In the beginning: Langlands' doctoral thesis

Derek W. Robinson[†] Australian National University March 2019

1 Introduction

Bob Langlands' mathematical research career effectively began with his 1960 PhD thesis at Yale. It was a remarkable beginning to a remarkable career, but a beginning which largely went unnoticed. It was remarkable as Bob wrote the thesis, with no direct guidance, during the first year of graduate studies; in his own words "it all happened in a hurry". This did have the serendipitous outcome that during the second year of graduate work he was free to let his interests wander in different directions. In particular his attention focused on Selberg's work on spectral theory of Lie groups, a direction of research which led, within a few years, to the famous Langlands program. The thesis was also remarkable as the major part was never published in full. The thesis consisted of two chapters. The first chapter, approximately a third of the thesis, resolved a problem of Hille [Hil50] in the arcane area of Lie semigroups. This material was subsequently published in the Canadian Journal of Mathematics [Lan60a]. The second longer and more interesting chapter only surfaced as a short announcement in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences [Lan60b]. This announcement is less than two pages in length and provides an excellent illustration of Polonius' aphorism that 'Brevity is the soul of wit'. Unfortunately the brief account failed to give an intelligible explanation of the detailed results. At least it was well beyond my wit and ken when I first tried to understand it in 1986. The second chapter developed a theory of general order elliptic operators affiliated with a continuous representation of a Lie group. This theory was then used to resolve a problem inherent in the work of Harish-Chandra [HC53] concerning the analytic structure of the representations. The problem was very topical in the late 1950s and its solution was a remarkable achievement for a first year graduate student without guidance.

The Delphic nature of the Academy announcement meant that the principal results of the thesis passed with little attention. Much later, in the mid 1980s, I was interested in the integration of representations of Lie algebras and this led to an investigation of the regularity properties of Lie group representations. At this point I noticed a reference to Bob's Academy note in a paper of Roe Goodman [Goo71]. The results stated in the note were clearly of relevance to my interests at the time and I searched the literature for further evidence of the thesis. Frustrated by my failure to find any other published trace of the work I eventually wrote a letter to Bob asking if he still had a copy of his thesis. Much to my surprise I found a copy in my mailbox a couple of weeks later. Now, almost 60 years later, the thesis is widely available. A photocopy of the original, which was typed by Bob's wife Charlotte in 1959, has been posted on the Princeton website http://publications.ias.edu/rpl/section/3. The thesis was subsequently retyped at Yale sometime after Summer 1968 and distributed to a few people. A revised and corrected version of the second typescript, prepared by myself in collaboration with Anthony Pulido, is also on the Princeton website. An alternative more detailed presentation of the material in the second part of the thesis can also be found in Chapters I and III of my book 'Elliptic Operators and Lie Groups' [Rob91]. This latter presentation provides an extended description which largely follows the reasoning of the thesis. But both the original and my alternative version are quite complicated and difficult to follow. Helgason's remark in his review of Bob's 1963 paper on automorphic forms "the proof involves many interesting ideas and techniques, which, however, do not emerge from the overly condensed exposition with the clarity they deserve" could well apply. Consequently the current intention is to attempt to give a different, more pedestrian, description which explains the principal difficulties and results of the thesis. Although this description adopts the general strategy of the original and uses the same techniques the reasoning follows a rather different route.

The story of the differential and analytic structure of representations of Lie groups started in 1947 with a key observation of Gårding [Går47]. He remarked that every continuous Banach space representation of a Lie group determines a representation of the associated Lie algebra. The image of an element of the Banach space under the action of the representation is a function on the group and the representatives of the Lie algebra can be viewed as first-order differential operators with smooth coefficients acting on these functions. Gårding established by a regularization technique that the corresponding subspace of infinitely often differentiable functions is dense. But in 1953 Harish-Chandra [HC53] observed that the Gårding subspace was not very satisfactory for many purposes and proposed restricting consideration to the subspace of the Gårding space formed by the functions with convergent Taylor series. He also introduced the terminology well-behaved functions, or well-behaved vectors. It was not, however, apparent that the subspace spanned by such functions would automatically be dense in the representation space. Nevertheless, Harish-Chandra did prove the density for certain representations of a specific class of groups. His proof relied heavily on the structure theory of Lie groups. Subsequently, in 1958, Cartier and Dixmier [CD58] introduced the alternative terminology analytic functions and established the density property for a wider class of groups and representations. In particular they established that the analytic functions are dense for every unitary representation of an arbitrary Lie group. This was the first indication that the density property of the analytic functions might be a universal property, valid for general representations of arbitrary Lie groups. This universality was the final conclusion, Theorem 10, of Bob's thesis. Strangely enough the result is not explicitly stated in the Academy announcement although it is a direct inference of the final sentence.

The problem of the density of the analytic functions also attracted the attention of Ed Nelson who was a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute of Advanced Studies (IAS) in Princeton. Nelson [Nel59] established the density property for general Lie groups and representations independently of Langlands although they were aware of each other's interests. As Bob explained "I do not think that Nelson ever saw my thesis. What happened is that Lennie Gross, who was then an instructor at Yale, invited two graduate students John Frampton and myself to drive with him to the IAS, where he was to visit friends from his graduate student years in Chicago, among them Ed Nelson and Paul Cohen. So it came that Nelson and I discovered a common interest. As I have mentioned before, it was that conversation, which I would guess went into some detail, that provided Ed and myself with

whatever we knew of each other's work." The only other remaining clue to overlap of their works is a reference to a forthcoming paper of Nelson in the introduction to Bob's thesis together with a reference to a related paper of Nelson and Stinespring [NS59]. In addition there is a reference to Nelson's published paper [Nel59] in the Academy announcement. The road trip to Princeton later had an unforeseen consequence with long term implications. As Bob wrote recently "I also believe that my invitation to come to Princeton as an instructor then came to me without any further action on my part, thus I made no application. I do not know any longer from whom the invitation came, but it was clear that the recommendation had come from Ed." As far as I am aware Nelson never made any specific reference to Bob's thesis or the announcement in the Proceedings of the Academy in any of his publications.

The reference to Bob's Academy note in Roe Goodmans's paper [Goo71] was a result of Roe spending the academic year 1968/69 at the IAS on leave from MIT. By this time Bob had moved back to Yale and Nelson's interest had moved on to Constructive Quantum Field Theory. Fortunately Roe became aware of Bob's thesis during this period and even obtained a copy. He wrote that it was "perhaps at the Institute or at the historic old Fine Hall library" although he subsequently admitted that "perhaps it was at MIT". There is now no trace of the thesis in the Princeton library records so the origin of the copy is obscure. It was possibly a copy of the second retyped version. In any case Roe wrote that he "read it in detail" and was probably the first and last reader until Bob sent me a copy in 1986.

The general strategy of Langlands and Nelson was very similar but differed significantly in detail. Both used techniques of semigroup theory and parabolic partial differential equations. The common idea was to construct elliptic operators as polynomials in the representatives of the Lie algebra and to argue that these operators generated continuous analytic semigroups which mapped the representation space into the subspace of analytic functions. The density property was then a direct consequence of the semigroup continuity. The implementation of this strategy differed between the two authors. Nelson only considered operators in the form of Laplacians, sum of squares of the Lie algebra representatives, but Langlands analyzed polynomials of all orders with complex coefficients. We will not attempt to describe Nelson's arguments albeit to say that they relied in part on probability theory and in part on results of Eidelman [Eid56] on analyticity of solutions of parabolic differential equations together with some observations of Gårding on the decrease properties of these solutions. A complete, simplified, version of Nelson's proof was subsequently given by Gårding [Går60]. Although we will not discuss Nelson's work it should be noted that it dealt with a broad range of topics involving analytic elements. In particular it became well known in the mathematical physics community for its results on single operator theory, the intracies involved in the addition of unbounded operators etc. I became acquainted with it in the early 60s some 25 years before I encountered Langlands' thesis.

