ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'É.N.S.

NIELS VIGAND PEDERSEN

On the characters of exponential solvable Lie groups

Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. 4^e série, tome 17, n° 1 (1984), p. 1-29
<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1984_4_17_1_1_0>

© Gauthier-Villars (Éditions scientifiques et médicales Elsevier), 1984, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. » (http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ansens) 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/

Ann. scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.,
4e série, t. 17, 1984, p. 1 à 29.

ON THE CHARACTERS OF EXPONENTIAL SOLVABLE LIE GROUPS

BY NIELS VIGAND PEDERSEN (*)

Introduction

Let G be a connected, simply connected solvable Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. In [6] it was shown that for any normal representation π of G (*cf.* [11]) there exists a continuous homomorphism $\chi : G \to \mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that π has a distribution χ-semicharacter. Moreover, it was shown that one can find a semi-invariant element u (with multiplier χ, say) in $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$, the universal enveloping algebra of the complexification $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$, such that any normal representation π whose associated orbit of $\mathscr{R}$ in $\mathfrak{g}'$ ([10], [11]) is contained in a certain G-invariant Zariski open subset of $\mathfrak{g}'$, has a distribution χ-semicharacter $f_{\pi,\chi}$ expressible by $f_{\pi,\chi}(\varphi)=\phi(\pi(u*\varphi))$ for $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(G)$, ϕ being the trace on the factor generated by π (here it is understood, in particular, that the right hand side is well defined). In [3] J.-Y. Charbonnel showed that for each normal representation π of G one can find a continuous homomorphism $\chi : G \to \mathbb{R}_+^*$ and an element $u\in U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ such that π has a distribution χ-semicharacter $f_{\pi,\chi}$ expressible as before: $f_{\pi,\chi}(\varphi)=\phi(\pi(u*\varphi))$ for $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(G)$. Here u is not necessarily semi-invariant; however, $d\pi(u)$ is semi-invariant, i. e.

$$\pi(s)d\pi(u)\pi(s^{-1})=\chi(s)^{-1}d\pi(u).$$

Suppose now that G is exponential (1) (and therefore, in particular, of type I, *cf.* [2]). In this paper we make a construction, depending only on the choice of a Jordan-Hölder sequence for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, of a finite set of polynomial functions $Q_j\geqslant 0$, $j=1, \ldots, n$, on $\mathfrak{g}'$, a finite set of continuous homomorphisms $\chi_j : G \to \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $j=1, \ldots, n$, and a finite set α_j, $j=1, \ldots, n$ of positive, G-invariant analytic functions on $\mathfrak{g}$ such that, setting

$$\Omega_j=\{\, g\in\mathfrak{g}' \mid \ Q_j(g)\neq 0,\ Q_k(g)=0 \text{ for } k<j \,\}$$

we have:

1) Ω_j is G-invariant and $\mathfrak{g}'=\bigcup_{j=1}^n \Omega_j$,
2) $Q_j(sg)=\chi_j(s)Q_j(g)$ for $s\in G$, $g\in\Omega_j$,

(*) Supported by a grant from the Danish Natural Science Research Council (S.N.F.).

(1) G is said to be exponential if the exponential map $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \to G$ is diffeomorphism.

ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE. — 0012-9593/1984/ 1 /$ 5.00
© Gauthier-Villars

3) for any G-orbit O contained in Ω_j the measure $Q_j\beta_O$ is a non-zero, positive, tempered, relatively invariant Radon measure on O with multiplier χ_j (here β_O is the canonical measure on O),

and such that, letting u_j, $j=1,\ldots,n$, be the element in $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ corresponding via symmetrization to the polynomial function $g \to Q_j(ig)$ on $\mathfrak{g}'_{\mathbb{C}}$, we have for the irreducible representation π of G associated with the orbit O contained in Ω_j,

4) the operator $d\pi(u_j)$ is a selfadjoint, positive, invertible operator, semi-invariant under π with multiplier χ_j,

5) the operator $\pi(u_j * \varphi)$ is traceclass for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(G)$,

6) the functional $\varphi \to \mathrm{Tr}(\pi(u_j * \varphi))$ is a non-zero, χ_j-semi-invariant distribution on G of positive type (a χ_j-distribution semicharacter for π), and

7) for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(G)$ we have

$$(*) \qquad \mathrm{Tr}(\pi(u_j * \varphi)) = \int_O (\alpha_j \cdot \varphi \circ \exp)\hat{}\,(l) Q_j(l) d\beta_O(l),$$

where « $\wedge$ » stands for the ordinary Euclidian Fourier transform.

This construction is carried out in sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, the theorem is formulated in section 1.4, and section 2 is devoted to the proof of the theorem; in section 3 we give a few examples.

We would like to emphasize the following feature of the formula (*) shared by no other previously known character formula for (non-nilpotent) solvable Lie groups: once a Jordan-Hölder basis in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ has been selected, *all* objects in the formula are explicitly constructible (for a given orbit O and associated representation π), i. e. there is no choice (in particular of the weight function α_j, *cf.* [9], [4], [5], [6], [3]) involved in setting up the formula. This, in particular, opens the possibility of using the formula (*) as a starting point for the pairing between orbits and representations, first established by Bernat ([1]), for exponential groups, and thus extending to these groups Pukanszky's approach to the Kirillov theory of nilpotent groups, [7].

In the special case where $\mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent $\chi_j \equiv 1$ and $\alpha_j \equiv 1$. Therefore Q_j is invariant on $O \subset \Omega_j$, $d\pi(u_j)$ is a scalar, and the formula (*) then gives that $d\pi(u_j) = Q_j(O)\mathrm{I}$ and

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\pi(\varphi)) = \int_O (\varphi \circ \exp)\hat{}\,(l) d\beta_O(l),$$

so (*) reduces in particular to the Kirillov character formula.

The main difference between the results obtained in [3] and the results obtained here can be subsumed under the following points: i. We exhibit a *finite* collection of elements $u_j \in U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ to choose from so as to make a formula like (*) valid, ii. we *construct* such a finite collection explicitly, and iii. here the functions $g \to Q_j(ig)$ in (*) are (rather surprisingly) the polynomial functions corresponding to the u_j's via *symmetrization.*

The polynomials Q_j were first considered by Pukanszky in the nilpotent case ([8], [10]). We also use in an essential way the work of Pukanszky on exponential groups ([9]) and the work of Duflo-Raïs ([5]). Our methods are very different from those of [3].

We conjecture that our results can be extended to arbitrary connected, simply connected

solvable Lie groups (with the usual condition on the support of the function φ appearing in the formula analogous to (*), though; *cf.* e. g. [6]).

I would like to thank prof. L. Pukanszky for useful comments on the first version of the paper, and prof. M. Flensted-Jensen, as well as the referee, for a very careful reading of the manuscript which resulted in the elimination of a number of inaccuracies and obscurities.

1. Preliminaries and formulation of Theorem

In sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 we introduce the notation necessary to formulate our Theorem in section 1.4.

1.1. — Let G be a connected, simply connected solvable Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let $\mathfrak{f}_j$, $j=0, \ldots, m$, be a Jordan-Hölder sequence in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, i. e. a sequence of ideals such that $\mathfrak{f}_j \supset \mathfrak{f}_{j-1}$ and such that $\dim \mathfrak{f}_j = j$, $j=0, \ldots, m$.

Let $\lambda_j : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{C}$ be the root associated with the irreducible $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathfrak{f}_j/\mathfrak{f}_{j-1}$ (i. e. $\mathrm{ad}X(Z) = \lambda_j(X)Z \pmod{\mathfrak{f}_{j-1}}$ for all $Z \in \mathfrak{f}_j$, $X \in \mathfrak{g}$), and let $\Lambda_j : G \to \mathbb{C}^*$ be the continuous homomorphism with $\Lambda_j(\exp X) = e^{\lambda_j(X)}$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. We have $\mathrm{Ad}(s)Z = \Lambda_j(s)Z \pmod{\mathfrak{f}_{j-1}}$ for all $Z \in \mathfrak{f}_j$, $s \in G$.

We let G act in $\mathfrak{g}'$ via the coadjoint representation. For $g \in \mathfrak{g}'$ we have the skewsymmetric bilinearform $B_g : \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $B_g(X, Y) = \langle g, [X, Y] \rangle$, $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. The radical of B_g is equal to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_g$ of the stabilizer G_g of g : $\mathfrak{g}_g = \{ X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid B_g(X, Y) = 0 \text{ for all } Y \in \mathfrak{g} \}$. We let $\hat{B}_g : \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_g \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_g \to \mathbb{R}$ designate the symplectic form on $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_g$ arising from B_g by factorization. We extend g, B_g, etc. in the natural way to $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ whenever convenient.

For $g \in \mathfrak{g}'$ we set $\mathfrak{f}_j(g) = \mathfrak{f}_j + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, $j=0, \ldots, m$. We then have a sequence of subalgebras:

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f}_m(g) \supset \mathfrak{f}_{m-1}(g) \supset \ldots \supset \mathfrak{f}_1(g) \supset \mathfrak{f}_0(g) = (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}},$$

and $\dim \mathfrak{f}_j(g)/\mathfrak{f}_{j-1}(g) = 0$ or $= 1$.

For $g \in \mathfrak{g}'$ we define J_g to be the set $\{ 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m \mid \mathfrak{f}_j(g) \supsetneqq \mathfrak{f}_{j-1}(g) \}$.

Let $Z_j \in \mathfrak{f}_j \setminus \mathfrak{f}_{j-1}$, $j=1, \ldots, m$. Then $Z_1, \ldots, Z_m$ is a basis in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and we have

$$j \in J_g \Leftrightarrow Z_j \notin \mathfrak{f}_{j-1} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f}_{j-1}(g).$$

If $g \in \mathfrak{g}'$ and $J_g = \{ j_1 < \ldots < j_d \}$ we have

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f}_{j_d}(g) \supsetneqq \mathfrak{f}_{j_{d-1}}(g) \supsetneqq \ldots \supsetneqq \mathfrak{f}_{j_1}(g) \supsetneqq \mathfrak{f}_0(g) = (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}.$$

In particular $Z_{j_1}, \ldots, Z_{j_d}$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} \pmod{(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}}$, and $d = \dim \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_g$.

Set $\mathscr{E} = \{ J_g \mid g \in \mathfrak{g}' \}$, and for $e \in \mathscr{E}$, set $\Omega_e = \{ g \in \mathfrak{g}' \mid J_g = e \}$. Then we have $\mathfrak{g}' = \bigcup_{e \in \mathscr{E}} \Omega_e$ as a (finite) disjoint union. Since clearly $J_{sg} = J_g$ for $s \in G$, Ω_e is a G-invariant subset of $\mathfrak{g}'$.

Let $e \in \mathscr{E}$. If $e \neq \emptyset$ with $e = \{ j_1 < \ldots < j_d \}$ we define the skewsymmetric $d \times d$-*matrix* $M_e(g)$, $g \in \mathfrak{g}'$, by

$$M_e(g) = [B_g(Z_{j_r}, Z_{j_s})]_{1 \leqslant r, s \leqslant d},$$

and let $P_e(g)$ denote the Pfaffian of $M_e(g)$. If $e=\emptyset$ we set $M_e(g)=1$, and $P_e(g)=1$. The map $g \to P_e(g)$ is a complex valued polynomial function on $\mathfrak{g}'$, and $P_e(g)$ depends only on the restriction of g to $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$. P_e has the property that $P_e(g)^2 = \det M_e(g)$. We set $Q_e(g) = |\det M_e(g)| = |P_e(g)|^2$. $g \to Q_e(g)$ is a real valued non-negative polynomial function on $\mathfrak{g}'$.

For $e \in \mathscr{E}$ we set $\Lambda_e = \prod_{j \in e} \Lambda_j$.

LEMMA 1.1.1. — Let $e \in \mathscr{E}$. If $g \in \Omega_e$, then $P_e(g) \neq 0$ and $P_e(sg) = \Lambda_e(s)^{-1} P_e(g)$ for all $s \in G$.

Proof. — Write $e = \{j_1 < \ldots < j_d\}$. Since $Z_{j_1}, \ldots Z_{j_d}$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} \pmod{(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}}$ we have that $M_e(g)$ is a regular matrix, hence $P_e(g)^2 = \det M_e(g) \neq 0$.

Now writing

$$\mathrm{Ad}(s^{-1}) Z_{j_p} = \sum_{u=1}^{d} a_{up} Z_{j_u} + c_p,$$

where $c_p \in (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, we have $a_{up} = 0$ for $u > p$ and $a_{pp} = \Lambda_{j_p}(s^{-1})$, and

$$B_{sg}(Z_{j_p}, Z_{j_q}) = \langle sg, [Z_{j_p}, Z_{j_q}] \rangle = \langle g, [\mathrm{Ad}(s^{-1}) Z_{j_p}, \mathrm{Ad}(s^{-1}) Z_{j_q}] \rangle$$
$$= \sum_{u,v=1}^{d} a_{up} \langle g, [Z_{j_u}, Z_{j_v}] \rangle a_{vq} = ({}^t A M_e(g) A)_{p,q},$$

where A is the matrix $[a_{pq}]_{1 \leqslant p,q \leqslant d}$. This shows that $M_e(sg) = {}^t A M_e(g) A$, and since $\det A = \prod_{p=1}^{d} \Lambda_{j_p}(s^{-1}) = \Lambda_e(s^{-1})$ we find that

$$P_e(sg) = Pf(M_e(sg)) = Pf({}^t A M_e(g) A) = (\det A) Pf(M_e(g)) = \Lambda_e(s^{-1}) P_e(g).$$

This ends the proof of the lemma.

COROLLARY 1.1.2. — If $g \in \Omega_e$, then $Q_e(g) > 0$ and $Q_e(sg) = |\Lambda_e(s)|^{-2} Q_e(g)$ for all $s \in G$.

For $e \in \mathscr{E}$ we set $|e| =$ the number of elements in e. We define a total ordering $<$ on $\mathscr{E}$ in the following way: let $e, e' \in \mathscr{E}$. Then $e < e'$ if and only if either $|e| > |e'|$ or $d = |e| = |e'|$ and, writing $e = \{j_1 < \ldots < j_d\}, e' = \{j'_1 < \ldots < j'_d\}, j_p < j'_p$, where $p = \min\{|\, 1 \leqslant r \leqslant d | j_r \neq j'_r\}$.

LEMMA 1.1.3. — $\Omega_e = \{ g \in \mathfrak{g}' \mid Q_{e'}(g) = 0$ for $e' < e$ and $Q_e(g) \neq 0 \}$.

Proof. — If $g \in \Omega_e$ we saw in Corollary 1.1.2 that $Q_e(g) \neq 0$. If $e' < e$ and $|e'| > |e|$, then, if $e' = \{j'_1 < \ldots < j'_c\}$, $Z_{j'_1}, \ldots, Z_{j'_c}$ are linearly dependent $\pmod{(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}}$, so $M_{e'}(g)$ is singular, and therefore $Q_{e'}(g) = 0$. If $|e| = |e'|$, and $j_1 = j'_1, \ldots, j_p = j'_p$, $j'_{p+1} < j_{p+1}$, then $Z_{j'_{p+1}} \in \mathfrak{f}_{j_p} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and therefore $Z_{j'_1}, \ldots, Z_{j'_{p+1}}$ are linearly dependent $\pmod{(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}}$, and again $Q_{e'}(g) = 0$. This shows the lemma.

Remark 1.1.4. — If $\mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent our definitions agree with those given by Pukanszky in [10], p. 525 f. f., *cf.* also [8]. In [6], section 4.2 a study of the completely solvable case was initiated.

1.2. — Recall the following facts: there exists an isomorphism ω (the symmetrization map) between the complex vector space $S(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ (the symmetric algebra of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$), and the complex vector space $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ (the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$), characterized by the following

property: if $Y_1, \ldots, Y_p$ are elements in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, then the image of the element $Y_1 \ldots Y_p$ in $S(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ by ω is the element $(p!)^{-1}\sum_{\sigma\in S_p} Y_{\sigma(1)} \ldots Y_{\sigma(p)}$ in $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$, where S_p is the group of permutations of p elements. The following lemma is easily verified:

LEMMA 1.2.1. — If Z is a central element in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, then $\omega(Zu)=Z\omega(u)$ for all $u\in S(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$.

We can identify $S(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ with $\mathrm{Pol}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, the complex vector space of complex valued polynomial functions on $\mathfrak{g}'$. If $u\in U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ we let P_u be the polynomial on $\mathfrak{g}'$ corresponding to $\omega^{-1}(u)$. The lemma above then says that if Z is central in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and if $u\in U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$, then $P_{Zu}=P_Z P_u$.

