

Astérisque

MOHAMMED E. B. BEKKA

ALAIN VALETTE

**Lattices in semi-simple Lie groups, and multipliers
of group C^* -algebras**

Astérisque, tome 232 (1995), p. 67-79

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AST_1995__232__67_0

© Société mathématique de France, 1995, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la collection « Astérisque » (<http://smf4.emath.fr/Publications/Asterisque/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
<http://www.numdam.org/>

Lattices in semi-simple Lie groups, and multipliers of group C^* -algebras

Mohammed E. B. BEKKA and Alain VALETTE

1 Introduction, and some history.

Let G be a locally compact group, and H be a closed subgroup. Viewing $L^1(G)$ as a two-sided ideal in the measure algebra $M(G)$, and viewing elements of $L^1(H)$ as measures on G supported inside H , we obtain an action of $L^1(H)$ on $L^1(G)$ as double centralizers. It is easy to check (see e.g. proposition 4.1 in [Rie]) that this action extends to an action of the full group C^* -algebra $C^*(H)$ as double centralizers on $C^*(G)$; this corresponds to a $*$ -homomorphism $j_H : C^*(H) \rightarrow M(C^*(G))$, where $M(C^*(G))$ denotes the multiplier C^* -algebra of $C^*(G)$. We now quote from p. 209 of Rieffel's Advances paper [Rie]:

It does not seem to be known whether this homomorphism j_H is injective. It will be injective if and only if every unitary representation of H is weakly contained in the restriction to H of some unitary representation of G [Fe2]. J.M.G. Fell has pointed out to us that the example that he gave in which this appeared to fail (p. 445 of [Fe2]) depended on the completeness of the classification of the irreducible representations of $SL_3(\mathbb{C})$ given in [GeN], and there is now some doubt that this classification is complete [Ste].

Probably this quotation requires some word of explanation. In [Fe2], Fell studies extensions to the topological framework of Frobenius reciprocity for finite groups. Thus he introduces a list of weak Frobenius properties, the last and weakest one being (WF3):

The locally compact group G satisfies property (WF3) if, for any closed subgroup H of G , every representation σ in the dual \hat{H} is weakly contained in the restriction $\pi|_H$ of some unitary representation π of G .

Property (WF3) is indeed equivalent to the injectivity of j_H for any closed subgroup H ; for completeness, we shall give a proof in Proposition 2.1 below. In §6 of [Fe2], Fell wishes to show that even (WF3) may fail, by taking $G = SL_3(\mathbb{C})$ and $H = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$; to this end he appeals to the incomplete description of \hat{G} given in [GeN]; Fell's proof was recently corrected in Remark 1.13(i) of [BLS].

In this paper, we take for G a semi-simple Lie group with finite centre and without compact factor, and as closed subgroup a lattice Γ . In section 3, we prove:

THEOREM 1.1 *Let G be a semi-simple Lie group without compact factors, with finite centre and with Kazhdan's property (T). Let Γ be an irreducible lattice in G , and let σ be a non-trivial irreducible unitary representation of Γ of finite dimension n . Then σ*

determines a direct summand of $C^*(\Gamma)$ which is contained in the kernel of $j_\Gamma : C^*(\Gamma) \rightarrow M(C^*(G))$; this direct summand is isomorphic to the algebra $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ of n -by- n matrices.

If G is a non-compact *simple* Lie group with finite centre, then G has property (T) unless G is locally isomorphic either to $SO_o(n, 1)$ or $SU(n, 1)$ (see [HaV]). For these two families, we prove in section 4:

THEOREM 1.2 *Let G be locally isomorphic either to $SO_o(n, 1)$ or $SU(n, 1)$, for some $n \geq 2$. Let Γ be a lattice in G . Denote by $\hat{\Gamma}_f$ the set of (classes of) irreducible, finite-dimensional unitary representations of Γ . If the trivial representation 1_Γ is not isolated in $\hat{\Gamma}_f$ (for the induced Fell-Jacobson topology), then infinitely many elements of $\hat{\Gamma}_f$ are not weakly contained in the restriction to Γ of any unitary representation of G . In particular $j_\Gamma : C^*(\Gamma) \rightarrow M(C^*(G))$ is not injective.*

In view of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, it seems natural to formulate the following

Conjecture. If Γ is a lattice in a non-compact semi-simple Lie group G , then $j_\Gamma : C^*(\Gamma) \rightarrow M(C^*(G))$ is not injective.

