Abstract. In the present article we study the following problem. Let $G$ be a linear algebraic group over $\mathbb{Q}$, $\Gamma$ be an arithmetic lattice and $H$ be an observable $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup. There is a $H$-invariant measure $\mu_H$ supported on the closed submanifold $H\Gamma/\Gamma$. Given a sequence $g_n$ in $G$ we study the limiting behavior of $(g_n)\ast \mu_H$. In the non-divergent case we give a rather complete classification. We further supplement this by giving criterion of non-divergence and prove non-divergence for arbitrary sequence $\{g_n\}$ for certain $H$. This work can be viewed as a natural extension of the work of Eskin–Mozes–Shah and Shapira–Zheng.
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Convention

We will use the following notations throughout the paper.

Definition 0.1. A standard triple $(G, H, \Gamma)$ consists of the following data:

- $G$ is a connected linear algebraic group defined over $\mathbb{Q}$;
- $H$ is a connected $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $G$;
- $\Gamma \leq G(\mathbb{Q})$ is an arithmetic subgroup commensurable with $G(\mathbb{Z})$;

If furthermore $H$ is an observable subgroup of $G$, then we say the standard triple is observable.
To simplify notation we use $G$ also for $G(\mathbb{C})$ for a linear algebraic group $G$ over $\mathbb{C}$. If $G$ is defined over $\mathbb{R}$, then the corresponding Roman letter $G$ denotes the analytic identity connected component of $G(\mathbb{R})$. And $\Gamma_H$ is defined to be $\Gamma \cap H$ for a $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup $H \leq G$. we always assume $\Gamma$ is contained in $G$ and write $\pi_\Gamma$ for the natural projection $G \to G/\Gamma$.

Given a standard triple $(G, \mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$, there exists a left $H$-invariant measure supported on $H/H \cap \Gamma$(see [Rag72, Lemma 1.4]), which is denoted by $\mu_H$. If $H$ is observable in $G$, then the natural map between $H/H \cap \Gamma$ and $H\Gamma/\Gamma$ is a closed embedding and we may push $\mu_H$ to a locally finite measure on $G/\Gamma$. For a nonempty open bounded subset $\mathcal{O} \subset H$, let $\mu_\mathcal{O}$ denote the restriction of $\mu_H$ to $\pi_H(\mathcal{O})$. One does not need $H$ to be observable to push $\mu_\mathcal{O}$ to a measure on $G/\Gamma$.

Consider the collection of nonzero locally finite positive measures on a locally compactly second countable space $X$. We say two such measures $\mu$ and $\nu$ are equivalent if there exists a positive real number $a > 0$ such that $a \mu = \nu$. The equivalence class containing $\mu$ is denoted by $[\mu]$. Whenever a measure $\mu$ is known to be finite we let $\overline{\mu}$ denote the unique probability measure in the equivalence class containing $\mu$. A sequence of classes $\{[\mu_i]\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ is said to converge to $[\nu]$ if and only if one of the following equivalent conditions is satisfied (see [SZ19, Proposition 3.3]):

1. For all $f_1, f_2 \in C_c(X)$, compactly supported continuous functions on $X$ such that $(f_2, \nu) \neq 0$ we have
   \[
   \lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{\int f_1(x)d\mu_i(x)}{\int f_2(x)d\mu_i(x)} = \frac{\int f_1(x)d\nu(x)}{\int f_2(x)d\nu(x)}.
   \]

2. There exists a sequence of positive real numbers $a_i > 0$ such that for all $f \in C_c(X)$, $a_i(f, \mu_i) \to (f, \nu)$.

The sequence $\{a_i\}$ may be interesting so sometimes we keep track of this too. Note that by [SZ19, Proposition 3.3], the asymptotic of $\{a_i\}$ is uniquely determined a representative $\nu$ is fixed.

1. Introduction

In the present article we study the following problem. Given a standard triple $(G, \mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ and a sequence $\{g_n\}$ in $G$, what is the limit of $(g_n)_*, \mu_H$? The original interest in such a problem comes from the study of the asymptotics of integer points on the homogeneous varieties. After the pioneering work of Duke–Rudnick–Sarnak [DRS93] where harmonic analysis method is used, Eskin–McMullen [EM93] gives a simpler proof using mixing. They assume that $H$ is symmetric, i.e., consists of the fixed point of some involution, and has no non-trivial $\mathbb{Q}$-characters, equivalently, $\Gamma_H$ is of finite covolume in $H$. Based on the unipotent rigidity theorem of Ratner [Ra91] and linearization technique developed by Dani–Margulis [DM93], Eskin–Mozes–Shah [EMS96], [EMS97] make a noneffective generalization assuming $H$ has no non-trivial $\mathbb{Q}$-characters. On the one hand, they prove that, assuming the non-divergence of $(g_n)_*, \mu_H$, any limit measure has to be a homogeneous measure. On the other hand, they complement this by showing that when $G$ and $H$ are both reductive and $H$ is not contained in any proper $\mathbb{Q}$-parabolic subgroup of $G$, then non-divergence of $(g_n)_*, \mu_H$ holds for all sequence $\{g_n\}$ in $G$. In recent years, there are interests in removing the condition of $H$ having no non-trivial $\mathbb{Q}$-characters. In the work of Oh–Shah [OS14], such a generalization is obtained for $G = SL_2$ and $H$ equal to the diagonal torus. A different proof is given by Kelmer–Kontorovich
[KK18a](c.f. [KK18b]) which yields stronger result. These two results are effective. Shapira–Zheng [SZ19] generalize the original approach of [EMS96] to treat the case when $G = \text{SL}_n$ and $H$ is a maximal $\mathbb{Q}$-split torus. From their work, the key is to define certain family of polytopes and show that they grow in all directions. Zhang [Zha19] further generalize their work by allowing $H$ to be an arbitrary maximal $\mathbb{Q}$-torus. The main new difficulty there is to show that the polytopes defined indeed give non-divergence.

On the other hand one should be careful when dropping the condition that $H$ has no $\mathbb{Q}$-character. For example when $G = \text{SL}_2$ with the standard $\mathbb{Q}$-structure and $H$ is the subgroup of upper triangular matrices, by duality one sees that $\pi_\Gamma(H)$ is dense in $G/\Gamma$. Hence $\mu_H$ even if defined, would not be a locally finite measure. A sufficient group theoretical condition to guarantee the closedness of $\pi_\Gamma(H)$ is that $H$ is an observable subgroup of $G$.

One may also decide not to consider the full orbit of $H$, but rather a bounded piece. And one does not have to require $H$ to be defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. See the work of Richard–Zamojski [RZ16].

One may also consider the similar question in the adelic setting. As we shall not touch upon this, the reader is referred to [Zam10], [EMMV15], [GMO08], [GO11], [DS18] and [DS19] for more information.

Let us start with definitions of an observable subgroup. Let me remind the reader that all representations are assumed to be finite-dimensional (algebraic) linear representations.

**Definition 1.1.** Let $G$ be a linear algebraic group over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $H$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup. $H$ is said to be an observable subgroup of $G$ if and only if one of the following equivalent conditions is satisfied:

1. There exists a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $(\rho, V)$ of $G$ and a nonzero vector $v \in V(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $H$ is the stabilizer of $v$ in $G$;
2. Same statement as in (1) replacing $\mathbb{Q}$ by $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$;
3. Each $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $(\rho_0, V_0)$ of $H$ is contained in a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation of $G$;
4. Same statement as in (3) replacing $\mathbb{Q}$ by $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$;
5. For any one-dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $(\rho_0, V_0)$ of $H$ that is contained in some $\mathbb{Q}$-representation of $G$, the dual of $\rho_0$ is also contained in some $\mathbb{Q}$-representation of $G$;
6. Same statement as in (5) replacing $\mathbb{Q}$ by $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

We also say that a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho : G \to \text{SL}(V)$ is observable if and only if the image of $G$ inside $\text{SL}(V)$ is an observable subgroup.

The equivalences between (3) and (5) and between (4) and (6) are proved in [BBHM63, Theorem 1]. The equivalence between (3) and (4) is proved in [BBHM63, Theorem 5]. The equivalence between (2) and (4) is proved in [BBHM63, Theorem 8] where it is also proved that (3) implies (1). As (1) trivially implies (2) we have all the equivalences above.

Examples of observable subgroups include all reductive groups and all groups with no non-trivial $\mathbb{Q}$-character. Parabolic subgroups are example of non-observable subgroups. Also, being observable is a relative notion, for instance, every group is an observable subgroup of itself. We shall also show that any $\mathbb{Q}$-linear group can be realized as an observable subgroup of some $\text{SL}_n$(see Lemma 2.9).
If \((G, H, \Gamma)\) is a observable standard triple and \(v \in V(\mathbb{Q})\) is as in the above definition, then \(\Gamma \cdot v\) is discrete and hence closed in \(G \cdot v\). As the map \(g \mapsto g \cdot v\) induces a homeomorphism between \(G/H\) and \(G \cdot v\), we see that \(\Gamma H\) is closed in \(G\) hence \(\pi \Gamma(H)\) is closed in \(G/\Gamma\)(it is proved in [Wei98, Corollary 7] that the converse is also true, see Corollary 3.19 for a different proof). Therefore, the natural map from \(H/\Gamma_H\) to \(H/\Gamma\) is a homeomorphism and so the latter supports a locally finite \(H\)-invariant measure(see [Rag72, Lemma 1.7]).

Now we take a sequence \(\{g_n\}\) in \(G\) and a nonempty open bounded subset \(\Omega\) in \(H\). We want to understand for which sequence \(\{h_n\}\) in \(H\) we have the non-divergence of \(\pi \Gamma(g_n h_n)\). Take a faithful observable \(\mathbb{Q}\)-representation of \(G\) into some \(\text{SL}_n\). Then non-divergence of \(\pi \Gamma(g_n h_n)\) is equivalent to that for some \(\varepsilon > 0\), \(\|g_n h_n v\| > \varepsilon\) for all nonzero integral vectors. In particular it is necessary to check this for all integral weight vectors with respect to \(H\). The reason why we are particularly interested in weight vectors is that the condition \(\|g_n h v\| > \varepsilon\) on \(h\) would give us a nice region (see Definition 2.1 and Equation 1 for the definition of this region \(P(g, \eta, \rho, \Phi_\eta)\)). It is the pre-image of some convex polytopes in the Lie algebra of \(S_H\) defined by finitely many functionals. Our first theorem says that being contained in this region is sufficient for non-divergence provided we take a bigger representation and allow \(h_n\) to be perturbed by \(\Omega\). The reader is referred to Section 2 for precise definitions of undefined terms below.

**Theorem 1.2.** Given a standard triple \((G, H, \Gamma)\). Let \(\rho''\) be a superfaithful \(\mathbb{Q}\)-representation of \(G\). Take \(\Omega\) to be a nonempty open bounded subset of \(H\). For each sequence \(\{g_n\}\) in \(G\), \(\eta > 0\) and \(h_n\) in \(P(g, \eta, \rho'', \Phi_{\rho''})\), all weak*-limits of \(\{(g_n h_n), \mu_\Omega\}\) in \(G/\Gamma\) have the same total mass as \(\mu_\Omega\).

Now suppose that the non-divergence of \(\pi \Gamma(g_n h_n, \Omega)\) is true, that is, there is a compact set \(K\) of \(G/\Gamma\) that intersect \(\pi \Gamma(g_n h_n, \Omega)\) non-trivially for all \(n\). Then for some sequence \(\{\omega_n\}\) in \(\Omega\), \(g_n h_n \omega_n\) is equal to \(\delta_n \gamma_n\) for some bounded sequence \(\{\delta_n\}\) in \(G\) and another sequence \(\{\gamma_n\}\) in \(\Gamma\). Therefore it suffices to understand the limiting distribution of \(\{(\gamma_n)\star \mu_\Omega\}\). In the case when \(H/\Gamma_H\) has infinite volume, \(\{(\gamma_n)\star \mu_\Omega\}\) may not converge to a homogeneous measure. However if \(H\) is observable and we translate the whole orbit then we have

**Theorem 1.3.** Let \((G, H, \Gamma)\) be an observable standard triple and \(\{\gamma_n\}\) be a sequence in \(\Gamma\). Passing to a subsequence there exists an observable \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroup \(L\) such that \((\{\gamma_n\}, L)\) is potentially \(H\)-minimal and \(\lim_{n \to \infty}(\gamma_n)\star \mu_H = [\mu_L]\). Moreover if \(L/\Gamma_L\) has finite volume, then we have

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\mu_H(P(\gamma_n, \eta, \rho'', \Phi_{\rho''}))}(\gamma_n)\star \mu_H = \mu_L
\]

for all small enough \(\eta > 0\) in the weak*-topology.

Potentially \(H\)-minimal means \(L\) contains conjugates of \(H\) by \(\gamma_n\) for all \(n\) and is minimal among observable subgroups that contains \(\gamma_n H \gamma_n^{-1}\) for infinitely many \(n\)(see Definition 3.1). Such an \(L\) always exists after passing to a subsequence.