For $e\in\mathscr{E}$, let u_e be the element in $U(\mathfrak{g})$ corresponding to the real valued polynomial function $g \to i^d Q_e(g)$ on $\mathfrak{g}'$. Note that u_e actually is contained in $U([\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}])$, since $Q_e(g)$ only depends on the restriction of g to $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$.

1.3. — If $g\in\mathfrak{g}'$, the weights of $\mathfrak{g}_g$ in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_g$ are of the form $\pm\mu_1, \ldots, \pm\mu_{d/2}$, where $d=\dim \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_g$, and these weights μ_j extend to linear forms, also called μ_j, on the ideal $\mathfrak{k}=\mathfrak{g}_g+[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ in such a manner that they are zero on $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ (*v.* [4], p. 248).

Following *loc. cit.* we set

$$S_\lambda(X)=\frac{\sin h(\lambda(X)/2)}{\lambda(X)/2},\ X\in\mathfrak{g},$$

for a complex linear form λ on $\mathfrak{g}$, and define the function P'_O on $\mathfrak{k}$ by

$$P'_O(X)=\prod_{j=1}^{d/2} S_{\mu_j}(X),\ X\in\mathfrak{k},$$

where $O=Gg$ is the G-orbit through g. This definition of P'_O does not depend on the choice of $g\in O$.

We set

$$j_G(X)=\left|\det\frac{1-e^{-\mathrm{ad}\,X}}{\mathrm{ad}\,X}\right|,\ X\in\mathfrak{g}.$$

j_G is a G-invariant analytic function on $\mathfrak{g}$, and if dX is a Lebesgue measure on $\mathfrak{g}$ there exists a Haar measure μ on G such that $d\mu(\exp X)=j_G(X)dX$.

If G is exponential we set for $e\in\mathscr{E}$,

$$\Gamma_e(X)=\left(\prod_{j\in e}|S_{\lambda_j}(X)|\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\ X\in\mathfrak{g}.$$

LEMMA 1.3.1. — (G exponential) Γ_e is a positive, G-invariant analytic function on $\mathfrak{g}$, extending P'_O for any G-orbit O contained in Ω_e.

Proof. — The function $X \to S_{\lambda_j}(X)$ is a G-invariant analytic function on $\mathfrak{g}$, and since $\mathfrak{g}$ is exponential $\lambda_j(X)\notin i\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ for all $X\in\mathfrak{g}$, hence $S_{\lambda_j}(X)\neq 0$ for all $X\in\mathfrak{g}$. This shows that Γ_e is positive, G-invariant and analytic. Now an easy argument shows that $P'_O(X)\geqslant 0$ for all $X\in\mathfrak{k}=\mathfrak{g}_g+[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ (*see* e. g. [4], p. 264 top; again we use that $\mathfrak{g}$ is exponential). Therefore

$$P'_O(X)=|P'_O(X)|=\prod_{j=1}^{d/2}|S_{\mu_j}(X)|=\left(\prod_{j=1}^{d/2}|S_{\mu_j}(X)|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}=\left(\prod_{j=1}^{d/2}(|S_{\mu_j}(X)|\,|S_{-\mu_j}(X)|)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and noting that λ_j vanishes on $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ and that the weights of $\mathfrak{g}_g$ in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_g$ are precisely

$$\{\lambda_{j_1}|\mathfrak{g}_g, \ldots, \lambda_{j_d}|\mathfrak{g}_g\}=\{\pm\mu_1|\mathfrak{g}_g, \ldots, \pm\mu_{d/2}|\mathfrak{g}_g\},$$

we get that $P'_O(X)=\Gamma_e(X)$ for $X\in\mathfrak{k}$. This proves the lemma.

We set

$$\alpha_e(X)=j_G(X)\Gamma_e(X)^{-1},\ X\in\mathfrak{g}$$

(still assuming that G is exponential). α_e is a positive, G-invariant analytic function on $\mathfrak{g}$.

REMARK 1.3.2. — Lemma 1.3.1 should be compared with [4], section 4, p. 262-264. In the exponential case the result *loc. cit.* is that there exists a G-invariant Zariski open subset Ω of $\mathfrak{g}'$ and a positive, G-invariant analytic function P on $\mathfrak{g}$, such that for any G-orbit O contained in Ω the restriction of P to $\mathfrak{k}=\mathfrak{g}_g+[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$, $g\in O$, is equal to P'_O. By Lemma 1.3.1 and Lemma 1.1.3 we can obtain this result by taking Ω to be Ω_e for the minimal element e in $\mathscr{E}$, and taking P to be Γ_e. In general the P from *loc. cit.* will be different from the one exhibited here. Incidentally, by refining the methods used here can give a complete solution to the problem raised, and partially solved, by Duflo, *loc. cit.*, p. 263, mid. However, at present this will not be needed, so we shall postpone it to a later time.

1.4. — Suppose now that G is exponential, and suppose in addition that the Jordan-Hölder sequence $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{f}_m\supset\ldots\supset\mathfrak{f}_0=\{0\}$ has the property that if $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_j\neq\mathfrak{f}_j$, then $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-1}=\mathfrak{f}_{j-1}$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_{j+1}=\mathfrak{f}_{j+1}$, $1\leqslant j\leqslant m-1$ (such a Jordan-Hölder sequence clearly exists). Set $\chi_e=|\Lambda_e|^{-2}$.

Theorem 1.4.1. — (G exponential) Let π be an irreducible representation of G, and let O be the G-orbit in $\mathfrak{g}'$ associated with π. Let $e\in\mathscr{E}$ be the unique element such that Ω_e contains O. Then

1) The measure $Q_e\beta_O$ is a non-zero, positive, tempered, relatively invariant Radon measure on O with multiplier $\chi_e\cdot$ (β_O is the canonical measure on O.)

2) The operator $d\pi(u_e)$ is a selfadjoint, positive, invertible operator, semi-invariant under π with multiplier χ_e (i. e. $\pi(s)d\pi(u_e)\pi(s^{-1})=\chi_e(s^{-1})d\pi(u_e)$).

3) For any $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(G)$ the operator $\pi(u_e*\varphi)$ is traceclass.

4) The functional $\varphi\to\mathrm{Tr}\,(\pi(u_e*\varphi))$ on $C_c^\infty(G)$ is a non-zero, χ_e-semi-invariant distribution on G of positive type (a distribution semicharacter for π (with multiplier χ_e)).

5) For any $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(G)$ we have the formula

$$(*)\qquad \mathrm{Tr}\,(\pi(u_e*\varphi))=\int_O(\alpha_e\cdot\varphi\circ\exp)\hat{}\,(l)Q_e(l)d\beta_O(l).$$

Here we use the notation $\hat{\psi}(l)=\int_{\mathfrak{g}}\psi(X)e^{i\langle X,l\rangle}dX$ for $\psi\in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$, $l\in\mathfrak{g}'$, where dX is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathfrak{g}$ with the property that $d\mu(\exp X)=j_G(X)dX$, $d\mu$ being a fixed Haar measure on G, and $\pi(\varphi)=\int_G\varphi(s)\pi(s)d\mu(s)$ for $\varphi\in L^1(G)$.

REMARK 1.4.2. — In the formula (*) above we can instead of α_e use any C^∞-function α on $\mathfrak{g}$ with the property that the restriction of α to $\mathfrak{k}=\mathfrak{g}_g+[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$, $g\in O$, is the same as the restriction of α_e to $\mathfrak{k}$.

REMARK 1.4.3. — It will follow from the proof of Theorem 1.4.1 that the distributions $\varphi \to \mathrm{Tr}\,(\pi(u_e * \varphi))$ have a finite order not exceeding $2d+1$, where $d = |e|$.

2. Proof of Theorem

Here we shall for brevity say that a Jordan-Hölder sequence $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f}_m \supset \ldots \supset \mathfrak{f}_0 = \{0\}$ is of class (*b*) if it has the property required in 1.4 (i. e. that $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_j \neq \mathfrak{f}_j$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m-1$, implies that $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-1} = \mathfrak{f}_{j-1}$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_{j+1} = \mathfrak{f}_{j+1}$), *cf.* [2] Définition 4.2.1, pp. 78.

2.1. — The purpose of this subsection is to prove the following lemma, from which part 1) of Theorem 1.4.1 follows immediately.

LEMMA 2.1.1. — The measure $P_e\beta_O$ is a non-zero, tempered, Λ_e^{-1}-relatively invariant (complex) Radon measure on O.

REMARK 2.1.2. — In the completely solvable case this was proved in [6], section 4.1.*d*. The proof *loc. cit.* does not carry over to the case at hand, so we have to modify our approach.

Proof. — We have only left to show that $P_e\beta_O$ is tempered, *cf.* Lemma 1.1.1.

(i) Let I be the set of indices $0 \leqslant j \leqslant m$ for which $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_j = \mathfrak{f}_j$. For $j \in I$ there exists an ideal $\mathfrak{g}_j$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $(\mathfrak{g}_j)_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f}_j$.

Set $I' = \{ j \in I \mid j-1 \in I \}$ and $I'' = \{ j \in I \setminus \{0\} \mid j-1 \notin I \}$. Then $I = \{0\} \cup I' \cup I''$ as a disjoint union, and for $j \in I''$ we have that $j-2 \in I$ (since $\mathfrak{f}_0, \ldots, \mathfrak{f}_m$ is of class (*b*)).

Now since Λ_e only depends on the Jordan-Hölder sequence $\mathfrak{f}_j$ and not on the basis Z_j we can assume here that the Z_j's are constructed in the following way: for $j \in I'$, let $X_j \in \mathfrak{g}_j \setminus \mathfrak{g}_{j-1}$, and set $Z_j = X_j$. For $j \in I''$, pick $Z_{j-1} \in \mathfrak{f}_{j-1} \setminus \mathfrak{f}_{j-2}$. Since $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-1} \neq \mathfrak{f}_{j-1}$ we have that $\overline{Z}_{j-1} \in \mathfrak{f}_j \setminus \mathfrak{f}_{j-1}$. Set $Z_j = \overline{Z}_{j-1}$, and define X_{j-1}, X_j by $Z_j = X_{j-1} + iX_j$. Then X_{j-1}, X_j is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_j \pmod{\mathfrak{g}_{j-2}}$, and $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $g_1, \ldots, g_m \in \mathfrak{g}'$ be the basis dual to $X_1, \ldots, X_m$.

Fix an element $g \in O$, and write $e = J_g = \{ j_1 < \ldots < j_d \}$. Set $D_1 = \{ 1 \leqslant k \leqslant d \mid j_k \in I' \}$, $D_2 = \{ 1 \leqslant k \leqslant d \mid j_k \notin I, j_k + 1 \notin J_g \}$, $D_3 = \{ 1 \leqslant k \leqslant d \mid j_k \notin I, j_k + 1 \in J_g \}$, $D_4 = \{ 1 \leqslant k \leqslant d \mid j_k \in I'' \}$. Clearly $\{1, \ldots, d\} = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4$ as a disjoint union. Observe that if $k \in D_3$, then clearly $k+1 \in D_4$. Conversely, if $k \in D_4$, then $j = j_k \in I'' \cap J_g$, and therefore $j-1 \in J_g$; in fact, if $j-1 \notin J_g$, then $Z_{j-1} \in \mathfrak{f}_{j-2} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, that is, $X_{j-1} - iX_j \in (\mathfrak{g}_{j-2})_{\mathbb{C}} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, implying that X_{j-1}, $X_j \in \mathfrak{g}_{j-2} + \mathfrak{g}_g$; but then $Z_j = X_{j-1} + iX_j \in (\mathfrak{g}_{j-2})_{\mathbb{C}} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f}_{j-2} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$ and therefore $j \notin J_g$ which is a contradiction. The conclusion of this is that $D_4 = \{ k+1 \mid k \in D_3 \}$.

For $j \in I$, set $G_g^j = \{ s \in G \mid sg = g \pmod{\mathfrak{g}_j^\perp} \}$. G_g^j is a closed, connected subgroup with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_g^j = \{ X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid Xg \in \mathfrak{g}_j^\perp \}$ (*cf.* [9], p. 105, III). Clearly $j \to \mathfrak{g}_g^j$, $j \in I$, is a decreasing sequence of subalgebras with $\mathfrak{g}_g^0 = \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_g^m = \mathfrak{g}_g$.

If $j \in I'$, then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_g^{j-1}/\mathfrak{g}_g^j = 0$ or $=1$, and $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j-1} \supsetneq \mathfrak{g}_g^j$ if and only if $j \in J_g$. If $j \in I''$, then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_g^{j-2}/\mathfrak{g}_g^j = 0$, $=1$ or $=2$, and $\dim \mathfrak{g}_g^{j-2}/\mathfrak{g}_g^j = 2$ if and only if $j, j-1 \in J_g$, $\dim \mathfrak{g}_g^{j-2}/\mathfrak{g}_g^j = 1$ if and only if $j-1 \in J_g$, $j \notin J_g$.

(ii) The following is an adaptation of [9], p. 102-106, II-III to the present situation:

For $k \in D_1$ there exists an element Y_k in $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k-1} \setminus \mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k}$ such that Y_k is a coexponential basis to $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k}$ in $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k-1}$ and such that $Y_k g = g_{j_k} \pmod{\mathfrak{g}_{j_k}^{\perp}}$, and for $s \in G_g^{j_k}$ we have

$$\mathrm{Ad}(s)Y_k = \Lambda_{j_k}(s^{-1})Y_k \pmod{\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k}}.$$

For $k \in D_2$ there exists an element Y_k in $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k-1} \setminus \mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k+1}$ such that Y_k is a coexponential basis to $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k+1}$ in $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k-1}$, and such that $Y_k g = g_{j_k} \pmod{\mathfrak{g}_{j_k+1}^{\perp}}$ (to obtain this it can be necessary to change X_{j_k}, X_{j_k+1} in a way that only affects Z_{j_k}, Z_{j_k+1} by multiplying them by a factor of modulus one), and for $s \in G_g^{j_k+1}$ we have $\mathrm{Ad}(s)Y_k = \Lambda_{j_k}(s^{-1})Y_k \pmod{\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k+1}}$ (so in particular $\Lambda_{j_k}(s^{-1})$ is real).

For $k \in D_3$ there exists elements Y_k, Y_{k+1} in $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k-1} \setminus \mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k+1}$ such that $Y_k g = g_{j_k} \pmod{\mathfrak{g}_{j_k+1}^{\perp}}$, $Y_{k+1} g = g_{j_{k+1}} \pmod{\mathfrak{g}_{j_{k+1}}^{\perp}}$, such that Y_k, Y_{k+1} is a coexponential basis to $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k+1}$ in $\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k-1}$, such that $\lambda_{j_k}(Y_k) = \lambda_{j_k}(Y_{k+1}) = 0$ and such that

$$\exp t_k Y_k \exp t_{k+1} Y_{k+1} = \exp(t_k Y_k + t_{k+1} Y_{k+1}) \pmod{G_g^{j_k+1}}$$
$$= \exp t_{k+1} Y_{k+1} \exp t_k Y_k \pmod{G_g^{j_k+1}}.$$

For $s \in G_g^{j_k+1}$ we have $\mathrm{Ad}(s)(Y_k + iY_{k+1}) = \Lambda_{j_k}(s^{-1})(Y_k + iY_{k+1}) \pmod{(\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_k+1})_{\mathbb{C}}}$.

(iii) The map $\mathbb{R}^d \to O = Gg$ given by

$$(*) \qquad (t_1, \ldots, t_d) \to \exp t_1 Y_1 \ldots \exp t_d Y_d g$$

is a differeomorphism. We shall compute the canonical measure β_O in terms of the coordinates $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_d)$.

Let ω be the canonical symplectic form on O. Via the natural correspondence between $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_g$ and the tangent space to O at g, ω_g corresponds to $\hat{B}_g$.

LEMMA 2.1.3. — For a β_O-integrable function f on O we have

$$\int_O f(l) d\beta_O(l) = C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\exp t_1 Y_1 \ldots \exp t_d Y_d g) \prod_{k<r} |\Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_r Y_r)| \, dt_1 \ldots dt_d,$$

where $C = ((2\pi)^d Q_e(g))^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

Proof. — Denote by σ the inverse of the map (*). σ is a global chart and

$$\int_O f(l) d\beta_O(l) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\sigma^{-1}(t)) \theta(\sigma^{-1}(t)) dt,$$

where $\theta(l) = (\det S_l)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, S_l being the skewsymmetric matrix $S_l = [\omega_l(\partial/\partial t_u, \partial/\partial t_v)]_{1 \leq u,v \leq d}$ ([9] Proposition 4, p. 99).

