

*Pacific
Journal of
Mathematics*

**DIVERGENCE OF THE NORMALIZATION FOR REAL
LAGRANGIAN SURFACES NEAR COMPLEX TANGENTS**

XIANGHONG GONG

DIVERGENCE OF THE NORMALIZATION FOR REAL LAGRANGIAN SURFACES NEAR COMPLEX TANGENTS

XIANGHONG GONG

We study real Lagrangian analytic surfaces in \mathbb{C}^2 with a non-degenerate complex tangent. Webster proved that all such surfaces can be transformed into a quadratic surface by formal symplectic transformations of \mathbb{C}^2 . We show that there is a certain dense set of real Lagrangian surfaces which cannot be transformed into the quadratic surface by any holomorphic (convergent) transformation of \mathbb{C}^2 . The divergence is contributed by the parabolic character of a pair of involutions generated by the real Lagrangian surfaces.

1. Introduction.

We consider a real analytic surface M in \mathbb{C}^2 . Let $\omega = dz \wedge dp$ be the holomorphic symplectic 2-form on \mathbb{C}^2 . M is a *real Lagrangian* surface if

$$(1.1) \quad \operatorname{Re} \omega|_M = 0.$$

The real Lagrangian surfaces were initially studied by S.M. Webster [10]. It was known that all totally real and real Lagrangian analytic submanifolds are equivalent under holomorphic symplectic transformations. When M has a non-degenerate complex tangent, Webster proved that under formal symplectic transformations, M can be transformed into the quadratic surface

$$(1.2) \quad Q : p = 2z\bar{z} + \bar{z}^2.$$

Furthermore, M can be transformed into Q by holomorphic transformations of \mathbb{C}^2 if and only if they are equivalent through holomorphic symplectic transformations [10]. The purpose of this paper is to show that there exist real Lagrangian surfaces such that the above normal form cannot be realized by any holomorphic (convergent) transformation.

In [7], J.K. Moser and S.M. Webster systematically investigated the holomorphic invariant theory of real surfaces in \mathbb{C}^2 , where a pair of involutions intrinsically attached to the complex tangents plays an important role. We shall see that the divergence for the normalization of the real Lagrangian surfaces is contributed by the parabolic character of the pair of involutions.

In [5], a parabolic pair of involutions was also used to show the divergence for the normalization of real analytic glancing hypersurfaces. The main idea of the divergence proof is inspired by a remark of Moser that divergence of solutions to linearized equations should indicate the same behavior of solutions to the original non-linear equations. In Section 3, we shall derive a relation between the linearized equations and the original non-linear ones, which says that for a certain type of non-linear equations, the existence of the convergent solutions to the linearized equations is indeed a necessary condition for the existence of convergent solutions to the non-linear equations. Our approach comes directly from the method used for the small divisors (see [2], [6] for the references). In particular, we follow the ideas of H. Dulac [3] and C.L. Siegel [8] closely.

To state our result, we let X be the set of convergent power series

$$(1.3) \quad r(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{i+j>3} r_{ij} z^i \bar{z}^j, \quad r_{ji} = \bar{r}_{ij}$$

with

$$(1.4) \quad r_{z\bar{z}}(z, -z) = 0.$$

Let us introduce a metric d on X by

$$d(r, s) = \sup \left\{ |r_{ij} - s_{ij}|^{\frac{1}{i+j}}, i + j > 3 \right\}, \quad r, s \in X.$$

To each $r \in X$, we associate a real Lagrangian surface

$$(1.5) \quad M_r: p = 2z\bar{z} + \bar{z}^2 + r_z(z, \bar{z}).$$

Denote by S the set of $r \in X$ such that the corresponding surface M_r cannot be transformed into (1.2) through any holomorphic transformation. We have

Theorem 1.1. *S is dense in the metric space $\{X, d\}$.*

In Section 4, we shall prove Theorem 1.1. Using the relation between the non-linear equations and the linearized equations established in Section 3, we shall prove that the parabolic pair of involutions generated by a real Lagrangian surface is generally not linearizable by any convergent transformation.

Acknowledgment. The main result in this paper is a part of author's thesis [4]. The author is grateful to Professor Sidney M. Webster for the guidance and encouragement. The author acknowledges the support by the NSF grant DMS-9304580 through a membership at the Institute for Advanced Study.

2. Formal theory and linearized equations.

In this section, we shall recall from [7] a pair of involutions which are intrinsically attached to surfaces with a complex tangent. We also need a result in [10] on the formal normalization of a parabolic pair of involutions.

