

SINGULARITIES OF FLAT FRONTS IN HYPERBOLIC 3-SPACE

M. KOKUBU, W. ROSSMAN, K. SAJI, M. UMEHARA AND K. YAMADA

ABSTRACT. It is well-known that the unit cotangent bundle of any Riemannian manifold has a canonical contact structure. A surface in a Riemannian 3-manifold is called a (wave) front if it is the projection of a Legendrian immersion into the unit cotangent bundle. We shall give easily-computable criteria for a singular point on a front to be a cuspidal edge or a swallowtail. Using this, we shall prove that generically flat fronts in the hyperbolic 3-space admit only cuspidal edges and swallowtails. Moreover, we will show that every complete flat front (which is not rotationally symmetric) has associated parallel surfaces whose singularities consist of only cuspidal edges and swallowtails.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M^2 be a 2-manifold and $f: M^2 \rightarrow \widetilde{M}^3(c)$ be a C^∞ -map into a space form $\widetilde{M}^3(c)$ of constant curvature c . The map f is called a *flat surface* if the set of regular points of f are dense in M^2 and the Gaussian curvature vanishes at all regular points. It is well-known that the associated parallel surfaces $f_t: M^2 \rightarrow \widetilde{M}^3(c)$, i.e. surfaces that are equi-distant from f at a distance t , are also flat. A singular point $p \in M^2$ of a flat surface $f: M^2 \rightarrow \widetilde{M}^3(c)$ is called *admissible* if it becomes a regular point of the parallel surfaces f_t for sufficiently small $t \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Flat surfaces whose singularities are all admissible are called *flat fronts*. Thus flat fronts are a natural subclass to study amongst flat surfaces, and it is of interest to investigate their singularities. For the case $c = 0$, there have appeared several articles concerning the singularities of developable surfaces in \mathbf{R}^3 . In particular, Izumiya [5] proved that the developable surfaces whose singularities are only cuspidal edges, swallowtails or cuspidal cross caps are open and dense in the set of non-cylindrical developable surfaces, where $(u, v) \mapsto (u, v^2, v^3)$ represents a cuspidal edge, $(u, v) \mapsto (3u^4 + u^2v, 4u^3 + 2uv, v)$ a swallowtail, and $(u, v) \mapsto (u, uv^3, v^2)$ a cuspidal cross cap. Recently, geometric inequalities for complete flat fronts in hyperbolic 3-space and complete maximal surfaces with certain singularities in Minkowski 3-space were found in [13] and [16]. We also note that Kitagawa has made a deep investigation of flat tori in the 3-sphere ([7], [8], [9]). The study of global properties of surfaces with singularities is a newly-developing research area in differential geometry.

In this paper, we shall investigate singularities of flat surfaces in the hyperbolic 3-space $H^3 = \widetilde{M}^3(-1)$. The geometry of flat fronts in H^3 has been investigated in [12, 13]. In particular, an analogue of the Osserman inequality for minimal surfaces in \mathbf{R}^3 was given in [13]. Like the case of constant mean curvature one surfaces in H^3 , flat surfaces have a representation formula in terms of holomorphic data, found by A. Gálvez, A. Martínez and F. Milán [3]: Let ω and θ be holomorphic 1-forms on a simply-connected Riemann surface M^2 such that $|\omega|^2 + |\theta|^2$ is positive definite. Then there exists a holomorphic immersion $E_f: M^2 \rightarrow \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad E_f^{-1}dE_f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta \\ \omega & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and its projection to H^3 gives a flat front $f = E_f E_f^*$ in H^3 , where we regard H^3 as

$$(1.2) \quad H^3 = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{C}) / \mathrm{SU}(2) = \{aa^* ; a \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})\} \quad (a^* = {}^t \bar{a}).$$

Moreover, any simply-connected flat front has such a representation with respect to the complex structure induced by the second fundamental form (see [3], [12] and [13]). We call ω and θ in (1.1) the *canonical forms* of f . In Section 3 here, we will show the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $f: M^2 \rightarrow H^3$ be a flat front with canonical forms $(\omega = \hat{\omega} dz, \theta = \hat{\theta} dz)$, where z is a local complex coordinate.*

- (1) *A point $p \in M^2$ is a singular point if and only if $|\hat{\omega}(p)| = |\hat{\theta}(p)|$ holds.*
- (2) *The image of f around a singular point p is locally diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge if and only if*

$$\hat{\omega}'\hat{\theta} - \hat{\theta}'\hat{\omega} \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Im} \left(\frac{(\hat{\theta}'/\hat{\theta}) - (\hat{\omega}'/\hat{\omega})}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}}} \right) \neq 0$$

hold at p , where $' = d/dz$.

- (3) *The image of f around a singular point p is locally diffeomorphic to a swallowtail if and only if*

$$\hat{\omega}'\hat{\theta} - \hat{\theta}'\hat{\omega} \neq 0, \quad \mathrm{Im} \left(\frac{(\hat{\theta}'/\hat{\theta}) - (\hat{\omega}'/\hat{\omega})}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}}} \right) = 0$$

$$\text{and} \quad \mathrm{Re} \left(\frac{s(\hat{\theta}) - s(\hat{\omega})}{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}} \right) \neq 0$$

hold at p , where $s(\hat{\omega})$ is the Schwarzian derivative $\{h, z\}$ of the function $h(z) := \int_{z_0}^z \omega$ with respect to z , that is,

$$(1.3) \quad s(\hat{\omega}) = \{h, z\} = \left(\frac{h''}{h'} \right)' - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h''}{h'} \right)^2 = \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right)' - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right)^2.$$

Consequently, cuspidal edges and swallowtails are stable under perturbations of (ω, θ) . It is well-known that generic fronts (which might not be flat) admit only cuspidal edges or swallowtails (see Arnol'd [1, Section 21.6]). However, it does not immediately follow that the same assertion holds for generic flat fronts. Using the above theorem, we shall prove the same assertion for flat fronts in H^3 . Moreover, we shall prove the following global result in Section 4. A front $f: M^2 \rightarrow H^3$ is called complete if there exist a compact set $C \subset M^2$ and a symmetric 2-tensor T on M^2 such that T is identically 0 outside C and $ds^2 + T$ is a complete Riemannian metric of M^2 , where ds^2 is the first fundamental form of f .

Theorem 1.2. *Let $f: M^2 \rightarrow H^3$ be a complete flat front which is not a covering of an hourglass (hourglasses are rotationally symmetric, see Example 6.2), and let $\{f_t\}$ be the family of parallel fronts of f . Then, except for only finitely many values of t , all the singular points of f_t are locally diffeomorphic to cuspidal edges or swallowtails.*

The image of the singular points under an hourglass is a single point in H^3 , namely the so-called ‘‘cone-like singularity’’ (see Figure 2 in Section 6), and any parallel front of an hourglass has the same singularity. Thus the assumption of Theorem 1.2 is necessary.

Fronts which admit only cuspidal edges and swallowtails are called A-mersions, and their topological properties have been investigated by Langevin, Levitt and Rosenberg [15]. The above theorem implies that complete flat fronts in H^3 are generically included in this category.

The union of singular sets for the entire parallel family of a given flat front is called a *caustic*. We note that Roitman [14] very recently studied the geometric properties of flat surfaces, motivated by a classical result of L. Bianchi (see Section 5.)

To prove Theorem 1.1, we shall give criteria for a singular point on a front to be a cuspidal edge or a swallowtail, as follows: Let N^3 be a Riemannian 3-manifold. Let U be a domain on $(\mathbf{R}^2; u, v)$, and let

$$f = f(u, v): U \longrightarrow N^3$$

be a C^∞ -map, with $p \in U$ a singular point of f . Then there exist three functions $a, b, c \in C^\infty(U)$ such that

$$df \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u} \right) \wedge df \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial v} \right) = a(u, v) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + b(u, v) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + c(u, v) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x},$$

where (x, y, z) is a local coordinate system of N^3 . The rank of a map defined by

$$\mathcal{G}: (u, v) \longmapsto (a(u, v), b(u, v), c(u, v)) \in \mathbf{R}^3$$

does not depend on the choice of local coordinate (x, y, z) nor on the choice of coordinate (u, v) . Since we have assumed N^3 is Riemannian, the unit cotangent bundle of N^3 has a contact structure and we can define fronts as the projection of Legendrian immersions. Now we assume f is a front. A singular point $p \in U$ of f is called *non-degenerate* if the Jacobian matrix of \mathcal{G} is of rank one at p . There exists a regular curve near a non-degenerate singular point p

$$\gamma = \gamma(t): (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \longrightarrow U$$

(called a singular curve) such that $\gamma(0) = p$, and so that the image of γ coincides with the set of singularities of f near p . The tangential direction of $\gamma(t)$ is called the *singular direction*, and a non-zero vector $\eta \in TU$ such that $df(\eta) = 0$ represents the *null direction*. For each point $\gamma(t)$, vectors in the null direction $\eta(t)$ are uniquely determined up to non-zero scalar multiplication.

Proposition 1.3. *Let N^3 be a Riemannian 3-manifold and $p = \gamma(0) \in U$ be a non-degenerate singular point of a front $f: U \rightarrow N^3$.*

- (1) *The germ of the front f at p is locally diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge if and only if $\eta(0)$ is not proportional to $\dot{\gamma}(0)$, where $\dot{\gamma}(t) = d\gamma(t)/dt$.*
- (2) *The germ of the front f at p is locally diffeomorphic to a swallowtail if and only if $\eta(0)$ is proportional to $\dot{\gamma}(0)$ and*

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \det(\dot{\gamma}(t), \eta(t)) \right|_{t=0} \neq 0.$$

We shall prove this proposition in Section 2. These criteria are useful in other situations. In fact, this proposition is applicable for the study of singularities of maximal surfaces in Minkowski space (see [16]).

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Shyuichi Izumiya and Go-o Ishikawa for fruitful discussions and valuable comments, especially Ishikawa for pointing out an error in a preliminary version of our paper.

2. CRITERIA FOR SINGULAR POINTS

2.1. Preliminaries. First, we recall well-known properties for singular points from [2]. Let

$$\varphi = \varphi(w): I \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}$$

be a C^∞ -function defined on an open interval I containing the origin such that $\varphi(0) = 0$. Then φ has an \mathcal{A}_k -singularity at 0 if

$$\varphi'(0) = \varphi''(0) = \cdots = \varphi^{(k)}(0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^{(k+1)}(0) \neq 0,$$

where $\varphi' = d\varphi/dw$ and $\varphi^{(j)} = d^j\varphi/dw^j$. Here, we shall consider the cases $k = 2$ and 3.

Let Ω be an open subset of $(\mathbf{R}^3; x, y, z)$ containing the origin $\mathbf{0}$. A map

$$\Phi: I \times \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}$$

is called an *unfolding* of φ if

$$\varphi(w) = \Phi(w, \mathbf{0})$$

holds. Moreover, if φ has an \mathcal{A}_k -singularity at 0 and the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Phi_x(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_x(0, \mathbf{0}) & \cdots & \Phi_x^{(k-1)}(0, \mathbf{0}) \\ \Phi_y(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_y(0, \mathbf{0}) & \cdots & \Phi_y^{(k-1)}(0, \mathbf{0}) \\ \Phi_z(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_z(0, \mathbf{0}) & \cdots & \Phi_z^{(k-1)}(0, \mathbf{0}) \end{pmatrix}$$

is of rank k , then Φ is called a *versal unfolding* of φ , where, for example,

$$\Phi'_x = \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x \partial w}, \quad \Phi_x^{(j)} = \frac{\partial^{j+1} \Phi}{\partial x \partial^j w}.$$

The set

$$D_\Phi := \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega; \text{there exists a } w \in I \text{ with } \Phi(w, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi'(w, \mathbf{x}) = 0\}$$

is called the *discriminant set* of Φ . The following fact is useful:

Fact 2.1 ([2]). *Suppose $\varphi: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ has an \mathcal{A}_k -singularity ($k = 2$ or 3) at 0 and $\Phi: I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ a versal unfolding of φ . Then*

- (1) D_Φ is locally diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge at $\mathbf{0}$ if $k = 2$.
- (2) D_Φ is locally diffeomorphic to a swallowtail at $\mathbf{0}$ if $k = 3$.

2.2. Non-degenerate singular points. Let N^3 be a Riemannian 3-manifold and $T_1^*N^3$ the unit cotangent bundle. A C^∞ -map $f: M^2 \rightarrow N^3$ is called a (*wave*) *front* if there exists a Legendrian immersion $L_f: M^2 \rightarrow T_1^*N^3$ such that $f = \pi \circ L_f$, where $\pi: T_1^*N^3 \rightarrow N^3$ is the projection. We call L_f the *Legendrian lift* of f . We shall use the following fact later:

Fact 2.2 (Zakalyulin [17]). *Let $U(\subset \mathbf{R}^2)$ be a neighborhood of the origin, and let $f_j: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ ($j = 1, 2$) be fronts. Suppose that $(0, 0)$ is a singular point of f_j and the set of regular points of f_j is dense in U for each $j = 1, 2$. Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exist neighborhoods $V_1, V_2(\subset \mathbf{R}^2)$ of the origin $(0, 0)$ and a local diffeomorphism on \mathbf{R}^3 which maps the image $f_1(V_1)$ to $f_2(V_2)$, namely the image of f_1 is locally diffeomorphic to that of f_2 .*
- (2) *There exists a local diffeomorphism h on \mathbf{R}^3 and a local contact diffeomorphism Ψ on $T_1^*\mathbf{R}^3$ which sends fibers to fibers such that $\Phi \circ L_{f_1} = L_{f_2} \circ h$, namely the lift L_{f_1} is Legendrian equivalent to the lift L_{f_2} .*

Again, we shall return to the general setting: Since any contact structure is locally equivalent to the canonical contact structure on $T_1^*\mathbf{R}^3$, we may restrict our attention to fronts in the Euclidean 3-space \mathbf{R}^3 . Let $(U; u, v)$ be a domain in \mathbf{R}^2 and $f: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ a front. Identifying the unit cotangent bundle $T_1^*\mathbf{R}^3$ with the unit tangent bundle $T_1\mathbf{R}^3 \simeq \mathbf{R}^3 \times S^2$, there exists a unit vector field

$$\nu: U \longrightarrow S^2 \subset \mathbf{R}^3$$

such that the Legendrian lift L_f is expressed as (f, ν) . Since $L_f = (f, \nu)$,

$$\langle df, \nu \rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \nu, \nu \rangle = 1$$

hold, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Euclidean inner product of \mathbf{R}^3 . We call ν the *unit normal vector field* of the front f . Then there exists a C^∞ -function $\lambda \in C^\infty(U)$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(u, v) \times \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}(u, v) = \lambda(u, v) \nu(u, v),$$

where \times denotes the cross product of \mathbf{R}^3 . Obviously, $(u, v) \in U$ is a singular point of f if and only if $\lambda(u, v) = 0$.

