

## PROJECTIVE CYCLIC GROUPS IN HIGHER DIMENSIONS

ANGEL CANO, LUIS LOEZA, AND ALEJANDRO UCAN-PUC

ABSTRACT. In this article we provide a classification of the projective transformations in  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  considered as automorphisms of the complex projective space  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ . Our classification is an interplay between algebra and dynamics. Just as in the case of isometries of  $CAT(0)$ -spaces, this is given by means of three types of transformations, namely: elliptic, parabolic and loxodromic. We describe the dynamics in each case, more precisely we determine the corresponding Kulkarni's limit set, the equicontinuity region, minimal sets, the discontinuity region and maximal regions where the corresponding cyclic group acts properly discontinuously. We also provide, in each case, some equivalent ways to classify the projective transformations.

## INTRODUCTION

Discrete groups of projective transformations arise as monodromy groups of ordinary differential equations (see [9]), associated to Riccati's foliations (see [12]) or as the monodromy groups of the so called orbifold uniformizing differential equations (see [14]). However outside the groups coming from complex hyperbolic geometry, little is known about their dynamics, see [3]. Yet, as in the one dimensional case, one might expect interesting results. In this paper we deal with the basic problem of classifying the projective transformations and understand their dynamic.

When we look at elements in  $PU(1, n)$ , one has that they preserve a ball, then, as in the one dimensional case, this fact enables us to classify the transformations in  $PU(1, n)$  by means of their fixed points and their position in the closed complex ball. More precisely, an element is said to be: elliptic if it has a fixed point in the complex ball, parabolic if it has a unique fixed point in the boundary of the complex ball and finally the element is said to be loxodromic if it has exactly two fixed points in the boundary of the complex ball. However, when we deal with automorphisms of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ , this type of classification makes no sense, since in general there is not an invariant ball. So, to extend the previous classification to  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ , we must think dynamically, more precisely we must look into the local behavior around the fixed points. The following definition captures this point of view.

**Definition 0.1.** Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation, then

- (1) The element  $\gamma$  is called elliptic if there is a lift  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  of  $\gamma$ , which is diagonalizable and each of its eigenvalues is unitary.
- (2) The element  $\gamma$  is called loxodromic is there is a lift  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  of  $\gamma$  having non-unitary eigenvalue.

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37F99, 32Q, 32M Secondary 30F40, 20H10, 57M60, 53C.

Supported by grants of the PAPPIT's project IN101816 and CONACYT's 272169.

- (3) The element  $\gamma$  is parabolic, if there is a lift  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  of  $\gamma$  which is non diagonalizable and has only unitary eigenvalues.

Clearly this definition exhausts all the possibilities and agrees with the standard classification in the one and two dimensional setting, as well as, in the case of transformations in  $PU(1, n)$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , see [3, 7]. There is also another classification of the projective transformations of  $PSL(3, \mathbb{C})$  in terms of the fixed set given in [12], which is closely related to our classification but properly talking does not agree with the one exposed here.

As in the two dimensional case, see [3], we want to know the relations between different notions of limit set (Kulkarni limit set, complement of the discontinuity set, complement of the equicontinuity set, minimal sets, complements of maximal sets where the action is properly discontinuously) for complex Kleinian groups in all dimensions, and a nice starting point towards the solution of this problem is providing a description of the after told mentioned sets for cyclic groups. In this article we show:

**Theorem 0.2** (The discontinuity set). *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation, then:*

- (1) *The element  $\gamma$  is elliptic if and only if the set of accumulation points of orbits of points in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  under the action of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  either is empty or the whole space  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ , depending on whether  $\gamma$  has finite order or not.*
- (2) *The element  $\gamma$  is parabolic if and only if the set of accumulation points of orbits of points in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  under the action of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  is a single proper projective subspace (see Theorem 1.6 for a detailed description).*
- (3) *The element  $\gamma$  is loxodromic if and only if the set of accumulation points of orbits of points in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  under the action of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  is a finite disjoint union of at least two projective subspaces (see Theorem 1.6 for a detailed description).*

**Theorem 0.3** (The equicontinuity set). *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation, then:*

- (1) *The element  $\gamma$  is elliptic if and only if the equicontinuity set of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  is the whole space  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ .*
- (2) *The element  $\gamma$  is parabolic if and only if the complement of the equicontinuity set of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  is a single projective subspace  $\mathcal{L}$  (see Theorem 2.8 for a precise description).*
- (3) *The element  $\gamma$  is loxodromic if and only if the complement of the equicontinuity set of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  can be described as the union of two proper distinct projective subspaces  $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  (see Theorem 2.8 for a precise description).*

The Kulkarni's discontinuity set was introduced in [10] as a way to construct regions where a group acts properly discontinuously (see the formal definitions below and see [3, 10] for a detailed discussion), respect this notion we show.

**Theorem 0.4** (The Kulkarni's limit set). *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation, then:*

- (1) *The element  $\gamma$  is elliptic if and only if the Kulkarni's limit set of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  is either empty or the whole space  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ , depending on whether  $\gamma$  has finite order or not. In this case the Kulkarni discontinuity region of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  is the largest open set on which  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  acts properly discontinuously.*

- (2) The element  $\gamma$  is parabolic if and only if the Kulkarni's limit set of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  is a projective subspace  $\mathfrak{L}$  (see Theorem 4.17 for a precise description). In this case the Kulkarni discontinuity region of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  might not be is the largest open set on which  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  acts properly discontinuously, see Corollary 4.19.
- (3) The element  $\gamma$  is loxodromic if and only if the Kulkarni's limit set of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  can be described as the union of two proper distinct projective subspaces  $\mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  ( see Theorem 5.6 for a precise description). In this case the Kulkarni's discontinuity region of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  might not be is the largest open set on which  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  acts properly discontinuously, see example 5.7.

Theorems 0.3 and 0.4 looks-alike, indeed for  $n \leq 2$  it is true that the equicontinuity set and the Kulkarni's discontinuity region agree, see [3], however as we well see in Examples 4.9, 4.10, 5.9 and 5.10, it happens that in the higher dimensional case the discontinuity set and the Kurkarni's discontinuity region might or might not agree.

From the one and two dimensional settings we know that Definition 0.1 can be given in terms of certain foliations (see [3]), in fact this provides a simple and useful way to describe the global dynamics of cyclic groups. In this article we propose a generalization of such foliations, but before we state the analogous results, let us introduce some notation. Let  $\mathbb{C}^{k,l}$ ,  $0 < k \leq l$ , be a copy of  $\mathbb{C}^{k+l}$  equipped with the hermitian form:

$$\langle U, V \rangle_{k,l} = - \sum_{j=1}^k u_j \bar{v}_j + \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+l} u_j \bar{v}_j.$$

Here  $U(k, l)$  will denote the subgroup of  $GL(k+l, \mathbb{C})$  preserving  $\langle, \rangle_{k,l}$  and  $PU(k, l)$  the respective projectivization. We define the  $(k, l)$ -ball, in symbols  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$ , as the projectivization of the set:

$$\left\{ (z_1, \dots, z_{k+l}) \in \mathbb{C}^{k+l} : \sum_{j=1}^k |z_j|^2 > \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+l} |z_j|^2 \right\}.$$

In a similar way the  $(k, l)$ -sphere is the projectivization of the set

$$\left\{ (z_1, \dots, z_{k+l}) \in \mathbb{C}^{k+l} : \sum_{j=1}^k |z_j|^2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+l} |z_j|^2 \right\}.$$

Observe the case  $k = 1$  correspond to the context of the complex hyperbolic geometry and in this case the  $(1, l)$ -sphere is homeomorphic to the  $2l - 1$ -sphere and the  $(1, l)$ -ball is a model of the complex hyperbolic geometry. With this in mind we finally state our results.

**Theorem 0.5.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation, then  $\gamma$  is elliptic if and only if  $\gamma$  preserves, up to conjugation, a foliation of  $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$  by concentric  $(1, n)$ -spheres.*

**Theorem 0.6.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation, then  $\gamma$  is parabolic if and only if and only if there are:*

- (1) Natural numbers  $0 < k \leq l$  satisfying  $k + l = n + 1$ .
- (2) A transformation  $\tau \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ .
- (3) A non-empty family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $(k, l)$ -spheres.

(4) A projective subspace  $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ .

satisfying

- (1) Each element of  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\tau\gamma\tau^{-1}$ -invariant.
- (2) The projective space  $\mathcal{Z}$  is  $\tau\gamma\tau^{-1}$ -invariant.
- (3) For every pair of different elements  $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  one has

$$\emptyset \neq \mathcal{Z} \subset T_1 \cap T_2 \subset \mathcal{Z}^{\perp}.$$

- (4) We have  $\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} T \setminus \mathcal{Z}^{\perp} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \mathcal{Z}^{\perp}$ .
- (5) The fixed set satisfies:  $Fix(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{Z}^{\perp}$ .
- (6) The action of  $\gamma$  restricted to  $\mathcal{Z}^{\perp}$  is a given non-loxodromic.

Condition (5) in the previous definition appear bit artificial, but as one can see from Example 4.8, it is necessary.

**Theorem 0.7.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation, then  $\gamma$  is loxodromic if and only if there is a proper open set  $W \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  such that  $\gamma(\overline{W}) \subset W$ .*

As corollary we get:

**Corollary 0.8.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation, then*

- (1) *The element  $\gamma$  is loxodromic if and only if there are couple of distinct points  $x, y \in Fix(\gamma) := \{z \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n : \gamma z = z\}$  such that the action of  $\gamma$  restricted to the complex line  $\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$  is loxodromic.*
- (2) *The element  $\gamma$  is parabolic if and only if every lift  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is non-diagonalizable and for every couple of distinct points  $x, y \in Fix(\gamma)$  the action of  $\gamma$  restricted to the complex line  $\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$  is elliptic.*
- (3) *The element  $\gamma$  is elliptic if and only if every lift  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is diagonalizable and for every couple of distinct points  $x, y \in Fix(\gamma)$  the action of  $\gamma$  restricted to the complex line  $\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$  is elliptic.*

Finally we prove the following result, concerning the existence of loxodromic elements in discrete groups.

**Theorem 0.9.** *Let  $\Gamma \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a strongly irreducible subgroup, then  $\Gamma$  contains a loxodromic element.*

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 1, we review some general facts and introduce the notation used along the text, in Section 2, we describe the discontinuity of a group, Sections 3, 4 and 5 deals with description of the dynamic of elliptic, parabolic and loxodromic elements respectively Finally in Section 6 we write down some questions, concerning cyclic, that where not considered in this article,

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

**1.1. Projective Geometry.** The complex projective space  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  is defined as:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n = (\mathbb{C}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{C}^*,$$

where  $\mathbb{C}^*$  acts by the usual scalar multiplication. This is a compact connected complex  $n$ -dimensional manifold, equipped with the Fubini-Study metric  $d_n$ .

If  $[\ ] : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  is the quotient map, then a non-empty set  $H \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  is said to be a projective subspace of dimension  $k$  if there is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear subspace  $\tilde{H}$  of dimension  $k+1$  such that  $[\tilde{H} \setminus \{0\}] = H$ . The projective subspaces of dimension  $(n-1)$  are called hyperplanes and the complex projective subspaces of dimension

1 are called lines. In this article  $e_1, \dots, e_{n+1}$  will denote the standard basis for  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ .

Given a set of points  $P$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ , we define:

$$\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = \bigcap \{l \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \mid l \text{ is a projective subspace containing } P\}.$$

Clearly  $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle$  is a projective subspace of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ . On the other hand the points in  $P$  are said to be in general position if for each subset  $R \subset P$  with  $1 \leq \text{Card}(R) \leq n+1$  we have that  $\langle\langle R \rangle\rangle$  has dimension  $\text{Card}(R) - 1$ .

**1.2. The Grassmanian.** Let  $0 \leq k < n$ , then we define the Grassmanian  $Gr(k, n)$  as the space of all  $k$ -dimensional projective subspaces of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  endowed with the Hausdorff topology. One has that  $Gr(k, n)$  is a compact, connected complex manifold of dimension  $k(n-k)$ . A method to realize the Grassmannian  $Gr(k, n)$  as a subvariety of the projective space of the  $(k+1)$ -th exterior power of  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ , in symbols  $P(\bigwedge^{k+1} \mathbb{C}^{n+1})$  is done by the so called Plücker embedding which is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : Gr(k, n) &\rightarrow P(\bigwedge^{k+1} \mathbb{C}^{n+1}) \\ \iota(V) &\mapsto [v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_{k+1}] \end{aligned}$$

where  $\langle\langle v_1, \dots, v_{k+1} \rangle\rangle = V$ , clearly this is a well defined  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ -equivariant embedding. Moreover, it is possible to check that the topology on  $Gr(k, n)$  induced by the Fubini-Study metric on  $P(\bigwedge^{k+1} \mathbb{C}^{n+1})$  agrees with the topology on  $Gr(k, n)$ .

### 1.3. Projective, Quasi-projective and Pseudo-projective transformations.

Consider the general linear group  $GL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ . It is clear that every linear automorphism of  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$  defines a holomorphic automorphism of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ , and it is well-known that every holomorphic automorphism of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  arises in this way. The group of projective automorphisms of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  is defined:

$$PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C}) := GL(n+1, \mathbb{C})/\mathbb{C}^*$$

where  $\mathbb{C}^*$  acts by the usual scalar multiplication. Then  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is a Lie group whose elements are called projective transformations. We denote by  $[[\ ]]$  :  $GL(n+1, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  the quotient map. Given  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  we say that  $\tilde{\gamma} \in GL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is a lift of  $\gamma$  if  $[[\tilde{\gamma}]] = \gamma$ . Notice that  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  takes projective subspaces into projective subspaces.

