

Formula for minimal K-type, maximally compact case

Assumptions:  $G$  linear connected semisimple

$\mathfrak{t} = \theta$ -stable Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ ,  $\mathfrak{k} \subseteq \mathfrak{k}$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ .

$\Delta =$  roots of  $(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{t}^{\mathbb{C}})$ ,  $\Delta^- =$  roots of  $(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{t}^{\mathbb{C}})$  vanishing on  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

→ Maximally compact assumption: No member of  $\Delta$  vanishes on  $\mathfrak{k}$ .

$\mathfrak{m}$  and  $M$  constructed in the usual way from  $\mathfrak{p}$ , so that  $\mathfrak{k}$  is a compact Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

We can speak of compact and noncompact roots - roots of  $(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{t}^{\mathbb{C}})$  that vanish on  $\mathfrak{p}$  and whose root vectors are in  $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$  or  $\mathfrak{p}^{\mathbb{C}}$ , respectively.  
(They are also in  $\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}}$ .)

We work only with  $M^{\#} = M_0 \mathbb{Z}_M$  since discrete series of  $M$  are induced from  $M^{\#}$ . (Probably  $M^{\#}$  is connected under our assumptions.)

Let  $\sigma =$  discrete series of  $M^{\#}$

$\lambda_0 =$  a Harish-Chandra parameter of  $\sigma$  relative to  $(\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}})$

$\lambda = \lambda_0 + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}}^- - \rho_{\mathfrak{k}}^- =$  unique minimal  $K \cap M^{\#}$  type of  $\sigma$ , with positive system  $(\Delta^-)^+$  of  $\Delta^-$  chosen to make  $\lambda_0$  dominant for it.

Remark:  $\mathfrak{k}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{k}$

Proof. Otherwise extend  $\mathfrak{k}$  to a maximal abelian subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{k}$  and then to a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and end up with a more compact Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  than  $\mathfrak{k}$  is.

Theorem.  $\Lambda = \lambda$  is the unique minimal K-type of  $\text{ind}_{K \cap M^{\#}}^K \sigma$ .

2

Lemma 1. Restriction from  $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathbb{C}}$  to  $\mathfrak{b}_1^{\mathbb{C}}$  carries  $\Delta - \Delta_m^-$  onto the set  $\Delta_c$  of roots of  $(\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{g}_1^{\mathbb{C}})$ .

Proof. Let  $\beta$  be in  $\Delta$  with  $E_{\beta}$  in  $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ , and write  $\beta = \beta_{\mathfrak{b}_1} + \beta_{\mathfrak{b}_2}$ .

Then  $E_{\beta} + \theta E_{\beta}$  is in  $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . If  $H$  is in  $\mathfrak{b}_1^{\mathbb{C}}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} [H, E_{\beta} + \theta E_{\beta}] &= [H, E_{\beta}] + \theta [H, E_{\beta}] = \beta_{\mathfrak{b}_1}(H) E_{\beta} + \beta_{\mathfrak{b}_2}(H) \theta E_{\beta} \\ &= \beta_{\mathfrak{b}_1}(H) (E_{\beta} + \theta E_{\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\beta_{\mathfrak{b}_1}$  is in  $\Delta_c$  or  $E_{\beta} + \theta E_{\beta} = 0$ . (We know that  $\beta_{\mathfrak{b}_1} \neq 0$ , since no member of  $\Delta$  vanishes everywhere on  $\mathfrak{b}_1$ .)

In the latter case,  $-E_{\beta} = \theta E_{\beta}$  is a root vector for  $\theta\beta = \beta_{\mathfrak{b}_2} - \beta_{\mathfrak{b}_1}$ ,

and so  $\beta = \theta\beta$ ,  $\beta_{\mathfrak{b}_1} = 0$ . Then  $\beta$  is in  $\Delta^-$ . Since  $E_{\beta}$  satisfies

$\theta E_{\beta} = -E_{\beta}$ ,  $E_{\beta}$  is in  $\mathfrak{p}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Hence  $\beta$  is in  $\Delta_m^-$ . We conclude

restriction carries  $\Delta - \Delta_m^-$  into  $\Delta_c$ .

