

ANNALI DELLA  
SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE DI PISA  
*Classe di Scienze*

ERIC BEDFORD

**Stability of the polynomial hull of  $T^2$**

*Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Scienze 4<sup>e</sup> série*, tome 8, n° 2  
(1981), p. 311-315

<[http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASNSP\\_1981\\_4\\_8\\_2\\_311\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASNSP_1981_4_8_2_311_0)>

© Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 1981, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Scienze » (<http://www.sns.it/it/edizioni/riviste/annaliscienze/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme  
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques  
<http://www.numdam.org/>

# Stability of the Polynomial Hull of $T^2$ .

ERIC BEDFORD

## 1. - Introduction.

As is well known, the polynomial hull of the standard 2-torus  $T^2 = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbf{C}^2: |z_1| = |z_2| = 1\}$  is the closure of the unit polydisk  $\Delta^2 = \{z \in \mathbf{C}^2: |z_1|, |z_2| < 1\}$ . The existence of the hull is seen because the topological boundary of  $\Delta^2$  consists of two 1-parameter families of disks, namely  $\partial\Delta \times \Delta$  and  $\Delta \times \partial\Delta$ , whose boundaries lie in  $T^2$ . Alexander [1] has shown that under a small deformation of  $T^2$ , there continue to exist two 1-parameter families of (deformed) disks, whose boundaries lie in the deformed torus. Here we extend that work somewhat and show that these deformed disks give exactly the polynomial hull. Our method is similar in spirit to that of [1]: we solve a functional equation that is analogous to the one used by Bishop [3] to construct disks near a «vanishing» disk. We also adopt the functional analysis approach to this problem developed by Hill and Taiani [5].

Given complex functions  $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2) \in C^{m+3}(T^2)^2$ , we may extend them to  $(\mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\})^2$  by making them constant in the variables  $|z_1|$  and  $|z_2|$ . Let us define the map  $\Psi = (\mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\})^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^2$  by setting  $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$  with

$$(1) \quad \Psi_j(z) = z_j(1 + \psi_j(z)).$$

Let  $T_\psi^2$  denote the image of  $T^2$  under  $\Psi$ .

We will prove that the polynomial hull of  $T^2$  is stable in the following sense.

**THEOREM.** *For  $m > 1$  and  $1 > \delta > 0$ , there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that if  $\psi \in C^{m+3}(T^2)^2$  and  $\|\psi\|_{C^{m+3}} < \varepsilon$ , then there exist*

$$F_\psi^{(1)} = F^{(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad F_\psi^{(2)} = F^{(2)}, \quad F^{(1)}: \partial\Delta \times \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^2, \quad F^{(2)} = \bar{\Delta} \times \partial\Delta \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^2$$

Pervenuto alla Redazione il 16 Maggio 1980.

with the following properties:

- (2a)  $\|F^{(j)}(z) - z\|_{C^m} < \delta$  (and thus  $F$  is a diffeomorphism) for  $j = 1, 2$ .  
 (2b)  $F^{(j)}$  is holomorphic in  $\zeta \in \Delta$  for fixed  $\tau \in \partial\Delta$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ .  
 (2c)  $F^{(1)}(\partial\Delta \times \partial\Delta) = F^{(2)}(\partial\Delta \times \partial\Delta) = \mathbf{T}_\psi^2$ .  
 (2d) If  $\Omega$  is the bounded component of  $\mathbf{C}^2 \setminus (F^{(1)}(\partial\Delta \times \bar{\Delta}) \cup F^{(2)}(\bar{\Delta} \times \partial\Delta))$ , then  $\bar{\Omega}$  is the polynomial hull of  $\mathbf{T}_\psi^2$ .