Given a real analytic function $R(z, \bar{z})$ with $R(0) = dR(0) = 0$, we consider the real Lagrangian surface

$$M \subset \mathbb{C}^2 : p = R_z(z, \bar{z}).$$

We have

$$\omega|_M = -R_{z\bar{z}}dz \wedge d\bar{z}.$$

M is totally real if and only if the Levi-form $R_{z\bar{z}} \neq 0$. It is known that all totally real and real Lagrangian analytic surfaces are equivalent under holomorphic symplectic transformations [10]. We now assume that M has a non-degenerate complex tangent at 0, i. e.

$$(2.1) \quad R_{z\bar{z}}(0) = 0, \quad dR_{z\bar{z}}(0) \neq 0.$$

Then with a suitable change of symplectic coordinates, we may assume that M is given by (1.5) for some real function (1.3). From (2.1), we see that M has complex tangents along the smooth curve $C \subset M : R_{z\bar{z}} = 0$. In fact, (1.4) implies that

$$C : z + \bar{z} = 0.$$

Here the complex tangents are *parabolic* according to E. Bishop [1].

Following [7], we consider the complexification of M defined by

$$M^c \subset \mathbb{C}^4 : \begin{cases} p = 2zw + w^2 + r_z(z, w), \\ q = 2z\bar{w} + z^2 + \bar{r}_{\bar{z}}(w, z). \end{cases}$$

We shall use (z, w) as the coordinates to identify M^c with \mathbb{C}^2 . Consider the projection $\pi_1 : (z, p, w, q) \rightarrow (w, q)$. The restriction of π_1 to M^c is a double-sheeted branched covering, and it induces a covering transformation $\tau_1 : M^c \rightarrow M^c$. Notice that w and q are invariant under τ_1 . Then $\tau_1 : (z, w) \rightarrow (z', w')$ is implicitly defined by

$$(2.2) \quad \tau_1 : \begin{cases} z' = -z - 2w - \frac{1}{z'-z} \{r_{\bar{z}}(z', w) - r_{\bar{z}}(z, w)\}, \\ w' = w. \end{cases}$$

We also have the projection $\pi_2: (z, p, w, q) \rightarrow (z, p)$ inducing another involution τ_2 of M^c . We notice that M^c is invariant under the complex conjugation

$$(z, p, w, q) \rightarrow (\bar{w}, \bar{q}, \bar{z}, \bar{p}).$$

Hence, its restriction to M^c is an anti-holomorphic involution $\rho: (z, w) \rightarrow (\bar{w}, \bar{z})$. From the relation $\pi_2 = c\pi_1\rho$ for $c(z, p) = (\bar{z}, \bar{p})$, it follows that τ_1 and τ_2 satisfy the reality condition

$$(2.3) \quad \tau_2 = \rho \circ \tau_1 \circ \rho.$$

Introduce the following coordinates for M^c

$$(2.4) \quad x = z + w, \quad y = z - w.$$

Then ρ takes the form

$$(2.5) \quad \rho(x, y) = (\bar{x}, -\bar{y}).$$

Now the pair of involutions τ_1, τ_2 can be written as

$$(2.6) \quad \tau_j(x, y) = \tau_j^*(x, y) + H_j(x, y), \quad H_j(x, y) = O(2)$$

with

$$(2.7) \quad \tau_1^*(x, y) = (-x, -2x + y), \quad \tau_2^*(x, y) = (-x, 2x + y).$$

Since $\tau_j^2 = id$, then

$$(2.8) \quad \tau_j^* \circ H_j + H_j \circ \tau_j = 0.$$

We also notice that the branch points of π_j , i. e. the fixed points of τ_j , are given by

$$2z + 2w + H_{z\bar{z}}(z, w) = 0,$$

i. e. $x = 0$. Hence, we have

$$(2.9) \quad H_j(0, y) = 0.$$

The reality condition on $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\}$ is still given by (2.3).

From [7], we now recall an intrinsic property of the pair of involutions generated by a surface with a non-degenerate complex tangent as follows. Let $\{\hat{\tau}_j, \rho\}$ and $\{\tau_j, \rho\}$ be two pairs of involutions corresponding to two real

(Lagrangian) analytic surfaces \hat{M} and M in the form (1.5). Then M and \hat{M} are equivalent through holomorphic transformations if and only if there is a biholomorphic mapping $\Phi: M^c \rightarrow \hat{M}^c$ such that

$$\Phi^{-1}\hat{\tau}_j\Phi = \tau_j, \quad \rho\Phi = \Phi\rho.$$

Notice that involutions generated by the quadratic surface (1.2) are the linear involutions (2.7). We shall prove that there is a dense subset S in X of which the involutions generated by the corresponding surfaces are not linearizable by any convergent transformations of M^c , from which Theorem 1.1 follows immediately.