We show the map is onto  $\Delta_c$ . Thus let  $\beta_1$  be in  $\Delta_c$ , with  $X_{\beta_1} \in \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$  an associated root vector  $\neq 0$ . Write

$$X_{\beta_1} = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta} E_{\beta} + H_0, \quad H_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Then  $H$  in  $\mathfrak{b}_1^{\mathbb{C}}$  implies

$$\beta_1(H) X_{\beta_1} = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta} \beta(H) E_{\beta}.$$

3

If  $H$  is in  $\ker \beta_1$ , then it follows that  $\beta(H) = 0$  whenever  $E_\beta \neq 0$ . If  $H = H_{\beta_1}$ , then it follows that  $\frac{\beta(H_{\beta_1})}{|\beta_1|^2} = 1$  whenever  $E_\beta \neq 0$  and that

$\frac{H_0}{|\beta_1|^2} = 0$ . Consequently  $H_0 = 0$  and  $\beta|_{\mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R}} = \beta_1$  for every  $\beta$  for which

$E_\beta \neq 0$ . Applying  $\theta$  and averaging, we obtain

$$X_{\beta_1} = \sum_{E_\beta \neq 0} (E_\beta + \theta E_\beta).$$

Choose  $\beta$  so that  $E_\beta + \theta E_\beta \neq 0$  in this expression; this is possible since  $X_{\beta_1} \neq 0$ .

Then  $\beta$  is not in  $\Delta_m^-$  and  $E_\beta \neq 0$ , so that  $\beta|_{\mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R}} = \beta_1$ . This proves the

map is onto.

Remark. We can regard  $\Delta_c^-$  as  $\subseteq \Delta_c$ , via the restriction map of Lemma 1.

Positive system  $\Delta_c^+$ :

$$\text{Let } \Delta_{0,c} = \{\beta|_{\mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R}} \mid \beta \in \Delta \text{ and } \langle \lambda_0, \beta \rangle = 0\} \subseteq \Delta_c$$

$$\Delta_{1,c}^+ = \{\beta|_{\mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R}} \mid \beta \in \Delta \text{ and } \langle \lambda_0, \beta \rangle > 0\} \subseteq \Delta_c.$$

These notions depend only on  $\beta|_{\mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R}}$ , not on all of  $\beta$ , since  $\lambda_0$  vanishes on  $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{R}$ .

Choose a positive system  $\Delta_{0,c}^+$  for  $\Delta_{0,c}$ , and define

$$\Delta_c^+ = \Delta_{1,c}^+ \cup \Delta_{0,c}^+.$$

Then  $\Delta_c^+$  is a positive system for  $\Delta_c$ , and  $(\Delta_c^-)^+ \subseteq \Delta_c^+$ .

Define  $P$ 's in the obvious way.

Theorem. Relative to the positive system  $\Delta_c^+$  of roots of  $(\mathfrak{k}^c, \mathfrak{h}^c)$ ,  $\Lambda = \lambda$

is the unique minimal  $K$ -type of  $\text{ind}_{K \cap M}^K \sigma$ .

4

Lemma 2.  $\Lambda = \lambda$  is integral for  $K$ , i.e.,  $\exp \Lambda$  is a well-defined character of the torus  $B$  of  $K$ .

Proof.  $\exp \lambda$  is a well-defined character of  $B$  as a torus in  $M$ , since  $\lambda$  is the Blattner weight of  $\sigma$ .

Lemma 3. Suppose  $\beta_1$  is a simple root for the system  $\Delta_c^+$  and is not the restriction of a member of  $(\Delta_c^-)^+$ . Then

(a)  $s_{\beta_1}(\Delta^-) \subseteq \Delta^-$

(b)  $s_{\beta_1}(\Delta_c^-) \subseteq \Delta_c^-$

(c)  $\langle P^-, \beta_1 \rangle \geq 0$

(d)  $s_{\beta_1}(\Delta_c^-)^+ \subseteq (\Delta_c^-)^+$  and hence  $\langle P_c^-, \beta_1 \rangle = 0$ .

Proof. (a) Let  $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_{02}$  be an extension of  $\beta_1$  to a member of  $\Delta - \Delta_m$ , by Lemma 1. Since  $\beta$  is not in  $(\Delta_c^-)^+$ , by assumption,  $\beta$  is not in  $\Delta^-$ . Thus  $\beta_{02} \neq 0$ . Thus

$$\frac{2\langle \beta, \beta \rangle}{|\beta|^2} = \frac{2\langle \beta_1 + \beta_{02}, \beta_1 - \beta_{02} \rangle}{|\beta_1 + \beta_{02}|^2} \text{ is } -1, 0, \text{ or } 1. \quad (*)$$

It cannot be 1, since otherwise  $2\beta_{02}$  would be in  $\Delta$ , and there are no members of  $\Delta$  that vanish on  $\beta_1$ .