Proposition 2.3. *A singular point $p \in U$ of a front $f: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ is non-degenerate if and only if $d\lambda \neq 0$ holds at p .*

Proof. Differentiating (2.1) at p , we have $d(f_u \times f_v)(p) = d\lambda(p)\nu(p)$. This implies that the rank of $f_u \times f_v: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ at p is at most 1, and that $d\lambda(p) \neq 0$ is equivalent to $d(f_u \times f_v)(p) \neq 0$. Therefore, $d\lambda(p) \neq 0$ if and only if $d(f_u \times f_v)$ has rank 1 at p , that is, the map \mathcal{G} in the introduction has rank 1 at p . \square

Let p be a non-degenerate singular point of a front $f: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$. Since the set of singular points is the set $\{\lambda = 0\}$, Proposition 2.3 implies that the set of singular points is parametrized by a smooth curve

$$\gamma: (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \longrightarrow U$$

in a neighborhood of p , so that $\gamma(0) = p$. We call the curve $\gamma(t)$ a *singular curve* passing through p , and the direction $\dot{\gamma}(0)$ the *singular direction* at the singular point p , where the dot denotes the derivative with respect to t . Since p is a non-degenerate singular point, so is any point $\gamma(t)$ for sufficiently small t . Then there exists a unique direction $\eta(t) \in T_{\gamma(t)}U$ up to scalar multiplication such that $df(\eta(t)) = 0$ for each t . We call $\eta(t)$, which is smooth in t , the *null direction*.

Definition 2.4. Let p be a non-degenerate singular point of a front $f: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$, $\gamma(t)$ the singular curve with $\gamma(0) = p$, and $\eta(t)$ the null direction. Then

- (1) p is of *type C* if $\eta(0)$ is not proportional to $\dot{\gamma}(0)$.
- (2) p is of *type S* if $\eta(0)$ is proportional to $\dot{\gamma}(0)$ and

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \det(\dot{\gamma}(t), \eta(t)) \neq 0$$

holds, where $\dot{\gamma}(t)$ and $\eta(t)$ are considered as column vectors in \mathbf{R}^2 .

This definition does not depend on the choices of γ and η .

Example 2.5. The map

$$\hat{f}_C(z, w) := (2w^3, -3w^2, z)$$

gives a cuspidal edge along the z -axis. The null direction is perpendicular to the z -axis, and it has a type C singularity at $(0, 0)$.

The map

$$\hat{f}_S(z, w) := (3w^4 + zw^2, 4w^3 + 2wz, z)$$

gives a swallowtail at $(0, 0)$. The singular curve is $6w^2 + z = 0$, and the null direction is parallel to the w -axis. So $(0, 0)$ is a singularity of type S.

The above $\hat{f} = (\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2, \hat{f}_3) = \hat{f}_C, \hat{f}_S$ satisfy that $\hat{f}_z(0, 0) = (0, 0, 1)$, $\hat{f}_3(z, w) = z$ and the derivative \hat{f}_w vanishes identically on the singular curve. We shall now prove that any front $f(u, v)$ can be given such a parameterization (z, w) near a

non-degenerate singular point, as follows: We assume that the origin $(0, 0)$ of the uv -plane is an arbitrarily given non-degenerate singular point of f , namely

$$\lambda(0, 0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad d\lambda(0, 0) \neq 0,$$

and set

$$f(0, 0) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Then we have:

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that $(0, 0)$ is a non-degenerate singular point of a front $f: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$. Then there is a diffeomorphism*

$$\Psi: (V; z, w) \mapsto (U; u, v)$$

with $\Psi(0, 0) = (0, 0)$ and a rotation at the origin

$$\Theta: \mathbf{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$$

such that

$$\hat{f}(z, w) = \left(\hat{f}_1(z, w), \hat{f}_2(z, w), \hat{f}_3(z, w) \right) = \Theta \circ f \circ \Psi(z, w): V \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$$

satisfies the following properties:

- (1) $\hat{f}_z(0, 0) = (0, 0, 1)$,
- (2) $\hat{f}_3(z, w) = z$,
- (3) the derivative \hat{f}_w vanishes identically along the singular curve. In particular $\hat{f}_w(0, 0) = (0, 0, 0)$ holds.
- (4) If $(0, 0)$ is of type C, the tangent vector $\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \in T_{(0,0)}V$ can be chosen to be the singular direction at the origin of V .

Proof. Let $\gamma(t)$ be the singular curve passing through $(0, 0)$. The null direction $\eta(t)$ can be extended to a vector field $\tilde{\eta}$ on U , that is,

$$\eta(t) = \tilde{\eta} \circ \gamma(t).$$

On the other hand, we take a vector $\xi_0 \in T_{(0,0)}U$ which is not proportional to $\eta(0)$ and satisfies

$$|df(\xi_0)| = 1.$$

If $(0, 0)$ is of type C, we choose ξ_0 to be proportional to $\dot{\gamma}(0)$. Then there exists a vector field ξ on U such that

$$\xi(0, 0) = \xi_0.$$

Then the vector fields ξ and $\tilde{\eta}$ are linearly independent in a neighborhood of the origin. Hence by a lemma in [10, page 182], there exists a new coordinate system (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) such that $\tilde{u}(0, 0) = \tilde{v}(0, 0) = 0$ and $\partial/\partial\tilde{u}$ (resp. $\partial/\partial\tilde{v}$) is proportional to ξ (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$). Scaling ξ and $\tilde{\eta}$, we may assume

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{u}} = \xi \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{v}} = \tilde{\eta},$$

without loss of generality. From now on, we use the coordinates (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) . However, for notational simplicity, we drop the overhead tilde's and write (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) as just (u, v) . So we may assume:

- The derivative f_v vanishes identically on the singular curve $\gamma(t)$.
- If $(0, 0)$ is of type C, the tangent vector $\frac{\partial}{\partial u} \in T_{(0,0)}U$ points in the singular direction at the origin.

Since $f_v(0, 0)$ has unit length, we can take a rotation at the origin $\Theta: \mathbf{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ which maps $f_u(0, 0)$ to $(0, 0, 1)$, and set

$$\tilde{f}(u, v) = \left(\tilde{f}_1(u, v), \tilde{f}_2(u, v), \tilde{f}_3(u, v) \right) = \Theta \circ f(u, v).$$

Then we have

$$\tilde{f}_u(0, 0) = (0, 0, 1), \quad \tilde{f}_v(0, 0) = (0, 0, 0).$$

We set

$$g(u, v, z) := \tilde{f}_3(u, v) - z.$$

Since

$$g_u(0, 0, 0) = (\tilde{f}_3)_u(0, 0) = 1 \neq 0,$$

there exists a function $u = u(z, v)$ such that $u(0, 0) = 0$ and $g(u(z, v), v, z) = 0$, namely,

$$(2.2) \quad \tilde{f}_3(u(z, v), v) = z.$$

Then by

$$u = u(z, w), \quad v = w,$$

(z, w) gives a new coordinate system. We now set

$$(2.3) \quad \hat{f}(z, w) := \tilde{f}(u(z, w), w).$$

Then (2) follows immediately. By differentiating (2.2), we have

$$u_z(0, 0)(\tilde{f}_3)_u(0, 0) = 1,$$

and we get

$$u_z(0, 0) = 1.$$

Thus, by differentiating (2.3), we have

$$\hat{f}_z(0, 0) = u_z(0, 0)\tilde{f}_u(0, 0) = (0, 0, 1),$$

which implies (1).

On the other hand,

$$\hat{f}_w(z, w) = \left(\tilde{f}(u(z, w), w) \right)_w = \tilde{f}_u(u(z, w), w)u_w(z, w) + \tilde{f}_w(u(z, w), w).$$

Since \tilde{f}_v vanishes on γ , so does $\tilde{f}_w(u(z, w), w)$. Thus we have

$$\hat{f}_w(z, w) = \tilde{f}_u(u(z, w), w)u_w(z, w) \quad \text{on } \gamma.$$

By differentiating $\tilde{f}_3(u(z, w), w) = z$ with respect to w , we have

$$u_w(z, w)(\tilde{f}_3)_u(u(z, w), w) = 0.$$

Here, $(\tilde{f}_3)_u(u(z, w), w)$ does not vanish near $(0, 0)$, since $(\tilde{f}_3)_u(0, 0) = 1$. Then we have

$$u_w(z, w) = 0$$

and thus \hat{f}_w vanishes on the singular curve, which proves (3). If $(0, 0)$ is of type C, then $(0, 0, 1)$ is proportional to the singular direction of \hat{f} . Since $\hat{f}_z(0, 0) = (0, 0, 1)$, we have (4). \square

Remark 2.7. In the proof above,

$$\hat{\nu}(z, w) := \nu(u(z, w), w)$$

gives the unit normal vector field of the (normalized) front $\hat{f}(z, w)$.

In addition to the case of surfaces, we shall define fronts for plane curves.

Definition 2.8. Let $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ be an interval. A map

$$\sigma = \sigma(w): I \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}^2$$

is called a (*planar*) *front* if there exists a map

$$n = n(w): I \longrightarrow S^1 \subset \mathbf{R}^2$$

such that $n(w)$ is perpendicular to $\sigma(w)$ and $w \mapsto (\sigma(w), n(w))$ is an immersion. A point $w = w_0$ with $\sigma'(w_0) = 0$ is called a singular point of the planar front $\sigma(w)$, where $' = d/dw$. At a singular point w_0 , $n'(w_0) \neq 0$ holds by definition.

A planar front is a projection of a Legendrian immersion in the unit cotangent bundle $T_1^*\mathbf{R}^2$ with respect to the canonical contact structure.

In the cases of \hat{f}_C and \hat{f}_S in Example 2.5, one can easily check that their slices $\sigma^z: w \mapsto \hat{f}(z, w)$ perpendicular to the z -axis give planar fronts. Then the tangent line of $\sigma^z(w)$ is given by

$$(2.4) \quad \Phi(w, x, y, z) := n_1(z, w)(x - \hat{f}_1(z, w)) + n_2(z, w)(y - \hat{f}_2(z, w)) = 0,$$

where $n(z, w) = (n_1(z, w), n_2(z, w))$ is the unit normal vector of $\sigma^z(w)$. Then σ^z is the envelope of this family of tangent lines, and the discriminant set D_Φ characterizes the image of \hat{f}_C and \hat{f}_S . According to this observation, we shall prove that $\hat{f}(z, w)$ as in Proposition 2.6, which has type C or type S singularities at $(0, 0)$, also satisfies that

- (a) the slice perpendicular to the z -axis gives a planar front,
- (b) the set D_Φ of Φ given by (2.4) is a discriminant set and is locally diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge or a swallowtail, by applying Fact 2.1.

Now we shall prove (a) for non-degenerate singular points as follows:

Proposition 2.9. *Let $(0, 0)$ be a non-degenerate singular point of the front*

$$\hat{f} = \hat{f}(z, w): V \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$$

satisfying (2) and (3) in Proposition 2.6. Then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the map defined by

$$\sigma^z: w \longmapsto (\hat{f}_1(z, w), \hat{f}_2(z, w)) \quad (|z| < \varepsilon)$$

is a planar front. Moreover, w is a singular point of σ^z if (z, w) is a singular point of \hat{f} .

To prove Proposition 2.9, we need the following:

Lemma 2.10. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.9, the derivative $\hat{\nu}_w(0, 0)$ is non-zero and perpendicular to $\mathbf{e}_3 := (0, 0, 1)$, where $\hat{\nu}$ is the unit normal vector field of \hat{f} .*

Proof. Since \hat{f} is a front, it follows from (3) in Proposition 2.6 that $\hat{\nu}_w(0, 0)$ does not vanish. Since $\langle \hat{f}_w, \hat{\nu} \rangle = 0$, we have

$$0 = \langle \hat{f}_w, \hat{\nu} \rangle_z = \langle \hat{f}_{wz}, \hat{\nu} \rangle + \langle \hat{f}_w, \hat{\nu}_z \rangle.$$

Since $\hat{f}_w(0, 0) = 0$ by (3) in Proposition 2.6, we have

$$\langle \hat{f}_{wz}(0, 0), \hat{\nu}(0, 0) \rangle = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{\nu}_w(0,0), \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle &= \langle \hat{\nu}_w(0,0), \hat{f}_z(0,0) \rangle \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \Big|_{(z,w)=(0,0)} \langle \hat{\nu}, \hat{f}_z \rangle - \langle \hat{\nu}(0,0), \hat{f}_{wz}(0,0) \rangle = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired conclusion. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.9. We fix z and let

$$\sigma(w) := (\hat{f}_1(z,w), \hat{f}_2(z,w), 0).$$

Then $\sigma(w)$ is a map into the xy -plane. By (2) in Proposition 2.6, we have

$$\sigma(w) = \hat{f}(z,w) - \langle \hat{f}(z,w), \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle \mathbf{e}_3 = \hat{f}(z,w) - \hat{f}_3(z,w) \mathbf{e}_3 = \hat{f}(z,w) - z \mathbf{e}_3$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dw} \sigma(w) = \hat{f}_w(z,w).$$

This implies that a singular point of σ is a singular point of \hat{f} .

On the other hand, we set

$$n(w) := \frac{\hat{\nu} - \langle \hat{\nu}(z,w), \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle \mathbf{e}_3}{\left(1 - \langle \hat{\nu}(z,w), \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle^2\right)^{1/2}}.$$

Since

$$\langle \hat{\nu}(0,0), \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle = \langle \hat{\nu}(0,0), \hat{f}_z(0,0) \rangle = 0,$$

$n(w)$ is a well-defined unit vector field near $(0,0)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_w(w), n(w) \rangle &= \langle \hat{f}_w(z,w), n(w) \rangle = \frac{\langle \hat{\nu}, \hat{f}_w \rangle - \langle \hat{\nu}, \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_3, \hat{f}_w \rangle}{\left(1 - \langle \hat{\nu}(z,w), \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle^2\right)^{1/2}} \\ &= - \frac{\langle \hat{\nu}, \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle}{\left(1 - \langle \hat{\nu}(z,w), \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle^2\right)^{1/2}} (\hat{f}_3)_w = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\hat{f}_3(z,w) = z$. Thus, $n(w)$ is a normal vector of $\sigma(w)$. By Lemma 2.10, we have $\langle \hat{\nu}_w(0,0), \mathbf{e}_3 \rangle = 0$, and

$$\frac{d}{dw} n(0) = \hat{\nu}_w(0,0) \neq 0.$$

Hence $n'(w) \neq 0$ for sufficiently small (z,w) , and the map $w \mapsto (\sigma(w), n(w))$ is an immersion. \square

2.3. Proof of the criteria. In this section, we shall prove Proposition 1.3 in the introduction. As pointed out in the beginning of the previous section, it is sufficient to prove the assertion for fronts in the Euclidean 3-space \mathbf{R}^3 . The idea of the proof is as follows: Let $(0,0)$ be a non-degenerate singular point of a front $f = f(u,v): U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$. Then by Proposition 2.6, we have a normalized front $\hat{f}(z,w)$. We set

$$\sigma(z,w) := (\hat{f}_1(z,w), \hat{f}_2(z,w)).$$

By Proposition 2.9, there exist positive numbers ε_1 and ε_2 such that

$$(-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) \ni w \mapsto \sigma(z,w) \in \mathbf{R}^2$$

gives a planar front for $|z| < \varepsilon_2$; that is, there exists a unit normal vector field

$$n = n(z, w): (-\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_2) \times (-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}^2$$

such that $\langle \sigma_w(z, w), n(z, w) \rangle = 0$. If we set $n = (n_1, n_2)$, the equation

$$n_1(z, w)(x - \hat{f}_1(z, w)) + n_2(z, w)(y - \hat{f}_2(z, w)) = 0$$

gives the tangent line of the planar front $w \mapsto \sigma(z, w)$, and the image of the planar front is the envelope of these tangent lines. On the other hand, it is well-known that the envelope generated by a family of lines

$$\{F(w, x, y) = 0; w \in \mathbf{R}\}$$

is given by $\{(x, y) \mid F(w, x, y) = F_w(w, x, y) = 0, w \in \mathbf{R}\}$. So if we set

$$(2.5) \quad \Phi(w, x, y, z) := n_1(z, w)(x - \hat{f}_1(z, w)) + n_2(z, w)(y - \hat{f}_2(z, w)),$$

the discriminant set

$$D_\Phi := \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega \mid \text{there exists a } w \in \mathbf{R} \text{ with } \Phi(w, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi_w(w, \mathbf{x}) = 0\}$$

coincides with the image of the front \hat{f} . Now we set

$$\varphi(w) = \Phi(w, 0, 0, 0).$$

Then if $\varphi(w)$ has an \mathcal{A}_k -singularity ($k = 2, 3$) and Φ is a versal unfolding, we can conclude that the image of \hat{f} is locally diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge or a swallowtail, by Fact 2.1.