Observable subgroups containing a reductive group may not be reductive. Nevertheless we prove the following assuming \(H\) is “big enough”. Maximal \(\mathbb{Q}\)-split tori are such examples and there are also examples that does not contain a maximal \(\mathbb{Q}\)-split torus.
Theorem 1.4. Same notations as in Theorem 1.3 above. We assume in addition that $G$ and $H$ are both reductive and $Z_G H / Z_G H \cap H$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-anisotropic. Then $L$ is also reductive. Moreover, if $\{ \gamma_n \}$ diverges in $G/Z_G S$ for all $\mathbb{Q}$-split tori $S$ contained in the center of $H$, then $L$ is not contained in any proper $\mathbb{Q}$-parabolic subgroup of $G$ and $G$ has no $\mathbb{Q}$-character. In particular, $L/\Gamma_L$ has finite volume.

When $Z_G H$ is assumed to be $\mathbb{Q}$-anisotropic, this is [EMS96, Theorem 1.9].

As a corollary we have

Corollary 1.5. Keep the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.4 above. All observable $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroups of $G$ that contain $H$ are reductive.

Organization of the paper. In section 2 we prove Theorem 1.2. This is based on a trick of taking exterior powers.

In section 3 we prove Theorem 1.3. Some basic facts on polytopes and cones are collected in Section 3.1. Then we recall [EMS96, Theorem 2.1] and enhance the statement in Section 3.2. In Section 3.3 we prove combine the notion of observability to conclude the proof.

In section 4 we prove Theorem 1.4. Besides Theorem 1.3, we also need the work of Kempf [Kem78]. We will also give an alternative short proof of non-divergence in this situation based on the real version of a theorem of Ness [Nes84](see [Wal17]).

2. Representation and non-divergence

Let $G$ be a connected linear algebraic group and $\rho : G \to \text{GL}(V)$ be a representation over $\mathbb{Q}$. We let $X^*(G)$ (resp. $X_*(G)$) be the $\mathbb{Z}$-module of $\mathbb{Q}$-characters (resp. $\mathbb{Q}$-cocharacters) on $G$. For each $\alpha \in X^*(G)$, let

$$V_\alpha := \{ v \in V \mid g v = \alpha(g) v, \forall g \in G \}, \quad \Phi_\alpha := \{ \alpha \in X^*(G) \mid V_\alpha \neq \{0\} \}.$$ 

For $\alpha \in X^*(G)$, $V_\alpha$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Let (see [BS73, Section 1.1])

$$^\circ G := \bigcap_{\alpha \in X^*(G)} \ker(\alpha^2), \quad S_G := G/^\circ G,$$

then $S_G$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-split torus. We let $\pi_G : G \to S_G$ be the natural projection. Note that for $s \in S_G$ and $\alpha \in X^*(G)$, $\alpha(s)$ is well defined. This is because $\alpha$ is trivial on $^\circ G$ (indeed, $\alpha(g) \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, $\alpha(g)^2 = 1$ implies that $\alpha(g) = 1$ for $g \in G$) and $S_G = G/^\circ G$. Therefore $d\alpha(t) := \ln \alpha(\exp(t))$ is also well-defined for $\alpha \in X^*(G)$ and $t \in \text{Lie}(S_G)$.

Now take $H$ to be a $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $G$. For a subset $\Phi \subset \Phi_\rho$, a $\mathbb{Z}$-structure on $V_\Phi$(the dependence on which we often suppress), an element $g \in G$ and a positive real number $\varepsilon$ we define a polytope in the Lie algebra of $S_H$ by

Definition 2.1.

$$\Omega(g, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi) := \{ t \in \text{Lie}(S_H) \mid \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_\alpha(\mathbb{Z})} \| g \exp(t)v \| \geq \varepsilon, \forall \alpha \in \Phi \}$$

$$= \{ t \in \text{Lie}(S_H) \mid d\alpha(t) \geq \ln \varepsilon - \ln \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_\alpha(\mathbb{Z})} \| g v \|, \forall \alpha \in \Phi \}.$$ 

Note that $\exp(t)v$ for $v$ in $V_\alpha$ is well defined up to $\pm$ sign. These definitions make sense even when $S_G = \{e\}$ in which case $\Omega$ is either $\{0\}$ or empty.

There is a slightly different situation that we shall encounter later in Section ??.

Take $(G, H, \Gamma)$ to be a standard triple. Let $L$ be another connected $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of
G. Let $X(H, L)$ be the set of $g \in G$ such that $gHg^{-1}$ is contained in $L$. For each $\gamma \in X(H, L) \cap \Gamma$, let $c_\gamma$ be the morphism from $H$ to $L$ defined by $h \mapsto \gamma h \gamma^{-1}$. Now take a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho$ of $L$. To define the analogous $\Phi_\rho$ in this case, we can certainly pullback $\Phi_{\rho,\varepsilon,\eta}$ to $X^*(H)$ but it depends on the choice of $\gamma$. So we instead define in this case $\Phi_{\rho, L}$ to be the set $\{c_\gamma^* \Phi_{\rho,\varepsilon,\eta}\}$ as $\gamma$ ranges over $X(H, L) \cap \Gamma$. We have

**Lemma 2.2.** $\Phi_{\rho, L}$ is a finite set.

**Proof.** Indeed if not true, then there is a set $\Lambda$ in $G(\mathbb{Q})$ of bounded denominator yet $\rho \circ c_\gamma(\Lambda)$ has unbounded denominator. This is a contradiction. \hfill \Box

For $\gamma \in X(H, L) \cap \Gamma$ and a subset $\Phi$ of $c_\gamma^* \Phi_{\rho,\varepsilon,\eta}$ we define

**Definition 2.3.**

\[
\Omega(c_\gamma, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi) := \{t \in \text{Lie}(SH) \mid \inf_{0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbb{V}_c(Z)} ||\gamma \exp(t)\gamma^{-1}|| \geq \varepsilon, \forall \alpha \in (c_\gamma), \Phi\}
\]

\[
= \{t \in \text{Lie}(SH) \mid d(\rho \circ c_\gamma)(t) \geq \ln \varepsilon - \ln \inf_{0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbb{V}_c(Z)} ||\alpha||, \forall \alpha \in (c_\gamma), \Phi\}
\]

If $\gamma$ is assumed to preserve the integral structure and $L = G$, then $\Omega(g, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi) = \Omega(c_\gamma, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi)$.

In both situations we define

\[
\mathcal{P}(\varepsilon, \rho, \Phi) := \{h \in H \mid \pi_{\varepsilon, H}(h) \in \exp(\Omega(g, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi))\}
\]

\[
\mathcal{P}(c_\gamma, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi) := \{h \in H \mid \pi_{\varepsilon, H}(h) \in \exp(\Omega(c_\gamma, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi))\}
\]

Both are right invariant by $^oH$ and hence by $\Gamma_H$ as $\Gamma_H$ is contained in $^oH$.

**Proposition 2.4.** Let $(G, H, \Gamma)$ be a standard triple. Take a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $(\rho, \mathbb{V})$ of $G$. Define $\rho'$ to be $\bigoplus_i \rho|_{H_i}$. Take a nonempty open bounded subset $\mathcal{O} \subset H$ and a positive number $\eta > 0$. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $g \in G$, $h \in \mathcal{P}(g, \eta, \rho', \Phi)$ and $v \neq 0 \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{Z})$, we have the inequality

\[
\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}} ||gh \cdot v|| \geq \varepsilon.
\]

**Proof.** Consider

\[
\mathcal{F} := \{f : H \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid f(h) = \langle hv, l \rangle, \exists v \in \mathcal{V}, l \in \mathcal{V}^*\}
\]

Then $\mathcal{F}$ is a finite dimensional vector space. Because $\mathcal{O} \cap H(\mathbb{Q})$ is Zariski-dense in $H$, the natural map $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{O} \cap H(\mathbb{Q})}$ is an isomorphism. As this is finite dimensional, we may further find a finite subset $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{O} \cap H(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_{\Lambda}$ is an isomorphism. This implies that $f \in \mathcal{F}$ vanishes on $\Lambda$ iff it vanishes on $H$. We may find a positive integer $N$ such that $\Lambda \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{Z}) \subset \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{Z})$. Now we fix a $v \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{Z})$.

Let $W$ be the $\mathbb{Q}$-linear subspace generated by $H(\mathbb{Q}) \cdot v$. $W$ is $H$-invariant. For $A \subset H(\mathbb{Q})$, $A \cdot v$ spans $W$ iff all linear functionals $l$ that vanish on $A \cdot v$ also vanish on $W$. This is a condition on $\mathcal{F}$ and hence $\Lambda \cdot v$ spans $W$ and we may choose $\{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_k\} \subset \Lambda$ such that $\{\lambda_i v\}_i$ forms a basis of $W$. Let $w := \wedge_i \lambda_i v$ then $N^k w \in \wedge^k \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{Z})$. Also, $H(\mathbb{Q})$ preserves the line spanned by $w$. Hence by definition of $\Omega(g, \eta, \rho', \Phi_{\rho'})$, we have

\[
N^k ||gh(\wedge \lambda_i v)|| = ||g \exp(t)(N^k w)|| \geq \eta.
\]

But

\[
N^k ||gh(\wedge \lambda_i v)|| \leq N^k \prod_i ||gh \lambda_i v|| \leq N^k \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}} ||gh \cdot v||^k,
\]
therefore
\[
\sup_{o \in \mathcal{O}} ||gho \cdot v|| \geq \eta^{1/k} N.
\]
Taking \( \varepsilon := \eta^{1/k} N \) completes the proof. \( \Box \)

Similarly we have

**Proposition 2.5.** Let \((G, H, \Gamma)\) be a standard triple and \(L\) be another \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroup of \(G\). Take a \(\mathbb{Q}\)-representation \((\rho, V)\) of \(L\). Define \(\rho'\) to be \(\bigoplus_i \rho^i\). Take a nonempty open bounded subset \(O \subset H\) and a positive number \(\eta > 0\). Then there exists \(\varepsilon > 0\) such that for all \(\gamma \in X(H, L), h \in \mathcal{P}(c_{\gamma, \eta, \rho, c^i \Phi_{\rho, H^i}^*)\) and \(v \neq 0 \in V(\mathbb{Z})\), we have the inequality
\[
\sup_{o \in \mathcal{O}} ||c_{\gamma}(ho) \cdot v|| \geq \varepsilon.
\]

**Proof.** Indeed the set of functions
\[
\mathcal{F} := \{ f : H \to \mathbb{C} \mid f(h) = \langle c_{\gamma}(h)v, l \rangle, \exists v \in V, l \in V^*, \gamma \in X(H, L) \cap \Gamma \}
\]
is also finite-dimensional. The rest of the proof is almost identical as above. \( \Box \)

To relate this proposition with non-divergence, we need the notion of \((C, \alpha)\)-good functions. Take a bounded open nonempty subset \(D\) in \(\text{Lie}(H)\). For a representation \((\rho, V)\) of \(G\) and a pair \((v, l) \in V \times V^*\) and \(g \in G\), define \(\phi_{g,v,l} : D \to \mathbb{C}\) by
\[
\phi_{g,v,l}(x) := \langle g \exp(x)v, l \rangle
\]
where angled bracket denotes the natural pairing between \(V\) and \(V^*\). Similarly, if \(L\) is a connected \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroup of \(G\) and \((\rho, V)\) is a representation of \(L\), for \(g \in X(H, L)\) and a pair \((v, l) \in V \times V^*\), we define \(\phi_{g,v,l} : D \to \mathbb{C}\) by
\[
\phi_{g,v,l}(x) := \langle c_g(\exp(x))v, l \rangle.
\]

Then there exist two positive numbers \(C\) and \(\alpha\) such that for all \((v, l) \in V \times V^*\) and \(g \in G\), \(\phi_{g,v,l}\) is \((C, \alpha)\)-good which means that (see [KM98, Section 3])
\[
\frac{1}{|B|} |\{ x \in B \mid ||\phi_{g,v,l}(x)|| \leq \varepsilon \} | \leq C(\varepsilon \sup_{x \in B} ||\phi_{g,v,l}(x)||)^\alpha
\]
holds for all \(\varepsilon > 0\) and open balls \(B \subset D\). Therefore \(\phi_{g,v}(x) := ||g \exp(x)v||\) is also \((C, \alpha)\)-good on \(D\) where we take \(||\bullet||\) to be a sup-norm with respect to some basis of \(V\) (see [KM98, Lemma 3.1]).

And similarly if we fix \(L\) and a representation \((\rho, V)\) of \(L\), there exist two positive numbers \(C\) and \(\alpha\) such that for all \((v, l) \in V \times V^*\) and \(g \in X(H, L)\), \(\phi_{g,v,l}\) is \((C, \alpha)\)-good. Also \(\phi_{g,v}(x) := ||c_g(\exp(x))v||\) is also \((C, \alpha)\)-good.

In both cases the set of functions \(\phi_{g,v,l}\) and \(\phi_{c_g,v,l}\) span a finite-dimensional space of analytic functions on \(D\). Hence [KM98, Prop??] implies that these two collections of functions are \((C, \alpha)\)-good for some \(C, \alpha\) positive.

We also need a qualitative version of a theorem of Kleinbock–Margulis [KM98, Theorem 5.2]. We have implicitly chosen an Euclidean metric on \(\text{Lie}(H)\) and a sup-norm in the representation space.

