

RESTRICTIONS ON ANOSOV SUBGROUPS OF $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$

SUBHADIP DEY, ZACHARY GREENBERG, AND J. MAXWELL RIESTENBERG

ABSTRACT. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ be a non-empty subset. We prove that if Θ contains an odd integer, then any P_Θ -Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is virtually isomorphic to a free group or a surface group. In particular, any Borel Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is virtually isomorphic to a free or surface group. On the other hand, if Θ does not contain any odd integers, then there exists a P_Θ -Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ which is not virtually isomorphic to a free or surface group. We also exhibit new examples of maximally antipodal subsets of certain flag manifolds; these arise as limit sets of rank 1 subgroups.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since their introduction by Labourie [20], Anosov subgroups of semisimple Lie groups have come to be regarded as the right generalization of convex cocompact actions on hyperbolic spaces to higher rank. An Anosov subgroup Γ of a semisimple Lie group G is word-hyperbolic and comes equipped with a boundary map from the Gromov boundary of Γ to a flag manifold $\mathcal{F} = G/P$ [13]. Alternatively, they can be characterized in terms of their coarse geometry as those subgroups with uniformly regular undistorted orbits in the symmetric space $\mathbb{X} = G/K$ [18].

It is intriguing to ask how large is the class of word-hyperbolic groups that appear as Anosov subgroups of semisimple Lie groups. Danciger-Guéritaud-Kassel [7] showed that a large family of word-hyperbolic groups, namely, any hyperbolic right-angled Coxeter group admit Anosov representations. However, Kapovich [17] gave examples of infinite hyperbolic groups whose linear representations always have finite image and, as a consequence, which cannot be realized as Anosov subgroups. Apart from linearity, no other obstructions for hyperbolic groups are currently known which prohibit them from admitting Anosov representations. Cf. [3, Problem 50.1].

On the other hand, fixing a semisimple Lie group G and a set of simple roots Θ , one may seek to understand obstructions on hyperbolic groups admitting Θ -Anosov representations into G . The work of Canary-Tsouvalas [4] gave an upper bound on the cohomological dimension of $\{k\}$ -Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$. In this regard, a challenging question was posed by Andrés Sambarino (see [4, §7]):

Question 1.1 (Sambarino). Is every Borel Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ virtually isomorphic to a free or surface group?

Z. Greenberg is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under both Project-ID 281071066-TRR 191 and Project ID 338644254-SPP2026 as well as PosLieRep ERC 101018839. J.M. Riestenberg is supported by the RTG 2229 “Asymptotic Invariants and Limits of Groups and Spaces” and by the DFG under Project-ID 338644254 - SPP2026. Z. Greenberg and J.M. Riestenberg completed this work at the University of Heidelberg.

While this question remains open in general, progress has been made by Canary-Tsouvalas [4], Tsouvalas [23], and the first author [8].

In this paper, we address this question for $G = \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and arbitrary Θ . Before stating our main result, we set up a notation for the simple roots: The root system for the symplectic Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is of type C_n ; it has n simple roots and we denote them by natural numbers $1, \dots, n$ in the order as they appear in the Dynkin diagram of type C_n , with n denoting the unique long root. See Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Dynkin diagram of type C_n

Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ be a non-empty subset.*

- (i) *If Θ contains an odd integer, then any Θ -Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is virtually isomorphic to a free group or a surface group.*
- (ii) *If Θ does not contain any odd integers, then the fundamental group of any closed, orientable, hyperbolic 3-manifold may be realized as a Θ -Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$.*

A special case of the first statement is that every Borel Anosov¹ subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is virtually isomorphic to a free or surface group. A Borel Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ can be viewed as a Borel Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ via the natural inclusion

$$\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R}),$$

so this special case also follows from [4] when $n = 2$ and from [8] when $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4}$. More generally, the above inclusion takes Θ -Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ to Θ' -Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, where Θ' is the subset of $\{1, \dots, 2n-1\}$ consisting of Θ and $\{2n-k : k \in \Theta\}$. In particular, when n is odd and Θ contains $\{n\}$, the result follows from [23]. After circulating an early draft of this paper, we learned that Theorem 1.2(i) was independently obtained by Beatrice Pozzetti and Kostas Tsouvalas with different techniques [22].

The restrictions on Anosov subgroups obtained here and in [8] are based on criteria for antipodal circles in partial flag manifolds to be *maximally antipodal*. It turns out that any Θ -Anosov subgroup of G with a maximally antipodal limit set cannot appear as an infinite index subgroup of another Θ -Anosov subgroup of G , see Proposition 2.9. We produce examples of higher-dimensional spheres which are maximally antipodal in certain partial flag manifolds. We let $\mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ denote the partial flag manifold consisting of pairs (V, W) of vector subspaces of \mathbb{R}^{2n} with $\dim(V) = 2$, $\dim(W) = 2n-2$ and $V \subset W$. We let $\mathrm{Iso}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ denote the space of isotropic 2-planes in \mathbb{R}^{2n} with respect to a symplectic form.

Theorem 1.3.

- (i) *There exists a maximally antipodal subset of $\mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ homeomorphic to S^2 .*

¹I.e., Θ -Anosov, where $\Theta = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

- (ii) *There exists a maximally antipodal subset of $\mathrm{Iso}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ homeomorphic to S^{2n-3} .*

These spheres arise as limit sets of totally geodesic copies of \mathbb{H}^3 and $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{H}^{n-1}$ inside the symmetric space $\mathbb{X} = \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})/U(n)$. In particular, we note that the partial flag manifold of isotropic 2-planes $\mathrm{Iso}_2(\mathbb{R}^6, \omega)$ admits maximally antipodal subsets homeomorphic to S^2 and S^3 .

Outline of the paper. The proof of [Theorem 1.2\(i\)](#) is based on extending the techniques of [\[8\]](#) to partial flag manifolds in general, which we do in [§2](#), supplemented with an elementary observation about partial flag manifolds associated to $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$; see [§3](#).

The proof of [Theorem 1.2\(ii\)](#), which we discuss in [§3.2](#), is constructive: We show that for all $n \geq 2$, there exists a representation $\rho_n: \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, which geometrically corresponds to a certain totally geodesic embedding of \mathbb{H}^3 in the symmetric space $\mathbb{X} = \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})/U(n)$, such that ρ_n maps any convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ to a Θ_{even} -Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$; see [Theorem 3.6](#). Since the fundamental group of any closed, orientable, hyperbolic 3-manifold can be realized as a uniform lattice in $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ (see [\[6\]](#)), [Theorem 1.2\(ii\)](#) follows as a special case.

The copies of S^2 that we mention in [Theorem 1.3\(i\)](#) arise as flag limit sets of $\rho_n(\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}))$. We prove they are maximally antipodal in [Theorem 3.7](#). A similar construction applied to the inclusion $\mathrm{SU}(n-1, 1) \subset \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ produces the S^{2n-3} in [Theorem 1.3\(ii\)](#). We prove these are maximally antipodal in [Theorem 3.11](#).

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Anna Wienhard, Fanny Kassel and Kostas Tsouvalas for interesting conversations related to the results of this paper. We would also like to thank Beatrice Pozzetti for a useful suggestion which simplified and improved [Theorem 1.2\(ii\)](#). We thank the referee for valuable feedback which improved the exposition of the paper.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let G be a connected real semisimple Lie group with a finite center. We fix a Cartan decomposition of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G ,

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p},$$

and then we fix a maximal abelian subspace $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}$. Let Σ denote the set of *roots*, i.e., the set of all nonzero elements $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ for which the associated weight space $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha = \{Y \in \mathfrak{g} : (\mathrm{ad} A)Y = \alpha(A)Y, \forall A \in \mathfrak{a}\}$ is nonzero. The adjoint action of \mathfrak{a} on \mathfrak{g} is a commuting family of diagonalizable linear transformations and hence we obtain a simultaneous eigenspace decomposition, called the *(restricted) root space decomposition* of \mathfrak{g} :

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Sigma} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

We choose a set of *positive roots* $\Sigma^+ \subset \Sigma$, which (equivalently) corresponds to a choice of a (closed) *positive Weyl chamber* $\overline{\mathfrak{a}^+} = \{A \in \mathfrak{a} : \alpha(A) \geq 0, \forall \alpha \in \Sigma^+\}$. The set of *simple roots* is denoted by $\Delta \subset \Sigma^+$. The *(restricted) Weyl group* is the group generated by reflections in the roots. It contains a unique element w_0 taking

\mathfrak{a}^+ to $-\mathfrak{a}^+$. The *opposition involution* $-w_0 : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ induces an operation on the simple roots

$$i: \Delta \rightarrow \Delta.$$

that we also call the opposition involution. Note that for $G = \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, which is the main focus of this article, $i: \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ is the identity map.

