# A CONTRIBUTION TO LOCAL BOL LOOPS

### A. VANŽUROVÁ

ABSTRACT. On an n-sphere,  $n \geq 2$  a geodesic local loop introduced in [Ki] is a Bol loop, has SO(n+1) as the group topologically generated by left translations of the loop, and is called here an n-dimensional spherical local Bol loop. Our aim is to prove that all smooth n-dimensional local Bol loops which are locally isotopic to an n-dimensional spherical local Bol loop are locally isomorphic to it.

#### 1. Introduction

A smooth (=  $C^{\infty}$ -differentiable) (local) loop  $(L, \cdot, /, e)$ ,  $e \in L$  is a pointed smooth manifold with a triple of smooth (local) mappings  $\cdot, /, /$  from open domains of  $L \times L$  to L such that for  $x, y, z \in L$  the identities

$$(x/y) \cdot y \approx x$$
,  $y \cdot (y \setminus x) \approx x$ ,  $(x \cdot y)/y \approx x$ ,  $y \setminus (y \cdot x) \approx x$ ,  $x \cdot e \approx e \cdot x \approx x/e \approx e \setminus x \approx x$ 

hold (whenever the left side of the identity is defined). A germ of smooth local loops with unit e can be introduced as an equivalence class in a usual way, [P], p. 67.

Due to smoothness, the conditions on the accompanying operations  $\backslash$ , / can be substituted by the assumption that both families of left translations  $\lambda_a: x \mapsto a \cdot x$  and right translations  $\varrho_a: x \mapsto x \cdot a$  are (local) diffeomorphisms (L.V. Sabinin in [K&N I], p. 298, [Ki]). Then a (local) isotopism of a smooth (local) loop  $(L,\cdot)$  onto a smooth (local) loop  $(M,\circ)$  can be introduced as a triple of (local) diffeomorphisms  $\alpha,\beta,\gamma:L\to M$  such that  $\gamma(x\cdot y)=\alpha(x)\circ\beta(y)$  for such x,y from L for which one side of the identity is defined. Two isotopic (local) loops determine the same web, [A&S]. Isomorphisms are obtained for  $\alpha=\beta=\gamma$ .

**Example 1.** Given a smooth manifold  $(M, \nabla)$  with an affine connection, or especially a Riemannian manifold (M, g) with the canonical connection, then in a restricted normal neighbourhood U of a distinguished point  $e \in M$  the so called geodesic local loop at the point e can be introduced with multiplication on U given by  $x \cdot y = \exp_x \tau_{(e,x)} \exp_e^{-1}(y)$ , [Ki]. Here  $\exp_x tX$ ,  $0 < t < \delta$  denotes the geodesic through x in the direction of a tangent vector  $X \in T_xM$ , and  $\tau_{(e,x)} : T_eM \to T_xM$ 

<sup>1991</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. 20N05, 53A60.

Key words and phrases. Local Bol loops, spherical geometry.

Supported by grant  $\mathrm{No}\dot{2}01/99/0265$  of The Grant Agency of Czech Republic.

intermediates the parallel translation of the tangent spaces along the geodesic segment.

A smooth (local) loop L is called a (local) left Bol loop if the identity  $(x \cdot (y \cdot (x \cdot z))) \approx (x \cdot (y \cdot x)) \cdot z$  is satisfied (on some neighbourhood of the unit e). In the following, "left" will be omitted. A (local) loop isotopic to a (local) Bol loop is also a (local) Bol loop.

Let G(L) denote the (local) group topologically generated by the family of left translations of a smooth (local) loop L,  $G(L) = \langle \Lambda \rangle$ ,  $\Lambda = \{\lambda_x : y \mapsto x \cdot y; x \in L\}$ , let 1 denote the unit in G. Let H denote the isotropic subgroup of a point e under the (partial) action of G(L) on L. If L is a smooth connected (local) Bol loop then G(L) is a connected (local) Lie group (by similar arguments as in [M&S1], Prop. XII.2.14.), and H is its closed subgroup. Let  $\mathfrak{g} = T_1G$  ( $\mathfrak{h}$ , respectively) be the Lie algebra of G(L) (of H, respectively) and let  $\mathfrak{m} := T_1\Lambda$  denote the tangent space of  $\Lambda$  at the unit  $1 \in G$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}$  is a vector complement of  $\mathfrak{h}$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{m}$ ,  $\mathfrak{m}$  generates  $\mathfrak{g}$  as Lie algebra and the following relation holds [M&S1], Prop. XII.8.23:

$$[\mathfrak{m}, [\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}]] \subset \mathfrak{m}.$$