The arguments in the thesis proceeded in four major steps, the first three of which corresponded to the theorems in the Academy note. First, it was necessary to prove that the (closure of the) elliptic operators did indeed generate analytic semigroups. Since Bob was considering operators of general order this was a very complicated technical problem whose resolution was given by Theorems 7 and 8 of the thesis and stated as Theorems 1 and 2 of [Lan60b]. Secondly, as a consequence of approaching the problem in such generality, it was straightforward to deduce that the semigroups mapped into the Gårding subspace

of infinitely often differentiable functions. Next his analysis established that the action of the semigroups was determined by a universal integrable kernel. This was Theorem 9 of [Lan60a] and Theorem 3 of [Lan60b]. Finally it was necessary to prove that the semigroups in fact map into the subspace of analytic functions. This was Theorem 10 in the thesis but only appeared as a passing remark at the end of the Academy paper. It was at this last stage that the proof depended on the theory of parabolic partial differential equations with analytic coefficients. In fact Langlands cites the work of Eidelman [Eid56] which was also used by Nelson. Since Eidelman's paper is in Russian this was a barrier in 1986 to my comprehension of the proof. This difficulty was compounded by Bob's observation in his thesis that "The facts we need from this paper are not explicitly stated as theorems and the proofs are not given in complete detail. However, since the proofs are quite complicated we prefer not to perform the calculations in detail here". Fortunately this final stage of the proof can be completed by a quite different argument. The Eidelman results on the analyticity of solutions of parabolic equations were expressed in terms of complex variables but one can instead use real variable arguments. This approach was given in detail in Chapter II of [Rob91] and we will give a streamlined version in the sequel.

Since our aim is to be as elementary as possible we will take a different approach to both Langlands and Nelson. We will work in Langlands' framework with general order elliptic operators and first give an elementary proof that the density property of the analytic functions holds for all representations of the multi-dimensional Euclidean group of translations. This result is essentially a straightforward exercise in Fourier analysis. Secondly we transfer the conclusions for the Euclidean group to all continuous representations of a general Lie group by using an alternative version of the parametrix arguments developed by Langlands in combination with some relatively simple functional analytic arguments. In the course of our argument we establish that the elliptic operators do generate holomorphic semigroups whose action is given by integrable kernels. In fact we also deduce that these kernels satisfy Gaussian-style bounds. All these conclusions are reached by variations of the arguments of Langlands' thesis supplemented by other results developed in the 1950s, the heyday of semigroup theory. We conclude with an overview of other lines of investigation which developed from the thesis work.

2 The Euclidean group

Our discussion of the density of analytic functions starts with an examination of the representations of the Euclidean group \mathbf{R}^d of translations. Since this group is commutative there are no complications of structure theory but it nevertheless remains to establish that the density property is universal for all representations of the group. In the \mathbf{R}^d -case we argue that the universality follows once one has demonstrated the density of the analytic functions for the unitary representation of translations on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Thus the proof of the density is reduced to understanding a relatively simple unitary representation and then lifting, or transferring, the result to a general representation. A similar strategy works in the general case as we demonstrate in the subsequent section.

We begin by recalling some well known properties of the unitary representation of \mathbf{R}^d by translations on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$, the Hilbert space of square integrable functions with respect to Lebesgue measure and with norm $\|\cdot\|_2$. The group representation T is given by the family of operators defined by $(T(y)\varphi)(x) = \varphi(x-y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $\varphi \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. If x_1, \ldots, x_d is a basis of \mathbf{R}^d then the generators of the one-parameter subgroups $t \in \mathbf{R} \mapsto T(tx_k)$ of translations in the coordinate directions are given by $-\partial_k$ where $\partial_k = \partial/\partial x_k$. The partial derivatives are the representatives of the Lie algebra. Next adopt the multi-index notation $x^{\alpha} = x_{k_1} \dots x_{k_n}, \ \partial^{\alpha} = \partial_{k_1} \dots \partial_{k_n}$ etc. where $\alpha = (k_1, \dots, k_n)$ and the $k_j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Further denote the length of α by $|\alpha| = n$.

The differential structure of the L_2 -representation is described by a well known family of Sobolev spaces. The subspace $L_{2;n}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ of differential functions of order n is the common domain $\bigcap_{\{\alpha:|\alpha|=n\}} D(\partial^{\alpha})$ of all the n-th order differential operators and the subspace of infinitely often differentiable functions is given by $L_{2;\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d) = \bigcap_{n\geq 0} L_{2;n}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. It follows by a standard argument with an approximate identity that $L_{2;\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is dense in $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Finally the function $\varphi \in L_{2;\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is defined to be an analytic function for translations if $\sum_{k\geq 1} (s^k/k!)N_k(\varphi) < \infty$ for some s > 0 and an entire analytic function if the sum converges for all s > 0. Here N_k is the seminorm on $L_{2;k}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ defined by $N_k(\varphi) = \sup_{\{\alpha:|\alpha|=k\}} \|\partial^{\alpha}\varphi\|_2$. This is the real analytic definition originally considered by Harish-Chandra [HC53]. There is, of course, an equivalent complex analytic definition in terms of extensions of the functions $y \in \mathbf{R}^d \mapsto T(y)\varphi$ to strips in \mathbf{C}^d but we will not need to consider such extensions. We will, however, need to norm the subspaces $L_{2;k}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and it is convenient to set $\|\varphi\|_k = \sup_{\{0\leq l\leq k\}} N_l(\varphi)$.

First, following Langlands, we introduce the *m*-th order partial differential operators $H = \sum_{\{\alpha: |\alpha| \le m\}} c_{\alpha} (-\partial)^{\alpha}$ with coefficients $c_{\alpha} \in \mathbf{C}$ where *m* is an even integer. Then *H* is defined to be strongly elliptic if there is a $\mu > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{Re}\left((-1)^{m/2}\sum_{\{\alpha:|\alpha|=m\}}c_{\alpha}\,\xi^{\alpha}\right) \ge \mu\,|\xi|^{m} \tag{1}$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbf{R}^d$. The largest value of μ is called the ellipticity constant of H. Thus if $h(\xi) = \sum_{\{\alpha: |\alpha| \le m\}} c_{\alpha} (i\xi)^{\alpha}$ then there are $\lambda \in \langle 0, \mu]$ and $\omega \ge 0$ such that $\operatorname{Re} h(\xi) \ge \lambda |\xi|^m - \omega$ for all $\xi \in \mathbf{R}^d$. Note that the strong ellipticity condition only involves the real part of the principal coefficients, i.e. those with $|\alpha| = m$. Moreover, it is easily established that the condition is independent of the choice of coordinate basis. A non-singular transformation of the basis does not affect the validity of the condition. Although Langlands mainly considers strongly elliptic operators he does in part examine properties of elliptic operators whose coefficients satisfy the weaker condition

$$\Big|\sum_{\{\alpha:|\alpha|=m\}} c_{\alpha} \,\xi^{\alpha}\,\Big| \ge \mu \,|\xi|^m \tag{2}$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbf{R}^d$. For brevity we will, however, concentrate on the strongly elliptic case.

Secondly, let $\widetilde{\varphi} \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ denote the Fourier transform of $\varphi \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$, i.e.

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dx \, e^{-ix.\xi} \, \varphi(x) \; .$$

Then $(-\partial_k \varphi)(\xi) = (i\xi_k) \,\widetilde{\varphi}(\xi)$ and $(H\varphi)(\xi) = h(\xi) \,\widetilde{\varphi}(\xi)$, i.e. the elliptic differential operators act as multiplication operators on the Fourier space with multiplier h. In particular H is a closed operator on the subspace of functions $\varphi \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ such that $h\widetilde{\varphi} \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Therefore H generates a semigroup S whose action is given by

$$(S_t\varphi)(x) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} d\xi \, e^{ix.\xi} \, e^{-th(\xi)} \, \widetilde{\varphi}(\xi) = (K_t * \varphi)(x)$$

for all $t \ge 0$ where $K_t(x) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} d\xi \, e^{ix.\xi} \, e^{-th(\xi)}$. The semigroup property follows from the action by multiplication on the Fourier space and this also ensures that the kernel is a convolution semigroup, i.e. $K_{s+t}(x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dz \, K_s(z) \, K_t(x-z)$.

