Rendiconti
del
Seminario Matematico
della
Università di Padova

Giovanni Bassanelli

On horospheres and holomorphic endomorfisms of the Siegel disc

Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova, tome 70 (1983), p. 147-165

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=RSMUP_1983__70__147_0>

REND. SEM. MAT. UNIV. PADOVA, Vol. 70 (1983)

On Horospheres and Holomorphic Endomorfisms of the Siegel Disc.

GIOVANNI BASSANELLI (*)

RIASSUNTO - Introdotte le nozioni di orosfera e di orociclo nel cerchio d Siegel $\mathcal{E}$ si estende ad $\mathcal{E}$ il classico lemma di Julia. Si prova, inoltre, che se F è un endomorfismo olomorfo di $\mathcal{E}$ con comportamento « regolare » su un orociclo e vicino ad un punto del bordo, allora F è un automorfismo.

Introduction.

The concept of horocycle and horosphere in the unit disc of $\mathbf{C}$ have been introduced by Poincaré with an immediate and suggestive interpretation: « the [h]orocycles may be regarded [...] as the loci of points having the same distance from a non euclidean line that lies at infinity » ([3], § 82). Similar notions of horospheres can be defined in the unit ball B_n (for the euclidean norm) of $\mathbf{C}^n$. The horospheres of B_n are characterised in terms of the Kobayashi distance, which plays, in this case, the role of the Poincaré distance (see [12]). One of the most important results about horospheres is the classical Julia's lemma.

P. C. Yang (see [12] and [8]) has extended these concepts and Julia's lemma to strictly pseudo-convex domains of $\mathbf{C}^n$, with smooth boundary.

In this paper, we shall introduce the notions of horosphere and horocycle in the Siegel disc $\mathcal{E}$. We characterise the Šilov boundary of horospheres in terms of the Kobayashi distance (Theorem 1.6)

(*) Indirizzo dell'A.: Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa.

and we establish an extension of Julia's lemma (Theorem 2.5). In the last part of the article it is proved that if F is a holomorphic endomorphism of $\mathcal{E}$, which behaves «regularly» on a horocycle and near a boundary point of $\mathcal{E}$, then $F \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ (Theorem 5.3). Comparison with an analogous theorem concerning the endomorphisms of B_n suggests that similar results might hold for other classical domains.

§ 1. – This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.6 (which establishes a connection between the Kobayashi distance and Šilov horocycles) and of Theorem 1.7 about the behaviour of automorphisms on horocycles and horospheres.

For the points of $\mathbf{C}^m$ we use the notation $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_m)$ and we set $\|\xi\| = (\sum_j |\xi_j|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. As usual

$$e_j = (0, \dots, 0, \underset{j}{1}, 0, \dots, 0)\,, \qquad j = 1, 2, \dots, m\,,$$

will denote the canonical base of $\mathbf{C}^m$. For any $m \times m$, complex matrix Z, $\|Z\|$ will be the operator-norm $\|Z\| = \sup\limits_{\substack{\xi \in \mathbf{C}^m \\ \|\xi\| = 1}} \|Z\xi\|$.

Let $N \geqslant 1$ be a natural number; we denote by $S(N; \mathbf{C})$ (respectively $S(N; \mathbb{R})$) the set of $N \times N$, complex (resp. real) symmetric matrices; by $U(N; \mathbf{C})$ the set of $N \times N$, complex unitary matrices.

The Siegel dise is the set

$$\mathcal{E} = \{Z \in S(N; \mathbf{C});\ I - \bar{Z}Z > 0\} = \{Z \in S(N; \mathbf{C});\ \|Z\| < 1\}$$

where I is the identity matrix of order N, and $I - \bar{Z}Z > 0$ means that $I - \bar{Z}Z$ is positive definite. The Šilov boundary of $\mathcal{E}$ is

$$\partial_S \mathcal{E} = \{Z \in S(N; \mathbf{C});\ I - \bar{Z}Z = 0\} = S(N; \mathbf{C}) \cap U(N; \mathbf{C})\,.$$

The group $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ has been determined by C. L. Siegel in [11]. For any $Z_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ the map Φ_{Z_0} defined by

$$(1.1) \qquad \Phi_{Z_0}(Z) = (I - Z_0\bar{Z}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(Z - Z_0)(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

belongs to $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$. The set of all Φ_{Z_0} when Z_0 varies on $\mathcal{E}$ is a subgroup acting transitively on $\mathcal{E}$. For any $\Psi \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ there exists $U \in$

$\in U(N;\mathbf{C})$ and $Z_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\Psi(Z) = U\Phi_{Z_0}(Z)\,{}^tU$ $(Z \in \mathcal{E})$. This formula and (1.1) show that every automorphism Ψ is defined in a neighbourhood of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\Psi(\partial_S \mathcal{E}) = \partial_S \mathcal{E}$.

1.1. Definition. *Let* $W \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$, $k \in \mathbb{R}^+_*$. *The set*

$$H(k, W) = \{Z \in S(N;\mathbf{C});\ 0 < k(I - \bar{Z}Z) - (I - \bar{Z}W)(I - \overline{W}Z)\}$$

is called horosphere; $\partial H(k, W)$ *is called horocycle, and the Šilov horocycle is, by definition*

$$\partial_S H(k, W) = \{Z \in S(N;\mathbf{C});\ 0 = k(I - \bar{Z}Z) - (I - \bar{Z}W)(I - \overline{W}Z)\}\,.$$

1.2. Remark.

$$H(k, W) = \left\{Z \in S(N;\mathbf{C});\ \left\| Z - \frac{1}{k+1}\,W \right\| < \frac{k}{k+1}\right\}.$$

The Carathéodory and Kobayashi metrics and distances on $\mathcal{E}$ coincide (see [4], Theorem IV.1.8 and Lemma V.1.5) and we can state the following

1.3. Definition. *Let* $Z, W \in \mathcal{E}$; *the distance between* Z *and* W *is*

$$d(Z, W) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1 + \|\Phi_Z(W)\|}{1 - \|\Phi_Z(W)\|}\,.$$

1.4. Lemma. *Let* $Z_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ *and* $Z, W \in S(N;\mathbf{C})$. *If* $\Phi_{Z_0}(Z)$ *and* $\Phi_{Z_0}(W)$ *are defined then*

$$(1.2)\qquad I - \overline{\Phi_{Z_0}(Z)}\,\Phi_{Z_0}(W) = (I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(I - \bar{Z}Z_0)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}W)\cdot \\ \cdot(I - \bar{Z}_0 W)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,.$$

Proof. See [9], p. 145, formula (2) ∎

For $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $[s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N]$ will stand for the diagonal matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_1 & & & & \\ & s_2 & & & \\ & & \cdot & & \\ & & & \cdot & \\ & & & & s_N \end{bmatrix}.$$

1.5. Lemma. *For* $Z \in S(N; \mathbf{C})$, *there exist* $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N \in \mathbf{R}^+$ *and* $U \in U(N; \mathbf{C})$ *such that* $Z = U[s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N]\,{}^tU$ *and* $s_1^2, s_2^2, \ldots, s_N^2$ *are the characteristic roots of* $\bar{Z}Z$.