Every (nonempty) subset $\Theta \subset \Delta$ determines a pair of nilpotent subalgebras

$$\mathfrak{u}_\Theta := \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma_\Theta^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{u}_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}} := \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma_\Theta^+} \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha},$$

where $\Sigma_\Theta^+ := \Sigma^+ \setminus \mathrm{Span}(\Delta \setminus \Theta)$. The normalizer of \mathfrak{u}_Θ in G for the adjoint action $G \curvearrowright \mathfrak{g}$ is called the *standard² parabolic subgroup*, denoted by P_Θ . Similarly, normalizer of $\mathfrak{u}_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$ in G is the standard *opposite parabolic subgroup*, which is denoted by P_Θ^{opp} . The closed subgroup $U_\Theta = \exp(\mathfrak{u}_\Theta)$ of P_Θ is called the *unipotent radical* of P_Θ .

Given a nonempty subset $\Theta \subset \Delta$, the corresponding *flag manifold*

$$\mathcal{F}_\Theta = G/P_\Theta$$

is a G -homogeneous space. In this paper, we only consider those standard parabolic subgroups P_Θ which are conjugate to its opposite parabolic subgroup P_Θ^{opp} ; equivalently, $\Theta = i(\Theta)$. In \mathcal{F}_Θ , the unique fixed point of P_Θ (resp. P_Θ^{opp}) will be denoted by τ_Θ (resp. $\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$). The action $P_\Theta \curvearrowright \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ has a unique open orbit $C(\tau_\Theta) := P_\Theta \cdot \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$. For any point $\tau \in C(\tau_\Theta)$, the unipotent radical U_Θ of P_Θ yields parametrization $U_\Theta \rightarrow C(\tau_\Theta)$, given by $u \mapsto u \cdot \tau$.

A pair of points $\tau_\pm \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ is called *antipodal* (or *transverse*) if there exists $g \in G$ such that $g\tau_- = \tau_\Theta$ and $g\tau_+ \in C(\tau_\Theta)$. For $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$, the set of all points in \mathcal{F}_Θ antipodal to τ is denoted by $C(\tau)$. Clearly, if $\tau_\pm \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ is a pair of antipodal points, then $g\tau_\pm$ is too, for any $g \in G$. Moreover, for all $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ and all $g \in G$, $g \cdot C(\tau) = C(g\tau)$.

2.1. The inversion property. Let Θ be an i -invariant subset of Δ .

Definition 2.1 (Inversion map). The *inversion map* is the involution

$$\iota : C(\tau_\Theta) \rightarrow C(\tau_\Theta), \quad \iota(\tau) = u_\tau^{-1} \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}},$$

where $u_\tau \in U_\Theta$ is the unique element such that $\tau = u_\tau \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$.

Lemma 2.2. *The inversion map $\iota : C(\tau_\Theta) \rightarrow C(\tau_\Theta)$ preserves $C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$.*

Proof. For $\tau \in C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$, let $u_\tau \in U_\Theta$ be the unique element such that $\tau = u_\tau \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Then, $u_\tau^{-1} \cdot \{\tau, \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}\} = \{\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}, u_\tau^{-1} \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}\}$. Since τ and $\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$ are antipodal and the action $U_\Theta \curvearrowright \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ preserves the property of being antipodal, it follows that $\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$ and $u_\tau^{-1} \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$ are antipodal. Thus, $\iota(\tau) = u_\tau^{-1} \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}} \in C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$. \square

By the [Lemma 2.2](#), the map ι induces a well-defined involution on the set of connected components of $C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$.

Definition 2.3 (Inversion property). The flag manifold \mathcal{F}_Θ is said to have *Property (I)* if the inversion map $\iota : C(\tau_\Theta) \rightarrow C(\tau_\Theta)$ does not leave invariant any connected components of $C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$.

We ask the following question:

²Here ‘‘standard’’ means standard with respect to the above choices.

Question 2.4. Which flag manifolds \mathcal{F}_Θ of G have Property (I)?

The main motivation for the above question is that an affirmative answer would imply strong restrictions on hyperbolic groups admitting P_Θ -Anosov representations into G ; see §2.2. In [8, Thm. 2.4], it is shown that, for all natural numbers $n \not\equiv 0, \pm 1 \pmod{8}$, the full flag manifold \mathcal{F}_Δ of $G = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ has Property (I). In the present paper, we show that $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})/P_\Theta$ has Property (I) if and only if Θ contains an odd integer; one implication is Lemma 3.4 and the other follows from Theorems 2.8 and 3.6.

The following result shows that Property (I) is “increasing,” which could be helpful to study the question above: Let $\Theta, \Theta' \subset \Delta$ be i -invariant subsets such that $\Theta' \subset \Theta$. The corresponding standard parabolic subgroups $P_\Theta, P_{\Theta'}$ satisfy $P_\Theta < P_{\Theta'}$ and, therefore, we have a well-defined G -equivariant surjective morphism

$$\pi : \mathcal{F}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\Theta'},$$

whose fiber over any point $\tau' \in P_{\Theta'}$ is isomorphic to $P_{\Theta'}/P_\Theta$.

Proposition 2.5. *If $\mathcal{F}_{\Theta'}$ has Property (I), then so does \mathcal{F}_Θ .*

Proof. Since $\Theta' \subset \Theta$, we have $\mathfrak{u}_{\Theta'} \subset \mathfrak{u}_\Theta$. Therefore, the unipotent radical $U_{\Theta'}$ = $\exp(\mathfrak{u}_{\Theta'})$ of $P_{\Theta'}$ is a subgroup of the unipotent radical $U_\Theta = \exp(\mathfrak{u}_\Theta)$ of P_Θ .

We first claim that $\pi(C(\tau_\Theta)) = C(\tau_{\Theta'})$: Indeed, since $\tau_{\Theta'} = \pi(\tau_\Theta)$ and $\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}} = \pi(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$, we get

$$\pi(C(\tau_\Theta)) = \pi(P_\Theta \cdot \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}) = P_\Theta \cdot \pi(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}) \subset P_{\Theta'} \cdot \tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}} = C(\tau_{\Theta'})$$

and, on the other hand,

$$\pi(C(\tau_\Theta)) = \pi(U_\Theta \cdot \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}) = U_\Theta \cdot \pi(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}) \supset U_{\Theta'} \cdot \tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}} = C(\tau_{\Theta'}),$$

proving the desired equality. In particular,

$$(1) \quad \pi(C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})) \subset C(\tau_{\Theta'}) \cap C(\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}})$$

We next claim that U_1 , the stabilizer of $\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}$ in U_Θ , is path-connected: Indeed, it follows by considering the long exact sequence of homotopy groups corresponding to the U_Θ -equivariant fibration

$$\pi : C(\tau_\Theta) \rightarrow C(\tau_{\Theta'})$$

that $\pi_0(F, \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$ is singleton, where $F = \pi^{-1}(\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}) = U_1 \cdot \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Thus, F and, hence, U_1 are path-connected. Consequently, since U_1 is path-connected and stabilizes $\tau_{\Theta'}$ and $\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}$, it follows that U_1 preserves the connected components of $C(\tau_{\Theta'}) \cap C(\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}})$.

Now we finish the proof: Let $\tau \in C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$ be any point. By definition, $\iota(\tau) = u^{-1}\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$, where $u \in U_\Theta$ is the unique element such that $\tau = u\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Moreover, let $\tau' := \pi(\tau) = \pi(u\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}) = u\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Let $u' \in U_{\Theta'}$ be the unique element such that $\tau' = u'\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Then, $u^{-1}u' \in U_\Theta$ stabilizes $\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}$ or, equivalently,

$$(2) \quad u^{-1} \in U_1(u')^{-1}.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_{\Theta'}$ has Property (I), τ' and $\iota(\tau') = (u')^{-1}\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}$ lie in different connected components of $C(\tau_{\Theta'}) \cap C(\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}})$. Furthermore, since U_1 is path-connected, it follows that τ' and $U_1 \cdot \iota(\tau') = U_1(u')^{-1}\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}$ also lie in different connected components of $C(\tau_{\Theta'}) \cap C(\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}})$. By (2), $\pi(\iota(\tau)) = u^{-1}\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}} \in U_1(u')^{-1}\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Thus, $\pi(\tau)$ and $\pi(\iota(\tau))$ lie in different connected components of $C(\tau_{\Theta'}) \cap C(\tau_{\Theta'}^{\mathrm{opp}})$. By (1), it then follows that τ and $\iota(\tau)$ lie in distinct connected components of $C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.6. *If the full flag manifold \mathcal{F}_Δ of G does not have Property (I), then no other flag manifold \mathcal{F}_Θ of G , where $\Theta \subset \Delta$ is i -invariant, has Property (I).*

For example, it is shown in [8, §2.5] that Property (I) fails for the full flag manifold of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, for all $n \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$.

