

# Totally geodesic submanifolds and arithmeticity

## (Manfred Einsiedler, Winter 2024)

Yuxiang Jiao  
<https://yuxiangjiao.github.io>

### Contents

1	Lecture 1	1
2	Lecture 2	3
3	Lecture 3	5
4	Lecture 4	6
5	Lecture 5	8
6	Lecture 6	9
7	Lecture 7	11
8	Lecture 8	13

### §1 Lecture 1

#### 1. Arithmeticity.

This minicourse focus on two following theorems about the arithmeticity of lattices.

**Theorem 1.1** (Margulis) A lattice  $\Gamma < \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$  is arithmetic.

**Theorem 1.2** (Bader-Fisher-Miller-Stover)

Let  $\Gamma < \mathrm{SO}(d, 1)(\mathbb{R})$  be a lattice. Suppose that  $M = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^d$  contains infinitely many maximal proper totally geodesic closed submanifolds of dimension at least two. Then  $\Gamma$  is arithmetic.

Reminders on arithmetic lattices.

**Example 1.3**

Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a semisimple algebraic  $\mathbb{Q}$ -subgroup of  $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbb{C})$ . Then  $\Gamma = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbb{Z})$  is a lattice in  $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$ . For instance,  $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbb{Z}) < \mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathrm{SO}(d, 1)(\mathbb{Z}) < \mathrm{SO}(d, 1)(\mathbb{R})$ .

**Example 1.4 (Restriction of scalar)**

Let  $F/\mathbb{Q}$  be a number field and fix a basis of  $F$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . For any  $\lambda \in F$ , we let  $A_\lambda$  be the representation of the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear map  $\lambda \cdot : x \in F \mapsto \lambda x \in F$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_F$  be the image of  $F$  under the map  $\lambda \mapsto A_\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_F \subset \mathbb{Q}^{d \times d}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}_F$  is a subalgebra defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . For example,  $F = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{a})$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{Q}$  not a square. Then  $\{1, \sqrt{a}\}$  form a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -basis of  $F$ . We have

$$\mathcal{A}_F = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x & ya \\ y & x \end{bmatrix} : x, y \in \mathbb{Q} \right\}.$$

Now let  $\mathbf{G}$  be an algebraic subgroup of  $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$  defined over  $F$ . The restriction of scalar  $\mathrm{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{G}$  is the following algebraic subgroup of  $\mathrm{SL}(nd, \mathbb{C})$  defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ :

$$\mathrm{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{G} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & \cdots & A_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ A_{n1} & \cdots & A_{nn} \end{bmatrix} : A_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}_F \text{ satisfy as blocks all equations that } \mathbf{G} \text{ satisfies} \right\}.$$

For example,

$$\mathrm{Res}_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})/\mathbb{Q}} \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} : A_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{ij} & y_{ij}a \\ y_{ij} & x_{ij} \end{bmatrix}, A_{11}A_{22} - A_{12}A_{21} = \mathrm{id} \right\}.$$

**Claim 1.5.**  $(\mathrm{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{G})(\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{C})^d$ .

This claim follows from the following observation. Considering  $\mathcal{A}_F$  as a linear variety in  $\mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ . Then

- (1) the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -points of  $\mathcal{A}_F$  are isomorphic to  $F$ ;
- (2) the  $\mathbb{R}$ -points of  $\mathcal{A}_F$  are isomorphic to  $F \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{C}^s$ ;
- (3) the  $\mathbb{C}$ -points of  $\mathcal{A}_F$  are isomorphic to  $F \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{C}^d$ .

Recall that  $F = \mathbb{Q}(\lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in F$ . Note that the characteristic polynomial of  $A_\lambda$  is the minimal polynomial of  $\lambda$ . Hence the eigenvalue of  $A_\lambda$  are the Galois conjugates of  $\lambda$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  or in  $\mathbb{C}$ . We can diagonalize  $A_\lambda$  by some  $g \in \mathrm{GL}(d, \mathbb{R})$  as

$$g^{-1} A_\lambda g = \mathrm{diag}(\varphi_1(\lambda), \dots, \varphi_r(\lambda), \psi_1(\lambda), \dots, \psi_s(\lambda)),$$

where  $\varphi_i : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\psi_i : F \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\psi_i(\lambda)$  can be viewed as  $2 \times 2$ -real matrix.

Now we conjugate  $\mathrm{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{G})$  by  $\mathrm{diag}(g, \dots, g)$ , we obtain the following.

**Claim 1.6.**  $\mathrm{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{G})(\mathbb{R}) \cong \prod_{\varphi: F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{G}^\varphi(\mathbb{R}) \times \prod_{\text{pairs of } \varphi: F \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} \mathbf{G}^\varphi(\mathbb{C})$ , where  $\mathbf{G}^\varphi$  is the algebraic group defined by the polynomials  $f^\varphi$  for all relations  $f$  that  $\mathbf{G}$  satisfies.

**Example 1.7**

Let  $F$  be a totally real number field and  $\lambda \in F$  such that  $\varphi(\lambda) > 0$  for precisely one Galois

embedding. Let

$$Q(x_1, \dots, x_n, y) = x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2 - \lambda y^2.$$

Then  $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{SO}(Q)$  is a semisimple algebraic group defined over  $F$  if  $n \geq 2$ . Hence

$$\mathrm{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R}) \cong \mathrm{SO}(n, 1)(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathrm{SO}(n + 1, \mathbb{R})^{d-1},$$

which is also semisimple. Using the first example we know that  $(\mathrm{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{G})(\mathbb{Z})$  is a lattice and hence the projection to  $\mathrm{SO}(n, 1)(\mathbb{R})$  is also a lattice.

**Definition 1.8.** Let  $G$  be a Lie group and  $\Gamma$  be a lattice. We say that  $\Gamma$  is **arithmetic** if there exists an algebraic group  $\mathbf{G}$  defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$  such that  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R}) = G \times K$  for a compact group  $K$ ,  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Z}) < \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$  is a lattice, and  $\Gamma$  is commensurable to a conjugate of the projection of  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Z})$  module  $K$  to  $G$ .

