TSUKUBA J. MATH.
Vol. 22 No. 1 (1998), 113-119

TOTALLY COMPLEX SUBMANIFOLDS OF THE CAYLEY PROJECTIVE PLANE

By

Liu XIMIN

Abstract. Let K be the sectional curvature of a compact submanifold M of the Cayley projective plane CaP^2. In this paper, we prove that the compact totally complex submanifold M of complex dimension 2 in CaP^2 satisfying $K > (1/8)$ is totally geodesic and $M = CP^2$.

1. Introduction

Let M be an n-dimensional compact Kaehler submanifold of complex projective space $CP^m(1)$. Denote by K the sectional curvature of M. In [6], Ros and Verstraelen showed that if $K > (1/8)$, then M is totally geodesic. The analogous result in the case of totally complex submanifolds of quaternion projective space $HP^m(1)$ was obtained by Xia [7]. In the present paper, we prove the following same type result for totally complex submanifolds of the Cayley projective plane CaP^2.

THEOREM. *Let M be a compact totally complex submanifold of complex dimension* 2, *immersed in the Cayley projective plane CaP^2. If the sectional curvature K of M satisfying $K > (1/8)$, then M is totally geodesic in CaP^2 and $M^2 = CP^2$.*

2. Cayley projective plane

In this section, we review simply the fundamental results about the Cayley projective plane, for details see [4].

Key words and phrases. totally complex submanifold, Cayley projective plane, sectional curvature.
1991 Mathematics Subject Classifications. 53C42, 53C40.
Received July 3, 1996
Revised October 14, 1996

Let us denote by Ca the Cayley number, it possesses a multiplicative identity 1 and a positive definite bilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ with norm $\|a\| = \langle a,a\rangle$, satisfying $\|ab\| = \|a\|\,\|b\|$, for $a, b \in Ca$. Every element $a \in Ca$ can be expressed in the form $a = a_0 1 + a_1$ for $a_0 \in R$ and $\langle a_1, 1\rangle = 0$. The conjugation map $a \to a^* = a_0 1 - a_1$ is an anti-automorphism $(ab)^* = b^* a^*$.

A canonical basis for Ca is any basis of the form $\{1, e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_6\}$ satisfying: (i) $\langle e_i, 1\rangle = 0$; (ii) $\langle e_i, e_j\rangle = \{0 \text{ for } i \neq j, \text{and } 1 \text{ otherwise}\}$; (iii) $e_i^2 = -1$; $e_i e_j + e_j e_i = 0$ $(i \neq j)$; (iv) $e_i e_{i+1} = e_{i+3}$ for $i \in Z_7$.

Let V be a vector space of real dimension 16 with automorphism group Spin(9). the splitting

$$V = Ca \oplus Ca$$

together with the above canonical basis on each summand, endows V with what we may refer to as a Cayley structure. We know that the Cayley projective plane CaP^2 is the 16-dimensional Riemannian symmetric space whose tangent space admits the Cayley structure pointwise. In the following, let $\{I_0, \ldots, I_6\}$ be the Cayley structure on CaP^2.

The curvature tensor $\bar{R}$ of CaP^2 is given in [2] as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}((a,b),(c,d))(e,f) = \frac{1}{4}((4\langle c,e\rangle a - 4\langle a,e\rangle c + (ed)b^* - (eb)d^* \\ + (ad - cb)f^*), (4\langle d,f\rangle b - 4\langle b,f\rangle d + a^*(cf) \\ - c^*(af) - e^*(ad - cb))). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

On $Ca \oplus Ca$ we have the positive definite bilinear form $\langle\,,\,\rangle$ given by

$$\langle (a,b),(c,d)\rangle = \langle a,c\rangle + \langle b,d\rangle. \tag{2.2}$$

3. Totally complex submanifolds

Let $V \subset T_x CaP^2$ be a real vector subspace, we say that V is a totally complex subspace if there exists an I such that there exists a basis with $I = I_0$ and (i) $I_0 V \subset V$, and (ii) $I_k V$ is perpendicular to V for $1 \leq k \leq 6$. Clearly, if V is a maximal subspace of this kind then $\dim_R V = 4$.