Consider the space of linear transformations from  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$  to  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$  denoted by  $M(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ , this is a linear complex space of dimension  $(n+1)^2$  where  $GL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is an open dense set in  $M(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ . Then  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is an open dense set in  $QP(n+1, \mathbb{C}) = (M(n+1, \mathbb{C}) \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{C}^*$  called the space of pseudo-projective maps, that is  $QP(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is a compactification, in the set theoretic sense, of  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ . Let us show how the previous compactification can be used, set  $\tilde{M} : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$  be a non-zero linear transformation  $Ker(\tilde{M})$  be its kernel and  $Ker([[ \tilde{M} ]])$  denote the respective projectivization, then  $\tilde{M}$  induces a map  $[[\tilde{M}]] : \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Ker([[ \tilde{M} ]]) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  by:

$$[[\tilde{M}]]([v]) = [\tilde{M}(v)].$$

which is clearly well defined. The following result provides a “relation” between convergence in  $QP(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  viewed as points in a projective space and the convergence viewed as functions.

**Proposition 1.1** (See [3]). *Let  $(\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a sequence of distinct elements, then*

- (1) *There is a subsequence  $(\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\tau_0 \in M(n+1, \mathbb{C}) \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\tau_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \tau_0$  as points in  $QP(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ .*
- (2) *If  $(\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the sequence given by the previous part of this lemma, then  $\tau_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \tau_0$ , as functions, uniformly on compact sets of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Ker(\tau_0)$ .*

As we will see below Proposition 1.1 enable us to describe in a simple way the equicontinuity region of a given family of automorphism of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ .

**1.4. Projective Unitary Groups.** Let  $0 < k \leq l$  and consider  $\mathbb{C}^{k+l}$  equipped with the Hermitian form of signature  $(k, l)$  given by:

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{k,l} = - \sum_{j=1}^k u_j \bar{v}_j + \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+l} u_j \bar{v}_j,$$

where  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{k+l})$  and  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{k+l})$ . A vector  $v$  is called negative, null and positive depending (in the obvious way) on the value of  $\langle v, v \rangle_{k,l}$ ; we denote the set of negative, null or positive vectors by  $N_-^{k,l}$ ,  $N_0^{k,l}$  and  $N_+^{k,l}$  respectively. We define  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  as the image of  $N_-^{k,l}$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  under the map  $[\ ]$ .

If we let  $U(k, l) \subset GL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be the subgroup consisting of the elements that preserve the above Hermitian form, then its projectivization  $PU(k, l) = [[U(k, l)]]_{n+1}$  is a Lie subgroup of  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  that we denote by  $PU(k, l)$ . In the case  $k = 1$ , the function  $d_B : \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^1 \times \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  given by:

$$d_B([v], [w]) = \operatorname{arccosh} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\langle v, w \rangle_{1,l} \langle v, w \rangle_{1,l}}{\langle v, v \rangle_{1,l} \langle w, w \rangle_{1,l}}} \right)$$

is a metric in  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^l$  compatible with the topology of  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^l$ . Where each element in  $PU(1, l)$  acts on  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^l$  as an isometry.

*Remark 1.2.* Let  $k > 1$  and  $l \geq k$ . Consider the projective transformation induced by the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $I$  is the identity matrix in  $SL(k+l-2)$ . Also consider the Hermitian quadric given by

$$Q = - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} |z_j|^2 + \sum_{j=k}^{k+l-2} |z_j|^2 + i(z_{k+l-1} \bar{z}_{k+l} - z_{k+l} \bar{z}_{k+l-1}),$$

clearly  $Q$  has signature  $(k, l)$ ,  $M$  preserves the  $(k, l)$ -ball  $B$  induced by  $Q$  and

$$\langle\langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{k-1}] \rangle\rangle \subset \operatorname{Fix}([M]) \cap B.$$

This example shows that for  $k \geq 2$  not every discrete group in  $PU(k, l)$  acts discontinuously on  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$ , which, by the Arzela- Azcoli theorem, shows that we cannot find a metric in  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  compatible with the topology in such way that  $PU(k, l)$  acts by isometries on  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$ .

**1.5. Kulkarni limit Set.** When we look at the action of a group acting on a general topological space, in general there is not a natural notion of limit set, back in 1970 Kulkarni introduce a notion of limit set which work in very general setting, in this subsection we present the Kulkarni's limit set.

**Definition 1.3** (see [10]). Let  $\Gamma \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a subgroup. We define

- (1) The set  $\Lambda(\Gamma)$  as the closure of the set of cluster points of  $\Gamma z$  where  $z$  runs over  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$
- (2) The set  $L_2(\Gamma)$  as the closure of cluster points of  $\Gamma K$  where  $K$  runs over all the compact sets in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \Lambda(\Gamma)$ .
- (3) The *Kulkarni's limit set* of  $\Gamma$  as:

$$\Lambda_{Kul}(\Gamma) = \Lambda(\Gamma) \cup L_2(\Gamma).$$

- (4) The *Kulkarni's discontinuity region* of  $\Gamma$  as:

$$\Omega_{Kul}(\Gamma) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \Lambda_{Kul}(\Gamma).$$

The Kulkarni's limit set has the following properties, for a more detailed discussion on this topic in the 2 dimensional setting see [3] and Corollary 2.6 below.

**Proposition 1.4** (See [3]). *Let  $\Gamma$  be a complex kleinian group. Then:*

- (1) *The sets  $\Lambda_{Kul}(\Gamma)$ ,  $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ ,  $L_2(\Gamma)$  are  $\Gamma$ -invariant closed sets.*
- (2) *The group  $\Gamma$  acts properly discontinuously on  $\Omega_{Kul}(\Gamma)$ .*
- (3) *Let  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  be a closed  $\Gamma$ -invariant set such that for every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \mathcal{C}$ , the set of cluster points of  $\Gamma K$  is contained in  $\Lambda(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}$ , then  $\Lambda_{Kul}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{C}$ .*
- (4) *The equicontinuity set of  $\Gamma$  is contained in  $\Omega_{Kul}(\Gamma)$ .*

As we will in this article Kulkarni's limit set is a nice starting point in order to study the different notion of limit sets.

**1.6. The  $\Lambda$  set for cyclic groups.** In the case of cyclic groups there is available a full description of the set  $\Lambda$ , in order to present such result the following definition is necessary.

**Definition 1.5.** Let  $\gamma \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a linear transformation transformation,  $V_1, \dots, V_k \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$  linear subspaces;  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ;  $\gamma_i : V_i \rightarrow V_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , be  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear transformations and  $r_1, \dots, r_k \in \mathbb{R}$ . The set  $(k, \{V_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{r_i\}_{i=1}^k)$  will be called a unitary decomposition for  $\gamma$  if it is verified that:

- (1)  $\bigoplus_{j=1}^k V_j = \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ .
- (2) For each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , the eigenvalues of  $\gamma_i$  are unitary complex numbers.
- (3)  $0 < r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_k$ .
- (4)  $\bigoplus_{j=1}^k r_j \gamma_j = \gamma$ .

Now is trivial to provide a description of  $\Lambda$  for the cyclic case, see [3].

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation with infinite order. If  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is a lift of  $\gamma$  and  $(k, \{V_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{r_j\}_{j=1}^k)$  is a unitary decomposition for  $\tilde{\gamma}$ , then:*

$$\Lambda(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \langle \{x \in V_j : x \text{ is an eigenvector of } \gamma_j\} \rangle.$$

Thus the set  $\Lambda(\langle\gamma\rangle)$  is a finite union of projective subspaces, trivially  $\Lambda(\langle\gamma\rangle)$  is a single proper non-empty projective subspace whenever  $\gamma$  is parabolic, it has at least two projective subspaces if and only if  $\gamma$  is a loxodromic and is either  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  or  $\emptyset$  when  $\gamma$  is elliptic. Now we can prove one of our main results.

**Proof of Theorem 0.2.**

*Proof.* This result is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.6. □

2. DESCRIBING THE EQUICONTINUITY SET BY MEANS OF PSEUDO-PROJECTIVE MAPS

In this section we provide a description of the equicontinuity set using pseudo projective maps. Let us recall the definition of the equicontinuity set

**Definition 2.1.** The *equicontinuity region* for a family  $G$  of endomorphisms of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ , denoted  $Eq(G)$ , is defined to be the set of points  $z \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  for which there is an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $z$  such that  $G|_U$  is a normal family.

The following technical lemmas will be useful, compare with Corollary 4.3, Proposition 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 in [3].

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $(\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a sequence of distinct elements and  $\gamma, \theta \in QP(n, \mathbb{C}) \setminus PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ , such that  $\gamma_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma$  and  $\gamma_m^{-1} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \theta$  in the sense of pseudo-projective transformations, then  $Im(\gamma) \subset Ker(\theta)$ , here  $Im(\gamma) = \gamma(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Ker(\gamma))$ .*

*Proof.* On the contrary, let us assume that  $Im(\gamma) \setminus Ker(\theta)$  is a non-empty set, then  $\gamma^{-1}(Im(\gamma) \setminus Ker(\theta))$  is a non-empty open set, since  $Ker(\gamma)$  and  $Im(\theta)$  are proper projective subspaces we can choose  $\tilde{p} \in \gamma^{-1}(Im(\gamma) \setminus Ker(\theta)) \setminus (Ker(\gamma) \cup Im(\theta))$ , then  $\tilde{p} = \gamma_m^{-1}(\gamma_m(\tilde{p})) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \theta(\gamma(\tilde{p}))$ , which is a contradiction. □

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $(\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a sequence of distinct elements,  $\gamma \in QP(n+1, \mathbb{C}) \setminus PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  and  $\mathfrak{L}$  a projective subspace of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ , such that  $(\gamma_m)$  converges to  $\gamma$  in the sense of pseudo-projective transformations,  $\mathfrak{L} \cap Ker(\gamma)$  is a single point  $p$  and  $dim(\mathfrak{L}) \geq dim(Im(\gamma)) + 1$ , then there is a subsequence  $(\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  and a projective subspace  $\mathcal{L}$  such that  $dim(\mathcal{L}) = dim(\mathfrak{L})$ ,  $Im(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$  and for every point  $y \in \mathcal{L}$  there is a sequence  $(x_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathfrak{L}$  satisfying  $\tau_m(x_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} y$  and  $x_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} p$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $k = dim(\mathfrak{L})$ . Since  $Gr(k, n)$  is compact, there is a sub sequence  $(\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\mathcal{L} \in Gr(k, n)$  such that  $\tau_m(\mathfrak{L}) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}$ . Let  $y \in \mathcal{L} \setminus Im(\gamma)$ , then there is convergent sequence  $(x_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathfrak{L}$  such that  $\tau(x_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} y$ . This implies that the limit point of  $(x_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  lies in  $Ker(\gamma)$ , thence such point is  $p$ . Finally, since  $\tau_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma$  and  $\mathfrak{L} \cap Ker(\gamma) = \{p\}$ , we conclude that  $Im(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$  □

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $(\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a sequence of distinct elements,  $\gamma \in QP(n+1, \mathbb{C}) \setminus PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ , such that  $(\gamma_m)$  converges to  $\gamma$  in the sense of pseudo-projective transformations, then:*

$$Eq(\{\gamma_m | m \in \mathbb{N}\}) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Ker(\gamma).$$

*Proof.* On the contrary let us assume that there is

$$p \in Ker(\gamma) \cap Eq(\{\gamma_m | m \in \mathbb{N}\}).$$

Let  $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  be a projective subspace disjoint from  $Ker(\gamma)$  and satisfying  $dim(\mathcal{Y}) = dim(Im(\gamma))$ . Define  $\mathcal{L} = \langle \langle \mathcal{Y}, x \rangle \rangle$ , then by Lemma 2.3 there is a subsequence  $(\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  a projective subspace such that  $\mathfrak{L} \cap Im(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $dim(\mathcal{L}) = dim(\mathfrak{L})$  and for every point  $y \in \mathfrak{L}$  there is a sequence  $(y_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{L}$  such that  $y_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} p$  and  $\gamma_m(y_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} y$ . Let  $z, w \in \mathfrak{L} \setminus Im(\gamma)$  be distinct points, then by the previous argument there are sequences  $(z_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}, (w_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{L}$  such that  $w_m, z_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} p$  and  $\gamma_m(z_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} z$  and  $\gamma_m(w_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} w$ . Finally, from the definition of equicontinuity, there is a subsequence  $(\kappa_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\kappa : Eq(\{\gamma_m | m \in \mathbb{N}\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  holomorphic such that  $\kappa_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \kappa$  in the compact open-topology. Since  $p \in Eq(\{\gamma_m | m \in \mathbb{N}\}) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Ker(\gamma)$ , our previous arguments  $z = \kappa(p) = w$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Now let us describe the equicontinuity set in terms of pseudo-projective maps, compare with Lemma 5.1 in [3].

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $\Gamma \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a group and define*

$$Lim(\Gamma) = \{\gamma \in QP(n+1, \mathbb{C}) : \text{there is } (\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Gamma, \text{ of distinct elements with } \gamma_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma\},$$

then

$$Eq(\Gamma) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma \in Lim(\Gamma)} Ker(\gamma)}.$$

*Proof.* From Proposition 1.1 we deduce  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma \in Lim(\Gamma)} Ker(\gamma)} \subset Eq(\Gamma)$ . Now the result follows from Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

Observe that the previous result remains valid for an arbitrary family of projective transformations. As a corollary we get the following result, compare with Corollary 5.3 in [?].

