Renormalization for irrationally indifferent fixed points of holomorphic functions

Mitsuhiro Shishikura Kyoto University

Frontiers in Complex Dynamics Celebrating John Milnor's 80th birthday BIRS, Banff, Canada February 23, 2011

Frontiers in Complex Dynamics

use renormalization!

Frontiers in Complex Dynamics include *boundaries* of Siegel disks

Frontiers in Complex Dynamics include *boundaries* of Siegel disks



use renormalization!

Frontiers in Complex Dynamics include *boundaries* of Siegel disks want to show that they are Jordan curves under some condition

Typical argument to show that some objects are continuous curves: for example, $J(z^2 + \varepsilon)$ is a Jordan curve

Typical argument to show that some objects are continuous curves: for example, $J(z^2 + \varepsilon)$ is a Jordan curve



Typical argument to show that some objects are continuous curves: for example, $J(z^2 + \varepsilon)$ is a Jordan curve



Typical argument to show that some objects are continuous curves: for example, $J(z^2 + \varepsilon)$ is a Jordan curve



Typical argument to show that some objects are continuous curves: for example, $J(z^2 + \varepsilon)$ is a Jordan curve



Conclusions from Informal Discussion:

Typical argument to show that some objects are continuous curves: for example, $J(z^2 + \varepsilon)$ is a Jordan curve



Conclusions from Informal Discussion: Lifts are important.

Typical argument to show that some objects are continuous curves: for example, $J(z^2 + \varepsilon)$ is a Jordan curve



Conclusions from Informal Discussion: Lifts are important. When lifts are not available, need to look for alternatives. *use renormalization!*

Typical argument to show that some objects are continuous curves: for example, $J(z^2 + \varepsilon)$ is a Jordan curve



Conclusions from Informal Discussion:
Lifts are important.
When lifts are not available, need to look for alternatives.
Gondola, T-bar, ... use renormalization!

Tame (zero entropy, minimal)

Tame (zero entropy, minimal)

Chaotic (positive entropy)

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Chaotic (positive entropy)

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Chaotic (positive entropy) Robust (stable under perturbation)

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Rigid (conjugacy is smooth) Chaotic (positive entropy) Robust (stable under perturbation)

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Rigid (conjugacy is smooth) Chaotic (positive entropy) Robust (stable under perturbation) Non-rigid (conj. not smooth)

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Rigid (conjugacy is smooth) Chaotic (positive entropy) Robust (stable under perturbation) Non-rigid (conj. not smooth)

 \mathbb{S}^1

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Rigid (conjugacy is smooth)

irrat. rotation α irrational



 \mathbb{S}^1

 $t \mapsto t + \alpha \mod \mathbb{Z}$

Chaotic (positive entropy) Robust (stable under perturbation) Non-rigid (conj. not smooth)

 \mathbb{S}^1

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Rigid (conjugacy is smooth)

irrat. rotation α irrational



 $t \mapsto t + \alpha \mod \mathbb{Z}$

Chaotic (positive entropy)Robust (stable under perturbation)Non-rigid (conj. not smooth)

doubling map



 $t \mapsto 2t \mod \mathbb{Z}$

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Rigid (conjugacy is smooth)

irrat. rotation α irrational



 $t\mapsto t+\alpha \!\!\mod \mathbb{Z}$

Chaotic (positive entropy)Robust (stable under perturbation)Non-rigid (conj. not smooth)

doubling map



 $t \mapsto 2t \mod \mathbb{Z}$

 $T_1 \Sigma_g$ ($\Sigma_g \text{ surface } g \ge 2$)