Let M be a compact Riemannian manifold isometrically immersed in CaP^2 by $j : M \to CaP^2$. Denote by h and A the second fundamental form of j and the Weingarten endomorphism respectively. Then we have

$$\langle h(X,Y), N\rangle = \langle X, A_N(Y)\rangle \quad X, Y \in TM, N \in TM^\perp \tag{3.1}$$

We take $\bar{\nabla}$, ∇ and $\nabla^{\perp}$ to be the Riemannian connections on CaP^2, M and the normal connection on M respectively. The corresponding curvature tensors are denoted by $\bar{R}$, R, and $R^{\perp}$ respectively. The first and second covariant derivatives of h are given by

$$(3.2)\qquad (\bar{\nabla}h)(X, Y; Z) = \nabla_z^{\perp}(h(X, Y)) - h(\nabla_z X, Y) - h(X, \nabla_z Y)$$

$$(3.3)\qquad (\bar{\nabla}^2 h)(X, Y; Z; W) = \nabla_w^{\perp}(\bar{\nabla}h)(X, Y; Z) - (\bar{\nabla}h)(\nabla_w X, Y; Z) - (\bar{\nabla}h)(X, \nabla_w Y; Z) - (\bar{\nabla}h)(X, Y; \nabla_w Z)$$

$$X, Y, Z, W \in TM.$$

The Codazzi equation takes the following form

$$(3.4)\qquad (\bar{\nabla}h)(X_{\tau(1)}, X_{\tau(2)}; X_{\tau(3)}) = (\bar{\nabla}h)(X_1, X_2; X_3),$$

where $\tau(i) \in S_3$ the permutation group and the arguments are in the tangent space of M. Recalling that h and $(\bar{\nabla}h)$ are symmetric, we have the Ricci identity

$$(3.5)\qquad (\bar{\nabla}^2 h)(X, Y; Z; W) - (\bar{\nabla}^2 h)(X, Y; W; Z) = -R^{\perp}(Z, W)h(X, Y) + h(R(Z, W)X, Y) + h(X, R(Z, W)Y).$$

We say that $j : M \to CaP^2$ is a totally complex immersion if $W = j_*(TM)$ is a totally complex subspace for each point of M. Observe that every totally complex submanifold of CaP^2 has a Kaehler structure. We set $I = I_0$, and consequently we have

(3.6)

(a) $\bar{\nabla}_X I = 0$

(b) $h(IX, Y) = Ih(X, Y)$

(c) $A_{IN} = IA_N = -A_N I$

(d) $IR(X, IX)X = R(X, IX)IX$

where X, $Y \in T_xM$ and $N \in T_xM^{\perp}$.

Define $f(u) = |h(u, u)|^2$, where $u \in UM$, the unit tangent bundle over M. Assume f attains its maximum at some vector $v \in UM_p$, $p \in M$, then ([5]):

$$(3.7)\qquad A_{h(v,v)}v = |h(v, v)|^2 v.$$

LEMMA 3.1. *Let M^n be a compact totally complex submanifold in CaP^2. Assume f attains its maximum at $v \in UM_p$, then*

$$3|h(v,v)|^2(1-4|h(v,v)|^2)+\sum_{i=1}^{6}\langle h(v,v),I_iv\rangle^2+4|(\overline{\nabla}h)(v,v;v)|^2\leq 0. \tag{3.8}$$

PROOF. Fix v in UM_p. For any $u\in UM_p$, let $r_u(t)$ be the geodesic in M satisfying the initial conditions $r_u(0)=p$, $r_u'(0)=u$. Parallel translating along $r_u(t)$ gives rise to a vector field $V_u(t)$. Put $f_u(t)=f(V_u(t))$, then

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}f_u(0)=2\langle(\overline{\nabla}^2h)(v,v;u;u),h(v,v)\rangle+2|(\overline{\nabla}h)(u,v;v)|^2. \tag{3.9}$$

