

THE LEWY COUNTEREXAMPLE AND THE LOCAL EQUIVALENCE PROBLEM FOR G-STRUCTURES

V.W. GUILLEMIN & S. STERNBERG

1. Let G be a Lie subgroup of $GL(n)$. Let M_1 and M_2 be differential manifolds of dimension n (in this paper all data will be assumed to be C^∞), and let \mathcal{F}_i , $i = 1, 2$, be the principal frame bundle on M_i . A sub-bundle, P_i , of \mathcal{F}_i with structure group G is called a G -structure on M_i . The G -structure on M_1 is said to be equivalent to the G -structure on M_2 if there exists a diffeomorphism $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ such that the induced diffeomorphism $f^* : \mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2$ carries P_1 into P_2 .

It is usually difficult to decide when two G -structures are equivalent; however the problem is a little simpler if we suppose that one of the structures, say P_1 , is locally transitive, and look only at the local problem. Then the following is a necessary condition for the two structures to be locally equivalent:

* At every point $m_1 \in M_1$ and every point $m_2 \in M_2$ there exists a power series mapping ρ (in local coordinates with origins at m_1 and m_2) such that ρ formally effects a local equivalence between P_1 and P_2 .

It might seem that (*) is not much of an improvement over the original problem; however, by techniques of homological algebra it can be converted into a much simpler statement about the vanishing of certain canonically defined tensors on P_2 (cf. [1], [2], [4]). The main problem therefore is to show that condition (*) is sufficient. This is known to be true in the following important cases:

- 1) G is of finite type.
- 2) The data are real analytic.

According to a recent result of Malgrange (unpublished) it is known to be true when G is elliptic. According to a result of the first author it is true when P_1 is flat. The purpose of this note is to show that condition (*) isn't always sufficient. In fact we will show that in certain cases the solution of the equivalence problem depends on the solution of a system of linear inhomogeneous partial differential equations resembling the Lewy counterexample [3]. These equations are determined, all the data in them are C^∞ and they have no solutions even in the weak (distribution) sense.

2. Let X_1 , X_2 and X_3 be globally defined vector fields on R^3 satisfying the following commutation relations: $[X_1, X_2] = X_3$, $[X_1, X_3] = X_1$, $[X_2, X_3] = -X_2$. (Take for example the standard basis of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ and identify R^3 with a subset of $SO(3)$ under the mapping $\exp: \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow$

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_* X_i &= f_* \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 c_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right) \\
 (2.3) \quad &= \sum_{j=1}^3 c_{ij} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \frac{\partial \phi_\alpha}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha} \right) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{L}_{x_i} f_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \mathcal{L}_{x_i} \phi_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha}.
 \end{aligned}$$

However, $f_* X_i$ must be the form

$$X_i + \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 h_{\alpha i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha},$$

where $h_{\alpha i}$ is a 2×3 matrix of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a, & b, & c \\ -b, & a, & d \end{pmatrix}.$$

From (2.1) we get a condition on f_1, f_2, f_3 , namely, $f_1(x), f_2(x), f_3(x)$ must define a diffeomorphism of R^3 into itself preserving X_1, X_2, X_3 .

We also get two conditions on ϕ_1, ϕ_2 :

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_1} \phi_2 - \mathcal{L}_{X_2} \phi_1 = 0, \quad \mathcal{L}_{X_1} \phi_2 + \mathcal{L}_{X_2} \phi_1 = 0.$$

These two equations can be more compactly written in complex form:

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{L}_{X_1 + \sqrt{-1}X_2} (\varphi_1 + \sqrt{-1}\varphi_2) = 0.$$

Summing up what has been proved above:

Proposition 1. *The diffeomorphisms of P_1 consist of all mappings of R^5 into R^5 of the form:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 x'_i &= f_i(x), & i &= 1, 2, 3, \\
 y'_\alpha &= y_\alpha + \phi_\alpha(x), & \alpha &= 1, 2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$ belongs to the (local) Lie group on R^3 associated with X_1, X_2, X_3 , and ϕ_1, ϕ_2 satisfy (2.4).

It is clear from Proposition 1 that the G -structure described above is transitive. In fact, it is frame transitive (the family of mappings induced on P_1 is transitive) and involutive (cf. [1] for definitions).

Now we consider another G -structure defined on R^5 as follows. Let

$$X'_i = X_i + \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 g_{\alpha i}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha}$$

where the $g_{\alpha i}$ are for the moment unspecified functions of x . Let P_2 be the G -structure obtained by applying all the matrices (2.1) to the moving frame

$$X'_1, X'_2, X'_3, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_2}.$$

We will consider what is involved in proving that P_1 and P_2 are locally equivalent. We must be able to find a local diffeomorphism f , of R^5 into R^5 with the property:

$$\begin{aligned} f_* X_i &= X'_i + \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 h_{\alpha i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha}, & i = 1, 2, 3, \\ f_* \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha}, & \alpha = 1, 2, \end{aligned}$$

where $(h_{\alpha i})$ is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a, & -b, & c \\ b, & a, & d \end{pmatrix}.$$

By an argument similar to that above we can show that f must have the following form in coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} x'_i &= f_i(x), & i = 1, 2, 3, \\ y'_\alpha &= y_\alpha + \phi_\alpha(x), & \alpha = 1, 2, \end{aligned}$$

where the conditions on f_1, f_2, f_3 are the same as in Proposition 1, but ϕ_1, ϕ_2 must satisfy the equation

$$(2.5) \quad (\mathcal{L}_{X_1 + \sqrt{-1} X_2})(\phi_1 + \sqrt{-1} \phi_2) = g_1 + \sqrt{-1} g_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &= g_{11}(\cdots, f_i(x), \cdots) - g_{22}(\cdots, f_i(x), \cdots), \\ g_2 &= g_{12}(\cdots, f_i(x), \cdots) + g_{21}(\cdots, f_i(x), \cdots). \end{aligned}$$

Lewy has shown that one can always choose the right hand side of (2.5) such that even locally it is impossible to find C^1 functions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 which satisfy (2.5). On the other hand this equation is always formally solvable; so the condition (*) of §1 is certainly satisfied by P_1 and P_2 . We can therefore conclude that (*) does not always guarantee that the two structures are locally equivalent.

Bibliography

- [1] V. W. Guillemin, *The integrability problem for G -structures*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **116** (1965) 544–560.
- [2] V. W. Guillemin & S. Sternberg, *Deformation theory of pseudogroup structures*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. No. 64, 1966.
- [3] H. Lewy, *An example of a smooth linear partial differential equation without solution*, Ann. of Math. 66 (1957) 155–158.
- [4] S. Sternberg, *Lectures on differential geometry*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964, Chapter VII.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

