla_\eta\eta = \kappa\xi.$$

The functions k and κ are the *signed* geodesic curvatures of the integral curves of the fields ξ and η respectively. We prove that $\lambda^2 = k^2 + \kappa^2$.

Denote the *signed* geodesic curvatures of the integral curves of the fields e_0 and e_1 as μ and σ respectively. Then

$$\nabla_{e_0}e_0 = \mu e_1, \quad \nabla_{e_1}e_1 = \sigma e_0.$$

The orientations of the frames (ξ, η) and (e_0, e_1) are independent. Set $s = 1$ if the orientations are coherent and $s = 0$ otherwise.

The following result (Lemma 3.2) is a basic tool for the study.

Let M be a 2-dimensional Riemannian manifold of Gaussian curvature K . The second fundamental form Ω of the submanifold $\xi(M) \subset T_1M$ is given by

$$\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} & (-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} \\ (-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} & e_1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} \right) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using the formula for the sectional curvature of T_1M^n , we find an expression for the Gaussian curvature of $\xi(M^2)$ (Lemma 3.4).

The Gaussian curvature K_ξ of a hypersurface $\xi(M) \in T_1M$ is given by

$$K_\xi = \frac{K^2}{4} + \frac{K(1-K)}{1+\lambda^2} + (-1)^{s+1} \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda^2} e_0(K) + \frac{1}{2} \mu e_1 \left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda^2} \right) - \left((-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} \right)^2,$$

where K is the Gaussian curvature of M .

As applications of these Lemmas, we prove the following theorems.

Theorem 3.1 *Let M^2 be a Riemannian manifold of constant Gaussian curvature K . A unit vector field ξ generating a totally geodesic submanifold in T_1M^2 exists if and only if $K = 0$ or $K = 1$. Moreover,*

- (a) if $K = 0$, then ξ is either a parallel vector field or moving along a family of parallel geodesics with constant angle speed. Geometrically, $\xi(M^2)$ is either M^2 imbedded isometrically into $M^2 \times S^1$ as a factor or a (helical) flat submanifold in $M^2 \times S^1$;
- (b) if $K = 1$, then ξ is a vector field on a standard sphere S^2 which is parallel along the meridians and moving along the parallels with a unit angle speed. Geometrically, $\xi(M^2)$ is a part of totally geodesic RP^2 locally isometric to sphere S^2 of radius 2 in $T_1S^2 \stackrel{isom}{\approx} RP^3$.

Theorem 3.3 Let M^2 be a space of constant Gaussian curvature K . Suppose that ξ is a unit geodesic vector field on M^2 . Then $\xi(M^2)$ has constant Gaussian curvature in one of the following cases:

- (a) $K = -c^2 < 0$ and ξ is a normal vector field for the family of horocycles on the hyperbolic 2-plane L^2 of curvature $-c^2$. In this case, $K_\xi = -c^2$ and therefore $\xi(M^2)$ is locally isometric the base space;
- (b) $K = 0$ and ξ is a parallel vector field on M^2 . In this case $K_\xi = 0$ and $\xi(M^2)$ is also locally isometric to the base space;
- (c) $K = 1$ and ξ is any (local) geodesic vector field on the standard sphere S^2 . In this case, $K_\xi = 0$.

Theorem 3.4 Let L^2 be a hyperbolic 2-plane of constant curvature $-c^2$. Then T_1L^2 admits a hyperfoliation with leaves of constant intrinsic curvature $-c^2$ and of constant extrinsic curvature $-\frac{c^2}{4}$. The leaves are generated by unit vector fields making a constant angle with a pencil of parallel geodesics on L^2 .

2 Basic definitions and preliminary results

Let (M, g) be an $(n+1)$ – dimensional Riemannian manifold with metric g . Let ∇ denote the Levi-Civita connection on M . Then $\nabla_X \xi$ is always orthogonal to ξ and hence, $(\nabla \xi)X \stackrel{def}{=} \nabla_X \xi : T_p M \rightarrow \xi_p^\perp$ is a linear operator at each $p \in M$. We define an adjoint operator $(\nabla \xi)^* X : \xi_p^\perp \rightarrow T_p M$ by

$$\langle (\nabla \xi)^* X, Y \rangle_g = \langle X, \nabla_Y \xi \rangle_g.$$

Then there is an orthonormal frame e_0, e_1, \dots, e_n in $T_p M$ and an orthonormal frame f_1, \dots, f_n in ξ_p^\perp such that

$$(\nabla \xi)e_0 = 0, \quad (\nabla \xi)e_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha f_\alpha, \quad (\nabla \xi)^* f_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha e_\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ are real-valued functions.

Definition 2.1 The orthonormal frames satisfying (1) are called singular frames for the linear operator $(\nabla \xi)$ and the real valued functions $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ are called the (signed) singular values of the operator $\nabla \xi$ with respect to the singular frame.

Remark that the sign of the singular value is defined up to the directions of the vectors of the singular frame.

For each $\tilde{X} \in T_{(p,\xi)}TM$ there is a decomposition

$$\tilde{X} = X_1^h + X_2^v$$

where $(\cdot)^h$ and $(\cdot)^v$ are the horizontal and vertical lifts of vectors X_1 and X_2 from T_pM to $T_{(p,\xi)}TM$. The Sasaki metric is defined by the scalar product of the form

$$\langle\langle \tilde{X}, \tilde{Y} \rangle\rangle = \langle X_1, Y_1 \rangle + \langle X_2, Y_2 \rangle,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ means the scalar product with respect to metric g .

The following lemma has been proved in [11].

