

CYCLE CONNECTIVITY AND PSEUDOCONCAVITY OF FLAG DOMAINS

TATSUKI HAYAMA

ABSTRACT. We prove that a non-classical flag domain is pseudoconcave if it satisfies a certain condition on the root system. Moreover, we prove that every point in a codimension-one real boundary orbit of a non-classical period domains is a pseudoconcave boundary point if it satisfies a certain Hodge-theoretical condition.

1. INTRODUCTION

Flag domains are open real group orbits in flag manifolds. The simplest example of flag domain is open orbits in $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$. The projective line $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ is a flag manifold with the holomorphic action of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$, which has the three real forms $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, $SU(1, 1)$, and $SU(2)$. Here the upper/lower-half planes are open $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -orbits, the unit disks around 0 and ∞ are open $SU(1, 1)$ -orbits, and $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ itself is the $SU(2)$ -orbit. In general, there are finitely many open real group orbits in flag manifolds, and study on flag domains has been developed by complex geometers (cf. [FHW]). Flag domains are classified into two kinds; *classical* or *non-classical*. Here we say a flag domain is non-classical if it has no non-constant holomorphic function. A classical flag domain is almost like a Hermitian symmetric domain and is well-studied, however a non-classical one is not. In this paper, we investigate non-classical flag domains. In particular, we focus on their *cycle connectivity* and *pseudoconcavity*.

Cycle connectivity of flag domains are investigated by Huckleberry [Huc2] and Green, Robles and Toledo [GRT]. We recall it briefly. Let \tilde{D} be a flag manifold with a holomorphic action of a connected complex semisimple Lie group G . Let D be an open $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit contained in \tilde{D} with a real form $G_{\mathbb{R}}$. For a base point $o \in D$, we have the parabolic subgroup P of G stabilizing o and $G_{\mathbb{R}} \cap P$ contains a θ -stable fundamental Cartan subgroup with a Cartan involution θ . For the maximal compact subgroup $K_{\mathbb{R}}$ fixed by θ , the $K_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit $C_0 = K_{\mathbb{R}}o$ is a compact submanifold contained in D . A flag domain D is non-classical if and only if any two points of D are connected by a connected chain $g_1 C_0 \cup \cdots \cup g_\ell C_0$ contained in D with $g_1, \dots, g_\ell \in G$.

The other property we discuss in this paper is pseudoconcavity. We say D is pseudoconcave if D contains a relatively compact subset where a Levi form on every boundary point has at least one negative eigenvalue. Pseudoconcavity of complex manifolds is studied by Andreotti and Grauert in 1960's. Pseudoconcave manifolds are a generalization of compact complex manifolds, which behave like compact complex manifolds in many ways. For instance, if D is pseudoconcave, $H^0(D, \mathcal{O}) = \mathbb{C}$ and $\dim H^0(D, E) < \infty$ (the finiteness theorem) for any holomorphic vector bundle E . Moreover, the field of all meromorphic functions on a pseudoconcave manifold D

is an algebraic field of transcendental degree less than $\dim D$. Huckleberry [Huc1] proved that classical flag domains are not pseudoconcave but pseudoconvex.

Cycle connectivity and pseudoconcavity are closely related. Huckleberry introduced *one-connectivity* in [Huc1]. One-connectivity is cycle connectivity in a strong sense, which requires that any two points are connected by a single cycle gC_0 with some $g \in G$. He showed that D is pseudoconcave if D is generically one-connected. For example, D is generically one-connected if $G_{\mathbb{R}} = SL(n, \mathbb{R})$, however we do not completely know what kind of flag domain this property holds. In [GGK2, Lecture 10], Green, Griffiths and Kerr examined pseudoconcavity of the Carayol domain (Example 3.8) by an argument about boundary behavior of its cycle space. On the other hand, Kollár [Ko] proved the finiteness theorem for every non-classical flag domains by using their cycle connectivity without pseudoconcavity. Huckleberry conjectured that any non-classical flag domain is pseudoconcave.

Our purpose of this paper is to give a sufficient condition for non-classical flag domains to be pseudoconcave, which [Huc1] did not reach. In the Lie algebra level, we have the θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathfrak{p}$ and the maximal compact subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$ fixed by θ . Let Δ be the set of roots. Then we have the graded Lie algebra decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^{-k} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{g}^k$ defined by a subset of the simple roots such that $\mathfrak{p} = \bigoplus_{\ell \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}^{\ell}$. We say a root $\alpha \in \Delta$ is compact (resp. non-compact) if $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{k})$ (resp. $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{k}^{\perp})$).

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that there exist a compact root β such that for any non-compact root α in $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}^{<0})$ the β -string containing α is one of the following:*

- $\{\alpha, \alpha + \beta\}$ with $\alpha + \beta \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p})$;
- $\{\alpha, \alpha + \beta, \alpha + 2\beta\}$ with $\alpha + 2\beta \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p})$.

Then D is pseudoconcave.

Our study is motivated by Hodge theory. A rational Hodge structure defines a rational algebraic group called a Mumford–Tate group, and an orbit of a real Mumford–Tate group is called a Mumford–Tate domain, which is a measurable flag domain (cf. [GGK1]). For example, a period domain (cf. [CG]) is a Mumford–Tate domain of a special kind. We give two examples of Mumford–Tate domain where the above theorem holds (Example 3.8–3.9).

In the latter half of this paper, we discuss pseudoconcavity at a boundary point of D in a real codimension-one $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit for a non-classical period domain D . In this case $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $Sp(2n)$ or $SO(p, q)$ depending on its Hodge numbers. Now the boundary $\text{bd}(D)$ in \tilde{D} is the disjoint union of finitely many boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbits. For a real codimension-one $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit \mathcal{O} , we may consider a Levi form and define pseudoconcavity at a point in \mathcal{O} . By transitivity of $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ acting on D , every point in \mathcal{O} is pseudoconcave boundary point of D if one point in \mathcal{O} is. We then say a codimension-one $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit \mathcal{O} is a pseudoconcave boundary orbit of D if a point in \mathcal{O} is pseudoconcave boundary point of D .

Boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbits have a relationship with degeneration of Hodge structures. By the nilpotent orbit theorem [S], degenerating Hodge structures over a product of punctured disks are asymptotically approximated by nilpotent orbits. A nilpotent orbit is generated by a pair consisting of $N \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $F^{\bullet} \in \tilde{D}$, and the limit point $\lim_{\text{Im}(z) \rightarrow \infty} \exp(zN) =: F_{\infty}^{\bullet} \in \tilde{D}$, which is called the reduced limit, is in a boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit. A boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit is said to be polarizable if it is a $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit of a reduced limit. Remark that *not* every boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbits are polarizable.