**Theorem 2.6.** Given a linear algebraic group \(G\) and connected \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroups \(H\) and \(L\). Let \(D\) be a nonempty open bounded subset in \(\text{Lie}(H)\). Take a representation \((\rho_1, V_1)\) (resp. \((\rho_2, V_2)\)) of \(G\) (resp. \(L\)). We fix an integral structure on \(V_1\) (resp. \(V_2\)). There exists a constant \(C' > 0, \alpha > 0\) and \(0 < \eta < \frac{1}{\dim V_i}(i = 1 \text{ or } 2)\) such
that the following is true. For all ball $B$ such that $3 \dim V B \subset D$ and $g \in G$ satisfying that

$$\sup_{x \in B} \|g \exp(x)v\| \geq \eta \quad \forall v \neq 0 \text{ pure wedge in } \bigwedge^i V_\lambda(\mathbb{Z}), \forall i,$$

we have whenever $\varepsilon \leq \eta$

$$\frac{1}{|B|} \{x \in B | 0 \neq v \in V_\lambda(\mathbb{Z}) : \|g \exp(o)v\| \geq \varepsilon\} \leq C'(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta})^\alpha.$$ 

Similarly, for all ball $B$ such that $3 \dim V B \subset D$ and $g \in X(H, L)$ satisfying that

$$\sup_{x \in B} \|c_g \exp(x)v\| \geq \eta \quad \forall v \neq 0 \text{ pure wedge in } \bigwedge^i V_\lambda(\mathbb{Z}), \forall i,$$

we have whenever $\varepsilon \leq \eta$

$$\frac{1}{|B|} \{x \in B | 0 \neq v \in V_\lambda(\mathbb{Z}) : \|c_g \exp(o)v\| \geq \varepsilon\} \leq C'(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta})^\alpha.$$ 

For a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $(\rho, V)$ of $G$ (resp. $L$) in $SL(V)$, to transfer non-divergence on $SL(V)/SL(V_\lambda)$ back to $G/\Gamma$ (resp. $L/\Gamma_L$), we need $\rho(G)$ (resp. $\rho(L)$) to be an observable subgroup of $SL(V)$.

**Definition 2.7.** We say a representation $\rho : G \to SL_N$ is observable if its image is an observable subgroup of $SL_N$.

**Lemma 2.8.** Let $\{V_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,l}$ be vector spaces. $G_m$ naturally acts on $\prod_i V_i \setminus \{0\}$ and $\bigotimes V_i$. Then the natural map $(\prod_i V_i \setminus \{0\})/G_m \to (\bigotimes V_i)/G_m$ is injective.

Proof is omitted.

**Lemma 2.9.** For each $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho : G \to SL_n$ there exists an observable $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho' : G \to SL_N$ containing $\rho$ as a direct summand.

**Proof.** By Chevalley, there is a representation $\psi : SL_n \to SL(V)$ and a nonzero $\mathbb{Q}$-vector $v$ such that $g \in SL_n$ stabilize the line $[v]$ spanned by $v$ iff $g$ is contained in $\rho(G)$. Then there is a character $\alpha : G \to G_m$ such that $\rho(g)v = \alpha(g)v$. Take $N = n + 2$ and let $\rho'(g) := \begin{pmatrix} \rho(g) & \alpha(g) \\ \alpha^{-1}(g) & \alpha(g) \end{pmatrix}$. It is clear that the image of $\rho'$ lands in $SL_N$ and $\rho$ is a direct summand of $\rho'$. We claim that $\rho'$ is observable. Embed $SL_n$ into $SL_N$ in the upper-left corner. As $SL_n$ is observable in $SL_N$, we may take a representation $(\tilde{\psi}_1, V_1)$ of $SL_N$ whose restriction to $SL_n$ contains $\psi$ as a direct summand. In particular there exists a nonzero $\mathbb{Q}$-vector $\tilde{v}_1$ such that $g \in SL_n$ stabilize $[v]$ iff $g$ is contained in $\rho(G)$. Take $(\tilde{\psi}_2, \tilde{V}_2)$ be the standard representation of $SL_N$ and $\tilde{v}_1$ to be $e_N$. Then $\rho'(g)$ stabilize $\tilde{v}_1 \oplus \tilde{v}_2$.

As the subgroup $\begin{pmatrix} SL_n & t \\ t^{-1} & t \end{pmatrix}$ is observable, we can find a representation $(\tilde{\psi}_3, \tilde{V}_3)$ of $SL_N$ and a nonzero $\mathbb{Q}$-vector $\tilde{v}_3$ in $\tilde{V}_3$ such that the stabilizer of the vector is exactly this subgroup. Now using Lemma 2.8 one can check that the stabilizer of $\tilde{v}_1 \oplus \tilde{v}_2 \oplus \tilde{v}_3$ is exactly $\rho'(G)$. This proves the observability of $\rho'(G)$. □
Given a faithful observable $\mathbb{Q}$-representation, assuming $\rho(G(\mathbb{Z})) \subset \text{SL}_N(\mathbb{Z})$, the induced map $G/G(\mathbb{Z}) \to \text{SL}_N(\mathbb{R})/\text{SL}_N(\mathbb{Z})$ is a proper map. Combined with Mahler’s criterion, we have the following lemma:

**Lemma 2.10.** Let $G$ be a linear algebraic group over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\Gamma \leq G(\mathbb{Q})$ be commensurable with $G(\mathbb{Z})$. Take a faithful observable $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho : G \to \text{SL}(V)$ and a lattice $V(\mathbb{Z}) \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$ that is preserved by $\Gamma$. Define for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$K_\varepsilon(\rho) := \{ \pi(g) \in G/\Gamma \mid \inf_{0 \neq v \in V(\mathbb{Z})} ||gv|| \geq \varepsilon \}.$$  

Then $K_\varepsilon(\rho)$ is compact and as $\varepsilon$ decreases to 0, $\{K_\varepsilon(\rho)\}$ forms an increasing family of compact sets whose interiors cover $G/\Gamma$.

The Proposition 2.4, Theorem 2.6 and Lemma 2.10 above together imply that

**Proposition 2.11.** Same notation as in Proposition 2.4 and we further assume that the $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $(\rho, V)$ is faithful into $\text{SL}(V)$ and observable. Let $\rho''$ be a further exterior product $\bigoplus_i \bigwedge^i \rho'. \text{ Then for any } \delta > 0 \text{ and } \eta > 0 \text{ there exist } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ such that for all } g \in G, h \in \mathcal{P}(g, \eta, \rho'', \Phi_{\rho''}) \text{ we have}

$$\tilde{\mu}_O(\pi_{\varepsilon}(g h o) \in K_\varepsilon(\rho)) \geq 1 - \delta.$$  

In particular, for any $\eta > 0$, $\{g_n\} \subset G$ and $\{h_n\} \subset \mathcal{P}(g_n, \eta, \rho'', \Phi_{\rho''})$, all weak-* limits of $(g_n h_n)_o, \tilde{\mu}_O$ are probability measures.

Similarly,

**Proposition 2.12.** Same notation as in Proposition 2.5 and we further assume that the $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $(\rho, V)$ is faithful into $\text{SL}(V)$ and observable. Let $\rho''$ be a further exterior product $\bigoplus_i \bigwedge^i \rho'. \text{ Then for any } \delta > 0 \text{ and } \eta > 0 \text{ there exists } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ such that for all } \gamma \in X(H, L) \cap \Gamma, h \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma_\varepsilon, \eta, \rho'', \Phi_{\rho''}) \text{ we have}

$$\tilde{\mu}_O(\pi_{\varepsilon}(\gamma_\varepsilon h o) \in K_\varepsilon(\rho)) \geq 1 - \delta.$$  

In particular, for $\eta > 0$, a sequence $\{\gamma_n\}$ in $X(H, L) \cap \Gamma$ such that all $\gamma_n \Phi_{\rho''|\gamma_n \Gamma} \text{ are equal to the same } \Phi$ and a sequence $\{h_n\}$ in $\mathcal{P}(\gamma_n, \eta, \rho'', \Phi)$, all weak-* limits of $(\gamma_n h_n)_o, \tilde{\mu}_O$ are probability measures.

The converse of Proposition 2.11, 2.12 is also true:

**Lemma 2.13.** For $\varepsilon > 0$, a nonempty open bounded set $O \subset H$, a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho_1 : G \to \text{SL}(V)$ and another faithful observable $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho_2$ defining $K_\varepsilon(\rho_2)$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for all $g \in G$ and $h \in H$ satisfying

$$\pi_{\varepsilon}(g h O) \cap K_\varepsilon(\rho_2) \neq \emptyset$$

we have $h \in \mathcal{P}(g, \eta, \rho, \Phi)$. Similar statements hold in the other situation.

**Definition 2.14.** We say a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho : G \to \text{SL}_N$ is superfaithful iff it contains all double exterior products of a faithful observable $\mathbb{Q}$-representation into $\text{SL}_n$ as a direct summand.

Such a representation always exists thanks to Lemma 2.9 and Theorem 1.2 follows from Proposition 2.11 above.
Remark 2.15. When the subgroup $H$ has no $\mathbb{Q}$-characters, the polytope is either empty of equal to $\{0\}$. And Proposition 2.11 says that non-divergence or not can be detected by $H$-fixed vectors in a superfaithful representation. In the case when $G$ is generated by unipotent elements one can only check those vectors arising from $\mathbb{Q}$-parabolic subgroups that contain $H$. See [DGU18] for a proof based on [DM93]. When $G$ is equal to $\text{SL}_n$ and $T$ is a maximal torus, the same thing is true (see [SZ19] and [Zha19]). It is hoped (but we fail to do so here) that such a result can be extended to the general case.

3. Translates by $\Gamma$ and equidistribution

In this section we are given an observable standard triple $(G, H, \Gamma)$ and a sequence $\{\gamma_n\} \subset \Gamma$ and we wish to study the possible limits of $(\gamma_n)_* \mu_H$.

Definition 3.1. Given a standard triple $(G, H, \Gamma)$, a connected $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup $L \leq G$ and a sequence $\{\gamma_n\} \subset \Gamma$. We say that $(\{\gamma_n\}, L)$ is minimal for $H$ if and only if for all infinite subsequences $\{n_k\}$, the closed subgroup generated by $\bigcup_{n_k} H_{\gamma_n^{-1}}$ is equal to $L$ and potentially minimal for $H$ if and only if for all infinite subsequences $\{n_k\}$, the closed subgroup generated by $\bigcup_{n_k} H_{\gamma_n^{-1}}$ is epimorphic in $L$.

Recall that a subgroup $H$ of $G$ is said to be epimorphic if for every representation $(\rho, V)$ of $G$ and every $v \in V$ that is fixed by $H$, $v$ is also fixed by $G$.

We need the following important input from the work of Eskin–Mozes–Shah (see [EMS96, Theorem 2.1] and [EMS98]). Note that a connected real algebraic group for them is $G$ here for some algebraic group $G$ defined over $\mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 3.2. Let $(G, H, \Gamma)$ be a standard triple, $L$ be a connected $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup and $\mathcal{O} \subset H$ be a nonempty open bounded subset. Assume that we are given a sequence of morphisms $\{c_i : H \to L\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ of algebraic groups over $\mathbb{Q}$ such that

1. no proper $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $L$ contains $c_i(H)$ for infinitely many $i$;
2. for every $h \in H(\mathbb{Q})$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\{c_i(h)\} \subset L(\frac{k}{2}\mathbb{Z})$;
3. for each sequence $\{h_i\}$ in $H$ that converges to $e_H$, all the eigenvalues for the action of $\text{Ad}(c_i(h_i))$ on $\text{Lie}(L)$ tend to 1 as $i \to \infty$;
4. for each regular algebraic function $f$ on $L$, $\{c_i^*(f)\}$ spans a finite-dimensional space of functions on $H$;
5. for all $i$, $c_i(\Gamma_H) \subset \Gamma_L$.

By the last assumption, $c_i$ induces a map $H/\Gamma_H \to L/\Gamma_L$. Take $\nu$ to be any limit point of $(c_i)_* \mu_\mathcal{O}$, then $\nu$ is a $\mathcal{O}$-$L$-invariant probability measure.

Note that the only difference is that neither $H$ nor $L$ is assumed to have non-trivial $\mathbb{Q}$-character and a full homogeneous measure is replaced by $\mu_\mathcal{O}$. Let me briefly recall the proof to assure the reader that almost the same proof still works. Undefined terms can be found in [EMS96].

One may assume that $\mathcal{O} = h_0 \exp(B)$ for some $h_0 \in H(\mathbb{Q}) \cap H$ and $B \subset \text{Lie}(H)$ open bounded and that by $(C, \alpha)$-goodness $\nu$ is a probability measure. In the original exposition of [EMS96] another class of functions $E_G(m, n, \Lambda)$ is used. Let us briefly explain we indeed have the $(C, \alpha)$-goodness. Fix a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-representation $V$ of $G$, let $\mathcal{F} := \{f : B \to \mathbb{C} \mid f(x) = \langle gc_i(h' \exp(x))v, l \rangle, v \in V, l \in V^*, h' \in H, i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$
Then $\mathcal{F}$ spans a finite-dimensional vector space $\mathcal{F}$. This is because the matrix coefficients are finite-dimensional, the fourth property from Theorem 3.2 holds and for any finite dimensional subspace of regular functions on $H$ there exists a bigger one that is still of finite dimension and left $H$-invariant (see [Spr98, Proposition 2.3.6]). Moreover, each function in $\mathcal{F}$ is analytic and hence one may conclude with [KM98, Proposition 3.4].