Now ω is G-invariant. Therefore, writing $s = \exp t_1 Y_1 \ldots \exp t_d Y_d$ and $l = sg$, we have

$$\omega_l((\partial/\partial t_u)_l, (\partial/\partial t_v)_l) = \omega_{sg}((\partial/\partial t_u)_{sg}, (\partial/\partial t_v)_{sg})$$
$$\omega_g(\gamma(s^{-1}) * (\partial/\partial t_u)_{sg}, \gamma(s^{-1}) * (\partial/\partial t_v)_{sg}),$$

where $\gamma(s) : l \to sl$. Let us then compute $\gamma(s^{-1}) * (\partial/\partial t_u)_{sg}$:

For a differentiable function φ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(s^{-1})_*(\partial/\partial t_u)_{sg}\varphi &= (\partial/\partial t_u)_{sg}\varphi\circ\gamma(s^{-1})\\ &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\varphi(s^{-1}\sigma^{-1}(t+\tau^u))\,|_{\tau=0} \qquad (\tau^u=(\delta_{uv}\tau)_{1\leqslant v\leqslant d})\\ &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\varphi(\exp -t_dY_d \ldots \exp -t_1Y_1 \exp t_1Y_1 \ldots \exp (t_u+\tau)Y_u \ldots \exp t_dY_d g|_{\tau=0}\\ &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\varphi(\exp -t_dY_d \ldots \exp -t_{u+1}Y_{u+1} \exp \tau Y_u \exp t_{u+1}Y_{u+1} \ldots \exp t_dY_d g)\,|_{\tau=0}\\ &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\varphi(s_u^{-1} \exp \tau Y_u s_u g)\,|_{\tau=0}=\frac{d}{d\tau}\varphi(\exp \tau \operatorname{Ad}(s_u^{-1})Y_u g)\,|_{\tau=0},\end{aligned}$$

where we have set $s_u=\exp t_{u+1}Y_{u+1}\ldots\exp t_dY_d$, $u<d$, $s_d=e$.

The conclusion of this is that $S_l=[B_g(\operatorname{Ad}(s_u^{-1})Y_u, \operatorname{Ad}(s_v^{-1})Y_v)]_{1\leqslant u,v\leqslant d}$. Since $Y_1,\ldots,Y_d$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}\,(\mathrm{mod}\,\mathfrak{g}_g)$ we can write

$$\operatorname{Ad}(s_u^{-1})Y_u=\textstyle\sum_{p=1}^{d}a_{pu}Y_p+c_u,$$

where $c_u\in\mathfrak{g}_g$, and then $S_l={}^tAS_gA$, where A is the matrix $[a_{uv}]_{1\leqslant u,v\leqslant d}$, so that $\theta(l)=|\det A|\,\theta(g)$.

We shall then find $\det A$: for $u\in D_1$ we have that $s_u\in G_g^{j_u}$, so $\operatorname{Ad}(s_u^{-1})Y_u=\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)Y_u\,(\mathrm{mod}\,\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_u})$, implying that $a_{uu}=\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)$, while $a_{uv}=0$ for $u<v$. For $u\in D_2$ we have

$$\operatorname{Ad}(s_u^{-1})Y_u=\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)Y_u\,(\mathrm{mod}\,\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_u+1})$$

implying that $a_{uu}=\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)=|\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)|$, while $a_{uv}=0$ for $u<v$. For $u\in D_3$ we have

$$\operatorname{Ad}(s_u^{-1})(Y_u+iY_{u+1})=\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)(Y_u+iY_{u+1})\,(\mathrm{mod}\,\mathfrak{g}_g^{j_u+1}),$$

implying that

$$\det\begin{bmatrix}a_{uu} & a_{uu+1}\\ a_{u+1u} & a_{u+1u+1}\end{bmatrix}=|\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)|^2,$$

while $a_{uv}=0$ and $a_{u+1v}=0$ for $v>u+1$. It follows that

$$\det A=\prod_{u\in D_1\cup D_2}|\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)|\cdot\prod_{u\in D_3}|\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)|^2.$$

Now for $u\in D_3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)&=\Lambda_{j_u}(\exp t_{u+1}Y_{u+1}\ldots\exp t_dY_d)\\ &=\Lambda_{j_u}(\exp t_{u+2}Y_{u+2}\ldots\exp t_dY_d)=\overline{\Lambda_{j_{u+1}}(\exp t_{u+2}Y_{u+2}\ldots\exp t_dY_d)}=\overline{\Lambda_{j_{u+1}}(s_{u+1})},\end{aligned}$$

so $|\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)|=|\Lambda_{j_{u+1}}(s_{u+1})|$, hence $\det A=\prod_{u=1}^{d}|\Lambda_{j_u}(s_u)|=\prod_{1\leqslant u<r\leqslant d}|\Lambda_{j_u}(\exp t_rY_r)|$.

Finally, a simple computation shows that $\det S_g = \det [B_g(Y_r, Y_s)]_{1 \leqslant r,s \leqslant d} = Q_e(g)^{-1}$. This ends the proof of the lemma.

(iv) For $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m$ we define the function S_j by

$$S_j(t_1, \ldots, t_d) = \langle \exp t_1 Y_1 \ldots \exp t_d Y_d g, Z_j \rangle .$$

We consider S_{j_k}: arguing like in [9], p. 106 we find for $k \in D_1 \cup D_2$:

$$S_{j_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_d) = \frac{e^{-t_k}\lambda_{j_k}(Y_k)^{-1}}{-\lambda_{j_k}(Y_k)} \prod_{r<k} \Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_r Y_r)^{-1} + S_{j_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_{k-1}, 0, \ldots, 0),$$

and for $k \in D_4$ we find

$$S_{j_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_d) = (t_{k-1} + it_k) \prod_{r<k-1} \Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_r Y_r)^{-1} + S_{j_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_{k-2}, 0, \ldots, 0).$$

(v) For a real number $n > 0$ we set $M(n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1+x^2)^{-n/2} dx$. We have $0 < M(n) \leq +\infty$ and $M(n) < +\infty$ if and only if $n > 1$.

LEMMA 2.1.4. — Let a, α, β be real numbers with $a > 0$, $\alpha \neq 0$, and let c, k be complex numbers with $k \neq 0$. We have

$$(*) \qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}} (a + |ke^{(\alpha+i\beta)t} - c|^2)^{-n/2} e^{\alpha t} dt < \frac{M(n)}{|\alpha|\,|k|\,a^{(n-1)/2}},$$

$$(**) \qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}_2} (a + |k(s+it) - c|^2)^{-n/2} ds dt = \frac{M(n)M(n-1)}{|k|^2 a^{(n-2)/2}}.$$

Proof. — Obviously we can assume that $k > 0$. Writing $k^{-1}c = be^{i\gamma}$, $b \geqslant 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}} (a + |ke^{(\alpha+i\beta)t} - c|^2)^{-n/2} e^{\alpha t} dt &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (a + k^2 |e^{\alpha t + i(t\beta - \gamma)} - b|^2)^{-n/2} e^{\alpha t} dt \\
&\leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}} (a + k^2 |e^{\alpha t} - b|^2)^{-n/2} e^{\alpha t} dt \\
&= |\alpha|^{-1} \int_0^{\infty} (a + k^2 |x - b|^2)^{-n/2} dx \\
&< |\alpha|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (a + k^2 |x - b|^2)^{-n/2} dx \\
&= |\alpha|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (a + k^2 x^2)^{-n/2} dx \\
&= \frac{M(n)}{|\alpha|\, k a^{(n-1)/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (*). Similarly for (**).

(vi) We shall then prove the temperedness of the measure $P_e\beta_O$. First observe that

$l \to (\sum_{j=1}^{m} |\langle l, Z_j \rangle|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} = ||l||$ is a norm on $\mathfrak{g}'$. We must show that we can find $n>0$ such that $\int_O (1+||l||^2)^{-n/2} |P_e(l)| d\beta_O(l)$ is finite. We have, using Lemma 2.1.3:

$$\int_O (1+||l||^2)^{-n/2} |P_e(l)| d\beta_O(l)$$

$$= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|P_e(\exp t_1 Y_1 \dots \exp t_d Y_d g)|}{(1+||\exp t_1 Y_1 \dots \exp t_d Y_d g||^2)^{n/2}} \prod_{k<r} |\Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_r Y_r)| \, dt_1 \dots dt_d$$

$$= (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\prod_{r \leq k} |\Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_r Y_r)|^{-1}}{(1+\sum_{j=1}^{m} |S_j(t_1, \dots, t_d)|^2)^{n/2}} dt_1 \dots dt_d$$

$$\leq (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\prod_{r \leq k} |\Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_r Y_r)|^{-1}}{(1+\sum_{k \notin D_3}^{d} |S_{j_k}(t_1, \dots, t_d)|^2)^{n/2}} dt_1 \dots dt_d.$$

Suppose first that $d \in D_1 \cup D_2$. Then (assuming that $\lambda_{j_d}(Y_d) \neq 0$)

$$S_{j_d}(t_1, \dots, t_d) = \frac{e^{-t_d \lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)} - 1}{-\lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)} \prod_{r<d} \Lambda_{j_d}(\exp t_r Y_r)^{-1} + S_{j_d}(t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}, 0),$$

and the last integral is equal to

$$(2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \prod_{r \leq k \leq d-1} |\Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_r Y_r)|^{-1} dt_1 \dots dt_{d-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F(t_1, \dots, t_d) dt_d,$$

where

$$F(t_1, \dots, t_d) = \frac{\Pi_{r=1}^{d} |\Lambda_{j_d}(\exp t_r Y_r)|^{-1}}{(1+\sum_{k \notin D_3}^{d-1} |S_{j_k}(t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}, 0)|^2 + |S_{j_d}(t_1, \dots, t_d)|^2)^{n/2}}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.1.4 with $a = 1+\sum_{k \notin D_3}^{d-1} |S_{j_k}(t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}, 0)|^2$, $\alpha + i\beta = -\lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)$, $k = -\lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)^{-1} \prod_{r<d} \Lambda_{j_d}(\exp t_r Y_r)^{-1}$, $c = -S_{j_d}(t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}, 0) - \lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)^{-1} \prod_{r<d} \Lambda_{j_d}(\exp t_r Y_r)^{-1}$ we find that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} F(t_1, \dots, t_d) dt_d \leq \frac{C_d \cdot M(n)}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{(1+\sum_{k \notin D_3}^{d-1} |S_{j_k}(t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}, 0)|^2)^{(n-1)/2}},$$

where $C_d = |\lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)| (|\operatorname{Re} \lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)|)^{-1}$ (note that since $\mathfrak{g}$ is exponential the non-vanishing of $\lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)$ implies the non-vanishing of $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_d(Y_d))$, and therefore

$$\int_O (1+||l||^2)^{-n/2} |P_e(l)| d\beta_O(l)$$

$$(\#) \qquad \leq \frac{C_d \cdot M(n)}{(2\pi)^d} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{\prod_{r \leq k \leq d-1} |\Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_r Y_r)|^{-1}}{(1+\sum_{k \notin D_3}^{d-1} |S_{j_k}(t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}, 0)|^2)^{(n-1)/2}} \, dt_1 \dots dt_{d-1}.$$

If $\lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)=0$ a simple change in the argument shows that the same relation is valid with $C_d=1$ (*cf.* below).

Suppose next that $d\in D_4$. Then

$$S_{j_d}(t_1, \ldots, t_d)=(t_{d-1}+it_d)\prod_{r\leqslant d-2}\Lambda_{j_d}(\exp t_rY_r)^{-1}+S_{j_d}(t_1, \ldots, t_{d-2}, 0, 0),$$

and therefore we find as above that

$$\int_O(1+\|l\|^2)^{-n/2}\,|P_e(l)|\,d\beta_O(l)$$
$$\leqslant(2\pi)^{-d/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-2}}\prod_{r\leqslant k\leqslant d-2}\Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_rY_r)^{-1}dt_1\ldots dt_{d-2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}F(t_1, \ldots, t_d)dt_{d-1}dt_d,$$

where now

$$F(t_1, \ldots, t_d)=\frac{\prod_{r=1}^{d-2}|\Lambda_{j_d}(\exp t_rY_r)|^{-2}}{(1+\sum_{k\notin D_3}^{d-2}|S_{j_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_{d-2}, 0, 0)|^2+|S_{j_d}(t_1, \ldots, t_d)|^2)^{n/2}}$$

(here we have used that $|\Lambda_{j_d}|=|\Lambda_{j_{d-1}}|$ and that

$$\lambda_{j_{d-1}}(Y_{d-1})=\lambda_{j_d}(Y_{d-1})=\lambda_{j_{d-1}}(Y_d)=\lambda_{j_d}(Y_d)=0).$$

Applying the relation (**) in Lemma 2.1.4 with $a=1+\sum_{k\notin D_3}^{d-2}|S_{j_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_{d-2}, 0, 0)|^2$, $k=\prod_{r=1}^{d-2}\Lambda_{j_d}(\exp t_rY_r)^{-1}$, and $c=-S_{j_d}(t_1, \ldots, t_{d-2}, 0, 0)$ we find that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}F(t_1, \ldots, t_d)dt_{d-1}dt_d\leqslant\frac{M(n)M(n-1)}{(2\pi)^{d/2}}\cdot\frac{1}{(1+\sum_{k\notin D_3}^{d-2}|S_{j_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_{d-2}, 0, 0)|^2)^{(n-2)/2}},$$

and therefore

$$\int_O(1+\|l\|^2)^{-n/2}\,|P_e(l)|\,d\beta_O(l)$$
$$(\#\#)\qquad\leqslant\frac{M(n)M(n-1)}{(2\pi)^{d/2}}\cdot\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-2}}\frac{\prod_{r\leqslant k\leqslant d-2}|\Lambda_{j_k}(\exp t_rY_r)|^{-1}}{(1+\sum_{k\notin D_3}^{d-2}|S_{j_k}(t_1, \ldots, t_{d-2}, 0, 0)|^2)^{(n-2)/2}}dt_1\ldots dt_{d-2}.$$

Repeating these two methods of estimation on the new integral (#) or (##) we find that

$$\int_O(1+\|l\|^2)^{-n/2}\,|P_e(l)|\,d\beta_O(l)\leqslant(2\pi)^{-d/2}M(n)\ldots M(n-d+1)C_d\ldots C_1<+\infty$$

for $n>d$. Here $C_k=|\lambda_{j_k}(Y_k)|(|\operatorname{Re}\lambda_{j_k}(Y_k)|)^{-1}$ if $\lambda_{j_k}(Y_k)\neq 0$, and $C_k=1$ if $\lambda_{j_k}(Y_k)=0$. This ends the proof of Lemma 2.1.1.

2.2. — The purpose of this subsection is to prove Proposition 2.2.1 below.

Let $\mathfrak{n}$ be the nilradical of $\mathfrak{g}$, and let N be the analytic subgroup corresponding to $\mathfrak{n}$. We have $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]\subset\mathfrak{n}\subset\mathfrak{g}$, and therefore $u_e\in U(n)$.

PROPOSITION 2.2.1. — If $g \in \Omega_e$ and if π is the irreducible representation of N corresponding to the orbit $O = Nf$, where $f = g \mid \mathfrak{n}$, then

$$d\pi(u_e) = Q_e(g)I.$$

REMARK 2.2.2. — Even in the special case where $\mathfrak{g}$ is assumed to be nilpotent (and therefore $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}$), Proposition 2.2.1 provides a new result.

Proof. — The proof is by induction on the dimension of $\mathfrak{g}$. The proposition is clearly valid for $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 1$ (in which case $e = \emptyset$, and $Q_e \equiv 1$, $u_e = 1$). Assume then that the proposition has been proved for all dimensions of $\mathfrak{g}$ less than or equal to $m-1$, and that $\dim \mathfrak{g} = m$. The case $e = \emptyset$ being trivial we can assume that $e \neq \emptyset$, and write $e = \{ j_1 < \ldots < j_d \}$.