Proof. See [11], Lemma 1, p. 12 ■

1.6. Theorem. *Let* $Z \in \mathcal{E}$, $W \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$, $k \in \mathbf{R}^+_*$. *Then* $Z \in \partial_S H(k, W)$ *if and only if*

$$\lim_{\substack{A \to W \\ A \in \mathcal{E}}} d(A, Z) - d(A, O) = \tfrac{1}{2} \log k \,. \tag{1.3}$$

Proof. Let $Z \in U[s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N]\,{}^tU \in \mathcal{E}$, $U \in U(N; \mathbf{C})$; then

$$\|Z\| = \max_j s_j \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|(I - \bar{Z}Z)^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{1 - \|Z\|^2} \,.$$

(1.3) is equivalent to

$$k = \lim_{\substack{A \to W \\ A \in \mathcal{E}}} \frac{1 - \|A\|^2}{1 - \|\Phi_A(Z)\|^2} = \lim_{\substack{A \to W \\ A \in \mathcal{E}}} \frac{\|(I - \overline{\Phi_A(Z)}\,\Phi_A(Z))^{-1}\|}{\|(I - \bar{A}A)^{-1}\|} \,,$$

i.e. (by (1.2)) to

$$k = \lim_{\substack{A \to W \\ A \in \mathcal{E}}} \cdot \tag{1.4}$$

$$\cdot \left\| \frac{(I - \bar{A}A)^{-\frac12}}{\|(I - \bar{A}A)^{-\frac12}\|} (I - \bar{A}Z)(I - \bar{Z}Z)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}A) \frac{(I - \bar{A}A)^{-\frac12}}{\|(I - \bar{A}A)^{-\frac12}\|} \right\| .$$

Assume that (1.4) holds. Let $C = (I - \bar{W}Z)(I - \bar{Z}Z)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}W)$, and $A = A(t) = tW$, $t \in (0, 1)$. Then, for each t,

$$\frac{(I - \bar{A}A)^{-\frac12}}{\|(I - \bar{A}A)^{-\frac12}\|} = I$$

and, in view of (1.4), as $t \nearrow 1$

$$k = \|C\| \,. \tag{1.5}$$

Let $q(t) = \sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-t}}$, $t \in (0,1)$; by Lemma 1.5 there exists $V \in U(N;\mathbf{C})$ such that $W = V\,{}^tV$. Let $A_j(t) = V[q(t), \dots, q(t), \sqrt{t}, q(t), \dots, q(t)]\,{}^tV$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$; then $A_j(t) \in \mathcal{E}$, $\lim_{t \nearrow 1} A_j(t) = W$ and

$$\frac{(I - \overline{A_j(t)}\,A_j(t))^{-\frac12}}{\|(I - \overline{A_j(t)}\,A_j(t))^{-\frac12}\|} = \bar{V}[(1-t)^{\frac12}, \dots, (1-t)^{\frac12}, \underset{j}{1}, (1-t)^{\frac12}, \dots, (1-t)^{\frac12}]\,{}^tV,$$

therefore

$$\lim_{t \nearrow 1} \frac{(I - \overline{A_j(t)}\,A_j(t))^{-\frac12}}{\|(I - \overline{A_j(t)}\,A_j(t))^{-\frac12}\|} = \bar{V}[0, \dots, 0, \underset{j}{1}, 0, \dots, 0]\,{}^tV.$$

Let $B_j = [0, \dots, 0, \underset{j}{1}, 0, \dots, 0]$. Condition (1.4) yields

$$k = \|\bar{V}B_j\,{}^tVC\bar{V}B_j\,{}^tV\| = \|B_j\,{}^tVC\bar{V}B_j\| = |d_{jj}|,$$

with ${}^tVC\bar{V} = (d_{ij})$; then $d_{jj} = ke^{i\theta_j}$, $\theta_j \in \mathbf{R}$. In view of (1.5)

$$k^2 \geqslant \|{}^tVC\bar{V}e_j\|^2 = \sum_{i \neq j} |d_{ij}|^2 + k^2 .$$

Hence ${}^tVC\bar{V} = k[e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2}, \dots, e^{i\theta_N}]$. Moreover

$$ke^{i\theta_j} = {}^t\bar{e}_j\,{}^tVC\bar{V}e_j = {}^t\bar{e}_j\,{}^tV(I - \bar{W}Z)(I - \bar{Z}Z)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}W)\bar{V}e_j;$$

putting

$$\xi = (I - \bar{Z}Z)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}W)\bar{V}e_j, \qquad ke^{i\theta_j} = {}^t\bar{\xi}(I - \bar{Z}Z)\xi = \|\xi\|^2 - \|Z\xi\|^2;$$

since $\|Z\| < 1$, $C = kI$. This proves that (1.4) implies $Z \in \partial_S H(k, W)$.

To prove the converse, let $C_A = (I - \bar{A}Z)(I - \bar{Z}Z)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}A)$ and

$$Q_A = \frac{(I - \bar{A}A)^{-\frac12}}{\|(I - \bar{A}A)^{-\frac12}\|}.$$

If $Z \in \partial_S H(k, W)$, then $\lim_{\substack{A \to W \\ A \in \mathcal{E}}} C_A = kI$. Hence

$$\big|\|Q_A C_A Q_A\| - k\big| = \big|\|Q_A C_A Q_A\| - \|Q_A kI Q_A\|\big| \leqslant \leqslant \|Q_A(C_A - kI)Q_A\| \leqslant \|C_A - kI\| \to 0$$

as $A \to W$ ∎

We investigate now how automorphism transforms horospheres.

1.7. THEOREM. *Let $\Psi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ be such that $\Psi^{-1}(0) \in \partial_S H(1/a, W)$, with $a \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and $W \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$. For every $k \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$,*

(i) $\Psi(H(k, W)) = H(ak, \Psi(W))$;

(ii) $\Psi(\partial H(k, W)) = \partial H(ak, \Psi(W))$;

(iii) $\Psi(\partial_S H(k, W)) = \partial_S H(ak, \Psi(W))$.