(2) Next one shows that $\nu$ is invariant under a non-trivial one-parameter unipotent flow $U$. Indeed having no non-trivial $\mathbb{Q}$-characters plays no role in the proof of [EMS96, Proposition 2.2]. Invoking rigidity theorem one obtains a $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup $F$ with $\nu(\pi_T S(F, U)) = 0$ and $\nu(\pi_T N(F, U)) \neq 0$.

(3) Then one applies [EMS96, Proposition 3.13]. Though stated for $E_G(m, n, \Lambda)$ it holds also for $(C, \alpha)$-good functions. Then one may continue with the argument on the last four paragraphs of [EMS96, Page 273] and note that the argument on page 274 therein has been replaced by [EMS98]. This part of arguments also make no use of having no non-trivial $\mathbb{Q}$-characters so it carries through.

(4) Now we obtain a normal $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup $F$, possibly different from the $F$ above, that is of Ratner class and contains $U$ above such that $\nu$ is $F$-invariant. Look at the fibre bundle

$$
Fg\Gamma / \Gamma = gF\Gamma / \Gamma \xrightarrow{\pi_F} G / \Gamma \\
\downarrow \pi_F \\
(G/F) / \pi_F(\Gamma)
$$

One may decompose the measure

$$
\nu = \int_{x \in (G/F)/\pi_F(\Gamma)} \hat{\mu}_{Fx\Gamma} \pi_\ast \nu(x)
$$

where $\hat{\mu}_{Fx\Gamma}$ is the unique $F$-invariant probability measure supported on $Fx\Gamma / \Gamma$. By induction (one can verify the natural induction hypothesis is satisfied) we see that $\pi_\ast \nu$ is invariant by $^o(G/F) = ^oG/F$. Then one can check by the integral expression above that $\nu$ is $^oG$-invariant.

**Corollary 3.3.** Suppose that we are given a standard triple $(G, H, \Gamma)$, a sequence $\{\gamma_n\} \subset \Gamma$ and a connected $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup $L \leq G$. Assume that $\{\{\gamma_n\}, L\}$ is minimal for $H$. Consider the map $c_n : H/\Gamma_H \rightarrow L/\Gamma_L$ induced from $c_{\gamma_n}$ defined by $c_{\gamma_n}(h) = \gamma_n h \gamma_n^{-1}$. Then for all nonempty open bounded subsets $\mathcal{O}$ of $H$, all weak-*$ limits of $\{(c_n)_\ast \hat{\mu}_\mathcal{O}\}$ in $L/\Gamma_L$ are $^oL$-invariant probability measures.

Note that for $N \subset M$ a closed embedded submanifold, a sequence of probability measures $\{\mu_n\}$ that converges to $\mu$ on $N$ also converges to $\mu$ on $M$. Hence in order for us to understand the limit of $\{(c_n)_\ast \mu_H\}$, in light of the above corollary, two things remain to be done:

- merely being $^oL$-invariant is not satisfactory. We want $\{(c_n)_\ast \mu_H\}$ to converge to $\mu_L$ on $L/\Gamma_L$;
- find such a $L$ that is observable in $G$.

We shall take care of the first point in Section 3.2 and the second point in Section 3.3. Before that we shall give some preliminaries on polytopes in Section ??.
3.1. Polytopes and Cones.

Definition 3.4. Let \((G, H, \Gamma)\) be a standard triple and \(L\) be a connected \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroup of \(G\). Given a \(\mathbb{Q}\)-representation \(\rho : L \to \text{SL}_N(V)\) and a sequence \(\{\gamma_n\}\) such that \(c_{\gamma_n}(H)\) is contained in \(L\) for all \(n\). For a subset \(\Phi_\rho\) of \(\Phi_{\rho,L}\) and \(\Phi\) of \(\Phi_{\rho}\), we say that \(\{\gamma_n\}\) is \(\Phi\)-clean if \(c_{\gamma_n}(\Phi_{\rho,L}^H)\) is equal to \(\Phi_{\rho}\) for all \(n\) and for each \(\alpha \in \Phi\), denoting \(\alpha_n := (c_{\gamma_n})_\alpha \in X^*(c_{\gamma_n}(H))\), either

1. \(\inf_{\alpha \neq v \in \mathbb{V}_{\alpha_n}(Z)} ||v|| \to +\infty\), or
2. \(\inf_{\alpha \neq v \in \mathbb{V}_{\alpha_n}(Z)} ||v|| \) remains bounded.

Recall that by Lemma 2.2, \(\Phi_{\rho,L}\) is a finite set. Hence for arbitrary sequence \(\{\gamma_n\} \subset X(H, L) \cap \Gamma\), by passing to a subsequence, we may always assume \(\{\gamma_n\}\) is \(\Phi\)-clean for some \(\Phi\).

Definition 3.5. For a \(\Phi\)-clean sequence \(\{\gamma_n\}\), let \(\Phi_\infty(\{\gamma_n\}) \subset \Phi\) consist of those \(\alpha\) that falls in case (1) and \(\Phi_{\text{bdd}}(\{\gamma_n\})\) be its complement. We also define

\[
\Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\}) := \{\alpha \in \Phi_{\text{bdd}}(\{\gamma_n\}) | \exists \alpha \in I \subset \Phi_{\text{bdd}}, \exists \{a_\beta\}_{\beta \in I} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \sum_{\beta \in I} a_\beta \beta = 0\}
\]

\[
\Phi_1(\{\gamma_n\}) := \Phi_{\text{bdd}}(\{\gamma_n\}) \cup \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\})
\]

Note that by definition, \(\Phi = \Phi_\infty(\{\gamma_n\}) \cup \Phi_1(\{\gamma_n\}) \cup \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\})\).

Though in the definition of \(\Phi_0\), \(a_\beta\)'s are just positive real numbers, but as characters form a \(\mathbb{Z}\)-lattice in its \(\mathbb{R}\)-linear span we may and do choose \(a_\beta\) to be positive rational numbers and even positive integers.

Now we turn to some generalities on polytopes and cones. For \(V\) a finite-dimensional \(\mathbb{R}\)-vector space and \(\Phi \subset V^*\) a finite collection of functionals, define

\[
\text{Cone}(\Phi) := \{v \in V | \alpha(v) \geq 0, \forall \alpha \in \Phi\}
\]

Let \(\Phi_0\) be defined the same way as in Definition 3.5 replacing \(\Phi_{\text{bdd}}\) by \(\Phi\).

Definition 3.6. Define \(W(\Phi)\) to be the \(\mathbb{R}\)-linear subspace spanned by \(\text{Cone}(\Phi)\) and \(\pi_W(\Phi) : V \to V/W(\Phi)\) to be the natural projection. Moreover we choose a splitting of \(\pi_W(\Phi)\) and identify \(U \cong V/W(\Phi)\) where \(U\) is a \(\mathbb{R}\)-linear subspace of \(V\) complementing \(W(\Phi)\).

It is clear that \(\text{Cone}(\Phi) = \text{Cone}(\Phi) \cap W(\Phi)\) is open in \(W(\Phi)\). Let \(\Phi'_0 := \{\alpha \in \Phi, \alpha|_{W(\Phi)} = 0\}\).

Lemma 3.7. \(\Phi_0 = \Phi'_0\) and \(W(\Phi) = \ker \Phi_0\).

Proof. We write \(W = W(\Phi)\) in the proof. First note that there exists \(v \in W\) such that \(\alpha(v) > 0\) for all \(\alpha \in \Phi \setminus \Phi'_0\). Let us fix such a vector and name it \(v_0\). Indeed, the weaker claim allowing \(v\) to depend on \(\alpha \in \Phi \setminus \Phi'_0\) is obvious. Then one may just sum them together.

For \(w \in \text{Cone}(\Phi'_0)\) small enough, \(v_0 + w\) is still contained in \(\text{Cone}(\Phi_0 \cup \Phi_1) \subset W\) and hence \(w\) is in \(W\). So \(\text{Cone}(\Phi'_0) = W = \ker(\Phi'_0)\). It remains to show \(\Phi_0 = \Phi'_0\).

The non-trivial direction is \(\Phi'_0 \subset \Phi_0\). We first show that \(0 \in V^*\) is in the interior of the cone spanned by \(\Phi'_0\) relative to the subspace spanned by the cone. Indeed, if not true, then \(0 \in V^*\) is in the relative boundary of the cone spanned by \(\Phi'_0\). By Hahn-Banach theorem, there exists \(v \in V\) such that \(\alpha(v) \geq 0\) for all \(\alpha \in \Phi'_0\) and there exists \(l\) in the cone spanned by \(\Phi'_0\) such that \(l(v) > 0\). Therefore \(\alpha(v) > 0\) for some \(\alpha \in \Phi'_0\). This is a contradiction to \(\text{Cone}(\Phi'_0) = \ker(\Phi'_0)\). Once this is true,
for any $\alpha \in \Phi_0'$ for $a > 0$ small enough, $-a\alpha$ can be written as non-negative linear combinations of elements from $\Phi_0'$. By the definition of $\Phi_0'$, we have $\alpha \in \Phi_0$. □

Built on this lemma, we can show that

**Lemma 3.8.** Let $V$ be a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-vector space and $\Phi \subset V^*$ be a finite collection of linear functionals on $V$. For each $a \in \text{Map}(\Phi, \mathbb{R})$, we define $\Omega(\Phi, a) := \{v \in V, \alpha(v) \geq a(\alpha) \forall \alpha \in \Phi\}$. Assume that we are given a decomposition $\Phi = \Phi_0 \sqcup \Phi_1 \sqcup \Phi_\infty$ and a sequence of $\{a_n\} \subset \text{Map}(\Phi, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ satisfying:

1. there exists $a_0 \in \text{Map}(\Phi_0 \sqcup \Phi_1, \mathbb{R})$ such that $a_n|_{\Phi_0 \cup \Phi_1} = a_0$ for all $n$;
2. for all $\alpha \in \Phi_\infty$, $a_n(\alpha)$ diverges to $+\infty$;
3. $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_0$ are as in Definition 3.5 where $\Phi_{\text{bd}} := \Phi_1 \sqcup \Phi_0$.

Then we can find $\{\omega_n\}$, a diverging sequence of positive numbers, such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega(\Phi_\infty \sqcup \Phi_1, -a_n + \omega_n) \cap \Omega(\Phi_0, -a_n))}{\text{Vol}(\Omega(\Phi, -a_n))} = 1.$$ 

In fact, let $U$ be the orthogonal complement of $W = W(\Phi)$ in $V$ and denote by $\pi_W^U$ the orthogonal projection onto $U$. Then there exists $\{\omega_n\}'$, a diverging sequence of positive numbers, such that if we define

$$\Omega_n^{\text{split}} := \pi_W^U(\Omega(\Phi_0, -a_0)) \oplus (W \cap \Omega(\Phi_\infty \sqcup \Phi_1, -a_n + \omega_n')),$$

then

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega_n^{\text{split}})}{\text{Vol}(\Omega(\Phi, -a_n))} = 1$$

and $\Omega_n^{\text{split}}$ is contained in $\Omega(\Phi_\infty \sqcup \Phi_1, -a_n + \omega_n) \cap \Omega(\Phi_0, -a_n)$ for $n$ large enough.

When $\Phi_0 = \emptyset$, this has been treated in [SZ19]. For simplicity write $\text{Top}(\omega_n)$ for $\Omega(\Phi_\infty \sqcup \Phi_1, -a_n + \omega_n) \cap \Omega(\Phi_0, -a_n)$ so $\Omega(\Phi, -a_n) = \text{Top}(0_n)$. We also write $U_0$ for $\pi_W^U(\Omega(\Phi_0, -a_0))$, then $\Omega_n^{\text{split}} = U_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}(\omega_n'))$.

The reader may find it helpful to keep the following example in mind. Take $V = \mathbb{R}^3$ with standard basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ and write its dual basis as $\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$. Let $\Phi := \{f_3, -f_3, f_1 - f_2, f_1 - f_2, f_2\}$, $a_n(f_3) = 0$, $a_n(-f_3) = n$ and $a_n(-f_1 - f_2) = a_n(f_1 - f_2) = a_n(f_2) = -1$. Then one can check that $\Phi_\infty = \{-f_3\}$, $\Phi_1 = \{f_3\}$ and $\Phi_0 = \{-f_1 - f_2, f_1 - f_2, f_2\}$. Also $W = \mathbb{R}e_3$. And $\Omega(\Phi, -a_n)$ is a cylinder based on a fixed triangle with the ceiling keeping growing and the floor remaining fixed. The projection $\pi_W$ in this case can be regarded as crushing the cylinder into its base triangle.

**Proof.** It suffices to prove the second asymptotic and the claim on the last line. First we note that

3.1.1. **Claim.** For every sequence $\{\omega_n\}$ of real numbers such that $a_n(\alpha) - \omega_n$ diverges to $+\infty$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi_\infty$, for $n$ large enough, $\pi_W(\Omega(\Phi_0, -a_0)) = \pi_W(\Omega(\Phi_0, -a_n))$ and both are bounded. Consequently, the same thing is true replacing $\pi_W$ by $\pi_W^U$.