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $\Gamma \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a discrete group, then  $\Gamma$  acts properly discontinuously on  $Eq(\Gamma)$ . Moreover  $Eq(\Gamma) \subset \Omega_{Kul}(\Gamma)$ .*

*Proof.* Assume on the contrary that  $\Gamma$  does not act discontinuously on  $Eq(\Gamma)$ . Then there is a compact set  $K$  and a sequence of distinct elements  $(\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Gamma$ , such that  $\gamma(K) \cap K \neq \emptyset$ . By Proposition 1.1, there is a subsequence of  $(\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and  $\tau \in QP(n+1, \mathbb{C}) \setminus PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ , such that  $(\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $\tau$  in the sense of pseudo-projective transformations. Moreover, by Lemma 2.2 we know that  $Im(\tau)$  is a projective subspace contained in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Eq(\Gamma)$ . Therefore there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $Im(\tau)$  disjoint from  $K$  and a natural number  $n_0$  such that  $\tau_m(K) \subset U$  for all  $m > n_0$ . This implies  $\tau_m(K) \cap K = \emptyset$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore  $\Gamma$  acts discontinuously on  $Eq(\Gamma)$ .

Finally, from the previous argument we deduce that for every compact set  $K \subset Eq(\Gamma)$  the cluster points of  $\Gamma K$  lie in  $L_1(\Gamma)$ , thus by Proposition 1.4 we conclude that  $Eq(\Gamma) \subset \Omega_{Kul}(\Gamma)$ .  $\square$

Now as a consequence of the results of this sections we are able to compute the equicontinuity set for cyclic groups. The following notation will be helpful.

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $V$  be a  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space,  $T : V \rightarrow V$  be a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map whose eigenvectors are unitary complex values. We will say  $(\{V_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{T_j\}_{j=1}^k)$  is a Block decomposition for  $T$  if:

- (1) We have  $V_1, \dots, V_k \subset V$  are linear subspaces satisfying  $\bigoplus_{j=1}^k V_j = V$ .
- (2) For  $j > 2$  we have  $\beta_j = \{v_{j1}, \dots, v_{jn_j}\}$  is an ordered base of  $V_j$ .
- (3) For  $1 \leq j \leq k$  there is  $T_j : V_j \rightarrow V_j$  a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear maps such that  $T_1$  is diagonalizable and the matrix associated to  $T_j$  with respect  $\beta_j$  is a Jordan block in other case.
- (4)  $\bigoplus_{j=1}^k T_j = T$ .

Given a unitary linear map we can define the following in terms of a block decomposition:

$$H(T) = \max(\{\dim V_j : j \in \{2, \dots, k\}\});$$

$$\Xi_j(T) = \{\langle \beta_j \setminus \{v_{jn_j}\} \rangle\} \quad \text{if } j \neq 1 \text{ and } \dim V_j = H(T)V_j \quad \text{in other case}$$

$$\Xi(T) = \text{Span} \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^k \Xi_j(T) \right).$$

Clearly  $\Xi(T)$  does not depend on the choice of the block decomposition.

**Theorem 2.8.** Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a projective transformation with infinite order. If  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is a lift of  $\gamma$ ,  $(k, \{V_j\}_1^k, \{\gamma_j\}_1^k, \{r_j\}_1^k)$  is a unitary decomposition for  $\tilde{\gamma}$ , and then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Eq(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \left[ \text{Span} \left( \bigcup_{j>1} V_j \cup \Xi(\gamma_1) \right) \setminus \{0\} \right] \cup \left[ \text{Span} \left( \bigcup_{j<k} V_j \cup \Xi(\gamma_k) \right) \setminus \{0\} \right].$$

*Proof.* Let  $T \in \text{Lim}(\langle \gamma \rangle)$ , then there is a sequence  $(n_m) \subset \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\gamma^{n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} T$ . After taking a subsequence, if it is necessary, we can assume that either  $(n_m)$  is negative or  $(n_m)$  is positive. Without loss of generality let us assume that  $n_m > 0$ . Let  $(\{U_j\}_1^r, \{\beta_j\}_1^r, \{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^r)$  be a block decomposition for  $\gamma_k$ , define  $A_1 = \{j \in \{2, \dots, r\} : \dim U_j < H(\gamma_k)\} \cup \{1\}$  and  $A_2 = \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus A_1$ , then a straightforward calculation shows:

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{\tilde{\gamma}^{n_m}}{\left( \frac{n_m}{H(\gamma_k) - 1} \right) r_k^{n_m}} = \sum_{j < k} \frac{r_j^{n_m} \gamma_j^{n_m}}{\left( \frac{n_m}{H(\gamma_k) - 1} \right) r_k^{n_m}} + \sum_{j \in A_1} \frac{\rho_j^{n_m}}{\left( \frac{n_m}{H(\gamma_k) - 1} \right)} + \sum_{j \in A_2} \frac{\rho_j^{n_m}}{\left( \frac{n_m}{H(\gamma_k) - 1} \right)}$$

By Perron-Frobenius theorem (see [3]) we conclude:

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{j < k} \left( \frac{n_m}{H(\gamma_k)} \right)^{-1} r_k^{-n_m} r_j^{n_m} \gamma_j^{n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0 \text{ point-wise}$$

$$(2.3) \quad \sum_{j \in A_1} \left( \frac{n_m}{H(\gamma_k)} \right)^{-1} \rho_j^{n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0 \text{ point-wise}$$

Now let  $(k_m) \subset (n_m)$  be a subsequence such that for each  $j \in A_2$  it is verified that  $\rho_j^{k_m}(u_{1j}) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \vartheta_j u_{1j}$ , where  $\vartheta_j \in \mathbb{S}^1$  for all  $j \in A_2$ . Now let  $j \in A_2$  and

$\beta_j = \{u_{ji}\}_{i=1}^{H(\gamma_k)}$  define the linear transformation  $S_j = U_j \rightarrow U_j$  induced by

$$S_j(u_{ji}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i < H(\gamma_k) \\ \vartheta_j u_{j1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Clearly

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{j \in A_2} \left( \begin{matrix} n_m \\ H(\gamma_k) \end{matrix} \right)^{-1} \rho_j^{n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \in A_2} S_j \text{ point-wise}$$

Finally, for each  $j \in A_1$  let  $S_j : U_j \rightarrow U_j$  given by  $S_j = 0$  and for  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  a define  $T_j = V_j \rightarrow V_j$  by

$$T_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j < k \\ \sum_{l=1}^r S_l & \text{if } j = k. \end{cases}$$

Clearly from Equations 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 we conclude  $\gamma^{k_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} [[\sum T_j]]$ . Therefore  $[[\sum T_j]] = T$ . Which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Now we can prove another of our main results.

### Proof of Theorem 0.3.

*Proof.* This result is straightforward in view of Theorem 2.8.  $\square$

It is possible to construct examples (see [?]) of non virtually cyclic groups whose equicontinuity set is a proper set of the Kulkarni's discontinuity set.

## 3. ELLIPTIC TRANSFORMATIONS

In this section we are going to study the dynamic of elliptic transformation, in particular we are going to show that any elliptic transformation can be conjugated to an element in  $PU(k, l)$ . Let us start with some technical results.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $l \geq k > 0$  and  $v, w \in N_0^{k,l}$  be linearly independent elements, then the quadratic form restricted to  $\langle\langle v, w \rangle\rangle$  is either identically 0 or has signature  $(1, 1)$ .*

*Proof.* By the theory of quadratic forms we know that  $\prec, \succ_{k,l}$  restricted to  $\langle\langle v, w \rangle\rangle$  is either 0 or is equivalent to one of the following quadratic forms:

$$|z_1|^2; |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2; -|z_1|^2; -|z_1|^2 - |z_2|^2; |z_1|^2 - |z_2|^2;$$

Since there are two linearly independent null points, we conclude that  $\prec, \succ_{k,l}$  restricted to  $\langle\langle v, w \rangle\rangle$  is either 0 or has signature  $(1, 1)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $l \geq k > 0$  and  $\gamma \in PU(k, l)$  be an elliptic element, then  $\gamma$  has fixed point in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \setminus \partial \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$ .*

*Proof.* On the contrary, let us assume that each fixed point of  $\gamma$  lies on  $\partial \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$ . Then if  $\tilde{\gamma} \in U(k, l)$  is a lift of  $\gamma$ , then we can find a basis  $\beta = \{v_1, \dots, v_{k+l}\}$  of  $\mathbb{C}^{k+l}$  made up of eigenvectors of  $\tilde{\gamma}$ .

Claim.- Let  $v, w \in \beta$  be distinct points, then  $\prec, \succ_{k,l}$  restricted to  $\langle\langle v, w \rangle\rangle$  cannot has signature  $(1, 1)$ . If this is not the case, we get that  $\gamma$  restricted to  $\langle\langle [v], [w] \rangle\rangle$  is conjugated to an element in  $PU(1, 1)$  with two fixed points in  $\partial \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{1,1}$ , that is  $[[\gamma]]$  restricted to  $\langle\langle [v], [w] \rangle\rangle$  is the identity, therefore  $\gamma$  has a fixed point  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  which is a

contradiction.

Finally, by lemma 3.1, it yields that  $\prec v, w \succ_{k,l} = 0$ . That is  $\prec, \succ_{k,l}$  is identically 0, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $l \geq k > 0$  and  $\gamma \in PU(k, l)$  be an elliptic element, then  $\gamma$  has fixed point in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}}$ .*

*Proof.* On the contrary let us assume that  $Fix(\gamma) \subset \overline{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}}$ . Let  $\tilde{\gamma} \in U(k, l)$  be a lift of  $\gamma$ , by Corollary 3.2 there is an eigenvector  $v_1$  of  $\tilde{\gamma}$  such that  $\prec v_1, v_1 \succ_{k,l} < 0$ . Clearly the Hermitian form  $\prec, \succ_{k,l}$  restricted to  $\{v_1\}^{\perp}$  has signature  $(k-1, l)$ . Since  $\{v_1\}^{\perp}$  is a  $\tilde{\gamma}$ -invariant subspace not containing  $v_1$ , Corollary 3.2 ensures that there is an eigenvector of  $\gamma$  in  $\{v_1\}^{\perp}$  namely  $v_2$  such that  $v_2 \in N_-^{k,l}$ . Trivially  $\{v_1\}^{\perp} \cap \{v_2\}^{\perp}$  is a  $\tilde{\gamma}$ -invariant subspace, whose intersection with  $Span(v_1, v_2)$  is trivial and where the restriction of the Hermitian form  $\prec, \succ_{k,l}$  has signature  $(k-2, l)$ . By an exhaustive process we can ensure the existence of a  $\tilde{\gamma}$ -invariant subspace  $W$  where the restriction of the Hermitian form  $\prec, \succ_{k,l}$  has signature  $(0, l)$ . Therefore there is there is an eigenvector of  $\gamma$  in  $W$  namely  $w$  such that  $\prec w, w \succ_{k,l} > 0$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

From the proof of Lemma 3.3 we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $l \geq k > 0$  and  $\gamma \in PU(k, l)$  be an elliptic element, then there are sets  $V_- \subset Fix(\gamma) \cap \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  and  $V_+ \subset Fix(\gamma) \cap (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}})$  such that  $Card(V_-) = k$ ,  $Card(V_+) = l$  and  $\langle\langle V_+ \cup V_- \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1}$ .*

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\gamma \in PU(k, l)$  be an element. Then  $\gamma$  is elliptic if and only if  $\gamma$  has  $k+l$  fixed points in general position, where  $k$  of this points lie in  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  and the other  $l$  are in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}}$ .*

*Proof.* By corollary 3.4 we only need to prove the converse of the proposition. Let  $\gamma \in PU(k, l)$  be an elliptic element, and  $\tilde{\gamma} \in U(k, l)$  be a lift of  $\gamma$ , then by hypothesis we can find a basis  $\beta = \{v_1, \dots, v_{k+l}\}$  made up of eigenvectors where the first  $k$  are in  $N_-^{k,l}$  and the rest are in  $N_+^{k,l}$ . Let  $M \in GL(k+l, \mathbb{C})$  be the change basis matrix which take the base  $\beta$  into the standard basis of  $\mathbb{C}^{k+l}$ , then  $M^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}M$  is a diagonal matrix, let us said

$$M^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}M = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \alpha_{k+l} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let  $r = \max\{|\alpha_1|, \dots, |\alpha_{k+l}|\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{I}^+ = \{i : 1, \dots, k+l | (\alpha_i^m / r^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is bounded away from } 0\},$$

$(l_m) \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\alpha_i^m r^{-m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \check{\alpha}_i$  for every  $i : 1, \dots, k+l$  and  $F : \mathbb{C}^{k+l} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{k+l}$  the linear map induced by  $F(e_i) = \check{\alpha}_i e_i$ . Then  $\gamma^{l_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} [M][F][M]^{-1} = \tau$  as points in  $QP(k+l, \mathbb{C})$ . If  $\gamma$  is not elliptic then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \neq Im(\tau) = [[M]](\langle\langle \{e_i : i \in \mathcal{I}\} \rangle\rangle),$$

therefore  $Im(\tau) \cap Span(\beta) \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}}$  are open and  $\gamma$ -invariant we deduce that  $Im(\tau) \subset \partial \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $l \geq k > 1$  and  $\gamma \in PU(k, l)$ , then  $\gamma$  is elliptic if and only if there is a  $\gamma$ -invariant projective subspace  $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k, l}$  of dimension  $k - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Now if  $\gamma$  has an invariant space  $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k, l}$  of dimension  $k - 1$ , then  $\mathcal{V}^{\perp}$  is a  $\gamma$ -invariant space of dimension  $l - 1$  disjoint from  $\mathcal{V}$ . Therefore we can pick up  $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \mathcal{V}$  linearly independent fixed points and  $v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+l} \in \mathcal{V}^{\perp}$  linearly independent fixed points, trivially  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} = \langle\langle v_1, \dots, v_{k+l} \rangle\rangle$  which concludes the proof.  $\square$

In view of proposition 3.6, one can naively think that loxodromic transformations in  $PU(k, l)$  (respectively parabolic) elements can be classified by saying simply that this elements correspond to those elements having exactly two (resp. one) invariant subspaces in  $\partial\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k, l}$ , the following examples shows us this can not be done.