## 2. - Construction of disks.

It will be more convenient for us to use  $\Psi^{-1}$  rather than  $\Psi$  in (1). If  $\|\psi\|_{C^1}$  is small, then  $\Psi$  gives a diffeomorphism between  $\mathbf{T}^2$  and  $\mathbf{T}_\psi^2$ . If we write  $z^* = \Psi(z)$ , then there exists  $\varphi \in C^{m+3}(\mathbf{T}^2)^2$  such that  $\Phi(z^*) = z$  for  $z \in \mathbf{T}^2$ . For points  $z^* \in \mathbf{T}_\psi^2$ , we may write  $\varphi$  as

$$\varphi_j(z^*) = \frac{-\psi_j(z)}{1 + \psi_j(z)}.$$

Thus there is an open set  $U \subset C^1(\mathbf{T}^2)^2$  containing  $0$  such that we may define

$$S: U \cap C^{m+3}(\mathbf{T}^2)^2 \rightarrow C^{m+2}(\mathbf{T}^2)^2$$

given by  $S(\psi) = \varphi$ , where  $\Phi|_{\mathbf{T}_\psi^2} = \Psi^{-1}$ . By Lemma 5.1 of [5]  $S$  is a mapping of class  $C^1$ . We note also that at  $\psi = 0$ , the differential of this Banach space mapping is the negative of the identity i.e.  $dS(0, \chi) = -\chi$ .

Now let us consider a fixed mapping  $G(\tau, \zeta) = (g_1, g_2) \in C^{m, \alpha}(\partial\Delta \times \bar{\Delta})^2$  such that  $G$  is holomorphic in  $\zeta \in \Delta$ . We assume also that  $G(\partial\Delta \times \partial\Delta) \subset \mathbf{T}_0^2$ . For small  $\psi$  we wish to find  $F_\psi \in C^{m, \alpha}(\partial\Delta \times \bar{\Delta})^2$  such that  $F_\psi(\partial\Delta \times \partial\Delta) \subset \mathbf{T}_\psi^2$ , and  $F_\psi(\tau, \zeta)$  is holomorphic in  $\zeta \in \Delta$ . With our notation, this means that we want

$$(3) \quad \Phi(F_\psi) \in \mathbf{T}_0.$$

Following [2], we write  $F_\psi = (f_1, f_2)$  in « polar » coordinates as

$$f_j(\phi, \theta) = g_j(\phi, \theta) \exp(I + i\mathcal{Y})\varrho_j(\phi, \theta)$$

where  $\tau = |\tau|e^{i\theta}$ ,  $\zeta = |\zeta|e^{i\theta}$ , and  $\mathcal{Y}$  denotes the harmonic conjugate operator acting in the  $\zeta$ -variable. Thus for all functions  $\varrho_j$ ,  $(I + i\mathcal{Y})\varrho_j$  is holomorphic

in  $\zeta$ . We let  $C_{\mathbf{R}}^{m,\alpha}(T^2)$  denote the real valued functions in  $C^{m,\alpha}(T^2)$ . It is well known that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a bounded operator from  $C_{\mathbf{R}}^{m,\alpha}(T^2)$  to itself for  $0 < \alpha < 1$ .

We consider the mapping

$$E: C_{\mathbf{R}}^{m,\alpha}(T^2)^2 \times C^{3m+3}(T^2)^2 \rightarrow C_{\mathbf{R}}^{m,\alpha}(T^2)^2$$

given by

$$E_j(\varrho, \psi) = \log |\Phi_j(F_\psi)| = \log |f_j(1 + \varphi_j(F_\psi))|$$

or

$$(4) \quad E_j(\varrho, \psi) = \varrho_j + \log |1 + \varphi_j(g \exp(I + i\mathcal{Y})\varrho)|.$$

Thus (3) is equivalent to

$$(5) \quad E(\varrho, \psi) = 0.$$

It follows from Lemma 5.1 of [5] that  $E$  is a Banach space mapping of class  $C^1$ . When  $\psi = 0, \varphi = 0$ , so  $d_1 E(d\varrho, 0) = d\varrho$ . It follows by the implicit function theorem that for  $\psi$  near 0 in  $C^{m+3}$  there is a  $\varrho_\psi \in C^{m,\alpha}$  solving (5), and the correspondence  $\psi \rightarrow \varrho_\psi$  is continuous.