 \mathbb{S}^1

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Rigid (conjugacy is smooth)

irrat. rotation α irrational



 $t\mapsto t+\alpha \!\!\mod \mathbb{Z}$

Chaotic (positive entropy)Robust (stable under perturbation)Non-rigid (conj. not smooth)

doubling map



 $t \mapsto 2t \mod \mathbb{Z}$

 $T_1\Sigma_g$

 \mathbb{S}^1

 $(\Sigma_g \text{ surface } g \ge 2)$



 \mathbb{S}^1

Tame (zero entropy, minimal) Fragile (easy to destroy) Rigid (conjugacy is smooth)

irrat. rotation α irrational



 $t\mapsto t+\alpha \!\!\mod \mathbb{Z}$

Chaotic (positive entropy) Robust (stable under perturbation) Non-rigid (conj. not smooth)

doubling map



 $t \mapsto 2t \mod \mathbb{Z}$

horocyclic flow $T_1 \Sigma_g$ (Σ_g surface $g \ge 2$) geodesic flow

Two extreme dynamics are often related ("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair")

Two extreme dynamics are often related
("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair")TameChaotic

Two extreme dynamics are often related
("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair")TameChaotic $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $F: t \mapsto 2t \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$

Two extreme dynamics are often related
("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair")TameChaotic $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $F: t \mapsto 2t \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$

 $R^2_{\alpha} \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$

Two extreme dynamics are often related
("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair")TameChaotic $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $F: t \mapsto 2t \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R_{\alpha}^2 \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$

horocyclic flow h^t on $T_1 \Sigma_g$ (stable)

geodesic flow g^t on $T_1 \Sigma_g$

Two extreme dynamics are often related
("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair")TameChaotic $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $F: t \mapsto 2t \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R_{\alpha}^2 \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$

horocyclic flow h^t on $T_1 \Sigma_g$ (stable)

geodesic flow
$$g^t$$
 on $T_1 \Sigma_g$

$$h^{\lambda t} \circ g^t = g^t \circ h^t$$

Two extreme dynamics are often related
("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair")TameChaotic $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha$ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} $F: t \mapsto 2t$ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} $R_{\alpha}^{2} \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$ $F: t \mapsto 2t$ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} horocyclic flow h^{t} on $T_{1}\Sigma_{g}$ geodesic flow g^{t} on $T_{1}\Sigma_{g}$ $h^{\lambda t} \circ g^{t} = g^{t} \circ h^{t}$ geodesic flow g^{t} on $T_{1}\Sigma_{g}$

shift σ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ $x_0 x_1 x_2 \dots \mapsto x_1 x_2 x_3 \dots$

Two extreme dynamics are often related ("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair") Chaotic Tame $F: t \mapsto 2t$ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R^2_{\alpha} \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$ geodesic flow g^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ horocyclic flow h^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ (stable) $h^{\lambda t} \circ q^t = q^t \circ h^t$ shift σ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ adding machine τ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ $x_0x_1x_2\ldots \mapsto x_1x_2x_3\ldots$ $1110010\ldots \mapsto 0001010\ldots$

Two extreme dynamics are often related ("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair") Chaotic Tame $F: t \mapsto 2t$ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R^2_{\alpha} \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$ geodesic flow g^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ horocyclic flow h^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ (stable) $h^{\lambda t} \circ q^t = q^t \circ h^t$ shift σ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ adding machine τ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ $1110010\ldots \mapsto 0001010\ldots$ $x_0x_1x_2\ldots \mapsto x_1x_2x_3\ldots$ $\sigma \circ \tau^2 = \tau \circ \sigma$
Two extreme dynamics are often related ("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair") Tame Chaotic $F: t \mapsto 2t \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R^2_{\alpha} \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$ geodesic flow g^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ horocyclic flow h^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ (stable) $h^{\lambda t} \circ q^t = q^t \circ h^t$ shift σ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ adding machine τ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ $1110010\ldots \mapsto 0001010\ldots$ $x_0x_1x_2\ldots \mapsto x_1x_2x_3\ldots$ $\sigma \circ \tau^2 = \tau \circ \sigma$

Anosov diffeo F on T^2

Two extreme dynamics are often related ("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair") Chaotic Tame $F: t \mapsto 2t$ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R^2_{\alpha} \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$ geodesic flow g^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ horocyclic flow h^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ (stable) $h^{\lambda t} \circ q^t = q^t \circ h^t$ shift σ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ adding machine τ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ $1110010\ldots \mapsto 0001010\ldots$ $x_0x_1x_2\ldots \mapsto x_1x_2x_3\ldots$ $\sigma \circ \tau^2 = \tau \circ \sigma$ irrat. flow ϕ^t on T^2