2.2. Restrictions on Anosov subgroups. In this subsection, we show that Property (I) restricts the group theoretic structure of Anosov subgroups. See [Theorem 2.8](#) below for a precise statement.

We recall a few definitions: Let $\Theta \subset \Delta$ be an i -invariant subset. A subset Λ of $\mathcal{F}_\Theta = G/P_\Theta$ is called *antipodal* if every pair of distinct points in Λ is antipodal. An antipodal subset $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ is called *maximally antipodal* if for all $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$, there exists $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that τ is not antipodal to λ . More generally, an antipodal subset $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ is called *locally maximally antipodal* if there exists a neighborhood N of Λ such that, for all $\tau \in N$, there exists $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that τ and λ are not antipodal.

Lemma 2.7. *If \mathcal{F}_Θ has Property (I), then all antipodal circles in \mathcal{F}_Θ are locally maximally antipodal.*

In the statement above, by an “antipodal circle” in \mathcal{F}_Θ , we mean the image of an embedding $\phi : S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ such that $\phi(S^1)$ is an antipodal subset of \mathcal{F}_Θ .

Proof of Lemma 2.7. Let $\tau_\pm \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ be any pair of antipodal points, and let $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Theta$, $f(\pm 1) = \tau_\pm$, be a continuous map. If $f((-1, 1)) \subset C(\tau_-) \cap C(\tau_+)$, then, let Ω be the connected component of $C(\tau_-) \cap C(\tau_+)$ containing the image $f((-1, 1))$. Since \mathcal{F}_Θ has Property (I), by the same argument used in the proof of [8, Theorem A] (see [8, §3]), it follows that every point in Ω is not antipodal to some point in $f((-1, 1))$.

If c is an antipodal circle, then, choose any distinct points $\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3 \in c$. For distinct indices $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, let Ω_{ijk} be the connected component of $C(\tau_i) \cap C(\tau_k)$ containing τ_j . Then $N = \Omega_{123} \cup \Omega_{231} \cup \Omega_{312}$ is an open neighborhood of c . By the previous paragraph, every point in N is not antipodal to some point in c , cf. [8, Corollary B]. Hence, c is locally maximally antipodal. \square

A subgroup Γ of G is said to be Θ -boundary embedded if Γ is hyperbolic and there exists a Γ -equivariant continuous map

$$(3) \quad \xi : \partial_\infty \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Theta$$

from the Gromov boundary $\partial_\infty \Gamma$ of Γ to \mathcal{F}_Θ , which sends every pair of distinct points in $\partial_\infty \Gamma$ to a pair of antipodal points in \mathcal{F}_Θ . A non-elementary boundary embedded subgroup is necessarily discrete, since ξ is an embedding and the action of Γ on $\partial_\infty \Gamma$ is a convergence group action, see [Freden \[10\]](#). We refer our readers to [Kapovich-Leeb-Porti \[18, §5.2\]](#) for more details on Θ -boundary embedded subgroups.

A subgroup Γ of G is said to be (P_Θ - or) Θ -Anosov if it is Θ -boundary embedded with a *strongly dynamics preserving* boundary map $\xi : \partial_\infty \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ (as in (3)); see [13, Definition 2.10] for a precise definition. In this situation, the image of this (unique) strongly dynamics preserving boundary map $\xi : \partial_\infty \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ is called the Θ -limit set of Γ .

Theorem 2.8. *Suppose that \mathcal{F}_Θ has Property (I). Then, any Θ -boundary embedded subgroup of G is virtually isomorphic to either a free group or a surface group.*

In particular, the same conclusion holds for any Θ -Anosov subgroup of G .

Proof. Let $\Gamma < G$ be a Θ -boundary embedded subgroup and let $\xi : \partial_\infty \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ be a boundary embedding as in (3). Assume that Γ not virtually free. Then, using [2, Corollary 2], we discover an embedding $j : S^1 \rightarrow \partial_\infty \Gamma$. We aim to demonstrate that j is surjective, and therefore, a homeomorphism:

We observe that $\xi \circ j(S^1) \subset \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ is an antipodal circle. By Lemma 2.7, it is locally maximally antipodal. Since $\xi : \partial_\infty \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ maps pairwise distinct points to pairwise antipodal points, there exists an open neighborhood N of $\xi(j(S^1))$ in \mathcal{F}_Θ which does not contain $\xi(z)$, for any $z \in \partial_\infty \Gamma \setminus j(S^1)$. Consequently, $j(S^1) = \xi^{-1}(N)$ is open (and closed) in $\partial_\infty \Gamma$. Since hyperbolic fixed points are dense in $\partial_\infty \Gamma$, there exists an infinite order element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that the attractive fixed point γ_+ of γ lies in $j(S^1)$. Then, we must have $\gamma(j(S^1)) = j(S^1)$ since $\gamma(j(S^1)) \cap j(S^1)$ is nonempty and $j(S^1)$ is both closed and open in $\partial_\infty \Gamma$.

Notably, the repulsive fixed point $\gamma_- \in \partial_\infty \Gamma$ of γ also lies in $j(S^1)$. This conclusion arises because γ_- is the accumulation point of the sequence $(\gamma^{-n}z)$, where $z \in j(S^1)$ is any point distinct from γ_+ , and $(\gamma^{-n}z)$ remains within $j(S^1)$.

Now we can show that $j : S^1 \rightarrow \partial_\infty \Gamma$ is surjective. As γ preserves $j(S^1)$, it also preserves its complement $\partial_\infty \Gamma \setminus j(S^1)$. Were $\partial_\infty \Gamma \setminus j(S^1)$ nonempty, then, for any point $z \in \partial_\infty \Gamma \setminus j(S^1)$, the sequence $(\gamma^n z)$ would accumulate at γ_+ (note that $z \neq \gamma_-$ as $\gamma_- \in j(S^1)$). However, since the sequence $(\gamma^n z)$ lies the closed subset $\partial_\infty \Gamma \setminus j(S^1)$, it cannot have an accumulation point outside it, leading to a contradiction!

Therefore, we have arrived at the conclusion that $\partial_\infty \Gamma$ is homeomorphic to a circle. Applying the deep results of Tukia [24], Gabai [11], Freden [10], Casson-Jungreis [5] (see also [16, Theorem 5.4]), it follows that Γ contains a finite index subgroup isomorphic to the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface. \square

Our next result shows that Θ -Anosov subgroups of G with maximally antipodal Θ -limit sets are *maximal* in the class of Θ -Anosov subgroups of G in the sense that they cannot be realized as infinite index subgroups of larger Θ -Anosov subgroups.

Proposition 2.9. *Let Γ be a residually finite Θ -Anosov subgroup of G . The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The Θ -limit set $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ of Γ is locally maximally antipodal.*
- (ii) *The Θ -limit set $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ of Γ is maximally antipodal.*
- (iii) *If Γ' is a Θ -Anosov subgroup of G such that $[\Gamma : (\Gamma \cap \Gamma')] < \infty$, then Γ is commensurable with Γ' .*

We remark that the residual finiteness assumption is only needed to show (iii) implies (ii).

Proof of Proposition 2.9. Clearly, (ii) implies (i). We show (i) implies (ii): Suppose that the Θ -limit set $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ of Γ is locally maximally antipodal. Let N be an open neighborhood of Λ in \mathcal{F}_Θ such that for all $\tau \in N$, there exists $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that τ is not antipodal to λ . If, on the contrary, Λ is not maximally antipodal, there exists $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ that is antipodal to any point in Λ . Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$ be an element with infinite order, and γ_+ denote the attractive fixed point of γ in $\partial_\infty \Gamma$. Since Λ is the image of a Γ -equivariant, strongly dynamics-preserving boundary map from $\partial_\infty \Gamma$ to \mathcal{F}_Θ , the sequence $(\gamma^n \tau)$ accumulates at $\xi(\gamma_+) \in \Lambda \subset N$. However, as $\gamma^n \tau$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is antipodal to any point in Λ , we can conclude that $\gamma^n \tau \notin N$; this leads to a contradiction with the preceding sentence.