Case (a) : Suppose that there exists a non-trivial abelian ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $g \mid \mathfrak{a} = 0$. Let A be the analytic subgroup of G corresponding to $\mathfrak{a}$. We have $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{n}$ and setting $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{a}, \tilde{\mathfrak{n}} = \mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}$ is the nilradical of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. We set $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j = \mathfrak{f}_j + a_{\mathbb{C}}/a_{\mathbb{C}}$, $0 \leqslant j \leqslant m$, and let $c : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{a}$ denote the coset map. Then we have the diagram

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbb{C}} = \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_m \supset \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-1} \supset \ldots \supset \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1 \supset \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_0 = \{ 0 \},$$

and $\dim \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j / \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-1} = 0$ or $= 1$. Set $I = \{ 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m \mid \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j \supsetneq \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-1} \}$, write $I = \{ i_1 < \ldots < i_{m'} \}$, and set $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_j = \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{i_j}$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m'$. We then have a Jordan-Hölder sequence in $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbb{C}}$:

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbb{C}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{m'} \supset \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{m'-1} \supset \ldots \supset \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_1 \supset \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_0 = \{ 0 \}$$

which is immediately seen to be of class (*b*), and setting $\tilde{Z}_j = c(Z_{i_j})$ we have that

$$\tilde{Z}_j \in \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_j \setminus \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-1}, j = 1, \ldots, m'.$$

Define $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}'$ by $\tilde{g} \circ c = g$ and $\tilde{f} = \tilde{g} \mid \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}$. We have $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_g$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\tilde{g}} = \mathfrak{g}_g/\mathfrak{a}$. Moreover, $j \in J_g \Rightarrow j \in I$, since $j \notin I \Rightarrow \mathfrak{f}_j \subset \mathfrak{f}_{j-1} + \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathfrak{f}_{j-1} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}} \Rightarrow j \notin J_g$. Writing

$$\tilde{e} = J_{\tilde{g}} = \{ \tilde{j}_1 < \ldots < \tilde{j}_d \}$$

we have $J_g = \{ i_{\tilde{j}_1} < \ldots < i_{\tilde{j}_d} \} = \{ j_1 < \ldots < j_d \}$. For $\tilde{l} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}'$ we then have with $l = \tilde{l} \circ c$:

$$Q_e(l) = \mid \det [B_l(Z_{j_r}, Z_{j_s})]_{1 \leqslant r,s \leqslant d} \mid = \mid \det [B_l(Z_{i_{\tilde{j}_r}}, Z_{i_{\tilde{j}_s}})]_{1 \leqslant r,s \leqslant d} \mid$$
$$= \mid \det [B_{\tilde{l}}(\tilde{Z}_{\tilde{j}_r}, \tilde{Z}_{\tilde{j}_s})]_{1 \leqslant r,s \leqslant d} \mid = Q_{\tilde{e}}(\tilde{l}).$$

This shows that the canonical image of u_e in $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ is precisely $u_{\tilde{e}}$ ($\in U(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}})$). Now the representation π is trivial on A, so there exists an irreducible representation $\tilde{\pi}$ of $\tilde{N} = N/A$ such that $\tilde{\pi} \circ (c \mid N) = \pi$, and the orbit of $\tilde{\pi}$ is $\tilde{N}\tilde{f}$. But since $\tilde{g} \in \Omega_{\tilde{e}}$ we have $d\tilde{\pi}(u_{\tilde{e}}) = Q_e(\tilde{g})I$ by the induction hypothesis, and therefore $d\pi(u_e) = d\tilde{\pi}(c(u_e)) = d\tilde{\pi}(u_{\tilde{e}}) = Q_{\tilde{e}}(\tilde{g})I = Q_e(g)I$. This ends case (a).

Case (b) : Suppose that we are not in case (a) and that $\lambda_1 \not\equiv 0$.

Write $Z_1 = X_1 + iY_1$ and set $\mathfrak{a} = \mathbb{R}X_1 + \mathbb{R}Y_1$. Then $\mathfrak{a}$ is an abelian ideal (of dimension 1 or 2), and $g \mid \mathfrak{a} \not\equiv 0$ (since otherwise we would be in case (a)), and therefore $\langle g, Z_1 \rangle \neq 0$.

Since G is exponential we can write $\lambda_1(X) = \alpha_1(X)(1 + ik_1)$, where α_1 is a real linear form on $\mathfrak{g}$, and where k_1 is a real number.

Set $\mathfrak{h}=\ker\lambda_1$ $(=\ker\alpha_1)$. $\mathfrak{h}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ of codimension 1 with $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]\subset\mathfrak{n}\subset\mathfrak{h}$, so the nilradical of $\mathfrak{h}$ is $\mathfrak{n}$. Clearly $Z_1\in\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Set $p=\min\{1\leqslant j\leqslant m \mid Z_j\notin\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}\}$. p is well-defined and $p\geqslant 2$. We observe that $p\in J_g=e$. In fact, suppose $p\notin J_g$. Then $Z_p\in\mathfrak{f}_{p-1}+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and therefore $0\neq\langle g,[Z_p,\mathfrak{f}_1]\rangle=\langle Z_pg,\mathfrak{f}_1\rangle=\langle\mathfrak{f}_{p-1}g,\mathfrak{f}_1\rangle=\langle g,[\mathfrak{f}_{p-1},\mathfrak{f}_1]\rangle=0$, which is a contradiction. Also $1\in J_g$, since otherwise $Z_1\in(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and therefore

$$0=\langle g,[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{f}_1]\rangle=\langle g,\mathfrak{f}_1\rangle\neq 0.$$

We also note that $\mathfrak{g}_g\subset\mathfrak{h}$, since otherwise $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{h}+\mathfrak{g}_g$ and therefore $0=\langle\mathfrak{g}g,\mathfrak{f}_1\rangle=\langle g,\mathfrak{f}_1\rangle\neq 0$.

Set $\hat{Z}_j=Z_j$ for $1\leqslant j\leqslant p-1$, $\hat{Z}_j=Z_{j+1}+c_{j+1}Z_p$ for $p\leqslant j\leqslant m-1$ and $\hat{Z}_m=Z_p$. Here c_j, $p+1\leqslant j\leqslant m$, is defined such that $Z_j+c_jZ_p\in\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$. This is possible since $\mathbb{C}Z_p\oplus\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Clearly $\hat{Z}_1,\ldots,\hat{Z}_m$ is a basis in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Set $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j=\mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_1\oplus\ldots\oplus\mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_j$. For $0\leqslant j\leqslant p-1$ we have that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j=\mathfrak{f}_j$. For $p-1\leqslant j\leqslant m-1$ we have $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j\oplus\mathbb{C}Z_p=\mathfrak{f}_{j+1}$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j=\mathfrak{f}_j \quad \text{for} \quad 0\leqslant j\leqslant p-1,\\ &\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j=\mathfrak{f}_{j+1}\cap\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} \quad \text{for} \quad p-1\leqslant j\leqslant m-1,\\ &\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_m=\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}.\end{aligned}$$

From this it follows that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j, j=0,\ldots,m$, is a Jordan-Hölder sequence for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-1}=\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$. We claim it is of class (b). In fact, since $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{p-1}=\mathfrak{f}_p\cap\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\bar{\hat{\mathfrak{f}}}_{p-1}=\mathfrak{f}_{p-1}$ it follows that $\bar{\hat{\mathfrak{f}}}_{p-1}=\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{p-1}$, and from this it is immediate that the claim is true. We thus have a new diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}=\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_m & \supset & \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-1} & \supset & \ldots & \supset & \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1 & \supset & \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_0=\{0\}.\\ & & \| & & & & & & \\ & & \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} & & & & & & \end{array}$$

The objects defined relative to this new Jordan-Hölder sequence are designated $\hat{J}_g$, $\hat{e}$, etc.

For $1\leqslant j\leqslant p-1$ we clearly have $j\in J_g\Leftrightarrow j\in\hat{J}_g$. Furthermore $p\in J_g$ (*see* above) and $m\in\hat{J}_g$. In fact, if $m\notin\hat{J}_g$, then $Z_p=\hat{Z}_m\in\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-1}+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and therefore

$$0\neq\langle Z_pg,\mathfrak{f}_1\rangle=\langle\mathfrak{h}g,\mathfrak{f}_1\rangle=0.$$

For $p+1\leqslant j\leqslant m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}j\notin J_g\Leftrightarrow Z_j\in\mathfrak{f}_{j-1}+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\Leftrightarrow Z_j\in\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-2}+\mathbb{C}Z_p+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\\ \Leftrightarrow\hat{Z}_{j-1}\in\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-2}+\mathbb{C}Z_p+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\Leftrightarrow\hat{Z}_{j-1}\in\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-2}+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\end{aligned}$$

(since $\mathfrak{g}_g\subset\mathfrak{h}$) $\Leftrightarrow j-1\notin\hat{J}_g$. Therefore, if $j_\alpha=p$ we have $\hat{j}_h=j_h$ for $1\leqslant h\leqslant\alpha-1$, $\hat{j}_h+1=j_{h+1}$ for $\alpha\leqslant h\leqslant d-1$ and $\hat{j}_d=m$, so

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_h}=Z_{j_h} \quad \text{for} \quad 1\leqslant h\leqslant\alpha-1,\\ &\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_h}=Z_{j_{h+1}}+c_{j_{h+1}}Z_{j_\alpha} \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha\leqslant h\leqslant d-1,\\ &\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_d}=Z_{j_\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, letting $C=[c_{rs}]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d}$ be the $d\times d$-matrix:

$$C=\left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|c} 1 & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & \\ \hline & & & c_{j_{\alpha+1}} & \cdots & c_{j_d} & 1 \\ \hline & & & 1 & & & \\ & & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & & 1 & \end{array}\right],$$

where the empty entries are 0, we have $\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_s}=\Sigma_{r=1}^{d}c_{rs}Z_{j_r}$, and therefore $M_{\hat{e}}(l)={}^tCM_e(l)C$, with $\hat{e}=\hat{J}_g$. Now $\det C=(-1)^{\alpha}$, so $\det M_e(l)=\det M_{\hat{e}}(l)$, and $Q_e(l)=Q_{\hat{e}}(l)$, and therefore $u_e=u_{\hat{e}}$. The conclusion of this is then that we can assume that $\mathfrak{f}_{m-1}=\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and this assumption will be in effect from now on. We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_e(l)&=|\det[B_l(Z_{j_r},Z_{j_s})]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d}| \\ &=\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l,[Z_{j_1},Z_{j_{\sigma(1)}}]\rangle\cdots\langle l,[Z_{j_d},Z_{j_{\sigma(d)}}]\rangle\Big| \\ &=|\langle l,[Z_1,Z_m]\rangle|^2\cdot\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d^*}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l,[Z_{j_2},Z_{j_{\sigma(2)}}]\rangle\cdots\langle l,[Z_{j_{d-1}},Z_{j_{\sigma(d-1)}}]\rangle\Big| \end{aligned}$$

where S_d^* is the set of elements $\sigma\in S_d$ with $\sigma(1)=d$, $\sigma(d)=1$.

Set $g_0=g\mid\mathfrak{h}$. Then $f=g_0\mid\mathfrak{n}$. We designate the objects associated with the group $H=\exp\mathfrak{h}$, and the class (*b*) Jordan-Hölder sequence $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{f}_{m-1}\supset\cdots\supset\mathfrak{f}_1\supset\mathfrak{f}_0=\{0\}$ by $J_{g_0}^0$, etc. We have $(\mathfrak{h}_{g_0})_{\mathbb{C}}=(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\oplus\mathbb{C}Z_1$, so $J_{g_0}^0=J_g\setminus\{1,m\}$, and therefore

$$J_{g_0}^0=\{j_1^0<\cdots<j_{d-2}^0\}$$

with $j_h^0=j_{h+1}$ for $1\leqslant h\leqslant d-2$, so we have for $l\in\mathfrak{h}'$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{e^0}(l)&=|\det[B_l(Z_{j_r^0},Z_{j_s^0})]_{1\leqslant r,\leqslant d-2}| \\ &=\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_{d-2}}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l,[Z_{j_1^0},Z_{j_{\sigma(1)}^0}]\rangle\cdots\langle l,[Z_{j_{d-2}^0},Z_{j_{\sigma(d-2)}^0}]\rangle\Big| \\ &=\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_{d-2}}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l,[Z_{j_2},Z_{j_{\sigma(2)+1}}]\rangle\cdots\langle l,[Z_{j_{d-1}},Z_{j_{(d-2)+1}}]\rangle\Big| \\ &=\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d^*}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l,[Z_{j_2},Z_{j_{\sigma(2)}}]\rangle\cdots\langle l,[Z_{j_{d-1}},Z_{j_{\sigma(d-1)}}]\rangle\Big|, \end{aligned}$$

and comparing with the result above we get $Q_e(l)=|\langle l,W\rangle|^2Q_{e^0}(l_0)$, where $W=[Z_1,Z_m]$ and $l_0=l\mid\mathfrak{h}$. Now since W is central in $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and since $P_W(l)=\langle l,W\rangle$, $P_{\overline{W}}(l)=\langle l,\overline{W}\rangle$ we find that $i^dQ_e(l)=-P_W(l)P_{\overline{W}}(l)i^{d-2}Q_{e^0}(l_0)$, and therefore $u_e=-W\overline{W}u_{e^0}$ by Lemma 1.2.1. By the induction hypothesis we have that $d\pi(u_{e^0})=Q_{e^0}(g)I$, and noting that

$$d\pi(W)=i\langle g,W\rangle I,\ d\pi(\overline{W})=i\langle g,\overline{W}\rangle I$$

we finally get $d\pi(u_e)=|\langle g,W\rangle|^2d\pi(u_{e^0})=|\langle g,W\rangle|^2Q_{e^0}(g)I=Q_e(g)I$. This settles case (b).

Case (c) : Suppose we are not in case (a) and (b) and that $\lambda_2 \not\equiv 0$.

Again we have $\langle g, Z_1 \rangle \neq 0$ and, moreover, $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_1 = \mathfrak{f}_1$ (since $\mathfrak{f}_1$ is a central ideal in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$). We write $[X, Z_2] = \lambda_2(X)Z_2 + \gamma(X)Z_1$, $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, where γ is a (complex valued) linear form on $\mathfrak{g}$. The linear form γ has the form $\gamma(X) = \gamma_1(X) + i\gamma_2(X)$, where γ_1, γ_2 are real linear forms on $\mathfrak{g}$. We extend λ_2, γ to complex linear forms on $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ such that we have

$$[Z, Z_2] = \lambda_2(Z)Z_2 + \gamma(Z)Z_1 \quad \text{for} \quad Z \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}.$$

We note the formula

$$\gamma([Z, W]) = \gamma(Z)\lambda_2(W) - \gamma(W)\lambda_2(Z) \tag{2.2.2}$$

for $Z, W \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, which we get by a simple application of the Jacobi identity.

Since G is exponential we can write $\lambda_2(X) = \alpha_2(X)(1 + ik_2)$, where α_2 is a real linear form on $\mathfrak{g}$ and where k_2 is a real number.

We then distinguish three subcases: (c1): rank $(\alpha_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2) = 3$, (c2): rank $(\alpha_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2) = 2$ and (c3): rank $(\alpha_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2) = 1$.

Case (c1): Set $\mathfrak{h} = \ker \gamma_1 \cap \ker \gamma_2$ $(= \ker \gamma \mid \mathfrak{g})$. It follows from the formula (2.2.2) that $\mathfrak{h}$ is a subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}$, and its codimension is 2. We observe that $Z \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ if and only if $\gamma(Z) = 0$ and $\gamma(\bar{Z}) = 0$. Set $\mathfrak{h}_0 = \ker \lambda_2 \mid \mathfrak{h} = \ker \alpha_2 \mid \mathfrak{h} = \ker \operatorname{ad} Z_2 \mid \mathfrak{g}$. $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ of codimension 3. That $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ follows from the fact that

$$\mathfrak{h}_0 = \ker \gamma \cap \ker \lambda_2 \cap \mathfrak{g}$$

and by applying the formula (2.2.2).

Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the nilradical of $\mathfrak{h}_0$. Since $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is an ideal we have that $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{h}_0 = \mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{h}$. Observe that $\dim \mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{m} = 2$. In fact, pick $W \in \mathfrak{h} \setminus \mathfrak{h}_0$. Then we have that

$$\gamma([Z, W]) = \lambda_2(W)\gamma(Z) \quad \text{for} \quad Z \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}},$$

and therefore $\gamma(\overline{[Z, W]}) = \lambda_2(\bar{W})\gamma(\bar{Z})$. Choosing Z such that $\gamma(Z) = 1$, $\gamma(\bar{Z}) = 0$ and Z' such that $\gamma(Z') = 0$, $\gamma(\bar{Z}') = 1$ we get that

$$\gamma([Z, W]) = \lambda_2(W) \neq 0,\ \gamma(\overline{[Z, W]}) = 0,\ \gamma(\overline{[Z', W]}) = \lambda_2(\bar{W}) \neq 0,\ \gamma([Z', W]) = 0,$$

and this shows that $[Z, W]$, $[Z', W]$ is a basis in $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathbb{C}} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}}}$.

