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## Eigenvalue estimates on homogeneous manifolds

by Peter Li

## §0. Introduction

In the recent years, much work has been done on studying the first eigenvalue of the equation

$$
\Delta f=-\lambda f
$$

where $f$ is a $C^{\infty}$ function defined on á compact Riemannian manifold. In general, it is known that [1] the first eigenvalue $\lambda_{1}$ cannot be bounded by either the diameter or the volume alone. In [3] Cheng showed that $\lambda_{1}$ has an upper bound depending on the diameter, $d$, and the lower bound of the Ricci curvature, $(n-1) K$. Yau [12] later conjectured that one should be able to estimate $\lambda_{1}$ from below in terms of $d$ and $(n-1) K$ also. This conjecture was shown to be true in [7] for a special case. The general case was later established by Yau and the author [9].

The purpose of the first part of this paper is to obtain a lower bound for $\lambda_{1}$ on a compact homogeneous manifold $M$. In fact, we will prove that $\lambda_{1} \geq \pi^{2} / 4 d^{2}$. This is rather surprising that homogeneity is strong enough to guarantee a lower estimate of $\lambda_{1}$ in terms of $d$ alone.

One can improve this estimate of $\lambda_{1}$ by assuming $K \geq 0$ (i.e. Ricci curvature $\geq 0$ ). Actually, we will show that by a method in [9], if a general compact manifold is non-negatively Ricci-curved and also the first eigenvalue has multiplicity greater than one, then $\lambda_{1} \geq \pi^{2} / d^{2}$. In particular, if $M$ is homogeneous, the multiplicity condition on $\lambda_{1}$ is shown to be automatically satisfied. Hence in addition if $K \geq 0$, then $\lambda_{1} \geq \pi^{2} / d^{2}$. Further more, this estimate is sharp. If, in addition, we assume that $M$ is an irreducible homogeneous manifold then $\lambda_{1} \geq n \pi^{2} / 4 d^{2}$.

In the third section, we will give an estimate on the differences of any two consecutive eigenvalues of a homogeneous manifold in terms of its lower eigenvalues. The method was also used in [10], [2] and [11]. In fact, if $\Lambda=\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \lambda_{i}$ then

$$
\lambda_{m}-\lambda_{m-1} \leq \frac{2}{m}\left(\sqrt{\Lambda^{2}+m \Lambda \lambda_{1}}+\Lambda\right)+\lambda_{1} .
$$

Finally, the last section is devoted to the studying of the spectrum of differential $p$-forms. When a homogeneous manifold is also assumed to have non-vanishing Euler number, we will show that the first eigenvalue for 1 -forms $\lambda_{1}^{1}$ has a lower bound depending on $d$ and $K$. A sufficient condition for a homogeneous manifold to have its $p^{\text {th }}$ Betti number no greater than $\left(\begin{array}{l}\binom{n}{p} \text { will also be derived. }\end{array}\right.$

Throughout this paper we will assume the $M$ is a compact homogeneous manifold with isometry group $G$ and isotropy subgroup $H$, unless specified.

## §1. Basic estimates

PROPOSITION 1. Let $E$ be a finite dimensional $G$-invariant subspace of the space of $L^{2} p$-forms on $M$. Suppose $\operatorname{dim} E=k$, then for all $\omega \in E$ and $x \in M$

$$
|\omega|^{2}(x) \leq \frac{k}{V}\|\omega\|_{2}^{2}
$$

where $|\omega|$ denotes the pointwise norm of $\omega$, and $V=$ volume of $M$.
Proof. Let $\left\{\omega_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{k}$ be an orthonormal basis of $E$ with respect to the $L^{2}$ inner product. We define the function

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2}(x) \quad x \in M . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly $F(x)$ is well defined under orthogonal change of basis. Let $x_{0} \in M$ be fixed, then

$$
\begin{align*}
F\left(x_{0}\right) & =\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|g^{*} \omega_{i}\left(g^{-1}\left(x_{0}\right)\right)\right| \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|\omega_{i}\left(g^{-1}\left(x_{0}\right)\right)\right| \quad g \in G . \tag{1.2}
\end{align*}
$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that g is an isometry, hence $\left\{\mathrm{g}^{*} \omega_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{k}$ form an orthonormal basis of $E$. Since $G$ acts transitively on $M$, there exists $g \in G$ such that $g(x)=x_{0}$. Hence (1.2) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(x_{0}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|\omega_{i}(x)\right|=F(x) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

which shows $F$ is a constant function. Integrating both sides of (1.1) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
V \cdot F\left(x_{0}\right)=\int_{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2}=k . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2}(x)=F(x)=F\left(x_{0}\right)=\frac{k}{V} \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the proposition follows directly.
COROLLARY 2. Let $E_{\lambda}^{p}$ be an eigenspace of p-forms with eigenvalue $\lambda$ on $M$. If $\omega \in E_{\lambda}^{p}$, then

$$
\|\omega\|_{\infty}^{2} \leq \frac{\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda}^{p}}{V}\|\omega\|_{2}^{2} .
$$

Proof. Since the Laplacian commutes with isometries, $E_{\lambda}^{p}$ is a finite dimensional $G$-invariant subspace, hence proposition 1 can be applied.