This conjecture means that, if ρ is a representation of G which is faithful on $M(C^*(G))$ (e.g. take for ρ either the universal representation of G , or the direct sum of all its irreducible representations), then $\rho|_\Gamma$ is never faithful on $C^*(\Gamma)$; this has bearing on a question of de la Harpe in his paper in these Proceedings (see immediately after Problem 13 in [Har]). In §5, we give examples of lattices Γ in $SO_o(n, 1)$ or $SU(n, 1)$ such that 1_Γ is not isolated in $\hat{\Gamma}_f$; this is the case for any lattice in $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$, any non-uniform lattice in $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$, and any arithmetic lattice in $SO_o(n, 1)$ for $n \neq 3, 7$.

In the final §6, we come back to property (WF3) and show that it always fails for almost connected, non-amenable groups:

THEOREM 1.3 *Let G be an almost connected, locally compact group. The following properties are equivalent:*

- (i) G has Fell's property (WF3);
- (ii) G is amenable.

Observe that Theorem 1.3 cannot hold for any locally compact group. Indeed, any discrete group G satisfies property (WF3) since, given a subgroup H of G , one checks easily that $C^*(H)$ is a C^* -subalgebra of $C^*(G) = M(C^*(G))$.

We thank M. Boileau, M. Burger, B. Colbois, T. Fack, F. Paulin and G. Skandalis for useful conversations and correspondence. P-A Cherix has nicely done the final TeXification and proofreading.

A word about terminology: as usual, semi-simple Lie groups are assumed to be connected and non-trivial; group representations are assumed to be unitary, strongly continuous, and on non-zero Hilbert spaces.

2 On multipliers of C^* -algebras.

For a C^* -algebra B , we denote by $M(B)$ its multiplier algebra.

PROPOSITION 2.1 *Let A, B be C^* -algebras, and let $j : A \rightarrow M(B)$ be a $*$ -homomorphism. The following properties are equivalent:*

- (i) j is one-to-one;
- (ii) for any $\sigma \in \hat{A}$, there exists a non-degenerate $*$ -representation π of B such that σ is weakly contained in $\tilde{\pi} \circ j$, where $\tilde{\pi}$ denotes the extension of π to $M(B)$;
- (iii) any $\sigma \in \hat{A}$ is weakly contained in $\{\tilde{\pi} \circ j \mid \pi \in \hat{B}\}$.

Fell's property (WF3), mentioned in §1, is deduced from property (ii) above by taking $B = C^*(G)$ and $A = C^*(H)$, for any closed subgroup H of the locally compact group G .

Proof of Proposition 2.1. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let us assume that j is injective, so that we may identify A with a C^* -subalgebra of $M(B)$. Let π be a faithful representation of B . It is known that the extension $\tilde{\pi}$ of π to $M(B)$ is also faithful ([Ped], 3.12.5). Thus any representation of A is weakly contained in the restriction of $\tilde{\pi}$ to A .

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) This follows from decomposition theory.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Assume that (iii) holds. Fix a non-zero element x of A ; choose $\sigma \in \hat{A}$ such that $\sigma(x) \neq 0$. Our assumption says that $\text{Ker } \sigma$ contains $\bigcap_{\pi \in \hat{B}} \text{Ker } \tilde{\pi} \circ j = \text{Ker}(\bigoplus_{\pi \in \hat{B}} \tilde{\pi} \circ j)$; in particular $x \notin \text{Ker}(\bigoplus_{\pi \in \hat{B}} \tilde{\pi} \circ j)$. It follows that $j(x) \neq 0$, i.e. that j is one-to-one.