(along expanding direction of F)

Anosov diffeo F on T^2

Two extreme dynamics are often related ("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair") Chaotic Tame $F: t \mapsto 2t \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R^2_{\alpha} \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$ geodesic flow g^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ horocyclic flow h^t on $T_1 \Sigma_a$ (stable) $h^{\lambda t} \circ q^t = q^t \circ h^t$ shift σ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ adding machine τ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ $1110010\ldots \mapsto 0001010\ldots$ $x_0x_1x_2\ldots \mapsto x_1x_2x_3\ldots$ $\sigma \circ \tau^2 = \tau \circ \sigma$ Anosov diffeo F on T^2 irrat. flow ϕ^t on T^2

(along expanding direction of F)

 $\phi^{\lambda t} \circ F = F \circ \phi^t$

Two extreme dynamics are often related ("intertwining relation" or "renormalization pair") Chaotic Tame $F: t \mapsto 2t$ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} $R_{\alpha}: t \mapsto t + \alpha \text{ on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ $R^2_{\alpha} \circ F = F \circ R_{\alpha}$ geodesic flow g^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ horocyclic flow h^t on $T_1 \Sigma_q$ (stable) $h^{\lambda t} \circ q^t = q^t \circ h^t$ shift σ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ adding machine τ on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ $1110010\ldots \mapsto 0001010\ldots$ $x_0x_1x_2\ldots \mapsto x_1x_2x_3\ldots$ $\sigma \circ \tau^2 = \tau \circ \sigma$

irrat. flow ϕ^t on T^2 (along expanding direction of *F*)

$$\phi^{\lambda t} \circ F = F \circ \phi^t$$

Anosov diffeo F on T^2

Conjugation by chaotic one is like a time change for tame one













 $\mathcal{R}f = (\text{first return map of } f) \text{ after rescaling}$ $= g \circ f^k \circ g^{-1} \quad (\text{if return time} \equiv k)$



 $\mathcal{R}f = (\text{first return map of } f) \text{ after rescaling}$ $= g \circ f^k \circ g^{-1} \quad (\text{if return time} \equiv k)$ Renormalization



 $\mathcal{R}f = (\text{first return map of } f) \text{ after rescaling}$ = $g \circ f^k \circ g^{-1}$ (if return time $\equiv k$) *Renormalization*

high iterates of f \longleftrightarrow fewer iterates of $\mathcal{R}f$ fine orbit structure for f \longleftrightarrow large scale orbit structure for $\mathcal{R}f$ Successive construction of $\mathcal{R}f, \mathcal{R}^2f, \ldots$, helps to understand the dynamics of f (orbits, invariant sets, rigidity, bifurcation, ...)



 $\mathcal{R}f = (\text{first return map of } f) \text{ after rescaling}$ $= g \circ f^k \circ g^{-1} \quad (\text{if return time} \equiv k)$ Renormalization

high iterates of f \longleftrightarrow fewer iterates of $\mathcal{R}f$ fine orbit structure for f \longleftrightarrow large scale orbit structure for $\mathcal{R}f$ Successive construction of $\mathcal{R}f, \mathcal{R}^2f, \ldots$, helps to understand the dynamics of f (orbits, invariant sets, rigidity, bifurcation, ...)

If f is a fixed point of renormalization \mathcal{R} (with return time $\equiv k$), then $g \circ f^k \circ g^{-1} = f$, i.e. $g \circ f^k = f \circ g$ (intertwining relation).