Now, we show that (ii) implies (iii): Suppose that the Θ -limit set Λ of Γ is maximally antipodal in \mathcal{F}_Θ . If Γ' is a Θ -Anosov subgroup of G such that $H = \Gamma \cap \Gamma'$ is a finite index subgroup of Γ , then H is also a Θ -Anosov subgroup of G with the same Θ -limit set Λ . We proceed to show that H is a finite index subgroup of Γ' . As Θ -Anosov subgroups are quasi-isometrically embedded in G , the inclusion $H \hookrightarrow \Gamma'$ is a quasi-isometric embedding, which gives rise to a natural embedding $j : \partial_\infty H \hookrightarrow \partial_\infty \Gamma'$. Moreover, the H -equivariant map $\xi : \partial_\infty H \rightarrow \Lambda$ is realized as the composition $\xi = \xi' \circ j$, where $\xi' : \partial_\infty \Gamma' \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ is the strongly dynamics-preserving boundary map for Γ' . If $[\Gamma' : H] = \infty$, then $j : \partial_\infty H \hookrightarrow \partial_\infty \Gamma'$ is not surjective, and therefore, $\Lambda = \xi' \circ j(\partial_\infty H)$ is a proper subset of the Θ -limit set $\xi'(\partial_\infty \Gamma')$ of Γ' . Thus, since Λ is maximally antipodal, $\xi'(\partial_\infty \Gamma')$ cannot be an antipodal subset of \mathcal{F}_Θ . As Θ -limit sets of Θ -Anosov subgroups of G are antipodal subsets of \mathcal{F}_Θ , this leads to a contradiction.

Finally, we show (iii) implies (ii): Suppose that the limit set Λ in \mathcal{F}_Θ of Γ is not maximally antipodal. Then, we can pick a pair of distinct points $\tau_\pm \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta \setminus \Lambda$ such that $\Lambda \cup \{\tau_\pm\}$ is antipodal. Let H be a cyclic Θ -Anosov subgroup of G with limit set $\{\tau_\pm\}$. Since Γ and H are residually finite, we can apply the Combination Theorem for Anosov subgroups [9, Theorem 1.3] to obtain finite index subgroups Γ_1 of Γ and H_1 of H such that the subgroup Γ' in G generated by Γ_1 and H_1 is Θ -Anosov and Γ' is naturally isomorphic to the free product $\Gamma_1 \star H_1$. Since $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma \cap \Gamma'$, it follows that $[\Gamma : (\Gamma \cap \Gamma')] \leq [\Gamma : \Gamma_1] < \infty$. But Γ_1 is an infinite index subgroup of Γ' . Therefore, Γ is not commensurable with Γ' . \square

Following Kapovich-Leeb-Porti, the flag limit set can be defined more generally for an arbitrary subgroup $G' < G$ [18, Definition 4.25]; this agrees with the previous definition when G' is a Θ -Anosov subgroup. The examples of Anosov subgroups we produce in §3.2 arise implicitly as convex cocompact subgroups of rank 1 subgroups $G' < G$. For a uniform lattice Γ in a rank 1 subgroup G' inside G , the Θ -limit set of Γ equals the Θ -limit set of G' . Therefore, our results in §3.2.2 and §3.3 are described in terms of flag limit sets of rank 1 subgroups.

Remark 2.10. Guichard-Wienhard [14, 15] have introduced the interesting notion of Θ -positive representations of surface groups. Such representations are Θ -Anosov, and triples in their Θ -limit sets lie in components of pairwise transverse triples of flags which are called Θ -positive. By [12, Proposition 2.5(3)], Θ -positive triples are sent to another component of pairwise transverse triples under the inversion map ι , see Definition 2.1. When the inversion map does not leave a component of $C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\text{opp}})$ invariant, arcs in that component (with endpoints at $\tau_\Theta, \tau_\Theta^{\text{opp}}$) are locally maximally antipodal, again by the proof of [8, Theorem A]. It follows that limit sets of Θ -positive representations are maximally antipodal. Hitchin representations and maximal representations are special cases of Θ -positive representations. These provide examples of maximally antipodal circles in $\text{Iso}_n(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega)$. We record this observation in the following result.

Corollary 2.11. *Let $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow G$ be a Θ -positive representation, where Γ is a surface group. Then, the Θ -limit set of $\rho(\Gamma)$ is a maximally antipodal subset of \mathcal{F}_Θ .*

In particular, if Γ' is a Θ -Anosov subgroup of G such that $[\rho(\Gamma) : (\rho(\Gamma) \cap \Gamma')] < \infty$, then $\rho(\Gamma)$ is commensurable with Γ' .

3. ANOSOV SUBGROUPS OF THE SYMPLECTIC GROUP

Let $J: \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ be the linear map defined by $Je_i = (-1)^i e_{2n-i+1}$ on the standard basis. Then $\omega(x, y) = x^T Jy$ defines a symplectic form and the symplectic group is given by

$$\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) = \{g \in \mathrm{GL}(2n, \mathbb{R}) : g^T Jg = J\}.$$

Observe that $J^2 = -1$, $J = -J^T$, and $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ if and only if $-Jg^T J = g^{-1}$.

3.1. Restrictions on Anosov subgroups of the symplectic group. The key restriction on Anosov subgroups comes from analyzing how the antiprincipal minors transform under inversion.

Definition 3.1. Define the *antiprincipal $k \times k$ minor* of g to be $p_k(g)$ where

$$ge_{2n} \wedge ge_{2n-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge ge_{2n-k+1} \wedge e_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n} = p_k(g)e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n}.$$

Lemma 3.2 (Key Lemma). *For $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, $p_k(g^{-1}) = (-1)^k p_k(g)$.*

We use the notation $g[I, J]$ to denote the submatrix of g formed by the rows I and columns J ; in particular, $p_k(g) = \det(g[\{1, \dots, k\}, \{2n, \dots, 2n-k+1\}])$.

Proof. We apply the definition:

$$\begin{aligned} p_k(g^{-1})e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n} &= g^{-1}e_{2n} \wedge g^{-1}e_{2n-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge g^{-1}e_{2n-k+1} \wedge e_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n} \\ &= (-Jg^T J e_{2n}) \wedge (-Jg^T J e_{2n-1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\ &\quad (-Jg^T J e_{2n-k+1}) \wedge e_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n} \\ &= (g^T J e_{2n}) \wedge (g^T J e_{2n-1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge (g^T J e_{2n-k+1}) \wedge J e_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge J e_{2n} \end{aligned}$$

To find the overall sign of applying J we note that each of $e_{2n-k+1}, \dots, e_{2n}$ appear twice. So it suffices to compute $(k+1) + \cdots + (2n-k) = 2n^2 - 2nk + n - k \equiv n+k \pmod{2}$. We continue:

$$\begin{aligned} &= (-1)^{n+k} (g^T e_1) \wedge (g^T e_2) \wedge \cdots \wedge (g^T e_k) \wedge e_{2n-k} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_1 \\ &= (-1)^{n+k} \det(g^T[\{2n, \dots, 2n-k+1\}, \{1, \dots, k\}]) \\ &\quad e_{2n} \wedge e_{2n-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n-k+1} \wedge e_{2n-k} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_1 \\ &= (-1)^{n+k} \det(g[\{1, \dots, k\}, \{2n, \dots, 2n-k+1\}]) \\ &\quad e_{2n} \wedge e_{2n-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n-k+1} \wedge e_{2n-k} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_1 \\ &= (-1)^k \det(g[\{1, \dots, k\}, \{2n, \dots, 2n-k+1\}]) \\ &\quad e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_k \wedge e_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n} \\ &= (-1)^k (ge_{2n}) \wedge (ge_{2n-1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge (ge_{2n-k+1}) \wedge e_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n} \\ &= (-1)^k p_k(g)e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{2n} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

The flag manifolds defined in §2 have the following concrete description for $G = \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$: Let us fix a subset $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. An *isotropic Θ -flag* is a partial flag $V^{k_1} \subset \cdots \subset V^{k_{|\Theta|}}$ in $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega)$ with a component V^i in each dimension $i \in \Theta$, such that each V^i is *isotropic*, i.e. the restriction of ω to V^i is identically zero. The space

of isotropic Θ -flags is naturally identified with the flag manifold \mathcal{F}_Θ associated to $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, see [1, p. 206].

A pair of isotropic Θ -flags V, W is antipodal if, for all $i \in \Theta$, $V^i \oplus (W^i)^\perp = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Here we let W^\perp denote the set of vectors v satisfying $\omega(v, w) = 0$ for all $w \in W$. In our setup, the standard flag τ_Θ , given by

$$\tau_\Theta^i = \mathrm{Span}\{e_1, \dots, e_i\}, \quad i \in \Theta,$$

is an isotropic Θ -flag as is the standard opposite flag $\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$, given by

$$(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})^i = \mathrm{Span}\{e_{2n}, \dots, e_{2n-i+1}\}, \quad i \in \Theta.$$

Note that τ_Θ is antipodal to $\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$. The stabilizer of τ_Θ in $G = \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is the parabolic subgroup P_Θ consisting of the intersection of G with block upper triangular matrices preserving the partial flag corresponding to τ_Θ . The unipotent radical U_Θ of P_Θ acts simply transitively on the flags antipodal to τ_Θ .³

We are interested in the space of pairwise antipodal triples of flags (τ_-, τ, τ_+) in \mathcal{F}_Θ : Let us assume that $\tau_- = \tau_\Theta$ and $\tau_+ = \tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Since τ is antipodal to τ_Θ , we may write $\tau = u\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$ for a unique $u \in U_\Theta$. Each $u \in U_\Theta$ is strictly upper triangular in the standard basis. We want to understand when $u\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$ is antipodal to $\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$.

