

GEODESICALLY REVERSIBLE FINSLER 2-SPHERES OF CONSTANT CURVATURE

ROBERT L. BRYANT

ABSTRACT. A Finsler space (M, Σ) is said to be *geodesically reversible* if each oriented geodesic can be reparametrized as a geodesic with the reverse orientation. A reversible Finsler space is geodesically reversible, but the converse need not be true.

In this note, building on recent work of LeBrun and Mason [13], it is shown that a geodesically reversible Finsler metric of constant flag curvature on the 2-sphere is necessarily projectively flat.

As a corollary, using a previous result of the author [4], it is shown that a reversible Finsler metric of constant flag curvature on the 2-sphere is necessarily a Riemannian metric of constant Gauss curvature, thus settling a long-standing problem in Finsler geometry.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to settle a long-standing problem in Finsler geometry: Whether there exists a *reversible* Finsler metric on the 2-sphere with constant flag curvature that is not Riemannian. By making use of some old results and a fundamental new result of Lebrun and Mason, I show that such Finsler structures do not exist.

In fact, I prove something slightly stronger: Any geodesically reversible Finsler metric on the 2-sphere with constant flag curvature must be projectively flat. Since the projectively flat Finsler metrics with constant flag curvature on S^2 were classified some years ago [4], the above result then reduces to examining the Finsler structures provided by this classification.

This problem was made more interesting by the discovery of non-reversible Finsler metrics on the 2-sphere with constant flag curvature in [3]. (However, it should be pointed out that Katok had already constructed non-reversible Finsler metrics on the 2-sphere [17] that later turned out to have constant flag curvature, although, apparently, this was not known at the time of [3].)

In the interests of brevity, no attempt has been made to give an exposition of the basics of Finsler geometry. There are many sources for this background material however, among them [1], [7], [8, 9], and [14].

Date: July 29, 2004.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53B40, 53C60.

Key words and phrases. Finsler metrics, flag curvature, projective structures.

Thanks to Duke University for its support via a research grant and to the NSF for its support via DMS-0103884.

This is Version 1.0 of ReversibleFinslerSphere.tex.

For background more specifically suited for studying the case of constant flag curvature, including its proper formulation in higher dimensions, see [2], [10, 11, 12], and [15, 16].

The question about (geodesically) reversible Finsler metrics of constant positive flag curvature on the n -sphere for $n > 2$ remains open at this writing, since an essential component of the proof for $n = 2$ that is due to Lebrun and Mason has not yet been generalized to higher dimensions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Structure equations	2
2.1. Cartan's coframing	2
2.2. Bianchi identities	4
2.3. Simplifications when $K \equiv 1$	4
3. A double fibration	5
3.1. Induced structures on Λ	6
3.2. Geodesic reversibility implies geodesic periodicity	7
3.3. Geodesic reversibility implies projective flatness	7
4. Classification	8
4.1. Consequences of projective flatness	8
4.2. Reversibility	8
References	8

2. STRUCTURE EQUATIONS

In this section, Cartan's structure equations for a Finsler surface will be recalled.

2.1. Cartan's coframing. Let M be a surface and let $\Sigma \subset TM$ be a smooth Finsler structure. I.e., Σ is a smooth hypersurface in M such that the basepoint projection $\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is a surjective submersion and such that each fiber

$$(2.1) \quad \pi^{-1}(x) = \Sigma_x = \Sigma \cap T_x M$$

is a smooth, strictly convex curve in $T_x M$ whose convex hull contains the origin 0_x in its interior.

Remark 1 (Reversibility). Note that there is no assumption that $\Sigma = -\Sigma$. In other words, a Finsler structure need not be 'reversible' (some sources call this property 'symmetry'), and assumption is not needed for the development of the local theory.

One should think of Σ as the unit vectors of a 'Finsler metric', i.e., a function $F : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that restricts to each tangent space $T_x M$ to be a not-necessarily-symmetric but strictly convex Banach norm on $T_x M$.

2.1.1. Σ -length of oriented curves. A curve $\gamma : (a, b) \rightarrow M$ will be said to be a Σ -curve (or 'unit speed curve') if $\gamma'(t)$ lies in Σ for all $t \in (a, b)$. Any smooth, immersed curve $\gamma : (a, b) \rightarrow M$ has an orientation-preserving reparametrization $h : (u, v) \rightarrow (a, b)$ such that $\gamma \circ h$ is a Σ -curve. This reparametrization is unique up to translation in the domain of h . Thus, one can unambiguously define the (oriented) Σ -length of a subcurve $\gamma : (\alpha, \beta) \rightarrow M$ to be $h^{-1}(\beta) - h^{-1}(\alpha)$, when $a < \alpha < \beta < b$.