 $\mathcal{R}f = (\text{first return map of } f) \text{ after rescaling}$ $= g \circ f^k \circ g^{-1} \quad (\text{if return time} \equiv k)$ Renormalization

high iterates of f \longleftrightarrow fewer iterates of $\mathcal{R}f$ fine orbit structure for f \longleftrightarrow large scale orbit structure for $\mathcal{R}f$ Successive construction of $\mathcal{R}f, \mathcal{R}^2f, \ldots$, helps to understand the dynamics of f (orbits, invariant sets, rigidity, bifurcation, ...)

If f is a fixed point of renormalization \mathcal{R} (with return time $\equiv k$), then $g \circ f^k \circ g^{-1} = f$, i.e. $g \circ f^k = f \circ g$ (intertwining relation).

Usually f tame and g expanding (chaotic).

f



I = [0, 1]

















 $J \subset I$ s.t. $f^2(J) \subset J$

Renormalization: Meta-dynamics Dynamics on the space of certain dynamical systems



I = [0, 1]



 $J \subset I$ s.t. $f^2(J) \subset J$

Renormalization: Meta-dynamics Dynamics *on the space of certain dynamical systems*

Hyperbolic fixed point or hyperbolic horseshoe of the meta-dynamics imply conclusion on rigidity and structure of parameter space



I = [0, 1]



 $J \subset I$ s.t. $f^2(J) \subset J$



Renormalization: Meta-dynamics Dynamics on the space of certain dynamical systems

Hyperbolic fixed point or hyperbolic horseshoe of the meta-dynamics imply conclusion on rigidity and structure of parameter space



Feigenbaum

Feigenbaum



Feigenbaum



Feigenbaum



proper subintervals

Feigenbaum



proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum



proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich

Feigenbaum

Circle map



proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich
Feigenbaum





proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich

Feigenbaum







proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich

Feigenbaum







proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich

partition of interval

Feigenbaum







proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich

partition of interval

Rand, Khanin-Sinai, de Faria, Yampolsky, A. Epstein-Yamplosky







proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich

partition of interval

Rand, Khanin-Sinai, de Faria, Yampolsky, A. Epstein-Yamplosky Sector/Near-parabolic



proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich

partition of interval

Rand, Khanin-Sinai, de Faria, Yampolsky, A. Epstein-Yamplosky



proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich





partition of interval

Rand, Khanin-Sinai, de Faria, Yampolsky, A. Epstein-Yamplosky

Sector/Near-parabolic



covering by sector or croissant-like domains





proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich





partition of interval

Rand, Khanin-Sinai, de Faria, Yampolsky, A. Epstein-Yamplosky Sector/Near-parabolic



covering by sector or croissant-like domains gluing/identification needed to define the renormalization





proper subintervals

-> Cantor set

Feigenbaum, Coullet-Tresser, Lanford, H. Epstein, Polynomial-like maps: Douady-Hubbard, Sullivan, McMullen, Lyubich





partition of interval

Rand, Khanin-Sinai, de Faria, Yampolsky, A. Epstein-Yamplosky Sector/Near-parabolic



covering by sector or croissant-like domains gluing/identification needed to define the renormalization

Yoccoz, Perez-Marco, Inou-S.

Irrationally indifferent fixed points $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$

 $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$

Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

$$f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$$

Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs)

$$f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$$

Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs) Siegel disk

 $\overline{f(z)} = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$



Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs) Siegel disk

 $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$



Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs) Siegel disk

Siegel-Bruno Theorem

If α satisfies Bruno condition $\left(\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n} < \infty \text{ for the convergents } p_n/q_n \text{ of } \alpha\right)$, then $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \ldots$ can be linearized. (Yoccoz: the radius of convergence $> C \exp\left(-\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n}\right)$ if f is univalent in $\{|z| < 1\}$.)