Suppose  $(*)$  is 0. Then it follows that  $s_{\beta_1} s_{\beta_{02}} = s_{\beta} s_{\beta_{02}}$ .

Since  $s_{\beta_{02}}$  fixes  $\Delta^-$ ,  $s_{\beta_1}$  acts as  $s_{\beta} s_{\beta_{02}}$  on  $\Delta^-$  and must carry  $\Delta^-$  into  $\Delta$ , hence into  $\Delta^-$ .



Suppose (\*) is -1. Then it follows that  $2\beta_1$  is in  $\Delta$ . Thus  $s_{\beta_1}$  carries  $\Delta^-$  into  $\Delta$ , hence into  $\Delta^-$ .

(b) Suppose (\*) is 0. Then  $\beta, \theta\beta$ , and their negatives generate a subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  isomorphic to  $sl(2, \mathbb{C})$ , and it follows that  $s_{\beta} s_{\theta\beta}$  has a representative  $w$  in  $K$ . Thus  $s_{\beta_1}$  acts on  $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$  in the same way as an element  $Ad(w)$  with  $w$  in  $K$  that normalizes  $\mathfrak{m}$ . The element  $w$  must then normalize  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Hence  $s_{\beta_1}$  leaves  $\Delta_c^-$  and  $\Delta_m^-$  stable.

Suppose (\*) is 1. Here  $\beta$  is not a root of a split  $G_2$  factor, and  $\beta_{or}$  is not useful. From "Dynkin diagram of a unipotent parabolic" and essentially,  $2\beta_1$  is a root of  $\Delta_m^-$  such that  $\pm 2\beta_1$  are orthogonal to all other roots of  $\Delta^-$ . Then it is clear that  $s_{\beta_1}(\Delta_c^-) \subseteq \Delta_c^-$ .

(c) In view of (a),

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{\beta_1}(2P^-) &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in (\Delta^-)^+ \\ s_{\beta_1}\alpha > 0}} s_{\beta_1}\alpha + \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in (\Delta^-)^+ \\ s_{\beta_1}\alpha < 0}} s_{\beta_1}\alpha = \sum_{\beta > 0} \beta - \sum_{\substack{\beta > 0 \\ s_{\beta_1}\beta < 0}} \beta \\
&= 2P^- - 2 \sum_{\substack{\beta > 0 \\ s_{\beta_1}\beta < 0}} \beta
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$s_{\beta_1}(P^-) = P^- - \sum_{\substack{\beta > 0 \\ s_{\beta_1}\beta < 0}} \beta$$

and

$$\frac{2\langle P^-, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2} = \sum_{\substack{\beta > 0 \\ s_{\beta_1}\beta < 0}} \frac{2\langle \beta, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2}$$

In the sum on the right, we have  $\beta > 0$  and  $s_{\beta_1} \beta < 0$ . Since  $\lambda_0$  is nonsingular for  $\Delta^-$ ,

$$\langle \lambda_0, \beta \rangle > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \lambda_0, s_{\beta_1} \beta \rangle < 0.$$

Hence 
$$\frac{2\langle \beta, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta|^2} \langle \lambda_0, \beta_1 \rangle > 0.$$

Since  $\beta_1$  is in  $\Delta_c^+$ ,  $\langle \lambda_0, \beta_1 \rangle \geq 0$ . Thus  $\frac{2\langle \beta, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta|^2} > 0$ , and (c) follows.

(d) Regard  $(\Delta_c^-)^+$  as  $\subseteq \Delta_c^+$ . Since  $\beta_1$  is simple for  $\Delta_c^+$  and is not in  $\Delta_c^-$ ,  $s_{\beta_1}(\Delta_c^-)^+ \subseteq \Delta_c^+$ . Then (b) shows that  $s_{\beta_1}(\Delta_c^-)^+ \subseteq (\Delta_c^-)^+$ , and it follows that  $\langle s_{\beta_1}^-, \beta_1 \rangle = 0$ .

7

Lemma 5.  $\lambda = \lambda$  is dominant for  $\Delta_c^+$ .