Lemma 2.1 *At each point $(p, \xi) \in \xi(M) \subset TM$ the vectors*

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{e}_0 = e_0^h, \\ \tilde{e}_\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\lambda_\alpha^2}}(e_\alpha^h + \lambda_\alpha f_\alpha^v), \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

form an orthonormal frame in the tangent space of $\xi(M)$ and the vectors

$$\tilde{n}_\sigma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\lambda_\sigma^2}}(-\lambda_\sigma e_\sigma^h + f_\sigma^v), \quad \sigma = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3)$$

form an orthonormal frame in the normal space of $\xi(M)$.

Let $R(X, Y)\xi = [\nabla_X, \nabla_Y]\xi - \nabla_{[X, Y]}\xi$ be the curvature tensor of M . Introduce the following notation

$$r(X, Y)\xi = \nabla_X \nabla_Y \xi - \nabla_{\nabla_X Y} \xi. \quad (4)$$

Then, evidently,

$$R(X, Y)\xi = r(X, Y)\xi - r(Y, X)\xi.$$

The following Lemma has also been proved in [11].

Lemma 2.2 *The components of second fundamental form of $\xi(M) \subset T_1M$ with respect to the frame (3) are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}_{\sigma|00} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\lambda_\sigma^2}} \langle r(e_0, e_0)\xi, f_\sigma \rangle, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\sigma|\alpha 0} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1+\lambda_\sigma^2)(1+\lambda_\alpha^2)}} \left[\langle r(e_\alpha, e_0)\xi + r(e_0, e_\alpha)\xi, f_\sigma \rangle + \lambda_\sigma \lambda_\alpha \langle R(e_\sigma, e_0)\xi, f_\alpha \rangle \right], \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\sigma|\alpha\beta} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1+\lambda_\sigma^2)(1+\lambda_\alpha^2)(1+\lambda_\beta^2)}} \left[\langle r(e_\alpha, e_\beta)\xi + r(e_\beta, e_\alpha)\xi, f_\sigma \rangle + \lambda_\alpha \lambda_\sigma \langle R(e_\sigma, e_\beta)\xi, f_\alpha \rangle + \lambda_\beta \lambda_\sigma \langle R(e_\sigma, e_\alpha)\xi, f_\beta \rangle \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_n; f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ is a singular frame of $(\nabla\xi)$ and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the corresponding singular values.

Let $\tilde{\nabla}$ and ∇ be the Levi-Civita connections of the Sasaki metric of TM and the metric of M respectively. The Kowalski formulas [8] give the covariant derivatives of combinations of lifts of vector fields.

Lemma 2.3 (O.Kowalski) *Let X and Y be vector fields on M . Then at each point $(p, \xi) \in TM$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\nabla}_{X^h} Y^h &= (\nabla_X Y)^h - \frac{1}{2} (R(X, Y)\xi)^v, \\ \tilde{\nabla}_{X^h} Y^v &= \frac{1}{2} (R(\xi, Y)X)^h + (\nabla_X Y)^v, \\ \tilde{\nabla}_{X^v} Y^h &= \frac{1}{2} (R(\xi, X)Y)^h, \\ \tilde{\nabla}_{X^v} Y^v &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

where R is the Riemannian curvature tensor of (M, g) .

This basic result allows to find the curvature tensor of TM (see [8]) and the curvature tensor of T_1M (see [4]). As a corollary, it is not too hard to find an expression for the *sectional curvature* of T_1M . It is well-known that ξ^v is a unit normal for T_1M as a hypersurface in TM . Thus, $\tilde{X} = X_1^h + X_2^v$ is tangent to T_1M if and only if $\langle X_2, \xi \rangle = 0$.

Let $\tilde{X} = X_1^h + X_2^v$ and $\tilde{Y} = Y_1^h + Y_2^v$, where $X_2, Y_2 \in \xi^\perp$, form an orthonormal base of a 2-plane $\tilde{\pi} \subset T_{(p, \xi)}T_1M$. Then we have [5]:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{K}(\tilde{\pi}) &= \langle R(X_1, Y_1)Y_1, X_1 \rangle - \frac{3}{4} \|R(X_1, Y_1)\xi\|^2 + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{4} \|R(\xi, Y_2)X_1 + R(\xi, X_2)Y_1\|^2 + \|X_2\|^2 \|Y_2\|^2 - \langle X_2, Y_2 \rangle^2 + \\ &\quad 3\langle R(X_1, Y_1)Y_2, X_2 \rangle - \langle R(\xi, X_2)X_1, R(\xi, Y_2)Y_1 \rangle + \\ &\quad \langle (\nabla_{X_1} R)(\xi, Y_2)Y_1, X_1 \rangle + \langle (\nabla_{Y_1} R)(\xi, X_2)X_1, Y_1 \rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

Combining the results of Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and (5), we can write an expression for the sectional curvature of $\xi(M)$.

Lemma 2.4 *Let \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} be an orthonormal vectors which span a 2-plane $\tilde{\pi}$ tangent to $\xi(M) \subset T_1M$. Denote by $K_\xi(\tilde{\pi})$ the sectional curvature $\xi(M)$ with respect to metric, induced by Sasaki metric of T_1M . Then*

$$K_\xi(\tilde{\pi}) = \tilde{K}(\tilde{\pi}) + \sum_{\sigma} \left(\Omega_{\sigma|}(\tilde{X}, \tilde{X})\Omega_{\sigma|}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}) - \Omega_{\sigma|}^2(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) \right),\tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{K}(\tilde{\pi})$ is the sectional curvature of T_1M given by (5), $\Omega_{\sigma|}$ are the components of the second fundamental form of $\xi(M)$ given by Lemma 2.2 and the vectors are given with respect to the frame (2).

3 The 2-dimensional case

Let M be a 2-dimensional Riemannian manifold. The following proposition gives useful information about the relation between the singular values of the $(\nabla\xi)$ -operator, geometric characteristics of the integral curves of singular frame and the Gaussian curvature of the manifold.