Lemma 3.3. *$\tau = u\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$ is antipodal to $\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$ if and only if for all $k \in \Theta$, $p_k(u) \neq 0$.*

Proof. We observe that $(u\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})^k = \mathrm{Span}\{ue_{2n}, \dots, ue_{2n-k+1}\}$ and $((\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})^k)^\perp = \mathrm{Span}\{e_{2n}, e_{2n-1}, \dots, e_{k+1}\}$. Therefore, $(u\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})^k \oplus ((\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})^k)^\perp = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ if and only if

$$ue_{2n} \wedge \dots \wedge ue_{2n-k+1} \wedge e_{k+1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{2n} = p_k(u)e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \dots \wedge e_{2n}$$

is nonzero. □

We are now in position to complete the proof of [Theorem 1.2\(i\)](#).

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. If Θ contains an odd integer, then \mathcal{F}_Θ has Property (I).*

Proof. Let Ω be any connected component of the intersection $C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$. We would like to show that $\iota(\Omega) \cap \Omega = \emptyset$. Since ι preserves the intersection $C(\tau_\Theta) \cap C(\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}})$ (see [Lemma 2.2](#)), it is enough to show that for some point $\tau \in \Omega$, $\iota(\tau) \notin \Omega$. We argue by contradiction: Given $\tau \in \Omega$, suppose, to the contrary, that there exists a continuous path $c : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$ from $\iota(\tau) = c(-1)$ to $\tau = c(1)$. For $t \in [-1, 1]$, let $u_t \in U_\Theta$ be the unique element such that $c(t) = u_t\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Note that

$$u_{-1} = u_1^{-1}.$$

Let $k \in \Theta$ be an odd integer. By definition, $c(t)$ is antipodal to both τ_Θ and $\tau_\Theta^{\mathrm{opp}}$, and so by [Lemma 3.3](#), $p_k(u_t) \neq 0$ for all $t \in [-1, 1]$. Since $t \mapsto u_t$ is continuous, the sign of $p_k(u_t)$ is constant for $t \in [-1, 1]$. However, since k is odd, by [Lemma 3.2](#),

$$p_k(u_{-1}) = -p_k(u_1),$$

giving a contradiction. □

Together with [Lemma 3.4](#), [Theorem 2.8](#) implies the following:

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose that $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ contains an odd integer. If Γ is a Θ -Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, then Γ is virtually isomorphic to a free group or a surface group.*

³ U_Θ is also called the horocyclic subgroup associated to Θ .

3.2. Examples from rank 1 subgroups. In §3.1, we showed that if $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ contains an odd integer, then Θ -Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ are virtually free or surface groups. In this section we show that this result is optimal. Let Θ_{even} denote the set of all even integers in $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and let $\mathcal{F}_{\text{even}}$ denote $\mathcal{F}_{\Theta_{\text{even}}}$. We construct examples of Θ_{even} -Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, which are not virtually free or surface groups.

3.2.1. Θ_{even} -Anosov subgroups inside a copy of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. When n is even, any irreducible representation $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ preserves a symplectic form, so the image is contained in $\mathrm{Sp}(n, \mathbb{C}) \subset \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, up to conjugating the symplectic form to our standard one. We let $\rho_n: \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ denote this representation. When n is odd, we consider the representation $\rho_n: \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ obtained by direct summing ρ_{n-1} with a trivial 2-dimensional representation. For concreteness, we fix the embedding $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}(2n+2, \mathbb{R})$ given by

$$(4) \quad \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 & B \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ C & 0 & D \end{bmatrix}$$

where I is the 2×2 identity matrix.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $n \geq 2$. If Γ is a convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, then $\rho_n(\Gamma)$ is a Θ_{even} -Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$.*

Before discussing the proof, we briefly recall the Cartan decomposition and restricted roots for $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. The map

$$\theta: \mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}), \quad \theta(X) = -X^T$$

is a Cartan involution of $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. The fixed point set is $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{o}(2n, \mathbb{R}) \cap \mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and its -1 -eigenspace, denoted \mathfrak{p} , is the intersection of $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ with the space of symmetric matrices. The Cartan decomposition is $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$. We let \mathfrak{a} denote the intersection of $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ with the space of diagonal matrices. Precisely, $\mathfrak{a} = \{\mathrm{Diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, -\lambda_n, \dots, -\lambda_1) : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}\}$. It is easy to see that \mathfrak{a} is a maximal abelian subspace of \mathfrak{p} , since it contains a diagonal element with distinct entries. The restricted roots $\Sigma \subset \mathfrak{a}^*$ are the nonzero weights of the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{a} on \mathfrak{g} . In this case, $\Sigma \cup \{0\} = \{\pm\lambda_i \pm \lambda_j\}_{ij}$. We take the positive Weyl chamber to be the subset of \mathfrak{a} with strictly decreasing entries. The corresponding set of simple roots is then $\Delta = \{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \lambda_2 - \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_{n-1} - \lambda_n, 2\lambda_n\}$. We label the simple roots by $\alpha_i = \lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1}$ for $i < n$ and $\alpha_n = 2\lambda_n$. Then the subset Θ_{even} is $\{\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}\}$, i.e. the subset of Δ consisting of simple roots labelled by even integers. Observe that the embedding given by (4) preserves the choices above and maps the positive Weyl chamber to the nonnegative Weyl chamber.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. We first consider the case when n is even: The representation ρ_n induces a representation of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Up to conjugation, this Lie algebra representation maps

$$H' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \mapsto H = \mathrm{Diag}((n-1)I, (n-3)I, \dots, (1-n)I),$$

where H is expressed as a block diagonal matrix of 2×2 blocks (I denotes the 2×2 identity matrix); this is easy to see directly but also follows from Proposition 3.9 below. Since the simple roots in Θ_{even} are positive on H , we may apply [13,

Proposition 4.7], which says that for any convex cocompact subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, $\rho_n(\Gamma)$ is Θ_{even} -Anosov in $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. (We remark that our subset Θ would be called $\Delta \setminus \Theta$ in the conventions of [13].)

For n odd, we start with the matrix H for ρ_{n-1} . Applying the inclusion (4) to H yields a matrix on which each simple root in Θ_{even} is positive, and [13, Proposition 4.7] applies once again. \square

3.2.2. *The Θ_{even} -limit set of $\rho_n(\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}))$ is maximally antipodal.* In Theorem 3.6, we obtained antipodal subsets of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{even}}$ homeomorphic to S^2 as a limit set of $\rho_n(\Gamma)$, where $\Gamma < \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ is any uniform lattice. In this section we show these subsets are maximally antipodal, see Corollary 3.8. In fact we will show something slightly stronger. Via the natural inclusion $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) \subset \mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, a Θ_{even} -Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ may be viewed as an Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ with respect to the subset of simple roots labelled by even integers $2 \leq k \leq 2n-2$, see [13, Proposition 4.4]. In particular, such a subgroup is $\{2, 2n-2\}$ -Anosov in $\mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and has a flag limit set in the flag manifold $\mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ of $\mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ consisting of pairs (x, y) where x is a 2-plane in \mathbb{R}^{2n} and y is a codimension 2-plane containing x . We show in Theorem 3.7 that the limit set of $\rho_n(\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}))$ in $\mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ is maximally antipodal.

In the analysis below, we view all matrices as 2×2 block matrices. We fix the following basis of 2×2 matrices:

$$(5) \quad I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

We note that the nonzero matrices in the span of I and R have positive determinant while the nonzero matrices in the span of T and P are traceless symmetric with negative determinant.