PROOF. There exist $U \in U(N; \mathbb{C})$ and $Z_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\Psi = U\Phi_{Z_0}{}^tU$. Since

$$Z_0 = \Psi^{-1}(0) \in \partial_S H(a^{-1}, W) ,$$
$$a^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0) - (I - \bar{Z}_0 W)(I - \overline{W}Z_0) = 0 .$$

Hence, using (1.2) we have

$$ak(I - \overline{\Psi(Z)}\Psi(Z)) - (I - \overline{\Psi(Z)}\Psi(W))\,(I - \overline{\Psi(W)}\Psi(Z)) =$$
$$= \bar{U}(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(I - \bar{Z}Z_0)^{-1} a[k(I - \bar{Z}Z) - (I - \bar{Z}W)(I - \overline{W}Z)]\cdot$$
$$\cdot(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}^tU .$$

Then $\Psi(Z) \in H(ak, \Psi(W)) \Leftrightarrow k(I - \bar{Z}Z) - (I - \bar{Z}W)(I - \overline{W}Z) > 0 \Leftrightarrow$ $\Leftrightarrow Z \in H(k, W)$ ■

§ 2. We show that each horosphere is, in some way, the limit of a sequence of ball for the distance d (Lemma 2.2 and 2.3). This result and the fact that holomorphic endomorphisms contract d enable us to prove an analogous of Julia's lemma (Theorem 2.5).

We begin by establishing these preliminary lemmas.

2.1. LEMMA. *Let $Z, Z_0 \in \mathcal{E}$. For every $r \in (0, 1)$, the following conditions are equivalent*:

(i) $d(Z, Z_0) < \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + r)/(1 - r)$;

(ii) $0 < I - \bar{Z}Z - (1 - r^2)(I - \bar{Z}Z_0)(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z)$.

PROOF.

$$d(Z, Z_0) < \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+r}{1-r} \Leftrightarrow \|\Phi_{Z_0}(Z)\| < r \Leftrightarrow 0 < I - r^{-2}\,\overline{\Phi_{Z_0}(Z)}\,\Phi_{Z_0}(Z) =$$
$$= I - r^{-2}(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(I - \bar{Z}Z_0)^{-1}(\bar{Z} - \bar{Z}_0)(I - Z_0\bar{Z}_0)^{-1}(Z - Z_0)\cdot$$
$$\cdot(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z)^{-1}(I - \bar{Z}_0 Z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

in view of (1.1). Multiplying on the left by the matrix $r(I-\bar{Z}Z_0)\cdot$ $\cdot(I-\bar{Z}_0Z_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and on the right by its adjoint we get

$$\begin{aligned}0 &< r^2(I-\bar{Z}Z_0)(I-\bar{Z}_0Z_0)^{-1}(I-\bar{Z}_0Z)-(\bar{Z}-\bar{Z}_0)(I-Z_0\bar{Z}_0)^{-1}(Z-Z_0)=\\ &=-(1-r^2)(I-\bar{Z}Z_0)(I-\bar{Z}_0Z_0)^{-1}(I-\bar{Z}_0Z)+\\ &+(I-\bar{Z}Z_0)(I-\bar{Z}_0Z_0)^{-1}(I-\bar{Z}_0Z)-(\bar{Z}-\bar{Z}_0)(I-Z_0\bar{Z}_0)^{-1}(Z-Z_0)=\\ &=I-\bar{Z}Z-(1-r^2)(I-\bar{Z}Z_0)(I-\bar{Z}_0Z_0)^{-1}(I-\bar{Z}_0Z) \quad \blacksquare\end{aligned}$$

2.2. Lemma. *Let* $W\in\partial_S\mathcal{E}$ *and let* $(Z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence in* $\mathcal{E}$ *converging to* W. *Let* $(r_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence in* $(0,1)$ *such that* $\lim(1-r_n^2)\cdot$ $\cdot(I-\bar{Z}_nZ_n)^{-1}=S\neq 0$. *Put* $k=\|S\|^{-1}$. *If* $Z\in H(k,W)$, *there exists* $n_0\in\mathbb{N}$ *such that* $d(Z,Z_n)<\frac{1}{2}\log(1+r_n)/(1-r_n)$, *for every* $n\geqslant n_0$.

Proof. For $Z\in H(k,W)$, $0<k(I-\bar{Z}Z)-(I-\bar{Z}W)(I-\overline{W}Z)$. Since $k=\|S\|^{-1}$, then $I-kS\geqslant 0$ and $0\leqslant(I-\bar{Z}W)(I-kS)(I-\overline{W}Z)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &< k[I-\bar{Z}Z-(I-\bar{Z}W)S(I-\overline{W}Z)]=\\ &=k[I-\bar{Z}Z-\lim(I-\bar{Z}Z_n)(1-r_n^2)(I-\bar{Z}_nZ_n)^{-1}(I-\bar{Z}_nZ)]\end{aligned}$$

and, if n is sufficiently large, we must have

$$0<I-\bar{Z}Z-(I-\bar{Z}Z_n)(1-r_n^2)(I-\bar{Z}_nZ_n)^{-1}(I-\bar{Z}_nZ)\,.$$

The conclusion follows from Lemma 2.1 ■

2.3. Lemma. *Let* $W\in\partial_S\mathcal{E}$ *and let* $(Z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence in* $\mathcal{E}$ *converging to* W. *Let* $(r_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence in* $(0,1)$ *such that the limit* $\lim(1-r_n^2)(I-\bar{Z}_nZ_n)^{-1}$ *exists and is* $\geqslant(1/k)I$ *for a suitable* $k\in\mathbb{R}_*^+$. *If* $Z\in\mathcal{E}$ *and if* $d(Z,Z_n)<\frac{1}{2}\log(1+r_n)/(1-r_n)$ *for infinitely many* $n\in\mathbb{N}$, *then* $Z\in\overline{H(k,W)}$.

Proof. In view of Lemma 2.1, $0<I-\bar{Z}Z-(1-r_n^2)(I-\bar{Z}Z_n)\cdot$ $\cdot(I-\bar{Z}_nZ_n)^{-1}(I-\bar{Z}_nZ)$ for infinitely many $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Then, as $n\to\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\leqslant I-\bar{Z}Z-(I-\bar{Z}W)\lim(1-r_n^2)(I-\bar{Z}_nZ_n)^{-1}(I-\overline{W}Z)\leqslant\\ &\leqslant I-\bar{Z}Z-\frac{1}{k}(I-\bar{Z}W)(I-\overline{W}Z) \quad \blacksquare\end{aligned}$$

2.4. Remark. *Let* $W \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$ *and let* $(Z_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ *be a sequence in* $\mathcal{E}$ *converging to* W. *Then* $\lim \|(I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)^{-1}\| = +\infty$.

Proof. Let $M > 0$. Since $\lim I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n = 0$, there is $\bar{n} \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\|(I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)\xi\| < M^{-1}$ for each $n \geqslant \bar{n}$ and for each $\xi \in \mathbf{C}^N$ with $\|\xi\| = 1$. Therefore

$$\left\| (I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)^{-1} \frac{1}{\|(I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)\xi\|} (I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)\xi \right\| > M \quad \blacksquare$$

2.5. Lemma. (Julia's lemma). *Let* $F\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ *be a holomorphic endomorphism. Suppose there is a sequence* $(Z_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ *in* $\mathcal{E}$ *such that*

$$\lim Z_n = W \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}\,, \qquad \lim F(Z_n) = V \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$$

and there exists $a \in \mathbf{R}_*^+$ *such that*

$$\lim \frac{(I - \overline{F(Z_n)}\, F(Z_n))^{-1}}{\|(I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)^{-1}\|} \geqslant \frac{1}{a} I\,. \tag{2.1}$$

Then $F(H(k, W)) \subseteq \overline{H(ak, V)}$ *for all* $k \in \mathbf{R}_*^+$.