A convergent or formal transformation

$$(2.10) \quad \Phi: x \mapsto x + u(x, y), \quad y \mapsto y + v(x, y)$$

is said to be *normalized* if

$$(2.11) \quad u(0, y) = 0, \quad u(x, 0) = u(-x, 0), \quad v(x, 0) = -v(-x, 0).$$

Lemma 2.1. ([10]). *Let τ_1 and τ_2 be a pair of involutions defined by (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8). Then there exists a unique normalized formal transformation Φ such that $\Phi\tau_j\Phi^{-1} = \tau_j^*$ for $j = 1, 2$.*

We also need the following.

Lemma 2.2. ([5]). *Let τ_j ($j = 1, 2$) be as in Lemma 2.1. Then τ_j are linearizable by convergent transformations if and only if the above unique normalized transformation is convergent.*

We now want to discuss the linearized equations for the pair of involutions. Put

$$H_j = (f_j, g_j), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Consider the composition

$$(2.12) \quad \sigma = \tau_1\tau_2 : \begin{cases} x' = x + G_1(x, y), \\ y' = 4x + y + G_2(x, y), \end{cases}$$

where

$$(2.13) \quad G_1 = -f_2 + f_1 \circ \tau_2, \quad G_2 = -2f_2 + g_2 + g_1 \circ \tau_2.$$

From $\Phi\tau_j = \tau_j^*\Phi$ ($j = 1, 2$), we get

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} u \circ \sigma - u &= -G_1, \\ v \circ \sigma - v &= -G_2 + 4u. \end{aligned}$$

This leads us to the following linearized equation

$$(2.15) \quad u(x, 4x + y) - u(x, y) = -G_1(x, y).$$

From (2.9), it follows that $x|G_1(x, y)$. Set

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} K &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 4^k \beta_k x^k D^k, \quad D = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \\ E(z) &= \frac{z}{e^z - 1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta_k z^k. \end{aligned}$$

Rewrite (2.14) as

$$(e^{4xD} - 1) u(x, y) = -G_1(x, y).$$

Clearly, $K(e^{4xD} - 1) = 4xD$. By applying K to the above, we finally reduce (2.15) to

$$(2.17) \quad \partial_y u(x, y) = \frac{1}{4} K a(x, y), \quad G_1(x, y) = -xa(x, y).$$

From (2.16), it follows that the linearized equation (2.15) has only divergent solutions. This can be seen easily if G_1 can be arbitrarily chosen. However, as G_1 comes from real Lagrangian surfaces, we need to study the linearized equations more closely. The solution (2.17) was suggested by Moser and then used in [5].

3. Linearizations.

In this section, we shall investigate the relation between non-linear equations and their first order approximate equations, i. e. the linearized equations. We shall consider non-linear equations which are formally solvable. Then under suitable conditions, we shall formally solve the linearized equations, and show that the existence of a divergent solution to linearized equations implies that the original non-linear equations have neither convergent solutions.

Consider a system of equations

$$(3.1) \quad F(x, y) = 0, \quad (x, y) \in X \times Y,$$

where $X = \bigoplus_{k=1}^{\infty} X_k$, $Y = \bigoplus_{k=1}^{\infty} Y_k$, and

$$F: X \times Y \rightarrow Z, \quad F(0, 0) = 0$$

with $Z = \bigoplus_{k=1}^{\infty} Z_k$. We shall denote by π_k the projection $X \rightarrow X_k$, as well as the projections $Y \rightarrow Y_k$ and $Z \rightarrow Z_k$. For each $x \in X$, there is a formal decomposition $x = x_1 + x_2 + \dots$ with $x_k \in X_k$. We put

$$[x]_k = x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_k$$

with $[x]_0 = 0$. Assume that X_k, Y_k, Z_k are finitely dimensional real vector spaces identified with Euclidean spaces. We then introduce the product topology on X, Y, Z . Thus, a sequence $\{x^{(n)}\} \subset X$ is convergent if and only if $\left\{x_k^{(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges in X_k for all k .