According to this plan, we shall first prove the criterion for cuspidal edges. First, we prepare three lemmas:

Lemma 2.11. $\sigma(0, 0) = \sigma'(0, 0) = \sigma_z(0, 0) = (0, 0)$ and $n'(0, 0) \neq (0, 0)$ hold, where $'$ denotes the derivative with respect to w .

Proof. These are easily computed from Proposition 2.6 and 2.9. Details are left to the reader. \square

Lemma 2.12. $\Phi_z(0, 0, 0, 0) = \Phi'_z(0, 0, 0, 0) = 0$.

Proof. These are computed by differentiating (2.5) and by using Lemma 2.11. Again details are left to the reader. \square

Lemma 2.13. $\varphi(w)$ has an \mathcal{A}_2 -singularity at $w = 0$ if and only if $\sigma''(0, 0) \neq (0, 0)$.

Proof. By differentiating $\langle \sigma', n \rangle = 0$ and using $\sigma'(0, 0) = (0, 0)$, we have $\langle \sigma''(0, 0), n(0, 0) \rangle = 0$. Since $n'(0, 0) \neq (0, 0)$ by Lemma 2.11, $\{n, n'/|n'|\}$ forms an orthonormal basis for \mathbf{R}^2 . Therefore,

$$(2.6) \quad \sigma''(0, 0) = \langle \sigma''(0, 0), n'(0, 0) \rangle n'(0, 0) / |n'(0, 0)|^2.$$

On the other hand, by differentiating (2.5) and by using Lemma 2.11, we have

$$\varphi(0) = \varphi'(0) = \varphi''(0) = 0, \quad -\varphi'''(0) = \langle \sigma''(0, 0), n'(0, 0) \rangle.$$

Hence φ has an \mathcal{A}_2 -singularity at the origin if and only if $\langle \sigma''(0, 0), n'(0, 0) \rangle \neq 0$. This and (2.6) prove the assertion. \square

Proposition 2.14. *Suppose $(0, 0)$ is a non-degenerate singular point. Then the germ of the image of the front is locally diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge if and only if $(0, 0)$ is of type C.*

Proof. By Fact 2.2, local diffeomorphic equivalence between singular points on fronts implies Legendrian equivalence. Since a cuspidal edge itself is of type C, any singular point locally diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge is of type C. Conversely, we shall show that a singularity of type C is locally diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge. To prove this, it is sufficient to show that φ as above has an \mathcal{A}_2 -singularity and Φ is versal. By Lemma 2.12, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Phi_x(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_x(0, \mathbf{0}) \\ \Phi_y(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_y(0, \mathbf{0}) \\ \Phi_z(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_z(0, \mathbf{0}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n_1(0, 0) & n'_1(0, 0) \\ n_2(0, 0) & n'_2(0, 0) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This matrix is of rank 2, since $n(0, 0)$ and $n'(0, 0)$ are linearly independent.

Next we prove that φ has an \mathcal{A}_2 -singularity. We set

$$\lambda = \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_z, \hat{\nu}),$$

where $\hat{\nu}$ is the unit normal vector of the front \hat{f} . Here $\lambda = 0$ on the singular curve. Since we have assumed that the $(0, 0)$ is of type C, (4) in Proposition 2.6 implies that $\partial/\partial z$ is the singular direction at the origin. So we have

$$\lambda_z(0, 0) = 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$0 \neq \lambda_w = \det(\hat{f}_{ww}, \hat{f}_z, \hat{\nu}) + \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_{zw}, \hat{\nu}) + \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_z, \hat{\nu}_w) = \det(\hat{f}_{ww}, \hat{f}_z, \hat{\nu})$$

holds at $(0, 0)$, because $\hat{f}_w(0, 0) = \mathbf{0}$. Since $\hat{f}_z(0, 0) \times \hat{\nu}(0, 0)$ is parallel to the xy -plane, we have

$$\langle \sigma''(0, 0), \hat{f}_z(0, 0) \times \hat{\nu}(0, 0) \rangle = \langle \hat{f}_{ww}(0, 0), \hat{f}_z(0, 0) \times \hat{\nu}(0, 0) \rangle \neq 0.$$

In particular we have $\sigma''(0, 0) \neq (0, 0)$, and by Lemma 2.13, $\varphi(w)$ has an \mathcal{A}_2 -singularity at $w = 0$. \square

Next, we prove the criterion for swallowtails:

Proposition 2.15. *Suppose $(0, 0)$ is a non-degenerate singular point. Then the germ of the image of the front is locally diffeomorphic to a swallowtail if and only if $(0, 0)$ is of type S.*

To prove this, we prepare a lemma:

Lemma 2.16. *Suppose $(0, 0)$ is a non-degenerate singular point of $\hat{f}(z, w)$, but not of type C. Then*

- (1) $\hat{f}_{ww}(0, 0) = \mathbf{0}$, in particular $\sigma''(0, 0) = (0, 0)$, and
- (2) $\Phi''_z(0, 0, 0, 0) \neq 0$.

Proof. By (3) of Proposition 2.6, \hat{f}_w vanishes identically on the singular curve. Since $(0, 0)$ is not of type C, the singular direction is equal to the null direction $\partial/\partial w$, thus $\hat{f}_{ww}(0, 0) = \mathbf{0}$. In particular, we have $\sigma''(0, 0) = (0, 0)$. Differentiating (2.5) by w and z and substituting the relation

$$\sigma(0, 0) = \sigma'(0, 0) = \sigma_z(0, 0) = \sigma''(0, 0) = (0, 0),$$

we have

$$-\Phi''_z(0, 0, 0, 0) = \langle n'(0, 0), \sigma'_z(0, 0) \rangle.$$

Since $\langle n, \sigma' \rangle = 0$, we have $\langle n, \sigma'_z \rangle = 0$. Since n' is orthogonal to n , σ'_z is proportional to n' . To show $\Phi''_z(0, 0, 0, 0) \neq 0$, it is sufficient to show $\sigma'_z(0, 0) \neq (0, 0)$. Moreover, $(\hat{f}_3)_{wz}$ vanishes identically, so $\sigma'_z(0, 0) \neq (0, 0)$ is equivalent to $\hat{f}_{zw}(0, 0) \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Differentiating

$$\lambda = \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_z, \hat{\nu})$$

with respect to z and using the relation $\hat{f}_w(0, 0) = \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$(2.7) \quad \lambda_z(0, 0) = \det(\hat{f}_{wz}(0, 0), \hat{f}_z(0, 0), \hat{v}(0, 0)).$$

Since $(0, 0)$ is not of type C, $\partial/\partial w$ is the singular direction. In particular $\lambda_w(0, 0) = 0$ holds. Since $d\lambda \neq 0$ at $(0, 0)$, we have $\lambda_z(0, 0) \neq 0$. Hence by (2.7), we have $\hat{f}_{zw}(0, 0) \neq \mathbf{0}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.15. For the same reason as in the proof of Proposition 2.14, any singular point locally diffeomorphic to a swallowtail is of type S. Conversely, we shall show that a singularity of type S is locally diffeomorphic to a swallowtail. To prove this, it is sufficient to show that φ as above has an \mathcal{A}_3 -singularity and Φ is versal. By Lemma 2.12, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Phi_x(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_x(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi''_x(0, \mathbf{0}) \\ \Phi_y(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_y(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi''_y(0, \mathbf{0}) \\ \Phi_z(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi'_z(0, \mathbf{0}) & \Phi''_z(0, \mathbf{0}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n_1(0, 0) & n'_1(0, 0) & * \\ n_2(0, 0) & n'_2(0, 0) & * \\ 0 & 0 & \Phi''_z(0, \mathbf{0}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.16, $\Phi''_z(0, \mathbf{0}) \neq 0$, and then the rank of the matrix is 3. By Lemma 2.11 and Lemma 2.16, we have

$$\varphi(0) = \varphi'(0) = \varphi''(0) = \varphi'''(0) = 0, \quad \varphi^{(4)}(0) = \langle \sigma'''(0), n'(0) \rangle.$$

By differentiating $\langle \sigma', n \rangle = 0$ twice, we have

$$\langle \sigma'''(0, 0), n(0, 0) \rangle = 0.$$

Thus, $\varphi(w)$ has an \mathcal{A}_3 -singularity if and only if $\sigma'''(0) \neq 0$, which is equivalent to $\hat{f}_{www}(0, 0) \neq \mathbf{0}$, since $\hat{f}_3(z, w) = z$.

Since $\lambda(z, w) = \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_z, \hat{v})$ and the singular curve γ is given by $\lambda(z, w) = 0$, the singular direction is given by

$$\xi(z, w) = (\lambda_w(z, w), -\lambda_z(z, w)) \quad \text{on } \gamma.$$

On the other hand, the null direction η is given by

$$\eta(z, w) = \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \quad \text{on } \gamma.$$

Since $(0, 0)$ is of type S, we have

$$(2.8) \quad 0 \neq \left. \frac{d}{dw} \right|_{w=0} \det(\xi(z, w), \eta(z, w)) = \lambda_{ww}(0, 0).$$

By the definition of λ , we have

$$\lambda_w = \det(\hat{f}_{ww}, \hat{f}_z, \hat{v}) + \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_{zw}, \hat{v}) + \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_z, \hat{v}_w).$$

Here, since $\hat{f}_w \times \hat{f}_z$ is proportional to \hat{v} , we have

$$\det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_z, \hat{v}_w) = \langle \hat{f}_w \times \hat{f}_z, \hat{v}_w \rangle = 0.$$

Thus, we have

$$\lambda_w = \det(\hat{f}_{ww}, \hat{f}_z, \hat{v}) + \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_{zw}, \hat{v}).$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ww} &= \det(\hat{f}_{www}, \hat{f}_z, \hat{v}) + \det(\hat{f}_{ww}, \hat{f}_z, \hat{v}_w) \\ &\quad + 2 \det(\hat{f}_{ww}, \hat{f}_{wz}, \hat{v}) + \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_{wwz}, \hat{v}) + \det(\hat{f}_w, \hat{f}_{wz}, \hat{v}_w). \end{aligned}$$

Using $\hat{f}_w(0, 0) = \hat{f}_{ww}(0, 0) = \mathbf{0}$ and (2.8), we have

$$0 \neq \lambda_{ww}(0, 0) = \det(\hat{f}_{www}(0, 0), \hat{f}_z(0, 0), \hat{v}(0, 0)),$$

which proves $\hat{f}_{www}(0, 0) \neq \mathbf{0}$. \square

Izumiya [5] gave criteria for the singularities of a non-cylindrical flat ruled front in Euclidean 3-space \mathbf{R}^3 to be cuspidal edges, swallowtails and cuspidal cross caps. One can prove this for the case of cuspidal edges and swallowtails by directly applying our criteria.

3. LOCAL PROPERTIES OF FLAT FRONTS IN H^3

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1 in the Introduction, and show that, generically, singular points of flat fronts are cuspidal edges or swallowtails.

3.1. Preliminaries. We denote by \mathbf{L}^4 the Minkowski 4-space with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ of signature $(-, +, +, +)$. The hyperbolic 3-space H^3 is considered as the upper half component of the two sheet hyperboloid in \mathbf{L}^4 with the metric induced by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Identifying \mathbf{L}^4 with $\text{Herm}(2)$, the set of 2×2 -hermitian matrices, as

$$\mathbf{L}^4 \ni (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_0 + x_3 & x_1 + \sqrt{-1}x_2 \\ x_1 - \sqrt{-1}x_2 & x_0 - x_3 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{Herm}(2),$$

H^3 is represented as

$$\begin{aligned} H^3 &= \{x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbf{L}^4; \langle x, x \rangle = -1, x_0 > 0\} \\ &= \{X \in \text{Herm}(2); \det X = 1, \text{trace } X > 0\} \\ &= \{aa^*; a \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})\} = \text{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})/\text{SU}(2). \end{aligned}$$

The tangent space of H^3 at $p \in H^3$ is the set of vectors in \mathbf{L}^4 which are perpendicular to p :

$$T_p H^3 = \{Y \in \mathbf{L}^4; \langle p, Y \rangle = 0\}.$$

We define a bilinear, skew-symmetric product \times as

$$(3.1) \quad X \times Y := \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}(Xp^{-1}Y - Yp^{-1}X) \quad \text{for } X, Y \in T_p H^3,$$

where X, Y and p are considered as matrices in $\text{Herm}(2)$, and the products of the right-hand side are matrix multiplications. It is easy to show that $X \times Y$ is a vector in $T_p H^3$ and perpendicular to both X and Y . We call “ \times ” the *cross product* of H^3 .

Let M^2 be an oriented simply-connected Riemannian 2-manifold, and let

$$f: M^2 \longrightarrow H^3 = \text{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})/\text{SU}(2)$$

be a front whose Legendrian lift is

$$L_f: M^2 \rightarrow T_1^* H^3 = \text{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})/\text{U}(1).$$

Identifying $T_1^* H^3$ with $T_1 H^3$, we can write $L_f = (f, \nu)$, where $\nu(p)$ is a unit vector in $T_p H^3$ such that $\langle df(p), \nu(p) \rangle = 0$ holds for each $p \in M^2$. We call ν the *unit vector field* of the front f .

Suppose that f is flat, then there is a (unique) complex structure on M^2 and a holomorphic Legendrian immersion

$$(3.2) \quad E_f: M^2 \longrightarrow \text{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})$$

such that f and L_f are projections of E_f , where being a holomorphic Legendrian map means that $E_f^{-1}dE_f$ is off-diagonal. In particular, $f = E_f E_f^*$, with H^3 considered to be as in (1.2). (See [3], [12] and [13] for details.) If we set

$$(3.3) \quad E_f^{-1}dE_f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta \\ \omega & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

the first and the second fundamental forms ds^2 and dh^2 are given by

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \omega\theta + \bar{\omega}\bar{\theta} + (|\omega|^2 + |\theta|^2) \\ dh^2 &= |\theta|^2 - |\omega|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We call ω and θ the *canonical forms* of the front f . The holomorphic 2-differential

$$(3.5) \quad Q := \omega\theta,$$

which appeared in the $(2,0)$ -part of ds^2 , is called the *Hopf differential* of f . By definition, the umbilic points of the front f coincide with the zeroes of Q . We remark that the $(1,1)$ -part of the first fundamental form

$$(3.6) \quad ds_{1,1}^2 := |\omega|^2 + |\theta|^2$$

is positive definite on M^2 .