Theorem 3.7. *Let Λ be the $\{2, 2n-2\}$ -limit set in $\mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ of $\rho_n(\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})) \subset \mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. Then Λ is maximally antipodal in $\mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$.*

Proof. Let $\tau_+ \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ be the partial flag defined by $(\tau_+)^2 = \mathrm{Span}\{e_1, e_2\}$ and $(\tau_+)^{2n-2} = \mathrm{Span}\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{2n-2}\}$. The horocyclic subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ corresponding to τ_+ is given by

$$U = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} I & A & B \\ 0 & I_{2n-4} & C \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \right\} \subset \mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$$

and acts simply transitively on $C(\tau_+) \subset \mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$. Let $\tau_- \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ be the partial flag with $(\tau_-)^2 = \mathrm{Span}\{e_{2n}, e_{2n-1}\}$ and $(\tau_-)^{2n-2} = \mathrm{Span}\{e_{2n}, e_{2n-1}, \dots, e_3\}$, and note that τ_- is transverse to τ_+ . We will show that for every $g \in U$, $g\tau_-$ is not antipodal to some point in Λ , up to an arbitrarily small perturbation of g . This suffices as the condition of being non-antipodal is closed: to see this, consider

$$\mathcal{E} = \{(y, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F} : f \in E(y)\}$$

where $E(y) = \mathcal{F} \setminus C(y)$ is the set of flags non-antipodal to y . Note that each $E(y)$ is compact, so the fibers of $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \Lambda$ are compact and the base is compact. It follows that \mathcal{E} is compact; indeed, since \mathcal{F} is metrizable, it suffices to show that \mathcal{E} is sequentially compact. Given a sequence (y_n, f_n) in \mathcal{E} , we can assume that (y_n) converges to y in Λ up to passing to a subsequence. By passing to a further subsequence, we may assume that f_n converges to f in \mathcal{F} . Since each $f_n \in E(y_n)$,

the limit f is contained in $E(y)$, so \mathcal{E} is sequentially compact. Therefore the image of $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is compact, and this image is exactly the set of flags non-antipodal to some point of Λ .

First consider the case where n is even. We let H, X, Y denote the images of H', X', Y' under the representation $\rho_n: \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. By [Proposition 3.9](#) below we may assume that

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} H &= \mathrm{Diag}((n-1)I, (n-3)I, \dots, (1-n)I) \\ X &= \mathrm{Diag}^1(c_1I, \dots, c_{n/2-1}I, c_{n/2}T, -c_{n/2+1}I, \dots, -c_nI) \\ Y &= \mathrm{Diag}^1(c_1R, \dots, c_{n/2-1}R, c_{n/2}P, c_{n/2+1}R, \dots, c_nR) \end{aligned}$$

where $c_k = \sqrt{kn - k^2}$. We have

$$\Lambda \setminus \{\tau_+\} = \{\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)\tau_- : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Consider $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)$ as a block 2×2 matrix. The entries are polynomials in α, β . The degree of a 2×2 block of $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)$ is k when that block is on the k th diagonal. In particular, the highest degree terms are the top-right block of $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)$, and the degree is $n-1$, hence odd.

The top right block of $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)$ is traceless symmetric, as we now explain. Looking at the explicit representation in (6), we observe that

$$\alpha X + \beta Y = \mathrm{Diag}^1(C_1, \dots, C_{n-1})$$

where $C_k = \alpha A_k + \beta B_k$. In particular, $C_{n/2}$ is in the span of T and P and for $k \neq n/2$, C_k is in the span of I and R . The top right block of $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)$ is then the product

$$\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)_{1n} = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} C_1 C_2 \cdots C_{n/2-1} C_{n/2} C_{n/2+1} \cdots C_{n-1}.$$

Multiplying any matrix in the span of T and P on the left or right by a matrix in the span of I and R remains in the span of T and P . Thus $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)_{1n}$ is in the span of T and P and therefore is traceless symmetric.

Any other flag $g^{-1}\tau_- \in C(\tau_+) \subset \mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ is transverse to Λ if and only if the second antiprincipal minor $p_2(g \exp(\alpha X + \beta Y))$ is nonvanishing for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ by [Lemma 3.3](#). We will show that for any $g \in U$ there exists g' arbitrarily near g and α, β such that $p_2(g' \exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)) = 0$.

The top-right block of $g \exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)$ is $Z_{1n} = \sum_j g_{1j} \exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)_{jn}$. As a polynomial in α, β , the highest degree term is $g_{11} \exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)_{1n}$ which has degree $n-1$. Since g_{11} is the identity matrix this term is traceless symmetric.

We now consider the components of Z_{1n} in the basis I, R, T, P , see (5). Observe that the coefficients of T and P have a higher degree than the coefficients of I, R , so for sufficiently large α, β the determinant of Z_{1n} is negative.

The coefficients of T and P have a common real root, up to an arbitrarily small perturbation of g . Indeed, let $f_T(\alpha, \beta)$ (resp. $f_P(\alpha, \beta)$) be the coefficient of T (resp. P) in Z_{1n} . f_T and f_P are real polynomials in the variables α, β . Let $\overline{f_T}$ (resp. $\overline{f_P}$) denote the sum of highest degree terms of f_T (resp. f_P). In fact, $\overline{f_T}$ (resp. $\overline{f_P}$) is independent of g , and equals the coefficient of T (resp. P) in $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)_{1n}$. It is convenient to consider the homogenizations $\widehat{f_T}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ and $\widehat{f_P}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, i.e. homogeneous polynomials such that $\widehat{f_T}(\alpha, \beta, 1) = f_T(\alpha, \beta)$ and $\widehat{f_P}(\alpha, \beta, 1) = f_P(\alpha, \beta)$.

Note that we can modify the constant terms of f_T, f_P by modifying g_{1n} . Therefore, up to an arbitrarily small perturbation of g , we can assume that the zero sets of $\widehat{f_T}$ and $\widehat{f_P}$ in \mathbb{CP}^2 have no common algebraic components. Then by Bezout's theorem, there are exactly $(n-1)^2$ common zeros of $\widehat{f_T}$ and $\widehat{f_P}$ in \mathbb{CP}^2 , counted with multiplicity. Since n is even, there are an odd number of zeros; since complex conjugation permutes the roots preserving multiplicity, there exists a real root. It then suffices to rule out the possibility of a real root "at infinity," i.e. when $\gamma = 0$. A real root at infinity for $\widehat{f_T}$ and $\widehat{f_P}$ corresponds to a nonzero root of $\overline{f_T}$ and $\overline{f_P}$. But a common real root of $\overline{f_T}$ and $\overline{f_P}$ is a pair of real numbers (α, β) such that $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)_{1n} = 0$. This can only occur when $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$, e.g. by transversality of the limit set.

At a common real root of f_T and f_P , the block Z_{1n} is in the span of R and I and so has determinant ≥ 0 . If it is zero, we are done; otherwise, we apply the intermediate value theorem, to see that a zero exists, and then we are done.

We now consider ρ_n where n is odd. The homomorphism ρ_n is induced by ρ_{n-1} and the inclusion (4). Then $H = \rho_n(H')$ is still diagonal with decreasing entries, but X and Y no longer have all entries on the superdiagonal. However, the top-right block for $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)$ under ρ_n agrees with the top-right block for ρ_{n-1} . To see this, consider a simultaneous permutation of the rows and columns swapping the central 2×2 block with the bottom-right 2×2 block:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 & B \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ C & 0 & D \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then as before, the top right block of $\exp(\alpha X + \beta Y)$ is traceless symmetric, has strictly larger degree than any other block, and this degree is odd. From this point we may apply the same proof as the even case. \square

Corollary 3.8. *The $\{2\}$ -limit set Λ_{Iso_2} of $\rho_n(\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})) < \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is maximally antipodal in $\text{Iso}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega)$. Moreover, the Θ_{even} -limit set $\Lambda_{\text{even}} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{even}}$ of $\rho_n(\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})) < \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is also maximally antipodal.*

Proof. The isotropic flag manifold $\text{Iso}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega)$ for $\text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ naturally embeds into the flag manifold $\mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ of $\text{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ via the map $V \mapsto (V \subset V^\perp)$. By [Theorem 3.7](#), Λ is maximally antipodal in $\mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$. Then in particular, every isotropic flag in $\text{Iso}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega) \subset \mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ is non-transverse to some point of Λ . So Λ_{Iso_2} is maximally antipodal in $\text{Iso}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega)$.

Now consider an arbitrary element τ of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{even}}$. By the previous paragraph, the 2-dimensional part of τ is non-transverse to some point of Λ_{Iso_2} . So Λ_{even} is maximally antipodal in $\mathcal{F}_{\text{even}}$. \square

Proposition 3.9. *Let n be even. Let $\rho: \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ be a representation such that the eigenvalues of*

$$\rho \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

are $(n-1, n-1, n-3, n-3, \dots, n-2k+1, \dots, 1-n, 1-n)$ (with multiplicity). Then, up to conjugation by an element of $\text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, ρ intertwines the Cartan involutions

of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and moreover maps

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} H' &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \mapsto H = \mathrm{Diag}((n-1)I, (n-3)I, \dots, (1-n)I) \\ X' &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mapsto X = \mathrm{Diag}^1(c_1I, \dots, c_{n/2-1}I, c_{n/2}T, -c_{n/2+1}I, \dots, -c_nI) \\ Y' &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & i \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mapsto Y = \mathrm{Diag}^1(c_1R, \dots, c_{n/2-1}R, c_{n/2}P, c_{n/2+1}R, \dots, c_nR) \end{aligned}$$

It will be convenient to set the following notation which appears in the proof.

