

A REPRESENTATION THEOREM IN STRICTLY PSEUDOCONVEX DOMAINS

BY
STEVEN R. BELL¹

Introduction

Let Ω be a smooth bounded strictly pseudoconvex domain contained in \mathbb{C}^n . In this note, the dual space of $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, the space of holomorphic functions on Ω which are smooth up to the boundary, is characterized as a space of holomorphic functions, $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$. The duality is exhibited via an extension of the usual L^2 inner product and this allows a strong converse to a theorem in [1] to be proved concerning the linear span of the Bergman kernel function in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and sets of determinacy.

In [1], it is shown that every function in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is the Bergman projection of a function in $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ which vanishes to arbitrarily high order on $b\Omega$. In the present work, this result is improved: every u in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is the Bergman projection of a function in $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ which vanishes to infinite order on $b\Omega$.

The methods and results have applications in the theory of boundary behavior of biholomorphic mappings.

1. Preliminaries

Throughout this note, Ω will denote a smooth bounded strictly pseudoconvex domain contained in \mathbb{C}^n . $\rho: \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ will be a C^∞ defining function for Ω , i.e., $\Omega = \{z: \rho(z) < 0\}$, $b\Omega = \{z: \rho(z) = 0\}$, and $d\rho \neq 0$ on $b\Omega$.

Let s be positive integer.

$W^s(\Omega)$ is the Sobolev space of complex valued functions on Ω with inner product given by

$$\langle u, v \rangle_s = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} 2^{-|\alpha|} \int_{\Omega} D^\alpha u \overline{D^\alpha v}.$$

$H^s(\Omega)$ is the subspace of $W^s(\Omega)$ consisting of holomorphic functions. For u and v in $H^s(\Omega)$, the inner product becomes

$$\langle u, v \rangle_s = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial z^\alpha} \overline{\frac{\partial^\alpha v}{\partial z^\alpha}}$$

Received February 12, 1980.

¹ Partially supported by the National Science Foundation.

where, as usual,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_k} \right).$$

$W_0^s(\Omega)$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $W^s(\Omega)$.

$W^{-s}(\Omega)$ is the dual space of $W_0^s(\Omega)$ and is identified with the space of distributions λ such that

$$\|\lambda\|_{-s} = \text{Sup} \{ |\lambda(\phi)| : \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega); \|\phi\|_s = 1 \}$$

is finite. $W^{-s}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space with this norm. We write $\langle \lambda, \phi \rangle_0$ for $\lambda(\phi)$.

$H^{-s}(\Omega)$ will denote the subspace of $W^{-s}(\Omega)$ consisting of holomorphic functions. For f in $H^{-s}(\Omega)$,

$$\|f\|_{-s} = \text{Sup} \left\{ \left| \int_{\Omega} f\phi \right| : \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega); \|\phi\|_s = 1 \right\}$$

$H^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) = \bigcap_{s \geq 0} H^s(\Omega)$ is a Frechet space of holomorphic functions on Ω which are smooth up to the boundary. The family of $H^s(\Omega)$ norms define the Frechet topology on $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

$H^{-\infty}(\Omega) = \bigcup_{s \geq 0} H^{-s}(\Omega)$ is a topological vector space under the usual inductive limit topology.

P will denote the Bergman orthogonal projection of $L^2(\Omega)$ onto its subspace $H(\Omega)$ of holomorphic functions. $K(w, z)$ is the Bergman kernel function. K and P are related via

$$Pf(z) = \langle f, K(\cdot, z) \rangle_0 = \int_{\Omega} K(z, w) f(w) dV_w \quad \text{for } f \in L^2(\Omega).$$

When Ω is smooth bounded and strictly pseudoconvex, it is known that P is bounded from $W^s(\Omega)$ to $H^s(\Omega)$ for each s (see Kohn [5]), and that $K(w, z) \in C^\infty(\Omega \times \bar{\Omega})$ (Kerzman [4]).

A set $D \subset \Omega$ will be called a set of determinacy for $H^\beta(\Omega)$ ($-\infty \leq \beta \leq \infty$) if the only function in $H^\beta(\Omega)$ which vanishes on D is the zero function.

2. Results

For Ω a smooth bounded strictly pseudoconvex domain contained in \mathbb{C}^n and for s a positive integer, we obtain:

THEOREM 1. *There is a bounded operator $\Phi^s: H^s(\Omega) \rightarrow W_0^s(\Omega)$ such that $P\Phi^s u = u$ for all $u \in H^s(\Omega)$.*

THEOREM 2. *The operator Λ^s defined via*

$$\Lambda^s f(z) = \langle f, K(\cdot, z) \rangle_s = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha} K(z, w) \frac{\partial^\alpha f}{\partial w^\alpha}(w) dV_w$$

is a Banach space isomorphism of $H^s(\Omega)$ onto $H^{-s}(\Omega)$.