Proof. Let $Z \in H(k, W)$. We can assume, without any restriction that

$$\lim \frac{(I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)^{-1}}{\|(I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)^{-1}\|} = Q \quad \text{with} \quad \|Q\| = 1\,.$$

By previous Remark we can define, for n sufficiently large,

$$r_n = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k\|(I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)^{-1}\|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

therefore

$$1 - r_n^2 = \frac{1}{k\|(I - \bar{Z}_n Z_n)^{-1}\|}\,.$$

It follows, from Lemma 2.2, that there exists $n_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that

$$d(Z, Z_n) < \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1 + r_n}{1 - r_n}\,, \qquad \text{for all } n \geqslant n_0\,.$$

Since F is a contraction for d,

$$d(F(Z), F(Z_n)) < \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+r_n}{1-r_n};$$

but

$$\frac{1}{a}I \leqslant \lim \frac{(I-\overline{F(Z_n)}F(Z_n))^{-1}}{\|(I-\bar{Z}_n Z_n)^{-1}\|}\frac{1-r_n^2}{1-r_n^2} = k \lim (1-r_n^2)(I-\overline{F(Z_n)}F(Z_n))^{-1}.$$

Lemma 2.3 yields $F(Z) \in \overline{H(k, W)}$ ■

§ **3.** H. Alexander has proved in [1] that if Ω is a domain of $\mathbf{C}^n$ $(n>1)$ with $\Omega \cap \partial B_n \neq \emptyset$ and if $F\colon \Omega \to \mathbf{C}^n$ is a holomorphic map such that $F(\Omega \cap \partial B_n) \subset \partial B_n$, then F is constant or F extends to an automorphism of B_n. Replacing $\mathbf{C}^n$ by $S(N; \mathbf{C})$ $(N > 1)$ and B_n by $\mathcal{E}$ some of the machinary involved in the proof of H. Alexander cannot be adapted because $\partial\mathcal{E}$ is not a smooth hypersurface. Then we can establish only some first consequences of previous hypothesies (see Theorem 3.6).

The Siegel upper half-plane is the set $\mathcal{H} = \{X + iY;\ X, Y \in S(N; \mathbf{R})$ and $Y > 0\}$. It is well known (see [7], p. 5) that the Cayley transformation $Z \mapsto \sigma(Z) = i(I+Z)(I-Z)^{-1}$ maps $\mathcal{E}$ bi-holomorphically onto $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover the Šilov boundary $\partial_S\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by the two equivalent conditions

$$(3.1)\qquad \partial_S\mathcal{E}^* = \{Z \in S(N; \mathbf{C});\ \det(I-Z) \neq 0\} \overset{\sigma}{\cong} \partial_S\mathcal{H} = \\ = \{X + iY;\ X, Y \in S(N; \mathbf{R}) \text{ and } Y = 0\}.$$

3.1. Lemma. *Let S be a smooth real submanifold of $S(N; \mathbf{C})$ such that $S \subset \partial\mathcal{E}$ and $S \cap \partial_S\mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$. Then* $\dim_{\mathbf{R}} S \leqslant N(N+1)/2$.

Proof. Replacing $\mathcal{E}$ by $\mathcal{H}$ we can assume $0 \in S \subset \partial\mathcal{H}$. Let $n = \dim_{\mathbf{R}} S$, then there is a C^∞ map $X + iY\colon \mathbf{R}^n \to S(N; \mathbf{R}) + iS(N; \mathbf{R})$ such that $X(0) = Y(0) = 0$ and $Y(s) \geqslant 0$ for all $s \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Moreover the jacobian matrix $[\partial X/\partial s, \partial Y/\partial s]$ has rank n.

Let $Y = (y_{ij})$. It is enough to prove that $(\partial y_{ij}/\partial s_\alpha)(0) = 0$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant N$, $\alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Since $y_{ii}(0) = 0$ and $y_{ii}(s) \geqslant 0$, for all s, then $(\partial y_{ii}/\partial s_\alpha)(0) = 0$. For all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant N$,

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{ii}(s) & y_{ij}(s) \\ y_{ij}(s) & y_{jj}(s) \end{bmatrix} \geqslant 0,$$

and therefore $(y_{ii}y_{jj})^{\frac{1}{2}} - y_{ij} \geqslant 0$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$y_{ii}(te_\alpha) = \frac{1}{p!}\frac{\partial^p y_{ii}}{\partial s_\alpha^p}(0)\,t^p + o(t^p)$$

and

$$y_{jj}(te_\alpha) = \frac{1}{q!}\frac{\partial^q y_{jj}}{\partial s_\alpha^q}(0)\,t^q + o(t^q) \qquad \text{with } \frac{\partial^p y_{ii}}{\partial s_\alpha^p}(0)\,,$$

$$\frac{\partial^q y_{jj}}{\partial s_\alpha^q}(0) \neq 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad p, q > 1\,.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s_\alpha}(y_{ii}y_{jj})^{\frac{1}{2}}(0) =$$
$$= \lim_{t\to 0}\frac{1}{t}\left[\left(\frac{1}{p!}\frac{\partial^p y_{ii}}{\partial s_\alpha^p}(0)\,t^p + o(t^p)\right)\left(\frac{1}{q!}\frac{\partial^q y_{jj}}{\partial s_\alpha^q}(0)\,t^q + o(t^q)\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0\,,$$

then $(\partial y_{ij}/\partial s_\alpha)(0) = 0$ ■

3.2. Lemma. *Let $U \in \partial\mathcal{E}\setminus\partial_S\mathcal{E}$. There exists a smooth real submanifold S of $S(N;\mathbf{C})$ such that $U \in S \subset \partial\mathcal{E}$ and* $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} S > N(N+1)/2$

Proof. Replacing $\mathcal{E}$ by $\mathcal{H}$ we can assume

$$U = X_0 + iA[d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_N]\,{}^tA$$

with $X_0 \in S(N;\mathbb{R})$, where A is an orthogonal matrix of order N, $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_N \geqslant 0$ and $d_1 > 0$, $d_2 = 0$. Then $(X, t) \equiv X + iA[t, d_2, \ldots, d_N]\,{}^tA$ with $X \in S(N;\mathbb{R})$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the required parametrization ■

3.3. Lemma. *Let Ω be a domain in $S(N;\mathbf{C})$ such that $\Omega \cap \partial_S\mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$. Let F be a diffeomorphism of Ω onto an open subset $F(\Omega)$ of $S(N;\mathbf{C})$. If $F(\Omega \cap \partial\mathcal{E}) \subset \partial\mathcal{E}$, then $F(\Omega \cap \partial_S\mathcal{E}) \subset \partial_S\mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. We begin by showing that $F(\Omega \cap \partial\mathcal{E})$ is open in $\partial\mathcal{E}$. Since is the unit ball for a norm in $S(N;\mathbf{C}) = \mathbb{R}^{N(N+1)}$ equivalent to the euclidean norm, then $\partial\mathcal{E}$ is homeomorphic to $S^{N(N+1)-1}$. Then, by Theorem 6.6 in [6] Ch. III, it is enough to notice that $F_{|\Omega\cap\partial\mathcal{E}}\colon \Omega \cap \partial\mathcal{E} \to F(\Omega \cap \partial\mathcal{E})$ is a homeomorphism and $\Omega \cap \partial\mathcal{E}$ is open in $\partial\mathcal{E}$.