We claim that $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_2 \neq \mathfrak{f}_2$. In fact, we have $[Z, Z_2] = \lambda_2(Z)Z_2 + \gamma(Z)Z_1$ for all $Z \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and therefore $[Z, \bar{Z}_2] = \overline{\lambda_2(\bar{Z})}\bar{Z}_2 + \overline{\gamma(\bar{Z})}\bar{Z}_1$. Since λ_2 does not vanish on $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ we have that $[\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{f}_2] = \mathbb{C}Z_2$ and $[\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}, \bar{\mathfrak{f}}_2] = \mathbb{C}\bar{Z}_2$. Therefore, if $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_2 = \mathfrak{f}_2$, then $\mathbb{C}Z_2 = \mathbb{C}\bar{Z}_2$, hence $\gamma(Z) = 0$ implies that $\gamma(\bar{Z}) = 0$, so $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the set of $Z \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $\gamma(Z) = 0$, contradicting the fact that $\operatorname{codim} \mathfrak{h} = 2$. We conclude that $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_2 \neq \mathfrak{f}_2$, and therefore that $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_1 = \mathfrak{f}_1$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_3 = \mathfrak{f}_3$. In particular $\bar{Z}_2 \notin \mathfrak{f}_2$.

We have seen that Z_1, Z_2, $\bar{Z}_2$ span $\mathfrak{f}_3$. Now since $\lambda_2(Z_2) = 0$ we have that $\alpha_2(Z_2) = 0$, and this means that $[\mathfrak{f}_3, \mathfrak{f}_2] \subset \mathfrak{f}_1$. We then distinguish two possibilities: case (c11): $[\mathfrak{f}_3, \mathfrak{f}_2] = 0$ and case (c12): $[\mathfrak{f}_3, \mathfrak{f}_2] = \mathfrak{f}_1$.

Set $f_0 = f \mid \mathfrak{m} = g \mid \mathfrak{m}$, and let π_0 be the irreducible representation of $M = \exp \mathfrak{m}$ corresponding to Mf_0.

Case (c11): (i) It is our first aim to show that $u_e \in U(\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}})$, and that $d\pi_0(u_e) = Q_e(g)I$. We start by noting that we can assume that $\langle g, Z_2 \rangle = 0$; in fact, if necessary replace Z_2 by $Z_2 - cZ_1$; this does not change e, Q_e, etc. (it changes $\gamma = \gamma_1 + i\gamma_2$, though, but does not affect $\mathfrak{h}_0$ and rank $(\alpha_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$).

Set $p = \min \{ 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m \mid Z_j \notin \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} \}$. p is well-defined, and $4 \leqslant p \leqslant m-1$, since $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and since the codimension of $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is 2. Set $q = \min \{ 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m \mid Z_j \notin \mathbb{C}Z_p \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} \}$. q is well-defined and $5 \leqslant p+1 \leqslant q \leqslant m$ (so $\dim \mathfrak{g} \geq 6$).

We first note $2, 3 \in J_g$. In fact, if $2 \notin J_g$, then $Z_2 \in \mathfrak{f}_1 + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and therefore

$$\gamma(Z) \langle g, Z_1 \rangle = \langle g, [Z, Z_2] \rangle = \langle Z_2 g, Z \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad Z \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$$

which is a contradiction. So $2 \in J_g$. If $3 \notin J_g$, then $\overline{Z}_2 \in \mathfrak{f}_2 + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, i. e. $\overline{Z}_2 = aZ_2 \pmod{(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}}$, $a \in \mathbb{C}$. But then

$$\overline{\gamma(\overline{Z})} \overline{\langle g, Z_1 \rangle} = \langle g, [Z, \overline{Z}_2] \rangle = \langle \overline{Z}_2 g, Z \rangle = a \langle Z_2 g, Z \rangle = a\gamma(Z) \langle g, Z_1 \rangle$$

which contradicts the fact that $\operatorname{codim} \mathfrak{h} = 2$, so $3 \in J_g$. We also note that $1 \notin J_g$, since $\mathfrak{f}_1 \subset (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Next we note that $p, q \in J_g$. In fact, if $p \notin J_g$, then $Z_p \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\overline{Z}_p \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and therefore

$$-\gamma(Z_p) \langle g, Z_1 \rangle = \langle g, [Z_2, Z_p] \rangle = \langle Z_p g, Z_2 \rangle \subset \langle \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} g, Z_2 \rangle$$
$$= \langle g, [\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}, Z_2] \rangle = \langle g, \mathbb{C}Z_2 \rangle = 0,$$

so $\gamma(Z_p) = 0$ and similarly $\gamma(\overline{Z}_p) = 0$ implying that $Z_p \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $p \in J_g$. Suppose then that $q \notin J_g$. Then $Z_q \in \mathbb{C}Z_p + \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}$, i. e. there exists $a \in \mathbb{C}$ with $Z_q = aZ_p (\mathrm{mod}\, (\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}))$. But then

$$-\gamma(Z_q) \langle g, Z_1 \rangle = \langle g, [Z_2, Z_q] \rangle = \langle Z_q g, Z_2 \rangle = a \langle Z_p g, Z_2 \rangle = -a\gamma(Z_p) \langle g, Z_1 \rangle,$$

from which $\gamma(Z_q) = a\gamma(Z_p)$. Similarly $\overline{\gamma(\overline{Z}_q)} = a\overline{\gamma(\overline{Z}_p)}$. Now consider the linear map from $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ to $\mathbb{C}^2$ given by $Z \to (\gamma(Z), \overline{\gamma(\overline{Z})})$. The kernel is $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, so it is surjective since $\operatorname{codim} \mathfrak{h} = 2$. But Z_p, Z_q is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} \pmod{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}}$, and we have just shown that the images of Z_p and of Z_q are linearly dependent; in fact, $(\gamma(Z_q), \overline{\gamma(\overline{Z}_q)}) = a(\gamma(Z_p), \overline{\gamma(\overline{Z}_p)})$. But this is a contradiction, and we conclude that $q \in J_g$.

Define $\hat{Z}_j = Z_j$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant p-1$, $\hat{Z}_j = Z_{j+1} + a_{j+1} Z_p$ for $p \leqslant j \leqslant q-2$ (empty if $q = p+1$), $\hat{Z}_j = Z_{j+2} + a_{j+2} Z_p + b_{j+2} Z_q$ for $q-1 \leqslant j \leqslant m-2$, $Z_{m-1} = aZ_p + bZ_q$, $Z_m = a'Z_p + b'Z_q$, where $a_{p+1}, \ldots, a_{q-1}, a_{q+1}, \ldots, a_m, b_{q+1}, \ldots, b_m$ has been picked such that $\hat{Z}_j \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m-2$; this is possible since $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \mathbb{C}Z_p \oplus \mathbb{C}Z_q$. The numbers $a, b, a', b' \in \mathbb{C}$ has been selected such that $ab' - a'b = 1$, and such that $\langle g, [\hat{Z}_{m-1}, Z_2] \rangle = 0$, $\langle g, [\hat{Z}_{m-1}, Z_3] \rangle \neq 0$, $\langle g, [\hat{Z}_m, Z_3] \rangle = 0$, $\langle g, [\hat{Z}_m, Z_2] \rangle \neq 0$ which is possible by a reasoning as above. Clearly $\hat{Z}_1, \ldots, \hat{Z}_m$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Set $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j = \mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_j$. For $0 \leqslant j \leqslant p-1$ we have

that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j=\mathfrak{f}_j$. For $p-1\leqslant j\leqslant q-2$ we have that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j\oplus\mathbb{C}Z_p=\mathfrak{f}_{j+1}$ and for $q-2\leqslant j\leqslant m-2$ we have that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j\oplus\mathbb{C}Z_p\oplus\mathbb{C}Z_q=\mathfrak{f}_{j+2}$. Also $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-2}=\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_m=\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j=\mathfrak{f}_j \quad \text{for} \quad 0\leqslant j\leqslant p-1,\\
&\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j=\mathfrak{f}_{j+1}\cap\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} \quad \text{for} \quad p-1\leqslant j\leqslant q-2,\\
&\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j=\mathfrak{f}_{j+2}\cap\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} \quad \text{for} \quad q-2\leqslant j\leqslant m-2,\\
&\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_m=\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}.
\end{aligned}$$

From this it follows that

$$\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}=\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-2}\supset\ \ldots\ \supset\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1\supset\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_0=\{0\}$$

is a Jordan-Hölder sequence for $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ (but note that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_0,\ \ldots,\ \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_m$ is not necessarily a Jordan-Hölder sequence for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, since $\mathfrak{h}$ is not necessarily an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$). We claim it is a Jordan-Hölder sequence of class (*b*). To see this, observe that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{p-1}=\bar{\hat{\mathfrak{f}}}_{p-1}$, since $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{p-1}=\mathfrak{f}_{p-1}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{p-1}=\mathfrak{f}_p\cap\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and $\mathfrak{f}_{q-2}=\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{q-2}$, since $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{q-2}=\mathfrak{f}_{q-1}\cap\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{q-2}=\mathfrak{f}_q\cap\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and from this it follows easily that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j$, $j=0,\ \ldots,\ m-2$ is of class (*b*).

Write $e=\{j_1<\ \ldots\ <j_d\}$, and let $j_\alpha=p$, $j_\beta=q$ with $1\leqslant\alpha<\beta\leqslant d$. Define the set $\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_g=\{\hat{j}_1<\ \ldots\ <\hat{j}_d\}$ by setting $\hat{j}_1=j_1,\ \ldots,\ \hat{j}_{\alpha-1}=j_{\alpha-1}$, $\hat{j}_h=j_{h+1}-1$ for $\alpha\leqslant h\leqslant\beta-2$, $\hat{j}_h=j_{h+2}-2$ for $\beta-1\leqslant h\leqslant d-2$, $\hat{j}_{d-1}=m-1$, $\hat{j}_d=m$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_h}=Z_{j_h} \quad \text{for} \quad 1\leqslant h\leqslant\alpha-1,\\
&\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_h}=Z_{j_{h+1}}+a_{j_{h+1}}Z_{j_\alpha} \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha\leqslant h\leqslant\beta-2,\\
&\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_h}=Z_{j_{h+2}}+a_{j_{h+2}}Z_{j_\alpha}+b_{j_{h+2}}Z_{j_\beta} \quad \text{for} \quad \beta-1\leqslant h\leqslant d-2,\\
&\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-1}}=aZ_{j_\alpha}+bZ_{j_\beta},\\
&\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_d}=a'Z_{j_\alpha}+b'Z_{j_\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, letting $C=[c_{rs}]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d}$ be the $d\times d$-matrix:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\qquad\qquad\quad \alpha \quad\quad \beta-2 \quad \beta-1 \quad d-2 \quad d-1 \quad d\\
\qquad\qquad\quad \downarrow \quad\quad \downarrow \quad\quad \downarrow \quad\quad \downarrow \quad\quad \downarrow \quad\quad \downarrow\\
\left[\begin{array}{c|ccc|c|c}
1 & & & & & \\
\ddots & & & & & \\
\cdot\ 1 & & & & & \\
\hline
 & a_{j_{\alpha+1}}\ \ldots\ a_{j_{\beta-1}} & & a_{j_{\beta+1}}\ \ldots\ a_{j_d} & a & a' \\
\hline
 & 1 & & & & \\
 & \ddots & & & & \\
 & \cdot\ 1 & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & b_{j_{\beta+1}}\ \ldots\ b_{j_d} & b & b' \\
\hline
 & & & 1 & & \\
 & & & \ddots & & \\
 & & & \cdot\ 1 & &
\end{array}\right]
\begin{array}{l}
\\ \\ \alpha\rightarrow \\ \\ C= \\ \\ \beta\rightarrow \\ \\ \\
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

where the empty entries are zero, we have $\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_s}=\Sigma_{r=1}^d c_{rs}Z_{j_r}$, and $\hat{M}_e(l)={}^tCM_e(l)C$, where

$\hat{M}_e(l)$ is the matrix $[B_l(\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}, \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_s})]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d}$. Now $\det C=(-1)^{\alpha+\beta}$, and therefore we have for $l\in\mathfrak{g}'$ with $\langle l, Z_2\rangle=0$:

$$\begin{aligned}Q_e(l)=|\det M_e(l)|=|\det \hat{M}_e(l)|\\ =\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_1},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(1)}}]\rangle\dots\langle l,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_d},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(d)}}]\rangle\Big|\\ =|\langle l,[\hat{Z}_2,\hat{Z}_m]\rangle|^2\,|\langle l,[\hat{Z}_3,\hat{Z}_{m-1}]\rangle|^2\\ \cdot\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d^*}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_3},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(3)}}]\rangle\dots\langle l,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-2}},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(d-2)}}]\rangle\Big|,\end{aligned}$$

where S_d^* is the set of permutations σ in S_d such that $\sigma(1)=d$, $\sigma(2)=d-1$, $\sigma(d-1)=2$, $\sigma(d)=1$.

Set $g_0=g\mid\mathfrak{h}$, and let $\hat{J}^0_{g_0}$, etc. designate the objects defined relative to the Jordan-Hölder sequence $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_0\subset\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1\subset\dots\subset\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-2}=\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Since clearly $\mathfrak{g}_g\subset\mathfrak{h}$, and $(\mathfrak{h}_{g_0})_{\mathbb{C}}=(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}+\mathbb{C}Z_2+\mathbb{C}Z_3$ we find that $1, 2, 3\notin\hat{J}^0_{g_0}$, and for $4\leqslant j\leqslant p-1$ we find $j\in\hat{J}^0_{g_0}\Leftrightarrow j\in J_g$. For $p+1\leqslant j\leqslant q-2$ we have

$$j\notin J_g\Leftrightarrow Z_j\in\mathfrak{f}_{j-1}+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\Leftrightarrow Z_j\in\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-2}+\mathbb{C}Z_p+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\Leftrightarrow\hat{Z}_{j-1}\in\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-2}+(\mathfrak{h}_{g_0})_{\mathbb{C}}\Leftrightarrow j-1\in\hat{J}^0_{g_0},$$

so $j\in J_g\Leftrightarrow j-1\in\hat{J}^0_{g_0}$. For $q+1\leqslant j\leqslant m$ we have

$$j\notin J_g\Leftrightarrow Z_j\in\mathfrak{f}_{j-1}+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\Leftrightarrow Z_j\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-3}+\mathbb{C}Z_p+\mathbb{C}Z_q+(\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}}\Leftrightarrow\hat{Z}_{j-2}\in\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-3}+(\mathfrak{h}_{g_0})_{\mathbb{C}}\Leftrightarrow j-2\notin\hat{J}^0_{g_0},$$

so $j\in J_g\Leftrightarrow j-2\in\hat{J}^0_{g_0}$. Therefore, if $\hat{e}^0=\hat{J}^0_{g_0}=\{\hat{j}^0_1<\dots<\hat{j}^0_{d-4}\}$ we find that $\hat{j}^0_h=j_{h+2}$ for $1\leqslant h\leqslant\alpha-3$, $\hat{j}^0_h+1=j_{h+3}$ for $\alpha-2\leqslant h\leqslant\beta-4$, $\hat{j}^0_h+2=j_{h+4}$ for $\beta-3\leqslant h\leqslant d-4$, and comparing with the definition of $\hat{j}_h$ we find that $\hat{j}^0_h=\hat{j}_{h+2}$ for $1\leqslant h\leqslant d-4$. Using this we get for $l_0\in\mathfrak{h}'$:

$$\begin{aligned}Q_{e_0}(l_0)=\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_{d-4}}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}^0_1},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}^0_{\sigma(1)}}]\rangle\dots\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}^0_{d-4}},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}^0_{\sigma(d-4)}}]\rangle\Big|\\ =\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_{d-4}}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_3},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(1)+2}}]\rangle\dots\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-2}},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(d-2)+2}}]\rangle\Big|\\ =\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d^*}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_3},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(3)}}]\rangle\dots\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-2}},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(d-2)}}]\rangle\Big|,\end{aligned}$$

and comparing with what we saw above we find for $l\in\mathfrak{g}'$ with $\langle l, Z_2\rangle=0$ and $l_0=l\mid\mathfrak{h}$:

$$(*)\qquad Q_e(l)=|\langle l,[\hat{Z}_2,\hat{Z}_m]\rangle|^2\,|\langle l,[\hat{Z}_3,\hat{Z}_{m-1}]\rangle|^2Q_{e^0}(l_0).$$

Let us now observe that the nilradical of $\mathfrak{h}$ is $\mathfrak{m}$. In fact, since $Z_2\in\mathfrak{h}$, $\lambda_2\mid\mathfrak{h}$ is a root for $\mathfrak{h}$, and therefore the nilradical of $\mathfrak{h}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{h}_0$ and consequently it is precisely $\mathfrak{m}$.

