

Shimura data and corners: topology

by

Jörg Wildeshaus *

Université Sorbonne Paris Nord

LAGA, CNRS (UMR 7539)

F-93430 Villetaneuse

France

wildesh@math.univ-paris13.fr

July 1, 2022

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to give a new construction of the map relating the Borel–Serre and the Baily–Borel compactifications of a Shimura variety, and to provide a close analysis of its main properties.

Keywords: Shimura varieties, geodesic action, manifolds with corners, Borel–Serre compactification, Baily–Borel compactification, canonical stratifications.

Math. Subj. Class. (2010) numbers: 14G35 (11F23, 11F75, 14P05).

*Partially supported by the *Agence Nationale de la Recherche*, project no. ANR-18-CE40-0017 “Péroides en géométrie arithmétique et motivique”.

Contents

0	Introduction	2
1	Homogeneous spaces of type S'	8
2	Geodesic action	20
3	The manifold with corners \mathfrak{X}^{BS}	30
4	The continuous map p from the Borel–Serre to the Baily–Borel compactification	46
5	The canonical stratifications	57
6	The fibres of the map p	63
7	Local triviality of p over each stratum	79

0 Introduction

Let M be a *Shimura variety*, and M^* its *Baily–Borel compactification* [AMRT, BB]. It is widely accepted that interesting topological, geometric and arithmetic information can be obtained from the control of the *cohomology* of M , of M^* , of its *boundary* $M^* - M$ and its *strata* (indexed by the conjugation classes of *admissible parabolics*), and of the interplay, *via* localization, of these data. A major difficulty for obtaining this control comes from the fact that $M^* - M$ is in general highly singular.

In order to circumvent this difficulty, one is led to consider a proper map with target M^* , satisfying three requirements: (A) the pre-image of M is mapped isomorphically to M , (B) the pre-image of the boundary $M^* - M$ is “less singular” than $M^* - M$ itself, (C) the higher direct images under the restriction of the proper map to the pre-image of each stratum of the boundary can be “controlled”.

Given such a map, *proper base change* relates cohomology of its source to cohomology of M^* ; thanks to (B) and (C), it is reasonable to expect the control of the former to be easier to obtain.

The present article is concerned with the map p from the *Borel–Serre compactification* M^{BS} [BS] to (the space of complex points of) M^* , whose existence was established in [Z2]. Our aim is to give a close analysis of p ,

aiming in particular at the aspects related to points (B) and (C) above.

More precisely, we first (1) make explicit the link between *Shimura data* [P1] and *spaces of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$* (the latter being the notion underlying all the constructions from [BS]). Part (1) is indeed necessary: as we shall explain below, the space \mathfrak{X} underlying Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) is *not* in general of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under the group $P(\mathbb{R})$ of real points of P . The “link” hinted at is therefore somewhat subtle to establish. Once this foundational issue clarified, we (2) identify the *geodesic action* (the main ingredient for the construction of M^{BS} [BS]), in terms of the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) , (3) give an adelic definition of M^{BS} , (4) provide a new, explicit, and direct construction of the map p . Using this construction, we (5) make explicit the interplay of the closures of the strata of M^{BS} (indexed by the conjugation classes of *all* parabolics), and the pre-images under p of the strata of M^* , (6) describe the fibres of p , together with their induced stratifications (using again the language of spaces of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$), (7) prove that if the “level” of M is *neat*, then the restriction of p to the pre-image of each stratum of M^* is a locally trivial stratified fibration. Variants of (6) and (7) exist for the map $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ between the spaces “covering” M^{BS} and M^* , and for the quotient map $p^r : M^{rBS} \rightarrow M^*$ from the *reductive Borel–Serre compactification* [Z1] to M^* ; the non-stratified versions of these variants are essentially known, at least when \mathfrak{X} is connected, thanks to [Z2] (concerning $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$) and [G] (concerning p^r).

The numbering of this program corresponds to the sections of this paper. Section 5 relates to point (B) above, and Sections 6 and 7, to point (C). The main applications to cohomology of M^* will be spelled out in a separate article [W].

As is apparent from the above discussion, there is a certain overlap with [Z2] and [G]. Here is what we see as our main new contributions: as far as the results are concerned, the direct construction of p and the detailed study of the interplay of the stratifications with its fibres and local splittings; concerning the methods, the systematic use of the language of Shimura data (a corollary of which is the total absence of Langlands decompositions). Of course, the method is not without influence on the results: we do think that their precise versions actually necessitate their formulation in the language of Shimura data (this is particularly true for our description of the geodesic action).

However, in order to have the constructions from [BS] at one’s disposal, one *a priori* needs homogeneous spaces, that are connected [BS, Rem. 2.4 (1)]. This is not necessarily the case for the space \mathfrak{X} underlying (P, \mathfrak{X}) — not even in those cases where \mathfrak{X} is a conjugation class of morphisms from the Deligne torus to $P_{\mathbb{C}}$ (rather than just a finite covering of such a class). Note that this phenomenon already occurs for $P = \mathrm{GL}_2$ and \mathfrak{X} equal to the comple-

ment of the real line in \mathbb{C} , with the standard action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. The solution consists in considering the (finitely many) connected components \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} , and proving that for each of them, the action of the stabilizer $\mathrm{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ on \mathfrak{X}^0 extends canonically to an action of the whole of $P(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathfrak{X}^0 (*sic!*); this extension coincides with the given action on \mathfrak{X} if and only if \mathfrak{X} is connected. The difference of the two actions manifests itself in the stabilizers of points: those of the extended action always contain a maximal compact sub-group of $P(\mathbb{R})$. The corresponding statement for the stabilizers of the action underlying the data (P, \mathfrak{X}) is not necessarily true: in general, maximal compact sub-groups of the stabilizer of $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$ are maximal compact only in $\mathrm{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$, but not necessarily in $P(\mathbb{R})$. This phenomenon remains in general visible at the level of the derived group P^{der} . The difference of the two actions also concerns analyticity: for example, on the upper half plane, by the above, the action of the sub-group $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})^+$ of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ of matrices of positive determinant can be canonically extended to an action of the whole of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. But only $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})^+$ acts by \mathbb{C} -analytic automorphisms (see our Example 1.15).

Let us now give a description of the individual sections.

Section 1 first gives a formal framework for extensions of the action from a sub-group of finite index of a real Lie group H to the whole of H . We modify the main technical notion from [BS], whence our definition of *homogeneous space of type S'* (Definition 1.3). Using enough information from [P1], we prove (Theorem 1.12) that every connected component \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} is homogeneous of type S' , provided that the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) satisfy two technical conditions (which for the purpose of this introduction will be ignored). Using the extension principle for spaces of type S' (Proposition 1.5), we prove, as mentioned above, that the action of the stabilizer $\mathrm{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ on \mathfrak{X}^0 can be canonically extended to an action of $P(\mathbb{R})$. We then prove that with this extended action, the space \mathfrak{X}^0 is of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ in the sense of [BS] (Theorem 1.21).

We are thus in a position to apply the program from [BS] to \mathfrak{X} (by applying it to every connected component), the essential ingredient of this program being the *geodesic action*. The purpose of Section 2 is to give a description of this action, that makes explicit use of the information coded within the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) , and more precisely, of the *weight co-characters* associated to the points of \mathfrak{X} . According to [BS], the geodesic action is a collection of actions on \mathfrak{X} , one for each parabolic sub-group Q of P . If the intersection of two parabolics Q and Q' remains parabolic, then the action indexed by $Q \cap Q'$ is generated by those indexed by Q and Q' , meaning that the geodesic action is known once the actions indexed by maximal proper parabolics are known. This observation allows to reduce our explicit description of the geodesic action to the case of maximal proper parabolics of P . The action

associated to a maximal proper parabolic is an action of the group \mathbb{R}_+^* of strictly positive real numbers. In order to describe its effect, note that maximal proper parabolics of P are admissible. But for admissible parabolics Q , the full force of the theory of *boundary components* of Shimura data [P1] can be employed: the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) contain in particular a rule assigning to any point $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ a weight co-character of $P_{\mathbb{C}}$, which for the purpose of this introduction will be denoted by w_x . The same is true for any boundary component associated to Q ; here the assigned weight co-character will be denoted by $w_{x,Q}$. While the technical conditions from Section 1 guarantee that w_x is defined over \mathbb{R} , this is not the case for $w_{x,Q}$ (unless $Q = P$). We therefore define the *real part of x with respect to Q* (Definition 2.4). This real part $\text{Re}_Q(x)$ is a point of one of the boundary components; its weight-co-character $w_{\text{Re}_Q(x)}$ is conjugate to $w_{x,Q}$, and defined over \mathbb{R} . The main insight of Section 2 is that if Q is not only admissible, but maximal proper, then the geodesic action of $r \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ maps x to its image under $w_{\text{Re}_Q(x)}(r) \in P(\mathbb{R})$ (Theorem 2.9). This result will be at the heart of our construction, and proof of continuity of the map p (Section 4). The reader familiar with [BS] will note that our approach to the parameterization of the geodesic action is dual to the one of [loc. cit.]: we use co-characters (since they can be “read off” the Shimura data), while [loc. cit.] uses characters. Theorem 2.9 also contains the dictionary allowing to pass from one point of view to the other.

In Section 3, we follow [BS], to construct, starting from the geodesic action on \mathfrak{X} , the *manifold with corners* \mathfrak{X}^{BS} (denoted $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ in [loc. cit.]), which contains \mathfrak{X} as an open sub-set. In order to obtain from \mathfrak{X}^{BS} the Borel–Serre compactification

$$M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} := P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f) / K)$$

of level K (Definition 3.13), care needs to be applied as the quotient is formed with respect to the action of P underlying the Shimura data, while \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is the result of a limit process involving the geodesic action. One therefore needs to know that the two actions commute (Proposition 3.11; [BS, Prop. 3.4] if \mathfrak{X} is connected). The main results from [BS] then carry over; in particular (Theorem 3.14), the Borel–Serre compactification is indeed compact.

We are then in a position to construct the map p^K relating the Borel–Serre compactification and

$$M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C}) = P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^* \times P(\mathbb{A}_f) / K) ,$$

the space of complex points of the Baily–Borel compactification $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})^*$. Here, the space \mathfrak{X}^* is obtained as a partial compactification of \mathfrak{X} , by adding one stratum for each boundary component of (P, \mathfrak{X}) . The map p^K will be the map induced by $p \times \text{id}_{P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K}$, where p is a $P(\mathbb{Q})$ -equivariant map from \mathfrak{X}^{BS} to \mathfrak{X}^* . We aim for a map respecting the stratifications of both \mathfrak{X}^{BS} and \mathfrak{X}^* . The space \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is stratified by its *faces* $e(Q)$, one for each parabolic

sub-group Q of P , while the stratification of \mathfrak{X}^* is indexed (only) by the admissible parabolics of P . As a preliminary step to the construction of p , one therefore needs a rule, to be denoted adm , associating to a parabolic of P an admissible one. This rule is certainly known already (“ Q and $\text{adm}(Q)$ have the same Hermitian factor”; see e.g. [G, Sect. 5.7, Figure 7]), but its description using the language of Shimura data is very useful. The result is Theorem 4.5, which for any parabolic Q establishes existence and unicity of an admissible parabolic sub-group $\text{adm}(Q)$ containing Q , and such that the minimal normal sub-group $\text{adm}_{Sh}(Q)$ of $\text{adm}(Q)$ underlying the boundary component associated to $\text{adm}(Q)$, is contained in Q :

$$\text{adm}_{Sh}(Q) \subset Q \subset \text{adm}(Q) .$$

Theorem 4.5 also gives an important characterization of $\text{adm}(Q)$ by a minimality property: if Q' is an admissible parabolic sub-group containing Q , then the closure of the stratum of \mathfrak{X}^* associated to Q' contains the stratum associated to $\text{adm}(Q)$. As a first application of minimality, we prove (Corollary 4.11) that the geodesic action indexed by Q leaves invariant the real part $\text{Re}_{\text{adm}(Q)}$ with respect to $\text{adm}(Q)$. In other words, the action only manifests itself *via* the *imaginary part with respect to* $\text{adm}(Q)$, as defined in [P1, Sect. 4.14]. A second application of minimality then gives an estimation on the variation of the imaginary part under the geodesic action indexed by Q (Corollary 4.12). Corollary 4.11 then allows a rather straightforward definition of p (Construction 4.13): each face $e(Q)$ is canonically identified with the quotient of \mathfrak{X} by the geodesic action; since points of x , that are conjugate under this action, only differ by their imaginary parts, they are conjugate under the unipotent radical of $\text{adm}(Q)$. Therefore, their classes in \mathfrak{X}^* are the same. Theorem 4.14 then states that p is continuous; the vital ingredient of the proof is the estimation from Corollary 4.12.

Section 5 gives an analysis of the canonical stratifications of the Borel–Serre, and the Baily–Borel compactification, respectively. Its main result (Theorem 5.8) describes the interplay of the closures of the canonical strata of the Borel–Serre compactification $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$, and the pre-images under p^K of the canonical strata of the Baily–Borel compactification $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})^*$. One particular feature of Theorem 5.8 is that these latter pre-images have much better separation properties than the strata of $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})^*$ themselves.

Section 6 is then concerned with the description of the fibres of the maps $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ (Theorem 6.8) and p^K , together with their stratifications (Theorem 6.20). Fix a point z_0 of \mathfrak{X}^* , and assume that it lies in a boundary component associated to an admissible parabolic Q_1 . Given Theorem 4.5, the parabolics Q in the pre-image of Q_1 under adm are precisely those satisfying

$$P_1 \subset Q \subset Q_1$$

($P_1 :=$ the normal sub-group of Q_1 underlying the boundary component con-

taining z_0); in particular, among the intersections of faces $e(Q)$ with the fibre $p^{-1}(z_0)$, the intersection $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_1)$ is of maximal dimension. We prove (Proposition 6.5) that $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_1)$ is actually a space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$, in the sense of [BS], associated to an algebraic sub-group C_1 of Q_1 , which is explicitly defined in terms of our Shimura data. Theorem 6.8 then states that the inclusion of $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_1)$ into \mathfrak{X}^{BS} extends uniquely to a continuous map from the manifold with corners $(p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_1))^{BS}$, identifying the latter with the full fibre $p^{-1}(z_0)$. The identification is C_1 -equivariant; this allows to control the fibres of p^K (Corollary 6.15). Using the analysis from the previous section, we then get the stratified versions of our results.

In the final Section 7, it is proved (Theorem 7.20) that over each of the canonical strata of the Baily–Borel compactification $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})^*$, the map p^K is a locally trivial fibration, provided the level K is neat; actually, the result still holds after restriction to any canonical stratum, or alternatively, to its closure, of the Borel–Serre compactification $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$ (Complement 7.22). The strategy of proof follows the pattern from Section 6: establish the analogous result for the map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$, taking care to trace the equivariant behaviour of our splittings, and of their interaction with the stratifications (Theorem 7.15 and its corollaries). Let again Q_1 be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P . Both the stratum $e(Q_1)$ of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} and the stratum of \mathfrak{X}^* associated to Q_1 are disjoint unions, indexed by the boundary components (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) associated to Q_1 . Fix one such. Its contribution to \mathfrak{X}^* equals the space \mathfrak{X}_1/W_1 in the pure Shimura data $(P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1)/W_1$ underlying (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) ($W_1 :=$ the unipotent radical of P_1), while the contribution to $e(Q_1) \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS}$ is the quotient by the geodesic action on $\mathfrak{X} \cap \mathfrak{X}_1$. The map p maps the class of $x \in \mathfrak{X} \cap \mathfrak{X}_1$ modulo the geodesic action to the image of x in \mathfrak{X}_1/W_1 under the quotient map from \mathfrak{X}_1 to \mathfrak{X}_1/W_1 (see the above discussion of the content of Section 4). In order to get the desired splittings, the language of mixed Shimura data turns out, yet again, to provide the appropriate setting: in fact, we prove (Proposition 7.2) that the projection of any mixed Shimura data to the underlying pure Shimura data is \mathbb{R} -analytically split (this is then applied to the boundary component (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1)). The splitting is canonical (hence its equivariant behaviour can be controlled) as soon as a fibre is fixed. A more detailed analysis of the splitting in the context of boundary components then shows (Corollary 7.8) that it respects the sub-set $\mathfrak{X} \cap \mathfrak{X}_1$ of \mathfrak{X}_1 ; therefore it can be composed with the quotient map to $e(Q_1)$, thus providing the sought-for splitting of the restriction of p to $e(Q_1)$. But by Construction 4.13 (see Theorem 4.5), the latter is dense in the pre-image of p of the disjoint union $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_1/W_1$ (*i.e.*, of the full stratum of \mathfrak{X}^* associated to Q_1), just as the intersection $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_1)$ is dense in the fibre $p^{-1}(z_0)$. It then turns out that our splitting of $p|_{e(Q_1)}$ is compatible with the identification of $(p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_1))^{BS}$ with the fibre $p^{-1}(z_0)$ from Theorem 6.8, allowing for a relative version of this result. This yields the splitting of the restriction of p to the full pre-image $p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_1/W_1)$ (Theorem 7.15).

Even though our main interest lies in the situation where the unipotent radical W of the group P is trivial, part of our results are valid in a more general context. This is true in particular for the material contained in Sections 1–3, the part of Section 4 concerning the map adm , and the analysis of the canonical stratification of the Borel–Serre compactification (the first half of Section 5). In particular, the reader might find it interesting that the Borel–Serre compactification of the universal Abelian scheme over Shimura varieties of Abelian type exists, and can be studied.

I wish to thank G. Ancona, M. Cavicchi, M. Goresky, S. Morra and J. Tilouine for useful comments and discussions. Two invitations to the *Institut de recherche mathématique avancée* at Strasbourg helped to speed up the process of writing up; these invitations, along with the very friendly and stimulating atmosphere were greatly appreciated. Special thanks go to D. Blottière and S. Morel for the organization of the *Groupe de travail “variétés de Shimura d’après R. Pink”* (Chevaleret, spring term 2004–05), in the course of which I had the occasion to present Theorem 4.5 (the definition of the map adm), as well as an erroneous version of Theorem 2.9 (the explicit description of the geodesic action). Last, but not least, it is difficult to appreciate, but impossible not to acknowledge the role of Covid19 in the making of this article.

Conventions: For an affine algebraic or real Lie group H , let us denote by H^0 (following [BS]) its neutral connected component (in the Zariski topology if H is algebraic; in the ordinary topology if H is a real Lie group). Note that if H is affine algebraic over \mathbb{R} , then $H^0(\mathbb{R})$ might be strictly larger than $H(\mathbb{R})^0$. In contrast to [BS], our homogeneous spaces will carry left, not right actions. Even when the group is P , its elements will be denoted by g , in order avoid confusion with the map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$. Finally (and still following [BS]), the reader needs to be prepared to find overlined symbols $\bar{*}$, whose meaning differs according to the nature of the symbol $*$: when Q is an affine algebraic group, then \bar{Q} denotes its maximal reductive quotient; when A equals the Lie group $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^r$, for some natural number r , then \bar{A} denotes the partial compactification $(0, +\infty]^r$ obtained by adding the point $+\infty$ in each coordinate; when e is a canonical stratum of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} or of one of the three (Borel–Serre, reductive Borel–Serre, or Baily–Borel) compactifications, then \bar{e} denotes its closure in the ambient space.

1 Homogeneous spaces of type S'

The aim of this section is to clarify the relation between mixed Shimura data [P1] and homogeneous spaces of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ [BS]. In order to do so, it turns

out to be useful to first introduce and study a preliminary notion, that of *homogeneous space of type S'* . This study culminates in the first main result of this section (Theorem 1.12): provided the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) satisfy two hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$ (which will be specified), any connected component \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} underlies in a canonical way a space of type S' . This result implies in particular (Corollary 1.13) that the action of the stabilizer $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ extends canonically to an action of the whole of $P(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathfrak{X}^0 . The second main result (Theorem 1.21) then states that for this extended action, the homogeneous space \mathfrak{X}^0 underlies a canonical structure of space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$.

Let us prepare our modification of the main notion of [BS]. We start by recalling a result due to Mostow.

Theorem 1.1 (Mostow). *Let N be a real Lie group with only finitely many connected components, and K a maximal compact sub-group of N . Then the canonical morphism (of finite groups)*

$$K/K^0 \longrightarrow N/N^0$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. It results from [M, Thm. 3.2 (1)] that the inclusion of K into G induces indeed a bijection on the level of connected components. **q.e.d.**

Lemma 1.2. *Let N and Z be real Lie groups, equipped with an action of Z on N by automorphisms (of Lie groups). Denote by $Z \ltimes N$ the semi-direct product formed with respect to this action. Assume N to have only finitely many connected components. Let N' be a sub-group of N containing N^0 , and K a maximal compact sub-group of N . Assume that N' and K are stable under the action of Z . Then the canonical application of quotients*

$$Z \ltimes N' / Z \ltimes (N' \cap K) \longrightarrow Z \ltimes N / Z \ltimes K$$

is a bijection.

Proof. We may assume that Z is trivial. According to Theorem 1.1, we have $K^0 = N^0 \cap K$ and

$$N' = N^0 \cdot (N' \cap K) .$$

It follows that the canonical application of quotients

$$N^0/K^0 \longrightarrow N'/(N' \cap K)$$

is bijective. The analogous statement being true also for N instead of N' , our claim follows. **q.e.d.**

For a real Lie group H and a closed normal sub-group N of H , a *connected complement of N in H* is a closed connected sub-group Z of H such that

$$H = Z \ltimes N .$$

If such a connected complement of N in H exists, then we say that N *admits connected complements*.

Definition 1.3. Let H be a real Lie group, and N a closed normal subgroup of H . We assume N to have only finitely many connected components, and to admit connected complements. A *homogeneous space of type S' under (H, N)* is a pair

$$(X^0, (K_x)_{x \in X^0})$$

consisting of a connected left homogeneous space X^0 under some closed subgroup H' of H containing H^0 , and a family $(K_x)_{x \in X^0}$ of maximal compact sub-groups K_x of N indexed by the points of X^0 , such that

(i) for all $x \in X^0$, we have

$$\text{Stab}_{H'}(x) = Z_x \rtimes (H' \cap K_x) \subset Z_x \rtimes N = H ,$$

for some connected complement Z_x of N in H , which leaves K_x stable under conjugation,

(ii) for all $h \in H'$ and all $x \in X^0$, we have $K_{hx} = \text{Int}(h)K_x$.

Remark 1.4. Three observations concerning Definition 1.3 are in order.

(a) Since H' contains H^0 , it also contains all connected complements of N in H . In particular, the intersection $H' \cap K_x$ is stable under conjugation by Z_x .

(b) If $(X^0, (K_x)_{x \in X^0})$ is homogeneous of type S' under (H, N) , then for all $x \in X^0$, we have $\text{Stab}_N(x) = H' \cap K_x$. Thus, $\text{Stab}_N(x)$ lies between K_x^0 and K_x . We can be more precise: since all maximal compact sub-groups of N are conjugate to each other under N^0 [M, Thm. 3.1 (2)], hence under $N' := H' \cap N$, the intersection $H' \cap K_x = N' \cap K_x$ is maximal compact in N' [M, proof of Thm. 3.2]. Hence so is $\text{Stab}_N(x)$.

(c) Once a maximal compact sub-group K_x of N satisfies condition 1.3 (i), for a point x of a connected left homogeneous space X^0 under H' , then the family $(K_x)_{x \in X^0}$ can be recovered, by *defining*

$$K_{hx} := \text{Int}(h)K_x$$

for $h \in H'$. (We leave it to the reader to verify that this is well-defined.) The resulting pair $(X^0, (K_x)_{x \in X^0})$ is then a homogeneous space of type S' under (H, N) .

Proposition 1.5. *Let H be a real Lie group, and N a closed normal subgroup of H . We assume N to have only finitely many connected components, and to admit connected complements. Let $(X^0, (K_x)_{x \in X^0})$ be a homogeneous space of type S' under (H, N) . Then there is a unique structure of homogeneous space under H on X^0 , extending the given action of $H' \subset H$ on X^0 , and such that for the induced action of N , we have*

$$\text{Stab}_N(x) = K_x, \forall x \in X^0 .$$

In particular, for this extended action, the sub-groups $\text{Stab}_N(x)$ are maximal compact (in N).

Remark 1.6. Proposition 1.5 states that a homogeneous space of type S' under (H, N) is the same as a homogeneous space under H , for which the stabilizers of the induced action of N are maximal compact. In particular, the sub-group H' in Definition 1.3 need not be specified (as long as its action on X^0 is transitive).

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Fix a point $x \in X^0$. Put $K := K_x$, $Z := Z_x$, and write

$$\text{Stab}_{H'}(x) = Z \rtimes (H' \cap K)$$

as in Definition 1.3. The map

$$H' / \text{Stab}_{H'}(x) \longrightarrow X^0, [h] \longmapsto hx$$

is bijective. The group H' contains Z (Remark 1.4 (a)); therefore,

$$H' = Z \rtimes (H' \cap N) \subset Z \rtimes N = H.$$

Thus,

$$H' / \text{Stab}_{H'}(x) = Z \rtimes (H' \cap N) / Z \rtimes (H' \cap K).$$

By Lemma 1.2 (with $N' := H' \cap N$), the canonical application

$$H' / \text{Stab}_{H'}(x) \longrightarrow H / Z \rtimes K$$

is a bijection.

Therefore, the action of H' on X^0 can be extended to H in such a way that

$$\text{Stab}_N(x) = \text{Stab}_H(x) \cap N = K.$$

As for uniqueness of the extension, it suffices to note that

$$H = Z \rtimes N = Z \rtimes ((H' \cap N)K) = H'K,$$

the second equation being valid as $H' \cap N \supset N^0$, and $N^0K = N$ (Theorem 1.1). **q.e.d.**

Corollary 1.7. *In the situation of Proposition 1.5, let $C \subset H$ a closed sub-group with only finitely many connected components, and $x \in X^0$. Assume that $C \cap K_x$ is maximal compact in C . Then the C^0 -orbit C^0x of x under the neutral connected component of C is stable under the action of the restriction to C of the extended action of H on X^0 from Proposition 1.5.*

Proof. As C^0 is contained in $\text{Stab}_C(C^0x)$, the latter is equal to the disjoint union of certain connected components of C . But $\text{Stab}_C(C^0x)$ contains $\text{Stab}_C(x)$ (since C^0 is normal in C), hence $\text{Stab}_{C \cap N}(x) = C \cap K_x$, which by our assumption is maximal compact in C . Therefore (Theorem 1.1) $\text{Stab}_C(C^0x)$ meets all connected components of C . **q.e.d.**

Let us set up our main example of homogeneous spaces of type S' . Let (P, \mathfrak{X}) be *mixed Shimura data* [P1, Def. 2.1]. In particular, P is a connected algebraic linear group over \mathbb{Q} , and $P(\mathbb{R})$ acts on the complex manifold \mathfrak{X} by complex analytic automorphisms. Denote by W the unipotent radical of P . If P is reductive, *i.e.*, if $W = 0$, then (P, \mathfrak{X}) is called *pure*.

We shall systematically denote by G the maximal reductive quotient P/W of P . Two additional hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$ will frequently be imposed on (P, \mathfrak{X}) :

- (+) The neutral connected component $Z(G)^0$ of the center $Z(G)$ of G is, up to isogeny, a direct product of a \mathbb{Q} -split torus with a torus T of compact type (*i.e.*, $T(\mathbb{R})$ is compact) defined over \mathbb{Q} .
- $(U = 0)$ The weight (-2) -part of P is trivial, in other words [P1, Def. 2.1 (v)], the normal sub-group U of W (which is part of the data (P, \mathfrak{X})) is trivial.

Note that condition $(U = 0)$ implies that \mathfrak{X} is actually left homogeneous under $P(\mathbb{R})$.

For an affine algebraic connected group L defined over \mathbb{Q} , denote by 0L the normal sub-group

$${}^0L := \bigcap_{\chi} \ker \chi^2$$

of L [BS, Sect. 1.1], where χ runs over all characters $L \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{m, \mathbb{Q}}$. We then have the following result.

Proposition 1.8 ([BS, Prop. 1.2]). *Let L be an affine algebraic connected group defined over \mathbb{Q} . Then the closed normal sub-group ${}^0L(\mathbb{R})$ of $L(\mathbb{R})$ contains every compact sub-group of $L(\mathbb{R})$. It admits connected complements in $L(\mathbb{R})$. The set of such connected complements equals the set of sub-groups of the form $T(\mathbb{R})^0$, for the \mathbb{R} -conjugates T of maximal \mathbb{Q} -split sub-tori of the radical RL of L .*

The case $L = P$ will be of interest for us. Note that RP is an extension of W by RG . Under the projection from P to G , any maximal \mathbb{Q} -split sub-torus of RP therefore maps isomorphically to *the* maximal \mathbb{Q} -split sub-torus of $Z(G)$. The analogous statement holds for maximal \mathbb{R} -split sub-tori.

Corollary 1.9. *Assume hypothesis (+). Let T be a maximal \mathbb{R} -split sub-torus of $RP_{\mathbb{R}}$.*

- (a) *The sub-group $T(\mathbb{R})^0$ of $P(\mathbb{R})$ is a connected complement of ${}^0P(\mathbb{R})$.*
- (b) *Let F be a sub-group of $P(\mathbb{R})$ containing $T(\mathbb{R})^0$. Then*

$$F = T(\mathbb{R})^0 \rtimes (F \cap {}^0P(\mathbb{R})) \subset T(\mathbb{R})^0 \rtimes {}^0P(\mathbb{R}) = P(\mathbb{R}).$$

If in addition $T(\mathbb{R})^0$ lies in the center of F , then the semi-direct product is direct:

$$F = T(\mathbb{R})^0 \times (F \cap {}^0P(\mathbb{R})) .$$

The space \mathfrak{X} has finitely many connected components. The stabilizer $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ of any such component \mathfrak{X}^0 contains $P(\mathbb{R})^0$. As part of our Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) , there is a map

$$h : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}}, P_{\mathbb{C}}) , \quad x \longmapsto h_x ,$$

where \mathbb{S} denotes the Deligne torus. It lands in $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{S}, P_{\mathbb{R}})$ if $(U = 0)$ [P1, Def. 2.1 (ii)].

Recall that $w : \mathbb{G}_{m, \mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ denotes the weight co-character of \mathbb{S} . If the morphism $h_x \circ w$ is defined over \mathbb{R} , then according to [P1, Def. 2.1 (v)], the sub-group $\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w)$ of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ surjects onto $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ under the canonical projection from $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ to $G_{\mathbb{R}}$, with a finite kernel. But as the centralizer of a torus, it is connected. Therefore, $\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w)$ is a Levi sub-group of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$. By definition, it contains the image of h_x . Denote by

$${}^0\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) \subset \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w)$$

the pre-image of $({}^0G)_{\mathbb{R}} \subset G_{\mathbb{R}}$ under the isomorphism $\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) \xrightarrow{\sim} G_{\mathbb{R}}$. Thus,

$${}^0\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) = \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) \cap {}^0P_{\mathbb{R}} .$$

Proposition 1.10. *Assume hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$. For all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, the automorphism $\text{Int}(h_x(i))$ induces a Cartan involution on ${}^0\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w)$.*

Here, we use the generalization of the notion of Cartan involution to reductive groups over \mathbb{R} from [BS, Def. 1.7].