Lemma 3.1 *Let ξ be a given smooth unit vector field on M^2 . Denote by e_0 a unit vector field on M^2 such that $\nabla_{e_0}\xi = 0$. Let η and e_1 be the unit vector fields on M^2 such that (ξ, η) and (e_0, e_1) form two orthonormal frames on M^2 . Denote by λ a signed singular value of the operator $(\nabla\xi)$. Then we have*

$$\nabla_{e_1}\xi = \lambda\eta,$$

and the following relations hold:

- (a) if $k = \langle \nabla_\xi\xi, \eta \rangle$ is a signed geodesic curvature of a ξ -curve and $\kappa = \langle \nabla_\eta\eta, \xi \rangle$ is a signed geodesic curvature of a η -curve, then

$$\lambda^2 = k^2 + \kappa^2;$$

- (b) if K is the Gaussian curvature of M^2 , then

$$(-1)^s K = e_0(\lambda) - \lambda\sigma,$$

where $\sigma = \langle \nabla_{e_1}e_1, e_0 \rangle$ is a signed geodesic curvature of a e_1 -curve and

$$s = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the frames } (\xi, \eta) \text{ and } (e_0, e_1) \text{ have the same orientation,} \\ 0 & \text{if the frames } (\xi, \eta) \text{ and } (e_0, e_1) \text{ have an opposite orientation} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. (a) If (ξ, η) is an orthonormal frame on M^2 , then

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\xi\xi &= k\eta, & \nabla_\xi\eta &= -k\xi, \\ \nabla_\eta\xi &= -\kappa\eta, & \nabla_\eta\eta &= \kappa\xi. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Geometrically, the functions k and κ are the signed geodesic curvatures of ξ - and η -curves respectively.

In a similar way we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{e_0}e_0 &= \mu e_1, & \nabla_{e_0}e_1 &= -\mu e_0, \\ \nabla_{e_1}e_0 &= -\sigma e_1, & \nabla_{e_1}e_1 &= \sigma e_0, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where μ and σ are the signed geodesic curvatures of the e_0 - and e_1 -curves respectively.

Let ω be an angle function between ξ and e_0 . Then we have two possible decompositions:

$$\text{Or}(+) \begin{cases} e_0 = \cos\omega\xi + \sin\omega\eta, \\ e_1 = -\sin\omega\xi + \cos\omega\eta, \end{cases} \quad \text{Or}(-) \begin{cases} e_0 = \cos\omega\xi + \sin\omega\eta, \\ e_1 = \sin\omega\xi - \cos\omega\eta. \end{cases}$$

In the case $Or(+)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{e_0} \xi &= (k \cos \omega - \kappa \sin \omega) \eta, \\ \nabla_{e_1} \xi &= -(k \sin \omega + \kappa \cos \omega) \eta,\end{aligned}$$

and due to the choice of e_0 and e_1 we see that

$$\begin{cases} k \cos \omega - \kappa \sin \omega &= 0, \\ k \sin \omega + \kappa \cos \omega &= -\lambda. \end{cases}$$

So, for the case of $Or(+)$ $k = -\lambda \sin \omega$, $\kappa = -\lambda \cos \omega$.

In a similar way, for the case of $Or(-)$ $k = \lambda \sin \omega$, $\kappa = \lambda \cos \omega$. In both cases

$$\lambda^2 = k^2 + \kappa^2.$$

(b) Due to the choice of the frames,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle R(e_0, e_1)\xi, \eta \rangle &= \langle \nabla_{e_0} \nabla_{e_1} \xi - \nabla_{e_1} \nabla_{e_0} \xi - \nabla_{\nabla_{e_0} e_1 - \nabla_{e_1} e_0} \xi, \eta \rangle = \\ &\langle \nabla_{e_0} (\lambda \eta) - \nabla_{-\mu e_0 + \sigma e_1} \xi, \eta \rangle = e_0(\lambda) - \lambda \sigma.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\langle R(e_0, e_1)\xi, \eta \rangle = \begin{cases} -K & \text{for the case of } Or(+), \\ +K & \text{for the case of } Or(-). \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Set $s = 1$ for the case $Or(+)$ and $s = 0$ for the case $Or(-)$. Combining the results, we get $(-1)^s K = e_0(\lambda) - \lambda \sigma$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

The result of Lemma 2.2 can also be simplified in the following way.

Lemma 3.2 *Let M be a 2-dimensional Riemannian manifold of Gaussian curvature K . In terms of Lemma 3.1 the second fundamental form of the submanifold $\xi(M) \subset T_1 M$ can be presented in two equivalent forms:*

(i)

$$\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} & (-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} \\ (-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} & e_1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} \right) \end{bmatrix},$$

(ii)

$$\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} & \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda^2}{1+\lambda^2} e_0(\lambda) \right) \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma \lambda + \frac{1-\lambda^2}{1+\lambda^2} e_0(\lambda) \right) & e_1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} \right) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof.

At each point $(p, \xi) \in \xi(M)$ the vectors

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{e}_0 = e_0^h, \\ \tilde{e}_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}(e_1^h + \lambda\eta^v) \end{cases}$$

form an orthonormal frame in the tangent space of $\xi(M)$ and

$$\tilde{n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}(-\lambda e_1^h + \eta^v),$$

is a unit normal for $\xi(M) \subset T_1M$.

