

## 5. Admissible representations and $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules

**5.1. Admissible representations.** Now let  $G$  be a Lie group and  $K \subset G$  a compact subgroup. For a continuous representation  $V$  of  $G$ , denote by  $V^{K\text{-fin}}$  the space  $(V|_K)^{\text{fin}}$ . In general  $V^{K\text{-fin}}$  is not contained in  $V^\infty$ ; for example, if  $K = 1$  then  $V^{K\text{-fin}} = V$ . However, this inclusion holds if  $K$  is sufficiently large and  $V$  is sufficiently small.

**Definition 5.1.**  $V$  is said to be  $K$ -admissible (or of finite  $K$ -type) if for every finite dimensional irreducible representation  $\rho$  of  $K$ , the space  $\text{Hom}_K(\rho, V)$  is finite dimensional.

**Example 5.2.** Let  $G$  be a connected Lie group and  $V = L^2(G/B)$  where  $B$  is a closed subgroup of  $G$  (half-densities on  $G/B$ ). Then  $V$  is  $K$ -admissible iff  $K$  acts transitively on  $G/B$ , i.e.,  $KB = G$ . In this case setting  $T = K \cap B$ , we have  $G/B = K/T$ , so  $V = L^2(K/T)$  and  $\text{Hom}_K(\rho, V) \cong (\rho^T)^*$ .<sup>11</sup>

**Example 5.3.** For  $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$  and  $K = SU(2)$ , the unitary representation of  $G$  on the space  $V = L^2(\mathbb{CP}^1)$  of square-integrable half-densities on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  is  $K$ -admissible. Indeed, taking  $\rho_n$  to be the representation of  $SU(2)$  with highest weight  $n$ , we have  $\dim \text{Hom}(\rho_n, V) = 0$  for odd  $n$  and 1 for even  $n$ .

More generally, for a real number  $s$  we may consider the representation  $V_s$  of square integrable  $\frac{1}{2} + is$ -densities on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$ ; this space is canonically defined since for a  $\frac{1}{2} + is$ -density  $f$ , the complex conjugate  $\bar{f}$  is a  $\frac{1}{2} - is$ -density, so  $|f|^2 = f\bar{f}$  is a density and can be integrated canonically over  $\mathbb{CP}^1$ . This representation has the same  $K$ -multiplicities as  $V = V_0$ .

Similarly, for  $G = SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $K = SO(2)$ , we have a unitary  $K$ -admissible representation  $V = L^2(\mathbb{RP}^1)$  (half-densities) and more generally  $V_s$  ( $\frac{1}{2} + is$ -densities). For the  $K$ -multiplicities we have equalities  $\dim \text{Hom}(\chi_n, V_s) = 1$  for odd  $n$  and 0 for even  $n$ , where  $\chi_n(\theta) = e^{in\theta}$ .

We will see that the representations  $V_s$  in both cases are irreducible and  $V_s, V_t$  are isomorphic iff  $s = \pm t$ . The family of representations  $V_s$  is called the **unitary spherical principal series**.

---

<sup>11</sup>Note that here we don't have to distinguish between half-densities and functions on  $K/T$  since  $K/T$  always has a  $K$ -invariant volume form as  $K$  is compact.

Note that this family makes sense also when  $s$  is a complex number which is not necessarily real. In this case  $V_s$  is not necessarily unitary but still a continuous representation on square integrable  $\frac{1}{2} + is$ -densities. The space of such densities is canonically defined as a topological vector space, although its Hilbert norm is not canonically defined unless  $s$  is real (however, we will see that for some non-real  $s$ , corresponding to so-called **complementary series**, this representation is still unitary, even though the inner product is not given by the standard formula). The family  $V_s$  with arbitrary complex  $s$  is called the **spherical principal series**.

Explicitly, the action of  $G$  on  $V_s$  looks as follows (realizing elements of  $V_s$  as functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ , removing the point at infinity):

$$\left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}^{-1} f \right) (z) = f \left( \frac{az + b}{cz + d} \right) |cz + d|^{-m(1+2is)},$$

where  $m = 1$  in the real case and  $m = 2$  in the complex case.

**Proposition 5.4.** *If  $V$  is  $K$ -admissible then  $V^{K\text{-fin}} \subset V^\infty$ , and it is a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -submodule (although not in general a  $G$ -submodule).*

*Proof.* For a finite dimensional irreducible representation  $\rho$  of  $K$ , let  $V^\rho := \text{Hom}(\rho, V) \otimes \rho$  be the isotypic component of  $\rho$ .