For the definition of the quotient Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X})/N$ by a normal sub-group N of P , we refer to [P1, Prop. 2.9]. Denote by P^{der} the derived group of P .

Proof of Proposition 1.10. The automorphism $\text{Int}(h_x(i))$ being algebraic, all we need to show is that the intersection of its fixed points with ${}^0\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_x \circ w)$ is maximal compact (in ${}^0\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_x \circ w)$).

Since $\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w)$ is a Levi sub-group, we may prove the statement on the level of the quotient $(P, \mathfrak{X})/W$, *i.e.*, we may assume that $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ is pure, in which case $\text{Cent}_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) = G_{\mathbb{R}}$.

According to [P1, Def. 2.1 (vi)], the involution $\text{Int}(h_x(i))$ induces a Cartan involution on $G_{\mathbb{R}}^{der}$ (which is contained in $({}^0G)_{\mathbb{R}}$). We may thus divide out G^{der} , *i.e.*, we may assume that G is a torus.

On the one hand, the involution $\text{Int}(h_x(i))$ is then trivial. On the other hand, according to (+), the neutral connected component ${}^0G^0$ of 0G is a torus of compact type. In other words, the whole of ${}^0G(\mathbb{R})$ is compact. **q.e.d.**

Definition 1.11. Assume hypotheses (+) and ($U = 0$). For $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, define

$$L_x := \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) ,$$

$${}^0L_x := {}^0\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) ,$$

$$Z_x := Z_d(L_x) ,$$

the maximal \mathbb{R} -split sub-torus of the center $Z(L_x)$ of L_x , and

$$K_x := \text{Cent}_{L_x(\mathbb{R})}(h_x(i)) \cap {}^0L_x(\mathbb{R}) .$$

Thus, L_x is a Levi sub-group of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, and K_x is maximal compact in ${}^0L_x(\mathbb{R})$, hence in ${}^0P(\mathbb{R})$, hence in $P(\mathbb{R})$. Note that $Z_x(\mathbb{R})$ and K_x centralize each other; in particular, K_x is stable under conjugation by $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0$. Our notation is compatible with the homogeneous structure of \mathfrak{X} : for $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $g \in P(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$L_{gx} = \text{Int}(g)L_x \quad \text{and} \quad K_{gx} = \text{Int}(g)K_x .$$

These choices being fixed, the first main result of this section reads as follows.

Theorem 1.12. *Assume hypotheses (+) and ($U = 0$). Let \mathfrak{X}^0 be a connected component of \mathfrak{X} . Then $(\mathfrak{X}^0, (K_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}^0})$ is homogeneous of type S' under $(P(\mathbb{R}), {}^0P(\mathbb{R}))$.*

The proof of Theorem 1.12 will be given later.

Corollary 1.13. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.12, there is a unique structure of homogeneous space under $P(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathfrak{X}^0 , extending the action of $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$, and such that for the induced action of ${}^0P(\mathbb{R})$, we have*

$$\text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = K_x$$

for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$. In particular, for this extended action, $\text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x)$ is maximal compact in ${}^0P(\mathbb{R})$ (hence, in $P(\mathbb{R})$), for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$.

Remark 1.14. Care needs to be taken when considering actions of $P(\mathbb{R})$. There are indeed two of them: (1) the action on \mathfrak{X} underlying the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) , which is one by complex analytic automorphisms, (2) the action on \mathfrak{X}^0 resulting from Corollary 1.13, which is one by homeomorphisms. They induce the same action by $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ (hence by $P(\mathbb{R})^0$) on \mathfrak{X}^0 . But they differ unless $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}^0$ is connected. Confusion may arise when considering stabilizers of points. For this reason, let us denote, as in the statement of Corollary 1.13, by $\text{Stab}_{\bullet}^{\text{exd}}(x)$ the stabilizer of the extended action (2), and by $\text{Stab}_{\bullet}(x)$ the stabilizer of the original action (1). We thus have

$$\text{Stab}_{\bullet}(x) = \text{Stab}_{\bullet}^{\text{exd}}(x) \cap \text{Stab}_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \subset \text{Stab}_{\bullet}^{\text{exd}}(x)$$

if \mathfrak{X}^0 is the connected component of \mathfrak{X} containing x ; in particular, the inclusion $\text{Stab}_{\bullet}(x) \subset \text{Stab}_{\bullet}^{\text{exd}}(x)$ might be proper.

Proof of Corollary 1.13. This results from Theorem 1.12 and Proposition 1.5. **q.e.d.**

Example 1.15. Consider the Shimura data $(\mathrm{GL}_{2,\mathbb{Q}}, \mathfrak{H}_2)$ [P1, Ex. 2.25, case $g = 1$], where $\mathfrak{H}_2 := \mathbb{C} - \mathbb{R}$ is the union of the upper and the lower half plane in \mathbb{C} , equipped with the usual transitive action $(A, \tau) \mapsto A(\tau)$ of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, where for

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix},$$

we have

$$A(\tau) = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}.$$

The stabilizer of each of the two connected components is

$$\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})^+ := \{A \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \mid \det(A) > 0\}.$$

Furthermore,

$${}^0\mathrm{GL}_{2,\mathbb{Q}} = \{A \in \mathrm{GL}_{2,\mathbb{Q}} \mid \det(A) = \pm 1\}$$

by definition (note that the group of characters of $\mathrm{GL}_{2,\mathbb{Q}}$ is generated by \det). Denote by c the morphism from $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{H}_2)$ mapping a matrix A to the identity if $\det(A) > 0$, and to complex conjugation if $\det(A) < 0$. We leave it to the reader to show that the action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ from Corollary 1.13 on each of the connected components of \mathfrak{H}_2 is given by

$$(A, \tau) \longmapsto c(A)(A(\tau)).$$

Note that the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

lies in $\mathrm{Stab}_{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\tau)$, for any purely imaginary element τ of \mathfrak{H}_2 , while it does not belong to any $\mathrm{Stab}_{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})}(\tau)$. Note also that while the action underlying the Shimura data is one by complex analytic automorphisms, this is no longer true for the extended action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ from Corollary 1.13 on each of the connected components of \mathfrak{H}_2 .

Let us prepare the proof of Theorem 1.12.

Proposition 1.16. *Assume $(+)$ and $(U = 0)$. Then for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, the sub-group $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0$ of $P(\mathbb{R})$ is a connected complement of ${}^0P(\mathbb{R})$, and*

$$\mathrm{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times \mathrm{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(x) \subset P(\mathbb{R}).$$

Proof. The Levi sub-group L_x contains the image of h_x , hence its center $Z(L_x)$ centralizes h_x . Any (topologically) connected sub-group of $Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R})$ therefore stabilizes x [P1, Cor. 2.12]; this is the case in particular for $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0$.

As the maximal \mathbb{R} -split sub-torus of the center of a Levi sub-group, Z_x is maximal \mathbb{R} -split in the radical $RP_{\mathbb{R}}$. From (+) and Corollary 1.9 (a), we deduce that

$$P(\mathbb{R}) = Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times {}^0P(\mathbb{R}) .$$

It remains to apply Corollary 1.9 (b) to $F = \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(x)$ (which is contained in $\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_x)$, hence in L_x). **q.e.d.**

Proposition 1.17. *Assume (+) and ($U = 0$). Then for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, we have*

$$\text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(x) = \text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \cap K_x = \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \cap K_x ,$$

where \mathfrak{X}^0 is the connected component of \mathfrak{X} containing x .

Proof. Since K_x is contained in ${}^0P(\mathbb{R})$, the second of the two equations is obvious.

As for the first, the inclusion “ $\text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(x) \subset \text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \cap K_x$ ” results from the definition of K_x : indeed, an element g of ${}^0P(\mathbb{R})$ stabilizing x centralizes h_x , hence both $h_x \circ w$ (meaning that $g \in L_x$, hence $g \in {}^0L_x$) and $h_x(i)$.

In order to get the equality we look for, note first that its right hand side

$$\tilde{K}_x := \text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \cap K_x$$

is maximal compact in $\text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ (cmp. Remark 1.4 (b)). According to Theorem 1.1, the inclusion of \tilde{K}_x into $\text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ therefore induces a bijection on the level of connected components.

Next, we claim that the neutral connected component \tilde{K}_x^0 is contained in the left hand side $\text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(x)$. Since \tilde{K}_x^0 is connected, this claim is equivalent, thanks to [P1, Cor. 2.12], to

$$\tilde{K}_x^0 \subset \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_x) ,$$

and therefore results from the inclusion

$$(\text{Cent}_{L_x(\mathbb{R})}(h_x(i)))^0 \subset \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_x) .$$

In order to show this latter inclusion, consider the Lie algebra

$$(\text{Lie } L_x)^{\text{Ad}(h_x(i))}$$

of $(\text{Cent}_{L_x(\mathbb{R})}(h_x(i)))^0$. The sub-space of $\text{Lie } L_x$ of invariants under $\text{Ad}(h_x(i))$ equals the direct sum of Hodge types (p, q) , for $p - q$ divisible by 4. But according to [P1, Def. 2.1 (iv)], the only Hodge types possibly occurring in $\text{Lie } L_x$ are $(-1, 1)$, $(0, 0)$, and $(1, -1)$ (recall that the group L_x is a Levi sub-group of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$). Therefore, $(\text{Lie } L_x)^{\text{Ad}(h_x(i))}$ equals the Hodge type $(0, 0)$, *i.e.*, it equals $(\text{Lie } L_x)^{\text{Ad}(h_x(\mathbb{S}))}$, which is contained in $(\text{Lie } P_{\mathbb{R}})^{\text{Ad}(h_x(\mathbb{S}))}$.

We have proved that

$$\tilde{K}_x^0 \subset \text{Stab}_{{}^0P(\mathbb{R})}(x) \subset \tilde{K}_x ,$$

meaning that $\text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(x)$ equals the disjoint union of certain of the connected components of \tilde{K}_x . The desired equation will therefore be proved once we show that $\text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(x)$ has at least as many connected components as \tilde{K}_x , *i.e.*, as $\text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$. But the quotient

$$\text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) / \text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(x)$$

is homeomorphic to \mathfrak{X}^0 , which is connected. Therefore, $\text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(x)$ must meet every connected component of $\text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$. **q.e.d.**

Proof of Theorem 1.12. In the notation of Definition 1.3, we have $H = P(\mathbb{R})$, $N = {}^0P(\mathbb{R})$, $X^0 = \mathfrak{X}^0$, and $H' = \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$. Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$. According to Proposition 1.16,

$$\text{Stab}_{H'}(x) = \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times \text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(x),$$

and $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0$ is a connected complement of ${}^0P(\mathbb{R})$ in $P(\mathbb{R})$. We already know that K_x is stable under conjugation by $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0$. The validity of the criterion from Definition 1.3 thus follows from the equation

$$\text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}(x) = \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \cap K_x$$

(Proposition 1.17). **q.e.d.**

Corollary 1.18. *Assume hypotheses (+) and ($U = 0$). Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then*

$$\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times K_x.$$

The sub-group $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x)$ contains the whole of $Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R})$, and

$$\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R}) \cdot K_x = Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R}) \cdot K_x.$$

Proof. The sub-group $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x)$ contains $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(x)$, hence $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0$ (Proposition 1.16). According to Corollary 1.9 (b),

$$\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times \text{Stab}_{0P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x),$$

which according to Corollary 1.13 equals $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times K_x$. But $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0$ and K_x centralize each other. This proves the formula

$$\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times K_x.$$

Now K_x is maximal compact in $L_x(\mathbb{R})$. Its intersection with the normal sub-group $Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R})$ is therefore maximal compact, *i.e.*, it equals *the* maximal compact sub-group of $Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R})$. But this latter group is a complement of $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0$ in $Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, $Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R})$ is indeed contained in $Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times K_x$, and hence, the inclusion

$$Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times K_x \subset Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R}) \cdot K_x$$

is an equality. Therefore, so are the inclusions

$$Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times K_x \subset Z_x(\mathbb{R}) \cdot K_x \subset Z(L_x)(\mathbb{R}) \cdot K_x.$$

q.e.d.

For future reference, let us formulate Propositions 1.16 and 1.17, and Corollary 1.18 in the pure case $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$. Denote by $Z_d := Z_d(G_{\mathbb{R}})$ the maximal \mathbb{R} -split sub-torus of $Z(G_{\mathbb{R}})$. Under hypothesis (+), it coincides with the base change to \mathbb{R} of the maximal \mathbb{Q} -split sub-torus $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ of $Z(G)$.

Corollary 1.19. *Assume that $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ is pure. Also assume (+).*

(a) *The sub-group $Z_d(\mathbb{R})^0$ is a connected complement of ${}^0G(\mathbb{R})$ in $G(\mathbb{R})$.*

(b) *For all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$,*

$$\text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}(x) = Z_d(\mathbb{R})^0 \times \text{Stab}_{{}^0G(\mathbb{R})}(x) = Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G)(\mathbb{R})^0 \times \text{Stab}_{{}^0G(\mathbb{R})}(x),$$

and

$$\text{Stab}_{{}^0G(\mathbb{R})}(x) = \text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \cap K_x,$$

where \mathfrak{X}^0 is the connected component of \mathfrak{X} containing x .

(c) *For all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$,*

$$\text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = Z_d(\mathbb{R})^0 \times K_x = Z(G)(\mathbb{R}) \cdot K_x.$$

Remark 1.20. The following will not be needed in the sequel. If $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$, and if (+) is valid, then the Cartan involution θ_{K_x} associated to K_x by [BS, Def. 1.7] can be made explicit: the group $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ is an almost direct product of Z_d and ${}^0G_{\mathbb{R}}$. The restriction of θ_{K_x} to ${}^0G(\mathbb{R})$ equals $\text{Int}(h_x(i))$, while the restriction of θ_{K_x} to $Z_d(\mathbb{R})$ equals inversion $x \mapsto x^{-1}$. Indeed, according to [BS, Def. 1.7], the involution θ_{K_x} exists, and stabilizes each normal sub-group of $G_{\mathbb{R}}$; this is therefore true in particular for Z_d and ${}^0G_{\mathbb{R}}$. On the two of them, the restrictions are again Cartan involutions (as K_x intersects maximally with each normal sub-group of $G(\mathbb{R})$). Now use Proposition 1.10 and the definition of K_x for ${}^0G_{\mathbb{R}}$, and the unique Cartan involution for the \mathbb{R} -split torus Z_d .

Here is the second main result of this section.

Theorem 1.21. *Assume hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$. Let \mathfrak{X}^0 be a connected component of \mathfrak{X} , equipped with the extended action of $P(\mathbb{R})$ from Corollary 1.13. Then the pair $(\mathfrak{X}^0, (L_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}^0})$ is a space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under P in the sense of [BS, Def. 2.3].*

Note that contrary to [loc. cit.], we use group actions from the left, not from the right.

Proof of Theorem 1.21. The connected normal solvable sub-group $R_{\mathfrak{X}^0}$ of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ from [BS, Def. 2.3, SI] is chosen to be equal to $R_d P$, the base change to \mathbb{R} of the \mathbb{Q} -split radical of P . Thus, $R_{\mathfrak{X}^0}$ is an extension of Z_d by $W_{\mathbb{R}}$, and all Z_x are maximal tori of $R_{\mathfrak{X}^0}$.

According to Corollary 1.18,

$$\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R}) \cdot K_x$$

for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$, where K_x is maximal compact, and normalizes $Z_x(\mathbb{R})$ (as it actually centralizes $Z_x(\mathbb{R})$). This proves the validity of axiom [BS, Def. 2.3, SI].

We also have $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) \subset L_x$ and $L_{gx} = \text{Int}(g)L_x$ by definition, for all $g \in \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ and $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$. In order to establish the validity of axiom [BS, Def. 2.3, SII], it remains to show the formula

$$L_{gx} = \text{Int}(g)L_x$$

for all $g \in P(\mathbb{R})$ and $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$, with respect to the extended action of $P(\mathbb{R})$. But for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$,

$$P(\mathbb{R}) = \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)K_x$$

(Theorem 1.1). For $g \in K_x$, we have $gx = x$ (Corollary 1.13) and $\text{Int}(g)L_x = L_x$ (as $K_x \subset L_x$). **q.e.d.**

Corollary 1.22. *Assume that $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ is pure. Also assume (+). Let \mathfrak{X}^0 be a connected component of \mathfrak{X} , equipped with the extended action of $G(\mathbb{R})$. Then the map $x \mapsto G^{\text{der}}(\mathbb{R}) \cap K_x$ identifies \mathfrak{X}^0 in a $G(\mathbb{R})$ -equivariant manner with the space of maximal compact sub-groups of $G^{\text{der}}(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. This is the content of [BS, Ex. 2.5 (2)] (observe that the group denoted A in [loc. cit.] is trivial as $Z(G)(\mathbb{R})$ is contained in all stabilizers (Corollary 1.19 (c))). **q.e.d.**

Remark 1.23. We insist again on the two actions of $P(\mathbb{R})$ (see Remark 1.14): (1) the action on \mathfrak{X} underlying the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) , which is one by complex analytic automorphisms, (2) the action on each connected component \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} , extended from the action of $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ by using Corollary 1.13, and which is one by homeomorphisms.

(a) The *mixed Shimura varieties* associated to (P, \mathfrak{X}) are indexed by the open compact subgroups of $P(\mathbb{A}_f)$. If K is one such, then the analytic space of \mathbb{C} -valued points of the corresponding variety $M^K := M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})$ is given as

$$M^K(\mathbb{C}) := P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f) / K)$$

[P1, Def. 3.1]. As is explained in [P1, Sect. 3.2], the analytic space $M^K(\mathbb{C})$ is a finite disjoint union of quotients of the form

$$\Gamma(g)_+ \backslash \mathfrak{X}^0,$$

for connected components \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} and elements $g \in P(\mathbb{A}_f)$, where

$$\Gamma(g) := P(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}$$

is a congruence sub-group of $P(\mathbb{Q})$, and

$$\Gamma(g)_+ := \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{Q})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \cap \Gamma(g)$$

is of finite index in $\Gamma(g)$. (The identification of $\Gamma(g)_+ \backslash \mathfrak{X}^0$ with an analytic sub-set of $M^K(\mathbb{C}) = P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K)$ maps the class of x to the class of (x, g) .)

Since $\Gamma(g)_+$ is contained in $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$, actions (1) and (2) coincide on $\Gamma(g)_+$. Therefore, when forming the connected components of the Shimura varieties associated to (P, \mathfrak{X}) , we need not worry about the distinction between (1) and (2).

(b) Each connected component \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} being a space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under P according to Theorem 1.21, it admits *geodesic actions* [BS, Sect. 3]. These are indexed by parabolic sub-groups Q of P . For any such, the geodesic action is an action of the group of real points of the center $Z(\bar{Q})$ of the maximal reductive quotient \bar{Q} of Q . Its definition involves lifts (indexed by $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$) of $Z(\bar{Q})(\mathbb{R})$ to sub-groups of $P(\mathbb{R})$, and the action by these sub-groups induced from the action (2) giving rise to the $S - \mathbb{Q}$ -structure [BS, Sect. 3.2].

The construction of the partial compactification $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$ of \mathfrak{X}^0 from [BS, Sect. 4, 5, 7] only uses the geodesic actions of the neutral connected components $Z(\bar{Q})(\mathbb{R})^0$ of the $Z(\bar{Q})(\mathbb{R})$. All these lift to sub-groups of $P(\mathbb{R})^0$, hence of $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$; therefore, as far as the formation of $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$ is concerned, there is no difference between actions (1) and (2). (However, care needs to and will be applied when considering the equivariant behaviour of the result.)

Remark 1.24. There are variants of all results of this section when hypothesis ($U = 0$) is not satisfied. They concern the sub-space

$$\text{Re}(\mathfrak{X}) := \{x \in \mathfrak{X}, h_x : \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow P_{\mathbb{C}} \text{ is defined over } \mathbb{R}\}$$

of \mathfrak{X} (which is the best possible replacement as \mathfrak{X} is not homogeneous under $P(\mathbb{R})$, but only under $P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$).

By contrast, hypothesis (+) cannot be avoided.

2 Geodesic action

Throughout the section, we fix mixed Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) . The aim of the present section is to give an explicit description, in terms of the data (P, \mathfrak{X}) , of the geodesic action (Theorem 2.9).

In order to do so, we first need to study the passage from P to parabolic sub-groups Q , and the rule of fixing Levi sub-groups of the latter [BS, Sect. 2.7 (3)]. This study will culminate in Theorem 2.6, and its Corollary 2.7.

Proposition 2.1 ([BS, Prop. 1.8]). *Let K a maximal compact sub-group of $P(\mathbb{R})$, and L a Levi sub-group of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, such that $K \subset L(\mathbb{R})$. Then there is a canonical map $Q \mapsto L_{K,Q}$ on the set of those closed sub-groups Q of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, for*

which $Q(\mathbb{R})$ acts transitively on the space of maximal compact sub-groups of $P(\mathbb{R})$. The map associates to any such Q a Levi sub-group $L_{K,Q}$ of Q . The latter is characterized by the following requirements:

- (i) $L_{K,Q}$ is contained in L ,
- (ii) $L_{K,Q}$ is stable under the Cartan involution θ_K of L with respect to K .

Explicitly, we have

$$L_{K,Q} = (Q \cap L) \cap \theta_K(Q \cap L) .$$

Corollary 2.2. *Let K a maximal compact sub-group of $P(\mathbb{R})$, and L a Levi sub-group of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, such that $K \subset L(\mathbb{R})$.*

(a) *Let Q be a closed sub-group of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, for which $Q(\mathbb{R})$ acts transitively on the space of maximal compact sub-groups of $P(\mathbb{R})$. Then writing $L' := \text{Int}(g)(L)$, we have*

$$\text{Int}(g)(L_{K,Q}) = L'_{\text{Int}(g)(K), \text{Int}(g)(Q)} , \quad \forall g \in P(\mathbb{R}) .$$

(b) *Let Q_1 and Q_2 be two closed sub-groups of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, and assume that $Q_1(\mathbb{R}) \cap Q_2(\mathbb{R})$ acts transitively on the space of maximal compact sub-groups of $P(\mathbb{R})$. Then*

$$L_{K, Q_1 \cap Q_2} = L_{K, Q_1} \cap L_{K, Q_2} .$$

In the context of the geodesic action, Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 will only be applied to the base change to \mathbb{R} of parabolic sub-groups of P (defined over \mathbb{Q}).

If (P, \mathfrak{X}) satisfy hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$, then for any point x of \mathfrak{X} , we have the Levi sub-group

$$L_x = \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w)$$

of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, and the maximal compact sub-group

$$K_x = \text{Cent}_{L_x(\mathbb{R})}(h_x(i)) \cap {}^0L_x(\mathbb{R}) .$$

of $P(\mathbb{R})$ (Definition 1.11).

Definition 2.3. Assume hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$, and let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. For any parabolic sub-group Q of P , denote by $L_{x,Q}$ the Levi sub-group $L_{K_x, Q_{\mathbb{R}}}$ associated to the Levi sub-group $L = L_x$, the maximal compact sub-group K_x and the parabolic sub-group $Q_{\mathbb{R}}$ by the map from Proposition 2.1.

We need to give an explicit formula for $L_{x,Q}$. Since any parabolic sub-group of P is a finite intersection of maximal proper parabolic sub-groups, the general formula will result from Corollary 2.2 (b), once we know it for maximal proper Q .

We shall consider a slightly more general situation: let Q_j be an *admissible* parabolic sub-group of P , meaning [P1, Def. 4.5] that under the projection, first from P to G , and then from G to its adjoint group G^{ad} , the group Q_j is the pre-image of a product of parabolic sub-groups of the simple constituents of G^{ad} , each either maximal proper or equal to the respective simple constituent. To Q_j is associated a canonical normal sub-group P_j of Q_j [P1, 4.7]. (We added the subscript j in order to have the same index for the parabolic sub-group and for its canonical normal sub-group.) There is a finite collection of *rational boundary components* (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) associated to P_j , and indexed by the $P_j(\mathbb{R})$ -orbits in $\pi_0(\mathfrak{X})$ [P1, 4.11]. The (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) are themselves mixed Shimura data. In particular, there is a distinguished closed sub-group U_j of the unipotent radical W_j of P_j (the weight (-2) -part of P_j), which depends only on Q_j , but not on X_j [P1, Lemma 4.8]. The proof of [P1, Cor. 4.10] shows that the (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) satisfy hypothesis (+) since (P, \mathfrak{X}) does. (By contrast, unless $Q_j = P$, they *do not* satisfy hypothesis $(U = 0)$!)

For a fixed $P_j(\mathbb{R})$ -orbit \mathcal{O} in $\pi_0(\mathfrak{X})$, write \mathfrak{X}^+ for the disjoint union of the connected components of \mathfrak{X} in \mathcal{O} , and (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) for the Shimura data associated to \mathcal{O} ; according to [P1, 4.11], there is then a $P_j(\mathbb{R})$ -equivariant map

$$\mathfrak{X}^+ \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}_j .$$

Taking the disjoint union over all orbits in $\pi_0(\mathfrak{X})$, we get a map

$$\mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j ;$$

this map is $Q_j(\mathbb{R})$ -equivariant [P1, 4.11], injective and complex analytic [P1, Cor. 4.13].

Definition 2.4. Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and Q_j an admissible parabolic sub-group of P . Denote by $x_j \in \mathfrak{X}_j$ the image of x under the map $\mathfrak{X}^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_j$ associated to the $P_j(\mathbb{R})$ -orbit in $\pi_0(\mathfrak{X})$ containing $\pi_0(x)$. We denote by $\text{Im}_j(x) \in U_j(\mathbb{C})$ the *imaginary part of x_j* [P1, Sect. 4.14], and define the *real part of x with respect to Q_j* as

$$\text{Re}_j(x) := \text{Im}_j(x)^{-1} x_j \in \mathfrak{X}_j .$$

Thus, the morphism

$$h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} : \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow P_{j,\mathbb{C}} \subset Q_{j,\mathbb{C}} \subset P_{\mathbb{C}}$$

is defined over \mathbb{R} .

Proposition 2.5. *Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and Q_j an admissible parabolic sub-group of P . Assume that the morphism*

$$h_x : \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow P_{\mathbb{C}}$$

is defined over \mathbb{R} (this is automatically the case if $(U = 0)$ [P1, Def. 2.1 (ii)]).

(a) Elements of $h_x \circ w(\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{R}})$ and of $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)}(\mathbb{S})$ commute with each other. In particular, the co-characters $h_x \circ w$ and $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$ of $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ commute with each other.

(b) We have the relation

$$\text{Int}(h_x(i))(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) = (h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w)^{-1} \cdot (h_x \circ w)^2$$

between co-characters of $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}$.

(c) Modulo the unipotent radical of $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}$, the product

$$(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) \cdot (h_x \circ w)^{-1}$$

equals the co-character canonically associated to the parabolic sub-group $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ [P1, Sect. 4.1]. In particular, modulo the unipotent radical of Q_j , this product is defined over \mathbb{Q} .

(d) The element $\text{Im}_j(x)$ belongs to $\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w)$.

The reader may be used to parameterize parabolic sub-groups using *characters* rather than co-characters, following [BT, Sect. 8]. The dictionary is the following: denoting by λ the product from Proposition 2.5 (c), and by λ' its composition with the epimorphism from Q_j to $Q'_j := Q_j/W \subset G$, a simple character α in the root system associated to a fixed minimal parabolic of G contained in Q'_j belongs to the parameters of Q'_j if and only if $\alpha \circ \lambda' = 0$. Reciprocally, if Q'_j is parameterized by simple α_i , for $i \in I$, then the co-character λ' canonically associated to Q'_j equals the sum of all fundamental weights associated to the simple roots α_i , for $i \notin I$.

Proof of Proposition 2.5. According to [P1, Prop. 4.6 (b)], there is a morphism

$$\omega = \omega_x : H_0 \longrightarrow P_{\mathbb{R}}$$

associated to x ($H_0 =$ the reductive sub-group of $\mathbb{S} \times \text{GL}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$ defined in [P1, Sect. 4.3]), such that

$$h_x = \omega \circ h_0 \quad \text{and} \quad h_{x_j} = \omega \circ h_{\infty},$$

where h_0 and h_{∞} are the morphisms $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow H_{0,\mathbb{C}}$ defined by

$$h_0(z_1, z_2) := \left((z_1, z_2), \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(z_1 + z_2) & -\frac{i}{2}(z_1 - z_2) \\ \frac{i}{2}(z_1 - z_2) & \frac{1}{2}(z_1 + z_2) \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

$$h_{\infty}(z_1, z_2) := \left((z_1, z_2), \begin{pmatrix} z_1 z_2 & i(1 - z_1 z_2) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

respectively. Indeed, the unicity statement in [P1, Sect. 4.3] and our hypothesis on h_x being real, imply that ω is indeed defined over \mathbb{R} . Note that setting

$$u_{\infty} := \left((1, 1), \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

we have

$$\text{Int}(u_\infty)^{-1}(h_\infty) : (z_1, z_2) \longmapsto \left((z_1, z_2), \begin{pmatrix} z_1 z_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right);$$

in particular, $h'_\infty := \text{Int}(u_\infty)^{-1}(h_\infty)$ is defined over \mathbb{R} . Hence so is

$$\omega \circ h'_\infty = \text{Int}(\omega(u_\infty))^{-1}(\omega \circ h_\infty) = \text{Int}(\omega(u_\infty))^{-1}(h_{x_j}).$$

We thus have $\text{Im}_j(x) = \omega(u_\infty)$, and

$$h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} = \omega \circ h'_\infty.$$

Statements (a), (b) and (d) then follow from the corresponding statements on the level of H_0 : indeed,

$$h_0 \circ w : z \longmapsto \left((z, z), \begin{pmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

is central, whence (a) and (d). Furthermore,

$$h'_\infty \circ w : z \longmapsto \left((z, z), \begin{pmatrix} z^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

and

$$\text{Int}(h_0(i))(h'_\infty \circ w) = (h'_\infty \circ w)^{-1} \cdot (h_0 \circ w)^2,$$

as both sides map z to

$$\left((z, z), \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & z^2 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

In order to prove part (c), note first that according to [P1, Prop. 4.6 (b) (iii)], the co-character canonically associated to Q_j is congruent, modulo W , to the product

$$(h_{x_j} \circ w) \cdot (h_x \circ w)^{-1}.$$

But modulo U_j , the latter equals $(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) \cdot (h_x \circ w)^{-1}$.

q.e.d.

From now on, the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) are assumed to satisfy hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$. The results from Section 1 are then at our disposal; in particular (Theorem 1.21), each connected component \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} is canonically equipped with a structure of space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under P .

