L^p-cohomology of symmetric spaces

P. Pansu

August 2, 2006

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- topological space \rightarrow cohomology
 - $manifold \rightarrow de Rham \ cohomology$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

\rightarrow	cohomology
\rightarrow	de Rham cohomology
\rightarrow	cohomology with decay condition
\rightarrow	de Rham cohomology with decay condition
	$\begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array}$

topological space	\rightarrow	cohomology
manifold	\rightarrow	de Rham cohomology
metric space	\rightarrow	cohomology with decay condition
Riemannian manifold	\rightarrow	de Rham cohomology with decay condition

Let M be a Riemannian manifold. Let p > 1. L^p -cohomology of M is the cohomology of the complex of L^p -differential forms on M whose exterior differentials are L^p as well,

 $H^{k,p}$ = closed k-forms in $L^p/d((k-1)-forms in L^p)$,

topological space	\rightarrow	cohomology
manifold	\rightarrow	de Rham cohomology
metric space	\rightarrow	cohomology with decay condition
Riemannian manifold	\rightarrow	de Rham cohomology with decay condition

Let M be a Riemannian manifold. Let p > 1. L^p -cohomology of M is the cohomology of the complex of L^p -differential forms on M whose exterior differentials are L^p as well,

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

 $R^{k,p}$ is called the reduced cohomology. $T^{k,p}$ is called the torsion.

Here $H^{0,p} = 0 = H^{2,p}$ for all *p*.



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

$$H^{1,2} = R^{1,2}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,2} &= R^{1,2} \\ &= \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\} / \mathbb{R} \,. \end{array}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

Using conformal invariance, switch from hyperbolic metric to euclidean metric on the disk D.

$$H^{1,2}$$
 = {harmonic functions h on D with $\nabla h \in L^2$ }/ \mathbb{R}

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R} \,. \end{array}$$

Using conformal invariance, switch from hyperbolic metric to euclidean metric on the disk D.

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,2} &= \{ \text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } D \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2 \} / \mathbb{R} \\ &= \{ \text{Fourier series } \Sigma a_n e^{in\theta} \text{ with } a_0 = 0, \Sigma |n| |a_n|^2 < +\infty \}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

Using conformal invariance, switch from hyperbolic metric to euclidean metric on the disk D.

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,2} &= \{ \text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } D \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2 \} / \mathbb{R} \\ &= \{ \text{Fourier series } \Sigma a_n e^{in\theta} \text{ with } a_0 = 0, \Sigma |n| |a_n|^2 < +\infty \}, \end{aligned}$$

which is Sobolev space $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ mod constants.

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

Using conformal invariance, switch from hyperbolic metric to euclidean metric on the disk D.

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,2} &= \{ \text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } D \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2 \} / \mathbb{R} \\ &= \{ \text{Fourier series } \Sigma a_n e^{in\theta} \text{ with } a_0 = 0, \Sigma |n| |a_n|^2 < +\infty \}, \end{aligned}$$

which is Sobolev space $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ mod constants.

More generally, for p > 1, $T^{1,p} = 0$ and $H^{1,p}$ is equal to the Besov space $B_{p,p}^{1/p}(\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ mod constants.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

 $H^{0,p} = 0.$

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

$$H^{0,p} = 0.$$

 $R^{1,p} = 0,$

 $H^{0,p} = 0.$

 $R^{1,p}=0,$

since every function in $L^{p}(\mathbb{R})$ can be approximated in L^{p} with derivatives of compactly supported functions. Therefore $H^{1,p}$ is only torsion.

 $H^{0,p} = 0.$

 $R^{1,p} = 0,$

since every function in $L^{p}(\mathbb{R})$ can be approximated in L^{p} with derivatives of compactly supported functions. Therefore $H^{1,p}$ is only torsion.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

 $T^{1,p}$ is non zero and thus infinite dimensional.

