## Lecture Notes 14

## Connections

Suppose that we have a vector field $X$ on a Riemannian manifold $M$. How can we measure how much $X$ is changing at a point $p \in M$ in the direction $Y_{p} \in T_{p} M$ ? The main problem here is that there exists no canonical way to compare a vector in some tangent space of a manifold to a vector in another tangent space. Hence we need to impose a new kind of structure on a manifold. To gain some insight, we first study the case where $M=\mathbf{R}^{n}$.

### 0.1 Differentiation of vector fields in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$

Since each tangent space $T_{p} \mathbf{R}^{n}$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathbf{R}^{n}$, any vector field on $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ may be identified as a mapping $X: \mathbf{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$. Then for any $Y_{p} \in T_{p} \mathbf{R}^{n}$ we define the covariant derivative of $X$ with respect to $Y_{p}$ as

$$
\nabla_{Y_{p}} X:=\left(Y_{p}\left(X^{1}\right), \ldots, Y_{p}\left(X^{n}\right)\right) .
$$

Recall that $Y_{p}\left(X^{i}\right)$ is the directional derivative of $X^{i}$ at $p$ in the direction of $Y$, i.e., if $\gamma:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M$ is any smooth curve with $\gamma(0)=p$ and $\gamma^{\prime}(0)=Y$, then

$$
Y_{p}\left(X^{i}\right)=\left(X^{i} \circ \gamma\right)^{\prime}(0)=\left\langle\operatorname{grad} X^{i}(p), Y\right\rangle .
$$

The last equality is an easy consequence of the chain rule. Now suppose that $Y: \mathbf{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ is a vector field on $\mathbf{R}^{n}, p \stackrel{Y}{\longmapsto} Y_{p}$, then we may define a new vector field on $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ by

$$
\left(\nabla_{Y} X\right)_{p}:=\nabla_{Y_{p}} X .
$$

Then the operation $(X, Y) \stackrel{\nabla}{\longmapsto} \nabla_{X} Y$ may be thought of as a mapping $\nabla: \mathcal{X}\left(\mathbf{R}^{n}\right) \times$ $\mathcal{X}\left(\mathbf{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}\left(\mathbf{R}^{n}\right)$, where $\mathcal{X}$ denotes the space of vector fields on $\mathbf{R}^{n}$.

Next note that if $X \in \mathcal{X}\left(\mathbf{R}^{n}\right)$ is any vector field and $f: M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a function, then we may define a new vector field $f X \in\left(\mathbf{R}^{n}\right)$ by setting $(f X)_{p}:=f(p) X_{p}$ (do not confuse $f X$, which is a vector field, with $X f$ which is a function defined by $\left.X f(p):=X_{p}(f)\right)$. Now we observe that the covariant differentiation of vector fields on $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ satisfies the following properties:

$$
\text { 1. } \nabla_{Y}\left(X_{1}+X_{2}\right)=\nabla_{Y} X_{1}+\nabla_{Y} X_{2}
$$

[^0]2. $\nabla_{Y}(f X)=(Y f) \nabla_{Y} X+f \nabla_{Y} X$
3. $\nabla_{Y_{1}+Y_{2}} X=\nabla_{Y_{1}} X+\nabla_{Y_{2}} X$
4. $\nabla_{f Y} X=f \nabla_{Y} X$

It is an easy exercise to check the above properties. Another good exercise to write down the pointwise versions of the above expressions. For instance note that item (2) implies that

$$
\nabla_{Y_{p}}(f X)=\left(Y_{p} f\right) \nabla_{Y_{p}} X+f(p) \nabla_{Y_{p}} X,
$$

for all $p \in M$.

### 0.2 Definition of connection and Christoffel symbols

Motivated by the Euclidean case, we define a connection $\nabla$ on a manifold $M$ as any mapping

$$
\nabla: \mathcal{X}(M) \times \mathcal{X}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(M)
$$

which satisfies the four properties mentioned above. We say that $\nabla$ is smooth if whenever $X$ and $Y$ are smooth vector fields on $M$, then $\nabla_{Y} X$ is a smooth vector field as well. Note that any manifold admits the trivial connection $\nabla \equiv 0$. In the next sections we study some nontrivial examples.

Here we describe how to express a connection in local charts. Let $E_{i}$ be a basis for the tangent space of $M$ in a neighborhood of a point $p$. For instance, choose a local chart $(U, \phi)$ centered at $p$ and set $E_{i}(q):=d \phi_{\phi(q)}^{-1}\left(e_{i}\right)$ for all $q \in U$. Then if $X$ and $Y$ are any vector fields on $M$, we may write $X=\sum_{i} X^{i} E_{i}$, and $Y=\sum_{i} Y^{i} E_{i}$ on $U$. Consequently, if $\nabla$ is a connection on $M$ we have

$$
\nabla_{Y} X=\nabla_{Y}\left(\sum_{i} X^{i} E_{i}\right)=\sum_{i}\left(Y\left(X^{i}\right) E_{i}+X^{i} \nabla_{Y} E_{i}\right)
$$

Now note that since $\left(\nabla_{E_{j}} E_{i}\right)_{p} \in T_{p} M$, for all $p \in U$, then it is a linear combination of the basis elements of $T_{p} M$. So we may write

$$
\nabla_{E_{j}} E_{i}=\sum_{k} \Gamma_{j i}^{k} E_{k}
$$

for some functions $\Gamma_{j i}^{k}$ on $U$ which are known as the Christoffel symbols. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{Y} X & =\sum_{i}\left(Y\left(X^{i}\right) E_{i}+X^{i} \sum_{j}\left(Y^{j} \sum_{k} \Gamma_{j i}^{k} E_{k}\right)\right) \\
& =\sum_{k}\left(Y\left(X^{k}\right)+\sum_{i j} Y^{i} X^{j} \Gamma_{i j}^{k}\right) E_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Conversely note that, a choice of the functions $\Gamma_{i j}^{k}$ on any local neighborhood of $M$ defines a connection on that neighborhood by the above expression. Thus we may define a connection on any manifold, by an arbitrary choice of Christoffel symbols in each local chart of some atlas of $M$ and then using a partition of unity.