Theorem 2.6. *Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and Q_j an admissible parabolic sub-group of P . Then*

$$L_{x, Q_j} = L_x \cap \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) = \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) \cap \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w).$$

Proof. First, let us show that the group

$$L_x^{Q_j} := L_x \cap \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w)$$

is indeed a Levi sub-group of $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}$. As L_x is a Levi sub-group of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, we may suppose that $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ is pure, in which case $L_x = G_{\mathbb{R}}$, and

$$L_x^{Q_j} = \text{Cent}_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) .$$

According to [P1, Prop. 4.6 (b) (iii)], $L_x^{Q_j}$ is contained in $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}$. According to [P1, Def. 2.1 (v)] (applied to the Shimura data (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j)),

$$P_{j,\mathbb{R}} \cap L_x^{Q_j} = \text{Cent}_{P_{j,\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w)$$

is a Levi sub-group of $P_{j,\mathbb{R}}$. Furthermore, as $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$ factors over $P_{j,\mathbb{R}}$, the quotient $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}/P_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ is pure of weight zero under $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$. Thus, the sub-group $L_x^{Q_j}$ of $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ splits the projection from $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ to $Q_{j,\mathbb{R}}/W_{j,\mathbb{R}}$. But according to [P1, proof of Lemma 4.8], the unipotent radical of Q_j equals W_j .

Next, in order to show that $L_x^{Q_j} = L_{x,Q_j}$, we need to establish that $L_x^{Q_j}$ is stable under the Cartan involution θ_{K_x} of L_x with respect to K_x . In order to do so, we may again suppose that $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ is pure. On the one hand, the center of $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ is obviously contained in $L_x^{Q_j}$. On the other hand, it is stable under θ_{K_x} [BS, Prop. 1.6]. Therefore, we may even suppose that $G = G^{ad}$, in which case $\theta_{K_x} = \text{Int}(h_x(i))$.

Let then q be an element of $L_x^{Q_j}$. We have

$$\text{Int}(\theta_{K_x}(q))(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) = \text{Int}(h_x(i)) \text{Int}(q) \text{Int}(h_x(i))(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) ,$$

which according to Proposition 2.5 (b) equals

$$\text{Int}(h_x(i)) \text{Int}(q) \left((h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w)^{-1} \cdot (h_x \circ w)^2 \right) = \text{Int}(h_x(i)) \text{Int}(q) (h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w)^{-1}$$

(note that $h_x \circ w$ is trivial as it lands in the center [P1, Def. 2.1 (iii)], and $Z(G) = Z(G^{ad})$ is trivial). But $\text{Int}(q)$ fixes $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, hence its inverse, and

$$\text{Int}(\theta_{K_x}(q))(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) = \text{Int}(h_x(i))(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w)^{-1} ,$$

which by another application of Proposition 2.5 (b) equals $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$. Altogether,

$$\theta_{K_x}(q) \in \text{Cent}_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) = L_x^{Q_j} .$$

q.e.d.

Corollary 2.7. *Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and Q a parabolic sub-group of P . Write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j are admissible parabolics.*

(a) *We have*

$$L_{x,Q} = L_x \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) = \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_x \circ w) \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) .$$

(b) *The co-characters $h_x \circ w$ and $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$, of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ all factor over the center $Z(L_{x,Q})$ of $L_{x,Q}$. In particular, they commute with each other.*

Proof. Part (a) follows from Theorem 2.6 and Corollary 2.2 (b).

As for part (b), fix a maximal \mathbb{R} -split sub-torus T of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ contained in $L_{x,Q}$. Given the definition of $L_{x,Q}$, the torus T centralizes $h_x \circ w$ and all $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$. Therefore, the torus T , together with the image of $h_x \circ w$, generates an \mathbb{R} -split sub-torus of $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, which by maximality must be equal to T . In other words, the image of $h_x \circ w$ is contained in T . One proceeds in the same way with each of the $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$; their images are thus all contained in T . In particular, the $h_x \circ w$ and $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$, all factor over $L_{x,Q}$, and they commute with each other. Again by definition, elements of $L_{x,Q}$ commute with elements in the image of each of the $h_x \circ w$ and $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$; the latter therefore belong to $Z(L_{x,Q})$. **q.e.d.**

The formula in Corollary 2.7 is valid in particular when Q is admissible parabolic, and the Q_j are maximal proper. This gives a hint on “how to count correctly” the number of co-characters which are necessary to determine the Levi sub-groups, and more precisely, to span the split part of their centers.

For a parabolic sub-group Q of P , denote by \bar{Q} its maximal reductive quotient, *i.e.*, the quotient by its unipotent radical (for $Q = P$, we thus have $\bar{P} = G$), and by π_Q the canonical epimorphism from Q to \bar{Q} . Denote by $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})$ the maximal \mathbb{Q} -split sub-torus of the center $Z(\bar{Q})$ of \bar{Q} . Note that an inclusion of parabolic sub-groups $Q \subset Q'$ induces a canonical monomorphism $Z(\bar{Q}') \hookrightarrow Z(\bar{Q})$.

Definition 2.8 ([BS, Sect. 4.2]). Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Define

$$S_Q := Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})/Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G)$$

and

$$A_Q := S_Q(\mathbb{R})^0.$$

For the formation of the Borel–Serre compactification, we need to control the geodesic action of the groups A_Q . The main result of this section reads as follows.

Theorem 2.9. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j are admissible parabolics.*

(a) *Let $j \in J$. The co-character*

$$\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$$

of \bar{Q} does not depend on the choice of $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, is defined over \mathbb{Q} , and factors over $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})$.

(b) *If the Q_j are pairwise different maximal proper parabolics, then we have*

$$Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q}) = Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G) \times \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{Q}})).$$

(c) Assume that the Q_j are pairwise different maximal proper parabolics. Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then the sub-torus of $Z(L_{x,Q})$ mapping isomorphically to the base change to \mathbb{R} of $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})$ under π_Q equals

$$Z_x \times \prod_{j \in J} (h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{R}})) \subset Z(L_{x,Q}).$$

(d) Assume that the Q_j are pairwise different maximal proper parabolics. Let $j \in J$. Then there is a natural number $n_j \geq 1$, depending only on the $P(\mathbb{Q})$ -conjugation class of Q_j (not on Q), and such that the following is true: for $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, consider the element

$$\underline{q}_j := (1, 1, \dots, 1, q, 1, \dots, 1) \quad (q \text{ in position } j),$$

of $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J$, viewed as an element of A_Q under the parameterization of [BS, Sect. 4.2 (2)], and the result $\underline{q}_j \cdot x$ of the geodesic action of \underline{q}_j on x [BS, Sect. 3.2]. Then

$$\underline{q}_j \cdot x = (h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(q^{1/n_j}))x$$

(for the action of $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(q^{1/n_j}) \in P(\mathbb{R})$ on x given by the Shimura data).

Proof. The co-character

$$\pi_P \circ h_x \circ w : \mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{R}} \longrightarrow G_{\mathbb{R}}$$

is central [P1, Def. 2.1 (iii)], hence by (+) defined over \mathbb{Q} . Also, because of transitivity of the action of $P(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathfrak{X} , it does not depend on the choice of x . *A fortiori*, the same is true for $\pi_{Q_j} \circ h_x \circ w$, $j \in J$.

(a): for each j , the co-character $\pi_{Q_j} \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$ does not depend on the choice of $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and is defined over \mathbb{Q} , as follows from Proposition 2.5 (c), and the above observation. *A fortiori*, the same is true for $\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$. By Corollary 2.7 (b), the latter lands in $Z(\bar{Q})$, hence in $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})$.

(b): fix a minimal parabolic sub-group B of G contained in $Q' := Q/W$, and a maximal \mathbb{Q} -split torus T of B . Let Δ be the basis of the root system associated to the choices of B and T . As the Q_j are assumed maximal proper, the co-character

$$\lambda'_j : \mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{Q}} \longrightarrow Q'_j := Q_j/W \hookrightarrow G$$

canonically associated to Q'_j is the fundamental weight associated to a unique element α_j of Δ . In the normalization of [BT, Sect. 5.12], the parabolic Q'_j is thus parametrized by $\Delta - \{\alpha_j\}$, and Q' , by $\Delta - \{\alpha_j \mid j \in J\}$. This means precisely that $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})$ equals the direct product of $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ and of the images of the co-characters induced by λ'_j , $j \in J$. Since by Proposition 2.5 (c), the co-characters λ'_j and $\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$ are congruent modulo $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G)$, we have indeed

$$Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q}) = Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G) \times \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{Q}})).$$

(c): use (b), and Corollary 2.7 (b).

(d): according to (b), the quotient $S_Q = Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})/Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ admits two morphisms: the isogeny

$$\prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) : \mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{Q}}^J \longrightarrow S_Q ,$$

or equivalently (by Proposition 2.5 (c)), $\prod_{j \in J} \lambda'_j$, with target S_Q , and the isogeny

$$\prod_{j \in J} \alpha_j : S_Q \longrightarrow \mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{Q}}^J$$

with source S_Q . Both induce isomorphisms between $A_Q = S_Q(\mathbb{R})^0$ and $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J$. In [BS, Sect. 4.2 (2)], the inverse of $\prod_{j \in J} \alpha_j$ is used in order to parameterize the geodesic action. Thus, putting $n_j := \alpha_j \circ \lambda'_j$, we have

$$\left(\prod_{j \in J} \alpha_j \right)^{-1} (q_j)_j = \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(q_j^{1/n_j})_j) \in A_Q$$

for all $(q_j)^j \in (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J$. In particular,

$$\underline{q}_j = \pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(q^{1/n_j}) .$$

According to the definition of the geodesic action [BS, Sect. 3.2],

$$\underline{q}_j \cdot x = a_x x ,$$

where $a_x \in Z(L_{x,Q})(\mathbb{R}) \subset P(\mathbb{R})$ is the unique lift of \underline{q}_j under π_Q . Our claim thus follows from (c) (and from Remark 1.23 (b)). **q.e.d.**

Readers not willing to identify the set J of indices for the maximal proper parabolic sub-groups Q_j of P containing Q with a sub-set of the natural numbers, by *choosing* an order on the indices, may find comfort in letting J be *equal* to the set of co-characters $\pi_{Q_j} \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$ (which determines the Q_j , thanks to [P1, Prop. 4.6 (b) (iii)]).

Corollary 2.10. *Let Q be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P . Write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j , $j \in J$, are pairwise different maximal proper parabolics. Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and write $\text{Re}_0(x)$ for the real part of x with respect to Q .*

(a) *Modulo Z_x , we have the relation*

$$h_{\text{Re}_0(x)} \circ w = \prod_{j \in J} (h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) \circ \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}$$

of co-characters of $Z(L_{x,Q})$, where $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}$ denotes the diagonal inclusion of $\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{R}}$ into $\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{R}}^J$.

(b) Modulo $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G)$, we have the relation

$$\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_0(x)} \circ w = \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) \circ \Delta$$

of co-characters of $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})$, where Δ denotes the diagonal inclusion of $\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{Q}}$ into $\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{Q}}^J$.

Proof. Apply Corollary 2.7 (b) twice, according to the representations $Q = Q$ and $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$ of Q as intersection of admissible parabolics. We obtain that the images of all co-characters $h_{\text{Re}_0(x)} \circ w$ and $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$, are indeed contained in $Z(L_{x,Q})$.

Given Theorem 2.9 (a), parts (a) and (b) of the statement are equivalent. As for (b), use Proposition 2.5 (c), the fact that $\pi_P \circ h_x \circ w$ is central [P1, Def. 2.1 (iii)], and the relation $\lambda_0 = \prod_{j \in J} \lambda_j \circ \Delta$ between co-characters canonically associated to Q , and to the Q_j , respectively. **q.e.d.**

Remark 2.11. For the improper parabolic $Q = P$, we have $J = \emptyset$, $\text{Re}_0(x) = x$, and Corollary 2.10 reduces to (a) $h_x \circ w$ is central in L_x , (b) $\pi_P \circ h_x \circ w$ is central in G [P1, Def. 2.1 (iii)].

According to Theorem 2.9 (b), the collection of co-characters $\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$, provides a parameterization

$$\prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \xrightarrow{\sim} A_Q$$

provided that the Q_j , $j \in J$, are the pairwise different maximal proper parabolic sub-groups of P containing Q . Actually, thanks to Theorem 2.9 (a), this parameterization does not depend on x ; let us therefore write

$$\prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(\bullet)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \xrightarrow{\sim} A_Q .$$

Concerning this parameterization, the following will be of use in Section 3 (cmp. [BS, proof of Lemma 3.2 (ii)]).

Lemma 2.12. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j , $j \in J$, are pairwise different maximal proper parabolics. Let $\gamma \in P(\mathbb{Q})$. Note that $\text{Int}(\gamma)(Q) = \bigcap_{j \in J} \text{Int}(\gamma)(Q_j)$, and consider the parameterizations of A_Q and of $A_{\text{Int}(\gamma)(Q)}$,*

$$\text{par}_Q = \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(\bullet)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \xrightarrow{\sim} A_Q$$

and

$$\text{par}_{\text{Int}(\gamma)(Q)} = \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_{\text{Int}(\gamma)(Q)} \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(\bullet)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \xrightarrow{\sim} A_{\text{Int}(\gamma)(Q)} ,$$

respectively. Then par_Q and $par_{\text{Int}(\gamma)(Q)}$ satisfy the relation

$$par_{\text{Int}(\gamma)(Q)} = \text{Int}(\gamma)(par_Q) .$$

Proof. This results from the formula $h_{\text{Re}_j(\gamma x)} = \text{Int}(\gamma) \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)}$, $j \in J$, $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, whose proof we leave to the reader. **q.e.d.**

Remark 2.13. When hypothesis $(U = 0)$ is not satisfied, then the results of this section are valid only for $x \in \text{Re}(\mathfrak{X})$ (cmp. Remark 1.24); this principle was made explicit in Proposition 2.5.

3 The manifold with corners \mathfrak{X}^{BS}

We continue to consider mixed Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) satisfying hypotheses $(+)$ and $(U = 0)$. In this section, we first carry out the program from [BS], making explicit the necessary modifications, to construct a partial compactification \mathfrak{X}^{BS} of \mathfrak{X} , using the geodesic action from Section 2. As before, particular care needs to be employed when distinguishing the natural action of $P(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathfrak{X} underlying our Shimura data, and the action of $P(\mathbb{R})$ on every connected component of \mathfrak{X} obtained by extending the natural action of the stabilizer (Section 1). Since the former turns out to commute with the geodesic action (which is obtained from the latter) (Proposition 3.11), we may and do define the *Borel–Serre compactification* of the Shimura varieties associated to (P, \mathfrak{X}) (Definition 3.13). One of the main results of [BS] then implies that the Borel–Serre compactification, as its name suggests, is indeed compact (Theorem 3.14). Along the lines of the construction, we introduce what will turn out to be a key notion for the applications to cohomology we have in mind: the notion of *contractible map* between topological spaces (Definition 3.4). The notion is local on the target; in particular, it is invariant under passage to the base change by a covering. The open immersion of \mathfrak{X} into \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is the main example of a contractible map we have in mind; our Proposition 3.6 gives a stratified version of this observation. The second part of the section will not be used on the rest of this paper, and is concerned with functoriality of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} in (P, \mathfrak{X}) .

Let Q be a parabolic sub-group, and Q_j , $j \in J$, the pairwise different maximal proper parabolic sub-groups of P containing Q . According to Theorem 2.9, we have

$$par_Q = \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(\bullet)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \xrightarrow{\sim} A_Q .$$

Consider the “partial compactification”

$$(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \hookrightarrow (0, +\infty]^J$$

obtained by adding the point $+\infty$ in each coordinate, and define

$$A_Q \hookrightarrow \bar{A}_Q$$

by transport of structure. Note that A_Q acts naturally on \bar{A}_Q , and that par_Q extends to give a parameterization, denoted by the same symbol

$$par_Q : (0, +\infty]^J \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{A}_Q .$$

Denote by $\infty_Q \in \bar{A}_Q$ the image under par_Q of the point $(+\infty, \dots, +\infty)$. The singleton $\{\infty_Q\}$ is the unique closed stratum of the stratification of \bar{A}_Q by orbits under the action of A_Q .

Definition 3.1. Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P .

(a) The *corner of \mathfrak{X} associated to Q* is

$$\mathfrak{X}(Q) := \bar{A}_Q^{A_Q} \times \mathfrak{X} .$$

Explicitly, $\mathfrak{X}(Q)$ is the space of equivalence classes of pairs (a, x) , for $a \in \bar{A}_Q$ and $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, with respect to the relation

$$(a, x) \sim (b, y) \iff \exists \alpha \in A_Q, b = \alpha^{-1}a \text{ and } y = \alpha \cdot x$$

(where $\alpha \cdot x$ denotes as before the geodesic action of α on x).

(b) The *face of \mathfrak{X} associated to Q* is

$$e(Q) := A_Q \backslash \mathfrak{X} .$$

Remark 3.2. Part (a) of Definition 3.1 is compatible with the definition from [BS, Sect. 5.1]: first, \mathfrak{X} is the disjoint union of its connected components, each of which can be canonically endowed with the structure of a space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under P (Theorem 1.21), and therefore carries the geodesic actions of the A_Q . Hence so does \mathfrak{X} . Next, as was already pointed out, [BS] is based on group actions from the right, not from the left. The rule transforming one type of action into the other being $a^{-1} \cdot x \leftrightarrow x \cdot a$, we need to add $+\infty$ where [BS, Sect. 5.1] adds the point 0^+ (cmp. [Z2, footnote (4) on p. 320]). Finally, our parameterization $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \xrightarrow{\sim} A_Q$ coincides with that used in [BS, Sect. 4.2] up to the positive powers n_j , $j \in J$, from Theorem 2.9 (d). Thus, the speed with which a given sequence converges, may change, but not its limit.

If $\mathfrak{X} = \coprod \mathfrak{X}^0$ is the decomposition of \mathfrak{X} into its finitely many connected components, then likewise $\mathfrak{X}(Q) = \coprod \mathfrak{X}^0(Q)$ for every parabolic sub-group Q of P , where $\mathfrak{X}^0(Q)$ is the corner of the space \mathfrak{X}^0 of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ associated to Q by [BS, Sect. 5.1].

If $Q_1 \subset Q_2$ is an inclusion of parabolic sub-groups of P , then A_{Q_2} is in a canonical way a sub-group of A_{Q_1} , and the inclusion $A_{Q_2} \hookrightarrow A_{Q_1}$ extends (uniquely) to a continuous map $\bar{A}_{Q_2} \rightarrow \bar{A}_{Q_1}$. This extension is injective and A_{Q_2} -equivariant (cmp. [BS, Sect. 4.3 and 4.5]). It follows that the corner

$\mathfrak{X}(Q_2)$ admits a canonical continuous map to the corner $\mathfrak{X}(Q_1)$, which extends the identity on \mathfrak{X} . Elements $a, b \in \bar{A}_{Q_2}$, and $\alpha \in A_{Q_1}$ satisfy the relation $b = \alpha^{-1}a$ only if $\alpha \in A_{Q_2}$. Therefore, the continuous map $\mathfrak{X}(Q_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(Q_1)$ is injective. Actually, it is an open immersion of manifolds with corners [BS, Prop. 5.3]. Thus, we can imitate the construction from [BS, Sect. 7.1].

Definition 3.3. The manifold with corners \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is defined as the disjoint union of the $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$, where \mathfrak{X}^0 runs through the connected components of \mathfrak{X} , and $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$ denotes the manifold with corners defined for the space \mathfrak{X}^0 of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under P in [BS, Sect. 7.1].

Thus, the $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$ are the connected components of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , the $\mathfrak{X}(Q)$ are open sub-manifolds with corners of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , providing a covering of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , and there is a stratification

$$\mathfrak{X}^{BS} = \coprod_R e(R) ,$$

where R runs over all parabolic sub-groups of P .

Except for connectivity of the spaces, the results from [BS, Sect. 5, Sect. 7] essentially carry over *verbatim* to \mathfrak{X} . First example: the stratification of the corner $\mathfrak{X}(Q) = \bar{A}_Q^{A_Q} \times \mathfrak{X}$ induced by $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} = \coprod_R e(R)$ equals the stratification induced by the orbits under the action of A_Q on \bar{A}_Q . We have

$$\mathfrak{X}(Q) = \coprod_{R \supset Q} e(R) ,$$

where R runs over all parabolics containing Q [BS, 5.1 (6)]. The unique open stratum is $e(P) = \mathfrak{X}$. The unique closed stratum is $e(Q)$, which is identified with the sub-space of $\mathfrak{X}(Q) = \bar{A}_Q^{A_Q} \times \mathfrak{X}$ of equivalence classes $[(\infty_Q, x)]$ of points of the form (∞_Q, x) , *via* the bijection

$$A_Q x \longleftrightarrow [(\infty_Q, x)] , \quad x \in \mathfrak{X} .$$

Second example: the closure $\overline{e(R)}$ of a face $e(R)$ in \mathfrak{X}^{BS} equals

$$\overline{e(R)} = \coprod_{R' \subset R} e(R') ,$$

where R' runs over all parabolics contained in R [BS, Prop. 7.3 (i)]. Third example: \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is Hausdorff [BS, Thm. 7.8].

The open immersion of \mathfrak{X} into \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is of a very specific local nature. This motivates the following.

Definition 3.4. A continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of topological spaces is called *contractible* if the topology on Y admits a basis $(V_i)_i$, for which the pre-images $f^{-1}(V_i)$ are contractible, for all i .

The property of a continuous map being contractible is local on its target. Also, if f and g are contractible, then so is their direct product $f \times g$. If f is contractible, then the image of f is dense in Y .

Examples 3.5. Let X be a topological space.

- (a) The map $X \rightarrow \{*\}$ to the singleton is contractible if and only if X is contractible.
- (b) The identity id_X is contractible if and only if X is locally contractible.

Proposition 3.6. *Let R be a parabolic sub-group of P , and $\mathfrak{X}' \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS}$ a locally closed union of strata containing $e(R)$, and contained in the closure $\overline{e(R)}$ of $e(R)$ in \mathfrak{X}^{BS} . Then the open immersion $\mathfrak{X}' \hookrightarrow \overline{e(R)}$ is contractible.*

Proof. We have $\overline{e(R)} = \coprod_{R' \subset R} e(R')$, where R' runs over all parabolics contained in R . Our claim being local on \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , it suffices to show that for any parabolic sub-group Q of P contained in R , the immersion $\mathfrak{X}' \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q) \hookrightarrow e(R) \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ is contractible.

Recall the parameterization

$$\text{par}_Q : (0, +\infty]^J \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{A}_Q .$$

According to [BS, 5.4 (5)], there is a homeomorphism

$$\bar{A}_Q \times e(Q) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{X}(Q)$$

respecting the stratifications. Furthermore [BS, 5.4 (6)], the pre-image of $e(R) \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ under this homeomorphism equals

$$\bar{A}_{Q,R} \times e(Q) ,$$

for a closed sub-set $\bar{A}_{Q,R}$ of \bar{A}_Q , which under par_Q corresponds to the sub-set defined by the conditions “ $x_j = +\infty$ ”, for all indices j belonging to a certain sub-set J_R of J . Whence an induced parameterization

$$\text{par}_{Q,R} : (0, +\infty]^{J-J_R} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{A}_{Q,R} .$$

We thus get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{A}'_{Q,R} \times e(Q) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathfrak{X}' \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q) \\ k \times \text{id}_{e(Q)} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bar{A}_{Q,R} \times e(Q) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q) \end{array}$$

for some open immersion $k : \bar{A}'_{Q,R} \hookrightarrow \bar{A}_{Q,R}$ of a union of A_Q -orbits in $\bar{A}_{Q,R}$. Under $\text{par}_{Q,R}$, this sub-set $\bar{A}'_{Q,R}$ corresponds to a finite union of sub-sets defined by conditions “ $x_j \neq +\infty$ ”, for certain indices $j \in J - J_R$. This shows that k is contractible. Our claim follows: as $e(Q)$ is locally contractible — in fact, it is diffeomorphic to a Euclidean space [BS, Sect. 3.9, Rem. 2.4 (1)] — the map $\text{id}_{e(Q)}$ is contractible. **q.e.d.**

The following principle will be used repeatedly.

Proposition 3.7. *In a connected algebraic group, two conjugate parabolic sub-groups, whose intersection remains parabolic, are identical.*

Proof. We may clearly suppose that the connected algebraic group in question is reductive. Now apply [BT, Sect. 4.3]. **q.e.d.**

Proposition 3.8. *Let R be a parabolic sub-group of P , and $Q \subset R$ a maximal proper parabolic of R (i.e., a parabolic containing Q and contained in R is equal either to Q or to R). Then the open immersion*

$$(\overline{e(R)} - e(R)) - \bigcup_{\gamma \in R(\mathbb{Q})} \overline{e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1})} \hookrightarrow (\overline{e(R)} - e(R)) - \bigcup_{\gamma \in R(\mathbb{Q})} e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1})$$

is contractible.

Proof. The claim being local on \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , it suffices to show that for any parabolic sub-group Q' of P contained in R , the immersion k of

$$((\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R)) - \bigcup_{\gamma \in R(\mathbb{Q})} \overline{e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1})}$$

into

$$((\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R)) - \bigcup_{\gamma \in R(\mathbb{Q})} e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1})$$

is contractible.

Consider as in the previous proof the parameterization

$$par_{Q'} : (0, +\infty]^J \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{A}_{Q'}$$

and the homeomorphism

$$\bar{A}_{Q'} \times e(Q') \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{X}(Q')$$

respecting the stratifications [BS, 5.4 (5)], and identifying

$$\bar{A}_{Q',R} \times e(Q')$$

with $\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')$ [BS, 5.4 (6)], for $\bar{A}_{Q',R} \subset \bar{A}_{Q'}$ closed, corresponding to the conditions “ $x_j = +\infty$ ”, for all indices j belonging to a certain sub-set J_R of J under $par_{Q'}$. The induced parameterization of $\bar{A}_{Q',R}$ is

$$par_{Q',R} : (0, +\infty]^{J-J_R} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{A}_{Q',R}.$$

We get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{A}_{Q',R}^\infty \times e(Q') & \xrightarrow{\cong} & (\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bar{A}_{Q',R} \times e(Q') & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q') \end{array}$$

where $\bar{A}_{Q',R}^\infty \subset \bar{A}_{Q',R}$ is the closed sub-set corresponding to the condition “ $x_j = +\infty$ for at least one $j \in J - J_R$ ”.

If Q' is not contained in any $R(\mathbb{Q})$ -conjugate of Q , then both source and target of k are equal to

$$(\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R) ,$$

which is homeomorphic to $\bar{A}_{Q',R}^\infty \times e(Q')$, and hence locally contractible [BS, Sect. 3.9, Rem. 2.4 (1)].

Let us assume that Q' is contained in $\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$, for some $\gamma \in R(\mathbb{Q})$. Proposition 3.7 tells us that there is no other conjugate of Q than $\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$ containing Q' . Replacing Q by $\gamma^{-1} Q \gamma$, we thus get

$$((\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R)) - \bigcup_{\gamma \in R(\mathbb{Q})} \overline{e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1})} = ((\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R)) - \overline{e(Q)}$$

and

$$((\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R)) - \bigcup_{\gamma \in R(\mathbb{Q})} e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}) = ((\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R)) - e(Q) .$$

Since Q is maximal proper in R , there is an index $j_Q \in J - J_R$, such that the above commutative diagram can be completed to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{A}_{Q',R}^{\infty,Q,0} \times e(Q') & \xrightarrow{\cong} & ((\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R)) \cap e(Q) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bar{A}_{Q',R}^{\infty,Q} \times e(Q') & \xrightarrow{\cong} & ((\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R)) \cap \overline{e(Q)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bar{A}_{Q',R}^\infty \times e(Q') & \xrightarrow{\cong} & (\overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q')) - e(R) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bar{A}_{Q',R} \times e(Q') & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \overline{e(R)} \cap \mathfrak{X}(Q') \end{array}$$

where $\bar{A}_{Q',R}^{\infty,Q}$ and $\bar{A}_{Q',R}^{\infty,Q,0}$ are the sub-sets of $\bar{A}_{Q',R}$ defined by

$$\bar{A}_{Q',R}^{\infty,Q} := \{a \in \bar{A}_{Q',R}^\infty, x_{j_Q}(a) = +\infty\}$$

and

$$\bar{A}_{Q',R}^{\infty,Q,0} := \{a \in \bar{A}_{Q',R}^\infty, x_{j_Q}(a) = +\infty, x_j \neq +\infty \text{ for } j \neq j_Q\} .$$

We leave it to the reader to show that the immersion of the complement of $\bar{A}_{Q',R}^{\infty,Q}$ into the complement of $\bar{A}_{Q',R}^{\infty,Q,0}$ (in $\bar{A}_{Q',R}^\infty$) is contractible. Our claim follows as $e(Q')$ is locally contractible [BS, Sect. 3.9, Rem. 2.4 (1)]. **q.e.d.**

Remark 3.9. (a) The hypothesis on Q being maximal proper in R is essential in Proposition 3.8.

(b) As the proofs shows, Propositions 3.6 and 3.8 are valid in the general context of spaces of type $S - k$ [BS, Def. 2.3].

Remark 3.10. Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . In analogy to Remark 1.23, there are two different actions of $Q(\mathbb{R})$ on the corner $\mathfrak{X}(Q)$, both of which respect the stratification

$$\mathfrak{X}(Q) = \coprod_{Q \subset R \subset P} e(R) :$$

(1) the action induced by and extending the one on \mathfrak{X} underlying the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) , (2) the action induced by and extending the one on \mathfrak{X} coming from extension of the action of $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ on each connected component \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} via Corollary 1.13. On each connected component $\mathfrak{X}^0(Q)$, they induce the same action of the sub-group $\text{Stab}_{Q(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$ of $Q(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, actions (1) and (2) coincide on $P(\mathbb{R})^0 \cap Q(\mathbb{R})$.

For both (1) and (2), recall that by definition,

$$\mathfrak{X}(Q) = \bar{A}_Q^{A_Q} \times \mathfrak{X} ,$$

and use the restriction to $Q(\mathbb{R})$ of the respective actions (1) and (2) on \mathfrak{X} . It results that both actions are by automorphisms of manifolds with corners.

Caution: for these constructions to work, it is necessary for the geodesic action of A_Q on \mathfrak{X} to commute with both actions of $Q(\mathbb{R})$. For action (2), this is the first statement of [BS, Prop. 3.4]. It thus remains to prove the following result.

Proposition 3.11. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Then the geodesic action of A_Q commutes with action (1) of $Q(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathfrak{X} .*

Proof. Let $a \in A_Q$, $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and $q \in Q(\mathbb{R})$. We have

$$a \cdot x = a_x x \quad \text{and} \quad a \cdot (qx) = a_{qx} qx ,$$

where a_x and a_{qx} are elements of $P(\mathbb{R})^0$, which by Corollary 2.2 (a) (or by the explicit description from Theorem 2.9 (d)) satisfy the relation $a_{qx} = qa_x q^{-1}$. It follows that

$$q(a \cdot x) = qa_x x = a_{qx} qx = a \cdot (qx) .$$

q.e.d.

Remark 3.12 (cmp. [BS, Prop. 7.6]). Using Lemma 2.12, one shows that the restrictions to $P(\mathbb{Q})W(\mathbb{R})$ of the actions (1) and (2) on \mathfrak{X} extend to \mathfrak{X}^{BS} . Both preserve the structure of manifold with corners. On each connected component $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0 = (\mathfrak{X}^{BS})^0$, they induce the same action of $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{Q})W(\mathbb{R})}(\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0)$. In particular, they coincide on $P(\mathbb{R})^0 \cap P(\mathbb{Q})W(\mathbb{R})$. The induced actions on the set of faces are the same, namely $g : e(Q) \mapsto e(\text{Int}(g)(Q))$.