 $H^{0,p} = 0.$

 $R^{1,p} = 0,$

since every function in $L^{p}(\mathbb{R})$ can be approximated in L^{p} with derivatives of compactly supported functions. Therefore $H^{1,p}$ is only torsion.

 $T^{1,p}$ is non zero and thus infinite dimensional.

Indeed, the 1-form $\frac{dt}{t}$ (cut off near the origin) is in L^p for all p > 1 but it is not the differential of a function in L^p .

- In talks by J. Rohlfs, L. Saper, B. Speh, S. Zucker : manifolds with thin ends. L^p-cohomology is related to the topology of a compactification.
- In this talk : manifolds with large ends, e.g. symmetric spaces themselves. L^p-cohomology is related to analytic features of a compactification (compare A. Koranyi's lectures).

 $cohomology \quad \rightarrow \quad continuous \ maps$

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲圖▶ ▲圖▶ = ● ● ●

 $\begin{array}{rcl} {\rm cohomology} & \to & {\rm continuous\ maps} \\ {\cal L}^p{\rm -cohomology} & \to & {\rm uniform\ maps}. \end{array}$

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

 $\begin{array}{rcl} {\rm cohomology} & \to & {\rm continuous\ maps} \\ L^p {\rm -cohomology} & \to & {\rm uniform\ maps}. \end{array}$

Definition

A map $f : X \to Y$ between metric spaces is uniform if d(f(x), f(x')) is bounded from above in terms of d(x, x') only.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

 $\begin{array}{rcl} {\rm cohomology} & \to & {\rm continuous\ maps} \\ L^p {\rm -cohomology} & \to & {\rm uniform\ maps}. \end{array}$

Definition

A map $f : X \to Y$ between metric spaces is uniform if d(f(x), f(x')) is bounded from above in terms of d(x, x') only.

Examples

The obvious map $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniform. Any homomorphism between groups (with left invariant metrics) is uniform. The parametrization of a cusp by a punctured disk is not uniform.

 $\begin{array}{rcl} {\rm cohomology} & \to & {\rm continuous\ maps} \\ {\cal L}^p{\rm -cohomology} & \to & {\rm uniform\ maps}. \end{array}$

Definition

A map $f : X \to Y$ between metric spaces is uniform if d(f(x), f(x')) is bounded from above in terms of d(x, x') only.

Examples

The obvious map $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniform. Any homomorphism between groups (with left invariant metrics) is uniform. The parametrization of a cusp by a punctured disk is not uniform.

Proposition

Among contractible Riemannian manifolds admitting a cocompact isometric group action, L^p-cohomology is natural under uniform maps.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

L^p-cohomology of discrete groups

L^p-cohomology can be discretized.

 L^{p} -cohomology can be discretized. It makes sense for discrete groups, and cannot see any difference between a cocompact lattice in a semi-simple Lie group *G*, the Lie group *G* itself or the Riemannian symmetric space *G*/*K*.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

 L^p -cohomology can be discretized. It makes sense for discrete groups, and cannot see any difference between a cocompact lattice in a semi-simple Lie group *G*, the Lie group *G* itself or the Riemannian symmetric space *G*/*K*.

In conclusion,

- ► *L^p*-cohomology is a tool to investigate discrete groups.
- It shares nearly all properties of usual cohomology.
- Nevertheless, it is not easy to calculate it.
- In the case of cocompact lattices in Lie groups, it can probably be computed by analytic means.

 L^p -cohomology can be discretized. It makes sense for discrete groups, and cannot see any difference between a cocompact lattice in a semi-simple Lie group *G*, the Lie group *G* itself or the Riemannian symmetric space *G*/*K*.

In conclusion,

- ► *L^p*-cohomology is a tool to investigate discrete groups.
- It shares nearly all properties of usual cohomology.
- Nevertheless, it is not easy to calculate it.
- In the case of cocompact lattices in Lie groups, it can probably be computed by analytic means.