Write $Z_2=X_2+iY_2$ and set $\mathfrak{b}=\mathbb{R}X_2\oplus\mathbb{R}Y_2$. Then $\mathfrak{b}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{h}$, and $g\mid\mathfrak{b}=0$. Let $c:\mathfrak{h}\to\mathfrak{h}/\mathfrak{b}=\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ be the coset map and define $\tilde{g}_0\in\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}'$ by $\tilde{g}_0\circ c=g_0$.

We now claim that $u_e\in U(\mathfrak{m})$, i. e. that Q_e only depends on its restriction to $\mathfrak{h}$ (and therefore to $\mathfrak{m}$). Assuming for a moment this claim to be true, we consider Q_e as a polynomial function on $\mathfrak{h}'$ and get for $\tilde{l}_0\in\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}'$ (using the formula (*)):

$$Q_e(\tilde{l}_0\circ c)=|\langle l_0,W_1\rangle|^2\,|\langle l_0,W_2\rangle|^2Q_{\hat{e}^0}(\tilde{l}_0\circ c),$$

where $W_1=c([\hat{Z}_2,\hat{Z}_m])$, $W_2=c([\hat{Z}_3,\hat{Z}_{m-1}])$. Now since $W_1,\overline{W}_1,W_2,\overline{W}_2$ are central

in $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ and since $P_{W_1}(\tilde{l}_0)=\langle W_1, \tilde{l}_0\rangle$, $P_{\overline{W}_1}(\tilde{l}_0)=\overline{\langle W_1, \tilde{l}_0\rangle}$, and similarly for W_2, we find that $i^d Q_e(\tilde{l}_0\circ c)=P_{W_1}(\tilde{l}_0)P_{\overline{W}_1}(\tilde{l}_0)P_{W_2}(\tilde{l}_0)P_{\overline{W}_2}(\tilde{l}_0)i^{d-4}Q_{\hat{e}^0}(\tilde{l}_0\circ c)$, and therefore

$$c(u_e)=W_1\overline{W}_1W_2\overline{W}_2c(u_{\hat{e}^0})$$

by Lemma 1.2.1.

Since $\mathfrak{b}$ is an abelian ideal in $\mathfrak{h}_0$ and since $\langle f_0, \mathfrak{b}\rangle=0$ there exists a representation $\tilde{\pi}_0$ of $\tilde{M}=M/B$, $B=\exp\mathfrak{b}$, such that $\tilde{\pi}_0\circ c=\pi_0$. Using the induction hypothesis we then get

$$\begin{aligned} d\pi_0(u_e)=d\tilde{\pi}_0(c(u_e))=d\tilde{\pi}_0(W_1\overline{W}_1W_2\overline{W}_2c(u_{\hat{e}^0}))&=|\langle f_0, W_1\rangle|^2\,|\langle f_0, W_2\rangle|^2 d\pi_0(u_{\hat{e}_0})\\ &=|\langle g, [\hat{Z}_2, \hat{Z}_m]\rangle|^2\,|\langle g, [\hat{Z}_3, \hat{Z}_{m-1}]\rangle|^2 Q_{\hat{e}^0}(g_0)I=Q_e(g)I.\end{aligned}$$

We have thus shown that $d\pi_0(u_e)=Q_e(g)I$. This ends case (c11) (i), except for the fact that we have to prove the claim from above:

Proof of claim: We shall prove that $Q_e(l)$ only depends on the restriction of l to $\mathfrak{h}$. If all $\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}$, $3\leqslant r\leqslant d-2$ belong to $(\mathfrak{h}_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$, then the result is clear (because $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is an ideal). Suppose then that there exists $3\leqslant r\leqslant d-2$ such that $\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}\notin(\mathfrak{h}_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and let ρ be the smallest such r. We then have $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}=\mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_\rho}\oplus(\mathfrak{h}_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}=\mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_\rho}\oplus\ker\alpha_2$. Set $Y_r=\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}+c_r\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_\rho}$, $r=1,\ldots,d$, where c_r is defined such that $Y_r\in\ker\alpha_2$ for $r\neq\rho$, and where $c_\rho=0$. We then have $Y_r\in(\mathfrak{h}_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$ for $1\leqslant r\leqslant d-2$, $r\neq\rho$, while $Y_\rho\notin(h_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$ and Y_d, $Y_{d-1}\in\ker\alpha_2$. We also have $[Y_d, Z_2]\in\mathbb{C}Z_1$, $[Y_d, Z_3]=0$, $[Y_{d-1}, Z_3]\in\mathbb{C}Z_1$, $[Y_{d-1}, Z_2]=0$.

Letting $C=[c_{rs}]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d}$ be the $d\times d$-matrix given by:

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c|cccc} 1 & & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & & \\ \hline & & & 1 & c_{\rho+1} & \cdots & & c_d \\ \hline & & & & 1 & & & 1 \\ & & & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & & & 1 & \end{array}\right]$$

the empty entries meaning zero, we have $Y_s=\sum_{r=1}^d c_{rs}\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}$, so, setting $N(l)=[B_l(Y_r, Y_s)]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d}$ we get $N(l)={}^tC\hat{M}_e(l)C$, from which $Q_e(l)=|\det M_e(l)|=|\det\hat{M}_e(l)|=|\det N(l)|$. Therefore

$$Q_e(l)=\left|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d}\operatorname{sign}\sigma P_\sigma(l)\right|,$$

where we have set $P_\sigma(l)=\langle l, [Y_1, Y_{\sigma(1)}]\rangle\ldots\langle l, [Y_d, Y_{\sigma(d)}]\rangle$.

Define the following subsets of S_d:

$$\begin{aligned} S_d^{(1)}&=\{\sigma\mid\sigma(1)=\rho,\ \sigma(2)=d-1,\ \sigma(\rho)=d,\ \sigma(d-1)=2,\ \sigma(d)=1\},\\ S_d^{(2)}&=\{\sigma\mid\sigma(1)=d,\ \sigma(2)=\rho,\ \sigma(\rho)=d-1,\ \sigma(d-1)=2,\ \sigma(d)=1\},\\ S_d^{(3)}&=\{\sigma\mid\sigma(1)=d,\ \sigma(2)=d-1,\ \sigma(\rho)=1,\ \sigma(d-1)=2,\ \sigma(d)=\rho\},\\ S_d^{(4)}&=\{\sigma\mid\sigma(1)=d,\ \sigma(2)=d-1,\ \sigma(\rho)=2,\ \sigma(d-1)=\rho,\ \sigma(d)=1\},\\ S_d^{(5)}&=\{\sigma\mid\sigma(\rho)\neq d\wedge\sigma(\rho)\neq d-1\wedge\rho\neq\sigma(d)\wedge\rho\neq\sigma(d-1)\},\\ S_d^{(6)}&=S_d\setminus\bigcup_{j=1}^5 S_d^{(j)}.\end{aligned}$$

We then assert that $P_\sigma = 0$ if $\sigma \in S_d^{(6)}$. In fact, observe first that

$$P_\sigma \neq 0 \Rightarrow (\sigma(1) = \rho \vee \sigma(1) = d) \wedge (\sigma(2) = \rho \vee \sigma(2) = d-1) \\ \wedge (1 = \sigma(\rho) \vee 1 = \sigma(d)) \wedge (2 = \sigma(\rho) \vee 2 = \sigma(d-1)).$$

Therefore, if $P_\sigma \neq 0$ and if $\sigma \notin S_d^{(5)}$ with e. g. $\sigma(\rho) = d$, then $\sigma(1) = \rho$, $\sigma(2) = d-1$, $\sigma(d) = 1$, $\sigma(d-1) = 2$, so $\sigma \in S_d^{(1)}$. Similarly, if $\sigma \notin S_d^{(5)}$ with $\sigma(\rho) = d-1$, then $P_\sigma \neq 0 \Rightarrow \sigma \in S_d^{(2)}$, etc. This shows our assertion.

We next assert that $P(l) = \sum_{j=1}^{4} \sum_{\sigma \in S_d^j} \operatorname{sign} \sigma P_\sigma(l) = 0$. To see this, define the permutations τ_1, τ_2, τ_3, τ_4 in S_d by $\tau_1 =$ identity, $\tau_2(1) = \rho$, $\tau_2(2) = 1$, $\tau_2(\rho) = 2$, $\tau_3(1) = \rho$, $\tau_3(\rho) = d$, $\tau_3(d) = 1$, $\tau_4(1) = \rho$, $\tau_4(\rho) = d-1$, $\tau_4(d-1) = 1$, all other elements left fixed. It is then immediate to verify that the map $\sigma \to \sigma \circ \tau_j$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, defines a bijection between $S_d^{(1)}$ and $S_d^{(j)}$, and since τ_j are even permutations we get

$$P(l) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_d^{(1)}} \operatorname{sign} \sigma \sum_{j=1}^{4} P_{\sigma \circ \tau_j}(l).$$

Now for $\sigma \in S_d^{(1)}$ we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{4} P_{\sigma \circ \tau_j}(l) = \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq 1,2,\rho, \\ d-1,d}}^{d} \langle l, [Y_i, Y_{\sigma(i)}] \rangle \left(\sum_{j=1}^{4} \prod_{\substack{i=1,2,\rho, \\ d-1,d}} \langle l, [Y_i, Y_{\sigma(\tau_j(i))}] \rangle \right),$$

and a direct computation shows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{4} \prod_{\substack{i=1,2,\rho, \\ d-1,d}} \langle l, [Y_i, Y_{\sigma(\tau_j(i))}] \rangle = 0$$

for all $l \in \mathfrak{g}'$. This shows that $P \equiv 0$, and therefore we have

$$Q_e(l) = \left| \sum_{\sigma \in S_d^{(5)}} \operatorname{sign} \sigma P_\sigma(l) \right|.$$

But we clearly have that $P_\sigma(l)$ only depends on the restriction of l to $\mathfrak{h}$ if $\sigma \in S_d^{(5)}$, because all $[Y_r, Y_{\sigma(r)}]$, $r = 1, \ldots, d$, then belong to $\mathfrak{h}$ (we use here that $\mathfrak{h}$ is a subalgebra and that $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is an ideal). This proves our claim and ends (i).

(ii) We now apply (i) to the same Jordan-Hölder sequence $\mathfrak{f}_j$, but to another basis $Z'_j \in \mathfrak{f}_j \setminus \mathfrak{f}_{j-1}$ (whereby $\mathfrak{h}_0$ and therefore $\mathfrak{m}$ are not changed), and we get similarly that $d\pi_0(u'_e) = Q'_e(g)\mathrm{I}$, where Q'_e, u'_e are the objects associated with this new basis. Setting in particular $Z'_j = \operatorname{Ad}(s) Z_j$, we get $u'_e = \operatorname{Ad}(s) u_e$, and $Q'_e(l) = Q_e(s^{-1} l)$ for $s \in G$, and therefore $d\pi_0(\operatorname{Ad}(s) u_e) = Q_e(s^{-1} g)\mathrm{I} = |\Lambda_e(s)|^2 Q_e(g)\mathrm{I}$.

Now since Z_1, Z_2, $\overline{Z}_2 \in \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}}$ it follows that $\mathfrak{n}_f \subset \mathfrak{m}$ and from this we get that

$$(\mathfrak{m}_{f_0})_{\mathbb{C}} = (\mathfrak{n}_f)_{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \mathbb{C} Z_2 \oplus \mathbb{C} \overline{Z}_2.$$

It follows that a polarization in $\mathfrak{m}$ at f_0 is also a polarization in $\mathfrak{n}$ at f, hence $\pi = \operatorname{ind}_{M \uparrow N} \pi_0$. Let then φ be a differentiable vector in $L^2(N, \pi_0)$, the space of the induced representation $\pi = \operatorname{ind}_{M \uparrow N} \pi_0$. We have $d\pi(u_e)\varphi(s) = d\pi_0(\operatorname{Ad}(s^{-1}) u_e)\varphi(s) = Q_e(g)\varphi(s)$, $s \in N$, so $d\pi(u_e) = Q_e(g)\mathrm{I}$. This ends case (c11).

Case (c12): (i) As in case (c11) we start by showing that $u_e \in U(\mathfrak{m})$ and that $d\pi_0(u_e) = Q_e(g)I$, and we can assume that $\langle g, Z_2 \rangle = 0$.

Since $[\mathfrak{f}_3, \mathfrak{f}_2] = \mathfrak{f}_1$ we have that Z_2, $Z_3 \notin \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C}Z_2 \oplus \mathbb{C}Z_3 \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Just like in case (c11) we see that 2, $3 \in J_g$. Define $\hat{Z}_1 = Z_1$, $\hat{Z}_j = Z_{j+2} + a_{j+2}Z_2 + b_{j+2}Z_3$ for $2 \leqslant j \leqslant m-2$, $\hat{Z}_{m-1} = Z_2$, $\hat{Z}_m = Z_3$, where $a_4, \ldots, a_m, b_4, \ldots, b_m$ have been picked such that $\hat{Z}_j \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m-2$. Clearly $\hat{Z}_1, \ldots, \hat{Z}_m$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Set $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j = \mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_j$. We have that $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1 = \mathfrak{f}_1$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j \oplus \mathbb{C}Z_2 \oplus \mathbb{C}Z_3 = \mathfrak{f}_{j+2}$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m-2$. Also $\mathfrak{f}_{m-2} = \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, $\mathfrak{f}_m = \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1 = \mathfrak{f}_1, \\ &\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_j = \mathfrak{f}_{j+2} \cap \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m-2, \\ &\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_m = \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}. \end{aligned}$$

From this it follows that $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} = \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-2} \supset \ldots \supset \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1 \supset \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_0 = \{0\}$ is a Jordan-Hölder sequence for $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$. We claim it is of class (*b*). But this follows easily from the fact that $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_1 = \mathfrak{f}_1$.

Write $e = \{j_1 < \ldots j_d\}$, and define the set $\hat{J}_g = \{\hat{j}_1 < \ldots < \hat{j}_d\}$ by setting $\hat{j}_h = j_{h+2} - 2$ for $1 \leqslant h \leqslant d-2$, $\hat{j}_{d-1} = m-1$, $\hat{j}_d = m$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_h} &= Z_{j_{h+2}} + a_{j_{h+2}}Z_{j_1} + b_{j_{h+2}}Z_{j_2} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leqslant h \leqslant d-2, \\ \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-1}} &= Z_{j_1}, \\ \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_d} &= Z_{j_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, letting $C = [c_{rs}]_{1 \leqslant r,s \leqslant d}$ be the $d \times d$-matrix:

$$C = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c|c} a_{j_3} & \ldots & a_{j_d} & 1 & \\ \hline b_{j_3} & \ldots & b_{j_d} & & 1 \\ \hline 1 & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & & 1 & & \end{array}\right],$$

where the empty entries are zero, we have $\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_s} = \Sigma_{r=1}^{d} c_{rs} Z_{j_r}$, and $\hat{M}_e(l) = {}^tCM_e(l)C$, where $\hat{M}_e(l)$ is the matrix $[B_l(\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}, \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_s})]_{1 \leqslant r,s \leqslant d}$. Now $\det C = 1$, and therefore we have for $l \in \mathfrak{g}'$ with $\langle l, Z_2 \rangle = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_e(l) &= |\det \hat{M}_e(l)| \\ &= \Big| \sum_{\sigma \in S_d} \operatorname{sign} \sigma \langle l, [\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_1}, \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(1)}}] \rangle \ldots \langle l, [\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_d}, \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(d)}}] \rangle \Big| \\ &= |\langle l, [\hat{Z}_{m-1}, \hat{Z}_m] \rangle|^2 \Big| \sum_{\sigma \in S_d^*} \operatorname{sign} \sigma \langle l, [\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_1}, \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(1)}}] \rangle \ldots \langle l, [\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-2}}, \hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(d-2)}}] \rangle \Big|, \end{aligned}$$

where S_d^* is the set of permutations σ in S_d such that $\sigma(d-1) = d$, $\sigma(d) = d-1$.

