# On immersion of locally bounded curvature 

By J. SZENTHE in Szeged

According to results of J. NaSh ([11]) and N. H. Kurper ([10]) C $C^{1}$-immersions are too general to admit a reasonable generalization of the curvature theory of $C^{2}$-immersions. The idea to extend the curvature theory to a restricted class is therefore justified and in fact this has been done at first by J. Hjelmslev ([8]) and G. Bouligand ([3]) in case of $C^{1}$-surfaces in 3-dimensional euclidean space. They were mainly interested in the curvature theory of curves on $C^{1}$-surfaces; i.e. in generalizations of the theorems of Euler and Meusnier. Later on various related results have been obtained by others ${ }^{1}$ ). In the first part of this paper a class of $C^{1}$-immersions of $k$-dimensional manifolds into $n$-dimensional euclidean space is introduced, which will be called immersions of locally bounded curvature, and it is shown that in their case the second fundamental tensor can be defined in a way which resembles very much the standard one. In the case $n=3, k=2$ similar results have been achieved by H. Busemann and W. Feller ([5]) and A. V. Pogorelov ([14]) for considerably wider classes with more refined methods. In the second part of the paper the case $k=n-1$, i.e. hypersurfaces of locally bounded curvature are considered. It is shown that the theorem on the uniqueness of $C^{2}$-hypersurfaces with given first and second fundamental forms generalizes to them which gives another point of considering immersions of locally bounded curvature.

## 1. Preliminaries

Some prerequisites of technical nature are provided in this section.
Let $E^{n}$ be the $n$-dimensional euclidean space, and $V_{k}^{n}(k=1, \ldots, n-1)$ the euclidean vector space formed by its $k$-vectors. Oriented $k$-dimensional subspaces of $V_{1}^{n}$ will be identified, as usual, with simple unit $k$-vectors, consequently the set $S_{k}^{n}\left(\subset V_{k}^{n}\right)$ of simple unit $k$-vectors will stand for the set of oriented $k$-dimensional subspaces of $V_{1}^{n}$ as well. Let further $B^{n}$ be the set of complete orthonormal systems

[^0]in $V_{1}^{n}, Q(n, k)$ the group of isometric isomorphisms of $V_{k}^{n}$, and $O(n)$ that of orthogonal $n \times n$ matrices with real entries. The facts which follow are well known. $O(n)$ is a simply transitive right transformation group of $B^{n}$ with the definition: $b \alpha=$ $=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i j} a_{i}\right)_{j=1, \ldots, n}$ for $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i=1, \ldots, n}=b \in B^{n}, \quad\left\|\alpha_{i j}\right\|=\alpha \in O(n)$. Distance on $B^{n}$ and $O(n)$ is defined by $\sigma\left(b^{\prime}, b^{\prime \prime}\right)=\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(a_{i}^{\prime \prime}-a_{i}^{\prime \prime}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mu\left(\alpha^{\prime}, \alpha^{\prime \prime}\right)=\left[\sum_{i, j=1}^{n}\left(\alpha_{i j}^{\prime}-\alpha_{i j}^{\prime \prime}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, respectively. If $b \in B^{n}$ is fixed then $\Phi_{b}=b \alpha$ defines a distance preserving map ${ }^{\prime} \Phi_{, n}:(O(n), \mu) \rightarrow\left(B^{n}, \sigma\right)$. With the above definition, $O(n)$ is a distance preserving transformation group of $B^{n}$, and $\mu$ is left and right invariant. If $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i=1, \ldots, n}=b \in B^{n}$ is fixed and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x^{i} a_{i}=x \in V_{1}^{n}$ then with the definition $\alpha x=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{i j} x^{j} a_{i}$ the group $O(n)$ is a left transformation group of $V_{1}^{n}$ and since each of these transformations is an isometric isomorphism of $V_{1}^{n}$ an isomorphism $\Psi_{b}: O(n) \rightarrow Q(n, 1)$ is obtained. But there is the standard homomorphism $\Sigma^{k}: Q(n, 1) \rightarrow Q(n, k)$, hence for any fixed $b \in B^{n}$ a homomorphism $\Lambda_{b}^{k}=\Sigma^{k} \circ \Psi_{b}: O(n) \rightarrow Q(n, k)$ is defined. If $X_{0}^{k} \in S_{k}^{n}$ and $H\left(X_{0}^{k}\right) \subset$ $\subset Q(n, k)$ is the subgroup of elements which leave $X_{0}^{k}$ fixed then the inverse image of $H\left(X_{0}^{k}\right)$ under $\Lambda_{b}^{k}$ is a subgroup $H_{b}\left(X_{0}^{k}\right)$ of $O(n)$ and there is a one to one correspondence between the left coset space $O(n) / H_{b}\left(X_{0}^{k}\right)$ and $S_{k}^{n}$, where the left coset corresponding to $X^{k} \in S_{k}^{n}$ is formed by those elements $\alpha$ of $O(n)$ for which $\Lambda_{b}^{k}(\alpha)$ sends $X_{0}^{k}$ into $X^{k}$.

A distance preserving map $\theta:(O(n), \mu) \rightarrow E^{n^{2}}$ is defined by $\theta(\alpha)=\left(x^{1}, \ldots, x^{n 2}\right)$, where $x^{l}=\alpha_{i j}$ for $l=(i-1) n+j$. If $O(n)$ is considered as a Lie group then $\theta$ is a $C^{\infty}$-embedding, therefore there is a Riemannian metric on $O(n)$ for which $\theta$ is isometric. Let $\varrho_{e}$ be the distance function of this Riemannian metric ([1], 124); $\varrho_{\mathrm{e}}\left(\alpha^{\prime}, \alpha^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is equal to the infimum of the length of curves joining $\alpha^{\prime}, \alpha^{\prime \prime}$ if their length is calculated with respect to the distance function $\mu$ ([5]). Therefore $\varrho_{e}$ and the above Riemannian metric are left and right invariant ([9], 169-172). If $b \in B^{n}$, $X_{0}^{k} \in S_{k}^{n}$ are fixed then a distance function $\bar{\varrho}_{e}$ is defined on the left coset space $O(n) / H_{b}\left(X_{0}^{k}\right)$ by $\bar{\varrho}_{e}\left(\alpha H_{b}\left(X_{0}^{k}\right), \beta H_{b}\left(X_{0}^{k}\right)\right)=\inf \left\{\varrho_{e}(\xi, \eta) \mid \xi \in \alpha H_{b}\left(X_{0}^{k}\right), \eta \in \beta H_{b}\left(X_{0}^{k}\right)\right\}$. The one to one correspondence $O(n) / H_{b}\left(X_{0}^{k}\right) \leftrightarrow S_{k}^{n}$ yields a distance function $d^{k}$ on $S_{k}^{n}$ for which this correspondence will be distance preserving. The distance function $d^{k}$ does not depend on the particular choice of $b$ and $X_{0}^{k}$ and it will be called the auxiliary metrization of $S_{k}^{n}$.

Lemma 1. 1. Let $G$ be a compact Lie group, $H$ a subgroup and $\varrho$ the distancë function of a Riemannian metric on $G$ which is left and right invariant. Let the distance function $\varrho$ on the left coset space $G / H$ be defined by

$$
\varrho(\alpha H, \beta H)=\inf \{\varrho(\xi ; \eta) \mid \xi \in \alpha H, \eta \in \beta \dot{H}\}
$$

Then there exist $\delta>0$ and $A>0$ such that in case $\bar{\varrho}(H, \alpha H)<\delta$ a unique $\xi \in \alpha H$ with $\varrho(\varepsilon, \check{\zeta})=\bar{\varrho}(H, \alpha H)$ exists, $\varepsilon$ being the identity in $G$; further in case $\bar{\varrho}\left(H, \alpha_{l} H\right)<\delta$. $(l=1,2)$ the inequality $\varrho\left(\xi_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right) \leqq A \bar{\varrho}\left(\alpha_{1} H, \alpha_{2} H\right)$ holds for the corresponding $\xi_{l} \in \dot{\alpha}_{l} H$. There is a Riemannian metric on $G / H$ with distance function $\varrho \geqq \geqq \underline{\varrho}$.