Several key properties of S follow immediately from the Fourier transform definition together with Plancherel's theorem, i.e. the identities $\|\varphi\|_2 = \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_2$. First one verifies easily that S is strongly continuous, i.e. $\lim_{t\to 0} \|(S_t - I)\varphi\|_2^2 = 0$. In addition the S_t satisfy the operator bounds $\|S_t\| \leq \exp(\omega t)$ with ω the constant in the ellipticity bound on Re h. Explicitly one has

$$||S_t \varphi||_2^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} d\xi \, e^{-2t \operatorname{Re} h(\xi)} \, |\widetilde{\varphi}(\xi)|^2 \le e^{2\omega t} \, ||\varphi||_2^2.$$

More interestingly one calculates that the semigroup S maps $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ into the subspace $L_{2;\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. For example.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^{\alpha} S_{t}\varphi\|_{2} &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^{d}} d\xi \,|\xi|^{2|\alpha|} e^{-2t\operatorname{Re}h(\xi)} \,|\widetilde{\varphi}(\xi)|^{2}\right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq t^{-k/m} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^{d}} d\xi \,(t|\xi|^{m})^{2|\alpha|/m} e^{-2(\lambda t|\xi|^{m}-\omega t)} \,|\widetilde{\varphi}(\xi)|^{2}\right)^{1/2} \leq C_{k} \,t^{-k/m} \,e^{\omega t} \,\|\varphi\|_{2} \end{aligned}$$

for all α with $|\alpha| = k$ where $C_k > 0$. The first step uses the ellipticity bound on $h(\xi)$ and the second follows from an estimate $(t|\xi|^m)^{2|\alpha|/m} \leq c_\lambda \exp(2\lambda t|\xi|^m)$. Consequently S_t maps $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ into $L_{2;k}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for each $k \geq 1$ and hence into $L_{2;\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Unfortunately this argument does not give a good control on the constants C_k . Nevertheless one can control the growth property by an iterative argument starting from the bounds on the first derivatives $\|\partial_i S_t \varphi\|_2$.

It follows from the foregoing that there is a $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$N_1(S_t\varphi) = \sup_{j \in \{1,...,d\}} \|\partial_j S_t\varphi\|_2 \le C_1 t^{-1/m} e^{\omega t} \|\varphi\|_2$$
(3)

for all $\varphi \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. But then

$$N_{k}(S_{t}\varphi) \leq \sup_{j_{1},\dots,j_{k}} \|(\partial_{j_{1}}S_{t/k})\dots(\partial_{j_{k}}S_{t/k})\varphi\|_{2} \leq C_{1}^{k} (t/k)^{-k/m} e^{\omega t} \|\varphi\|_{2}$$

for all $k \geq 1$ and $\varphi \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Hence, by Stirling's formula, there are a, b > 0 such that

$$N_k(S_t\varphi) \le a \, b^k \, t^{-k/m} \, (k!)^{1/m} \, e^{\omega t} \, \|\varphi\|_2 \tag{4}$$

for all $k \geq 1$, t > 0 and $\varphi \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Therefore $S_t \varphi$ is an entire analytic function for translations. But $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|S_t \varphi - \varphi\|_2 = 0$. So the entire analytic functions are dense in $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and we have proved more than we set out to do.

After this initial skirmish with the L_2 -representation of \mathbf{R}^d we next explain how one can transfer the density result for the analytic functions to a general continuous Banach space representation. It is here that estimates on the semigroup kernel K_t are of importance. In addition there are two new elements entering the arguments, the continuity and the boundedness properties of the representation. Let χ be a Banach space and U a continuous representation of \mathbf{R}^d by bounded operators $U(x), x \in \mathbf{R}^d$, on χ . There are two types of continuity of interest, strong continuity $||(U(x) - I)\varphi|| \to 0$ as $|x| \to 0$, and weak^{*} continuity. But a basic result of Yosida establishes that strong continuity is equivalent to weak continuity, i.e. equivalent to the conditions

$$\lim_{|x|\to 0} (f, U(x)\varphi) = (f, \varphi)$$
(5)

for all $\varphi \in \chi$ and $f \in \chi^*$, the dual of χ . Alternatively, if χ is the dual of a Banach space χ_* , the predual of χ , then U is weak^{*} continuous if $f \circ U \in \chi_*$ for all $f \in \chi_*$ and (5) is valid for all $\varphi \in \chi$ and $f \in \chi_*$. Thus both types of continuity can be handled similarly. It also follows from the group property and either form of continuity that there are $M \ge 1$ and $\rho \ge 0$ such that one has bounds

$$\|U(x)\| \le M e^{\rho|x|} \tag{6}$$

for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$. Here $\|\cdot\|$ indicates the standard operator norm associated with the Banach space.

Now to emulate the earlier L_2 -arguments for the Banach space representation it is necessary to define an analogue of the semigroup S. One direct way of doing this is by noting that on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ the semigroup satisfies

$$(S_t\varphi)(x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dy \, K_t(y) \, \varphi(x-y) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dy \, K_t(y) \, (T(y)\varphi)(x) \; .$$

Thus, formally at least, one has the operator representation

$$S_t = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dy \, K_t(y) \, T(y) = T(K_t) \tag{7}$$

where the integral is in the weak sense. Therefore the correct analogue of S in the Banach space setting should be the semigroup

$$S_t^{(U)} = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dy \, K_t(y) \, U(y) = U(K_t)$$
(8)

where the integral is in the weak or weak^{*} sense. This is an observation that we will use in the subsequent discussion of general Lie groups. But in order to make sense of either of the relations (7) or (8) one needs control on the growth properties of the kernel K_t . In fact the kernel and its derivatives satisfy Gaussian-type bounds.

Proposition 2.1 There exist b > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$, and for each multi-index α an $a_{\alpha} > 0$, such that

$$|(\partial^{\alpha} K_t)(x)| \le a_{\alpha} t^{-(d+|\alpha|)/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b(|x|^m/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$

for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and all t > 0.

Proof First consider the case that $\alpha = 0$. Then by contour integration one deduces that

$$|K_t(x)| = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \left| \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} d\xi \, e^{ix.(\xi+i\eta)} \, e^{-th(\xi+i\eta)} \right| \le (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} d\xi \, e^{-x.\eta} \, e^{-t\operatorname{Re}h(\xi+i\eta)}$$

for all $\eta \in \mathbf{R}^d$. But then there are $\lambda > 0$ and $\sigma, \omega \ge 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{Re} h(\xi + i\eta) \ge \lambda \, |\xi|^m - \sigma \, |\eta|^m - \omega \, .$$

Therefore $|K_t(x)| \leq a e^{\omega t} e^{-\eta \cdot x} e^{\sigma t |\eta|^m}$ and the required bound follows by minimizing with respect to η .

Secondly, if $\alpha \neq 0$ then the derivatives introduce additional multipliers $(i\xi)^{\alpha}$ on the Fourier transform. But for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $k_{\alpha,\varepsilon} > 0$ such that

$$|(\xi + i\eta)^{\alpha}| \le (t|\xi + i\eta|^m)^{|\alpha|/m} t^{-|\alpha|/m} \le k_{\alpha,\varepsilon} t^{-|\alpha|/m} e^{\varepsilon t(|\xi|^m + |\eta|^m)}$$

Then, if ε is sufficiently small, the estimates for the derivatives follow as above.

One also has analogous bounds on the functions $x \to x^{\beta}(\partial^{\alpha}K_t)(x)$.

Corollary 2.2 There exist b > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$, and for each pair of multi-indices α, β an $a_{\alpha,\beta} > 0$, such that

$$|x^{\beta}(\partial^{\alpha}K_{t})(x)| \leq a_{\alpha,\beta} t^{-(d+|\alpha|-|\beta|)/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b(|x|^{m}/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$

for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and all t > 0.

Proof The statement follows by remarking that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $l_{\beta,\varepsilon} > 0$ such that

$$|x^{\beta}| \le |x|^{|\beta|} = (|x|^m/t)^{|\beta|/m} t^{|\beta|/m} \le l_{\beta,\varepsilon} e^{\varepsilon(|x|^m/t)^{1/(m-1)}} t^{|\beta|/m}$$

Thus if ε is sufficiently small the bounds follow from those of Proposition 2.1 with a slightly smaller value of b.

The bounds of the corollary will be applied in the sequel to differential operators whose effective order is lower than the nominal order. If $D_n = \sum_{\{\alpha; |\alpha| \le n\}} c_\alpha \partial^\alpha$ is an *n*-th order partial differential operator with smooth coefficients supported in a compact neighbourhood of the origin and $(\partial^\beta c_\alpha)(0) = 0$ for all β with $|\beta| < (|\alpha| - k) \vee 0$ then D_n is defined to have effective order k. Corollary 2.2 then gives the bounds

$$|(D_n K_t)(x)| \le a_{\alpha,\beta} t^{-(d+k)/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b(|x|^m/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$

for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and all t > 0, i.e. the order of the t singularity is governed by the effective order k rather than the real order n.

