# Some characterizations of vanishing Bochner curvature tensor 

By Toyoko Kashiwada

Introduction. In Riemannian manifolds, it is well known that the Weyl conformal curvature tensor vanishes if and only if $R_{a b o d}=0$ for indices $a, b, c, d$, which differ from one another. In this paper, we get the analogous property to it for the Bochner curvature tensor, and by this, we have some necessary and sufficient conditions in terms of sectional curvatures in order that Kähler manifolds have vanishing Bochner curvature tensor. These theorems are analogous to results of J. Haantjes and W. Wrona [3] and R. S. Kulkarni [4].
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§ 1. Relations of $\boldsymbol{R}_{a b c a}$ and $\boldsymbol{B}_{a b c a l}$. Let $\left(M^{n}, g\right)$ be an $n(=2 m)$ dimensional Kähler manifold and $\varphi_{a b}, R_{a b c}{ }^{d}, R_{a b}\left(=R_{e a b}{ }^{e}\right)$ be its complex structure, the Riemannian curvature tensor and the Ricci tensor respectively. Let $S_{a b}=\varphi_{a}^{e} R_{e b}$. With respect to a $\varphi$-base $\left\{e_{1}, \cdots, e_{m}, \varphi e_{1}, \cdots, \varphi e_{m}\right\}$ the components of these tensors have relations as follows ${ }^{11}$ :

$$
\begin{gathered}
g_{a b}=\delta_{a b}, \\
\varphi_{i i *}=-\varphi_{i * i}=1, \quad \varphi_{i a}=0 \quad\left(a \neq i^{*}\right), \\
R_{a b k l *}=-R_{a b k * l}, \quad R_{i j}=R_{i * j *}, \quad R_{i j *}=-R_{i * j}, \\
S_{i j}=S_{i * j *}=R_{i * j}, \quad S_{i j *}=-S_{i * j}=R_{i j} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Let $B$ be the Bochner curvature tensor, i.e.

$$
B_{a b c i}=R_{a b c c t}+\frac{1}{n+4} U_{a b c d}
$$

where we put

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{a b c a}= & R_{a c} g_{b d}-R_{b c} g_{a d}+R_{b d} g_{a c}-R_{a d} g_{b c} \\
& +S_{a c} \varphi_{b d}-S_{b c} \varphi_{a d}+S_{b d} \varphi_{a c}-S_{a d} \varphi_{b c}+2 S_{a b} \varphi_{c d}+2 S_{a d} \varphi_{a b} \\
& -\frac{R}{n+2}\left(g_{a c} g_{b i d}-g_{b c} g_{a d}+\varphi_{a c} \varphi_{b d}-\varphi_{b c} \varphi_{a d}+2 \varphi_{a b} \varphi_{c t}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that

[^0]\[

$$
\begin{align*}
U_{a b b a} & =-\left(R_{a a}+R_{b b}-\frac{R}{n+2}\right) \quad\left(|a| \neq\left.|b|\right|^{1)},\right.  \tag{1.1}\\
U_{u i * i * i} & =-\left(8 R_{u t}-\frac{4 R}{n+2}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$
\]

We get an analogous property of conformally flat manifold as follows. Proposition ${ }^{2}$. Let $M, n=2 m \geqq 8$, be a Kähler manifold. If

$$
R_{a b c i}=0 \quad(|a|,|b|,|c|,|d| \neq)^{3}
$$

holds good for every $\varphi$-base $\left\{e_{1}, \cdots, e_{m}, \varphi e_{1}, \cdots, \varphi e_{m}\right\}$, then the Bochner curvature vanishes. The converse is true.

To prove this proposition, at first, we remark the following property, (Bishop \& Goldberg [1]].

Lemma. Let L be a semi-curvature-like tensor, i.e. tensor field of type (1.3) such that
(1) $L_{a b c d}=-L_{b a c d}$
(2) $L_{a b c a}=L_{c a a b}$
(3) 1-st Bianchi's identity is satisfied.

Then $L=0$ if and only if $L_{a b b a}=0$ for every base.
Especially, in the case of a Kähler manifold, for $L=0$, it suffices that $L_{a b b a}=0$ for every $\varphi$-base.

The Bochner curvature tensor $B$ is a semi-curvature-like tensor. So, by virtue of this lemma, it suffices to prove that $B_{a b b a}=0$ for every $\varphi$-base.