Definition 3.10. We let \bar{A} denote the *adjugate* of a 2×2 matrix A :

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{bmatrix} = \bar{A}$$

We easily observe that $\bar{I} = I$ and $\bar{T} = -T, \bar{R} = -R, \bar{P} = -P$.

Proof of Proposition 3.9. By the Karpelevic-Mostow Theorem [19, 21], we may assume that ρ intertwines the Cartan involutions $\theta'(Z) = -\bar{Z}^T$ of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $\theta(Z) = -Z^T$ of $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. It then follows that it takes H' to \mathfrak{p} . Then up to conjugation in K we may assume that $\rho(H')$ is diagonal, since K acts transitively on the maximal abelian subspaces of \mathfrak{p} . Moreover, the Weyl group acts transitively on chambers, so we may further conjugate so that $\rho(H') = H$.

We now show that we can conjugate ρ so that X' maps to X , except possibly at the middle block. The matrices Z satisfying $[H, Z] = 2Z$ are exactly the superdiagonal matrices given by $Z = \mathrm{Diag}^1(A_1, \dots, A_{n-1})$. Such a Z is in $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ if and only if $A_{n-k} = -\bar{A}_k$. The Levi subgroup is $L = Z_{\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})}(H) = \{\mathrm{Diag}(g_1, \dots, g_n) : g_{n-k+1}^{-1} = \bar{g}_k\}$. It acts on superdiagonal matrices by

$$\mathrm{Diag}^1(\dots, A_k, \dots) \mapsto \mathrm{Diag}^1(\dots, g_k A_k g_{k+1}^{-1}, \dots).$$

We will only conjugate ρ by the subgroup $L \cap K$ where each g_k is orthogonal, so that we preserve the Cartan involution. We know that $[\rho(X'), \rho(X'^T)] = \rho([X', X'^T]) = \rho(H') = H$; it follows that each A_k appearing in $\rho(X')$ is invertible. Since ρ intertwines the Cartan involution, it follows that each A_k is an orthogonal matrix times $c_k = \sqrt{kn - k^2}$. Therefore, by setting $g_1 = I$, the equations $g_k A_k = c_k g_{k+1}$ determine an element of L taking $\rho(X')$ to $\mathrm{Diag}^1(c_1I, \dots, c_{n/2-1}I, A, -c_{n/2+1}I, \dots, -c_nI)$ for some A satisfying $A = -\bar{A}$. Now the subgroup of L given by $\{\mathrm{Diag}(g, \dots, \bar{g}^{-1})\}$ preserves all the blocks of X except possibly the middle block A , and it takes A to $gA\bar{g} = \det(g)gAg^{-1}$.

In order to control the middle block A , we must consider the image of Y' . As before, $\rho(Y')$ is superdiagonal with blocks B_k . The fact that $[X', Y'] = 0$ implies that $c_{k+1}B_k = c_k B_{k+1}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n/2 - 1$. We need to see that $\det(A_k)$ and $\det(B_k)$ have the same sign for all k . Observe that the top right block of $\exp(\alpha\rho_n(X') + \beta\rho_n(Y'))$ is the product

$$\exp(\alpha\rho(X') + \beta\rho(Y'))_{1n} = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} C_1 C_2 \cdots C_{n/2-1} C_{n/2} (-\bar{C}_{n/2}) \cdots (-\bar{C}_1)$$

where $C_k = \alpha A_k + \beta B_k$. By transversality, this block has nonzero determinant when α, β are not both zero. It follows that $\{\alpha A_k + \beta B_k : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a definite subspace of $(M_2(\mathbb{R}), \det)$ for all k , so indeed $\det(A_k)$ and $\det(B_k)$ have the same

sign. The middle block is traceless, so must have negative determinant. Now the middle block is, up to rescaling by $c_{n/2}$, orthogonal with negative determinant. Hence we can conjugate so that $A_{n/2}$ becomes $c_{n/2}T$.

At this point, we have shown that ρ can be conjugated to intertwine the Cartan involutions, take H' to H , and take X' to X . We know that $\rho(Y')$ is a superdiagonal block matrix of the form $\text{Diag}^1(c_1B_0, c_2B_0, \dots, c_{n/2}B'_0, \dots)$ with B_0 and B'_0 orthogonal, $\det(B_0) = 1$ and $\det(B'_0) = -1$. Since the bracket $[X', Y'] = 0$ we have $B'_0 = B_0T$. We now consider the inner product $B_\theta(U, V) = -B(\theta U, V)$ on $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. Since ρ is injective and intertwines the Cartan involutions the pullback ρ^*B_θ agrees with $B_{\theta'}$ up to a constant scalar. Therefore $B_\theta(\rho(X'), \rho(Y')) = 0$. This implies that B_0 is traceless; since moreover B_0 is orthogonal with determinant 1, it must be $\pm R$. Then $B'_0 = B_0T = \pm P$.

We need to show that we can further conjugate $\rho(Y')$ to Y while keeping all of the data above preserved. For this we are only able to conjugate using the group $L \cap K \cap Z_{\text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})}(X)$, which contains only the block diagonal elements where $g \in \{\pm I, \pm P\}$. Up to conjugating by the block diagonal matrix of P 's, we have that $B_0 = R$. Then $B'_0 = RT = P$. \square

3.3. Maximal antipodality of the limit set of $\text{SU}(n-1, 1)$. We let $\text{SU}(n-1, 1)$ denote the subgroup of $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ preserving the indefinite hermitian form $h(u, v) = \bar{u}^T Q v$ where $Q(e_1) = e_n$, $Q(e_n) = e_1$ and $Q(e_k) = e_k$ for $1 < k < n$. We have

$$\mathfrak{su}(n-1, 1) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(X) & -\bar{v}^T & ib \\ u & X & v \\ ic & -\bar{u}^T & -a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(X) \end{bmatrix} : \begin{array}{l} a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u, v \in \mathbb{C}^{n-2}, \\ X \in \mathfrak{u}(n-2) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Note that $\text{Tr}(X) \in i\mathbb{R}$. The Cartan involution $\theta(Z) = -\bar{Z}^T$ preserves $\mathfrak{su}(n-1, 1)$ and induces the Cartan decomposition $\mathfrak{su}(n-1, 1) = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$. Here \mathfrak{k} is the intersection $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{su}(n-1, 1) \cap \mathfrak{u}(n)$, i.e. the intersection of $\mathfrak{su}(n-1, 1)$ with skew-Hermitian matrices and \mathfrak{p} is the intersection of $\mathfrak{su}(n-1, 1)$ with Hermitian matrices. The intersection of \mathfrak{p} with real diagonal matrices is the maximal abelian subspace $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ given by

$$\mathfrak{a} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -x \end{bmatrix} : x \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

In the induced restricted root space decomposition

$$\mathfrak{su}(n-1, 1) = \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$$

we have

$$\mathfrak{g}_\alpha = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\bar{z}_1 & \cdots & -\bar{z}_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & z_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & z_n \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & iy \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : y \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

We identify \mathbb{C}^n with \mathbb{R}^{2n} via $(x_1 + iy_1, \dots, x_n + iy_n) \mapsto (x_1, y_1, \dots, x_n, y_n)$. The imaginary part of h is a real-valued symplectic form ω_h preserved by $\mathrm{SU}(n-1, 1)$. Under the identification of \mathbb{C}^n with \mathbb{R}^{2n} it may be written as $\omega_h(x, y) = x^T J_h y$ for the matrix

$$J_h = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & R \\ 0 & R & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & R & 0 \\ R & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which has the 2×2 block R in the top-right, lower-left, and otherwise has R down the diagonal blocks.

Under this identification, the horocyclic subalgebra $\mathfrak{u}' = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{u}' = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\alpha^T \otimes I + \beta \otimes R & \gamma R \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha \otimes I + \beta \otimes R \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : \begin{array}{l} \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \end{array} \right\}$$

where e.g. $\alpha \otimes I$ denotes an $n-2 \times 2$ block matrix according to the Kronecker product. It exponentiates to the group

$$U' = \exp(\mathfrak{u}') = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} I & -\alpha^T \otimes I + \beta \otimes R & -\frac{1}{2}(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2)I + \gamma R \\ 0 & I & \alpha \otimes I + \beta \otimes R \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} : \begin{array}{l} \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \end{array} \right\}.$$

where $|\alpha|^2$ denotes the standard norm squared of α . Note that U' acts simply transitively on $\Lambda \setminus \{\tau_+\}$.