Thus we see that in a 2-dimensional case the components of Ω take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{00} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} \langle r(e_0, e_0)\xi, \eta \rangle, & \Omega_{11} &= \frac{1}{(1+\lambda^2)^{3/2}} \langle r(e_1, e_1)\xi, \eta \rangle, \\ \Omega_{01} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2} \left[\langle r(e_1, e_0)\xi + r(e_0, e_1)\xi, \eta \rangle + \lambda^2 \langle R(e_1, e_0)\xi, \eta \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Keeping in mind (4), (8) and (9), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle r(e_0, e_0)\xi, \eta \rangle &= -\mu\lambda, & \langle r(e_0, e_1)\xi, \eta \rangle &= e_0(\lambda), \\ \langle r(e_1, e_0)\xi, \eta \rangle &= \sigma\lambda, & \langle r(e_1, e_1)\xi, \eta \rangle &= e_1(\lambda), \\ \langle R(e_0, e_1)\xi, \eta \rangle &= (-1)^s K. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{00} &= -\mu \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}, & \Omega_{11} &= \frac{e_1(\lambda)}{(1+\lambda^2)^{3/2}} = e_1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} \right), \\ \Omega_{01} &= \frac{1}{2(1+\lambda^2)} (e_0(\lambda) + \lambda\sigma - \lambda^2(-1)^s K) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma\lambda + \frac{1-\lambda^2}{1+\lambda^2} e_0(\lambda) \right) \end{cases}, \end{aligned}$$

where Lemma 3.1 (b) has been applied in two ways. ■

3.1 Totally geodesic vector fields

The main goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *Let M^2 be a Riemannian manifold of constant Gaussian curvature K . A unit vector field ξ generating a totally geodesic submanifold in T_1M^2 exists if and only if $K = 0$ or $K = 1$. Moreover,*

- a) if $K = 0$, then ξ is either a parallel vector field or is moving along a family of parallel geodesics with constant angle speed. Geometrically, $\xi(M^2)$ is either M^2 imbedded isometrically into $M^2 \times S^1$ as a factor or a (helical) flat submanifold in $M^2 \times S^1$;
- b) if $K = 1$, then ξ is a vector field on a sphere S^2 which is parallel along the meridians and moving along the parallels with a unit angle speed. Geometrically, $\xi(M^2)$ is a part of totally geodesic RP^2 locally isometric to sphere S^2 of radius 2 in $T_1S^2 \stackrel{isom}{\approx} RP^3$.

The proof will be divided into a series of separate propositions.

Proposition 3.1 *Let M^2 be a Riemannian manifold. Let D be a domain in M^2 endowed with a semi-geodesic coordinate system such that $ds^2 = du^2 + f^2 dv^2$, where $f(u, v)$ is some non-vanishing function. Denote by (e_0, e_1) an orthonormal frame in D and specify $e_0 = \partial_u$, $e_1 = f^{-1}\partial_v$. If ξ is a unit vector field in D parallel along u -geodesics, then ξ can be written given as*

$$\xi = \cos \omega e_0 + \sin \omega e_1,$$

where $\omega = \omega(v)$ is an angle function and

- (a) a singular frame for ξ may be chosen as $\{e_0, e_1, \eta = -\sin \omega e_0 + \cos \omega e_1\}$;
(b) a singular value for ξ in this case is $\lambda = e_1(\omega) - \sigma$, where σ is a signed geodesic curvature of the e_1 -curves.

Proof. Indeed, if ξ is parallel along u -geodesics, then evidently the angle function ω between ξ and the u -curves does not depend on u . So this function has the form $\omega = \omega(v)$ and $\xi = \cos \omega e_0 + \sin \omega e_1$. Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{e_0} e_0 &= 0, & \nabla_{e_0} e_1 &= 0, \\ \nabla_{e_1} e_0 &= \frac{f_u}{f} e_1, & \nabla_{e_1} e_1 &= -\frac{f_u}{f} e_0, \end{aligned}$$

we see that $\sigma = -\frac{f_u}{f}$ and $\nabla_{e_1} \xi = (e_1(\omega) - \sigma) \eta$, where $\eta = -\sin \omega e_0 + \cos \omega e_1$. Therefore, $\lambda = e_1(\omega) - \sigma$ and the proof is complete. ■

Proposition 3.2 *Let M^2 be a Riemannian manifold of constant negative curvature $K = -r^{-2} < 0$. Then there is no totally geodesic unit vector field on M^2 .*

Proof. Suppose ξ is totally geodesic unit vector field on M^2 . Set $\Omega \equiv 0$ in Lemma 3.2. Then $\lambda\mu \equiv 0$. If $\lambda \equiv 0$ in some domain $D \subset M^2$, then ξ is parallel in this domain and hence M^2 is flat in D , which contradicts the hypothesis. Suppose that $\mu \equiv 0$ at least in some domain $D \subset M^2$. This means that e_0 -curves are geodesics in D and the field ξ is parallel along them. Choose a family of e_0 -curves and the orthogonal trajectories as a local coordinate net in D . Then the first fundamental form of M^2 takes the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + f^2 dv^2,$$

where $f(u, v)$ is some function. Since M^2 is of constant curvature $K = -\frac{1}{r^2}$, the function f satisfies the equation

$$f_{uu} - \frac{1}{r^2}f = 0.$$

The general solution of this equation is

$$f(u, v) = A(v) \cosh(u/r) + B(v) \sinh(u/r).$$

There are two possible cases:

- (i) $A^2(v) \equiv B^2(v)$ over the whole domain D ;
- (ii) $A^2(v) \neq B^2(v)$ in some subdomain $D' \subset D$.

Case (i). In this case, in dependence of the signs of $A(v)$ and $B(v)$,

$$f(u, v) = A(v)e^{u/r} \quad \text{or} \quad f(u, v) = A(v)e^{-u/r}.$$

Consider the first case (the second case can be reduced to the first one after the parameter change $u \rightarrow -u$). Making an evident v -parameter change, we reduce the metric to the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + r^2 e^{2u/r} dv^2.$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 for $f = re^{u/r}$, we get $\lambda = \frac{1}{r}(\omega' e^{-u/r} + 1)$. Setting $\Omega_{11} \equiv 0$, we see that $e_1(\lambda) \equiv 0$. Hence $\omega'' = 0$, i.e., $\omega = av + b$. Therefore,

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{r} \left(a e^{-u/r} + 1 \right).$$

Considering $\Omega_{01} \equiv 0$ (with $s = 1$ because of $Or(+)$ -case), we get

$$-\frac{1}{2r^2} + \frac{\frac{1}{r}e_0(ae^{-u/r} + 1)}{1 + \frac{1}{r^2}(e^{-u/r}a + 1)^2} = -\frac{(\frac{1}{r^2} + 1)(ae^{-u/r} + 1)^2 - a^2e^{-2u/r}}{2r^2[1 + \frac{1}{r^2}(ae^{-u/r} + 1)^2]} \neq 0,$$

and hence, this case is not possible.