Proof of Proposition: For a $\varphi$-base $\left\{e_{1}, \cdots, e_{m}, \varphi e_{1}, \cdots, \varphi e_{m}\right\}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{a b c d}=0 \quad(|a|,|b|,|c|,|d| \neq) . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We take another $\varphi$-base

$$
\begin{align*}
& e_{i}^{\prime}=c e_{i}+s e_{j} \\
& e_{j}^{\prime}=-s e_{i}+c e_{j}  \tag{*}\\
& e_{a}^{\prime}=e_{a} \quad(|a| \neq i, j)
\end{align*}
$$

where $c$ and $s$ are real numbers such that $c^{2}+s^{2}=1$ and $c s \neq 0$.
As (1.2) is true for this base, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & =g\left(R\left(e_{i}^{\prime}, e_{a}\right) e_{j}^{\prime}, e_{b}\right) \\
& =-c s\left(R_{\text {atit }}-R_{j a j b}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

[^1]i. e.
$$
R_{a i i b}=R_{a j j b} \quad(|a|,|b|, i, j \neq) .
$$

By replacing $e_{i}$ with $e_{i *}$, we have

$$
R_{a i * i * b}=R_{a j j b} .
$$

So we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{a i i b}=R_{a i * i * b} \quad(|a|,|b|, i \neq) . \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since (1.3) is true for every $\varphi$-base, for $\varphi$-base $\left(^{*}\right)$ we know

$$
g\left(R\left(e_{i}^{\prime}, e_{k *}\right) e_{k *}, e_{j}^{\prime}\right)=-g\left(R\left(e_{i}^{\prime}, e_{k}\right) e_{k}, e_{j}^{\prime}\right)
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{i k * k * i}-R_{j k * k * j}=R_{i k k t}-R_{j k k j} . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Replacing $e_{j}$ with $e_{j *}$ and adding it to (1.4) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{i k * k * i}=R_{i k k i} \quad(i \neq k) \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since (1.5) is true for every $\varphi$-base, computing (1.5) with respect $\varphi$-base (*),

$$
g\left(R\left(e_{i}^{\prime}, e_{j *}^{\prime}\right) e_{j *}^{\prime}, e_{i}^{\prime}\right)=g\left(R\left(e_{i}^{\prime}, e_{j}^{\prime}\right) e_{j}^{\prime}, e_{i}^{\prime}\right),
$$

we obtain after all,

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{i t * i * i}+R_{j j * j * j}=8 R_{i j j i} \quad(i \neq j) . \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j(\neq i)}^{m}\left(R_{i * * i * i}+R_{j j * j * j}\right) & =8 \sum_{j=1}^{m} R_{i j j i} \\
(m-2) R_{i i * i * i}+\mu & =4\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} R_{i j j i}+\sum_{j(* i)}^{m} R_{i j * j * i}\right) \\
& =4\left(R_{i i}-R_{i i * * * i}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{i * * * i}=\frac{1}{m+2}\left(4 R_{i i}-\mu\right) \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we put $\mu=\sum_{j=1}^{m} R_{j j * j * j}$ and take account of $R_{i j j i}=R_{i j * j * i}$. Taking sum of (1.7) from $i=1$ to $i=m$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
R=(m+1) \mu . \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

So from (1.7) and (1.8) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{i t * i * i}=\frac{1}{n+4}\left(8 R_{i i}-\frac{4 R}{n+2}\right) . \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

On account of (1.6), it follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{i j j i}=\frac{1}{n+4}\left(R_{i i}+R_{j j}-\frac{R}{n+2}\right) \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand,

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{i * j * j * i *}=R_{i j j i} \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, from (1.1), (1.5) and (1.9)~(1.11) we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& B_{a b b a}=R_{a b b a}+\frac{1}{n+4} U_{a b b a}=0 \quad(|a| \neq|b|) \\
& B_{i i * i * b}=R_{i i * i * i}+\frac{1}{n+4} U_{i i * i * i}=0 \tag{1.12}
\end{align*}
$$

So by lemma, we get

$$
B=0
$$

The converse is trivial since $U_{a b c d}=0$ for $|a|,|b|,|c|,|d| \neq$. Q.E.D.
Remark: In this proof, we know that the property (1.12) depends only the property (1.6).
§ 2. Theorems. We have several necessary and sufficient conditions to be $B=0$ in terms of the sectional curvature.