**Example 3.7.** Consider the following matrices

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, C = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2^{-1} & 2^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that  $M$  is a Hermitian matrix with signature  $(2, 2)$ ,  $B$  induces a parabolic transformation,  $C$  induces a loxodromic transformation, we have the relations  $C^*MC = M = B^*MB$  and  $vCv^* = 0$  whenever  $v \in \text{Span}(e_1, e_2) \cup \text{Span}(e_3, e_2) \cup \text{Span}(e_3, e_4)$

Now let us provide geometrical characterization of elliptic elements in  $PU(k, l)$  in terms of  $(k, l)$ -spheres. First recall that elliptic elements in  $PU(1, 2)$  preserves a foliation in  $\mathbb{H}^2$  made up “concentric 3-spheres” and it is known that such property characterizes elliptic elements in  $PU(1, 2)$ , see [3], in this section we will extend this result to the general setting, let us start with a definition

**Definition 3.8.** The family

$$\mathcal{F}_{k, l} = \left\{ T_r^{k, l} = \left\{ [z_1, \dots, z_{k+l}] \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n : \sum_{j=1}^k |z_j|^2 = r \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+l} |z_j|^2 \right\}, r > 0 \right\},$$

is the concentric foliation of  $(k, l)$ -spheres.

The family  $\mathcal{F}_{k, l}$  provides a foliation of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus (\langle\langle e_1, \dots, e_k \rangle\rangle \cup \langle\langle e_{k+1}, \dots, e_{k+l} \rangle\rangle)$  and  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{k, l}$  is a leaf. In order to characterize the elliptic elements in terms of the foliation  $\mathcal{F}_{k, l}$  the following standard result from linear algebra will be necessary

**Theorem 3.9** (Witt’s extension theorem, see [11]). *Let  $V_1, V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{k+l}$  be subspaces where the restriction of the hermitian form  $\prec, \succ_{k, l}$  is non degenerate. Then any isometry  $f : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$  extends to an isometry  $F$  of  $\mathbb{C}^{k+l}$ .*

**Proposition 3.10.** *A transformation  $\gamma \in PU(k, l)$  is elliptic if and only if there is  $h \in PU(k, l)$  such that  $\gamma$  leaves invariant each leaf of the foliation  $h(\mathcal{F}_{k, l})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma \in PU(k, l)$  be an elliptic element and  $\tilde{\gamma}$  a lift of  $\gamma$ . Then by Proposition 3.6 there is a projective subspace  $V \subset N_{-}^{k, l}$  of dimension  $k$  and invariant under  $\tilde{\gamma}$ . Pick up vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  such that  $\prec v_i, v_j \succ_{k, l}$  is 0 if  $i \neq j$  and  $-1$  in other case, then considering the linear extension  $F$  of the function  $f(e_i) = v_i$  we get an

isometry from  $U = \text{Span}(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  to  $W = \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_l)$  and the restriction of the hermitian form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{k,l}$  to  $U$  and  $W$  is negative definite. By Witt's extension theorem  $F$  extends to an element  $\check{F} \in PU(k, l)$ , clearly

$$\check{F}^{-1} \check{\gamma} \check{F} = \begin{pmatrix} M & \\ & N \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $M \in U(k)$  and  $N \in U(l)$ . Let  $\widetilde{M} \in U(k)$  and  $\widetilde{N} \in U(l)$  be such that  $\widetilde{M}^{-1} M \widetilde{M}$  and  $\widetilde{N}^{-1} N \widetilde{N}$  are diagonal. In order to conclude this part of the proof we must define

$$h = \check{F} \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{M} & \\ & \widetilde{N} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now assume that given  $\gamma, h \in PU(k, l)$  we know that  $\gamma$  preserves each leaf of the foliation  $h(\mathcal{F}^{k,l})$ , then  $h^{-1}\gamma h \in PU(k, l)$  and leaves invariant each leaf of the foliation  $\mathcal{F}^{k,l}$ , therefore  $h^{-1}\gamma h$  leaves  $\langle\langle e_1, \dots, e_k \rangle\rangle \subset \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  invariant. By proposition 3.6 we conclude that  $\gamma$  is elliptic.  $\square$

Now the following result is easily proven.

**Corollary 3.11.** *Let  $l \geq k > 0$ , then the following fact are equivalent:*

- (1) *The element  $\gamma \in \text{PSL}(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  is elliptic,*
- (2) *There is  $h \in \text{PSL}(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  such that  $\gamma$  leaves invariant  $h(\partial\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l})$  and  $h(\langle\langle e_1, \dots, e_k \rangle\rangle)$ ,*
- (3) *There is  $h \in \text{PSL}(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  such that  $\gamma$  leaves invariant each leaf of the foliation  $h(\mathcal{F}^{k,l})$ .*

Now we have.

**Proof of Theorem 0.5.**

*Proof.* This result is a direct consequence of Corollary 3.11.  $\square$

To conclude this subsection let us describe the Kulkarni's limit set and the equicontinuity set for the cyclic group generated by an elliptic element.

**Theorem 3.12.** *Let  $\gamma \in \text{PSL}(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be an elliptic element, then*

- (1) *The limit set  $\Lambda_{Kul}(\langle\gamma\rangle)$  is either empty or the whole space  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  according  $\gamma$  having finite or infinite order.*
- (2) *The equicontinuity set  $E(\langle\gamma\rangle) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ .*

Trivially  $\Omega_{Kul}(\langle\gamma\rangle)$  is the largest open set on which  $\langle\gamma\rangle$  acts properly discontinuously.

#### 4. PARABOLIC TRANSFORMATIONS

In this section we describe parabolic elements and its relationship with  $PU(k, l)$ . Our interest with other semi-definite sesquilinear forms arises from the following: recall that in the one and two dimensional case is not hard to see that parabolic elements are simply those coming from  $PU(1, n)$ , where  $n = 1, 2$ , but as the following example shows, in higher dimensions there are parabolic elements which are not conjugated to an element in  $PU(1, n)$ .

**Example 4.1.** Let  $n \geq 4$  and  $\gamma$  be the projective transformation in  $PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  induced by the matrix

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & & & \\ 0 & 1 & & & \\ & & 1 & 1 & \\ & & 0 & 1 & \\ & & & & I_{n-4} \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $I_{n-4}$  is the identity matrix if  $n > 4$  and nothing in other case, then  $\gamma$  is a parabolic element which cannot be conjugated to an element in  $PU(1, n)$ .

*Proof.* A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\gamma^{\pm m} = \left[ \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 1 & \pm m & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & & & & \\ & & 1 & \pm m & & \\ & & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & & & & I_{n-4} \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 0 & 1 & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & & & & \\ & & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & 0 & 0 & & \\ & & & & & 0_{n-4} \end{array} \right]$$

in consequence  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Eq(\langle \gamma \rangle)$  is not an hyperplane, which is not possible for elements in  $PU(1, n)$ , see [?]. Therefore,  $\gamma$  is not conjugate to an element in  $PU(1, n)$ .  $\square$

So in order to describe parabolic elements we will need to understand the relationship between Jordan blocks and Hermitian products. Let us consider the following functions:

**Definition 4.2.** Given  $n > 2$  and  $k, j : 1, \dots, n$ , let us define

$$\ll k, j \gg^{(+)}, \ll k, j \gg^{(-)} : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} \ll k, j \gg^{(+)}(z_1, \dots, z_n) &= z_k \bar{z}_j + \bar{z}_k z_j \\ \ll k, j \gg^{(-)}(z_1, \dots, z_n) &= i(z_k \bar{z}_j - \bar{z}_k z_j) \end{aligned}$$

Clearly each of this functions define a hermitian quadric form with signature  $(1, n-2, 1)$ . The following results which we present without proof will be useful. First let us consider the following stability lemma.

**Lemma 4.3** (Weyl, see [2]). *Let  $A, B \in M(n, \mathbb{C})$  be hermitian matrices with eigenvalues  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  and  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$  respectively. Then*

$$\max_j |\alpha_j - \beta_j| \leq \|A - B\|.$$

Where  $\| \cdot \|$  denotes the operator bound norm.

And now let us consider the following result.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $A \in M(n, \mathbb{C})$  be an invertible matrix, let us define:*

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ \bar{A}^t & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

*then  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$  is an eigenvector of  $C$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda$  if and only if  $x$  is an eigenvector of  $A\bar{A}^t$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda^2$  and  $y = \lambda Ax$ .*

**Lemma 4.5.** *If  $n = 2k + 1$  and  $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_r\}_{r \in \mathbb{R}}$  is the family of hermitian quadratic forms given by:*

$$r \ll n, n \gg^{(+)} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (-1)^{j+k} \ll 1+j, n-j \gg^{(+)} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \sum_{m=0}^j \sum_{l=0}^m (-1)^{m-j+k} \binom{m}{l} \ll 2+j-l, n-j+m \gg^{(+)} \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (-1)^{2k-m} \binom{m-1}{l} \ll k+1-j, k+1+m \gg^{(+)} + \frac{1}{2} \ll k+1, k+1 \gg^{(+)}.$$

Then the following properties are valid:

- (1) *It is verified that  $e_1 \in \bigcap_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} Q^{-1}(0)$ .*
- (2) *For each pair of distinct elements  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds that*

$$Q_r^{-1}(0) \cap Q_s^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{L} = \langle \langle e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} \rangle \rangle.$$
- (3) *It yields that  $\bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{R}} Q_r^{-1}(0) \setminus \mathcal{L} = \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathcal{L}$ .*
- (4) *Each quadric in  $\mathcal{Q}$  has signature  $(k, k+1)$ .*
- (5) *If  $A$  is a  $n \times n$ -Jordan block with proper value 1, then for each  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  we get  $A(Q_r^{-1}(0)) = Q_r^{-1}(0)$ .*

*Proof.* The proofs of (1), (2) and (3) are straightforward calculations so we will omit they here.

Let us show (4). A simply inspection reveals that the Hermitian matrix  $C_r$  associated to  $Q_r$  has the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & A \\ 0 & 1 & b \\ \bar{A}^t & \bar{b}^t & B_r \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $A \in SL(k, \mathbb{C})$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{C}^k$  and

$$B_r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & r \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now let us consider the following hermitian matrix

$$C_{0,0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & A \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \bar{A}^t & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

then lemma 4.4 yields that  $C_{0,0}$  signature  $(k, k+1)$ . Consider the family of hermitian matrices  $\{C_{r,v} : (r, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^k\}$  given by

$$C_{r,v} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & A \\ 0 & 1 & v \\ \bar{A}^t & \bar{v}^t & B_r \end{pmatrix}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that  $\det(C_{r,v}) \neq 0$ , thus Lemma 4.3, yields that the sets

$$U_{l,m} = \{(r, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^k : C_{r,v} \text{ has signature } (l, m)\}$$

form an open cover of disjoint sets for  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^k$ . Since  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^k$  is connected we conclude that  $U_{k,k+1} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^k$ , which concludes the proof.

Let us show (5). Clearly it is enough to show that  $H = (-1)^k Q_0$  is invariant under  $A$ . The proof is by induction on  $k$ . If  $k = 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} AH &= ((z_1 + z_2)\bar{z}_3 + z_3(\bar{z}_1 + \bar{z}_2)) - |z_2 + z_3|^2 + \frac{1}{2}((z_2 + z_3)\bar{z}_3 + z_3(\bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_3)) \\ &= (z_1\bar{z}_3 + z_3\bar{z}_1) + (z_2\bar{z}_3 - z_3\bar{z}_2) - |z_2|^2 - |z_3|^2 - (z_2\bar{z}_3 + z_3\bar{z}_2) + \frac{1}{2}(z_2\bar{z}_3 + z_3\bar{z}_2) + |z_3|^2 \\ &= H \end{aligned}$$

Let us prove the case  $k_0 = k$ . Trivially, we can write down  $H = H_1 + H_2$  where:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (-1)^j \ll 1+j, n-j \gg^{(+)} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-2} \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} \sum_{l=0}^m (-1)^{m-j} \binom{m}{l} \ll 2+j-l, n-j+m \gg^{(+)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (-1)^{2k-m} \binom{m-1}{l} \ll k+1-j, k+1+m \gg^{(+)} + \frac{1}{2} \ll k+1, k+1 \gg^{(+)} . \\ H_2 &= \ll 1, n \gg^{(+)} + \sum_{j=2}^k \sum_{l=0}^{j-2} \binom{j-2}{l} \ll l+2, n \gg^{(+)} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{l} \ll 2+j, n \gg^{(+)} . \end{aligned}$$

By applying the inductive to  $H_1$  we get

$$AH_1 = H_1 - \ll 2, n \gg^{(+)} - \sum_{j=2}^k \sum_{l=0}^{j-2} \binom{j-2}{l} \ll l+3, n \gg^{(+)} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{l} \ll 3+j, n \gg^{(+)}$$

a simple calculation shows that:

$$AH_2 = H_2 + \ll 2, n \gg^{(+)} + \sum_{j=2}^k \sum_{l=0}^{j-2} \binom{j-2}{l} \ll l+3, n \gg^{(+)} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{l} \ll 3+j, n \gg^{(+)}$$

To conclude is enough to observe that  $AH = AH_1 + AH_2 = H_1 + H_2$ .  $\square$

Through similar arguments one can show

**Lemma 4.6.** *If  $n = 2k$  and  $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_r\}_{r \in \mathbb{R}}$  is the family of hermitian quadratic forms given by:*

$$r \ll n, n \gg^{(+)} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (-1)^j \ll 1+j, n-j \gg^{(-)} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \sum_{m=0}^j \sum_{l=0}^m (-1)^{m-j} \binom{m}{l} \ll 2+j-l, n-j+m \gg^{(-)} .$$

Then the following properties hold:

- (1) It is verified that  $e_1 \in \bigcap_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} Q^{-1}(0)$ .
- (2) For each pair of distinct elements  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds that
$$Q_r^{-1}(0) \cap Q_s^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{L} = \langle \langle e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} \rangle \rangle .$$
- (3) It yields that  $\bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{R}} Q_r^{-1}(0) \setminus \mathcal{L} = \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathcal{L}$ .
- (4) Each quadric in  $\mathcal{Q}$  has signature  $(k, k)$ .
- (5) If  $A$  is the  $n \times n$ -Jordan block being 1 its proper value, then for each  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  we have  $A(Q_r^{-1}(0)) = Q_r^{-1}(0)$ .