**Proof of Claim 3.1.1.** The non-trivial direction is to show that $\pi_W(\Omega(\Phi_1))$ contains $\pi_W(\Omega(\Phi_0, -a_0))$. First we claim that $\pi_W(\Omega(\Phi_0, -a_0))$ is bounded. Indeed $\Phi_0$ descends to a set of functionals $\Phi_0$ on $V/W$. If not bounded then we can find a ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot x$ in $\pi_W(\Omega(\Phi_0, -a_0))$, that is, $\Phi(x) \geq -a_0$ for all $r \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in \Phi_0$. Hence $\Phi(x) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi_0$. As there are strictly positive numbers $a_{\alpha}$ such that $\sum a_{\alpha}x = 0$. We conclude that $\Phi(x) = 0$, hence $x = 0$ by definition of $W$. 

Now we take a compact set $B \subset \Omega(\Phi_0, -a_0)$ such that $\pi_{\nu}(B) = \pi_{\nu}(\Omega(\Phi_0, -a_0))$. As $\Phi$ is a finite set, we can find $b > 0$ such that $a|_{B} > -b$ for all $a \in \Phi$. We also take $v_0 \in W$ as in the proof of Lemma 3.7 such that $\alpha(v_0) > 0$ for all $a \in \Phi_1$. Then we can find $r_0 > 0$ such that $\alpha(v + r_0v_0) > -a_0$ for all $a \in \Phi_1$ and $v \in B$. Now there exists a possibly different $b' > 0$ such that $\alpha|_{B + r_0v_0} > -b'$ for all $a \in \Phi_\infty$. Take $n$ such that $a_n(\alpha) - \omega_n > b'$ and $v \in B$, we show that $v + W \cap \text{Top}_{\Phi_1}$ is nonempty. Indeed for $\alpha \in \Phi_\infty$, $\alpha(v + r_0v_0) > -b' > a_n(\alpha) + \omega_n$. And inequalities for $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_0$ are already verified. So we are done. 

Hence for any choice of $\omega_n$ and for $n$ large enough,

$$\text{Vol}(\text{Top}_{\nu}(\omega_n)) = \int_{u \in U_0} \text{Vol}((u + W) \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(\omega_n)) du$$

As $U_0$ is bounded we can find a number $\omega_0 > 0$ such that for every choice of $\{\omega_n\}$ and each $u \in U_0$,

$$(u + W) \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(\omega_n) \supset u + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(\omega_n + \omega_0)),
(u + W) \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(0) \subset u + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(-\omega_0)).$$

In particular the first containment implies $\Omega^\text{split}_n = U_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}(\omega'_n))$ is contained in $\text{Top}(\omega_n)$ if we define $\omega'_n := \omega_n + \omega_0$ and $n$ is large enough (depending on the choice of $\omega_n$).

And the second containment implies that

$$\frac{\text{Vol}(U_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(\omega'_n)))}{\text{Vol}(\text{Top}_{\nu}(0))} \geq \frac{\text{Vol}(U_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(\omega'_n)))}{\text{Vol}(U_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(-\omega_0)))}$$

As $\text{Cone}(\Phi_{\text{bdd}})$ restricted to $W$ is nonempty and open, arguing as in [SZ19, Lemma 6.2, 6.4], we know that there exists a divergent sequence of positive numbers $\{\omega'_n\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\text{Vol}(u_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(\omega'_n)))}{\text{Vol}(u_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(-\omega_0)))} = 1$$

for all $u_0 \in U_0$. Plugging into the integration expression above yields that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\text{Vol}(U_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(\omega'_n)))}{\text{Vol}(U_0 + (W \cap \text{Top}_{\nu}(-\omega_0)))} \geq 1.$$ 

So we are done.

3.2. Step I. We fix a superfaithful $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho$ of $L$. We assume that the sequence $\{\gamma_n\}$ is $\Phi$-clean for some $\Phi \in \Phi_\rho$. Take $W = W(\Phi_{\text{bdd}})$ defined to be ker$\Phi_0$ and $U$ is a fixed splitting of $\pi_{\nu}$. Moreover we require $\rho$ to contain a direct summand of the form

$$L \to S_L \to SL_N$$

with the second arrow being faithful. In particular,

- there exists a basis $\{\tilde{\alpha}_1, ..., \tilde{\alpha}_n\}$ of $X^*(S_L) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ consisting of $\mathbb{Q}$-characters appearing in $\Phi_\rho$ and positive numbers $m_1, ..., m_n > 0$ such that $\sum m_i\tilde{\alpha}_i = 0$.

Without loss of generality we assume that $m_i$’s are actually positive integers. The dependence on $\rho$ will often be dropped as it will be fixed throughout this subsection.
Apply Lemma 3.8 to \( \Phi \), \( V = \text{Lie}(S_H) \) and \( a_n(d\alpha) = -\ln \varepsilon + \ln \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_n(\mathbb{Z})} ||v|| \) with \( \alpha_n := (c_{\gamma_n})_*\alpha \). Also \( \Phi_* = \Phi_*\{\gamma_n\} \) for \( * = 0, 1, \infty \). By passing to a subsequence we assume that \( a_n(d\alpha) \) either diverges to \(+\infty\) or remains constantly equal to some \( a_0(d\alpha) \).

Keep the notation \( U, W \) and \( U_0 \) as in Lemma 3.8. As \( U_0 \) depends on \( \varepsilon \), we shall write it as \( U_0(\varepsilon) \). Note that as \( \varepsilon \) decreases to 0, \( U_0(\varepsilon) \) forms an increasing family of polytopes whose union covers \( U \).

**Lemma 3.9.** There exists a sequence of real numbers \( \omega_n \to +\infty \) such that if we define

\[
\Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{spl} := U_0(\varepsilon) \oplus (W \cap \Omega(c_{\gamma_n}, \varepsilon + \omega_n, \Phi_1 \sqcup \Phi_\infty))
\]

then \( \Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{spl} \) is contained in \( \Omega(c_{\gamma_n}, \varepsilon, \Phi) \) for \( n \) large enough and

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{spl})}{\text{Vol}(\Omega(c_{\gamma_n}, \varepsilon, \Phi))} = 1.
\]

We also define

\[
\Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{vert} := W \cap \Omega(c_{\gamma_n}, \varepsilon + \omega_n, \Phi_1 \sqcup \Phi_\infty)
\]

and

\[
\mathcal{P}_{n,\varepsilon} := \{ h \in H \mid \pi_H(h) \in \Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{spl}\}.
\]

The homomorphism \( c_{\gamma_n} \) induces \( p_n : S_H \to S_L \), which does not depend on \( n \) after passing to a subsequence. We shall call this map \( p := p_n \).

**Lemma 3.10.** \( p_n = p_m \) if \( \gamma_n \) and \( \gamma_m \) are in the same Zariski connected component of \( X(H, L) \).

**Proof.** Note that \( X(H, L) \) is an affine variety. Apply [Spr98, Proposition 3.2.8]. \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.11.** By abuse of notation we also write \( p : S_H \to S_L \) as a morphism of Lie groups. Then \( p \) factors through \( \overline{p} : S_H / \text{exp}(W) \to S_L \).

**Proof.** Recall that we have fixed a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-basis \( \{\tilde{\alpha}_1, ..., \tilde{\alpha}_n\} \) of characters of \( S_L \) appearing in \( \Phi_p \) and positive numbers \( m_1, ..., m_n > 0 \) such that \( \sum m_i\tilde{\alpha}_i = 0 \). It suffices to show that \( \tilde{\alpha}_i(p(\exp w)) = 1 \) for all \( w \in W \) and for all \( i \). For this it suffices to show that \( \alpha_i := \pi^*_H \circ p^* (\tilde{\alpha}_i) \) lies in \( \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\}) \). By the very definition of \( \Phi_0 \), we only need to prove that they are in \( \Phi_{\text{adj}}(\{\gamma_n\}) \) which also follows from the definition as \( (c_{\gamma_n})_*\alpha_i = \pi^*_L\tilde{\alpha}_i \) is independent of \( n \). \( \square \)

In summary we now have the following commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
\mathcal{P}_{n,\varepsilon}^{spl} & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_n} & H & \xrightarrow{c_{\gamma_n}} & L \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{P}_{n,\varepsilon}^{spl}/\Gamma_H & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_n} & H/\Gamma_H & \xrightarrow{c_{\gamma_n}} & L/\Gamma_L \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\exp(\Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{spl}) & \xrightarrow{\pi_W} & S_H & \xrightarrow{p} & S_L \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\exp(U_0(\varepsilon)) & \xrightarrow{\pi_W} & (S_H)/\text{exp}(W)
\end{array}
\]
For each \( \eta > 0 \), let \( \mathcal{O}_\eta = \{ h \in H \mid d(h,e) \leq \eta \} \). We normalize the Haar measure \( \mu_H \) on \( H/\Gamma_H \) and \( \mu_L \) on \( L/\Gamma_L \) such that \( \mu_H \) (resp. \( \mu_L \)) can be written as fibre integration of probability homogeneous measures of \( \lambda^o H \) (resp. \( \lambda^o L \)) over the base \((S_H, \mu_{S_H})\) (resp. \((S_L, \mu_{S_L})\)) such that \( p_* \mu_{S_H} = \mu_{S_L} \). Also, we assume the Vol is the same as \( \mu_{S_H} \) under the exponential map.

Now we come to the main proposition of the subsection

**Proposition 3.12.** Given a standard triple \((G, H, \Gamma)\), a sequence \( \{ \gamma_n \} \subset \Gamma \) and a connected \( \mathbb{Q} \)-subgroup \( L \leq G \). Assume that \( \{ \gamma_n \}, L \) is minimal for \( H \). Consider the map \( c_n : H/\Gamma_H \to L/\Gamma_L \) induced from \( c_{\gamma_n} \). Then \( \lim_n \mu_n(\gamma_n) \ast \mu_H = \mu_L \) in \( L/\Gamma_L \) with \( \mu_n = 1/\text{Vol}(\Omega_{\kappa_n}) \).

**Proof of Proposition 3.12.** Let \( \eta > 0 \) be an arbitrary small number. We can find \( W_0 \subset W \) depending on \( \eta \) such that for each \( n \) there exists \( I_n = \{ t^3 \}_{t=1,\ldots,n} \subset \text{Lie}(S_H) \) such that

\[
\Omega_{\eta, \varepsilon}^{pl} \approx_{\eta \text{Vol}(\Omega)} \bigcup_{t \in I_n} U_0(\varepsilon) \oplus (t + W_0)
\]

where \( \approx_{\eta \text{Vol}(\Omega)} \) means that the measure of the symmetric difference between both sides are smaller than \( \eta \text{Vol}(\Omega) \) for some constant \( \kappa_\eta \) decreasing to 0 as \( \eta \) does. Hence we can also find \( \mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{P}_{n,\varepsilon}^{pl} \) such that \( \mathcal{O} \) maps onto \( U_0(\varepsilon) \) under the natural projection and there exists \( J_n = \{ h_j \}_{j=1,\ldots,n} \subset \lambda^o H \) such that

\[
\mathcal{P}_{n,\varepsilon}^{pl}/\Gamma_H \approx_{\eta \text{Vol}(\mathcal{P})} \bigcup_{h \in J_n} h \mathcal{O} \Gamma_H / \Gamma_H
\]

Let us take arbitrary \( k \in J_n \) for each \( n \) and let \( h_n := h_n^k \). Let \( \nu \) be a limit of \( \{ (c_n h_n, \widehat{\mu}_\mathcal{O}) \} \). So we can find an infinite subsequence \( \{ n_k \} \) such that

\[
\nu = \lim_{k \to \infty} (c_{n_k} h_{n_k}) \ast \widehat{\mu}_\mathcal{O}.
\]

Then by Proposition 2.11, \( \nu \) is a probability measure on \( L/\Gamma_L \) and \( c_{\gamma_n}(h_{n_k} \mathcal{O}_\eta) \Gamma_L \) is non-divergent, i.e., intersects a compact set in \( L/\Gamma_L \) non-trivially for all \( k \). Hence there exist

- \( \{ \gamma'_k \} \subset \Gamma_L \), \( \delta_k \subset L \) bounded and \( \{ o_k \} \subset \mathcal{O}_\eta \) such that
- \( \gamma_n h_{n_k} o_k \gamma_n^{-1} = \delta_k \gamma'_k \).

