

**BMO ON THE BERGMAN SPACES
 OF THE CLASSICAL DOMAINS**

C. A. BERGER, L. A. COBURN AND K. H. ZHU

Let Ω be a bounded symmetric (Cartan) domain with its Harish-Chandra realization in \mathbf{C}^n [T]. For dv the usual Euclidean volume measure on $\mathbf{C}^n = \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, normalized so that $v(\Omega) = 1$, we consider the Hilbert space of square-integrable complex-valued functions $L^2 = L^2(\Omega, dv)$ and the Bergman subspace $H^2 = H^2(\Omega)$ of holomorphic functions in L^2 . The self-adjoint projection from L^2 onto H^2 is denoted by P . For f, g in L^2 , we consider the *multiplication operator* M_f on L^2 given by $M_f g = fg$ and the *Hankel operator* H_f on L^2 given by $H_f = (I - P)M_f P$. For f in L^2 , these operators are only densely defined and may be unbounded. The commutator $[M_f, P] = M_f P - P M_f$ is densely defined on L^2 and may also be unbounded. From the equations

$$[M_f, P] = H_f - H_{\bar{f}}^*, \quad (I - P)[M_f, P] = H_f, \quad [M_f, P](I - P) = -H_{\bar{f}}^*,$$

it follows that $[M_f, P]$ is a bounded operator if and only if $H_f, H_{\bar{f}}$ are bounded. Moreover, $[M_f, P]$ is a compact operator if and only if $H_f, H_{\bar{f}}$ are compact.

In earlier work [BCZ], it was shown that for f in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, the algebra of bounded measurable functions on Ω , $[M_f, P]$ is compact if and only if f has vanishing mean oscillation at the boundary $\partial\Omega$, where oscillation is defined in terms of the Bergman metric on Ω . In this note, we announce the companion result: *For f in L^2 , $[M_f, P]$ is bounded if and only if f is of "bounded mean oscillation on Ω ", where oscillation is defined as in [BCZ].* The space of such functions is denoted by $\text{BMO}(\Omega)$. We also obtain the expected result that: *For f in L^2 , $[M_f, P]$ is compact if and only if f is in the subspace $\text{VMO}_\partial(\Omega)$ of functions which have vanishing mean oscillation at the boundary $\partial\Omega$.* Our results are analogous to known results for arc-length measure on the unit circle [G, p. 278] and demonstrate the value of the Bergman metric in function-theoretic analysis on the classical domains.

Let $K(\cdot, a)$ be the Bergman reproducing kernel in $H^2(\Omega)$ for evaluation at $a \in \Omega$. For

$$k_a(\cdot) = K(a, a)^{-1/2} K(\cdot, a),$$

we define the *Berezin transform* of f in L^2 [BCZ] by

$$\tilde{f}(a) = \langle f k_a, k_a \rangle$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the usual L^2 inner product. For typographical reasons, we write the Berezin transform of $|f|^2$ as $(|f|^2)^\sim$. It follows from known properties of

Received by the editors January 20, 1987.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification* (1985 *Revision*). Primary 32M15; Secondary 32A40, 30C40.

Research supported by National Science Foundation grants.

the $\{k_a\}$ that \tilde{f} is defined and smooth (C^∞) everywhere on Ω . The transform \tilde{f} is critical to our analysis as are some previously unremarked properties of the Bergman metric $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ on Ω [K, p. 45; H, p. 298]. In the remainder of this note, we provide enough detail to rigorously state our main results and the main technical lemmas required for the proofs.

We recall that the Bergman metric $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a complete Riemannian metric on Ω which gives the usual topology on Ω [H, p. 52]. Moreover, the closed metric balls

$$E(a, r) = \{z: \beta(a, z) \leq r\}$$

are compact [H, p. 56]. By definition [K, p. 45], β is the “integrated form” of the infinitesimal metric

$$g_{ij}(z) = 1/2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} \log K(z, z).$$