Clearly, we get similar results if we replace the matrix  $A$  by any Jordan-block with an unitary eigenvalue. Now, let us provide a characterization of parabolic elements in terms of foliations by  $(k, l)$ -spheres, the following will be helpful.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be an element such that  $\gamma$  has a lift  $\tilde{\gamma}$  such that  $\tilde{\gamma}$  is a  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ -Jordan block being 1 its unique eigenvalue, then*

- (1) For each  $n > k \geq 0$  the action of  $[\bigwedge_k \tilde{\gamma}]$  on  $\mathbb{P}(\bigwedge_{j=1}^k \mathbb{C}^n)$  has a unique fixed point in  $\iota(Gr(k-1, n))$  namely

$$[e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \dots \wedge e_k] .$$

- (2) For each  $\ell \in Gr(k, n)$  we know  $\gamma^m(\ell) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle\langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{k+1}] \rangle\rangle$ .
- (3) It is verified that  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{n-1} \setminus Eq(\langle\gamma\rangle) = \langle\langle [e_1], \dots, [e_n] \rangle\rangle$ .
- (4) It is verified that  $\Lambda_{Kut}(\langle\gamma\rangle) = \langle\langle [e_1], \dots, [e_n] \rangle\rangle$ .
- (5) If  $\gamma$  is conjugated to an element in  $PU(k, l)$ , then  $k = \text{floor}((n+1)2^{-1})$  and  $l = \text{ceiling}((n+1)2^{-1})$ , here  $\text{floor}(x)$  denote the largest integer less than or equal to  $x$  and  $\text{ceiling}(\cdot)$  is the smallest integer greater than or equal to  $x$ .

*Proof.* Let us show (1). Let us make the proof by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 1$ , we are simply considering the action of  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  on  $\wedge^1 \mathbb{C}^{1+1} = \mathbb{C}^2$ , which trivially has a unique fixed point, thus in this case the proof is trivial. Now let us proceed to check the case  $n + 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a  $k$ -dimensional projective invariant under the action of  $\tilde{\gamma}$ , from standard linear algebra we may can assume that  $k > 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{L} \cap \langle\langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{n_0}] \rangle\rangle$  is a projective subspace, whose dimension is either  $k - 1$  or  $k - 2$ , invariant under  $\tilde{\gamma}$ . By the inductive hypothesis we conclude that  $\langle\langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{k-1}] \rangle\rangle \subset \mathcal{L}$ . Therefore, given  $p \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \langle\langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{k-1}] \rangle\rangle$  we have:

$$p = \alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_{n+1} e_{n+1}$$

Let  $m = \max\{j = 1, \dots, n+1 : \alpha_j \neq 0\}$ , then  $m > k-1$ . The set  $\{p, \tilde{\gamma}(p), \dots, \tilde{\gamma}^{m-1}(p)\}$  is linearly independent, this can be viewed from:

$$\begin{vmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 & \dots & \alpha_1 + \alpha_m \\ \alpha_2 & \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 & \dots & \alpha_2 + 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha_m & \alpha_m + 0 & & \alpha_m + 0 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \dots & \alpha_m \\ \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha_m & 0 & & 0 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$$

That is  $m \leq k$ , which concludes this part of the proof.

The proof of (2) follows from part (1) of the present Lemma and Theorem 1.6. The proof of (3) is trivial from Section 2. The proof of (4) follows from parts (1), (3) of the present Lemma and Theorem 1.4.

Finally let us shows (5). Let us suppose that  $\gamma$  is conjugate to an element in  $PU(k, l)$  with  $l - k \geq 2$ . Let  $(\gamma_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  a sequence of different elements of  $\Gamma = \langle\gamma\rangle$ . Taking the polar unitary decomposition of  $\gamma_m$  we get

$$(4.1) \quad \gamma_m = u_m \begin{bmatrix} D_1^{(m)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{l-k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & D_2^{(m)} \end{bmatrix} v_m,$$

with  $D_1 = \text{Diag}(a_{1,m}, a_{2,m}, \dots, a_{k,m})$ ,  $D_2 = \text{Diag}(a_{k,m}^{-1}, a_{k-1,m}^{-1}, \dots, a_{1,m}^{-1})$ ,  $a_{i,m} \geq a_{j,m} \geq 1$  if  $i > j$ ,  $I_{l-k}$  is the identity in  $GL(l - k, \mathbb{C})$  and  $u_m, v_m$  are unitary matrices. Without lost of generality, let us assume that  $a_{k,m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \infty$ . Taking a subsequence  $(\gamma_{n_m})$  of  $(\gamma_m)$ , if necessary, we may assume that there are  $u, v$  unitary matrices with  $u_{n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} u$  and  $v_{n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} v$ . Let us define the following subspaces

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &:= u(\langle\langle e_{k+1}, e_{k+2}, \dots, e_l \rangle\rangle), \\ J_2 &:= v^{-1}(\langle\langle e_{k+1}, e_{k+2}, \dots, e_l \rangle\rangle), \\ J_3 &:= u(\langle\langle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k \rangle\rangle), \\ J_4 &:= v^{-1}(\langle\langle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k \rangle\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

and consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : J_1 &\rightarrow J_2 \\ p &\mapsto uv(p). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  be any  $k$  dimensional projective subspace satisfying  $J_4 \subset \mathcal{L} \subset \langle\langle J_4, J_2 \rangle\rangle$ , then there is a element  $p \in J_2$  such that  $\mathcal{L} = \langle\langle J_4, p \rangle\rangle$ . If  $p = v^{-1} \left[ \sum_{j=k+1}^l x_j e_j \right]$ , define

$$x_m = v^{-1}([a_{1,n_m}^{-2} x_1 : a_{2,n_m}^{-2} x_2 : \cdots : a_{k,n_m}^{-2} x_k : x_{k+1} : \cdots : x_l : \cdots : 0]),$$

clearly  $(x_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{L}$  and

$$(4.2) \quad \gamma_{n_m}(x_{n_m}) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \phi(p).$$

Since  $(\gamma_{n_m}(J_4))$  converge to  $J_3$ , the Grassmannian is compact and Equation 4.2, we deduce that  $\gamma_{n_m}(\mathcal{L}) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle\langle J_3, \phi(p) \rangle\rangle$ , however this is a contradicts part (2) of the present lemma, so  $l - k < 2$ .  $\square$

The last part of the previous lemma is telling us that the Hermitian metric constructed in Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 , is “essentially” unique. Now we can show:

**Proof of Theorem 0.6.**

*Proof.* Let  $(k, \{V_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^k)$  be a Jordan decomposition for  $\tilde{\gamma}$ . For each  $j : 1, \dots, k$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $Q_{j,r}$  be the hermitian quadratic form in  $V_j$  given by:

$$Q_{j,r} = \begin{cases} \text{The corresponding quadratic given by Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6} & \text{if } \gamma_j \text{ is a Jordan block} \\ \text{The quadric induced by } e^r Id_{V_j} & \text{if } \gamma_j \text{ is a diagonal matrix} \end{cases}$$

Let  $(k_i, l_i)$  be the signature of the quadric  $Q_{j,r}$ . Then  $T_r = \bigoplus_{j=1}^k Q_{j,r}$  is a family of  $\gamma$ -invariant hermitian quadratics each of one has signature  $(\sum_{j=1}^k k_j, \sum_{j=1}^k l_j)$ . For each  $j$  define

$$Z_j = \begin{cases} \text{The unique fixed point of } \gamma_j, \text{ if } \gamma_j \text{ is non-diagonalizable} \\ \emptyset \text{ in other case} \end{cases}$$

$$K_j = \begin{cases} \text{The unique fixed hyperplane of } \gamma_j, \text{ if } \gamma_j \text{ is non-diagonalizable} \\ V_j \text{ in other case} \end{cases}$$

Define  $\mathcal{Z} = \langle\langle \bigcup_{j=i}^k Z_j \rangle\rangle$  and  $\mathcal{K} = \langle\langle \bigcup_{j=i}^k H_j \rangle\rangle$ , then  $\mathcal{Z}^\perp = \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\gamma|_{\mathcal{Z}^\perp}$  is non-loxodromic,  $Fix(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{Z}^\perp$ ,  $\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} T \setminus \mathcal{Z}^\perp = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \mathcal{Z}^\perp$  and whenever  $T_1, T_2$  are different quadratics in  $T_r$  we have  $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{Z} \subset T_1 \cap T_2 \subset \mathcal{Z}^\perp$ . Which concludes this part of the proof.

Let us show the reciprocal proposition. Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  and  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  a family of  $\gamma$ -invariant  $(k, l)$ -spheres and  $\mathcal{Z}$  a projective subspace of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  satisfying the items of this Theorem.

Claim 1.- The element  $\gamma$  can not be elliptic. On the contrary, let us assume that  $\gamma$  is elliptic, by Proposition 3.5 there is a set  $V \subset \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  with  $k$  elements and a set  $W \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k,l}$  with  $l$  elements such that each point in  $V \cup W$  is fixed by  $\gamma$  and  $\langle\langle V \cup W \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ , which is a contradiction since  $Fix(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{Z}^\perp$ .

Let us assume that  $\gamma$  is loxodromic, by results in section 2 there are pseudo-projective transformations  $\tau, \rho$  and a sequence  $(n_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\gamma^{n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \tau$ ,  $\gamma^{-n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \rho$ ,  $Im(\rho) \cap Im(\tau) = \emptyset$ ,  $Im(\rho), Im(\tau)$  are  $\gamma$ -invariant projective subspaces and  $\gamma|_{Im(\rho)}, \gamma|_{Im(\tau)}$  are elliptic, thus  $Im(\rho) \cup Im(\tau) \subset \mathcal{Z}^\perp$ . On the other hand, given  $p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \setminus (Ker(\rho) \cup Ker(\tau) \cup \mathcal{Z}^\perp)$ , we get  $\gamma^{n_m}(p) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \tau(p) \in \mathcal{Z}^\perp$  and  $\gamma^{-n_m}(p) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \rho(p) \in \mathcal{Z}^\perp$ , therefore  $\gamma$  restricted to  $\mathcal{Z}^\perp$  is loxodromic element, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

The following example shows a non parabolic transformation preserving a family of invariant horospheres sharing a tangent hyperplane.

**Example 4.8.** Consider the transformation given by:

$$\tau = \begin{pmatrix} i & & \\ & i & \\ & & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

for each  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  define the sphere:

$$C_r = \{[z_1, z_2, z_3] : r|z_2|^2 + |z_3|^2 + \overline{z_1}z_2 + z_1\overline{z_2} = 0, r \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

and let  $\mathcal{F} = \{C_r : r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . An easy computation prove that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family satisfying:

- (1) Each element of  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $(1, 2)$ -sphere which is  $\tau$ -invariant.
- (2) We have  $C_r \cap C_s = [e_1]$  whenever  $s \neq r$ .
- (3) Also  $\bigcup \mathcal{F} \setminus [e_1] = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \setminus \overleftrightarrow{e_1, e_3}$

**4.1. The limit set for parabolic elements.** In this part of the article we will describe the Kulkarni's limit set for cyclic groups generated by a parabolic element. Let us start with a couple of examples which shows us that the Kulkarni's discontinuity set can or cannot agree with the equicontinuity set.

**Example 4.9.** Consider first the matrix  $S$ :

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $B$  is  $k \times k$ -Jordan block:

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then one can check  $Eq(\langle S \rangle) = \Omega_{\text{Kul}}(\langle S \rangle)$  and their complement consists of the projective space generated by the set  $\{e_1, e_2, e_4, e_5\}$ .

**Example 4.10.** Now let

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $B$  is as above and  $D$  is:

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this case one has that  $\Omega_{\text{Kul}}(\langle C \rangle)$  is the complement of the projective space generated by the set  $\{e_1, e_2, e_4, e_5, e_6\}$ , while the complement of the equicontinuity region is the projective space generated by the set  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6\}$ .