We claim that for any continuous representation  $V$  the space  $V^\infty \cap V^\rho$  is dense in  $V^\rho$ . Indeed, let  $\psi_\rho \in L^2(K)^{\text{fin}}$  be the character of  $\rho$  given by

$$\psi_\rho = \sum_i \psi_{\rho ii}.$$

Let  $\xi_\rho$  be the pushforward of  $\psi_\rho dx$  from  $K$  to  $G$  (a measure on  $G$  supported on  $K$ ). Then  $\pi(\xi_\rho)$  is the projector to  $V^\rho$  annihilating  $\overline{\bigoplus_{\eta \neq \rho} V^\eta}$ . Let  $\phi_n \rightarrow \delta_1$  be a smooth Dirac sequence on  $G$ . Then for  $v \in V^\rho$ ,

$$\pi(\xi_\rho * \phi_n)v = \pi(\xi_\rho)\pi(\phi_n)v \rightarrow \pi(\xi_\rho)v = v$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . However,  $\xi_\rho * \phi_n$  is smooth, so  $\pi(\xi_\rho * \phi_n)v \in V^\infty \cap V^\rho$ .

Thus if  $V^\rho$  is finite dimensional (which happens for  $K$ -admissible  $V$ ) then  $V^\infty \cap V^\rho = V^\rho$ , so  $V^\rho \subset V^\infty$ . Hence  $V^{K\text{-fin}} \subset V^\infty$ .

Finally, it is clear that for  $b \in \mathfrak{g}$  and  $v \in V^\rho$ , the vector  $bv$  generates a  $K$ -submodule of a multiple of  $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \rho$ , so  $bv \in V^{K\text{-fin}}$ . It follows that  $V^{K\text{-fin}}$  is a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -submodule.  $\square$

**Example 5.5.** If  $G = SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $K = SO(2)$ ,  $V = V_s = L^2(S^1)$  is a spherical principal series representation, then  $V^{K\text{-fin}}$  is the space of trigonometric polynomials. Note that this space is *not* invariant under

the action of  $G$ . However, the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{R})$  does act on this space.

**Exercise 5.6.** Compute this Lie algebra action in the basis  $v_n = e^{in\theta}$  and write it as first order differential operators in the angle  $\theta$ . (Pick generators  $e, h, f$  in  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$  so that  $h$  acts diagonally in the basis  $v_i$ ).

5.2. **( $\mathfrak{g}, K$ )-modules.** This motivates the following definition. Let  $K$  be a compact connected Lie group and  $\mathfrak{k} = \text{Lie}K$ . Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a finite dimensional real Lie algebra containing  $\mathfrak{k}$ , and suppose the adjoint action of  $\mathfrak{k}$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$  integrates to an action of  $K$ . In this case we say that  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$  is a **Harish-Chandra pair**.

**Definition 5.7.** Let  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$  be a Harish-Chandra pair.

(i) A **( $\mathfrak{g}, K$ )-module** is a vector space  $M$  with actions of  $K$  and  $\mathfrak{g}$  such that

- $M$  is a direct sum of finite dimensional continuous  $K$ -modules;
- the two actions of  $\mathfrak{k}$  on  $M$  (coming from the actions of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $K$ ) coincide.

(ii) Such a module is said to be **admissible** if for every  $\rho \in \text{Irr}K$  we have  $\dim \text{Hom}_K(\rho, M) < \infty$ .

(iii) An admissible  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module which is finitely generated over  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  is called a **Harish-Chandra module**.

**Exercise 5.8.** (i) Show that if  $M$  is a  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module then for every  $g \in K, a \in \mathfrak{g}, v \in M$  we have

$$gav = \text{Ad}(g)(a)gv,$$

where  $\text{Ad}$  denotes the  $K$ -action on  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

In fact, a  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module is a purely algebraic object, since finite-dimensional  $K$ -modules can be described as algebraic representations of the complex reductive group  $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Moreover, we can represent them even more algebraically in terms of the action of  $\mathfrak{k}$ . Namely, let us say that a finite dimensional representation of  $\mathfrak{k}$  is **integrable** to  $K$  if it corresponds to a representation of  $K$  (note that this is automatic if  $K$  is simply connected). Then  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules are simply  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules which are locally integrable to  $K$  when restricted to  $\mathfrak{k}$  (i.e., sum of integrable modules). So if  $K$  is simply connected (in which case  $\mathfrak{k}$  is semisimple) then a  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module is the same thing as a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module which is locally finite when restricted to  $\mathfrak{k}$  (i.e., sum of finite dimensional modules).