 $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$



Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs) Siegel disk

Siegel-Bruno Theorem

If α satisfies Bruno condition $\left(\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n} < \infty \text{ for the convergents } p_n/q_n \text{ of } \alpha\right)$, then $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ can be linearized. (Yoccoz: the radius of convergence $> C \exp\left(-\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n}\right)$ if f is univalent in $\{|z| < 1\}$.) Proof by Yoccoz uses the renormalization

 $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$



Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs) Siegel disk

Siegel-Bruno Theorem

If α satisfies Bruno condition $\left(\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n} < \infty \text{ for the convergents } p_n/q_n \text{ of } \alpha\right)$, then $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ can be linearized. (Yoccoz: the radius of convergence $> C \exp\left(-\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n}\right)$ if f is univalent in $\{|z| < 1\}$.) Proof by Yoccoz uses the renormalization

Yoccoz Theorem

If α does not satisfy Bruno condition, then there exists $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ which cannot be linearized. (In fact, $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + z^2$.)

 $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$



Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs) Siegel disk

Siegel-Bruno Theorem

If α satisfies Bruno condition $\left(\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n} < \infty \text{ for the convergents } p_n/q_n \text{ of } \alpha\right)$, then $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ can be linearized. (Yoccoz: the radius of convergence $> C \exp\left(-\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n}\right)$ if f is univalent in $\{|z| < 1\}$.) Proof by Yoccoz uses the renormalization

Yoccoz Theorem

If α does not satisfy Bruno condition, then there exists $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ which cannot be linearized. (In fact, $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + z^2$.)

Yoccoz renormalization

 $f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$

 $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$



Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs) Siegel disk

Siegel-Bruno Theorem

If α satisfies Bruno condition $\left(\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n} < \infty \text{ for the convergents } p_n/q_n \text{ of } \alpha\right)$, then $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ can be linearized. (Yoccoz: the radius of convergence $> C \exp\left(-\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n}\right)$ if f is univalent in $\{|z| < 1\}$.) Proof by Yoccoz uses the renormalization

Yoccoz Theorem

If α does not satisfy Bruno condition, then there exists $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ which cannot be linearized. (In fact, $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + z^2$.)

Yoccoz renormalization

$$f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$$

 $\alpha_{n+1} = \text{fractional part of } \frac{1}{\alpha_n}$

 $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Q}$



Linearization: local conjugacy to its linear part $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i \alpha} z$

and beyond: boundary of linearization domain, invariant sets (hedgehogs) Siegel disk

Siegel-Bruno Theorem

If α satisfies Bruno condition $\left(\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n} < \infty \text{ for the convergents } p_n/q_n \text{ of } \alpha\right)$, then $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ can be linearized. (Yoccoz: the radius of convergence $> C \exp\left(-\sum \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n}\right)$ if f is univalent in $\{|z| < 1\}$.) Proof by Yoccoz uses the renormalization

Yoccoz Theorem

If α does not satisfy Bruno condition, then there exists $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + \dots$ which cannot be linearized. (In fact, $f(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z + z^2$.)

Yoccoz renormalization

$$f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$$

 $\alpha_{n+1} = \text{fractional part of } \frac{1}{\alpha_n}$

Gauss map for continued fractions

$$f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$$



$$f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$$

$$f_n$$
•

$$f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$$

$$f_n$$

 $f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$



$$f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$$



$$f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$$

$$f_n$$

$$glue$$

$$f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$$













Yoccoz renormalization for Siegel-Bruno Theorem $f_n(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_n} z + \dots \iff f_{n+1}(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha_{n+1}} z + \dots$ f_n first return map glue uniformize






















































 $\mathcal{R}f$ can be defined when $f(z) = e^{2\pi i\alpha}z + \dots$ is a small perturbation of $z + a_2 z^2 + \dots (a_2 \neq 0)$ and $|\arg \alpha| < \pi/4$.