Let \( \lambda_k := \gamma'_k \gamma_n \) and \( c'_k \) be the map from \( H/\Gamma_H \to L/\Gamma_L \) induced from \( c_{\lambda_k} \). Then

\[
\gamma_n h_{n_k} o \gamma_n^{-1} = \delta_k \lambda_k \gamma_n^{-1} o \gamma_n^{-1} \gamma_k, \quad \forall o \in \mathcal{O}
\]

So we have

\[
(c_{n_k} h_{n_k}) \ast \widehat{\mu}_\mathcal{O} \approx_{\eta} (\delta_k \circ c'_k) \ast \widehat{\mu}_\mathcal{O}
\]

where \( \approx_{\eta} \) means the total mass of the symmetric difference of both sides is smaller than \( \kappa_\eta \) for some \( \kappa_\eta \) converging to 0 as \( \eta \) does. By Corollary 3.3 we assume that by passing to a subsequence \( k_i \),

\[
\lim_{i \to \infty} (c'_{k_i}) \ast \widehat{\mu}_\mathcal{O} =: \nu' = \int_{S_L} \mu_{\pi^{-1}(s)} \pi_* \nu'(s)
\]

where each \( \mu_{\pi^{-1}(s)} \) is the unique probability \( \lambda^o L \)-invariant measure supported on \( \pi^{-1}(s) \) and \( \nu' \) is a probability measure. We may also assume that \( \delta_{k_i} \) converges to some \( \delta_\infty \) and so

\[
\lim_{i \to \infty} (\delta_{k_i}, c'_{k_i}) \ast \widehat{\mu}_\mathcal{O} =: \nu'' = \int_{S_L} \mu_{\pi^{-1}(s)} \pi_* \nu(s).
\]
Now
\[ \pi_* \nu'' = \lim_{i \to \infty} (\pi \circ \delta_{k_i} \circ c_{k_i})_* \hat{\mu}_O \approx \eta \lim_{i \to \infty} (\pi \circ c_{n_k} \circ h_{n_k})_* \hat{\mu}_O \]
\[ = \lim_{i \to \infty} (p \circ \pi \circ h_{n_k})* \hat{\mu}_O = \lim_{i \to \infty} (pW \circ \pi \circ h_{n_k})* \hat{\mu}_O \]
\[ = p_* \hat{\mu}_{U_0(\varepsilon)} = \int_{SL} \mu^{\pi^{-1}(s)} \hat{\mu}_{SL} |_{U_0(\varepsilon)} \]
where we have employed the commutative diagram above. As the output is independent of the subsequence chosen and \( \eta > 0 \), by letting \( \eta \) converge to 0 and note that \( \nu \approx \eta \nu'' \), we actually have
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} (c_n h_n)_* \hat{\mu}_O = \int_{SL} \mu^{\pi^{-1}(s)} \hat{\mu}_{SL} |_{U_0(\varepsilon)} \]
By taking average,
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} (c_n)_* \mu_H |_{P_{n,\varepsilon}} = \int_{SL} \mu^{\pi^{-1}(s)} \hat{\mu}_{SL} |_{U_0(\varepsilon)} \]
Also, by our normalization of Haar measure,
\[ \mu_H (P_{n,\varepsilon}^{pl} / \Gamma_H) = \text{Vol}(\Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{pl}) = \text{Vol}(U_0(\varepsilon)) \cdot \text{Vol}(\Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{vert}) \]
Letting \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), we have
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\Omega_{n,\varepsilon}^{vert})} (c_n)_* \mu_H = \mu_L. \]

3.2.1. Example. The perhaps most basic example is to take \( G = L = \begin{bmatrix} a & \ast \\ 0 & 1/a \end{bmatrix} \), \( H = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1/a \end{bmatrix} \), \( \Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & Z \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \) and \( \gamma_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & n \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \). It is not hard to check that \( (\gamma_n)_* \mu_H \rightarrow [\mu_G] \). Let us see why this is true intuitively. We first take a model of \( G \rightarrow G/\Gamma \):

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & G \\
\downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi_G \\
\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}/Z & \xrightarrow{\phi} & G/\Gamma
\end{array} \]

where \( \pi \) is the natural quotient map and \( \Phi(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} e^x & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-x} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \). Then the set \( \gamma_n H \) becomes \( \{ (x, y) | y = e^{-2x} \} \) carried with the measure dx. And we may view \( \pi_G(\gamma_n H) \) as a cord wrapping about an infinite cylinder. The larger the \( n \) is, the denser the wrapping becomes. Measure theoretically our theorem in this case is equivalent to the following elementary statement: for each compactly supported function \( f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \) and each nonzero integer \( m \),
\[ \int f(x) \exp(2\pi i m n e^{-2x}) \, dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \]
3.3. **Step II.** A drawback of Proposition 3.12 is that the convergence happens inside $L/\Gamma_L$. In order for the convergence to happen on $G/\Gamma$, it is sufficient that $L\Gamma/\Gamma$ is closed in $G/\Gamma$. This is true if $L$ is observable in $G$. The converse is also true, as is proved in [Wei98]. We shall not make use of the latter fact but rather derive it as a corollary.

In this section we fix a superfaithful $\mathbb{Q}$-representation $\rho : G \to \text{SL}_N$ which contains all exterior products of the Adjoint representation of $G$. We write $\Phi$ for $\Phi_\rho$.

**Lemma 3.13.** Given a standard triple $(G, H, \Gamma)$ and $\rho$ as above. Let $\{\lambda_n\} \subset \Gamma$ be a sequence that is $\Phi$-clean. Let $L \leq G$ be a connected $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup. Assume that $(\{\lambda_n\}, L)$ is minimal for $H$ for some infinite subsequence $n_k$. Let $L'$ be the observable hull of $L$ in $G$. If $\Phi_1(\{\lambda_n\}) = \emptyset$, then

1. A normal $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $L$ is also normal in $G$;
2. $L = L'$.

**Proof.** Take $N$ to be a normal $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $L$. Let $v_N$ be a nonzero vector in $V(\mathbb{Z})$ that represents $\text{Lie}(N)$. Then $g \in G$ normalize $N$ iff $g[v_N] = [v_N]$ where $[v_N]$ denotes the line spanned by $v_N$. We know by assumption that $\lambda_n H \lambda_n^{-1}[v_N] = [v_N]$. By passing to an infinite subsequence we may assume that for some $\alpha \in \Phi$,

$$\lambda_n H \lambda_n^{-1} v_N = \alpha(h)v_N, \forall k$$

which implies that $\alpha$ is contained in $\Phi_{\text{odd}}(\{\lambda_n\}) = \Phi_0(\{\lambda_n\})$.

So there exists $I = \{\alpha_0 = \alpha, \alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n\} \subset \Phi_0(\{\lambda_n\})$ and $\{a_0, ..., a_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $\sum a_i \alpha_i = 0$. Passing to a further subsequence we may assume for each $i$, there exists a nonzero $v_i$ that is simultaneously an $\alpha_i$-weight vector of $\lambda_n H \lambda_n^{-1}$ for all $k$. Let $w := v_n^{\otimes a_0} \otimes \otimes_{i=1}^{n} v_i^{\otimes a_i}$, then

$$\lambda_n h \lambda_n^{-1} w = \prod_{i=0}^{n} \alpha_i(h)^{a_i}(h)w = w, \forall k \Rightarrow Lw = w \Rightarrow L'w = w$$

By Lemma 2.8, $L'[v_N] = [v_N]$ so we have proved the first claim.

Now apply this to $R_L$, the radical of $L$. So $R_L$ is normal in $G$. Note that $L/R_L \leq G/R_L$ is observable as $L/R_L$ is semisimple. This implies that $L \leq L'$ is also observable so we are done. \(\square\)

Now we can state and prove the main proposition of this subsection

**Proposition 3.14.** Given an observable standard triple $(G, H, \Gamma)$ and $\rho$ as above. Let $\{\lambda_n\} \subset \Gamma$ be a sequence that is $\Phi$-clean. Let $F$ be a connected $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $G$. Assume that $(\{\gamma_n\}, L)$ is minimal for $H$ and let $L$ be the observable hull of $F$ in $G$. Then $\lim_{n \to \infty} a_n(\gamma_n)*\mu_H = \mu_L$ with $a_n$ same as in Proposition 3.12.

**Proof.** Take $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough and $\{h_n\} \subset P^{\text{spl}}_{n, \varepsilon}$, then by Proposition 2.11, there exists a bounded sequence $\{\alpha_n\} \subset H$, a bounded sequence $\{\delta_n\} \subset F$ and $\{\lambda_n\} \subset \Gamma_F$ such that

$$\gamma_n h_n \alpha_n \gamma_n^{-1} = \delta_n \gamma_n'. $$

Define $\lambda_n = \gamma_n' \gamma_n$ and note that $\{\lambda_n\}$ is $\Phi$-clean. So we have $\Phi = \Phi_\infty(\{\lambda_n\}) \sqcup \Phi_1(\{\lambda_n\}) \sqcup \Phi_0(\{\lambda_n\})$. 

3.3.1. Claim. \( \Phi_\infty(\{\lambda_n\}) \supset \Phi_\infty(\{\gamma_n\}) \cup \Phi_1(\{\gamma_n\}) \).

Proof. Take \( \alpha \in \Phi_\infty (\{\gamma_n\}) \cup \Phi_1(\{\gamma_n\}) \). By definition

\[
\inf_{0 \neq v \in V_0(\mathbb{Z})} ||\gamma_n h_n v|| \rightarrow +\infty.
\]

So

\[
\inf_{0 \neq v \in V_0(\mathbb{Z})} ||\lambda_n v|| = \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_0(\mathbb{Z})} ||\delta_n^{-1} \gamma_n h_n \alpha_n v|| \approx \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_0(\mathbb{Z})} ||\gamma_n h_n v|| \rightarrow +\infty
\]

where \( \approx \) means “differed by a bounded error as \( n \) varies” and we are done.

3.3.2. Claim. \( \Phi_1(\{\lambda_n\}) = \emptyset \) and \( \Phi_0(\{\lambda_n\}) = \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\}) \).

Proof. Take \( \alpha \in \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\}) \), then there exists \( \{\alpha_0 = \alpha, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \subset \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\}) \) and \( \{a_0, a_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0} \) such that \( \sum a_i \alpha_i = 0 \). On the other hand, there exists \( M > 0 \) such that \( \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_0(\mathbb{Z})} ||\gamma_n v|| \leq M \) for all \( \lambda_n \). Therefore,

\[
\inf_{0 \neq v \in V_0(\mathbb{Z})} ||\gamma_n h_n v|| \geq \varepsilon, \quad \forall i, n \implies \alpha_i(h_n) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{M}, \quad \forall i, n
\]

\[
\implies \alpha^\alpha(h_n) = \prod_{i \neq 0} \frac{1}{\alpha_i^\varepsilon(h_n)} \leq \left( \frac{M}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\sum \alpha_i \alpha_i}, \quad \forall n
\]

\[
\implies \alpha(h_n) \leq \left( \frac{M}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\sum \alpha_i \alpha_i / \alpha_0}, \quad \forall n
\]

So we have

\[
\inf_{0 \neq v \in V_0(\mathbb{Z})} ||\lambda_n v|| \approx \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_0(\mathbb{Z})} ||\gamma_n v|| \alpha(h_n)
\]

is bounded from above, implying that \( \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\}) \) is contained in \( \Phi_{\text{bdd}}(\{\lambda_n\}) \). By definition of \( \Phi_0 \), this actually implies that \( \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\}) \subset \Phi_0(\{\lambda_n\}) \). The asserted equalities then come from the fact that

\[
\Phi = \phi_\infty(\{\lambda_n\}) \cup \Phi_1(\{\lambda_n\}) \cup \Phi_0(\{\lambda_n\}) = \phi_\infty(\{\gamma_n\}) \cup \Phi_1(\{\gamma_n\}) \cup \Phi_0(\{\gamma_n\})
\]

Take arbitrary infinite subsequence \( \{n_k\} \) and a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-subgroup \( L' \leq G \) such that \( \{\lambda_{n_k}\}, L' \) is \( H \)-minimal. We may assume \( \delta_{n_k} \) converges to some \( \delta_\infty \) in \( F \). Then \( L' \) is observable by Lemma 3.13 and

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} [\lambda_{n_k}, \mu_H] = [\mu_L] \implies \lim_{k \to \infty} [(\lambda_{n_k})^\ast, \mu_H] = (\delta_\infty)^\ast [\mu_L]^\ast
\]

in \( G / \Gamma \). Now we claim that \( L' = F \), which would conclude the proof. It is clear that \( L' \) is contained in \( F \). It is sufficient to show that it is also epimorphic. Indeed take a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-representation of \( F \) and a nonzero \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector \( v \) fixed by \( L' \), i.e., \( \lambda_n H \gamma_n^{-1} v = v \) for all \( n \). Note \( \lambda_n = \delta_n^{-1} \gamma_n h_n \alpha_n \), so \( \lambda_n H \gamma_n^{-1} = \delta_n^{-1} \gamma_n H \gamma_n^{-1} \delta_n \). Hence \( \delta_n v \) is fixed by \( \gamma_n H \gamma_n^{-1} \). On the other hand

\[
\delta_n v = \gamma_n h_n \alpha_n \gamma_n^{-1} \delta_n^{-1} v = \gamma_n \gamma_n^{-1} \lambda_n h_n \alpha_n \gamma_n^{-1} = \gamma_n \gamma_n^{-1} v
\]

is both discrete and bounded. Hence by passing to a subsequence we may assume that there exists \( w \), another \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector, such that \( w = \delta_n v = \gamma_n^{-1} v \).

Now \( w \) is fixed by \( \gamma_n H \gamma_n^{-1} \) for all \( n \) and so it is fixed by \( \mathcal{F} \). Therefore \( v \) is also fixed by \( F \). So we are done.
3.4. Complements.

**Definition 3.15.** Given an observable standard triple \((G, H, \Gamma)\) and a connected observable \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroup \(L\). Let \(\Lambda\) be a subgroup of \(\Gamma\). \(H\) is said to \(\Lambda\)-converge to \(L\) iff there exists a sequence \(\{\lambda_n\}\) in \(\Lambda\) such that \(\{\lambda_n, L\}\) is potentially minimal for \(H\).

By Proposition 3.14, if \(H\) \(\Lambda\)-converges to \(L\) then \((\lambda_n)_*[\mu_H]\) converges to \(\mu_L\) for some sequence \(\{\lambda_n\}\) of \(\Lambda\). And the converse is also true by ignoring finitely many \(n\)'s. One may ask when \(H\) could \(\Lambda\)-converge to \(L\). We shall make some observations here but will not be able to answer the general question even when \(\Lambda = \Gamma\).