THEOREM 3. *$H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is dense in $H^{-s}(\Omega)$.*

THEOREM 4. *There is a non-degenerate sesquilinear pairing*

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0: H^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \times H^{-\infty}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

which exhibits $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$ as being mutually dual. Furthermore,

$$\langle f, g \rangle_0 = \int_{\Omega} f \bar{g}$$

whenever f and g are in $L^2(\Omega)$. In general, the pairing is given by $\langle \Phi^s f, g \rangle_0$ when $g \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$.

THEOREM 5. *The norm $\|f\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$ is equivalent to the norm*

$$\|f\|_s = \text{Sup} \left\{ \left| \int_{\Omega} f \bar{g} \right| : g \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega}); \|g\|_{-s} = 1 \right\}.$$

Furthermore, $u \in H(\Omega)$ is in $H^s(\Omega)$ if and only if $\|u\|_s < \infty$.

THEOREM 6. *The linear span of $\{K(\cdot, z): z \in D\}$ is dense in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ if and only if D is a set of determinacy for $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$.*

THEOREM 7. *If u is in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, then $u = P\phi$ for some ϕ in $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ which vanishes to infinite order on $b\Omega$.*

3. The proofs

3.1 *Proof of Theorem 1.* The construction of Φ^s is discussed in [1] and [2]. Let $\delta > 0$ be small enough so that $d\rho \neq 0$ on $\{z: |\rho(z)| \leq \delta\} = A_\delta$. If $\{\phi_{ij}\}_{i=1}^m$ is a C^∞ partition of unity of $A_{\delta/2}$ supported in A_δ , and $\{z_{ij}\}_{i=1}^m$ are complex directions such that $\partial\rho/\partial z_i \neq 0$ on $\text{Supp } \phi_i$, then a suitable Φ^s can be written as

$$\Phi^s u = u - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \theta_k^i \rho^{k+1} \right)$$

where the θ_k^i are defined inductively via

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_0^i &= \frac{\phi_i u}{\left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_i} \right)}, \\ U_i^l &= \phi_i u - \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} \left(\sum_{k=0}^l \theta_k^i \rho^{k+1} \right), \\ \theta_{l+1}^i &= \frac{\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial v} \right)^{l+1} U_i^l}{(l+2)! \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $(\partial/\partial v)^l$ stands for differentiation in the $\nabla\rho/|\nabla\rho|^2$ direction l times.

$\Phi^s u$ can be written as

$$\Phi^s u = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k \leq N_s} b_{\alpha, k} D^\alpha u \rho^k = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k \leq N_s} \tilde{b}_{\alpha, k} \frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial z^\alpha} \rho^k$$

where the b 's are in $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, and $N_s = (1/2)(s+1)s$.

If $u \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, then $\Phi^s u$ vanishes to order $s-1$ on $b\Omega$, i.e., $D^\alpha \Phi^s u(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in b\Omega$, $|\alpha| \leq s-1$ (see [1], [2]). Hence $\Phi^s u \in W_0^s(\Omega)$. Furthermore,

$$\langle \Phi^s u, \Phi^s u \rangle_s = \sum_{\substack{k, m \leq N_s, \\ |\alpha| - k \leq s, \\ |\beta| - m \leq s}} \int_{\Omega} b_{\beta, k}^{\alpha, m} \frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial z^\alpha} \rho^k \frac{\overline{\partial^\beta u}}{\partial z^\beta} \rho^m = \sum_{\substack{|\alpha| \leq s, \\ |\beta| \leq s}} \int_{\Omega} b_{\alpha, \beta} \frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial z^\alpha} \frac{\overline{\partial^\beta u}}{\partial z^\beta}.$$

(Here, we have used integration by parts and the fact that u is holomorphic.)
Hence,

$$\|\Phi^s u\|_s \leq C \|u\|_s \quad \text{for } u \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega}).$$

$H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is dense in $H^s(\Omega)$ because $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is dense in $W^s(\Omega)$ and P is bounded from $W^s(\Omega)$ to $H^s(\Omega)$. Finally, $P\Phi^s u = u$ because

$$\Phi^s u = u - \sum \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} v_i \quad \text{where } v_i = 0 \text{ on } b\Omega.$$