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Irrat_N$ be the set of irrational number of high type:



For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Irrat_N$ be the set of irrational number of high type:

$$Irrat_N \ni \alpha = \pm \frac{1}{a_1 \pm \frac{1}{a_2 \pm \frac{1}{\ddots}}} \quad \text{where } a_i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } a_i \ge N,$$

For a neighborhood V of 0, define $P(z) = z(1+z)^2$ and

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \left\{ f = P \circ \varphi^{-1} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \varphi : V \to \mathbb{C} \text{ is univalent (with qc extension)} \\ \varphi(0) = 0, \ \varphi'(0) = 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Irrat_N$ be the set of irrational number of high type:

$$Irrat_N \ni \alpha = \pm \frac{1}{a_1 \pm \frac{1}{a_2 \pm \frac{1}{\ddots}}} \quad \text{where } a_i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } a_i \ge N,$$

For a neighborhood V of 0, define $P(z) = z(1+z)^2$ and

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \left\{ f = P \circ \varphi^{-1} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \varphi : V \to \mathbb{C} \text{ is univalent (with qc extension)} \\ \varphi(0) = 0, \ \varphi'(0) = 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

Theorem (Inou & S.): For some V and N, the near-parabolic renormalization \mathcal{R} from

$$\{e^{2\pi i\alpha}f: \alpha \in Irrat_N, f \in \mathcal{F}_1\} = Irrat_N \times \mathcal{F}_1$$

is well defined and expanding along α direction and uniformly contracting along \mathcal{F}_1 direction. Moreover $\mathcal{R}(e^{2\pi i\alpha}z + z^2)$ belong to the above set for $\alpha \in Irrat_N$.









$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \left\{ f = P \circ \varphi^{-1} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \varphi : V \to \mathbb{C} \text{ is univalent (with qc extension)} \\ \varphi(0) = 0, \ \varphi'(0) = 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

A priori bound:



A priori bound: $\mathcal{R}: e^{2\pi i\alpha}P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longmapsto e^{-2\pi i/\alpha}P \circ \psi^{-1}$



A priori bound: $\mathcal{R}: e^{2\pi i\alpha} P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longmapsto e^{-2\pi i/\alpha} P \circ \psi^{-1}$ ψ satisfies the same condition as φ . In fact, it extends to a fixed domain containing \overline{V} .



A priori bound: $\mathcal{R}: e^{2\pi i\alpha} P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longmapsto e^{-2\pi i/\alpha} P \circ \psi^{-1}$ ψ satisfies the same condition as φ . In fact, it extends to a fixed domain containing \overline{V} .

Hyperbolicity:



A priori bound: $\mathcal{R}: e^{2\pi i\alpha} P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longmapsto e^{-2\pi i/\alpha} P \circ \psi^{-1}$ ψ satisfies the same condition as φ . In fact, it extends to a fixed domain containing \overline{V} .

Hyperbolicity: $P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longleftrightarrow \varphi \longleftrightarrow [\tilde{\varphi}] \in Teich(\mathbb{C} \smallsetminus V)$ where $\tilde{\varphi}$ is a qc-extension of φ to $\mathbb{C} \smallsetminus V$



A priori bound: $\mathcal{R}: e^{2\pi i\alpha} P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longmapsto e^{-2\pi i/\alpha} P \circ \psi^{-1}$ ψ satisfies the same condition as φ . In fact, it extends to a fixed domain containing \overline{V} .

Hyperbolicity: $P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longleftrightarrow \varphi \longleftrightarrow [\tilde{\varphi}] \in Teich(\mathbb{C} \smallsetminus V)$

where $\tilde{\varphi}$ is a qc-extension of φ to $\mathbb{C} \setminus V$ Royden-Gardiner: Holomorphic map between Teichmüller spaces are weakly contracting.



A priori bound: $\mathcal{R}: e^{2\pi i\alpha} P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longmapsto e^{-2\pi i/\alpha} P \circ \psi^{-1}$ ψ satisfies the same condition as φ . In fact, it extends to a fixed domain containing \overline{V} .

Hyperbolicity: $P \circ \varphi^{-1} \longleftrightarrow \varphi \longleftrightarrow [\tilde{\varphi}] \in Teich(\mathbb{C} \smallsetminus V)$

where $\tilde{\varphi}$ is a qc-extension of φ to $\mathbb{C} \setminus V$ Royden-Gardiner: Holomorphic map between Teichmüller spaces are weakly contracting.

 ψ conformal near $\partial V \Longrightarrow$ strict contraction.

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \alpha = 0 \\ \mbox{parabolic fixed point} \end{tabular} \end{tabular} \end{tabular} \end{tabular} \end{tabular}$

$\alpha = 0$ parabolic fixed point



$\alpha = 0$ parabolic fixed point





$\alpha = 0$ parabolic fixed point













irrat. indiff. (near-parabolic)



irrat. indiff. (near-parabolic)

use Douady-Hubbard-Lavaurs theory of parabolic implosion



irrat. indiff. (near-parabolic)



use Douady-Hubbard-Lavaurs theory of parabolic implosion











irrat. indiff. (near-parabolic)





use Douady-Hubbard-Lavaurs theory of parabolic implosion









 F_{can} ($\infty = \text{fixed pt}$)









use Douady-Hubbard-Lavaurs theory of parabolic implosion
More on a priori bound



















use Douady-Hubbard-Lavaurs theory of parabolic implosion















With many estimates, one can show that this much of the pattern is preserved.







For applications, we need to see how to reconstruct f from its renormalizations.

For applications, we need to see how to reconstruct f from its renormalizations. For simplicity, let us consider the sector renormalization:

f














































In the case of near-parabolic renormalization, chart can be taken as



In the case of near-parabolic renormalization, chart can be taken as



In the case of near-parabolic renormalization, chart can be taken as



In the case of near-parabolic renormalization, chart can be taken as



dynamics:

1. well-defined after gluing

In the case of near-parabolic renormalization, chart can be taken as



1. well-defined after gluing 2. return map is F_{can} modulo ψ_g

In the case of near-parabolic renormalization, chart can be taken as



1. well-defined after gluing 2. return map is F_{can} modulo ψ_g 3. this picture embeds into f

In the case of near-parabolic renormalization, chart can be taken as



1. well-defined after gluing 2. return map is F_{can} modulo ψ_g 3. this picture embeds into f



























Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Construct approximate boundary curves by joining segments in $\Omega_{f,k_1,\ldots,k_n}^{(n)}$ in its canonical coordinate. They converge exponentially.

height of the approx. curve: $h_n = B(\alpha_n)$

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Construct approximate boundary curves by joining segments in $\Omega_{f,k_1,\ldots,k_n}^{(n)}$ in its canonical coordinate. They converge exponentially.

height of the approx. curve: $h_n = B(\alpha_n)$

mapping $\Omega_{f,k_1}^{(1)} \to \Omega_{\mathcal{R}f}^{(0)}$ is uniformly expanding (with respect to Poincaré metrics of $\Omega_f^{(0)}$ and $\Omega_{\mathcal{R}f}^{(0)}$)

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

Construct approximate boundary curves by joining segments in $\Omega_{f,k_1,\ldots,k_n}^{(n)}$ in its canonical coordinate. They converge exponentially.

height of the approx. curve: $h_n = B(\alpha_n)$

mapping $\Omega_{f,k_1}^{(1)} \to \Omega_{\mathcal{R}f}^{(0)}$ is uniformly expanding (with respect to Poincaré metrics of $\Omega_f^{(0)}$ and $\Omega_{\mathcal{R}f}^{(0)}$)

One only needs to work in model space (i.e. truncated checkerboard pattern)

Idea of the proof: Construct approximating curves and show that they converge.



approximation of bdry of Siegel disk

expanding

Construct approximate boundary curves by joining segments in $\Omega_{f,k_1,\ldots,k_n}^{(n)}$ in its canonical coordinate. They converge exponentially.

height of the approx. curve: $h_n = B(\alpha_n)$

mapping $\Omega_{f,k_1}^{(1)} \to \Omega_{\mathcal{R}f}^{(0)}$ is uniformly expanding (with respect to Poincaré metrics of $\Omega_f^{(0)}$ and $\Omega_{\mathcal{R}f}^{(0)}$)

One only needs to work in model space (i.e. truncated checkerboard pattern)

Happy Birthday, Jack!