Let $Z \in \Omega \cap \partial_S\mathcal{E}$ and suppose $F(Z) \in \partial\mathcal{E}\setminus\partial_S\mathcal{E}$. By Lemma 3.2 there is smooth real submanifold S such that $F(Z) \in S \subset F(\Omega \cap \partial\mathcal{E})$ and $\dim_{\mathbf{R}} S > N(N+1)/2$. Thus, by Lemma 3.1, $\dim_{\mathbf{R}} F^{-1}(S) \leqslant N(N+1)/2$. This is a contradiction ■

For $r \in \mathbf{R}_*^+$ and $Z_0 \in S(N; \mathbf{C})$, let

$$B_r(Z_0) = \{Z \in S(N; \mathbf{C});\ \|Z - Z_0\| < r\}\,.$$

3.4. Lemma. *Let* $0 < r < 1$. *There exist an open neighbourhood* Σ *of the identity matrix* I, *a continous function* f *on* $B_r(I)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that*

(i) $\Sigma \cap \mathcal{E} \subset\subset B_r(I)$;

(ii) f *is plurisubharmonic on* $B_r(I)$;

(iii) *For all* $Z_0 \in \Sigma \cap \mathcal{E} \cap B_\varepsilon(I)$, $Z_1 \in \partial\Sigma \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}$, $f(Z_0) > f(Z_1)$.

Proof. Let $0 < \varrho < 1$ and $\Sigma = \{Z \in S(N; \mathbf{C});\ \|Ze_j + e_j\| > 2\varrho,\ j = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ Let $Z \in \Sigma \cap \mathcal{E}$, therefore

$$\|Ze_j + e_j\|^2 + 4\varrho^2 < \|Ze_j - e_j\|^2 + \|Ze_j + e_j\|^2 = \\ = 2(\|Ze_j\|^2 + \|e_j\|^2) \leqslant 4 \tag{3.2}$$

hence $\|Ze_j - e_j\| < 2(1-\varrho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. For any $\xi \in \mathbf{C}^N$, with $\|\xi\| = 1$, we have

$$\|(Z - I)\xi\| \leqslant \sum_j |\xi_j|\,\|Ze_j - e_j\| < 2(1-\varrho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} N^{\frac{1}{2}}\,.$$

If ϱ is such that $(1 - r^2/4N)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \varrho < 1$, then (i) is satisfied.

The function $f(Z) = \sum_j \log \frac{1}{2}\|Ze_j + e_j\|$ is plurisubharmonic (see [4], Lemma II.6.2).

Let $0 < \varepsilon < 2(1 - \sqrt[N]{\varrho})$ and $\varepsilon < r$. If $Z_0 \in \Sigma \cap \mathcal{E} \cap B_\varepsilon(I)$, then

$$\|Z_0 e_j + e_j\| \geqslant \|2e_j\| - \|Z_0 e_j - e_j\| > 2 - \varepsilon\,.$$

If follows that $f(Z_0) > \log((2-\varepsilon)/2)^N > \log \varrho$.

If $Z_1 \in \partial\Sigma \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}$, there is j_0 such that $\|Z_1 e_{j_0} + e_{j_0}\| = 2\varrho$. By (3.2), $\|Z_1 e_j + e_j\| \leqslant (4 - \|Z_1 e_j - e_j\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ $(j = 1, 2, \dots, N)$; therefore

$$\prod_j\left(\frac{1}{2}\|Z_1 e_j + e_j\|\right) \leqslant \varrho \prod_{j \neq j_0}\left(1 - \frac{\|Z_1 e_j - e_j\|^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant \varrho\,.$$

It follows $f(Z_0) > \log \varrho \geqslant f(Z_1)$ ■

3.5. Remark. *Let Ω be a domain in $S(N; \mathbf{C})$ such that $\Omega \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$. If $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbf{C}$ is a holomorphic function such that $f(Z) = 0$, for every $Z \in \Omega \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}$, then $f \equiv 0$ in Ω.*

Proof. In view of (3.1) $\Omega \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}$ is bi-holomorphically equivalent to an open subset of

$$\partial_s \mathcal{H} \simeq \left\{\xi \in \mathbf{C}^{N(N+1)/2};\ \operatorname{Im} \xi_j = 0,\ j = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{N(N+1)}{2}\right\} \quad \blacksquare$$

3.6. Theorem. *Let Ω be a domain in $S(N; \mathbf{C})$ such that $\Omega \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$. If $F\colon \Omega \to S(N; \mathbf{C})$ is a holomorphic map such that $F(\Omega \cap \partial \mathcal{E}) \subset \partial \mathcal{E}$, then one of the following statements holds:*

(i) *There exists $\xi \in \mathbf{C}^N \setminus \{0\}$ such that the map $Z \mapsto F(Z)\xi$ is constant;*

(ii) *There is $\tilde{Z} \in \Omega \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}$ such that $dF(\tilde{Z})$ is invertible and there is an open neighbourhood Ω_1 of $\tilde{Z}$ such that $F(\Omega_1 \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}) \subset \partial_S \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. If there is $\tilde{Z} \in \Omega \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}$ such that $dF(\tilde{Z})$ is invertible, then the theorem follows from Lemma 3.3. Therefore it is enough assume $\det dF(Z) = 0$ on $\Omega \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}$ and prove (i). Hence by previous Remark, $\det dF(Z) = 0$ on Ω. If $N = 1$, then F is a constant map. Let $N > 1$. Since $\max\limits_{Z \in \Omega}$ rank $dF(Z) = n < N(N+1)/2$, there exists a minor $M = M(Z)$ of $dF(Z)$ of order n such that $\det M(A) \neq 0$ for a suitable A. Still by Remark 3.5 there is $B \in \Omega \cap \partial \mathcal{E}_S$ such that $\det M(B) \neq 0$.