Proof. The existence of a $\bar{\zeta} \in \alpha H$ with $\varrho(\varepsilon, \xi)=\bar{\varrho}(H, \alpha H)$ for any left coset $\alpha H$ is obvious. Since the given Riemannian metric is left and right invariant, $H$ and its left cosets are totally geodesic submanifolds ([1],136-137). There is such a $\delta^{\prime}>0$ that the spherical neighborhood $U(\vartheta)$ of of $\varepsilon$ with radius $\vartheta$ is convex if $0<\vartheta \leqq \delta^{\prime}([1], 246$ -$-150)$. Assume that for some $\alpha H$ with $\bar{\varrho}(H, \alpha H) \leqq \delta^{\prime}$ there are $\xi^{\prime}, \xi^{\prime \prime} \in \alpha H$ with $\xi^{\prime} \neq \xi^{\prime \prime}$, $\varrho\left(\varepsilon, \xi^{\prime}\right)=\varrho\left(\varepsilon, \xi^{\prime \prime}\right)=\bar{\varrho}(H, \alpha H)=\vartheta$. Since $\xi^{\prime}, \xi^{\prime \prime} \in U(\vartheta)$, there is a unique minimizing. geodesic arc joining them, which with the exception of its endpoints lies in the interior of $U(\vartheta)$. But $\alpha H$ is totally geodesic, therefore this geodesic arc is in $\alpha H$. By the invariance of the Riemannian metric $\bar{\varrho}(H, \alpha H)=\inf \{\varrho(\varepsilon, \zeta) \mid \zeta \in \alpha H\}$, therefore $\bar{\varrho}(H, \alpha H)<\vartheta$, which is a contradiction. There is a canonical coordinate system of the first kind $\varphi: W \rightarrow E^{m}$ and one of the second kind $\psi: W \rightarrow E^{m}$, both defined on the neighborhood $W$ of $\varepsilon$, such that 1) if $g_{i j}(i, j=1, \ldots, m)$ are the components of the fundamental tensor of the given Riemannian metric in the coordinate system $\varphi$, then $\left.g_{i j}(\varphi(\varepsilon))=\delta_{i j} ; 2\right)$ if $\psi(\zeta)=\left(z^{1}, \ldots, z^{m}\right)$ for $\zeta \in W$, then $\psi(\zeta)=\left(0, \ldots, 0, z^{s+1}, \ldots, z^{m}\right)$ for $\zeta \in H \cap W$; moreover, if $\alpha H \cap W$ is not empty then there is a unique $\bar{\alpha} \in \alpha H \cap W$ such that $\zeta=\bar{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\xi}$ with $\bar{\xi} \in H \cap W$ holds for any $\zeta \in \alpha H \cap W$ and

$$
\begin{gathered}
\psi(\bar{\alpha})=\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}, 0, \ldots, 0\right), \quad \psi(\bar{\xi})=\left(0, \ldots, 0, \bar{z}^{s+1}, \ldots, \bar{z}^{m}\right), \\
\psi(\zeta)=\left(\bar{a}^{1} ; \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}, \bar{z}^{s+1}, \ldots, \bar{z}^{m}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

3) if $\varphi(\zeta)=\left(y^{1}, \ldots, y^{m}\right)$ for $\zeta \in W$ and $y^{i}=\chi^{i}\left(z^{1}, \ldots, z^{m}\right)(i=1, \ldots, m)$ are the transition functions from $\psi$ to $\varphi$, then $\chi^{i}\left(\frac{1}{0}, \ldots, \frac{j-1}{0}, t, \frac{j+1}{0}, \ldots, \frac{m}{0}\right)=\delta_{i j} t$ for $j=s+1, \ldots, m$, if $\left.\stackrel{\frac{1}{0}}{(1)}, \stackrel{j=1}{0} \stackrel{j}{j}_{i}^{j}, \ldots, \stackrel{m}{0}, \ldots\right) \in \psi(W)([9]$, II. 62-86). Let $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow G$ be the unique minimizing geodesic arc joining $\varepsilon$ and $\zeta \in W$; then $\gamma$ is given by $\gamma^{i}(t)=\gamma^{i} \cdot t(0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$, in the coordinate system $\dot{\varphi}$. Hence

$$
\varrho(\varepsilon, \zeta)=\int_{0}^{1}\left[\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} g_{i j}(\varphi \circ \gamma(t)) \gamma^{i} \gamma^{j}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} d t=\int_{0}^{1}\left[\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} g_{i j}(\varphi(\varepsilon)) \gamma^{i} \gamma^{j}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} d t=\left[\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(y^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

Therefore if $\alpha H$ is such a coset that the corresponding $\xi \in \alpha \cap W$ and $\psi(\xi)=$ $=\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}, \bar{x}^{s+1}, \ldots, \bar{x}^{m}\right)$, then

$$
F_{j}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}, \bar{x}^{s+1}, \ldots, \bar{x}^{m}\right)=\left.\sum_{i=1}^{m} \chi^{i}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \dot{\bar{a}}^{s}, \bar{x}^{s+1}, \ldots, \bar{x}^{m}\right) \cdot \frac{\partial \chi^{i}}{\partial z^{j}}\right|_{\psi(\xi)}=0
$$

for $j=s+1, \ldots, m$. But

$$
\frac{\partial F_{j}}{\partial z^{I}}=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\partial \chi^{i}}{\partial z^{i}} \frac{\partial \chi^{i}}{\partial z^{j}}+\chi^{i} \frac{\partial^{2} \chi^{i}}{\partial z^{i} \partial z^{j}}\right) \quad \text { and hence }\left.\quad \frac{\partial F_{j}}{\partial z^{I}}\right|_{\psi(\varepsilon)}=\delta_{j l}
$$

for $j, l=s+1, \ldots, m$. Consequently there is a neighborhood $U \subset W$ of $\varepsilon$ with $\left.\frac{\partial\left(F_{s+1}, \ldots, F_{m}\right)}{\partial\left(z^{s+1}, \ldots, z^{m}\right)}\right|_{\psi(\zeta)} \neq 0$ for $\zeta \in U$. Therefore by the implicit function theorem there are analytic functions $\omega^{s+1}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}\right), \ldots, \omega^{m}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}\right)$ defined on a neighborhood $V$ of the origin in $E^{s}$ such that

$$
F_{j}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}, \omega^{s+1}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}\right), \ldots, \omega^{m}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}\right)\right)=0 \quad(j=s+1, \ldots, m)
$$

for $\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}\right) \in V$ and there are no other solutions of $F_{j}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{m}, z^{s+1}, \ldots, z^{m}\right)=0$ $(j=s+1, \ldots, m)$ in $V$. Let $\alpha H$ be such a coset that $\xi \in \alpha H \cap W$ and $\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}\right) \in V$. Then $x^{j}=\omega^{j}\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}\right)(j=s+1, \ldots, \dot{m})$. Let $\delta^{\prime \prime}>0$ be such that $\xi \in \alpha H \cap W$, $\left(\bar{a}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}^{s}\right) \in V$ if $\bar{\varrho}(H, \alpha H) \leqq \delta^{\prime \prime}$. Put $\delta=\min \left(\frac{1}{4} \delta^{\prime}, \delta^{\prime \prime}\right)$ and assume that $\varrho\left(H, \alpha_{1} H\right)=$ $=\vartheta_{1} \leqq \bar{\varrho}\left(H, \alpha_{2} H\right)=\vartheta_{2} \leqq \delta$. Since $\varrho\left(\xi_{1}^{\prime \prime}, \xi_{2}\right) \leqq \frac{1}{2} \delta^{\prime}$, there is a unique $\xi_{2}^{\prime} \in \alpha_{2} H$ with $\bar{\varrho}\left(\alpha_{1} H, \alpha_{2} H\right)=\varrho\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}^{\prime}\right)$. Further there are such bounds $A^{\prime} \leqq A^{\prime \prime}$ that

$$
A^{\prime}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}^{i}-z_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqq \varrho\left(\zeta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right) \leqq A^{\prime \prime}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}^{i}-z_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

for $\zeta_{1}, \mathcal{C}_{i} \in \in^{\top}, \psi\left(\zeta_{l}\right)=\left(z_{l}^{1}, \ldots, z_{l}^{m}\right) \quad(l=1,2) \quad([5])$. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\varrho\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}\right)}{\varrho\left(\alpha_{1} H, \alpha_{2} H\right)}=\frac{\varrho\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}\right)}{\varrho\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}^{\prime}\right)} \leqq \frac{A^{\prime \prime}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{i}-\bar{a}_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}+\sum_{j=s+1}^{m}\left(x_{1}^{j}-x_{2}^{j}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{A^{\prime}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{i}-\bar{a}_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}+\sum_{j=s+1}^{m}\left(x_{1}^{j}-x_{2}^{\prime j}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqq} \\
& \quad \leqq \frac{A^{\prime \prime}}{A^{\prime}}\left[1+\frac{\sum_{j=s+1}^{m}\left(x_{1}^{j}-x_{2}^{j}\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{i}-\bar{a}_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqq \\
& \\
& \leqq \frac{A^{\prime \prime}}{A^{\prime}}\left[1+\left[\frac{\sum_{j=s+1}^{m}\left(\omega^{j}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{1}^{s}\right)-\omega^{j}\left(\bar{a}_{2}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{2}^{s}\right)\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{i}-\bar{a}_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}}\right]\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