In this talk, we explain 3 applications of L^p -cohomology to negatively curved Riemannian manifolds and groups.

- 1. Hopf's conjecture about Euler characteristic
- 2. Cannon conjecture on groups with boundary a 2-sphere
- 3. Curvature pinching

1. Hopf's conjecture about Euler characteristic

2. Cannon conjecture on groups with boundary a 2-sphere

3. Curvature pinching

Remark

- Compact 2-dimensional negatively curved manifolds have negative Euler characteristic.
- ▶ 2m-dimensional compact hyperbolic manifolds have Euler characteristic proportional to (-1)^m.
- This generalizes to all compact negatively curved locally symmetric spaces (Gauss-Bonnet).

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Remark

- Compact 2-dimensional negatively curved manifolds have negative Euler characteristic.
- ▶ 2m-dimensional compact hyperbolic manifolds have Euler characteristic proportional to (-1)^m.
- This generalizes to all compact negatively curved locally symmetric spaces (Gauss-Bonnet).

Conjecture

(H. Hopf). If M is 2m-dimensional compact negatively curved, then $(-1)^m \chi(M) > 0$.

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Remark

- Compact 2-dimensional negatively curved manifolds have negative Euler characteristic.
- ▶ 2m-dimensional compact hyperbolic manifolds have Euler characteristic proportional to (-1)^m.
- This generalizes to all compact negatively curved locally symmetric spaces (Gauss-Bonnet).

Conjecture

(H. Hopf). If M is 2m-dimensional compact negatively curved, then $(-1)^m \chi(M) > 0$.

Theorem

(M. Gromov, 1991). This is true provided M also admits a Kähler metric.

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

Then M is a complex manifold. Every complex submanifold in complex projective space admits a Kähler metric.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

Then M is a complex manifold. Every complex submanifold in complex projective space admits a Kähler metric.

Proposition

(Part of hard Lefschetz theorem). Let M^{2m} be a compact Kähler manifold with Kähler form ω . Then wedging with ω maps harmonic forms to harmonic forms,

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

Then M is a complex manifold. Every complex submanifold in complex projective space admits a Kähler metric.

Proposition

(Part of hard Lefschetz theorem). Let M^{2m} be a compact Kähler manifold with Kähler form ω . Then wedging with ω maps harmonic forms to harmonic forms, and this induces an injection in cohomology $H^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \to H^{k+2}(M, \mathbb{R})$ for all k < m.

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ
Definition

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

Then M is a complex manifold. Every complex submanifold in complex projective space admits a Kähler metric.

Proposition

(Part of hard Lefschetz theorem). Let M^{2m} be a compact Kähler manifold with Kähler form ω . Then wedging with ω maps harmonic forms to harmonic forms, and this induces an injection in cohomology $H^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \to H^{k+2}(M, \mathbb{R})$ for all k < m.

Corollary

Let M^{2m} be a complete Kähler manifold with Kähler form ω . Then wedging with ω maps L^2 -harmonic forms to L^2 -harmonic forms, and this induces an injection in reduced L^2 -cohomology $R^{k,2}(M) \to R^{k+2}(M)$ for all k < m.

(*M.* Gromov). Let \tilde{M} be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let $k \ge 2$.

Coning of cycles). Every k − 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with vol(c) ≤ const. vol(z).

(*M.* Gromov). Let \tilde{M} be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let $k \geq 2$.

- (Coning of cycles). Every k 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with $vol(c) \leq const. vol(z)$.
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||₁∞ ≤ const. || α ||₁∞.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

(*M.* Gromov). Let \tilde{M} be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let $k \ge 2$.

- (Coning of cycles). Every k − 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with vol(c) ≤ const. vol(z).
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||_L[∞] ≤ const. || α ||_L[∞].

Corollary

Assume \tilde{M}^{2m} covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ for all $k \neq m$.