Replacing F by $F \circ \Phi$, for a suitable $\Phi \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$, there is no restriction in assuming $B = I$. Let

$$M(I) = \begin{bmatrix} \dfrac{F_{j_1 h_1}}{z_{a_1 b_1}}(\mathrm{I}) \ldots \dfrac{F_{j_1 h_1}}{Z_{a_n b_n}}(\mathrm{I}) \\ \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \\ \dfrac{F_{j_n h_n}}{z_{a_1 b_1}}(\mathrm{I}) \ldots \dfrac{F_{j_n h_n}}{z_{a_n b_n}}(\mathrm{I}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\operatorname{rank} dF(I) \geqslant \operatorname{rank} dF(Z)$ $(Z \in \Omega)$, by the implicit function theorem there exists r, $0 < r < 1$, such that all the F_{jh}, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant h \leqslant N$, are functionally dependent on $B_r(I) \subset \Omega$, on $F_{j_1 h_1}, F_{j_2 h_2}, \ldots, F_{j_n h_n}$.

With the same notations as in Lemma 3.4 let $Z_0 \in \Sigma \cap \mathcal{E} \cap B_\varepsilon(I)$

and let Γ be the set defined by

$$\begin{cases} F_{j_1h_1}(Z) = F_{j_1h_1}(Z_0)\,, \\ \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots \\ F_{j_nh_n}(Z) = F_{j_nh_n}(Z_0)\,. \end{cases}$$

Then $\Gamma \cap \partial(\Sigma \cap \mathcal{E}) \neq \emptyset$. (In fact in a neighbourhood of I Γ is biholomorphically equivalent to an affine subspace). The function f attains its maximum on $\Gamma \cap \overline{\Sigma \cap \mathcal{E}}$ in a suitable matrix $Z_1 \in \partial(\Sigma \cap \mathcal{E})$ (see [5], p. 272). In view of Lemma 3.4, $Z_1 \in \Sigma \cap \mathcal{E} \subset B_r(I)$. Then $F(Z_0) = F(Z_1) \in \partial\mathcal{E}$. It follows that there exists $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{C}^N$, with $\|\xi_0\| = 1$, such that $\|F(Z_0)\xi_0\| = 1$.

Let Z_2 be a matrix near Z_0. Then $Z_0 + \lambda(Z_2 - Z_0) \in \Sigma \cap \mathcal{E} \cap B_\varepsilon(I)$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| < 1$. Therefore, by the previous argument $F(Z_0 + \lambda(Z_2 - Z_0)) \in \partial\mathcal{E}$. It follows $\|F(Z_0 + \lambda(Z_2 - Z_0)\xi\| \leqslant 1$. Hence, by the strong maximum principle $F(Z_0 + \lambda(Z_2 - Z_0))\xi_0 = F(Z_0)\xi_0$ for each λ. Thus $F(Z)\xi_0$ is constant ■

§ 4. In this section we shall show that if F is a holomorphic endomorphism of $\mathcal{E}$ which maps a piece of the Šilov horocycle $\partial_S H(1, I)$ into the same Šilov horocycle and behaves « regularly » near a point of $\partial_S \mathcal{E}$, then F maps $\mathcal{E} \cap \overline{H(k, I)}$ into $\overline{H(k, I)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{R}^+_*$ (Theorem 4.4).

The group $\{W \mapsto W + A;\ A \in S(N; \mathbb{R})\}$ is a group of automorphism of $\mathcal{H}$ which acts transitively on $\partial_S \mathcal{H}$. For $A \in S(N; \mathbb{R})$, let $\Psi_A(Z) = \sigma^{-1}(\sigma(Z) + A)$ $(Z \in \mathcal{E})$. Since $\Psi_A \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$, we can extend Ψ_A in a neighbourhood of $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$.

4.1. PROPOSITION. *The set* $\{\Psi_A;\ A \in S(N; \mathbb{R})\}$ *is a subgroup of* $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ *which acts transitively on* $\partial_S \mathcal{E}^*$. *Moreover, for all* $A \in S(N; \mathbb{R})$,

(i) $\Psi_A(I) = I$;

(ii) $\Psi_A^{-1}(0) \in \partial_S H(1, I)$.

PROOF. To prove (i) it is enough to verify that

$$\lim \Psi_A((1 - 1/n)I) = I \quad ■$$

4.2. LEMMA. *Let* $U, V \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$ *and* $k \in \mathbb{R}^+_*$. *If* $\det(U - V) \neq \emptyset$ *then there exists* $\Psi \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ *such that* $\Psi(U) = I$, $\Psi(V) = -I$, $\Psi(\partial_S H(k, U)) = \partial_S H(1, I)$ *and* $\Psi(\partial H(k, U)) = \partial H(1, I)$.

PROOF. In view of Lemma 1.5, there exists $T \in U(N; \mathbf{C})$ such that $U = T\,{}^tT$. Let $W = {}^t\overline{T}V\overline{T}$. Since $\det(I - W) = \det(U - V) \neq 0$, by Proposition 4.1, there exists $A \in S(N; \mathbf{R})$ such that $\Psi_A(W) = -I$. Let $\Psi(Z) = (\Phi_{((1-k)/(1+k))I} \circ \Psi_A)({}^t\overline{T}Z\overline{T})$. Since $\Phi^{-1}_{((1-k)/(1+k))I}(0) \in \partial_S H(k, I)$ and $\Phi_{((1-k)/(1+k))I}(I) = I$, the lemma follows from Theorem 1.7 and Proposition 4.1 ■

4.3. REMARK. *Let* $Z \in \partial_S H(2, I) \setminus \{-\frac{1}{3}I\}$. *Then* $d(0, Z) > d(0, -\frac{1}{3}I)$.

PROOF. It follows, from Definition 1.1, that $\frac{1}{2}(3Z - I) \in U(N; \mathbf{C})$ and $\bar{Z}Z = Z\bar{Z}$. Therefore there exists $U \in U(N; \mathbf{C})$ such that $Z = U[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_N]\,{}^t\overline{U}$. Hence $\frac{1}{2}|3\lambda_j - 1| = 1$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$; thus $|\lambda_j| > \frac{1}{3}$ or $\lambda_j = -\frac{1}{3}$. Therefore $\|Z\| = \max_j |\lambda_j| > \frac{1}{3} = \|-\frac{1}{3}I\|$ ■

4.4. THEOREM. *Let* $F\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ *be a holomorphic endomorphism for which the following conditions hold*:

(i) *There is a domain* $\Omega \subset \mathcal{E}$ *such that*

(*A*) $\Omega \cap \partial_S H(1, I) \neq \emptyset$,

(*B*) $F(\Omega \cap \partial_S H(1, I)) \subset \partial_S H(1, I)$;

(ii) *There is a sequence* $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ *in* $\mathcal{E}$ *such that*

(*C*) $\lim Z_n = -I$,

(*D*) $\lim F(Z_n) = W$ *for a suitable* $W \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$.