By $z \rightarrow \partial\Omega$, we mean that the usual distance function

$$d(z, \partial\Omega) \equiv \inf\{|z - w|: w \in \partial\Omega\}$$

has the property that $d(z, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow 0$. Let $BC(\Omega)$ denote the algebra of bounded continuous functions on Ω , with $C_\partial(\Omega)$ the subalgebra of all continuous functions for which $f(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \partial\Omega$. For f continuous on Ω , we define

$$\text{Osc}_z(f) = \sup\{|f(z) - f(w)|: \beta(z, w) \leq 1\}.$$

It is not hard to check, using the completeness of β , that $\text{Osc}_z(f)$ is also a continuous function of z . We say f is of *bounded oscillation* ($f \in \text{BO}(\Omega)$) if $\text{Osc}_z(f)$ is in $BC(\Omega)$ (as a function of z). We say f is of *vanishing oscillation at $\partial\Omega$* ($f \in \text{VO}_\partial(\Omega)$) if $\text{Osc}_z(f)$ is in $C_\partial(\Omega)$ (as a function of z) (cf. [BCZ]). For f in L^2 , the quantity

$$\text{MO}(f, z) = (|f|^2)^\sim(z) - |\tilde{f}(z)|^2$$

is a continuous function on Ω . We say f is of *bounded mean oscillation on Ω* ($f \in \text{BMO}(\Omega)$) if $\text{MO}(f, \cdot)$ is in $BC(\Omega)$. We say f has *vanishing mean oscillation at $\partial\Omega$* ($f \in \text{VMO}_\partial(\Omega)$) if $\text{MO}(f, \cdot)$ is in $C_\partial(\Omega)$.

We also have a more geometric notion of mean oscillation. Let $|E(z, r)| = v(E(z, r))$. For fixed $r > 0$ and f in L^2 , the quantities

$$\hat{f}(z, r) = |E(z, r)|^{-1} \int_{E(z, r)} f(w) dv(w),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MO}_r(f, z) &= |E(z, r)|^{-1} \int_{E(z, r)} |f(w) - \hat{f}(z, r)|^2 dv(w) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |E(z, r)|^{-2} \int_{E(z, r)} \int_{E(z, r)} |f(w) - f(u)|^2 dv(w) dv(u) \end{aligned}$$

are continuous functions on Ω . We say f in L^2 is in $\text{BMO}_r(\Omega)$ if $\text{MO}_r(f, \cdot)$ is in $BC(\Omega)$. We say f in L^2 is in $\text{VMO}_r^\partial(\Omega)$ if $\text{MO}_r(f, \cdot)$ is in $C_\partial(\Omega)$.

We require a few additional definitions. We write

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f \in L^2: (|f|^2)^\sim \in BC(\Omega)\}, \quad I = \{f \in L^2: (|f|^2)^\sim \in C_\partial(\Omega)\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{F} \subset \text{BMO}(\Omega)$ and $I \subset \text{VMO}_\partial(\Omega)$. For S any subset of Ω , we write

$$\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(S)} \equiv \sup_{z \in S} \text{MO}(f, z)^{1/2}$$

and

$$\|f\|_{\text{BMO}} \equiv \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\Omega)}, \quad \|f\|_r \equiv \sup_{z \in \Omega} \text{MO}_r(f, z)^{1/2}.$$

Our main result is

THEOREM A. *For f in L^2 , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $H_f, H_{\bar{f}}$ are bounded.
- (ii) $f \in \text{BMO}(\Omega)$.
- (iii) $f \in \text{BMO}_r(\Omega)$ for all $r > 0$.
- (iv) $f \in \text{BMO}_r(\Omega)$ for some $r > 0$.
- (v) $f \in \text{BO} + \mathcal{F}$.

Moreover, the quantities $\max\{\|H_f\|, \|H_{\bar{f}}\|\}$, $\|[M_f, P]\|$, $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}}$, and $\|f\|_r$ are equivalent and \tilde{f} is in BO with $f - \tilde{f}$ in \mathcal{F} whenever any of (i)–(v) hold.

We also have a corresponding extension of the main result of [BCZ]:

THEOREM B. *For f in L^2 , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $H_f, H_{\bar{f}}$ are compact.
- (ii) $f \in \text{VMO}_\partial(\Omega)$.
- (iii) $f \in \text{VMO}_\partial^r(\Omega)$ for all $r > 0$.
- (iv) $f \in \text{VMO}_\partial^r(\Omega)$ for some $r > 0$.
- (v) $f \in \text{VO}_\partial(\Omega) + I$.

Moreover, \tilde{f} is in $\text{VO}_\partial(\Omega)$ and $f - \tilde{f}$ is in I whenever any of (i)–(v) hold.

For x in \mathbb{C}^n and z in Ω we define

$$H(z, x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n x_i \bar{x}_j g_{ij}(z).$$

For f in H^2 and z in Ω we have the analytic gradient

$$\nabla_z f = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(z), \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_2}(z), \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_n}(z) \right)$$

and we can define, as in [T],

$$Q_f(z) = \sup\{|\langle \nabla_z f, \bar{x} \rangle| H(z, x)^{-1/2} : 0 \neq x \in \mathbb{C}^n\}.$$

Following [T], we say f is in the Bloch space $B(\Omega)$ if

$$\sup_{z \in \Omega} Q_f(z) \equiv \|f\|_B < \infty.$$

We say f is in the little Bloch space $B_0(\Omega)$ if

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \partial\Omega} Q_f(z) = 0.$$

For f in H^2 , it is easy to see that $H_f = 0$. In this case, we obtain some additional information:

THEOREM C. *For f in H^2 , $H_{\bar{f}}$ is bounded if and only if f is in $B(\Omega)$. Moreover, $\|H_{\bar{f}}\|$ and $\|f\|_B$ are equivalent quantities.*

THEOREM D. For f in $H^2, H_{\bar{f}}$ is compact if and only if f is in $B_0(\Omega)$. For $\text{rank}(\Omega) \neq 1, B_0(\Omega)$ consists of just the constant functions.

The proofs of Theorems A and B depend on two key results about the Bergman metric and the Berezin transform.

THEOREM E. The function $\beta(0, \cdot)$ is in $L^p(\Omega, dv)$ for all $p > 0$.

THEOREM F. For any smooth curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow \Omega$ ($I = [0, 1]$) with $s = s(t)$ the arc-length of γ with respect to the Bergman metric $(g_{ij}(z))$, and for any f in $BMO(\Omega)$, we have

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{f}(\gamma(t)) \right| \leq 2\sqrt{2} \left(\frac{ds}{dt} \right) \|f\|_{BMO(\gamma(I))}.$$

We also use a recent result of [FK] and some estimates from [BCZ]. Proofs will appear elsewhere.

It should be recalled that, as $z \rightarrow \partial\Omega$,

$$\beta(0, z) \rightarrow +\infty, \quad K(z, z) \rightarrow +\infty.$$

The point of Theorem E is that, for bounded symmetric domains Ω , $\beta(0, z)$ does not blow up too badly near $\partial\Omega$.

REMARK. The function $\beta(0, \cdot)$ is the prototype of $BO(\Omega)$. Using the invariance of the metric $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ under automorphisms of Ω and Theorem E, it is easy to check that $\beta(0, \cdot)$ is in $BMO(\Omega)$. The function $\exp\{i\beta(0, \cdot)^{1/2}\}$ is in $VMO_{\partial}(\Omega)$, as noted in [BCZ].

The measure $dv(z)$ may be replaced by Harish-Chandra measures of the form $C_t K(z, z)^t dv(z)$ with $t < t_0(\Omega)$ and Theorems A and B remain true. We conjecture that Theorems A and B hold, with different proofs, for domains considerably more general than the bounded symmetric (Cartan) domains.

REFERENCES

- [BCZ] C. A. Berger, L. A. Coburn, and K. H. Zhu, *Function theory on Cartan domains and the Berezin-Toeplitz symbol calculus*, Amer. J. Math. (to appear).
 [FK] J. Faraut and A. Korányi, *Function spaces and reproducing kernels on bounded symmetric domains*, to appear.
 [G] J. Garnett, *Bounded analytic functions*, Academic Press, 1982.
 [H] S. Helgason, *Differential geometry, Lie groups and symmetric spaces*, Academic Press, 1978.
 [K] S. Krantz, *Function theory of several complex variables*, Wiley, 1982.
 [T] R. M. Timoney, *Bloch functions in several complex variables*, I. Bull. London Math. Soc. **12** (1980), 241–267; II. J. Reine Angew. Math. **319** (1980), 1–22.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, LEHMAN COLLEGE, CUNY, BRONX, NEW YORK, 10468

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUNY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NEW YORK, 14214

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98195