2.1.2. *Cartan's coframing.* The fundamental result about the geometry of Finsler surfaces is due to Cartan [6]:

Theorem 1 (Canonical coframing). *Let $\Sigma \subset TM$ be a Finsler structure on the oriented surface M with basepoint projection $\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow M$. Then there exists a unique coframing $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$ on Σ with the properties:*

- (1) $\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2$ is a positive multiple of any π -pullback of a positive 2-form on M ,
- (2) The tangential lift γ' of any Σ -curve satisfies $(\gamma')^* \omega_2 = 0$ and $(\gamma')^* \omega_1 = dt$,
- (3) $d\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 = 0$,
- (4) $\omega_1 \wedge d\omega_1 = \omega_2 \wedge d\omega_2$, and
- (5) $d\omega_1 = \omega_3 \wedge \omega_2$ and $\omega_3 \wedge d\omega_2 = 0$.

Moreover, there exist unique functions I , J , and K on Σ so that

$$\begin{aligned} d\omega_1 &= -\omega_2 \wedge \omega_3, \\ (2.2) \quad d\omega_2 &= -\omega_3 \wedge (\omega_1 - I\omega_2), \\ d\omega_3 &= -(K\omega_1 - J\omega_3) \wedge \omega_2. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2 (The invariants I , J , and K). The 1-form ω_1 is called *Hilbert's invariant integral*. A Σ -curve γ is a geodesic of the Finsler structure if and only if its tangential lift satisfies $(\gamma')^* \omega_3 = 0$. (Of course, by definition, $(\gamma')^* \omega_2 = 0$.)

The function I vanishes if and only if Σ is the unit circle bundle of a Riemannian metric on M , in which case the function K becomes the π -pullback of the Gauss curvature of the underlying metric.

The function J vanishes if and only if the Finsler structure is what is called *Landsberg* [1].

The function K is known as the Finsler-Gauss curvature and plays the same role in the Jacobi equation for Finsler geodesics as the Gauss curvature does in the Jacobi equation for Riemannian geodesics.

Let X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 be the vector fields on Σ that are dual to the coframing $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$. Then the flow of X_1 is the geodesic flow on Σ .

Remark 3 (The effect of orientations). If one reverses the orientation of M , then the canonical coframing ω on Σ is replaced by $(\omega_1, -\omega_2, -\omega_3)$.

2.1.3. *Reconstruction of M and its Finsler structure.* The information contained in the 3-manifold Σ and its coframing $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$ is sufficient to recover M and the embedding of Σ into M , a fact that is implicit in Cartan's analysis.

In fact, the integral curves of the system $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0$ on Σ are closed and the codimension 2 foliation they define has trivial holonomy, so M can be identified with the leaf space of this system and carries a unique smooth structure for which the leaf projection $\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is a smooth submersion. Because of the connectedness of the fibers, there will be a unique orientation on M such that a positive 2-form pulls back under π to be a positive multiple of $\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2$. Thus, M , its smooth structure, and its orientation can be recovered from the coframing.

The inclusion $\iota : \Sigma \rightarrow TM$ is then seen to be simply given by $\iota(u) = \pi'(X_1(u)) \in T_{\pi(u)}M$. Thus, even the Finsler structure on M can be recovered from Σ and the coframing.

The upshot of this discussion is this: Any orientation-preserving Finsler isometry $\phi : M \rightarrow M$ lifts uniquely to a diffeomorphism $\phi' : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ where ϕ' preserves

the coframing ω and, conversely, any diffeomorphism $\psi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ that preserves ω is of the form $\psi = \phi'$ for a unique orientation-preserving Finsler isometry $\phi : M \rightarrow M$.

Remark 4 (Recognizing orientation-reversing isometries). Similarly, any diffeomorphism $\psi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ that satisfies $\psi^*(\omega) = (\omega_1, -\omega_2, -\omega_3)$ is of the form $\psi = \phi'$ for a unique orientation-reversing Finsler isometry $\phi : M \rightarrow M$.