**Lemma 3.16.** Keep the notations as in the above definition. Given three connected observable \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroups \(A, B\) and \(C\) of \(G\). Then \(A\) \(\Lambda\)-converges to \(B\) and \(B\) \(\Lambda\)-converges to \(C\) implies that \(A\) \(\Lambda\)-converges to \(C\). As a consequence, \(A \leq_{\Lambda} B\) iff \(A\) \(\Lambda\)-converges to \(B\) defines a partial order on the set of all connected observable \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroups.

**Proof.** By assumption we can find a sequence \(\{a_n\}\) (resp. \(\{b_n\}\)) in \(\Lambda\) such that \((\{a_n\}, B)\) (resp. \((\{b_n\}, C)\)) is potentially minimal for \(A\) (resp. \(B\) ). Let \(\mathcal{D}\) be the collection of connected observable \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroups of \(C\). It is a countable set and we fix a enumeration \(\mathcal{D} = \{D_1, D_2, \ldots\}\).

Then for each positive integer \(i\) there exists \(N_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\) such that for all \(n \geq N_i, b_nBb_n^{-1}\) is not contained in \(D_j\) for all \(j \leq i\). For each fixed \(n_j\), \((\{a_n, m\}, b_nB_n^{-1})\) is minimal for \(A\). So we can find \(M_{n,i} \in \mathbb{Z}^+\) such that for all \(n \geq N_i\) and \(m \geq M_{n,i}, b_nB_n^{-1}\) is not contained in \(D_j\) for all \(j \leq i\) (here we use the fact that \(D_j \cup b_nB_n^{-1}\) is an observable subgroup of strictly smaller dimension than \(b_nB_n^{-1}\)). Hence if we define \(c_i = b_n, m_i\) in \(\Lambda\) for some \(n_i \geq N_i\) and \(m_i \geq M_{n,i}\), then \((\{c_n\}, C)\) is potentially minimal for \(A\).

**Lemma 3.17.** Notations are the same as above. Assume that \(H\) is an observable subgroup of \(G\) and is maximal with respect to \(\leq_{\Lambda}\). Then \(H\) is virtually normalized by \(\Lambda\) in the sense that there is a finite index subgroup \(\Lambda_0\) of \(\Lambda\) such that \(\Lambda_0\) normalize \(H\).

**Proof.** If the conclusion is false, then we can find a sequence \(\{\lambda_n\}\) in \(\Lambda\) such that \(\lambda_nH\lambda_n^{-1} \neq \lambda_mH\lambda_m^{-1}\) for any \(n \neq m\). Passing to an infinite subsequence we may assume there exists a connected \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroup \(L\) of \(G\) such that \((\{\lambda_n\}, L)\) is minimal for \(H\). But by assumption \(\dim L = \dim H\), so for all \(n, L = \lambda_nH\lambda_n^{-1}\) and this is a contradiction.

**Corollary 3.18.** Notations are the same as above. Assume that \(G\) is \(\mathbb{Q}\)-simple and \(\mathbb{Q}\)-isotropic. Then the only maximal element with respect to \(\leq_{\Gamma}\) is the trivial group or \(G\). Consequently for all non-trivial connected observable \(\mathbb{Q}\)-subgroup \(L\) of \(G\), there exists a sequence \(\{\gamma_n\}\) in \(\Gamma\) such that \(\lim_n(\gamma_n)_*[\mu_L] = [\mu_G]\).

**Proof.** Take such a maximal element \(L\). Then \(L\) is normalized by some finite-index subgroup \(\Gamma_0\) of \(\Gamma\). But Borel’s density theorem implies that \(\Gamma_0\) is Zariski-dense in \(G\). Hence \(L\) is normalized by \(G\), which must be either the trivial group or \(G\).

We also deduce a result of Weiss [Wei98, Corollary 5].

**Corollary 3.19.** Given a standard triple \((G, H, \Gamma)\) and assume \(H\) is epimorphic in \(G\), then \(\pi_\Gamma(H)\) is dense in \(G/\Gamma\).
Proof. Take a Levi decomposition of \( H = L \cdot U \) where \( L \) is reductive and hence observable in \( G \). Let \( \Lambda = U_\Gamma \) and take \( F \) to be an \( \mathbb{Q} \)-observable subgroup such that \( L \Lambda \)-converge to \( F \) and \( F \) is maximal with respect to this property. By Lemma 3.17 and that any finite index subgroup of \( \Lambda \) is Zariski dense in \( U \), we see that \( F \) is normalized by \( U \).

Now we use item (6) in Definition 1.1 to check that \( F \cdot U \) is observable in \( G \). Only here we use \( V \) to stand for \( V(\mathbb{Q}) \) instead of \( V(\mathbb{C}) \). Take a character \( \alpha \) of \( F \cdot U \) that extends to a representation of \( G \). In other words, there is a representation \((\rho, V_1)\) of \( G \) and nonzero \( v \in V \) such that \( xv = \alpha(x)v \) for all \( x \in F \cdot U \). As \( F \) is observable, by (6) in Definition 1.1, there exists another representation \((\rho', V')\) such that the subspace \( V'_{-\alpha}|_F \) is nonzero. As \( U \) normalize \( F, U \) preserves the subspace \( V'_{-\alpha}|_F \). But \( U \) is a unipotent group so there exists a nonzero \( v' \in V'_{-\alpha}|_F \) that is fixed by \( U \). Hence \( -\alpha \), which is just the dual of \( \alpha \), is also contained in a representation of \( G \).

As \( F \cdot U \) contains \( H \) by definition, \( F \cdot U \) is equal to \( G \). Hence we also have \( G = F \cdot U \).

Now we take \( X \) to be the closure of \( \pi_\Gamma(H) \) in \( G/\Gamma \). It is invariant by \( U \). On the other hand it contains \( UF/\Gamma = G/\Gamma \) and the proof completes.

4. Translates of reductive subgroups

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4. Let \((G, H, \Gamma)\) be a standard triple and assume that both \( G \) and \( H \) are reductive groups.

4.1. Non-divergence. We want to put an assumption on \( H \) that would guarantee non-divergence when translated by an arbitrary sequence in \( G \). If \( a \) is a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-cocharacter in \( G \) that centralize \( H \) yet not contained in \( H \), then the full orbit \( \pi_\Gamma(aH) \) diverges to infinite set-theoretically, that is, for any compact subset \( K \) of \( G/\Gamma \) and for \( t \) large enough, \( \pi_\Gamma(aHt) \cap K = \emptyset \). If one wants to avoid this scenario, then it is necessary to put the following group-theoretically condition:

- \( Z_GH/(Z_GH \cap H) \) is \( \mathbb{Q} \)-anisotropic.

Proposition 4.1. Under this condition, there exists a compact set \( K \subset G/\Gamma \) such that \( \pi_\Gamma(gH) \cap K \neq \emptyset \) for all \( g \in G \).

In the case when \( Z_GH \) is \( \mathbb{Q} \)-anisotropic, this is proved in [EMS97, Theorem 1.1]. And in the present case it can be deduced from [RS18] and [KM98]. We shall give an alternative short proof based on Proposition 2.11 (which also relies on [KM98]) and some input from geometric invariant theory. In view of Proposition 2.11 it suffices to prove Proposition 4.5 below.

First we record a result from [Kem78, Corollary 4.5].

Lemma 4.2. Take a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-representation \( \rho : G \to GL(V) \) and a vector \( v_0 \neq 0 \) in \( V(\mathbb{Q}) \) fixed by \( H \). If \( Z_GH/(Z_GH \cap H) \) is \( \mathbb{Q} \)-anisotropic, then \( G \cdot v_0 \) is closed.

Take a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-representation \( \rho : G \to GL(V) \) and assume \( H \) is reductive. We can find a Cartan involution of \( GL(V) \) that preserves the image of \( G \) and \( H \) (see [Mos55]). Then we take an Euclidean metric on \( V \) that is invariant under the maximal compact subgroup associated with this Cartan involution. Note that under this assumption, if \( W \) is an \( H \)-invariant subspace, then \( W^\perp \) is also \( H \)-invariant.
Lemma 4.3. With the assumption in the last paragraph, we take a vector \( v_0 \neq 0 \) in \( V(\mathbb{Q}) \) fixed by \( H \). If \( Z_G(H) \cdot v_0 \) is closed and \( v_1 \) is a vector with minimum length in \( Z_G(H) \cdot v_0 \), then \( v_1 \) is also a vector with minimum length in \( G \cdot v_1 \).

The proof is a modification of the proof in [Wal17, Theorem 3.27].

Proof. We apply Ness’s theorem over \( \mathbb{R} \) [Wal17, Theorem 3.28] which states that \( v \in V \) achieves the minimum length of a closed orbit of \( H \) (resp. \( Z_G H \), resp. \( G \)) iff \( \langle Xv, v \rangle = 0 \) for all \( X \) in \( \text{Lie} H \) (resp. \( \text{Lie}(Z_G H) \), resp. \( \text{Lie}(G) \)).

So we know that \( \langle Xv_1, v_1 \rangle = 0 \) for all \( X \in \text{Lie}(Z_G H) \) and we only need to show that this holds for all \( X \in \text{Lie}(G) \).

Consider the following diagram where we denote \( \text{Lie}(G) \) by \( \mathfrak{g} \) and \( \text{Lie}(Z_G H) \) by \( \mathfrak{z}_g \).

\[
\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{z}_g(\mathfrak{h}) \oplus \mathfrak{z}_g(\mathfrak{h})^\perp \quad \rightarrow \quad V = V^H \oplus (V^H)^\perp \quad \downarrow \quad V^H
\]

where the horizontal arrow is defined by sending \( X \mapsto Xv_1 \) and the vertical arrow is the natural projection to the first factor and the remaining diagonal arrow is the composition of the other two. Hence the diagram is commutative by definition and all arrows are \( \mathbb{R} \)-linear. It is also \( H \)-equivariant. The vertical arrow is \( H \)-equivariant as both subspaces are \( H \)-invariant. Take \( h \in H \), as \( hv_1 = v_1 \) we have \( hXh^{-1}v_1 = h(Xv_1) \) and so the horizontal arrow is also \( H \)-equivariant.

There is no component of trivial \( H \)-representation in \( \mathfrak{z}_g(\mathfrak{h})^\perp \) by definition so it is sent to \( \{0\} \) by the diagonal arrow. So the \( V^H \) component of \( Xv_1 \) for \( X \in \mathfrak{z}_g(\mathfrak{h})^\perp \) is trivial. In particular \( \langle Xv_1, v_1 \rangle = 0 \) for \( X \in \mathfrak{z}_g(\mathfrak{h})^\perp \) and hence this is true for all \( X \in \mathfrak{g} \).

\( \square \)

Lemma 4.4. Assume that \( Z_G H/(Z_G H \cap H) \) is \( \mathbb{Q} \)-anisotropic. Take a representation \( V \) of \( G \) over \( \mathbb{Q} \) and fix a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-structure of \( V_{\mathbb{Q}} \) and an Euclidean metric on \( V \). Then there exists a constant \( c > 0 \) such that for all \( v \neq 0 \in V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{Z}) \), we have \( ||G \cdot v|| \geq c \).

Proof. Indeed \( ||Z_G H \cdot v|| > c' \) uniformly over \( v \in V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{Z}) \) because \( Z_G H(\mathbb{Z}) \) is cocompact in \( Z_G H \mod H \). As any two norms on \( V \) are equivalent, we apply Lemma 4.3 to conclude the proof.

\( \square \)

Proposition 4.5. Assume that \( Z_G H/(Z_G H \cap H) \) is \( \mathbb{Q} \)-anisotropic. Take a representation \( (\rho, V) \) of \( G \) over \( \mathbb{Q} \) and fix a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-structure of \( V_{\mathbb{Q}} \) and an Euclidean metric on \( V \). Then there exists \( c > 0 \) such that \( \Omega(g, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi_\rho) \) is nonempty for all \( g \in G \).

Proof. Consider the all possible subsets \( I = \{\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_k\} \) of \( \Phi_\rho \) such that \( \sum_i m_i \alpha_i = 0 \) has a solution \( \{m_i\} \) in positive numbers. For each \( I \) we fix a set of positive integers \( \{m_i\} \) such that \( \sum_i m_i \alpha_i = 0 \). As there are at most finitely many such \( I \)'s, the representation \( W := \bigoplus_i V^\otimes m_i \) is finite-dimensional. Apply Lemma 4.4 to \( W \) we have a constant \( c > 0 \) which is a lower bound for \( ||gw|| \) for all \( g \in G \) and \( w \in W_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{Z}) \).