But

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\left|\omega^{j}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{1}^{s}\right)-\omega^{j}\left(\bar{a}_{2}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{2}^{s}\right)\right|}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{i}-\bar{a}_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{1}} \leqq \sum_{i=1}^{s}\left\{\left|\frac{\partial \omega^{j}}{\partial \bar{a}^{i}}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{1}^{s}\right)\right|+\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\int_{0}^{1}\left|\frac{\partial \omega^{j}}{\partial \bar{a}^{i}}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{1}+t\left(\bar{a}_{2}^{1}-\bar{a}_{1}^{1}\right), \ldots, \bar{a}_{1}^{s}+t\left(\bar{a}_{2}^{s}-\bar{a}_{1}^{s}\right)\right)-\frac{\partial \omega^{j}}{\partial \bar{a}^{i}}\left(\bar{a}_{1}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{1}^{s}\right)\right| d t\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence the quantity under square root is bounded and the existence of a bound $A$ with $\varrho\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}\right) \leqq A \bar{\varrho}\left(\alpha_{1} H, \alpha_{2} H\right)$ for $\bar{\varrho}\left(H, \alpha_{l} H\right) \leqq \delta(l=1,2)$ follows. A Riemannian metric with distance function $\check{\varrho} \geqq \varrho\left(\begin{array}{c}\text { can } \\ \text { be evidently given by the standard }\end{array}\right.$ construction of a homogeneous Riemannian metric on $G / H$ based on the Haar measure of $G([1], 136)$.

Lemma 1. 2. There is such a bound B that $d^{k}\left(X_{1}^{k}, X_{2}^{k}\right) \leqq B \cdot\left\|X_{1}^{k}-X_{2}^{k}\right\|$ for any $X_{1}^{k}, X_{2}^{k} \in S_{k}^{n}$, where the norm is taken in the euclidean vector space $V_{k}^{n}$.

Proof. Since $S_{k}^{n}$ is a $C^{\infty}$-submanifold of $V_{k}^{n}$ this embedding defines a Riemannian metric on $S_{k}^{n}$ which has a distance function $\varrho^{\prime}$, and admits such a bound $B^{\prime}$ that $\varrho^{\prime}\left(X_{1}^{k}, X_{2}^{k}\right) \equiv \equiv B^{\prime} \cdot\left\|X_{1}^{k}-X_{2}^{k}\right\|$ for $X_{1}^{k}, X_{2}^{k} \in S_{k}^{n}([5])$. Let $\bar{\varrho}$ be the distance function provided by Lemma 1.1, then there is such a $B^{\prime \prime}$ that $\check{\varrho} \leqq B^{\prime \prime} \cdot \varrho^{\prime}$. Consequently $B=B^{\prime} \cdot B^{\prime \prime}$ is the bound required.

## 2. Immersions of locally bounded curvature

Immersions of locally bounded curvature are introduced in this section and the basic concepts of the curvature theory of $C^{2}$-immersions are generalized for them.

Let $f: M^{k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ be a $C^{1}$-immersion of the $C^{1}$-manifold $M^{k}$ and for $p \in M^{k}$ let $U$ be an oriented neighborhood of $p$ in $M^{k}$. Then the tangent space $T_{9} M^{k}$ for $q \in U$ is mapped by the induced map of the tangent bundles $f_{*}: T M^{k} \rightarrow T E^{n}$ onto an oriented $k$-dimensional subspace of $T_{f(q)} E^{n}$ which in turn is mapped by $\exp _{j(q)}: T_{f(q)} E^{n} \rightarrow E^{n}$ onto an oriented $k$-plane $L_{q}^{k}$ of $E^{n}$ which defines a simple unit $k$-vector $X_{q}^{k} \in S_{k}^{n}$. The immersion $f$ defines a Riemannian metric on $M^{k}$; let $d$ be its distance function. If there is such a $K_{p}$ that $\limsup _{q \rightarrow p} \frac{\left\|X_{q}^{k}-X_{p}^{k}\right\|}{d(p, q)} \leqq K_{p}$, then $f$ is said to be of bounded curvature at $p$ with the bound $K_{p}$. If $p$ has a neighborhood $V$ such that $f$ is of bounded curvature at every $q \in V$ with the same bound $K_{V}$, then $f$ is said to be of locally bounded curvature at $p$ with the bound $K_{V}$. If $f$ is of locally bounded curvature at every point of $M$ then it is called an immersion of locally bounded curvature.

Lemma 2. 1. Let the $C^{1}$-immersion $f: M^{k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ of the $C^{1}$-manifold $M^{k}$ be of locally bounded curvature at $p \in M^{k}$. Then there is a coordinate system $\alpha: U \rightarrow E^{k}$ of the $C^{1}$-manifold $M^{k}$ defined on a neighborhood $U$ of $p$ such that the second derivatives of the vector valued function $x_{\alpha}=f \circ \alpha^{-1}: \alpha(U) \rightarrow E^{n}$ exist are measurable, and independent of the order derivations almost everywhere on $\alpha(U)$.

Proof. Let $\pi_{p}: E^{n} \rightarrow L_{p}^{k}$ be the orthogonal projection on $L_{p}^{k}$. There is a neighborhood $U^{\prime}$ of $p$ in $M^{k}$ such that $\alpha=\pi_{p} \circ f: U^{\prime} \rightarrow L_{p}^{k}$ yields a coordinate system
of the $C^{1}$-manifold $M^{k}$. Let $V$ be the neighborhood of $p$ on which $f$ is of locally bounded curvature with the bound $K_{V}$ according to the assumption of the lemma. Choose $\delta^{\prime}>0$ such that $U\left(2 \delta^{\prime}\right)$, the spherical neighborhood of $p$ with radius $2 \delta^{\prime}$ taken according to the distance function $d$, is contained in $V$. Then $\frac{\left\|X_{q_{1}}^{k}-X_{q_{2}}^{k}\right\|}{d\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right)} \leqq K_{V}$ $\dot{d}\left(q_{l}, p\right) \leqq \delta^{\prime}(l=1,2)$. In fact, by assuming the contrary and considering successive bisections of a minimizing geodesic arc joining $q_{1}, q_{2}$, one would arrive at a point of $V$ where $K_{V}$ cannot be a bound for $f$. Put $\delta=\min \left(\delta^{\prime}, \frac{1}{K_{V}}\right)$, then $U=U(\delta)$, the spherical neighborhood of $p$ with radius $\delta$, is contained in $U^{\prime}$. To verify the last assertion it suffices to see that there is no $q \in U$ with $\left\langle X_{q}^{k}, X_{p}^{k}\right\rangle=0$ ([13], 117-119); but this is obvious since $q \in U$ and $\left\langle X_{q}^{k}, X_{p}^{k}\right\rangle=0$ would imply that $d(p, q) \geqq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{K_{V}}$; If orthonormal coordinate systems are suitably chosen in $E^{n}$ and $L_{p}^{k}$, then

$$
x_{\alpha}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)=\left(u^{1}, \ldots ; u^{k}, x_{\alpha}^{k+1}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right), \ldots, x_{\alpha}^{n}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)\right)
$$

with $\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)=\alpha(q)$ for $q \in U^{\prime}$. Put.