It is also worth noting that  $\mathrm{SO}(n, 1)(\mathbb{R})$  contains some non-arithmeticity lattices. An approach to construct non-arithmetic lattices is the following. We begin with two non compact arithmetic hyperbolic spaces  $M_i = \Gamma_i \backslash \mathbb{H}^n$  and assume that they contain a same hyperbolic submanifold  $N$ . We then divide these them along  $N$  respectively and glue them back with exchanged pieces such that the resulting hyperbolic manifold  $M$  is still non compact. The non arithmeticity of  $M$  can be deduced from the following: the trace field for non-cocompact arithmetic lattices is  $\mathbb{Q}$  and hence the length of closed geodesics are in  $\exp(\mathbb{Q})$ , but this is not always true for some weird ways of gluing manifolds.

## §2 Lecture 2

### 2. Finite generation.

**Theorem 2.1** (Garland-Raghunathan)

If  $G$  is a semisimple Lie group and  $\Gamma < G$  is a lattice, then  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated.

We do not prove this theorem in this lecture. We will show the following proposition instead, which is easier to establish.

**Proposition 2.2**

If  $G$  is compactly generated and  $\Gamma < G$  is a cocompact lattice, then  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated.

*Proof.* Let  $Q \subset G$  be a compact subset such that  $G = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} Q^n$ . Let  $B \subset G$  be compact such that  $\Gamma B = G$ . Define  $S := \Gamma \cap (B \cup BQB^{-1})$ , which is a finite set.

**Claim 2.3.**  $BQ \subset SB$ .

Indeed, let  $b \in B, g \in Q$  then  $bg = \gamma b_1$  with  $\gamma \in \Gamma, b_1 \in B$ . Then  $\gamma = bgb_1^{-1} \in S$ .

Therefore,  $BQ^n \subset S^n B$  and hence  $G \subset \langle S \rangle B$ . For any  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , there exists some  $\eta \in \langle S \rangle$  and  $b \in B$  with  $\gamma = \eta b$ . Note that  $b = \eta^{-1} \gamma \in \Gamma \cap B \subset S$ , hence  $\gamma \in \langle S \rangle$ .  $\square$

### 3. Trace fields.

**Proposition 2.4**

Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a semisimple algebraic group defined over  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$  has no compact factors. Let  $\Gamma < G$  be a lattice. Then

$$F := \mathbb{Q}(\{ \text{tr}(\text{Ad}_\gamma) : \gamma \in \Gamma \})$$

is a finitely generated field. Moreover, there exists an algebraic group  $\mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}$  defined over  $F$  and an algebraic isogeny  $\varphi : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}$  defined over  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\varphi(\Gamma) \subset \mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}(F)$ .

*Proof.* We define the map  $T : h \in \mathbf{G} \mapsto \text{tr}(\text{Ad}_h)$ , which is a polynomial function on  $\mathbf{G}$ . For every  $g \in \mathbf{G}$ , we have that  $g.T : h \in \mathbf{G} \mapsto \text{tr}(\text{Ad}_{hg})$  is another polynomial of the same degree. Hence  $V = \langle g.T : g \in \mathbf{G} \rangle$  is finite dimensional.

**Claim 2.5.**  $V = \langle \gamma.T : \gamma \in \Gamma \rangle$ .

*Proof.* Because the right hand side  $W = \langle \gamma.T : \gamma \in \Gamma \rangle$  satisfies  $\gamma.W = W$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . By Borel density ( $\Gamma$  is Zariski dense in  $\mathbf{G}$ ), this implies that  $W$  is invariant for every  $g \in \mathbf{G}$  and hence  $W = V$  by the definition of  $V$ .  $\square$

Let  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \in \Gamma$  be such that  $\{ \gamma_i.T \}$  forms a basis of  $V$ . We define  $\varphi(g)$  to be the matrix representation of  $g.$  on  $V$  with respect to the basis  $\{ \gamma_i.T \}$ . Then  $\varphi(g) \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$  and we take  $\mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}$  to be the image of  $\varphi$ .

**Exercise 2.6.** (1) Use Borel density to show that  $\{ \gamma_i.T|_\Gamma \}$  is linearly independent.  
 (2) Moreover, there exists  $s_1, \dots, s_n \in \Gamma$  such that  $\{ \gamma_i.T \}$  is linearly independent restricted to  $\{ s_1, \dots, s_n \}$ .

Consequently,  $A = \left[ \text{tr}(\text{Ad}_{s_i \gamma_j}) \right]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ . Fix  $j$  and conclude that

$$\gamma \gamma_j.T = \sum_i \varphi(\gamma)_{ij} \gamma_i.T.$$

Now we evaluate this polynomial on  $s_k$ , we obtain

$$\gamma \gamma_j.T(s_k) = \sum_i \varphi(\gamma)_{ij} \gamma_i.T(s_k) = \sum_i \varphi(\gamma)_{ij} A_{kj}.$$

On the other hand,  $\gamma \gamma_j.T(s_k) = \text{tr}(\text{Ad}_{s_k \gamma \gamma_j}) \in F$ . Hence  $\varphi(\Gamma) \subset \mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}(F)$ . By Borel density,

$$\overline{\mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}(F)}^{\text{Zar}} = \varphi(\overline{\Gamma}^{\text{Zar}}) = \varphi(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}.$$

Hence  $\mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}$  is defined over  $F$ .

Finally, recall that  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated by some  $S \subset \Gamma$ . Let  $L \subset F$  be the field generated by the matrix entries of  $\varphi(\gamma)$  for  $\gamma \in S$ . Then  $L$  is finitely generated and  $\varphi(\Gamma) \subset \mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}(L)$ . This implies that both  $\mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}$  and its Lie algebra are defined over  $L$ . We conclude that  $\text{tr}(\text{Ad}_\gamma)$  calculated after applying the derivative of  $\varphi$  inside the Lie algebra of  $\mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}$  gives values in  $L$ . We obtain  $F \subset L \subset F$  and hence  $L = F$ .  $\square$

#### 4. Margulis's strategy for arithmeticity.

Suppose  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}^{\text{ad}}$  and  $\Gamma \subset \mathbf{G}(F)$ ,  $F$  is finitely generated satisfying  $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\mathbb{k}$  be a local field and  $\varphi : F \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  be a Galois embedding. Let  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}^\varphi$  be the algebraic  $\mathbb{k}$ -group obtained by applying  $\varphi$  to the coefficient of the elements of  $\mathbf{G}$ . Then  $\varphi(\Gamma) \subset \mathbf{H}(\mathbb{k})$  is Zariski dense by Borel density theorem.

**Claim 2.7.** Suppose for any such  $\mathbb{k}$  and any group homomorphism  $\varphi_\Gamma : \Gamma \rightarrow H = \mathbf{H}(\mathbb{k})$  one of the followings holds:

- $\varphi_\Gamma$  has a continuous extension to  $G$ , or
- $\varphi_\Gamma$  has bounded image, i.e.  $\overline{\varphi_\Gamma(\Gamma)} \subset \mathbf{H}(\Gamma)$  is compact in  $H$ .

Then  $\Gamma$  is arithmetic.

**Notation 2.8.**  $\overline{V}^{\text{Zar}}$  is the closure in Zariski topology and  $\overline{V}$  is the closure in Hausdorff topology induced by the local field.

### §3 Lecture 3

This time, we aim to show the claim mentioned at the end of last course.

**Step 1:  $F$  is a number field.** Suppose for a contradiction that  $\text{tr}(\text{Ad}_{\gamma_0}) = x_0 \in F$  is transcendental for some  $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ . Pick  $p$  to be a prime and some transcendental  $x'_0 \in \mathbb{Q}_p$  with  $\|x'_0\|_p > 1$ . We can find a finite field extension  $\mathbb{k}/\mathbb{Q}_p$  and  $\varphi : F \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  with  $x_0 \mapsto x'_0$ .

We apply the assumption for this  $\varphi$  and  $\mathbb{k}$ :

- $\varphi_\Gamma$  cannot have a continuous extension  $\varphi_G : G \rightarrow H$ . Notice that  $G^\circ$  is connected and hence  $\varphi_G(G^\circ) = \{\text{id}\}$ . This implies that  $\varphi_G(G)$  is finite, which contradicts the Zariski density.
- $\varphi_\Gamma(\Gamma)$  cannot be compact because  $\|\text{tr Ad}_{\varphi_\Gamma(\gamma_0)}\|_p = \|x'_0\|_p > 1$  and hence  $\text{Ad}_{\varphi_\Gamma(\gamma_0)}$  has an eigenvalue larger than 1.

**Step 2:  $\Gamma$  is “almost integral”.** For simplicity, we assume that  $F = \mathbb{Q}$ . As  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated, there exists primes  $p_1, \dots, p_\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\Gamma \subset \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Z}[1/(p_1 \cdots p_\ell)])$ . Applying the assumption for  $\varphi : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p$  with  $p = p_j$ , we have that  $\overline{\varphi_\Gamma(\Gamma)}$  is compact. This means that all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  have entries where the powers of  $p$  in the denominator is bounded. In other words, since  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  is compact open and  $\overline{\varphi_\Gamma(\Gamma)}$  is compact, we have  $\overline{\varphi_\Gamma(\Gamma)} \cap \mathbf{H}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  has finite index in  $\overline{\varphi_\Gamma(\Gamma)}$ .

Applying this for all primes  $p = p_j$ , we obtain that  $[\Gamma : \Gamma \cap \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Z})] < \infty$ . For general fields  $F$ , this argument shows that  $[\Gamma : \Gamma \cap \mathbf{G}(\mathcal{O}_F)] < \infty$ .

#### Step 3: Informations from the real and complex $\varphi$ 's.

**Case 1.**  $\varphi_\Gamma$  has a continuous extension.

**Claim 3.1.** In this case  $\varphi = \text{id} : F \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* If  $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{R}$  then  $\varphi$  is clearly an isogeny. Hence calculating the trace in the Lie algebras of  $H$  and  $G$  gives the same. This gives  $\varphi(\text{tr Ad}_\gamma) = \text{tr Ad}_\gamma$  for  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and hence  $\varphi = \text{id}$  as  $F$  is generated by traces.

Suppose  $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be the image of the real Lie algebra of  $G$  under the derivative of  $\varphi_G$ . Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be the complex Lie algebra of  $H$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}$  is an  $\mathbb{R}$  Lie subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}}$  is preserved by  $\varphi_\Gamma(\Gamma)$  and hence preserved by  $\mathbf{H}$ . Therefore  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}}$  is an ideal in  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Since  $\varphi_\Gamma(\Gamma)$  is Zariski dense in  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}}$  must be  $\mathfrak{h}$  itself. Now we take an  $\mathbb{R}$ -basis of the Lie algebra of  $G$ . The

pushforward of this basis under the derivative  $\varphi_G$  is an  $\mathbb{R}$ -basis of  $\mathfrak{m}$  and hence a  $\mathbb{C}$ -basis of  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{h}$ . Applying the same argument with the case  $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{R}$ , we obtain that  $\varphi|_F = \text{id}$ .  $\square$

**Case 2.**  $\overline{\varphi_{\Gamma}(\Gamma)}$  is compact in  $H$ .

**Claim 3.2.**  $\varphi(F) \subset \mathbb{R}$  and  $H$  is compact.

*Proof.* Let  $M = \overline{\varphi_{\Gamma}(\Gamma)} \subset H$ , which is compact by the assumption. Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be the real Lie algebra of  $M$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{h}$  by the same argument. Moreover, if  $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$  then  $\mathfrak{m} \cap (i\mathfrak{m}) = \emptyset$ . This is because for every  $v \in \mathfrak{m} \cap (i\mathfrak{m})$ , the exponential map  $\exp : t \mapsto \exp(tv) \in M$  is a bounded entire function over  $\mathbb{C}$  and hence  $v = 0$ .