3 Proof of theorem 1.1

We slightly generalize Theorem 1.1 in the following form:

THEOREM 3.1 *Let G be a non-compact semi-simple Lie group with finite centre and with Kazhdan's property (T). Let Γ be an irreducible lattice in G , and let σ be an irreducible representation of Γ of finite dimension n , which is not contained in the restriction to Γ of a unitary, finite-dimensional representation of G . Then σ determines a direct summand of $C^*(\Gamma)$ isomorphic to the algebra $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ of n -by- n matrices, which moreover is contained in the kernel of $j_\Gamma : C^*(\Gamma) \rightarrow M(C^*(G))$.*

Observe that Theorem 1.1 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1: indeed, if G has no compact factor, then any unitary, finite-dimensional representation of G is trivial.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since G has property (T), so has Γ (see [HaV], Théorème 4 in Chapter 3). Let σ be an irreducible representation of Γ , of finite dimension n . By Theorem 2.1 in [Wan], σ is isolated in the dual $\hat{\Gamma}$, hence determines a direct sum decomposition of $C^*(\Gamma)$:

$$C^*(\Gamma) = J \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C})$$

where J is the C^* -kernel of σ .

We assume from now on that σ is not contained in the restriction to Γ of a unitary, finite-dimensional representation of G , and wish to prove that the direct summand $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ lies in the kernel of $j_\Gamma : C^*(\Gamma) \rightarrow M(C^*(G))$. Suppose by contradiction that j_Γ is non-zero on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Choose $\pi \in \hat{G}$ such that $\tilde{\pi} \circ j_\Gamma$ is non-zero, hence faithful on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ (here $\tilde{\pi}$ denotes the extension of π to $M(C^*(G))$, as in Proposition 2.1). Then the C^* -kernel of $\tilde{\pi} \circ j_\Gamma$ is contained in J , which means that σ is weakly contained in the restriction $\pi|_\Gamma$. As σ is isolated in $\hat{\Gamma}$, this implies that σ is actually a subrepresentation of $\pi|_\Gamma$ (see Corollary 1.9 in [Wan]). Our assumption shows that π is infinite-dimensional. Two cases may occur:

- (a) π is a discrete series representation of G (if any); this would imply that σ is an irreducible subrepresentation of the left regular representation of Γ , which in turn implies that Γ is finite - and this is absurd.
- (b) π is not in the discrete series of G ; then, by a result of Cowling and Steger (Proposition 2.4 in [CoS]), the restriction $\pi|_\Gamma$ is irreducible, which contradicts the fact that σ is a finite-dimensional subrepresentation.

With a contradiction reached in both cases, the proof of Theorem 3.1 is complete. We thank G. Skandalis for a helpful conversation that led to a more explicit version of Theorem 3.1.

Remark. Let us show that there are countably many finite-dimensional elements $\sigma \in \hat{\Gamma}$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 3.1.

Thus, let $G/Z(G)$ be the adjoint group of G ; this is a linear group. Denote by Γ_1 the image of Γ in $G/Z(G)$; as a finitely generated linear group, Γ_1 is residually finite (see [Mal]); a non-trivial irreducible representation σ of Γ that factors through a finite quotient of Γ_1 cannot be contained in the restriction to Γ of a finite-dimensional unitary representation of G .

This argument shows that $\text{Ker}[j_\Gamma : C^*(\Gamma) \rightarrow M(C^*(G))]$ contains the C^* -direct sum of countably many matrix algebras.

4 The cases $SO_o(n, 1)$ and $SU(n, 1)$.

We begin with the following result, which is certainly known to many experts (see [Moo], Proposition 3.6; compare also with [Mar], Chap. III, (1.12), Remark 1).

PROPOSITION 4.1 *Let G be a simple Lie group with finite centre, and let Γ be a lattice in G . Denote by γ the quasi-regular representation of G on $L^2(G/\Gamma)$, and by γ_0 the restriction of γ to $L^2_o(G/\Gamma) = \{f \in L^2(G/\Gamma) \mid \int f = 0\}$.*

- (a) *There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the N -fold tensor product $\gamma_0^{\otimes N}$ is weakly contained in the left regular representation λ_G of G .*
- (b) *The trivial representation 1_G is not weakly contained in γ_0 .*

Proof. (a) Suppose first that G has Kazhdan's property (T). Then, by Theorems 2.4.2 and 2.5.3 in [Cow], there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi^{\otimes N}$ is weakly contained in