Set $g_0 = g \mid \mathfrak{h}$, and let $\hat{J}_{g_0}^0$, etc. designate the objects defined relative to the Jordan-Hölder sequence $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_0 \subset \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1 \subset \ldots \subset \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{m-2} = \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Since clearly $\mathfrak{g}_g \subset \mathfrak{h}$, and $\mathfrak{h}_{g_0} = \mathfrak{g}_g$ we find that $1 \notin \hat{J}_{g_0}^0$, and for $4 \leqslant j \leqslant m$ we have

$$j \notin J_g \Leftrightarrow Z_j \in \mathfrak{f}_{j-1} + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}} \Leftrightarrow Z_j \in \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-3} + \mathbb{C}Z_2 + \mathbb{C}Z_3 + (\mathfrak{g}_g)_{\mathbb{C}} \Leftrightarrow \hat{Z}_{j-2} \in \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{j-3} + (\mathfrak{h}_{g_0})_{\mathbb{C}} \Leftrightarrow j-2 \notin \hat{J}_{g_0}^0,$$

so $j\in J_g \Leftrightarrow j-2\in\hat{J}^0_{g_0}$. Therefore, if $\hat{e}^0=\hat{J}^0_{g_0}=\{\hat{j}^0_1<\ldots<\hat{j}^0_{d-2}\}$ we find that $\hat{j}^0_h+2=j_{h+2}$ for $1\leqslant h\leqslant d-2$, and comparing with the definition of $\hat{j}_h$ we find that $\hat{j}^0_h=\hat{j}_h$ for $1\leqslant h\leqslant d-2$. Using this we get for $l_0\in h'$:

$$\begin{aligned}Q_{\hat{e}^0}(l_0)&=|\det[B_{l_0}(\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}^0_r},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}^0_s})]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d-2}|\\&=\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_{d-2}}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_1},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(1)}}]\rangle\ldots\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-2}},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(d-2)}}]\rangle\Big|\\&=\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S^*_d}\operatorname{sign}\sigma\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_1},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(1)}}]\rangle\ldots\langle l_0,[\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-2}},\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{\sigma(d-2)}}]\rangle\Big|,\end{aligned}$$

and comparing with what we saw above we find for $l\in g'$ with $\langle l,Z_2\rangle=0$:

$$(*)\qquad Q_e(l)=|\langle l,[\hat{Z}_m,\hat{Z}_{m-1}]\rangle|^2Q_{\hat{e}^0}(l_0),$$

where $l_0=l\mid\mathfrak{h}$.

We then claim that $Q_e(l)$ only depends on the restriction of l to $\mathfrak{h}$. Assuming for a moment this to be true, we find that the formula $(*)$ is valid for all $l\in g'$. The conclusion of this is that $i^dQ_e(l)=-\langle l,W\rangle\langle l,\overline{W}\rangle i^{d-2}Q_{\hat{e}^0}(l_0)$, where $W=[\hat{Z}_m,\hat{Z}_{m-1}]=[Z_2,Z_3]\in\mathfrak{f}_1$, and therefore that $u_e=-W\overline{W}u_{\hat{e}^0}$.

Let us then prove our claim: if all $\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}$, $1\leqslant r\leqslant d-2$ belong to $(\mathfrak{h}_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$, then the result is clear (since $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is an ideal). Suppose then that there exists $1\leqslant r\leqslant d-2$ such that $\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}\notin(\mathfrak{h}_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and let ρ be the smallest such number r. We then have $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}=\mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_\rho}\oplus(\mathfrak{h}_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$, and $g_{\mathbb{C}}=\mathbb{C}\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_\rho}\oplus\ker\alpha_2$. Set $Y_r=\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}+c_r\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_\rho}$, $r=1,\ldots,d$, where c_r is defined such that $Y_r\in\ker\alpha_2$ for $r\neq\rho$ and where $c_\rho=0$. We then have $Y_r\in(\mathfrak{h}_0)_{\mathbb{C}}$ for all $1\leqslant r\leqslant d-2$, $r\neq\rho$, while $Y_\rho\in(\mathfrak{h})_{\mathbb{C}}$, $Y_d=\hat{Z}_m=\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_d}$, $Y_{d-1}=\hat{Z}_{m-1}=\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_{d-1}}\in\ker\alpha_2$.

Letting $C=[c_{rs}]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d}$ be the $d\times d$-matrix given by:

$$C=\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c|c}1 & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & & 1 & & \\ \hline & & & 1 & c_{\rho+1}\ \ldots\ c_{d-2}\ 0\ 0 \\ \hline & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & \ddots \\ & & & & & & 1\end{array}\right]$$

the empty entries meaning zero, we have $Y_s=\sum_{r=1}^d c_{rs}\hat{Z}_{\hat{j}_r}$, so, setting $N(l)=[B_l(Y_r,Y_s)]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant d}$ we get $N(l)={}^tC\hat{M}_e(l)C$, from which $Q_e(l)=|\det M_e(l)|=|\det\hat{M}_e(l)|=|\det N(l)|$. Therefore $Q_e(l)=\big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d}\operatorname{sign}\sigma P_\sigma(l)\big|$, where we have set $P_\sigma(l)=\langle l,[Y_1,Y_{\sigma(1)}]\rangle\ldots\langle l,[Y_d,Y_{\sigma(d)}]\rangle$. Define then the following subsets of S_d:

$$\begin{aligned}S^{(1)}_d&=\{\sigma\mid\sigma(d-1)=\rho\wedge\sigma(d)=d-1\wedge\sigma(\rho)=d\},\\S^{(2)}_d&=\{\sigma\mid\sigma(d-1)=d\wedge\sigma(d)=\rho\wedge\sigma(\rho)=d-1\},\\S^{(3)}_d&=\{\sigma\mid\sigma(d-1)\neq\rho\wedge\sigma(d)\neq\rho\},\\S^{(4)}_d&=S_d\setminus(S^{(1)}_d\cup S^{(2)}_d\cup S^{(3)}_d).\end{aligned}$$

We then assert that: $\sigma\in S_d^{(4)} \Rightarrow P_\sigma=0$. In fact, observe first that since:

$$[Y_{d-1}, Y_r]\neq 0 \Rightarrow r=d \vee r=\rho,$$

and since: $[Y_d, Y_r]\neq 0 \Rightarrow r=d-1 \vee r=\rho$ we have:

$$P_\sigma\neq 0 \Rightarrow (\sigma(d-1)=d \vee \sigma(d-1)=\rho) \wedge (\sigma(d)=d-1 \vee \sigma(d)=\rho).$$

Moreover, if $r\notin\{\rho, d-1, d\}$, then: $[Y_r, Y_{\sigma(r)}]\neq 0 \Rightarrow \sigma(r)\neq d-1 \wedge \sigma(r)\neq d$, hence:

$$P_\sigma\neq 0 \Rightarrow (d=\sigma(d-1) \vee d=\sigma(\rho)) \wedge (d-1=\sigma(d) \vee d-1=\sigma(\rho)).$$

Therefore, if $P_\sigma\neq 0$ and $\sigma\notin S_d^{(3)}$ with e. g. $\sigma(d-1)=\rho$, then $\sigma(d)=d-1$ and $\sigma(\rho)=d$, and therefore $\sigma\in S_d^{(1)}$. Similarly, if $\sigma\notin S_d^{(3)}$ with $\sigma(d)=\rho$, then $P_\sigma\neq 0 \Rightarrow \sigma\in S_d^{(2)}$. This shows our assertion.

We next assert that $P(l)=\sum_{\sigma\in S'_d} \operatorname{sign}\sigma P_\sigma(l)=0$, where $S'_d=S_d^{(1)}\cup S_d^{(2)}$. To see this, define the permutation τ in S_d by $\tau(\rho)=d$, $\tau(d-1)=\rho$, $\tau(d)=d-1$, all other elements left fixed. It is then immediate to verify that the map $\sigma\to\sigma\circ\tau$ defines a bijection between $S_d^{(1)}$ and $S_d^{(2)}$, and since τ is an even permutation we get $P(l)=\sum_{\sigma\in S_d^{(1)}} \operatorname{sign}\sigma(P_\sigma+P_{\sigma\circ\tau})$. Now for $\sigma\in S_d^{(1)}$ we have

$$P_\sigma(l)+P_{\sigma\circ\tau}(l)=\prod_{\substack{i\neq\rho,\\ d-1,d}} \langle l, [Y_i, Y_{\sigma(i)}]\rangle \Big(\prod_{\substack{i=\rho,\\ d-1,d}} \langle l, [Y_i, Y_{\sigma(i)}]\rangle + \prod_{\substack{i=\rho,\\ d-1,d}} \langle l, [Y_i, Y_{\sigma(\tau(i))}]\rangle\Big),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\prod_{\substack{i=\rho,\\ d-1,d}} \langle l, [Y_i, Y_{\sigma(i)}]\rangle + \prod_{\substack{i=\rho,\\ d-1,d}} \langle l, [Y_i, Y_{\sigma(\tau(i))}]\rangle\\ &= \langle l, [Y_\rho, Y_d]\rangle\langle l, [Y_{d-1}, Y_\rho]\rangle\langle l, [Y_d, Y_{d-1}]\rangle\\ &+ \langle l, [Y_\rho, Y_{d-1}]\rangle\langle l, [Y_{d-1}, Y_d]\rangle\langle l, [Y_d, Y_\rho\rangle = 0.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $P\equiv 0$, and therefore we have

$$Q_e(l)=\Big|\sum_{\sigma\in S_d^{(3)}} \operatorname{sign}\sigma P_\sigma(l)\Big|,$$

and since $P_\sigma(l)$ only depends on the restriction of l to $\mathfrak{h}$ when $\sigma\in S_d^{(3)}$ we have proved our assertion.

Now if $\mathfrak{m}$ is the nilradical of $\mathfrak{h}$ it follows from the induction hypothesis that $d\pi_0(u_{\hat{e}_0})=Q_{\hat{e}^0}(g_0)I$, and since $d\pi_0(W)=i\langle f_0, W\rangle$, and $u_e=-W\overline{W}u_{\hat{e}^0}$ we get that

$$d\pi_0(u_e)=|\langle f_0, W\rangle|^2 Q_{\hat{e}^0}(g_0)I=Q_e(g)I,$$

and this proves (i) in this case.

Suppose then that $\mathfrak{m}$ is not the nilradical $\mathfrak{m}_1$ of $\mathfrak{h}$. Then $\mathfrak{m}=\mathfrak{h}_0\cap\mathfrak{m}_1$, and $\dim \mathfrak{m}_1/\mathfrak{m}=1$. Setting $M_1=\exp\mathfrak{m}_1$ we now face two possibilities (1) either π_0 extends to an irreducible representation π'_0 of M_1 or (2) $\operatorname{ind}_{M\uparrow M_1}\pi_0=\pi'_0$ is an irreducible representation of M_1. In the first case we obviously get as above that $d\pi'_0(u_e)=Q_e(g)I$, and therefore $d\pi_0(u_e)=Q_e(g)I$. In the second case we have $\pi'_0\,|\,M=\int_{M_1/M}^{\oplus} s\pi_0 ds$, and therefore we get by the induction

hypothesis that $Q_e(g)I = d\pi'_0(u_e) = \int_{M_1/M}^{\oplus} d(s\pi_0)(u_e)d\dot{s}$, from which $d(s\pi_0)(u_e) = Q_e(g)I$ for almost all $\dot{s}$, hence for all $\dot{s}$ by continuity. This shows that $d\pi_0(u_e) = Q_e(g)I$, and ends (i).

(ii) Just like in case (c11) (ii) we conclude from (i) that

$$d\pi_0(\mathrm{Ad}\,(s)u_e) = Q_e(s^{-1}g)I = |\Lambda_e(s)|^2 Q_e(g)I \quad \text{for all} \quad s \in G.$$

Now since Z_2, $Z_3 \in \mathfrak{n}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and since $[\mathfrak{m}, Z_2] = [\mathfrak{m}, Z_3] = 0$ we see at once that $\mathfrak{m}_{f_0} = \mathfrak{n}_f$. Suppose then that $\mathfrak{p}$ is a polarization in $\mathfrak{m}$ at f_0. Then, writing $Z_2 = X_2 + iY_2$, $\mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{p} \oplus \mathbb{R}Y_2$ is a polarization in $\mathfrak{n}$ at f, and therefore $\pi = \mathrm{ind}_{P_1 \uparrow N} \eta_1$, where η_1 is the unitary character on $P_1 = \exp \mathfrak{p}_1$ corresponding to $f \mid \mathfrak{p}_1$. Similarly $\pi_0 = \mathrm{ind}_{P \uparrow M} \eta$, where $P = \exp \mathfrak{p}$, $\eta = \eta_1 \mid P$. We then set $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \mathbb{R}Y_2$, and note that $\mathfrak{n}_1$ is a direct product of $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathbb{R}Y_2$. Let π_1 be the irreducible representation of $N_1 = \exp \mathfrak{n}_1$ with $\pi_1 \mid M = \pi_0$,

$$\pi_1(\exp tY_2) = e^{it\langle f, Y_2 \rangle}.$$

Then $\pi = \mathrm{ind}_{P_1 \uparrow N} \eta_1 = \mathrm{ind}_{N_1 \uparrow N} (\mathrm{ind}_{P_1 \uparrow N_1} \eta_1) = \mathrm{ind}_{N_1 \uparrow N} \pi_1$. Now noting that N_1 is a normal subgroup in N and that clearly $d\pi_1(\mathrm{Ad}\,(s)u_e) = Q_e(g)I$ for $s \in N$, we can end this case just like case (c11) (ii). This ends case (c12).

Case (c2): (i) Since $\mathfrak{f}_1 = \bar{\mathfrak{f}}_1$ we can clearly assume that $Z_1 = X_1 \in \mathfrak{g}$. A standard argument shows that λ_2 must be a real root in this case, so $\lambda_2 = \alpha_2$. We claim that it is no loss of generality to assume that $\gamma_2 \equiv 0$. In fact, let a_1, a_2, b be real numbers, not all equal to zero, such that $0 = a_1\gamma_1 + a_2\gamma_2 + b\alpha_2$. Then $(a_1, a_2) \neq (0, 0)$, since $\alpha_2 \neq 0$, and we can assume that $a_1^2 + a_2^2 = 1$. Replacing Z_2 by $Z'_2 = (a_2 + ia)Z_2 - bZ_1$ does not change Q_e, and it is trivial to verify that $[X, X'_2] = \lambda_2(X)Z'_2 + \gamma'_1(X)Z_1$, where $\gamma'_1 = a_2\gamma_1 - a_1\gamma_2$. This proves the claim. So, from now on we assume that $Z_1 = X_1 \in \mathfrak{g}$, $\gamma = \gamma_1$, and writing $Z_2 = X_2 + iY_2$ we then have

$$[X, X_2] = \lambda_2(X)X_2 + \gamma(X)X_1$$
$$[X, Y_2] = \lambda_2(X)Y_2.$$

Set $\mathfrak{h} = \ker \gamma$. It follows from the formula (2.2.2) that $\mathfrak{h}$ is a subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}$, and its codimension is 1. Set $\mathfrak{h}_0 = \ker \alpha_2 \mid \mathfrak{h} = \ker \mathrm{ad}\, Z_2 \mid \mathfrak{g}$. $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ of codimension 2.

Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the nilradical of $\mathfrak{h}_0$. Since $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is an ideal we have that $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{h}_0 = \mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{h}$. Observe that $\dim \mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{m} = 1$. In fact, pick $W \in \mathfrak{h} \setminus \mathfrak{h}_0$. We then have $\gamma([X, W]) = \lambda_2(W)\gamma(X)$ for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. Choosing X such that $\gamma(X) = 1$ we get that $\gamma([X, W]) = \lambda_2(W) \neq 0$, and this shows that $[X, W]$ is a basis in $\mathfrak{n}$ (mod $\mathfrak{m}$).

Set $f_0 = f \mid \mathfrak{m} = g \mid \mathfrak{m}$, and let π_0 be the irreducible representation of $M = \exp \mathfrak{m}$ corresponding to Mf_0.