Note that the extensions of the actions from \mathfrak{X} to the corners and to the whole of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} (Remarks 3.10 and 3.12) are necessarily unique as \mathfrak{X} is dense in \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , and \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is Hausdorff [BS, Thm. 7.8].

Definition 3.13. Let K be an open compact sub-group of $P(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Define the *Borel–Serre compactification of the Shimura variety* $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})$ as the quotient space

$$M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} := P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f) / K)$$

formed with respect to the action (1) of $P(\mathbb{Q})$ extending the one on \mathfrak{X} underlying the Shimura data.

Thus, the Borel–Serre compactification of $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})$ contains the space of complex points

$$M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C}) = P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f) / K)$$

of the Shimura variety $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})$ as an open dense sub-set. If

$$M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C}) = \coprod \Gamma(g)_+ \backslash \mathfrak{X}^0$$

is a representation of $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$ as finite disjoint union of its connected components as in [P1, Sect. 3.2] (cmp. Remark 1.23 (a)), then

$$M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} = \coprod \Gamma(g)_+ \backslash \bar{\mathfrak{X}}^0 .$$

Recall that by definition,

$$\Gamma(g)_+ = \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{Q})}(\mathfrak{X}^0) \cap \Gamma(g) ,$$

with

$$\Gamma(g) = P(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1} .$$

In particular, the group $\Gamma(g)_+$ is contained in $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(\mathfrak{X}^0)$, meaning that as far as the formation of the connected components of the Borel–Serre compactification is concerned, we need not worry about the difference of actions (1) and (2).

Theorem 3.14 (Borel–Serre). *Let K be an open compact sub-group of $P(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Then the Borel–Serre compactification of $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})$ is compact.*

Proof. We identified $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$ with a finite disjoint union

$$\coprod \Gamma(g)_+ \backslash \bar{\mathfrak{X}}^0 .$$

According to [BS, Thm. 9.3], each of the components $\Gamma(g)_+ \backslash \bar{\mathfrak{X}}^0$ is compact. **q.e.d.**

The rest of the present section is concerned with functoriality, and will not be used in the sequel. In the general context of homogeneous spaces $(X, (L_x)_{x \in X})$ of type $S - k$, little seems to have been said in the literature about the functorial behaviour of the manifold with corners \bar{X} . Clearly, a morphism $(H, X, (L_x)_{x \in X}) \rightarrow (H', Y, (L'_y)_{y \in Y})$ should be a pair consisting of a morphism of algebraic groups $\varphi : H \rightarrow H'$ and a continuous map $\psi : X \rightarrow Y$ satisfying (i) $\psi(hx) = \varphi(h)\psi(x)$ for all $h \in H$ and $x \in X$, (ii) for

all $x \in X$, the image under φ of the Levi sub-group L_x of H associated to x is contained in the Levi sub-group $L'_{\psi(x)}$ of H' associated to $\psi(x)$. But in order to obtain a map $\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{Y}$, the construction from [BS], which involves in particular very careful choices of Levi sub-groups of parabolics (cmp. Proposition 2.1), suggests that at least another requirement needs to be imposed, namely *compatibility of Cartan involutions*: denote by K_x and K'_y the unique maximal compact sub-groups of $\text{Stab}_{H^0(\mathbb{R})}(x)$ and $\text{Stab}_{(H')^0(\mathbb{R})}(y)$, respectively [BS, Rem. 2.2], then the associated Cartan involutions θ_{K_x} and $\theta_{K'_y}$ satisfy (iii) $\varphi \circ \theta_{K_x} = \theta_{K'_y} \circ \varphi : L_x^0 \rightarrow (L')^0_{\psi(x)}$ for all $x \in X$. In order to relate the morphisms $L_x \rightarrow L'_{\psi(x)}$ induced by φ to the maximal reductive quotients of H and H' , respectively, it also appears reasonable to demand that (iv) the image under φ of the unipotent radical of H is contained in the unipotent radical of H' .

We decided not to pursue these general considerations concerning functoriality. In the context of morphisms of Shimura data (where (i)–(iv) are automatically satisfied), our result reads as follows.

Theorem 3.15. *The manifold with corners \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is functorial in (P, \mathfrak{X}) .*

For the rest of the section, we fix a morphism $(\varphi, \psi) : (P, \mathfrak{X}) \rightarrow (P', \mathfrak{Y})$ of Shimura data [P1, Def. 2.3], both of which satisfy hypotheses (+) and ($U = 0$). In particular, we have a $P(\mathbb{R})$ -equivariant analytic map $\psi : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$. Given that \mathfrak{X} is dense in \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , and \mathfrak{Y}^{BS} is Hausdorff [BS, Thm. 7.8], Theorem 3.15 is equivalent to the following: the composition

$$\mathfrak{X} \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathfrak{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{Y}^{BS}$$

can be extended to a morphism of manifolds with corners $\psi^{BS} : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}^{BS}$.

Our strategy has three steps: (A) using φ , define a map $Q \mapsto Q'$ associating to every parabolic sub-group of P a parabolic sub-group of P' , (B) show that for every parabolic sub-group Q of P , the morphism φ induces $\varphi_Q : A_Q \rightarrow A_{Q'}$, admitting a (necessarily unique) continuous extension $\bar{A}_Q \rightarrow \bar{A}_{Q'}$, which in addition respects the stratifications of source and target, (C) show that for every Q , the analytic map ψ is compatible with the geodesic action of A_Q on the source \mathfrak{X} , and of $A_{Q'}$ on the target \mathfrak{Y} .

We denote by W' the unipotent radical of P' .

As for step (A), here is the most concise description of the map $Q \mapsto Q'$: choose a co-character λ of P , such that $\text{Lie } Q$ is the sum of $\text{Lie } W$ and of all non-negative weight spaces in $\text{Lie } P$ under $\text{Ad} \circ \lambda$. Then define Q' as the unique connected sub-group of P' , whose Lie algebra is the sum of $\text{Lie } W'$ and all non-negative weight spaces in $\text{Lie } P'$ under $\text{Ad} \circ \varphi \circ \lambda$. With an eye towards steps (B) and (C), we need to be more explicit.

First, compatibly with what is suggested by our notation, the parabolic sub-group of P' associated by our map to P is P' itself. Next, assume that Q_j is admissible. The construction of Q'_j is then spelled out in [P1, Sect. 4.16]: choose any point $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and let $Q'_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ be the unique connected sub-group of $P'_{\mathbb{R}}$, whose Lie algebra is the direct sum of all non-negative weight spaces in $\text{Lie } P'_{\mathbb{R}}$ under $\text{Ad} \circ \varphi \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$. It is proved [P1, Sect. 4.16] that $Q'_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ does not depend on the choice of x , and is defined over \mathbb{Q} , *i.e.*, it is the base change to \mathbb{R} of a closed connected sub-group Q'_j of P' . According to [loc. cit.], the sub-group Q'_j is admissible parabolic; actually, the morphism (φ, ψ) induces morphisms $(P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) \rightarrow (P'_j, \mathfrak{Y}_j)$ between the boundary components associated to the canonical normal sub-groups P_j of Q_j and P'_j of Q'_j , respectively. We therefore have $\varphi \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} = h_{\text{Re}_j(\psi(x))}$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. Finally, for an arbitrary parabolic sub-group Q of P , write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j , $j \in J$, are admissible, and define Q' as the intersection $\bigcap_{j \in J} Q'_j$. With this definition, it is obvious that for two parabolics Q and R of P , whose intersection is still parabolic, we have $(Q \cap R)' = Q' \cap R'$. In particular, if $R \subset Q$, then $R' \subset Q'$.

Proposition 3.16. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j are admissible parabolics.*

(a) *For all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, the Lie algebra $\text{Lie } Q'_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the direct sum of all weight spaces in $\text{Lie } P'_{\mathbb{R}}$, which are simultaneously non-negative under the commuting co-characters*

$$\text{Ad} \circ \varphi \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w = \text{Ad} \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(\psi(x))} \circ w ,$$

$j \in J$.

(b) *The sub-group Q' of P' is parabolic.*

(c) *The pre-image of Q' under φ satisfies*

$$\varphi^{-1}(Q') = Q \ker(\varphi) .$$

(d) *If φ is an epimorphism, then $Q' = \varphi(Q)$.*

Proof. The $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$, commute with each other according to Corollary 2.7 (b). Hence so do their compositions with φ .

The description of $\text{Lie } Q'_{\mathbb{R}} = \bigcap_{j \in J} \text{Lie } Q'_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ from part (a) then follows from that of the individual $\text{Lie } Q'_{j,\mathbb{R}}$, $j \in J$, given before.

Part (d) is implied by (a).

As for part (b), observe that the formation of Q' is compatible with composition of morphisms of Shimura data. By (d), statement (b) is true if φ is an epimorphism. In the general case, note that each of the Q'_j being parabolic, it contains the unipotent radical W' of P' . Hence so does Q' . Therefore, and by (d), statements (b) for (φ, ψ) and for the composition of (φ, ψ) with the canonical projection from (P', \mathfrak{Y}) to the quotient $(P', \mathfrak{Y})/W'$ are equivalent. We may therefore assume that (P', \mathfrak{Y}) is pure, *i.e.*, that P' is reductive. The morphism (φ, ψ) factors over the quotient $(P, \mathfrak{X})/\ker \varphi$

[P1, Prop. 2.9]. The Lie algebra of W being equal to the weight (-1) -part of $\text{Lie } P$ [P1, Def. 2.1 (v)], the kernel $\ker \varphi$ contains W . Thus, the quotient $(P, \mathfrak{X})/\ker \varphi$ is pure. Part (b) being known for the epimorphism $(P, \mathfrak{X}) \twoheadrightarrow (P, \mathfrak{X})/\ker \varphi$, we may therefore assume that (P, \mathfrak{X}) is pure, too, and that φ is a monomorphism.

It clearly suffices to show that $Q'_\mathbb{R}$ is parabolic. Choose a maximal \mathbb{R} -split sub-torus T of $P'_\mathbb{R}$ containing the images of the $\varphi \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$. On the \mathbb{R} -vector space $X_*(T) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$, choose a notion of positivity, for which the $\varphi \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$, are all positive (this is possible since the $h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$, $j \in J$, are positive with respect to a minimal parabolic sub-group of $P_\mathbb{R}$ contained in $Q_\mathbb{R}$). Then the direct sum of all weight spaces of $\text{Lie } P'_\mathbb{R}$, which are simultaneously non-negative under all positive co-characters of $X_*(T)$, is the Lie algebra of a minimal parabolic of $P'_\mathbb{R}$ contained in $Q'_\mathbb{R}$ [BT, Sect. 5.12].

Part (a) implies that

$$(\varphi^{-1}(Q'))^0 = Q(\ker(\varphi))^0 :$$

check on the level of Lie algebras, and use the fact that Q is connected. Since Q' is connected, we have

$$\varphi^{-1}(Q') = (\varphi^{-1}(Q'))^0 \ker(\varphi) .$$

This proves part (c).

q.e.d.

Corollary 3.17. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P , and $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then φ maps the Levi sub-group $L_{x,Q}$ of Q to the Levi sub-group $L_{\psi(x),Q'}$ of Q' .*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.16 (a) and Corollary 2.7.

q.e.d.

Now for step (B). Recall (Definition 2.8) that A_Q is the neutral connected component of the group of \mathbb{R} -points of the \mathbb{Q} -split torus

$$S_Q = Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})/Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(G) .$$

The morphism $(\varphi, \psi) : (P, \mathfrak{X}) \rightarrow (P', \mathfrak{Y})$ remains fixed.

Proposition 3.18. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P .*

(a) *The image under the unipotent radical $\text{Rad}^u(Q)$ of Q under φ is contained in the unipotent radical $\text{Rad}^u(Q')$ of Q' . In particular, φ induces a morphism, equally denoted by φ , from \bar{Q} to \bar{Q}' .*

(b) *The image of $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q})^0$ under $\varphi : \bar{Q} \rightarrow \bar{Q}'$ is contained in $Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q}')^0$. In particular, φ induces a morphism, still denoted by φ , from S_Q^0 to $S_{Q'}^0$.*

Proof. (a): according to [P1, Def. 2.1 (v)], the Lie algebra of W is equal to the weight (-1) -part of $\text{Lie } P$, and similarly for $\text{Lie } W'$. It follows that φ maps W to W' . Therefore, the statement is true for $Q = P$.

If $Q = Q_j$ is admissible, then (φ, ψ) induces morphisms $(P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) \rightarrow (P'_j, \mathfrak{Y}_j)$ between the boundary components associated to the canonical normal sub-groups P_j of Q_j and P'_j of Q'_j , respectively [P1, Sect. 4.16]. Again by [P1, Def. 2.1 (v)], we have $\varphi(\text{Rad}^u(P_j)) \subset \text{Rad}^u(P'_j)$. But

$$\text{Rad}^u(Q_j) = \text{Rad}^u(P_j)W$$

N [P1, proof of Lemma 4.8], and likewise for $\text{Rad}^u(Q'_j)$. Therefore, the statement is true if Q is admissible.

In the general case, write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j , $j \in J$, are admissible, hence $Q' = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q'_j$, use Proposition 3.16 (b) and the fact that if an intersection of parabolic sub-groups R_j is parabolic, then the unipotent radical of that intersection is the product of the unipotent radicals of the R_j . (b): we may assume that both $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ and $(P', \mathfrak{Y}) = (G', \mathfrak{Y})$ are pure. Choose a point $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. The morphism φ maps $\text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}(x)$ to $\text{Stab}_{G'(\mathbb{R})}(\psi(x))$. According to Corollary 1.19 (b),

$$Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G)(\mathbb{R})^0 \subset \text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}(x),$$

and $\text{Stab}_{G'(\mathbb{R})}(\psi(x))$ is a direct product of $Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G')(\mathbb{R})^0$ and a compact group. Therefore, φ maps $Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G)(\mathbb{R})^0$ to $Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G')(\mathbb{R})^0$, hence $Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G)^0$ to $Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G')^0$. Thus, the statement is true for $Q = P$.

In the general case, write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j , $j \in J$, are pairwise different maximal proper parabolics. We have $Q' = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q'_j$. According to Theorem 2.9 (b),

$$Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q}) = Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G) \times \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathbb{Q}})) .$$

But for all $j \in J$,

$$\varphi \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w = h_{\text{Re}_j(\psi(x))} \circ w .$$

The parabolic sub-group Q'_j of P' is admissible [P1, Sect. 4.16]; according to Theorem 2.9 (a), the image under $\pi_{Q'}$ of $h_{\text{Re}_j(\psi(x))} \circ w$ is therefore contained in $Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q}')$. It remains to recall that $\varphi(Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G)^0) \subset Z_{d, \mathbb{Q}}(G')^0$ by the above. **q.e.d.**

Note that for $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L_{x, Q} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\pi_Q} & \bar{Q}_{\mathbb{R}} \\ \varphi \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi \\ L_{\psi(x), Q'} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\pi_{Q'}} & \bar{Q}'_{\mathbb{R}} \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Corollary 3.19. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P .*

(a) *The morphism φ induces a morphism*

$$\varphi : A_Q \longrightarrow A_{Q'} .$$

(b) Let R be a parabolic sub-group of P contained in Q . Then the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_Q & \hookrightarrow & A_R \\ \varphi \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi \\ A_{Q'} & \hookrightarrow & A_{R'} \end{array}$$

is commutative.

In order to show that $\varphi : A_Q \rightarrow A_{Q'}$ extends to a map $\bar{A}_Q \rightarrow \bar{A}_{Q'}$ respecting the stratifications, we now give an explicit description in terms of the parameterizations of A_Q and $A_{Q'}$. Write $Q = \bigcap_{j \in J} Q_j$, where the Q_j , $j \in J$, are pairwise different maximal proper parabolics of P . Write $Q' = \bigcap_{i \in I} R_i$, where the R_i , $i \in I$, are pairwise different maximal proper parabolics of P' . Thus, for every $i \in I$, there exists $j \in J$ such that $Q'_j \subset R_i$. For $i \in I$ and $j \in J$, define $e_{i,j}$ to be equal to 1 if $Q'_j \subset R_i$, and to be equal to 0 if $Q'_j \not\subset R_i$. Thus, for all $i \in I$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in J} e_{i,j} \geq 1 .$$

Consider the parameterizations

$$par_Q = \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(\bullet)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \xrightarrow{\sim} A_Q$$

and

$$par_{Q'} = \prod_{i \in I} (\pi_{Q'} \circ h_{\text{Re}_i(\bullet)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^I \xrightarrow{\sim} A_{Q'} .$$

Proposition 3.20. *Define the morphism*

$$inc_{Q,Q'} : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \longrightarrow (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^I$$

by sending

$$(q_j)_{j \in J} \quad \text{to} \quad \left(\prod_{j \in J} q_j^{e_{i,j}} \right)_{i \in I} .$$

Then the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J & \xrightarrow[\cong]{par_Q} & A_Q \\ inc_{Q,Q'} \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi \\ (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^I & \xrightarrow[\cong]{par_{Q'}} & A_{Q'} \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and write $y := \psi(x)$. We have

$$\varphi \circ par_Q = \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_{Q'} \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(y)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \longrightarrow A_{Q'} ,$$

while

$$\text{par}_{Q'} = \prod_{i \in I} (\pi_{Q'} \circ h_{\text{Re}_i(y)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^I \xrightarrow{\sim} A_{Q'} .$$

But by Corollary 2.10 (b), for each $j \in J$, we have

$$\pi_{Q'} \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(y)} \circ w = \prod_{\{i \in I, e_{i,j}=1\}} (\pi_{Q'} \circ h_{\text{Re}_i(y)} \circ w) \circ \Delta ,$$

where Δ denotes the diagonal inclusion of \mathbb{R}_+^* into $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{\{i \in I, e_{i,j}=1\}}$. **q.e.d.**

Corollary 3.21. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P .*

(a) *The morphism $\varphi : A_Q \rightarrow A_{Q'}$ extends (uniquely) to a continuous map*

$$\varphi : \bar{A}_Q \longrightarrow \bar{A}_{Q'} .$$

This extension is A_Q -equivariant.

(b) *The extension $\varphi : \bar{A}_Q \rightarrow \bar{A}_{Q'}$ respects the stratifications of \bar{A}_Q and $\bar{A}_{Q'}$.*

(c) *We have $\varphi(\infty_Q) = \infty_{Q'}$.*

Proof. (a): for the first part of the statement, it suffices to observe that the formula

$$(q_j)_{j \in J} \longmapsto \left(\prod_{j \in J} q_j^{e_{i,j}} \right)_{i \in I}$$

for $\text{inc}_{Q,Q'}$ from Proposition 3.20 still makes sense if the coordinates q_j are allowed to take the value $+\infty$ (with the usual conventions for multiplication by $+\infty$). The second part follows from unicity of this extension (or from the explicit formula for $\text{inc}_{Q,Q'}$).

(b): since the extension is A_Q -equivariant, it maps orbits under A_Q to orbits under $A_{Q'}$. But these orbits constitute the respective stratifications.

(c): according to Proposition 3.20,

$$\varphi(\infty_Q) = \text{par}_{Q'} \left(\prod_{j \in J} (+\infty)^{e_{i,j}} \right)_{i \in I} = \text{par}_{Q'} \left((+\infty)^{\sum_{j \in J} e_{i,j}} \right)_{i \in I} .$$

As we observed already, the natural number $\sum_{j \in J} e_{i,j}$ is strictly positive for every $i \in I$. **q.e.d.**

Given the results already obtained, not much remains to be done for step (C). We keep the morphism $(\varphi, \psi) : (P, \mathfrak{X}) \rightarrow (P', \mathfrak{Y})$.

Proposition 3.22. *The analytic map $\psi : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ is compatible with the geodesic actions. More precisely, let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P , $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, $a \in A_Q$, and $\varphi(a)$ the image of a under $\varphi : A_Q \rightarrow A_{Q'}$. Then*

$$\psi(a \cdot x) = \varphi(a) \cdot \psi(x) .$$

Proof. The element a is of the form $\pi_Q(a_x)$, for some $a_x \in Q(\mathbb{R})$ belonging to the neutral connected component of the center of $L_{x,Q}$. According to the definition of the geodesic action [BS, Sect. 3.2],

$$a \cdot x = a_x x .$$

By Corollary 3.17 and Proposition 3.18 (b), the element $\varphi(a_x) \in Q'(\mathbb{R})$ belongs to the center of $L_{\psi(x),Q'}$ and lifts $\varphi(a)$. Therefore,

$$\varphi(a) \cdot \psi(x) = \varphi(a_x)\psi(x) .$$

The claim thus follows from the relation

$$\psi(a_x x) = \varphi(a_x)\psi(x) ,$$

which is satisfied as $(\varphi, \psi) : (P, \mathfrak{X}) \rightarrow (P', \mathfrak{Y})$ is a morphism of Shimura data. **q.e.d.**

Theorem 3.15 is implied by part (a) of the following result.

Proposition 3.23. *Let $(\varphi, \psi) : (P, \mathfrak{X}) \rightarrow (P', \mathfrak{Y})$ be a morphism of Shimura data, both of which satisfy hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$.*

(a) *The analytic map $\psi : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ extends uniquely to a continuous map $\psi^{BS} : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}^{BS}$. This map is a morphism of manifolds with corners.*

(b) *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Then ψ^{BS} maps the corner $\mathfrak{X}(Q)$ to the corner $\mathfrak{Y}(Q')$, and the face $e(Q)$ of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} to the face $e(Q')$ of \mathfrak{Y}^{BS} .*

(c) *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Then the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathfrak{X} & \longrightarrow & A_Q \backslash \mathfrak{X} = e(Q) & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \\ \psi \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi|_{e(Q)} & & \downarrow \psi^{BS} \\ \mathfrak{Y} & \longrightarrow & A_{Q'} \backslash \mathfrak{Y} = e(Q') & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{Y}^{BS} \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Proof. (a): as mentioned already, unicity of ψ^{BS} follows from the fact that \mathfrak{X} is dense in \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , and \mathfrak{Y}^{BS} is Hausdorff [BS, Thm. 7.8]. The same principle shows that continuous extensions of ψ to open sub-sets of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} containing \mathfrak{X} necessarily coincide on the intersection, and hence glue to give an extension of the union. It is therefore sufficient to show that for every parabolic Q of P , the composition

$$\mathfrak{X} \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathfrak{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{Y}^{BS}$$

can be continuously extended to the corner $\mathfrak{X}(Q)$, and that this extension is a morphism of manifolds with corners. Consider the continuous maps

$$\varphi : \bar{A}_Q \longrightarrow \bar{A}_{Q'} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Y} ;$$

according to Corollary 3.21 (a) and Proposition 3.22, both are A_Q -equivariant. Therefore, they induce a continuous map

$$\mathfrak{X}(Q) = \bar{A}_Q \cdot A_Q \times \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \bar{A}_{Q'} \cdot A_{Q'} \times \mathfrak{Y} = \mathfrak{Y}(Q') ,$$

which is the continuous extension of ψ we are looking for. It is a morphism of manifolds with corners thanks to Corollary 3.21 (b).

(b): the inclusion $\psi^{BS}(\mathfrak{X}(Q)) \subset \mathfrak{Y}(Q')$ follows from our construction. As for $\psi^{BS}(e(Q)) \subset e(Q')$, use Corollary 3.21 (c), and the identification of $e(Q)$ and $e(Q')$ with the sub-spaces of equivalence classes $[(\infty_Q, x)]$ and $[(\infty_{Q'}, y)]$, respectively.

(c): the identification

$$A_Q \setminus \mathfrak{X} = e(Q) \longleftrightarrow \{[(\infty_Q, x)], x \in \mathfrak{X}\}$$

maps $A_Q x$ to $[(\infty_Q, x)]$, and likewise for $e(Q')$. But by definition the extension ψ^{BS} maps $[(\infty_Q, x)]$ to $[(\infty_{Q'}, \psi(x))]$. **q.e.d.**

Remark 3.24. Unicity of the extension $\psi^{BS} : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}^{BS}$ implies that it is equivariant for all continuous group actions, for which $\psi : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ is equivariant. This is the case in particular for the group $P(\mathbb{Q})W(\mathbb{R})$, and its action (1) on \mathfrak{X} and (via $\varphi : P(\mathbb{Q})W(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow P'(\mathbb{Q})W'(\mathbb{R})$) on \mathfrak{Y} .

Corollary 3.25. *Let $(\varphi, \psi) : (P, \mathfrak{X}) \rightarrow (P', \mathfrak{Y})$ be a morphism of Shimura data, both of which satisfy hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$. Let $K \subset P(\mathbb{A}_f)$ and $K' \subset P'(\mathbb{A}_f)$ be open compact sub-groups, such that $\varphi(K) \subset K'$. Then the morphism*

$$[(\varphi, \psi)]_{K, K'} : M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow M^{K'}(P', \mathfrak{Y})(\mathbb{C})$$

of complex analytic spaces [P1, Sect. 3.4 (b)] extends uniquely to a continuous map

$$M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} \longrightarrow M^{K'}(P', \mathfrak{Y})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$$

between the Borel–Serre compactifications. It is a morphism of manifolds with corners if both K and K' are neat.

Proof. Uniqueness of the continuous extension results from Theorem 3.14. It is given by the map induced by

$$\psi^{BS} \times \varphi(\mathbb{A}_f) : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Y}^{BS} \times P'(\mathbb{A}_f)$$

on the quotients $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$ and $M^{K'}(P', \mathfrak{Y})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$, respectively.

If both K and K' are neat, then the quotient maps

$$\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K \longrightarrow M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{Y}^{BS} \times P'(\mathbb{A}_f)/K' \longrightarrow M^{K'}(P', \mathfrak{Y})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$$

are local homeomorphisms, and $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$ and $M^{K'}(P', \mathfrak{Y})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$ inherit the structure of manifold with corners [BS, Sect. 9.5]. The statement therefore follows from Proposition 3.23 (a). **q.e.d.**

Remark 3.26. Except for Definition 3.13, Theorem 3.14 and Corollary 3.25, all constructions and results of this section admit variants for $\text{Re}(\mathfrak{X})$ instead of \mathfrak{X} when hypothesis $(U = 0)$ is not satisfied. The manifold with corners is $\text{Re}(\mathfrak{X})^{BS}$, and for every open compact sub-group K of $P(\mathbb{A}_f)$, one can form the quotient space

$$M^K(P, \text{Re}(\mathfrak{X}))(\mathbb{C})^{BS} := P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\text{Re}(\mathfrak{X})^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K) .$$

It is compact, and contains the “real locus”

$$M^K(P, \text{Re}(\mathfrak{X}))(\mathbb{C}) := P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\text{Re}(\mathfrak{X}) \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K)$$

of the space of complex points of the Shimura variety $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})$ as an open dense sub-set. But it is not a compactification of $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$.

4 The continuous map p from the Borel–Serre to the Baily–Borel compactification

The present section aims at an alternative proof of a result of Zucker’s [Z2]: the space \mathfrak{X}^* dominating the *Baily–Borel compactification* of our Shimura varieties is in a canonical way a quotient of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} . Actually, [Z2] contains the analogous statement for all Satake compactifications instead of only \mathfrak{X}^* . Our construction of the quotient map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ is explicit in terms of the Shimura data. Given the combinatorics of the strata of the respective boundaries of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} and of \mathfrak{X}^* , it is necessary first to define a rule $Q \mapsto \text{adm}(Q)$ associating to each parabolic sub-group of P an admissible one (Theorem 4.5). Using this rule, we are then in a position to give the definition of p (Construction 4.13). Our analysis of the geodesic action with respect to the data involved in $Q \mapsto \text{adm}(Q)$ then allows (Theorem 4.14) to prove that p is continuous and is, indeed, the unique continuous extension of $\text{id}_{\mathfrak{X}}$. In particular, it coincides with the quotient map from [Z2].

We fix mixed Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) . Until Corollary 4.11, no further hypotheses on (P, \mathfrak{X}) will be required. Recall that to any admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of P is associated a canonical normal sub-group $P_j \subset Q_j$ [P1, 4.7], underlying finitely many boundary components of (P, \mathfrak{X}) .

Definition 4.1. Let Q_1 and Q_2 be two admissible parabolic sub-groups of P , with associated canonical normal sub-groups $P_1 \subset Q_1$ and $P_2 \subset Q_2$. We define the relation

$$Q_2 \preceq Q_1$$

to hold if boundary components (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) and (P_2, \mathfrak{X}_2) of (P, \mathfrak{X}) can be chosen such that (P_2, \mathfrak{X}_2) is a boundary component of (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) .

As for transitivity of the notion of boundary component, we refer to [P1, Sect. 4.17]. It follows from [P1, Lemma 4.19 (b)] that $Q_2 \preceq Q_1$ only if $Q_1 \cap Q_2$ remains parabolic. Note also that if $Q_2 \preceq Q_1$, then *any* boundary component (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) , admits a boundary component of the form (P_2, \mathfrak{X}_2) , and *any* boundary component (P_2, \mathfrak{X}_2) is a boundary component of some (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) (use the fact that both

$$\mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_2$$

are equivariant under $(Q_1 \cap Q_2)(\mathbb{R})$ [P1, 4.11]).

Proposition 4.2. *Let Q_1 and Q_2 be two admissible parabolic sub-groups of P , with associated canonical normal sub-groups $P_1 \subset Q_1$ and $P_2 \subset Q_2$. Assume that $Q_2 \preceq Q_1$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (i) $Q_1 = Q_2$,
- (ii) $P_1 = P_2$,
- (iii) the weight (-2) -part U_2 of P_2 is contained in the unipotent radical W_1 of P_1 .

Proof. Clearly (i) implies (ii), and (ii) implies (iii).

(P_2, \mathfrak{X}_2) being a boundary component of (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) , for a fixed choice of $x \in \mathfrak{X}_1$, there is a morphism

$$\omega = \omega_x : H_{0,\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow P_{1,\mathbb{C}}$$

associated to x , such that

$$h_x = \omega \circ h_0 \quad \text{and} \quad h_{x_2} = \omega \circ h_\infty$$

[P1, Prop. 4.6 (b)]. Here, x_2 is the image of x under the map

$$\mathfrak{X}_1 \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_2,$$

and h_0 and h_∞ are the morphisms $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow H_{0,\mathbb{C}}$ from [P1, Sect. 4.3] (cmp. the proof of Proposition 2.5); for our purposes, it will be sufficient to recall that $h_0 \circ w$ and $h_\infty \circ w$ are of the shape

$$h_0 \circ w : z \longmapsto \left((z, z), \begin{pmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

and

$$h_\infty \circ w : z \longmapsto \left((z, z), \begin{pmatrix} z^2 & i(1-z^2) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Setting

$$u_\infty := \left((1, 1), \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

we see that we have the relations

$$\text{Int}(h_0 \circ w(z))(u_\infty) = u_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Int}(h_\infty \circ w(z))(u_\infty) = u_\infty^{z^2}$$

for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^*$. Thus, the element

$$u := \omega(u_\infty)$$

of $P_1(\mathbb{C})$ is of weight 0 under $h_x \circ w$ and of weight -2 under $h_{x_2} \circ w$. The latter property means that u belongs to $U_2(\mathbb{C})$ [P1, Def. 2.1 (v)].