We also consider the horocyclic subgroup U of $\mathrm{Sp}(\omega_h)$ acting simply transitively on $C(\tau_+) \subset \mathrm{Iso}_2$. This is given by

$$U = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} I & -\overline{F(u, v, w, z)}^T & q(u, v, w, z)I + bR + cT + dP \\ 0 & I & F(u, v, w, z) \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} : \begin{array}{l} b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u, v, w, z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \end{array} \right\}$$

where, for $u, v, w, z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} q(u, v, w, z) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(-|u|^2 - |v|^2 + |w|^2 + |z|^2 \right), \\ F(u, v, w, z) &= u \otimes I + v \otimes R + w \otimes T + z \otimes P, \\ -\overline{F(u, v, w, z)}^T &= -u^T \otimes I + v^T \otimes R + w^T \otimes T + z^T \otimes P. \end{aligned}$$

To see that U can be parameterized in this way, observe that each element can be factored into a product of a matrix of the form

$$\exp \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\overline{F(u, v, w, z)}^T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & F(u, v, w, z) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

and a matrix of the form

$$\exp \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & bR + cT + dP \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Theorem 3.11. *The limit set $\Lambda \cong S^{2n-3} \subset \text{Iso}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_h)$ associated to $\text{SU}(n-1, 1) \subset \text{Sp}(\omega_h)$ is maximally antipodal.*

Before presenting the proof, we first explain how the symplectic form ω_h is related to the symplectic form ω we discussed above. It is convenient to fix a transformation $f: \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ which relates the two symplectic forms. When n is even, we may use

$$f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{2}I & & & & & & & & & 0 \\ & I & & & & & & & & I \\ & & \ddots & & & & & & & \\ & & & I & I & & & & & \\ & & & T & -T & & & & & \\ & & & & & \ddots & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & T & & & & & & -T \\ 0 & & & & & & & & & \sqrt{2}I \end{bmatrix}$$

and when n is odd, we modify f by inserting a middle row and column with $\sqrt{2}I$ in the center block and zeros elsewhere. It is easy to check that $fJf^T = J_h$, and it then follows directly that $g \in \text{Sp}(\omega_h)$ if and only if $f^T g f^{-T} \in \text{Sp}(\omega)$ if and only if $f^{-1} g f \in \text{Sp}(\omega)$. Moreover, a subspace V is ω_h -isotropic if and only if $f^T V$ is ω -isotropic. In particular, the standard isotropic 2-flag and standard opposite isotropic 2-flag are each ω_h -isotropic.

Proof of Theorem 3.11. We will show that for any $g \in U$, there exists $g' \in U'$ such that $gg'\tau_-$ is not antipodal to τ_- . To show that $gg'\tau_-$ is not antipodal to τ_- , we only need to show that the 2×2 block $(gu)_{1n}$ has determinant 0. Indeed, we may still apply [Lemma 3.3](#) because the ω_h -perpendicular of $\tau_{\{2\}}^{\text{opp}}$ is equal to its ω -perpendicular.

As before, we write $(gg')_{1n}$ in the basis I, R, T, P . We first examine the I term of $(gg')_{1n}$, where g and g' are expressed in the parameters described above. The coefficient of the I term is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2} \left(|\alpha|^2 + 2\alpha \cdot u + |u|^2 + |\beta|^2 - 2\beta \cdot v + |v|^2 - |w|^2 - |z|^2 \right) \\ & = -\frac{1}{2} |\alpha + u|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\beta - v|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |w|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |z|^2 \end{aligned}$$

which vanishes for a suitable choice of α and β .

It is then easy to choose γ so that the R term vanishes. This results in a 2×2 block which may have zero or negative determinant. If the determinant is zero,

then we are done. Otherwise, the determinant is negative; but in this case, observe that by choosing sufficiently large γ we can make the determinant positive. By the intermediate value theorem, there then exists some γ such that the determinant becomes zero. \square

Lemma 3.12. *The limit set $\Lambda \cong S^{2n-3} \subset \mathcal{F}_{2,2n-2}$ associated to $\mathrm{SU}(n-1, 1) \subset \mathrm{SL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is not maximally antipodal.*

Proof. With the conventions as above, take

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & I \\ 0 & I_{2n-4} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then for any $g' \in U'$, $g\tau_-$ is antipodal to $g'\tau_-$. In fact the block $(g^{-1}g'\tau_-)_{1n}$ is

$$-\frac{1}{2} \left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 + 2 \right) I + \gamma R$$

Clearly, $g\tau_-$ is transverse to τ_+ . \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 7–9*. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. Translated from the 1975 and 1982 French originals by Andrew Pressley.
- [2] Mario Bonk and Bruce Kleiner. Quasi-hyperbolic planes in hyperbolic groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133(9):2491–2494, 2005.
- [3] Richard Canary. Anosov representations: Informal lecture notes. <https://dept.math.lsa.umich.edu/~canary/Anosovlecnotes.pdf>, 2021.
- [4] Richard Canary and Konstantinos Tsouvalas. Topological restrictions on Anosov representations. *J. Topol.*, 13(4):1497–1520, 2020.
- [5] Andrew Casson and Douglas Jungreis. Convergence groups and Seifert fibered 3-manifolds. *Invent. Math.*, 118(1):441–456, 1994.
- [6] Marc Culler. Lifting representations to covering groups. *Advances in Mathematics*, 59(1):64–70, 1986.
- [7] Jeffrey Danciger, François Guéritaud, and Fanny Kassel. Convex cocompactness in pseudo-Riemannian hyperbolic spaces. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 192(1):87–126, 2018.
- [8] Subhadip Dey. On Borel Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbb{R})$. *arXiv:2208.02109*, 2022.
- [9] Subhadip Dey, Michael Kapovich, and Bernhard Leeb. A combination theorem for Anosov subgroups. *Math. Z.*, 293(1-2):551–578, 2019.
- [10] Eric M. Freden. Negatively curved groups have the convergence property. I, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.*, 20(2):333–348, 1995.
- [11] David Gabai. Convergence groups are Fuchsian groups. *Ann. of Math.*, 136(3):447–510, 1992.
- [12] Olivier Guichard, François Labourie, and Anna Wienhard. Positivity and representations of surface groups. *arXiv:2106.14584*, 2021.
- [13] Olivier Guichard and Anna Wienhard. Anosov representations: domains of discontinuity and applications. *Invent. Math.*, 190(2):357–438, 2012.
- [14] Olivier Guichard and Anna Wienhard. Positivity and higher Teichmüller theory. *arXiv:1802.02833*, 2018.
- [15] Olivier Guichard and Anna Wienhard. Generalizing Lusztig’s total positivity. *arXiv:2208.10114*, 2022.
- [16] Ilya Kapovich and Nadia Benakli. Boundaries of hyperbolic groups. In *Combinatorial and geometric group theory (New York, 2000/Hoboken, NJ, 2001)*, volume 296 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 39–93. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [17] Michael Kapovich. Representations of polygons of finite groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 9:1915–1951, 2005.
- [18] Michael Kapovich, Bernhard Leeb, and Joan Porti. Anosov subgroups: dynamical and geometric characterizations. *Eur. J. Math.*, 3(4):808–898, 2017.

- [19] F. I. Karpelevič. Surfaces of transitivity of a semisimple subgroup of the group of motions of a symmetric space. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)*, 93:401–404, 1953.
- [20] François Labourie. Anosov flows, surface groups and curves in projective space. *Invent. Math.*, 165(1):51–114, 2006.
- [21] G. D. Mostow. Some new decomposition theorems for semi-simple groups. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 14:31–54, 1955.
- [22] Maria Beatrice Pozzetti and Konstantinos Tsouvalas. On projective Anosov subgroups of symplectic groups. [arXiv:2305.05018](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.05018), 2023.
- [23] Konstantinos Tsouvalas. On Borel Anosov representations in even dimensions. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 95(4):749–763, 2020.
- [24] Pekka Tukia. Homeomorphic conjugates of Fuchsian groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 391:1–54 (1988).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, YALE UNIVERSITY, 219 PROSPECT ST, NEW HAVEN, CT 06511
Email address: `subhadip.dey@yale.edu`

MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS IN THE SCIENCES IN LEIPZIG, INSELSTRASSE 22,
04103 LEIPZIG, GERMANY
Email address: `greenberg@mis.mpg.de`

MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS IN THE SCIENCES IN LEIPZIG, INSELSTRASSE 22,
04103 LEIPZIG, GERMANY
Email address: `riestenberg@mis.mpg.de`