Remark. One can also apply the proposition to any $G$-invariant subspace of $E_{\lambda}^{p}$.

PROPOSITION 2. If $E$ is a finite dimensional $G$-invariant subspace of $L^{2}$ functions on M, then

$$
\|f\|_{\infty}^{2} \leq \frac{k}{V}\|f\|_{2}^{2} \quad \text { for all } \quad f \in E
$$

where $k=\operatorname{dim} E$. Moreover if $E \neq\{0\}$, there exists $f_{0} \in E$ such that

$$
\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}=\frac{k}{V}\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2} .
$$

Proof. The first part of the proposition is just a special case of proposition 1. The equality follows from the existence of "zonal functions" discovered by E. Cartan in the case of symmetric spaces. However for completeness sake, we will sketch its proof.

Define $E_{0} \subset E$ to be the subspace

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{0}=\left\{f \in E \mid f\left(x_{0}\right)=0\right\} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x_{0} \in M$ is fixed. By homogeneity of $M$ and the fact that $E \neq\{0\}$, we have $E_{0} \neq E$. We claim that the perpendicular subspace $E_{0}^{\perp}$ of $E_{0}$ in $E$ is of dimension 1. If not, let $f_{0}$ and $f_{1}$ be two linearly independent functions in $E_{0}^{\perp}$. On the other hand, there exists $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\alpha f_{0}\left(x_{0}\right)+\beta f_{1}\left(x_{0}\right)=0
$$

But this implies $\alpha f_{0}+\beta f_{1} \in E_{0}$, which is a contradiction. Hence there exists $f_{0} \in E$ such that $E_{0} \oplus\left\langle f_{0}\right\rangle=E$ and $\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{2}=1$. Let $\left\{f_{1}\right\}_{i=1}^{k}$ be an orthonormal basis of $E$ with $f_{0}=f_{1}$. By equation (1.5), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{k} f_{i}^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)=\frac{k}{V} \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

However $f_{\alpha}\left(x_{0}\right)=0$, for $\alpha \geq 2$, therefore $f_{0}^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)=k / V$ which proves the proposition.

Remark. Let us denote $H_{0}$ to be the isotropic subgroup of $G$ which leaves $x_{0}$ fixed. Then $f_{0}$ is invariant under the action of $H_{0}$ and hence takes constant value on each orbit of $H_{0}$. This was the original definition of zonal functions. We will call $f_{0}$ the zonal function of $E$ at $x_{0}$.

COROLLARY 4. Let $E_{\lambda}^{0}$ be an eigenspace of functions with eigenvalue $\lambda$. Then for a fixed point $x_{0} \in M$, there exists a unique $f_{0} \in E_{\lambda}^{0}$ which satisfies
(i) $\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}=f_{0}\left(x_{0}\right)=\left(\frac{\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda}^{0}}{V}\right)^{1 / 2}$
(ii) $\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{2}=1$
(iii) $f_{0}$ is invariant under $H_{0}$
(iv) $\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} \geq f^{2}(x)$ for all $f \in E_{\lambda}^{0}$
(v) $\left\langle f_{0}\right\rangle \oplus E_{0}=E$.

## §2. The first eigenvalue for functions

In this section we will utilize corollaries 2 and 4 of the above section to obtain a lower bound for $\lambda_{1}$. A sharp estimate can be obtained if in addition we assume the homogeneous manifold $M$ is non-negatively Ricci-curved.

THEOREM 5. Let $E_{\lambda}^{0}$ be an eigenspace of functions on $M$. Suppose $f_{0} \in E_{\lambda}^{0}$ is a zonal function we obtained in corollary 4. Then

$$
\left|\nabla f_{0}\right|^{2}(x)+\lambda f_{0}^{2}(x) \leq \lambda\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} \quad \text { for all } \quad x \in M
$$

Proof. Let $x_{0} \in M$ be a point such that $f_{0}$ is a zonal function at $x_{0}$. Consider $g \in G$ such that $g\left(x_{0}\right)=x$. Then the action of $g$ on $f_{0}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
g \cdot f_{0}(y)=f_{0}(g(y)) \quad \text { for all } \quad y \in M \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

One can complete $\left\{f_{0}\right\}$ to $\left\{f_{1}\right\}_{i=1}^{k}$ an orthonormal basis for $E_{\lambda}^{0}$ with $f_{0}=f_{1}$ and $f_{\alpha} \in E_{0}$, for $\alpha \geq 2$. We may also assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
g \cdot f_{0}=a f_{0}+b f_{2} \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left\|g \cdot f_{0}\right\|_{2}=1$, we have $a^{2}+b^{2}=1$. By the fact that $g$ is an isometry

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\nabla f_{0}\right|^{2}(x)+\lambda f_{0}^{2}(x)=\left|\nabla\left(g \cdot f_{0}\right)\right|^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)+\lambda\left(g \cdot f_{0}\right)^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)=b^{2}\left|\nabla f_{2}\right|^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)+\lambda a^{2} f_{0}^{2}\left(x_{0}\right) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last equality follows from (2.2) and the fact that $f_{0}$ attains its supremum at $x_{0}$. $a^{2}+b^{2}=1$ implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\nabla f_{0}\right|^{2}(x)+\lambda f_{0}^{2}(x)=\lambda f_{0}^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)+b^{2}\left[\left|\nabla f_{2}\right|^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)-\lambda f_{0}^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)\right] \leq \lambda\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}+b^{2}\left[\left\|\nabla f_{2}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}-\lambda\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}\right] . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we claim that the second term of the right hand side of (2.4) is non-positive.
In fact, if we consider the subspace $\tilde{E}=\left\{d f \mid f \in E_{\lambda}^{0}\right\}$ of 1-forms, then it is easy to see that since $\lambda \neq 0, \tilde{E}$ is a subspace of dimension $k=\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda}^{0}$. Also $\tilde{E}$ is invariant under $G$ by the fact that $d$ commutes with any $g \in G$. Hence by proposition 1,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\nabla f\|_{\infty}^{2} \leq \frac{k}{V}\|\nabla f\|_{2}^{2}=\frac{\lambda k}{V}\|f\|_{2}^{2} \quad \text { for all } \quad f \in E_{\lambda}^{0} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, corollary 4 gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}=\frac{k}{V} . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\nabla f_{2}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} \leq \frac{\lambda k}{V}=\lambda\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

which proves the theorem.
COROLLARY 6. The first eigenvalue $\lambda_{1}$ for functions on a homogeneous manifold satisfies $\pi^{2} / 4 d^{2} \leq \lambda_{1}$, where $d=$ diameter of $M$.

Proof. By theorem 5, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left|\nabla f_{0}\right|}{\sqrt{ }\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}-f_{0}^{2}} \leq \lambda^{1 / 2} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integrating along the shortest geodesic $\gamma$ joining $x_{0}$ and $N$ the zero set of $f_{0}$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
d \cdot \lambda^{1 / 2} \geq \int \frac{\left|\nabla f_{0}\right|}{\sqrt{ }\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}-f_{0}^{2}} \geq \sin ^{-1}\left(\frac{f_{0}\left(x_{0}\right)}{\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}}\right)=\frac{\pi}{2} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The corollary follows.
Remark. The gradient estimate in theorem 5 is the same as the one obtained in [9], where we had to assume $\boldsymbol{M}$ is non-negatively Ricci-curved. In general without the assumption $\mathrm{Ric}_{M} \geq 0$, the conclusion of theorem 5 is false. It is hence rather surprising that the homogeneity condition alone gives such strong gradient estimate.

If $M$ is assumed to be non-negatively Ricci-curved and also if $\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0} \geq 2$, then by following the method in [9] one can derive a sharp lower bound for $\lambda_{1}$.

THEOREM 7. Let $M$ be a compact manifold (not necessarily homogeneous) with Ricci curvature bounded below by $(n-1) K$. Suppose $\lambda_{1}$ is the first non-zero eigenvalue for
(i) $\Delta \varphi=-\lambda_{1} \varphi \quad$ when $\quad \partial M=\emptyset$
(ii) $\Delta \varphi=-\lambda_{1} \varphi \quad$ and $\quad \partial \varphi / \partial \nu=0 \quad$ when $\quad \partial M \neq \emptyset$,
where $\partial / \partial \nu$ denotes the outward unit normal to $\partial M$. Assuming also $\partial M$ is convexed.
If $\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0} \geq 2$, then $\lambda_{1} \geq \pi^{2} / d^{2}+\min \{(n-1) K, 0\}$.

Proof. First we show that there exists $\varphi \in E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup \varphi=|\inf \varphi| \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0} \geqslant 2$, let $\varphi_{0}$ and $\varphi_{1}$ be two linearly independent eigenfunctions in $E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0}$. We may assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup \varphi_{i}>\left|\inf \varphi_{i}\right| \quad i=0,1 \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider the functions defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{t}=(1-t) \varphi_{0}-t \varphi_{1} \quad t \in[0,1] \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi(t)=\sup \varphi_{t}+\inf \varphi_{t} . \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly $\varphi_{t} \in E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0}$ and $\Phi(t)$ is a continuous function in $t$. By (2.11), we know that

$$
\Phi(0)=\sup \varphi_{0}+\inf \varphi_{0}>0
$$

and

$$
\Phi(1)=\sup \left(-\varphi_{1}\right)+\inf \left(-\varphi_{1}\right)=-\inf \varphi_{1}-\sup \varphi_{1}<0 .
$$

Therefore there exists $t \in[0,1]$ such that

$$
0=\Phi(t)=\sup \varphi_{t}+\inf \varphi_{t}
$$

which proves the claimed.
The rest of the proof follows the same way as in Theorems 10 and 12 of [9], with a slight modification as follows: Let $\gamma$ be a shortest geodesic joining the supremum and infemum points of $\varphi$. Consider $\gamma_{1}$ and $\gamma_{2}$ as parts of $\gamma$ joining the supremum point and the zero set, and joining the infemum point and the zero set respectively. Since $\gamma$ has length no greater than $d$, either $\gamma_{1}$ or $\gamma_{2}$ has length no greater than $d / 2$. Assume $l\left(\gamma_{2}\right) \leq d / 2$. Integrating the gradient estimate along $\gamma_{2}$ and using the fact that $|\inf \varphi|=\sup \varphi$ the theorem follows.

COROLLARY 8. Let $M$ be a compact homogeneous manifold without boundary. Then

$$
\lambda_{1} \geq \frac{\pi^{2}}{d^{2}}+\min \{(n-1) K, 0\}
$$

Proof. In view of theorem 7, it suffices to show that $\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0} \geq 2$. However if $E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0}=\langle f\rangle$, by proposition 1

$$
f^{2}=\text { const }
$$

which contradicts the fact that $f$ is the first eigenfunction.
Remark. Theorem 7 yields a sharp estimate for $\lambda_{1}$. If one considers $M=$ $S^{1}(r) \times N$ where $N$ has non-negative Ricci curvature. It is well known that the eigenvalues of $M$ split into sums of eigenvalues of $S^{1}(r)$ and $N$. Hence for $r$ sufficiently large

$$
\lambda_{1}(M)=\lambda_{1}\left(S^{1}(r)\right)=\frac{1}{r^{2}} .
$$

On the other hand $d^{2}(M)=d^{2}\left(S^{1}(r)\right)+d^{2}(N)=\pi^{2} r^{2}+d^{2}(N)$. Therefore

$$
\lambda_{1}(M) \times d^{2}(M)=\pi^{2}+\frac{d^{2}(N)}{r^{2}}
$$

which tends to $\pi^{2}$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. This shows the sharpness of theorem 7 .

DEFINITION. $M=G / H$ is said to be a compact irreducible homogeneous manifold if $G$ is a compact isometry group of $M$ and the isotropy subgroup $H$ acts irreducibly on the tangent space of $M$.

THEOREM 9. Let $M$ be a compact irreducible homogeneous Riemannian manifold. Suppose $E_{\lambda}^{0}$ is an eigenspace of functions on $M$. If $f_{0} \in E_{\lambda}^{0}$ is a zonal function of $E_{\lambda}^{0}$, then for all $x \in M$

$$
\left|\nabla f_{0}\right|^{2}(x)+\frac{\lambda}{n} f_{0}^{2}(x) \leq \frac{\lambda}{n}\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} .
$$

Proof. It is known that [5] an irreducible homogeneous Riemannian manifold, $M$, can be isometrically minimally immersed into the standard sphere by any of its
eigenspaces. In fact, the immersion $\Phi: M \rightarrow S^{k-1}(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{k}$ is given by $\Phi=$ $\left(\alpha \varphi_{1}, \ldots, \alpha \varphi_{k}\right)$ where $\left\{\varphi_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{k}$ is an orthonormal basis of $E_{\lambda}^{0}$ and $\lambda=n / r^{2}$.

First we will show that for any $f \in E_{\lambda}^{0}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\nabla f|^{2} \leq \frac{\lambda}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varphi_{t}^{2}=\frac{\lambda}{n} \cdot \frac{k}{V} \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

We may assume that $f=\varphi_{1}$. By the fact that $\Phi$ is an isometry, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
d \Phi(X)=1 \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all unit vector $X \in T \times M$. This implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(X \varphi_{i}\right)^{2}=1 \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

By choosing $X$ appropriately, we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\alpha^{2}} \geq\left(X \varphi_{1}\right)^{2}=|\nabla f|^{2} \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, since $\Phi(M) \subseteq S^{k-1}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varphi_{i}^{2}=r^{2}=\frac{n}{\lambda} \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence combining with (2.17) gives

$$
|\nabla f|^{2} \leq \frac{\lambda}{n}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \varphi_{i}^{2}\right)
$$

Now Theorem 9 follows from the proof of Theorem 5 where we substitute $\lambda / n$ instead of $\lambda$.

COROLLARY 10. Let $M$ be an irreducible homogeneous Riemannian manifold. Then the first eigenvalue $\lambda_{1}$ for functions satisfies

$$
\frac{\pi^{2}}{4 d^{2}} \leq \lambda_{1}
$$

Proof. Follow the proof of Corollary 6 but using Theorem 9 instead of Theorem 5.

Remark. If we integrate the inequality

$$
\left|\nabla f_{0}\right|^{2}(x)+\frac{\lambda}{n} f_{0}^{2}(x) \leq \frac{\lambda}{n}\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}
$$

over $M$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{\lambda}{n}\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq \frac{\lambda}{n} \cdot V \cdot\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} . \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n+1)\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq V\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all zonal functions in any eigenspaces of $M$. Moreover equality holds if $M \simeq S^{n}(r)$. In fact, if $(n+1)\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}=V\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}$ then combining with proposition 2 : $n+1=k$. However since $\Phi: M^{n} \rightarrow S^{k-1}(r)=S^{n}(r)$ is an isometric immersion, this implies that $M^{n}$ is a constant curvature manifold with curvature $=1 / r^{2}$. It is not hard to see that the only constant positive curvature irreducible homogeneous space which can be isometrically immersed in $S^{n}(r)$ via its eigenspace has to be $S^{n}(r)$ (see [6]).

## §3. Higher eigenvalues for functions

In the following theorem we show that $\lambda_{m}$ can be estimated from above in terms of $\lambda_{i}, i \leq m-1$. In [10] and [2], the authors utilized the fact that the coordinate functions are harmonic and gave upper bounds for $\lambda_{m}$ on domains and minimal submanifolds in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$. Since the coordinate functions of a minimal submanifold in $S^{n}$ are eigenfunctions, Yang and Yau [11] found upper bounds for $\lambda_{m}$ using similar philosophy as mentioned above. It turns out that a similar method carries through when $M$ is homogeneous, which depends heavily on proposition 1.

THEOREM 11. Let $\Lambda=\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \lambda_{i}$. Then

$$
\lambda_{m}-\lambda_{m-1} \leq \frac{2}{m}\left({\left.\sqrt{\Lambda^{2}+m \Lambda \lambda_{1}}+\Lambda\right)+\lambda_{1} .} .\right.
$$

Proof. Let $\left\{\varphi_{\alpha}\right\}_{\alpha=1}^{k}$ be an orthonormal basis of the first eigenspace $E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0}$, and $\left\{\varphi_{i}\right\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$ be the set of first $m^{\text {th }}$ orthonormal eigenfunctions (including constant function). Then

$$
\Delta \varphi_{\alpha}=-\lambda_{1} \varphi_{\alpha} \quad \text { for } \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq k
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta \varphi_{i}=-\lambda_{i} \varphi_{i} \quad \text { for } \quad 0 \leq i \leq n-1 . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We define

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{\alpha i}=\varphi_{\alpha} \varphi_{i}-\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\alpha i j} \varphi_{j} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
a_{\alpha i j}=\int \varphi_{\alpha} \varphi_{i} \varphi_{j}=a_{\alpha i i} .
$$

Clearly

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int u_{\alpha i} \varphi_{i}=0 \quad \text { for all } \quad 0 \leq j \leq n-1 \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence by the variational principle for $\lambda_{m}$, we have

$$
\lambda_{m} \leq \frac{\int\left|\nabla u_{\alpha i}\right|^{2}}{\int u_{\alpha i}^{2}} \text { for all } \alpha, i .
$$

## However

$$
\begin{align*}
\int\left|\nabla u_{\alpha i}\right|^{2}= & -\int u_{\alpha i} \Delta u_{\alpha i}=-\int u_{\alpha i}\left[-\left(\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{i}\right) \varphi_{\alpha} \varphi_{i}+2\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle\right. \\
& \left.+\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\alpha i j} \lambda_{i} \varphi_{j}\right]=\left(\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{i}\right) \int u_{\alpha i}^{2}-2 \int u_{\alpha i}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle . \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{m} \leq \lambda_{1}+\lambda_{i}-\frac{2 \int u_{\alpha i}\left(\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle}{\int u_{\alpha i}^{2}} \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{m}-\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{m-1} \leq \frac{-2 \sum_{i, \alpha} \int u_{\alpha i}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle}{\sum_{i, \alpha} \int u_{\alpha i}} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

But

$$
\begin{align*}
&-2 \sum_{i, \alpha} \int u_{\alpha i}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle=\sum_{i, \alpha} \int-2 \varphi_{\alpha} \varphi_{i}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle+\sum_{\alpha, i, j} \int 2 a_{\alpha i j} \varphi_{j}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle \\
&=\sum_{i, \alpha} \frac{1}{2} \int-\left\langle\nabla\left(\varphi_{\alpha}^{2}\right), \nabla\left(\varphi_{i}^{2}\right)\right\rangle+\sum_{\alpha, i, j} \int a_{\alpha i j}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla\left(\varphi_{i} \varphi_{j}\right)\right\rangle\left(\text { since } a_{\alpha i j}=a_{\alpha j i}\right) \\
&=\sum_{\alpha, i, j} \int a_{\alpha i j} \lambda_{1} \varphi_{\alpha} \varphi_{i} \varphi_{j}\left(\text { since } \sum \varphi_{\alpha}^{2}=\text { constant }\right) \\
&=\lambda_{1} \sum_{\alpha, i, j} a_{\alpha i j}^{2} \tag{3.7}
\end{align*}
$$

Also

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{\alpha, i} \int u_{\alpha i}^{2} & =\sum_{\alpha, i} \int \varphi_{\alpha}^{2} \varphi_{i}^{2}-2 \sum_{\alpha, i, j} \int \varphi_{\alpha} \varphi_{i} a_{\alpha i j} \varphi_{j}+\sum_{\alpha, i, j, l} \int a_{\alpha i j} a_{\alpha i l} \varphi_{j} \varphi_{l} \\
& =\sum_{\alpha} \varphi_{\alpha}^{2} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int \varphi_{i}^{2}-2 \sum_{\alpha, i, j} a_{\alpha i j}^{2}+\sum_{\alpha, i, j} a_{\alpha i j}^{2}=\frac{k m}{V}-\sum_{\alpha, i, j} a_{\alpha i j}^{2} \tag{3.8}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, if we let $A=\sum_{\alpha, i, j} a_{\alpha i j}^{2}$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{m}-\lambda_{m-1}-\lambda_{1} \leq \frac{\lambda_{1} A}{\frac{k m}{V}-A} \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{\alpha, i}\left|\int u_{\alpha i}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle\right| & \leq \sum_{\alpha, i}\left(\int u_{\alpha i}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\int\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& \leq\left(\sum_{\alpha, i} \int u_{\alpha i}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\sum_{\alpha, i} \int\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& =\left(\sum_{\alpha, i} \int u_{\alpha i}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\sum_{i} \int\left(\sum_{\alpha}\left|\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}\right|^{2}\right)\left|\nabla \varphi_{i}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& =\left(\sum_{\alpha, i} \int u_{\alpha i}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\frac{\lambda_{1} k}{V} \sum_{i} \lambda_{i}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{3.10}
\end{align*}
$$

The last equality follows from Proposition 1 and the fact that $\int\left|\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}\right|^{2}=\lambda_{1}$. Substituting this into (3.6), we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\lambda_{m}-\lambda_{m-1}-\lambda_{1} & \leq \frac{-2 \sum_{\alpha, i} \int u_{\alpha i}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle}{\left[\sum_{\alpha, i} \mid \int u_{\alpha i}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle\right]^{2}} \times \frac{k \lambda_{1} \Lambda}{V} \\
& \leq \frac{2 k \lambda_{1} \Lambda}{V}\left(\sum_{\alpha, i}\left|\int u_{\alpha i}\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{\alpha}, \nabla \varphi_{i}\right\rangle\right|\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{2 k \lambda_{1} \Lambda}{V}\left(\frac{2}{\lambda_{1} A}\right)  \tag{by3.7}\\
& =\frac{4 \Lambda k}{V A} \tag{3.11}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (3.11) with (3.9) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{m}-\lambda_{m-1}-\lambda_{1} \leq \min \left\{\frac{\lambda_{1} V A}{k m-V A}, \frac{4 \Lambda k}{V A}\right\} \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Observe that as a function of $V A, \lambda_{1} V A / k m-V A$ is an increasing function on $[0, \mathrm{~km}]$ and approaches $\infty$ as $V A$ tends to $k m$. Also $4 \Lambda k / V A$ is a decreasing function on $[0, k m]$ and approaches $\infty$ as $V A$ tends to 0 . Hence the minimum between the two functions is bounded by their common value taken at

$$
V A=\frac{\sqrt{16 \Lambda k^{2}\left(\Delta+m \lambda_{1}\right)}-4 \Lambda k}{2 \lambda_{1}}
$$

Therefore

$$
\lambda_{m}-\lambda_{m-1}-\lambda_{1} \leq \frac{2}{m}\left({\sqrt{\Lambda}{ }^{2}+m \Lambda \lambda_{1}}^{m} \Lambda\right)
$$

## §4. First eigenvalues for differential forms

The celebrated Hodge theorem tells us that the $p^{\text {th }}$ Betti number is given by the dimension of the space of harmonic $p$-forms. Clearly the Laplace-Beltrami operator $\Delta=\delta d+d \delta$ depends heavily on the metric. Yet the notion of Betti numbers are purely topological. This phenomenon explains why the study of the first eigenvalues for differential forms is much more difficult than for functions.

The only known result in estimating lower bounds for $\lambda_{1}^{p}$ is due to Gallot and Meyer [4]. They had to assume that the curvature operator is bounded below by a positive number. However this assumption automatically implied the vanishing of the Betti numbers, which is the famous vanishing theorem of S . Bochner.

The objective of this section is to establish a lower bound for $\lambda_{1}^{1}$ on homogeneous manifolds. In most cases, we have to impose additional assumption about the geometry in order to avoid the topological difficulty mentioned above.

THEOREM 12. Let $E_{\lambda}^{p}$ be the eigenspace of p-forms with eigenvalue $\lambda$. Then there exists $\omega_{0} \in E_{\lambda}^{p}$, such that

$$
1 \leq d\left[\min \left\{k,\binom{n}{p}\right\} \times\left(\lambda-(n-p) p K_{p}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}+\inf \left|\omega_{0}\right|\left(\frac{V}{k} \times \min \left\{k,\binom{n}{p}\right\}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

where $k=\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda}^{p}$ and

$$
K_{p}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
(n-1)^{-1} \times(\text { lower bound of Ricci curvature }) \text {, if } p=1 \\
\text { lower bound of the curvature operator, if } p>1 .
\end{array}\right.
$$

Proof. Consider an orthonormal basis $\left\{\omega_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{k}$ for the eigenspace $E_{\lambda}^{p}$. A formula of Bochner gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\nabla \omega_{i}\right|^{2}=\lambda\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \Delta\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2}-F\left(\omega_{i}\right) . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Summing over all $i$ and using (1.5) of Proposition 1 yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i}\left|\nabla \omega_{i}\right|^{2}=\lambda \sum_{i}\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2}-\sum_{i} F\left(\omega_{i}\right) . \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

However it is known that [4]

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq p(n-p) K_{p}\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2} . \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum\left|\nabla \omega_{i}\right|^{2} \leq\left(\lambda-p(n-p) K_{p}\right) \sum\left|\omega_{i}\right|^{2}=\left(\lambda-p(n-p) K_{p}\right) \frac{k}{V} . \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

However Lemma 9 of [8] implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\nabla| \omega_{i}| |^{2} \leq\left|\nabla \omega_{i}\right|^{2} . \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\nabla\left|\omega_{1}\right|\right\|_{\infty} \leq\left[\lambda-(n-p) p K_{p}\right]^{1 / 2}\left(\frac{k}{V}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Theorem 12 of [8], we can choose $\omega_{0} \in E_{\lambda}^{p}$ to satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min \left\{k,\binom{n}{p}\right\}\left\|\omega_{0}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} \geq \frac{k}{V}\left\|\omega_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2} \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Letting $\omega_{0}=\omega_{1}$ and integrating (4.6) along the shortest geodesic $\gamma$ joining inf $\left|\omega_{0}\right|$ and $\sup \left|\omega_{0}\right|=\left\|\omega_{0}\right\|_{\infty}$ yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left[\lambda-p(n-p) K_{p}\right]^{1 / 2}\left(\frac{k}{V}\right)^{1 / 2} & \geq d\left\|\nabla\left|\omega_{0}\right|\right\|_{\infty} \geq \int_{\gamma}\left\|\nabla\left|\omega_{0}\right|\right\| \\
& \geq\left\|\omega_{0}\right\|_{\infty}-\inf \left|\omega_{0}\right| \geq\left(\frac{k}{V \times \min \left\{k,\binom{n}{p}\right\}}\right)^{1 / 2}-\inf \left|\omega_{0}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves the theorem.