2.2. Bianchi identities. Taking the exterior derivatives of the structure equations (2.2) yields the formulae

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{pmatrix} dI \\ dJ \\ dK \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} J & I_2 & I_3 \\ -K_3 - KI & J_2 & J_3 \\ K_1 & K_2 & K_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

for some functions $I_2, I_3, J_2, J_3, K_1, K_2$, and K_3 on Σ .

2.3. Simplifications when $K \equiv 1$. The Finsler structures of interest in this article are the ones that satisfy $K \equiv 1$. In this case, the structure equations simplify to

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} d\omega_1 &= -\omega_2 \wedge \omega_3, \\ d\omega_2 &= -\omega_3 \wedge (\omega_1 - I\omega_2), \\ d\omega_3 &= -(\omega_1 - J\omega_3) \wedge \omega_2, \end{aligned}$$

and the Bianchi identities become

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{pmatrix} dI \\ dJ \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} J & I_2 & I_3 \\ -I & J_2 & J_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note, in particular, that $I^2 + J^2$ is constant on the integral curves of $\omega_2 = \omega_3 = 0$, i.e., the lifts of geodesics, though this function is not generally constant on Σ . Thus, $I^2 + J^2$ is a conservation law for the geodesic flow on Σ .

Suppose now that M is geodesically complete, or equivalently, that, the vector field X_1 is complete on Σ , and let $\Psi_t : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the time t flow of X_1 . Since the structure equations show that

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{L}_{X_1} \omega_1 = 0, \quad \mathcal{L}_{X_1} \omega_2 = \omega_3, \quad \mathcal{L}_{X_1} \omega_3 = -\omega_2,$$

it follows that

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi_t^* \omega_1 &= \omega_1, \\ \Psi_t^* \omega_2 &= \cos t \omega_2 + \sin t \omega_3, \\ \Psi_t^* \omega_3 &= -\sin t \omega_2 + \cos t \omega_3. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\Psi_\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ satisfies

$$(2.8) \quad \Psi_\pi^* \omega = (\omega_1, -\omega_2, -\omega_3)$$

and hence, by Remark 4, $\Psi_\pi = \alpha' : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ for some unique orientation-reversing Finsler isometry $\alpha : M \rightarrow M$.

Since X_1 is the geodesic flow vector field, it follows from this that all of the unit speed geodesics leaving a point $p \in M$ converge at distance π to pass through $\alpha(p)$.

Moreover, since $K \equiv 1$, it follows from the usual second variation argument that geodesic segments of length greater than π are unstable. Consequently, the diameter of M is at most π and the universal cover of M is compact. Since M is assumed orientable, it follows that M must be diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere.

Just as in the Riemannian case, it is now easy to show that, for each $p \in M$, the mapping $E_p : \Sigma_p \times (0, \pi) \rightarrow M$ defined by

$$(2.9) \quad E_p(u, t) = \pi(\Psi_t(u))$$

is a diffeomorphism onto $M \setminus \{p, \alpha(p)\}$. Details are left to the reader.

Proposition 1. *Either $\alpha^2 = \text{id}$ on M (in which case, all of the Σ -geodesics are closed of length 2π) or else α^2 has exactly 2 fixed points, say n and $\alpha(n)$, such that each geodesic passing through n passes through $\alpha(n)$ at distance π and each geodesic passing through $\alpha(n)$ passes through n at distance π .*

In the latter case, there exists a positive definite inner product on $T_n M$ that is invariant under $(\alpha^2)'(n) : T_n M \rightarrow T_n M$ and there is an angle $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$ such that $(\alpha^2)'(n)$ is a counterclockwise rotation by θ in this inner product.

Proof. Assume that $\alpha^2 : M \rightarrow M$ is not the identity, or else there is nothing to prove. Since α^2 is an orientation preserving diffeomorphism of the 2-sphere, it must have at least one fixed point. Let n be such a fixed point. By the very definition of α , it then follows that $\alpha(n)$ is also a fixed point of α^2 . It must be shown that α^2 has no other fixed points.

First, consider the linear map $L = (\alpha^2)'(n) : T_n M \rightarrow T_n M$. Since α^2 is a Finsler isometry, the linear map L must preserve $\Sigma_n \subset T_n M$. Let $K_n \subset T_n M$ be the convex set bounded by Σ_n .