(ii) We first show that $u_e \in U(\mathfrak{m})$, and that $d\pi_0(u_e) = Q_e(g)I$. We start by noting that we can assume that $\langle g, X_2 \rangle = 0$; in fact, if necessary replace X_2 by $X_2 - cX_1$; this does not change e, Q_e, etc. (it will change γ, $\mathfrak{h}$, though, but does not affect $\mathfrak{h}_0$, rank $(\alpha_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ and the fact that $\gamma_2 \equiv 0$).

Except for some obvious modifications we can now proceed just like in case (c11) (i).

(iii) Just like in case (c11) (ii) we conclude that $d\pi_0(\mathrm{Ad}(s)u_e) = |\Lambda_e(s)|^2 Q_e(g)\mathrm{I}$ for $s \in G$.

Now since $X_1, X_2 \in \mathfrak{m}$ it follows that $\mathfrak{n}_f \subset \mathfrak{m}$ and from this we get that $\mathfrak{m}_{f_0} = \mathfrak{n}_f \oplus \mathbb{R}X_2$. Therefore a polarization in $\mathfrak{m}$ at f_0 is also a polarization in $\mathfrak{n}$ at f, hence $\pi = \mathrm{ind}_{M \uparrow N} \pi_0$. We can then end this case just like we did in case (c11) (ii).

Case (c3): It is no loss of generality to assume that $\gamma \equiv 0$. In fact, there exists real numbers a_1, a_2 such that $\gamma_1 = a_1\alpha_2$, $\gamma_2 = a_2\alpha_2$, and therefore $\gamma_1 = a_1(1+ik_2)^{-1}\lambda_2$, $\gamma_2 = a_2(1+ik_2)^{-1}\lambda_2$. Replacing Z_2 by $Z_2' = Z_2 + (1+ik_2)^{-1}(a_1 + ia_2)Z_1$ does not change Q_e, etc., and we have $[X, Z_2'] = \lambda_2(X)Z_2'$. This proves the assertion.

Set $\mathfrak{h} = \ker \lambda_2$. Then $\mathfrak{h}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ of codimension 1, so $\mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{h}$. We can now proceed here much like in case (b), so we omit the details.

Case (d): Suppose we are not in case (a), (b) or (c).

We have $[X, Z_2] = \gamma(X)Z_1$, where $\gamma \neq 0$ and $\langle g, Z_1 \rangle \neq 0$ (since otherwise we would be in case (a)), and also $f_1 = \bar{f}_1$.

Writing $\gamma = \gamma_1 + i\gamma_2$ we distinguish two subcases: (d1): $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = 2$ and (d2): $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = 1$.

Case (d1): Set $\mathfrak{h} = \ker \gamma_1 \cap \ker \gamma_2$. Then $\mathfrak{h}$ is an ideal of codimension 2. We then distinguish two possibilities: case (d11): $[f_3, f_2] = 0$ and case (d12): $[f_3, f_2] = f_1$. We can then proceed here much like in case (c1) (the case at hand is easier, since here $\mathfrak{h}$ is an ideal containing $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$). We omit the details.

Case (d2): Just like in case (c2) we see that we can assume that $\gamma_2 = 0$. Set $\mathfrak{h} = \ker \gamma$. Then $\mathfrak{h}$ is an ideal of codimension 1, and we can treat this case much like case (b). We also omit the details here. This ends the proof of Proposition 2.2.1.

2.3. — We shall now end the proof of Theorem 1.4.1. We use [4], 4.2.2 Théorème, p. 121 with $\psi(l) = |P_e(l)|$. It follows from Lemma 2.1.1 that the condition of the theorem *loc. cit.* is satisfied. The conclusion is that the operator $A\pi(\varphi)A$ is traceclass for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(G)$, that $\varphi \to \mathrm{Tr}([A\pi(\varphi)A])$ is a distribution (of positive type) on G, and that

$$\mathrm{Tr}([A\pi(\varphi)A]) = \int_0 (\alpha_e \cdot \varphi \circ \exp)\hat{}(l) Q_e(l) d\beta_0(l).$$

Here we have also used Lemma 1.3.1.

REMARK 2.3.1. — In [4], p. 248 and [5], p. 118 appear two different definitions of the function P_0' (*cf.* section 1.3). Here we use the one from [4] (which is the most natural one), while the 4.2.2. Théorème in [5] uses the definition of P_0' from [5]. There is no difficulty in proving 4.2.2. Théorème with the definition of P_0' from [4] when ψ has the property that $\psi(l)$ only depends on the restriction of l to $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ which is the case here (*cf.* [5] 4.2.3. Remarque).

We shall then identify the operator A: Set $G_0 = \ker \chi_e$, let $\mathfrak{g}_0$ be the Lie algebra of G_0,

and let π_0 be the irreducible representation associated with $g_0 = g \mid \mathfrak{g}_0$. Then $\pi = \mathrm{ind}_{G_0 \uparrow G} \pi_0$, and A is realized on $L^2(G, \pi_0)$, the space of the induced representation $\pi = \mathrm{ind}_{G_0 \uparrow G} \pi_0$, by $Af(s) = \psi(sg) f(s) = |P_e(sg)| f(s)$. Now it follows from Proposition 2.2.1 that $d\pi_0(u_e) = Q_e(g)\mathrm{I}$, and that $d\pi_0(\mathrm{Ad}(s)u_e) = Q_e(s^{-1}g)\mathrm{I}$ which implies that we have for a differentiable vector $f \in L^2(G, \pi_0)$:

$$d\pi(u_e) f(s) = d\pi_0(\mathrm{Ad}(s^{-1})u_e) f(s) = Q_e(sg) f(s) = |P_e(sg)|^2 f(s) = A^2 f(s),$$

and thus $d\pi(u_e) = A^2$.

Now since $A\pi(\varphi) \subset \pi(\chi_e^{-1}\varphi)A$ we have that $A\pi(\varphi)A \subset A^2\pi(\chi_e^{-1}\varphi)$, and therefore $[A\pi(\varphi)A] = [A^2\pi(\chi_e^{-1}\varphi)]$ from which $[A^2\pi(\chi_e^{-1}\varphi)]$, hence $[A^2\pi(\varphi)]$, is traceclass for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(G)$, and $\mathrm{Tr}([A^2\pi(\varphi)]) = \mathrm{Tr}([A\pi(\chi_e\varphi)A]) = \mathrm{Tr}([A\pi(\varphi)A])$, the last equality being valid because the distribution $\varphi \to \mathrm{Tr}([A\pi(\varphi)A])$ is supported on G_0 (*cf.* [5], [6]). Observing finally that $[A^2\pi(\varphi)] = \pi(u_e * \varphi)$, we have proved the theorem.

3. Examples

We shall give a few examples of the calculation of $\mathscr{E}$, Q_e, u_e, Ω_e for an exponential solvable Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. If $Z_1, \ldots, Z_m$ is a Jordan-Hölder basis for $\mathfrak{g}_C$ we denote by $M(g)$, $g \in \mathfrak{g}'$, the skewsymmetric $m \times m$-matrix $[\langle g, [Z_i, Z_j] \rangle]_{1 \leq i,j \leq m}$ and we write $\zeta_j = \langle g, Z_j \rangle$. The matrices $M_e(g)$ are all submatrices of $M(g)$. Note that $Z = \sum_{j=1}^m z_j Z_j$ belongs to $(\mathfrak{g}_g)_C$ if and only if $M(g)\underline{z} = \underline{0}$, where $\underline{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_m)$. We write $\mathscr{E} = \{e_1 < \ldots < e_p\}$.

3.1. — Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the five dimensional real solvable Lie algebra with the following non-vanishing brackets: $[X_5, X_4] = -X_4$, $[X_5, X_3] = 2X_3$, $[X_5, X_2] = X_2$, $[X_4, X_3] = X_2$, $[X_4, X_2] = X_1$. Then $X_1, \ldots, X_5$ is a Jordan-Hölder basis for $\mathfrak{g}$, so $\mathfrak{g}$ is completely solvable. We set $Z_j = X_j$ and $\xi_j = \langle g, X_j \rangle = \zeta_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, 5$.

We have

$$M(g) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\xi_1 & -\xi_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\xi_2 & -2\xi_3 \\ 0 & \xi_1 & \xi_2 & 0 & -\xi_4 \\ 0 & \xi_2 & 2\xi_3 & \xi_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

i) If $\xi_2^2 - 2\xi_1\xi_3 \neq 0$, then $\mathfrak{g}_g = \mathbb{R}X_1$ and therefore $J_g = \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$.

ii) If $\xi_2^2 - 2\xi_1\xi_3 = 0$ and $\xi_1 \neq 0$ then

$$\mathfrak{g}_g = \mathbb{R}X_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}(-\xi_2 X_2 + \xi_1 X_3) \oplus \mathbb{R}(-\xi_4 X_2 - \xi_2 X_4 + \xi_1 X_5), \quad J_g = \{3, 5\}.$$

iii) If $\xi_2^2 - 2\xi_1\xi_3 = 0$, $\xi_1 = 0$ and $\xi_3 \neq 0$, then $\mathfrak{g}_g = \mathbb{R}X_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}X_2 \oplus \mathbb{R}(-\xi_4 X_3 + 2\xi_3 X_4)$, $J_g = \{3, 5\}$.

iv) If $\xi_2^2-2\xi_1\xi_3=0$, $\xi_1=0$, $\xi_3=0$ and $\xi_4\neq 0$, then

$$\mathfrak{g}_g=\mathbb{R}X_1\oplus\mathbb{R}X_2\oplus\mathbb{R}X_3,\quad J_g=\{4,5\}$$

v) If $\xi_2^2-2\xi_1\xi_3=0$, $\xi_1=0$, $\xi_3=0$, $\xi_4=0$, then $\mathfrak{g}_g=\mathfrak{g}$, $J_g=\emptyset$.

We can then write down:

$$\begin{aligned}
&e_1=\{2,3,4,5\}, && \Omega_{e_1}=\{g\mid \xi_2^2-2\xi_1\xi_3\neq 0\},\\
&e_2=\{2,4\}, && \Omega_{e_2}=\{g\mid \xi_2^2-2\xi_1\xi_3=0,\ \xi_1\neq 0\},\\
&e_3=\{3,5\}, && \Omega_{e_3}=\{g\mid \xi_1=\xi_2=0,\ \xi_3\neq 0\},\\
&e_4=\{4,5\}, && \Omega_{e_4}=\{g\mid \xi_1=\xi_2=\xi_3=0,\ \xi_4\neq 0\},\\
&e_5=\emptyset && \Omega_{e_5}=\{g\mid \xi_1=\xi_2=\xi_3=\xi_4=0\},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_{e_1}(g)=(\xi_2^2-2\xi_1\xi_3)^2, && u_{e_1}=(X_2^2-2X_1X_3)^2,\\
&Q_{e_2}(g)=\xi_1^2, && u_{e_2}=-X_1^2,\\
&Q_{e_3}(g)=4\xi_3^2, && u_{e_3}=-4X_3^2,\\
&Q_{e_4}(g)=\xi_4^2, && u_{e_4}=-X_4^2,\\
&Q_{e_5}(g)=1, && u_{e_5}=1.
\end{aligned}$$

3.2. — Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the six dimensional real exponential solvable Lie algebra having a basis $X_1,\ldots,X_6$ with the following non-vanishing brackets: $[X_6,X_5]=X_4+X_5$, $[X_6,X_4]=X_4-X_5$, $[X_6,X_2]=X_1+X_2$, $[X_6,X_1]=X_1-X_2$, $[X_5,X_4]=X_3$, $[X_5,X_3]=X_2$, $[X_4,X_3]=X_1$. Set $Z_1=X_1-iX_2$, $Z_2=X_1+iX_2$, $Z_3=X_3$, $Z_4=X_4-iX_5$, $Z_5=X_4+iX_5$, $Z_6=X_6$. Then $Z_1,\ldots,Z_6$ is a Jordan-Hölder basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and

$$M(g)=\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -(1-i)\zeta_1\\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -(1+i)\zeta_2\\
0 & 0 & 0 & -\zeta_1 & -\zeta_2 & 0\\
0 & 0 & \zeta_1 & 0 & -2i\zeta_3 & -(1-i)\zeta_4\\
0 & 0 & \zeta_2 & 2i\zeta_3 & 0 & -(1+i)\zeta_5\\
(1-i)\zeta_1 & (1+i)\zeta_2 & 0 & (1-i)\zeta_4 & (1+i)\zeta_5 & 0
\end{bmatrix}$$

Writing $\xi_j=\langle g,X_j\rangle$, $j=1,\ldots,6$, we have $\zeta_1=\xi_1-i\xi_2$, $\zeta_2=\xi_1+i\xi_2$, $\zeta_3=\xi_3$, $\zeta_4=\xi_4-i\xi_5$, $\zeta_5=\xi_4+i\xi_5$, $\zeta_6=\xi_6$.

i) If $\zeta_1\neq 0$, then $J_g=\{1,3,4,6\}$.

ii) If $\zeta_1=0$ ($\Rightarrow \zeta_2=0$), $\zeta_3\neq 0$, then $J_g=\{4,5\}$.

iii) If $\zeta_1=0$, $\zeta_3=0$, $\zeta_4\neq 0$, then $J_g=\{4,6\}$.

iv) If $\zeta_1=0$, $\zeta_3=0$, $\zeta_4=0$ ($\Rightarrow \zeta_5=0$), then $J_g=\emptyset$.

We can then write down:

$$e_1=\{1,3,4,6\},\qquad \Omega_{e_1}=\{g\mid \xi_1^2+\xi_2^2\neq 0\},$$
$$e_2=\{4,5\},\qquad \Omega_{e_2}=\{g\mid \xi_1^2+\xi_2^2=0,\ \xi_3\neq 0\},$$
$$e_3=\{4,6\},\qquad \Omega_{e_3}=\{g\mid \xi_1^2+\xi_2^2=0,\ \xi_3=0,\ \xi_4^2+\xi_5^2\neq 0\},$$
$$e_4=\emptyset,\qquad \Omega_{e_4}=\{g\mid \xi_1=\xi_2=\xi_3=\xi_4=\xi_5=0\},$$
$$Q_{e_1}(g)=2(\xi_1^2+\xi_2^2)^2,\qquad u_{e_1}=2(X_1^2+X_2^2)^2,$$
$$Q_{e_2}(g)=4\xi_3^2,\qquad u_{e_2}=-4X_3^2,$$
$$Q_{e_3}(g)=2(\xi_4^2+\xi_5^2),\qquad u_{e_3}=-2(X_4^2+X_5^2),$$
$$Q_{e_4}(g)=1,\qquad u_{e_4}=1.$$

REFERENCES

[1] P. BERNAT, *Sur les représentations unitaires des groupes de Lie résolubles* (*Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, Vol. 82, 1965, pp. 37-99).

[2] P. BERNAT *et al.*, *Représentations des groupes de Lie résolubles*, Dunod, Paris, 1972.

[3] J.-Y. CHARBONNEL, *Sur les semi-caractères des groupes de Lie résolubles connexes* (*J. Funct. Anal.*, Vol. 41, 1981, pp. 175-203).

[4] M. DUFLO, *Caractères des représentations des groupes résolubles associées à une orbite entière*, Chap. IX in [2].

[5] M. DUFLO, M. RAÏS, *Sur l'analyse harmonique sur les groupes de Lie résolubles* (*Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, Vol. 9, 1976, pp. 107-144).

[6] N. V. PEDERSEN, *Semicharacters and solvable Lie groups* (*Math. Ann.*, Vol. 247, 1980, pp. 191-244).

[7] L. PUKANSZKY, *Leçons sur les représentations des groupes*, Dunod, Paris, 1967.

[8] L. PUKANSZKY, *On the characters and the Plancherel formula of nilpotent groups* (*J. Funct. Anal.*, Vol. 1, 1967, pp. 255-280).

[9] L. PUKANSZKY, *On the unitary representations of exponential groups* (*J. Funct. Anal.*, Vol. 2, 1968, pp. 73-112).

[10] L. PUKANSZKY, *Unitary representations of solvable Lie groups* (*Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, Vol. 4, 1971, pp. 457-608).

[11] L. PUKANSZKY, *Characters of connected Lie groups* (*Acta Math.*, Vol. 133, 1974, pp. 81-137).

(Manuscrit reçu le 22 juin 1982,
révisé le 9 mai 1983).

N. V. PEDERSEN,
Mathematical Institute
University of Copenhagen
Universitetsparken 5
2100 København Ø, Denmark
and
Mathematical Institute
The Technical University of Denmark
Building 303, 2800 Lyngby
(Copenhagen) Denmark
(current adress)