The previous examples are telling us that in order to understand the Kulkarni's limit set we should be interested when the transformation is made of two blocks, *i. e.* we should consider the following results:

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $A \in GL(k, \mathbb{C})$  be a diagonal matrix such that each of its proper values is a unitary complex number,  $B \in GL(l, \mathbb{C})$  be a  $l \times l$ -Jordan block such that 1 is its proper value and  $\tilde{\gamma} \in GL(k+l, \mathbb{C})$  be given by:*

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}.$$

If  $\gamma = [[\tilde{\gamma}]]$ , then:

$$\Omega_{\text{Kul}}(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \text{Eq}(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \setminus \langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{k+l-1}] \rangle \rangle$$

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $l$ . For  $l = 2$  we get that

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} B & & \\ & 1 & 1 \\ & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

for which the claim is trivial. Let us show the claim in the case  $l + 1$ . Set  $\langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{k+l-1}] \rangle \rangle = \mathcal{L}_1$ , it will be enough to show that for  $z \in \mathcal{L}_1 \setminus \langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_k] \rangle \rangle$ , it holds that  $\langle \langle z, e_{k+l} \rangle \rangle \subset \Lambda_{\text{Kul}}(\langle \gamma \rangle)$ . Applying the inductive hypothesis to  $\gamma$  restricted to  $\mathcal{L}_2 = \langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{k+l}] \rangle \rangle$ , we conclude that  $\Lambda_{\text{Kul}}(\langle \gamma|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \rangle) = \mathcal{L}_1$ . Thus there is a sequence  $(z_{1m}) \subset \mathcal{L}_2$  such that the cluster points of  $(z_{1m})$  lies on  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l} \setminus \Lambda(\langle \gamma \rangle)$ , and

$$\gamma^m(z_{1m}) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} z.$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is compact we can assume  $z_{1m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} z_1$ , where  $z_1 = [v_1, \dots, v_{k+l}, 0]$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^l |v_{k+j}|^2 \neq 0$ . On the other hand, let  $\langle \langle [e_{k+1}], \dots, [e_{k+l+1}] \rangle \rangle = \mathcal{L}_3$  and  $M \subset \mathcal{L}_3$  a projective subspace of dimension  $l - 1$  such that  $[e_{k+1}], [\sum_{j=1}^l v_{k+j} e_{k+j}] \notin M$ , by applying Lemma 4.7, to  $\gamma$  restricted to  $\mathcal{L}_3$  and  $M$  we conclude that there is a sequence  $(z_{2m}) \subset M$  such that:

$$\gamma^m(z_{2m}) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} [e_{k+l}].$$

Clearly we can assume that  $z_{1m} \neq z_{2m}$  for each  $m$ . Define  $\ell_m = \langle \langle k_{1m}, k_{2m} \rangle \rangle$ , thus

$$\gamma^m(\ell_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle \langle z, e_{k+l} \rangle \rangle,$$

in order to conclude the proof we must observe that the cluster points of  $\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_m$  do not intersect  $\Lambda(\langle \gamma \rangle)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.12.** *Let  $B \in GL(l, \mathbb{C})$  be a  $l \times l$ -Jordan block such that 1 is its proper value and  $\tilde{\gamma} \in GL(2l, \mathbb{C})$  be given by:*

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}.$$

If  $\gamma = [[\tilde{\gamma}]]$ , then:

$$\Omega_{\text{Kul}}(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \text{Eq}(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+l-1} \setminus \langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{l-1}], [e_{l+1}], \dots, [e_{2l-1}] \rangle \rangle$$

*Proof.* Clearly

$$Eq(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{l-1}], [e_{l+1}], \dots, [e_{2l-1}] \rangle \rangle$$

By Theorems 2.8 and 1.4 to conclude the result will be enough to show that

$$W = \langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{l-1}], [e_{l+1}], \dots, [e_{2l-1}] \rangle \rangle \subset L_2(\langle \gamma \rangle).$$

Let  $\ell_1 \subset \langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_l] \rangle \rangle \setminus \{[e_1]\}$  and  $\ell_2 \subset \langle \langle [e_{l+1}], \dots, [e_{2l}] \rangle \rangle \setminus \{[e_{l+1}]\}$  be projective subspaces of dimension  $l-2$ . Define  $\mathcal{L} = \langle \langle \ell_1 \cup \ell_2 \rangle \rangle$ , clearly  $\mathcal{L} \cap \Lambda(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \emptyset$ . By Lemma 4.7 we get

$$\gamma^m(\mathcal{L}) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} W.$$

Which concludes the proof.  $\square$

In order to determine the limit set for parabolic transformation the previous analysis is not enough, we need to introduce the following notions.

**Definition 4.13.** Let  $M \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  and  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n > 0$  be the proper values of  $M\bar{M}^t$ , we define the  $(k, p)$ -Ky Fan norm, see [5], by:

$$|M|_{k,p} = \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

**Lemma 4.14.** [See Lemma 10.9 in [4]] Let  $A \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ , then:

$$|A|_{1,1}^2 (|A|_{2,1} - |A|_{1,1})^2 = \max\{\det(\bar{V}^t A \bar{A}^t V) : V \in M(n \times 2, \mathbb{C}) \text{ and } \bar{V}^t V = Id_2\}.$$

**Lemma 4.15.** Let  $M \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a Jordan block of size  $n+1 \times n+1$ . If 1 is the unique proper value of  $M$ , then:

(1) There are  $0 < s < r$  such that for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we get:

$$s \binom{m}{n} < |M^m|_{1,1} < r \binom{m}{n}.$$

(2) Also we have:

$$\frac{|M^m|_{2,1} - |M^m|_{1,1}}{m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

*Proof.* An inductive argument shows:

$$M^m = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \binom{m}{1} & \binom{m}{2} & \cdots & \binom{m}{n} \\ 0 & 1 & \binom{m}{1} & \cdots & \binom{m}{n-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & \binom{m}{n-2} \\ & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Define  $B_m = M^m(\bar{M}^m)^t$ , a simple computation shows  $B_m$  is given by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{m}{j}^2 & \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-1} & \sum_{j=2}^n \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-2} & \cdots & \sum_{j=n}^n \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-n} \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-1} & \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{m}{j}^2 & \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-1} & \cdots & \sum_{j=n-1}^{n-1} \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-n+1} \\ \sum_{j=2}^n \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-2} & \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-1} & \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \binom{m}{j}^2 & \cdots & \sum_{j=n-2}^{n-2} \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-n+2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sum_{j=n}^n \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-n} & \sum_{j=n-1}^{n-1} \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-n+1} & \sum_{j=n-2}^{n-2} \binom{m}{j} \binom{m}{j-n+2} & \cdots & \sum_{j=0}^0 \binom{m}{j}^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Let us show (1). From the previous equation we deduce:

$$\left[ \left[ \binom{m}{n}^{-2} B_m \right] \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \begin{bmatrix} \left[ \begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{array} \right] \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus there are  $0 < s < r$  satisfying:

$$s \binom{m}{n}^2 < |B_m|_{1,1} = |M^m|_{1,1}^2 < r \binom{m}{n}^2,$$

which concludes this part of the proof.

In order to conclude let us show (2). By Lemma 4.14, there are  $V_m \in SL(n \times 2, \mathbb{C})$  such that:

$$k_m = |M^m|_{1,1}^2 (|M^m|_{2,1}^2 - |M^m|_{1,1})^2 = \det(\bar{V}^t A^m \bar{A}^{m^t} V_m)$$

A straightforward calculation shows:

$$k_m \left( m \binom{m}{n} \right)^{-2} = \det \left( \bar{V}^t \left( m \binom{m}{n} \right)^{-2} B_m V_m \right) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.16.** *Let  $A \in GL(k, \mathbb{C})$  and  $B \in GL(l, \mathbb{C})$  be Jordan blocks such that 1 is its proper value and  $k > l$ . If  $\tilde{\gamma} \in GL(k+l, \mathbb{C})$  is given by:*

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix},$$

and  $\gamma = [[\tilde{\gamma}]]$ , then:

$$\Lambda_{Kul}(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \langle \langle [e_1], \dots, [e_{l_k-1}], [e_{k+1}], \dots, [e_{k+l-1}] \rangle \rangle$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.7 and results in [11] there are  $\nu_1 \in SL(k, \mathbb{C}), \nu_2 \in SL(l, \mathbb{C})$ , Hermitian matrices  $H_1 \in GL(k, \mathbb{C}), H_2 \in GL(l, \mathbb{C})$  and  $(u_{1m}), (v_{1m}) \in U(k), (u_{2m}), (v_{2m}) \in U(l)$  such that: The signatures of  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are respectively  $(\text{floor}(\frac{k}{2}), \text{ceiling}(\frac{k}{2})), (\text{floor}(\frac{l}{2}), \text{ceiling}(\frac{l}{2}))$ , we know  $\hat{A} = \nu_1 A \nu_1^{-1} \in U(H_1) \hat{B} = \nu_1 B \nu_1^{-1} \in U(H_2)$  and

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{A}^m &= \hat{u}^{1m} \text{Diag}(\alpha_{1m}, \dots, \alpha_{km}) \hat{v}_{1m} \\ \hat{B}^m &= \hat{u}^{2m} \text{Diag}(\beta_{1m}, \dots, \beta_{lm}) \hat{v}_{2m} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_i > \alpha_{i+1}$ ,  $\beta_i > \beta_{i+1}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\text{floor}(k/2)-i} \alpha_{\text{ceiling}(k/2)+1+i} &= 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq \text{floor}(k/2) - 1 \\ \beta_{\text{floor}(l/2)-i} \beta_{\text{ceiling}(l/2)+1+i} &= 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq \text{floor}(k/2) - 1 \end{aligned}$$

Since the dynamics of  $A, B$  and  $\hat{A}, \hat{B}$  are conjugate, from Lemma 4.15 we get

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{\frac{\alpha_{1m}}{\beta_{1m}} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \infty}{\max\{\alpha_{im}, \beta_{im}; i > 2\}} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \infty$$

Up to conjugation, we can assume that:

$$(4.5) \quad \gamma^m = \hat{u}_m \begin{pmatrix} D_m & & \\ & \beta_{1m}^{-1} & \\ & & \alpha_{1m}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \hat{v}_m$$

where  $\hat{u}_m$  and  $\hat{v}_m$  are unitary matrices and

$$D_m = \text{Diag}(\alpha_{1m}, \dots, \alpha_{k-1,m}, \beta_{1m}, \dots, \beta_{l-1,m}),$$

. Let's denoted by  $\rho_{im}$  the elements of  $D_m$ , define

$$\kappa_{im} = \min\{\rho_{im}^{-1} \rho_{jm} : j = 1, \dots, k+l-2\}$$

Let  $(n_m) \subset \mathbb{N}$  be any strictly increasing sequence such that  $\hat{v}_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \hat{v} \in U(k+l)$ ,

$\hat{u}_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \hat{u} \in U(k+l)$  and  $\kappa_{im} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_i \in \mathbb{R}$  then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}(\langle\langle e_1, \dots, e_s \rangle\rangle) &= \langle\langle e_1, \dots, e_s \rangle\rangle, \\ \hat{v}^{-1}(\langle\langle e_{s+1}, e_{s+2} \rangle\rangle) &= \langle\langle e_{s+1}, e_{s+2} \rangle\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

Let  $x = [x_1, \dots, x_{k+l-2}, 0, 0] \in \langle\langle e_1, \dots, e_{k+l-2} \rangle\rangle$  and define

$$\zeta_m = \hat{v}_m^{-1}([\kappa_{1m} x_1, \dots, \kappa_{k+l-2,m} x_{k+l-2}, 1, 1])$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \zeta &= \hat{v}_m^{-1}([\kappa_1 x_1, \dots, \kappa_{k+l-2} x_{k+l-2}, 1, 1]) \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \langle\langle e_{s+1}, e_{s+2} \rangle\rangle, \\ \gamma^{n_m} \zeta_m &\rightarrow \hat{u}x. \end{aligned}$$

This shows the assertion.  $\square$

The following is an easy consequence of Lemmas 4.11, 4.17 and 4.16.

**Lemma 4.17.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a parabolic element,  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a lift of  $\gamma$  and  $(k, \{V_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^k)$  be a block decomposition for  $\tilde{\gamma}$ . If  $k \geq 2$  and for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  it is verified that  $\gamma_j$  is a  $l_j \times l_j$  Jordan block with proper value 1, then*

$$\Omega_{Kul}(\langle\gamma\rangle) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \left\langle \left\langle V_1 \cup \bigcup_{j=2}^k \Lambda_{Kul}(\langle\gamma_j\rangle) \right\rangle \right\rangle.$$

Now the following are straightforward Corollaries whose proof we omit here.

**Corollary 4.18.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a parabolic element,  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  a lift of  $\gamma$  and  $(\{V_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^k, \{T_j\}_{j=1}^k)$  a block decomposition of  $\tilde{\gamma}$ , then*

(1) *The largest open set  $\Omega_\gamma$  on which  $\langle\gamma\rangle$  acts properly discontinuously is*

$$\Omega_\gamma = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \left\langle \left\langle V_1 \cup \bigcup_{j=2}^k \{v_{j1}, \dots, v_{j, \text{ceiling}(\dim v_j / 2)}\} \right\rangle \right\rangle$$

- (2) We have  $Eq(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \Omega_{Kul}(\langle \gamma \rangle)$  if and only if for each  $j, m > 2$  we have  $dimV_j = dimV_m$ .
- (3) We have  $\Omega_{Kul}(\langle \gamma \rangle)$  is the largest open set on which  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  acts properly discontinuously if and only if for each  $j > 2$  we have  $dimV_j = 2, 3$ .
- (4) We have  $Eq(\langle \gamma \rangle) = \Omega_{Kul}(\langle \gamma \rangle)$  is the Largest open set on which  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  acts properly discontinuously if and only if for each  $j, m > 2$  we have  $dimV_j = dimV_m$  and  $dimV_2 = 2, 3$ .