Define a positive definite quadratic form on $T_n^* M$ by letting $\langle \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \rangle$ be defined for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in T_n^* M$ to be the average of the quadratic function $\lambda_1 \lambda_2$ over K_n (using any translation invariant measure on K_n induced by its inclusion into the vector space $T_n M$). Since L is a linear map carrying K_n into itself, it must preserve this quadratic form. Since L also preserves an orientation on $T_n M$, it follows that, with respect to this inner product, L must be a counterclockwise rotation by some angle $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$.

If θ were 0, i.e., L were the identity on $T_n M$, then all of the geodesics through n would close at length 2π . In particular, the mapping $\Psi_{2\pi} : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ would have a fixed point and would preserve the coframing ω , implying that $\Psi_{2\pi}$ is the identity and hence that α^2 is the identity, contrary to assumption. Thus, $0 < \theta < 2\pi$.

In particular, L cannot fix any point of Σ_n and, since $E_n : \Sigma_n \times (0, \pi) \rightarrow M \setminus \{n, \alpha(n)\}$ is a diffeomorphism that intertwines $L \times \text{id}$ with α^2 , it follows that α^2 cannot fix any points of M other than n or $\alpha(n)$. \square

Remark 5. The famous examples analyzed by Ziller [17] turn out¹ to have $K \equiv 1$ and are examples in which α^2 turns out not to be the identity. Thus, the second possibility in Proposition 1 can indeed occur.

3. A DOUBLE FIBRATION

Throughout this section Σ will be assumed to be a Finsler structure on M (assumed diffeomorphic to the 2-sphere) satisfying $K \equiv 1$.

I begin by noting that, if all the geodesics on M close at distance 2π , then the set of oriented Σ -geodesics has the structure of a manifold in a natural way.

¹Colleen Robles, private communication

Proposition 2 (The space of oriented geodesics). *If α^2 is the identity, there exists a smooth surface Λ diffeomorphic to S^2 and a smooth submersion $\lambda : \Sigma \rightarrow \Lambda$ such that the fibers of λ are the integral curves of $\omega_2 = \omega_3 = 0$. The action*

$$(3.1) \quad u \cdot e^{it} = \Psi_t(u)$$

defines a smooth S^1 -action on Σ that makes $\lambda : \Sigma \rightarrow \Lambda$ into a principal right S^1 -bundle over Λ . \square

Remark 6 (Double fibration and path geometries). The two mappings $\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ and $\lambda : \Sigma \rightarrow \Lambda$ define a double fibration and it is easy to see that this double fibration satisfies the usual nondegeneracy axioms for double fibrations. For example, $\lambda \times \pi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Lambda \times M$ is clearly a smooth embedding. The other properties are similarly easy to verify using the structure equations. Thus, Σ defines a (generalized) path geometry on each of Λ and M .

For more background on path geometries and their invariants, see, for example, Section 2 of [4].

3.1. Induced structures on Λ . I will now recall some results from [4]. Throughout this subsection, I will be assuming that α^2 is the identity, so that Λ exists as a smooth manifold.

The relations (2.7) show that the quadratic form $\omega_2^2 + \omega_3^2$ is invariant under the flow of X_1 . Consequently, there is a unique Riemannian metric on Λ , say g , such that

$$(3.2) \quad \lambda^*(g) = \omega_2^2 + \omega_3^2$$

Moreover, the 2-form $\omega_3 \wedge \omega_2$ is invariant under the flow of X_1 , so it is the pullback under λ of an area 2-form for g , which will be denoted dA_g .

Now, there is an embedding $\xi : \Sigma \rightarrow T\Lambda$ defined by

$$(3.3) \quad \xi(u) = \lambda'(X_3(u))$$

and one sees that ξ embeds Λ as the unit sphere bundle of Λ endowed with the metric g .

The structure equations (2.4) show that, under this identification of Σ with the unit sphere bundle of Λ , the Levi-Civita connection form on Σ is

$$(3.4) \quad \rho = -\omega_1 + I\omega_2 + J\omega_3.$$

Note that $-\omega_1$ and $I\omega_2 + J\omega_3$ are invariant under the flow of X_1 .

The next result now follows simply by unraveling the definitions.

Proposition 3. *There exists a g -compatible affine connection with torsion ∇ on Λ such that the ∇ -geodesics are the λ -projections of the integral curves of the system $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0$. \square*

For the next result, the reader may want to consult Lebrun and Mason [13] for the definition and properties of the projective structure $[\nabla]$ associated to an affine connection ∇ on a surface. [While they restrict themselves to the consideration of torsion-free connections only, as they point out, this does not affect the results.]