Next note that for every $p \in U$ we have:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\nabla_{Y} X\right)_{p}=\sum_{k}\left(Y_{p}\left(X^{k}\right)+\sum_{i j} Y^{i}(p) X^{j}(p) \Gamma_{i j}^{k}(p)\right) E_{k}(p) . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

This immediately shows that
Theorem 0.1. For any point $p \in M,\left(\nabla_{Y} X\right)_{p}$ depends only on the value of $X$ at $p$ and the restriction of $Y$ to any curve $\gamma:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M$ which belongs to the equivalence class of curves determined by $X_{p}$.

Thus if $p \in M, Y_{p} \in T_{p} M$ and $X$ is any vector field which is defined on an open neighborhood of $p$, then we may define

$$
\nabla_{Y_{p}} X:=\left(\nabla_{Y} X\right)_{p}
$$

where $Y$ is any extension of $Y_{p}$ to a vector field in a neighborhood of $p$. Note that such an extension may always be found: for instance, if $Y_{p}=\sum Y_{p}^{i} E_{i}(p)$, where $E_{i}$ are some local basis for tangent spaces in a neighborhood $U$ of $p$, then we may set $Y_{q}:=\sum Y_{p}^{i} E_{i}(q)$ for all $q \in U$. By the previous proposition, $\left(\nabla_{Y} X\right)_{p}$ does not depend on the choice of the local extension $Y$, so $\nabla_{Y_{p}} X$ is well defined.

### 0.3 Induced connection on submanifolds

As we have already seen $M$ admits a standard connection when $M=\mathbf{R}^{n}$. To give other examples of manifolds with a distinguished connection, we use the following observation.

Lemma 0.2. Let $\bar{M}$ be a manifold, $M$ be an embedded submanifold of $M$, and $X$ be $\frac{a}{U}$ vector field of $M$. Then for every point $p \in M$ there exists an open neighborhood $\bar{U}$ of $p$ in $\bar{M}$ and a vector filed $\bar{X}$ defined on $\bar{U}$ such that $\bar{X}_{p}=X_{p}$ for all $p \in M$.

Proof. Recall that, by the rank theorem, there exists a local chart $(\bar{U}, \bar{\phi})$ of $\bar{M}$ centered at $p$ such that $\bar{\phi}(U \cap M)=\mathbf{R}^{n-k}$ where $k=\operatorname{dim}(\bar{M})-\operatorname{dim}(M)$. Now, note that $d \bar{\phi}(X)$ is a vector field on $\mathbf{R}^{n-k}$ and let $Y$ be an extension of $d \bar{\phi}(X)$ to $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ (any vector field on a subspace of $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ may be extended to all of $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ ). Then set $\bar{X}:=d \bar{\phi}^{-1}(Y)$.

Now if $\bar{M}$ is a Riemannian manifold with connection $\bar{\nabla}$, and $M$ is any submanifold of $\bar{M}$, we may define a connection on $M$ as follows. First note that for any $p \in M$,

$$
T_{p} \bar{M}=T_{p} M \oplus\left(T_{p} M\right)^{\perp},
$$

that is any vector $X \in T_{p} \bar{M}$ may written as sum of a vector $X^{\top} \in T_{p} M$ (which is tangent to $M$ and vector $X^{\perp}:=X-X^{\top}$ (which is normal to $M$ ). So for any vector fields $X$ and $Y$ on $M$ we define a new vector field on $M$ by setting, for each $p \in M$,

$$
\left(\nabla_{Y} X\right)_{p}:=\left(\bar{\nabla}_{\bar{Y}} \bar{X}\right)_{p}^{\top}
$$

where $\bar{Y}$ and $\bar{X}$ are local extensions of $X$ and $Y$ to vector fields on a neighborhood of $p$ in $M$. Note $\left(\nabla_{Y} X\right)_{p}$ is well-defined, because it is independent of the choice of local extensions $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ by Theorem 0.1.

### 0.4 Covariant derivative

We now describe how to differentiate a vector field along a curve in a manifold $M$ with a connection $\nabla$. Let $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ be a smooth immersion, i.e., $d \gamma_{t} \neq 0$ for all $t \in I$, where $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ is an open interval. By a vector filed along $\gamma$ we mean a mapping $X: I \rightarrow T M$ such that $X(t) \in T_{\gamma(t)} M$ for all $t \in I$. Let $\mathcal{X}(\gamma)$ denote the space of vector fields along $\gamma$.

For any vector field $X \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$, we define another vector field $D_{\gamma} X \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$, called the covariant derivative of $X$ along $\gamma$, as follows. First recall that $\gamma$ is locally one-to-one by the inverse function theorem. Thus, by the previous lemma on the existence of local extensions of vector fields on embedded submanifolds, there exists an open neighborhood $U$ of $\gamma\left(t_{0}\right)$ and a vector field $\bar{X}$ defined on $U$ such that $\bar{X}_{\gamma(t)}=X(t)$ for all $t \in\left(t_{0}-\epsilon, t_{0}+\epsilon\right)$. Set

$$
D_{\gamma} X\left(t_{0}\right):=\nabla_{\gamma^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)} \bar{X} .
$$

Recall that $\gamma^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right):=d \gamma_{t_{0}}(1) \in T_{\gamma\left(t_{0}\right)} M$. By Theorem 0.1, $D_{\gamma} X\left(t_{0}\right)$ is well defined, i.e., it does not depend on the choice of the local extension $\bar{X}$. Thus we obtain a mapping $D_{\gamma}: \mathcal{X}(\gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$. Note that if $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$, then $(X+Y)(t):=X(t)+$ $Y(t) \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$. Further, if $f: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is any function then $(f X)(t):=f(t) X(t) \in$ $\mathcal{X}(\gamma)$. It is easy to check that

$$
D_{\gamma}(X+Y)=D_{\gamma}(X)+D_{\gamma}(Y) \quad \text { and } \quad D_{\gamma}(f X)=f D_{\gamma}(X)
$$

Proposition 0.3. If $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$, and $X \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$, then $D_{\gamma} X=X^{\prime}$. In particular, $D_{\gamma} \gamma^{\prime}=\gamma^{\prime \prime}$.