Conversely, the following assertion holds (see [13] for the front case and [3] for the regular case):

Fact 3.1. *Let ω and θ be holomorphic 1-forms on a simply-connected Riemann surface M^2 such that $|\omega|^2 + |\theta|^2$ is positive definite. Then the solution of the ordinary differential equation*

$$E^{-1}dE = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta \\ \omega & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E(z_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

gives a holomorphic Legendrian immersion of M^2 into $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})$, where $z_0 \in M^2$ is a base point, and its projection into H^3 gives a flat front. Conversely, any flat front is locally expressed in this manner.

Remark 3.2. If we identify H^3 with the upper-half component of the hyperboloid in Minkowski 4-space \mathbf{L}^4 , the parallel surface of f is written as

$$f_t = (\cosh t)f + (\sinh t)\nu: M^2 \rightarrow H^3 \subset \mathbf{L}^4,$$

where t is the signed distance from f and ν is the unit normal vector of f in H^3 . As pointed out in [3] and [13],

$$(3.7) \quad E_{f_t} = E_f \begin{pmatrix} e^{-t/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{t/2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the canonical forms ω_t and θ_t of f_t are written as

$$(3.8) \quad \omega_t = e^{-t}\omega, \quad \theta_t = e^t\theta.$$

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $f: M^2 \rightarrow H^3$ be a flat front. Then, on a neighborhood of p , we can take a holomorphic Legendrian immersion E_f as in (3.2). Since $ds_{1,1}^2 = |\omega|^2 + |\theta|^2$ is positive definite, it holds that either $\omega(p) \neq 0$ or $\theta(p) \neq 0$. So, by (3.2) and the fact that $f = E_f E_f^*$, we have

$$f^{-1}df = (E_f^*)^{-1} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta \\ \omega & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \bar{\omega} \\ \bar{\theta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} E_f^*.$$

Thus, if we write $\omega = \hat{\omega} dz$ and $\theta = \hat{\theta} dz$ in a complex coordinate z , we have

$$f^{-1}f_z = (E_f^*)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hat{\theta} \\ \hat{\omega} & 0 \end{pmatrix} E_f^* \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-1}f_{\bar{z}} = (E_f^*)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \bar{\hat{\omega}} \\ \bar{\hat{\theta}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} E_f^*,$$

and then

$$(f^{-1}f_z) \times (f^{-1}f_{\bar{z}}) = (|\hat{\theta}|^2 - |\hat{\omega}|^2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where “ \times ” is the cross product as in (3.1). Thus, the singular set is the set of zeroes of the function

$$\lambda = |\hat{\theta}|^2 - |\hat{\omega}|^2.$$

Then p is a singular point if and only if

$$(3.9) \quad |\hat{\omega}(p)| = |\hat{\theta}(p)|.$$

Hence (1) is proven. Since f is a front, $ds_{1,1}^2$ as in (3.6) is positive definite. Hence $|\hat{\omega}(p)| = |\hat{\theta}(p)| \neq 0$ holds on a singular point p .

Moreover, at a singular point p , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\lambda &= d\left(\hat{\theta}\bar{\theta} - \hat{\omega}\bar{\omega}\right) = \left(\hat{\theta}'\bar{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'\bar{\omega}\right) dz + \overline{\left(\hat{\theta}'\bar{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'\bar{\omega}\right)} d\bar{z} \\ &= \left\{\hat{\theta}'\frac{\hat{\theta}\bar{\theta}}{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'\bar{\omega}\right\} dz + \overline{\left\{\hat{\theta}'\frac{\hat{\theta}\bar{\theta}}{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'\bar{\omega}\right\}} d\bar{z} \\ &= \left\{\hat{\theta}'\frac{\hat{\omega}\bar{\omega}}{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'\bar{\omega}\right\} dz + \overline{\left\{\hat{\theta}'\frac{\hat{\omega}\bar{\omega}}{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'\bar{\omega}\right\}} d\bar{z} \quad (\text{by (3.9)}) \\ &= \frac{\bar{\omega}}{\theta} \left(\hat{\theta}'\omega - \hat{\omega}'\hat{\theta}\right) dz + \frac{\hat{\omega}}{\bar{\theta}} \overline{\left(\hat{\theta}'\omega - \hat{\omega}'\hat{\theta}\right)} d\bar{z}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence a singular point p is non-degenerate if and only if

$$(3.10) \quad \hat{\theta}'\hat{\omega} - \hat{\omega}'\hat{\theta} \neq 0$$

holds at p .

Let p be a non-degenerate singular point, that is, (3.9) and (3.10) hold at p . Let $\gamma(t)$ be a singular curve such that $\gamma(0) = p$. Since $|\hat{\theta}|^2 - |\hat{\omega}|^2 = 0$ holds on $\gamma(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left(\hat{\theta}'\bar{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'\bar{\omega}\right) \dot{\gamma} + \overline{\left(\hat{\theta}'\bar{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'\bar{\omega}\right)} \dot{\bar{\gamma}} \\ &= |\hat{\theta}|^2 \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\bar{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\bar{\omega}}\right) \dot{\gamma} + |\hat{\theta}|^2 \overline{\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\bar{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\bar{\omega}}\right)} \dot{\bar{\gamma}} = 2|\hat{\theta}|^2 \left\langle \overline{\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\bar{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\bar{\omega}}\right)}, \dot{\gamma} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

holds on $\gamma(t)$, because of (3.9), where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Hermitian inner product on \mathbf{C} .

Hence $\sqrt{-1}\left(\hat{\theta}'/\bar{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'/\bar{\omega}\right)$ gives the singular direction. Thus, by a suitable choice of the parameter t , the singular curve $\gamma(t)$ can be parametrized as

$$(3.11) \quad \dot{\gamma}(t) = \sqrt{-1} \overline{\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\bar{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\bar{\omega}}\right)}.$$

The first fundamental form ds^2 is written as

$$ds^2 = \left(\hat{\omega} dz + \bar{\theta} d\bar{z}\right) \left(\hat{\theta} dz + \bar{\omega} d\bar{z}\right)$$

on the curve $\gamma(t)$. Now we set $\rho = \hat{\theta}/\hat{\omega}$. Since $\rho(p) \neq 0$, there exists a holomorphic function g defined on a neighborhood of p such that $g^2 = \rho$. Since $|g| = 1$ on the singular curve $\gamma(t)$, we have

$$\hat{\omega} \left(\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{g\hat{\omega}}\right) + \bar{\theta} \overline{\left(\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{g\hat{\omega}}\right)} = \sqrt{-1} \left(\frac{1}{g} - \bar{g}\right) = 0.$$

Thus the null direction $\eta(t)$ is given by

$$\eta(t) = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{g\hat{\omega}} = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}}}.$$

So we have

$$(3.12) \quad \det(\dot{\gamma}, \eta) = \operatorname{Im} \bar{\gamma} \eta = \operatorname{Im} \left\{ \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega} \hat{\theta}}} \right\}.$$

Here, by Proposition 1.3, p is diffeomorphic to a cuspidal edge if $\det(\dot{\gamma}, \eta) \neq 0$ at $t = 0$. Hence, we have (2).

Next, let us prove (3). Using (3.11) and (3.12), we can compute that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \det(\dot{\gamma}, \eta) = \operatorname{Re} \left[\frac{s(\hat{\theta}) - s(\hat{\omega})}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega} \hat{\theta}}} |\hat{\omega} \hat{\theta}| \overline{\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right)} \right].$$

Hence, if $(\hat{\theta}'/\hat{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'/\hat{\omega})/\sqrt{\hat{\omega} \hat{\theta}} \in \mathbf{R}$ at p , then

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \det(\dot{\gamma}, \eta) \right|_{t=0} = \left\{ |\hat{\omega} \hat{\theta}| \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'/\hat{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'/\hat{\omega}}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega} \hat{\theta}}} \right) \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{s(\hat{\theta}) - s(\hat{\omega})}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega} \hat{\theta}}} \right) \right\} \Big|_p.$$

This proves (3), because of Proposition 1.3. \square

Remark 3.3. We set the two hyperbolic Gauss maps to be

$$G = \frac{A}{C}, \quad G_* = \frac{B}{D}, \quad \text{where } E_f = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}.$$

As shown in [12], we have the following expression

$$(3.13) \quad E_f = \begin{pmatrix} G/\xi & \xi G_*/(G - G_*) \\ 1/\xi & \xi/(G - G_*) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \xi := c \exp \left(\int_{z_0}^z \frac{dG}{G - G_*} \right),$$

where $c = e^{-t/2} \in \mathbf{R}$ determines which member of the parallel family f_t of f we have. In this (G, G_*) -construction of flat fronts, it is convenient to rewrite the conditions in Theorem 1.1 in terms of (G, G_*) . We have the following identities, which will be useful for an application of Theorem 1.1 (see [13]):

$$(3.14) \quad Q := \omega \theta = -\frac{dG dG_*}{(G - G_*)^2},$$

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} = \frac{G''}{G'} - 2 \frac{G'}{G - G_*}, \quad \frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} = \frac{G_*''}{G_*'} - 2 \frac{G_*'}{G_* - G},$$

$$(3.16) \quad s(\hat{\omega}) = 2\hat{Q} + \{G, z\}, \quad s(\hat{\theta}) = 2\hat{Q} + \{G_*, z\},$$

where $' := d/dz$, $Q = \hat{Q} dz^2$, $s(\cdot)$ is as in (1.3) and $\{G, z\}$ represents the Schwarzian derivative of G with respect to z :

$$(3.17) \quad \{G, z\} = \left(\frac{G''}{G'} \right)' - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{G''}{G'} \right)^2.$$

3.3. Generic singularities of flat fronts. As an application of Theorem 1.1, we shall now show that generic singularities of flat fronts are cuspidal edges or swallowtails. Let U be a simply-connected domain in \mathbf{C} , and $\mathcal{O}(U)$ the set of holomorphic functions on U . Then, for each $h \in \mathcal{O}(U)$, we can construct a flat front

$$f_h: U \longrightarrow H^3$$

which is represented by a pair of holomorphic 1-forms $(\omega, \theta) = (dz, e^h dz)$.

Conversely, if p is not an umbilic point (i.e. $Q(p) = \omega(p)\theta(p) \neq 0$), both $\omega(p)$ and $\theta(p)$ are not equal to zero, and we can choose a complex coordinate such that $\omega = dz$ and $\theta = e^h dz$. Thus, any flat front is locally congruent to some f_h , except in neighborhoods of umbilic points. We remark that an umbilic point cannot be

a singular point, since $ds_{1,1}^2 = |\omega|^2 + |\theta|^2$ is positive definite. By Theorem 1.1, we have the following

- (1) The zeros of $\operatorname{Re} h$ correspond to singular sets. Moreover, a singular point $p \in U$ is non-degenerate if and only if $h'(p) \neq 0$.
- (2) A singular point p is a cuspidal edge if and only if it is non-degenerate and $e^{-h(p)/2}h'(p) \notin \mathbf{R}$.
- (3) A singular point p is a swallow tail if and only if it is non-degenerate, $e^{-h(p)/2}h'(p) \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\operatorname{Re} [e^{-h(p)}(h''(p) - \frac{1}{2}h'(p)^2)] \neq 0$.

We let $J_H^k(U)$ be the space of k -jets of holomorphic functions on U . Then $J_H^k(U)$ canonically identified with the product space $U \times \mathbf{C}^{k+1}$:

$$J_H^k(U) \ni j^k h \longleftrightarrow (p, h(p), h'(p), h''(p), \dots, h^{(k)}(p)) \in U \times \mathbf{C}^{k+1}.$$

In particular, $J_H^k(U)$ can be considered as a C^∞ -manifold of dimension $2(k+2)$ as well as a complex manifold of dimension $k+2$. For a compact set K of U and an open subset O in $J_H^k(U)$, we set

$$[K, O]_k := \{h \in \mathcal{O}(U); j^k h(K) \subset O\}.$$

Let \mathfrak{D}_k be the topology of $\mathcal{O}(U)$ generated by such $[K, O]_k$, which is called *the compact open C^k -topology*. If $\pi : J_H^{k+1}(U) \rightarrow J_H^k(U)$ is the canonical projection, it can be easily seen that π is a continuous map and $[K, \pi^{-1}(O)]_{k+1} = [K, O]_k$. In particular, $\mathfrak{D}_k \subset \mathfrak{D}_{k+1}$ holds, and

$$\mathfrak{D} := \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{D}_k$$

gives a topology on $\mathcal{O}(U)$, called the *compact open C^∞ -topology*. A holomorphic function $h \in \mathcal{O}(U)$ is an interior point of a given subset $\mathcal{V}(\subset \mathcal{O}(U))$ (with respect to the compact open C^∞ -topology) if and only if there exist a non-negative integer l and a finite number of compact sets C_1, \dots, C_s in U and open subsets $O_1, \dots, O_s \subset J_H^l(U)$ such that

$$h \in \bigcap_{r=1}^s [K_r, O_r]_l \subset \mathcal{V}.$$

Now we give a topology on the family of flat fronts $\{f_h\}_{h \in \mathcal{O}(U)}$ induced from the compact open C^∞ -topology on $\mathcal{O}(U)$. We shall prove the following:

Theorem 3.4. *Let K be an arbitrary compact set of U and $S(K)$ the subset of $\{f_h\}_{h \in \mathcal{O}(U)}$ which consists of f_h whose singular points on K are locally diffeomorphic to cuspidal edges or swallowtails. Then $S(K)$ is an open and dense subset of $\{f_h\}_{h \in \mathcal{O}(U)}$.*

Remark 3.5. Generic properties of C^∞ maps are usually described in terms of the Whitney C^∞ -topology (cf. [4]), because it is suitable for the technique of multiplying by a cut-off function. However, generic properties of analytic functions are different in the Whitney C^∞ -topology. In the above theorem, we use the compact open C^∞ -topology. The two topologies are the same when the source space is compact. However, they are different on $\mathcal{O}(U)$. In fact, when the source space is non-compact, the C^∞ -topology satisfies the second axiom of countability, but the Whitney C^∞ -topology on $\mathcal{O}(U)$ does not satisfy even the first axiom of countability and cannot be treated by sequence convergence. We do not know if the set $S(U)$ (which consists of f_h whose singular points on U are locally diffeomorphic to cuspidal edges or swallowtails) is an open dense subset with respect to the Whitney C^∞ -topology.

Proof. We set

$$A_1 := \{j^2 h(p) \in J_H^2(U) \mid \operatorname{Re} h(p) = 0 \text{ and } h'(p) = 0\},$$

$$A_2 := \left\{ j^2 h(p) \in J_H^2(U) \left| \begin{array}{l} \operatorname{Re} h(p) = 0, \quad \operatorname{Im}(e^{-h(p)/2} h'(p)) = 0, \\ \operatorname{Re}[e^{-h(p)} (h''(p) - \frac{1}{2} h'(p)^2)] = 0 \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Then A_1 and A_2 are both closed subsets of $J_H^2(U)$. The set given by

$$\hat{S}(K) = \{h \in \mathcal{O}(U); j^2 h(K) \subset J_H^2(U) \setminus (A_1 \cup A_2)\} = [K, J_H^2(U) \setminus (A_1 \cup A_2)]_2$$

corresponds to $S(K)$ under the identification $h \leftrightarrow f_h$, which is by definition an open subset in $\mathcal{O}(U)$.