The Fréchet derivative of F at $(0, 0)$ is defined by

$$DF(x, y) = \lim_{\mathbb{R} \ni t \rightarrow 0} \frac{F(tx, ty) - F(0, 0)}{t}, \quad x \in X, \quad y \in Y.$$

We assume that $DF: X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ is a well-defined linear mapping. We further assume that DF is *homogeneous*, i. e.

$$(3.2) \quad DF: X_k \times Y_k \rightarrow Z_k.$$

Decompose

$$DF(x, y) = D_1F(x) + D_2F(y)$$

with $D_1F(x) = DF(x, 0)$ and $D_2F(y) = DF(0, y)$. Put

$$QF = F - DF.$$

We assume that for $k \geq 1$

$$(3.3) \quad \pi_k QF(x, y) = \pi_k Q([x]_{k-1}, [y]_{k-1}).$$

With the above notations and assumptions, we have

Lemma 3.1. *Let F be as above. Assume that F satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i) *There is a solution operator $P: X \rightarrow Y$ with $F(x, P(x)) = 0$ and $P(0) = 0$.*
- (ii) *$D_2F: Y \rightarrow Z$ is injective.*

Then $DF(x, y) = 0$ is solvable by $L: X \rightarrow Y$ with

$$(3.4) \quad L(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k P(x_k), \quad x \in X.$$

Moreover, $\tilde{P} = P - L$ satisfies that

$$(3.5) \quad \pi_k \tilde{P}(x) = \pi_k \tilde{P}([x]_{k-1}).$$

Proof. Fix $x \in X$. Notice that L is homogeneous. Hence, it suffices to show that (3.5) holds and

$$(3.6) \quad DF(x_k, L(x_k)) = 0.$$

From (3.3), we see immediately that (3.6) holds for $k = 1$. We also have

$$DF(x_1, \pi_1 P(x)) = 0.$$

Since D_2F is injective, then we get $\pi_1 \tilde{P}(x) = 0$. We now assume that (3.5) and (3.6) hold for $k < n$. From (3.5), we get $[P(x)]_{n-1} = [P([x]_{n-1})]_{n-1}$. In particular, $[P(x_n)]_{n-1} = 0$. Now (3.3) gives

$$DF(x_n, \pi_n P(x_n)) = 0.$$

We also have

$$DF(x_n, \pi_n P(x)) = -\pi_n QF(x, P(x)).$$

Since $[P(x)]_{n-1}$ depends only on $[x]_{n-1}$, we obtain from the last two identities that

$$DF(0, \pi_n \tilde{P}(x)) = -\pi_n QF([x]_{n-1}, [P([x]_{n-1})]_{n-1}).$$

Since D_2F is injective, we can find a left inverse $K: Z \rightarrow Y_0$ of D_2F such that $K: Z_k \rightarrow Y_k$. Thus, we get

$$\pi_n \tilde{P}(x) = -K \pi_n QF([x]_{n-1}, [P([x]_{n-1})]_{n-1}).$$

This proves that $\pi_n \tilde{P}(x)$ depends only on $[x]_{n-1}$. Therefore, (3.5) holds for $k = n$. The proof of Lemma 3.1 is complete. \square

Assume that X is endowed with a metric d such that

$$d(x', x'') = \sup\{d(x'_k, x''_k); k = 1, 2, \dots\}.$$

We also assume that each Y_k is endowed with a metric \tilde{d}_k which is invariant under translations. Put

$$\tilde{d}(y', y'') = \sup \left\{ \tilde{d}_k(y'_k, y''_k); k = 1, 2, \dots \right\}, \quad y', y'' \in Y,$$

and $\hat{Y} = \{y \in Y; \tau(y, 0) < \infty\}$.

With the above notations and assumptions, we want to prove the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that there exists $x^* \in X$ with $LP(x^*) \notin \hat{Y}$. Let $\epsilon_0 = d(x^*, 0)$. Then for any $x \in X$, there is $x' \in X$ with $d(x, x') \leq \epsilon_0$ such that $P(x') \notin \hat{Y}$.*

For the application of Lemma 3.2 to real Lagrangian surfaces, Y will be taken as a certain space of normalized formal solutions, and the metric on Y will be so chosen that \hat{Y} is precisely the set of convergent solutions among all the normalized formal solutions. Thus, Lemma 3.2 says that the existence of convergent solutions to linearized equations is a necessary condition for the existence of a convergent solution to the original functional equations. On the other hand, we notice that Siegel's theory on the Hamiltonian systems [9] concluded that there are functional equations of which the convergent solutions does exist for the linearized equations, but not for the original functional equations. Finally, we mention that the metric which we put on the space of convergent power series in Theorem 1.1 is weaker than that used by Siegel in [8], where the small divisors are essential.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Since $LP(x^*) \notin \hat{Y}$, then we can choose a sequence of positive integers n_k such that

$$(3.7) \quad \tilde{d}_{n_k}(LP(x_{n_k}^*), 0) \geq k$$

for all k . Fixing $x \in X$, we put $x'_n = x_n$ for all $n \neq n_k$. To determine $\{x'_{n_k}\}$, we assume that for $m < n_k$, all x_m have been so chosen that

$$(3.8) \quad \tilde{d}_{n_j}(\pi_{n_j}P([x']_{n_j}), 0) \geq j/2$$

for all $j < k$. Let $\tilde{x} = [x']_{n_k-1} + x_{n_k}$. If

$$\tilde{d}_{n_j}(p_{n_k}(\tilde{x}), 0) \geq j/2,$$

we put $x'_{n_k} = x_{n_k}$. Then (3.8) holds for $j = k$. Otherwise, we choose

$$x'_{n_k} = x_{n_k} + x_{n_k}^*.$$

Then from Lemma 3.1, it follows that

$$\pi_{n_k} P([x']_{n_k}) = LP(x_{n_k}^*) + \pi_{n_k} P(\tilde{x}).$$

Since all \tilde{d}_n are invariant under translation, then

$$\tilde{d}_{n_k}(\pi_{n_k} P([x']_{n_k}, 0)) \geq \tilde{d}_{n_k}(LP(x_{n_k}^*), 0) - \tilde{d}_{n_k}(\pi_{n_k} P(\tilde{x}), 0).$$

Now (3.7) implies that (3.8) holds for $j = k$. Thus, we have chosen x' such that (3.8) holds for all j . Notice that $[P(x)]_k$ depends only on $[x]_k$ for all k . Therefore, (3.8) implies that $P(x') \notin \hat{Y}$. The proof of Lemma 3.2 is complete. \square

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1.

In this section, we shall give a proof of Theorem 1.1 by using Lemma 3.2. Thus, we shall verify that for the problem of linearizing the pair of involutions generated by a real Lagrangian surface, its linearized equations have divergent solutions.

We first give some notations. Let (X, d) be as in Theorem 1.1. Denote by X_k the set of homogeneous polynomials $r \in X$ with degree $k + 2$. Let Z_k ($k \geq 2$) be the set of ordered power series (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) in x, y , where each w_j is a homogeneous polynomial of degree k . Put Z to be the direct sum of Z_k ($k \geq 2$). Denote by Y_k the set of ordered pairs (u, v) of homogeneous polynomials of degree k in x, y which satisfy the normalizing condition (2.11). Let Y be the direct sum of Y_k ($k \geq 2$). The metric on Y_k is defined by

$$\tilde{d}_k((u', v'), (u, v)) = \max_{i+j=k} \left\{ |u'_{ij} - u_{ij}|^{\frac{1}{i+j}}, |v'_{ij} - v_{ij}|^{\frac{1}{i+j}} \right\}.$$

We now put the system of equations $\Phi\tau_j\Phi^{-1} = \tau_j^*$ ($j = 1, 2$) into the form (3.1) with

$$F(r, u, v) = (\Phi \circ \tau_1 - \tau_1^* \circ \Phi, \Phi \circ \tau_2 - \tau_2^* \circ \Phi).$$

Then we have

$$D_2F(u, v) = (u \circ \tau_1^* + u, v \circ \tau_1^* - v + 2u, u \circ \tau_2^* + u, v \circ \tau_2^* - v - 2u).$$

In order to apply Lemma 3.2, we need to verify that D_2F is injective. This is essentially contained in the argument in [10]. To give the details, we notice that $D_2F(u, v) = 0$ implies that u is invariant under both τ_1^* and τ_2^* . Then $u(x, y)$ depends only x , and it contains only power of x with odd order (see Lemma 4.1 in [5]). From the normalizing condition (2.11), it follows that

$u = 0$. We now know that v is skew-invariant under τ_j ($j = 1, 2$). Then $v(x, y)$ depends only x and contains only power of x of even order. Thus, (2.11) implies that $v = 0$. It is easy to verify that DF is homogeneous and F satisfies (3.3).

To compute D_1F , we fix $r \in X$ and put

$$(4.1) \quad \tau_1 : \begin{cases} z' = -z - 2w + q(z, w), & q(z, w) = O(2), \\ w' = w. \end{cases}$$

By the implicit formula (2.2), we obtain

$$q(z, w) = Lq(z, w) + Qq(z, w)$$

with

$$(4.2) \quad Lq(z, w) = -\frac{1}{2z + 2w} \{r_{\bar{z}}(-z - 2w, w) - r_{\bar{z}}(z, w)\},$$

where each coefficient $(Qq)_{i,j}$ of Qq does not contain linear terms in r and terms $r_{i',j'}$ with $i' + j' \geq i + j + 2$. From (2.4), (2.6) and (4.1), we get

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} f_1 &= g_1 = q \circ T, \\ T(x, y) &= \left(\frac{x + y}{2}, \frac{x - y}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau_2 = \rho\tau_1\rho$, we have

$$(4.4) \quad \tau_2(x, y) = \left(-x + \bar{f}_1(x, -y), 2x + y - \bar{g}_1(x, -y) \right).$$

It follows from (4.3) that

$$(4.5) \quad f_2(x, y) = -g_2(x, y) = \bar{q} \circ T(x, -y).$$

We now can obtain

$$D_1F(r) = Lq \circ T(x, y) \cdot (1, 1, 0, 0) + \bar{Lq} \circ T(x, -y) \cdot (0, 0, 1, -1).$$

The equation $DF(r, u, v) = 0$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} u \circ \tau_1^*(x, y) + u(x, y) &= -Lq \circ T(x, y), \\ u \circ \tau_2^*(x, y) + u(x, y) &= -\bar{Lq} \circ T(x, -y). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$(4.6) \quad u(x, 4x + y) - u(x, y) = A(x, y)$$

with

$$A(x, y) = \overline{Lq} \left(\frac{x-y}{2}, \frac{x+y}{2} \right) - Lq \left(\frac{x+y}{2}, \frac{3x+y}{2} \right).$$

Then from (4.2), we get

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} 2xA(x, y) &= r_{\bar{z}} \left(\frac{5x+y}{2}, -\frac{3x+y}{2} \right) - r_{\bar{z}} \left(\frac{x+y}{2}, -\frac{3x+y}{2} \right) \\ &\quad + \bar{r}_{\bar{z}} \left(-\frac{3x+y}{2}, \frac{x+y}{2} \right) - \bar{r}_{\bar{z}} \left(\frac{x-y}{2}, \frac{x+y}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.17), we have

$$(4.8) \quad x\partial_y u(x, y) = \frac{1}{4}KA(x, y).$$

Let

$$(4.9) \quad e_{n+2} = \epsilon^{n+2} (i^{n-1}z^n\bar{z}^2 + (-i)^{n-1}\bar{z}^nz^2) \equiv i^{n-1}P_{n+2}(z, \bar{z}).$$

Then $e_{n+2} \in X_n$ and $\bar{e}_{n+2}(z, \bar{z}) \equiv -i^{n-1}P_{n+2}(-z, -\bar{z})$. Let A_n be given by (4.7) in which r is replaced by e_{n+2} . Then

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} 2^{n+2}i^{1-n}xA_n(x, y) &= P_{n+2, \bar{z}}(5x+y, -3x-y) \\ &\quad - P_{n+2, \bar{z}}(x+y, -3x-y) + P_{n+2, \bar{z}}(3x+y, -x-y) \\ &\quad - P_{n+2, \bar{z}}(-x+y, -x-y). \end{aligned}$$

We now put

$$r^*(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} e_n(z, \bar{z}), \quad P(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} P_n(z, \bar{z}).$$

Then we have

$$A(x, y) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} A_n(x, y).$$

Lemma 4.1. $KA(x, y)$ diverges.

Proof. We need to compute

$$K|_{y=0} P_{n+2, \bar{z}}(ax+y, bx-y) \equiv \gamma_{n+1}x^{n+1}.$$

We have

$$P_{n+2, \bar{z}}(z, \bar{z}) = \epsilon^{n+2} (2z^n \bar{z} + (-1)^{n-1} n \bar{z}^{n-1} z^2).$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\epsilon^{n+2}} \gamma_{n+1} &= \frac{1}{\epsilon^{n+2}} \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} 4^j \beta_j \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right)^j \Big|_{x=1, y=0} P_{n+2, \bar{z}}(ax + y, bx - y) \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=0}^n 4^j \beta_j \frac{n!}{(n-j)!} a^{n-j} b - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} 4^j \beta_j \frac{n!}{(n-j+1)!} a^{n-j+1} \\ &\quad + (-1)^{n-1} n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} 4^j \beta_j \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-1-j)!} (-1)^j b^{n-1-j} a^2 \\ &\quad + (-1)^{n-1} n \sum_{j=1}^n 4^j \beta_j 2 \binom{j}{1} \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-j)!} (-1)^{j-1} b^{n-j} a \\ &\quad + (-1)^{n-1} n \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} 4^j 2 \binom{j}{2} \beta_j \frac{(n-1)!}{(n+1-j)!} (-1)^{j-2} b^{n+1-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Cauchy product, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma_{n+1}}{n! \epsilon^{n+2}} x^{n+1} &= 2bx E(x) e^{ax} - 2E(x) e^{ax} + a^2 x^2 E(x) e^{-bx} \\ &\quad + 2ax^2 E'(x) e^{-bx} + x E''(x) e^{-bx} \\ &\equiv 2ax^2 E'(x) e^{-bx} + \tilde{S}_{a,b}(x) \equiv S_{a,b}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus from (4.10), we obtain

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{i^{1-n} 2^{n+2}}{n! \epsilon^{n+2}} x (K A_n)(x, 0) = S(x)$$

with

$$S(x) = S_{5,-3}(x) - S_{1,-3}(x) + S_{3,-1}(x) - S_{-1,-1}(x).$$

For a non-zero integer k ,

$$\tilde{S}(x) = \tilde{S}_{5,-3}(x) - \tilde{S}_{1,-3}(x) + \tilde{S}_{3,-1}(x) - \tilde{S}_{-1,-1}(x)$$

has no pole of order 2 at $x = k\pi i/2$. Hence $S(x)$ has a pole of order 2 at $x = k\pi i/2$ if $e^{3x} + e^x \neq 0$, i. e. if k is even. Now let $S(x) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} S_n x^n$.

Then we have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|S_n|} > 0$. Therefore, one can see that $(KA)(x, 0)$ diverges. The proof of Lemma 4.1 is complete. \square

We have proved that (4.6) has a divergent solution. Hence, the equation

$$DF(r^*, u, v) = 0$$

has a divergent solution for (u, v) . Since $d(r^*, 0) = \epsilon$, then Lemma 3.2 implies that for any $r \in X$, there is $r' \in X$ with $d(r', 0) \leq \epsilon$ such that the equation $F(r', u, v)$ has no convergent solution in Y . From Lemma 3.1, it follows that the corresponding pair of involutions $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\}$ is not linearizable by any convergent transformation. This proves Theorem 1.1. \square

References

- [1] E. Bishop, *Differentiable manifolds in complex Euclidean space*, Duke Math. J., **32** (1965), 1-22.
- [2] A.D. Bruno, *Analytic form of differential equations*, Trans. Moscow Math. Soc., **25** (1971), 131-288; **26** (1972), 199-239.
- [3] H. Dulac, *Recherches sur les points singuliers des équations différentielles*, J. de L'École Poly., **2(9)** (1904), 1-125.
- [4] X. Gong, *Real Analytic submanifolds under unimodular transformations*, Thesis, University of Chicago, August, 1994.
- [5] ———, *Divergence for the normalization of real analytic glancing hypersurfaces*, Commun. in Partial Diff. Equations, nos. 3&4, **19** (1994), 643-654.
- [6] M.R. Herman, *Recent results and some open questions on Siegel's linearization theorem of germs of complex analytic diffeomorphisms of \mathbb{C}^n near a fixed point*, VIII-th Inter. Congress on Math. Physics (Marseille, 1986), 138-184, World Sci. Publ., Singapore, 1987.
- [7] J.K. Moser and S.M. Webster, *Normal forms for real surfaces in \mathbb{C}^2 near complex tangents and hyperbolic surface transformations*, Acta Math., **150** (1983), 255-296.
- [8] C.L. Siegel, *On integrals of canonical systems*, Ann. Math., **42** (1941), 806-822.
- [9] ———, *Über die Existenz einer Normalform analytischer HAMILTONscher Differentialgleichungen in der Nähe einer Gleichgewichtslösung*, Math. Ann., **128** (1954), 144-170.
- [10] S.M. Webster, *Holomorphic symplectic normalization of a real function*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. di Pisa, **19** (1992), 69-86.

Received January 26, 1995.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
 ANN ARBOR, MI 48109-1109
 E-mail address: xgong@math.lsa.umich.edu

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Founded in 1951 by

E. F. Beckenbach (1906-1982)

F. Wolf (1904-1989)

EDITORS

Sun-Yung A. Chang (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
pacific@math.ucla.edu

F. Michael Christ
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
christ@math.ucla.edu

Nicholas Ercolani
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
ercolani@math.arizona.edu

Robert Finn
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
finn@gauss.stanford.edu

Steven Kerckhoff
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
spk@gauss.stanford.edu

Martin Scharlemann
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
mgscharl@math.ucsb.edu

Gang Tian
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139
tian@math.mit.edu

V. S. Varadarajan
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
vsv@math.ucla.edu

Dan Voiculescu
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
dvv@math.berkeley.edu

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

ACADEMIA SINICA, TAIPEI
CALIF. INST. OF TECHNOLOGY
CHINESE UNIV. OF HONG KONG
HONG KONG UNIV. OF SCI. & TECH.
KEIO UNIVERSITY
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY
MATH. SCI. RESEARCH INSTITUTE
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIV.
OREGON STATE UNIV.
PEKING UNIVERSITY
RITSUMEIKAN UNIVERSITY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

TOKYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSIDAD DE LOS ANDES
UNIV. OF ARIZONA
UNIV. OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
UNIV. OF CALIF., BERKELEY
UNIV. OF CALIF., DAVIS
UNIV. OF CALIF., IRVINE
UNIV. OF CALIF., LOS ANGELES
UNIV. OF CALIF., RIVERSIDE
UNIV. OF CALIF., SAN DIEGO
UNIV. OF CALIF., SANTA BARBARA

UNIV. OF CALIF., SANTA CRUZ
UNIV. OF HAWAII
UNIV. OF MELBOURNE
UNIV. OF MONTANA
UNIV. NACIONAL AUTONOMA DE MEXICO
UNIV. OF NEVADA, RENO
UNIV. OF OREGON
UNIV. OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIV. OF UTAH
UNIV. OF WASHINGTON
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

The supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its contents or policies.

Manuscripts must be prepared in accordance with the instructions provided on the inside back cover.

The table of contents and the abstracts of the papers in the current issue, as well as other information about the Pacific Journal of Mathematics, may be found on the Internet at <http://www.math.uci.edu/pjm.html>.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* (ISSN 0030-8730) is published monthly except for July and August. Regular subscription rate: \$245.00 a year (10 issues). Special rate: \$123.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, back issues published within the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163, U.S.A. Prior back issues are obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics at the University of California, c/o Department of Mathematics, 981 Evans Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720 (ISSN 0030-8730) is published monthly except for July and August. Second-class postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 6143, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS at University of California,
Berkeley, CA 94720, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

This publication was typeset using AMS-LATEX,
the American Mathematical Society's TEX macro system.
Copyright © 1995 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Volume 176 No. 2 December 1996

One remark on polynomials in two variables	297
ENRIQUE ARTAL BARTOLO and PIERRETTE CASSOU-NOGUÈS	
Divergence of the normalization for real Lagrangian surfaces near complex tangents	311
XIANGHONG GONG	
Classification of the stable homotopy types of stunted lens spaces for an odd prime	325
JESUS GONZALEZ	
Plancherel formulae for non-symmetric polar homogeneous spaces	345
JING-SONG HUANG	
A uniqueness theorem for the minimal surface equation	357
JENN-FANG HWANG	
Differential Galois groups of confluent generalized hypergeometric equations: an approach using Stokes multipliers	365
CLAUDINE MITSCHI	
Oscillatory theorem and pendent liquid drops	407
KIMIYAKI NARUKAWA and TAKASHI SUZUKI	
Local and global plurisubharmonic defining functions	421
ALAN NOELL	
Specializations and a local homeomorphism theorem for real Riemann surfaces of rings	427
M. J. DE LA PUENTE	
Eigenvalue comparisons in graph theory	443
GREGORY T. QUENELL	
Applications of loop groups and standard modules to Jacobians and theta functions of isospectral curves	463
WILLI SCHWARZ	
Bridged extremal distance and maximal capacity	507
ROBERT E. THURMAN	
Imbedding and multiplier theorems for discrete Littlewood-Paley spaces	529
IGOR E. VERBITSKY	
On constrained extrema	557
THOMAS VOGEL	
Heat flow of equivariant harmonic maps from \mathbb{B}^3 into $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$	563
YUANLONG XIN	
Proof of Longuerre's theorem and its extensions by the method of polar coordinates	581
ZHIHONG YU	
Correction to: "Special generating sets of purely inseparable extension fields of unbounded exponent"	587
BONIFACE IHEMOTUONYE EKE	