The pointwise bounds on the kernel and its derivatives allow one to deduce various weighted bounds. For example, the bounds of Proposition 2.1 give

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d}} e^{\rho|x|} |(\partial^{\alpha} K_{t})(x)| \leq a_{\alpha} t^{-(d+|\alpha|)/m} e^{\omega t} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d}} \left(e^{\rho|x|} e^{-b(|x|^{m}/t)^{1/(m-1)}} \right)$$
$$< a_{\alpha} t^{-(d+|\alpha|)/m} e^{\omega'(1+\rho^{m})t}$$

with $\omega' > 0$. Weighted L_1 -bounds are also valid.

Proposition 2.3 There is an $\omega > 0$ and for each multi-index α an $a_{\alpha} > 0$, such that

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dx \left| (\partial^{\alpha} K_t)(x) \right| e^{\rho|x|} \le a_{\alpha} t^{-|\alpha|/m} e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t}$$

for all $\rho, t > 0$.

These bounds follow straightforwardly from the estimates of Proposition 2.1.

The weighted estimates of Proposition 6 combined with the continuity bounds (6) imply

$$\left|\int_{\mathbf{R}^{d}} dy \, K_{t}(y) \left(f, U(y)\varphi\right)\right| \leq M \int_{\mathbf{R}^{d}} dy \, |K_{t}(y)| \, e^{\rho|y|} \, \|f\| \cdot \|\varphi\| \leq a \, M \, e^{\omega(1+\rho^{m})t} \, \|f\| \cdot \|\varphi\|$$

for all $f \in \chi^*$, or χ_* , and $\varphi \in \chi$. Thus $S_t^{(U)} = U(K_t)$, formally given by (8), is indeed well-defined as a bounded operator on χ , for each t > 0, and one has bounds

$$||S_t^{(U)}|| \le a M e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t}$$

for all t > 0. Then since the K_t form a convolution semigroup it follows straightforwardly that the $S_t^{(U)}$ form a continuous semigroup with the type of continuity dictated by the continuity of the representation, either strong or weak^{*}. But one can also identify the generator of $S^{(U)}$.

First let X_1, \ldots, X_d denote the generators of the one-parameter semigroups $t \in \mathbf{R} \mapsto U(tx_k)$ in the coordinate directions x_1, \ldots, x_d , e.g. $X_k = \lim_{t\to 0} (U(tx_k) - I)/t$. Then set $\chi_n = \bigcap_{\{\alpha: |\alpha|=n\}} D(X^{\alpha})$ and $\chi_{\infty} = \bigcap_{n\geq 1} \chi_n$. These subspaces correspond in an obvious way to the *n*-th order differentiable functions and the infinitely often differentiable functions respectively. Secondly, note that

$$\begin{aligned} X_k S_t^{(U)} \varphi &= \lim_{t \to 0} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dy \, K_t(y) \left(U(y + tx_k) - I \right) \varphi/t \\ &= \lim_{t \to 0} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dy \left(K_t(y - tx_k) - K_t(y) \right) U(y) \varphi/t = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dy \left(-\partial_k K_t \right) (y) \, U(y) \varphi \,. \end{aligned}$$

Then by iteration

$$X^{\alpha}S_{t}^{(U)}\varphi = U((-\partial)^{\alpha}K_{t})\varphi = \prod_{j\in\alpha}U(-\partial_{j}K_{t/|\alpha|})\varphi$$
(9)

for all $\varphi \in \chi$ and all α . The right hand side is well-defined by another application of the bounds of Proposition 6. In fact the proposition leads to bounds

$$\|X^{\alpha}S_t^{(U)}\varphi\| \le a_{\alpha} M t^{-|\alpha|/m} e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t} \|\varphi\|$$
(10)

for all α . Therefore one concludes that $S_t^{(U)} \chi \subseteq \chi_{\infty}$. Thirdly, define the (entire) analytic functions in χ , corresponding to the representation U, to be the subspace of $\varphi \in \chi_{\infty}$ for which $\sum_{k\geq 1} (s^k/k!) N_k(\varphi) < \infty$ for (for all) some s > 0 where N_k is now the seminorm on χ_k defined by $N_k(\varphi) = \sup_{\{\alpha: |\alpha|=k\}} ||X^{\alpha}\varphi||$ and the corresponding norms are again defined by $||\varphi||_k = \sup_{\{0\leq l\leq k\}} N_l(\varphi)$.

The principal structural result following from this discussion is the density of the entire analytic functions.

Proposition 2.4 The operators $S_t^{(U)} = U(K_t)$ are well-defined as strong, or weak^{*}, integrals on χ . They form a strongly, or weakly^{*}, continuous holomorphic semigroup whose generator is the strong, or weak^{*}, closure of the operator $H^{(U)} = \sum_{\{\alpha: |\alpha| \le m\}} c_{\alpha} X^{\alpha}$ on χ_m . Moreover, there are a, b > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$ such that

$$N_k(S_t^{(U)}\varphi) \le a \, b^k \, t^{-k/m} \, (k!)^{1/m} \, e^{\omega t} \, \|\varphi\| \tag{11}$$

for all $k \geq 1$, t > 0 and $\varphi \in \chi$. Hence $S_t^{(U)}$ maps χ into the subspace of entire analytic functions for U. Therefore the latter subspace is strongly, or weakly^{*}, dense in χ .

Proof We have already discussed the definition of the S_t as a continuous semigroup. Next the bounds on the seminorm start by iterating the bounds

$$N_1(S_t\varphi) \le C_1 t^{-1/m} e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t} \|\varphi\|$$

which follow for all $\varphi \in \chi$ from the estimates (10) with $|\alpha| = 1$. The bounds (11) then follow from the factorization $X^{\alpha}S_t^{(U)}\varphi = X_{j_1}S_{t/n}^{(U)} \dots X_{j_n}S_{t/n}^{(U)}\varphi$ if $\alpha = \{j_1, \dots, j_n\}$ in direct analogy with the argument for translations on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. In fact the bounds (11) are the direct generalization of the L_2 -bounds (4). The mapping property and the density property are then an immediate consequence, as before.

It remains to identify the generator of the semigroup. But $S_t^{(U)}\chi \subseteq \chi_m = D(H_{(U)})$ by the mapping property. In particular $S_t^{(U)}D(H_{(U)}) \subseteq D(H_{(U)})$. Therefore $D(H_{(U)})$ is a core of the semigroup generator, i.e. the generator is the closure of $H_{(U)}$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_m$.

The proposition establishes the density of the analytic functions for all the continuous representations of \mathbf{R}^d and there are two features of the analysis which persist in the subsequent discussion of general Lie groups. First we have shown that the analytic properties of all continuous representations U can be inferred from those of left translations Tby replacing the semigroup $S_t = T(K_t)$ by the transferred operator $S_t^{(U)} = U(K_t)$. This transference technique carries over to the general situation. Then properties governed by the semigroups can be analyzed by considering the universal semigroup kernel on the $L_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ -spaces. Chapter II of Bob Langlands' thesis was based on these tactics although the presentation was somewhat different. Our approach in the next section puts a different emphasis on the semigroup kernel and its properties.

Before proceeding to general groups we sketch a class of examples which illustrate the diversity of representations of \mathbf{R}^d and the breadth of application of Proposition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A})$ denote the space of all bounded operators on the Hilbert space $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ equipped with the usual operator norm. This space is in fact an algebra equipped with an adjoint operator corresponding to the adjoint operation on the operators. It is a von Neumann algebra, or a W^* -algebra depending on choice of terminology. It clearly contains all bounded multiplication operators but also all bounded functions of the partial derivatives ∂_k . The latter operators typically act by convolution. Now there is an action τ of \mathbf{R}^d on the algebra given by $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A}), x \in \mathbf{R}^d \mapsto \tau_x(A) = L(x)AL(x)^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A})$. The τ form a group of *-automorphisms of $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A})$ which is weakly* continuous. Alternatively there are a great variety of *-subalgebras which are closed in respect to the operator norm, C^* -algebras, which are invariant under τ . On these algebras the automorphisms are weakly (strongly) continuous. All the foregoing results apply to this range of examples. My interest in the differential structure of representations of Lie groups was initially sparked by such examples and my involvement in the application of operator algebras to quantum field theory and quantum statistical mechanics (see [BR87] [BR97]).