$$
Y^{k}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)=\left.\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{1}}\right|_{\alpha(q)} \wedge \ldots \wedge \frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{k} .}\right|_{\alpha(q)} \text { and } N\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)=\left\|Y^{k}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)\right\|
$$

for $q \in U^{\prime}$. Let $Q$ be the solid $k$-dimensional cube spanned by the basic vectors of the coordinate system of $L_{p}^{k}$; then its inverse image in $L_{q}^{k}$ under $\pi_{p}$ is a solid $k$-dimensional parallelepiped $Q_{q}$, which is spanned by the . vectors $\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{1}}\right|_{\alpha(q)}, \ldots,\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{k}}\right|_{\alpha(q)}$, for $q \in U^{\prime}$. But $N\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)$ is equal to the $k$-dimensional volume of $Q_{q}$ and

$$
\left\langle Y^{k}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right), X_{p}^{k}\right\rangle=N\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)\left\langle X_{q}^{k}, X_{p}^{k}\right\rangle=1 \quad([10], 56-57)
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|N\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-N\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right|=\left|\frac{\left\langle X_{q_{2}}^{k}-X_{q_{1}}^{k}, X_{p}^{k}\right\rangle}{\left\langle X_{q_{1}}^{k}, X_{p}^{k}\right\rangle \cdot\left\langle X_{q_{2}}^{k}, X_{p}^{k}\right\rangle}\right| \leqq \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\left\lvert\, 1-\frac{1}{2}\left\|X_{q_{1}}^{k}-X_{p}^{k}\right\|^{2}-X_{q_{1}}^{k}\right. \|
\end{gathered}
$$

if $q_{1}, q_{2} \in U$. There is a $C>0$ such that $d\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right)^{2} \leqq C^{2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}$ for $q_{1}, q_{2} \in U^{\prime}$. Consequently

$$
\left|N\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-N\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right| \leqq 4 \cdot K_{V} \cdot d\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right) \leqq 4 \cdot K_{V} \cdot C \cdot\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

for $q_{1}, q_{2} \in U$. Therefore

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\|Y^{k}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-Y^{k}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right\| \leqq N\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right) \cdot\left\|X_{q_{1}}^{k}-X_{q_{2}}^{k}\right\|+ \\
+\left|N\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-N\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right| \leqq 6 \cdot K_{V} \cdot d\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right) \leqq 6 \cdot K_{V} \cdot C \cdot\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]_{\cdots}^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{gathered}
$$

if $q_{1}, q_{2} \in U$. This means in other words that $Y^{k}: \alpha(U) \rightarrow V_{k}^{n}$ is a Lipschitz map. Since

$$
\left\|\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha\left(q_{1}\right)}-\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha\left(q_{2}\right)}| | \leqq Y^{k}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{k}^{1}\right)-Y^{k}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right\|
$$

it follows that $\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{i}}: \alpha(U) \rightarrow V_{1}^{n}$ is a Lipschitz map as well. Therefore by Rademacher's theorem ([13], 271-272), $\frac{\partial^{2} x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{j} \partial u^{i}}(i, j=1, \ldots, k)$ exist almost everywhere on $\alpha(U)$ and are neasurable. The fact that $\frac{\partial^{2} x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{i} \partial u^{i}}=\frac{\partial^{2} x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{i} \partial u^{j}}$ almost everywhere on $\alpha(U)$ follows by an obvious application of Fubini's theorem.

If the $C^{1}$-immersion $f: M^{k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ is of locally bounded curvature at $p$ and $\alpha: U \rightarrow E^{k}$ is a coordinate system of the $C^{1}$-manifold $M^{k}$ on the neighborhood $U$ of $\dot{p}$ constructed according to the proof of the preceding lemma then $\alpha: U \rightarrow E^{k}$ will be called a distinguished coordinate system.

Let $f: M^{k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ be a $C^{1}$-immersion, $N M^{k}$ its normal bundle, $\pi: N M^{k} \rightarrow M^{k}$ the projection in the normal bundle and $v: N M^{k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ the normal map of the immersion; $\pi^{-1}(p)=N_{p} M^{k}$ is a euclidean vector space and the restriction of $v$ to it is an isometric vector space isomorphism. Assume that $f$ is of locally bounded curvature on the neighborhood $V$ of $p$ with the bound $K_{V}$. Let $\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right)=b \in B^{n}$. be such a base that $a_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge a_{k}=X_{p}^{k}$ and $\Lambda_{b}^{k}: O(n) \rightarrow \dot{Q}(n, k)$ the corresponding homomorphism. Then $H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right) \subset O(n)$ is the subgroup of elements which leave $X_{p}^{k}$ fixed, and by the correspondence $O(n) / H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right) \leftrightarrow S_{k}^{n}$ for any $q \in M^{k}$ there is a left coset $\alpha_{q} H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right)$ consisting of those elements which send $X_{p}^{k}$ to $X_{q}^{k}$. Let $\delta>0$ be the number provided by Lemma 1.1 for the case $G=\dot{O}(n), H=H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right), \varrho=\varrho_{e}$ and $B$ the bound given by Lemma 1.2. There is a neighborhood $U\left(\delta^{\prime}\right)$ of radius $\delta^{\prime}>0$ of $p$ such that $U\left(2 \delta^{\prime}\right) \subset V$ and $\delta^{\prime} \leqq \frac{\delta}{K_{V} \cdot B}$. Consequently if $q \in U\left(\delta^{\prime}\right)$, then

$$
\bar{\varrho}_{e}\left(H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right), \alpha_{i} H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right)\right)=d^{k}\left(X_{p}^{k}, X_{q}^{k}\right) \leqq B \cdot\left\|X_{p}^{k}-X_{q}^{k}\right\| \leqq \delta
$$

Hence by Lemma 1.1 for any $q \in U\left(\delta^{\prime}\right)$ there exists a unique $\xi_{q} \in \alpha_{q} H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right)$ with
$\varrho_{e}\left(\varepsilon, \xi_{q}\right)=\bar{\varrho}_{e}\left(H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right), \alpha_{q} H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right)\right)$. The field of bases $\beta: U \rightarrow B^{n}$ defined on $U=U\left(\delta^{\prime}\right)$ by $\beta(q)=b \cdot \xi_{q}=\left(\bar{w}_{1}(q), \ldots, \bar{w}_{n}(q)\right)(q \in U)$ will be called a distinguished field of bases. Assume that a distinguished coordinate system $\alpha: U \rightarrow E^{n}$ is given as well. Then $\left(w_{1}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right), \ldots, w_{n}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)\right),\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right) \in \alpha(U)$ with $w_{i}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)=w_{i}(q)$ $(i=1, \ldots, n)$ for $\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)=\alpha(q)(q \in U)$ is called a coordinate representation of the distinguished field of bases. If $w \in \pi^{-1}(U)$ then
$v(w)=\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} t^{j} \bar{w}_{j}(q)=\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} t^{j} w_{j}\left(\dot{u}^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)$ and $\zeta_{\alpha \beta}(w)=\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}, t^{k+1}, \ldots, t^{n}\right)$
defines a coordinate system $\zeta_{\alpha \beta}: \pi^{-1}(U) \rightarrow \alpha(U) \times E^{n-k}$ for the normal bundle; this will be called a distinguished coordinate system of the normal bundle. The map $z_{\alpha \beta}: \alpha(U) \times E^{n-k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ defined by $\left.\because z_{\alpha \beta}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}, t^{k+1}, \ldots, t^{n}\right)=\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} t^{j} w_{j} \dot{u^{1}}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)$ is called a distinguished coordinate representation of the normal map.

Lemma 2. 2. Let the $C^{1}$-immersion $f: M^{k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ be of locally bounded curvature at $p \in M^{k}$, let $\alpha: U \rightarrow E^{k}, \beta: U \rightarrow B^{n}$ be a distïnguished coordinate system and a distinguished field of bases on the neighborhood $U$ of $p$. Then the corresponding coordinate representation $z_{\alpha \beta}: \alpha(U) \times B_{\vartheta}^{n-k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ of the normal map is a Lipschitz map, where $B_{3}^{n-k}$ is the solid ball of radius $\vartheta>0$ at the origin in $E^{n-k}$.