Thus  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules form an abelian category closed under extensions (and this category can be defined over any algebraically closed field of characteristic zero). The same applies to admissible  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules and to Harish-Chandra modules (the latter is closed under

taking kernels of morphisms because the algebra  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  is Noetherian, as so is its associated graded  $S\mathfrak{g}$  by the Hilbert basis theorem).

**Example 5.9.** Let  $G$  be a connected complex semisimple Lie group. Then its maximal compact subgroup is the compact form  $K = G_c$ . Thus a  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module is a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $M$  which is locally finite for  $\mathfrak{g}_c \subset \mathfrak{g}$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}_c = \text{Lie}G_c$ . Note that the action of  $\mathfrak{g}$  here is only **real linear**. Thus we may pass to complexifications:  $(\mathfrak{g}_c)_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}$ , and  $\mathfrak{g}$  sits inside  $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}$  as the diagonal. Thus a  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module is simply a  $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}$ -module which is locally finite for the diagonal copy of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . This is the same as a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -bimodule<sup>12</sup> with locally finite adjoint action

$$\text{ad}(b)m := [b, m] = bm - mb.$$

For example, if  $I$  is any two-sided ideal in  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  then  $U(\mathfrak{g})/I$  is a  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module.

Thus we obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.10.** *If  $V$  is a  $K$ -admissible continuous representation of  $G$  then  $V^{K\text{-fin}}$  is an admissible  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module.*

**Exercise 5.11.** Show that for any continuous representation  $V$  of  $G$ , the intersection  $V^{\infty} \cap V^{K\text{-fin}}$  is a  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module (not necessarily admissible).

**Exercise 5.12.** Show that if  $V$  is an admissible representation of  $G$  and  $L$  a finite dimensional (continuous) representation of  $G$  then  $V \otimes L$  is also admissible. Prove the same statement for  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules.

**5.3. Harish-Chandra's admissibility theorem.** We will now restrict our attention to **semisimple** Lie groups  $G$ . By this we will mean a connected linear real Lie group  $G$  with semisimple Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . "Linear" means that it has a faithful finite dimensional representation, i.e., is isomorphic to a closed subgroup of  $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ . In other words,  $G$  is the connected component of the identity in  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$ , where  $\mathbf{G}$  is a semisimple algebraic group defined over  $\mathbb{R}$ . Typical examples of such groups include  $SL_n(\mathbb{R})$  and  $SL_n(\mathbb{C})$  (in the latter case  $\mathbf{G} = SL_n \times SL_n$  and the real structure defined by the involution permuting the two factors).

A fundamental result about the structure of semisimple Lie groups is

**Theorem 5.13.** *(E. Cartan) Every semisimple Lie group  $G$  has a maximal compact subgroup  $K \subset G$  which is unique up to conjugation.*

<sup>12</sup>Indeed, every  $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}$ -module  $M$  with action  $(a, b, v) \mapsto (a, b) \circ v$ ,  $a, b \in \mathfrak{g}$ ,  $v \in M$  is a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -bimodule with  $av = (a, 0) \circ v$  and  $vb = (0, -b) \circ v$ , and vice versa.

**Example 5.14.** For  $G = SL_n(\mathbb{R})$  we have  $K = SO(n)$  and for  $G = SL_n(\mathbb{C})$  we have  $G = SU(n)$ .

We will say that a continuous representation  $V$  of  $G$  is **admissible** if it is  $K$ -admissible with respect to a maximal compact subgroup  $K \subset G$  (does not matter which since they are all conjugate).

**Theorem 5.15.** (*Harish-Chandra's admissibility theorem*) *Every irreducible unitary representation of a semisimple Lie group is admissible.*

We will not give a proof.

**Remark 5.16.** 1. This theorem extends straightforwardly to the more general case of real reductive Lie groups.

2. Let  $G = \widetilde{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$  be the universal covering of  $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ . Then  $G$  is not linear (why?) and so it is **not** viewed as a semisimple Lie group according to our definition. In fact, Harish-Chandra's theorem does not hold for this group, since it has no nontrivial compact subgroups. This happens because when we take the universal cover, the maximal compact subgroup  $SO(2) = S^1$  gets replaced by the noncompact group  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Exercise 5.17.** Let  $M$  be an admissible  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module and

$$M^\vee := \bigoplus_{V \in \text{Irr}K} (\text{Hom}(V, M) \otimes V)^* \subset M^*$$

be the restricted dual to  $M$ . Show that  $M^\vee$  has a natural structure of an admissible  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module, and  $(M^\vee)^\vee \cong M$ .

MIT OpenCourseWare  
<https://ocw.mit.edu>

## 18.757 Representations of Lie Groups

Fall 2023

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <https://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.