**Corollary 4.19.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a parabolic element,  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  a lift of  $\gamma$  and  $(\{V_j\}_{j=1}^m, \{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^m, \{T_j\}_{j=1}^m)$  a block decomposition of  $\tilde{\gamma}$ . If  $\gamma$  is conjugate to an element in  $PU(k, l)$ , then:*

$$\sum_{j=2}^m \text{ceiling}((dimv_j)/2) \leq k.$$

As we are going to see the results developed in this section will provide a good understanding of the dynamic for loxodromic elements.

## 5. LOXODROMIC TRANSFORMATIONS

Recall that a loxodromic element  $\gamma$  in  $PSL(2, \mathbb{C})$  by definition has two fixed points in  $p, q \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$ . One of these points is repelling, the other attracting. Due to this fact one can always choose a small enough ball  $W$  with center at the attracting point such that  $\gamma(\overline{W}) \subset W$ . We will see bellow that this property characterizes the loxodromic elements. The following technical lemmas will help in this characterization of the loxodromic elements.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be an element for which there is a proper open set  $W$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  such that  $\gamma(\overline{W}) \subset W$ , then  $\Lambda(\langle \gamma \rangle)$  is a non-empty disconnected set.*

*Proof.* Define

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \gamma^n(\overline{W} \setminus \gamma(\overline{W})).$$

Then  $\Omega$  is a non-empty set where  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  acts properly discontinuously. In consequence

$$\Lambda(\langle \gamma \rangle) \subset W \cup \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \overline{W}.$$

To conclude observe that  $\Lambda(\gamma) \cap W \neq \emptyset$  and  $\Lambda(\gamma) \cap \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \overline{W} \neq \emptyset$ . □

**Lemma 5.2** (See [13]). *Let  $T \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n+1$ . If  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n+1}$  are the eigenvalues of  $T$ , then the eigenvalues of  $\bigwedge_k T$  has the form  $\alpha_{j_1} \cdots \alpha_{j_k}$  where  $j_1, \dots, j_k \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$  and  $j_l < j_k$ , whenever  $k < l$ .*

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $T \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n+1}$  be the eigenvalues of  $T$ . If  $p \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$  is a eigenvector for  $\alpha_1$ ,  $|\alpha_1| = \max\{|\alpha_j| : j \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}\}$  and  $|\alpha_1| \neq |\alpha_k|$  for  $k > 2$ , then  $[p]$  is an attracting fixed point for the action of  $[[T]]$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$*

*Proof.* By the Normal Jordan normal form theorem, there is  $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$  and  $W$  a linear subspace such that  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1} = \langle v \rangle \oplus W$ ,  $W$  is  $T$ -invariant,  $v$  is eigenvector with eigenvalue  $\alpha_1$  and the spectral radius of  $T|_W$  is less than  $|\alpha_1|$ . Consider the affine chart  $w \in W \mapsto [v+w]$ , in this chart  $[v]$  correspond to the origin and  $[[T]]$  is simply  $\alpha_1^{-1}T|_W$ . Since  $D(\alpha_1^{-1}T|_W)(0) = \alpha_1^{-1}T|_W$  and the spectral radius of  $\alpha_1^{-1}T|_W$  is less than 1, we conclude that  $[v]$  is an attracting fixed point. □

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $U \subset \iota Gr(k, n)$  be an open set (resp. a closed set), then  $\bigcup_{\ell \in U} \ell$  is an open set in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  (resp. closed).*

*Proof.* Let us show the case when  $U$  is an open set. Clearly, is enough to assume that  $U$  is an open ball in  $\iota Gr(k, n)$ . Let us assume that  $U = B_d(r, \ell)$ , where  $d$  is the Fubini-Study metric restricted to  $\iota Gr(k, n)$ . Let  $v_1, \dots, v_{k+1} \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$  be points in general position such that  $[Span(v_1, \dots, v_{k+1}) \setminus \{0\}] = \ell$ , for each set  $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  of points in general position, consider the following function  $\nabla_W : \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus [(W) \setminus \{0\}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , given by

$$\nabla_W([z]) = d([w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_k \wedge z], [v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_{k+1}])$$

Clearly  $\nabla_W$  is a well defined continuous function. To conclude is enough to observe that  $\bigcup_{\ell \in U} \ell = \bigcup_W \{z \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus [(W) \setminus \{0\}] : \nabla_W(z) < r\}$ .

Finally, let us proof the case when  $U$  is a closed set. Let  $(x_m) \subset \bigcup_{\ell \in U} \ell$  be a sequence converging to  $x$ . For each  $m$  we can choose an element  $\ell_m \in U$  such that  $x_m \in \ell_m$ . Since  $Gr(k, n)$  is compact we can assume that there is  $\ell_0 \in U$  such that  $\ell_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \ell_0$ , in the topology of  $Gr(k, n)$ . In consequence  $\ell_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \ell_0$  as closed sets in the Hausdorff topology. Therefore  $x \in \ell_0$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.5.** *Given  $\mathcal{L} \in Gr(k, n)$ , there is an open set  $U \subset Gr(k, n)$  such that  $\mathcal{L} \in U$  and  $\bigcup_{\ell \in U} \ell \neq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $W \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \mathcal{L}$  a non empty open set such that  $\overline{W} \cap \mathcal{L} = \emptyset$ . Define

$$\widetilde{W} = \{\ell \in Gr(k, n) : \ell \cap \overline{W} \neq \emptyset\},$$

clearly  $\widehat{W} = Gr(k, n) \setminus \widetilde{W}$  is an open set containing  $\mathcal{L}$  also satisfying  $W \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \bigcup_{\ell \in \widehat{W}} \ell$ . Which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 0.7.**

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a linear transformation with one non-unitary eigenvalue, then by the Normal Jordan form we can assume that  $\gamma$  can be written as

$$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 A_1 & & & \\ & r_2 A_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & r_k A_k \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $r_k < r_{k-1} < \dots < r_1$  and each matrix  $A_k$  has only unitary eigenvalues. Now let  $\tilde{n} = \dim A_1$  and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\tilde{n}}$  be the eigenvalues of  $A_1$ . A straightforward calculation shows that  $p = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_{\tilde{n}}$  is an eigenvalue of  $T = \bigwedge^{\tilde{n}} \gamma$  with eigenvalue  $\alpha = r_1^{\tilde{n}} \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{\tilde{n}}$ , moreover by Lemma 5.2 we deduce that  $\alpha$  is a simple root of  $Det(T - \lambda I) = 0$  and  $r_1^{\tilde{n}} = \max\{|\beta| : \beta \text{ eigenvalue of } T\}$ . By Lemma 5.3 it yields that  $[p]$  is an attracting fixed point of  $[[T]]$  acting on  $P(\bigwedge^{\tilde{n}} \mathbb{C}^n)$ . Due to the Plucker embedding and Lemma 5.5 we conclude that there is an open set  $U \subset Gr(\tilde{n} - 1, n)$  such that:  $[[\gamma]](\overline{U}) \subset U$ ,  $\langle \langle e_1, \dots, e_{\tilde{n}} \rangle \rangle \in U$  and  $\bigcup_{\ell \in U} \ell \neq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ . To conclude observe that Lemma 5.4 yields that  $W = \bigcup_{\ell \in U} \ell$  is a proper open set which satisfy  $[[\gamma]](\overline{W}) \subset W$ . Which concludes this part of the proof.

The proof now concludes by Lemmas 1.6 and 5.1.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let  $\gamma \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a given by:*

$$\begin{pmatrix} r_1 A_1 & & & \\ & r_2 A_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & r_k A_k \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $0 < r_k < r_{k-1} < \dots < r_1$  and each  $A_j$  has only unitary eigenvectors, also let

$$W_1 = \begin{cases} \langle \langle \Lambda_{Kul}(\langle A_1 \rangle) \cup \{e_{\dim A_1+1}, \dots, e_{n+1}\} \rangle \rangle & \text{if } A_1 \text{ is non-diagonalizable.} \\ \langle \langle e_{\dim A_1+1}, \dots, e_{n+1} \rangle \rangle & \text{if } A_1 \text{ is diagonalizable} \end{cases}$$

and

$$W_k = \begin{cases} \langle \langle \Lambda_{Kul}(\langle A_k \rangle) \cup \{e_{\dim 1}, \dots, e_{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \dim(A_j)}\} \rangle \rangle & \text{if } A_k \text{ non-diagonalizable.} \\ \langle \langle e_{\dim 1}, \dots, e_{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \dim(A_j)} \rangle \rangle & \text{if } A_k \text{ is diagonalizable} \end{cases}$$

Thus  $\Lambda_{Kul}(\langle \gamma \rangle) = W_1 \cup W_k$ .

*Proof.* The following proof is a straightforward application of Lemmas 4.11, 4.17 and 4.16.  $\square$

As in the two dimensional case, see [10], the Kulkarni's discontinuity region is not the largest open set where the cyclic groups act properly discontinuously, the following example depicts this situation.

**Example 5.7.** Let  $\gamma \in PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a loxodromic element such that there is  $\tilde{\gamma} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  a lift of  $\gamma$  and  $(k, \{V_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{r_i\}_{i=1}^k)$  an unitary decomposition of  $\tilde{\gamma}$  such that  $k > 3$ , then:

$$\Omega_1 = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \left( [V_1 \setminus \{0\}] \cup \left[ \langle \langle \bigcup_{j>2} V_j \rangle \rangle \setminus \{0\} \right] \right)$$

$$\Omega_2 = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus \left( [V_k \setminus \{0\}] \cup \left[ \langle \langle \bigcup_{j<k} V_j \rangle \rangle \setminus \{0\} \right] \right)$$

are maximal discontinuity regions.

In the two dimensional setting is well known that loxodromic transformation have at most 2 maximal open sets on which the respective cyclic group acts properly discontinuously, in the higher dimensional case this situation can be more complicated as the following example shows.

**Example 5.8.** Let us consider the element  $\gamma \in PU(1, n)$  induced by the following matrix

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & & \\ & I_{n-1} & \\ & & 2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and  $\Gamma = \langle \langle \gamma \rangle \rangle$ . It is not hard to show that

$$Eq(\Gamma) = \mathbb{P}^n \setminus (\{e_1\}^{\perp} \cup \{e_{n+1}\}^{\perp}) = \Omega_{Kul}(\Gamma).$$

On the other hand, when one tries to determine if the previous sets are maximal open sets on which  $\Gamma$  acts properly discontinuously, we find the following phenomena: given  $U, W \subset \text{Span}(\{e_2, \dots, e_n\}) = \mathcal{L}$  disjoint open sets such that  $\overline{U} \cup \overline{W} = \mathcal{L}$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} &= \{\overleftarrow{e_1}, \overleftarrow{u} \mid u \in \overline{U}\} \\ \mathcal{V} &= \{\overleftarrow{e_{n+1}}, \overleftarrow{v} \mid v \in \overline{V}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Is not hard to show  $\mathbb{P}^n \setminus (\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V})$  is a maximal open set on which  $\Gamma$  acts properly discontinuously and every maximal open set for the action of  $\Gamma$  arises in this way.

From the previous section one expect to get examples where the Kulkarni and the equicontinuity agree and others where they disagree. This situation is showed by the following examples.

**Example 5.9.** Consider first the matrix  $S$ :

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} rB & 0 \\ 0 & r^{-1}B \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $r > 1$  and  $B$  is the  $k \times k$  identity. Then one can check  $Eq(\langle S \rangle) = \Omega_{\text{Kul}}(\langle S \rangle)$ .

**Example 5.10.** Let

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} rB & & & \\ & rD & & \\ & & r^{-1}D & \\ & & & r^{-1}B \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $r > 1$ ,  $B$  is a  $k+1 \times k+1$ -Jordan block and  $D$  is a  $k \times k$ -Jordan block. Is clear that  $\Omega_{\text{Kul}}(\langle C \rangle) \neq Eq(\langle C \rangle)$ .

**5.1. Existence of Loxodromic elements.** Loxodromic elements will play an important role in the dynamic of kleinian groups, in this final part of the article we are going to show that in the case of strongly irreducible groups we can ensure the existence of loxodromic elements.

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $(\gamma_m) \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  and  $\gamma \in PS(n+1, \mathbb{C}) \setminus PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  such that  $\gamma_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma$  as pseudo projective transformations. If  $Im(\gamma) \cap Ker(\gamma) = \emptyset$ , then for  $m$  large we get  $\gamma_m$  is loxodromic.*

*Proof.* We have that  $\gamma_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma$  uniformly on compact sets of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Ker(\gamma)$ . Let  $W$  be an open neighborhood of  $Im(\gamma)$  such that  $\overline{W} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n \setminus Ker(\gamma)$ , then for  $m$  large we get  $\gamma_m(\overline{W}) \subset W$ , that is  $\gamma_m$  is loxodromic.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.12.** *Let  $(M_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}, (N_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset M(n, \mathbb{C})$  be sequences of matrices such that  $M_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} M$  and  $N_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} N$  point-wise. If  $Im(N) \not\subset Ker(M)$ , then  $[M_m N_m] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} [MN]$  in the sense of pseudo-projective transformations.*

*Proof.* By the continuity of the matrices product we deduce that  $M_m N_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} MN$ , therefore in order to conclude the proof we need to show that  $MN \neq 0$ , which is trivial since  $Im(N) \not\subset Ker(M)$ .  $\square$

From linear algebra we know that for every linear transformation  $T : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  and every  $1 \leq k \leq n$  we got a linear transformation  $\bigwedge_k T : \bigwedge_{j=1}^k \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \bigwedge_{j=1}^k \mathbb{C}^n$  which is induced by  $\bigwedge_k T(v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k) = T(v_1) \wedge \dots \wedge T(v_k)$ , so if we have a subgroup  $\Gamma \subset PSL(n+1)$ , we can define

$$\bigwedge_k \Gamma = \left\{ \left[ \left[ \bigwedge_k \gamma \right] \right] : [[\gamma]] \in \Gamma \right\}$$

**Lemma 5.13.** *Let  $(M_m)_{m \in \mathbf{N}} \subset M(n, \mathbb{C})$  be a sequence of matrices such that  $M_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} M$  point-wise.*

- (1) *If  $\dim(\text{Im}(M)) \geq k$ , then  $\left[ \bigwedge_{j=1}^k M_m \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \bigwedge_{j=1}^k M \right]$  in the sense of pseudo-projective transformations.*
- (2) *If  $\dim(\text{Im}(M)) = k$ , then:*

$$\text{Im} \left( \left[ \bigwedge_{j=1}^k M \right] \right) = \iota_{k-1, n-1}(\text{Im}(M)).$$

Moreover

$$\text{Im} \left( \left[ \left[ \bigwedge_{j=1}^k M \right] \right] \right) \subset \text{Ker} \left( \left[ \left[ \bigwedge_{j=1}^k M \right] \right] \right)$$

if and only if  $\text{Ker}([M]) \cap \text{Im}([M]) \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* Let us show part (1). By the continuity of wedge product we have

$$\bigwedge_{j=1}^k M_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \bigwedge_{j=1}^k M,$$

therefore in order to conclude the proof we need to show that  $\bigwedge_{j=1}^k M \neq 0$ . Let  $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \text{Im}(M)$  be linearly independent vectors and  $\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_k$  be such that  $M(\tilde{v}_i) = v_i$ , then

$$M_m(\tilde{v}_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \tilde{v}_k) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} M(\tilde{v}_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \tilde{v}_k) = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k \neq 0,$$

which concludes the proof.