Proof. Since

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{\left\|z_{\alpha \beta}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}, t_{1}^{k+1}, \ldots, t_{1}^{n}\right)-z_{\alpha \beta}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}, t_{2}^{k+1}, \ldots, t_{2}^{n}\right)\right\|}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}+\sum_{j=k+1}^{n}\left(t_{1}^{j}-t_{2}^{j}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leqq \\
\leqq \frac{\left\|x_{\alpha}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-x_{\alpha}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right\|}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}+\frac{\left[\sum_{j=k+1}^{n}\left(t_{1}^{j}-t_{2}^{j}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left[\sum_{j=k+1}^{n}\left(t_{1}^{j}-t_{2}^{j}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}+ \\
+\frac{\left.\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} t_{2}^{j}\left(w_{j}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-w_{j}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right)\right]^{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}}{} .
\end{gathered}
$$

it sufficies to find bounds for the first and the last term. With the notations of and
according to the proof of the preceding lemma

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|x_{\alpha}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-x_{\alpha}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right\| \\
& =\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}=.
$$

But .

$$
\left\|Y^{k}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)\right\|=N\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)=\frac{1}{\left\langle X_{q_{1}}^{k}, X_{p}^{k}\right\rangle}=\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{2}\left\|X_{q_{1}}^{k}-X_{p}^{k}\right\|^{2}} \leqq 2
$$

and

$$
R_{j i}=\int_{0}^{1}\left(\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}^{j}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha(q(t))}-\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}^{j}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha\left(q_{1}\right)}\right)\left(u_{2}^{i}-u_{1}^{i}\right) d t,
$$

where

$$
\alpha(q(t))=\left(u_{1}^{1}+t\left(u_{2}^{1}-u_{1}^{1}\right), \ldots, u_{1}^{k}+t\left(u_{2}^{k}-u_{1}^{k}\right)\right), \quad(0 \leqq t \leqq 1) .
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|R_{j i}\right| \leqq \int_{0}^{1} \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|\left(\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}^{j}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha(q(t))}-\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}^{j}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha\left(q_{1}\right)}\right)\left(u_{2}^{i}-u_{1}^{i}\right)\right| d t \leqq \\
& \leqq\left[\sum_{s=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \int_{0}^{1}\left[2 \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}^{j}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha(q(t))}-\left.\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}^{j}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha\left(q_{1}\right)}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} d t \leqq \\
& \leqq\left[2 \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{0}^{1}\left\|Y^{k}(\alpha(q(t)))-Y^{k}\left(\alpha\left(q_{1}\right)\right)\right\| d t \leqq \\
& \leqq\left[2 \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot 6 \cdot K_{V} \cdot d\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently

$$
\frac{\left\|x_{\alpha}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-x_{\alpha}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right\|}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leqq 1+8 \sqrt{2} .
$$

By Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} t_{j}\left(w_{j}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-w_{j}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right)\right\| \\
& \leqq \vartheta\left[\sum_{j=k+1}^{n}\left(w_{j}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{k}\right)-w_{j}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \therefore, u_{2}^{k}\right)\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqq \vartheta \cdot \sigma\left(b \xi_{q_{1}}, b \xi_{q_{2}}\right)= \\
& =\vartheta \cdot \mu\left(\xi_{q_{1}}, \xi_{q_{2}}\right) \leqq \vartheta \cdot \varrho_{e}\left(\zeta_{q_{1}}, \xi_{q_{2}}\right) \leqq \vartheta \cdot A \cdot \bar{\varrho}_{e}\left(\alpha_{1} H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right), \alpha_{2} H_{b}\left(X_{p}^{k}\right)\right)= \\
& =\vartheta \cdot A \cdot d^{k}\left(X_{q_{1}}^{k}, X_{q_{2}}^{k}\right) \leqq \vartheta \cdot A \cdot B \cdot\left\|X_{q_{1}}^{k}-X_{q_{2}}^{k}\right\| \leqq \vartheta \cdot A \cdot B \cdot K_{V} \cdot d\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right) \leqq \\
& \\
& \leqq \vartheta \cdot A \cdot B \cdot K_{V} \cdot C\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 2. 1. Let $f: M^{k} \rightarrow E^{n}$ be an immersion of locally bounded curvature. Then its second fundamental tensor and second fundamental forms exist almost everywhere on $M^{k}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha: U \rightarrow E^{k}$ be a distinguished coordinate system, $\beta: U \rightarrow B^{n}$ a distinguished field of bases. By the preceding lemma $w_{i}: \alpha(U) \rightarrow V_{1}^{n}(i=1, \ldots, n)$ is a Lipschitz map and therefore, according to Rademacher's theorem, $\frac{\partial w_{i}}{\partial u^{s}}(s=1, \ldots, k)$ exist almost everywhere on $\alpha(U)$ and are measurable. As a consequence the usual definition of the second fundamental tensor applies almost everywhere on $U$ as follows. Let $w\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)=\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \beta^{j}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right) w_{j}\left(u^{i}, \ldots, u^{k}\right)$ be the coordinate representation of a normal field, where $\beta^{j}$ are differentiable functions on $\alpha(U)$, and $v=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha^{i} \frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\left.\partial u^{i}\right|_{\alpha(q)}}$, then $D(v, w)$, the derivative of $w$ in the direction of $v$, exists if $\left.\frac{\partial w_{j}}{\partial u^{i}}\right|_{\alpha(q)}(i=1, \ldots, k ; j=k+1, \ldots, n)$ all exist. Let $S_{q}(v, w)$ be the orthogonal projection of $D(v, w)$ on $X_{q}^{k}$; then

$$
\dot{S}_{q}(v, w)=\left.\sum_{i=1}^{k} \cdot \sum_{r=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{k} \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} g^{i r}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{k}\right) \alpha^{s} \beta^{j}\left(u^{1}, \ldots: u^{k}\right)\left\langle\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{r}}, \frac{\partial w_{j}}{\partial u^{s}}\right\rangle\right|_{\alpha(q)} \frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\left.\partial u^{i}\right|_{\alpha(q)}}
$$

where $g^{i r}$ are the contravariant components of the first fundamental tensor. Therefore
$S_{q}(v, w)$ defines a tensor $S_{q}: T_{q} M^{k} \times N_{q} M^{k} \rightarrow T_{q} M^{k}$. Consequently a tensor field $S$ is obtained which is defined for almost every $q \in M^{k}$ and is called the second fundamental tensor of the immersion. If $\|w\|=1$ and $w$ is fixed then $l_{w}\left(v, v^{\prime}\right)=$ $=\left\langle S_{q}(v, w), v^{\prime}\right\rangle=\sum_{r=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{k} \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \alpha^{\prime r} \alpha^{s} \beta^{j}\left\langle\frac{\partial x_{\alpha}}{\partial u^{r}}, \frac{\partial w_{j}}{\partial u^{s}}\right\rangle$ is a bilinear form

$$
l_{w}: T_{q} M^{k} \times T_{q} M^{k} \rightarrow E^{1}
$$

 form of the immersion at $q$ in the normal direction $w \in N_{q} M^{k}$ :

In case of a hypersurface of locally bounded curvature $f: M^{n-1} \rightarrow E^{n}$ there is essentially one choice for $w$, therefore the hypersurface has one second fundamental form $l$. The above theorem and Lemma 2.1 give the following

Corollary. Let $f: M^{n-1} \rightarrow E^{n}$ be a hypersurface of locally bounded curvature and $l$ its second fundamental form, then $l_{q}: T_{q} M^{n-1} \times T_{q} M^{n-1} \rightarrow E^{1}$ is symmetric for almost every $q \in M^{n-1}$. The coefficients of $l$ are measurable in any distinguished coordinate system of the hypersurface.

## 3. The uniqueness of hypersurfaces of locally bounded curvature with given first and second fundamental forms

The uniqueness theorem for $C^{\infty}$-hypersurfaces is the following: Let the $C^{\infty}$-hypersurfaces $f_{1}, f_{2}: M^{n-1} \rightarrow E^{n}(n \geqq 3)$ have common first and second fundamental forms where the second fundamental forms are taken with respect to $C^{\infty}$-unit normal fields $\bar{w}_{n}^{1}, \bar{w}_{n}^{2}: M^{n-1} \rightarrow V_{1}^{n}$ of the hypersurfaces $f_{1}, f_{2}$. Then there exists a distance preserving transformation $\Phi: E^{n} \rightarrow E^{n}$ with $f_{2}=\Phi \circ f_{1}$ ([7], 79-81).

This theorem will be generalized to hypersurfaces of locally bounded curvature in this section.