Proof. Let  $\beta_1$  be simple for  $\Delta_c^+$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\langle \lambda, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2} &= \frac{2\langle \lambda_0, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2} + \frac{2\langle \rho_m^- - \rho_c^-, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2} \\ &= \frac{2\langle \lambda_0, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2} + \frac{2\langle \rho^-, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2} - \frac{2\langle 2\rho_c^-, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2}. \quad (*) \end{aligned}$$

If  $\beta_1$  is the restriction of a member of  $(\Delta_c^-)^+$ , then  $\beta_1$  is simple for  $(\Delta_c^-)^+$  since  $(\Delta_c^-)^+ \subseteq \Delta_c^+$ . Hence

$$\frac{2\langle \rho^-, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2} \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2\langle 2\rho_c^-, \beta_1 \rangle}{|\beta_1|^2} = 2.$$

Since  $\lambda_0$  is  $\Delta^-$ -nonsingular, we conclude (\*) is  $> -1$ ,  $\beta_1$  being positive. But the left side of (\*) is an integer, by Lemma 2, and must therefore be  $\geq 0$ .

Now suppose  $\beta_1$  is not the restriction of a member of  $(\Delta_c^-)^+$ . Then the first term on the right of (\*) is  $\geq 0$  since  $\beta_1 > 0$ , the second term is  $\geq 0$  by Lemma 3c, and the third term is 0 by Lemma 3d. Hence the left side of (\*) is  $\geq 0$ .

Lemma 6. For  $\lambda = \lambda$ ,  $\tau_\lambda$  occurs in  $\text{ind}_{K \cap M^\#}^K \sigma$ .

Remark. We shall use that  $M^\#$  is connected here.

Proof. Let  $\phi_\lambda$  be a highest weight vector for  $\tau_\lambda$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\lambda(H)\phi_\lambda &= \lambda(H)\phi_\lambda && \text{for } H \in \mathfrak{h}^\mathbb{C} \\ \tau_\lambda(E_\beta)\phi_\lambda &= \tau_\lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}(E_\beta + \theta E_{\beta'})\right)\phi_\lambda = 0 && \text{for } \beta \in (\Delta_c^-)^+ \subseteq \Delta_c^+ \end{aligned}$$

Also  $M^\#$  is connected. Thus  $\text{span}\{\tau_\lambda(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m}^\#)\phi_\lambda\}$  is an irreducible  $K \cap M^\#$  module of type  $\lambda$ . Since  $\sigma_\lambda$  occurs in  $\sigma$  and  $\tau_\lambda|_{K \cap M^\#}$  has been shown to contain  $\sigma_\lambda$ , we conclude  $\tau_\lambda$  occurs in  $\text{ind}_{K \cap M^\#}^K \sigma$  by Frobenius reciprocity.

Lemma 7.  $\langle \rho_c - \rho_c^-, \gamma \rangle \geq 0$  for  $\gamma \in (\Delta^-)^+$ .

Proof. First we observe  $s_\gamma$  leaves  $\Delta_c - \Delta_c^-$  stable. In fact if  $\beta_1$  is obtained by restriction to  $\mathfrak{h}$  from  $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_{\alpha_1}$  with  $\beta_{\alpha_1} \neq 0$  (cf. Lemma 1), then  $s_\gamma \beta_1$  is obtained from  $s_\gamma \beta = s_\gamma \beta_1 + \beta_{\alpha_1}$ .

Then we write

$$s_\gamma(\rho_c - \rho_c^-) = s_\gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_1 \notin \Delta_c^-}} \beta_1\right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_1 \notin \Delta_c^- \\ s_\gamma \beta_1 > 0}} s_\gamma \beta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_1 \notin \Delta_c^- \\ s_\gamma \beta_1 < 0}} s_\gamma \beta_1$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_1 \notin \Delta_c^- \\ s_\gamma \beta_1 > 0}} \beta_1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_1 \notin \Delta_c^- \\ s_\gamma \beta_1 < 0}} \beta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_1 \notin \Delta_c^- \\ s_\gamma \beta_1 < 0}} \beta_1 - \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_1 \notin \Delta_c^- \\ s_\gamma \beta_1 < 0}} \beta_1$$

$$= \rho_c - \rho_c^- - \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_1 \notin \Delta_c^- \\ s_\gamma \beta_1 < 0}} \beta_1$$