Vice versa, given a Lie algebra  $\mathfrak g$  and a subalgebra  $\mathfrak h$  containing no non-trivial ideal of  $\mathfrak g$  then a vector complement  $\mathfrak m$  of  $\mathfrak h$  in  $\mathfrak g$  determines a unique local Bol loop L if and only if  $\mathfrak g=\mathfrak m+[\mathfrak m,\mathfrak m]$  ( $\mathfrak m$  generates  $\mathfrak g$  as Lie algebra), and the relation (1) holds, [M&S1] p. 428. The local Bol loop L associated with the triple  $(\mathfrak g,\mathfrak h,\mathfrak m)$  has the property that the group  $G=\exp\mathfrak g$  with unit  $1\in G$  is the group topologically generated by the family of left translations of L, the group  $H=\exp\mathfrak h$  is the stabilizer of the unit  $e\in L$ , and  $\Lambda=\exp\mathfrak m$  is the set of left translation of L ([M&S2], p. 62-65).

**Example 2.** Example 2 If M is a symmetric (locally symmetric, respectively) space equipped with the canonical connection then a geodesic loop at any point  $e \in M$  is a smooth local Bol loop, [M&S2], p. 12, 13. If M is a compact symmetric space then the group G topologically generated by the left translations of  $(M,\cdot)$  coincides with the compact connected Lie group of displacements of the symmetric space L. Since the group G acts transitively on the symmetric space L the geodesic loops for different points as units are isomorphic.

To distinguish isotopic (respectively isomorphic) smooth local Bol loops we can use a local version of the result proved by K. Strambach and P.T. Nagy which can be be formulated as follows, [Va]:

**Lemma 1.** Let  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  be smooth connected local Bol loops realized on the same manifold and having the same group  $G = \langle \Lambda_1 \rangle = \langle \Lambda_2 \rangle$  topologically generated by the family of the left translations of  $L_1$ , or  $L_2$ , respectively. Consider the tangent subspaces  $T_1\Lambda_1 = \mathfrak{m}_1$  and  $T_1\Lambda_2 = \mathfrak{m}_2$  of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g} = T_1G$  of G. The local loops  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are isotopic if and only if there exists an element  $g \in G$  such that  $\mathrm{Ad}(g)(\mathfrak{m}_1) = \mathfrak{m}_2$  where  $\mathrm{Ad}$  is the adjoint action of G on  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The local loops  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are isomorphic if and only if there exists an automorphism  $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}\, G$  of the

group such that for the induced automorphism  $\alpha_*$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  the relations  $\alpha_*(\mathfrak{h}_1) = \mathfrak{h}_2$  and  $\alpha_*(\mathfrak{m}_1) = \mathfrak{m}_2$  hold.

### 2. Spherical geometry

The unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^n$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  is a compact Riemannian manifold of constant curvature (equal 1, [W], p. 66) endowed with a Riemannian metric induced by the standard scalar product on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . The compact orthogonal group O(n+1) plays the role of the full group of isometries of the *n*-sphere, and G = SO(n+1) is the connected component of unit. An *n*-dimensional spherical geometry  $\mathcal{S}_n$  has elements of  $\mathbb{S}^n$  as its points and maximal geodesics as lines; maximal geodesics are sections of  $\mathbb{S}^n$  with 2-planes of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  containing the origin. Collineations of the spherical geometry arise as restrictions to  $\mathbb{S}^n$  of actions of elements  $A \in G$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ .

On G, an involutive automorphism  $\sigma$  is given by  $\sigma(A) = SAS^{-1}$ ,  $A \in G$  where S = diag(-1, 1, ..., 1). The component of unit  $H^0$  of the subgroup H consisting of all elements invariant under  $\sigma$  is of the form

(2) 
$$H^0 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} ; B \in SO(n) \right\}.$$

So  $H^0$  may be identified with SO(n). The triple  $(G, H^0, \sigma)$  determines a symmetric Riemannian space ([K&N II], p. 208, 225), and there is a diffeomorphism between the homogeneous symmetric space SO(n+1)/SO(n) and  $\mathbb{S}^n$  such that the canonical connection of the symmetric space coincides with the Riemannian connection on  $\mathbb{S}^n$ , [K&N I], p. 277–228. Given a point e of  $S_n$  we can choose an orthonormal basis  $\langle e, e_1, \ldots, e_n \rangle$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  with respect to which the isotropic subgroup in  $S_n$  of the point  $S_n$  is exactly  $S_n$ .

The scalar product determines an orthogonality relation on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  (and in  $\mathcal{S}_n$ ) which is denoted by  $\bot$ . A reflection  $\sigma_{(x,-x)}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{S}^n$  at the point pair  $\{x,-x\}$  in  $\mathcal{S}_n$  is a map induced by the orthogonal transformation of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  which fixes elementwise the 1-dimensional subspace X of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  containing both points x, -x and induces the inversion  $y \mapsto -y$ ,  $y \in X^{\bot}$  on the hyperplane  $X^{\bot}$  orthogonal to X. Hence the matrix of  $\sigma_{(x,-x)}$  is conjugate with the matrix diag $(1,-1,\ldots,-1)$ .

Let U be a neighbourhood of e in  $\mathbb{S}^n$  such that for every point x in U there exists exactly one geodesic in U incident with e and x, [K&N I], Th. 8.7., p. 146. Let  $x \in U$ ,  $x \neq e$ . In the geodesic segment [e,x] contained in U there is a unique middle point  $\frac{x}{2}$  such that the reflection  $\sigma_{(\frac{x}{2},-\frac{x}{2})}$  at  $\{\frac{x}{2},-\frac{x}{2}\}$  maps e onto x. The product  $\lambda_x := \sigma_{(\frac{x}{2},-\frac{x}{2})}\sigma_{(e,-e)}$  called a local transvection at x, [K&N II], p. 219, [W], p. 232, maps also e onto x, and is contained in the connected group SO(n+1), [K&N II], Lemma 1, p. 218. (Local) transvections are (local) isometries the tangent maps of which induce parallel translation of tangent spaces along geodesics,  $T\lambda_x : T_e\mathbb{S}^n \to T_x\mathbb{S}^n$ , [W], L.8.1.2. p. 232. If we denote by  $U \cap \mathbb{S}^n$  the line of  $\mathcal{S}_n$  containing the segment [e,x] then the local transvection  $\lambda_x$  can be characterized as a map induced by the orthogonal transformation of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  which

fixes an (n-1)-dimensional subspace  $U^{\perp}$  of U in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  elementwise and acts on U as a rotation. To any point x in the neighbourhood U there exists precisely one transvection mapping e onto x. All transvections  $\lambda_y$  for points y of the geodesic segment  $[e,x]\subset U$  form a local 1-parameter group. On U the local geodesic loop multiplication is given as in the Example 1. If V is a normal neighborhood of e contained in U such that for any two points  $x,y\in V$  the image  $\lambda_x(y)$  is contained in U then the multiplication  $(x,y)\mapsto \lambda_x(y),\ V\times V\to U$  coincides with the geodesic multiplication  $(x,y)\mapsto x\cdot y$  on V since the formula is the same. That is,  $(x,y)\mapsto \lambda_x(y)$  belongs to the germ of geodesic multiplication of a locally symmetric space at e, and hence defines on V a smooth local Bol loop with identity e. It will be called an n-dimensional spherical local Bol loop  $(L(S_n,e))$ ; by the Example 2, it is independent of the choice of the point e up to isomorphism.

# 3. The structure of the groups SO(n+1)

Let  $n \geq 2$ . In the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{so}(n+1) = \{A \in M(\mathbb{R}, n+1); A+A^t=0\}$  we can choose an  $\mathbb{R}$ -basis consisting of the family of  $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$  matrices  $M_{i,j} = E_{ij} - E_{ji}$  where i < j and  $E_{ij}$  is a matrix with 1 on the position (i,j) and 0 otherwise. The Lie multiplication  $[M_{r,s}, M_{u,v}] = M_{r,s}M_{u,v} - M_{u,v}M_{r,s}$  satisfies the relations

