

Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifolds of locally conformal Kaehler manifolds

By LIU XIMIN (Tianjin)

Abstract. Some necessary and sufficient conditions for an anti-holomorphic submanifold in a locally conformal Kaehler manifold to be a Sasakian submanifold are obtained.

1. Introduction

The differential geometry of the CR submanifolds of a locally conformal Kaehler (l.c.K.) manifold have been studied in the last ten years (cf. [2]–[5]). A. BEJANCU introduced the concept of Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifolds in a Kaehler manifold [1]. The Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifolds in an l.c.K. manifold are studied by F. VERROCA [7], she gives some characterizations for them under the condition that the normal connection is flat. In the present paper we make a further study of the Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifolds of an l.c.K. manifold, we give some characterizations for them so that the results in §4 of [7] are still true without supposing that the normal connection is flat.

2. Preliminaries

Let $(\bar{M}, g, J)$ be a Hermitian manifold of complex dimension n with Kaehler 2-form Ω_0 , i.e. $\Omega_0(X, Y) = g(X, JY)$, $X, Y \in T\bar{M}$. Then $\bar{M}$ is a

Mathematics Subject Classification: 53C40, 53C15.

Key words and phrases: Anti-holomorphic submanifold, locally conformal Kaehler manifold, Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifold.

locally conformal Kaehler (l.c.K.) manifold if there exists a closed 1-form ω_0 on $\bar{M}$ such that [6]

$$(2.1) \quad d\Omega_0 = \omega_0 \wedge \Omega_0.$$

The 1-form ω_0 is called the Lee form, then the Lee vector field is the vector field B_0 such that $g(B_0, X) = \omega_0(X)$. If $\bar{\nabla}$ denotes the Riemannian connection of $\bar{M}$, then one has:

$$(2.2) \quad (\bar{\nabla}_X J)Y = \frac{1}{2}(\theta_0(Y)X - \omega_0(Y)JX - \Omega_0(X, Y)B_0 - g(X, Y)A_0)$$

for any $X, Y \in T\bar{M}$, where $\theta_0 = \omega_0 \cdot J$ is the anti-Lee 1-form and $A_0 = -JB_0$ is the anti-Lee vector field.

An m -dimensional submanifold M of $\bar{M}$ is called a CR submanifold if the tangent bundle TM is expressed as a direct sum of two distributions D and $D^\perp$, such that D is holomorphic (i.e. $J_x D_x = D_x$, $x \in M$) and $D^\perp$ is totally real (i.e. $J_x D_x^\perp \subset T_x^\perp M$), in particular, if $J_x D_x^\perp = T_x^\perp M$, then M is called anti-holomorphic submanifold. Denote by P and Q the projection morphism of TM to D and $D^\perp$, respectively, then, restricted to M , $P + Q = I$.

For $X \in T_x M$, denote

$$(2.3) \quad JX = \phi X + FX$$

where ϕX and FX are, respectively the tangent part and the normal part of JX , then we have

$$(2.4) \quad \phi = J \cdot P, \quad F = J \cdot Q, \quad F \cdot \phi = 0, \quad \phi \cdot Q = 0$$

$$(2.5) \quad \phi^2 = -P = -I + Q.$$

The Gauss and Weingarten formulas are given by

$$(2.6) \quad \bar{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla_X Y + h(X, Y), \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\nabla}_X N = -A_N X + \nabla_X^\perp N$$

respectively, where $X, Y \in TM$, $N \in T^\perp M$. Now ∇, h, A and $\nabla^\perp$ are the induced connection, the second fundamental form, the Weingarten operator and the normal connection, respectively. Denote by θ, ω and Ω the forms induced on M by θ_0, ω_0 and Ω_0 , respectively. Then one has

$$(2.7) \quad \theta = \omega \cdot \phi + \omega_0 \cdot F, \quad \Omega(X, Y) = g(X, \phi Y), \quad X, Y \in TM.$$

For $X, Y \in TM$, define

$$(2.8) \quad dF(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_X^\perp FY - \nabla_Y^\perp FX - F[X, Y]).$$

From (2.2), we have

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla_X^\perp FY &= \nabla_X^\perp JQY = (\bar{\nabla}_X JQY)^\perp = ((\bar{\nabla}_X J)QY + J\bar{\nabla}_X QY) \\ &= F\nabla_X QY - \frac{1}{2}(\omega(QY)FX + g(X, QY)A_0). \end{aligned}$$

Let $E_1, \dots, E_p, JE_1, \dots, JE_p$ be an orthonormal basis for D , then the normal vector field

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2p} \sum_{i=1}^p (h(E_i, E_i) + h(JE_i, JE_i))$$

is well defined and is called the D -mean curvature vector of M .

Definition 2.1. Let M be an anti-holomorphic submanifold of an l.c.K. manifold $\bar{M}$; M is called normal if for any $X, Y \in TM$

$$(2.10) \quad N^{(1)}(X, Y) \equiv [\phi, \phi](X, Y) - 2J(dF)(X, Y) = 0.$$

Here $[\phi, \phi]$ is the Nijenhuis torsion of ϕ . M is called contact if $H_D \neq 0$ and

$$(2.11) \quad (dF)(X, Y) = -\Omega(X, Y)H_D, \quad X, Y \in TM.$$

A normal contact anti-holomorphic submanifold of an l.c.K. manifold is called a Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifold.

Proposition 2.1. *If M is a normal (or contact) anti-holomorphic submanifold of an l.c.K. manifold $\bar{M}$, then*

$$(2.12) \quad N^{(2)}(X, Y) = dF(\phi X, Y) - dF(\phi Y, X) = 0.$$

PROOF. If M is a contact anti-holomorphic submanifold of $\bar{M}$, then from (2.11) we obtain (2.12) immediately. Now suppose that M is a normal anti-holomorphic submanifold for $\xi \in D^\perp$; from (2.10) we obtain

$$(2.13) \quad (\phi^2[X, \xi] - \phi[\phi X, \xi]) - J(\nabla_X^\perp F\xi - \nabla_\xi^\perp FX - F[X, \xi]) = 0,$$

so we have

$$(2.14) \quad \nabla_X^\perp F\xi - \nabla_\xi^\perp FX - F[X, \xi] = 0.$$

Replacing X by ϕX in (2.14) we have

$$(2.15) \quad \nabla_{\phi X}^\perp F\xi = F[\phi X, \xi].$$

Substituting (2.9) into (2.15), we get

$$(2.16) \quad 0 = \nabla_{\phi X}^\perp F\xi - F\nabla_{\phi X}\xi + F\nabla_\xi\phi X = F\nabla_\xi\phi X.$$

On the other hand, from (2.4) and (2.5) we can derive

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= N^{(1)}(X, \phi Y) = [\phi, \phi](X, \phi Y) - 2JdF(X, \phi Y) \\ &= [\phi X, QY] - [\phi X, Y] - \phi[\phi X, \phi Y] + \phi[X, PY] \\ &\quad - [X, \phi Y] + J\nabla_{\phi Y}^\perp FX. \end{aligned}$$

Projecting to $D^\perp$ we obtain

$$(2.18) \quad J\nabla_{\phi Y}^\perp FX - Q[\phi X, Y] + Q[\phi X, QY] - Q[X, \phi Y] = 0.$$

Operating (2.18) by J we have

$$(2.19) \quad -\nabla_{\phi Y}^\perp FX + F[\phi Y, X] + F[\phi X, QY] - F[\phi X, Y] = 0.$$

From (2.15) we get

$$(2.20) \quad F[\phi X, QY] = \nabla_{\phi X}^\perp FY.$$

From (2.19) and (2.20) we have

$$-\nabla_{\phi Y}^\perp FX + F[\phi Y, X] + \nabla_{\phi X}^\perp FY - F[\phi X, Y] = 0,$$

i.e. $N^{(2)}(X, Y) = dF(\phi X, Y) - dF(\phi Y, X) = 0$.