Expanding the left side, we obtain

$$\frac{2\langle \rho_c - \rho_c^-, \gamma \rangle}{|\gamma|^2} \gamma = \sum_{\substack{\beta_i \in \Delta_c^+ \\ \beta_i \notin \Delta_c^- \\ s_i \beta_i < 0}} \beta_i.$$

Taking the inner product with  $\lambda_0$  and using the inequality  $\langle \beta_i, \lambda_0 \rangle \geq 0$ , we

find

$$\frac{2\langle \rho_c - \rho_c^-, \gamma \rangle}{|\gamma|^2} \langle \gamma, \lambda_0 \rangle = \sum \langle \beta_i, \lambda_0 \rangle \geq 0.$$

Since  $\langle \gamma, \lambda_0 \rangle > 0$  for  $\gamma \in (\Delta^-)^+$ , the lemma follows.

Proof of theorem. Let  $\tau_{\lambda_0}$  be a minimal  $K$ -type of  $\text{ind}_{K \cap M}^K \sigma$ . By

Frobenius reciprocity,  $\tau_{\lambda_0}|_{K \cap M}$  contains some  $K \cap M$  type  $\sigma_{\lambda'}$  of  $\sigma$ .

Then  $\lambda'$  is a weight of  $\tau_{\lambda_0}$ , and we have

- $|\lambda_0 + 2\rho_c|^2 \leq |\lambda + 2\rho_c|^2$  by Lemma 6 and minimality (1)
- $|\lambda + 2\rho_c^-|^2 \leq |\lambda' + 2\rho_c^-|^2$  by minimality (2)
- $|\lambda'|^2 \leq |\lambda_0|^2$  since  $\lambda'$  is a weight of  $\tau_{\lambda_0}$  (3)
- $\lambda' = \lambda_0 - \sum m_i \beta_i$  since  $\lambda'$  is a weight of  $\tau_{\lambda_0}$  (4)  
( $\beta_i \in \Delta_c^+$ ,  $m_i \geq 0$ )

We write

$$\begin{aligned}
|\lambda|^2 &= |\lambda + 2\rho_c^-|^2 - 4\langle \lambda, \rho_c^- \rangle - 4|\rho_c^-|^2 \\
&\leq |\lambda' + 2\rho_c^-|^2 - 4\langle \lambda, \rho_c^- \rangle - 4|\rho_c^-|^2 && \text{by (2)} \\
&= |\lambda'|^2 + 4\langle \lambda' - \lambda, \rho_c^- \rangle \\
&\leq |\Lambda_0|^2 + 4\langle \lambda' - \lambda, \rho_c^- \rangle && \text{by (3)} \\
&= |\Lambda_0 + 2\rho_c|^2 - 4\langle \Lambda_0, \rho_c \rangle - 4|\rho_c|^2 + 4\langle \lambda' - \lambda, \rho_c^- \rangle \\
&\leq |\Lambda + 2\rho_c|^2 - 4\langle \Lambda_0, \rho_c \rangle - 4|\rho_c|^2 + 4\langle \lambda' - \lambda, \rho_c^- \rangle && \text{by (1)} \\
&= |\Lambda|^2 + 4\langle \Lambda - \Lambda_0, \rho_c \rangle + 4\langle \lambda' - \lambda, \rho_c^- \rangle \\
&= |\lambda|^2 + 4\langle \lambda - \lambda' - \sum m_i \beta_i, \rho_c \rangle + 4\langle \lambda' - \lambda, \rho_c^- \rangle && \text{by (4)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $4\langle \lambda' - \lambda, \rho_c - \rho_c^- \rangle \leq -4\langle \sum m_i \beta_i, \rho_c \rangle \leq 0$ .

By Schmid's theorem,  $\lambda' - \lambda$  is the sum of members of  $(\Delta^-)^+$ . Then

$$4\langle \lambda' - \lambda, \rho_c - \rho_c^- \rangle \geq 0 \text{ by Lemma 7.}$$

We conclude first that  $\langle \sum m_i \beta_i, \rho_c \rangle = 0$ , from which it follows that  $\lambda' = \Lambda_0$ , and second that  $|\lambda + 2\rho_c^-|^2 = |\lambda' + 2\rho_c^-|^2$  in the chain of inequalities above, from which it follows that  $\lambda' = \lambda$ . Then  $\Lambda_0 = \lambda' = \lambda = \Lambda$ , and the theorem is proved.