Assuming hypothesis (iii), we have that $u \in W_1(\mathbb{C})$. But then [P1, Def. 2.1 (v)], it must be of weight -1 under $h_x \circ w$. Therefore, u belongs to the kernel of ω . This kernel being normal in $H_{0,\mathbb{C}}$, it contains $H_{0,\mathbb{C}}^{der}$. In other words, the morphism ω factors over the quotient $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{C}}$ of $H_{0,\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \text{GL}_{2,\mathbb{C}}$.

Therefore, the co-characters $h_x \circ w$ and $h_{x_2} \circ w$ are in fact equal. By [P1, Prop. 4.6 (b) (iii)], the Lie algebra $\text{Lie } Q_1$ is the sum of all non-negative weight spaces in $\text{Lie } P$ under $\text{Ad} \circ h_x \circ w$, while $\text{Lie } Q_2$ is the sum of all non-negative weight spaces in $\text{Lie } P$ under $\text{Ad} \circ h_{x_2} \circ w$. **q.e.d.**

The implication “(ii) \Rightarrow (i)” from Proposition 4.2 shows in particular that the relations $Q_1 \preceq Q_2$ and $Q_2 \preceq Q_1$ imply equality $Q_1 = Q_2$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let Q_1 and Q_2 be two admissible parabolic sub-groups of P , with associated canonical normal sub-groups $P_1 \subset Q_1$ and $P_2 \subset Q_2$. Assume that $Q_1 \cap Q_2$ remains parabolic, and that P_1 and P_2 normalize each other. Then $Q_1 = Q_2$.*

Proof. Consider the quotient $(G^{ad}, \mathfrak{H}^{ad}) := ((P, \mathfrak{X})/W)/Z(G)$ of (P, \mathfrak{X}) . Any parabolic sub-group Q of P is the pre-image of a unique parabolic sub-group of G^{ad} , namely of $Q/WZ(G)$. The latter is admissible if and only if Q is. We may therefore show the claim on the level of $(G^{ad}, \mathfrak{H}^{ad})$, *i.e.*, we may assume that P is semi-simple, with trivial center.

Next, observe that the definition of the canonical normal sub-groups P_j only depends on the Shimura data $(P, h(\mathfrak{X}))$ [P1, Sect.4.7]. Thus, we may assume that

$$h : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{S}, P_{\mathbb{R}}), \quad x \longmapsto h_x$$

is injective. As a consequence, under the decomposition $P = \prod_n P_n$ of P into its simple factors, the space \mathfrak{X} decomposes as well, in other words, we have $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = \prod_n (P_n, \mathfrak{X}_n)$ in the sense of [P1, Def. 2.5]. The relation \preceq being compatible with products, we may assume that P is simple.

Fix a minimal parabolic sub-group Q of P contained in $Q_1 \cap Q_2$. Since P is simple, the restriction of the relation \preceq to the (finitely many) admissible parabolic sub-groups containing Q is a total order [P1, Rem. (ii) on p. 91]. In particular, we have $Q_1 \preceq Q_2$ or $Q_2 \preceq Q_1$.

Assume that $Q_2 \preceq Q_1$, which implies $P_2 \subset P_1$. By assumption, P_1 normalizes P_2 . Therefore, it normalizes the weight (-2) -part U_2 of P_2 . It

being unipotent, this implies that U_2 is contained in the unipotent radical W_1 of P_1 . By Proposition 4.2, we have $Q_1 = Q_2$.

One argues symmetrically when $Q_1 \preceq Q_2$.

q.e.d.

Remark 4.4. *Via [P1, Rem. (ii) on p. 91], the proof of Proposition 4.3 makes use of the explicit description of roots systems possibly occurring in the simple factors of G^{ad} . We tried in vain to find a proof not using this description. Observe that the same type of information is used in [Z2], in order to establish the relation between certain Satake compactifications and the Baily–Borel compactification [Z2, Sect. (3.11)].*

Here is the first main result of this section.

Theorem 4.5. *Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P .*

(a) *There is a unique admissible parabolic sub-group Q_∞ of P , with associated canonical normal sub-group $P_\infty \subset Q_\infty$, such that*

$$P_\infty \subset Q \subset Q_\infty .$$

(b) *The admissible parabolic Q_∞ from (a) is the unique minimal element, with respect to the relation \preceq , in the (finite) set of admissible parabolics containing Q .*

Proof. Let us first establish unicity in (a). If

$$P_j \subset Q \subset Q_j$$

for $j = 1, 2$, then $Q_1 \cap Q_2$ contains Q , and is therefore parabolic. P_1 is contained in Q_2 , and hence normalizes P_2 . Similarly, P_2 normalizes P_1 . According to Proposition 4.3, we have indeed $Q_1 = Q_2$.

Next, assume that existence in (a) has been proved for all proper boundary components of (P, \mathfrak{X}) . Let Q_1 be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P , with associated canonical normal sub-group $P_1 \subset Q_1$, and containing Q . Then $Q \cap P_1$ is a parabolic sub-group of P_1 (as P_1 is normal in Q_1). If $Q_1 \neq P$, meaning that P_1 underlies proper boundary components of (P, \mathfrak{X}) , then by our induction hypothesis, there exists an admissible parabolic sub-group Q_{12} of P_1 , with associated canonical normal sub-group $P_2 \subset Q_{12}$, such that

$$P_2 \subset Q \cap P_1 \subset Q_{12} .$$

According to [P1, Lemma 4.19], there is a unique admissible parabolic sub-group Q_2 of P , whose associated canonical normal sub-group equals P_2 , and such that

$$Q_{12} = Q_2 \cap P_1 .$$

Now Q , being contained in Q_1 , normalizes P_1 , hence $Q \cap P_1$, hence (by unicity in (a)) P_2 , hence (by unicity in [P1, Lemma 4.19]) Q_2 . The latter being parabolic, we have $Q \subset Q_2$. Thus,

$$P_2 \subset Q \cap P_1 \subset Q \subset Q_2 .$$

This construction establishes existence in (a) as long as Q_1 can be chosen to be proper. If the only admissible parabolic is equal to P , then $Q = P$, and $\text{adm}(P) = P$. Thus, existence in (a) is proved in any case.

The above construction also shows (b), again as long as the admissible parabolic P is excluded. But P is the unique maximal element, with respect to \preceq , in the set of all admissible parabolics. **q.e.d.**

Definition 4.6. Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Define $\text{adm}(Q)$ as the unique admissible parabolic from Theorem 4.5 (a), and $\text{adm}_{sh}(Q)$ as the normal sub-group canonically associated to $\text{adm}(Q)$.

Remark 4.7. The map $Q \mapsto \text{adm}(Q)$ can be described using Dynkin diagrams. We refer to [G, Sect. 5.7, Figure 7] in the case when G^{ad} is simple (noting that P from [loc. cit.] is our Q , and Q in [loc. cit.] is our $\text{adm}(Q)$). The principle “ L_P and L_Q have the same Hermitian factor” from [loc. cit.] translates into the double inclusion

$$\text{adm}_{sh}(Q) \subset Q \subset \text{adm}(Q) .$$

Proposition 4.8. Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P , with associated canonical normal sub-group $P_j \subset Q_j$. Then the canonical epimorphism $pr_j : Q_j \twoheadrightarrow Q_j/P_j$ induces an inclusion-preserving bijection $R \mapsto pr_j^{-1}(R)$ between the set of parabolics of Q_j/P_j and the set $\text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$ of parabolics Q of P satisfying $\text{adm}(Q) = Q_j$.

Proof. This is obvious from the definition. **q.e.d.**

It will be important to have an alternative description of the fibres of adm at our disposal, using sub-groups rather than quotients of the admissible parabolics.

Definition 4.9. Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P , with associated canonical normal sub-group $P_j \subset Q_j$. Define a closed connected normal sub-group C_j of Q_j as

$$C_j := \{q \in Q_j , \pi_{Q_j}(q) \in \text{Cent}_{\bar{Q}_j}(\pi_{Q_j}(P_j))\}^0 .$$

Here as before, the morphism $\pi_Q : Q \twoheadrightarrow \bar{Q}$ is the canonical epimorphism of a parabolic Q to its maximal reductive quotient.

Corollary 4.10. Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P , with associated canonical normal sub-group $P_j \subset Q_j$. Then the monomorphism $C_j \hookrightarrow Q_j$ induces an inclusion-preserving bijection $R \mapsto C_j \cap R$ between the set $\text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$ and the set of parabolics of C_j . Its inverse is given by $S \mapsto SP_j$.

Proof. Write $\bar{P}_j := \pi_{Q_j}(P_j)$, and choose a connected almost direct complement H of \bar{P}_j in \bar{Q}_j (which is possible since both are reductive, and \bar{P}_j is normal in \bar{Q}_j). Then $\text{Cent}_{\bar{Q}_j}(\bar{P}_j)^0 = Z(\bar{P}_j)^0 H$. The composition

$$H \hookrightarrow \bar{Q}_j \twoheadrightarrow \bar{Q}_j/\bar{P}_j$$

is surjective, with finite kernel. Thus, the composition

$$C_j \hookrightarrow Q_j \twoheadrightarrow Q_j/P_j \twoheadrightarrow \bar{Q}_j/\bar{P}_j$$

is surjective, with solvable kernel. It therefore induces a bijection of the sets of parabolics. The same is true for the canonical epimorphism from Q_j/P_j to \bar{Q}_j/\bar{P}_j (as its kernel is unipotent). Altogether, the composition

$$C_j \hookrightarrow Q_j \twoheadrightarrow Q_j/P_j$$

induces a bijection of the sets of parabolics of Q_j/P_j and of C_j . Now apply Proposition 4.8. **q.e.d.**

Theorem 4.5 allows to analyze the geodesic action more closely.

Corollary 4.11. *Assume hypotheses (+) and ($U = 0$). Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . For $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, denote by $\text{Re}_\infty(x)$ the real part of x with respect to $\text{adm}(Q)$ (Definition 2.4). Then*

$$\text{Re}_\infty(a \cdot x) = \text{Re}_\infty(x) , \forall x \in \mathfrak{X} , a \in A_Q .$$

Proof. By definition,

$$a \cdot x = a_x x ,$$

for some element a_x of $Q(\mathbb{R}) \subset \text{adm}(Q)(\mathbb{R})$. The group $\text{adm}(Q) =: Q_\infty$ normalizes the weight (-2) -part U_∞ of $P_\infty = \text{adm}_{Sh}(Q)$; therefore,

$$\text{Re}_\infty(a \cdot x) = \text{Re}_\infty(a_x x) = a_x \text{Re}_\infty(x) .$$

Our claim is thus equivalent to a_x belonging to the stabilizer of the point $\text{Re}_\infty(x) \in \mathfrak{X}_\infty$, or (as A_Q is connected; cpm. [P1, Cor. 2.12]), to a_x commuting with $h_{\text{Re}_\infty(x)}$.

In order to prove this commutation, recall that a_x belongs more precisely to

$$Z(L_{x,Q}) \subset L_{x,Q} \subset Q .$$

Here, $L_{x,Q}$ is the Levi sub-group

$$L_{x,Q} = \bigcap_j \text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) ,$$

where the intersection is over all admissible parabolics Q_j containing Q , including P (Corollary 2.7 (a)). According to Theorem 4.5 (b), $Q_\infty \preceq Q_j$ for all j . By Proposition 2.5 (a) (applied to the admissible parabolic $Q_\infty \cap P_j$ of P_j ; cpm. [P1, Sect. 4.17]), the image of $h_{\text{Re}_\infty(x)}$ centralizes all co-characters

$h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w$. It is thus contained in $L_{x,Q}$. Thus, it commutes with any element in $Z(L_{x,Q})$. **q.e.d.**

Corollary 4.11 says that “the geodesic action of A_Q is visible only in the imaginary part, formed with respect to $\text{adm}(Q)$ ”. It remains to obtain sufficient control on the effect of the action on the imaginary part. For an admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of P , consider the complex analytic map

$$\mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j$$

of \mathfrak{X} to the rational boundary components associated to Q_j . For any connected component \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} , denote by $C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_j)$ the image of the map Im_j from Definition 2.4. According to [P1, Prop. 4.15 (b)], using additive notation, $C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_j)$ is an open convex cone in the real vector space $U_j(\mathbb{R})(-1)$ of purely imaginary elements of $U_j(\mathbb{C})$. Via the parameterization

$$\text{par}_Q = \prod_{j \in J} (\pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(\bullet)} \circ w) : (\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J \xrightarrow{\sim} A_Q$$

from Theorem 2.9 (b), we identify A_Q and $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J$.

Corollary 4.12. *Assume hypotheses (+) and ($U = 0$). Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . For $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, denote by $\text{Im}_\infty(x)$ the imaginary part of x with respect to $\text{adm}(Q)$. Then for all $a \in [1, +\infty)^J \subset A_Q$, there is an element $u(a)$ in the closure $\overline{C(\mathfrak{X}^0, \text{adm}_{\text{Sh}}(Q))}$ of $C(\mathfrak{X}^0, \text{adm}_{\text{Sh}}(Q))$, such that*

$$\text{Im}_\infty(a \cdot x) = \text{Im}_\infty(x) + u(a), \quad \forall x \in \mathfrak{X}^0.$$

Proof. Write $Q_\infty := \text{adm}(Q)$, hence $P_\infty = \text{adm}_{\text{Sh}}(Q)$. The geodesic action respects \mathfrak{X}^0 . Therefore, if the claim is true for two elements a and b of the monoid $[1, +\infty)^J$, it is true for their product (as $\overline{C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_\infty)}$ is closed under sums). We may therefore suppose that a is of the form

$$a = \pi_Q \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(\bullet)} \circ w(q),$$

for one of the maximal proper parabolics Q_j containing Q , and $q \geq 1$. Then

$$a \cdot x = a_x x,$$

for $a_x := h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(q)$ (Theorem 2.9 (c)). The group U_j equals the weight (-2) -part of P_j . Therefore,

$$a_x \text{Im}_j(x) = q^2 \text{Im}_j(x).$$

According to Theorem 4.5 (b), $Q_\infty \preceq Q_j$. This means that the boundary component (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) containing the image x_j of x under $\mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j$ admits a boundary component of the shape $(P_\infty, \mathfrak{X}_\infty)$, containing the image x_∞ of x_j under $\mathfrak{X}_j \rightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_\infty$. But x_∞ is also the image of x under $\mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_\infty$, given the transitivity of formation of boundary components [P1, Sect. 4.17]. We thus have

$$\text{Im}_\infty(x) = \text{Im}_\infty(x_j) = \text{Im}_\infty(\text{Im}_j(x) \text{Re}_j(x)) = \text{Im}_\infty(\text{Re}_j(x)) + \text{Im}_j(x)$$

(note that as $(P_\infty, \mathfrak{X}_\infty)$ is a boundary component of (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) , the group U_j is contained in U_∞ [P1, Lemma 4.4 (a)]). According to Proposition 2.5 (d), applied to the admissible parabolic $Q_\infty \cap P_j$ of P_j and $\text{Re}_j(x) \in \mathfrak{X}_j$, the element $a_x = h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(q)$ fixes $\text{Im}_\infty(\text{Re}_j(x))$.

Altogether,

$$\text{Im}_\infty(a \cdot x) = \text{Im}_\infty(a_x x) = a_x \text{Im}_\infty(x) = a_x (\text{Im}_\infty(\text{Re}_j(x)) + \text{Im}_j(x))$$

equals

$$\text{Im}_\infty(\text{Re}_j(x)) + q^2 \text{Im}_j(x) = \text{Im}_\infty(x) + (q^2 - 1) \text{Im}_j(x) ,$$

where $q^2 - 1 \geq 0$ by assumption. But $\text{Im}_j(x) \in C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_j)$, which according to [P1, Prop. 4.21 (b)] is contained in $C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_\infty)$. **q.e.d.**

For the rest of the section, the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are assumed to be pure (hence $(U = 0)$ is satisfied). We also assume hypothesis (+). Let

$$\mathfrak{X}^* := \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j ,$$

where the disjoint union is over all rational boundary components (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) of (G, \mathfrak{X}) ($W_j :=$ the unipotent radical of P_j). The set \mathfrak{X}^* is equipped with the *Satake topology* [AMRT, Chap. III, Sect. 6.1] (see [P1, Sect. 6.2] for an equivalent description), with respect to which the inclusion $\mathfrak{X} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ becomes an open immersion with dense image. The space \mathfrak{X}^* is Hausdorff [BB, Thm. 4.9 (iii), (iv)]. There is an action of $G(\mathbb{Q})$ by continuous automorphisms on \mathfrak{X}^* [P1, Sect. 6.2, Sect. 4.16], which is uniquely characterized by the requirement of extending the action on \mathfrak{X} underlying the Shimura data (G, \mathfrak{X}) .

Construction 4.13. We propose ourselves to extend the identity on \mathfrak{X} to a map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$. As $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} = \coprod_Q e(Q)$ (Q running over all parabolic subgroups of G), we need to define the restriction p_Q of p to the stratum $e(Q)$, for each parabolic sub-group Q of G . In order to do so, write $Q_\infty := \text{adm}(Q)$, hence $P_\infty = \text{adm}_{Sh}(Q)$. The unipotent radical of P_∞ is denoted by W_∞ . Consider the map

$$\mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_\infty$$

to the disjoint union of the finitely many spaces \mathfrak{X}_∞ underlying rational boundary components associated to P_∞ , and its composition

$$\tilde{\pi}_\infty : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_\infty / W_\infty \subset \mathfrak{X}^*$$

with the projections from \mathfrak{X}_∞ to $\mathfrak{X}_\infty / W_\infty$. Define

$$p_Q : e(Q) = A_Q \backslash \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^* , \quad A_Q x \longmapsto \tilde{\pi}_\infty(x) .$$

According to Corollary 4.11, p_Q is well-defined. It is continuous, as the Satake topology induces the quotient topology on each $\mathfrak{X}_\infty / W_\infty$. By construction,

it is the unique map that makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{X} & \longrightarrow & e(Q) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_Q \\ \mathfrak{X} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_\infty} & \coprod \mathfrak{X}_\infty/W_\infty \end{array}$$

commute. Every element of $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_\infty/W_\infty$ is of the form $\tilde{\pi}_\infty(x)$, for some $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ [P1, Prop. 4.15 (b)]; therefore, the image of the map p_Q equals the whole of $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_\infty/W_\infty$. Note that for $Q = G$, the map $\tilde{\pi}_\infty$ is the identity [P1, Sect. 2.13].

By definition, the map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ equals p_Q on $e(Q)$, for each parabolic sub-group Q of G . Given the definition of the set \mathfrak{X}^* , p is surjective.

Here is the second main result of this section.

Theorem 4.14. *The map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ is the unique continuous extension of the identity on \mathfrak{X} .*

Note that as \mathfrak{X} is dense in \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , and \mathfrak{X}^* is Hausdorff [BB, Thm. 4.9 (iii), (iv)], there is at most one continuous extension of $\text{id}_\mathfrak{X}$. This establishes the uniqueness assertion. Before giving the proof of continuity of p , let us indicate how to deduce existence of the continuous extension from the main results from [Z2] (which are formulated only for spaces of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under semi-simple groups). It suffices to show that for every connected component \mathfrak{X}^0 of \mathfrak{X} , the identity on \mathfrak{X}^0 extends to a continuous map $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$. According to Theorem 1.21, \mathfrak{X}^0 is a space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under G . It follows [BS, Ex. 2.5 (2)] that a certain quotient $A \backslash \mathfrak{X}$ is of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under G^{der} . Here, A is a complement of $\text{Stab}_{Z(G)(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x)$ in $Z(G)(\mathbb{R})$, for one, hence any point $x \in \mathfrak{X}^0$. But according to Corollary 1.18, we have

$$\text{Stab}_{Z(G)(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = Z(G)(\mathbb{R}),$$

hence A is trivial, and \mathfrak{X}^0 itself is of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under G^{der} . Note that $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$, defined with respect to the $S - \mathbb{Q}$ -structure under G^{der} , coincides with $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$, defined with respect to the $S - \mathbb{Q}$ -structure under G : indeed, the map $Q \mapsto Q \cap G^{der}$ induces a bijection of sets of parabolic sub-groups, and the formation of the sub-groups S_Q of G^{ad} [BS, Sect. 4.2] is invariant under this bijection.

By [Z2, Sect. (3.7) (2)], the identity $\text{id}_\mathfrak{X}$ first extends to give a continuous map, denoted p^* in [loc. cit.], from $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$ to a space denoted ${}_{\mathbb{Q}}\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^*$; actually, the latter is *constructed* as a quotient of $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^0$. Implicit in this construction is the choice of an irreducible representation τ of G^{der} . According to [Z2, Theorem (3.10)], there is then a continuous bijection from ${}_{\mathbb{Q}}\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}^*$ to the Satake compactification, denoted ${}_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathfrak{X}^*$. Finally [Z2, Sect. (3.11)], for certain choices of τ , the spaces ${}_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathfrak{X}^*$ and $(\mathfrak{X}^0)^* \subset \mathfrak{X}^*$ are homeomorphic.

Proof of Theorem 4.14. We need to show that for every point \bar{x} of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , the pre-image under p of every member of a fundamental system of neighbourhoods of $p(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{X}^*$ contains a neighbourhood of \bar{x} .

Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of G , and

$$\bar{x} = A_Q x \in e(Q) \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS}.$$

Write $Q_\infty := \text{adm}(Q)$, hence $P_\infty = \text{adm}_{Sh}(Q)$. The unipotent radical is denoted by W_∞ , and U_∞ is its weight (-2) -part. By definition, we have $p(\bar{x}) = \tilde{\pi}_\infty(x)$, where

$$\tilde{\pi}_\infty : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_\infty / W_\infty \subset \mathfrak{X}^*.$$

Denote by \mathfrak{X}^0 the connected component of \mathfrak{X} containing x , and by \mathfrak{X}_∞ the space for which $\tilde{\pi}_\infty(x) \in \mathfrak{X}_\infty / W_\infty$. Let us describe a fundamental system of neighbourhoods of $\tilde{\pi}_\infty(x)$, following [P1, Sect. 6.2]: fix a *convex core* $D \subset C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_\infty)$. The precise definition of this notion will not be important; however, our choice of D needs to be done in a way stable under addition by elements of $\overline{C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_\infty)}$:

$$D + \overline{C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_\infty)} \subset D$$

[P1, Sect. 6.1]. The fundamental system has two parameters: first, the neighbourhoods \mathfrak{Y} of $\tilde{\pi}_\infty(x)$ in $\mathfrak{X}_\infty / W_\infty$; second, strictly positive real numbers μ . To such a pair (\mathfrak{Y}, μ) , one associates the open sub-set

$$\mathfrak{U}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)} := \coprod \tilde{\pi}_j(\tilde{\pi}_\infty^{-1}(\mathfrak{Y}) \cap \text{Im}_\infty^{-1}(\mu D)) \subset \mathfrak{X}^*,$$

where the disjoint union is over all rational boundary components (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) between (G, \mathfrak{X}) and $(P_\infty, \mathfrak{X}_\infty)$, and

$$\tilde{\pi}_j : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j \subset \mathfrak{X}^*$$

is defined in the same way as $\tilde{\pi}_\infty$. Set

$$\mathfrak{V}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)} := \mathfrak{U}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)} \cap \mathfrak{X} = \tilde{\pi}_\infty^{-1}(\mathfrak{Y}) \cap \text{Im}_\infty^{-1}(\mu D).$$

The point $\bar{x} = A_Q x$ belongs to $e(Q)$, hence to the open sub-set $\mathfrak{X}(Q) = \bar{A}_Q^{A_Q} \times \mathfrak{X}$ of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} . We identify A_Q and $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^J$, hence \bar{A}_Q and $(0, +\infty]^J$ (Theorem 2.9 (b)). Given the definition of the quotient topology, the image $\mathfrak{W}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)}$ of the product $(1, +\infty]^J \times \mathfrak{V}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)}$ under the projection

$$\bar{A}_Q \times \mathfrak{X} \twoheadrightarrow \bar{A}_Q^{A_Q} \times \mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}(Q)$$

is open in $\mathfrak{X}(Q)$, hence in \mathfrak{X}^{BS} . It contains $[(\infty_Q, x)] = A_Q x$, *i.e.*, it is a neighbourhood of \bar{x} . Our proof will be complete once we have established that $p(\mathfrak{W}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)}) \subset \mathfrak{U}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)}$.

First, note that $\tilde{\pi}_\infty^{-1}(\mathfrak{Y})$ is stable under the geodesic action of A_Q (Corollary 4.11), and $\text{Im}_\infty^{-1}(\mu D)$ is stable under the geodesic action of $[1, +\infty]^J \subset A_Q$ (Corollary 4.12), given our choice of D (indeed, $\overline{C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_\infty)}$ being a cone, we have $\mu \overline{C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_\infty)} = \overline{C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_\infty)}$). Therefore, $\mathfrak{V}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)}$ is stable under the geodesic action of $[1, +\infty]^J$. This means that for any parabolic R of G containing Q , the intersection $\mathfrak{W}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)} \cap e(R)$ is contained in the image of $\mathfrak{V}_{(\mathfrak{Y}, \mu)}$ under the projection $\mathfrak{X} \twoheadrightarrow e(R)$.

Next, fix one of the rational boundary components (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) between (G, \mathfrak{X}) and $(P_\infty, \mathfrak{X}_\infty)$, and a parabolic R of G containing Q_j , and such that $\text{adm}(R) = Q_j$. The contribution of $e(R)$ to the intersection

$$p(\mathfrak{W}_{(\mathfrak{y}, \mu)}) \cap \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$$

equals $p_R(\mathfrak{W}_{(\mathfrak{y}, \mu)} \cap e(R))$, which by the above is contained in the image of $\mathfrak{W}_{(\mathfrak{y}, \mu)}$ under the composition of $\mathfrak{X} \rightarrow e(R)$ and p_R .

The commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{X} & \longrightarrow & e(R) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_R \\ \mathfrak{X} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_j} & \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \end{array}$$

then establishes the desired inclusion

$$p_R(\mathfrak{W}_{(\mathfrak{y}, \mu)} \cap e(R)) \subset \tilde{\pi}_j(\mathfrak{W}_{(\mathfrak{y}, \mu)}) .$$

q.e.d.

Let us note the following aspect of our construction.

Complement 4.15. *Fix an admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of G , and consider the disjoint union $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j$ of the finitely many spaces \mathfrak{X}_j underlying rational boundary components associated to Q_j , as well as its quotient $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ by the action of the unipotent radical W_j , considered as a locally closed sub-set of \mathfrak{X}^* . Then under the map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ from Theorem 4.14,*

$$p^{-1}\left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j\right) = \coprod_{P_j \subset R \subset Q_j} e(R) \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS} ,$$

where the disjoint union runs over the parabolics R of P contained in Q_j and containing P_j , the canonical normal sub-group of Q_j .

Proof. This follows directly from Construction 4.13 (as $P_j \subset R \subset Q_j$ if and only if $Q_j = \text{adm}(R)$). **q.e.d.**

Remark 4.16. Complement 4.15 should be compared to the first statement of [Z2, Prop. (3.8) (ii)].

As far as equivariance of p is concerned, we have the following result.

Complement 4.17. *The continuous map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ from Theorem 4.14 is $G(\mathbb{Q})$ -equivariant (with respect to the action (1) on \mathfrak{X}^{BS}).*

Proof. \mathfrak{X} is dense in \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , and \mathfrak{X}^* is Hausdorff [BB, Thm. 4.9 (iii), (iv)]. **q.e.d.**

Corollary 4.18. *Let $K \subset G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ be an open compact sub-group. Then the identity on the Shimura variety $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})$ extends uniquely to a continuous map*

$$p^K : M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} \longrightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$$

between the Borel–Serre compactification and the space of complex points of the Baily–Borel compactification of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})$.

Proof. The space

$$M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C}) = G(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K)$$

is compact [AMRT, Chap. II, Thm. 2], hence Hausdorff; therefore there is at most one continuous extension of $\text{id}_{M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})}$. In order to define it, use the map

$$p \times \text{id}_{G(\mathbb{A}_f)} : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times G(\mathbb{A}_f) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)$$

and Complement 4.17. **q.e.d.**

5 The canonical stratifications

The aim of the present section is to define the canonical stratifications of both the Borel–Serre (Definition 5.1) and the Baily–Borel compactification (Definition 5.6). The main result (Theorem 5.8) then gives a description of the intersections of the closures of the canonical strata of the Borel–Serre compactification on the one hand, and the pre-images under the map p^K of the canonical strata of the Baily–Borel compactification on the other hand. An important feature of these intersections is that the immersion into their closures is contractible provided the “level” K is neat (Theorem 5.8 (c)).

We fix mixed Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) satisfying hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$, and an open compact sub-group K of $P(\mathbb{A}_f)$. The stratification of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} by the faces $e(R)$ induces a stratification of the Borel–Serre compactification $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$ (cmp. [BS, Prop. 9.4 (i)]). Every stratum is the image $e^K(R, g)$ of a copy

$$e(R) \times \{gK\} \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$$

of a face $e(R)$ under the projection from $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$ to

$$M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} = P(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K),$$

for some $g \in P(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Denoting by $\overline{e^K(R, g)}$ the closure of $e^K(R, g)$ in $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$, one checks that $\overline{e^K(R, g)}$ equals the image of

$$\overline{e(R)} \times \{gK\} \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$$

under the projection from $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$ (cmp. [BS, Prop. 9.4 (ii)]), *i.e.*,

$$\overline{e^K(R, g)} = \bigcup_{R' \subset R} e^K(R', g),$$

where R' runs over all parabolics contained in R . The stratification of $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$ that will be of interest for us, is coarser than the one by the $e^K(R, g)$.

Definition 5.1. (a) Let R be a parabolic sub-group of P . Define

$$e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$$

to be the image of $e(R) \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$ under the projection from $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$. In other words,

$$e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) = \bigcup_{g \in P(\mathbb{A}_f)} e^K(R, g).$$

(b) The *canonical stratification of the Borel–Serre compactification* is the stratification by the $e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))$, where R runs through the parabolic sub-groups of P .

We leave it to the reader to check that $e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))$ and $e^K(R', P(\mathbb{A}_f))$ have a non-empty intersection if and only if they are equal, which in turn is equivalent to R and R' being $P(\mathbb{Q})$ -conjugate to each other. In particular, the $e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))$ *do* form a stratification. Also,

$$e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) = \prod_{g \in I} e^K(R, g)$$

if the index set I on the right hand side is chosen to be a set of representatives of the (finite) double quotient $R(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$. Denoting by $\overline{e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$ the closure of $e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))$, we thus have

$$\overline{e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} = \prod_{g \in I} \overline{e^K(R, g)} = \bigcup_{g \in P(\mathbb{A}_f)} \overline{e^K(R, g)},$$

which equals the image of $\overline{e(R)} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$ under the projection from $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$ to $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$. Thus,

$$\overline{e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} = \bigcup_{R' \subset R} e^K(R', P(\mathbb{A}_f)),$$

where R' runs over all parabolics contained in R .