Lemma 3.1. Let the $C^{1}$-hypersurface $f: M^{n-1} \rightarrow E^{n}$ be of locally bounded curvature at $p \in M^{n-1}$ with the bound $K_{V}$, let $\alpha: U \rightarrow E^{n-1}$ be a distinguished coordinate system, $\beta: U \rightarrow B^{n}$ a distinguished field of bases on the neighborhood $U$ of $p$ and $z_{\alpha \beta}: \alpha(U) \times E^{1} \rightarrow E^{n}$ the corresponding coordinate representation of the normal map. Then there exist a neighborhood $\tilde{U} \subset U$ of $p$ and numbers $\delta, \vartheta>0$ such that

$$
\left\|z_{\alpha \beta}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{n-1}, t_{1}^{n}\right)-z_{\alpha \beta}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{n-1}, t_{2}^{n}\right)\right\| \geqq \delta\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(u_{1}^{i}-u_{2}^{i}\right)^{2}+\left(t_{1}^{n}-t_{2}^{n}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

if

$$
\left(u_{l}^{1}, \ldots, u_{l}^{n-1}, t_{l}^{n}\right) \in \alpha(\widetilde{O}) \times B_{3}^{1} \quad(l=1,2)
$$

Proof. If $u_{1}^{i}=u_{2}^{i}(i=1, \ldots, n-1)$, the inequality holds with $\delta=1$ for any $\vartheta>0$, therefore it will be assumed that $\left(u_{i}^{1}, \ldots, u_{i}^{n-1}\right)(l=1,2)$ correspond to different $q_{1}, q_{2} \in U$. Assume further that $t_{1}^{n} \geqq t_{2}^{n}$ and put $t=t_{2}^{n}, \Delta t=t_{1}^{n}-t_{2}^{n}$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Delta u=\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(u_{2}^{i}-u_{1}^{i}\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad x=x_{\alpha}\left(u_{1}^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{n-1}\right)-x_{\alpha}\left(u_{2}^{1}, \ldots, u_{2}^{n-1}\right) \\
\tilde{w}_{l}=\bar{w}_{n}\left(q_{l}\right), \quad y=x+t\left(\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right), \quad z=x+t_{1}^{n} \tilde{w}_{1}-t_{2}^{n} \tilde{w}_{2}, \quad d=d\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

Let $\varepsilon_{l}$ be the angle of the vector $x$ and the subspace $X_{q_{l}}^{n-1}$ and put $\gamma_{l}=\varangle\left(x, \tilde{w}_{l}\right)$, $\gamma^{\prime}=\varangle\left(y, \tilde{w}_{1}\right), \quad \gamma^{\prime \prime}=\varangle\left(x, \tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right), \quad 2 \gamma=\varangle\left(\tilde{w}_{1}, \tilde{w}_{2}\right) \quad$ where $\gamma^{\prime \prime}=0 \quad$ if $\quad \tilde{w}_{1}=\tilde{w}_{2}$. According to the proof of Lemma $2.2,1 \leqq \frac{\|x\|}{\Delta u} \leqq 1+8 \sqrt{2}$ if $\dot{q}_{1}, q_{2} \in U$. Let $\alpha^{\prime}: U^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{n-1}$ be a distinguished coordinate system at $q_{1} \in U$ and let $q_{2} \in U^{\prime} \cap U$. Then for a coordinate system suitably chosen in $E^{n}$ we have $\left|\operatorname{tg} \varepsilon_{1}\right|=\left|\frac{\Delta x_{\alpha^{\prime}}^{n}}{\Delta u^{\prime}}\right|$ where, like below, primes refer to analogous quentities in case of the coordinate system $\alpha^{\prime}$. Therefore

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|\operatorname{tg} \varepsilon_{1}\right|=\left|\left(\left.\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial x_{\alpha^{\prime}}^{n}}{\partial u^{\prime}}\right|_{\alpha^{\prime}\left(q_{2}\right)} \frac{u_{1}^{\prime i}-u_{2}^{\prime i}}{\Delta u^{\prime}}+\frac{R_{n i}^{\prime}}{\Delta u^{\prime}}\right)\right| \leqq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(\left|\frac{\partial x_{\alpha^{\prime}}^{n}}{\partial u^{\prime}}\right|_{\alpha^{\prime}\left(q_{2}\right)}+\frac{\left|R_{n i}^{\prime}\right|}{\Delta u^{\prime}}\right) \leqq \\
\left.\leqq \sqrt{2} \| Y^{n-1}\left(u_{2}^{\prime}, \ldots, u_{2}^{\prime n-1}\right)\left|+\frac{1}{\Delta u^{\prime}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\right| R_{n i}^{\prime} \right\rvert\, \leqq \\
\leqq \sqrt{2}\left\|Y^{n-1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}{ }^{1}, \ldots, u_{1}^{\prime n-1}\right)-Y^{n-1}\left(u_{2}^{\prime}, \ldots, u_{2}^{\prime n-1}\right)\right\|+ \\
+\frac{1}{\Delta u^{\prime}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left|R_{n i}^{\prime}\right| \leqq \sqrt{2} \cdot 6 \cdot K_{V} \cdot C^{\prime} \cdot \Delta u^{\prime}+\sqrt{2} \cdot 6 \cdot K_{V} \cdot C^{\prime} \cdot \Delta u^{\prime}=12 \cdot \sqrt{2} \cdot K_{V} \cdot C^{\prime} \cdot \Delta u^{\prime}
\end{gathered}
$$

with respect to the proof of Lemmas 2. 1. and 2. 2. Hence $\frac{\left|\operatorname{tg} \varepsilon_{1}\right|}{\|x\|} \leqq \frac{\left|\operatorname{tg} \varepsilon_{1}\right|}{\Delta u^{\prime}} \leqq$ $\leqq 12 \cdot \sqrt{2} \cdot K_{V} \cdot C^{\prime}$ if $q_{1} \in U, q_{2} \in U^{\prime} \cap U$. But the value of $C^{\prime}$ which may depend on $q_{1}$ is bounded on a neighborhood of $p$, since $f$ is a $C^{1}$-hypersurface. Therefore a neighborhood $\tilde{U} \subset U$ of $p$ and a bound $D$ exist with $\frac{\left|\operatorname{tg} \varepsilon_{t}\right|}{\|x\|} \leqq D$ for $q_{1}, q_{2} \in \tilde{U}$ ( $l=1,2$ ). Obviously

$$
\begin{gathered}
\|z\|^{2}=(\Delta t)^{2}+\|x\|^{2}+t^{2}\left\|\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right\|^{2}- \\
-2 \Delta t\left[\|x\|^{2}+t^{2}\left\|\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right\|^{2}-2 t\|x\| \cdot\left\|\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right\| \cdot \cos \gamma^{\prime \prime}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \cos \gamma^{\prime}- \\
-2 t\|x\| \cdot\left\|\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right\| \cdot \cos \gamma^{\prime}
\end{gathered}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \|z\|^{2} \geqq(\Delta t)^{2}+\|x\|^{2}-t^{2} \cdot K_{V}^{2} \cdot d^{2}- \\
& \quad-2 \Delta t\left[\|x\|^{2}+t^{2} \cdot K_{V}^{2} \cdot d^{2}+2 t \cdot\|x\| \cdot K_{V} \cdot d \cdot \cos \gamma^{\prime}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}-2 t \cdot\|x\| \cdot K_{V} \cdot d=(\Delta t)^{2}+ \\
& \quad+(\Delta u)^{2}\left[\frac{\|x\|^{2}}{(\Delta u)^{2}}-t^{2} \cdot K_{V}^{2} \cdot \frac{d^{2}}{(\Delta u)^{2}}-2 \Delta t \frac{\|x\|}{\Delta u}\left(\frac{\|x\|}{\Delta u}+t \cdot K_{V} \cdot \frac{d}{\Delta u}\right) \frac{\cos \gamma^{\prime}}{\|x\|}\right. \\
& \left.\quad-2 t \cdot K_{V} \cdot \frac{\|x\|}{\Delta u} \cdot \frac{d}{\Delta u}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

But

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\cos \gamma^{\prime}}{\|x\|} & =\frac{\left\langle\tilde{w}_{1}, x+t\left(\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right)\right\rangle}{\|x\| \cdot\left\|x+t\left(\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right)\right\|}= \\
& =\left[\frac{\cos \gamma_{1}}{\|x\|}+2 t \frac{\sin ^{2} \gamma}{\|x\|}\right] \cdot\left[1+t^{2} \frac{\left\|\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right\|^{2}}{\|x\|^{2}}+2 t\left(\frac{\cos \gamma_{1}}{\|x\|}-\frac{\cos \gamma_{2}}{\|x\|}\right)\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

and as obvious calculations show $\left|\cos \gamma_{l}\right| \leqq\left|\sin \varepsilon_{l}\right| \leqq\left|\operatorname{tg} \varepsilon_{l}\right|, \frac{\left\|\tilde{w}_{1}-\tilde{w}_{2}\right\|}{\|x\|} \leqq K_{V} \cdot C$, $\frac{\sin \gamma}{\|x\|}=K_{V} \cdot C$. Therefore $\frac{\cos \gamma^{\prime}}{\|x\|}$ is bounded if $q_{1}, q_{2} \in \widetilde{U}$ and $t$ is sufficiently small. The above estimates yield the existence of such $\delta, \vartheta>0$ that $\|z\| \geqq \delta\left[(\Delta t)^{2}+(\Delta u)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ if $q_{1}, q_{2} \in \widetilde{U}$ and $\left|t_{1}^{n}\right|,\left|t_{2}^{n}\right| \leqq \vartheta$.