Proof. Let $\bar{X}$ be a vector field on an open neighborhood of $\gamma\left(t_{0}\right)$ such that

$$
\bar{X}(\gamma(t))=X(t),
$$

for all $t \in\left(t_{0}-\epsilon, t_{0}+\epsilon\right)$. Then

$$
D_{\gamma} X\left(t_{0}\right)=\nabla_{\gamma^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)} \bar{X}=(\bar{X} \circ \gamma)^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=X^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) .
$$

Corollary 0.4. Let $M$ be an immersed submanifold of $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ with the induced connection $\bar{\nabla}$, and corresponding covariant derivative $\bar{D}$. Suppose $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ is an immersed curve, and $X \in \mathcal{X}_{M}(\gamma)$ is a vector field along $\gamma$ in $M$. Then $\bar{D}_{\gamma} X=$ $\left(X^{\prime}\right)^{\top}$.

### 0.5 Geodesics

Note that, by the last exercise, the only curves $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ with the property that

$$
D_{\gamma} \gamma^{\prime} \equiv 0
$$

are given by $\gamma(t)=a t+b$, which trace straight lines. With this motivation, we define a geodesic (which is meant to be a generalization of the concept of lines) as an immersed curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ which satisfies the above equality for all $t \in I$. A nice supply of examples of geodesics are provided by the following observation:

Proposition 0.5. Let $M \subset \mathbf{R}^{n}$ be an immersed submanifold, and $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ an immersed curve. Then $\gamma$ is a geodesic of $M$ (with respect to the induced connection from $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ ) if and only if $\gamma^{\prime \prime \top} \equiv 0$. In particular, if $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ is a geodesic, then $\left\|\gamma^{\prime}\right\|=$ const.

Proof. The first claim is an immediate consequence of the last two results. The last sentence follows from the leibnitz rule for differentiating inner products in Euclidean space: $\left\langle\gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle^{\prime}=2\left\langle\gamma^{\prime \prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle$. Thus if $\gamma^{\prime \prime \top} \equiv 0$, then $\left\|\gamma^{\prime}\right\|^{2}=$ const.

As an application of the last result, we can show that the geodesics on the sphere $\mathbf{S}^{2}$ are those curves which trace a great circle with constant speed:

Example 0.6 (Geodesics on $\mathbf{S}^{2}$ ). A $C^{2}$ immersion $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^{2}$ is a geodesic if and only if $\gamma$ has constant speed and lies on a plane which passes through the center of the sphere, i.e., it traces a segment of a great circle.

First suppose that $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^{2}$ has constant speed, i.e. $\left\|\gamma^{\prime}\right\|=$ const., and that $\gamma$ traces a part of a great circe, i.e., $\langle\gamma, u\rangle=0$ for some fixed vector $u \in \mathbf{S}^{2}$ (which is the vector orthogonal to the plane in which $\gamma$ lies). Since $\left\langle\gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle=\left\|\gamma^{\prime}\right\|^{2}$ is constant, it follows from the Leibnitz rule for differentiating the innerproduct that $\left\langle\gamma^{\prime \prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle=0$. Furthermore, differentiating $\langle\gamma, u\rangle=0$ yields that $\left\langle\gamma^{\prime \prime}, u\right\rangle=0$. So, $\gamma^{\prime \prime}$ lies in the plane of $\gamma$, and is orthogonal to $\gamma$. So, since $\gamma$ traces a circle, $\gamma^{\prime \prime}$ must be parallel to $\gamma$. This in turn implies that $\gamma^{\prime \prime}$ must be orthogonal to $T_{\gamma} \mathbf{S}^{2}$, since $\gamma$ is orthogonal to $T_{\gamma} \mathbf{S}^{2}$. So we conclude that $\left(\gamma^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\top}=0$.

Conversely, suppose that $\left(\gamma^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\top}=0$. Then $\gamma^{\prime \prime}$ is parallel to $\gamma$. So if $u:=\gamma \times \gamma^{\prime}$, then $u^{\prime}=\gamma^{\prime} \times \gamma^{\prime}+\gamma \times \gamma^{\prime \prime}=0+0=0$. So $u$ is constant. But $\gamma$ is orthogonal to $u$, so $\gamma$ lies in the plane which passes through the origin and is orthogonal to $u$. Finally, $\gamma$ has constant speed by the last proposition.

### 0.6 Ordinary differential equations

In order to prove an existence and uniqueness result for geodesic in the next section we need to develop first a basic result about differential equations:

Theorem 0.7. Let $U \subset \mathbf{R}^{n}$ be an open set and $F: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ be $C^{1}$, then for every $x_{0} \in U$, there exists an $\bar{\epsilon}>0$ such that for every $0<\epsilon<\bar{\epsilon}$ there exists a unique curve $x:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow U$ with $x(0)=x_{0}$ and $x^{\prime}(t)=F(x(t))$.