Theorem $1^{1)}$. Let $M^{2 m}, m \geqq 4$, be a Kähler manifold. Then, the followings are equivalent at every point $p \in M$.
(1) The Bochner curvature tensor $B(p)=0$.
$(2)^{2)}$ For every $\varphi$-base at $p$,

$$
\rho\left(e_{i}, e_{i *}\right)+\rho\left(e_{j}, e_{j *}\right)=8 \rho\left(e_{i}, e_{j}\right)^{3}
$$

(3) For each holomorphic 8-plane $W \subseteq T_{p}(M)$,

$$
k_{p}(W, \boldsymbol{b})=\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{1}, \boldsymbol{e}_{2}\right)+\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{3}, e_{4}\right)
$$

is independent of $\varphi$-base $b=\left\{e_{1}, \cdots, e_{4}, \varphi e_{1}, \cdots, \varphi e_{4}\right\}$ of $W$.
(4) For every orthogonal 8 vectors of $T_{p}(M)$ such that $\left\{e_{1}, \cdots, e_{4}, \varphi e_{1}\right.$, $\left.\cdots, \varphi e_{4}\right\}$,

$$
\rho\left(e_{1}, e_{2}\right)+\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{3}, e_{4}\right)=\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{1}, e_{4}\right)+\rho\left(e_{2}, e_{3}\right)
$$

Proof. (2) $\Rightarrow(1)$ is noted at the last of proof of proposition.
$(1) \Rightarrow(2)$ is trivial since (1.1) and

1) An analogous theorem have been got independently by Ogitsu and Iwasaki, [5],
2) This was remarked by Mr. M. Sekizawa.
3) $\rho\left(\mathrm{e}_{a}, \mathrm{e}_{b}\right)$ means Riemannian sectional curvature with respect to tse plane spanned by $e_{a}, e_{b}$.

$$
R_{a b b a}=\frac{-1}{n+4} U_{a b b a} .
$$

$(3) \Longrightarrow(4)$ is trivial.
$(4) \Rightarrow(1)$ : Let $\left\{e_{1}, \cdots, e_{m}, \varphi e_{1}, \cdots, \varphi e_{m}\right\}$ be arbitrary $\varphi$-base of $T_{p}(M)$. For $\left\{e_{i}, e_{j}, e_{k}, e_{i}, \varphi e_{i}, \varphi e_{j}, \varphi e_{k}, \varphi e_{i}\right\}$, by assumption,

$$
R_{i j j i}+R_{k t l u k}=R_{i l u i}+R_{j k k j} .
$$

We take another orthonormal vectors $\left\{e_{i}, e_{j}^{\prime}, e_{k}^{\prime}, e_{l}, \varphi e_{i}, \varphi e_{j}^{\prime}, \varphi e_{k}^{\prime}, \varphi e_{l}\right\}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e_{j}^{\prime}=c e_{j}+s e_{k} \\
& e_{k}^{\prime}=-s e_{j}+c e_{k}, \quad\left(c^{2}+s^{2}=1, \quad c s \neq 0\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\rho\left(e_{i}, e_{j}^{\prime}\right)+\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{k}^{\prime}, e_{i}\right)=\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{i}, e_{i}\right)+\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{j}^{\prime}, e_{k}^{\prime}\right)$, it follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{j i d k}=R_{j l l k} . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since (2.1) is true for every $\varphi$-base, for the above base,

$$
g\left(R\left(e_{i} e_{j}^{\prime}\right) \boldsymbol{e}_{j}^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{e}_{i}\right)=g\left(R\left(e_{i} e_{k}^{\prime}\right) \boldsymbol{e}_{k}^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{e}_{i}\right)
$$

which implies

$$
R_{i j k l}+R_{i k j l}=0 .
$$

Then by Bianchi's identity, we get $R_{i j k l}=0$. Replacing $e_{i} \rightarrow e_{i *}, e_{j} \rightarrow e_{j *} \ldots$ etc, we obtain $R_{a b c d}=0(|a|,|b|,|c|,|d| \neq)$. So, by proposition, the Bochner curvature tensor vanishes.
$(1) \Rightarrow(3):$ Let $B=0$. Then, for a $\varphi$-base, it follows

$$
R_{a b b a}=\frac{1}{n+4}\left(R_{a a}+R_{b b}-\frac{R}{n+2}\right) \quad(|a| \neq|b|) .
$$

Let $\boldsymbol{b}=\left\{e_{1}, e_{2}, e_{3}, e_{4}, \varphi e_{1}, \varphi e_{2}, \varphi e_{3}, \varphi e_{4}\right\}, \quad \boldsymbol{b}^{\prime}=\left\{e_{1}^{\prime}, e_{2}^{\prime}, e_{3}^{\prime}, e_{4}^{\prime}, \varphi e_{1}^{\prime}, \varphi e_{2}^{\prime}, \varphi e_{3}^{\prime}, \varphi e_{4}^{\prime}\right\}$, be basis of $W \subseteq T_{p}(M)$. We construct two basis of $T_{p}(M)$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
f & =\left\{e_{1}, \cdots, e_{m}, \varphi e_{1}, \cdots, \varphi e_{m}\right\} \\
f^{\prime} & =\left\{e_{1}^{\prime}, \cdots, e_{4}^{\prime}, e_{5}, \cdots, e_{m}, \varphi e_{1}^{\prime}, \cdots, \varphi e_{4}^{\prime}, \varphi e_{5}, \cdots, \varphi e_{m}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho\left(e_{1}, e_{2}\right)+\rho\left(e_{3}, e_{4}\right)=\frac{1}{n+4} \sum_{k=1}^{4}\left(R_{2 k}-\frac{2 R}{n+2}\right) . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $R_{a a}, R_{a a}^{\prime}$ be components of the Ricci tensor with respect to base $f, f^{\prime}$. So, as $R=\sum R_{a a}=\sum R_{a a}^{\prime}$ and $R_{i i}^{\prime}=R_{i i}(i>4)$, we have