Theorem 3.1. Let $f_{1}, f_{2}: M^{n-1} \rightarrow E^{n}$ be hypersurfaces of locally bounded curvature, $g^{1}, g^{2}$ their first fundamental forms, and $l^{1}, l^{2}$ their second fundamental forms which are calculated with respect to continious unit normal fields $\tilde{w}_{n}^{1}, \tilde{w}_{n}^{2}: M^{n-1} \rightarrow V_{1}^{n}$ of the hypersurfaces. Assume that $g^{1}=g^{2}$ and $l_{q}^{1}=l_{q}^{2}$ for almost every $q \in M^{n-1}$. Then there exists a distance preserving transformation $\Phi: E^{n} \rightarrow E^{n}$ such that $f_{2}=\Phi \circ f_{1}$.

Proof. Let $N^{l} M^{n-1}$ be the normal bundle and $\gamma_{l}: N^{l} M^{n-1} \rightarrow E^{n}$ be the normal map of the hypersurface $f_{l}(l=1,2)$. In consequence of the preceding lemma for any $p \in M^{n-1}$ there is a distinguished coordinate system $\alpha_{l}: U \rightarrow E^{n-1}$ and a distinguished field of bases $\beta_{l}: U \rightarrow B^{n}$ of $f_{l}(l=1,2)$ on a neighborhood $U$ of $p$ such that if $z_{l}: \alpha_{l}(U) \times E^{l} \rightarrow E^{n}$ is the corresponding representation of the normal map, then $\delta, \vartheta>0$ and $\widetilde{U} \subset U$ exist for which the assertion of the lemma holds. Here $\beta_{1}, \beta_{2}$ are chosen so as to give $\bar{w}_{n}^{l}(q)=\tilde{w}_{n}^{l}(q)$ for $q \dot{\in} U$. Let $\pi_{l}: N^{l} M^{n-1}$ be the projection in the bundle and $V^{t}=\left\{w \mid w \in \pi_{l}^{-1}(\widetilde{U}),\|w\|<\vartheta\right\}$; then the restriction of $v^{l}$ to $V^{l}$ is one-to-one. Consequently there is such a distance function $\varrho^{l}$ that $v_{l}:\left(V^{l}, \varrho^{l}\right) \rightarrow E^{n}$ is distance preserving. By convexification of the distance function $\varrho_{l}$ an intrinsic distance function $\varrho^{l}$ is obtained on $V^{l}$ ([2], [4], 77.). The map $\gamma_{l}:\left(V^{l}, \varrho^{l}\right) \rightarrow E^{n}$ is locally distance preserving. If $w \in V^{1}$ then there is a unique $w^{\prime} \in V^{2}$ such that $\pi_{1}(w)=$ $=\pi_{2}\left(w^{\prime}\right)=q$ and if $\gamma_{1}(w)=f_{1}(q)+t^{n} \bar{w}_{n}^{1}(q)$ then $v_{2}\left(w^{\prime}\right)=f_{2}(q)+t^{n} \bar{w}_{n}^{2}(q)$. Let
$\Psi_{\tilde{u}}: V^{1} \rightarrow V^{2}$ be defined by $\Psi_{\tilde{U}}(w)=w^{\prime}$, then $\Psi_{\tilde{U}}$ is one-to-one and maps $V^{1}$ onto $V^{2}$. The following argument will show that $\Psi_{\tilde{u}}:\left(V^{1}, \bar{\varrho}^{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(V^{2}, \bar{\varrho}^{2}\right)$ is distance preserving. Let $\bar{g}_{a b}^{1}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}, t^{n}\right)$ be defined for $a, b=1, \ldots, n$, and $\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}, t^{n}\right)$ $\in \alpha_{1}(\widetilde{U}) \times B_{\exists}^{1} \quad$ by

$$
\bar{g}_{a b}^{1}= \begin{cases}\left\langle\frac{\partial z_{1}}{\partial u^{a}}, \frac{\partial z_{1}}{\partial u^{b}}\right\rangle \quad \text { if } \quad a, b=1, \ldots, n-1 \\ \left\langle\frac{\partial z_{1}}{\partial u^{a}}, \frac{\partial z_{1}}{\partial t^{n}}\right\rangle & \text { if } \quad a=1, \ldots, n-1 ; b=n \\ \left\langle\frac{\partial z_{1}}{\partial t^{n}}, \frac{\partial z_{1}}{\partial u^{b}}\right\rangle & \text { if } \quad a=n ; b=1, \ldots, n-1 \\ \left\langle\frac{\partial z_{1}}{\partial t^{n}}, \frac{\partial z_{1}}{\partial t^{n}}\right\rangle & \text { if } \quad a=b=n\end{cases}
$$

Then

$$
\bar{g}_{a b}^{1}=g_{a b}^{1}+t^{n}\left(l_{a b}^{1}+l_{b a}^{1}\right)+\left(t^{n}\right)^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{r=1}^{n-1} \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} g_{i j}^{1} g_{1}^{r i} g_{1}^{s j} l_{a r}^{1} l_{b s}^{1}
$$

if $a b=1, \ldots, n-1$, where $g_{a b}^{1}, g_{1}^{a b}$ are the covariant and contravariant components of the first fundamental tensor and the $l_{a b}^{1}$ coefficients of the second fundamental form of $f_{1}$ in the coordinate system $\alpha_{1} ; \bar{g}_{a b}^{1}=0$ if $a=1, \ldots, n-1 ; b=n$ or $a=n$; $b=1, \ldots, n-1 ; \bar{g}_{a b}^{1}=1$ if $a=b=n$. The functions $\bar{g}_{a b}^{1}$ are measurable on $\alpha_{1}(\widetilde{U}) \times B_{9}^{1}$. Let $\hat{x}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}\right) \quad \hat{w}_{n}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}\right)$ be defined by $\hat{x}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}\right)=f_{2}(g)$, $\hat{w}_{n}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}\right)=\bar{w}_{n}^{2}(g),\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}\right)=\alpha_{1}(g),(g \in \widetilde{U})$ and put $\hat{z}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}, t^{n}\right)=$ $=\hat{x}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}\right)+t^{n} \hat{w}_{n}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}\right)$ for $\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}, t^{n}\right) \in \alpha_{1}(\widetilde{U}) \times B_{3}^{1}$. Let the $\overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}, t^{n}\right)$ be defined for $a, b=1, \ldots, n$ and $\left(u^{1}, \ldots, u^{n-1}, t^{n}\right) \in \alpha_{1}(\widetilde{U}) \times B_{3}^{1}$ by

$$
\overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}= \begin{cases}\left\langle\frac{\partial \hat{z}}{\partial u^{a}}, \frac{\partial \hat{z}}{\partial u^{b}}\right\rangle & \text { if } a, b=1, \ldots, n-1, \\ \left\langle\frac{\partial \hat{z}}{\partial u^{a}}, \frac{\partial \hat{z}}{\partial t^{n}}\right\rangle & \text { if } a=1, \ldots, n-1 ; b=n, \\ \left\langle\frac{\partial \hat{z}}{\partial t^{n}}, \frac{\partial \hat{z}}{\partial u^{b}}\right\rangle & \text { if } a=n ; b=1, \ldots, n-1, \\ \left\langle\frac{\partial \hat{z}}{\partial t^{n}}, \frac{\partial \hat{z}}{\partial t^{n}}\right\rangle & \text { if } a=b=n .\end{cases}
$$