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2. Λ^s is a bounded operator from $H^s(\Omega)$ to $H^{-s}(\Omega)$ because for $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ and $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\langle \Lambda^s u, \phi \rangle_0 = \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha} K(z, w) \frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial w^\alpha}(w) dV_w \overline{\phi(z)} dV_z = \langle u, P\phi \rangle_s$$

using Fubini's theorem and the fact that $K(z, w) \in C^\infty(\Omega \times \bar{\Omega})$ (Kerzman [4]).
Hence,

$$\|\Lambda^s u\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)} = \text{Sup} \{ |\langle u, P\phi \rangle_s| : \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega); \|\phi\|_s = 1 \},$$

because P is bounded from $W^s(\Omega)$ to $H^s(\Omega)$.

The relation $\langle \Lambda^s u, \phi \rangle_0 = \langle u, P\phi \rangle_s$ extends to hold for all $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ and $\phi \in W_0^s(\Omega)$. From this, it follows easily that Λ^s is one to one because if $\Lambda^s u = 0$, then

$$0 = \langle \Lambda^s u, \Phi^s v \rangle_0 = \langle u, P\Phi^s v \rangle_s = \langle u, v \rangle_s$$

for all $v \in H^s(\Omega)$. Hence $u = 0$.

To see that Λ^s is surjective, notice that for $f \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$,

$$u \mapsto \langle f, \Phi^s u \rangle_0$$

is a continuous anti-linear functional on $H^s(\Omega)$. Hence, there is a function $F \in H^s(\Omega)$ such that $\langle f, \Phi^s u \rangle_0 = \langle F, u \rangle_s$ for all $u \in H^s(\Omega)$. Let $u = K(\cdot, z)$ to obtain $\Lambda^s F(z) = \langle f, \Phi^s K(\cdot, z) \rangle_0$.

The proof of Theorem 2 will be finished if we show that

$$f(z) = \langle f, \Phi^s K(\cdot, z) \rangle_0.$$

To do this, we will need to use a stability property of the Bergman kernel function proved by Greene and Krantz [7]. Let

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \{z: \rho_\varepsilon(z) < 0\} \quad \text{where } \rho_\varepsilon = \rho + \varepsilon,$$

and let $K_\varepsilon(w, z)$ be the Bergman kernel function associated to Ω_ε . Greene and Krantz prove that

$$\|K_\varepsilon(\cdot, z) - K(\cdot, z)\|_{H^1(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for all t . Using the same partition of unity and complex directions as in the construction of Φ^s in the proof of Theorem 1, we can define operators

$$\Phi_\varepsilon^s: H^s(\Omega_\varepsilon) \rightarrow W_0^s(\Omega_\varepsilon) \subseteq W_0^s(\Omega)$$

for small $\varepsilon > 0$. It is easy to check that $\Phi_\varepsilon^s K_\varepsilon(\cdot, z) \rightarrow \Phi^s K(\cdot, z)$ in $W_0^s(\Omega)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, \Phi^s K(\cdot, z) \rangle_0 &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle f, \Phi_\varepsilon^s K_\varepsilon(\cdot, z) \rangle_0 \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} f(w) \overline{K_\varepsilon(w, z)} dV_w = f(z). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $f(z) = \langle f, K(\cdot, z) \rangle_0 = \Lambda^s F(z)$, and the proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3. It suffices to prove that Λ^s maps $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ into $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ because $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is dense in $H^s(\Omega)$. If $u \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^s u(z) &= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \left\langle \frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial w^\alpha}, \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial w^\alpha} K(\cdot, z) \right\rangle_0 \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \left\langle \Phi^s \frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial w^\alpha}, \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial w^\alpha} K(\cdot, z) \right\rangle_0 \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} (-1)^{|\alpha|} \left\langle \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha} \Phi^s \left(\frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial w^\alpha} \right), K(\cdot, z) \right\rangle_0 \\ &= P \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} (-1)^{|\alpha|} \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha} \Phi^s \left(\frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial w^\alpha} \right) \right)(z). \end{aligned}$$

The function inside the brackets is in $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$; hence, $\Lambda^s u \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

3.4 Proof of Theorem 4. If $u \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and $v \in H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$, then the pairing $\langle u, v \rangle_0$ is defined to be $\langle \Phi^s u, v \rangle_0$ where s is any integer such that $v \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$. The pairing is well defined because $\langle \Phi^{s_1} u - \Phi^{s_2} u, f \rangle_0 = 0$ for all f in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, and $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is dense in $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$ by Theorem 3.

If λ is a continuous linear functional on $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, then λ satisfies

$$|\lambda(u)| \leq (\text{const}) \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$$

for some s . Therefore, there is a function $f \in H^s(\Omega)$ such that

$$\lambda(u) = \langle u, f \rangle_s = \langle P\Phi^s u, f \rangle_s = \langle \Phi^s u, \Lambda^s f \rangle_0 = \langle u, \Lambda^s f \rangle_0.$$

Hence, λ is represented by $\Lambda^s f \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$.

If η is a continuous linear functional on $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$, then for each s , there is a function $\phi_s \in W_0^s(\Omega)$ such that $\eta(v) = \langle v, \phi_s \rangle_0$ for all $v \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$. Restricting v to be in $H(\Omega)$ reveals that $P\phi_1 = P\phi_2 = P\phi_3 = \dots$. Write $u = P\phi_1 \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$. Now $\eta(v) = \langle v, u \rangle_0$, because if $v \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$, then $\eta(v) - \langle v, u \rangle_0 = \langle v, \phi_s - \Phi^s u \rangle_0$, and this is zero because $\langle f, \phi_s - \Phi^s u \rangle_0 = 0$ for all $f \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

The non-degeneracy of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0$ follows from the relation

$$\langle u, v \rangle_s = \langle u, \Lambda^s v \rangle_0 \quad \text{for } u \text{ and } v \text{ in } H^s(\Omega)$$

and the isomorphism and density theorems.

3.5 Proof of Theorem 5. Given $u \in H(\Omega)$ such that $\|u\|_s < \infty$, we wish to show that $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ and that $c_1 \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_s \leq c_2 \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$.

Let Ω_ε and Φ_ε^s be defined as in the proof of Theorem 2. Write

$$\psi_\varepsilon = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} (-1)^{|\alpha|} \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha} \Phi_\varepsilon^s \left(\frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial w^\alpha} \right).$$

Then $P\psi_\varepsilon \in H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ because ψ_ε has compact support in Ω , and

$$\langle u, P\psi_\varepsilon \rangle_0 = \langle u, \psi_\varepsilon \rangle_0 = \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega_\varepsilon)}^2.$$

Hence,

$$\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega_\varepsilon)}^2 \leq \|u\|_s \|P\psi_\varepsilon\|_{H^{-s}(H)}.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P\psi_\varepsilon\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)} &= \text{Sup} \{ |\langle P\psi_\varepsilon, \phi \rangle_0| : \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega); \|\phi\|_s = 1 \} \\ &= \text{Sup} |\langle u, P\phi \rangle_{H^s(\Omega_\varepsilon)}| \leq \text{Sup} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \|P\phi\|_{H^s(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega_\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

So $\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \leq C \|u\|_s$. If $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ then $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ and $\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_s$.

The second inequality $\|u\|_s \leq c_2 \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$ follows from

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle u, v \rangle_0| &= |\langle \Phi^s u, v \rangle_0| \leq \|\Phi^s u\|_{W_0^s(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq (\text{const}) \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

for u and v in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

3.6 Proof of Theorem 6. Given $D \subset \Omega$, the linear span of $\{K(\cdot, z) : z \in D\}$ is not dense in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ if and only if there is a function $g \neq 0$ in $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$ such that

$0 = \langle K(\cdot, z), g \rangle_0 = \overline{g(z)}$ for all $z \in D$ if and only if D is not a set of determinacy for holomorphic functions in $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$.

3.7 Proof of Theorem 7. The proof is inspired by a construction due to L. Hörmander.

Suppose that u is in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$. We construct ϕ_s in $W_0^s(\Omega)$ such that $P\phi_s = u$ and $\|\phi_s - \phi_{s-1}\|_{s-1} \leq 2^{-s}$. Then

$$\phi = \phi_1 + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (\phi_{s+1} - \phi_s)$$

is the desired C^∞ function which vanishes to infinite order on $b\Omega$ with $P\phi = u$.

Suppose $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_{k-1}$ have been constructed. Let $\psi_k = \Phi^k u$. We construct V_k in $W_0^k(\Omega)$ with $PV_k = 0$ and

$$\|\psi_k + V_k - \phi_{k-1}\|_{k-1} \leq 2^{-k}.$$

$\phi_k = \psi_k + V_k$ then satisfies the induction hypothesis. Choose ω_k in $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with

$$\|\psi_k + \omega_k - \phi_{k-1}\|_{k-1}$$

so small that

$$\|\psi_k + \omega_k - \Phi^k P\omega_k - \phi_{k-1}\|_{k-1} < 2^{-k}.$$

This is possible because

$$\|\Phi^k P\omega_k\|_{k-1} \leq C_1 \|P\omega_k\|_{k-1}$$

and

$$\|P\omega_k\|_{k-1} = \|P(\psi_k + \omega_k - \phi_{k-1})\|_{k-1} \leq C_2 \|\psi_k + \omega_k - \phi_{k-1}\|_{k-1}.$$

$V_k = \omega_k - \Phi^k P\omega_k$ is in $W_0^k(\Omega)$, projects to zero, and

$$\|\psi_k + V_k - \phi_{k-1}\|_{k-1} \leq 2^{-k}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 7.