*Proof of (2a), (2b), and (2c) of the Theorem.*

Let us set  $G: \partial\Delta \times \Delta \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^2$  equal to the identity mapping  $G(\tau, \zeta) = (\tau, \zeta)$ . By the argument above, we have  $F_\psi^{(1)}: \partial\Delta \times \Delta \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^2$ . To obtain  $F_\psi^{(2)}: \Delta \times \partial\Delta \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^2$ , we replace  $\mathcal{Y}_\theta$  in (4) by  $\mathcal{Y}_\theta$ , the conjugate operator in in the  $\tau$ -variable. By the continuity of  $\psi \rightarrow (F_\psi^{(1)}, F_\psi^{(2)})$ , we have (2a). Now (2b) follows from the definition of  $f_j$ , and (2c) follows from (3).

### 3. – Polynomial hull.

We write  $M_1 = M_1(\psi) = F_\psi^{(2)}(\partial\Delta \times \Delta)$  and  $M_2 = M_2(\psi) = F_\psi^{(1)}(\Delta \times \partial\Delta)$ . Since  $\bar{M}_1(0)$  and  $\bar{M}_2(0)$  intersect transversally at  $T_0^2$ , it follows from (2a) and (2c) that  $\bar{M}_1(\psi)$  and  $\bar{M}_2(\psi)$  are transverse at  $T_\psi^2$ . It follows from the transversality, then, that  $\bar{M}_1(\psi) \cap \bar{M}_2(\psi) = T_\psi^2$ . Thus  $M_1(\psi) \cup M_2(\psi) \cup T_\psi^2$  is homeomorphic to  $S^3$ , and it separates  $\mathbf{C}^2$  into two components. Let  $\Omega(\psi)$  denote the bounded component of  $\mathbf{C}^2 \setminus (\bar{M}_1(\psi) \cup \bar{M}_2(\psi))$ . Clearly  $M_1(\psi)$  and  $M_2(\psi)$  are Levi flat surfaces, and thus they are pseudoconvex from both sides. It follows that  $\bar{M}_1(\psi) \cup \bar{M}_2(\psi)$  is pseudoconvex from the « acute » side of the intersection, and so  $\Omega(\psi)$  is pseudoconvex.

In order to show that  $\overline{\Omega(\psi)}$  is polynomially convex, we will construct a family  $\{\Omega^t\}$  of pseudoconvex domains with the properties:

$$(6a) \quad \Omega^0 = \Omega(\psi), \quad \overline{\Omega(\psi)} = \bigcap_{s>0} \Omega^s.$$

$$(6b) \quad \Omega^s \subset \Omega^t \quad \text{if } s < t$$

$$(6c) \quad \bigcup_{s<t} \Omega^s = \Omega^t \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{t>\infty} \Omega^t = \mathbf{C}^2$$

$$(6d) \quad \text{int} \bigcap_{s>t} \Omega^s = \Omega^t.$$

When the family  $\{\Omega^t\}$  has been constructed, the polynomial convexity of  $\overline{\Omega^0}$  will follow from the Docquier-Grauert Theorem [4].

To construct the domain  $\Omega^t$ , we set

$$\psi_t = \psi + t$$

and

$$\tilde{\psi}_t = (1 + t)^{-1}\psi.$$

Thus  $\|\tilde{\psi}_t\|_{C^{m+3}} \leq \|\psi\|_{C^{m+3}}$  so by Section 2, we have a domain  $\Omega(\tilde{\psi}_t)$  satisfying (2a), (2b), and (2c) of the Theorem. Now we set

$$\Omega^t = (1 + t) \Omega(\tilde{\psi}_t).$$

In order to verify (6 a-d) we need only verify (6b).

To show (6b) we look at the behavior of  $M_1(\psi_s)$  as  $s$  increases. It will suffice to show that for  $t > s$ ,  $|t - s|$  small,  $F_t^{(1)} - F_s^{(1)}$  is transverse to  $\overline{M}_1(\psi_s)$  and points outward.