Lemma 2.1. [7]. *Let M be a CR submanifold of the l.c.K. manifold $\bar{M}$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} 2g((\nabla_X\phi)Y, Z) &= 3(d\Omega)(X, \phi Y, \phi Z) - 3(d\Omega)(X, Y, Z) + g([\phi, \phi](Y, Z), \phi X) \\ &\quad + 2g((dF)(\phi Y, Z), FX) + 2g((dF)(\phi Y, X), FZ) \\ &\quad - 2g((dF)(\phi Z, X), FY) - 2g((dF)(\phi Z, Y), FX). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.2. *If M is a contact anti-holomorphic submanifold of an l.c.K. manifold $\bar{M}$, and M is orthogonal to the Lee vector field B_0 , then*

$$(2.21) \quad 2g((\nabla_X \phi)Y, Z) = g(N^{(1)}(Y, Z), \phi X) + 2g(N^{(2)}(Y, Z), FX) \\ + 2g(dF(\phi Y, X), FZ) - 2g(dF(\phi Z, X), FY).$$

PROOF. Since M is orthogonal to the Lee vector field B_0 for $X, Y, Z \in TM$, from Lemma 2.1, (2.10) and (2.12) we can obtain (2.21).

3. Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifolds

Theorem 3.1. *Let M be an anti-holomorphic submanifold of an l.c.K. manifold, and M orthonormal to the Lee vector field B_0 . If M is a Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifold, then*

$$(3.1) \quad (\nabla_X \phi)Y = g(\phi X, \phi Y)JH_D + g(FY, H_D)PX.$$

Conversely, if there exists $\xi \in T^\perp M$ such that

$$(3.1)' \quad (\nabla_X \phi)Y = g(\phi X, \phi Y)J\xi + g(FY, \xi)PX$$

then M is a Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifold and $\xi = H_D$.

PROOF. Suppose M is a Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifold. By Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2 we have

$$(3.2) \quad g((\nabla_X \phi)Y, Z) = g(dF(\phi Y, X), FZ) - g(dF(\phi Z, X), FY) \\ = g(\phi Y, \phi X)g(-H_D, FZ) + g(\phi Z, \phi X)g(H_D, FY) \\ = g(\phi Y, \phi X)g(JH_D, Z) + g(H_D, FY)g(PX, Z)$$

for any Z , so we get (3.1).

Conversely, suppose that (3.1)' holds, then from (2.9) and (2.5) we get

$$(3.3) \quad 2dF(X, Y) = \nabla_X^\perp FY - \nabla_Y^\perp FX - F[X, Y] \\ = F(\nabla_X QY - \nabla_Y QX - \nabla_X Y - \nabla_Y X) \\ = F(\nabla_X \phi^2 Y - \nabla_Y \phi^2 X) = F((\nabla_X \phi)\phi Y - (\nabla_Y \phi)\phi X) \\ = (-g(\phi X, \phi^2 Y) + g(\phi Y, \phi^2 X))\xi = -2\Omega(X, Y)\xi.$$

In the sequel we prove that $\xi = H_D$. Let $E_1, \dots, E_p, JE_1, \dots, JE_p$ be an orthonormal basis for D , then

$$\begin{aligned} -h(E_i, E_i) &= F(Jh(E_i, E_i)) = F(J(\bar{\nabla}_{E_i} E_i)) = F(Q\bar{\nabla}_{E_i} JE_i) \\ &= F(Q\bar{\nabla}_{E_i} \phi E_i) = F(Q(\nabla_{E_i} \phi)E_i) = F(Q(\nabla_{E_i} \phi)E_i) = -\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have $h(JE_i, JE_i) = \xi$, so $\xi = H_D$ is the D -mean curvature vector of M , and M is a contact anti-holomorphic submanifold.