Proposition 5.2. *Let Q and R be parabolic sub-groups of P .*

(a) *The stratum $e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))$ is contained in $\overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$ if and only if R is contained in a $P(\mathbb{Q})$ -conjugate of Q .*

(b) We have

$$\overline{e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} \cap \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} = \bigcup_{\gamma} \overline{e^K(R \cap \gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} ,$$

where the union runs over all $\gamma \in P(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $R \cap \gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$ is parabolic.

Proof. (a): if $R \subset \gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$, then

$$e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) = e^K(\gamma^{-1} R \gamma, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} .$$

Conversely, assume $e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$. Then

$$e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) = e^K(R', P(\mathbb{A}_f)) ,$$

for some parabolic $R' \subset Q$. But then, R and R' are $P(\mathbb{Q})$ -conjugate to each other.

(b): let R' be a parabolic contained in R . Then according to (a),

$$e^K(R', P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$$

if and only if $R' \subset \gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$, for some $\gamma \in P(\mathbb{Q})$. But then the intersection $R \cap \gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$, containing a parabolic, is itself parabolic. **q.e.d.**

Recall the map adm_{Sh} from Definition 4.6 between the set of parabolics of P and the set of sub-groups of P underlying boundary components of (P, \mathfrak{X}) .

Definition 5.3. Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P . Define

$$e(Q)' := \prod_{\text{adm}_{Sh}(Q) \subset R \subset Q} e(R) \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS}$$

and

$$e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' := \bigcup_{\text{adm}_{Sh}(Q) \subset R \subset Q} e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} ,$$

where the unions run over all parabolic sub-groups R contained in Q , and containing $\text{adm}_{Sh}(Q)$.

We have the double inclusion

$$e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' \subset \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} .$$

In particular, the closure of $e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ equals $\overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$.

Proposition 5.4. Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P .

(a) The set $e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ is the image of

$$e(Q)' \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$$

under the projection to $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$.

(b) The set $e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ is open in $\overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$. In particular, it is locally

closed in $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$.

(c) If K is neat, then the inclusion

$$e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' \hookrightarrow \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$$

is contractible.

Proof. Let us first show the following claim (*): if $R \subset Q$ is a parabolic such that

$$e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))',$$

then $\text{adm}_{sh}(Q) \subset R \subset Q$.

The assumption on R is equivalent to the existence of $\gamma \in P(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\text{adm}_{sh}(Q) \subset \gamma R \gamma^{-1} \subset Q$. This implies that R is contained in both Q and $\gamma^{-1} Q \gamma$. Therefore, the intersection $Q \cap \gamma^{-1} Q \gamma$ remains parabolic. According to Proposition 3.7, this implies $Q = \gamma^{-1} Q \gamma$, i.e., that $\gamma \in Q$. But $\text{adm}_{sh}(Q)$ is normal in $\text{adm}(Q)$, hence in Q . Altogether, the inclusion $\text{adm}_{sh}(Q) \subset \gamma R \gamma^{-1} \subset Q$ implies that $\text{adm}_{sh}(Q) \subset R \subset Q$.

Claim (a) is a direct consequence of (*).

As for (b), we have $e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' \subset \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$, and $\overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$ is the image of $e(Q) \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$ under the projection from $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$; actually, this projection identifies $\overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))}$ with a topological quotient of $e(Q) \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$. Now according to (*), the pre-image of $e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ under the projection equals

$$e(Q)' \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K.$$

But $e(Q)' \subset \overline{e(Q)}$ is open (it equals the intersection of $\overline{e(Q)}$ with the union of the corners $\mathfrak{X}(R)$, for all parabolics R containing $\text{adm}_{sh}(Q)$).

In order to prove (c), note that the restriction of the projection from $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$ to each of the $\overline{e(Q)} \times \{gK\}$ equals the quotient by the action of the stabilizer in $P(\mathbb{Q})$ of $e(Q) \times \{gK\}$ [BS, Prop. 9.4 (ii)]. But this action is free on the whole of $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f)/K$ as the group K is supposed neat [BS, Sect. 9.5]. Our claim therefore follows from (*) and Proposition 3.6.

q.e.d.

Here is the key property of the sets $e^K(Q_j, P(\mathbb{A}_f))'$.

Proposition 5.5. *Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P , with canonical normal sub-group P_j . Let Q be a parabolic sub-group of P containing P_j , and such that $Q_j \cap Q$ remains parabolic. Then*

$$e^K(Q_j, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' \cap \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} = e^K(Q_j \cap Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))'.$$

This statement should be compared to Proposition 5.2 (b).

Proof of Proposition 5.5. Write $Q_k := \text{adm}(Q)$ and $P_k := \text{adm}_{sh}(Q)$. Thus,

$$P_k \subset Q \subset Q_k.$$

We have $P_j \subset Q_j \cap Q \subset Q_j$, meaning that $\text{adm}_{Sh}(Q_j \cap Q) = P_j$ and $\text{adm}(Q_j \cap Q) = Q_j$. This implies that

$$e^K(Q_j, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' \cap \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} \supset e^K(Q_j \cap Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' .$$

In order to show the reverse inclusion, note first that the parabolic $Q_j \cap Q$ is contained in Q_k . Therefore (Theorem 4.5 (b)), the relation $Q_j = \text{adm}(Q_j \cap Q) \preceq Q_k$ is satisfied.

Next, let $R \subset Q_j$ be a parabolic, and $\gamma \in P(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $P_j \subset R \subset Q_j \cap \gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$. In other words,

$$e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset e^K(Q_j, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' \cap \overline{e^K(Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))} .$$

We have $P_j \subset R \subset Q_j$, meaning that $\text{adm}(R) = Q_j$. But R is also contained in the admissible parabolic $\gamma Q_k \gamma^{-1}$. Therefore (Theorem 4.5 (b)), the relation $Q_j \preceq \gamma Q_k \gamma^{-1}$, or equivalently, $\gamma^{-1} Q_j \gamma \preceq Q_k$ holds. Thus, the conjugate admissible parabolics Q_j and $\gamma^{-1} Q_j \gamma$ both give rise to Shimura data, which are boundary components of Shimura data associated to Q_k . According to [P1, Remark (iii) on p. 91], the parabolics Q_j and $\gamma^{-1} Q_j \gamma$ are conjugate under $P_k(\mathbb{Q})$, *i.e.*,

$$\gamma^{-1} Q_j \gamma = \delta^{-1} Q_j \delta ,$$

for some $\delta \in P_k$. The product $\delta \gamma^{-1}$ normalizes Q_j , and hence belongs to Q_j . The sub-group P_j of Q_j being normal, we have $P_j = (\delta \gamma^{-1}) P_j (\delta \gamma^{-1})^{-1}$. Hence the inclusion $P_j \subset R \subset Q_j \cap \gamma Q_k \gamma^{-1}$ implies

$$P_j \subset (\delta \gamma^{-1}) R (\delta \gamma^{-1})^{-1} \subset (\delta \gamma^{-1}) (Q_j \cap \gamma Q_k \gamma^{-1}) (\delta \gamma^{-1})^{-1} = Q_j \cap \delta Q \delta^{-1} .$$

But $\delta \in P_k \subset Q$, therefore $\delta Q \delta^{-1} = Q$. Altogether,

$$P_j \subset (\delta \gamma^{-1}) R (\delta \gamma^{-1})^{-1} \subset Q_j \cap Q ,$$

hence

$$e^K(R, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) = e^K((\delta \gamma^{-1}) R (\delta \gamma^{-1})^{-1}, P(\mathbb{A}_f)) \subset e^K(Q_j \cap Q, P(\mathbb{A}_f))' .$$

q.e.d.

Definition 5.6. Assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure.

(a) Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of G . Consider the disjoint union $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j$ of the finitely many spaces \mathfrak{X}_j underlying rational boundary components associated to Q_j , as well as its quotient $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j$ by the action of the unipotent radical W_j , considered as a locally closed sub-set of \mathfrak{X}^* . Define

$$M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X}) \subset M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*$$

to be the image of $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ under the projection

$$\mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f) / K \longrightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C}) .$$

(b) The *canonical stratification of the Baily–Borel compactification* is the stratification by the $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$, where Q_j runs through the admissible parabolic sub-groups of P .

We leave it to the reader to check that $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$ and $M^K(Q_k, \mathfrak{X})$ have a non-empty intersection if and only if they are equal, which in turn is equivalent to Q_j and Q_k being $G(\mathbb{Q})$ -conjugate to each other.

Remark 5.7. (a) Let us connect the $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$ to the notation introduced in [P1, Sect. 6.3]: in [loc. cit.], quotients $\Delta_1 \backslash M^{\pi_1(K_f^1)}((P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1)/W_1)$ of “smaller” Shimura varieties $M^{\pi_1(K_f^1)}((P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1)/W_1)$ are considered, indexed by rational boundary components (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) and $g \in G(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Then $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$ equals the union of the $\Delta_1 \backslash M^{\pi_1(K_f^1)}((P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1)/W_1)$, for all $g \in G(\mathbb{A}_f)$, and all boundary components (P_1, \mathfrak{X}_1) associated to Q_j (*i.e.*, satisfying $P_1 = P_j$, the canonical normal sub-group of Q_j). In particular, the canonical stratification of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})$ is coarser than the stratification considered in [P1].

(b) *A priori*, Definition 5.6 concerns a locally closed sub-set $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$ of the space of \mathbb{C} -valued points $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$ of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*$. It follows from [P1, Main Theorem 12.3 for the Baily–Borel compactification] that this sub-set is indeed identified with the set of \mathbb{C} -valued points of a locally closed sub-scheme $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$ of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*$.

Putting everything together, we obtain the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.8. *Assume that $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+). Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of G .*

(a) *Under the map $p^K : M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} \rightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$, we have*

$$(p^K)^{-1}(M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})) = e^K(Q_j, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' \subset M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}.$$

(b) *Let Q be a parabolic of G containing P_j , and such that $Q_j \cap Q$ remains parabolic. Then*

$$(p^K)^{-1}(M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} = e^K(Q_j \cap Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'.$$

In particular, the intersection $(p^K)^{-1}(M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}$ contains $e^K(Q_j \cap Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))$, and is open in $\overline{e^K(Q_j \cap Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}$.

(c) *Assume K to be neat. Let Q be a parabolic of G containing P_j , and such that $Q_j \cap Q$ remains parabolic. Then the immersion*

$$(p^K)^{-1}(M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} \hookrightarrow \overline{e^K(Q_j \cap Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}$$

is contractible. In particular, the immersion

$$(p^K)^{-1}(M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})) \hookrightarrow \overline{e^K(Q_j, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}$$

is contractible.

Proof. Part (a) follows from Complement 4.15, part (b) from (a), Proposition 5.4 (b) and Proposition 5.5, and part (c) from (a) and Proposition 5.4 (c). **q.e.d.**

Remark 5.9. (a) According to Theorem 5.8 (a), the map p^K is a *morphism of stratifications*: indeed, the pre-image under p^K of any stratum of the canonical stratification of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$ is a union of strata of the canonical stratification of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$.

(b) Theorem 5.8 states that the pre-images $e^K(Q_j, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ of the canonical strata of the Baily–Borel compactification have much better separation properties than the canonical strata $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$ themselves. Let us illustrate what we mean: let Q_j and Q_k be admissible parabolics of G , and assume that $Q_j \preceq Q_k$. Given the definition of the Satake topology, this implies that $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$ is contained in the closure of $M^K(Q_k, \mathfrak{X})$. But for the pre-images $e^K(Q_j, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ and $e^K(Q_k, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'$, the situation is quite different: the closure of $e^K(Q_k, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ equals $\overline{e^K(Q_k, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'}$, and

$$e^K(Q_j, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' \cap \overline{e^K(Q_k, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'} = e^K(Q_j \cap Q_k, G(\mathbb{A}_f))',$$

which equals $e^K(Q_j, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ if and only if $Q_j = Q_k$. Furthermore, if K is neat, then the inclusion of $e^K(Q_j, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' \cap \overline{e^K(Q_k, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'}$ into its closure is contractible — a property which is (very) false in general for the inclusion of $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$ into its closure in $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$!

6 The fibres of the map p

The first main result of this section (Theorem 6.8) gives a description of the fibres of the map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ constructed in Section 4, by identifying them with manifolds with corners \mathfrak{Z}^{BS} associated to spaces \mathfrak{Z} of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ associated to certain algebraic sub-groups of the group P underlying our Shimura data. Theorem 6.8 will then be used to describe the fibres of the map p^K between the Borel–Serre and the Baily–Borel compactification of the Shimura variety (Corollary 6.15 (b)). Combining this with the results from the previous section, we get the second main result (Theorem 6.20), which yields a precise analysis of the intersection of the fibres of p^K with the (closures of the) canonical strata of the Borel–Serre compactification. For the sake of completeness, we also give the corresponding results concerning the *reductive Borel–Serre compactification*; here, we recover in particular the part of [G, Thm. 5.8] concerning the fibres of the map from that compactification to the Baily–Borel compactification (Corollary 6.15 (c)).

We fix mixed Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) , and an admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of P , with canonical normal sub-group P_j . Consider the complex analytic

map

$$\iota_j : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j$$

of \mathfrak{X} to the disjoint union of the finitely many spaces \mathfrak{X}_j underlying rational boundary components associated to Q_j , and its composition

$$\tilde{\pi}_j : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j .$$

with the canonical epimorphisms $\pi_j : \mathfrak{X}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. The map ι_j is equivariant with respect to $Q_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$ [P1, 4.11], hence so is $\tilde{\pi}_j$. Recall (Definition 4.9) the closed connected normal sub-group

$$C_j = \{q \in Q_j, \pi_{Q_j}(q) \in \text{Cent}_{Q_j}(\pi_{Q_j}(P_j))\}^0$$

of Q_j . By its very definition, the group $C_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$ acts trivially on all $h(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$. Therefore [P1, Cor. 2.12], the neutral connected component $C_j(\mathbb{R})^0U(\mathbb{C})$ acts trivially on the target of $\tilde{\pi}_j$. In other words, it respects all fibres of $\tilde{\pi}_j$.

Proposition 6.1. *The induced action of $C_j(\mathbb{R})^0U(\mathbb{C})$ on each of the fibres of $\tilde{\pi}_j$ is transitive.*

Proof. Let (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) be one of the rational boundary components associated to Q_j , and $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. For $x, y \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$, write $x_j := \iota_j(x)$ and $y_j := \iota_j(y)$. These two elements of \mathfrak{X}_j being mapped to z_0 under π_j , there are $w \in W_j(\mathbb{R})$ and $u \in U_j(\mathbb{C})$ such that $y_j = uwx_j$. We may assume that u is purely imaginary. In additive notation, the element u thus equals $\text{Im}(y_j) - \text{Im}(x_j)$.

Denote by \mathfrak{X}^0 the connected component of \mathfrak{X} containing x and y . According to [P1, Prop. 4.15], the action of $Q_j(\mathbb{R})^0U(\mathbb{C})$ on the cone $C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_j)$ is transitive. We have $Q_j = C_j P_j^{\text{der}}$, and $P_j^{\text{der}}(\mathbb{R})$ acts trivially on U_j [P1, Prop. 2.14 (a), Rem. (ii) on p. 82]. Therefore, the induced action of $C_j(\mathbb{R})^0U(\mathbb{C})$ on $C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_j)$ is transitive. We may thus suppose that x_j and y_j have the same imaginary part.

It follows that u is trivial, *i.e.*, that $y_j = wx_j$. But the map ι_j is $Q_j(\mathbb{R})$ -equivariant and injective, and the element w belongs to $W_j(\mathbb{R}) \subset C_j(\mathbb{R})^0$.

q.e.d.

Proposition 6.2. *Assume (+) and ($U = 0$). Then each of the fibres of $\tilde{\pi}_j$ is stable under the restriction to $C_j(\mathbb{R})$ of the extended action of $P(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathfrak{X} from Corollary 1.13.*

Proof. If K is maximal compact in $P(\mathbb{R})$, then $C_j(\mathbb{R}) \cap K_x$ is maximal compact in $C_j(\mathbb{R})$ as C_j is normal in Q_j , and Q_j is parabolic (cmp. [BS, Sect. 1.4]). Now apply Corollary 1.7. **q.e.d.**

Corollary 6.3. *Assume (+) and $(U = 0)$. Then each of the fibres of $\tilde{\pi}_j$ is a homogeneous space under the restriction to $C_j(\mathbb{R})$ of the extended action of $P(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathfrak{X} from Corollary 1.13.*

Proof. Apply Propositions 6.1 and 6.2, noting that the restrictions to $C_j(\mathbb{R})^0 \subset P(\mathbb{R})^0$ of the extended action (2) and the action (1) underlying the Shimura data coincide. **q.e.d.**

Remark 6.4. (a) An alternative proof of Corollary 6.3 could be given by first verifying that $(\tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0), (C_j(\mathbb{R}) \cap K_x)_{x \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)})$ is homogeneous of type S' under $(C_j(\mathbb{R}), C_j(\mathbb{R}) \cap {}^0P(\mathbb{R}))$, and then using Proposition 1.5 in order to get an extended action of $C_j(\mathbb{R})$. Unicity guarantees that the result is indeed equal to the restriction of the extended action of $P(\mathbb{R})$.

(b) If $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$, then the restrictions of (1) the action of $P(\mathbb{R})$ underlying the Shimura data and (2) the extended action of $P(\mathbb{R})$, coincide on the sub-group

$$\text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$$

of finite index of $C_j(\mathbb{R})$, consisting of the elements acting trivially on (equivalently [P1, Cor. 2.12], stabilizing) the connected component $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j containing z_0 .

(c) It is straightforward to show that the pair

$$(\tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0), (C_{j,\mathbb{R}} \cap L_{x,Q_j})_{x \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)})$$

is a *space of type S* under C_j in the sense of [BS, Def. 2.3]. Note: the connected normal solvable sub-group of $C_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ from [BS, Def. 2.3, SI] needs to be defined as the base change to \mathbb{R} of the sub-group of the \mathbb{Q} -split radical of C_j generated by the unipotent radical of W_j (hence of C_j) and the \mathbb{Q} -split radical of P (cmp. [BS, Lemma 2.6]).

(d) Unless Q_j equals P ,

$$(\tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0), (C_{j,\mathbb{R}} \cap L_{x,Q_j})_{x \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)})$$

is *not* of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under C_j , the reason being that the stabilizers

$$\text{Stab}_{C_j(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R})^0 \times (C_j(\mathbb{R}) \cap K_x) = Z_x(\mathbb{R}) \cdot (C_j(\mathbb{R}) \cap K_x)$$

are too small. Indeed, the image of $\text{Stab}_{C_j(\mathbb{R})}^{\text{exd}}(x)^0$ under π_{Q_j} has trivial intersection with $\pi_{Q_j} \circ h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w(\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathbb{R}}) \subset Z_{d,\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{Q}_j)_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Recall (Corollary 4.11) that the geodesic action of A_{Q_j} respects each of the fibres of $\tilde{\pi}_j$. Furthermore [BS, Prop. 3.4], it commutes with the action of $C_j(\mathbb{R})$.

Proposition 6.5. *Assume (+) and $(U = 0)$. Let $z_0 \in \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. Let $\tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$ be equipped with the action of $C_j(\mathbb{R})$ from Proposition 6.2. Then the pair*

$$(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0), (C_{j,\mathbb{R}} \cap L_{x,Q_j})_{x \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)})$$

is a space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under C_j .

Proof. Denote by \mathfrak{X}^0 the connected component of \mathfrak{X} containing $\tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$ (the latter is connected thanks to Proposition 6.1). According to [BS, Sect. 3.9],

$$(A_{Q_j} \backslash \mathfrak{X}^0, (L_{x,Q_j})_{x \in A_{Q_j} \backslash \mathfrak{X}^0})$$

is a space of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under Q_j . Given the definition of C_j , the neutral connected component $Z(L_{x,Q_j})^0$ of the center $Z(L_{x,Q_j})$ is contained in $C_{j,\mathbb{R}}$, for every $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, and hence, for every $x \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$.

Our claim then follows from the following abstract principle concerning spaces of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$, whose proof we leave to the reader: let $(X, (L_x)_{x \in X})$ be of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under G , and $N \subset G$ a normal sub-group. Let $Y \subset X$ be an orbit under $N(\mathbb{R})$, such that for every $x \in Y$, we have $Z(L_x) \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then $(Y, (N_{\mathbb{R}} \cap L_x)_{x \in Y})$ is of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under N . **q.e.d.**

Given Proposition 6.5, the manifolds with corners $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$, formed with respect to the action of $C_j(\mathbb{R})$ from Proposition 6.2, are defined [BS, Sect. 7.1] (in the notation of [loc. cit.], they would be denoted $\overline{A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)}$), for every $z_0 \in \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. The space $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$ carries an action of $\text{Stab}_{Q_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0)$, induced by the $\text{Stab}_{Q_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0)$ -action on $A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \subset A_{Q_j} \backslash \mathfrak{X}^0$. Its restriction to $\text{Stab}_{C_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0) \subset \text{Stab}_{Q_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0)$ coincides with the restriction to $\text{Stab}_{C_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0) \subset C_j(\mathbb{Q})$ of the $C_j(\mathbb{Q})$ -action on $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$ from [BS, Prop. 7.6].

Recall from Corollary 4.10 that the map $Q \mapsto C_j \cap Q$ is a bijection between $\text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$ and the set of parabolics of C_j . In order to relate the manifolds with corners $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$, $z_0 \in \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$, to \mathfrak{X}^{BS} , we need to compare geodesic actions, formed with respect to parabolics of P , and with respect to parabolics of C_j .

Proposition 6.6. *Let Q be a parabolic contained in Q_j and containing P_j (in other words, we have $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$). Write $\overline{C_j \cap Q}$ for the maximal reductive quotient of $C_j \cap Q$. Then the inclusion $C_j \cap Q \hookrightarrow Q$ induces an isomorphism*

$$Z(\overline{C_j \cap Q})^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} Z(\overline{Q})^0.$$

Proof. By definition,

$$C_j \cap Q = \{q \in Q, \pi_{Q_j}(q) \in \text{Cent}_{\overline{Q_j}}(\pi_{Q_j}(P_j))\}^0,$$

which equals

$$\{q \in Q, qgq^{-1}g^{-1} \in \text{Rad}^u(Q_j), \forall g \in P_j\}^0.$$

But P_j being normal in Q , the commutators $qgq^{-1}g^{-1}$ all lie in P_j . Hence, if they belong to the unipotent radical of a group containing, and normalizing P_j , then they belong to W_j . Therefore,

$$C_j \cap Q = \{q \in Q, \pi_Q(q) \in \text{Cent}_{\bar{Q}}(\pi_Q(P_j))\}^0.$$

It follows that on the one hand, $Z(\bar{Q})^0$ is contained in $\overline{C_j \cap Q}$, hence in $Z(\overline{C_j \cap Q})$. On the other hand, we have $\bar{Q} = \overline{(C_j \cap Q)\pi_Q(P_j)}$, and hence $Z(\overline{C_j \cap Q}) \subset Z(\bar{Q})$. **q.e.d.**

It follows that the inclusion “ $Z(L_{x,Q})^0 \subset C_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ ” used in the proof of Proposition 6.5 is valid for more general choices of Q .

Corollary 6.7. *Assume (+) and ($U = 0$). Let $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$.*

(a) *The inclusion $C_j \cap Q \hookrightarrow Q$ induces an isomorphism*

$$A_{C_j \cap Q} \xrightarrow{\sim} A_Q.$$

(b) *For all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, we have*

$$Z(C_{j,\mathbb{R}} \cap L_{x,Q})^0 = Z(L_{x,Q})^0.$$

In particular, $Z(L_{x,Q})^0 \subset C_{j,\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. Claim (a) follows from Proposition 6.6, Definition 2.8, and the fact that the neutral connected component of $Z(G)$ is contained in $\overline{C_j \cap Q}$, hence in $Z(\overline{C_j \cap Q})$.

As for claim (b), the intersection $C_{j,\mathbb{R}} \cap L_{x,Q}$ is a Levi sub-group of $(C_j \cap Q)_{\mathbb{R}}$ as $C_j \cap Q$ is normal in Q . Now use Proposition 6.6. **q.e.d.**

Therefore, “the geodesic action lies in C_j ” as long as it is formed with respect to parabolics Q in $\text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$. By slight abuse of notation, we shall identify $A_{C_j \cap Q}$ and A_Q , for every such Q .

Consider the inclusion $\tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ of one of the fibres of $\tilde{\pi}_j$. It induces an inclusion

$$A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \hookrightarrow A_{Q_j} \setminus \mathfrak{X} = e(Q_j)$$

(which was exploited in the proof of Proposition 6.5). The space $e(Q_j)$ is one of the faces of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} . Here is the first main result of this section.

Theorem 6.8. *Assume hypotheses (+) and ($U = 0$). Let $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$.*

(a) *The inclusion*

$$A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \hookrightarrow e(Q_j) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS}$$

extends uniquely to a continuous map

$$\kappa_{z_0,j} : (A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS} .$$

The map $\kappa_{z_0,j}$ is a morphism of manifolds with corners.

(b) The morphism $\kappa_{z_0,j}$ is injective. It is a morphism of stratifications; more precisely, for any parabolic Q of P , we have

$$\kappa_{z_0,j}^{-1}(e(Q)) = e(C_j \cap Q) \subset (A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$$

if $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$, and

$$\kappa_{z_0,j}^{-1}(e(Q)) = \emptyset$$

if $Q \notin \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$.

(c) The morphism $\kappa_{z_0,j}$ is $C_j(\mathbb{Q})W(\mathbb{R})$ -equivariant with respect to the action from Proposition 6.2. It is therefore $\text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{Q})W(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant with respect to the action underlying the Shimura data, $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ denoting the connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j containing z_0 .

(d) If the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, then $\kappa_{z_0,j}$ yields an \mathbb{R} -analytic identification of $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$ with the fibre of $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ over $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \subset \mathfrak{X}^*$. The map $\kappa_{z_0,j}$ is the unique continuous extension of the identification of $A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$ with the sub-space $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j)$ of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} .

Proof. (a), (b): as for the unicity statement in (a), we argue as usual ($A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$ is dense in $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$, and \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is Hausdorff [BS, Thm. 7.8]). By Corollary 4.10, the map $Q \mapsto C_j \cap Q$ is a bijection between $\text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$ and the set of parabolics of C_j . By Corollary 6.7, this bijection is compatible with the geodesic action. The remaining claims therefore follow from the definition of the spaces $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$ and \mathfrak{X}^{BS} [BS, Sect. 7.1].

(c): the inclusion

$$A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \hookrightarrow e(Q_j) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS}$$

is $C_j(\mathbb{Q})W(\mathbb{R})$ -equivariant. Therefore, the first part of the claim follows from unicity of $\kappa_{z_0,j}$ (part (a)). As for the second, apply Remark 6.4 (b).

(d): recall (Complement 4.15) that the pre-image $p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$ equals the disjoint union of those faces $e(Q)$ for which $\text{adm}(Q) = Q_j$. By Construction 4.13, the restriction p_Q of p to each such face $e(Q)$ fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{X} & \longrightarrow & e(Q) = A_Q \backslash \mathfrak{X} \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_Q \\ \mathfrak{X} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_j} & \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \end{array}$$

But the base change to $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ of this diagram is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) & \longrightarrow & A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_Q \\ \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_j} & \{z_0\} \end{array}$$

q.e.d.

Remark 6.9. The isomorphism

$$\kappa_{z_0,j} : (A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}(z_0)$$

from Theorem 6.8 (d) is *a priori* compatible with [Z2, Cor. (3.8)], but we were unable to deduce either result from the other.

In the situation of Theorem 6.8, the quotient

$$A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) = A_Q \backslash (A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))$$

is of type $S - \mathbb{Q}$ under $C_j \cap Q$, for every $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$ (Proposition 6.5, [BS, Sect. 3.9]). In particular, the manifold with corners $(A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$ is defined.

Corollary 6.10. *Assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+). Let $z_0 \in (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \subset \mathfrak{X}^*$. Let $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$.*

(a) *The morphism $\kappa_{z_0,j}$ yields a $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant \mathbb{R} -analytic isomorphism*

$$A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q),$$

and a $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant isomorphism of manifolds with corners

$$(A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(Q)}.$$

(b) *Both $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q)$ and $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(Q)}$ are contractible. In particular, they are connected.*

(c) *Let Γ_C be an arithmetic sub-group of $(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{Q})$. Then the action of $\text{Cent}_{\Gamma_C}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ on $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(Q)}$ is properly discontinuous. It is free if Γ_C is neat in the sense of [B, Sect. 17.1].*

Proof. Except for the statement on $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariance (rather than just $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariance), part (a) follows from [BS, Prop. 7.3 (i)] and Theorem 6.8. Use the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) & \longrightarrow & A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \subset e(Q) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_Q \\ \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_j} & \{z_0\} \end{array}$$

for the action of $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$, recalling [BS, Prop. 3.4] that the geodesic action of A_Q commutes with the action of $Q(\mathbb{R})$.

In order to prove (b), apply (a) and [BS, Lemma 8.3.1 and its proof].

As for (c), use (a) and [BS, Thm. 9.3, Sect. 9.5]. **q.e.d.**

Recall ([G, Def. 5.2], cmp. [Z1, (4.1)]) the definition of the space \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} (denoted \bar{D}^{rBS} in [G]) as a quotient of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} : two elements x and y of \mathfrak{X}^{BS} map to the same point of \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} only if they belong to the same face. If $x, y \in e(Q)$, then x and y map to the same point of \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} if and only if there is an element w belonging to the real points of the unipotent radical $\text{Rad}^u(Q)$ of Q , such that $y = wx$. Set theoretically, we thus have

$$\mathfrak{X}^{rBS} = \coprod_Q e^r(Q) ,$$

where $e^r(Q) := \text{Rad}^u(Q)(\mathbb{R}) \setminus e(Q)$. By construction, the epimorphism from \mathfrak{X}^{BS} to \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} respects the stratifications. It induces on \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} a continuous action of $G(\mathbb{Q})$, with respect to which it is equivariant.

Corollary 6.11. *Assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+).*

(a) *The map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ factors over a continuous, $G(\mathbb{Q})$ -equivariant map $p^r : \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$.*

(b) *Let $z_0 \in (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \subset \mathfrak{X}^*$. Then $\kappa_{z_0, j}$ induces a $\text{Cent}_{\bar{C}_j(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant identification of*

$$((A_{Q_j} W_j(\mathbb{R})) \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{rBS}$$

with the fibre of $p^r : \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^$ over z_0 . In particular, the fibre $(p^r)^{-1}(z_0)$ is connected.*

Proof. Let Q be a parabolic of P . Write $Q_\infty := \text{adm}(Q)$, hence $P_\infty = \text{adm}_{sh}(Q)$. According to Corollary 4.10,

$$Q = (C_\infty \cap Q) P_\infty .$$

The group C_∞ contains W_∞ ; therefore,

$$\text{Rad}^u(Q) = \text{Rad}^u(C_\infty \cap Q) \subset C_\infty ,$$

and $\text{Rad}^u(Q)(\mathbb{R}) \subset C_\infty(\mathbb{R})^0$.