3 General groups

The preceding analysis of representations of \mathbf{R}^d gives a simple illustration of the principal results in the second part of Bob Langlands' thesis. In addition it provides a starting point and a strategy for the analysis of the continuous representations of a general Lie group G.

We have shown that the analytic structure of the representations of \mathbf{R}^d can be inferred from the study of the representation of the group as left translations on the L_p -spaces and we next explain how this approach can be modified and expanded to understand the representations of the general group. The resulting strategy is essentially the same as in the thesis but our tactics are somewhat different. Both the original proofs and the following arguments use three basic techniques, the exponential map, the parametrix method and a transference technique. We assume the reader is conversant with the definition and the standard properties of the exponential map and we do not dwell on the details. In contrast we will elaborate on the formulation and structure of the parametrix method. There is little to add about the transference techique as it is applied exactly as in the \mathbf{R}^d -case.

The next subsection is devoted to the parametrix method as a precursor to the applications in the following two subsections. In the first of these we use a parametrix to establish that each strongly elliptic operator affiliated with the group representation generates a holomorphic semigroup determined by an integral kernel satisfying Gaussian-type bounds. The proof starts from the estimates for the Euclidean group discussed in the previous section. Then in the following subsection we analyze the connection between the semigroups and the analytic elements of the representation. Throughout we use real analytic arguments and avoid complex function theory.

3.1 The parametrix method

Let G be a connected d-dimensional Lie group with a corresponding Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . The main framework of our analysis is the representation L of the group by left translations on the space $L_2(G; dg)$ of functions over G which are square integrable with respect to the Haar measure dg. Explicitly

$$(L(g)\varphi)(h) = \varphi(g^{-1}h) ,$$

for all $\varphi \in L_2(G; dg)$ and $g, h \in G$. It is, however, convenient to consider in addition the representation L on the associated spaces $L_p(G; dg)$. The representation L is usually referred to as the left regular representation although it is the direct analogue of translations in the Euclidean case. Note that for $p \in [1, \infty)$ the representation is strongly continuous and for $p = \infty$ it is weakly^{*} continuous. All subsequent topological properties, and in particular continuity and density properties, are understood in the strong topology if $p \in [1, \infty)$, or the weak^{*} topology if $p = \infty$.

The first step in the analysis is to note that the Lie group is a manifold which is locally diffeomorphic to \mathbf{R}^d under the usual exponential map. Therefore the semigroup kernel constructed in the previous section for a given strongly elliptic operator on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ can be used as a local approximation for the kernel of the corresponding elliptic operator on $L_2(G; dg)$. Subsequently, starting from the local approximation, one can construct iteratively a family of functions on G which formally corresponds to the semigroup kernel in the general representation. The iterative method which lies at the heart of this approach is Langlands' version of Levi's parametrix method [Lev07] dating back to 1907. Despite its early origins the method was not well known in the 1950s and Bob no doubt learnt of it from Felix Browder's Yale lectures which he observed to be 'of a singularly instructive nature'. I certainly learnt of it from reading Bob's thesis 28 years later and my initial understanding was enhanced by reading Avner Friedman's book [Fri64] on parabolic differential equations. The method can be formulated as a technique for solving parabolic and elliptic differential equations starting from local approximations obtained by fixing the coefficients at a given point. In semigroup theory the two approaches give approximations to the semigroup and resolvent, respectively. These approximations are analogous to the well known 'time-dependent' and 'time-independent' methods of perturbation theory although one does not have a perturbation in any conventional sense. In the Australian vernacular it is a Claytons¹ perturbation theory. We rely on the parabolic parametrix method. It has two remarkable features. First it leads to a global solution starting from the initial local approximation. Technically this arises because the terms in the series expansion are given by convolution of terms localized in a fixed compact region. Therefore larger distances only arise in higher order terms. Secondly, the expansion has extremely good convergent properties. The solution of the parabolic equation is a function over $\mathbf{R}_+ \times G$ with the variable $t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ interpretable as the time parameter. The series expansion is in powers of t and is uniformly convergent over G for all t > 0. In many time-dependent problems the perturbation series are only convergent for small times but in the current context one obtains convergence for all times as a consequence of the Gaussian bounds on the local Euclidean approximant.

The local approximation procedure starts with the exponential map. Recall that if $a \in \mathfrak{g}$ then $\exp(a) \in G$ is defined by $\exp(a) = \gamma(1)$ where $\gamma: \mathbf{R} \mapsto G$ is the unique oneparameter subgroup of G whose tangent vector at the identity e of G is equal to a. The map is a diffeomorphism of a neighbourhood of the origin in \mathfrak{g} to a neighbourhood of $e \in G$. In the case of a matrix Lie group $\exp(X)$ coincides with the usual definition of the exponential of the matrix X by a power series expansion. In the physics literature it is commonplace to use the notation e^X for the map since it shares many of the basic features of the standard exponential. Now let a_1, \ldots, a_d be a vector space basis of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G. Then $t \mapsto \exp(-ta_j)$ is a one-parameter subgroup of G and the corresponding left translations $t \mapsto L(\exp(-ta_j))$ form a continuous one-parameter group on each of the spaces $L_p(G; dg)$. Let A_j denote the generator of this group. For example, if $G = \mathbf{R}^d$ then $A_j = -\partial_j$. Now we consider m-th order operators

$$H = \sum_{\alpha; \; |\alpha| \le m} c_{\alpha} \, A^{\alpha}$$

with $c_{\alpha} \in \mathbf{C}$ and m an even integer. The domain of H in $L_p(G; dg)$ is the subspace $L_{p;m}(G) = \bigcap_{|\alpha| \leq m} D(A^{\alpha})$ of m-times left-differentiable functions. It is not difficult to establish that $L_{p;m}(G; dg)$ is dense in $L_p(G; dg)$. Hence H is densely defined. Then the adjoint H^* of H is densely defined. Hence H is closable and, for simplicity, we retain the notation H for the closure. Moreover, the subspace $L_{p;\infty}(G; dg) = \bigcap_{m\geq 0} L_{p;m}(G; dg)$ of C^{∞} -functions is a core for each H. The operators H are the direct analogue of those examined in the previous section for the Euclidean group and the definition of strong ellipticity (1) and the definition of the ellipticity constant are unchanged. Again the strong ellipticity condition is independent of the choice of basis of \mathfrak{g} and also of the lack of commutativity. If, for example, one replaces $A_i A_j$ by $A_j A_i$ in the definition of H one

¹In the late 1970s when I first came to Australia there was a vigorous government campaign against drink driving. Concurrently a non-alcoholic drink with a colour resembling whisky and appropriately bottled was heavily promoted under the brand name Claytons 'as the drink you have when you're not having a drink'. Since then the prefix Claytons has been commonly used to indicate an ersatz product lacking the vital ingredient.

effectively introduces a modification $A_jA_i - A_iA_j$ which is linear in the A by the structure relations of \mathfrak{g} . Therefore reordering only changes the lower order terms, those with $|\alpha| < m$, and does not affect the principal terms, those with $|\alpha| = m$. It also follows that the product H_1H_2 of two strongly elliptic operators with real coefficients H_1 and H_2 of orders m_1 and m_2 , respectively, is a strongly elliptic operator of order m_1m_2 . The principal coefficients of the product operator are products of the principal coefficients of the component operators.

Our immediate aim is to establish that each (closed) strongly elliptic H generates a continuous semigroup S on $L_2(G; dg)$ whose action is given by a kernel K satisfying Gaussian type bounds. As mentioned above we approach this problem by constructing a family of functions K by a local approximation with the kernel of the analogous operator on the Euclidean group, corresponding formally to the semigroup kernel. Then in the following subsection we verify that the family does indeed have the correct properties for a semigroup kernel and that H is the generator of the semigroup.