(*M.* Gromov). Let \tilde{M} be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let $k \ge 2$.

- (Coning of cycles). Every k 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with $vol(c) \leq const. vol(z)$.
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||_L[∞] ≤ const. || α ||_L[∞].

Corollary

Assume \tilde{M}^{2m} covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ for all $k \neq m$. Furthermore, $T^{*,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$.

(*M.* Gromov). Let \tilde{M} be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let $k \ge 2$.

- (Coning of cycles). Every k 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with $vol(c) \leq const. vol(z)$.
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||_L[∞] ≤ const. || α ||_L[∞].

Corollary

Assume \tilde{M}^{2m} covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ for all $k \neq m$. Furthermore, $T^{*,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$. Proof. Lift Kähler form to universal cover \tilde{M} . Write $\omega = db$ with b bounded.

(*M.* Gromov). Let \tilde{M} be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let $k \ge 2$.

- (Coning of cycles). Every k − 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with vol(c) ≤ const. vol(z).
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||₁∞ ≤ const. || α ||₁∞.

Corollary

Assume \tilde{M}^{2m} covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ for all $k \neq m$. Furthermore, $T^{*,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$. Proof. Lift Kähler form to universal cover \tilde{M} . Write $\omega = db$ with b bounded. Let k < m. For α a closed k-form in L^2 ,

 $\omega \wedge \alpha = d(b \wedge \alpha)$ and $b \wedge \alpha \in L^2$,

(*M.* Gromov). Let \tilde{M} be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let $k \ge 2$.

- (Coning of cycles). Every k − 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with vol(c) ≤ const. vol(z).
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||₁∞ ≤ const. || α ||₁∞.

Corollary

Assume \tilde{M}^{2m} covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ for all $k \neq m$. Furthermore, $T^{*,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$. Proof. Lift Kähler form to universal cover \tilde{M} . Write $\omega = db$ with b bounded. Let k < m. For α a closed k-form in L^2 ,

 $\omega \wedge \alpha = d(b \wedge \alpha)$ and $b \wedge \alpha \in L^2$,

thus $\omega \wedge \alpha = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{k+2,2}(\tilde{M})$. If α is harmonic, conclude that $\alpha = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$.

Let \tilde{M} cover a compact manifold M. If nonzero, $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$ is infinite dimensional.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

L²-Betti numbers

Let \tilde{M} cover a compact manifold M. If nonzero, $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$ is infinite dimensional. Nevertheless, M. Atiyah defined a von Neumann dimension

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \dim_{vN} R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}),$$

called the k-th L^2 -Betti number of M.

L²-Betti numbers

Let \tilde{M} cover a compact manifold M. If nonzero, $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$ is infinite dimensional. Nevertheless, M. Atiyah defined a von Neumann dimension

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \dim_{vN} R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$$

called the k-th L^2 -Betti number of M.

Examples

(W. Lück). If M admits a tower of finite degree d_j normal coverings M_j such that $\bigcap_j \pi_1(M_j) = \{1\}$, then

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{b^k(M_j, \mathbb{R})}{d_j}.$$

L²-Betti numbers

Let \tilde{M} cover a compact manifold M. If nonzero, $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$ is infinite dimensional. Nevertheless, M. Atiyah defined a von Neumann dimension

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \dim_{vN} R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}),$$

called the k-th L^2 -Betti number of M.

Examples

(W. Lück). If M admits a tower of finite degree d_j normal coverings M_j such that $\bigcap_j \pi_1(M_j) = \{1\}$, then

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{b^k(M_j, \mathbb{R})}{d_j}$$

Proposition

Let \tilde{M} cover a compact manifold M. Then

$$\chi(M) = \sum_{k} (-1)^{k} b^{k,2}(M).$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let \tilde{M} be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let \tilde{M} be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$.