We obtain that if  $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$  then  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus i\mathfrak{m}$ . Using a  $\mathbb{R}$ -basis of  $\mathfrak{m}$  as a  $\mathbb{C}$ -basis of  $\mathfrak{h}$ , we see that  $\varphi(F) \subset \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{C}$ . So we can assume without loss of generality that  $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{R}$ .

As in the real world, every compact subgroups are algebraic. Because  $M$  is compact and Zariski dense in  $\mathbf{H}$ , we obtain that  $H$  is compact.  $\square$

We conclude what we have obtained from different embeddings.

- (1)  $F$  is a number field.
- (2)  $\Gamma \cap \mathbf{G}(\mathcal{O}_F)$  is finite index in  $\Gamma$ .
- (3) For  $\varphi : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{C}$  with continuous extensions:  $\varphi|_F = \text{id}$ .
- (4) For  $\varphi : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{C}$  with compact closures,  $\varphi(F) \subset \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{G}^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R})$  is compact.

Now we apply  $\text{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}}\mathbf{G}$  and obtain a new semisimple algebraic group  $\mathbf{Q}$ . Its group of  $\mathbb{R}$ -points is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{G}^{\text{id}}(\mathbb{R}) \times K$ , where  $K = \prod_{\varphi \neq \text{id}, \varphi: F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{G}^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R})$  is compact. Moreover (by choosing a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $\mathcal{O}_F$  in the construction of  $\text{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{G})$ ) we can ensure that  $\text{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{G})(\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbf{G}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ . Finally, projecting module  $K$  we obtain the arithmetic lattice  $\mathbf{G}^{\text{id}}(\mathcal{O}_F) \subset G$ . As  $\Gamma \cap \mathbf{G}^{\text{id}}(\mathcal{O}_F)$  has finite index in  $\Gamma$ , we obtain that  $\Gamma$  is arithmetic.  $\square$

## §4 Lecture 4

### 5. Superrigidity.

#### Theorem 4.1 (Margulis's Superrigidity)

Let  $G = \text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\Gamma$  be a lattice. Let  $\mathbb{k}$  be a local field and  $\mathbf{H}$  be a simple adjoint algebraic group over  $\mathbb{k}$ . Let  $\varphi : \Gamma \rightarrow H = \mathbf{H}(\mathbb{k})$  a homomorphism with a Zariski dense image. Then one of the following must hold:

- (1)  $\varphi$  has a continuous extension  $\varphi_G : G \rightarrow H$ , or
- (2)  $\overline{\varphi(\Gamma)}$  is compact in  $H$ .

This theorem implies the arithmeticity by Claim 2.7.

### 6. Getting started for $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ .

Let  $U < \text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$  be a root subgroup, for example  $\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & * & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$ . Then  $U$  acts ergodically on  $X = \Gamma \backslash G$  by Moore's ergodic theorem. Let  $x_0 \in X$  be a  $U$ -generic point for  $U$ , that is

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{x_0 u_t} dt \xrightarrow{w*} m_X \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let  $V$  be an irreducible representation of  $H$  over  $\mathbb{k}$ . Then  $H$  acts on  $\mathbb{P}(V)$  without fixed points. Restricting on  $\varphi(\Gamma)$  this remains true.

Although this superrigidity also states for  $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ , we can keep in mind that  $H$  is a  $p$ -adic Lie group but  $G$  is a real Lie group. In this case,  $\varphi$  is the only thing links these two group. So we may consider the space

$$\tilde{X} = \Gamma \backslash (G \times \mathbb{P}(V)),$$

where  $\gamma$  acts on  $G \times \mathbb{P}(V)$  as  $(g, [v]) \mapsto (\gamma g, \varphi(\gamma)[v])$  diagonally. Note that the projection  $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X, \Gamma(g, [v]) \mapsto \Gamma g$  is a nice factor map (projecting to  $\mathbb{P}(V)$  is not nice since  $\Gamma$  acting on  $\mathbb{P}(V)$  is not properly discontinuously).

Let  $\tilde{x}_0$  be any point in  $\tilde{X}$  mapping to  $x_0$ . Let

$$\mu_T = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{\tilde{x}_0 u_t} dt.$$

Suppose  $\mu_T \rightarrow \mu$  along a subset of  $T$ 's, then  $\mu$  satisfies

- $\mu$  is  $U$ -invariant, and
- $\mu$  is a probability measure projecting to  $m_X$ .

## 7. Getting started for $\mathrm{SO}(d, 1)(\mathbb{R})$ .

We skip this part for the moment. This will be discussed in [Lecture 8](#).

## 8. A measure-valued map.

We are given a subgroup  $S < G$  (for example,  $S = U$ ), an extension  $\tilde{X} = \Gamma \backslash (G \times \mathbb{P}(V))$  and an  $S$ -invariant measure  $\mu$  on  $\tilde{X}$  projecting to  $m_X$ .

We unfold  $\tilde{X}$  to create an infinite  $\Gamma$  invariant measure  $\tilde{\mu}$  on  $G \times \mathbb{P}(V)$ . We want to use conditional measures for the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{B}_G \times \mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}$ , where  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}$  is the trivial  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathbb{P}(V)$ . This way we get a measurable map

$$g \times G \rightarrow \delta_g \times \nu_g,$$

where  $\nu_g$  is a probability measure on  $\mathbb{P}(V)$ . Moreover,  $\tilde{\mu}$  is invariant under  $S$ . Hence the conditional measure satisfy a resulting compatibility. In this case, we obtain  $\nu_{gs} = \nu_g$  for  $s \in S$  and almost every  $g$ .

Also  $\tilde{\mu}$  is  $\Gamma$  invariant. Then the conditional measure also satisfies

$$\delta_{\gamma g} \times \nu_{\gamma g} = \gamma_*(\delta_g \times \nu_g) = \delta_{\gamma g} \times (\varphi(\gamma)_* \nu_g),$$

and hence  $\nu_{\gamma g} = \varphi(\gamma)_* \nu_g$  for  $\gamma$  and almost every  $g \in G$ . We can interpret this as a measurable  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map

$$\phi : G/S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{P}(V)), \quad gS \mapsto \nu_g.$$

## 9. Locally closed orbits.

Let  $V = \mathbf{V}(\mathbb{k})$  be a variety over a local field  $\mathbb{k}$ . Let  $H = \mathbf{H}(\mathbb{k})$  act algebraically on  $V$ . We want to understand  $H$ -orbits and  $H$ -ergodic measures on  $V$ .

**Claim 4.2.**  $H$ -orbits are locally close, i.e. for any  $v \in V$  there exists a neighborhood  $B$  of  $v$  so that  $B \cap \overline{Hv} = B \cap Hv$ .

*Proof.*  $h \in H \mapsto h.v \in V$  is an algebraic map (possibly with a non-trivial stabilizer). Using that a polynomial regular map will only miss points from a lower dimension subvariety of the Zariski closure of the image, one can choose  $B$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.3**

Let  $\mu$  be a measure on  $V$  that is  $H$ -ergodic. Then there is some  $v \in V$  such that  $\mu$  gives full measure to  $H.v$ .

**§5 Lecture 5**

*Proof.* Let  $B_1, B_2, \dots$  be a basis of the topology of  $V$ . For any  $n$  we apply the assumed ergodicity to  $H.B_n$ . Hence we have  $\mu(H.B_n) = \emptyset$  or  $\mu(V \setminus H.B_n) = \emptyset$ . We take the union of these null sets and suppose  $v_0, v_1$  do not belong to these null sets.

**Claim 5.1.**  $H.v_0 = H.v_1$ .

*Proof.* By the local closeness, we can take  $B_{n_0} \ni v_0$  such that  $B_{n_0} \cap \overline{H.v_0} = B_{n_0} \cap H.v_0$ . Since  $v_0$  does not belong to these null set, we have  $\mu(H.B_{n_0}) > 0$ . Consequently,  $\mu(V \setminus H.B_{n_0}) = 0$  and hence  $v_1 \in H.B_{n_0}$ . Then we can take some  $h_1 \in H$  such that  $h_1 v_1 \in B_{n_0}$ .

Assume that  $h_1 v_1 \notin H.v_0 \cap B_{n_0}$ . By the local discreteness of the orbits, we can take some  $B_{n_1} \ni h_1 v_1$  such that  $B_{n_1} \subset B_{n_0}$  and  $B_{n_1} \cap H.v_0 = \emptyset$ . A same deduction as above, we have  $\mu(H.B_{n_1}) > 0$  and  $v_0 \in H.B_{n_1}$ . This contradicts  $B_{n_1} \cap H.v_0 = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

$\square$

**Proposition 5.2**

Let  $H = \mathbf{H}(\mathbb{k})$  act algebraically on  $V = \mathbf{V}(\mathbb{k})$ . Let  $\mu$  be a Borel probability measure on  $V$ . Then  $\text{Stab}_H(\mu) = \{h \in H : h_*\mu = \mu\}$  is a compact extension of the  $\mathbb{k}$ -points of the algebraic group  $\text{Fix}_H(\mu) = \{h : h.v = v, \forall v \in \text{supp } \mu\}$ .

*Sketch of the proof.* Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\text{supp } \mu$  is Zariski dense in  $\mathbf{V}$ . If  $h \in \text{Stab}_H(\mu)$  then  $h$  normalizes  $\text{Fix}_H(\mu)$ . By taking the quotient we can assume that  $\text{Fix}_H(\mu) = \{\text{id}\}$ . Then we can find a finite set  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\} \subset \text{supp } \mu$  such that  $\dim \text{Fix}_H(v_1, \dots, v_n) = 0$ .

**Exercise 5.3.** For all  $(v'_1, \dots, v'_n)$  in a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ , we have  $\dim \text{Fix}_H(v'_1, \dots, v'_n) = 0$ .

Assuming by contradiction that  $\text{Stab}_H(\mu)$  is non compact, we can apply Poincaré recurrence. Choose  $(v'_1, \dots, v'_n)$  near  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  which is infinitely recurrent under the  $\text{Stab}_H(\mu)$  action. But the orbits are locally closed. Therefore there are infinitely many  $h \in \text{Stab}_H(\mu)$  fixing  $(v'_1, \dots, v'_n)$ . This contradicts  $\dim \text{Fix}_H(v'_1, \dots, v'_n) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.4 (Zimmer)**

The  $H$ -actions on  $\mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{P}(V))$  has locally closed orbits.



## 10. Creating a map with values in $H/L$ .

Recall that we have a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map

$$\phi : G/U \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{P}(V)).$$

Let  $m_{G/U}$  be a smooth measure on  $G/U$ . By ergodicity of  $U$  on  $\Gamma \backslash G$ , we have by duality that the  $\Gamma$ -action on  $(G/U, m_{G/U})$  is ergodic. Hence  $\phi_*(m_{G/U})$  is a  $\Gamma$ -ergodic measure on  $\mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{P}(V))$ . So it is also  $H$ -ergodic. Since  $H$ -orbits on  $\mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{P}(V))$  are locally closed,  $\phi_*(m_{G/U})$  gives the full measure to a single  $H$ -orbit  $H.v_0$ . That is,

$$\phi : G/U \rightarrow H.v_0 \cong H/\text{Stab}_H(v_0) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We distinguish two cases:

- (1)  $\text{Stab}_H(v_0)$  is non-compact. Then we take  $\mathbf{L}_0 = \text{Fix}_{\mathbf{H}}(\text{supp } v_0)$  satisfying that  $\mathbf{L}(k)$  is non compact but not all of  $H$ . In this case  $\text{Stab}_H(v_0) \subset N_H(\mathbf{L}_0) = \mathbf{L}$ , where  $\mathbf{L}$  is a proper algebraic subgroup of  $\mathbf{H}$ .
- (2)  $\text{Stab}_H(v_0)$  is compact.

Hence these two cases come to be

- (1) There exists a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant  $\phi : G/U \rightarrow H/L$  for  $L = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{k})$  and  $\mathbf{L} < \mathbf{H}$  a proper  $\mathbb{k}$ -subgroup.
- (2) There exists a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant  $\phi : G/U \rightarrow H/L$  where  $L < H$  is compact.

## §6 Lecture 6

Let us recall our strategy to establish Margulis superrigidity:

- (1) Consider a root group  $U$  acting ergodically on  $X = \Gamma \backslash G$  with a generic point  $x_0$ .
- (2) Using an  $\tilde{x}_0 \in \tilde{X} = \Gamma \backslash (G \times \mathbb{P}(V))$  to construct a lifting measure  $\tilde{\mu}$  on  $\tilde{X}$  which is  $U$ -invariant and projects to  $m_X$ .
- (3) Consider the conditional measure of  $m_X$ , which gives a  $U$ -invariant and  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map

$$\phi : G \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{P}(V)).$$

- (4) By the ergodicity of  $\Gamma \curvearrowright G/U$  and the local closeness of  $H$ -orbits on  $\mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{P}(V))$ , we know that  $\phi(G)$  falls in one  $H$ -orbit  $H.v_0 \cong H/\text{Stab}_H(v_0)$ .
- (5) By studying the algebraic structure of  $\text{Stab}_H(v_0)$ , there are only two cases should be considered:
  - There exists a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant  $\phi : G/U \rightarrow H/L$  for  $L = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{k})$  and  $\mathbf{L} < \mathbf{H}$  a proper  $\mathbb{k}$ -subgroup.
  - There exists a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant  $\phi : G/U \rightarrow H/L$  where  $L < H$  is compact.

## 11. Metric ergodicity (Bader-Gelander)

We now consider the case  $\phi : G/U \rightarrow H/L$  where  $L$  is compact. In this case,  $H/L$  has an  $H$ -invariant metric.

### Lemma 6.1

Let  $S$  be a unbounded subgroup of a simple group  $G$ . Let  $\phi : G/S \rightarrow Y$  be continuous and  $G$ -equivariant for an action of  $G$  on  $Y$  preserving a metric on  $Y$ . Then  $\phi$  is constant.

*Proof. Case 1.* Assume that  $S$  contains some diagonalizable element  $a$ . Let  $u \in U = G_a^+$  then  $a^n u a^{-n} \rightarrow \text{id}$ . Then

$$a^n \phi(uS) = \phi(a^n uS) = \phi(a^n u a^{-n} S) \rightarrow \phi(\text{id}S), \quad n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Note that  $d(a^n \phi(uS), \phi(\text{id}S)) = d(\phi(uS), a^{-n} \phi(\text{id}S))$ , we also have

$$\phi(\text{id}S) = a^{-n} \phi(\text{id}S) \rightarrow \phi(uS).$$

Hence  $\phi$  is  $u$ -invariant. Noting that  $G_a^+, G_a^-$  generates  $G$ , we obtain that  $\phi$  is constant.

**Case 2.** Assume that  $S \supset U$  a unipotent subgroup. We think the case that  $G = \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$  and  $U = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & * \\ & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$ . Let  $v_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & \frac{1}{n} \end{bmatrix}$  and then there exists  $u_n, u'_n \in U$  such that  $u_n v_n u'_n \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 2 & \\ & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix} = a$ . Then we have  $u_n \phi(v_n S) \rightarrow \phi(aS)$  and  $\phi(v_n S) \rightarrow \phi(\text{id}S)$ . Since the metric is  $G$ -invariant, we have  $u_n \phi(v_n S) \rightarrow u_n \phi(\text{id}S) = \phi(\text{id}S)$  and hence  $\phi(aS) = \phi(\text{id}S)$ . This argument works for every  $a$  so we obtain that  $\phi$  is  $A$ -invariant. Then we can apply the result of the first case.  $\square$

But in our case, the map  $\phi$  is only measurable and  $\Gamma$ -equivariant. The assumption of this lemma is too strong to apply. We need to apply the lemma to another map associated to  $\phi$ .

### Theorem 6.2

Let  $G = \text{GL}(3, \mathbb{R}) \supset U$  a root group,  $\Gamma < G$  a lattice and  $\phi : G/U \rightarrow H/L$  a measurable  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map, where  $L < H$  is compact so that  $H/L$  has an  $H$ -invariant metric. Then  $\phi$  is constant almost surely. In particular,  $\overline{\phi_\Gamma(\Gamma)} \subset H$  is compact.

*Proof of "in particular".* If  $\phi(gU) \equiv h_0 L$  for  $m_G$ -almost every  $g \in G$ . Then

$$\phi(\gamma)h_0L \doteq \phi(\gamma gU) \doteq h_0L, \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma,$$

here  $\doteq$  denotes the almost surely equality. Therefore,  $\overline{\phi_\Gamma(\Gamma)} \in h_0 L h_0^{-1}$  which is compact.  $\square$

*Proof.* Replacing the metric on  $H/L$  be a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant one, we may assume that the metric is bounded. We define

$$Y = L(G, H/L)^\Gamma := \{ \Gamma\text{-equivariant measurable maps from } G \text{ to } H \}.$$

We endow  $Y = L(G, H/L)^\Gamma$  with the metric

$$d_Y(f_1, f_2) = \int_F d_{H/L}(f_1(g), f_2(g)) \, dm_G(g),$$

where  $F$  is a fundamental domain of  $\Gamma$ . The action of  $G$  on  $Y$  is given by

$$\forall g_0 \in G, f \in Y, \quad g_0.f := (g \in G \mapsto f(gg_0)) \in Y.$$

**Exercise 6.3.** Show that the  $G$ -action is continuous and isometric on  $Y$ .

Now we define a new map  $\tilde{\phi} : G/U \rightarrow Y$  given by

$$g_0 U \mapsto (g \in G \mapsto \phi(gg_0 U) \in H/L).$$

Note that this map is also  $G$ -invariant. By applying the lemma to  $\tilde{\phi}$ , we know that  $\phi$  is a constant almost surely.  $\square$

## 12. Algebraic $T$ -shadows (Bader-Furman)

This concept occurs in the study of **algebraic representations of ergodic actions (AREA)**. Recall that we want to study the  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $\phi : G/U \rightarrow H/L$  for  $L = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{k})$  noncompact and  $\mathbf{L} < \mathbf{H}$  a proper  $\mathbb{k}$ -subgroup.