Corollary 1. *Suppose that Σ satisfies $\alpha^2 = id$. Then the geodesics of the projective structure $[\nabla]$ on Λ are all closed.*

Proof. By Proposition 3, the geodesics of $[\nabla]$ are the λ -projections of the integral curves of the system $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0$, but these are the fibers of the map $\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ and hence are closed. \square

3.2. Geodesic reversibility implies geodesic periodicity. It is now time to come to the main point of this note.

Definition 1 (Reversibility). The Finsler structure $\Sigma \subset TM$ is said to be *reversible* if $\Sigma = -\Sigma$.

Definition 2 (Geodesic reversibility). A Finsler structure $\Sigma \subset TM$ will be said to be *geodesically reversible* if any Σ -geodesic $\gamma : (a, b) \rightarrow TM$ can be reparametrized in an orientation-reversing way so as to remain a Σ -geodesic.

Remark 7. Any reversible Finsler structure is certainly geodesically reversible. On the other hand, the non-Riemannian Finsler examples constructed in Section 4 of [4] are geodesically reversible, but not reversible, so this class is not empty.

Proposition 4. *If (M, Σ) is geodesically reversible, then α^2 is the identity on M .*

Proof. For any point $p \in M$, consider the geodesics leaving p . As has already been mentioned, they all converge at distance π on $\alpha(p)$ but do not intersect between distance 0 and distance π . By assumption, reversing these geodesic segments, i.e., starting them at $\alpha(p)$ yields Σ -geodesics, no longer necessarily unit speed. However, all of these geodesics remain disjoint until they pass through p , at which point, they all converge. However, it is known that the unit speed geodesics leaving $\alpha(p)$ remain disjoint for distances between 0 and π , and that they all converge on $\alpha(\alpha(p))$ at distance π .

It follows that $\alpha(\alpha(p))$ must be p . In other words α^2 is the identity and all Σ -geodesics are periodic of period 2π . \square

Remark 8. The converse of Proposition 4 does not hold. Most of the $K \equiv 1$ examples described in Section 5 of [5] that are based on Guillemin's Zoll metrics have all their geodesics closed of length 2π (and hence α^2 is the identity), but they are not geodesically reversible.

3.3. Geodesic reversibility implies projective flatness. The next step is to consider the space of *unoriented* Σ -geodesics on M . This only makes sense if one assumes that Σ is geodesically reversible, so assume this for the rest of this subsection.

For each oriented Σ -geodesic $\gamma : S^1 \rightarrow M$, let $\beta(\gamma)$ denote the reversed curve, reparametrized so as to be a Σ -geodesic. Obviously $\beta : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ is a fixed point free involution of Λ , so that the quotient manifold Λ/β is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{RP}^2 .

Proposition 5. *The path geometry on Λ defined by the geodesics of $[\nabla]$ is invariant under β and hence descends to a well-defined path geometry on Λ/β . Moreover, this path geometry is the path geometry of a projective connection on Λ/β with all of its geodesics closed.*

Proof. Since, by definition, a point p in M lies on a geodesic γ if and only if it lies on $\beta(\gamma)$, it follows that β carries each $[\nabla]$ -geodesic into itself. In particular, even though β may not (indeed, most likely does not) preserve ∇ , it must preserve $[\nabla]$ since the projective equivalence class of ∇ is determined by its geodesics. Thus, the claims of the Proposition are verified. \square

It is at this point that the crucial contribution of Lebrun and Mason [13] enters:

Theorem 2 (Lebrun-Mason). *Any projective structure on \mathbb{RP}^2 that has all of its geodesics closed is projectively equivalent to the standard (i.e., flat) projective structure.*

Corollary 2. *If Σ is a geodesically reversible Finsler structure on $M \simeq S^2$ that satisfies $K \equiv 1$, then the induced projective structure $[\nabla]$ on Λ is projectively flat.* \square

4. CLASSIFICATION

In this final section, the main theorem will be proved.

4.1. Consequences of projective flatness. Recall from Section 2 of [4] that if a projective structure on a surface is projectively flat then its dual path geometry is projective and, moreover, projectively flat.