$$\begin{split} &= M_{k,i}, & \text{for } k < i, & [M_{i,j}, M_{i,l}] = M_{l,j}, & \text{for } l < j, \\ &= -M_{i,k}, & \text{for } i < k, & = -M_{j,l}, & \text{for } j < l, \\ &[M_{i,j}, M_{j,l}] = M_{i,l}, & [M_{i,j}, M_{k,i}] = -M_{k,j} \end{split}$$

and is equal 0 otherwise. The matrices  $M_{i,j}$  with  $2 \le i < j \le n+1$  and  $2 \le i \le n$  form a basis for the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak h$  of the isotropic subgroup  $H^0$  of e in G,

$$\mathfrak{h} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} \; ; \, b \in \mathfrak{so}(n) \right\}.$$

The matrices  $M_{1,j}$ ,  $2 \leq j \leq n+1$  form a basis of a vector subspace  $\mathfrak{m}$  which is complementary to  $\mathfrak{h}$  in the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{so}(n+1)$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{m}\oplus\mathfrak{h}$ . The inclusions  $[\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{m}]\subset\mathfrak{h}$  and  $[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{m}]\subset\mathfrak{m}$  hold. Hence the space  $\mathfrak{m}$  determines together with the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{h}$  a symmetric space and if we denote by  $\Lambda$  the family of transvections  $\lambda_x = \sigma_{(\frac{\pi}{3},-\frac{\pi}{3})}\sigma_{(e,-e)}$  then  $\Lambda = \exp\mathfrak{m}$ . The matrix group

(3) 
$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} ; A \in O(n) \right\}$$

leaves the vector subspace  $U_n = \left\{\sum_{i=2}^{n+1} a_i M_{1,i} \mid (a_2,\dots,a_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^n\right\}$  invariant with respect to the conjugation and acts on  $U_n$  as the full orthogonal group O(n) on the euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Hence the vector space  $\mathfrak{so}(n+1)$  can be decomposed as a direct sum  $U_n \oplus U_{n-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus U_1$  of subspaces  $U_i$  which are orthogonal to each other and the matrices  $M_{i,j}$ ,  $i+1 \leq j \leq n+1$  form an orthogonal basis of  $U_i$ . The subgroup  $\left\{\begin{pmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix}; C \in O(n+1-r)\right\}$  of the matrix group (3) where  $2 \leq r \leq n$  and  $I_r$  is

the  $(r \times r)$ -identity matrix fixes each of the subspaces  $U_i$  for  $1 \le i \le r-1$ . Now let us choose a special canonical basis in each vector complement to the Lie algebra of the stabilizer. Namely, let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be an n-dimensional complement of the subalgebra  $\mathfrak{h}$  in  $\mathfrak{so}(n+1)$  and let  $\mathfrak{a}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{a}_n$  be an orthogonal basis of  $\mathfrak{m}$ . If we denote by  $\pi_k$  the projection of  $\mathfrak{so}(n+1)$  onto  $U_k$  then the images  $\pi_k(\mathfrak{a}_i)$  of the vectors  $\mathfrak{a}_i$  are for different i orthogonal to each other. Using the action of the group (3) on the orthogonal subspaces  $U_i$  we can suitably transform the original basis vectors; in fact we can assume that the k-th vector  $\mathfrak{a}_k$  is of the form

$$\mathfrak{a}_k = M_{1,k+1} + \sum_{j=2}^{n+1-k} \beta_k^j M_{j,k+j}, \qquad 1 \le k \le n$$

where  $\beta_k^j \geq 0$  are non-negative reals (otherwise we can conjugate  $\mathfrak{a}_k$  by a suitable diagonal matrix having as entries 1 and -1). A canonical basis  $\mathcal{B}(\beta_j^k)$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq n$ ,  $2 \leq j \leq n+1-k$  of this type will be called a *normalized basis* of a complement  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $\mathfrak{h}$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Two complements having different normalized basis cannot determine isomorphic local Bol loops.

## 4. ISOTOPISMS AND ISOMORPHISMS

Now we are interested how many isomorphism subclasses can be distinguished in the class of smooth (local) Bol loops isotopic with an n-dimensional spherical local Bol loop  $(L(S_n, e))$ . We shall show that in this case, isotopism is equivalent with isomorphism. The following technical lemma shows that there is the only isomorphism class since there is in fact a unique complement  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $\mathfrak{h}$  satisfying (1), namely a subspace spanned by the normalized basis  $\langle M_{1,2}, M_{1,3}, \ldots, M_{1,n+1} \rangle$ .