Case (ii). Choose a subdomain $D' \subset D$ such that $A^2(v) < B^2(v)$ or $A^2(v) > B^2(v)$ over D' . Then the function f may be presented respectively in two forms:

- (a) $f(u, v) = \sqrt{B^2 - A^2} \sinh(u/r + \theta)$ or
- (b) $f(u, v) = \sqrt{A^2 - B^2} \cosh(u/r + \theta)$,

where $\theta(v)$ is some function.

Consider the case (a). After a v -parameter change, the metric in D' takes the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + r^2 \sinh^2(u/r + \theta) dv^2.$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 for $f = r \sinh(u/r + \theta)$, we get

$$\lambda = \frac{\omega'}{r \sinh(u/r + \theta)} + \frac{1}{r} \coth(u/r + \theta).$$

Considering $\Omega_{11} \equiv 0$, we have $e_1(\lambda) \equiv 0$ which implies the identity

$$\omega'' \sinh(u/r + \theta) - \omega' \theta' \cosh(u/r + \theta) - \theta' \equiv 0.$$

From this we get $\omega'' = 0$, $\theta' = 0$ and hence $\begin{cases} \theta = \text{const}, \\ \omega = av + b \end{cases}$ ($a, b = \text{const}$).

After a parameter change we reduce the metric to the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + r^2 \sinh^2(u/r) dv^2$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 for $f = r \sinh(u/r)$, we get $\lambda = \frac{a + \cosh(u/r)}{r \sinh(u/r)}$. The substitution into Ω_{01} gives

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\frac{1}{r^2} + 1)[a + \cosh(u/r)]^2 - a^2 + 1}{r^2 \sinh^2(u/r) + [a + \cosh(u/r)]^2} \neq 0,$$

which completes the proof for the polar case.

The *Cartesian* case consideration gives $\omega = av + b$, $\lambda = \frac{a + \sinh(u/r)}{r \cosh(u/r)}$ and

$$\Omega_{01} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\frac{1}{r^2} + 1)[a + \sinh(u/r)]^2 - a^2 - 1}{r^2 \cosh^2(u/r) + [a + \sinh(u/r)]^2} \neq 0, \text{ which completes the proof.}$$

■

Proposition 3.3 *Let M^2 be a Riemannian manifold of constant positive curvature $K = r^{-2} > 0$. Then a totally geodesic unit vector field ξ on M^2 exists if $r = 1$ and ξ is parallel along the meridians of M^2 locally isometric to S^2 and moves along the parallels with a unit angle speed. Geometrically, $\xi(M^2)$ is a part of totally geodesic RP^2 locally isometric to sphere S^2 of radius 2 in $T_1 S^2 \stackrel{\text{isom}}{\approx} RP^3$.*

Proof. Suppose ξ is totally geodesic unit vector field on M^2 . The same arguments as in Proposition 3.2 lead to the case $\mu \equiv 0$ at least in some domain $D \subset M^2$. So, choose again a family of e_0 -curves and the orthogonal trajectories as a local coordinate net in D . Then the first fundamental form of M^2 can be expressed as $ds^2 = du^2 + f^2 dv^2$, where $f(u, v)$ is some function. Since M^2 is of constant curvature $K = r^{-2}$, the function f satisfies the equation

$$f_{uu} + \frac{1}{r^2} f = 0.$$

The general solution of this equation $f(u, v) = A(v) \cos(u/r) + B(v) \sin(u/r)$ may be presented in two forms:

- (a) $f(u, v) = \sqrt{A^2 + B^2} \sin(u/r + \theta)$ or
- (b) $f(u, v) = \sqrt{A^2 + B^2} \cos(u/r + \theta),$

where $\theta(v)$ is some function.

Consider first, the case (a). After v -parameter change, the metric in D takes the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + r^2 \sin^2(u/r + \theta) dv^2.$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 for $f = r \sin(u/r + \theta)$, we get

$$\lambda = \frac{\omega'}{r \sin(u/r + \theta)} + \frac{1}{r} \cot(u/r + \theta).$$

Setting $\Omega_{11} \equiv 0$, we find $e_1(\lambda) \equiv 0$ which implies the identity

$$\omega'' \sin(u/r + \theta) - \omega' \theta' \cos(u/r + \theta) + \theta' \equiv 0.$$

From this $\omega'' = 0$, $\theta' = 0$ and we have again $\begin{cases} \theta = \text{const}, \\ \omega = av + b \end{cases}$ $a, b = \text{const}$.

After a suitable u -parameter change, we reduce the metric to the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + r^2 \sin^2(u/r) dv^2$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 for $f = r \sin(u/r)$, we get $\lambda = \frac{a + \cos(u/r)}{r \sin(u/r)}$. Substitution into Ω_{01} gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\frac{1}{r^2} - 1)[a + \cos(u/r)]^2 + a^2 - 1}{r^2 \sin^2(u/r) + [a + \cos(u/r)]^2} \equiv 0,$$

which is possible only if $r = 1$ and $|a| = 1$. So, we obtain to the standard sphere metric

$$ds^2 = du^2 + \sin^2 u dv^2$$

and (after the $\pm v + b \rightarrow v$ parameter change) the unit vector field

$$\xi = \left\{ \cos v, \frac{\sin v}{\sin u} \right\}.$$

This vector field is parallel along the meridians of S^2 and moves helically along the parallels of S^2 with unit angle speed.