Green, Griffiths and Kerr [GGK2] and Kerr and Pearlstein [KP] showed that any codimension-one boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit \mathcal{O} is polarizable. We then have a nilpotent orbit (N, F^\bullet) so that the reduced limit F_∞^\bullet is in \mathcal{O} , which is called a *minimal degeneration*. Minimal degenerations are studied by Green, Griffiths and Robles [GGR]. In Theorem 4.4, we will give a sufficient condition of (N, F^\bullet) for \mathcal{O} to be a pseudoconcave boundary orbit examining minimal degenerations.

In this paper, we do not deal with degree of pseudoconcavity, and we leave it open. If a flag domain D is q -pseudoconcave in the sense of Andreotti-Grauert, we have the finiteness theorem for cohomology groups of degree less than $\dim D - q - 1$ with locally free sheaves. In addition, it is speculated that the finiteness theorem is true for degree less than $\dim C_0$ in [GGK2, Lecture 10] as an open question.

2. PSEUDOCONCAVITY OF COMPLEX MANIFOLDS

We recall pseudoconcavity of complex manifolds following [A]. Let Ω be an open subset of \mathbb{C}^n with a smooth boundary. For every point z_0 in the boundary $\text{bd}(\Omega)$, we can find a neighborhood U_{z_0} of z_0 and a C^∞ -function $\phi : U_{z_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(d\phi)_{z_0} \neq 0, \quad \Omega \cap U_{z_0} = \{z \in U_{z_0} \mid \phi(z) < \phi(z_0)\}.$$

The real tangent plane at z_0 to $\text{bd}(\Omega)$ contains the $(n-1)$ -dimensional complex plane defined by the equation

$$\sum_k \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z^k}(z_0)(z^k - z_0^k) = 0$$

with the coordinate function z^1, \dots, z^n . This is called the analytic tangent plane. Since ϕ is real-valued, the quadratic form

$$L(\phi)_{z_0}(z) := \sum_{k, \ell} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^k \partial \bar{z}^\ell}(z_0) z^k \bar{z}^\ell,$$

is Hermitian, which is called the Levi form. The boundary point z_0 is said to be pseudoconcave if the Levi form has at least one negative eigenvalue on the analytic tangent plane. Remark that the number of positive/negative eigenvalues does not depend on the choice of coordinate function and defining function. We may assume $z_0 = 0$ and $\phi(0) = 0$, and we may change the coordinate so that the Taylor expansion of ϕ at 0 is

$$\phi(z) = 2\text{Re}(z^1) + L_0(\phi)(z) + O(\|z\|^3)$$

and the Levi form restricted to the analytic tangent plane $T_0(\text{bd}(\Omega))$, defined by $z^1 = 0$, is

$$L(\phi)_0|_{T_0(\text{bd}(\Omega))}(z) = \sum_{k \geq 2}^n \lambda_k |z^k|^2$$

with eigenvalues $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$. If 0 is a pseudoconcave boundary point, we have at least one negative eigenvalue, then we have a holomorphic map $\rho : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \text{cl}(\Omega)$ from the unit disk such that $\rho(0) = 0$ and $\text{bd}(\rho(\mathbb{D})) \subset \Omega$. On the other hand, if 0 is not a pseudoconcave boundary point, we do not have such a holomorphic map. We then define pseudoconcavity of complex manifolds as follows:

Definition 2.1. Let X be a connected complex manifold. We say X is pseudo-concave if there exists a relatively compact open subset U with a smooth boundary such that at every point $z \in \text{bd}(U)$ a holomorphic map $\rho : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \text{cl}(U)$ where $\rho(0) = z$ and $\text{bd}(\rho(\mathbb{D})) \subset U$ exists.

Example 2.2. (1) Every compact complex connected manifold is pseudoconcave.
 (2) Let Z be a compact complex connected manifold of dimension greater than 2 and let Y be a complex submanifold with $\dim Y \leq \dim Z - 2$. Then $Z - Y$ is pseudoconcave.

3. FLAG DOMAINS

We review flag domains and their root structure, and then we prove Theorem 1.1. This proof is based on technique of [Huc1, §3.2]. The key point of Huckleberry's proof is to construct a relatively compact neighborhood of the base cycle C_0 which is filled out by cycles and where any points are one-connected to C_0 . We construct such a neighborhood in Lemma 3.7. Here Cayley transform associated with compact root plays important role.

3.1. Parabolic subalgebras. Let \mathfrak{g} be a complex semisimple Lie algebra, and let \mathfrak{p} be a parabolic subgroup. Let $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$ be a real form of \mathfrak{g} . We fix a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathfrak{p}$ and choose a Borel subgroup $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ containing the Cartan subgroup $\mathfrak{h} := \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. The Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} determines a set $\Delta = \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ of roots. A root $\alpha \in \Delta$ defines the root space \mathfrak{g}^{α} , and we have the root space decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta} \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha}$. For a subalgebra \mathfrak{s} , we denote by $\Delta(\mathfrak{s})$ the subset of roots of which root spaces contained in \mathfrak{s} . The Borel subalgebra \mathfrak{b} defines a positive root system by

$$\Delta^+ := \Delta(\mathfrak{b}) = \{\alpha \in \Delta \mid \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha} \subset \mathfrak{b}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r\}$ be the set of simple roots, and let $\{\mathbf{S}^1, \dots, \mathbf{S}^r\}$ be the dual basis to \mathcal{S} . An integral linear combination $\mathbf{E} = \sum_j n_j \mathbf{S}^j$ is called a grading element. The \mathbf{E} -eigenspaces

$$\mathfrak{g}^{\ell} = \bigoplus_{\alpha(\mathbf{E})=\ell} \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha}, \quad \mathfrak{g}^0 = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha(\mathbf{E})=0} \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha}$$

determines a graded Lie algebra decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^{-k} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{g}^k$ in the sense that $[\mathfrak{g}^{\ell}, \mathfrak{g}^m] \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\ell+m}$. A grading \mathbf{E} defines a parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbf{E}} = \bigoplus_{\ell \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}^{\ell}$. On the other hand, setting

$$I(\mathfrak{p}) = \{i \mid \mathfrak{g}^{-\sigma_i} \not\subset \mathfrak{p}\},$$

the parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbf{E}}$ defined by $\mathbf{E} = \sum_{i \in I(\mathfrak{p})} \mathbf{S}^i$ coincides with \mathfrak{p} .