Then

$$
\overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}=\hat{g}_{a b}^{2}+t^{n}\left(\hat{l}_{a b}^{2}+\hat{l}_{b a}^{2}\right)+\left(t^{n}\right)^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{r=1}^{n-1} \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \hat{g}_{i j}^{2} \hat{g}_{2}^{r i} \hat{g}_{2}^{s j} \hat{l}_{a r}^{2} \hat{l}_{b s}^{2}
$$

if $a, b=1, \ldots, n-1$, where $\hat{g}_{a b}^{2}, \hat{g}_{2}^{a b}, \hat{l}_{a b}^{2}$ are the corresponding quantities of $f_{2}$ in the coordinate system $\alpha_{1} ; \overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}=0$ if $a=1, \ldots, n-1 ; b=n$ or $a=n ; b=1, \ldots, n-1$; $\overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}=1$ if $a=b=n$. The measurability of the functions $\overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}$ follows again by the Corollary to Theorem 2. 1 but a coordinate transformation have to be considered as well. According to assumptions of the theorem $\bar{g}_{a b}^{1}=\overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2} \cdot(a, b=1, \ldots, n)$ almost everywhere on $\alpha_{1}(\widetilde{U}) \times B_{1}^{9}$. If $w_{1}, w_{2} \in V^{1}$ are sufficiently near then there is an $n$-dimensional parallelepiped $P$ in $v_{1}\left(V^{1}\right)$ formed by a set $S$ of straight line segments parallel and congruent to the one joining $v_{1}\left(w_{1}\right), v_{1}\left(w_{2}\right)$ and such that their endpoints fill two $(n-1)$-dimensional cubes the centres of which are $v_{1}\left(w_{1}\right)$ and $v_{1}\left(w_{2}\right)$. Let the $\operatorname{arc} \varphi:[0,1] \rightarrow V^{1}$ be such that $\nu_{1} \circ \varphi:[0,1] \rightarrow E^{n}$ is a linear representation of a segment in $S$, and let the functions $\varphi^{h}(t)(h=1, \ldots, n ; 0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$ be defined by $z_{1}\left(\varphi^{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(t)\right)=v_{1} \circ \varphi(t)(0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$. In consequence of Lemma 3.1 $\varphi^{h}(t)$ are Lipschitz functions; therefore $\dot{\varphi}(t)$ exist almost everywhere on $[0,1]$ and are measurable in case of any segment in the set $S$. Obvious applications of Fubini's theorem to the set $P$ yield that there are segments in $S$ arbitrary near to the one joining $v_{1}\left(w_{1}\right), v_{1}\left(w_{2}\right)$ such that 1) $\bar{g}_{a b}^{1}\left(\varphi^{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(t)\right), \overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}\left(\varphi^{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(t)\right)(a, b=1, \ldots, n)$ are measurable on $[0,1] ; 2) \bar{g}_{a b}^{1}\left(\varphi^{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(t)\right)=\overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}\left(\varphi^{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(t)\right)(a, b=1, \ldots, n)$ almost everywhere on $[0,1]$. The distance of the points $v_{1} \circ \varphi(0), v_{1} \circ \varphi(1)$ in case of such segments is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0}^{1}\left[\sum_{a, b=1}^{n} \bar{g}_{a b}^{1}\left(\varphi^{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(t)\right) \dot{\varphi}^{a}(t) \dot{\varphi}^{b}(t)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} d t= \\
& =\int_{0}^{1}\left[\sum_{a, b=1}^{n} \overline{\hat{g}}_{a b}^{2}\left(\varphi^{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(t)\right) \dot{\varphi}^{a}(t) \dot{\varphi}^{b}(t)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} d t
\end{aligned}
$$

But by Tonelli's theorem the last integral is equal to the length of the curve $\hat{z}\left(\varphi^{1}(t), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(t)\right)(0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$ since it is of bounded variation in consequence of Lemma 2. 2. Furthermore we have $\hat{z}\left(\varphi^{1}(0), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(0)\right)=v_{2} \circ \Psi_{\tilde{v} \circ \varphi(0) \text { and }}$ $\hat{z}\left(\varphi^{1}(1), \ldots, \varphi^{n}(1)\right)=v_{2} \circ \Psi_{\tilde{U}} \circ \varphi(1)$, and therefore

$$
\varrho^{1}(\varphi(0), \varphi(1)) \geqq \varrho^{2}\left(\Psi_{\tilde{U}} \circ \varphi(0), \Psi_{\tilde{U}} \circ \varphi(1)\right)
$$

Consequently $\varrho^{1}\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right) \geqq \varrho^{2}\left(\Psi_{\tilde{u}}\left(\dot{w}_{1}\right), \Psi_{\tilde{u}\left(w_{2}\right)}\right)$, and changing the role of $f_{1}, f_{2}$ in the above argument gives $\varrho^{1}\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right) \leqq \varrho^{2}\left(\Psi_{\tilde{U}}\left(w_{1}\right), \Psi_{\tilde{U}}\left(w_{2}\right)\right)$. These imply that $\Psi_{\tilde{U}}:\left(V^{1}, \varrho^{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(V^{2}, \varrho^{2}\right)$ is locally distance preserving and $\Psi_{\tilde{U}}:\left(V^{1}, \bar{\varrho}^{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(V^{2}, \bar{\varrho}^{2}\right)$ is distance preserving. Proceeding in like manner a sequence of neighborhoods $\left\{\tilde{U}_{m}\right\}_{m=1,2, \ldots}$ covering $M^{n-1}$ can be obtained with the corresponding sequences $\left\{\left(V_{m}^{l}, \bar{\varrho}_{m}^{l}\right)\right\}_{m=1,2, \ldots}$ of metrized neighborhoods in $N^{l} M^{n-1}$ and the distance preserving maps $\Psi_{m}:\left(V_{m}^{1}, \bar{\varrho}_{m}^{1}\right)$. The set $V_{l}=\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} V_{m}^{l}$ is a neighborhood of the zero section in $N^{l} M^{n-1}$ and since $\bar{\varrho}_{m^{\prime}}^{l}$, $\bar{\varrho}_{m^{\prime \prime}}^{l}$ are equal on $V_{m^{\prime}}^{l} \cap V_{m^{\prime \prime}}^{l}$ there is an intrinsic distance
function $\bar{\varrho}^{l}$ on $V_{l}$ which is equal to $\bar{\varrho}_{m}^{l}$ on $V_{m}^{l}(m=1,2, \ldots, ; l=1,2)$. Further $\Psi_{m}$, and $\Psi_{m^{\prime \prime}}$ coincide on $V_{m^{\prime}}^{1} \cap V_{m^{\prime \prime}}^{1}$, therefore there is a distance preserving map $\Psi:\left(V_{1}, \bar{\varrho}_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(V_{2}, \bar{\varrho}_{2}\right)$ which coincides with $\Psi_{m}$ on $V_{m}^{1}$ for $m=1,2, \ldots$. Hence $v_{l}:\left(V_{l}, \bar{\varrho}_{l}\right) \rightarrow E^{n}$ is locally distance preserving. There is an open subset of $V_{1}^{1}$ with compact closure $A$ such that $v_{1}:\left(A, \bar{\varrho}_{1}\right) \rightarrow E^{n}$ and $v_{2} \circ \Psi:\left(A, \bar{\varrho}_{1}\right) \rightarrow E^{n}$ are distance preserving, therefore there is a distance preserving transformation $\Phi: E^{n} \rightarrow E^{n}$ witi $v_{2} \circ \Psi=\Phi \circ v_{1}$ on $A$. Assume that the last equality does not hold on $V_{1}$. Tien there is a $w^{*} \in V_{1}$ nearest to $A$ with $v_{2} \circ \Psi\left(w^{*}\right) \neq \Phi \circ v_{1}\left(w^{*}\right)$. But $w^{*}$ has a neighborhood $V^{*}$ on which $v_{1}, v_{2} \circ \Psi$ are distance preserving, consequently there is a distance preserving transformation $\Phi^{*}: E^{n} \rightarrow E^{n}$ with $\nu_{2} \circ \Psi=\Phi^{*} \circ \nu_{1}$ on $V^{*}$. Since $\varrho_{1}$ is intrinsic and locally euclidean there is an open subset $V^{\prime} \subset V^{*}$ such that $v_{2} \circ \Psi=\Phi \circ v_{1}$ on $V^{\prime}$. Consequently $v_{2} \circ \Psi=\Phi \circ v_{1}$ on $V^{*}$ in contradiction with the above assumption. Therefore $\nu_{2} \circ \Psi=\Phi \circ \nu_{1}$ on $V_{1}$. The restriction of this equality to the zero section in $N^{1} M^{n-1}$ yields the assertion of the theorem.

Remark. The assumption of Theorem 3.1 that there are continuous unit normal fields on the whole manifold $M^{n-1}$ for both hypersurfaces does not mean an essential restriction since if $M^{n-1}$ is not orientable its orientable covering manifold can be considered instead.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ ) An account of related results can be found in Busemann [4].