For the case (b) one can find $\omega = av + b$, $\lambda = \frac{a - \sin(u/r)}{r \cos(u/r)}$ and

$$\Omega_{01} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\frac{1}{r^2} - 1)[a - \sin(u/r)]^2 + a^2 - 1}{r^2 \cos^2(u/r) + [a - \sin(u/r)]^2} \equiv 0,$$

which gives $r = 1$ and $|a| = 1$ as a result. Thus, we have a metric

$$ds^2 = du^2 + \cos^2 u dv^2$$

and a vector field $\xi = \left\{ \cos v, \frac{\sin v}{\cos u} \right\}$. It is easy to see that the results of cases (a) and (b) are geometrically equivalent.

Introduce the local coordinates (u, v, ω) on T_1S^2 , where ω is the angle between arbitrary unit vector ξ and the coordinate vector field $X_1 = \{1, 0\}$. The first fundamental form of T_1S^2 with respect to these coordinates is [10]

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = du^2 + dv^2 + 2 \cos u \, dv \, d\omega + d\omega^2.$$

The local parameterization of the submanifold $\xi(S^2)$, generated by the given field, is $\omega = v$ and the induced metric on $\xi(S^2)$ is

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = du^2 + 2(1 + \cos u) \, dv^2 = du^2 + 4 \cos^2 u / 2 \, dv^2.$$

Thus, $\xi(S^2)$ is locally isometric to sphere S^2 of radius 2. Since $T_1S^2 \stackrel{isom}{\approx} RP^3$ and there are no other totally geodesic submanifolds in RP^3 except RP^2 , we see that $\xi(S^2)$ is a part of RP^2 . So the proof is complete. ■

Proposition 3.4 *Let M^2 be a Riemannian manifold of constant zero curvature $K = 0$. Then a totally geodesic unit vector field ξ on M^2 is either parallel or moves along the family of parallel geodesics with constant angle speed. Geometrically, $\xi(M^2)$ is either E^2 imbedded isometrically into $E^2 \times S^1$ as a factor or a helical flat submanifold in $E^2 \times S^1$.*

Proof. Suppose ξ is totally geodesic unit vector field on M^2 . Set $\Omega \equiv 0$ in Lemma 3.2. Then $\lambda\mu \equiv 0$. If $\lambda \equiv 0$ over some domain $D \subset M^2$, then ξ is parallel in this domain.

Suppose $\lambda \neq 0$ in a domain $D \subset M^2$. Then $\mu \equiv 0$ on at least a subdomain $D' \subset D$. This means that the e_0 -curves are geodesics in D' and the field ξ is parallel along them. Choose a family of e_0 -curves and the orthogonal trajectories as a local coordinate net in D' . Then the first fundamental form of M^2 takes the form $ds^2 = du^2 + f^2 dv^2$ and since M^2 is of zero curvature, f satisfies the equation

$$f_{uu} = 0.$$

A general solution of this equation is $f(u, v) = A(v)u + B(v)$. There are two possible cases:

- (a) $A(v) \neq 0$ in some subdomain $D'' \subset D'$;
- (b) $A(v) \equiv 0$ over the whole domain D' .

Case(a). The function f may be presented over D'' in the form

$$f(u, v) = A(v)(u + \theta),$$

where $\theta(v) = B(v)/A(v)$. After a v -parameter change, the metric in D'' takes the form $ds^2 = du^2 + (u + \theta)^2 dv^2$. Applying Proposition 3.1 for $f = u + \theta$, we get $\lambda = \frac{\omega' + 1}{u + \theta}$. Setting $\Omega_{11} \equiv 0$, we obtain the identity

$$\omega''(u + \theta) - (\omega' + 1)\theta' \equiv 0.$$

From this we get $\begin{cases} \omega'' = 0 \\ \omega' = -1 \end{cases}$ or $\begin{cases} \omega'' = 0 \\ \theta' = 0 \end{cases}$. In the first case, $\lambda = 0$ and the field ξ is parallel again. In the second case $\begin{cases} \theta = \text{const}, \\ \omega = av + b \end{cases}$ $a, b = \text{const}$.

Making a parameter change, we reduce the metric to the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + u^2 dv^2$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 with $f(u, v) = u$, we get $\lambda = \frac{a+1}{u}$. The substitution into Ω_{01} gives the condition

$$-\frac{a+1}{u^2 + (a+1)^2} = 0$$

which is possible only if $a = -1$. But this means that again $\lambda = 0$ and hence ξ is a parallel vector field.

Case (b). After a v -parameter change, the metric takes the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + dv^2.$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 for $f \equiv 1$, we get $\lambda = \omega'$. Setting $\Omega_{11} \equiv 0$, we find $\omega'' \equiv 0$. This means that $\omega = av + b$ and ξ is either parallel along the u -lines ($a = 0$) or moves along the u -lines helically with constant angle speed.

Let (u, v, ω) be standard coordinates in $E^2 \times S^1$. Then the first fundamental form of $E^2 \times S^1$ is

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = du^2 + dv^2 + d\omega^2.$$

If $a = 0$, then with respect to these coordinates the local parameterization of $\xi(E^2)$ is $\omega = \text{const}$ and $\xi(E^2)$ is nothing else but E^2 isometrically imbedded into $E^2 \times S^1$. If $a \neq 0$, then the local parameterization of $\xi(E^2)$ is $\omega = av + b$ and the induced metric is

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = du^2 + (1 + a^2) dv^2$$

which is flat. The imbedding is helical in the sense that this submanifold meets each flat element of the cylinder $p : E^2 \times S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ under constant angle $\varphi = \arccos \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+a^2}}$. So the proof is complete. ■