The motivation for the construction is the observation that the kernel K, if it exists, should be a solution of the parabolic equation

$$(\partial_t + H)K_t = 0$$

for t > 0 with the initial condition $K_t \to \delta$ as $t \to 0$. Alternatively if one defines $K_t = 0$ for $t \leq 0$ then $(t,g) \mapsto K_t(g)$ from $\mathbf{R} \times G$ into \mathbf{C} should be the fundamental solution for the heat operator $\partial_t + H$, i.e., one should have

$$((\partial_t + H)K_t)(g) = \delta(t)\,\delta(g) \tag{12}$$

for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$ and $g \in G$. Now the parametrix method expresses K as a 'perturbation' expansion in the 'time' variable t.

Let $\Omega \subset G$ be an open relatively compact neighbourhood of the identity $e \in G$ and B_0 an open ball in \mathfrak{g} centred at the origin such that $\exp|_{B_0} : B_0 \to \Omega$ is an analytic diffeomorphism. Set $a_x = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i a_i$, for $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$, and $B = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : a_x \in B_0\}$. Then for $\varphi \colon \Omega \to \mathbf{C}$ define $\hat{\varphi} \colon B_0 \to \mathbf{C}$ by $\hat{\varphi}(x) = \varphi(\exp(a_x))$. If Ω is small enough the image of Haar measure under this map is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. In particular, there exists a positive C^{∞} -function σ on B, bounded from below by a strictly positive constant, such that all derivatives are bounded on B and such that

$$\int_{\Omega} dg \,\varphi(g) = \int_{B} dx \,\sigma(x) \,\hat{\varphi}(x) \tag{13}$$

for all $\varphi \in L_1(\Omega; dg)$. We normalize the Haar measure dg such that $\sigma(0) = 1$ and choose the modulus on \mathfrak{g} such that $|a_x| = |x|$ for all $x \in B$.

The key feature of the exponential map is the existence of C^{∞} -vector fields X_1, \ldots, X_d on B, i.e. first-order partial differential operators with coefficients in $C_c^{\infty}(B)$, with the property

$$(X_k\hat{\varphi})(x) = (\widehat{A_k\varphi})(x) = (A_k\varphi)(\exp(a_x))$$
(14)

for all $\varphi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$, where the A_1, \ldots, A_d are generators of left translations. Thus the X_k are representatives on $L_2(\Omega; dg)$ of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Moreover,

$$X_k \hat{\varphi} = -\partial_k \hat{\varphi} + Y_k \hat{\varphi} \tag{15}$$

for $\varphi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$ where the Y_k are again C^{∞} -vector fields. But the crucial feature is that the Y_k have effective order zero as defined in Section 2. Explicitly, $Y_k = \sum_{l=1}^d c_{kl} \partial_l$ with coefficients $c_{kl} \in C_c^{\infty}(B)$ which have a first-order zero at the origin. This property is a consequence of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula. This asserts that if Ω is sufficiently small and $\exp(a)$, $\exp(b)$ are both in Ω then there is a $c(a, b) \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that $\exp(-a) \exp(b) = \exp(c(a, b))$ and

$$c(a,b) = -a + b + R(a,b)$$

where the remainder R(a, b) is a sum of multi-commutators of a and b with each commutator containing at least one a and one b. Now $X_k \hat{\varphi}$ is the transform of the limit as $s \to 0$ of the expression

$$s^{-1}\Big((L(\exp(sa_k))\varphi)(\exp(a_x)) - \varphi(\exp(a_x))\Big) = s^{-1}\Big(\varphi(\exp(c(sa_k, a_x)) - \varphi(\exp(a_x))\Big)$$

The identity (15) follows immediately. The term $-\partial_k$ originates from the leading term $-sa_k$ in the expression for $c(sa_k, a_x)$. The Y_k , however, stem from the term linear in s which occurs in the remainder $R(sa_k, a_x)$. This term is of the form $\sum_{l=1}^{d} c_{kl}a_l$ and, importantly, the coefficients c_{kl} have a first-order zero. The latter property is a consequence of the structure relations of the Lie algebra since the remainder is a sum of multi-commutators, each of which contains at least one a_x . Therefore it follows from the identity (15) that

$$\widehat{H\varphi} = \widehat{H}_0 \hat{\varphi} + \widehat{H}_1 \hat{\varphi} \tag{16}$$

where $\widehat{H}_0 = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} (-\partial)^{\alpha}$ is the operator with constant coefficients corresponding to H on \mathbf{R}^d and \widehat{H}_1 is an operator of effective order at most m-1. In particular the coefficients of \widehat{H}_1 have a zero at the origin. This local representation of H on \mathbf{R}^d is the starting point for constructing the semigroup corresponding to H on G.

Let \widetilde{K}_t denote the kernel associated with \widehat{H}_0 on \mathbb{R}^d but with $\widetilde{K}_t = 0$ if $t \leq 0$. Further let $\chi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$ with $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and $\chi = 1$ in a neighbourhood of the identity. Then define $K_t^{(0)}$ by setting $\widehat{K}_t^{(0)} = \widehat{\chi} \widetilde{K}_t$ on B. It follows immediately from (16) that

$$((\partial_t + H)K_t^{(0)})(x) = ((\partial_t + \widehat{H}_0)(\widehat{\chi}\widetilde{K}_t))(x) + (\widehat{H}_1(\widehat{\chi}\widetilde{K}_t))(x)$$
$$= \delta(t)\,\delta(x) + \widehat{M}_t(x)$$

where $\widehat{M}_t = \widehat{D}\widetilde{K}_t$ with \widehat{D} a partial differential operator of the form $\sum_k \widehat{\chi}_k(x) M^{(k)}$, the sum is finite, the $\widehat{\chi}_k \in C_c^{\infty}(B)$ and the $M^{(k)}$ are operators of effective order at most m-1. Therefore the corresponding functions $K_t^{(0)}$ and M_t on G have compact support and satisfy the heat equation

$$((\partial_t + H)K_t^{(0)})(g) = \delta(t)\,\delta(g) + M_t(g) \tag{17}$$

for all $g \in G$ and t > 0. But it follows from the heat equations (12) and (17) that

$$K_t - K_t^{(0)} = -\int_0^t ds \, K_{t-s} * M_s \tag{18}$$

for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$ where * denotes the usual convolution product on G. Thus defining the convolution product $\hat{*}$ on $\mathbf{R} \times G$ by

$$(\varphi \,\hat{\ast} \,\psi)_t(g) = \int_0^t ds \,(\varphi_{t-s} \ast \psi_s)(g) = \int_0^t ds \,\int_G dh \,\varphi_{t-s}(h)\psi_s(h^{-1}g) \;,$$

one has

$$K_t = K_t^{(0)} - (K \,\hat{\ast} \, M)_t \tag{19}$$

for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$. Then by iteration this latter equation gives

$$K_t = K_t^{(0)} - (K^{(0)} \hat{*} M)_t + (K^{(0)} \hat{*} M \hat{*} M)_t - \dots$$
(20)

This is the parabolic parametrix expansion alluded to above. It represents the solution of the parabolic equation (12) and is the analogue of the series expansion encountered in 'time-dependent' perturbation theory. It is the principal tool we use in the following subsection to construct the kernel $K = \{K_t\}_{t>0}$ and demonstrate that the family K_t forms a convolution semigroup. Although we do not need the elliptic or 'time-independent' version of the expansion we note that it can be defined by Laplace transformation from the parabolic version.

One can in principle define functions L_{λ} for sufficiently large λ by

$$L_{\lambda} = \int_0^\infty dt \, e^{-\lambda t} \, K_t \; .$$

Formally L_{λ} is the solution of the elliptic equation $((\lambda I + H)L_{\lambda})(g) = \delta(g)$. Then, assuming the L_{λ} are well-defined, the parametrix identity (19) immediately gives the relations

$$L_{\lambda} = L_{\lambda}^{(0)} - L_{\lambda} * N_{\lambda}$$

where $L_{\lambda}^{(0)}$ and N_{λ} are the Laplace transforms of $K_t^{(0)}$ and M_t , respectively. Now by iteration one obtains the elliptic version of the parametrix expansion

$$L_{\lambda} = L_{\lambda}^{(0)} - L_{\lambda}^{(0)} * N_{\lambda} + L_{\lambda}^{(0)} * N_{\lambda} * N_{\lambda} - \dots$$

Note that it follows from the definition of the M_t that $N_{\lambda} = DL_{\lambda}^{(0)}$ where D is a partial differential operator of effective order at most m-1. The unifying feature of the two versions of the parametrix method is that they both lead to inverses of partial differential operators. The K_t are inverses of the operator $(\partial_t + H)$ on $\mathbf{R}_+ \times G$ and the L_{λ} are inverses of the operator $(\lambda I + H)$ on G.