**Lemma 2.** Let  $\mathfrak{m} = \langle \mathfrak{a}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{a}_n \rangle$  be an n-dimensional complement of the subalgebra  $\mathfrak{so}(n+1)$  spanned by normalized basis vectors

(4) 
$$\mathfrak{a}_{n-k} = M_{1,n-k+1} + \beta_{n-k}^2 M_{2,n-k+2} + \dots + \beta_{n-k}^{k+1} M_{k+1,n+1}$$

with  $k=0,\ldots,n-1$ . The subspace  $\mathfrak{m}$  satisfies the condition (1), if and only if  $\beta_{n-k}^t=0$  for all  $t\in\{2,\ldots,k+1\},\ k\in\{0,\ldots,n-1\},\ i\dot{e}if$  and only if

(5) 
$$\mathfrak{a}_{n-k} = M_{1,n-k+1} \quad \text{for } k = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

*Proof.* If the basis vectors are of the form (5) then (1) holds. Vice versa, let us verify that if a vector subspace  $\mathfrak{m}$  satisfies (1) then all coefficients  $\beta_j^t$  are equal zero. Let k=1. Then  $[\mathfrak{a}_{n-1},\mathfrak{a}_n]=-M_{n,n+1}+\beta_{n-1}^2M_{1,2}$  and

$$(6) \quad \mathfrak{u}(n-1,n,n-1) = [[\mathfrak{a}_{n-1},\mathfrak{a}_n],\mathfrak{a}_{n-1}] = (1 + (\beta_{n-1}^2)^2) M_{1,n+1} - 2\beta_{n-1}^2 M_{2,n}.$$

If (1) holds then  $\mathfrak{u}(n-1,n,n-1)\in\mathfrak{m}$  which means that the element can be written in the form  $\mathfrak{u}(n-1,n,n-1)=\varrho_1^{(n-1,n,n-1)}\mathfrak{a}_1+\cdots+\varrho_n^{(n-1,n,n-1)}\mathfrak{a}_n$ . Comparing both expressions we deduce that this is true if and only if  $\varrho_n^{(n-1,n,n-1)}=1+(\beta_{n-1}^2)^2$  and  $\varrho_p^{(n-1,n,n-1)}=0$  for p< n since no multiple of  $M_{1,k}$  appears in the formula (6) for k< n+1. Consequently,  $\mathfrak{u}(n-1,n,n-1)\in\mathfrak{m}$  holds if and only if  $\beta_{n-1}^2=0$ ,

 $\varrho_n^{(n-1,n,n-1)}=0$ , and  $\mathfrak{a}_{n-1}=M_{1,n}$ . We can proceed step by step. In the k-th step, assume that the statement holds for some fixed  $k-1\in\{2,\ldots,n-1\}$ , that is, we know that  $\beta_{n-s}^t=0$  for all  $s\in\{0,\ldots,k-1\}$  and all  $t\in\{2,\ldots,s+1\}$ , and  $\mathfrak{a}_n=M_{1,n+1},\ \mathfrak{a}_{n-1}=M_{1,n},\ldots,\ \mathfrak{a}_{n-k+1}=M_{1,n-k+2}$ . Let us check  $\mathfrak{a}_{n-k}=M_{1,n-k+1}$  by proving that  $\beta_{n-k}^2=\cdots=\beta_{n-k}^{k+1}=0$ . For any  $j\in\{n-k+1,\ldots,n-1\}$ ,

$$\begin{split} &= -M_{n-k+1,j} + \beta_{n-k}^{k-n+j+1} M_{1,k-n+j+1}, \\ &u(n-k,j,n) = [[\mathfrak{a}_{n-k},\mathfrak{a}_j],\mathfrak{a}_n] = -\beta_{n-k}^{k-n+j+1} M_{k-n+j+1,n+1}. \end{split}$$