Proof of Gromov's theorem. Assume M is compact and admits both a negatively curved metric and a Kähler metric. Then all $b^{k,2}(M)$ vanish except $b^{m,2}(M)$, which is nonzero, thus $(-1)^m \chi(M) = b^{m,2}(M) > 0$.

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let \tilde{M} be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$.

Proof of Gromov's theorem. Assume M is compact and admits both a negatively curved metric and a Kähler metric. Then all $b^{k,2}(M)$ vanish except $b^{m,2}(M)$, which is nonzero, thus $(-1)^m \chi(M) = b^{m,2}(M) > 0$.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In conclusion, we have used

Lefschetz mechanism, L²-Betti numbers.

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let \tilde{M} be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$.

Proof of Gromov's theorem. Assume M is compact and admits both a negatively curved metric and a Kähler metric. Then all $b^{k,2}(M)$ vanish except $b^{m,2}(M)$, which is nonzero, thus $(-1)^m \chi(M) = b^{m,2}(M) > 0$.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In conclusion, we have used

- ▶ Lefschetz mechanism, L²-Betti numbers.
- ▶ Vanishing of *L*[∞]-cohomology.

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let \tilde{M} be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$.

Proof of Gromov's theorem. Assume M is compact and admits both a negatively curved metric and a Kähler metric. Then all $b^{k,2}(M)$ vanish except $b^{m,2}(M)$, which is nonzero, thus $(-1)^m \chi(M) = b^{m,2}(M) > 0$.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In conclusion, we have used

- ▶ Lefschetz mechanism, L²-Betti numbers.
- ▶ Vanishing of *L*[∞]-cohomology.
- Cup-product $H^{k,2} \otimes H^{2,\infty} \to H^{k+2,\infty}$.

- 1. Hopf's conjecture about Euler characteristic
- 2. Cannon conjecture on groups with boundary a 2-sphere

3. Curvature pinching

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲圖▶ ▲圖▶ = ● ● ●

Definition (*M. Gromov 1986*). Say a finitely generated group is hyperbolic if its triangles are thin.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Definition

(*M. Gromov 1986*). Say a finitely generated group is hyperbolic if its triangles are thin. A hyperbolic group has a functorial ideal boundary.

Definition (*M. Gromov 1986*). Say a finitely generated group is hyperbolic if its triangles are thin. A hyperbolic group has a functorial ideal boundary.

Examples

• A free group is hyperbolic, its ideal boundary is totally disconnected.

In negatively curved manifolds, triangles are thin.

Definition

(*M. Gromov 1986*). Say a finitely generated group is hyperbolic if its triangles are thin. A hyperbolic group has a functorial ideal boundary.

Examples

- A free group is hyperbolic, its ideal boundary is totally disconnected.
- ► The fundamental group of a compact negatively curved n-manifold is hyperbolic, its ideal boundary is an n − 1-sphere.

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

In negatively curved manifolds, triangles are thin.

Definition

(*M. Gromov 1986*). Say a finitely generated group is hyperbolic if its triangles are thin. A hyperbolic group has a functorial ideal boundary.

Examples

- A free group is hyperbolic, its ideal boundary is totally disconnected.
- ► The fundamental group of a compact negatively curved n-manifold is hyperbolic, its ideal boundary is an n − 1-sphere.

Conjecture

(J. Cannon). Let Γ be a hyperbolic group whose ideal boundary is a 2-sphere. Then Γ is virtually a cocompact lattice in $PSL(2, \mathbb{C})$.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

The ideal boundary of a hyperbolic group carries a natural conformal structure, but no canonical metric.

The ideal boundary of a hyperbolic group carries a natural conformal structure, but no canonical metric.

Definition

Define the conformal dimension of a hyperbolic group as the least Hausdorff dimension of a metric in the natural conformal structure.

The ideal boundary of a hyperbolic group carries a natural conformal structure, but no canonical metric.

Definition

Define the conformal dimension of a hyperbolic group as the least Hausdorff dimension of a metric in the natural conformal structure.

Strategy (B. Kleiner). Prove that this infimum is achieved. Then prove that dimension minimizing metrics are Riemannian if boundary is 2-dimensional. Then apply a result of D. Sullivan (1978): every uniformly quasiconformal group of the standard 2-sphere is conjugate to a subgroup of $PSL(2, \mathbb{C})$.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

The ideal boundary of a hyperbolic group carries a natural conformal structure, but no canonical metric.

Definition

Define the conformal dimension of a hyperbolic group as the least Hausdorff dimension of a metric in the natural conformal structure.

Strategy (B. Kleiner). Prove that this infimum is achieved. Then prove that dimension minimizing metrics are Riemannian if boundary is 2-dimensional. Then apply a result of D. Sullivan (1978): every uniformly quasiconformal group of the standard 2-sphere is conjugate to a subgroup of $PSL(2, \mathbb{C})$.

Theorem

(S. Keith-T. Laakso, M. Bonk-B. Kleiner 2005). Let Γ be a hyperbolic group whose ideal boundary is a 2-sphere. If conformal dimension is achieved, then Γ is virtually a cocompact lattice in PSL(2, \mathbb{C}).

For hyperbolic groups, $H^{1,p}$ is nonzero for p large, but zero for p small.

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

For hyperbolic groups, $H^{1,p}$ is nonzero for p large, but zero for p small. For instance, $H^{1,p}(SO(n,1)) = 0 \Leftrightarrow p \le n-1$.

Definition

Define the L^p -dimension of a group as the least p > 1 such that its $H^{1,p}$ is nonzero.

For hyperbolic groups, $H^{1,p}$ is nonzero for p large, but zero for p small. For instance, $H^{1,p}(SO(n,1)) = 0 \Leftrightarrow p \le n - 1$.

Definition

Define the L^p-dimension of a group as the least p > 1 such that its $H^{1,p}$ is nonzero.

Theorem

(Same people + M. Bourdon-H. Pajot 2003). Let Γ be a hyperbolic group. Then L^p -dimension is less than or equal to conformal dimension.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

For hyperbolic groups, $H^{1,p}$ is nonzero for p large, but zero for p small. For instance, $H^{1,p}(SO(n,1)) = 0 \Leftrightarrow p \le n - 1$.

Definition Define the L^p -dimension of a group as the least p > 1 such that its $H^{1,p}$ is nonzero.

Theorem

(Same people + M. Bourdon-H. Pajot 2003). Let Γ be a hyperbolic group. Then L^p -dimension is less than or equal to conformal dimension. If conformal dimension is achieved, then L^p -dimension and conformal dimension coincide.

Examples

(M. Bourdon-H. Pajot). There exist hyperbolic groups for which conformal dimension $> 2 \ge L^{p}$ -dimension. For such groups, conformal dimension cannot be achieved.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In conclusion, we have used

- ▶ Mayer-Vietoris and L²-Betti numbers.
- Expression of $H^{1,p}$ as a function space on the ideal boundary.

- 1. Hopf's conjecture about Euler characteristic
- 2. Cannon conjecture on groups with boundary a 2-sphere

3. Curvature pinching

Rank one symmetric spaces are hyperbolic spaces over the reals $H^n_{\mathbb{C}}$, the complex numbers $H^m_{\mathbb{C}}$, the quaternions $H^m_{\mathbb{H}}$, and the octonions $H^0_{\mathbb{C}}$. Real hyperbolic space has sectional curvature -1. Other rank one symmetric spaces are $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched, i.e. their sectional curvature ranges between -1 and $-\frac{1}{4}$.

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Rank one symmetric spaces are hyperbolic spaces over the reals $H^n_{\mathbb{C}}$, the complex numbers $H^m_{\mathbb{C}}$, the quaternions $H^m_{\mathbb{H}}$, and the octonions $H^0_{\mathbb{C}}$. Real hyperbolic space has sectional curvature -1. Other rank one symmetric spaces are $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched, i.e. their sectional curvature ranges between -1 and $-\frac{1}{4}$.

Definition

Define the optimal pinching $\delta(G)$ of a discrete (or Lie) group G as the least $\delta > -1$ such that G is bi-uniformly equivalent to a δ -pinched Riemannian manifold.

Rank one symmetric spaces are hyperbolic spaces over the reals $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$, the complex numbers $H^m_{\mathbb{C}}$, the quaternions $H^m_{\mathbb{H}}$, and the octonions $H^0_{\mathbb{C}}$. Real hyperbolic space has sectional curvature -1. Other rank one symmetric spaces are $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched, i.e. their sectional curvature ranges between -1 and $-\frac{1}{4}$.

Definition

Define the optimal pinching $\delta(G)$ of a discrete (or Lie) group G as the least $\delta > -1$ such that G is bi-uniformly equivalent to a δ -pinched Riemannian manifold.

Conjecture

The optimal pinching of SU(m, 1), Sp(m, 1) ($m \ge 2$) and F_4^{-20} is $-\frac{1}{4}$.
Theorem If M^n is simply connected and δ -pinched for some $\delta \in [-1,0)$, then

$$p < 1 + \frac{n-k}{k-1}\sqrt{-\delta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T^{k,p}(M) = 0.$$

Theorem

If M^n is simply connected and δ -pinched for some $\delta \in [-1, 0)$, then

$$p < 1 + \frac{n-k}{k-1}\sqrt{-\delta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T^{k,p}(M) = 0.$$

This is sharp. For instance, consider the semidirect product $G = \mathbb{R}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$ where $\alpha = diag(1, 1, 2)$.

▶ It admits a $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched left-invariant Riemannian metric, therefore $\delta(G) \leq -\frac{1}{4}$.

▶ It has $T^{2,p}(G) \neq 0$ for $2 . This implies that <math>\delta(G) = -\frac{1}{4}$.

Theorem

If M^n is simply connected and δ -pinched for some $\delta \in [-1, 0)$, then

$$p < 1 + rac{n-k}{k-1}\sqrt{-\delta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T^{k,p}(M) = 0.$$

This is sharp. For instance, consider the semidirect product $G = \mathbb{R}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$ where $\alpha = diag(1, 1, 2)$.

- ▶ It admits a $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched left-invariant Riemannian metric, therefore $\delta(G) \leq -\frac{1}{4}$.
- ▶ It has $T^{2,p}(G) \neq 0$ for $2 . This implies that <math>\delta(G) = -\frac{1}{4}$.

Remark

Complex hyperbolic plane $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ is isometric to $G' = \text{Heis}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$ where $\alpha = \text{diag}(1, 1, 2)$ and Heis denotes the Heisenberg group. Therefore it is very close to G.

Theorem

If M^n is simply connected and δ -pinched for some $\delta \in [-1, 0)$, then

$$p < 1 + \frac{n-k}{k-1}\sqrt{-\delta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T^{k,p}(M) = 0.$$

This is sharp. For instance, consider the semidirect product $G = \mathbb{R}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$ where $\alpha = diag(1, 1, 2)$.

- ▶ It admits a $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched left-invariant Riemannian metric, therefore $\delta(G) \leq -\frac{1}{4}$.
- ▶ It has $T^{2,p}(G) \neq 0$ for $2 . This implies that <math>\delta(G) = -\frac{1}{4}$.

Remark

Complex hyperbolic plane $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ is isometric to $G' = \text{Heis}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$ where $\alpha = \text{diag}(1, 1, 2)$ and Heis denotes the Heisenberg group. Therefore it is very close to G.

Theorem $T^{2,p}(H^2_{\mathbb{C}}) = 0$ for 2 .