Next we turn to the problem of proving that the parametrix relation (19) and the expansion (20) are well-defined and the K_t form a convolution semigroup.

3.2 Kernels and semigroups

The initial step in constructing the semigroup kernel corresponding to H is to prove that the expansion (20) determines a unique bounded integrable function K_t for all t > 0. Subsequently we derive more detailed boundedness and smoothness property and establish that the family of functions form a convolution semigroup.

It follows from the definition of $\widehat{K}_t^{(0)}$ and \widehat{M}_t that there are a, b > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$ such that

$$|\widehat{K}_{t}^{(0)}(x)| \le a t^{-d/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b(|x|^{m}/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$
(21)

and

$$|\widehat{M}_t(x)| \le a t^{-(d+m-1)/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b(|x|^m/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$
(22)

for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and all t > 0. These bounds follow from Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 if $x \in B$ but then are obviously true for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ since both functions have support in *B*. Next we convert these bounds into bounds on $K_t^{(0)}$ and M_t on *G*.

One can associate with G and the left-invariant Haar measure dg a modulus $g \in G \mapsto |g|$ as the shortest length measured by dg of the absolutely continuous paths from g to e. Then the modulus is locally equivalent to the modulus on \mathfrak{g} by the exponential map. In particular there is a c > 0 such that

$$c^{-1}|a| \le |\exp(a)| \le c|a|$$

for all $a \in B_0$. Therefore, by the choice of modulus on \mathfrak{g} , one has

$$c^{-1}|x| \le |\exp(a_x)| \le c|x|$$

for all $x \in B$. In particular $|x| \ge c^{-1} |\exp(a_x)|$ for all $x \in B$. Since $\widehat{K}_t^{(0)}$ and \widehat{M}_t have support in *B* the bounds (21) and (22) immediately translate into bounds on $K_t^{(0)}$ and M_t . Explicitly there are a, b > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$ such that

$$|K_t^{(0)}(g)| \le a t^{-d/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b c^{-1}(|g|^m/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$
(23)

and

$$|M_t(g)| \le a t^{-(d+m-1)/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b c^{-1}(|g|^m/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$
(24)

for all $g \in G$ and all t > 0. These estimates immediately yield the basic existence result for the K_t .

Proposition 3.1 Define $K_t^{(n)}$ recursively by $K_t^{(n)} = -(K^{(n-1)} * M)_t$ where $K^{(0)}$ and M are defined as above. It follows that the series $\sum_{n\geq 0} K_t^{(n)}$ is $L_p(G;dg)$ -convergent to a limit $K_t \in L_p(G;dg)$ for all $p \in [1,\infty]$ and t > 0. The function $t > 0 \mapsto K_t$ is continuous and satisfies the heat equation (12).

Proof It suffices to prove that the series is L_1 -, and L_{∞} -, convergent because the L_p convergence is then an immediate consequence. The L_1 -convergence is particularly easy
because the estimates (23) and (24) imply that

$$\|K_t^{(0)}\|_1 \le a e^{\omega t}$$
 and $\|M_t\|_1 \le a t^{-(m-1)/m} e^{\omega t}$ (25)

for suitable a > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$. For example, one can establish analogous estimates for the $L_1(\mathbf{R}^d; \sigma dx)$ norms of $\widehat{K}^{(0)}$ and \widehat{M} from (21) and (22) and these translate into the $L_1(G; dg)$ bounds by (13). But the recursion inequalities

$$\|K_t^{(n)}\|_1 \le \int_0^t ds \, \|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}\|_1 \, \|M_s\|_1 \tag{26}$$

follow from the definition of the $K_t^{(n)}$. Then, arguing by induction, one establishes bounds

$$||K_t^{(n)}||_1 \le a \, b^n \, (t^n/n!)^{1/m} e^{\omega t}$$

for all $n \ge 0$ and all t > 0. In particular the series is L_1 -convergent for all t > 0.

The L_{∞} -convergence is slightly more complicated. It relies on the L_1 -bounds (25) together with the analogous L_{∞} -bounds

$$\|K_t^{(0)}\|_{\infty} \le a t^{-d/m} e^{\omega t}$$
 and $\|M_t\|_{\infty} \le a t^{-(m-1)/m} t^{-d/m} e^{\omega t}$. (27)

Now one has the recursion relations

$$\|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)} * M_s\|_{\infty} \le \int_G dh |K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}(h)| |M_s(h^{-1}g)| \le \|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}\|_1 \|M_s\|_{\infty}$$

but these do not immediately give useful bounds on $\|(K^{(n-1)}*M)_t\|_{\infty}$ because the bounds (27) on $s > 0 \mapsto \|M_s\|_{\infty}$ are not integrable at s = 0. One does, however, have the alternative bounds

$$\|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)} * M_s\|_{\infty} \le \int_0^t ds \, \|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}\|_{\infty} \, \sup_{g \in G} \int_G dh \, |M_s(h^{-1}g)| \, ds \, \|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}\|_{\infty} \,$$

But now the problem is that the left-invariant measure dh is not necessarily right-invariant. Nevertheless,

$$\int_{G} dh \left| M_{s}(hg) \right| = \Delta(g)^{-1} \int_{G} dh \left| M_{s}(h) \right|$$

where Δ is the modular function. Since M_s has support in a compact s-independent set and Δ is locally bounded one then concludes that there is a $\gamma \geq 1$ such that

$$\|K_t^{(n)}\|_{\infty} = \|(K^{(n-1)} \hat{*} M)_t\|_{\infty} \le \gamma \int_0^t ds \, \|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}\|_{\infty} \, \|M_s\|_1 \, .$$

Then combination of these observations readily gives the recursive inequalities

$$\|K_t^{(n)}\|_{\infty} \le \gamma \int_0^t ds \left(\|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}\|_{\infty} \|M_s\|_1 \right) \wedge \left(\|K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}\|_1 \|M_s\|_{\infty} \right).$$
(28)

These inequalities lead to finite bounds on each $||K_t^{(n)}||_{\infty}$ since $s \mapsto ||K_{t-s}^{(0)}||_{\infty}$ is integrable at s = 0 and $s \mapsto ||K_{t-s}^{(0)}||_1$ is integrable at s = t. Another induction argument indeed establishes bounds

$$\|K_t^{(n)}\|_{\infty} \le a \, b^n \, (t^n/n!)^{1/m} \, t^{-d/m} e^{\omega t}$$

for suitable a, b, ω , uniformly for all t > 0 and $n \ge 0$. Hence one obtains uniform convergence of the series for K_t .

Secondly, similar estimates allow one to verify that $t \mapsto K_t$ is continuous and satisfies the heat equation (12). For example, the heat equation is established from a term by term calculation with the expansion (20). Explicitly, one has

$$(\partial_t + H)(K_t^{(0)} * \varphi) = \varphi + M_t * \varphi$$
$$-(\partial_t + H)((K^{(0)} * M)_t * \varphi) = -M_t * \varphi + (M * M)_t * \varphi \quad \text{etc.}$$

by use of the heat equation (17). Addition of the terms to *n*-th order gives cancellations leaving a single term composed of convolutions of (n+1)-factors M_t with φ . This remainder converges to zero as $n \to \infty$ by estimates of the foregoing type.

The proof of Proposition 3.1 immediately leads to bounds

$$||K_t||_1 \le a e^{\omega t}$$
 and $||K_t||_\infty \le a t^{-d/m} e^{\omega t}$

for all t > 0. But a slight elaboration of the proof yields much stronger results.

Corollary 3.2 Let U_{ρ} denote the operator of multiplication by the function $e^{\rho|g|}$ where $\rho \geq 0$. Then there are a > 0 and $\omega \geq 0$ such that

$$\|U_{\rho} K_t\|_1 \le a \, e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t} \quad and \quad \|U_{\rho} K_t\|_{\infty} \le a \, t^{-d/m} \, e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t}$$
(29)

for all $\rho, t > 0$. Hence there are a, b > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$ such that

$$|K_t(g)| \le a t^{-d/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b(|g|^m/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$
(30)

for all $q \in G$ and t > 0.