We review Chevalley basis and their properties (cf. [Hum, §25]). Since the Killing form defines a non-degenerate negative-definite symmetric form on $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}$, we have the induced form (\bullet, \bullet) on $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$. Let $\alpha \in \Delta \cup \{0\}$ and let $\beta \in \Delta$. The set of all members of $\Delta \cup \{0\}$ of the form $\alpha + n\beta$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is called the β -string containing α . Then the β -string containing α is given by

$$(3.1) \quad \{\alpha + n\beta \mid -r \leq n \leq q\}.$$

If α and β are linearly independent, we have

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle := 2 \frac{(\alpha, \beta)}{(\beta, \beta)} = r - q.$$

We can choose $\mathbf{H}^\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $x^\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} [x^\alpha, x^{-\alpha}] &= \mathbf{H}^\alpha, \quad [\mathbf{H}^\beta, x^\alpha] = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle x^\alpha, \\ [x^\alpha, x^\beta] &= \begin{cases} c_{\alpha, \beta} x^{\alpha+\beta} & \text{if } \alpha + \beta \in \Delta \\ 0 & \text{if } \alpha + \beta \notin \Delta \end{cases} \\ \text{where } c_{\alpha, \beta} &= -c_{-\alpha, -\beta} \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $c_{\beta, \alpha} = \pm(r+1)$ if α and β are linearly independent and $\alpha + \beta \in \Delta$. Now

$$\{x^\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Delta\} \cup \{\mathbf{H}^\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

is a basis of \mathfrak{g} , which is called a Chevalley basis.

Lemma 3.1 ([Hum, §25.2]). *If α and β are linearly independent, then*

$$[x^{-\beta}, [x^\beta, x^\alpha]] = q(r+1)x^\alpha$$

where (r, q) is given by the form (3.1).

Example 3.2 ($\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$). A basis of $\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{R} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is given by

$$x^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{H}^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x^{-\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{H}^\alpha$ is a Cartan subalgebra, and $x^{\pm\alpha}$ is in the root space $\mathfrak{g}^{\pm\alpha}$ where α is the root given by $\alpha(\mathbf{H}^\alpha) = 2$. This triple satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad [x^\alpha, x^{-\alpha}] = \mathbf{H}^\alpha, \quad [\mathbf{H}^\alpha, x^\alpha] = 2x^\alpha, \quad [\mathbf{H}^\alpha, x^{-\alpha}] = -2x^{-\alpha}.$$

In this case, $\Delta = \{\pm\alpha\}$ and we set α as a positive root. We define a grading $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{S}$ where \mathbf{S} is the dual of α . Then

$$\mathfrak{g}^1 = \mathfrak{g}^\alpha, \quad \mathfrak{g}^0 = \mathfrak{h}, \quad \mathfrak{g}^{-1} = \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha},$$

and $\mathfrak{p}_\mathbf{E} = \mathfrak{g}^1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}^0$.

In general, a triple in a semisimple Lie algebra satisfying (3.2) is called a standard sl_2 -triple.

3.2. Flag domains and Cayley transforms. In the Lie group level, we have the parabolic subgroup $P \subset G$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. The homogeneous manifold $\tilde{D} = G/P$ is called a flag manifold. We fix a Cartan involution of $\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{R}$. Let \mathfrak{p}_x be the Lie algebra of the parabolic subgroup P_x of G stabilizing $x \in \tilde{D}$. By [FW, Theorem 4.2.2], the $G_\mathbb{R}$ -orbit $G_\mathbb{R}x$ is open if and only if $\mathfrak{p}_x = \mathfrak{p}_\mathbf{E}$ where

- $\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{R} \cap \mathfrak{p}_x$ contains a fundamental Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R}$, and
- \mathbf{E} is an integral linear combination of a set of simple roots for a system $\Delta^+ \subset \Delta = \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ with $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ such that $\tau\Delta^+ = -\Delta^+$ for the complex conjugation τ .

An open $G_\mathbb{R}$ -orbit is called a flag domain. Let D be a flag domain contained in \tilde{D} , and fix a base point $o \in D$. We may assume $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_o$. There exists a fundamental Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{R} \cap \mathfrak{p}$, a positive root system Δ^+ , and a grading \mathbf{E} such that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_\mathbf{E}$. We may choose a Chevalley basis of \mathfrak{g} . We define the Cayley transform \mathbf{c}_α for $\alpha \in \Delta$ by

$$\mathbf{c}_\alpha = \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{4}(x^{-\alpha} - x^\alpha)\right).$$

Remark 3.3. Usually, Cayley transforms of the above form are defined for non-compact imaginary roots as [Kn, §VI.7]. We use a Cayley transform for a *compact* root in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Example 3.4 ($\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$). This is continuation of Example 3.2. Let us consider the three real forms $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$, and $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$. We set

$$u^\alpha := x^\alpha - x^{-\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad h^1 := \mathbf{i}H^\alpha = \mathbf{i} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$v^\alpha := \mathbf{i}(x^\alpha + x^{-\alpha}) = \mathbf{i} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{su}(2) &= \mathbb{R}u^\alpha + \mathbb{R}h^1 + \mathbb{R}v^\alpha, & \mathfrak{su}(1, 1) &= \mathbb{R}iu^\alpha + \mathbb{R}h^1 + \mathbb{R}iv^\alpha, \\ \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) &= \mathbb{R}x^\alpha + \mathbb{R}H^\alpha + \mathbb{R}x^{-\alpha} = \mathbb{R}(u_\alpha - \mathbf{i}v_\alpha) + \mathbb{R}ih^1 + \mathbb{R}(u_\alpha + \mathbf{i}v_\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

The G -orbit \check{D} is $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ in this case. Each real group orbits of $o = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \check{D}$ are

$$\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}), \quad \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ z \end{pmatrix} ; |z| < 1 \right\}, \quad \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ y \end{pmatrix} ; y \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \cup \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

In a case where $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ or $\mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$, the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R}h^1$ is compact and $\tau x^\alpha = x^{-\alpha}$ for the complex conjugate τ . On the other hand, in the case where $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$, the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R}ih^1$ is noncompact and $\tau x^\alpha = x^\alpha$. The Cayley transform for α is

$$\mathbf{c}_\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then have

$$\mathbf{c}_\alpha(o) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{c}_\alpha^2(o) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proposition 3.5. *If α and β are linearly independent, then*

$$\mathrm{Ad}(\mathbf{c}_{-\beta}^2)x^\alpha = \begin{cases} \pm x^{\alpha+\beta} & \text{if } (r, q) = (0, 1), \\ \pm x^{\alpha+2\beta} & \text{if } (r, q) = (0, 2) \end{cases}$$

where (r, q) is given by the form (3.1).

Proof. First, we consider the case for $(r, q) = (0, 1)$. Since $\alpha - \beta \notin \Delta$,

$$\mathrm{ad}(x^\beta - x^{-\beta})x^\alpha = \mathrm{ad}(x^\beta)x^\alpha = c_{\beta, \alpha}x^{\alpha+\beta}.$$

By Lemma 3.1,

$$[x^{-\beta}, [x^\beta, x^\alpha]] = x^\alpha.$$

Then

$$(\mathrm{ad}(x^\beta - x^{-\beta}))^2 x^\alpha = -[x^{-\beta}, [x^\beta, x^\alpha]] = -x^\alpha.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ad}(\exp(\frac{\pi}{2}(x^\beta - x^{-\beta})))x^\alpha &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{2\ell}}{(2\ell)!} (\frac{\pi}{2})^{2\ell} x^\alpha + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} (\frac{\pi}{2})^{2k+1} c_{\beta, \alpha} x^{\alpha+\beta} \\ &= \cos(\frac{\pi}{2})x^\alpha + \sin(\frac{\pi}{2})c_{\beta, \alpha}x^{\alpha+\beta} = c_{\beta, \alpha}x^{\alpha+\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_{\beta,\alpha} = \pm 1$, the equation holds.