3.2 The curvature

The main goal of this section is to obtain an explicit formula for the Gaussian curvature of $\xi(M^2)$ and apply it to some specific cases. The first step is the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3 *Let ξ be a unit vector field on a 2-dimensional Riemannian manifold of Gaussian curvature K . In terms of Lemma 3.1, the sectional curvature $K_{T_1M}(\xi)$ of T_1M along 2-planes tangent to $\xi(M)$ is given by*

$$K_{T_1M}(\xi) = \frac{K^2}{4} + \frac{K(1-K)}{1+\lambda^2} + (-1)^{s+1} \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda^2} e_0(K).$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\pi}$ be a 2-plane tangent to $\xi(M)$. Then $\tilde{X} = e_0^h$ and $\tilde{Y} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}(e_1^h + \lambda\eta^v)$ form an orthonormal basis of $\tilde{\pi}$. So we may apply (5) setting $\tilde{X}_1 = e_0$, $\tilde{X}_2 = 0$, $Y_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}e_1$, $Y_2 = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}\eta$.

We get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle R(X_1, Y_1)Y_1, X_1 \rangle &= \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2} \langle R(e_0, e_1)e_1, e_0 \rangle = \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2}K, \\ \|R(X_1, Y_1)\xi\|^2 &= \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2} \|R(e_0, e_1)\xi\|^2 = \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2}K^2, \\ \|R(\xi, Y_2)X_1\|^2 &= \frac{\lambda^2}{1+\lambda^2} \|R(\xi, \eta)e_0\|^2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{1+\lambda^2}K^2, \\ \langle (\nabla_{X_1}R)(\xi, Y_2)Y_1, X_1 \rangle &= \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda^2} \langle (\nabla_{e_0}R)(\xi, \eta)e_1, e_0 \rangle = -(-1)^s \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda^2}e_0(K),\end{aligned}$$

where K is the Gaussian curvature of M . Applying directly (5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}K_{T_1M}(\xi) &= \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2} \left(K - \frac{3}{4}K^2 + \frac{\lambda^2K^2}{4} + (-1)^{s+1}\lambda e_0(K) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2} \left(K(1-K) + \frac{(1+\lambda^2)K^2}{4} + (-1)^{s+1}\lambda e_0(K) \right) \\ &= \frac{K^2}{4} + \frac{K(1-K)}{1+\lambda^2} + (-1)^{s+1} \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda^2} e_0(K).\end{aligned}$$

■

Now we have the following.

Lemma 3.4 *Let ξ be a unit vector field on a 2-dimensional Riemannian manifold M . In terms of Lemma 3.1, the Gaussian curvature K_ξ of the hypersurface $\xi(M) \in T_1M$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}K_\xi &= \frac{K^2}{4} + \frac{K(1-K)}{1+\lambda^2} + (-1)^{s+1} \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda^2} e_0(K) + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2}\mu e_1 \left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda^2} \right) - \left((-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} \right)^2,\end{aligned}$$

where K is the Gaussian curvature of M .

Proof. In our case, one can easily reduce the formula (6) to the form

$$K_\xi = K_{T_1M}(\xi) + \det \Omega.$$

Applying Lemma 3.2, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\det \Omega &= -\mu \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} e_1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} \right) - \left((-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} \right)^2 = \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\mu e_1 \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{1+\lambda^2} \right) - \left((-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} \right)^2 = \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mu e_1 \left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda^2} \right) - \left((-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1+\lambda^2} \right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this result with Lemma 3.3, we get what was claimed. ■

As an application of Lemma 3.4 we prove the following theorems.

Theorem 3.2 *Let M^2 be a 2-dimensional Riemannian manifold of Gaussian curvature K . Suppose that ξ is a unit geodesic vector field on M^2 . Then the submanifold $\xi(M^2) \subset T_1M^2$ has non-positive extrinsic curvature.*

Proof. By definition, the extrinsic curvature of a submanifold is the difference between the sectional curvature of the submanifold and the sectional curvature of ambient space along the planes, tangent to the submanifold. In our case, this is $\det \Omega$. If ξ is a geodesic vector field, then we may choose $e_0 = \xi$ and then $\mu = k = 0$. Therefore, for the extrinsic curvature we get

$$- \left((-1)^{s+1} \frac{K}{2} + \frac{e_0(\lambda)}{1 + \lambda^2} \right)^2 \leq 0.$$

■

Theorem 3.3 *Let M^2 be a space of constant Gaussian curvature K . Suppose that ξ is a unit geodesic vector field on M^2 . Then $\xi(M^2)$ has constant Gaussian curvature in one of the following cases:*

- (a) $K = -c^2 < 0$ and ξ is a normal vector field for the family of horocycles on the hyperbolic 2-plane L^2 . In this case $K_\xi = -c^2$ and therefore $\xi(L^2)$ is locally isometric to L^2 ;
- (b) $K = 0$ and ξ is a parallel vector field on M^2 . In this case $K_\xi = 0$ and $\xi(M^2)$ is also locally isometric to M^2 ;
- (c) $K = 1$ and ξ is any (local) geodesic vector field on the standard sphere S^2 . In this case $K_\xi = 0$.

Proof.