Then, for every $k \in \mathbf{R}^+_*$,

$$F(\mathcal{E} \cap \overline{H(k, I)}) \subset \overline{H(k, I)}\,. \tag{4.1}$$

PROOF. Setting $\beta(Z) = 2Z - I$, β is an isomorphism of $S(N; \mathbf{C})$ and $\beta(\partial_S H(1, I)) = \partial_S \mathcal{E}$, $\beta(\mathcal{E}) = \{Z \in S(N; \mathbf{C});\ \|Z + I\| < 2\}$. Let

$G = \beta \circ F \circ \beta^{-1}\colon \beta(\mathcal{E}) \to \beta(\mathcal{E})$. It follows from (*B*) that $G(\partial_S \mathcal{E} \cap \beta(\Omega)) \subset \partial_S \mathcal{E}$.

The map L defined by $L(Z) = \overline{G(\bar{Z}^{-1})}$ is holomorphic on

$$R = \{Z \in \beta(\mathcal{E});\ \det Z \neq 0 \text{ and } \bar{Z}^{-1} \in \beta(\mathcal{E})\}\,.$$

If $Z \in \beta(\Omega) \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}$, then Z, $G(Z) \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$ and $L(Z)\,G(Z) = I$. We denote by R_1 the union of these connected components of R which intersect

$\beta(\Omega) \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}$. In view of (3.1),

$$\beta(\mathcal{E}) \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E} = \partial_S \mathcal{E}^* \simeq \partial_S \mathcal{H} = \\ = \{\xi \in \mathbf{C}^{N(N+1)/2};\ \operatorname{Im} \xi_j = 0;\ j = 1, 2, \ldots, N(N+1)/2\},$$

which is connected; therefore $\partial_S \mathcal{E}^* \subset R_1$. Hence by Remark 3.5, we have

$$L(Z)\, G(Z) = I\,, \qquad \text{for all } Z \in R_1 \tag{4.2}$$

and a fortiori for every $Z \in \beta(\mathcal{E}) \cap \partial_S \mathcal{E}$, i.e.

$$F(\mathcal{E} \cap \partial_S H(1, I)) \subset \partial_S H(1, I)\,. \tag{4.3}$$

For every $t \in (-3, -1)$, $tI \in R$; moreover, since $-I \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}^* \cap R_1$, $tI \in R_1$. Then $-3I \in \partial R_1$. From (C) it follows that $\lim \beta(Z_n) = -3I$; thus, for every n sufficiently large, $\beta(Z_n) \in R_1$, and (4.2) yields

$$\overline{G(\overline{\beta(Z_n)}^{-1})}\, G(\beta(Z_n)) = I \tag{4.4}$$

for every n sufficiently large. By (D), $\lim G(\beta(Z_n)) = \beta(W) = 2W - I$ and $\lim \overline{G(\overline{\beta(Z_n)}^{-1}} = \overline{G(-\frac{1}{3}I)}$. By (4.4),

$$\overline{G(-\tfrac{1}{3}I)}(2W - I) = I\,. \tag{4.5}$$

If $\det(I - W) = 0$, then, for a suitable $\xi \in \mathbf{C}^N \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\overline{G(-\tfrac{1}{3}I)}\, \xi = \xi \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\overline{G(-\tfrac{1}{3}I)} + I\| \geqslant 2\,,$$

contradicting $G(-\frac{1}{3}I) \in \beta(\mathcal{E})$. Thus $\det(I - W) \neq 0$. We can apply Lemma 4.2 to I and W, and replace F by $\Psi \circ F$, so there is not restriction assuming $W = -I$. Therefore (4.5) becomes $\overline{G(-\frac{1}{3}I)} = -\frac{1}{3}I$, i.e.

$$F(\tfrac{1}{3}I) = \tfrac{1}{3}I\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Let $T = \Phi_{\frac{1}{3}I} \circ F \circ \Phi_{\frac{1}{3}I}^{-1}\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$. It follows, from Theorem 1.7, (4.3) and (4.6) that $T(0) = 0$ and $T(\mathcal{E} \cap \partial_S H(2, I)) \subset \partial_S H(2, I)$. Since T is a contraction for d, then $d(0, -\frac{1}{3}I) \geqslant d(0, T(-\frac{1}{3}I))$.

By remark 4.3, $T(-\frac{1}{3}I) = -\frac{1}{3}I$. Thus F is a holomorphic map with $F(0) = 0$. Therefore we can apply the Schwarz lemma (see [4], Theorem III.2.3): by (4.6), $\|F(\frac{1}{3}I)\| = \|\frac{1}{3}I\|$ and I is a complex extremal point of $\mathcal{E}$, then $F(\mu\frac{1}{3}I) = \mu F(\frac{1}{3}I)$ for every $\mu \in \mathbf{C}$, $|\mu| < 3$. It follows that $F(\lambda I) = \lambda I$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbf{C}$, $|\lambda| < 1$. Since the sequence $((1-1/n)I)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ satisfies (2.1), then the theorem follows from Julia's lemma ■

§ 5. We come now to the proof of our main theorem (Theorem 5.3).

5.1. Lemma. *Let $K\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ be a holomorphic endomorphism with $K(0) = 0$. Then the sequence $(K^n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ of the iterates $K^n = K\circ\ldots\circ K$ of K contains a subsequence convergent on all compact subsets of $\mathcal{E}$ to a holomorphic endomorphism L of $\mathcal{E}$. Moreover*

$$d(L(A), L(B)) = d(L^2(A), L^2(B)) \tag{5.1}$$

for every $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proof. For all i, j such that $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant N$, the sequence $(K^n_{ij})_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ is equibounded, because $\|K^n_{ij}(Z)\| \leqslant \|K^n(Z)\| \leqslant 1$. Thus there exists a subsequence $(K^{n_k})_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$ uniformely convergent on all compact subsets of $\mathcal{E}$ to a holomorphic map L. Moreover, by the Schwarz lemma,

$$\|Z\| \geqslant \lim_{k\to\infty} \|K^{n_k}(Z)\| = \|L(Z)\|, \text{ then } L\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}.$$

The holomorphic endomorphisms contract the distance d, hence

$$d(L(A), L(B)) \geqslant d(L^2(A), L^2(B))$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d(K^n(A), K^n(B)) = \inf_{n\in\mathbf{N}} d(K^n(A), K^n(B)),$$

for every $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$. Therefore

$$d(L(A), L(B)) = \lim_{k\to\infty} d(K^{n_k}(A), K^{n_k}(B)) \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant \lim_{k\to\infty}\lim_{h\to\infty} d(K^{n_k+n_h}(A), K^{n_k+n_h}(B)) = d(L^2(A), L^2(B)) \quad ■$$

5.2. Lemma. *Let $K\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ be a holomorphic endomorphism. Suppose there is a domain $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{E}$ such that*

$$d(Z_1, Z_2) = d(K(Z_1), K(Z_2))$$

for all $Z_1, Z_2 \in \Lambda$. Then $K \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$.