Note that, from the geometric point of view the above theorem states that there passes an integral curve through every point of a vector field. To prove this result we need a number of preliminary results. Let $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ be an interval, $(X, d)$ be a compact metric space, and $\Gamma(I, X)$ be the space of maps $\gamma: I \rightarrow X$. For every pair of curves $\gamma_{1}, \gamma \in \Gamma(I, X)$ set

$$
\delta\left(\gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}\right):=\sup _{t \in I} d\left(\gamma_{1}(t), \gamma_{2}(t)\right) .
$$

It is easy to check that $(\Gamma, \delta)$ is a metric space. Now let $C(I, X) \subset \Gamma(I, X)$ be the subspace of consisting of continuous curves.

Lemma 0.8. $(C, \delta)$ is a complete metric space.
Proof. Let $\gamma_{i} \in C$ be a Cauchy sequence. Then, for every $t \in I, \gamma_{i}(t)$ is a Cauchy sequence in $X$. So $\gamma_{i}(t)$ converges to a point $\bar{\gamma}(t) \in X$ (since every compact metric space is complete). Thus we obtain a mapping $\bar{\gamma}: I \rightarrow X$. We claim that $\bar{\gamma}$ is continuous which would complete the proof. By the triangular inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
d(\bar{\gamma}(s), \bar{\gamma}(t)) & \leq d\left(\bar{\gamma}(s), \gamma_{i}(s)\right)+d\left(\gamma_{i}(s), \gamma_{i}(t)\right)+d\left(\gamma_{i}(t), \bar{\gamma}(t)\right) \\
& \leq 2 \delta\left(\bar{\gamma}, \gamma_{i}\right)+d\left(\gamma_{i}(s), \gamma_{i}(t)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

So, since $\gamma_{i}$ is continuous,

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow s} d(\bar{\gamma}(s), \bar{\gamma}(t)) \leq 2 \delta\left(\bar{\gamma}, \gamma_{i}\right) .
$$

All we need then is to check that $\lim _{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta\left(\bar{\gamma}, \gamma_{i}\right)=0$ : Given $\epsilon>0$, choose $i$ sufficiently large so that $\delta\left(\gamma_{i}, \gamma_{j}\right)<\epsilon$ for all $j \geq i$. Then, for all $t \in I, d\left(\gamma_{i}(t), \gamma_{j}(t)\right) \leq$ $\epsilon$, which in turn yields that $d\left(\gamma_{i}(t), \bar{\gamma}(t)\right) \leq \epsilon$. So $\delta\left(\gamma_{i}, \bar{\gamma}\right) \leq \epsilon$.

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section:
Proof of Theorem 0.7. Let $B=B_{r}^{n}\left(x_{0}\right)$ denote a ball of radius $r$ centered at $x_{0}$. Choose $r>0$ so small that that $\bar{B} \subset U$. For any continuous curve $\alpha \in C((-\epsilon, \epsilon), \bar{B})$ we may define another continuous curve $s(\alpha) \in\left((-\epsilon, \epsilon), \mathbf{R}^{n}\right)$ by

$$
s(\alpha)(t):=x_{0}+\int_{0}^{t} F(a(u)) d u .
$$

We claim that if $\epsilon$ is small enough, then $s(\alpha) \in C((-\epsilon, \epsilon), \bar{B})$. To see this note that

$$
\left\|s(\alpha)(t)-x_{0}\right\|=\left\|\int_{0}^{t} F(\alpha(u)) d u\right\| \leq \int_{0}^{t}\|F(\alpha(u))\| d u \leq \epsilon \sup _{\bar{B}}\|F\| .
$$

So setting $\epsilon \leq r / \sup _{\bar{B}}\|F\|$, we may then assume that

$$
s: C((-\epsilon, \epsilon), \bar{B}) \rightarrow C((-\epsilon, \epsilon), \bar{B}) .
$$

Next note that for every $\alpha, \beta \in C((-\epsilon, \epsilon), \bar{B})$, we have

$$
\delta(s(\alpha), s(\beta))=\sup _{t}\left\|\int_{0}^{t} F(\alpha(u))-F(\beta(u)) d u\right\| \leq \sup _{t} \int_{0}^{t}\|F(\alpha(u))-F(\beta(u))\| d u
$$

Further recall that, since $F$ is $C^{1}$, by the mean value theorem there is a constant $K$ such that

$$
\|F(x)-F(y)\| \leq K\|x-y\|,
$$

for all $x, y \in \bar{B}$ (in particular recall that we may set $K:=\sqrt{n} \sup _{\bar{B}}\left|D_{j} F^{i}\right|$ ). Thus

$$
\int_{0}^{t}\|F(\alpha(u))-F(\beta(u))\| d u \leq K \int_{0}^{t}\|\alpha(u)-\beta(u)\| d u \leq K \epsilon \delta(\alpha, \beta) .
$$

So we conclude that

$$
\delta(s(\alpha), s(\beta)) \leq K \epsilon \delta(\alpha, \beta)
$$

Now assume that $\epsilon<1 / K$ (in addition to the earlier assumption that $\epsilon \leq r / \sup _{\bar{B}}\|F\|$ ), then, $s$ must have a unique fixed point since it is a contraction mapping. So for every $0<\epsilon<\bar{\epsilon}$ where

$$
\bar{\epsilon}:=\min \left\{\frac{r}{\sup _{\bar{B}}\|F\|}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n} \sup _{\bar{B}}\left|D_{j} F^{i}\right|}\right\}
$$

there exists a unique curve $x:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \bar{B}$ such that $x(0)=s(x)(0)=x_{0}$, and $x^{\prime}(t)=s(x)^{\prime}(t)=F(x(t))$.

It only remains to show that $x:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow U$ is also the unique curve with $x(0)=x_{0}$ and $x^{\prime}(t)=F(x(t))$, i.e., we have to show that if $y:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow U$ is any curve with $y(0)=x_{0}$ and $y^{\prime}(t)=F(y(t))$, then $y=x$ (so far we have proved this only for $y:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \bar{B})$. To see this recall that $\epsilon \leq r / \sup _{\bar{B}}\|F\|$ where $r$ is the radius of $\bar{B}$. Thus

$$
\left\|y(t)-x_{0}\right\| \leq \int_{0}^{t}\left\|y^{\prime}(u)\right\| d u=\int_{0}^{t}\|F(y(u))\| d u \leq \epsilon \sup _{\bar{B}}\|F\| \leq r
$$

So the image of $y$ lies in $\bar{B}$, and therefore we must have $y=x$.

### 0.7 Existence and uniqueness of geodesics

Note that for every point $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n}$ and and vector $X \in T_{p} \mathbf{R}^{n} \simeq \mathbf{R}^{n}$, we may find a geodesic through $p$ and with velocity vector $X$ at $p$, which is given simply by $\gamma(t)=p+X t$. Here we show that all manifolds with a connection share this property:

Theorem 0.9. Let $M$ be a manifold with a connection. Then for every $p \in M$ and $X \in T_{p} M$ there exists an $\bar{\epsilon}>0$ such that for every $0<\epsilon<\bar{\epsilon}$ there is a unique geodesic $\gamma:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(0)=p$ and $\gamma^{\prime}(0)=X$.

To prove this theorem, we need to record some preliminary observations. Let $M$ and $\widetilde{M}$ be manifolds with connections $\nabla$ and $\widetilde{\nabla}$ respectively. We say that a diffeomorphism $f: M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ is connection preserving provided that

$$
\left(\nabla_{Y} X\right)_{p}=\left(\widetilde{\nabla}_{d f(Y)} d f(X)\right)_{f(p)}
$$

for all $p \in M$ and all vector fields $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(M)$. It is an immediate consequence of the definitions that

Lemma 0.10. Let $f: M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ be a connection preserving diffeomorphism. Then $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ is a geodesic if and only of $f \circ \gamma$ is a geodesic.

Note that if $f: M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ is a diffeomorphism, and $M$ has a connection $\nabla$, then $f$ induces a connection $\widetilde{\nabla}$ on $\widetilde{M}$ by

$$
\left(\widetilde{\nabla}_{\widetilde{Y}} \widetilde{X}\right)_{\widetilde{p}}:=\left(\nabla_{d f^{-1}(\widetilde{X})} d f^{-1}(\widetilde{Y})\right)_{f^{-1}(\widetilde{p})}
$$

It is clear that then $f: M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ will be connection preserving. So we may conclude that

Lemma 0.11. Let $(U, \phi)$ be a local chart of $M$, then $\gamma: I \rightarrow U$ is a geodesic if and only of $\phi \circ \gamma$ is a geodesic with respect to the connection induced on $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ by $\phi$.

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section:
Proof of Theorem 0.9. Let $(U, \phi)$ be a local chart of $M$ centered at $p$ and let $\nabla$ be the connection which is induced on $\phi(U)=\mathbf{R}^{n}$ by $\phi$. We will show that there exists an $\bar{\epsilon}>0$ such that for every $0<\epsilon<\bar{\epsilon}$ there is a unique geodesic $c:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$, with respect to the induced connection, which satisfies the initial conditions

$$
c(0)=\phi(p) \quad \text { and } \quad c^{\prime}(0)=d \phi_{p}(X) .
$$

Then, by a previous lemma, $\gamma:=\phi^{-1} \circ c:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M$ will be a geodesic on $M$ with $\gamma(0)=p$ and $\gamma^{\prime}(0)=X$. Furthermore, $\gamma$ will be unique. To see this suppose that $\bar{\gamma}:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M$ is another geodesic with $\bar{\gamma}(0)=p$ and $\bar{\gamma}^{\prime}(0)=X$. Let $\epsilon^{\prime}$ be the supremum of $t \in[0, \epsilon]$ such that $\bar{\gamma}(-t, t) \subset U$, and set $\bar{c}:=\left.\phi \circ \bar{\gamma}\right|_{\left(-\epsilon^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\prime}\right)}$.

Then, by Theorem 0.7, $c=\bar{c}$ on $\left(-\epsilon^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\prime}\right)$, because $\epsilon^{\prime}<\bar{\epsilon}$. So it follows that $\gamma=\bar{\gamma}$ on $\left(-\epsilon^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\prime}\right)$, and we are done if $\left(-\epsilon^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\prime}\right)=(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$. This is indeed the case, for otherwise, $\left(-\epsilon^{\prime}-\delta, \epsilon^{\prime}+\delta\right) \subset(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$, for some $\delta>0$. Further $\bar{\gamma}\left( \pm \epsilon^{\prime}\right)=\gamma\left( \pm \epsilon^{\prime}\right) \in U$. So if $\delta$ is sufficiently small, then $\bar{\gamma}\left(-\epsilon^{\prime}-\delta, \epsilon^{\prime}+\delta\right) \subset U$, which contradicts the definition of $\epsilon^{\prime}$.

So all we need is to establish the existence and uniqueness of the geodesic $c:(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ mentioned above. For $c$ to be a geodesic we must have

$$
D_{c} c^{\prime} \equiv 0
$$

We will show that this may be written as a system of ordinary differential equations. To see this first recall that

$$
D_{c} \dot{c}(t)=\nabla_{\dot{c}(t)} \overline{\dot{c}}
$$

where $\overline{\dot{c}}$ is a vector filed in a neighborhood of $c(t)$ which is a local extension of $\dot{c}$, i.e.,

$$
\bar{c}(c(t))=\dot{c}(t) .
$$

By (1) we have

$$
\nabla_{\dot{c}(t)} \overline{\dot{c}}=\sum_{k}\left(\dot{c}(t)\left(\bar{c}^{k}\right)+\sum_{i j} \dot{c}^{i}(t) \dot{c}^{j}(t) \Gamma_{i j}^{k}(c(t))\right) e_{k},
$$

where $e_{i}$ are the standard basis of $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ and $\Gamma_{i j}^{k}(p)=\left\langle\left(\nabla_{e_{i}} e_{j}\right)_{p}, e_{k}\right\rangle$. But

$$
\dot{c}(t)\left(\bar{c}^{k}\right)=\left(\bar{c}^{k} \circ c\right)^{\prime}(t)=\left(\dot{c}^{k}\right)^{\prime}(t)=\ddot{c}^{k}(t) .
$$

So $D_{c} c^{\prime} \equiv 0$ if and only if

$$
\ddot{c}^{k}(t)+\sum_{i j} \dot{c}^{i}(t) \dot{c}^{j}(t) \Gamma_{i j}^{k}(c(t))=0
$$

for all $t \in I$ and all $k$. This is a system of $n$ second order ordinary differential equations (ODEs), which we may rewrite as a system of $2 n$ first order ODEs, via substitution $\dot{c}=v$. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{c}^{k}(t) & =v^{k}(t) \\
\dot{v}^{k}(t) & =-\sum_{i j} v^{i}(t) v^{j}(t) \Gamma_{i j}^{k}(c(t)) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now let $\alpha(t):=(c(t), v(t))$, and define $F: \mathbf{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{2 n}, F=\left(F^{1}, \ldots, F^{2 n}\right)$ by

$$
F^{\ell}(x, y)=y_{\ell}, \quad \text { and } \quad F^{\ell+n}(x, y)=-\sum_{i j} y^{i} y^{j} \Gamma_{i j}^{\ell}(x)
$$

for $\ell=1, \ldots, n$. Then the system of $2 n$ ODEs mentioned above may be rewritten as

$$
\alpha^{\prime}(t)=F(\alpha(t)),
$$

which has a unique solution with initial conditions $\alpha(0)=(\phi(p), d \phi(X))$.

### 0.8 Parallel translation

Let $M$ be a manifold with a connection, and $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ be an immersed curve. Then we say that a vector field $X \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$ is parallel along $\gamma$ if

$$
D_{\gamma} X \equiv 0 .
$$

Thus, in this terminology, $\gamma$ is a geodesic if its velocity vector field is parallel. Further note that if $M$ is a submanifold of $\mathbf{R}^{n}$, the, by the earlier results in this section, $X$ is parallel along $\gamma$ if and only $\left(X^{\prime}\right)^{\top} \equiv 0$.

Example 0.12. Let $M$ be a two dimensional manifold immersed in $\mathbf{R}^{n}, \gamma: I \rightarrow M$ be a geodesic of $M$, and $X \in \mathcal{X}_{M}(\gamma)$ be a vector field along $\gamma$ in $M$. Then $X$ is parallel along $\gamma$ if and only if $X$ has constant length and the angle between $X(t)$ and $\gamma^{\prime}(t)$ is constant as well. To see this note that $\left(\gamma^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\top} \equiv 0$ since $\gamma$ is a geodesic; therefore,

$$
\left\langle X, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle^{\prime}=\left\langle X^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle+\left\langle X, \gamma^{\prime \prime}\right\rangle=\left\langle X^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle .
$$

So, if $\left(X^{\prime}\right)^{\top}=0$, then it follows that $\left\langle X, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle$ is constant which since $\gamma^{\prime}$ and $X$ have both constant lengths, implies that the angle between $X$ and $\gamma^{\prime}$ is constant. Conversely, suppose that $X$ has constant length and makes a constant angle with $\gamma^{\prime}$. Then $\left\langle X, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle$ is constant, and the displayed expression above implies that $\left\langle X, \gamma^{\prime}\right\rangle=0$ is constant. Furthermore, $0=\langle X, X\rangle^{\prime}=2\left\langle X, X^{\prime}\right\rangle$. So $X^{\prime}(t)$ is orthogonal to both $X(t)$ and $\gamma^{\prime}(t)$. If $X(t)$ and $\gamma^{\prime}(t)$ are linearly dependent, then this implies that $X^{\prime}(t)$ is orthogonal to $T_{\gamma(t)} M$, i.e., $\left(X^{\prime}\right)^{\top} \equiv 0$. If $X(t)$ and $\gamma^{\prime}(t)$ are linearly dependent, then $\left(X^{\prime}\right)^{\top}=D_{\gamma}(X)=D_{\gamma}\left(f \gamma^{\prime}\right)=f D_{\gamma}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0$.

Example 0.13 (Foucault's Pendulum). Here we explicitly compute the parallel translation of a vector along a meridian of the sphere. To this end let

$$
X(\theta, \phi):=(\cos (\theta) \sin (\phi), \sin (\theta) \sin (\phi), \cos (\phi))
$$

be the standard parametrization or local coordinates for $\mathbf{S}^{2}-\{(0,0, \pm 1)\}$. Suppose that we want to parallel transport a given unit vector $V_{0} \in T_{X\left(\theta_{0}, \phi_{0}\right)} \mathbf{S}^{2}$ along the meridian $X\left(\theta, \phi_{0}\right)$, where we identify tangent space of $\mathbf{S}^{2}$ with subspaces of $\mathbf{R}^{3}$. So we need to find a mapping $V:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^{2}$ such that $V(0)=V_{0}$ and $V^{\prime}(\theta) \perp$ $T_{X\left(\theta, \phi_{0}\right)} \mathbf{S}^{2}$. The latter condition is equivalent to the requirement that

$$
\begin{equation*}
V^{\prime}(\theta)=\lambda(\theta) X\left(\theta, \phi_{0}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

since the normal to $\mathbf{S}^{2}$ at the point $X(\theta, \phi)$ is just $X(\theta, \phi)$ itself. To solve the above differential equation, let

$$
E_{1}(\theta):=\frac{\partial X / \partial \theta\left(\theta, \phi_{0}\right)}{\| \partial X / \partial \theta\left(\theta, \phi_{0} \|\right.}=(-\sin (\theta), \cos (\theta), 0)
$$

and

$$
E_{2}(\theta):=\frac{\partial X / \partial \phi\left(\theta, \phi_{0}\right)}{\| \partial X / \partial \phi\left(\theta, \phi_{0} \|\right.}=\left(\cos (\theta) \cos \left(\phi_{0}\right), \sin (\theta) \cos \left(\phi_{0}\right),-\sin \left(\phi_{0}\right)\right) .
$$

Now note that $\left\{E_{1}(\theta), E_{2}(\theta)\right\}$ forms an orthonormal basis for $T_{X\left(\theta_{0}, \phi_{0}\right)} \mathbf{S}^{2}$. Thus (2) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle V^{\prime}(\theta), E_{1}(\theta)\right\rangle=0 \quad \text { and } \quad\left\langle V^{\prime}(\theta), E_{2}(\theta)\right\rangle=0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

So it remains to solve this differential equation. To this end first recall that since $V_{0}$ has unit length, and parallel translation preserves length, we may write

$$
V(\theta)=\cos (\alpha(\theta)) E_{1}(\theta)+\sin (\alpha(\theta)) E_{2}(\theta)
$$

So differentiation yields that

$$
V^{\prime}=E_{1}^{\prime} \cos (\alpha)-\sin (\alpha) \alpha^{\prime} E_{1}+\sin (\alpha) E_{2}^{\prime}+\cos (\alpha) \alpha^{\prime} E_{2} .
$$

Further, it is easy to compute that

$$
E_{1}^{\prime}=-\cos \left(\phi_{0}\right) E_{2}-\sin \left(\phi_{0}\right) E_{3} \quad \text { and } \quad E_{2}^{\prime}=\cos \left(\phi_{0}\right) E_{1}
$$

where $E_{3}(\theta):=X\left(\theta, \phi_{0}\right)$. Thus we obtain:

$$
V^{\prime}=\sin (\alpha)\left(\cos \left(\phi_{0}\right)-\alpha^{\prime}\right) E_{1}+\cos (\alpha)\left(\alpha^{\prime}-\cos \left(\phi_{0}\right)\right) E_{2}+(*) E_{3}
$$

So for (3) to be satisfied, we must have $\alpha^{\prime}=\cos \left(\phi_{0}\right)$ or

$$
\alpha(\theta)=\cos \left(\phi_{0}\right) t+\alpha(0),
$$

which in turns determines $V$. Note in particular that the total rotation of $V$ with respect to the meridian $X\left(\theta, \phi_{0}\right)$ is given by

$$
\alpha(2 \pi)-\alpha(0)=\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \alpha^{\prime} d \theta=2 \pi \cos \left(\phi_{0}\right) .
$$

Thus

$$
\phi_{0}=\cos ^{-1}\left(\frac{\alpha(2 \pi)-\alpha(0)}{2 \pi}\right) .
$$

The last equation gives the relation between the precession of the swing plane of a pendulum during a 24 hour period, and the longitude of the location of that pendulum on earth, as first observed by the French Physicist Leon Foucault in 1851.

Lemma 0.14. Let $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ and $U \subset \mathbf{R}^{n}$ be open subsets and $F: I \times U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$, be $C^{1}$. Then for every $t_{0} \in I$ and $x_{0} \in U$ there exists an $\bar{\epsilon}>$ such that for every $0<\epsilon<\bar{\epsilon}$ there is a unique curve $x:\left(t_{0}-\epsilon, t_{0}+\epsilon\right) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ with $x\left(t_{0}\right)=x_{0}$ and $x^{\prime}(t)=F(t, x(t))$.

Proof. Define $\bar{F}: I \times U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ by $\bar{F}(t, x):=(1, F(t, x))$. Then, by Theorem 0.7 , there exists an $\bar{\epsilon}>0$ and a unique curve $\bar{x}:\left(t_{0}-\epsilon, t_{0}+\epsilon\right) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, for every $0<\epsilon<\bar{\epsilon}$, such that $\bar{x}\left(t_{0}\right)=\left(1, x_{0}\right)$ and $\bar{x}^{\prime}(t)=\bar{F}(\bar{x}(t))$. It follows then that $\bar{x}(t)=(t, x(t))$, for some unique curve $x:\left(t_{0}-\epsilon, t_{0}+\epsilon\right) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$. Thus $\bar{F}(\bar{x}(t))=(1, F(t, x(t)))$, and it follows that $x^{\prime}(t)=F(t, x(t))$.

Lemma 0.15. Let $A(t), t \in I$, be a $C^{1}$ one-parameter family of matrices. Then for every $x_{0} \in \mathbf{R}^{n}$ and $t_{0} \in I$, there exists a unique curve $x: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ with $x\left(t_{0}\right)=x_{0}$ such that $x^{\prime}(t)=A(t) \cdot x(t)$.
Proof. Define $F: I \times \mathbf{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ by $F_{t}(x)=A(t) \cdot x$. By the previous lemma, there exists a unique curve $x:\left(t_{0}-\epsilon, t_{0}+\epsilon\right) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ with $x\left(t_{0}\right)=x_{0}$ such that $F_{t}(x(t))=x^{\prime}(t)$ for all $t \in\left(t_{0}-\epsilon, t_{0}+\epsilon\right)$.

Now let $J \subset I$ be the union of all open intervals in $I$ which contains $t_{0}$ and such that $x^{\prime}(t)=F(x(t))$ for all $t$ in those intervals. Then $J$ is open in $I$ and nonempty. All we need then is to show that $J$ is closed, for then it would follow that $J=I$. Suppose that $\bar{t}$ is a limit point of $J$ in $I$. Just as we argued in the first paragraph, there exists a curve $y:(\bar{t}-\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{t}+\bar{\epsilon}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n}$ such that $y^{\prime}(t)=F(y(t))$ and $y^{\prime}(\bar{t}) \neq 0$. Thus we may assume that $y^{\prime} \neq 0$ on $(\bar{t}-\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{t}+\bar{\epsilon})$, after replacing $\bar{\epsilon}$ by a smaller number. In particular $y^{\prime}(\widetilde{t}) \neq 0$ for some $\widetilde{t} \in(\bar{t}-\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{t}+\bar{\epsilon}) \cap J$, and there exists a matrix $B$ such that $B \cdot y^{\prime}(\widetilde{t})=x^{\prime}(\widetilde{t})$.

Now let $\bar{y}(t):=B \cdot y(t)$. Since $F(y(t))=y^{\prime}(t)$, we have $F(\bar{y}(t))=\bar{y}^{\prime}(t)$. Further, by construction $\bar{y}(\widetilde{t})=x(\widetilde{t})$, so by uniqueness part of the previous result we must have $\bar{y}=x$ on $(\bar{t}-\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{t}+\bar{\epsilon}) \cap J$. Thus $x$ is defined on $J \cup(\bar{t}-\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{t}+\bar{\epsilon})$. But $J$ was assumed to be maximal. So $(\bar{t}-\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{t}+\bar{\epsilon}) \subset J$. In particular $\bar{t} \in J$, which completes the proof that $J$ is closed in $I$.

Theorem 0.16. Let $X: I \rightarrow M$ be a $C^{1}$ immersion. For every $t_{0} \in I$ and $X_{0} \in$ $T_{\gamma\left(t_{0}\right)} M$, there exists a unique parallel vector field $X \in \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$ such that $X\left(t_{0}\right)=X_{0}$.
Proof. First suppose that there exists a local chart $(U, \phi)$ such that $\gamma: I \rightarrow U$ is an embedding. Let $\bar{X}$ be a vector field on $U$ and set $X(t):=\bar{X}(\gamma(t))$. By (1),

$$
D_{\gamma}(X)(t)=\nabla_{\gamma^{\prime}(t)} \bar{X}=\sum_{k}\left(\gamma^{\prime}(t)\left(\bar{X}^{k}\right)+\sum_{i j} \gamma^{i}(t) X^{j}(t) \Gamma_{i j}^{k}(\gamma(t))\right) E_{k}(\gamma(t)) .
$$

Further note that

$$
\gamma^{\prime}(t) \bar{X}=(\bar{X} \circ \gamma)^{\prime}(t)=X^{\prime}(t) .
$$

So, in order for $X$ to be parallel along $\gamma$ we need to have

$$
\dot{X}^{k}+\sum_{i j} \gamma^{i}(t) \Gamma_{i j}^{k}(\gamma(t)) X^{j}(t)=0,
$$

for $k=1, \ldots, n$. This is a linear system of ODE's in terms of $X^{i}$, and therefore by the previous lemma it has a unique solution on $I$ satisfying the initial conditions $X^{i}\left(t_{0}\right)=X_{0}^{i}$.

Now let $J \subset I$ be a compact interval which contains $t_{0}$. There exists a finite number of local charts of $M$ which cover $\gamma(J)$. Consequently there exist subintervals $J_{1}, \ldots, J_{n}$ of $J$ such that $\gamma$ embeds each $J_{i}$ into a local chart of $M$. Suppose that $t_{0} \in J_{\ell}$, then, by the previous paragraph, we may extend $X_{0}$ to a parallel vector field defined on $J_{\ell}$. Take an element of this extension which lies in a subinterval $J_{\ell^{\prime}}$ intersecting $J_{\ell}$ and apply the previous paragraph to $J_{\ell^{\prime}}$. Repeating this procedure, we obtain a parallel vector field on each $J_{i}$. By the uniqueness of each local extension mentioned above, these vector fields coincide on the overlaps of $J_{i}$. Thus we obtain a well-defined vector filed $X$ on $J$ which is a parallel extension of $X_{0}$. Note that if $\bar{J}$ is any other compact subinterval of $I$ which contains $t_{0}$, and $\bar{X}$ is the parallel extension of $X_{0}$ on $\bar{J}$, then $X$ and $\bar{X}$ coincide on $J \cap \bar{J}$, by the uniqueness of local parallel extensions. Thus, since each point of $I$ is contained in a compact subinterval containing $t_{0}$, we may consistently define $X$ on all of $I$.

Finally let $\bar{X}$ be another parallel extension of $X_{0}$ defined on $I$. Let $A \subset I$ be the set of points where $\bar{X}=X$. Then $A$ is closed, by continuity of $\bar{X}$ and $X$. Further $A$ is open by the uniqueness of local extensions. Furthermore, $A$ is nonempty since $t_{0} \in A$. So $A=I$ and we conclude that $X$ is unique.

Using the previous result we now define, for every $X_{0} \in T_{\gamma\left(t_{0}\right)} M$,

$$
P_{\gamma, t_{0}, t}\left(X_{0}\right):=X(t)
$$

as the parallel transport of $X_{0}$ along $\gamma$ to $T_{\gamma(t)} M$. Thus we obtain a mapping from $T_{\gamma\left(t_{0}\right)} M$ to $T_{\gamma(t)} M$.

Exercise 0.17. Show that $P_{\gamma, t_{0}, t}: T_{\gamma\left(t_{0}\right)} M \rightarrow T_{\gamma(t)} M$ is an isomorphism (Hint: Use the fact hat $D_{\gamma}: \mathcal{X}(\gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(\gamma)$ is linear). Also show that $P_{\gamma, t_{0}, t}$ depends on the choice of $\gamma$.

Exercise 0.18. Show that

$$
\nabla_{\gamma^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)} X=\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}} \frac{X_{\gamma\left(t_{0}\right)}-P_{\gamma, t_{0}, t}^{-1}\left(X_{\gamma(t)}\right)}{t} .
$$

(Hint: Use a parallel frame along $\gamma$.)
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