So it is sufficient to show that $\hat{S}(K)$ is a dense subset. Obviously, A_1 is a real closed submanifold of $J_H^2(U)$ with codimension three. We remark that $J_H^2(U) \setminus A_1$ is an open submanifold of $J_H^2(U)$. The following lemma holds:

Lemma 3.6. $A_2 \setminus A_1$ is a submanifold of $J_H^2(U)$ with codimension three.

Proof. We define a C^∞ -map $\zeta = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \zeta^3): J_H^2(U) \setminus A_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(j^2 h(p)) &= \left(\operatorname{Re} h(p), \operatorname{Im}(e^{-h(p)/2} h'(p)), \operatorname{Re} \left[e^{-h(p)} \left(h''(p) - \frac{1}{2} (h'(p))^2 \right) \right] \right) \\ &= \left(u, e^{-u/2} (v_1 \cos \frac{v}{2} - u_1 \sin \frac{v}{2}), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{e^{-u}}{2} ((-u_1^2 + v_1^2 + 2u_2) \cos v + 2(-u_1 v_1 + v_2) \sin v) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$h(z) = u(z) + \sqrt{-1}v(z), \quad h'(z) = u_1(z) + \sqrt{-1}v_1(z), \quad h''(z) = u_2(z) + \sqrt{-1}v_2(z).$$

Then $(z, u, v, u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2)$ gives the canonical coordinate system on $J_H^2(U)$. By a direct calculation, we have $\zeta^{-1}(0, 0, 0) = A_2 \setminus A_1$. We show that $(0, 0, 0)$ is a regular value of ζ . To determine the rank of the Jacobian matrix of ζ at any point in $\zeta^{-1}(0, 0, 0)$, we calculate the derivative of ζ with respect to u, u_1 and v_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} (\zeta_u^1, \zeta_u^2, \zeta_u^3) &= \left(1, \frac{e^{-u/2}}{2} (-v_1 \cos \frac{v}{2} + u_1 \sin \frac{v}{2}), \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{e^{-u}}{2} ((-u_1^2 + v_1^2 + 2u_2) \cos v + 2(-u_1 v_1 + v_2) \sin v) \right), \\ (\zeta_{u_1}^1, \zeta_{u_1}^2, \zeta_{u_1}^3) &= \left(0, -e^{-u/2} \sin \frac{v}{2}, -e^{-u} (u_1 \cos v + v_1 \sin v) \right), \\ (\zeta_{v_1}^1, \zeta_{v_1}^2, \zeta_{v_1}^3) &= \left(0, e^{-u/2} \cos \frac{v}{2}, e^{-u} (v_1 \cos v - u_1 \sin v) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\frac{\partial(\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \zeta^3)}{\partial(u, u_1, v_1)} = e^{-3u/2} (u_1 \cos \frac{v}{2} + v_1 \sin \frac{v}{2}).$$

We now suppose $\zeta(z, u, v, u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) = 0$. Then

$$u = 0, \quad e^{-u/2} (v_1 \cos \frac{v}{2} - u_1 \sin \frac{v}{2}) = 0$$

hold and thus

$$(3.18) \quad v_1 \cos \frac{v}{2} - u_1 \sin \frac{v}{2} = 0.$$

Then (3.18) and $\partial(\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \zeta^3)/\partial(u, u_1, v_1) = 0$ imply that $u = u_1 = v_1 = 0$, namely, that $(z, u, v, u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2)$ belongs to A_1 . Hence $d\zeta$ is of rank 3 at $\zeta^{-1}(0, 0, 0)$ in $J_H^2(U) \setminus A_1$. By the implicit function theorem, $A_2 \setminus A_1$ is a submanifold of codimension 3. \square

Proof of Theorem (continued). We shall prove that $\hat{S}(K)$ is a dense subset. We now fix a function $h \in \mathcal{O}(U)$. Let B be the set of polynomial of degree at most 2 in z and define a map as follows

$$G: U \times B \ni (z, \varphi) \mapsto j^2(h + \varphi)(z) \in J_H^2(U).$$

Obviously the map G is a diffeomorphism. In particular, $G^{-1}(A_1)$ and $G^{-1}(A_2 \setminus A_1)$ are both submanifolds of dimension 5 diffeomorphic to A_1 and $A_2 \setminus A_1$ respectively. Let

$$\pi: U \times B \longrightarrow B$$

be the canonical projection. Since B is a C^∞ -manifold of dimension 6, Sard's theorem yields that $\pi(G^{-1}(A_1))$ and $\pi(G^{-1}(A_2 \setminus A_1))$ are measure zero sets in B . Thus

$$\pi(G^{-1}(A_1 \cup A_2)) = \pi(G^{-1}(A_1 \cup (A_2 \setminus A_1))) = \pi(G^{-1}(A_1)) \cup \pi(G^{-1}(A_2 \setminus A_1))$$

is also a measure zero set. Thus there is a sequence $\{\varphi_n\}$ in B such that φ_n converges to the zero polynomial and $\varphi_n \notin \pi(G^{-1}(A_1 \cup A_2))$. We set $h_n := h + \varphi_n$. Then $(j^2 h_n)(U) \not\subset A_1 \cup A_2$, that is,

$$h_n \in [U, J_H^2(U) \setminus (A_1 \cup A_2)]_2 \subset \hat{S}(K).$$

Let d be a distance function on $J_H^l(U)$ which is compatible with respect to its topology. Then a sequence $\{g_n\}$ in $C^0(U, J_H^l(U))$ converges to g uniformly on a given compact subset K of U if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer n_0 such that

$$\sup_{z \in K} d(g_n(z), g(z)) < \varepsilon \quad (n \geq n_0)$$

holds.

We remark that

$$j^k(\mathcal{O}(U)) \subset C^0(U, J_H^l(U))$$

holds. Since the difference $h_n - h$ is only a polynomial φ_n of degree at most 2 converging to the zero polynomial, one can easily check that for each non-negative integer l , $j^l h_n$ converges to $j^l h$ uniformly on any compact subset of U .

Let \mathcal{V} be an open neighborhood of h in $\mathcal{O}(U)$. Then by the definition of the compact open C^∞ -topology, there exist a non-negative integer l , a finite number of compact sets C_1, \dots, C_s of U , and open subsets O_1, \dots, O_s of $J_H^l(U)$ such that

$$h \in \bigcap_{r=1}^s [C_r, O_r]_l \subset \mathcal{V}.$$

We set

$$\delta_r = d(j^l h(C_r), J_H^l(U) \setminus O_r) > 0 \quad (r = 1, 2, 3, \dots, s).$$

Note that

$$C := C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_s.$$

is a compact set. Since $j^l h_n$ converges to $j^l h$ uniformly on any compact subset of U , there exists an integer $n_0 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{z \in C} d((j^l h)(z), (j^l h_n)(z)) < \frac{\min(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_s)}{2} \quad (n \geq n_0).$$

On the other hand,

$$d((j^l h)(z), J_H^l(U) \setminus O_r) \leq d((j^l h)(z), (j^l h_n)(z)) + d((j^l h_n)(z), J_H^l(U) \setminus O_r),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} d(j^l(h_n)(z), J_H^l(U) \setminus O_r) &\geq d(j^l h(z), J_H^l(U) \setminus O_r) - d((j^l h)(x), (j^l h_n)(z)) \\ &\geq \delta_r - \frac{\min(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_s)}{2} > 0 \quad (z \in C_r). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $j^l h_n(z) \in O_r$ if $z \in C_r$. Thus $h_n \in [C_r, O_r]_l$ holds for all $r = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and

$$h_n \in \bigcap_{r=1}^s [C_r, O_r]_l \subset \mathcal{V} \quad (n \geq n_0).$$

Since $h_n \in \hat{S}(K)$, this implies that $\hat{S}(K)$ is a dense subset. \square

4. GLOBAL PROPERTIES OF SINGULAR POINTS

In this section, we shall give a proof of Theorem 1.2 in the Introduction.

4.1. Preliminaries. Let $f: M^2 \rightarrow H^3$ be a flat front defined on a Riemann surface M^2 . In this section, we do not assume that M^2 is simply-connected. Thus the holomorphic lift E_f of f is defined only on the universal cover \widetilde{M}^2 of M^2 :

$$E_f: \widetilde{M}^2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathcal{C}),$$

and then the canonical forms ω and θ as in (3.3) are holomorphic 1-forms defined on \widetilde{M}^2 . Note that the first and second fundamental forms as in (3.4), the Hopf differential as in (3.5), and the $(1, 1)$ -part $ds_{1,1}^2$ of the first fundamental form are all well-defined on M^2 . Moreover $ds_{1,1}^2$ is positive definite on M^2 . We have that

$$(4.1) \quad \omega \text{ and } \theta \text{ have no common zeroes on } \widetilde{M}^2, \text{ and}$$

$$(4.2) \quad |\omega|^2 \text{ and } |\theta|^2 \text{ are well-defined pseudometrics on } M^2.$$

From now on, we assume f is *complete*, that is, there exist a compact set $C \subset M^2$ and a symmetric 2-tensor T such that T is identically zero outside C and $ds^2 + T$ is a complete Riemannian metric (see [13]). We remark that f is complete if and only if (see [11])

- (1) The $(1, 1)$ -part $ds_{1,1}^2$ of the first fundamental form is complete (in this case, we say that f is “ L -complete”),
- (2) $ds_{1,1}^2$ has finite total absolute curvature, and
- (3) the singular set is a compact set of M^2 .

In the proof of Theorem 1.2, we use only properties (1) and (2); that is, the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 holds for L -complete flat fronts such that $ds_{1,1}^2$ has finite absolute total curvature.

By completeness, we know that there exist a compact Riemann surface \overline{M}^2 and a finite number of points $\{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$ in \overline{M}^2 such that

$$M^2 \cong \overline{M}^2 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\} \quad (\text{i.e. they are biholomorphic})$$

([13, Lemma 3.3], see also [3]). We call the points $\{p_j\}$ the *ends* of f . Moreover, as shown in [3, Lemma 2], the Hopf differential Q can be extended meromorphically on \overline{M}^2 , and at each end p_j there exists a complex coordinate z around p_j such that $z(p_j) = 0$ and the canonical forms are written as

$$(4.3) \quad \omega = \hat{\omega}(z) dz = z^\mu \hat{\omega}_0(z) dz, \quad \theta = \hat{\theta}(z) dz = z^{\mu_*} \hat{\theta}_0(z) dz, \quad (\mu, \mu_* \in \mathbf{R}),$$

where $\hat{\omega}_0$ and $\hat{\theta}_0$ are holomorphic functions in z which do not vanish at the origin. Since μ and μ_* do not depend on the choice of complex coordinates, we denote

$$\mathrm{ord}_{p_j} \omega := \mu, \quad \mathrm{ord}_{p_j} \theta := \mu_*.$$

These are the orders of the pseudometrics $|\omega|^2$ and $|\theta|^2$, respectively. By (3.4), we have

$$\mu + \mu_* = \text{ord}_{p_j} \omega + \text{ord}_{p_j} \theta = \text{ord}_{p_j} Q \in \mathbf{Z},$$

where, by convention, $\text{ord}_0 Q = k$ if $Q = z^k dz^2$. Since f is complete, $ds_{1,1}^2$ is a complete Riemannian metric on M^2 [13, Corollary 3.4]. Thus, we have

$$(4.4) \quad \min\{\text{ord}_{p_j} \omega, \text{ord}_{p_j} \theta\} \leq -1.$$

Definition 4.1. An end p_j is called *cylindrical* if

$$\text{ord}_{p_j} \omega = \text{ord}_{p_j} \theta.$$

Let G and G_* be the hyperbolic Gauss maps of f . Then G and G_* are both meromorphic functions on M^2 , and $G(p) \neq G_*(p)$ for all $p \in M^2$.

Fact 4.2 ([3, Theorem 4]). *At an end p_j , the following properties are equivalent:*

- (1) G is meromorphic at p_j .
- (2) G_* is meromorphic at p_j .
- (3) $\text{ord}_{p_j} Q \geq -2$, that is, Q has at most a pole of order 2 at p_j .

Definition 4.3. An end p_j is called *regular* if the three properties in Fact 4.2 hold. Otherwise, p_j is called *irregular*.

Remark 4.4. The ends of the hyperbolic cylinders are regular and cylindrical. As a special case of [3, Theorem 6], a regular cylindrical end is asymptotic to a finite cover to a hyperbolic cylinder. Properties of irregular cylindrical ends will be investigated in a forthcoming paper [11].

An *umbilic point* $q \in M^2$ is a zero of the Hopf differential Q . When Q is identically zero, that is, f is totally umbilic, f represents the horosphere. In this section, we assume that f is not totally umbilic. Since Q is meromorphic on the compact Riemann surface \overline{M}^2 , the number of umbilic points is finite. As $ds_{1,1}^2$ is positive definite at q , (3.5) implies that either

$$(4.5) \quad (\text{ord}_q \omega = \text{ord}_q Q \in \mathbf{Z}_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ord}_q \theta = 0) \\ \text{or} \quad (\text{ord}_q \theta = \text{ord}_q Q \in \mathbf{Z}_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ord}_q \omega = 0)$$

holds at each umbilic point q .

Using a local complex coordinate z , we write

$$(4.6) \quad \omega = \hat{\omega} dz, \quad \theta = \hat{\theta} dz, \quad Q = \hat{Q} dz^2.$$

4.2. Global descriptions of the criteria for singular points. Let \overline{M}^2 be a compact Riemann surface and

$$f: M^2 = \overline{M}^2 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\} \longrightarrow H^3$$

a complete flat front which is not totally umbilic. Using the canonical forms ω and θ in (3.3), we define

$$\rho := \frac{\theta}{\omega}.$$

Though ρ might be defined only on the universal cover of M^2 , (4.2) implies that $|\rho|$ is well-defined on M^2 . Moreover, by (4.3), $|\rho|$ can be extended on \overline{M}^2 as a continuous map

$$|\rho|: \overline{M}^2 \longrightarrow [0, +\infty].$$

As seen in Section 3, the set of singular points of the flat front f is given by

$$\Sigma(f) := \{p \in M^2; |\rho(p)| = 1\}.$$

Using a local expression as in (4.6), we define

$$(4.7) \quad \xi := \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right) \hat{Q} dz^3, \quad \zeta_c := \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right)^2 \frac{1}{\hat{Q}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_s := \frac{s(\hat{\theta}) - s(\hat{\omega})}{\hat{Q}},$$

where $Q = \hat{Q} dz^2$, $' = d/dz$ and $s(\cdot)$ is as in (1.3).

Lemma 4.5. *The quantities in (4.7) are independent on the choice of complex coordinate. In particular, ξ is a meromorphic 3-form on \overline{M}^2 , and both ζ_c and ζ_s are meromorphic functions on \overline{M}^2 .*

Proof. Since $|\rho|$ is well-defined on M^2 ,

$$d(\rho\bar{\rho}) = |\rho|^2 \left(\frac{d\rho}{\rho} + \frac{d\bar{\rho}}{\bar{\rho}} \right)$$

is well-defined on M^2 , and then so is its $(1,0)$ -part. Hence

$$\frac{d\rho}{\rho} = \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right) dz$$

is a meromorphic 1-form on M^2 . Moreover, by (4.3) and (4.5), $d\rho/\rho$ is a meromorphic 1-form on \overline{M}^2 . Since Q is a meromorphic 2-differential on \overline{M}^2 , $\xi = (d\rho/\rho) \cdot Q$ is a meromorphic 3-differential. As the symmetric product $(d\rho/\rho) \cdot (d\rho/\rho)$ is a meromorphic 2-differential,

$$\zeta_c = \frac{(d\rho/\rho) \cdot (d\rho/\rho)}{Q}$$

is a meromorphic function on \overline{M}^2 .

Though the Schwarzian derivative as in (3.17) depends on the choice of complex coordinates, the difference of two Schwarzian derivatives is considered as a meromorphic 2-differential; that is, if we write $S(G) := \{G, z\} dz^2$ in the complex coordinate z ,

$$S(G_*) - S(G) = [\{G_*, z\} - \{G, z\}] dz^2$$

is independent of the choice of a coordinate z , as a meromorphic 2-differential. Here, by (3.16),

$$(4.8) \quad \zeta_s = \frac{\{G_*, z\} - \{G, z\}}{\hat{Q}} = \frac{S(G_*) - S(G)}{Q}$$

holds. This shows that ζ_s is a well-defined meromorphic function on M^2 . Moreover, by (4.3) and the definition (4.7), ζ_s is meromorphic at each end. \square

Using the invariants of (4.7), we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(f) &:= \{p \in M^2; |\rho(p)| = 1\}, \\ Z_0(f) &:= \{p \in M^2; \xi(p) = 0\}, \\ Z_c(f) &:= \{p \in M^2; \text{Im} \sqrt{\zeta_c(p)} = 0\}, \\ Z_s(f) &:= \{p \in M^2; \text{Re} \zeta_s(p) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Though $\sqrt{\zeta_c}$ is multi-valued on M^2 , the condition $\text{Im} \sqrt{\zeta_c} = 0$ is unambiguous.

Then by Theorem 1.1, the following hold:

- $p \in M^2$ is a singular point if and only if $p \in \Sigma(f)$.

- $p \in \Sigma(f)$ is a non-degenerate singular point if and only if $p \in Z_0(f)^c$.
- $p \in \Sigma(f)$ is a cuspidal edge if and only if $p \in Z_0(f)^c \cap Z_c(f)^c$.
- $p \in \Sigma(f)$ is a swallowtail if and only if $p \in Z_0(f)^c \cap Z_c(f) \cap Z_s(f)^c$.
- A singular point $p \in \Sigma(f)$ is neither a cuspidal edge nor a swallowtail if and only if

$$p \in Z_0(f) \cup (Z_c(f) \cap Z_s(f)).$$

Here we denote the complementary set by the upper suffix c . Since $Z_c(f)$ (resp. $Z_s(f)$) describes a criterion for a singular point to be a cuspidal edge (resp. a swallowtail), we use the lower suffix “ c ” (resp. “ s ”).

The sets $Z_0(f)$, $Z_c(f)$ and $Z_s(f)$ are the same for all the parallel fronts of f ; that is, if $\{f_t\}_{t \in \mathbf{R}}$ is the family of parallel fronts of f , then we have:

Lemma 4.6.

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(f_t) &= \{p \in M^2; |\rho(p)| = e^{-2t}\}, \\ Z_0(f_t) &= Z_0(f), \quad Z_c(f_t) = Z_c(f), \quad Z_s(f_t) = Z_s(f). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By (3.8), we have the first assertion. Though the remaining parts can be proved by direct calculations, we give an alternative proof: Let G and G_* be the hyperbolic Gauss maps of f . Then by (3.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \left(\frac{G''}{G'_*} - \frac{G''}{G'} + 2 \frac{G' + G'_*}{G - G_*} \right) \hat{Q} dz^3, \\ \zeta_c &= \left(\frac{G''}{G'_*} - \frac{G''}{G'} + 2 \frac{G' + G'_*}{G - G_*} \right)^2 \frac{1}{\hat{Q}}, \end{aligned}$$

and ζ_s is written as in (4.8). Since the hyperbolic Gauss maps and the Hopf differential are independent of the choice of parallel front f_t , we have the conclusion. \square

By a direct calculation using the formulas in the proof of Lemma 4.6, we have

$$(4.9) \quad \zeta_s = \frac{\sqrt{\zeta_c'}}{\sqrt{\hat{Q}}} \quad \left(' = \frac{d}{dz} \right).$$

Using this, we can prove that:

Proposition 4.7. *Let f be a complete flat front which is not totally umbilic. Then the function ζ_c is constant if and only if f is a covering of a front of revolution.*

Proof. If $\zeta_c = 0$, $d\rho = 0$ holds on M^2 . Hence ρ is constant. In this case, one can conclude that f is a covering of a hyperbolic cylinder, which is a surface of revolution.

On the other hand, assume ζ_c is a non-zero constant. By (4.3), $\hat{\theta}'/\hat{\theta} - \hat{\omega}'/\hat{\omega}$ can only have simple poles. Then by the definition of ζ_c in (4.7), the order of Q is at least -2 . Thus, by Fact 4.2, all ends must be regular.

By (4.9), $\zeta_s = 0$ holds. Then by (4.8), we have $\{G, z\} = \{G_*, z\}$ with respect to any complex coordinate z . Then it holds that

$$(4.10) \quad G_* = b \star G = \frac{b_{11}G + b_{12}}{b_{21}G + b_{22}}, \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{C}),$$

where \star denotes the Möbius transformation. Here, the group $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{C})$ acts isometrically on H^3 as

$$(4.11) \quad H^3 \ni x \longmapsto axa^* \in H^3 \quad a \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{C}),$$

where we consider H^3 as in (1.2). Under the isometry (4.11), the hyperbolic Gauss maps transform as $(G, G_*) \mapsto (a \star G, a \star G_*)$. Hence we may assume b in (4.10) is a Jordan normal form.

When b is diagonal, we have $G_* = \mu G$, where μ is constant. Here, since f is a flat front, G and G_* have no common branch points (see [13]). Thus G has no branch point, and then we can take $z = G$ as a local coordinate. Hence, as seen in Example 6.2 in Section 6, f is locally congruent to a front of revolution. Thus we have the conclusion.

If b is not diagonal, the eigenvalue of b is ± 1 , which is a double root. Then we have $G_* = G - 1$. Since the ends of f are the points where $G = G_*$ ([13, Lemma 4.10]), the ends are common poles of G and G_* . In this case, by (3.14) we have $Q = -dG dG_* = -dG^2$. Then the $\text{ord}_p Q$ at a pole p of G is less than or equal to -4 , which contradicts the fact that all ends are regular. \square

4.3. Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let

$$(4.12) \quad f: M^2 = \overline{M}^2 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\} \longrightarrow H^3$$

be a complete flat front which is not totally umbilic, and $\{f_t\}$ its parallel family. For simplicity, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_t := \Sigma(f_t), \quad Z_0 := Z_0(f_t) = Z_0(f), \quad Z_c := Z_c(f_t) = Z_c(f), \\ \text{and} \quad Z_s := Z_s(f_t) = Z_s(f). \end{aligned}$$

A point $p \in M^2$ is a singular point of f_t which is neither a cuspidal edge nor a swallowtail if and only if

$$p \in \Sigma_t \cap (Z_0 \cup (Z_c \cap Z_s)).$$

Then by Lemma 4.6, f_t admits such a singular point if and only if

$$(4.13) \quad \{|\rho(p)|; p \in Z_0 \cup (Z_c \cap Z_s)\} \ni e^{-2t}.$$

Since ξ in (4.7) is a meromorphic 3-differential on the compact Riemann surface \overline{M}^2 and Z_0 is the set of zeroes of ξ , Z_0 is a finite set of points. Thus, to prove Theorem 1.2, it is sufficient to show the following proposition:

Proposition 4.8. *Let f be a complete flat front such that ζ_c defined in (4.7) is not constant. Then $\{|\rho(p)|; p \in Z_c \cap Z_s\} \subset \mathbf{R}_+$ is a finite set.*

Before proving this proposition, we shall give a proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Assume a complete flat front f is a front of revolution. Such a flat front is a horosphere, a finite cover of a hyperbolic cylinder, a snowman, or an hourglass (see Example 6.2 in Section 6). Among these, the horospheres and hyperbolic cylinders do not have singular points, and all singularities of the snowman are cuspidal edges. Since we assumed f is not a cover of an hourglass, we have the conclusion for the case of fronts of revolution.

Next, we assume f is not a front of revolution. Then by Proposition 4.7, ζ_c is non-constant. Hence by Proposition 4.8, $\{|\rho(p)|; p \in Z_c \cap Z_s\}$ is a finite set. On the other hand, the parallel front f_t admits a singular point which is neither a cuspidal edge nor a swallowtail if and only if (4.13) holds. Hence we have the conclusion. \square

To prove Proposition 4.8, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.9. *Let f be a complete flat front as in (4.12) with non-constant ζ_c . Assume $Z_c \cap Z_s$ accumulates at a point $p \in \overline{M}^2$. Then*

- (1) p is a non-umbilic point in M^2 or an irregular cylindrical end, and

- (2) *there exists a neighborhood U of p such that the number of connected components of*

$$(U \setminus \{p\}) \cap (Z_c \cap Z_s)$$

is finite, and each connected component is a level set of $|\rho|$.

This lemma will be proven in Section 4.4 later. Using these, we shall prove Proposition 4.8.

Proof of Proposition 4.8. Assume

$$\#\{|\rho(p)|; p \in Z_c \cap Z_s\} = +\infty.$$

Then there exists an infinite sequence $\{z_n\} \subset Z_c \cap Z_s$ such that $|\rho(z_n)|$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) are mutually distinct. Since $\overline{M^2}$ is compact, we can take a subsequence of $\{z_n\}$ such that z_n converges to $z_\infty \in \overline{M^2}$. Thus by Lemma 4.9, $\#\{|\rho(z_n)|\}$ is finite. This is a contradiction because the $|\rho(z_n)|$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) are mutually distinct. \square

4.4. Proof of Lemma 4.9.

Proof of the first part of Lemma 4.9. Let p be an accumulation point of $Z_c \cap Z_s$, and take a sequence $\{p_n\}$ consisting of mutually distinct points in $Z_c \cap Z_s$ such that $p_n \rightarrow p$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We show the first assertion of the lemma by way of contradiction: We assume

- $p \in M^2$ is an umbilic point, or
- $p \in \overline{M^2}$ is an end which is not an irregular cylindrical end,

and set

$$\mu = \text{ord}_p \omega, \quad \mu_* = \text{ord}_p \theta \quad \text{and} \quad k = \text{ord}_p Q = \mu + \mu_* \in \mathbf{Z}.$$

If p is an umbilic point, $\mu \neq \mu_*$ holds because of (4.5). If p is an end, $\mu = \mu_*$ holds when p is cylindrical. So, we consider two cases:

Case 1: $\mu \neq \mu_*$, that is, p is an umbilic point or a non-cylindrical end.

Case 2: $\mu = \mu_*$, that is, p is a cylindrical end. In this case, p is a regular end because of our assumption. Then by Fact 4.2 and (4.4), we have $\mu = \mu_* = -1$.

Case 1: We have $\mu \neq \mu_*$. If we take a complex coordinate z around p such that $z(p) = 0$, we can write

$$(4.14) \quad \frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} = \frac{a}{z}(1 + O(z)) \quad (a := \mu_* - \mu),$$

where $O(z)$ denotes a higher-order term. On the other hand, the Hopf differential Q is written as

$$Q = z^k (q_0 + O(z)) dz^2 \quad (q_0 \neq 0).$$

Thus, it follows from (4.7) that

$$(4.15) \quad \sqrt{\zeta_c} = z^{-(k+2)/2} \left(\frac{a}{\sqrt{q_0}} + O(z) \right).$$

We assume $k \neq -2$. Then by (4.14), (4.15) and (4.9), we have

$$(4.16) \quad \zeta_s = z^{-k-2} \left(\frac{a}{q_0} + O(z) \right).$$

Let $z_n = z(p_n)$. Then z_n tends to the origin as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $p_n \in Z_c \cap Z_s$, $\operatorname{Im} \sqrt{\zeta_c(z_n)} = \operatorname{Re} \zeta_s(z_n) = 0$ holds. Since $a \in \mathbf{R}$, there exist sequences $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ and $\{\varepsilon'_n\}$ of real numbers such that

$$(4.17) \quad 0 \equiv \arg \sqrt{\zeta_c(z_n)} = -\left(\frac{k}{2} + 1\right) \arg z_n - \frac{1}{2} \arg q_0 + \varepsilon_n \pmod{\pi},$$

$$(4.18) \quad \frac{\pi}{2} \equiv \arg \zeta_s(z_n) = -(k+2) \arg z_n - \arg q_0 + \varepsilon'_n \pmod{\pi},$$

and $\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Here, by (4.17) and (4.18), we have

$$-\frac{\pi}{2} \equiv 2 \arg \sqrt{\zeta_c(z_n)} - \arg \zeta_s(z_n) \equiv 2\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon'_n \pmod{\pi},$$

giving a contradiction. Then the case $k \neq -2$ is impossible.

Assume $k = -2$. In this case, (4.15) is written as $\sqrt{\zeta_c} = aq_0^{-1/2} + O(z)$. Then by the assumption that ζ_c is non-constant, there exists a positive integer l such that

$$(4.19) \quad \sqrt{\zeta_c} = \frac{a}{\sqrt{q_0}} + bz^l + O(z^{l+1}) \quad (b \neq 0).$$

In this case, by (4.9), we have

$$(4.20) \quad \zeta_s = z^l \left(\frac{lb}{\sqrt{q_0}} + O(z) \right).$$

Here $\operatorname{Im} \sqrt{\zeta_c(z_n)} = 0$ holds on a sequence $\{z_n = z(p_n)\}$ such that $z_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and $a \in \mathbf{R}$. Hence (4.19) implies that $\sqrt{q_0} \in \mathbf{R}$. Thus, we have

$$(4.21) \quad 0 \equiv \arg \sqrt{\zeta_c(z_n)} = \arg (bz_n^l + O(z^{l+1})) = l \arg z_n + \arg b + \varepsilon_n \pmod{\pi},$$

$$(4.22) \quad \frac{\pi}{2} \equiv \arg \zeta_s(z_n) = l \arg z_n + \arg b + \varepsilon'_n, \pmod{\pi},$$

where $\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Again, (4.21) and (4.22) contradict each other.

Case 2: We assume $\mu = \mu_* = -1$. Taking a complex coordinate z such that $z(p) = 0$, we can write $\hat{Q} = z^{-2}(q_0 + O(z))$. Denote by $d \in \mathbf{Z}_+ \cup \{0\}$ the branch order of G at $z = 0$. (for example, if $G = a + z^{d+1}$, the branch order of G at $z = 0$ is d .) Since $\mu = -1$, (3.16) implies that

$$q_0 = \frac{1}{4}(d+1)^2 > 0.$$

Since $\mu = \mu_* = -1$, it holds that $(\hat{\theta}'/\hat{\theta}) - (\hat{\omega}'/\hat{\omega}) = O(1)$. Hence we have $\sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} = O(z)$. Thus, we can write

$$\sqrt{\zeta_c} = bz^l + O(z^{l+1}), \quad \hat{Q} = \frac{1}{z^2} \left(\frac{1}{4}(d+1)^2 + O(z) \right),$$

where $l \geq 1$ is an integer and $b \neq 0$. Thus,

$$\zeta_s = \frac{lb}{\sqrt{q_0}} z^l (1 + O(z)) = \frac{lb}{d+1} z^l (1 + O(z)).$$

As in Case 1, we set $z_n = z(p_n)$. Then we have

$$\arg b + l \arg z_n + \varepsilon_n \equiv 0, \quad \arg b + l \arg z_n + \varepsilon'_n \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} \pmod{\pi},$$

where $\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n \rightarrow 0$. This is impossible.

Hence in any case, $Z_c \cap Z_s$ does not accumulate at 0. \square

Proof of the second part of Lemma 4.9. We consider two cases.

Case 1: Suppose that $Z_c \cap Z_s$ accumulates at a non-umbilic point $p \in M^2$, i.e. $Q(p) \neq 0$.

Take a complex coordinate z around p with $z(p) = 0$. Since $\hat{Q}(0) \neq 0$, there exists a holomorphic function $\varphi(z)$ defined on a neighborhood of the origin such that

$$(\varphi(z))^2 = \hat{Q}(z); \quad \text{that is, } \varphi(z) = \sqrt{\hat{Q}(z)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(0) \neq 0.$$

On the other hand, both $\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{\omega}$ have neither a zero nor a pole at $z = 0$, so by (4.7), $\sqrt{\zeta_c}$ is a holomorphic function near $z = 0$. Since ζ_c is not a constant, there exists a positive integer l such that $\sqrt{\zeta_c} = a + bz^l + O(z^{l+1})$, where $b \neq 0$. Then by the Weierstrass preparation theorem, we can choose a coordinate z such that

$$\sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} = a + z^l, \quad \varphi(z) = \sqrt{\hat{Q}(z)} = \varphi_0 + O(z) \quad (l \in \mathbf{Z}_+, \varphi_0 \in \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}).$$

Moreover, replacing $\varphi_0 z$ by z , we can set

$$(4.23) \quad \sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} = a + bz^l, \quad \varphi(z) = 1 + O(z) \quad (l \in \mathbf{Z}_+, b = \varphi_0^{-l} \in \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}).$$

Here, since Z_c accumulates at 0, a in (4.23) must be real, and then

$$(4.24) \quad \text{Im} \sqrt{\zeta_c} = \text{Im}(bz^l)$$

holds. On the other hand, by (4.9),

$$(4.25) \quad \zeta_s = \frac{lbz^{l-1}}{\varphi(z)} = lbz^{l-1}(1 + O(z)).$$

We identify a neighborhood of p with a neighborhood of the origin of z -plane. Since $Z_c \cap Z_s$ accumulates to the origin, we can take a sequence $\{z_n\} \subset Z_c \cap Z_s$ such that $z_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then by (4.24) and (4.25), there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\} \subset \mathbf{R}$ such that $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$(4.26) \quad \arg b + l \arg z_n \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi},$$

$$(4.27) \quad \arg b + (l-1) \arg z_n + \varepsilon_n \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} \pmod{\pi}$$

hold. Subtracting (4.27) from (4.26), we have

$$(4.28) \quad \arg z_n - \varepsilon_n \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} \pmod{\pi}.$$

On the other hand, subtracting (4.26) multiplied by $l-1$ from (4.27) multiplied by l , we have

$$\arg b \equiv l \frac{\pi}{2} + l \varepsilon_n \pmod{\pi}.$$

Here, since $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, we deduce that

$$\arg b \equiv l \frac{\pi}{2} \pmod{\pi} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_n = 0.$$

Substituting these into (4.28), we have $\arg z_n \equiv \pi/2 \pmod{\pi}$; that is, $z_n \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}$. Since $\sqrt{\zeta_c(z_n)} \in \mathbf{R}$ holds for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, the imaginary part of $\sqrt{\zeta_c(z)}$ vanishes identically on $\sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}$, namely,

$$(4.29) \quad \sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} \in \mathbf{R} \quad (\text{if } z \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}).$$

Similarly, one can prove that

$$\zeta_s(z) \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R} \quad (\text{if } z \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}).$$

Thus, on a neighborhood of the origin, $Z_c \cap Z_s$ is the imaginary axis in the z -plane.

Next, we shall prove that the imaginary axis is a level set of $|\rho|$. By (4.23), (4.25) and (4.29),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\pi}{2} &\equiv \arg \zeta_s(z) = \arg \left(lbz^{l-1} \frac{1}{\varphi} \right) = \arg(bz^l) - \arg z\varphi(z) \\ &= \arg \sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} - \arg z - \arg \varphi(z) \\ &= -\arg z - \arg \varphi(z) = -\frac{\pi}{2} - \arg \varphi(z) \pmod{\pi} \end{aligned}$$

holds on the imaginary axis. Thus we have

$$\varphi(z) \in \mathbf{R} \quad (\text{if } z \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}).$$

As seen in (3.11) in Section 3, the tangent vector field of a level set of $|\rho|$ is represented as

$$\sqrt{-1} \overline{\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right)}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} = \frac{1}{\varphi(z)} \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right) \in \mathbf{R}, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(z) \in \mathbf{R} \quad (\text{if } z \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}).$$

Without loss of generality, $d\rho \neq 0$ holds on $U \setminus \{0\}$, where U is a neighborhood of the origin, because a zero of $d\rho$ is isolated in \overline{M}^2 . Then the tangent vector of the level set of $|\rho|$ at a point on the imaginary axis is parallel to the imaginary axis. Hence the level set passing through a point of the imaginary axis is the imaginary axis. That is, $Z_c \cap Z_s$ coincides with the imaginary axis, which is a level set of $|\rho|$. *Case 2:* Suppose now that $Z_c \cap Z_s$ accumulates at an irregular cylindrical end p . Let z be a complex coordinate with $z(p) = 0$. By irregularity, $\text{ord}_p Q \leq -3$ holds. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\text{ord}_p Q$ is an even number. In fact, if we set $z = w^2$, that is, we take the double cover of a neighborhood of p , the order Q at the origin with respect to the coordinate w will be an even number.

Hence, we assume

$$\text{ord}_p Q = -2k, \quad \text{ord}_p \omega = \text{ord}_p \theta = -k,$$

where $k \geq 2$ is an integer. The second equality holds because p is a cylindrical end.

Since Q has even order at the origin, $\sqrt{\hat{Q}}$ is a meromorphic function on a neighborhood of 0. More precisely, we can write

$$\varphi := \sqrt{\hat{Q}} = \frac{1}{z^k} (\varphi_0 + O(z)) \quad (\varphi_0 \in \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}).$$

Since $\text{ord}_p \omega = \text{ord}_p \theta$, (4.7) implies that $\sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} = O(z^k)$, that is, there exists an integer l ($l \geq k$) such that $\sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} = az^l + O(z^{l+1})$ ($a \in \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}$). Then by the Weierstrass preparation theorem, we can choose a coordinate z such that

$$(4.30) \quad \sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} = z^l, \quad \varphi = \frac{1}{z^k} (b + O(z)) \quad (b \in \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}).$$

Then by (4.9), ζ_s is written as

$$(4.31) \quad \zeta_s(z) = lz^{l+k-1} \left(\frac{1}{b} + O(z) \right).$$

As $\{z_n\} \subset Z_c \cap Z_s$ is a sequence with $z_n \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$(4.32) \quad l \arg z_n \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi},$$

$$(4.33) \quad -\arg b + (l+k-1) \arg z_n + \varepsilon_n \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} \pmod{\pi},$$

where $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$. Subtracting (4.33) from (4.32), and (4.32) multiplied by $l + k - 1$ from (4.33) multiplied by l , we have

$$-\arg b + (k-1)\arg z_n + \varepsilon_n \equiv \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad -l\arg b + l\varepsilon_n \equiv l\frac{\pi}{2} \pmod{\pi}.$$

Since $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, this yields $-l\arg b \equiv l\pi/2 \pmod{\pi}$, and then $\varepsilon_n = 0$ for sufficiently large n . Thus, we have

$$(4.34) \quad (k-1)\arg z_n \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} + \arg b \pmod{\pi}.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{L}_j := \left\{ z \in U; \arg z \equiv \frac{1+2j}{2(k-1)}\pi + \frac{\arg b}{k-1} \pmod{\pi} \right\} \quad (j = 0, \dots, k-1).$$

Then $\{\mathcal{L}_j\}$ is a set consisting of a finite number of lines in the z -plane through the origin, and by (4.34), each z_n lies on some \mathcal{L}_j . Hence there exists a subset $J \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ such that each \mathcal{L}_j ($j \in J$) contains an infinite number of elements of $\{z_n\}$. We fix $j \in J$. Then we can take a subsequence $\{z_m\}$ of $\{z_n\}$ such that $z_m \in \mathcal{L}_j \cap Z_c \cap Z_s$ and $z_m \rightarrow 0$. Since $\zeta_c(z_m) \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\zeta_s(z_m) \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}$, we have

$$(4.35) \quad \sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} \in \mathbf{R}, \quad \zeta_s(z) \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R} \quad (\text{if } z \in \mathcal{L}_j).$$

This shows that, on a neighborhood of the origin, $Z_c \cap Z_s$ coincides with the set of lines $\bigcup_{j \in J} \mathcal{L}_j$.

Next, we show that \mathcal{L}_j ($j \in J$) is a level set of $|\rho|$ for each j . By (4.30) and (4.35),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\pi}{2} &\equiv \arg \zeta_s(z) = \arg \sqrt{\zeta_c(z)} - \arg z - \arg \varphi \\ &= -\frac{1+2j}{2(k-1)}\pi - \frac{\arg b}{k-1} - \arg \varphi \pmod{\pi} \end{aligned}$$

holds on \mathcal{L}_j . Hence we have

$$\arg \varphi \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{1+2j}{2(k-1)}\pi - \frac{\arg b}{k-1} \pmod{\pi} \quad (\text{if } z \in \mathcal{L}_j).$$

At any point in \mathcal{L}_j , the argument of the tangent vector of the level set of $|\rho|$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \sqrt{-1} \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right) &\equiv \arg \left(\sqrt{-1} \left(\sqrt{\zeta_c \varphi} \right) \right) \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} - \arg \varphi - \arg \sqrt{\zeta_c} \\ &\equiv \frac{\pi}{2} - \arg \varphi = \frac{1+2j}{2(k-1)}\pi + \frac{\arg b}{k-1} \pmod{\pi}, \end{aligned}$$

and then, the tangent vector is proportional to the line \mathcal{L}_j . Hence each \mathcal{L}_j ($j \in J$) is a level set of $|\rho|$. Thus, we have the conclusion. \square

Remark 4.10. Let $p \in \overline{M}^2$ be an accumulation point of $Z_c \cap Z_s$. Then by the second part of Lemma 4.9, $Z_c \cap Z_s$ is a level set of $|\rho|$ in a neighborhood of p ; that is, by taking a suitable parallel front, we may assume that a component of $Z_c \cap Z_s$ is a part of the singular set. Since the null direction and the singular direction coincide at each point in $Z_c \cap Z_s$, the image of such a singular set is a single point in H^3 . If the point p is not an end, such a singularity seems to be a so-called *cone-like singularity*, see, for example, the hourglass in Example 6.2. Another example is as follows: Set

$$\omega = \exp \left(z + \frac{1}{3}z^3 \right) dz, \quad \theta = \exp \left(-z - \frac{1}{3}z^3 \right) dz$$




FIGURE 1. The example in Remark 4.10

on \mathcal{C} . Then by solving (3.2), we have a flat front $f: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow H^3$. The singular set of f contains the imaginary axis, which coincides with $Z_c \cap Z_s$ (see Figure 1). However, this example is not complete because the canonical forms have an essential singularity at $z = \infty$.

5. CAUSTICS OF FLAT FRONTS

In [14], Roitman investigated the caustic of (the parallel family of) a flat front, which is considered as the locus of singular points of the fronts in the parallel family. In this section, we discuss caustics of flat fronts from our point of view.

Let $U \subset \mathcal{C}$ be a simply connected domain and $f: U \rightarrow H^3$ a flat front without umbilic points. We denote by ω and θ the canonical forms of f , and $\rho := \theta/\omega$, as in the previous section. Since f has no umbilic points, ρ does not take values 0 and ∞ .

For a point $z \in U$, we denote by κ_1 and κ_2 the principal curvatures of f at z . Then by (3.4), we have

$$(5.1) \quad \kappa_1 = \frac{|\rho| + 1}{|\rho| - 1}, \quad \kappa_2 = \frac{|\rho| - 1}{|\rho| + 1}$$

Since $\rho \neq 0, \infty$, $|\kappa_1| > 1$ holds. Then there exists a real number r_1 such that $\coth r_1 = \kappa_1$, which is called the *radius of curvature*. By (5.1), we have

$$(5.2) \quad e^{2r_1} = |\rho|.$$

The *caustic* C_f of f is defined as

$$C_f: U \ni z \mapsto \cosh r_1(z)f(z) + \sinh r_1(z)\nu(z) \in H^3 \subset \mathbf{L}^4,$$

where \mathbf{L}^4 is the Minkowski 4-space and ν is the unit normal vector of f . In other words, C_f is the locus of the centers of the principal curvature κ_1 of f .

Let $E_f: U \rightarrow \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathcal{C})$ be the holomorphic lift of the front f . Then f and the unit normal vector ν are given by

$$f = E_f E_f^*, \quad \nu = E_f \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} E_f^*.$$

Thus, the caustic of f is

$$\begin{aligned} C_f &= E_f \left[\cosh r_1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \sinh r_1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right] E_f^* \\ &= E_f \begin{pmatrix} e^{r_1} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-r_1} \end{pmatrix} E_f^* = E_f \begin{pmatrix} |\rho|^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & |\rho|^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix} E_f^*. \end{aligned}$$

Hence if we set

$$(5.3) \quad E_c = E_f \begin{pmatrix} \rho^{1/4} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho^{-1/4} \end{pmatrix} P, \quad P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{-1} \\ \sqrt{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SU}(2),$$

we have

$$(5.4) \quad C_f = E_c E_c^*, \quad \text{and} \quad E_c^{-1} dE_c = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_c \\ \omega_c & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$(5.5) \quad \omega_c = \sqrt{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}} dz - \sqrt{-1} \frac{d\rho}{4\rho}, \quad \theta_c = \sqrt{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}} dz + \sqrt{-1} \frac{d\rho}{4\rho} \quad (\omega = \hat{\omega} dz, \theta = \hat{\theta} dz).$$

Since U contains no umbilic points of f , ω_c and θ_c have no common zeros. Thus ω_c and θ_c have no common zero, which implies that:

Theorem 5.1 (Roitman [14]). *The caustic $C_f = E_c E_c^*: U \rightarrow H^3$ of a flat front $f: U \rightarrow H^3$ without umbilic points is a flat front with canonical forms ω_c and θ_c as in (5.5). Moreover, we have*

$$E_c = \frac{(-1)^{1/4} \alpha^{-1/4}}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{G-G_*}} \begin{pmatrix} G + \sqrt{\alpha}G_* & \sqrt{-1}(G - \sqrt{\alpha}G_*) \\ 1 + \sqrt{\alpha} & \sqrt{-1}(1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \end{pmatrix} \quad \left(\alpha = \frac{dG}{dG_*} \right),$$

where G and G_* are the hyperbolic Gauss maps of f . In particular, the hyperbolic Gauss maps $(G_c, G_{c,*})$ of C_f are given by

$$G_c = \frac{G + \sqrt{\alpha}G_*}{1 + \sqrt{\alpha}}, \quad G_{c,*} = \frac{G - \sqrt{\alpha}G_*}{1 - \sqrt{\alpha}}.$$

If z is a singular point of f , $r_1(z) = 0$ holds because $|\rho(z)| = 1$. Therefore, the caustic of a parallel family $\{f_t\}$ of flat fronts is the locus of singular points of the fronts f_t for $t \in \mathbf{R}$.

Since the parallel family has a common caustic, the sets Z_0 , Z_c and Z_s in Section 4 can be considered as well-defined on the caustic. In particular, we have the following:

Proposition 5.2. *Let f be a flat front with caustic C_f . Then*

- (1) *A point $p \in M_0^2$ is a singular point of the caustic C_f if and only if $p \in Z_c(f)$.*
- (2) *A point $p \in M_0^2$ is a non-degenerate singular point of the caustic if and only if $S(G) - S(G_*) \neq 0$ holds at p , where G and G_* are the hyperbolic Gauss maps of f .*
- (3) *A point $p \in Z_c(f)$ where $S(G) - S(G_*) \neq 0$ is a cuspidal edge of the caustic if and only if $p \notin Z_s(f)$.*

In other words, the locus of the cuspidal edges of $\{f_t\}_{t \in \mathbf{R}}$ is the set of regular points of the caustic. Furthermore, the locus of the swallowtails of $\{f_t\}$ is the set of cuspidal edges on the caustic, except the points at which $S(G) - S(G_*) = 0$.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. A point $p \in M_0^2$ is a singular point of C_f if and only if $|\omega_c|^2 = |\theta_c|^2$. By (5.5), this is equivalent to

$$\operatorname{Im} \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}} \rho'}{\rho} = \operatorname{Im} \left[|\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}}} \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'}{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'}{\hat{\omega}} \right) \right] = |\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}| \operatorname{Im} \sqrt{\zeta_c}.$$

Hence the first assertion holds.

In this case, p is a degenerate singular point of C_f if and only if

$$0 = \hat{\theta}'_c \hat{\omega}_c - \hat{\omega}'_c \hat{\theta}_c = \sqrt{\hat{\omega}\hat{\theta}} (s(\hat{\theta}) - s(\hat{\omega})).$$

Then by (3.16), we have the second assertion.




FIGURE 2. Examples 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3

Finally, if p is a non-degenerate singular point of C_f , p is a cuspidal edge if and only if

$$(5.6) \quad \operatorname{Im} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}_c \hat{\theta}_c}} \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}'_c}{\hat{\theta}_c} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'_c}{\hat{\omega}_c} \right) = 0.$$

Here, by direct calculation,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}_c \hat{\theta}_c}} \frac{\hat{\theta}'_c}{\hat{\theta}_c} - \frac{\hat{\omega}'_c}{\hat{\omega}_c} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}_c \hat{\theta}_c}^3} \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{4} \sqrt{\hat{\omega} \hat{\theta}}^3 (s(\hat{\theta}) - s(\hat{\omega})) \\ &= \sqrt{-1} \frac{\zeta_s(z)}{16 + \zeta_c(z)} \end{aligned}$$

holds. Since $\zeta_c(z)$ is a positive real number if $z \in Z_c$, (5.6) holds if and only if $\zeta_s(z) \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}$. \square

6. EXAMPLES

Here we give examples that reaffirm the properties of singularities in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. We make examples of flat fronts by choosing hyperbolic Gauss maps G and G_* as follows: Let G and G_* be meromorphic functions on a compact Riemann surface \overline{M}^2 such that G is not identically equal to G_* , and let

$$\{p_1, \dots, p_N\} = \{p \in \overline{M}^2; G(p) = G_*(p)\} \quad \text{and} \quad M^2 = \overline{M}^2 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\}.$$

If the period condition

$$\oint_{\gamma} \frac{dG}{G - G_*} \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}$$

holds for any loop γ on M^2 , we have the parallel family of a complete flat front

$$f_t: M^2 = \overline{M}^2 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\} \longrightarrow H^3$$

by substituting G and G_* in the representation formula (3.13) in Remark 3.3. For details, see [13].

Example 6.1 (Cylinders). Let $G = z$ and $G_* = 1/z$ on $\overline{M}^2 = \mathbf{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Then $\xi = e^{-t/2} \sqrt{z^2 - 1}$ and $\rho(z) = e^{-2t}$. So $|\rho| = 1$ if and only if $t = 0$ and then all points of the front are singular. When $t = 0$, $\zeta_c = \zeta_s = 0$ identically, and the surface is a single geodesic line. When $t \neq 0$, we have a cylinder with no singularities (Figure 2 (a)).

Example 6.2 (Flat fronts of revolution). Let $G = z$ and $G_* = \mu z$ on $\overline{M}^2 = \mathbf{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, where $\mu \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{1\}$. Then $\xi = e^{-t/2} z^{1/(\mu-1)}$. The set of singular points is

$$\Sigma_t = \left\{ e^{\sqrt{-1}\beta} \left(\frac{e^{-t} \sqrt{\mu}}{\mu - 1} \right)^{\frac{\mu-1}{\mu+1}}; \beta \in \mathbf{R} \right\}.$$

Since $\sqrt{\zeta_c}|_{\Sigma_t} = \pm 2\sqrt{-1}(\mu + 1)/\sqrt{\mu}$ is constant, and real if and only if $\mu < 0$, the singularities are cuspidal edges when $\mu > 0$. When $\mu < 0$, $\zeta_s|_{\Sigma_t} = 0$. In this case, the singular points are neither cuspidal edges nor swallowtails. (The singular image is a single point, but there are many singular points in the domain.)

When $\mu > 0$, the image of Σ_t is a circular cuspidal edge centered about the surface's rotation axis (the *snowman*, see Figure 2 (b)). When $\mu < 0$, the image of Σ_t is a single point on the rotation axis (the *hourglass*, Figure 2 (c)).

When $\mu = 0$, the surface is a horosphere, and when $\mu = -1$, the surface is a hyperbolic cylinder.

When $\mu \rightarrow +1$, the entire surface approaches the ideal boundary ∂H^3 of H^3 . When $\mu > 0$, the corresponding caustic is a cylinder.

Example 6.3 (Peach fronts). Let $G = z + \frac{1}{2}$ and $G_* = z - \frac{1}{2}$ on $\overline{M^2} = \mathbf{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Then one has a parallel family of flat fronts $f_t: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow H^3$ resembling peaches. Since $\xi = e^{-t/2}e^z$, the set of singular points is $\Sigma_t = \{t/2 + \sqrt{-1}y; y \in \mathbf{R}\}$. Since $\sqrt{\zeta_c}|_{\Sigma_t} = \pm 4\sqrt{-1}$ is not real, we have a single cuspidal edge along a vertical line on \mathbf{C} . This cuspidal edge travels out to the end, hence we have a simple example for which every open neighborhood of the end contains singular points, in particular, each f_t is not complete. As noted in [14], the corresponding caustic is the horosphere. See Figure 2 (d).

Example 6.4 (Flat fronts with $G = z^n$ and $G_* = z^m$ for $1 \leq n < m$). In this case, $M^2 = \mathbf{C} \setminus \{z; z^m = z^n\}$, and we have $m - n + 2$ ends. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\xi &= e^{-t/2}z^n(z^{m-n} - 1)^{\frac{n}{n-m}}, \\ \rho(z) &= -\frac{m}{n}e^{-2t}z^{m+n}(z^{m-n} - 1)^{\frac{2(m+n)}{n-m}}, \\ \sqrt{\zeta_c} &= \pm\sqrt{-1}\frac{(m+n)(z^m + z^n)}{\sqrt{mn}}z^{\frac{m+n}{2}}, \\ \zeta_s &= \frac{(m+n)(2(m+n)z^{m+n} - (2n+m)(z^{2n} + z^{2m})^2)}{mnz^{m+n}} - \frac{3}{2}\zeta_c.\end{aligned}$$

For small values of m and n , we can easily investigate the singularities.

For $n = 1$ and $m = 2$ (resp. $m = 3$), for all t , all singularities are cuspidal edges except two (resp. four) swallowtails when $e^{2t} < 1/32$ (resp. $e^{2t} < 3/16$) and at one (resp. two) degenerate singularity (resp. singularities) when $e^{2t} = 1/32$ (resp. $e^{2t} = 3/16$). As the value e^{2t} increases through $1/32$ (resp. $3/16$), the two (resp. four) swallowtails come together into a single (resp. two) degenerate singularity (resp. singularities) and then disappear, leaving only cuspidal edges. Surfaces for $n = 1$ and $m = 2$ and 3 , and their corresponding caustics, are shown in Figure 3.

For $n = 2$ and $m = 3$, and for all t , singular points are cuspidal edges or swallowtails. All singular points are cuspidal edges, except for one swallowtail when $t < 0$. When $t \geq 0$, there are no swallowtails. As t increases to 0 , the swallowtail moves out to an end and disappears when $t = 0$. For $t = 0$, the singular set is the line $\operatorname{Re} z = 1/2$, and hence the cuspidal edge travels out to the end $z = \infty$.

Example 6.5 (n -noid flat fronts). n -ended flat fronts for $n \geq 3$ can be made with $G = z$, $G_* = z^{1-n}$ on $M^2 = \mathbf{C} \cup \{\infty\} \setminus \{z; z^n = 1\}$. For all t , the points $z = 0, \infty$




FIGURE 3. Example 6.4




FIGURE 4. Example 6.5: caustics for 3-noids and 4-noids.

are finite and non-singular. We have $\xi = e^{-t/2} \sqrt[n]{z^n - 1}$,

$$\rho(z) = (1 - n)e^{-2t} z^{n-2} (z^n - 1)^{\frac{4-2n}{n}},$$

$$\sqrt{\zeta_c} = \pm \frac{(n-2)(z^n + 1)}{z^{\frac{n}{2}} \sqrt{n-1}}$$

$$\zeta_s = \frac{n(2-n)}{2(n-1)}(z^n + z^{-n}) + \frac{n(n-2)}{n-1}.$$

For 3-noids, $\sqrt{\zeta_c}$ is real when $z \in S^1$ or $z^3 \in \mathbf{R}^+ \setminus \{0\}$. Since $\frac{1}{2}\zeta_s + \frac{3}{4}\zeta_c = \frac{3}{2}$, $Z_c \cap Z_s = \{z; z^3 = -1\}$.

For 4-noids, $\sqrt{\zeta_c}$ is real only when $z \in S^1 \cup \mathbf{R} \cup \sqrt{-1}\mathbf{R}$. For such z , $\text{Re } \zeta_s = (-4/3)(z^4 - 1)^2 z^{-4}$ is zero if and only if $z^4 = -1$.

In the case $n = 3$ (resp. 4), if $6t > \log 2$ (resp. $2t < \log(3/2)$), there are twelve (resp. sixteen) swallowtails, and all other singularities are cuspidal. If $6t = \log 2$ (resp. $\log(3/2)$), there are three (resp. four) degenerate singularities at the points $z^3 = -1$ (resp. $z^4 = -1$). If $6t < \log 2$ (resp. $\log(3/2)$), then there are six (resp. eight) swallowtails, and otherwise cuspidal edges. For figures of 3-noids, see [12]. The caustics corresponding to 3-noids and 4-noids are shown in Figure 4.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. I. Arnol'd, S. M. Gusein-Zade and A. N. Varchenko, SINGULARITIES OF DIFFERENTIABLE MAPS, VOL. 1, Monographs in Math. **82**, Birkhäuser (1984).
- [2] J. W. Bruce and J. Giblin, CURVES AND SINGULARITIES, Cambridge University press, (1984).
- [3] J. A. Gálvez, A. Martínez and F. Milán, *Flat surfaces in hyperbolic 3-space*, Math. Ann. **316** (2000), 419–435.

- [4] M. Golubitsky and V. Guillemin, STABLE MAPPINGS AND THEIR SINGULARITIES, GTM **14**, Springer-Verlag (1973).
- [5] S. Izumiya, *Generating families of developable surfaces in \mathbf{R}^3* , preprint.
- [6] S. Izumiya, *On Legendrian singularities*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **101** (1987), 748–752.
- [7] Y. Kitagawa, *Periodicity of the asymptotic curves on flat tori in S^3* , J. Math. Soc. Japan, **40** (1988) 457–476.
- [8] Y. Kitagawa, *Embedded flat tori in the unit 3-sphere*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, **47** (1995) 275–296.
- [9] Y. Kitagawa, *Isometric deformation of flat tori in the 3-sphere*, Tôhoku Math. J., **52** (2000) 283–298.
- [10] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, FOUNDATIONS OF DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY I, John Wiley & Sons Inc., (1963).
- [11] M. Kokubu, W. Rossman, M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *Flat fronts in hyperbolic 3-space II*, in preparation.
- [12] M. Kokubu, M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *An elementary proof of Small's formula for null curves in $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbf{C})$ and an analogue for Legendrian curves in $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbf{C})$* , Osaka J. of Math., **40** (2003), 697–715.
- [13] M. Kokubu, M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *Flat fronts in hyperbolic 3-space*, to appear in Pacific Journal of Math., math.DG/0301224.
- [14] P. Roitman, *Flat surfaces in hyperbolic 3-space as normal surfaces to a congruence of geodesics*, preprint.
- [15] R. Langevin, G. Levitt and H. Rosenberg, *Classes d'homotopie de surfaces avec rebroussements et queues d'aronde dans \mathbf{R}^3* , Canadian J. Math. **47** (1995), 544–572.
- [16] M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *Maximal surfaces with singularities in Minkowski 3-space*, preprint, math.DG/0307309.
- [17] V. M. Zakalyulin, *Lagrangian and Legendrian singularities*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **10** (1976), 23–31.

(Masatoshi Kokubu) DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL SCIENCE, SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING, TOKYO DENKI UNIVERSITY, 2-2 KANDA-NISHIKI-CHO, CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 101-8457, JAPAN
E-mail address: kokubu@cck.dendai.ac.jp

(Wayne Rossman) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, KOBE UNIVERSITY, ROKKO, KOBE 657-8501, JAPAN
E-mail address: wayne@math.kobe-u.ac.jp

(Kentaro Saji) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, HIROSHIMA UNIVERSITY, HIGASHI-HIROSHIMA 739-8526, JAPAN
E-mail address: sajik@hiroshima-u.ac.jp

(Masaaki Umehara) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, TOYONAKA, OSAKA 560-0043, JAPAN
E-mail address: umehara@math.wani.osaka-u.ac.jp

(Kotaro Yamada) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, KYUSHU UNIVERSITY 36, HIGASHI-KU, FUKUOKA 812-8581, JAPAN
E-mail address: kotaro@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp