

A potential theory for the Wess–Zumino–Witten equation in the space of Kähler potentials

Kuang-Ru Wu

Abstract

We develop a potential theory for the Wess–Zumino–Witten (WZW) equation in the space of Kähler potentials which is parallel to the potential theory for the Hermitian–Yang–Mills equation. A concept called ω -harmonicity on graphs is introduced which characterizes the WZW equation. We also show that, with respect to a Banach–Mazur type distance function, the distance between two solutions of the WZW equation is subharmonic.

The harmonic map into the space of Kähler potentials, as a special case of the WZW equation, is also investigated. In particular, we show the solvability of the Dirichlet problem for the harmonic map, and the approximation/quantization by its finite dimensional counterparts.

1 Introduction

Let X be a compact complex manifold of dimension n with a Kähler form ω . The space of Kähler potentials is $\mathcal{H}_\omega = \{\phi \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}) : \omega_\phi = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi > 0\}$. In the study of canonical metrics in Kähler geometry, the geodesic equation in \mathcal{H}_ω is indispensable ([Sem92, Don99, Che00]). One generalization of the geodesic equation is the Wess–Zumino–Witten (WZW) equation. For a map $\Phi : D \subset \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\omega$, the WZW equation is

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m |\nabla \Phi_{z_j}|_\Phi^2 - 2\Phi_{z_j \bar{z}_j} + i\{\Phi_{\bar{z}_j}, \Phi_{z_j}\}_\Phi = 0,$$

where $\{z_j\}$ are coordinates on D and $|\nabla \Phi_{z_j}(z)|_\Phi^2$ is computed using the metric $\omega_{\Phi(z)}$, and $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{\Phi(z)}$ is the Poisson bracket determined by the symplectic form $\omega_{\Phi(z)}$. An equivalent way of writing the WZW equation is, viewing Φ as a function $D \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$(i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi + \pi^*\omega)^{n+1} \wedge (i \sum_{j=1}^m dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j)^{m-1} = 0,$$

where π is the projection from $D \times X$ to X . For motivation and application of the WZW equations, see [Sem92, Don99, RZ10, Lem20, Wu23].

Another generalization of the geodesic equation is the harmonic map equation. For an open set D in \mathbb{C}^m with the Euclidean metric and \mathcal{H}_ω with the Mabuchi metric, the harmonic map equation for $\Phi : D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\omega$ is the following

$$(1.2) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m |\nabla \Phi_{z_j}|_\Phi^2 - 2\Phi_{z_j \bar{z}_j} = 0.$$

We will study the WZW equations first and then apply the results to the harmonic map equations.

In [Wu23], we show the existence of weak solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the WZW equation by interpolation. One purpose of this paper is to understand the weak solution through potential theory. Since the WZW equations can be approximated by the Hermitian–Yang–Mills (HYM) equations ([Wu23, Theorem 1.2]) and the potential theory for HYM equations was established already by Rochberg, Slodkowski, Coifman and Semmes in [Roc84, Slo88, CS93], it is natural to expect some potential theory for the WZW equations. In this paper, we develop such a potential theory that is almost analogous to the HYM potential theory.

Let us recall the following definition introduced in [Wu23]

Definition 1. An upper semicontinuous function $u : D \times X \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ is said to be ω -subharmonic on graphs if, for any holomorphic map f from an open subset of D to X , $\psi(f(z)) + u(z, f(z))$ is subharmonic, where ψ is a local potential of ω .

In [Wu23], we did not include upper semicontinuity in the definition. We do so in this paper to make the presentation cleaner. Definition 1 corresponds to the subsolution of the WZW equation (see [Wu23, Lemma 4.1] or Lemma 11 below). To study the supersolution, we introduce

Definition 2. A lower semicontinuous function $u : D \times X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is said to be ω -superharmonic on graphs if for any v that is ω -subharmonic on graphs in $U \times X$ with U an open subset of D , the function $h(z) := \sup_{x \in X} v(z, x) - u(z, x)$ is subharmonic in U .

A function u is said to be ω -harmonic on graphs if it is both ω -subharmonic and ω -superharmonic on graphs. These definitions are motivated by the study of interpolation problems in [Roc84, Slo88, Slo90a, Slo90b, Sem88, CS93]. The definition of ω -harmonicity on graphs is what we need in order to develop a potential theory for the WZW equations. Especially, the solutions to the WZW equation can be characterized by ω -harmonicity on graphs:

Theorem 3. *Suppose u is a C^2 function on $D \times X$ and $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u(z, \cdot) > 0$ on X for all $z \in D$. Then u is ω -harmonic on graphs if and only if u solves the WZW equation*

$$(i\partial\bar{\partial}u + \pi^*\omega)^{n+1} \wedge (i \sum_{j=1}^m dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j)^{m-1} = 0.$$

Thus, the study of the WZW equations can be translated to the study of ω -harmonicity on graphs.

In the theory of interpolation of norms [Roc84, Slo88, CS93], one can pass between subharmonicity and superharmonicity by taking the dual of norms (such duality is proved by Słodkowski in [Slo88, Slo90b]). However, in our case of ω -sub/superharmonicity, the duality is still missing. One possibility is the Legendre transform ([BCEKR20b], see also [Lem83, Lem85, BCEKR20a]). We provide some justification at the end of Section 3.

The concept of ω -harmonicity on graphs is also linked to the geometry of \mathcal{H}_ω . The space of Kähler potentials \mathcal{H}_ω with the Mabuchi metric is non-positively curved ([Mab87, Don99, CC02, CS12]), so the distance between two harmonic maps into \mathcal{H}_ω is subharmonic ([BH99, Chapter II.1 and 2]). The WZW equations which differ from the harmonic map equations by the Poisson bracket have a similar property, but with a different distance function defined as follows. For two functions u and v on $D \times X$, we define

$$(1.3) \quad d(u, v) = \max(\delta(u, v), \delta(v, u)) \quad \text{where } \delta(u, v)(z) := \sup_{x \in X} u(z, x) - v(z, x).$$

This distance function is a variant of the Banach-Mazur type distance introduced in [Sem88, Page 160] and [CS93, Formulas (8.1) and (8.2)]. With respect to (1.3), we have

Theorem 4. *If u and v are ω -harmonic on graphs in $D \times X$, then the distance function $z \mapsto d(u, v)$ is subharmonic in D .*

The proof is a direct consequence of the definition. Indeed, since v is ω -superharmonic on graphs and u is ω -subharmonic on graphs, the function $\delta(u, v)(z)$ is subharmonic in D by Definition 2. Switching u and v , we see that $\delta(v, u)(z)$ is also subharmonic in D , and hence $d(u, v)$ is subharmonic in D .

According to Theorem 3, functions ω -harmonic on graphs can be viewed as weak solutions for the WZW equations, so Theorem 4 basically says that the distance between two solutions for the WZW equations is subharmonic.

Let us apply the potential theory above to the Dirichlet problem for the WZW equation. We recall the interpolation of the Dirichlet problem first. Let D be a bounded smooth strongly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^m . Let ν be a continuous map from $\partial D \times X$ to \mathbb{R} such that $\nu(z, \cdot) \in \text{PSH}(X, \omega)$ for $z \in \partial D$, and denote by V the sup of the Perron family

$$G_\nu := \{u \in \text{usc}(D \times X) : u \text{ is } \omega\text{-subharmonic on graphs, and } \limsup_{D \ni z \rightarrow \zeta \in \partial D} u(z, x) \leq \nu(\zeta, x)\}.$$

We assume here ω is in an integral class, so that by [Wu23] V is continuous, attains the boundary data ν , and it is a weak solution in the sense that if V is C^2 then it solves the WZW equation. (It is likely that the integral assumption on ω can be removed, but we have not been able to do so. Note also that although in [Wu23] the boundary data is assumed in $C^\infty(\partial D, \mathcal{H}_\omega)$, the same results still hold for continuous boundary data; the only concern is

the use of Tian–Catlin–Zelditch asymptotic theorem in line 14 on page 350 in [Wu23], but the same estimate can also be obtained by [DW22, Lemma 5.10]). We give a more precise description of V here.

Theorem 5. *The sup V of the Perron family G_ν is ω -harmonic on graphs.*

Theorem 5 gives the existence part for the Dirichlet problem. Uniqueness follows readily from Theorem 4. Indeed, if V_1 and V_2 are ω -harmonic on graphs in $D \times X$ and assume the boundary data ν , then $V_1 = V_2$ in $D \times X$ by Theorem 4 and the maximum principle that ensues. There is a recent development on the boundary-less case by Finski in [Fin24].

1.1 Harmonic maps

In this subsection, we will apply the results developed above and in [Wu23] to study harmonic maps into the space of Kähler potentials \mathcal{H}_ω or more generally into $\text{PSH}(X, \omega)$.

We assume that L is a positive line bundle over X , and h is a positively curved metric on L whose curvature equals ω (so ω is in an integral class). For a positive integer k , we denote by \mathcal{H}_k the space of inner products on $H^0(X, L^k)$.

We will show the existence of a weak solution to the Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps into the space of Kähler potentials \mathcal{H}_ω ; moreover, such a solution can be approximated by harmonic maps into \mathcal{H}_k . (Rubinstein and Zelditch in [RZ10, Theorem 1.1] solved the Dirichlet problem and showed C^2 approximation, but their results are for the toric case.)

Let D' be an open set in \mathbb{R}^m . We will denote the coordinates in D' by $t = (t_1, \dots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Let ν be a real-valued continuous function on $\partial D' \times X$ such that for fixed $t \in \partial D'$ the function $\nu(t, \cdot)$ on X is in $\text{PSH}(X, \omega)$.

Let us first consider the approximation part and the harmonic maps into \mathcal{H}_k . To that end, we will use the Hilbert map $H_k : \text{PSH}(X, \omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ and the Fubini–Study map $FS_k : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\omega$ (which will be recalled in Section 5). For the boundary data $H_k(\nu) : \partial D' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$, the following Dirichlet problem for the harmonic map equation

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} \left((V^k)^{-1} \frac{\partial V^k}{\partial t_j} \right) = 0 \\ V^k|_{\partial D'} = H_k(\nu) \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution $V^k : \overline{D'} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ which is continuous on $\overline{D'}$ and smooth on D' by [Ham75]. The metric on D' is Euclidean, and the metric on \mathcal{H}_k is $(A, B) = \text{Tr}(h^{-1}Ah^{-1}B)$ for $h \in \mathcal{H}_k$ and $A, B \in T_h\mathcal{H}_k$ (see [Kob87, Section 1, Chapter VI]).

Theorem 6. *Let ν be a continuous map from $\partial D' \times X$ to \mathbb{R} such that $\nu(t, \cdot) \in \text{PSH}(X, \omega)$ for $t \in \partial D'$. There exists a continuous function V on $\overline{D'} \times X$ such that for fixed $t \in \overline{D'}$ the function $V(t, \cdot)$ is in $\text{PSH}(X, \omega)$, $V|_{\partial D'} = \nu$, and V can be approximated/quantized by*

harmonic maps $V^k : \overline{D'} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ from (1.4) in the following sense. The functions $FS_k(V^k)$ converge to V uniformly on $D' \times X$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, if V is C^2 , then it solves the harmonic map equation

$$(1.5) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m |\nabla V_{t_j}|_V^2 - 2V_{t_j t_j} = 0.$$

The idea is based on the fact that the harmonic map equation can be complexified to the WZW equation just like the geodesic equation can be complexified to the Monge–Ampère equation. To be precise, we complexify $t_j \in \mathbb{R}$ by considering $e^{t_j + \sqrt{-1}s_j} = \zeta_j \in \mathbb{C}$ and extend the boundary data ν to a rotationally invariant boundary data $\tilde{\nu}$. The sup of the Perron family $G_{\tilde{\nu}}$ will be ω -harmonic on graphs (by Theorem 5) and rotationally invariant (by Theorem 4 and the maximum principle), and hence it defines a function in $D' \times X$ which is the V in Theorem 6 (see Section 5 for details).

When $m = 1$ and D' is the open interval $(0, 1)$, V of Theorem 6 defines a geodesic in $\text{PSH}(X, \omega)$. Actually, such V behaves also like a geodesic with respect to the distance d in (1.3) in the sense that

$$(1.6) \quad d(V(s), V(t)) = |s - t|d(V(0), V(1))$$

(the proof is given in Section 6. Such a formula is already mentioned in [Sem88, CS93] for interpolation of norms. That the same curve behaves like a geodesic with respect to different metrics is discussed in [Dar15, DLR20, Lem22]). However, the curve $t \mapsto tV(1) + (1-t)V(0)$ also satisfies (1.6) as one can check easily. For higher dimension m , the harmonic maps can probably be used to find flats in \mathcal{H}_ω ([RWN23]).

Besides the harmonic maps or the HYM equations above, one may also think about twisted harmonic maps or the Hitchin equation on the bundle $D \times H^0(X, L^k) \rightarrow D$ ([Hit87, Don87, Cor88, Sim88]). But we do not know what the 'limiting' equation in $D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\omega$ should look like. We hope to investigate the Hitchin equation in the space of Kähler potentials and its quantization in a future paper.

We organize the paper as follows. We prove three lemmas in Section 2 and prove the characterization of the WZW equation, Theorem 3, in Section 3. Remarks about Legendre duality and ω -harmonicity are also given in Section 3. The fact that the sup of the Perron family is ω -harmonic is proved in Section 4. The harmonic maps into \mathcal{H}_ω and their quantization are discussed in Section 5. In Section 6, we show that the geodesics in \mathcal{H}_ω with respect to the Mabuchi metric also behave like geodesics with respect to the distance d in (1.3).

I would like to thank Rémi Reboulet for discussions during the preparation of the paper. I am grateful to László Lempert for his remarks on the draft of the paper, especially the suggestion on Lemma 8. Thanks are also due to Tamás Darvas for his interest in the paper.

2 Lemmas

We begin with a lemma that guarantees that the function h in Definition 2 is always upper semicontinuous.

Lemma 7. *Let u be an upper semicontinuous function on $D \times X$. The function $h(z) := \sup_{x \in X} u(z, x)$ is upper semicontinuous in D .*

Proof. Suppose that $\limsup_{z \rightarrow z_0} h(z) > h(z_0)$ for some z_0 in D . We can find a positive constant c such that $\limsup_{z \rightarrow z_0} h(z) > h(z_0) + c$. For any positive integer n , there exists $z_n \in B(z_0, 1/n)$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad h(z_n) > h(z_0) + c.$$

Meanwhile, $h(z_n) = \sup_{x \in X} u(z_n, x) = u(z_n, x_n)$ for some $x_n \in X$ because u is upper semicontinuous and X is compact. Using the compactness of X , there exists $\tilde{x} \in X$ such that some subsequence of x_n converges to \tilde{x} (we still denote the subsequence by x_n). By the upper semicontinuity of u , we have $\limsup_{z \rightarrow z_0} u \leq u(z_0, \tilde{x}) \leq h(z_0)$. Therefore, there exists some $r > 0$ such that $h(z_0) + c/2 > \sup_{B((z_0, \tilde{x}), r)} u$. But for n large,

$$\sup_{B((z_0, \tilde{x}), r)} u \geq u(z_n, x_n) = h(z_n) > h(z_0) + c.$$

We get $h(z_0) + c/2 > h(z_0) + c$, a contradiction.

Alternatively, let $\pi_1 : D \times X \rightarrow D$ be the projection. If $c \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\{z \in D : h(z) \geq c\} = \pi_1\{(z, x) : u(z, x) \geq c\}$ is closed because $\{(z, x) : u(z, x) \geq c\}$ is closed and π_1 is proper. ■

Lemma 8. *Let T be a biholomorphic map from \tilde{D} to D where \tilde{D} and D are open sets in \mathbb{C}^m . The following are equivalent*

1. *For any subharmonic function h in an open subset of D , the composition $h \circ T$ is subharmonic.*
2. *For any $z_0 \in \tilde{D}$, if we denote by A the Jacobian matrix $T'(z_0)$, then $\text{Tr}A^*MA \geq 0$ for any $m \times m$ Hermitian matrix M with $\text{Tr}M \geq 0$.*
3. *The Jacobian matrix T' satisfies $T'(T')^* = aI_m$ for some positive function a on \tilde{D} where I_m is the m -by- m identity matrix and $(T')^*$ is the conjugate transpose of T' .*

Proof. The equivalence between Statement 1 and Statement 2 can be verified by straightforward computation. We now assume Statement 2 and try to prove Statement 3. Replacing M by $-M$, we see that $\text{Tr}A^*MA \leq 0$ if M is Hermitian and $\text{Tr}M \leq 0$. So, the kernel of the linear functional $M \mapsto \text{Tr}A^*MA$ contains the kernel of the linear functional $M \mapsto \text{Tr}M$.

This implies that the former functional is a constant multiple of the latter, and the constant is $\frac{1}{m}\text{Tr}A^*A$ which can be computed by setting $M = I_m$. Therefore,

$$(2.2) \quad \text{Tr}A^*MA = \frac{1}{m}(\text{Tr}A^*A)(\text{Tr}M), \text{ for any Hermitian } M.$$

Let U be a unitary matrix such that $UAA^*U^* = \Delta$ where Δ is a diagonal matrix with diagonals $\{d_j\}_{j=1 \sim m}$. Since $\text{Tr}A^*MA = \text{Tr}UAA^*U^*UMU^* = \text{Tr}\Delta UMU^*$ and $(\text{Tr}A^*A)(\text{Tr}M) = (\text{Tr}UAA^*U^*)(\text{Tr}UMU^*) = (\text{Tr}\Delta)(\text{Tr}UMU^*)$, formula (2.2) becomes

$$(2.3) \quad \text{Tr}\Delta UMU^* = \frac{1}{m}(\text{Tr}\Delta)(\text{Tr}UMU^*), \text{ for any Hermitian } M.$$

By choosing UMU^* to be the diagonal matrix with the k -th diagonal equal to one and zero for other diagonals, we get $d_k = \sum_j d_j/m$. So, the d_k are equal among themselves, say equal to d . Hence $AA^* = U^*\Delta U = dI_m$. After varying z_0 , we get Statement 3. The implication from Statement 3 to Statement 2 can be verified easily and we skip the details. \blacksquare

If T satisfies the properties in Lemma 8, then so does T^{-1} by using Statement 3. When $m = 1$, any biholomorphic T satisfies the properties in Lemma 8. Another example that we will use later is given by $T(z_1, \dots, z_m) = (\lambda_1 z_1, \dots, \lambda_m z_m)$ with $|\lambda_j| = 1$.

Lemma 9. *Let T be a biholomorphic map from \tilde{D} to D where \tilde{D} and D are open sets in \mathbb{C}^m . Assume T satisfies the properties in Lemma 8. If u is ω -subharmonic on graphs in $D \times X$, then $u(T(z), x)$ is ω -subharmonic on graphs in $\tilde{D} \times X$.*

Moreover, if u is ω -harmonic on graphs in $D \times X$, then $u(T(z), x)$ is ω -harmonic on graphs in $\tilde{D} \times X$.

Proof. Let f be a holomorphic map from an open subset of \tilde{D} to X . We want to show that $u(T(z), f(z)) + \psi(f(z))$ is subharmonic where ψ is a local potential of ω . In fact, the function

$$(2.4) \quad u(T(z), f(z)) + \psi(f(z)) = u(\zeta, f(T^{-1}(\zeta))) + \psi(f(T^{-1}(\zeta)))$$

is subharmonic in ζ by ω -subharmonicity of u and it is also subharmonic in z by the assumption on T (we use Statement 1 in Lemma 8).

For the second part, we only need to show that $u(T(z), x)$ is ω -superharmonic on graphs in $\tilde{D} \times X$. Let v be ω -subharmonic on graphs in $U \times X$ with U an open subset of \tilde{D} . We want to show that $h(z) = \sup_{x \in X} v(z, x) - u(T(z), x)$ is subharmonic in U . In fact,

$$(2.5) \quad h(z) = \sup_{x \in X} v(z, x) - u(T(z), x) = \sup_{x \in X} v(T^{-1}(\zeta), x) - u(\zeta, x)$$

is subharmonic in ζ since $v(T^{-1}(\zeta), x)$ is ω -subharmonic on graphs in $T(U) \times X$ by the first part and u is ω -superharmonic on graphs. By the assumption on T , the function $h(z)$ is subharmonic in z . \blacksquare

3 Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we show that solutions of the WZW equation can be characterized by ω -harmonicity on graphs. We will use the following formula from [Wu23]. Suppose u is a C^2 function on $D \times X$ and ψ is a local potential of ω . Consider the complex Hessian of $u + \psi$ with respect to a fixed coordinate z_j in D and local coordinates x in X where ψ is defined

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} (u + \psi)_{z_j \bar{z}_j} & (u + \psi)_{z_j \bar{x}_1} & \cdots & (u + \psi)_{z_j \bar{x}_n} \\ (u + \psi)_{x_1 \bar{z}_j} & (u + \psi)_{x_1 \bar{x}_1} & \cdots & (u + \psi)_{x_1 \bar{x}_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (u + \psi)_{x_n \bar{z}_j} & (u + \psi)_{x_n \bar{x}_1} & \cdots & (u + \psi)_{x_n \bar{x}_n} \end{pmatrix};$$

we will denote this matrix by $(u + \psi)_j$. Then

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & (i\partial\bar{\partial}u + \pi^*\omega)^{n+1} \wedge (i \sum_{j=1}^m dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j)^{m-1} \\ & = (n+1)!(m-1)! \sum_{j=1}^m \det(u + \psi)_j \left(\bigwedge_{k=1}^m idz_k \wedge d\bar{z}_k \wedge \bigwedge_{l=1}^n idx_l \wedge d\bar{x}_l \right). \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is implicit in the proof of [Wu23, Lemma 4.1] already.

Lemma 10. *Assume that u is a C^2 function on $D \times X$ and $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u(z, \cdot) > 0$ on X for all $z \in D$. Let f be any holomorphic function from an open subset of D to X . We have*

$$(3.3) \quad \Delta(\psi(f(z)) + u(z, f(z))) \geq \sum_j \frac{\det(u + \psi)_j}{\det(\psi_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} + u_{\mu\bar{\lambda}})}$$

where ψ is a local potential of ω , and $u_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} = \partial^2 u / \partial x_\mu \partial \bar{x}_\lambda$ and $\psi_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} = \partial^2 \psi / \partial x_\mu \partial \bar{x}_\lambda$ with x_μ, x_λ local coordinates in X .

Moreover, fixing $(z_0, x_0) \in D \times X$, we can find f with $f(z_0) = x_0$ such that the equality holds at (z_0, x_0) ,

$$(3.4) \quad \Delta(\psi(f(z)) + u(z, f(z)))|_{z_0} = \sum_j \frac{\det(u + \psi)_j}{\det(\psi_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} + u_{\mu\bar{\lambda}})} \Big|_{(z_0, x_0)}.$$

Proof of Lemma 10. We simply compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta(\psi(f(z)) + u(z, f(z))) = \\ & \sum_{i,\lambda,\mu} \psi_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial z_i} \frac{\partial \bar{f}^\lambda}{\partial \bar{z}_i} + \sum_i u_{i\bar{i}} + \sum_{i,\lambda} u_{i\bar{\lambda}} \frac{\partial \bar{f}^\lambda}{\partial \bar{z}_i} + \sum_{i,\mu} u_{i\bar{\mu}} \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial z_i} + \sum_{i,\lambda,\mu} u_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial z_i} \frac{\partial \bar{f}^\lambda}{\partial \bar{z}_i} \end{aligned}$$

where f^μ is the μ -th component of f . If we denote the matrix $(\psi_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} + u_{\mu\bar{\lambda}})$ by A and the column vector $(u_{i\bar{\lambda}})$ by B_i , then the above expression is the same as

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_i \left(\left\langle A \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i} \right\rangle + \left\langle B_i, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i} \right\rangle + \overline{\left\langle B_i, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i} \right\rangle} + u_{i\bar{i}} \right),$$

where the angled inner product is the usual Euclidean inner product and $\partial f / \partial z_i$ is the column vector $(\partial f^\mu / \partial z_i)$. The matrix form can be further written as

$$(3.6) \quad \sum_i \left(\left\| \sqrt{A} \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i} + \sqrt{A}^{-1} B_i \right\|^2 - \left\| \sqrt{A}^{-1} B_i \right\|^2 + u_{i\bar{i}} \right).$$

Notice that

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_i \left(-\left\| \sqrt{A}^{-1} B_i \right\|^2 + u_{i\bar{i}} \right) &= \sum_i (u_{i\bar{i}} - \langle A^{-1} B_i, B_i \rangle) = \sum_i (u_{i\bar{i}} - \sum_{\lambda, \mu} u_{i\bar{\lambda}} (\psi + u)^{\bar{\lambda}\mu} u_{i\bar{\mu}}) \\ &= \sum_i \frac{\det(u + \psi)_i}{\det(\psi_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} + u_{\mu\bar{\lambda}})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality can be deduced from Schur's formula for determinants of block matrices (for details see line 5, page 352 in [Wu23]). From (3.6) and (3.7), we obtain (3.3).

For a given point $(z_0, x_0) \in D \times X$, we may assume $(z_0, x_0) = (0, 0)$ and consider $f(z) = \sum_i (-A^{-1} B_i)|_{(z_0, x_0)} z_i$. Evaluating at (z_0, x_0) , we see that the first term in (3.6) is zero since $\partial f / \partial z_i(z_0) = -A^{-1} B_i(z_0, x_0)$. Hence,

$$\Delta(\psi(f(z)) + u(z, f(z)))|_{z_0} = \sum_i \frac{\det(u + \psi)_i}{\det(\psi_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} + u_{\mu\bar{\lambda}})}|_{(z_0, x_0)}.$$

■

By Lemma 10, we immediately have the following (see [Wu23, Lemma 4.1]).

Lemma 11. *Suppose u is a C^2 function on $D \times X$ and $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u(z, \cdot) > 0$ on X for all $z \in D$. Then u is ω -subharmonic on graphs if and only if*

$$(i\partial\bar{\partial}u + \pi^*\omega)^{n+1} \wedge \left(i \sum_{j=1}^m dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j \right)^{m-1} \geq 0.$$

On the other hand, for ω -superharmonicity on graphs, we have the following partial result.

Lemma 12. *Suppose u is a C^2 function on $D \times X$ and $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u(z, \cdot) > 0$ on X for all $z \in D$. Then u is ω -superharmonic on graphs if*

$$(i\partial\bar{\partial}u + \pi^*\omega)^{n+1} \wedge \left(i \sum_{j=1}^m dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j \right)^{m-1} \leq 0.$$

Proof. Let v be defined on $U \times X$ with U an open subset of D and v be ω -subharmonic on graphs. Define $h(z) = \sup_{x \in X} v(z, x) - u(z, x)$. We want to show that $h(z)$ is subharmonic in U . By Lemma 7, h is upper semicontinuous.

Fixing z_0 in U , we have $h(z_0) = v(z_0, x_0) - u(z_0, x_0)$ for some x_0 in X because X is compact and $v - u$ is upper semicontinuous. Using Lemma 10, we can find a holomorphic function f from an open subset of D to X with $f(z_0) = x_0$ satisfying

$$(3.8) \quad \Delta\left(u(z, f(z)) + \psi(f(z))\right)|_{z_0} = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\det(u + \psi)_j}{\det(\psi_{\mu\bar{\lambda}} + u_{\mu\bar{\lambda}})} \Big|_{(z_0, x_0)} \leq 0;$$

the inequality is due to our assumption that $(i\partial\bar{\partial}u + \pi^*\omega)^{n+1} \wedge (i\sum_{j=1}^m dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j)^{m-1} \leq 0$ and formula (3.2).

According to the definition of h , we have

$$(3.9) \quad h(z) \geq v(z, f(z)) - u(z, f(z))$$

with equality at z_0 . We denote by $\int_{B(z_0, r)} h(z)$ the average of h over a ball centered at z_0 with radius r in \mathbb{C}^m . From the inequality (3.9), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(z_0, r)} h(z) - h(z_0) &\geq \left(\int_{B(z_0, r)} v(z, f(z)) - u(z, f(z)) \right) - \left(v(z_0, x_0) - u(z_0, x_0) \right) \\ &= \left(\int_{B(z_0, r)} v(z, f(z)) + \psi(f(z)) - u(z, f(z)) - \psi(f(z)) \right) \\ &\quad - \left(v(z_0, x_0) + \psi(x_0) - u(z_0, x_0) - \psi(x_0) \right) \\ &\geq - \left(\int_{B(z_0, r)} u(z, f(z)) + \psi(f(z)) \right) + u(z_0, x_0) + \psi(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact that v is ω -subharmonic on graphs and hence $v(z, f(z)) + \psi(f(z))$ is subharmonic. As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\int_{B(z_0, r)} h(z) - h(z_0) \right) \\ &\geq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} - \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\int_{B(z_0, r)} u(z, f(z)) + \psi(f(z)) - u(z_0, x_0) - \psi(x_0) \right) \\ &= - \Delta\left(u(z, f(z)) + \psi(f(z))\right)|_{z_0} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from (3.8). Hence, h is subharmonic by [Sak32] or [CS93, Lemma 11.2], and u is ω -superharmonic on graphs. \blacksquare

Let us now prove Theorem 3:

Proof of Theorem 3. If u solves the WZW equation, then by Lemma 11 and Lemma 12, u is ω -harmonic on graphs.

Conversely, assume u is ω -harmonic on graphs in $D \times X$. Suppose at a point p in $D \times X$,

$$(i\partial\bar{\partial}u + \pi^*\omega)^{n+1} \wedge (i\sum_{j=1}^m dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j)^{m-1} > 0.$$

By formula (3.2), we see $\sum_j \det(u + \psi)_j$ is positive at p . Since u is C^2 , there exists a compact neighborhood N of p in $D \times X$ where $\sum_j \det(u + \psi)_j$ is positive. Choose a smooth function $\rho \geq 0$ supported in N but not identically zero such that $\sum_j \det(\rho + u + \psi)_j > 0$ in N . By Lemma 11, the function $\rho + u$ is still ω -subharmonic on graphs in $D \times X$ (this is where we use ω -subharmonicity of u). However, since u is ω -superharmonic on graphs, the function $z \mapsto \sup_{x \in X} (\rho + u - u)(z, x) = \sup_{x \in X} \rho(z, x)$ is subharmonic in D . But the function $z \mapsto \sup_{x \in X} \rho(z, x)$ is zero near the boundary ∂D , and by the maximum principle we have $z \mapsto \sup_{x \in X} \rho(z, x) \leq 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, over $D \times X$

$$(i\partial\bar{\partial}u + \pi^*\omega)^{n+1} \wedge (i\sum_{j=1}^m dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j)^{m-1} \leq 0.$$

The opposite inequality also holds by Lemma 11, so u solves the WZW equation. ■

Lemma 12 is only a partial result, similar to [Roc84, Theorem 4.2 (b)] and [CS93, Theorem 15.4 (b)] that studied interpolation of norms; the full equivalence of their case was proved by Slodkowski in [Slo88, Theorem 6.6] and in [Slo90b]. In the study of interpolation of norms, one can simply take the dual of a norm, but in our case, it is not obvious how to take dual on a function defined on $D \times X$. Nevertheless, careful examination suggests some type of Legendre transform. We give a heuristic computation below.

The idea coming from [CS93, BCEKR20b] is to replace the inner product in the classical Legendre transformation by a local potential of ω . To that end, it seems necessary to assume that ω is real analytic, so locally $\omega = i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi$ for some real analytic ψ , and we can consider the polarization $\psi_{\mathbb{C}}$ of ψ . If B a ball centered at 0 in \mathbb{C}^n is a coordinate system of X and $\psi(x) = \sum c_{\alpha\beta} x^\alpha \bar{x}^\beta$ in B , then $\psi_{\mathbb{C}}(x, y) = \sum c_{\alpha\beta} x^\alpha \bar{y}^\beta$ in some neighborhood of the diagonal in $B \times B$. In order to have a transformation that is defined globally on the manifold X , we will use the Calabi diastasis function

$$(3.10) \quad D_\omega(x, y) = \psi(x) + \psi(y) - 2\text{Re}\psi_{\mathbb{C}}(x, y).$$

For a function $u : D \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define the Legendre transform

$$(3.11) \quad \hat{u}(z, y) = \sup_{x \in X} -D_\omega(x, \bar{y}) - u(z, x).$$

Note that \hat{u} is a function on $D \times X$ and the transformation is performed only in the x variable. It is not hard to see that the Kähler form $i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi(\bar{x})$ is globally defined on X , and we will denote it by $\tilde{\omega}$. (the extra complex conjugation \bar{y} in (3.11) has appeared in [Roc84, Slo88, CS93] when they studied duality for norms).

We have the following duality:

(3.12) if u is ω -superharmonic on graphs, then \hat{u} is $\tilde{\omega}$ -subharmonic on graphs.

Indeed, letting f be a holomorphic map from some open subset of D to X , we want to show that the following function is subharmonic

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}(z, f(z)) + \psi(\overline{f(z)}) &= \sup_{x \in X} \left(2\operatorname{Re}\psi_{\mathbb{C}}(x, \overline{f(z)}) - \psi(x) - \psi(\overline{f(z)}) - u(z, x) \right) + \psi(\overline{f(z)}) \\ &= \sup_{x \in X} 2\operatorname{Re}\psi_{\mathbb{C}}(x, \overline{f(z)}) - \psi(x) - u(z, x). \end{aligned}$$

This is true since $(z, x) \mapsto 2\operatorname{Re}\psi_{\mathbb{C}}(x, \overline{f(z)}) - \psi(x)$ is ω -subharmonic on graphs and $u(z, x)$ is ω -superharmonic on graphs. That $(z, x) \mapsto 2\operatorname{Re}\psi_{\mathbb{C}}(x, \overline{f(z)}) - \psi(x)$ is ω -subharmonic on graphs is because for a holomorphic map $g(z)$ from some open subset of D to X , the function

$$2\operatorname{Re}\psi_{\mathbb{C}}((g(z)), \overline{f(z)}) - \psi(g(z)) + \psi(g(z)) = 2\operatorname{Re}\psi_{\mathbb{C}}((g(z)), \overline{f(z)})$$

is subharmonic by $\psi_{\mathbb{C}}(x, y) = \sum c_{\alpha\beta} x^{\alpha} \bar{y}^{\beta}$.

However, how to use (3.12) to prove the converse of Lemma 12, we still do not know. We also do not know if the Legendre transform turns ω -subharmonicity to $\tilde{\omega}$ -superharmonicity.

4 Proof of Theorem 5

Let D be a bounded smooth strongly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^m . Let ν be a continuous map from $\partial D \times X$ to \mathbb{R} such that $\nu(z, \cdot) \in \operatorname{PSH}(X, \omega)$ for $z \in \partial D$. Recall the Perron family

$$G_{\nu} := \{u \in \operatorname{usc}(D \times X) : u \text{ is } \omega\text{-subharmonic on graphs, and } \limsup_{D \ni z \rightarrow \zeta \in \partial D} u(z, x) \leq \nu(\zeta, x)\}.$$

Denote by V the sup of the Perron family G_{ν} . In this section, we assume ω is in an integral class, so V is in G_{ν} , V attains the boundary data ν , and V extends continuously on $\overline{D} \times X$ according to [Wu23, Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.3]. The goal of the section is to show that V is ω -harmonic on graphs.

Lemma 13. *Let u be ω -subharmonic on graphs in $D \times X$ and upper semicontinuous on $\overline{D} \times X$. The function*

$$h(z) := \sup_{x \in X} u(z, x) - V(z, x)$$

satisfies $\sup_D h \leq \sup_{\partial D} h$.

Proof. If we denote $\sup_{\partial D} h$ by M , then $u(z, x) - V(z, x) \leq M$ for $(z, x) \in \partial D \times X$. Since $V = \nu$ on $\partial D \times X$, we have $u(z, x) - \nu(z, x) \leq M$ for $(z, x) \in \partial D \times X$. The function $u(z, x) - M$ is ω -subharmonic on graphs, and hence it is in G_{ν} . As a result, $u(z, x) - M \leq V(z, x)$ on $D \times X$ and $\sup_D h \leq M$. \blacksquare

Let U be an open subset of D which is also smooth and strongly pseudoconvex. Since the sup V is in G_ν , V is ω -subharmonic on graphs and by [Wu23, Lemma 3.1], for fixed z , $V(z, \cdot)$ is in $\text{PSH}(X, \omega)$, so we can use $V|_{\partial U \times X}$ as boundary data and consider the Perron family $G_{V|_{\partial U \times X}}$. We have the following reiteration lemma.

Lemma 14. *The sup of $G_{V|_{\partial U \times X}}$ which we denote by \mathcal{V} satisfies $\mathcal{V} = V$ on $U \times X$.*

Proof. For any $u \in G_\nu$, the restriction $u|_{U \times X}$ is in $G_{V|_{\partial U \times X}}$, so $u|_{U \times X} \leq \mathcal{V}$. Since V is in G_ν , we have $V \leq \mathcal{V}$ on $U \times X$. Conversely, consider $u_0 \in G_{V|_{\partial U \times X}}$ and define

$$(4.1) \quad u = \begin{cases} V \text{ on } (D \setminus U) \times X, \\ \max(u_0, V) \text{ on } U \times X. \end{cases}$$

Using the fact V and u_0 are both ω -subharmonic on graphs, it is straightforward to check u is in G_ν . Therefore, $u \leq V$ and $u_0 \leq V$ on $U \times X$, hence $\mathcal{V} \leq V$ on $U \times X$. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 5. We already know that V is in G_ν , so V is ω -subharmonic on graphs. For ω -superharmonicity, we let u be ω -subharmonic on graphs in $U \times X$ with U an open subset of D . We want to show that $h(z) := \sup_{x \in X} u(z, x) - V(z, x)$ is subharmonic in U . By Lemma 7, h is upper semicontinuous.

Let B be a ball with $\overline{B} \subset U$, and $g(z)$ a harmonic function in B continuous up to \overline{B} . It is clear that $u(z, x) - g(z)$ is ω -subharmonic on graphs in $B \times X$ and upper semicontinuous on $\overline{B} \times X$. Meanwhile, Lemma 14 says that the Perron family with boundary data $V|_{\partial B \times X}$ still has the same sup V . Therefore, using Lemma 13 on $\overline{B} \times X$, we see that

$$\sup_{x \in X} u(z, x) - g(z) - V(z, x) = h(z) - g(z)$$

satisfies the maximum principle on B . Therefore h is subharmonic in U and V is ω -superharmonic on graphs. \blacksquare

5 Harmonic maps

Let us recall the setup in Subsection 1.1. Let L be a positive line bundle over X , and h a positively curved metric on L with curvature ω . For a positive integer k we denote by \mathcal{H}_k the space of inner products on $H^0(X, L^k)$.

Let D' be an open set in \mathbb{R}^m . We denote the coordinates in D' by $t = (t_1, \dots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Let ν be a real-valued continuous function on $\partial D' \times X$ such that for fixed $t \in \partial D'$ the function $\nu(t, \cdot)$ on X is in $\text{PSH}(X, \omega)$.

We recall the Hilbert map and the Fubini–Study map. The Hilbert map $H_k : \text{PSH}(X, \omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ is

$$H_k(\phi)(s, s) = \int_X h^k(s, s) e^{-k\phi} \omega^n, \text{ for } \phi \in \text{PSH}(X, \omega) \text{ and } s \in H^0(X, L^k).$$

The Fubini–Study map $FS_k : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\omega$ is

$$FS_k(G)(x) = \frac{1}{k} \log \sup_{s \in H^0(X, L^k), G(s, s) \leq 1} h^k(s, s)(x), \text{ for } G \in \mathcal{H}_k \text{ and } x \in X.$$

Refer to [DLR20, DW22] for more details about the maps.

For the boundary data $H_k(\nu) : \partial D' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$, we know by [Ham75] that the following Dirichlet problem for the harmonic map equation has a unique solution $V^k : \overline{D'} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} \left((V^k)^{-1} \frac{\partial V^k}{\partial t_j} \right) = 0 \\ V^k|_{\partial D'} = H_k(\nu). \end{cases}$$

Proof of Theorem 6. For the coordinates $t = (t_1, \dots, t_m)$ in $D' \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, we complexify the variable t_j by adding a variable $\sqrt{-1}s_j$ with $s_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and introducing

$$e^{t_j + \sqrt{-1}s_j} = \zeta_j \in \mathbb{C}$$

so that $t_j = \log |\zeta_j|$. We denote by $D \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ the corresponding set for the complex variables $(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m)$; namely,

$$D = \{(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m : (\log |\zeta_1|, \dots, \log |\zeta_m|) \in D'\}.$$

We define $\tilde{\nu} : \partial D \rightarrow \text{PSH}(X, \omega)$ by setting

$$(5.2) \quad \tilde{\nu}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) = \nu(\log |\zeta_1|, \dots, \log |\zeta_m|).$$

Then as in [Wu23], we use the boundary data $\tilde{\nu}$ to consider the Perron family

$$G_{\tilde{\nu}} := \{u \in \text{usc}(D \times X) : u \text{ is } \omega\text{-subharmonic on graphs, and } \limsup_{D \ni \zeta \rightarrow \eta \in \partial D} u(\zeta, x) \leq \tilde{\nu}(\eta, x)\}.$$

A small change from the setup in [Wu23] is that the metric we use on D here is not Euclidean $\sum_j d\zeta_j \wedge d\bar{\zeta}_j$ but $\sum_j |\zeta_j|^2 d\zeta_j \wedge d\bar{\zeta}_j$.

The upper envelope $\tilde{V} = \sup\{u : u \in G_{\tilde{\nu}}\}$ is continuous in $D \times X$, attains the boundary data $\tilde{\nu}$, and is ω -harmonic on graphs in $D \times X$ by Theorem 5 and [Wu23, Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.3].

The boundary data $\tilde{\nu}$ is rotationally invariant, namely, $\tilde{\nu}(\lambda_1 \zeta_1, \dots, \lambda_m \zeta_m) = \tilde{\nu}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m)$ with $|\lambda_j| = 1$. We claim that \tilde{V} is also rotationally invariant. In fact, $\tilde{V}(\lambda_1 \zeta_1, \dots, \lambda_m \zeta_m)$ with $|\lambda_j| = 1$ is ω -harmonic on graphs by Lemma 9 and shares the same boundary data with $\tilde{V}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m)$. Hence by Theorem 4, we have $\tilde{V}(\lambda_1 \zeta_1, \dots, \lambda_m \zeta_m) = \tilde{V}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m)$, as claimed.

One can also show the rotational invariance of \tilde{V} through quantization/approximation. In fact, let us consider the boundary data $H_k(\tilde{\nu}) : \partial D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ which can be viewed as a

Hermitian metric on the bundle $\partial D \times H^0(X, L^k) \rightarrow \partial D$. There exists a unique smooth Hermitian metric \tilde{V}^k on the bundle $D \times H^0(X, L^k) \rightarrow D$ that solves the Hermitian–Yang–Mills equation ([Don92, CS93])

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{cases} \Lambda \Theta(\tilde{V}^k) = 0 \\ \tilde{V}^k|_{\partial D} = H_k(\tilde{\nu}), \end{cases}$$

where $\Theta(\tilde{V}^k)$ is the curvature of the Hermitian metric \tilde{V}^k and Λ is the trace with respect to the metric $\sum_j |\zeta_j|^2 d\zeta_j \wedge d\bar{\zeta}_j$ on D . Moreover, $FS_k(\tilde{V}^k)$ converges to \tilde{V} uniformly on $D \times X$ by [Wu23, Theorem 1.2] (when applying this theorem, one has to take an extra duality on the Hermitian metrics). The boundary data $H_k(\tilde{\nu})$ is rotationally invariant, and so is \tilde{V}^k due to the uniqueness of the Hermitian–Yang–Mills equation. Hence, the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} FS_k(\tilde{V}^k) = \tilde{V}$ is rotationally invariant.

One way or another, we can define a function V on $D' \times X$ by setting

$$V(t_1, \dots, t_m, x) = \tilde{V}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m, x)$$

where $t_j = \log |\zeta_j|$. Since \tilde{V} is continuous, so is V . Meanwhile, we know that $\tilde{V}|_{\partial D} = \tilde{\nu}$, so $V|_{\partial D'} = \nu$. Also, $\tilde{V}(\zeta, \cdot)$ is in $\text{PSH}(X, \omega)$ for fixed ζ by [Wu23, Lemma 3.1], hence we see that $V(t, \cdot)$ is in $\text{PSH}(X, \omega)$ for fixed t .

So far we have proved the first part of Theorem 6. Now we move on to the quantization. If we take some holomorphic frame of the bundle $D \times H^0(X, L^k) \rightarrow D$ and represent the Hermitian metric \tilde{V}^k as matrix-valued functions, then the Hermitian–Yang–Mills equation (5.3) is

$$(5.4) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m 4|\zeta_j|^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\zeta}_j} \left((\tilde{V}^k)^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{V}^k}{\partial \zeta_j} \right) = 0;$$

note again that the metric we use on D is $\sum_j |\zeta_j|^2 d\zeta_j \wedge d\bar{\zeta}_j$. Since \tilde{V}^k is rotationally invariant and can be viewed as a map from D to \mathcal{H}_k , it gives rise to a map $V^k : D' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ with

$$V^k(t_1, \dots, t_m) = \tilde{V}^k(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) \text{ and } t_j = \log |\zeta_j|.$$

By the chain rule

$$(5.5) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{V}^k}{\partial \bar{\zeta}_j} = \frac{\partial V^k}{\partial t_j} \frac{1}{2\zeta_j} \text{ and } \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{V}^k}{\partial \zeta_j \partial \bar{\zeta}_j} = \frac{\partial^2 V^k}{\partial t_j^2} \frac{1}{4|\zeta_j|^2},$$

equation (5.4) becomes

$$(5.6) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} \left((V^k)^{-1} \frac{\partial V^k}{\partial t_j} \right) = 0$$

which is the harmonic map equation for maps from D' to \mathcal{H}_k , namely (5.1). The uniform convergence $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} FS_k(\tilde{V}^k) = \tilde{V}$ on $D \times X$ thus translates to the uniform convergence $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} FS_k(V^k) = V$ on $D' \times X$.

Finally, if V or \tilde{V} is C^2 , then \tilde{V} solves the WZW equation by [Wu23, Theorem 1.3]

$$(5.7) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m 4|\zeta_j|^2 \left(|\nabla \tilde{V}_{\zeta_j}|_{\tilde{V}}^2 - 2\tilde{V}_{\zeta_j \bar{\zeta}_j} + i\{\tilde{V}_{\zeta_j}, \tilde{V}_{\zeta_j}\}_{\tilde{V}} \right) = 0.$$

Using the chain rule similar to (5.5), we turn equation (5.7) to

$$(5.8) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m |\nabla V_{t_j}|_V^2 - 2V_{t_j t_j} + i\{V_{t_j}, V_{t_j}\}_V = 0;$$

since the Poisson bracket $\{V_{t_j}, V_{t_j}\}_V$ is zero, the equation (5.8) is the harmonic map equation (see equation (1.2)). \blacksquare

From the proof of Theorem 6, we see that the weak solution V of the harmonic map equations into \mathcal{H}_ω is given by the sup of the Perron family

$$G_{\tilde{v}} = \{u \in \text{usc}(D \times X) : u \text{ is } \omega\text{-subharmonic on graphs, and } \limsup_{D \ni \zeta \rightarrow \eta \in \partial D} u(\zeta, x) \leq \tilde{v}(\eta, x)\}.$$

Actually a subfamily will yield the same sup. Indeed, let us consider the rotationally invariant Perron family $G_{\tilde{v}}^{R.I.}$ that consists of $u \in G_{\tilde{v}}$ which are invariant under rotation: $u(\lambda_1 \zeta_1, \dots, \lambda_m \zeta_m) = u(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m)$ with $|\lambda_j| = 1$. We claim that

$$\sup\{u : u \in G_{\tilde{v}}^{R.I.}\} = \sup\{u : u \in G_{\tilde{v}}\}.$$

Let us denote $\sup\{u : u \in G_{\tilde{v}}\}$ by \tilde{V} . By [Wu23, Corollary 3.3], the envelope \tilde{V} is in $G_{\tilde{v}}$, but \tilde{V} is rotationally invariant as is shown in the proof of Theorem 6, so \tilde{V} is in $G_{\tilde{v}}^{R.I.}$. Therefore, we see

$$\tilde{V} \leq \sup\{u : u \in G_{\tilde{v}}^{R.I.}\} \leq \sup\{u : u \in G_{\tilde{v}}\} = \tilde{V}.$$

Such a characterization of harmonic maps is perhaps not that satisfactory because we still have to use ω -subharmonicity which involves holomorphic terms.

Similarly, the solution V^k of the harmonic map equations (5.1) into \mathcal{H}_k can also be written as the sup of some rotationally invariant Perron family. In fact, The solution \tilde{V}^k of the Hermitian–Yang–Mills equation (5.3) is the sup of the Perron family

$$G_{\tilde{v}}^k := \{D \ni \zeta \rightarrow U_\zeta \in \mathcal{N}_k \text{ is subharmonic and } \limsup_{D \ni \zeta \rightarrow \eta \in \partial D} U_\zeta^2(s) \leq H_k(\tilde{v}_\eta)(s, s) \text{ for any } s \in H^0(X, L^k)\},$$

where \mathcal{N}_k is the set of norms on $H^0(X, L^k)$ and U_ζ is said to be subharmonic if $\log U_\zeta(f(\zeta))$ is subharmonic for any holomorphic section $f : W \subset D \rightarrow H^0(X, L^k)$. The rotationally invariant subfamily $(G_{\tilde{v}}^k)^{R.I.}$ will yield the same sup by the same argument.