Proposition 6. *If Σ is a geodesically reversible Finsler structure on $M \simeq S^2$ with $K \equiv 1$, then the Σ -geodesics in M are the geodesics of a flat projective structure.*

Proof. The dual path geometry of Λ with its projective structure $[\nabla]$ is M with the space of paths being the Σ -geodesics. Now apply Corollary 2. \square

Corollary 3. *Let M be diffeomorphic to S^2 . Up to diffeomorphism, any geodesically reversible Finsler structure $\Sigma \subset TM$ with $K \equiv 1$ is equivalent to a member of the 2-parameter family described in Theorem 10 of [4].*

Proof. In light of Proposition 6, one can apply Theorems 9 and 10 of [4], which gives the result. \square

Remark 9. It is interesting to note that each member of the 2-parameter family described in Theorem 10 of [4] is projectively flat and hence geodesically reversible.

4.2. Reversibility. Now for the main rigidity theorem.

Theorem 3. *Any reversible Finsler structure on $M \simeq S^2$ that satisfies $K \equiv 1$ is Riemannian and hence isometric to the standard unit sphere.*

Proof. Such a Finsler structure would be geodesically reversible and hence a member of the family described in Theorem 10 of [4]. However, by inspection, the only member of this geodesically reversible family that is actually reversible is the Riemannian one. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Bao, S.-S. Chern, and Z. Shen, *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **200**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. MR 2001g:53130 1, 3
- [2] D. Bao and Z. Shen, *Finsler metrics of constant curvature on the Lie group S^3* , preprint, 2001. 2
- [3] R. Bryant, *Finsler structures on the 2-sphere satisfying $K = 1$* , Finsler Geometry, Contemporary Mathematics **196** (1996), 27–42. MR 97e:53128 1
- [4] ———, *Projectively flat Finsler 2-spheres of constant curvature*, Selecta Math., New Series **3** (1997), 161–204. MR 98i:53101 1, 6, 7, 8

- [5] ———, *Some remarks on Finsler manifolds with constant flag curvature*, Houston J. Math. **28** (2002), 221–262. 7
- [6] É. Cartan, *Sur un problème d'équivalence et la théorie des espaces métriques généralisés*, *Mathematica* **4** (1930), 114–136. (Reprinted in *Oeuvres Complètes*, partie III, vol. 2, Éditions du CNRS, 1984.) 3
- [7] ———, *Les Espace Finsler*, Exposés de Géométrie, t. 79, Hermann, Paris, 1934. 1
- [8] S.-S. Chern, *On the Euclidean connections in a Finsler space*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **29** (1943), 33–37. (Reprinted in *Shiing-shen Chern: Selected Papers, vol. II*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989, pp. 107–111.) MR 4,259c 1
- [9] ———, *Local equivalence and Euclidean connections in Finsler spaces*, Science Reports Tsing Hua Univ. **5** (1948), 95–121. (Reprinted in *Shiing-shen Chern: Selected Papers, vol. II*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989, pp. 194–212. MR 11,212a 1
- [10] P. Funk, *Über Geometrien, bei denen die Geraden die Kürzesten sind*, Math. Annalen **101** (1929), 226–237. 2
- [11] ———, *Über zweidimensionale Finslersche Räume, insbesondere über solche mit geradlinigen Extremalen und positiver konstanter Krümmung*, Math. Zeitschr. **40** (1936), 86–93. 2
- [12] ———, *Eine Kennzeichnung der zweidimensionalen elliptischen Geometrie*, Österreich. Akad. Wiss. Math.-Natur. Kl. S.-B. II **172** (1963), 251–269. MR 30 #1460 2
- [13] C. Lebrun and L. J. Mason, *Zoll manifolds and complex surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **61** (2002), 453–535. MR 04d:53043 1, 6, 7
- [14] H. Rund, *The Differential Geometry of Finsler Surfaces*, Grundlehren der Math. Wiss., Band 101, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1959. MR 21 #4462 1
- [15] Z. Shen, *Finsler manifolds of constant positive curvature*, In: *Finsler Geometry*, Contemporary Math. **196** (1996), 83–92. MR 97m:53120 2
- [16] Z. Shen, *Projectively flat Finsler metrics of constant curvature*, preprint, September 2001, arXiv:math.DG/0109178. 2
- [17] W. Ziller, *Geometry of the Katok examples*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, **3** (1983), 135–157. MR 86g:58036 1, 5

DUKE UNIVERSITY MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, P.O. BOX 90320, DURHAM, NC 27708-0320
E-mail address: `bryant@math.duke.edu`
URL: `http://www.math.duke.edu/~bryant`