Proof of torsion comparison theorem

Use the gradient vectorfield ξ of a Busemann function and its flow ϕ_t , whose derivative is controlled by sectional curvature. For α a closed k-form in L^p ,

$$\phi_t^* \alpha = \alpha + d \left(\int_0^t \phi_s^* \iota_\xi \alpha \, ds \right)$$

has a limit as $t \to +\infty$ under the assumptions of the theorem. This boundary value map injects $H^{k,p}$ into a function space of closed forms on the ideal boundary, showing that $H^{k,p}$ is Hausdorff.

Proof of torsion comparison theorem

Use the gradient vectorfield ξ of a Busemann function and its flow ϕ_t , whose derivative is controlled by sectional curvature. For α a closed k-form in L^p ,

$$\phi_t^* \alpha = \alpha + d \left(\int_0^t \phi_s^* \iota_\xi \alpha \, \mathrm{d} s \right)$$

has a limit as $t \to +\infty$ under the assumptions of the theorem. This boundary value map injects $H^{k,p}$ into a function space of closed forms on the ideal boundary, showing that $H^{k,p}$ is Hausdorff.

Proof of torsion vanishing for $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$

For $p \notin \{4/3, 2, 4\}$, differential forms α on $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ split into components α_+ and α_+ which are contracted (resp. expanded) by ϕ_t . Then

$$B_t: \alpha \mapsto \int_0^t \phi_s^* \iota_{\xi} \alpha_+ \, ds - \int_{-t}^0 \phi_s^* \iota_{\xi} \alpha_- \, ds$$

converges as $t \to +\infty$ to a bounded operator *B* on L^p . P = 1 - dB - Bd retracts the L^p de Rham complex onto a complex of differential forms on *Heis*³ with missing components and weakly regular coefficients. If 2 , this complex is nonzero in degrees 1 and 2, but it is so small that its cohomology can be shown to be Hausdorff.

Use Poincaré duality. Let p'=p/p-1 denote the conjugate exponent. In order to prove that a closed k-form α is nonzero in cohomology, it suffices to construct a sequence ψ_j of (n-k)-forms such that $\parallel d\psi_j \parallel_{L^{p'}}$ tends to zero but $\int \alpha \wedge \psi_j$ does not tend to zero.

Use Poincaré duality. Let p'=p/p-1 denote the conjugate exponent. In order to prove that a closed k-form α is nonzero in cohomology, it suffices to construct a sequence ψ_j of (n-k)-forms such that $\parallel d\psi_j \parallel_{L^{p'}}$ tends to zero but $\int \alpha \wedge \psi_j$ does not tend to zero.

In conclusion, we have used

- Poincaré duality.
- A deformation retraction of space onto a subspace, with controlled effect on the L^p-norms of forms. For certain ranges of p, this provides a boundary value.

Use Poincaré duality. Let p' = p/p - 1 denote the conjugate exponent. In order to prove that a closed k-form α is nonzero in cohomology, it suffices to construct a sequence ψ_j of (n - k)-forms such that $\| d\psi_j \|_{L^{p'}}$ tends to zero but $\int \alpha \wedge \psi_j$ does not tend to zero.

In conclusion, we have used

- Poincaré duality.
- A deformation retraction of space onto a subspace, with controlled effect on the L^p-norms of forms. For certain ranges of p, this provides a boundary value.

Conjecture

- ▶ For rank 1 symmetric spaces, T^{k,p} = 0 except for at most 1 value of p in each degree.
- ▶ For higher rank symmetric spaces, $H^{k,p} = 0$ for k < rank, $T^{k,p} = 0$ for k = rank.
- For k = rank, R^{k,p} ≠ 0 for p large, and R^{k,p} is a function space on the maximal boundary.
- For each p > 1, there exists k such that $H^{k,p} \neq 0$.

 L^p -cohomology of $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?



◆ロト ◆母 ト ◆臣 ト ◆臣 ト ○臣 ○ のへで