**Definition 6.4.** Let  $T < G$  be unbounded. A measurable map  $\psi : G \rightarrow H/L$  is called **an algebraic  $T$ -shadow** (for the  $(\Gamma \times T)$ -space  $G$ ) if

- (1)  $L = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{k})$  for an algebraic subgroup  $\mathbf{L} < \mathbf{H}$  over  $\mathbb{k}$ .
- (2)  $\psi$  is measurable and defined almost everywhere.
- (3) For every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,  $\psi(\gamma g) = \phi(\gamma)\psi(g)$  almost everywhere.
- (4) For every  $t \in T$ , there exists  $\tau(t) \in N_H(L)/L$  so that

$$\psi(gt) = \psi(g)\tau(t), \quad \text{a.e..}$$

### Lemma 6.5

$\tau$  is uniquely determined by the definition and  $\tau$  is a measurable (hence continuous) homomorphism  $\tau : T \rightarrow N_H(L)/L$ .

### Lemma 6.6

If  $\psi : G \rightarrow H/L$  is a  $T_j$ -shadow for  $j = 1, \dots, \ell$  and  $T = \langle T_1, \dots, T_\ell \rangle$ , then  $\psi$  is also a  $T$ -shadow.

## §7 Lecture 7

**Aim 7.1.** To show  $\psi$  is a  $T$ -shadow for large  $T$ .

### Lemma 7.2 ( $G$ -shadow)

Suppose  $\psi : G \rightarrow H/L$  is a  $G$ -shadow. Then  $L$  is a normal subgroup of  $H$  and there exists an  $h_0 \in H$  so that  $\tau(\gamma) = h_0\gamma h_0^{-1} \in H/L$ . In particular, if  $H$  is simple, adjoint and  $L \neq H$  then  $L = \{\text{id}\}$ .

*Proof.* For every  $g$ , we have  $\psi(g_0g)L = \psi(g_0)\tau(g)L$  for almost every  $g_0$ . By a Fubini argument, for almost every  $g_0$ , we have (without loss of generality)

$$\psi(g_0g)L = \psi(g_0)\tau(g)L, \quad \forall g \in G.$$

Let  $\psi(g_0) = h_0L$ . Then for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,

$$\psi(\gamma g_0g) = \gamma\psi(g_0g) \subset \gamma h_0 N_H(L)/L.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\psi(\gamma g_0g) = \psi(g_0(g_0^{-1}\gamma g_0)g) = \psi(g_0)\tau(g_0^{-1}\gamma g_0)\tau(g) \subset h_0 N_H(L)/L.$$

Hence we obtain  $h_0^{-1}\gamma h_0 \in N_H(L)$  and hence  $N_H(L) = H$  by the Zariski density of  $\Gamma$ .  $\square$

**Definition 7.3.** Let  $\psi_1 : G \rightarrow H/L_1$  and  $\psi_2 : G \rightarrow H/L_2$  be two  $T$ -shadows. We say that  $\psi_2$  is a **factor** of  $\psi_1$  if there exists  $p \in H$  with  $L_1 p \subset p L_2$  and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & G/L_1 \\ & \nearrow \psi_1 & \downarrow \cdot p L_2 \cdot \\ G & & \\ & \searrow \psi_2 & \\ & & G/L_2 \end{array}$$

**Lemma 7.4**

Assuming  $\psi_2$  is a factor of  $\psi_1$  and  $p \in H$  is as in the definition. Then

$$\tau_1(t) p L_2 = p \tau_2(t) L_2, \quad \forall t \in T.$$

**Proposition 7.5** (Initial  $T$ -shadow)

Assume that  $T$  is unbounded. There exists a  $T$ -shadow  $\psi : G \rightarrow H/L_{\min}$  so that any other  $T$ -shadow is a factor. In fact, every  $T$ -shadow with  $L_{\min} = \overline{L_{\min}}^{\text{Zar}}$  minimal in the set of all such Zariski closures is an initial  $T$ -shadow as above.

**Corollary 7.6** (Normalizer)

Let  $\psi_{\min} : G \rightarrow H/L_{\min}$  be an initial  $T$ -shadow as in the proposition. Then  $\psi_{\min}$  is also an initial  $N_G(T)$ -shadow.

*Proof.* Let  $a \in N_G(T)$ , we define a new  $T$ -shadow  $\psi_a : G \rightarrow H/L_{\min}$  by  $\psi_a(g) = \psi_{\min}(ga)$  and  $\tau_a(t) = \tau_{\min}(a^{-1}ta)$ . Then

$$\psi_a(gt) = \psi_{\min}(gta) = \psi_{\min}(ga)\tau_{\min}(a^{-1}ta) = \psi_a(g)\tau_a(t).$$

Noting that  $\tau_{\min}$  is initial, there exists  $p = p_a$  such that  $\psi_a = (\cdot p L_{\min}) \circ \psi_{\min}$ . That is,  $\psi_{\min}(ga)L_{\min} = \psi_{\min}(g)p_a L_{\min}$ . Therefore we obtain a  $N_G(T)$ -shadow by letting  $\tau(a) = p_a$ .  $\square$

### 13. Conclusion for $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ .

**Aim 7.7.** Start with a  $U$ -shadow and end up with a  $G$ -shadow.

*Proof.* For the  $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$  case, the root space can be generated by  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, -\alpha, -\beta, -\gamma$ . We start with  $U = U_{\alpha}$ . By the proposition and the corollary, there exists an initial  $U_{\alpha}$ -shadow  $\psi_{\min}$ , which is also a  $U_{\beta}$ -shadow. Applying the corollary again, we can find an initial  $U_{\beta}$ -shadow  $\psi'_{\min}$  (which a priori can be greater than  $\psi_{\min}$ ). Then we have that  $\psi'_{\min}$  is also  $U_{\gamma}$ -shadow. We continue this process and will turn back to get a  $U_{\alpha}$ -shadow.