Next, we consider the case for $(r, q) = (0, 2)$. As is the case for $(r, q) = (0, 1)$, we have

$$\text{ad}(x^\beta - x^{-\beta})x^\alpha = c_{\beta,\alpha}x^{\alpha+\beta}, \quad [x^{-\beta}, [x^\beta, x^\alpha]] = 2x^\beta.$$

Then

$$(\text{ad}(x^\beta - x^{-\beta}))^2 x^\alpha = c_{\beta,\alpha+\beta}c_{\beta,\alpha}x^{\alpha+2\beta} - 2x^\alpha.$$

By Lemma 3.1,

$$[x^\beta, [x^{-\beta}, x^{\alpha+2\beta}]] = 2x^{\alpha+2\beta}.$$

On the other hand,

$$[x^\beta, [x^{-\beta}, x^{\alpha+2\beta}]] = c_{\beta,\alpha+\beta}c_{-\beta,\alpha+2\beta}x^{\alpha+2\beta}.$$

Then $c_{\beta,\alpha+\beta}c_{-\beta,\alpha+2\beta} = 2$. Therefore,

$$(\text{ad}(x^\beta - x^{-\beta}))^3 x^\alpha = -c_{-\beta,\alpha+2\beta}c_{\beta,\alpha+\beta}c_{\beta,\alpha}x^{\alpha+\beta} - 2c_{\beta,\alpha}x^{\alpha+\beta} = -4c_{\beta,\alpha}x^{\alpha+\beta}.$$

To summarize the above calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(\exp(\frac{\pi}{2}(x^\beta - x^{-\beta})))x^\alpha &= x^\alpha + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)!} (\frac{\pi}{2})^{2k+1} (-4)^k c_{\beta,\alpha} x^{\alpha+\beta} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\ell)!} (\frac{\pi}{2})^{2\ell} (-4)^{\ell-1} (c_{\beta,\alpha+\beta}c_{\beta,\alpha}x^{\alpha+2\beta} - 2x^\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)!} (\frac{\pi}{2})^{2k+1} (-4)^k &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} (\frac{\pi}{2})^{2k+1} 2^{2k+1} = \frac{1}{2} \sin \pi = 0, \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\ell)!} (\frac{\pi}{2})^{2\ell} (-4)^{\ell-1} &= -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^\ell}{(2\ell)!} (\frac{\pi}{2})^{2\ell} 2^{2\ell} = -\frac{1}{4} (\cos \pi - 1) = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\text{Ad}(\exp(\frac{\pi}{2}(x^\beta - x^{-\beta})))x^\alpha = \frac{1}{2}c_{\beta,\alpha+\beta}c_{\beta,\alpha}x^{\alpha+2\beta}.$$

Since $c_{\beta,\alpha+\beta} = \pm 2$ and $c_{\beta,\alpha} = \pm 1$, the equation holds. \square

In the case for $(r, q) = (1, 0)$ or $(r, q) = (2, 0)$, the same equation holds if β is replaced by $-\beta$.

Remark 3.6. The proof of Proposition 3.5 looks similar to the one of [Kn, Proposition 6.72]. However, the latter one requires that β is orthogonal to α , i.e. $r = q$.

3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1. There exists a Cartan involution θ of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a θ -stable fundamental Cartan subalgebra. Let $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\perp}$ be the Cartan decomposition associated with θ . We set the base cycle $C_0 = K_{\mathbb{R}}o$ with the maximal compact subgroup $K_{\mathbb{R}}$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$. By [FHW, Theorem 4.3.1], the base cycle C_0 is a compact complex manifold satisfying $C_0 = Ko$ with $K = K_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes \mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that there exists a compact root β satisfying the condition of Theorem 1.1. We choose a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ so that*

$$\mathcal{K} := \left\{ k \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \exp(\varepsilon_i x^{\alpha_i}) z \mid \begin{array}{l} k \in K_{\mathbb{R}}, z \in C_0 \\ \sum_i |\varepsilon_i|^2 \leq \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}$$

is contained in D where $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell\} = \Delta(\mathfrak{k}^\perp) \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{g}^{<0})$. Then $\text{int}(\mathcal{K})$ is a relatively compact subset containing C_0 . Moreover, for every point z' in \mathcal{K} , there exists $gC_0 \subset \mathcal{K}$ with $g \in G$ such that $C_0 \cap gC_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $z' \in gC_0$.

Proof. Let U_o be an open neighbourhood of o in C_0 . Since $\{\prod_{i=1}^\ell \exp(\varepsilon_i x^{\alpha_i})z ; |\varepsilon_i| < \varepsilon, z \in U_o\}$ is an open neighborhood of o in D and $K_{\mathbb{R}}$ acts on C_0 transitively, $\text{int}(\mathcal{K})$ is a relatively compact open subset containing C_0 . Let $z' = k\xi z \in \mathcal{K}$ where $k \in K_{\mathbb{R}}$, $z \in C_0$, and

$$\xi = \prod_{i=1}^\ell \exp(\varepsilon_i x^{\alpha_i})$$

with $\sum_i |\varepsilon_i|^2 \leq \varepsilon$. Since $z' \in k\xi C_0$, it is enough to show $k\xi C_0 \cap C_0 \neq \emptyset$. Now we have

$$\text{Ad}^G(\mathbf{c}_{-\beta}^2)\xi = \prod_{i=1}^\ell \exp(\varepsilon_i \text{Ad}(\mathbf{c}_{-\beta}^2)x^{\alpha_i})$$

where Ad^G is the adjoint action on G . By Proposition 3.5 and the hypothesis, $\text{Ad}(\mathbf{c}_{-\beta}^2)x^{\alpha_i} \in \mathfrak{p}$, therefore $\text{Ad}^G(\mathbf{c}_{-\beta}^2)\xi \in P$. Then $\text{Ad}^G(\mathbf{c}_{-\beta}^2)(\xi)o = o$, and hence $\xi \mathbf{c}_{\beta}^2(o) = \mathbf{c}_{\beta}^2(o)$. Since $\mathbf{c}_{\beta} \in K$ and K acts on C_0 transitively, $\mathbf{c}_{\beta}^2(o) \in C_0 \cap \xi C_0$. It concludes that $k\xi \mathbf{c}_{\beta}^2(o) \in C_0 \cap k\xi C_0$. \square

By applying the above \mathcal{K} to the proof of [Huc1, Theorem 3.7], we complete the proof. To show pseudoconcavity at any point $z \in \text{bd}(\mathcal{K})$, we need to construct a disk \mathbb{D} about z such that $\text{bd}(\mathbb{D}) \subset \text{int}(\mathcal{K})$. By the above lemma, we have $gC_0 \subset \mathcal{K}$ with $g \in G$ containing z such that there exists a point $z_0 \in gC_0 \cap C_0$. We may construct $Z \subset gC_0$ with $z \in Z$ and $Z \cong \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ so that Z intersects an arbitrary neighborhood of z_0 . We then choose $y_0 \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}) \cap Z$ and define \mathbb{D} to be the complement in Z of the closure of a sufficiently small disk about y_0 so that $\text{bd}(\mathbb{D}) \subset \text{int}(\mathcal{K})$. Therefore z is a pseudoconcave boundary point, and hence D is pseudoconcave.