An element  $u(n-k,j,n)\in\mathfrak{m}$  if and only if  $u(n-k,j,n)=\sum_{p}\varrho_{p}^{(n-k,j,n)}\mathfrak{a}_{p}$ . Comparing both expressions we obtain that all coefficients in the combination vanish,  $\varrho_{p}^{(n-k,j,n)}=0,\ p=1,\ldots,n,$  and u(n-k,j,n) must be a zero vector. Equivalently,  $\beta_{n-k}^{k-n+j+1}=0$  for all  $j\in\{n-k+1,\ldots,n-1\}$ . It remains to verify  $\beta_{n-k}^{k+1}=0$ . By similar arguments as above, the product  $\mathfrak{u}(n-k,n,n-1)=[-M_{n-k+1,n+1}+\beta_{n-k}^{k+1}M_{1,k+1},M_{1,n}]=-\beta_{n-k}^{k+1}M_{k+1,n}\in\mathfrak{m}$  if and only if  $\beta_{n-k}^{k+1}=0$ . Hence  $\mathfrak{a}_{n-k}=M_{1,n-k+1}$  under the assumption (1), and the statement is true also for k. Consequently the complementary subspace  $\mathfrak{m}$  satisfies (1) if and only if it is spanned by the normalized basis  $\langle M_{1,2},M_{1,3},\ldots,M_{1,n+1}\rangle$ .

**Theorem 1.** All smooth n-dimensional local Bol loops which are locally isotopic to an n-dimensional spherical local Bol loop  $(L(S_n, e))$  are locally isomorphic to it.

Proof. Let L be a smooth local Bol loop locally isotopic to an n-dimensional spherical geodesic loop  $(L(S_n, e))$ . Then the left translation group of L is locally isomorphic to SO(n+1), the stabilizer of a unit is locally isomorphic to the Lie group of the shape (2), and its Lie algebra is  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Using the above considerations and notation we can pass to the tangent objects and say that two vector complements  $\mathfrak{m}$ ,  $\mathfrak{m}'$  to  $\mathfrak{h}$  in  $\mathfrak{so}(n+1)$  determine isomorphic local Bol loops if and only if they are provided with the same normalized basis  $\mathcal{B}(\beta_j^k)$ . But they also satisfy the condition (1), and the only normalized basis for which the products of basis vectors  $[[\mathfrak{a}_i,\mathfrak{a}_j],\mathfrak{a}_k]$  belong to  $\mathfrak{m}$  is the basis  $\langle M_{1,2},\ldots,M_{1,n+1}\rangle$  presented in the above Lemma 2.  $\square$ 

#### References

- [A&S] M.A. Akivis, A.M. Shelekhov, Geometry and Algebra of Multidimensional Three-Webs, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1992
- [F] A.T. Fomenko, Variational Principles in Topology, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1982
- [Ki] M. Kikkawa, On local loops in affine manifolds, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I, 28 1964, 199–207.
- $[{\rm K\&N~I}]~~{\rm S.~Kobayashi,~K.~Nomizu,}~Foundations~of~Differential~Geometry~I,~{\rm Moskva},~1981$
- [K&N II] S. Kobayashi, K. Nomizu, Foundations of Differential Geometry II, Moskva, 1981
- [Pf] H.O. Pflugfelder, Quasigroups and Loops: Introduction, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1990
- [M&S1] P.O. Mikheev, L.V. Sabinin, Quasigroups and Differential Geometry, Chap. XII in: Quasigroups and Loops: Theory and Applications, (Eds.: O. Chein. H.O. Pflugfelder

- and J.D.H. Smith), Sigma Series in Pure Math. 8 Heldermann Verlag addr Berlin, 1990, 357–430.
- [M&S2] P.O. Mikheev, L.V. Sabinin, The Theory of Smooth Bol Loops, Friendship of Nations University, Moscow, 1985
- [P] M.M. Postnikov, Lie Groups and Lie Algebras, Nauka, Moskva, 1982
- [Sa] L.V. Sabinin, Smooth Quasigroups and Loops, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1999
- [Va] A. Vanžurová, Sabinin's method for classification of local Bol loops, The 18's Winter School "Geometry and Physics", Srní, 10–17 January 1998, Suppl. Rend. del Circ. Mat. di Palermo, Ser. II, 59, 1999
- [W] J.A. Wolf, Spaces of Constant Curvature, Univ. of California, Berkeley, California, 1972

Dept. Algebra and Geometry, Palacký University, Tomkova 40, Olomouc, Czech Republic