This means that  $\psi'_{\min}$  can not be better than  $\psi_{\min}$ . Moreover,  $\psi_{\min}$  is an initial  $T$ -shadow for  $T = U_{\alpha}, U_{\beta}, U_{\gamma}, U_{-\alpha}, U_{-\beta}, U_{-\gamma}$ . These root groups generate  $G$  and hence  $\psi_{\min}$  is a  $G$ -shadow. Therefore  $L$  is trivial and we obtain a continuous extension of  $\varphi_{\Gamma}$ .  $\square$

*Proof idea for Proposition 7.5.* Given  $\psi_{\min}$  and  $\psi$ , we define

$$\psi_V(g) = (\psi_{\min}(g), \psi(g)) \in V = H/L_{\min} \times H/L.$$

Then  $\mathbf{M} = \overline{\{(\tau_{\min}(t), \tau(t)) : t \in T\}}^{\text{Zar}} \subset N_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{L}_{\min}) \times N_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{L})$  and  $\mathbf{V} = \overline{V}^{\text{Zar}}$  is homogeneous for  $\mathbf{H}$  acting diagonally. By the ergodicity and locally-closed orbits we obtain that  $\psi_V$  takes values in only one  $H \times M$ -orbit.  $\square$

## §8 Lecture 8

### 7. Getting started for $\text{SO}(d, 1)(\mathbb{R})$ .

Now we will discuss about this skipped part. First, we discuss about the totally geodesic submanifolds in  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^d$ .

For the case of  $d = 3$ ,  $\mathbb{H}^3$  can be interpreted as  $\text{SO}(3, 1)(\mathbb{R})^\circ / \text{SO}(3, \mathbb{R})$  or  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) / \text{SU}(2, \mathbb{R})$ . In  $\mathbb{H}^3$ , there is a standard embedded  $\mathbb{H}^2$  as

$$\mathbb{H}^2 \cong \text{SO}(2, 1)(\mathbb{R})^\circ \text{SO}(3, \mathbb{R}) / \text{SO}(3, \mathbb{R}) \subset \text{SO}(3, 1)(\mathbb{R})^\circ / \text{SO}(3, \mathbb{R}),$$

or

$$\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) / \text{SU}(2, \mathbb{R}) \subset \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) / \text{SU}(2, \mathbb{R}).$$

Then  $g\text{SO}(2, 1)(\mathbb{R})^\circ \text{SO}(3, \mathbb{R}) / \text{SO}(3, \mathbb{R})$  for  $g \in \text{SO}(3, 1)(\mathbb{R})^\circ$  or  $g\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) / \text{SU}(2, \mathbb{R})$  for  $g \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  give the algebraic description of two-dimensional hyperbolic planes inside  $\mathbb{H}^3$ .

The totally geodesic (closed) 2-dimensional subspace of  $M = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^3$  are precisely of the form

$$\Gamma g\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) / \text{SU}(2, \mathbb{R}) \subset M$$

if the set is closed. Any closed totally geodesic plane in  $M$  corresponds this way to a closed orbit

$$\Gamma g\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \subset X = \Gamma \backslash \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

#### Lemma 8.1 (Dani's argument)

These closed orbits always have finite volume.

The proof uses a version of Margulis-Dani's nondivergence:

#### Theorem 8.2 (Nondivergence)

Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and a compact  $A \subset X$ , there exists a compact  $B \subset X$  so that for all  $x \in A$  and  $T > 0$  we have

$$\frac{1}{T} |\{t \in [0, T] : xu_t \in B\}| > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* Consider the Haar measure  $\mu$  on the closed  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -orbit. We apply the nondivergence for the unipotent subgroup of  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ . Then we can find a compact  $B$  contained in the closed orbit. Consider the function

$$f = \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}_B(\cdot u_t) dt.$$

**Exercise 8.3.** Show that  $f \in L^2(\mu)$ .

Then  $f$  is a  $\{u_t\}$ -invariant function. By Mautner's phenomenon,  $f$  is  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -invariant. Hence  $f$  is constant and  $f > 0$  on  $A$ . Therefore  $\mu$  is a finite.  $\square$

**Theorem 8.4 (Mozes-Shah)**

For a sequence of probability measure  $\mu_n$  on  $X = \Gamma \backslash \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  corresponding to a sequence of pairwise distinct totally geodesic closed 2-dimensional submanifolds we have equidistribution to the Haar measure on  $X$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ . As  $\mu_n$  is  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -invariant, then

1.  $\mu$  is  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$  invariant, and
2.  $\mu$  is a probability measure: because there exists a compact subset  $A \subset \mathbb{C}$  such that any closed geodesic has to hit  $A$ . Then for every  $\varepsilon$ , let  $B$  be given by the nondivergence, we have  $\mu_n(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$  and hence  $\mu(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$ .

Then we apply Ratner's theorem for  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -invariant measures:

**Theorem 8.5 (Ratner)**

$\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -invariant ergodic probability measures are homogeneous.

Finally we need a linearization argument. We explain the idea here. Assume that  $\mu = \sum c_j \nu_j + c_0 m_X$  be the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ , where  $\nu_j$  supported on closed orbits. (We admit that there are only countably many ergodic components). For this we assume that  $Y = \Gamma g_0 \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$  is a closed orbit. We want to show  $\mu(Y) = 0$ . We can choose an  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -invariant complement of  $Y$  and use this to construct a transversal neighborhood of  $Y$ . Let  $x$  be a generic point of  $\mu_n$ . By the property of polynomials (the  $(C, \alpha)$ -good property), the time of the orbit of  $x$  entering a super small transversal neighborhood of  $Y$  is a little. Hence we can conclude that  $\mu(Y) = 0$ .  $\square$

Mozes-Shah's theorem plays a crucial role in the construction of a measure on the fiber bundle  $\tilde{X}$  as in Part 6 (Getting started for  $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ ). This helps to establish the arithmeticity of certain lattices in  $\mathrm{SO}(d, 1)$ .