4. Remarks

(1) Theorem 6 has applications in the theory of boundary behavior of biholomorphic mappings. If Ω_1 and Ω_2 are two smooth bounded domains in \mathbb{C}^n such that $\text{span} \{K_{\Omega_i}(\cdot, z); z \in \Omega_i\}$ is dense in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, then biholomorphic mappings between Ω_1 and Ω_2 extend smoothly to the boundary (see [2]).

(2) The inverse to the operator Λ^s can be written down explicitly. The orthogonal projection of $W^s(\Omega)$ onto $H^s(\Omega)$ defines an $H^s(\Omega)$ Bergman kernel function $K_s(w, z)$ which satisfies $P_s f(z) = \langle f, K_s(\cdot, z) \rangle_s$ for all f in $W^s(\Omega)$. K_s has many properties in common with the usual kernel function.

We now define $L^s: H^s(\Omega) \rightarrow H^s(\Omega)$ via

$$L^s f(z) = \int_{\Omega} K_s(z, w) f(w) dV_w = \langle f, K_s(\cdot, z) \rangle_0.$$

It is easy to check that

- (a) $\|L^s u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$
- (b) $\Lambda^s L^s = I$
- (c) L^s is compact self adjoint on $H^s(\Omega)$ and satisfies

$$\langle L^s u, v \rangle_s = \langle u, v \rangle_0 = \langle u, L^s v \rangle_s.$$

L^s extends to be a bounded operator from $H^{-s}(\Omega)$ to $H^s(\Omega)$ via

$$L^s f(z) = \langle f, \Phi^s K_s(\cdot, z) \rangle_0,$$

and this is the inverse of Λ^s .

(3) The operator Φ^s can be made canonical. Let V be the $W_0^s(\Omega)$ orthogonal complement of the closed subspace of functions ϕ in $W_0^s(\Omega)$ such that $\langle \phi, f \rangle_0 = 0$ for all f in $H(\Omega)$. Let Q be the orthogonal projection of $W_0^s(\Omega)$ onto V . The canonical Φ^s is given by $\Phi_{\text{canonical}}^s = Q\Phi^s$.

(4) $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$ is the space of holomorphic functions which satisfy finite growth conditions at the boundary, i.e., u is in $H^{-\infty}(\Omega)$ if and only if $u\rho^k$ is in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ for some integer k .

(5) The special Sobolev inequality $|\langle f, g \rangle_0| \leq C\|f\|_{H^s(\Omega)}\|g\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)}$ holds for f and g in $H^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ in any smooth bounded domain.

REFERENCES

1. S. BELL, *Non-vanishing of the Bergman kernel function at boundary points of certain domains in \mathbb{C}^n* , Math. Ann., vol. 244 (1979), pp. 69–74.
2. S. BELL and E. LIGOCKA, *A simplification and extension of Fefferman's theorem on biholomorphic mappings*, Invent. Math., vol. 57 (1980), pp. 283–289.
3. G. FOLLAND and J. J. KOHN, *The Neumann problem for the Cauchy-Riemann complex*, Ann. of Math. Studies, No. 75, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1972.
4. N. KERZMAN, *The Bergman kernel function. Differentiability at the boundary*, Math. Ann., vol. 195 (1972), pp. 149–158.
5. J. J. KOHN, *Harmonic integrals on strongly pseudoconvex manifolds, I and II*, Ann. of Math., vol. 78 (1963), pp. 112–148 and vol. 79 (1964), pp. 450–472.
6. D. H. PHONG and E. M. STEIN, *Estimates for the Bergman and Szegő projections on strongly pseudoconvex domains*, Duke Math. J., vol. 44 (1977), pp. 695–704.
7. R. GREENE and S. KRANTZ, *Deformation of complex structures, estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ equation, and stability of the Bergman kernel*, to appear.
8. S. BELL, *Biholomorphic mappings and the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem*, Ann. of Math., vol. 114 (1981), pp. 103–113.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY