Errata for Manifolds and Differential Geometry

Jeffrey M. Lee

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, TEXAS TECH UNI-VERSITY, LUBBOCK, TEXAS, 79409

 $Current \; address:$ Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, 79409

E-mail address: jeffrey.lee@ttu.edu

0.1. Main Errata

Chapter 1

(1) Page 3. Near the end of the page "...we have a second derivative $D^2 f(a) : \mathbb{R}^n \to L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ " should read

"...we have a second derivative $D^2 f(a) : \mathbb{R}^n \to L(\mathbb{R}^n, L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m))$ "

(2) . Page 4. The is a missing exponent of 2 in the partial derivatives in the display at the top of the page. It should (of course) read as

$$u^{i} = \sum_{j,k} \frac{\partial^{2} f^{i}}{\partial x^{j} \partial x^{k}} (a) v^{j} w^{k}$$

(3) Page 19, forth line from the top at the beginning of Notation 1.44:

$$(x_1,\ldots,x_{n+1})\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

should be changed to

$$(x_1,\ldots,x_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$$

- (4) Page 23. 6th line from the top. The expression $\mathbf{y} \circ f \circ \mathbf{x}|_{\alpha}^{-1}$ should be changed to $\mathbf{y}_{\beta} \circ f \circ \mathbf{x}_{\alpha}|_{U}^{-1}$
- (5) Page 28. In the display at the bottom of the page, change the x in the exponential to a t.

Chapter 2

(1) Page 61. The curve defined in the 6th line from the bottom of the page is missing a t and should read as follows:

$$c_i(t) := \mathbf{x}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}(p) + t\mathbf{e}_i),$$

- (2) Page 68. In Definition 2.19: "...so a tangent vector in T_qM " should read "...so a tangent vector in T_qN ".
- (3) Page 73. At the end of the second display, (M_2, p) should be changed to (M_2, q) .
- (4) Page 109. In the proof of Theorem 2.113, the first display should read

$$X_1(p), \ldots, X_k(p), \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{k+1}} \right|_p, \ldots, \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial y^n} \right|_p$$

(The initially introduced coordinates are $y^1, ..., y^n$.)

(5) On Page 115, in the second set of displayed equations there is both a spurious q and a spurious p (although, the action of the derivations

in question are indeed happening at the respective points: The display should read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi^* df)|_p v &= df|_q \left(T_p \phi \cdot v\right) \\ &= \left(\left(T_p \phi \cdot v\right) f\right) \\ &= v \left(f \circ \phi\right) = \left. d(\phi^* f)|_p v. \end{aligned}$$

(6) Page 124. Problem (18). The second to last line of part (b) we should find $T_0 R^n = \Delta_{\infty} \cong (\mathfrak{m}_{\infty}/\mathfrak{m}_{\infty}^2)^*$.

Chapter 3

(1) Page 167, Equation 4.3.

Equation 4.3 is missing a square root. It should read

$$L(c) = \int_{a}^{b} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} g_{ij}(c(t)) \frac{dc^{i}}{dt} \frac{dc^{j}}{dt} \right)^{1/2} dt,$$

where $c^i(t) := u^i \circ c$.

(2) The last displayed set of equations on page 175 is missing two square roots in the integrands and should read as follows:

$$\begin{split} L(\gamma) &= \int_{a}^{b} \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\| \ dt = \int_{a}^{b} \left\langle \sum \frac{du^{i}}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial u^{i}}, \sum \frac{du^{j}}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial u^{j}} \right\rangle^{1/2} \ dt \\ &= \int_{a}^{b} \left(\sum_{i,j}^{n-1} g_{ij}(u(t)) \frac{du^{i}}{dt} \frac{du^{j}}{dt} \right)^{1/2} dt, \end{split}$$

Chapter 5

- (1) Page 212. In the first displayed equation in the proof of Theorem 5.7.2, the time derivative should be taken at an arbitrary time t and so $\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} \bar{c}(t)$ should be changed to $\frac{d}{dt}\bar{c}(t)$.
- (2) Page 218. The latter part of the third sentence in the proof of Theorem 5.81 on page 218 should read "is a relatively closed set in U".

Chapter 6

- (1) Insert the following definition after the exercise on page 271:
 - If (E, π, M, V) is a vector bundle, then we also have the associated **dual bundle** (E^*, π^*, M, V^*) . Here $E^* = \bigcup_{p \in M} E_p^*$. The vector bundle charts are obtained by duality on each fiber in the obvious way.
- (2) Page 285. First line of Section 6.5. We need not assume the same typical fiber in the two bundles. Change to read as follows:

Let
$$\xi_1 := (E_1, \pi_1, M, V)$$
 and $\xi_2 := (E_2, \pi_2, M, W)$

Chapter 9

- (1) Page 395. All integrations in the first set of displayed equations should be over the entire space \mathbb{R}^n . (In an earlier version I had put the support in the left half space but after changing my mind I forgot to modify these integrals.)
- (2) Page 395. In "Case 2" right before the line the begins "If j = 1", the variable u^1 ranges from $-\infty$ to 0 and so "= $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}$ " should be replaced by "= $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}$ ".
- (3) Page 395. In "Case 2" right *after* the line the begins "If j = 1", the displayed equation should read

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_{u^1 \le 0}} d\omega_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{\partial f}{\partial u^1} du^1 \right) du^2 \cdots du^n$$