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} (3.4) \quad [\phi, \phi](X, Y) &= [\phi X, \phi Y] + \phi^2[X, Y] - \phi[\phi X, Y] - \phi[X, \phi Y] \\ &= (\nabla_{\phi X} \phi)Y - (\nabla_{\phi Y} \phi)X + \phi(\nabla_Y \phi)X - \phi(\nabla_X \phi)Y \\ &= g(\phi^2 X, \phi Y)J\xi - g(\phi^2 Y, \phi X)J\xi = -2\Omega(X, Y)J\xi \\ &= -2\Omega(X, Y)JH_D. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (3.3), (3.4) and $\xi = H_D$ we have $N^{(1)} = 0$, M is normal, and this completes the Proof of Theorem 3.1.

By direct computation we have

$$(3.5) \quad (\nabla_X \Omega)(Y, Z) = g(Y, (\nabla_X \phi)Z).$$

From (3.1) and (3.5) we obtain the

Theorem 3.2. *Let M be an anti-holomorphic submanifold of an l.c.K. manifold $\bar{M}$. If M is orthonormal to the Lee vector field B_0 , then M is a Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifold if and only if for any $X, Y, Z \in TM$*

$$(3.6) \quad (\nabla_X \Omega)(Y, Z) = g(\phi X, \phi Y)g(H_D, FZ) - g(\phi X, \phi Z)g(H_D, FY).$$

Remark. From Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 we know that the results in §4 of [7] still hold without the assumption that the normal connection is flat.

Theorem 3.3. *Let M be a Sasakian anti-holomorphic submanifold of an l.c.K. manifold, and $\xi \in D^\perp$. If M is orthonormal to the Lee vector field B_0 , then*

$$(3.7) \quad P\nabla_X \xi = g(F\xi, H_D)\phi X.$$

In particular, if $F\xi$ is parallel with respect to the normal connection, then

$$(3.8) \quad \nabla_X \xi = g(F\xi, H_D)\phi X.$$

PROOF. From (3.1) we have

$$(3.9) \quad 0 = \phi \nabla_X \xi + (\nabla_X \phi)\xi = \phi \nabla_X \xi + g(F\xi, H_D)PX.$$

Operating (3.9) by ϕ and combining with (2.5), we get (3.7).

Using (2.9) again, we have

$$\nabla_X \xi = P\nabla_X \xi + Q\nabla_X \xi = g(F\xi, H_D)\phi X - J\nabla_X^\perp F\xi,$$

and this implies (3.8).

References

- [1] A. BEJANCU, Geometry of CR-submanifolds, *Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht*, 1986.
- [2] S. DRAGOMIR, Cauchy-Riemann submanifolds of locally conformal Kaehler manifolds, *Geom. Dedi.* **28** (1988), 181–197.
- [3] K. MATSUMOTO, On CR-submanifolds of locally conformal Kaehler manifolds, *J. Korean Math. Soc.* **21** (1984), 49–61.
- [4] K. MATSUMOTO, On CR-submanifolds of locally conformal Kaehler manifolds II, *Tensor, N.S.* **45** (1987), 144–150.
- [5] L. ORNEA, Cauchy-Riemann manifolds of locally conformal Kaehler manifolds, *Demonstratio Mathematic.* **19** (1986), 863–869.
- [6] I. VAISMAN, Locally conformal Kaehler manifolds with parallel Lee form, *Rend. Math.* **12** (1979), 263–284.
- [7] F. VERROCA, On Sasakian anti-holomorphic Cauchy-Riemann submanifolds of locally conformal Kaehler manifolds, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **43** (1993), 303–313.
- [8] K. YANO and M. KON, Structures on manifolds, *World Sci. Publishing Co.*, 1984.

LIU XIMIN
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
NANKAI UNIVERSITY
TIANJIN 300071
P.R. CHINA

(Received July 12, 1996)