But $C_\infty(\mathbb{R})^0$ acts trivially on $\mathfrak{X}_\infty/W_\infty$. Together with Complement 4.17, this shows part (a).

If $Q = Q_j$ (hence $Q_\infty = Q_j$), then by the above, $\text{Rad}^u(C_j) = \text{Rad}^u(Q_j)$, which equals W_j [P1, proof of Lemma 4.8]. Thus, the quotient \bar{C}_j is contained in \bar{Q}_j , and $(A_{Q_j} W_j(\mathbb{R})) \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$ is identified with $(p^r)^{-1}(z_0) \cap e^r(Q_j)$. We leave it to the reader to deduce part (b) from the construction of \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} , and from Theorem 6.8 (d). **q.e.d.**

Definition 6.12. Assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+). Let K be an open compact sub-group of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Define the *reductive Borel–Serre compactification of the Shimura variety* $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})$ as the quotient space

$$M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{rBS} := G(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^{rBS} \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K) .$$

Corollary 6.13. Assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+). Let $K \subset G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ be an open compact sub-group. Then

$$p^K : M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} \longrightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$$

factors over a continuous map

$$p^{r,K} : M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{rBS} \longrightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$$

between the reductive Borel–Serre compactification and the space of complex points of the Baily–Borel compactification of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})$.

Proof. By Corollary 6.11 (a), the map $p^r \times \text{id}_{G(\mathbb{A}_f)}$ is $G(\mathbb{Q})$ -equivariant. **q.e.d.**

In order to identify the fibres of p^K and $p^{r,K}$, we need to analyze the nature of the action of arithmetic sub-groups of Q_j on \mathfrak{X}^* . Recall that

$$\tilde{\pi}_j : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j .$$

is equivariant with respect to $Q_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$.

Proposition 6.14. Let $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$, and denote by $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ the connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j containing z_0 . Let $\Gamma \subset Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$ an arithmetic sub-group. Define $\Gamma_C := C_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap \Gamma$.

(a) The inclusion $\text{Cent}_{\Gamma_C}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) \subset \text{Stab}_{\Gamma_C}(z_0)$ is an equality. In particular, the sub-group $\text{Stab}_{\Gamma_C}(z_0)$ of Γ_C does not change when replacing z_0 by another point in $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$.

(b) The group $\text{Cent}_{\Gamma_C}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) = \text{Stab}_{\Gamma_C}(z_0)$ is an arithmetic sub-group of $C_j(\mathbb{Q})$.

(c) If the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) satisfy hypothesis (+), then the index

$$[\text{Stab}_{\Gamma}(z_0) : \text{Stab}_{\Gamma_C}(z_0)]$$

is finite.

(d) Assume that the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) satisfy hypothesis (+). If Γ is neat, then (so is Γ_C , and) both inclusions

$$\text{Stab}_{\Gamma_C}(z_0) \subset \text{Stab}_{\Gamma}(z_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Stab}_{\Gamma_C}(z_0) \subset \Gamma_C$$

are equalities. Therefore, we have $\text{Cent}_{\Gamma_C}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) = \text{Stab}_{\Gamma}(z_0) = \Gamma_C$. In particular, the sub-group $\text{Stab}_{\Gamma}(z_0)$ of Γ does not change when replacing z_0 by another point in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j , or \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j by another rational boundary component

associated to the same admissible parabolic Q_j .

(e) Assume that the Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) satisfy hypothesis (+). If Γ is neat, then its action on $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ factors through an action of Γ/Γ_C . This latter action is free.

Proof. First, let us show that

$$C_j(\mathbb{R})^0 U(\mathbb{C}) \subset \text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) = \text{Stab}_{C_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(z_0). \quad (*)$$

For this, recall that by definition, the group $C_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$ acts trivially on all $h(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$. Therefore [P1, Cor. 2.12], an element of $C_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$ stabilizes a connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j if and only if it centralizes the connected component in question. This principle proves (*), but also the following: let $c \in C_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$. Then

$$c \text{ acts trivially on } \pi_0(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) \iff c \text{ acts trivially on } \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j. \quad (**)$$

Observation (*) clearly implies claims (a) and (b).

Next, write $\bar{C}_j := \pi_j(C_j) \subset Q_j$. We have $Q_j = \bar{C}_j(P_j/W_j)$, hence the quotient Q_j/C_j is canonically isomorphic to $(P_j/W_j)/Z$, where $Z := \bar{C}_j \cap (P_j/W_j)$ is contained in the center of P_j/W_j . The Shimura data (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) satisfy (+) [P1, proof of Cor. 4.10], hence so does $((P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j)/W_j)/Z$.

The image Γ/Γ_C of Γ under the epimorphism $Q_j \twoheadrightarrow Q_j/C_j \cong (P_j/W_j)/Z$ is arithmetic. It follows from (+), and from [BW, Lemma 1.3] that the action of Γ/Γ_C on $((P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j)/W_j)/Z$ is properly discontinuous. In particular, its stabilizers are finite. If Γ is neat, then they are trivial.

This shows claim (c), and the equality

$$\text{Stab}_{\Gamma_C}(z_0) = \text{Stab}_{\Gamma}(z_0)$$

from (d) (under the neatness assumption). Consider the algebraic representation of C_j on the set of connected components of (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) . Its restriction to any neat sub-group of $C_j(\mathbb{Q})$ is trivial. The equality

$$\text{Stab}_{\Gamma_C}(z_0) = \Gamma_C$$

therefore follows from observation (**).

Up to freeness of the action of Γ/Γ_C , claim (e) follows from (d). Claim (d) also implies that the action of Γ/Γ_C is without fixed points. But according to [P1, Sect. 6.3], the action of Γ on $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ is properly discontinuous in the sense of [P1, Sect. 0.4]. Therefore, the action of Γ/Γ_C is properly discontinuous in the usual sense. **q.e.d.**

Corollary 6.15. *Assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+). Let K be an open compact sub-group of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$, $z_0 \in \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$, and $g \in G(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Consider the point*

$$[(z_0, gK)] \in G(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K) = M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C}),$$

and define

$$H := H(z_0, gK) := \text{Stab}_{Q_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0) \cap gKg^{-1} \subset Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$$

and

$$H_C := H_C(z_0, gK) := C_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap H = \text{Stab}_{C_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0) \cap gKg^{-1} \subset C_j(\mathbb{Q}) .$$

(a) The group H_C is an arithmetic sub-group of $C_j(\mathbb{Q})$, which is of finite index in H . If K is neat, then so is H_C , and both inclusions

$$H_C \subset H \quad \text{and} \quad H_C \subset C_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}$$

are equalities; in particular, if K is neat, then so is $H = C_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}$, and H does not depend on the choice of z_0 in $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$.

(b) The isomorphism

$$\kappa_{z_0, j} : (A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}(z_0)$$

from Theorem 6.8 (d) induces an isomorphism

$$H \backslash (A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \xrightarrow{\sim} (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) .$$

In particular, the fibre $(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)])$ is connected. If K is neat, then the above isomorphism gives

$$(C_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}) \backslash (A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \xrightarrow{\sim} (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) .$$

It identifies the fibre $(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)])$ with the quotient by the free action of $C_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}$ on the contractible space $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$.

(c) The isomorphism $\kappa_{z_0, j}$ from Theorem 6.8 (d) induces an isomorphism

$$\pi_{Q_j}(H) \backslash ((A_{Q_j} W_j(\mathbb{R})) \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{rBS} \xrightarrow{\sim} (p^{r, K})^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) .$$

In particular, the fibre $(p^{r, K})^{-1}([(z_0, gK)])$ is connected.

Proof. (a): put $\Gamma := Q_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}$, and apply Proposition 6.14 (b)–(d).

(b): we leave it to the reader to prove first that under

$$p^K : G(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K) \longrightarrow G(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K) ,$$

the pre-image of the point $[(z_0, gK)]$ is indeed identified, via $[(x, gK)] \mapsto Hx$, to the quotient by the action of H on $p^{-1}(z_0)$. Then use Theorem 6.8 (d) and part (a). The claim concerning freeness of the action of H_C (provided the latter is neat) is Corollary 6.10 (c) (given Proposition 6.14 (a)).

(c): the strategy is formally identical to the one employed for (b) (replace Theorem 6.8 (d) by Corollary 6.11 (b)). **q.e.d.**

Remark 6.16. (a) According to [BS, Thm. 9.3], the action of H_C on $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$ is properly discontinuous. Therefore (Corollary 6.15 (a)), the same is true for the action of H . It follows (Corollary 6.15 (b)) that the

fibre $(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)])$ is locally isomorphic to a quotient of $(A_{Q_j} \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS}$ by a finite group, which is trivial if K is neat.

(b) The isomorphism

$$\pi_{Q_j}(H_C) \backslash ((A_{Q_j} W_j(\mathbb{R})) \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{rBS} \xrightarrow{\sim} (p^{r,K})^{-1}([(z_0, gK)])$$

from Corollary 6.15 (c) is already known, at least if \mathfrak{X} is connected: see [G, Thm. 5.8] (which is stated without the assumption on neatness). It can be safely supposed that Corollary 6.15 (b) is known as well. Its not being stated in [loc. cit.] seems to be solely due to the wish to avoid the use of homogeneous spaces under non-reductive algebraic groups.

Let us prepare the stratified version of Corollary 6.15 (Theorem 6.20).

Definition 6.17. Assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+). Let K be an open compact subgroup of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$, $z_0 \in \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$, $g \in G(\mathbb{A}_f)$, and $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$.

(a) Define

$$e^K(Q, g)_{z_0} \subset (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)])$$

as the image of $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q)$ under the projection

$$p^{-1}(z_0) \twoheadrightarrow (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) , \quad x \mapsto [(x, gK)] .$$

(b) Define

$$\overline{e^K(Q, g)_{z_0}} \subset (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)])$$

as the closure of $e^K(Q, g)_{z_0}$ (in $(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)])$ or in $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$).

Recall that by definition, $e^K(Q, g)$ equals the image of $e(Q)$ under $x \mapsto [(x, gK)]$. We thus have

$$e^K(Q, g)_{z_0} \subset (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, g)$$

and

$$\overline{e^K(Q, g)_{z_0}} \subset (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, g)} .$$

Recall also that $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j)$ is dense in $p^{-1}(z_0)$ (Theorem 6.8 (d)). It follows that

$$\overline{e^K(Q_j, g)_{z_0}} = (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) .$$

Proposition 6.18. *We keep the setting of Definition 6.17. Define*

$$H(z_0, gK) := \text{Stab}_{Q_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0) \cap gKg^{-1}$$

as in Corollary 6.15.

(a) $\overline{e^K(Q, g)_{z_0}}$ is the image of $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(Q)}$ under $x \mapsto [(x, gK)]$. Both $e^K(Q, g)_{z_0}$ and $\overline{e^K(Q, g)_{z_0}}$ are connected.

(b) We have

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} = (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))',$$

where $e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ is the sub-set of $\overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}$ from Definition 5.3.

(c) We have

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f)) = \bigcup_{\gamma \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q})} e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}$$

and

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q})} \overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}}.$$

(d) Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$. The following are equivalent.

$$(i) e^K(\gamma_1 Q \gamma_1^{-1}, g)_{z_0} = e^K(\gamma_2 Q \gamma_2^{-1}, g)_{z_0},$$

$$(ii) \overline{e^K(\gamma_1 Q \gamma_1^{-1}, g)_{z_0}} = \overline{e^K(\gamma_2 Q \gamma_2^{-1}, g)_{z_0}},$$

(iii) the intersection $\overline{e^K(\gamma_1 Q \gamma_1^{-1}, g)_{z_0}} \cap \overline{e^K(\gamma_2 Q \gamma_2^{-1}, g)_{z_0}}$ is not empty,

(iv) the classes of γ_1 and γ_2 in the double quotient

$$H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q}) / Q(\mathbb{Q})$$

are the same.

(e) Let $\Omega \subset Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$ be a set of representatives of $H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q}) / Q(\mathbb{Q})$. Then

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f)) = \prod_{\gamma \in \Omega} e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}.$$

and

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} = \prod_{\gamma \in \Omega} \overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}}.$$

(f) The map $\gamma \mapsto \overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}}$ induces a canonical bijection between the double quotient $H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q}) / Q(\mathbb{Q})$ and the set of connected components of

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}.$$

In particular, the double quotient $H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q}) / Q(\mathbb{Q})$ is finite.

Proof. (a): the image of the closed sub-set $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(Q)}$ under the quotient map $x \mapsto [(x, gK)]$ is closed. Now use Corollary 6.10 (a) and (b).
(b): apply Theorem 5.8 (b).

(c): observe that for any $\gamma \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$,

$$\overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)}_{z_0} \subset \overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} = \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}.$$

Therefore,

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} \supset \bigcup_{\gamma \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q})} \overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)}_{z_0}.$$

In order to show the reverse inclusion, let $x \in p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(R)$, for some parabolic R of G , and assume that the point $[(x, gK)]$ belongs to

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} \stackrel{(b)}{=} (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'.$$

Since $[(x, gK)]$ obviously belongs to $e^K(R, G(\mathbb{A}_f))$, we have $R = \gamma R' \gamma^{-1}$, for some parabolic R' containing P_j and contained in Q , and some $\gamma \in G(\mathbb{Q})$. In particular, $\text{adm}(R') = Q_j$. But since $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(R)$ is not empty, $\text{adm}(R) = Q_j$ as well (Complement 4.15). The map adm being $G(\mathbb{Q})$ -equivariant, we conclude that γ belongs in fact to $Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$. Therefore, $x \in \overline{e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1})}$, and

$$[(x, gK)] \in \overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)}_{z_0}.$$

The proof of the equality

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f)) = \bigcup_{\gamma \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q})} \overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)}_{z_0}$$

is left to the reader.

(d): clearly (iv) \Rightarrow (i) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (iii). It remains to show that (iii) implies (iv). Thus, assume that the intersection

$$\overline{e^K(\gamma_1 Q \gamma_1^{-1}, g)}_{z_0} \cap \overline{e^K(\gamma_2 Q \gamma_2^{-1}, g)}_{z_0}$$

is not empty. According to (a), there exist parabolics $R_1 \subset \gamma_1 Q \gamma_1^{-1}$ and $R_2 \subset \gamma_2 Q \gamma_2^{-1}$, points

$$x_i \in p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(R_i), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and $h \in G(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}$, such that $x_2 = hx_1$. We have $\text{adm}(R_i) = Q_j$, $i = 1, 2$ (Complement 4.15). Since

$$R_2 = hR_1h^{-1},$$

we find as in (c) that $h \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$. But h stabilizes z_0 ; therefore, $h \in H(z_0, gK)$. The intersection $\gamma_2 Q \gamma_2^{-1} \cap (h\gamma_1)Q(h\gamma_1)^{-1}$ contains R_2 and is therefore parabolic. According to Proposition 3.7,

$$\gamma_2 Q \gamma_2^{-1} = (h\gamma_1)Q(h\gamma_1)^{-1}.$$

In other words, we have $\gamma_2 = (h\gamma_1)q$, for some element q of Q .

(e): this follows from (c) and (d).

(f): each $\overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}}$ is closed, and also connected according to (a). Using (e), we see that it is the complement of a union of $\overline{e^K(\gamma' Q \gamma'^{-1}, g)_{z_0}}$, the union in question being indexed by the complement of the class of γ in $H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q})/Q(\mathbb{Q})$. Therefore, if this index set is finite, then $\overline{e^K(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}}$ is open, and our claim is proved.

As for finiteness of $H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q})/Q(\mathbb{Q})$, observe first that by Corollary 6.15 (a), we may replace $H(z_0, gK)$ by an arithmetic sub-group H' of $C_j(\mathbb{Q})$. Next, write $S := C_j \cap Q$. This sub-group pf C_j is parabolic, and $Q = SP_j$ (Corollary 4.10). The inclusion of $C_j(\mathbb{Q})P_j(\mathbb{Q})$ into $Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$ being of finite index (as $Q_j = C_j P_j$), our claim follows from the finiteness of the double quotient

$$H' \backslash C_j(\mathbb{Q})/S(\mathbb{Q})$$

[B, Cor. 15.7]

q.e.d.

Remark 6.19. (a) Via $\gamma \mapsto \gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$, the double quotient

$$H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q})/Q(\mathbb{Q})$$

is in bijection with the set of orbits under the action of $H(z_0, gK)$ on the parabolic sub-groups of Q_j that are conjugate to Q .

It will be important to reformulate this observation, using parabolic sub-groups of C_j . The bijective correspondence $Q' \mapsto C_j \cap Q'$, $S \mapsto SP_j$ from Corollary 4.10 between parabolics of Q_j containing P_j on the one hand, and parabolics on C_j on the other, respects Q_j -conjugation (as C_j and P_j are normal in Q_j). However, a $Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$ -orbit may consist of several $C_j(\mathbb{Q})$ -orbits (the number of such $C_j(\mathbb{Q})$ -orbits equals the index of $C_j(\mathbb{Q})Q(\mathbb{Q})$ in $Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$).

Here is the precise statement: via $\gamma \mapsto C_j \cap \gamma Q \gamma^{-1}$, the double quotient

$$H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q})/Q(\mathbb{Q})$$

is in bijection with the set of orbits under the action of $H(z_0, gK)$ on the parabolic sub-groups of C_j that are $Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$ -conjugate to $C_j \cap Q$.

(b) If K is neat, then according to Corollary 6.15 (a), the group

$$H(z_0, gK) = C_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}$$

does not depend on $z_0 \in \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. Hence, neither does the double quotient

$$H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q})/Q(\mathbb{Q}) .$$

Putting everything together, we obtain the second main result of this section.

Theorem 6.20. *Assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+). Let K be an open compact sub-group of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$, $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$, $g \in G(\mathbb{A}_f)$, and $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$. Consider the*

point $[(z_0, gK)] \in M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$, the canonical stratum $e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))$ of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$, and its closure $\overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}$. Define

$$H(z_0, gK) := \text{Stab}_{Q_j(\mathbb{Q})}(z_0) \cap gKg^{-1}$$

as in Corollary 6.15, and fix a (necessarily finite) set $\Omega \subset Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$ of representatives of $H(z_0, gK) \backslash Q_j(\mathbb{Q})/Q(\mathbb{Q})$.

(a) The projection

$$p^{-1}(z_0) \twoheadrightarrow (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) , \quad x \mapsto [(x, gK)]$$

induces isomorphisms between

$$\prod_{\gamma \in \Omega} \left((H(z_0, gK) \cap \gamma Q(\mathbb{Q})\gamma^{-1}) \backslash (p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})) \right)$$

and

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f)) ,$$

and between

$$\prod_{\gamma \in \Omega} \left((H(z_0, gK) \cap \gamma Q(\mathbb{Q})\gamma^{-1}) \backslash (p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})}) \right)$$

and

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} = (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' .$$

(b) If K is neat, then for every $\gamma \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q})$, we have

$$H(z_0, gK) \cap \gamma Q(\mathbb{Q})\gamma^{-1} = (C_j \cap \gamma Q\gamma^{-1})(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1} .$$

Each component

$$\left((H(z_0, gK) \cap \gamma Q(\mathbb{Q})\gamma^{-1}) \backslash (p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})}) \right)$$

occurring in the isomorphism from (a) is equal to the quotient by the free action of $(C_j \cap \gamma Q\gamma^{-1})(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}$ on the contractible space $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})}$.

Proof. According to Proposition 6.18 (e), we have

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f)) = \prod_{\gamma \in \Omega} e^K(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}$$

and

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} = \prod_{\gamma \in \Omega} \overline{e^K(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}} ,$$

while

$$(p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap \overline{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))} = (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) \cap e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'$$

(Proposition 6.18 (b)). We thus may treat every component $e^K(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}$, resp. $\overline{e^K(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1}, g)_{z_0}}$, separately. By Definition 6.17 (a), the former is the image of $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})$ under the projection

$$p^{-1}(z_0) \twoheadrightarrow (p^K)^{-1}([(z_0, gK)]) , x \longmapsto [(x, gK)] .$$

According to Proposition 6.18 (a), the latter is the image of $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})}$ under the same projection.

Then, claim (a) follows from Corollary 6.15 (b), as $\gamma Q(\mathbb{Q})\gamma^{-1}$ equals the stabilizer in $G(\mathbb{Q})$ of $e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})$, and also of $\overline{e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})}$.

The part of claim (b) concerning the group by which we divide, follows from Corollary 6.15 (a). As for freeness of the action, and contractibility of $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(\gamma Q\gamma^{-1})}$, use Corollary 6.15 (b) and Corollary 6.10 (b). **q.e.d.**

We leave it to the reader to formulate and prove the variant of Theorem 6.20 valid for the fibres of $p^{r,K} : M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{rBS} \rightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$.

7 Local triviality of p over each stratum

In this last section, we prove (Theorems 7.15 and 7.20 (a)), that over any stratum of their target, both maps p and p^K are locally trivial fibrations (whose fibres were described in Section 6); as far as p^K is concerned, this result necessitates the level K to be neat. As for p , our result is known, since implied by [Z2, Prop. (3.8) (ii)]. The analogue of the result concerning p^K for the projection from the reductive Borel–Serre to the Baily–Borel compactification holds, too (Theorems 7.20 (b)); we thus recover [G, Thm. 5.8]. For the cohomological applications we have in mind, it will be important to have the stratified variants of Theorems 7.15 and 7.20 at our disposal: Corollary 7.17 and Complement 7.22.

We fix mixed Shimura data (P, \mathfrak{X}) . Until Complement 7.11, no further hypotheses on (P, \mathfrak{X}) will be required. We write $(G, \mathfrak{X}/W)$ for the quotient $(P, \mathfrak{X})/W$, and π for the canonical epimorphism from (P, \mathfrak{X}) to $(G, \mathfrak{X}/W)$. We need to study sections of the map $\mathfrak{X} \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{X}/W$ induced by π ; the latter map will be denoted by the same symbol.

Definition 7.1. Let $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}/W$. Define a map

$$\Phi_{z_0} : \pi^{-1}(z_0) \times \mathfrak{X}/W \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X} , (x, z) \longmapsto \ell x ,$$

where $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w)$ is such that $\pi(\ell)z_0 = z$.

Proposition 7.2. Let $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}/W$.

- (a) The map Φ_{z_0} is well defined.
- (b) The map Φ_{z_0} is an \mathbb{R} -analytic isomorphism.

(c) There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi^{-1}(z_0) \times \mathfrak{X}/W & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{z_0}} & \mathfrak{X} \\ & \searrow \text{pr}_2 & \swarrow \pi \\ & & \mathfrak{X}/W \end{array}$$

where pr_2 denotes the projection onto the second factor.

(d) The map Φ_{z_0} is $P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$ -equivariant in the following sense:

$$P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) = W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \rtimes \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w)$$

for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$; for $w \in W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$, we have

$$\Phi_{z_0}(wx, z) = w\Phi_{z_0}(x, z), \quad \forall (x, z) \in \pi^{-1}(z_0) \times \mathfrak{X}/W,$$

and for $x \in \pi^{-1}(z_0)$ and $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w)$, we have

$$\Phi_{z_0}(x, \pi(\ell)z) = \ell\Phi_{z_0}(x, z), \quad \forall z \in \mathfrak{X}/W.$$

(e) Let z_1 be another point of \mathfrak{X}/W . Then for all $(y, z) \in \pi^{-1}(z_1) \times \mathfrak{X}/W$, we have

$$\Phi_{z_1}(y, z) = \Phi_{z_0}(\ell'y, z),$$

where $\ell' \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_y \circ w)$ is such that $\pi(\ell')z_1 = z_0$.

Proof. We first repeat the remark preceding Proposition 1.10, showing that for any $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, the sub-group $\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{C}}}(h_x \circ w)$ is a Levi sub-group of $P_{\mathbb{C}}$. According to [P1, Def. 2.1 (ii)], its image in $(P/U)_{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined over \mathbb{R} , whence the first equality in (d),

$$P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) = W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \rtimes \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w).$$

Fix $x_0 \in \pi^{-1}(z_0)$. We identify \mathfrak{X} in a $P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$ -equivariant way with

$$W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \times (\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w) / \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(x_0)),$$

by sending gx_0 to the class of g modulo $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(x_0)$, for every g in $P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) = W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \rtimes \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w)$; likewise, we identify \mathfrak{X}/W with

$$G(\mathbb{R}) / \text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}(z_0).$$

These identifications are \mathbb{R} -analytic, and $\pi : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}/W$ corresponds to the projection onto the second factor $\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w) / \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(x_0)$, followed by the map induced by $\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w) \xrightarrow{\sim} G(\mathbb{R})$.

(a): the isomorphism $\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w) \xrightarrow{\sim} G(\mathbb{R})$ induces an isomorphism $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(x) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}(z_0)$ [P1, Lemma 1.17 (a), Cor. 2.12].

(b)–(d): note first that for $g \in P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$ and $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, we have

$$\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{gx} \circ w) = \text{Int}(g)(\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w))$$

and

$$\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(gx) = \text{Int}(g)(\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(x)) .$$

It follows that in our \mathbb{R} -analytic identifications

$$\mathfrak{X} = W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \times (\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w) / \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(x_0))$$

and

$$\mathfrak{X}/W = G(\mathbb{R}) / \text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}(z_0) ,$$

the map Φ_{z_0} associates to

$$(u, [g]) \in W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \times G(\mathbb{R}) / \text{Stab}_{G(\mathbb{R})}(z_0)$$

the pair

$$(u, [\ell] \in W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \times (\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w) / \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(x_0)) ,$$

where $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w)$ maps to g under π .

(e): by definition,

$$\Phi_{z_0}(\ell'y, z) = \ell_0 \ell'y ,$$

with $\ell_0 \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{\ell'y} \circ w) = \text{Int}(\ell')(\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_y \circ w))$ such that $\pi(\ell_0)z_0 = z$. Thus, the element ℓ_0 is of the form $\text{Int}(\ell')(\ell_1)$, with $\ell_1 \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_y \circ w)$. But then, the product $\ell_0 \ell' = \ell' \ell_1$ also belongs to $\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_y \circ w)$, and $\pi(\ell_0 \ell')(z_1) = \pi(\ell_0)z_0 = z$. **q.e.d.**

Remark 7.3. The following will not be used in the sequel. If hypotheses (+) and ($U = 0$) are satisfied, then we have the geodesic actions on \mathfrak{X} and on \mathfrak{X}/W . The formula

$$\Phi_{z_0}(x, \pi(\ell)z) = \ell \Phi_{z_0}(x, z) , \quad \forall z \in \mathfrak{X}/W ,$$

for $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_x \circ w) = L_x(\mathbb{R})$ (Proposition 7.2 (d)), and Proposition 3.22 together imply that

$$\Phi_{z_0}(x, a \cdot z) = a \cdot \Phi_{z_0}(x, z) , \quad \forall z \in \mathfrak{X}/W ,$$

for any parabolic Q of P and $a \in A_Q$ (which we identify with $A_{\pi(Q)}$). It follows that Φ_{z_0} extends to an isomorphism of manifolds with corners

$$\Phi_{z_0}^{BS} : \pi^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}/W)^{BS} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{X}^{BS} .$$

There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}/W)^{BS} & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{z_0}^{BS}} & \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \\ & \searrow pr_2 & \swarrow \pi^{BS} \\ & & (\mathfrak{X}/W)^{BS} \end{array}$$

where pr_2 denotes the projection onto the second factor, and π^{BS} is the map from Proposition 3.23 (a). In particular, the latter is a trivial fibration.

Definition 7.4. Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. Define a map

$$s_x : \mathfrak{X}/W \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X} , z \longmapsto \Phi_{\pi(x)}(x, z) .$$

Proposition 7.5. Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$.

- (a) The map s_x is an \mathbb{R} -analytic section of π .
(b) The map s_x is $G(\mathbb{R})$ -equivariant in the following sense: for $g \in G(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$s_x(gz) = \ell s_x(z) , \forall z \in \mathfrak{X}/W ,$$

where $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w)$ is such that $\pi(\ell) = g$. In particular, the image of s_x equals the orbit of x under $\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w)$.

- (c) Let y be another point of the image of s_x . Then $s_y = s_x$.
(d) Let $z, z' \in \mathfrak{X}/W$. Then the imaginary parts [P1, Sect. 4.14] of $s_x(z)$ and of $s_x(z')$ are the same:

$$\text{Im}(s_x(z)) = \text{Im}(s_x(z')) \in U(\mathbb{C}) .$$

Proof. Parts (a) and (b) follow from the definition of s_x , and from Proposition 7.2 (b), (c) and (d).

As for (c), let $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_x \circ w)$ such that $y = \ell x$, and $z \in \mathfrak{X}/W$. We have

$$\Phi_{\pi(x)}(x, z) = \Phi_{\pi(\ell)\pi(x)}(\ell x, z)$$

according to Proposition 7.2 (e), hence $s_x(z) = s_y(z)$.

In order to prove (d), put $z_0 := \pi(x)$, $u := \text{Im}(x)$, and $x_0 := u^{-1}x$. Thus, the point x_0 lies in the same fibre $\pi^{-1}(z_0)$ as x , and in addition belongs to $\text{Re}(\mathfrak{X})$, meaning that the morphism $h_{x_0} : \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow P_{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined over \mathbb{R} . Hence so is the Levi sub-group $\text{Cent}_{P_{\mathbb{C}}}(h_{x_0} \circ w)$ (it actually coincides with the base change from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{C} of the group L_{x_0} from Definition 1.11). As $\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w)$ maps isomorphically to $G(\mathbb{R})$ under π , it follows that

$$\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_0} \circ w) = \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_{x_0} \circ w) \subset P(\mathbb{R}) .$$

We repeat the identification

$$\mathfrak{X} = W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \times (\text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_{x_0} \circ w) / \text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(x_0))$$

from the proof of Proposition 7.2 with respect to the base point x_0 , meaning that gx_0 corresponds to the class of g modulo $\text{Stab}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(x_0)$, for every $g \in P(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) = W(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C}) \rtimes \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_{x_0} \circ w)$. In particular, the point x is identified with $(u, [1])$.

By definition, the map s_x equals $\Phi_{z_0}(x, \bullet)$; in the above identification, any element in the image of s_x is therefore of the shape $(u, [\ell])$, for some $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P(\mathbb{R})}(h_{x_0} \circ w)$. In particular, its imaginary part equals u . **q.e.d.**

The following is immediate from the definition.

Proposition 7.6. *Let $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}/W$. Then*

$$\Phi_{z_0}(x, z) = s_x(z), \quad \forall (x, z) \in \pi^{-1}(z_0) \times \mathfrak{X}/W.$$

As in [P1, Chap. 4], let us denote by $U(\mathbb{R})(-1)$ the real vector space of purely imaginary elements of $U(\mathbb{C})$.