The proof of part (2) goes as follows: let  $W \in \text{Gr}(k-1, n-1)$ , then we can choose  $w_1, \dots, w_k \in W$  so  $\iota_{k-1, n-1}(W) = [w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_k]$ , in consequence

$$\left[ \left[ \bigwedge_k M \right] \right] [w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_k] = \begin{cases} \iota_{k-1, n-1}(\text{Im}(M)) & \text{if } W \cap \text{Ker}(M) = \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{in other case} \end{cases}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.14.** *Let  $\mathcal{L} \subset \text{Gr}(n-1, n)$  be an infinite collection whose elements are in general position and  $\mu : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  be such that  $\mu(\ell) \in \ell$  for every  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ , then there are  $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $\mu(\mathcal{K}_2) \notin \mathcal{K}_1$  and  $\mu(\mathcal{K}_1) \notin \mathcal{K}_2$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is going to be by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 2$  the proof is worked out in [1]. Now let us assume that the result is valid for  $n_0$  but is not longer true for  $n_0 + 1$ . Then there  $\mathcal{L} \subset \text{Gr}(n, n+1)$  and  $\mu : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow P_{\mathbb{C}}^{n+1}$  as in the hypothesis of this result such that for every  $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \in \mathcal{L}$  we have either  $\mu(\mathcal{K}_2) \in \mathcal{K}_1$  or  $\mu(\mathcal{K}_1) \in \mathcal{K}_2$ .

Since the elements of  $\mathcal{L}$  are in general position we can assume that  $\mu$  is injective. Let  $\mathcal{K}_0 \in \mathcal{L}$  be a fixed, then there exist  $\mathcal{L}' \subset \mathcal{L}$  an infinite subset such that:

$$\mu(\mathcal{K}_0) \notin \bigcup \mathcal{L}'.$$

Thus  $\mathcal{L}' \cap \mathcal{K}_0 = \{\ell \cap \mathcal{K}_0 : \ell \in \mathcal{L}'\}$  is an infinite set of projective subspaces with co dimension one on  $\mathcal{K}_0$  and lying in general position. Moreover, if

$$\mu'(\ell \cap \mathcal{K}_0) = \mu(\ell) \text{ for every } \ell \in \mathcal{L}',$$

we get  $\mu'(\ell \cap \mathcal{K}_0) \in \mathcal{K}_0 \cap \ell$ . By the inductive hypothesis, there are  $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \in \mathcal{L}'$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu'(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_0) &\notin \mathcal{K}_0 \cap \mathcal{K}_2 \\ \mu'(\mathcal{K}_2 \cap \mathcal{K}_0) &\notin \mathcal{K}_0 \cap \mathcal{K}_1 \end{aligned}$$

therefore  $\mu(\mathcal{K}_1) \notin \mathcal{K}_2$  and  $\mu(\mathcal{K}_2) \notin \mathcal{K}_1$ , which is a contradiction. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.15.** *Let  $\Gamma \subset PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a discrete strongly irreducible group, then  $\Gamma$  contains a loxodromic element.*

*Proof.* Since  $\Gamma$  is discrete we conclude that there is  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  with infinite order, see [3]. Let assume that  $\gamma$  is parabolic then there a strictly increasing sequence  $(n_m) \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $\rho_0 \in PS(n+1, \mathbb{C}) \setminus PSL(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  such that  $\rho_m = \gamma^{n_m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \rho_0$  as pseudo projective transformations and  $Im(\rho) \subset Ker(\rho)$ . Let  $\tilde{\rho}_m \in M(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  be a lift of  $\rho_m$  such that  $\tilde{\rho}_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\rho}_0$  point-wise Set  $k = dim(Im(\rho_0)) + 1$ , by Lemma 5.13, we deduce that  $\bigwedge^k \rho_m = [[\bigwedge^k \tilde{\rho}_m]] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \bigwedge^k \rho_0 = [[\bigwedge^k \tilde{\rho}_0]]$  and  $Im(\bigwedge^k \rho_0)$  is a single point contained in  $Ker(\bigwedge^k \rho_0)$ . Since the action of  $\bigwedge_k \Gamma$  acts strongly irreducible we deduce that there is a sequence of distinct elements  $(\tau_m) \subset \bigwedge_k \Gamma$  such that  $\mathcal{L} = \{\tau_m(Ker(\bigwedge^k \rho_0)) : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a family of hyperplanes in general position. By applying Lemma 5.14 to  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mu : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^{n+1})$  given by

$$\mu(\tau_m(Ker(\bigwedge^k \rho_0))) = \tau_m(Im(\bigwedge^k \rho_0)),$$

we deduce that there are  $i_0, j_0 \{1, \dots, dim(\bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^{n+1})\}$  satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{i_0}(Im(\bigwedge^k \rho_0)) &\notin \tau_{j_0}(Ker(\bigwedge^k \rho_0)); \\ \tau_{j_0}(Im(\bigwedge^k \rho_0)) &\notin \tau_{i_0}(Ker(\bigwedge^k \rho_0)). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\tilde{\tau}_{j_0}, \tilde{\tau}_{i_0} \in End(\bigwedge^k \mathbb{C}^{n+1})$  are lifts of  $\tau_{j_0}$  and  $\tau_{i_0}$  respectively, then by Lemma 5.12 we conclude that

$$\eta_m = \tau_{i_0}^{-1} \tau_{j_0} \left( \bigwedge^k \rho_m \right) \tau_{j_0}^{-1} \tau_{i_0} \left( \bigwedge^k \rho_m \right) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \eta_0 = \left[ \left[ \tilde{\tau}_{i_0}^{-1} \tilde{\tau}_{j_0} \left( \bigwedge^k \tilde{\rho}_0 \right) \tilde{\tau}_{j_0}^{-1} \tilde{\tau}_{i_0} \left( \bigwedge^k \tilde{\rho}_0 \right) \right] \right],$$

Observe

$$(5.1) \quad Ker(\eta_0) = \left[ \left( \left( \bigwedge^k \tilde{\rho}_0 \right)^{-1} \left( \tilde{\tau}_{i_0}^{-1} \left( \tilde{\tau}_{j_0} \left( Ker \left( \bigwedge^k \rho_0 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \setminus \{0\} \right]$$

Since  $Im(\bigwedge^k \rho_0) \notin \tau_{i_0}^{-1} \tau_{j_0} (Ker(\bigwedge^k \rho_0))$  by equation 5.1 we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} Ker(\eta_0) &= Ker(\bigwedge_k \rho_0) \\ Im(\eta_0) &= \tau_{i_0}^{-1} \tau_{j_0} (\bigwedge_k \rho_0) \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $Im(\eta_0)$  is a point not contained in  $Ker(\eta_0)$ , by Lemma 5.11 we conclude that for  $m$  large  $\eta_m$  is loxodromic, if  $\eta \in \Gamma$  satisfies that  $\bigwedge_k \eta = \eta_m$  we conclude that  $\eta$  is loxodromic, which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 6. FINAL TOUGHS

In the case of projective parabolic transformation, our previous discussion shows that for elements in  $PU(k, l)$ ,  $k \geq 2$ , the Kulkarni's discontinuity set is not longer the largest open set where the corresponding group acts properly discontinuously. For discrete groups in  $PU(k, l)$  it would be interesting to determine if there is a generalization of the notion of the Chen-Greenberg limit set, determine its limit set in the Kulkarni's sense and if there is an open set which is the largest open set on which the group acts properly discontinuously.

In the one and two dimensional case and for some transformations in  $PU(k, l)$ , maps can be classified by the use of the trace, see [3, ?], it would be useful to have a similar result.

Let  $X$  be the space, of all positive definite, symmetric  $3 \times 3$ -matrices with real coefficients, of determinant 1, there is a metric  $d$  such that  $X$  is a  $CAT(0)$ -space and the action of  $SL(3, \mathbb{R})$  on  $X$  given by  $fxf^t$ , where  $x \in X$  and  $f \in SL(3, \mathbb{R})$ , is by isometries. Then by using the classification of isometries in  $CAT(0)$ -spaces one can classify elements of  $SL(3, \mathbb{R})$  in to parabolic, loxodromic and elliptic however is not hard to show, see [6], that such classification does no agree with the one induced by definition 0.1.

From the the theory of  $CAT(0)$ -spaces one know that isometries can be classified in to three types namely elliptic, parabolic or hyperbolic. In virtue of the similarity of our results with the ones coming from  $CAT(0)$ -spaces, is natural to ask if it is possible to use this theory to deal with the classification of projective transformations. We got two naive partial answers: first since  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  is compact one cannot use directly the theory of  $CAT(0)$ -spaces to deal with the problem of classification of projective transformations, second, a result in [6] asserts that the fixed set of parabolic elements should be contractible in the Tits boundary of  $X$ , in consequence for  $n > 1$ , the projective space  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n$  cannot be the tits boundary of a proper  $CAT(0)$ -space where the projective transformations are extensions of isometries of  $X$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank to people the IMUNAM Unidad Cuernavaca as well as the IIT of UACJ for their hospitality and kindness during the writing of this paper and we are specially grateful to N. Gusevskii, J. P. Navarrete, John Parker, José Seade and A. Verjovsky for valuable discussions.

## REFERENCES

1. W. Barrera, A. Cano, J. P. Navarrete, *On the number of lines in the limit set for discrete subgroups of  $PSL(3, \mathbb{C})$* , Pacific Journal of mathematics, Vol. 281 (2016), No. 1, 1749.
2. R. Bhatia, *Perturbation Bounds for Matrix Eigenvalues*, SIAM, 2007.
3. A. Cano, J. P. Navarrete, J. Seade, *Complex Kleinian Groups*, Volume 303, Progress in Mathematics - Birkhuser, Springer, 2013.
4. H. Dym, *Linear Algebra in action*, Vol. 78, Graduate studies in mathematics, AMS, 2006.
5. Ky Fan, *Maximum Properties and Inequalities for the Eigenvalues of Completely Continuous Operators*, Proc Natl Acad Sci U. S. A., Nov. 1951, Vol 31, Issue 11, pp. 760-766.

6. K. Fujiwara, K. Nagano, T. Shioya, *Fixed point sets of parabolic isometries of  $CAT(0)$ -spaces*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici, Volume 81, Issue 2, 2006, pp. 305-335.
7. W. M. Goldman, *Complex Hyperbolic Geometry*, Clarendon Press, 1999.
8. Krishnendu Gongopadhyay, Shiv Parsad, J. Parker, *On the classification of unitary matrices*  
To appear in Osaka Journal of Mathematics.
9. K. Iwasaki, *From Gauss to Painleve: a modern theory of special functions.*, Vieweg, 1991.
10. R. S. Kulkarni, *Groups with Domains of Discontinuity*, Math. Ann. No 237, pp. 253-272 (1978).
11. Y. A. Neretin, *Lectures on Gaussian Integral Operators and Classical Groups*, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics, 2011.
12. F. Santos, B. Scardua, *Construction of vector fields and Riccati foliations associated to groups of projective automorphism*, Conf. Geom. and Dyn., Volume 14 (2010), 154-166.
13. R. Shaw, *Multilinear algebra and group representations*, volume 2 of Linear Algebra and Group Representations, Academic Press (1983).
14. M. Yoshida, *Hyper Geometric Functions, My Love: Modular Interpretations of Configuration Spaces*, Friedrick Vieweg & Son, 1997.

UCIM, AV. UNIVERSIDAD S/N. COL. LOMAS DE CHAMILPA, C.P. 62210, CUERNAVACA, MORELOS, MÉXICO.

*E-mail address:* `angelcano@im.unam.mx`

IIT UACJ, AV. DEL CHARRO 610 NORTE, PARTIDO ROMERO, C.P. 32310, CIUDAD JUÁREZ, CHIHUAHUA, MÉXICO

*E-mail address:* `luis.loeza@uacj.mx`

UCIM, AV. UNIVERSIDAD S/N. COL. LOMAS DE CHAMILPA, C.P. 62210, CUERNAVACA, MORELOS, MÉXICO.

*E-mail address:* `manuel.ucan@im.unam.mx`