COROLLARY 13. Let $M$ be a compact homogeneous manifold with $\chi(M) \neq$ 0 .Then the first eigenvalue for 1 -forms $\lambda_{1}^{1}$ satisfies

$$
\lambda_{1}^{1} \geq \frac{1}{n d^{2}}+(n-1) K
$$

Proof. Since $K_{\mathrm{p}}=K$, theorem 11 gives

$$
1 \leq d\left[n\left(\lambda_{1}^{1}-(n-1) K\right]^{1 / 2}+\inf \left|\omega_{0}\right| \times\left(V^{1 / 2}\right)\right.
$$

However $\chi(M) \neq 0$, implies $\omega_{0}$ has to vanish somewhere, hence inf $\left|\omega_{0}\right|=0$. The corollary follows.

COROLLARY 14. Let $M$ be a compact homogeneous manifold. Then the first eigenvalue $\lambda_{1}$ for functions satisfies

$$
\lambda_{1} \geq \frac{1}{n d^{2}}+(n-1) K
$$

Proof. Let $E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0}$ be the first eigenspace for functions. Since $\tilde{E}=\left\{d f \mid f \in E_{\lambda_{1}}^{0}\right\}$ is a $G$-invariant subspace of eigen 1 -forms, Theorem 11 applies. Moreover, at the supremum point of $f, d f=0$, hence inf $\left|\omega_{0}\right|=0$.

COROLLARY 15. Let $M$ be a compact homogeneous manifold. Suppose

$$
\frac{1}{d^{2}}>-\binom{n}{p} p(n-p) K_{\mathrm{p}}
$$

Then the $p^{\text {th }}$ Betti number $b_{p}$ satisfies

$$
b_{p} \leq\binom{ n}{p}
$$

Proof. If $b_{p}>\binom{n}{p}$, then since the dimension of $p$-tensors on an $n$-dimensional vector space is $\binom{n}{p}$, at a fixed point $x_{0} \in M$, there exists $\omega_{0} \in E_{0}^{p}$ which vanishes at $x_{0}$. By theorem 11, we have

$$
1 \leq d\left[-\binom{n}{p} p(n-p) K_{\mathrm{p}}\right]^{1 / 2}
$$

which is a contradiction to the assumption.
Remark. Corollary 15 actually shows that if the dimension of the first eigenspace for $p$-forms is greater than $\binom{n}{p}$, then
$\lambda_{1}^{\mathrm{p}} \geq \frac{1}{d^{2}\binom{n}{p}}+(n-p) p K_{p}$.
COROLLARY 16. Let $M$ be a compact irreducible homogeneous manifold. If $M$ is not parallelizable, then

$$
\lambda_{1}^{1} \geq \frac{1}{n d^{2}}+(n-1) K
$$

Proof. It suffices to show that if the $\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda_{1}}^{1} \leq n$ then there exists $\omega \in E_{\lambda_{1}}^{1}$ such that $\omega=0$ at some point. If not, say for all $\omega \in E_{\lambda_{1}}^{1}, \omega$ never vanish, we want to find a contradiction. Let us first fix a point $x \in M$. By the irreducibility condition of $H_{x},\left\{h^{*} \omega(x)\right\}$ spans $T_{x}^{*} M=$ cotangent space of $M$ at $x$, for any fixed $\omega \in E_{\lambda_{1}}^{1}$. On the other hand, since $h^{*} \omega\left(h \in H_{x}\right)$ is also an eigen 1 -form and $\operatorname{dim}\left(T_{x}^{*} M\right)=n$,
$\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda_{1}}^{1}$ must be at least $n$. Therefore $\operatorname{dim} E_{\lambda_{1}}^{1}=n$. However by the assumption that all $\omega \in E_{\lambda}^{1}$, do not vanish, this implies that there exist $n$ linearly independent sections of the cotangent bundle of $M$. Hence $M$ is parallelizable which is a contradiction.

Combining with the remark above, this proves the corollary.
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