Let us compute the differential  $dE(\varrho, \psi; \chi_e, \chi_v)$  of  $E$  with respect to the variables  $\varrho$  and  $\psi$  in the directions  $\chi_e$  and  $\chi_v$ , respectively. We find that  $dF(\varrho; \chi_e) = F(I + iY)\chi_e$  and thus

$$(7) \quad dE_j(\varrho, \psi; \chi_e, \chi_v) = \chi_e + |1 + \varphi_j(F)|^{-1} \times \\ \left[ (1 + \text{Re } \varphi_j(F)) (\text{Re } dS(\psi; \chi)(F) + \text{Im } \varphi_j(F) \text{Im } dS(\psi; \chi_v)(F) + \nabla |1 + \varphi_j(F)| \cdot \right. \\ \left. \cdot (F(I + iY)\chi_e) \right]$$

where  $\nabla$  denotes the gradient of  $\varphi_j$  as a function on  $\mathbf{R}^4 = \mathbf{C}^2$ , and  $\cdot$  is the Euclidean inner product on  $\mathbf{R}^4$ , where we have identified  $(a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2)$  with  $(a_1 + ib_1, a_2 + ib_2)$ .

Now let us set (7) equal to zero and consider the mapping  $R: \chi_v \rightarrow \chi_e$ . For  $\psi = 0$ , we have  $\varphi = 0$  and  $dS(0, \chi_v) = -\chi_v$ ; thus  $\chi_e = \text{Re } \chi_v$ . Now

for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small, we have  $|\nabla\varphi| \|\mathcal{Y}\| \ll 1$ , and so  $R$  is a small perturbation of the real part operator. We wish to compare the sets

$$\Omega^s = (1 + s) \Omega(\tilde{\psi}_s)$$

and

$$\Omega^t = (1 + s) \Omega\left(\tilde{\psi}_s + \frac{t-s}{1+s}\right),$$

so we take

$$\chi_\psi = \tilde{\psi}_s + \frac{t-s}{1+s} - \tilde{\psi}_s = \frac{t-s}{1+s}.$$

Since  $R$  is a small perturbation of the identity operator it follows that  $\chi_e > 0$  when  $\chi_\psi = (t-s)/(1+s)$ .

Thus to first order in  $\chi_e$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(1)} - F_s^{(1)} &\approx \tau(\exp(I + i\mathcal{Y})(\varrho_s + \chi_e) - \exp(I + i\mathcal{Y})\varrho_s) \\ &\approx \tau(\exp(I + i\mathcal{Y})\varrho_s((I + i\mathcal{Y})\chi_e). \end{aligned}$$

When  $\psi = 0$ , the outward normal to  $M_1 = \partial\Delta \times \Delta$  at  $(\tau, \zeta)$  is  $\tau$ . Since  $\mathcal{Y}\chi_e$  is bounded in terms of  $\chi_e$  and since  $\chi_e > 0$ , it follows that  $|\text{Arg}(I + i\mathcal{Y})\chi_e| < \kappa < \pi/2$ . Thus by (2a),  $F_t^{(1)} - F_s^{(1)}$  is transverse to  $M_1(\psi_s)$ , and so (6b) holds, which completes the proof.

*Remark added in proof.* The polynomial convexity of  $\overline{\Omega(\psi)}$  may also be seen because it is starshaped with respect to 0.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] H. ALEXANDER, *Hulls of deformations in  $C^n$* .
- [2] E. BEDFORD - B. GAVEAU, *Envelopes of holomorphy of certain 2-spheres in  $C^2$* .
- [3] E. BISHOP, *Differentiable manifolds in complex Euclidean space*, Duke Math. J., **32** (1965), pp. 1-21.
- [4] F. DOCQUIER - H. GRAUERT, *Levisches Problem and Rungescher Satz für Teilgebiete Steinscher Mannigfaltigkeiten*, Math. Ann., **140** (1960), pp. 94-123
- [5] C. D. HILL - G. TAIANI, *Families of analytic disks in  $C^n$  with boundaries in a prescribed CR manifold*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa, **5** (1978), pp. 327-380.

Princeton University,  
Department of Mathematics  
Fine Hall - Box 37  
Princeton, New Jersey 08544