Since ξ is geodesic, we may set $e_0 = \xi$, $e_1 = \eta$, $s = 1$. Taking into account (7) and (8), we see that $\lambda = -\kappa = -\sigma$. Lemma 3.1 (b) gives $-K = -e_0(\sigma) + \sigma^2$. So the result of Lemma 3.4 takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} K_\xi &= \frac{K^2}{4} + \frac{K(1-K)}{1+\sigma^2} - \left(\frac{K}{2} - \frac{e_0(\sigma)}{1+\sigma^2} \right)^2 = \\ &= \frac{K^2}{4} + \frac{K(1-K)}{1+\sigma^2} - \left(\frac{K}{2} - \frac{K+\sigma^2}{1+\sigma^2} \right)^2 = \\ &= \frac{K(1-K)}{1+\sigma^2} + \frac{K(K+\sigma^2)}{1+\sigma^2} - \left(\frac{K+\sigma^2}{1+\sigma^2} \right)^2 = \\ &= K - \left(\frac{K+\sigma^2}{1+\sigma^2} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that K_ξ is constant. Then the following cases should be considered:

(a) $\sigma = \text{const} \neq 0$. This means that the orthogonal trajectories of the field ξ consist of curves of constant curvature. With respect to this natural coordinate system, the metric of M^2 takes the form $ds^2 = du^2 + f^2 dv^2$. Set $\sigma = -c$. Then the function f should satisfy the equation

$$\frac{f_u}{f} = c$$

the general solution of which is $f(u, v) = A(v)e^{cu}$. After v -parameter change we obtain metric of the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + e^{2cu} dv^2.$$

So, the manifold M^2 is locally isometric to the hyperbolic 2-plane L^2 of curvature $-c^2$ and the field ξ is a geodesic field of (internal or external) normals to the family of horocycles.

(b) $\sigma = 0$. Then evidently ξ is a parallel vector field and therefore the manifold M^2 is locally Euclidean which implies $K_\xi = 0$.

(c) σ is not constant. Then K_ξ is constant if $K = 1$ only. So, M^2 is contained in a standard sphere S^2 and the curvature of $\xi(S^2)$ does not depend on σ . Thus, the field ξ is any (local) geodesic vector field. Evidently, $K_\xi = 0$ for this case. ■

The case (a) of the Theorem 3.3 has an interesting generalization of the following kind.

Theorem 3.4 *Let L^2 be a hyperbolic 2-plane of curvature $-c^2$. Then T_1L^2 admits a hyperfoliation with leaves of constant intrinsic curvature $-c^2$ and of constant extrinsic curvature $-\frac{c^2}{4}$. The leaves are generated by unit vector fields making a constant angle with a pencil of parallel geodesics on L^2 .*

Proof. Consider L^2 with metric $ds^2 = du^2 + e^{2cu} dv^2$ and a family of vector fields

$$\xi_\omega = \cos \omega X_1 + \sin \omega X_2 \quad (\omega = \text{const}),$$

where $X_1 = \{1, 0\}$, $X_2 = \{0, e^{-cu}\}$ are the unit vector fields.

Since $\nabla_{X_1} \xi_\omega = 0$, we may set $e_0 = X_1$, $e_1 = X_2$ and therefore we have $\sigma = -c$, $\lambda = c$. Then, setting $K = -c^2$ and $\lambda = c$ in Lemma 3.4, we get

$$K_\xi = -c^2.$$

The extrinsic curvature of $\xi(L^2)$ is also constant since

$$\det \Omega = -\frac{1}{4}c^2.$$

Now fix a point P_∞ at infinity boundary of L^2 and draw a pencil of parallel geodesics from P_∞ through each point of L^2 . Define a family of submanifolds $\xi_\omega(L^2)$ for this pencil. Evidently, through each point $(p, \zeta) \in T_1L^2$ there passes only one submanifold of this family. Thus, a family of submanifolds ξ_ω form a

hyperfoliation on T_1L^2 of constant intrinsic curvature $-c^2$ and constant extrinsic curvature $-\frac{c^2}{4}$.

Geometrically, $\xi_\omega(L^2)$ is a family of coordinate hypersurfaces $\omega = \text{const}$ in T_1L^2 . Indeed, let (u, v, ω) form a natural local coordinate system on T_1L^2 . Then the metric of T_1L^2 has the form

$$ds^2 = du^2 + 2e^{2u}dv^2 + 2dv d\omega + d\omega^2.$$

With respect to these coordinates, the coordinate hypersurface $\omega = \text{const}$ is nothing else but $\xi_\omega(L^2)$ and the induced metric is

$$ds^2 = du^2 + 2e^{2cu}dv^2.$$

Evidently, its Gaussian curvature is constant and equal to $-c^2$.

■

References

- [1] Aminov Yu. The geometry of vector fields.//Gordon&Breach Publ., 2000.
- [2] Boeckx E., Vanhecke L. Harmonic and minimal radial vector fields.// Acta Math. Hungar. 90(2001), 317-331.
- [3] Boeckx E., Vanhecke L. Harmonic and minimal vector fields on tangent and unit tangent bundles.// Differential Geom. Appl.13 (2000), 77-93.
- [4] Boeckx E., Vanhecke L. Characteristic reflections on unit tangent sphere bundle.// Houston J. Math. 23(1997), 427-448.
- [5] Borisenko A., Yampolsky A. The sectional curvature of the Sasaki metric of T_1M^n .//Ukr. Geom. Sb. 30 (1987), 10-17. (Engl. transl.: J. Sov. Math. 51(1990), No 5, 2503-2508).
- [6] Gluck H., Ziller W. On the volume of a unit vector field on the three-sphere. // Comm. Math. Helv. 61 (1986), 177-192.
- [7] González-Dávila J.C., Vanhecke L. Examples of minimal unit vector fields.// Ann Global Anal. Geom. 18 (2000), 385-404.
- [8] Kowalski O. Curvature of the induced Riemannian metric on the tangent bundle of a Riemannian manifold.// J. Reine Angew. Math. 250(1971), 124-129.
- [9] Sasaki S. On the differential geometry of tangent bundles of Riemannian manifolds. // Tôhoku Math. J. 10 (1958), 338-354.
- [10] Klingenberg W, Sasaki S. Tangent sphere bundle of a 2- sphere.// Tôhoku Math. J. 27 (1975), 45-57.

- [11] Yampolsky A. On the mean curvature of a unit vector field.// Math. Publ. Debrecen, 2002, to appear.

Department of Geometry,
Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics,
Kharkiv National University,
Svobody Sq. 4,
61077, Kharkiv,
Ukraine.
e-mail: yamp@univer.kharkov.ua