Example 3.8. Let D be the Mumford–Tate domain with $G_{\mathbb{R}} = SU(2, 1)$ investigated by Carayol [C]. The root diagram is depicted in Figure 1, where compact roots are those within a box and the shaded area is a Weyl Chamber. The parabolic





FIGURE 1. The root diagram of $\mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{C})$

subalgebra \mathfrak{p} is associated with $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{S}^1 + \mathbf{S}^2$. Here $\{-\sigma_1, -\sigma_2\} = \Delta(\mathfrak{k}^\perp) \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{g}^{<0})$, and $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \in \Delta(\mathfrak{k})$ satisfies the condition of Theorem 1.1. Hence D is pseudoconcave.

FIGURE 2. The root diagram of $\mathfrak{so}(5, \mathbb{C})$

Example 3.9. Let D be the period domain with $h^{2,0} = 2$ and $h^{1,1} = 1$. Then $G_{\mathbb{R}} = SO(4, 1)$, and the root diagram is depicted in Figure 2. The parabolic subalgebra \mathfrak{p} is associated with $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{S}^1$. Here $\{-\sigma_1, -\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\} = \Delta(\mathfrak{k}^{\perp}) \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{g}^{<0})$, and $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \in \Delta(\mathfrak{k})$ satisfies the condition. Hence D is pseudoconcave.

4. PERIOD DOMAINS

We review minimal degeneration for period domains and prove Theorem 4.4. Strategy of this proof is similar to the one of Theorem 1.1. We will show that a certain boundary point and an interior point are connected by a single cycle gC_0 , which induces pseudoconcavity at the boundary orbit. We examine sl_2 -triples associated with minimal degenerations for this proof.

In this section, D is a period domain parametrizing Hodge structures of weight n with Hodge numbers $\{h^{p,q}\}_{p+q=n}$ on a real vector space $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ polarized by Q . Here

$$G_{\mathbb{R}} = \text{Aut}(V_{\mathbb{R}}, Q) \cong \begin{cases} Sp(m, \mathbb{R}) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ SO(m_{\text{ev}}, m_{\text{od}}) & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

where $2m = \dim V$ if n is odd, $m_{\text{ev}} = \sum_{p: \text{ even}} h^{p,q}$ and $m_{\text{od}} = \sum_{p: \text{ odd}} h^{p,q}$ if n is even. We then have

$$D \cong \begin{cases} Sp(m, \mathbb{R}) / \prod_{p < k} U(h^{p,q}) & \text{if } n = 2k + 1, \\ SO(m_{\text{ev}}, m_{\text{od}}) / (\prod_{p < k} U(h^{p,q}) \times SO(h^{k,k})) & \text{if } n = 2k. \end{cases}$$

If we choose a reference point in D , then the $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit D is a flag domain contained in the G -orbit with $G = \text{Aut}(V_{\mathbb{C}}, Q)$.

4.1. Nilpotent orbits and SL_2 -orbits. We recall the nilpotent orbit theorem and the SL_2 -orbit theorem of [S]. A pair (N, F^{\bullet}) consisting of a nilpotent $N \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$, as an element of $\text{End}(V_{\mathbb{R}})$, and $F^{\bullet} \in \check{D}$ is called a nilpotent orbit if it satisfies the following conditions:

- $\exp(zN)F^{\bullet} \in D$ if $\text{Im}(z)$ is sufficiently large;
- $NF^p \subset F^{p-1}$.

For a nilpotent orbit (N, F^{\bullet}) , there exists the monodromy weight filtration $W_{\bullet} := W_{\bullet}(N)[-n]$, and $(W_{\bullet}, F^{\bullet})$ is a mixed Hodge structure, which is called the limit mixed Hodge structure.

Let (N, F^{\bullet}) be a nilpotent orbit such that $(W_{\bullet}, F^{\bullet})$ is split over \mathbb{R} , i.e. the Deligne decomposition

$$V_{\mathbb{C}} = \bigoplus_{p,q} I^{p,q}$$

is defined over \mathbb{R} . We define $Y \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$ which acts on $I^{p,q}$ by the scalar $p + q - n$ and $N^+ \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$ so that (N^+, Y, N) is a sl_2 -triple in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$. The SL_2 -orbit theorem guarantees existence of a homomorphism $v : SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow G_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that

$$v_* \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = N^+, \quad v_* \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = Y, \quad v_* \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = N$$

and a $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ -equivalent horizontal holomorphic map $\psi : \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \check{D}$ given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ z \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \exp(zN)F^\bullet$$

Here $\exp(zN)F^\bullet \in D$ for $\text{Im}(z) > 0$, and ψ defines a $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ -equivalent map from the upper half plane to D .

Let

$$\mathbf{d}_N := \exp(\mathbf{i}\frac{\pi}{4}(N^+ + N)).$$

We then have

$$\varphi := \mathbf{d}_N(F^\bullet) = \psi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \psi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{i} \end{pmatrix}\right) \in D,$$

which defines the Hodge decomposition

$$V_{\mathbb{C}} = \bigoplus V^{p,n-p}$$

and homomorphism $\varphi : S^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} ; |z| = 1\} \rightarrow G_{\mathbb{R}}$ of real algebraic groups given by

$$\varphi(z)v = z^{2p-n}v \quad \text{for } v \in V^{p,n-p}.$$

The image $\varphi(S^1)$ is contained in a compact maximal torus T ([GGK1, Proposition IV.A.2]), and we define the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{t} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. The associated grading element is $\mathbf{E}_\varphi = \frac{1}{4\pi\mathbf{i}}\varphi'(1) \in \mathfrak{t}$, which satisfies

$$\mathbf{E}_\varphi v = \frac{2p-n}{2}v \quad \text{for } v \in V^{p,n-p}.$$

Now φ defines a weight-0 real Hodge structure on \mathfrak{g} with the polarization given by minus the Killing form B . Here the $(p, -p)$ -component is the eigenspace

$$\mathfrak{g}^p = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \text{ad}(\mathbf{E}_\varphi)X = pX\} = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid XV^{k,n-k} \subset V^{k+p,n-k-p}\}.$$

The Lie algebra of the parabolic subgroup stabilizing φ is $\mathfrak{p} = \bigoplus_{p \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}^p$. Since $\varphi(\mathbf{i})$ is the Weil operator, $-B(\varphi(\mathbf{i})\bullet, \bullet)$ is positive definite. Therefore $\text{Ad}(\varphi(\mathbf{i}))$ is an Cartan involution defined over \mathbb{R} , which defines the Cartan decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^\perp$ such that

$$\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes \mathbb{C} = \bigoplus_{p: \text{ even}} \mathfrak{g}^p, \quad \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^\perp \otimes \mathbb{C} = \bigoplus_{p: \text{ odd}} \mathfrak{g}^p.$$

The maximal compact subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}}$, i.e. D is measurable in the sense of [FW, §4.5].

We set the sl_2 -triple

$$(\bar{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{E}) := \text{Ad}_{\mathbf{d}_N}(N^+, Y, N)$$

in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Then

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{2}(N + N^+ - \mathbf{i}Y), \quad \mathcal{Z} = \mathbf{i}(N - N^+), \quad \mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2}(N + N^+ + \mathbf{i}Y).$$

Since $NF^p \subset F^{p-1}$ by the property of nilpotent orbits, we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathfrak{g}^1, \quad \mathcal{Z} \in \mathfrak{g}^0, \quad \mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{g}^{-1}.$$

Let $V_{\mathbb{C}} = \bigoplus V^{\mu}$ be the weight space decomposition with respect to \mathfrak{h} . That is, $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $v \in V^{\mu}$ if and only if $\xi(v) = \mu(\xi)v$ for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{h}$. Then we have $V^{p,n-p} = \bigoplus_{\mu(\mathbb{E}_{\varphi})=(2p-n)/2} V^{\mu}$. The infinitesimal period relation is bracket-generating in the sense of [R, §3.12]. Then we have

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbf{d}_N(I^{p,q}) = \bigoplus_{\substack{\mu(\mathbb{E}_{\varphi})=(2p-n)/2 \\ \mu(\mathcal{Z})=p+q-n}} V^{\mu} = \{v \in V^{p,n-p} \mid \mathcal{Z}v = (p+q-n)v\}.$$

by [R, Theorem 5.5(d)] and [R, Theorem 5.9(b)].

4.2. Minimal degenerations. For a nilpotent orbit (N, F^{\bullet}) , we have the reduced limit

$$F_{\infty}^{\bullet} = \lim_{\text{Im}(z) \rightarrow \infty} \exp(zN)F^{\bullet} \in \text{bd}(D).$$

A nilpotent orbit (N, F^{\bullet}) is called a minimal degeneration if F_{∞}^{\bullet} is in a real codimension-one boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit of D . Type of minimal degenerations is classified into two kinds as follows:

Theorem 4.1 ([GGR] Theorem 1.7). *A minimal degeneration in a period domain is either*

- Type I: $N \neq 0$, $N^2 = 0$ and $\text{rank } N = 1, 2$, or
 Type II: $N^2 \neq 0$, $N^3 = 0$ and $\text{rank } N = 2$.

Moreover, type of minimal degeneration is determined by $\{i^{p,q}\}$, where $i^{p,q} = \dim I^{p,q}$, and $\{h^{p,q}\}$ (see also Figure 3):

- (I) (N, F^{\bullet}) is of type I if and only if there exists $p_o \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $2p_o < n$ satisfying the following conditions:
 - (i) $i^{p_o+1, n-p_o}, i^{p_o, n-p_o-1} = 1$;
 - (ii) $i^{p_o, n-p_o} = h^{p_o, n-p_o} - 1$ and $i^{p_o+1, n-p_o-1} = h^{p_o+1, n-p_o-1} - 1$;
 - (iii) for all other p such that $2p < n$, $i^{p, n-p} = h^{p, n-p}$.
- (II) (N, F^{\bullet}) is of type II if and only if $n = 2m$ is even and it satisfies the following conditions:
 - (i) $i^{m-1, m-1}, i^{m+1, m+1} = 1$;
 - (ii) $i^{m-1, m+1} = h^{m-1, m+1} - 1$ and $i^{m+1, m-1} = h^{m+1, m-1} - 1$;
 - (iii) for all other p such that $2p < n$, $i^{p, n-p} = h^{p, n-p}$.

Let (N, F^{\bullet}) be a minimal degeneration such that the limit mixed Hodge structure is \mathbb{R} -split. In this case, N and N^+ are root vectors and \mathbf{d}_N is the Cayley transform (see [GGK2, Appendix to Lecture 10] or [KP]).

Lemma 4.2. (1) Suppose that (N, F^{\bullet}) is of type I. Let $v \in I^{p_o+1, n-p_o}$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_N(v) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + \mathbf{i}Nv), & \mathbf{d}_N(Nv) &= \frac{\mathbf{i}}{\sqrt{2}}(v - \mathbf{i}Nv), \\ \mathbf{d}_N(\bar{v}) &= \mathbf{i} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{d}_N(Nv)}, & \mathbf{d}_N(N\bar{v}) &= \mathbf{i} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{d}_N(v)}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $n = 2p_o + 1$ and $v \in I^{p_o+1, p_o+1} \cap V_{\mathbb{R}}$, $\mathbf{d}_N(v) = \mathbf{i} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{d}_N(Nv)}$.




FIGURE 3. Deligne decompositions for minimal degenerations

(2) Suppose that (N, F^\bullet) is of type II. Let $v \in I^{m+1, m+1}$. We then have

$$\mathbf{d}_N(v) = \frac{1}{2}v + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{i}Nv - \frac{1}{4}N^2v, \quad \mathbf{d}_N(Nv) = \mathbf{i}(v + \frac{1}{2}N^2v), \quad \mathbf{d}_N(N^2v) = -2\overline{\mathbf{d}_N(v)}$$

Proof. First, we prove (1). By property of limit mixed Hodge structure, N is a $(-1, -1)$ -endomorphism and the nil-positive element N^+ is a $(1, 1)$ -endomorphism of the limit mixed Hodge structure (W_\bullet, F^\bullet) . Moreover, N is an isomorphism from $I^{p_o+1, n-p_o}$ to the image. Then

$$(N^+ + N)v = Nv, \quad (N^+ + N)^2v = N^+Nv = [N^+, N]v = Yv = v.$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_N(v) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^\ell}{(2\ell)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2\ell} v + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2k+1} \mathbf{i}Nv \\ &= \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)v + \mathbf{i}\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)Nv = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + \mathbf{i}Nv), \\ \mathbf{d}_N(Nv) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^\ell}{(2\ell)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2\ell} Nv + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2k+1} \mathbf{i}v \\ &= \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)Nv + \mathbf{i}\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)v = \frac{\mathbf{i}}{\sqrt{2}}(v - \mathbf{i}Nv). \end{aligned}$$

The equations for $\mathbf{d}_N(\bar{v})$ and $\mathbf{d}_N(N\bar{v})$ follows from similar calculations.

Next, we prove (2). By property of limit mixed Hodge structure,

$$\begin{aligned} N^+Nv &= [N^+, N]v = Yv = 2v, \\ N^+N^2v &= [N^+, N]Nv + NN^+Nv = YNv + 2Nv = 2Nv, \\ (4.2) \quad (N^+ + N)v &= Nv, \quad (N^+ + N)^2v = N^+Nv + N^2v = 2v + N^2v, \\ (N^+ + N)^3v &= 2Nv + N^+N^2v = 4Nv. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathbf{d}_N(v) = v + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2k+1} 4^k \mathbf{i}Nv + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^\ell}{(2\ell)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2\ell} 4^{\ell-1} (2v + N^2v).$$

Here

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2k+1} 4^k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2k+1} 2^{2k+1} = \frac{1}{2} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^\ell}{(2\ell)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2\ell} 4^{\ell-1} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^\ell}{(2\ell)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2\ell} 2^{2\ell} = \frac{1}{4} (\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) - 1) = -\frac{1}{4}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{d}_N(v) = \frac{1}{2}v + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{i}Nv - \frac{1}{4}N^2v.$$

Since we have $(N^+ + N)Nv = (N^+ + N)^2v$, by using (4.2) and (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_N(Nv) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^\ell}{(2\ell)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2\ell} 4^\ell (Nv) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2k+1} 4^k \mathbf{i}(2v + N^2v) \\ &= \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)Nv + \frac{\mathbf{i}}{2}(2v + N^2v) = \mathbf{i}(v + \frac{1}{2}N^2v). \end{aligned}$$

Since we have $(N^+ + N)N^2v = N^+N^2v = 2Nv$, by using (4.2) and (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_N(N^2v) &= N^2v + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2k+1} 4^k 2\mathbf{i}Nv + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^\ell}{(2\ell)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{2\ell} 4^{\ell-1} 2(2v + N^2v) \\ &= N^2v + \mathbf{i}Nv - \frac{1}{2}(2v + N^2v) = \frac{1}{2}N^2v + \mathbf{i}Nv - v = -2\overline{\mathbf{d}_N(v)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

4.3. Pseudoconcave boundary orbits. For a point in a codimension-one boundary orbit, we may define a local defining function. Considering its Levi form, we can define pseudoconcavity at a point in a codimension-one boundary orbit as Definition 2.1:

Definition 4.3. A codimension-one boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit \mathcal{O} in $\text{bd}(D)$ is pseudoconcave boundary orbit of D if a holomorphic map $\rho : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \text{cl}(D)$ where $\rho(0) \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\text{bd}(\rho(\mathbb{D})) \subset D$ exists.

Let \mathcal{O} be a codimension-one boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit. We have a minimal degeneration (N, F^\bullet) where the associated reduced limit F_∞^\bullet is in \mathcal{O} .

Theorem 4.4. Suppose that there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $i^{r, n-r} \neq 0$ satisfying one of the following conditions:

- (i) (N, F^\bullet) is of type I and $r = p_o + 2\ell$ or $r = p_o - 2\ell + 1$ ($\ell \geq 1$);
- (ii) (N, F^\bullet) is of type II and $r = m + 2\ell + 1$ ($\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$).

Then \mathcal{O} is a pseudoconcave boundary orbit of D .

Example 4.5. Let D be the period domain with $h^{3,0} = h^{2,1} = 1$. This is the period domain for quintic-mirror threefolds. In this case, nontrivial nilpotent orbits and the Deligne–Hodge numbers of the limit mixed Hodge structures are classified into the following three types:

- (I) $N^2 = 0$ and $\dim(\text{Im } N) = 1$ ($i^{2,2} = i^{1,1} = i^{3,0} = i^{0,3} = 1$);
- (II) $N^2 = 0$ and $\dim(\text{Im } N) = 2$ ($i^{3,1} = i^{1,3} = i^{2,0} = i^{0,2} = 1$);
- (III) $N^3 \neq 0$ and $N^4 = 0$ ($i^{3,3} = i^{2,2} = i^{1,1} = i^{0,0} = 1$).

Here (I) and (II) are minimal degeneration of type I. Moreover (I) satisfies the condition of Theorem 4.4, and then the corresponding codimension-one boundary $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ -orbit is a pseudoconcave boundary orbit.

4.4. Proof of Theorem 4.4. For a nilpotent orbit (N, F^{\bullet}) , there uniquely exists $\tilde{F}^{\bullet} \in \check{D}$ such that the limit mixed Hodge structure $(W_{\bullet}, \tilde{F}^{\bullet})$ is \mathbb{R} -split by [CKS, Proposition 2.20]. Since $\mathcal{O} = G_{\mathbb{R}} F_{\infty}^{\bullet} = G_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{F}_{\infty}^{\bullet}$ by [KP, §5.1], we may choose $F^{\bullet} \in \check{D}$ so that $F^{\bullet} = \tilde{F}^{\bullet}$.

We have $\varphi = \mathbf{d}_N(F^{\bullet}) \in D$ as in §4.1. Let $K_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the maximal compact subgroup containing $G_{\mathbb{R}} \cap P$ where P is the parabolic subgroup of G stabilizing φ . We define the base cycle $C_0 = K_{\mathbb{R}}\varphi$. For $\mathcal{E} = \text{Ad}_{\mathbf{d}_N}(N)$ we have

$$\exp(\mathbf{i}\mathcal{E})\varphi = \psi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{i} \end{pmatrix}\right) = F_{\infty}^{\bullet}.$$

By Lemma 4.6, $\exp(\mathbf{i}\mathcal{E})C_0 \ni F_{\infty}^{\bullet}$ and $\exp(\mathbf{i}\mathcal{E})C_0 \cap C_0 \neq \emptyset$. We may construct $Z \subset gC_0$ and a disk $\mathbb{D} \subset Z$ about F_{∞}^{\bullet} satisfying $\text{bd}(\mathbb{D}) \subset D$ applying the discussion of the proof of [Huc1, Theorem 3.7].

Hence we prove Lemma 4.6, which completes the proof of Theorem 4.4.

Lemma 4.6. *If $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying the condition of Theorem 4.4 exists, then there exists $k \in K$ such that $\text{Ad}(k)(\mathcal{E}) \in \mathfrak{p}$. In particular, $k^{-1}\varphi \in C_0$ is a fixed point of $\exp(\lambda\mathcal{E})$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Proof. We first consider the case for type I. Let $v \in I^{p_o+1, n-p_o}$. By Lemma 4.2

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}\mathbf{d}_N(v) &= \mathbf{d}_N(Nv), & \overline{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{d}_N(v)} &= -\mathbf{id}_N(\bar{v}), \\ \mathcal{E} \cdot \overline{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{d}_N(v)} &= -\mathbf{id}_N(N\bar{v}) = \overline{\mathbf{d}_N(v)}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $n = 2p_o + 1$ and $v \in I^{p_o+1, p_o+1} \cap V_{\mathbb{R}}$, then

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbf{d}_N(v) = \mathbf{i} \cdot \overline{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{d}_N(v)}, \quad \mathcal{E} \cdot \overline{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{d}_N(v)} = -\mathbf{i}\mathcal{E}\mathbf{d}_N(v).$$

We put $w := \mathcal{E}\mathbf{d}_N(v)$. We may assume $\|w\| = 1$ for the Hodge norm $\|\bullet\| = Q(\varphi(\mathbf{i}\bullet, \bar{\bullet}))$. Let $r = p_o + 2\ell$ with $\ell \geq 1$ and $i^{r, n-r} \neq 0$. Since $I^{r, n-r} \subset W^n$ is contained in $\text{Ker } N$ by property of monodromy weight filtration, $I^{r, n-r} = \mathbf{d}_N(I^{r, n-r}) \subset V^{r, n-r}$. We choose $u \in I^{r, n-r}$ so that $\|u\| = 1$. We define $k \in \text{Aut}(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ by

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} kw &= u, & ku &= w, & k\bar{u} &= \bar{w}, & k\bar{w} &= \bar{u}, \\ kv' &= v' & \text{if } v' &\perp w, u, \bar{w} \text{ and } \bar{u} \text{ with respect to } Q. \end{aligned}$$


Then $k \in G$, and $\text{Ad}(\varphi(\mathbf{i}))k = k$, i.e. $k \in K$ (see Figure 4).

By using (4.4) and (4.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(k)(\mathcal{E})\mathbf{d}_N(v) &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{i} \text{Ad}(k)(\mathcal{E})\bar{w} = \mathbf{i}k\mathcal{E}\bar{u} = 0 & \text{if } n = 2p_o + 1, \\ kw = u & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \\ \text{Ad}(k)(\mathcal{E})\bar{u} &= k\mathcal{E}\bar{w} = \begin{cases} -\mathbf{i}kw = -\mathbf{i}u & \text{if } n = 2p_o + 1, \\ \mathcal{E}\bar{w} = \overline{\mathbf{d}_N(v)} & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \\ \text{Ad}(k)(\mathcal{E})v' &= 0 \quad \text{if } v' \perp u \text{ and } \overline{\mathbf{d}_N(v)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{d}_N(v) \in V^{p_o+1, n-p_o-1}$ by (4.1), we conclude that

$$(4.7) \quad \text{Ad}(k)\mathcal{E} \in \begin{cases} \mathfrak{g}^{4\ell-1} \subset \mathfrak{p} & \text{if } n = 2p_o + 1, \\ \mathfrak{g}^{2\ell-1} \subset \mathfrak{p} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

FIGURE 4. Hodge decompositions with respect to φ

For the case where $r = p_o - 2\ell + 1$ with $\ell \geq 1$, we put $w = \mathbf{d}_N(v)$ instead and define $k \in K$ as (4.6). Then we obtain (4.7).

Next, we consider the case for type II. Let $v \in I^{m+1, m+1}$ such that $\|\mathbf{d}_N(v)\| = 1$ and put $w = \mathbf{d}_N(v)$. Then

$$\overline{\mathcal{E}w} = -\mathcal{E}w, \quad -2\bar{w} = \mathcal{E}^2 w.$$

Let $r = m + 2\ell + 1$ with $i^{r, n-r} \neq 0$. Since $n - r = m + 2(-\ell - 1) + 1$ and $i^{n-r, r} \neq 0$, we may assume $\ell < 0$. We choose $u \in V^{r, n-r}$ so that $\|u\| = 1$. We define $k \in K$ as (4.6), and then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(k)(\mathcal{E})u &= k\mathcal{E}w = \mathcal{E}w, & \text{Ad}(k)(\mathcal{E})\mathcal{E}w &= -2\bar{u}, \\ \text{Ad}(k)(\mathcal{E})v' &= 0 & \text{if } v' \perp \bar{u} \text{ and } \overline{\mathcal{E}w}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{E}w \in V^{m, m}$, we have $\text{Ad}(k)\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{g}^{-2\ell-1} \subset \mathfrak{p}$. □

REFERENCES

- [A] A. Andreotti, *Nine lectures on complex analysis*. (Centro Internaz. Mat. Estivo C.I.M.E., I Ciclo, Bressanone, 1973), 1–175. Edizioni Cremonese, Rome, 1974.
- [C] H. Carayol, *Cohomologie automorphe et compactifications partielles de certaines variétés de Griffiths-Schmid*, Compos. Math. **141** (2005), no. 5, 1081–1102.
- [CG] J. Carlson and P. Griffiths, *What is ... a period domain?*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **55** (2008), no. 11, 1418–1419.
- [CKS] E. Cattani, A. Kaplan and W. Schmid, *Degeneration of Hodge structures*, Ann. of Math. **123** (1986), 457–535.
- [FHW] G. Fels, A. Huckleberry and J. A. Wolf, *Cycle Spaces of Flag Domains: A Complex Geometric Viewpoint*, Progress in Mathematics **45**. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., 2006.
- [GGK1] M. Green, P. Griffiths and M. Kerr, *Mumford-Tate groups and domains: their geometry and arithmetic*, Annals of Math Studies **183**. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [GGK2] M. Green, P. Griffiths and Matt Kerr, *Hodge theory, complex geometry, and representation theory*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics **118**. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 2013.
- [GGR] M. Green, P. Griffiths and C. Robles, *Extremal degenerations of polarized Hodge structures*, preprint (arXiv:1403.0646).
- [GRT] P. Griffiths, C. Robles and D. Toledo, *Quotients of non-classical flag domains are not algebraic*, Algebr. Geom. **1** (2014), no. 1, 1–13.
- [Hum] J. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **9**. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1972.
- [Huc1] A. Huckleberry, *Remarks on homogeneous manifolds satisfying Levi-conditions*, Bollettino U.M.I. (9) III (2010) 1–23.
- [Huc2] A. Huckleberry, *Hyperbolicity of cycle spaces and automorphism groups of flag domains*, Amer. J. Math. **135** (2013), no. 2, 291–310.
- [Kn] A. Knapp, *Lie groups beyond an introduction, second edition*, Progress in Mathematics, **140**. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., 2002.
- [Ko] J. Kollár, *Neighborhoods of subvarieties in homogeneous spaces*, Contemp. Math. **647** (2015), 91–108.
- [KP] M. Kerr and G. Pearlstein, *Naive boundary strata and nilpotent orbits*, Annales de l’Institut Fourier **64** (2014), no. 6, 2659–2714.
- [R] C. Robles, *Classification of horizontal $SL(2)$ ’s*, Compositio Math. **152** (2016), no. 05, 918–954.
- [S] W. Schmid, *Variation of Hodge structure: the singularities of the period mapping*, Invent. Math. **22** (1973), 211–319.

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, SENSU UNIVERSITY, HIGASHIMITA 2-1-1, TAMA, KAWASAKI, KANAGAWA 214-8580, JAPAN

E-mail address: hayama@isc.senshu-u.ac.jp