Corollary 7.7. *Let $\mathfrak{H}' \subset \mathfrak{X}/W$ and $C \subset U(\mathbb{R})(-1)$ be open sub-sets. Consider the open sub-set*

$$\mathfrak{V} := \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{H}') \cap \text{Im}^{-1}(C)$$

of \mathfrak{X} . Then the induced complex analytic map $\pi|_{\mathfrak{V}} : \mathfrak{V} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}'$ is \mathbb{R} -analytically split. More precisely, for every $z_0 \in \mathfrak{H}'$, the map Φ_{z_0} induces an \mathbb{R} -analytic isomorphism

$$\pi|_{\mathfrak{V}}^{-1}(z_0) \times \mathfrak{H}' \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{V}.$$

Proof. Apply Propositions 7.5 (d) and 7.6. **q.e.d.**

For an admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of P , consider as in Section 6 the complex analytic, $Q_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})$ -equivariant map

$$\tilde{\pi}_j : \mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j.$$

Corollary 7.8. *Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P . Then the complex analytic map $\tilde{\pi}_j : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ is \mathbb{R} -analytically split. More precisely, let (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) be a rational boundary component associated to Q_j , and $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. Denote by $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ the connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j containing z_0 , and define $\mathfrak{X}^0 := \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$.*

(a) The map

$$\Phi_{z_0} : \pi_j^{-1}(z_0) \times \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{X}_j$$

induces an \mathbb{R} -analytic isomorphism

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0, j} : \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{X}^0.$$

(b) There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0, j}} & \mathfrak{X}^0 \\ & \searrow \text{pr}_2 & \swarrow \tilde{\pi}_j|_{\mathfrak{X}^0} \\ & & (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \end{array}$$

where pr_2 denotes the projection onto the second factor.

(c) For all $x \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$, we have

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0, j}(x, z_0) = x.$$

Proof. Put $\mathfrak{H} := (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$. According to [P1, Sect. 4.11], its pre-image $\mathfrak{X}^0 = \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(\mathfrak{H})$ is a connected component of \mathfrak{X} . Define C as the image $C(\mathfrak{X}^0, P_j)$ of the composition of ι_j and the imaginary part Im_j associated to (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) . Then [P1, Prop. 4.15 (a), (b)], the sub-set C of $U_j(\mathbb{R})(-1)$ is open, and the map ι_j identifies \mathfrak{X}^0 and

$$\mathfrak{Y} := \pi_j^{-1}(\mathfrak{H}) \cap \text{Im}_j^{-1}(C) .$$

Now apply Corollary 7.7 and Proposition 7.2 (c) to (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) , \mathfrak{H} and C .

q.e.d.

Remark 7.9. In the situation of Corollary 7.8, the map Φ_{z_0} actually induces an isomorphism of the larger open sub-sets

$$\tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Im}_j^{-1}(C) .$$

But unless \mathfrak{X} is connected, the right hand side is not in general contained in the sub-set \mathfrak{X} of \mathfrak{X}_j .

Example 7.10. Consider the Shimura data $(\text{GL}_{2,\mathbb{Q}}, \mathfrak{H}_2)$ of Example 1.15, and the admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of $\text{GL}_{2,\mathbb{Q}}$ of upper triangular matrices. According to [P1, Sect. 4.25], there is a unique rational boundary component (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) associated to Q_j . It is isomorphic to the mixed Shimura data denoted (P_0, \mathfrak{X}_0) in [P1, Ex. 2.24]. We have

$$\mathfrak{H}_2 = \mathfrak{H}^+ \amalg \mathfrak{H}^- ,$$

where \mathfrak{H}^+ and \mathfrak{H}^- denote the upper and the lower half plane in \mathbb{C} , respectively,

$$\mathfrak{X}_j = \mathbb{C} \amalg \mathbb{C}$$

(two copies of \mathbb{C}), and

$$\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j = \{+\} \amalg \{-\} .$$

The map $\iota_j : \mathfrak{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_j$ equals the inclusion of \mathfrak{H}^+ into the first component \mathbb{C} and the inclusion of \mathfrak{H}^- into the second [P1, Sect. 4.26], and the canonical epimorphism $\mathfrak{X}_j \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ is the projection to the respective base points, $+$ for the first, and $-$ for the second component \mathbb{C} .

This illustrates Remark 7.9, even in a situation where Proposition 7.2 is trivial: put $z_0 := +$. The \mathbb{R} -analytic isomorphism

$$\Phi_+ : \mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{X}_j$$

(\mathbb{C} being the first component of \mathfrak{X}_j) maps $(z, +)$ to the point z in the first component \mathbb{C} of \mathfrak{X}_j , and $(z, -)$ to the point z in the second component \mathbb{C} . Therefore,

$$\Phi_+(\mathfrak{H}^+ \times \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) = \mathfrak{H}^+ \amalg \mathfrak{H}^+ \not\subset \mathfrak{H}_2 .$$

Indeed, the splitting of $\tilde{\pi}_j$ provided by Corollary 7.8 equals Φ_+ (only) on $\mathbb{C} \times \{+\} \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$, and Φ_- on $\mathbb{C} \times \{-\}$, for the second component \mathbb{C} of \mathfrak{X}_j .

Recall (Definition 4.9) the closed connected normal sub-group

$$C_j = \{q \in Q_j, \pi_{Q_j}(q) \in \text{Cent}_{\bar{Q}_j}(\pi_{Q_j}(P_j))\}^0$$

of Q_j .

Complement 7.11. *Let (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) be a rational boundary component associated to Q_j , and $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. Denote by $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ the connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j containing z_0 , and define $\mathfrak{X}^0 := \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$. Then the map*

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j} : \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{X}^0$$

is $\text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant in the following sense: for all $q \in \text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{R})U(\mathbb{C})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$, we have

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(qx, z) = q\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z), \quad \forall (x, z) \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0.$$

Proof. The desired equality can be checked in \mathfrak{X}_j as ι_j is injective. Write x_j for the image of x under ι_j . By Definition 7.1,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z) = \ell x_j,$$

where $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P_j(\mathbb{R})U_j(\mathbb{C})}(h_{x_j} \circ w)$ is such that $\pi_j(\ell)z_0 = z$. But then, the element $q\ell q^{-1}$ belongs to $\text{Cent}_{P_j(\mathbb{R})U_j(\mathbb{C})}(h_{qx_j} \circ w)$. Since $q \in C_j$, it satisfies $\pi_j(q\ell q^{-1}) = \pi_{Q_j}(q)\pi_j(\ell)\pi_{Q_j}(q)^{-1} = \pi_j(\ell)$. Thus, again by Definition 7.1,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(qx, z) = (q\ell q^{-1})qx_j,$$

which equals $q\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z)$.

q.e.d.

We are ready to analyze the compatibility between the splittings $\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}$ and the geodesic action. Recall the Levi sub-groups $L_{x,Q}$ (Definition 2.3, Corollary 2.7).

Lemma 7.12. *Assume hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$. Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P , and Q a parabolic contained in Q_j and containing P_j (in other words, we have $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$). Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. The inclusion*

$$\text{Cent}_{{}^0P_j^0(\mathbb{R})}(h_{\iota_j(x)} \circ w) \subset \text{Cent}_{({}^0P_j^0(\mathbb{R}))U_j(\mathbb{C})}(h_{\iota_j(x)} \circ w)$$

is an equality, and

$$\text{Cent}_{{}^0P_{j,\mathbb{R}}^0}(h_{\iota_j(x)} \circ w) \subset L_{x,Q}.$$

Proof. Let $q \in {}^0P_j^0(\mathbb{R})$ and $u \in U_j(\mathbb{R})(-1)$. For any $y \in \mathfrak{X}_j$, we then have

$$\text{Im}((qu)y) = \text{Int}(q)(u + \text{Im}(y))$$

[P1, Sect. 4.14]. The Shimura data (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) , are irreducible [P1, Rem. (ii) on p. 82]. Therefore [P1, Prop. 2.14 (a)], the group P_j acts on $\text{Lie } U_j$ through a character. But all characters of P_j are trivial on ${}^0P_j^0$ [BS, Sect. 1.1]. It follows that

$$\text{Im}((qu)y) = u + \text{Im}(y) .$$

This shows that if $(qu)y$ and y have the same imaginary part, then u is trivial. In particular,

$$\text{Cent}_{({}^0P_j^0(\mathbb{R}))U_j(\mathbb{C})}(h_{\iota_j(x)} \circ w) \subset {}^0P_j^0(\mathbb{R}) ,$$

which establishes the first of the two claims. Next,

$$\text{Cent}_{{}^0P_{j,\mathbb{R}}^0}(h_{\iota_j(x)} \circ w) = \text{Cent}_{{}^0P_{j,\mathbb{R}}^0}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) ,$$

again since ${}^0P_{j,\mathbb{R}}^0$ centralizes U_j .

In order to establish the second claim, it therefore suffices to show that

$$\text{Cent}_{P_{j,\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) \subset L_{x,Q} .$$

Recall (Corollary 2.7 (a)) that

$$L_{x,Q} \subset \text{Cent}_{P_{j,\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) .$$

It follows that there is an inclusion

$$P_{j,\mathbb{R}} \cap L_{x,Q} \subset \text{Cent}_{P_{j,\mathbb{R}}}(h_{\text{Re}_j(x)} \circ w) .$$

But both sides are Levi sub-groups of $P_{j,\mathbb{R}}$ (recall that P_j is normal in Q). Therefore, the inclusion is an equality. **q.e.d.**

Corollary 7.13. *Assume hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$. Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P , and $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$. Let (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) be a rational boundary component associated to Q_j , and z_0 and z be points in the same connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j . Then for all $x \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0)$, there exists*

$$\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P_j(\mathbb{R})U_j(\mathbb{C})}(h_{\iota_j(x)} \circ w) \cap L_{x,Q}(\mathbb{R})$$

such that $\pi_j(\ell)z_0 = z$.

Proof. Write $G_j := P_j/W_j$. By Corollary 1.19 (a), (b), the stabilizer of z_0 in $G_j(\mathbb{R})$ contains a connected complement of ${}^0G_j(\mathbb{R})$ in $G_j(\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, the sub-group ${}^0G_j(\mathbb{R})$ in $G_j(\mathbb{R})$ acts transitively on \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j . Choose $g \in {}^0G_j(\mathbb{R})^0$ such that $gz_0 = z$, and $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P_j(\mathbb{R})U_j(\mathbb{C})}(h_{\iota_j(x)} \circ w)$ such that $\pi_j(\ell) = g$. Given the choice of g , the element ℓ actually belongs to $\text{Cent}_{({}^0P_j(\mathbb{R})^0)U_j(\mathbb{C})}(h_{\iota_j(x)} \circ w)$. Now apply Lemma 7.12. **q.e.d.**

Corollary 7.14. *Assume hypotheses (+) and $(U = 0)$. Let Q_j be an admissible parabolic sub-group of P , (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) a rational boundary component*

associated to Q_j , and $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. Denote by $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ the connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j containing z_0 , and define $\mathfrak{X}^0 := \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$. Then the \mathbb{R} -analytic isomorphism

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j} : \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{X}^0$$

is equivariant for the geodesic action: for all $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$, and for all $a \in A_Q$, we have

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(a \cdot x, z) = a \cdot \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z), \quad \forall (x, z) \in \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0.$$

Proof. Recall that

$$a \cdot x = a_x x,$$

where $a_x \in Z(L_{x,Q})(\mathbb{R})$ maps to a under π_Q . By Corollary 6.7 (b) and Complement 7.11,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(a \cdot x, z) = \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(a_x x, z) = a_x \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z).$$

Our statement is therefore proved once we establish the equality

$$a \cdot \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z) = a_x \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z).$$

By Definition 7.1,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z) = \ell x,$$

where $\ell \in \text{Cent}_{P_j(\mathbb{R})U_j(\mathbb{C})}(h_{\nu_j(x)} \circ w)$ is such that $\pi_j(\ell)z_0 = z$. According to Corollary 7.13, ℓ can be chosen in $L_{x,Q}(\mathbb{R})$. But then, ℓ and a_x commute with each other. Therefore,

$$a_x = \ell a_x \ell^{-1} \in Z(L_{\ell x, Q})(\mathbb{R}),$$

and

$$a \cdot \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z) = a \cdot (\ell x) = a_x \ell x = a_x \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}(x, z).$$

q.e.d.

For the rest of the section, assume that the Shimura data $(P, \mathfrak{X}) = (G, \mathfrak{X})$ are pure, and that they satisfy hypothesis (+). Also, fix an admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of P . Consider as before the composition $\tilde{\pi}_j : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ of the inclusion of \mathfrak{X} into the disjoint union of the spaces \mathfrak{X}_j underlying rational boundary components associated to Q_j , and the canonical epimorphisms $\pi_j : \mathfrak{X}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$.

Recall the map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$. By Construction 4.13, its restriction p_{Q_j} to the face $e(Q_j)$ is defined by the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{X} & \twoheadrightarrow & e(Q_j) = A_{Q_j} \backslash \mathfrak{X} \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_{Q_j} \\ \mathfrak{X} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_j} & \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \end{array}$$

Corollary 7.14 implies in particular that $\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}$ induces an isomorphism

$$(p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 = A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} A_{Q_j} \setminus \mathfrak{X}^0,$$

which we shall denote by $A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}$. Its composition with the inclusions

$$p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j) \hookrightarrow (p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0, \quad x \mapsto (x, z_0)$$

and

$$A_{Q_j} \setminus \mathfrak{X}^0 \hookrightarrow A_{Q_j} \setminus \mathfrak{X} = e(Q_j)$$

equals the inclusion of $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j)$ into $e(Q_j)$, as follows from Corollary 7.8 (c).

The following is the first main result of this section.

Theorem 7.15. *Let (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) be a rational boundary component associated to Q_j , and $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. Denote by $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ the connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j containing z_0 , and define $\mathfrak{X}^0 := \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$.*

(a) *The composition of the isomorphism*

$$A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j} : (p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} A_{Q_j} \setminus \mathfrak{X}^0$$

and the inclusion

$$A_{Q_j} \setminus \mathfrak{X}^0 \hookrightarrow e(Q_j) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS}$$

extends uniquely to a continuous map

$$k_{z_0,j} : p^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS}.$$

The map $k_{z_0,j}$ is a morphism of manifolds with corners.

(b) *We have*

$$k_{z_0,j}(x, z_0) = x, \quad \forall x \in p^{-1}(z_0).$$

(c) *The morphism $k_{z_0,j}$ is injective. It respects the stratifications; more precisely, for any parabolic Q of G , we have*

$$k_{z_0,j}^{-1}(e(Q)) = (p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$$

if $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$, and

$$k_{z_0,j}^{-1}(e(Q)) = \emptyset$$

if $Q \notin \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$.

(d) *The morphism $k_{z_0,j}$ is $\text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant: we have*

$$k_{z_0,j}(qx, z) = qk_{z_0,j}(x, z), \quad \forall (x, z) \in p^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0,$$

for all $q \in \text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$.

(e) *The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 & \xrightarrow{k_{z_0,j}} & \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \\ \text{\scriptsize } pr_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{X}^* \end{array}$$

is commutative ($pr_2 :=$ the projection onto the second factor).

(f) *The diagram from (e) is Cartesian. In other words, the morphism $k_{z_0,j}$ yields an identification of $p^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ with the pre-image under $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ of $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \subset \mathfrak{X}^*$.*

Proof. Using the isomorphism

$$\kappa_{z_0,j} : (A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}(z_0)$$

from Theorem 6.8, the required map $k_{z_0,j}$ is identified with

$$(A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS},$$

extending the inclusion

$$A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}} A_{Q_j} \setminus \mathfrak{X}^0 \hookrightarrow e(Q_j) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS}.$$

(a), (c), (d): imitate the proof of Theorem 6.8 (a), (b), (c), using Corollary 7.14 and Complement 7.11.

(b): as $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j)$ is dense in $p^{-1}(z_0)$, and \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is Hausdorff [BS, Thm. 7.8], the inclusion of $p^{-1}(z_0)$ into \mathfrak{X}^{BS} is the only continuous extension to $p^{-1}(z_0)$ of the inclusion of $p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q_j)$.

(e): as $A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ is dense in $(A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0))^{BS} \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$, and \mathfrak{X}^* is Hausdorff [BB, Thm. 4.9 (iii), (iv)], it suffices to show that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 & \xrightarrow{k_{z_0,j}} & \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \\ \text{\scriptsize } pr_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{X}^* \end{array}$$

commutes. But the restriction of $k_{z_0,j}$ to $A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ equals

$$A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{A_{Q_j} \setminus \tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}} A_{Q_j} \setminus \mathfrak{X}^0 \hookrightarrow e(Q_j) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS}.$$

Our claim therefore follows from Construction 4.13 and Corollary 7.8 (b).

(f): by Construction 4.13, the pre-image $p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$ equals the disjoint union of those faces $e(Q)$ for which $\text{adm}(Q) = Q_j$. Therefore,

$$p^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) = \coprod_{\text{adm}(Q)=Q_j} A_Q \setminus \mathfrak{X}^0.$$

It thus suffices to observe that the right hand side of this equation equals the image of $k_{z_0,j}$. **q.e.d.**

Remark 7.16. Parts (e) and (f) of Theorem 7.15 imply in particular that over any connected component $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ of a stratum of \mathfrak{X}^* , the map $p : \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ is a trivial fibration with contractible fibres. This result is already known: [Z2, Prop. (3.8) (ii)].

Corollary 7.17. *Let (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) be a rational boundary component associated to Q_j , and $z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. Denote by $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ the connected component of \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j containing z_0 , and define $\mathfrak{X}^0 := \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$. Let $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$. Then*

$$k_{z_0, j} : p^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$$

restricts to a $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant \mathbb{R} -analytic isomorphism

$$(p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) \cap e(Q),$$

and a $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant isomorphism of manifolds with corners

$$(p^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e(Q)}) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) \cap \overline{e(Q)}.$$

Proof. For all claims except $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariance of

$$(p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} p^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) \cap e(Q),$$

apply Theorem 7.15 (c) and (d) (recall that by Theorem 7.15 (c), the only faces $e(R)$ having non-empty intersection with $p^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$, are those for which $R \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$). Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{X} & \longrightarrow & A_Q \backslash \mathfrak{X} = e(Q) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_Q \\ \mathfrak{X} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_j} & \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \end{array}$$

as well as its base changes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{X}^0 & \longrightarrow & A_Q \backslash \mathfrak{X}^0 = p^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) \cap e(Q) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_Q \\ \mathfrak{X}^0 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_j} & (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \end{array}$$

to $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$, and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) & \longrightarrow & A_Q \backslash \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) = p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow p_Q \\ \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_j} & \{z_0\} \end{array}$$

to $\{z_0\}$, recalling [BS, Prop. 3.4] that the geodesic action of A_Q commutes with the action of $Q(\mathbb{R})$. The diagrams are therefore $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant. The restriction

$$(p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \longrightarrow p^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) \cap e(Q),$$

of $k_{z_0,j}$ to $(p^{-1}(z_0) \cap e(Q)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ is thus identified with the map

$$A_Q \setminus \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \longrightarrow A_Q \setminus \mathfrak{X}^0$$

induced by $\tilde{\Phi}_{z_0,j}$, which is indeed $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant (Complement 7.11). **q.e.d.**

The reader will find no difficulty, proceeding as in the proof of Corollary 6.11 (a), to show the analogues of Theorem 7.15 and Corollary 7.17 for the map $p^r : \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$. We therefore content ourselves with their statement.

Corollary 7.18. *Let (P_j, \mathfrak{X}_j) be a rational boundary component associated to Q_j , and $z_0 \in (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$. Define $\mathfrak{X}^0 := \tilde{\pi}_j^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$.*

(a) *The isomorphism $k_{z_0,j}$ induces a $\text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant identification of $(p^r)^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ with the pre-image under $p^r : \mathfrak{X}^{rBS} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^*$ of $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \subset \mathfrak{X}^*$.*

(b) *Let $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$. Then the isomorphism*

$$(p^r)^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} (p^r)^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$$

from (a) restricts to a $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{R})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant isomorphism

$$((p^r)^{-1}(z_0) \cap e^r(Q)) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} (p^r)^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) \cap e^r(Q),$$

and a $\text{Cent}_{(C_j \cap Q)(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -equivariant isomorphism

$$((p^r)^{-1}(z_0) \cap \overline{e^r(Q)}) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} (p^r)^{-1}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0) \cap \overline{e^r(Q)}$$

($\overline{e^r(Q)}$:= the closure of $e^r(Q)$ in \mathfrak{X}^{rBS}).

Let us finish the present section by spelling out the consequences of the above results for Shimura varieties and their compactifications. As before, consider the disjoint union $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j$ of the finitely many spaces underlying rational boundary components associated to Q_j , and its quotient $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$.

Proposition 7.19. *Let K be an open compact sub-group of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$, and $g \in G(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Consider the image $i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$ of $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \times \{gK\}$ under the projection*

$$\mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K \longrightarrow G(\mathbb{Q}) \setminus (\mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K) = M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C}).$$

Define

$$H_Q := H_Q(gK) := Q_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1} \subset Q_j(\mathbb{Q}).$$

(a) *As a sub-set of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$,*

$$i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) = H_Q \setminus \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \times \{gK\} \right) \subset G(\mathbb{Q}) \setminus (\mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K).$$

Consequently, the pre-image under $p^K : M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} \rightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$ of $i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$ equals

$$H_Q \setminus \left(p^{-1} \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \right) \times \{gK\} \right) \subset G(\mathbb{Q}) \setminus (\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K) .$$

(b) If K is neat, then the action of

$$H_C := H_C(gK) := C_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1} \subset C_j(\mathbb{Q})$$

on $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ is trivial. The induced action on $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ of the quotient H_Q/H_C is free.

(c) If K is neat, then the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_C \setminus \left(p^{-1} \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \right) \times \{gK\} \right) & \longrightarrow & (p^K)^{-1} \left(i_{K,g} \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \right) \right) \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow p^K \\ \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \times \{gK\} & \longrightarrow & i_{K,g} \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \right) \end{array}$$

is Cartesian.

Proof. We leave the proof of part (a) to the reader.

Part (b) is Proposition 6.14 (e), applied to $\Gamma = H_Q$.

Under the identifications from (a), the diagram in (c) transforms into

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_C \setminus p^{-1} \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \right) & \longrightarrow & H_Q \setminus p^{-1} \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \right) \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j & \longrightarrow & H_Q \setminus \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \right) \end{array}$$

Denote by F the Cartesian product of $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ and $H_Q \setminus p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$ over $H_Q \setminus (\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$. It is easy to see that the map

$$\alpha : H_C \setminus p^{-1} \left(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \right) \longrightarrow F$$

is surjective. Let x and y be elements of $p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$, and assume that their images in $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ and in $H_Q \setminus p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$ are the same. In other words, there is an element $q \in H_Q$ such that $y = qx$, and such that q stabilizes $p(x)$. The action of H_Q/H_C on $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$ being free (according to (b)), the latter property of q implies $q \in H_C$. Therefore, the points x and y yield the same class in $H_C \setminus p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$, and α is injective. **q.e.d.**

Here is the second main result of this section.

Theorem 7.20. *Let K be an open compact neat sub-group of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Fix an admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of P , and consider the canonical stratum $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$ of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*$ (according to Definition 5.6 (a), its space of complex points thus equals the image of $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ under the projection*

$$\mathfrak{X}^* \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K \longrightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C}) .$$

(a) The base change of the map $p^K : M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} \rightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$ to $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$ is a locally trivial fibration.

(b) The base change of the map $p^{r,K} : M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{rBS} \rightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$ to $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$ is a locally trivial fibration.

Proof. We may replace $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$ by $i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)$, for g running through the elements of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$. According to Proposition 7.19 (a), (b), it is sufficient to prove the claims after base change *via* the projection

$$\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \times \{gK\} \twoheadrightarrow i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j).$$

(a): following Proposition 7.19 (c), the base change diagram is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_C \backslash \left(p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) \times \{gK\} \right) & \longrightarrow & (p^K)^{-1}(i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)) \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow p^K \\ \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \times \{gK\} & \longrightarrow & i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) \end{array}$$

Thus, we need to show that the map

$$p : H_C \backslash \left(p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) \right) \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$$

is locally trivial. This in turn will be achieved once we know that

$$p : p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) \longrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$$

is H_C -equivariantly locally trivial. Let $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$ be a connected component of $\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$. Choose a point z_0 in $(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0$. Then according to Theorem 7.15 (d)–(f), the morphism of manifolds with corners

$$k_{z_0,j} : p^{-1}(z_0) \times (\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{BS}$$

is a $\text{Cent}_{C_j(\mathbb{Q})}((\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0)$ -, hence H_C -equivariant trivialization of $p|_{(\mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)^0}$.

(b): imitate the proof of part (a), using Corollary 7.18 (a) instead of Theorem 7.15. **q.e.d.**

Remark 7.21. Theorem 7.20 (b), together with the description of the fibres of $p^{r,K}$ from Corollary 6.15 (c), follows from [G, Thm. 5.8], at least if \mathfrak{X} is connected.

Here is the stratified version of Theorem 7.20 (a).

Complement 7.22. Let K be an open compact neat sub-group of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Fix an admissible parabolic sub-group Q_j of P , and consider the canonical stratum $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})$ of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*$. Let $Q \in \text{adm}^{-1}(Q_j)$, and consider the canonical stratum $e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))$ of $M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$, as well as the sub-set $e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))'$ of the closure $e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))$ from Definition 5.3.

(a) The base change of

$$p|_{e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}^K : e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f)) \hookrightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} \xrightarrow{p^K} M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$$

to $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$ is a locally trivial fibration.

(b) The base change of

$$p_{|e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}'^K : e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' \hookrightarrow M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS} \xrightarrow{p^K} M^K(G, \mathfrak{X})^*(\mathbb{C})$$

to $M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$ is a locally trivial fibration.

Proof. According to Theorem 5.8 (b), we have

$$e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' \subset (p^K)^{-1}(M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})) .$$

Thus, our claims amount to local triviality of

$$p_{|e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}'^K : e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' \longrightarrow M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})$$

and

$$p_{|e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}'^K : e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' \longrightarrow M^K(Q_j, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C}) .$$

We leave it to the reader to show that

$$e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f)) = \coprod_{g \in \Lambda} e^K(Q, g) \quad \text{and} \quad e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))' = \coprod_{g \in \Lambda} e^K(Q, g)' ,$$

for a (necessarily finite) set $\Lambda \subset G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ of representatives of $Q(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash G(\mathbb{A}_f) / K$. Here, the set $e^K(Q, g)'$ denotes the image of

$$e(Q)' \times \{gK\} \subset \mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f) / K$$

under the projection from $\mathfrak{X}^{BS} \times P(\mathbb{A}_f) / K$ to $M^K(P, \mathfrak{X})(\mathbb{C})^{BS}$. Thus, it will be sufficient to show local triviality of

$$p_{|e^K(Q, g)}^K : e^K(Q, g) \longrightarrow i_{K, g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j)$$

and

$$p_{|e^K(Q, g)}^K : e^K(Q, g)' \longrightarrow i_{K, g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j) ,$$

for any $g \in G(\mathbb{A}_f)$.

Let us indicate the necessary modifications of the proof of Theorem 7.20: first reproduce the Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_C \backslash \left(p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j) \times \{gK\} \right) & \longrightarrow & (p^K)^{-1}(i_{K, g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j)) \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow p^K \\ \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j \times \{gK\} & \longrightarrow & i_{K, g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j / W_j) \end{array}$$

from Proposition 7.19 (c). Restriction to $e^K(Q, g)$ and $e^K(Q, g)'$, respectively,

in the upper right corner yields the Cartesian diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_C \backslash (Y \times \{gK\}) & \longrightarrow & e^K(Q, g) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
H_C \backslash (p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) \times \{gK\}) & \longrightarrow & (p^K)^{-1}(i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)) \\
p \downarrow & & \downarrow p^K \\
\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \times \{gK\} & \longrightarrow & i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)
\end{array}$$

for $Y := \coprod_{\gamma \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}} e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1})$, and

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_C \backslash (Y' \times \{gK\}) & \longrightarrow & e^K(Q, g)' \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
H_C \backslash (p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) \times \{gK\}) & \longrightarrow & (p^K)^{-1}(i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)) \\
p \downarrow & & \downarrow p^K \\
\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j \times \{gK\} & \longrightarrow & i_{K,g}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j)
\end{array}$$

for $Y' := \coprod_{\gamma \in Q_j(\mathbb{Q}) \cap gKg^{-1}} e(\gamma Q \gamma^{-1})'$ (using Proposition 3.7 and Complement 4.15 (b)).

Second, we need to show that the restrictions of

$$p : p^{-1}(\coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j) \twoheadrightarrow \coprod \mathfrak{X}_j/W_j$$

to Y and to Y' , respectively, are H_C -equivariantly locally trivial. But the morphisms $k_{z_0, j}$ used in the proof of Theorem 7.20 are not only H_C -equivariant (Theorem 7.15 (d)–(f)), but they also respect the stratifications (Corollary 7.17). **q.e.d.**

Remark 7.23. The fibres of the maps $p_{|e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}^K$ and $p_{|e^K(Q, G(\mathbb{A}_f))}'^K$ are described in Theorem 6.20.

We leave it to the reader to formulate and prove the stratified version of Theorem 7.20 (b).

References

- [AMRT] A. Ash, D. Mumford, M. Rapoport, Y. Tai, *Smooth Compactification of Locally Symmetric Varieties*, in: *Lie groups: History, Frontiers and Applications*, Vol. IV, Math. Sci. Press (1975).
- [BB] W.L. Baily, A. Borel, *Compactification of arithmetic quotients of bounded symmetric domains*, Ann. of Math. **84** (1966), 442–528.

- [B] A. Borel, *Introduction aux groupes arithmétiques*, Hermann (1969).
- [BS] A. Borel, J.-P. Serre, *Corners and Arithmetic Groups (Appendice : Arrondissement des variétés à coins par A. Douady and L. Hérault)*, Comment. Math. Helvetici **48** (1973), 436–491.
- [BT] A. Borel, J. Tits, *Groupe réductifs*, Publ. Math. IHES **27** (1965), 55–151, *Compléments*, Publ. Math. IHES **41** (1972), 253–276.
- [BW] J.I. Burgos, J. Wildeshaus, *Hodge modules on Shimura varieties and their higher direct images in the Baily–Borel compactification*, Ann. Scient. ENS. **37** (2004), 363–413.
- [G] M. Goresky, *Compactifications and cohomology of modular varieties*, in J. Arthur et al (eds.), *Harmonic analysis, the trace formula and Shimura varieties, Proceedings of the Clay Mathematics Institute 2003 summer school, Toronto, Canada, June 2–27, 2003*, Clay Mathematics Proceedings **4**, Amer. Math. Soc. (2005), 551–582.
- [M] G.D. Mostow, *Self-adjoint groups*, Ann. of Math. **62** (1955), 44–55.
- [P1] R. Pink, *Arithmetical compactification of mixed Shimura varieties*, Bonner Mathematische Schriften **209**, Univ. Bonn (1990).
- [P2] R. Pink, *On ℓ -adic sheaves on Shimura varieties and their higher direct images in the Baily–Borel compactification*, Math. Ann. **292** (1992), 197–240.
- [W] J. Wildeshaus *Shimura data and corners: cohomology*, in preparation.
- [Z1] S. Zucker, *L_2 cohomology of warped products and arithmetic groups*, Invent. Math. **70** (1982), 169–218.
- [Z2] S. Zucker, *Satake compactifications*, Comment. Math. Helvetici **58** (1983), 312–343.