6 Appendix

In this appendix, we prove the claim in Subsection 1.1 that, when $m = 1$ and D' is the open interval $(0, 1)$, V satisfies $d(V(s), V(t)) = |s - t|d(V(0), V(1))$. Indeed, V as the sup of the Perron family is ω -harmonic on graphs, and $V(0)$ as a function on $D' \times X$, independent of the variable in D' , is also ω -harmonic on graphs (as if extending across D' trivially), so by Theorem 4 the function $t \mapsto d(V(0), V(t))$ is convex. Similarly, $t \mapsto d(V(1), V(t))$ is also convex. As result,

$$(6.1) \quad d(V(0), V(t)) \leq td(V(0), V(1)) \text{ and } d(V(t), V(1)) \leq (1 - t)d(V(0), V(1)).$$

Adding these two inequalities and using the triangle inequality for d , we get

$$d(V(0), V(1)) \leq d(V(0), V(t)) + d(V(t), V(1)) \leq d(V(0), V(1))$$

which forces the equality sign in (6.1). Next, we fix s_0 and vary t between s_0 and 1. Since V and $V(s_0)$ are both ω -harmonic on graphs, we get by convexity

$$(6.2) \quad d(V(s_0), V(t)) \leq \frac{t - s_0}{1 - s_0}d(V(s_0), V(1)) \text{ and } d(V(t), V(1)) \leq \frac{1 - t}{1 - s_0}d(V(s_0), V(1)).$$

Adding these two inequalities, we get

$$d(V(s_0), V(1)) \leq d(V(s_0), V(t)) + d(V(t), V(1)) \leq d(V(s_0), V(1)).$$

So, (6.2) are actually equalities. The second equality in (6.1) and the first equality in (6.2) together give $d(V(s_0), V(t)) = (t - s_0)d(V(0), V(1))$ as claimed.

References

- [BCEKR20a] Bo Berndtsson, Dario Cordero-Erausquin, Bo'az Klartag, and Yanir A. Rubinstein, *Complex interpolation of \mathbb{R} -norms, duality and foliations*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **22** (2020), no. 2, 477–505. MR 4049223
- [BCEKR20b] ———, *Complex Legendre duality*, Amer. J. Math. **142** (2020), no. 1, 323–339. MR 4060878
- [BH99] Martin R. Bridson and André Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 319, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999. MR 1744486
- [CC02] E. Calabi and X. X. Chen, *The space of Kähler metrics. II*, J. Differential Geom. **61** (2002), no. 2, 173–193. MR 1969662

- [Che00] Xiuxiong Chen, *The space of Kähler metrics*, J. Differential Geom. **56** (2000), no. 2, 189–234. MR 1863016
- [Cor88] Kevin Corlette, *Flat G -bundles with canonical metrics*, J. Differential Geom. **28** (1988), no. 3, 361–382. MR 965220
- [CS93] Ronald Coifman and Stephen Semmes, *Interpolation of Banach spaces, Perron processes, and Yang-Mills*, Amer. J. Math. **115** (1993), no. 2, 243–278. MR 1216432
- [CS12] Xiuxiong Chen and Song Sun, *Space of Kähler metrics (V)—Kähler quantization*, Metric and differential geometry, Progr. Math., vol. 297, Birkhäuser/Springer, Basel, 2012, pp. 19–41. MR 3220438
- [Dar15] Tamás Darvas, *The Mabuchi geometry of finite energy classes*, Adv. Math. **285** (2015), 182–219. MR 3406499
- [DLR20] Tamás Darvas, Chinh H. Lu, and Yanir A. Rubinstein, *Quantization in geometric pluripotential theory*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **73** (2020), no. 5, 1100–1138. MR 4078714
- [Don87] S. K. Donaldson, *Twisted harmonic maps and the self-duality equations*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **55** (1987), no. 1, 127–131. MR 887285
- [Don92] ———, *Boundary value problems for Yang-Mills fields*, J. Geom. Phys. **8** (1992), no. 1-4, 89–122. MR 1165874
- [Don99] ———, *Symmetric spaces, Kähler geometry and Hamiltonian dynamics*, Northern California Symplectic Geometry Seminar, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 196, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999, pp. 13–33. MR 1736211
- [DW22] Tamás Darvas and Kuang-Ru Wu, *Griffiths extremality, interpolation of norms, and Kähler quantization*, J. Geom. Anal. **32** (2022), no. 7, Paper No. 203, 27. MR 4425365
- [Fin24] Siarhei Finski, *Lower bounds on fibered Yang-Mills functionals: generic nefness and semistability of direct images*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08598 (2024).
- [Ham75] Richard S. Hamilton, *Harmonic maps of manifolds with boundary*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. Vol. 471, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975. MR 482822
- [Hit87] N. J. Hitchin, *The self-duality equations on a Riemann surface*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **55** (1987), no. 1, 59–126. MR 887284

- [Kob87] Shoshichi Kobayashi, *Differential geometry of complex vector bundles*, Publications of the Mathematical Society of Japan, vol. 15, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1987, Kanô Memorial Lectures, 5. MR 909698
- [Lem83] László Lempert, *Solving the degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equation with one concentrated singularity*, Math. Ann. **263** (1983), no. 4, 515–532. MR 707246
- [Lem85] ———, *Symmetries and other transformations of the complex Monge-Ampère equation*, Duke Math. J. **52** (1985), no. 4, 869–885. MR 816389
- [Lem20] ———, *On complex Legendre duality*, J. Geom. Anal. **30** (2020), no. 3, 2581–2592. MR 4105129
- [Lem22] ———, *The principle of least action in the space of Kähler potentials*, Math. Res. Lett. **29** (2022), no. 3, 785–833. MR 4516039
- [Mab87] Toshiki Mabuchi, *Some symplectic geometry on compact Kähler manifolds. I*, Osaka J. Math. **24** (1987), no. 2, 227–252. MR 909015
- [Roc84] Richard Rochberg, *Interpolation of Banach spaces and negatively curved vector bundles*, Pacific J. Math. **110** (1984), no. 2, 355–376. MR 726495
- [RWN23] Rémi Reboulet and David Witt Nyström, *Infinite-dimensional flats in the space of positive metrics on an ample line bundle*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13451 (2023).
- [RZ10] Yanir A. Rubinstein and Steve Zelditch, *Bergman approximations of harmonic maps into the space of Kähler metrics on toric varieties*, J. Symplectic Geom. **8** (2010), no. 3, 239–265. MR 2684507
- [Sak32] S. Saks, *On subharmonic functions*, Acta Litt. Sci. Szeged **5** (1932), 187–193.
- [Sem88] Stephen Semmes, *Interpolation of Banach spaces, differential geometry and differential equations*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **4** (1988), no. 1, 155–176. MR 1009123
- [Sem92] ———, *Complex Monge-Ampère and symplectic manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. **114** (1992), no. 3, 495–550. MR 1165352
- [Sim88] Carlos T. Simpson, *Constructing variations of Hodge structure using Yang-Mills theory and applications to uniformization*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), no. 4, 867–918. MR 944577
- [Slo88] Zbigniew Slodkowski, *Complex interpolation of normed and quasinormed spaces in several dimensions. I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **308** (1988), no. 2, 685–711. MR 951623

- [Slo90a] ———, *Complex interpolation of normed and quasinormed spaces in several dimensions. II. Properties of harmonic interpolation*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **317** (1990), no. 1, 255–285. MR 949900
- [Slo90b] ———, *Complex interpolation of normed and quasinormed spaces in several dimensions. III. Regularity results for harmonic interpolation*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **321** (1990), no. 1, 305–332. MR 991968
- [Wu23] Kuang-Ru Wu, *A Wess-Zumino-Witten type equation in the space of Kähler potentials in terms of Hermitian-Yang-Mills metrics*, Anal. PDE **16** (2023), no. 2, 341–366. MR 4593768

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL TSING HUA UNIVERSITY, HSINCHU,
TAIWAN

`krwu@math.nthu.edu.tw`