

THE HILBERT BALL AND BI-BALL ARE HOLOMORPHICALLY INEQUIVALENT¹

BY STEPHEN J. GREENFIELD AND NOLAN R. WALLACH

Communicated by Irving Glicksberg, August 31, 1970

1. Introduction. In this note we prove that if B is the unit ball of a complex Hilbert space then B and $B \times B$ are holomorphically inequivalent. This answers a question of Burghlelea. We also announce some results on the automorphism groups of bounded domains in a Hilbert space.

2. The ball and the bi-ball. Let H be a complex Hilbert space. Let $B = \{z \in H \mid \|z\| < 1\}$. Here $\|\cdot\|$ is the Hilbert norm, and we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the inner product on H .

THEOREM 2.1. *B and $B \times B$ are holomorphically inequivalent. (That is, there is no diffeomorphism $f: B \rightarrow B \times B$ so that $df(z)$ is complex linear for each $z \in B$.)*

PROOF. Suppose that $f: B \rightarrow B \times B$ is a holomorphic equivalence. We derive a contradiction. We first assert that we may assume that $f(0) = (0, 0)$. Indeed, suppose that $f(z) = (0, 0)$, $z \in B$. Define for $w \in B$, $w = w_1 + \lambda z$, $\langle w_1, z \rangle = 0$,

$$h(w) = \frac{(1 - \|z\|^2)^{1/2} w_1 + (\lambda + 1)z}{\lambda \|z\|^2 + 1}.$$

It is not hard to check that $h: B \rightarrow B$ is a holomorphic self-equivalence and $h(0) = z$. Replace f by $f \circ h$. Then $f(0) = (0, 0)$.

Let $z \in B$. Then

$$(1) \quad f(\lambda z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\lambda^k / k!) d^k f(0) z^k \quad \text{for } |\lambda| \leq 1$$

and the convergence is uniform on $|\lambda| \leq 1$. (Here $d^k f(0)$ is the k th derivative of f , z^k is the k -tuple (z, \dots, z) .)

Set

$$G(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-i\theta} f(e^{i\theta} z) d\theta.$$

AMS 1969 subject classifications. Primary 5755, 3260, 2270.

Key words and phrases. Hilbert space, Banach space, unit balls, inequivalence of polyballs, Cartan domains, Siegel domains, Schwarz lemma.

¹ Partially supported by the NSF through grants GP-20631 and GP-20647.