Note that for each \( t \in \text{Lie}(S_H) \), \( \Omega(g, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi_\rho) \) is nonempty iff \( \Omega(g \exp t, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi_\rho) \) is nonempty. We want to find a \( t \) such that \( \Omega(g \exp t, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi_\rho) \) contains 0. Consider
the function
\[ \phi : \text{Lie}(S_H) \to \mathbb{R} \]
\[ t \mapsto \sup_{\alpha \in \Phi} (\ln \varepsilon - \ln \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_\alpha(Z)} ||g \exp(t)v||) \]
\[ = \sup_{\alpha \in \Phi} (-d\alpha(t) - \ln \varepsilon - \ln \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_\alpha(Z)} ||g v||) \]
So \( \Omega(g \exp t, \varepsilon, \rho, \Phi_\rho) \) contains 0 iff \( \inf_{t \in \text{Lie}(S_H)} \phi(t) \) is nonpositive. If \( \inf \phi(t) \) is equal to \(-\infty\) then we are done. Otherwise \( \inf \phi \) can be achieved by some \( t_0 \). Consider the set \( \Phi \) of \( \alpha \in \Phi_\rho \) that achieves the supreme in the definition of \( \phi(t_0) \). Define \( \Phi_0 \) and \( \Phi_1 \) as before. We claim that \( \Phi_0 \) is nonempty. Otherwise there exists \( t \) such that \( d\alpha(t) > 0 \) for all \( \alpha \in \Phi \) and perturbing by such an element would destroy the infimum. Hence there are \( \{\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_k\} \) in \( \Phi \) and positive integers \( \{m_1, ..., m_k\} \) such that \( \sum m_i \alpha_i = 0 \). Moreover we take the same \( \{m_i\} \)'s as in the beginning of the proof. Thus \( v_i^{\otimes m_i} \) is contained in \( W^H(Z) \) and
\[ \prod_{i=1}^k ||g \exp(t)v_i||^{m_i} = ||g \otimes v_i^\otimes m_i|| \geq c \]
for all \( 0 \neq v_i \in V_{\alpha_i}(Z) \). This implies that there exists \( i_0 \) and \( c' > 0 \) such that \( \inf_{0 \neq v \in V_{\alpha_i}(Z)} ||g \exp(t)v|| \geq c' \). By taking \( \varepsilon \) such that \( \ln \varepsilon - \ln c' < 0 \) then we are done. \( \square \)

4.2. Equidistribution. In this section we enhance Proposition 3.14 in the current case.

Proposition 4.6. Let \( (G, H, \Gamma) \) be a standard triple. We assume in addition that \( G, H \) are both reductive and that \( Z_G H/(Z_G H \cap H) \) is \( \mathbb{Q} \)-anisotropic. Given an arbitrary sequence \( \{g_n\} \) in \( G \), after passing to a subsequence, there exists a bounded sequence \( \{\delta_n\} \) in \( G \), a sequence \( \{\gamma_n\} \) in \( \Gamma \) and a reductive \( \mathbb{Q} \)-subgroup \( L \) of \( G \) such that \( g_n \mu_H = \delta_n \gamma_n \mu_H, \gamma_n H \gamma_n^{-1} \subset L \) and \( [\gamma_n \mu_H] \to [\mu_L] \). Moreover if \( \{g_n\} \) is unbounded when projecting to \( G/Z_G S \) for all \( \mathbb{Q} \)-split subtori \( S \) in \( Z(H) \), then \( L \) is not contained in any proper \( \mathbb{Q} \)-parabolic subgroup and \( \mu_L \) is finite.

In view of Proposition 3.14 and 4.1, we have such an observable subgroup \( L \). It only remains to show the remaining claims about \( L \). However, we will only be able to establish the Corollary 1.5 after we prove the proposition above (though there are special cases of this corollary where one has a rather direct proof, see [Gro97, Lemma 3.10] when \( H \) is a maximal torus).

Definition 4.7. For a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-cocharacter \( a : G_m \to G \) of a reductive \( \mathbb{Q} \)-group \( G \), we define \( P_a \) to be the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-parabolic subgroup \( \{x \in G \mid \lim_{t \to 0} a_t x a_t^{-1} \text{ exists}\} \).

Then the unipotent radical of \( P_a \) is the subgroup \( \{x \in G, \lim_{t \to 0} a_t x a_t^{-1} = e_G\} \).

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Assume that the conclusion is false and take \( F \) to be such a group, which we may assume to be connected. Write \( U \) to be the non-trivial unipotent radical of \( F \). By Proposition 4.6 above if \( H \leq \Gamma F \) then we are done. So assume that this is also false and without loss of generality assume that \( H \) is a subgroup of \( F \) that is maximal with respect to \( \leq \Gamma \), then it is automatically maximal with respect to any subgroup of \( \Gamma \). In particular this is true for \( \Lambda := \Gamma \cap U \), a lattice in \( U \). Arguing as in Lemma 3.17, we see that \( H \) is normalized by a finite index subgroup \( \Lambda_0 \) of \( \Lambda \), which is Zariski dense in \( U \) (see [Rag72, Theorem 2.1]).
Hence $H$ and consequently its center are normalized by $U$. Let $S$ be the maximal $\mathbb{Q}$-split torus in the center of $H$. Then it follows that $S$ is also normalized by $U$. Hence $S$ is centralized by $U$ as $U$ is connected (see [Spr98, Corollary 3.29]).

On the other hand, there exists a proper parabolic $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup $P$ of $G$ that contains $U$ inside its unipotent radical and also contains $N_GU$. As $H$ is normalized $U$, $P$ contains $H$. So by Lemma 4.8 below, $P$ is equal to $P_a$ for some cocharacter $a$ of $S$. But this is a contradiction as $U$ is contained in the unipotent radical of $P$ so is impossible to centralize the image of $a$.

**Lemma 4.8.** Let $G$ be a reductive $\mathbb{Q}$-group and $H$ be a reductive $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $G$ such that $Z_GH/(Z_GH \cap H)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-anisotropic. Then any $\mathbb{Q}$-parabolic $P$ containing $H$ is equal to $P_a$ for some $\mathbb{Q}$-cocharacter $a$ of $S$ where $S$ is the maximal $\mathbb{Q}$-split torus in the center of $H$.

**Proof.** Let $L$ be a Levi subgroup of $P$ that contains $H$ and $S'$ be the maximal $\mathbb{Q}$-split torus of the center of $L$. Then $P$ is equal to $P_a$ for some $\mathbb{Q}$-cocharacter $a$ of $S'$. But $S'$ centralize $H$, therefore is contained in $S$ by the assumption that $Z_GH/(Z_GH \cap H)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-anisotropic.

Let us now turn to the proof of proposition 4.6. We need [Kem78, Theorem 4.2].

**Theorem 4.9.** Let $G$ be a reductive $\mathbb{Q}$-group and $(\rho, V)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-representation of $G$. For each $\nu \in V(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\overline{G}\cdot \nu \ni \{0\}$, there is a unique $\mathbb{Q}$-parabolic subgroup $P_\nu$ of $G$ such that for each $\mathbb{Q}$-cocharacter $a$ of $G$ that is “optimal”, we have $P_\nu = P_a$. Moreover, if $H$ preserves the line spanned by $\nu$, then $H$ is contained in $P_\nu$.

We refer the reader to [Kem78] for the precise meaning of “optimal”. Here we only note that if $\nu$ is a weight vector with respect to a $\mathbb{Q}$-split subtorus $S$ with nonzero weight $\alpha$ and $G$ is semisimple, then a $\mathbb{Q}$-cocharacter is optimal within the class of $\mathbb{Q}$-cocharacters of $S$ if and only if it is contained in $\mathbb{Q}^+\alpha^\vee$ where $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha^\vee$ denotes the identification of $X_+(S) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ with $X_+(S) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ provided by the restriction of Killing form. If it happens that this cocharacter is also optimal in the class of $\mathbb{Q}$-cocharacters of $G$, then we also write $P_\alpha$ for $P_\nu$ in this case. And if we decompose the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of $G$ with respect to the Adjoint action of $S$ as $\oplus_{\beta \in X^+(S)} \mathfrak{g}_{\beta}$, then the Lie algebra of $P_\alpha$ is $\oplus_{\beta \in X^+(S), (\beta, \alpha) \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$.

**Proof of Proposition 4.6.** We let $\tilde{S}_H$ be the unique lift of $S_H$ in $H$. This is the maximal $\mathbb{Q}$-split torus in the center of $H$. By passing to a subsequence, we assume that there is a subtorus $S_0$ of $\tilde{S}_H$ such that

- for all subtori $S$ of $\tilde{S}_H$ that properly contains $S_0$, $\{g_n\}$ is unbounded when projecting to $G/Z_GS$ and
- the sequence $\{g_n\}$ is contained in $Z_GS_0$.

Hence we may replace the ambient group $G$ by $Z_GS_0$. As the center plays no role in the dynamics, we may further replace it by its derived semisimple subgroup $[G, G]$. Under these assumptions, one may check that the sequence $\{g_n\}$ is unbounded when projecting to $G/Z_GS$ for all non-trivial subtori $S$ in $\tilde{S}_H$.

By non-divergence, there is a bounded sequence $\{h_n\}$ in $G$, a bounded sequence $\{h_n\}$ in $H$ and a sequence $\{\gamma_n\}$ in $\Gamma$ such that $g_nh_n = \delta_n\gamma_n$. Then $(g_n)_*\mu_H = (\delta_n\gamma_n)_*\mu_H$ and $\{\gamma_n\}$ is unbounded when projecting to $G/Z_GS$ for all non-trivial subtori $S$ in $\tilde{S}_H$. Passing to a subsequence we find an observable $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup $L$
such that \( \{ \gamma_n \}, L \) is \( H \)-minimal. It suffices to show that \( L \) is not contained in any parabolic \( \mathbb{Q} \)-subgroup of \( G \).

Recall the notation in previous sections. Take \( \rho : G \to \text{SL}(V) \) to be a superfaithful \( \mathbb{Q} \)-representation that contains all exterior powers of the Adjoint representation of \( G \). Passing to a subsequence we assume that \( \gamma_n \) is \( \Phi_{\rho} \)-clean. Hence \( \Phi_0, \Phi_1 \) and \( \Phi_{\infty} \) are defined. By the proof of Proposition 3.14 we may assume that \( \Phi_1 \) is empty.

Let us first show that \( \Phi_0 \), and hence \( \Phi_{\text{bdd}} \), is contained in \{0\}. If not, there are nonzero characters \( \{ \alpha_i \}_{i=1,\ldots,l} \) of \( S_H \), positive numbers \( \{ a_i \}_{i=1,\ldots,l} \) and nonzero vectors \( v_n(\alpha_i) \in V_\alpha(Z) \) such that \( \sum_{i=1}^l a_i \alpha_i = 0 \) and \( \{ \gamma_nv_n(\alpha_i) \}_n \) bounded. As \( \{ \gamma_nv_n(\alpha_i) \}_n \) is discrete, we assume that \( \gamma_nv_n(\alpha_i) \) is constantly equal to some \( v_i \in V(Z) \) by passing to a further subsequence. As \( \alpha_i \) is nonzero, the \( G \)-orbit through \( v_i \) contains \{0\} in its closure. According to Theorem 4.9, there exists a canonical \( \mathbb{Q} \)-parabolic subgroup \( P_i \) that contains the stabilizer of the line \( \mathbb{Q}v_i \). In particular \( P_i \) contains \( \gamma_nH\gamma_n^{-1} \) for all \( n \).

By Lemma 4.8 and Theorem 4.9 above, there exists a cocharacter \( a_i^\vee \) of \( S_H \) such that \( t \mapsto \gamma_ta_i^\vee(t)\gamma_n \) is optimal for \( v_i \) and \( P_i = \gamma_nP_{a_i^\vee}\gamma_n^{-1} \). By the remarks made after Theorem 4.9, we have \( P_{a_i^\vee} = P_{a_i^\vee} \), independent of \( n \). Hence \( \gamma_nP_{a_i^\vee}\gamma_n^{-1} = \gamma_1P_{a_i^\vee}\gamma_1^{-1} \) and so \( \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_n \) normalizes \( P_{a_i^\vee} \). But the normalizer of a parabolic subgroup is equal to itself (see [Spr98, Corollary 6.4.10]), so \( \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_n \) is contained in \( F \), defined to be the intersection of \( P_{a_i^\vee} \)’s as \( i \) ranges from 1 to \( l \).

Referring to the remarks made after Theorem 4.9 again, the Lie algebra of \( F \) consists of \( g_\beta \) with \( (\beta, \alpha_i) \geq 0 \) for all \( i \). But \( \sum_{i=1}^l a_i \alpha_i = 0 \) for some positive numbers \( \{ a_i \}_{i=1,\ldots,l} \), we are forced to have \( (\beta, \alpha_i) = 0 \) for all \( i \). Let \( S_\beta \) be any \( \mathbb{Q} \)-split subtorus of \( S_H \) which is the image of some non-trivial cocharacter \( \alpha \) that is in the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-span of \( \beta^\vee \). Then the Adjoint action of \( S_\beta \) restricted to the Lie algebra of \( F \) is trivial. In other words, \( F^c \) is contained in the centralizer of \( S_\beta \). This is a contradiction as \( \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_n \) would then be bounded in \( G/\mathbb{Z}G\).

So we have proved \( \Phi_{\text{bdd}} \) is at most \{0\}. Now suppose that \( P \) is a proper parabolic \( \mathbb{Q} \)-subgroup of \( G \), we want to show that \( L \) is not contained in \( P \). If this is not true, we have \( \gamma_nH\gamma_n^{-1} \) normalize the unipotent radical \( U \) of \( P \) for all \( n \). Let \( v_U \) be an integer vector in \( \Lambda_{\dim U}^\vee g \) that represents \( U \), then \( \gamma_nH\gamma_n^{-1} \) stabilize the line spanned by \( v_U \) for all \( n \). Then we see that the character of \( H \) associated to \( \gamma_n^{-1}v_U \) is in \( \Phi_{\text{bdd}} \), which has been shown to be contained in \{0\}. But this is a contradiction to Lemma 4.8 above.

\[ \square \]
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