Using (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle(\overline{\nabla}^2h)(v,v;Iv;Iv),h(v,v)\rangle &= \langle\overline{\nabla}^2h)(v,Iv;v;Iv),h(v,v)\rangle\\ &= -\langle(\overline{\nabla}^2h)(v,v;v;v),h(v,v)\rangle\\ &\quad+\langle R^{\perp}(Iv,v)h(Iv,v),h(v,v)\rangle\\ &\quad-2\langle R(Iv,v)Iv,A_{h(v,v)}v\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

From the Ricci equation, (2.1), (2.2) and (3.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle R^{\perp}(Iv,v)h(Iv,v),h(v,v)\rangle\\ &=\langle\bar{R}(Iv,v)h(Iv,v),h(v,v)\rangle+\langle[A_{h(Iv,v)},A_{h(v,v)}]Iv,v\rangle\\ &=-\frac{1}{2}|h(v,v)|^2-2|A_{h(v,v)}v|^2+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{6}\langle h(v,v),I_iv\rangle^2\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Now, by the Gauss equation and using (2.1), (2.2) and (3.6) we have

$$\langle R(Iv,v)Iv,A_{h(v,v)}v\rangle=-|h(v,v)|^2+2|A_{h(v,v)}v|^2. \tag{3.12}$$

Since f attains its maximum at v, we have

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}f_v(0)+\frac{d^2}{dt^2}f_{Iv}(0)\leq 0. \tag{3.13}$$

Combining (3.9)–(3.13) and noticing (3.7), we get (3.8).

4. Proof of the Theorem

We will prove the Theorem by showing that under its assumptions the hypothesis that M is not totally geodesic leads to a contradiction.

From Lemma (3.1) it follows that, by the hypothesis $h \neq 0$.

$$|h(v, v)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} \tag{4.1}$$

For any $u \in UM_p$, let $r_u(t)$ be the geodesic in M determined by the initial conditions $r_u(0) = p$ and $r'_u(0) = u$. Parallel translation of v along $r_u(t)$ yields a vector field $V_u(t)$. Then we know that the function f_u defined by $f_u(t) = f(V_u(t))$ attains a maximum at $t = 0$. This implies that

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} f_u(0) + \frac{d^2}{dt^2} f_{Iu}(0) \leq 0. \tag{4.2}$$

for all $u \in UM_p$.

By direct computations we have

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} f_u(0) = 2\langle(\overline{\nabla}^2 h)(v, v; u; u), h(v, v)\rangle + 2|(\overline{\nabla} h)(u, v; v)|^2 \tag{4.3}$$

Using (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle(\overline{\nabla}^2 h)(v, v; Iu; Iu), h(v, v)\rangle &= \langle(\overline{\nabla}^2 h)(v, Iv; u; Iu), h(v, v)\rangle \\ &= -\langle(\overline{\nabla}^2 h)(v, Iv; Iu; u), h(v, v)\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle R^{\perp}(Iu, u) Ih(v, v), h(v, v)\rangle \\ &\quad - 2\langle R(Iu, u) Iv, A_{h(v,v)} v\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

From the Ricci equation, (2.1), (2.2), and (3.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle R^{\perp}(Iu, u) Ih(v, v), h(v, v)\rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{R}(Iu, u) Ih(v, v), h(v, v)\rangle + \langle [A_{h(Iv,v)}, A_{h(v,v)}] Iu, u\rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}|h(v, v)|^2 - 2|A_{h(v,v)} u|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{6}\langle h(v, v), I_i u\rangle^2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

By the Gauss equation, we get

$$\langle R(Iu, u) Iv, A_{h(v,v)} v\rangle = -|h(v, v)|^2 \langle R(u, Iu) Iv, v\rangle. \tag{4.6}$$