$$
\sum_{\lambda=1}^{4} R_{\lambda \lambda}=\sum_{k=1}^{4} R_{\lambda \lambda}^{\prime} .
$$

Then by virtue of (2.2), we know that $k_{p}(W, \boldsymbol{b})$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{b}$.
Q.E.D.

By this proof, we know " 8 -plane" can be changed with arbitrary " $2 d$ plane" ( $8 \leqq 2 d \leqq m$ ) in this theorem. So, for example,

Theorem 2. Let $M$ be a Kähler manifold of dimension $4 m \geqq 8$. Then, $B=0$ if and only if, for every $\varphi$-base $f$ of $T_{p}(M)$,

$$
k_{p}\left(f^{\prime}\right)=\rho\left(e_{1}, e_{2}\right)+\cdots+\rho\left(e_{2 m-1}, e_{2 m}\right)
$$

is independent of $\boldsymbol{f}$.

## § 3. Another proof ${ }^{1>}$ of a part of Kulkarni's result.

Theorem (Kulkarni [4], Theorem 3. 2). Let $M^{n}, n \geqq 4$, be a Riemennian manifold. Then the Weyl conformal curvature tensor $C$ vanishes if and only if

$$
\rho\left(e_{1}, e_{2}\right)+\rho\left(e_{3}, e_{4}\right)=\rho\left(e_{1}, e_{4}\right)+\rho\left(e_{2}, e_{3}\right)
$$

for every quadruple of (orthogonal) vectors $\left\{e_{1}, e_{2}, e_{3}, e_{4}\right\}$.
Kulkarni proved this by conformal change of metric. Now, as equations in this theorem are all algebraic, we shall give an algebraic proof.

Proof of Kulkarni's theorem. Necessity is trivial.
Sufficiency: By assumption,

$$
\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{i}, e_{j}\right)+\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{k}, e_{l}\right)=\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{i}, e_{l}\right)+\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(e_{j}, e_{k}\right) \quad(i, j, k, l \neq) .
$$

Taking summation with respect to $l(\neq i, j, k)$ and $k(\neq i, j)$, we have

$$
(n-1)(n-2) \rho\left(e_{i}, e_{j}\right)=(n-1)\left\{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \rho\left(e_{i}, e_{t}\right)+\sum_{t=1}^{n} \rho\left(e_{j}, e_{t}\right)\right\}-\sum_{t, r=1}^{n} \rho\left(e_{t}, e_{r}\right) .
$$

This equation means

$$
R_{i j i l}-\frac{1}{n-2}\left(R_{i i}+R_{j j}\right)-\frac{R}{(n-1)(n-2)}=0,
$$

which is nothing but

$$
C_{i j j i}=0 .
$$

As the last equation is valid for any base, we know $C=0$ by virtue of lemma.
Q.E.D.

Department of Mathematics,
Ochanomizu University, Tokyo, Japan

[^2]
## Bibliography

[1] R. L. Bishop and S. I. GQLDberg: Some implications of the generalized GaussBonnet theorem. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 112 (1964), 508-535.
[2] L. P. Eisenhart: Riemannian geometry, Princeton Paperbacks.
[3] J. HanntJes and W. Wrona: Ueber konformeuklidische und Einsteinsche raume gerader dimension.
[4] R. S. Kulkarni: Curvature structures and conformal transformation, J. Differential Geometry, 4 (1969), 425-451.
[5] N. Ogitsu and K. Iwasaki: On a characterization of the Bochner curvature tensor $=$ O, Nat. Sci. Rep. of the Ochanomizu Univ., 25 (1974), 1-6.
(Received January 5, 1974)


[^0]:    1) $a, b, \cdots=1, \cdots, m, 1^{*}, \cdots, m^{*} ; \quad i^{*}=i+m ; \quad i, j, \cdots=1, \cdots, m$.
[^1]:    1) $\quad|i|=i, \quad\left|i^{*}\right|=i$.
    2) Cf. Eisenhart [2], p. 124.
    3) This means that $|a|,|b|,|c|,|d|$ differ from one another.
[^2]:    1) This proof was ramarked by Prof. S. Tachibana.