(4) Page 396. In the first line of the second set of displayed equations a U_{α} need to be changed to M. Also, we use the easily verified fact that $\int_{M} \omega = \int_{U} \omega$ when the support of ω is contained in an open set U. (We apply this to the $\rho_{\alpha}\omega$ in the proof.) The display should read:

$$\int_{M} d\omega = \int_{M} \sum_{\alpha} d(\rho_{\alpha}\omega) = \sum_{\alpha} \int_{U_{\alpha}} d(\rho_{\alpha}\omega)$$
$$= \sum_{\alpha} \int_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}(U_{\alpha})} (\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}^{-1})^{*} d(\rho_{\alpha}\omega) = \sum_{\alpha} \int_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}(U_{\alpha})} d((\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}^{-1})^{*} \rho_{\alpha}\omega)$$
$$= \sum_{\alpha} \int_{\partial \{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}(U_{\alpha})\}} ((\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}^{-1})^{*} \rho_{\alpha}\omega) = \sum_{\alpha} \int_{\partial U_{\alpha}} \rho_{\alpha}\omega = \int_{\partial M} \omega,$$

- (5) Page 396-397. Starting at the bottom of 396 and continuing onto 397, all references to the interval $(-\pi, \pi)$ should obviously be changed to $(0, \pi)$. The integrals at the top of page 397 should be changed accordingly.
- (6) Page 399. The last line before the final display should read "where $(\rho X^k)_i := d(\rho X^k)(E_i)$ for all k, i."

Chapter 10

(1) On page 444 immediately before Definition 10.3, the following should be inserted: Recall that if a sequence of module homomorphisms, $\dots \to A_{k-1} \xrightarrow{f_k} A^k \xrightarrow{f_{k+1}} A_{k+1} \to \dots$ has the property that $\operatorname{Ker}(f_{k+1}) =$ $\operatorname{Im}(f_k)$, then we say that the sequence is exact at A_k and the sequence is said to be **exact** if it is exact at A_k for all k (or all k such that the kernel an image exist).

- (2) Page 444. In the middle of the page, the sentence that defines a chain map should state that the map is linear. Indeed, in this section it is likely that all maps between modules or vector spaces are linear by default.
- (3) Page 444. The last line before definition 10.5 should read " $x \in Z^k(A)$ ". The following should be added: Note that if x x' = dy then f(x) f(x') = f(dy) = d(f(y) so that $f(x) \sim f(x')$.
- (4) Page 451. In the second and third lines of the first display of "Case I", the factor $(-1)^k$ should be omitted (in both lines). This factor does appear in the forth line.
- (5) Page 451. In the second to last display there is a spurious "*". Replace $(f \circ s_a \circ \pi^*) \pi^* \alpha$ by $(f \circ s_a \circ \pi) \pi^* \alpha$.
- (6) Page 457. Top of the page. Here the author accidentally changed notation. The map denoted $\iota_0^* + \iota_1^*$ should just be denoted by j^* . Also, two instances of Ker d^* should be replaced by Im d^* . Thus the last part of the proof should read:

... for a given q

$$\longrightarrow H^q(M_k \cap U_{k+1}) \xrightarrow{d^*} H^q(M_{k+1}) \xrightarrow{j^*} H^{q+1}(M_k) \oplus H^{q+1}(U_{k+1}) \longrightarrow,$$

which gives the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Im} d^* \longrightarrow H^q(M_{k+1}) \xrightarrow{j^*} \operatorname{Im} (j^*) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $H^q(M_k \cap U_{k+1})$ and $H^{q+1}(M_k) \oplus H^{q+1}(U_{k+1})$ are finite-dimensional by hypothesis, the same is true of $\operatorname{Im} d^*$ and $\operatorname{Im}(j^*)$. It follows that $H^q(M_{k+1})$ is finite-dimensional and the induction is complete.

Chapter 12

- (1) Page 502. Line 14 from the top. We should find the following: "Thus we get a well-defined map $\nabla : TM \times \Gamma(M, E) \to E$ such that..."
- (2) Page 502. That $\nabla_v s \in E_{\pi(v)}$ should be made clear. The map respects fibers. We could adjust the first required property to read (i') $\nabla_{av}(s) = a \nabla_v s \in E_{\pi(v)}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{F}$, $v \in TM$ and $s \in \Gamma(M, E)$;
- (3) Page 505. 13 lines from the bottom. Correct by including the base point *p*:

$$L(T_pM, E_p) \cong E_p \otimes T_p^*M$$

(4) Page 508. The correct form for a covariant derivative along a map is supposed to be $\nabla^f : TN \times \Gamma_f(E) \to E$. **Teachable moment:** The reason that the author made this error is because of a vacillation between to ultimately equivalent ways of defining a covariant derivative. We either have

$$\nabla^f : TN \times \Gamma_f(E) \to E$$

or

$$\nabla^f : \mathfrak{X}(N) \times \Gamma_f(E) \to \Gamma_f(E)$$

The latter is derived from the former according to the prescription that for $U \in \mathfrak{X}(N)$ we let $\nabla_U^f \sigma$ be defined by $p \mapsto \nabla_{U(p)}^f \sigma$ as explained in the text.

- (5) Page 510. In the proof of the lemma the N should be E_p : The first sentence of the proof should start as follows: $\pi \circ i \circ \gamma$ is constant for each smooth curve γ in E_p ,...
- (6) Page 511. In the last line of Exercise 12.10 change $M \times E$ to $N \times E$.
- (7) Page 511. Line 6 from the bottom. Change "complex vector bundle" to "complex vector space".

Appendices

(1) Page 639, Definition A.4,.

"A morphism that is both a monomorphism and an epimorphism is called an isomorphism."

should be changed to

"A morphism that is both a monomorphism and an epimorphism is called a **bimorphism**. A morphism is called an **isomorphism** if it has both a right and left inverse."

(2) Page 648. In the constant rank theorem a q needs to be changed to a 0. We should read "...there are local diffeomorphisms g_1 : $(\mathbb{R}^n, p) \to (\mathbb{R}^n, 0)$ ".