Proof. Let $C \in \Lambda$. Replacing K by $\Phi_{K(C)} \circ K \circ \Phi_{-C}$ we may assume $C = 0$, and $K(0) = 0$.

Let $s \in (0, 1)$ be such that $B_s(0) \subset \Lambda$ therefore $d(0, Z) = d(0, K(Z))$, i.e.—by Definition 1.3—$\|Z\| = \|K(Z)\|$, for every $Z \in B_s(0)$. Let $Z \in \mathcal{E}$, then $sZ \in B_s(0)$, $\|K(sZ)\| = \|sZ\|$ and by the Schwarz lemma $\|K(Z)\| = \|Z\|$. Moreover $K(Z) = dK(0)Z + \omega(Z)\|Z\|$, with $\lim\limits_{Z\to 0} \omega(Z) = 0$. Let $W \in \partial\mathcal{E}$, then, for $0 < \varrho < 1$, $\varrho = \|K(\varrho W)\| = \|dK(0)\,\varrho W + \omega(\varrho W)\,\varrho\|$; therefore $1 = \lim\limits_{\varrho \searrow 0} \|dK(0)\,W + \omega(\varrho W)\| = \|dK(0)\,W\|$. The lemma follows from Theorem III.2.4 in [4] ■

5.3. Theorem. *Let $F\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ be a holomorphic endomorphism. Let $V_1, V_2, W_1, W_2 \in \partial_S \mathcal{E}$, $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+_*$ be such that the following conditions hold:*

(i) $\det(V_1 - W_1) \neq 0$;

(ii) *There exists a domain $\Omega \subset \mathcal{E}$ such that*

(*A*) $\Omega \cap \partial_S H(k_1, V_1) \neq \emptyset$,

(*B*) $F(\Omega \cap \partial H(k_1, V_1)) \subset \partial H(k_2, V_2)$;

(iii) *There is a sequence $(Z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{E}$ such that* $\lim Z_n = W_1$ *and* $\lim F(Z_n) = W_2$.

Then $F \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$.

Proof. Replacing F by $\Psi \circ F \circ \Phi$ by a suitable choice of $\Psi, \Phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ (see Lemma 4.2) we can assume $V_1 = V_2 = I$, $W_1 = -I$, $k_1 = k_2 = 1$.

As in the proof of Theorem 4.4, replace F by $G = \beta \circ F \circ \beta^{-1}$. Since $G(\beta(\Omega) \cap \partial\mathcal{E}) \subset \partial\mathcal{E}$, then we can appply Theorem 3.6. But $\lim G(\beta(Z_n)) = \beta(W_2)$ with $\|G(\beta(Z_n)) + I\| < 2$ and $\frac{1}{2}(\beta(W_2) + I) \in U(N; \mathbb{C})$, therefore there is no $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^N \setminus \{0\}$ such that $T \mapsto G(T)\xi$ is constant. Hence all hypothesies of Theorem 4.4 are satisfied.

Let $Z \in \Omega \cap \partial_S H(1, I)$ and let $\Psi_1, \Phi_1 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ be such that $\Phi_1(0) = Z$, $\Phi_1(I) = I$, $\Psi_1(F(Z)) = 0$, $\Psi_1(I) = I$. Setting $K = \Psi_1 \circ F \circ \Phi_1$, it follows, from Theorem 1.7 and from (4.1), that

$$K(\mathcal{E} \cap \overline{H(k, I)}) \subset \overline{H(k, I)} \tag{5.3}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$. Moreover

$$K(0) = 0 \,. \tag{5.4}$$

Let $t > 0$ be such that $B_t(0) \subset \Phi_1^{-1}(0)$; then by (ii, B) and by the Schwarz lemma

$$K(B_t(0) \cap \partial H(1, I)) \subset B_t(0) \cap \partial H(1, I) \,. \tag{5.5}$$

In view of (5.4), Lemma 5.1 can be applied. Thus (by (5.5)) $\beta \circ L \circ \beta^{-1}$ satisfied the hypothesies of Theorem 3.6, and (by (5.3), (5.4))

$$L(\mathcal{E} \cap \overline{H(k, I)}) \subset \overline{H(k, I)} \,,$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$, and $L(0) = 0$. Therefore there is no $\xi \in \mathbf{C}^N \setminus \{0\}$ such that $(\beta \circ L \circ \beta^{-1})(Z)\xi$ is a constant map. It follows, from Theorem 3.6, that there is $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $dL(\tilde{Z})$ is invertible. Hence, for a suitable open neighbourhood Ω_1 of $\tilde{Z}$, $\Lambda = L(\Omega_1)$ is an open neighbourhood of $\tilde{W} = L(\tilde{Z})$ It follows, from (5.1),

$$d(W, \tilde{W}) = d(L(W), L(\tilde{W}))$$

for all $W \in \Lambda$. Since

$$d(W, \tilde{W}) \geqslant d(K(W), K(\tilde{W})) \geqslant d(L(W), L(\tilde{W})) \,,$$

then $d(W, \tilde{W}) = d(K(W), K(\tilde{W}))$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.2,

$$\Psi_1 \circ F \circ \Phi_1 = K \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{E}) \quad \blacksquare$$

5.4. Remark. Hypothesis (iii) in Theorem 5.3 can not be dropped (see Remark 1 in [2]).

REFERENCES

[1] H. Alexander, *Holomorphic mappings from the ball and polydisc*, Math. Ann., **209** (1974), pp. 249-256.

[2] G. Bassanelli, *On holomorphic endomorphisms of the ball*, to appear in Rend. Acc. Naz. Lincei.

[3] C. Carathéodory, *Theory of functions of a complex variable*, Chelsea Publishing Co., 1954.

[4] T. Franzoni - E. Vesentini, *Holomorphic maps and invariant distances*, Noth-Holland, 1980.

[5] R. C. Gunning - H. Rossi, *Analytic functions of severals complex variables*, Prentice-Hall, 1965.

[6] W. S. Massey, *Singular homology theory*, Springer, 1980.

[7] S. Murakami, *On automorphisms of Siegel domains*, Lecture Notes in Math., **286**, Springer, 1972.

[8] L. Niremberg - S. Webster - P. Yang, *Local boundary regularity of holomorphic mappings*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **33** (1980), pp. 305-338.

[9] V. P. Potapov, *The multiplicative structure of J-contractive matrix functions*, Amer. Math. Soc. Trans., Series 2, **15** (1960), pp. 131-243.

[10] W. Rudin, *Function theory in the unit ball of* $\mathbf{C}^n$, Springer, 1980.

[11] C. L. Siegel, *Symplectic geometry*, Academic Press, 1964.

[12] P. Yang, *Holomorphic curves and boundary regularity of biholomorphic maps of pseudo-convex domains*, unpublished.

Manoscritto pervenuto in redazione il 20 maggio 1982.