From (4.2)–(4.6), we obtain

$$2|h(v, v)|^2 \langle R(u, Iu) Iv, v\rangle - \frac{1}{2}|h(v, v)|^2 - 2|A_{h(v,v)} u|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{6}\langle h(v, v), I_i u\rangle^2 \leq 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Since $n=2$, we can always choose a unit eigenvector u of $A_{h(v,v)}$ such that $\langle u,v\rangle = \langle u,Iv\rangle = 0$, using the equation of Gauss which implies that

$$R(u,v)v = \frac{1}{4}u + A_{h(v,v)}u - A_{h(u,u)}v \tag{4.8}$$

$$R(u,Iv)Iv = \frac{1}{4}u - A_{h(v,v)}u - A_{h(u,u)}v \tag{4.9}$$

we have

$$A_{h(v,v)}u = \frac{1}{2}(R(u,v)v - R(u,Iv)Iv) = \frac{1}{2}(K(u,v) - K(u,Iv))u \tag{4.10}$$

where $K(r,s)$ is the sectional curvature of M at p for the plane spanned by r, $s \in T_pM$. The Bianchi identity shows that

$$\langle R(u,Iu)Iv,v\rangle = K(u,v) + K(u,Iv) \tag{4.11}$$

From (4.7), (4.10) and (4.11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2|h(v,v)|^2(K(u,v)+K(u,Iv)) - \frac{1}{2}|h(v,v)|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(K(u,v)^2 + K(u,Iv)^2 \\ - 2K(u,v)K(u,Iv)) + \sum_{i=1}^{6}\langle h(v,v), I_iu\rangle^2 \le 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

or equivalently,

$$aK(u,v) + bK(u,Iv) - \frac{1}{2}|h(v,v)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{6}\langle h(v,v), I_iu\rangle^2 \le 0. \tag{4.13}$$

where

$$a = 2|h(v,v)|^2 - \frac{1}{2}K(u,v) + \frac{1}{2}K(u,Iv) \tag{4.14}$$

$$b = 2|h(v,v)|^2 - \frac{1}{2}K(u,Iv) + \frac{1}{2}K(u,v) \tag{4.15}$$

Now, we prove that $a,b>0$. From the equation of Gauss it follows that

$$K(u,v) + K(u,Iv) = \frac{1}{2} - 2|h(v,v)|^2 \le \frac{1}{2} \tag{4.16}$$

By (4.1) and (4.14), we have

$$1 - K(u,v) + K(u,Iv) \le 2a \tag{4.17}$$

From (4.16) and (4.17), we know

$$1 + 2K(u, Iv) \leq 2a + \frac{1}{2} \tag{4.18}$$

Which by the assumption $K > (1/8)$ implies that $a > 0$. In the same way it follows that also $b > 0$. Since a and b are strictly positive and $K > (1/8)$, by (4.13) we get the strictly inequality

$$\frac{1}{8}(a + b) - \frac{1}{2}|h(v, v)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{6} \langle h(v, v), I_i u\rangle^2 < 0 \tag{4.19}$$

But from (4.14) and (4.15) it follows that

$$a + b = 4|h(v, v)|^2 \tag{4.20}$$

Which combines with (4.19) yields the desired contradiction. So M is totally geodesic, by the Theorem 2.2 in [4], we known that $M = CP^2$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. The author is grateful to the referee for a careful reading and very helpful comments on earlier version of the manuscript.

References

[1] Besse, A. L., manifolds all of whose geodesic are closed, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1978.
[2] Brown, R. and Gray, A., Riemannian manifolds with holonomy group Spin(9), in Diff. Geom. in honor of K. Yano, Tokyo, 1972, pp. 42–59.
[3] Coulton, P. and Gauchman, H., Submanifold of quaternion projective space with bounded second fundamental forms, Kodai Math. J. **12** (1989), 296–307.
[4] Goulton, P. and Glazebrook, J., Submanifolds of the Cayley projective plane with bounded second fundamental form, Geom. Dedi. **33** (1990), 265–275.
[5] Ros, A., Positively curved Kaehler submanifolds, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **93** (1985), 329–331.
[6] Ros, A. and Verstraelen, L., On a conjecture of K. Ogiue, J. Diff. Geom. **19** (1984), 561–565.
[7] Xia, C. Y., Totally complex submanifolds in $HP^m(1)$, Geom. Dedi., **54** (1995), 103–112.

Department of Applied Mathematics
Dalian University of Technology
Dalian 116024
China
E-mail: xmliu@dlut.edu.cn