Proof The proof is a simple repetition of the preceding arguments applied to the weighted functions $U_{\rho} K_t^{(n)}$. Now

$$|U_{\rho} K_{t}^{(n)}| \leq \left(|U_{\rho} K^{(n-1)}| \hat{*} |U_{\rho} M| \right)_{t}$$

as a consequence of the recursive definition of $K^{(n)}$ and the triangle inequality for the modulus |g|. Therefore the estimates (26) and (28) are valid with $K^{(n)}$ and M replaced by $U_{\rho} K^{(n)}$ and $U_{\rho} M$. But to make recursive estimates one needs to replace the bounds (25) and (27) by bounds on $U_{\rho} K^{(0)}$ and $U_{\rho} M$. It follows, however, from Proposition 2.3, and the discussion preceding it, that the introduction of the weight U_{ρ} merely introduces an additional factor $e^{\omega \rho^m t}$ to the $K^{(0)}$ and M bounds, e.g. one has $\|U_{\rho} K_t^{(0)}\|_1 \leq a e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t}$. Therefore the induction argument now gives bounds (29). But the second of these bounds also gives

$$|K_t(g)| \le a t^{-d/m} e^{\omega t} \inf_{\rho \ge 0} e^{-\rho|g|} e^{\omega \rho^m t}$$

which immediately yields (30).

Slight elaborations of these arguments establish differentiability properties of the K_t .

Corollary 3.3 The functions K_t are in $L_{p;m}(G;dg)$ for all $p \in [1,\infty]$. Moreover, there are a > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$ such that

$$\|U_{\rho} A^{\alpha} K_t\|_1 \le a t^{-|\alpha|/m} e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t}$$
 and $\|U_{\rho} A^{\alpha} K_t\|_{\infty} \le a t^{-(d+|\alpha|)/m} e^{\omega(1+\rho^m)t}$

for all t > 0, $\rho \ge 0$ and α with $|\alpha| \le m$.

The L_1 -estimates correspond to the bounds of Proposition 2.3 in the Euclidean case and the L_{∞} -estimates lead to Gaussian-type bounds

$$|(A^{\alpha}K_t)(g)| \le a t^{-(d+|\alpha|)/m} e^{\omega t} e^{-b(|g|^m/t)^{1/(m-1)}}$$
(31)

analogous to those of Proposition 2.1 by the remark at the end of the previous proof.

Proof of Corollary 3.3 First note that it suffices to consider the case $\rho = 0$ since the factor U_{ρ} can be added by the argument used to prove Corollary 3.2. Secondly, observe that $K_t^{(0)} \in D(A^{\alpha})$ for all α . Consequently $K_t^{(n)} \in D(A^{\alpha})$ for all n and α . Moreover,

$$A^{\alpha}K_t^{(n)} = -((A^{\alpha}K^{(n-1)}) \hat{*}M)_t .$$

Therefore the recursion bounds (26) and (28) are valid with $K^{(n)}$ replaced by $A^{\alpha}K^{(n)}$. Thirdly, the \mathbf{R}^{d} -bounds of Proposition 2.1 give estimates

$$||A^{\alpha}K_{t}^{(0)}||_{1} \le a_{\alpha}t^{-|\alpha|/m}e^{\omega t}$$
 and $||A^{\alpha}K_{t}^{(0)}||_{\infty} \le a_{\alpha}t^{-(d+|\alpha|)/m}e^{\omega t}$

for suitable $a_{\alpha} > 0$ and $\omega \ge 0$. The derivatives A^{α} introduce the additional factors $t^{-|\alpha|/m}$. But $s \mapsto \|K_{t-s}^{(0)}\|_1$ is integrable at s = t if and only if $|\alpha| \le m - 1$. If the latter condition is satisfied then the sum of the sequence $A^{\alpha}K_t^{(n)}$ is L_1 -convergent by the proof of Proposition 3.1 to a limit $K_{\alpha;t}$ satisfying bounds $\|K_{\alpha;t}\|_1 \le a t^{-|\alpha|/m} e^{\omega t}$. Moreover, the sum of the $A^{\alpha}K_t^{(n)}$ is uniformly convergent to $K_{\alpha;t}$ with bounds $\|K_{\alpha;t}\|_{\infty} \le a e^{\omega t} t^{-(d+|\alpha|)/m}$. Next one must prove that K_t is in $L_{\infty;m-1}(G; dg)$ and the sum of the series is indeed equal to $A^{\alpha}K_t$. But left translations are weak* continuous on $L_{\infty}(G; dg)$. Therefore $\varphi \in D(A_j)$ if and only if $\sup_{s \in \langle 0,1]} s^{-1} \|(I - L(sa_j))\varphi\|_{\infty} < \infty$. Since one has $s^{-1} \|(I - L(sa_j))K_t^{(n)}\|_{\infty} \le \|A_jK_t^{(n)}\|_{\infty}$ it immediately follows by the convergence argument that $K_t \in D(A_j)$ and $K_{\{j\};t} = A_jK_t$. Higher order derivatives are treated by iterating this argument.

Finally one must deal with the case $|\alpha| = m$. This is achieved by splitting the integral over s into two components, the integral over [0, t/2] which causes no problem, and the integral over $\langle t/2, t \rangle$. Then if $\alpha = \{k\} \cup \alpha'$ with $|\alpha'| = m - 1$ one has

$$(A^{\alpha}K_{t-s}^{(n-1)} * M_s)(g) = -\int_G dh \, (A^{\alpha'}K_{t-s}^{(n-1)})(h)(A_kL(h)M_s)(g) \; .$$

But

$$(A_k L(h) M_s)(g) = L(h) \frac{d}{du} (L(h^{-1}) \exp(u \, a_k) L(h) M_s)(g) \Big|_{u=0}$$

= $L(h) \frac{d}{du} (\exp(u \, x_k(h) . a) M_s)(g) \Big|_{u=0}$

where $|x_k|_{\infty} \leq \sigma e^{\tau |h|}$ with $\sigma \geq 1$ and $\tau \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\|A_k L(h)M_s\|_{\infty} \le \sigma e^{\tau |h|} \sup_{1 \le j \le d} \|A_j M_s\|_{\infty}$$

and

$$\int_{t/2}^{t} ds \, \|A^{\alpha} K_{t-s}^{(n-1)} * M_{s})\|_{\infty} \le \sigma \int_{t/2}^{t} ds \, \|U_{\tau} A^{\alpha'} K_{t-s}^{(n-1)}\|_{\infty} \sup_{1 \le j \le d} \|A_{j} M_{s}\|_{\infty} \, .$$

Thus the integral is finite. Using this decomposition gives an alternative recursion inequality which allows one to argue as before. $\hfill \Box$

The foregoing argument can be iterated to deduce that $K_t \in L_{p,\infty}(G; dg)$. It is a rather tedious method of deducing that the kernel is infinitely often differentiable and it does not give good control over the growth of the bounds as $|\alpha|$ increases. An alternative argument can be constructed using arguments of elliptic regularity.

The expansion used to construct the kernel K has a notable localization feature. The zero-order approximant $K^{(0)}$ and the remainder function M are supported by Ω . Then since $K^{(n)}$ involves a convolution of $K^{(0)}$ and n copies of M it must be supported by Ω^n . Thus the larger distance behaviour of the kernel is only affected by the higher-order terms.

Proposition 3.1 establishes that the K_t satisfy the heat equation (12) and the expectation is they are the kernel of a holomorphic semigroup $S_t = L(K_t)$ on the $L_p(G; dg)$ spaces. Our next aim is to explain this property on the Hilbert space $L_2(G; dg)$. First since $||K_t||_1 \leq a e^{\omega t}$ by the earlier estimates it follows that the S_t are bounded operators on each of the L_p -spaces with operator norms satisfying $||S_t||_{p\to p} \leq a e^{\omega t}$. Moreover, one has bounds

$$||S_s - S_t||_{p \to p} \le a ||K_s - K_t||_1$$

uniformly for s, t in bounded intervals of $(0, \infty)$. Therefore the continuity of the K_t implies that the S_t are uniformly continuous on bounded intervals. This is a characteristic of holomorphic semigroups. Moreover, it follows from the parametrix construction and the bounds on the $K_t^{(n)}$ that

$$\|S_t\varphi - L(K_t^{(0)})\varphi\|_p \le a t \, \|\varphi\|_p$$

for all $\varphi \in L_p(G; dg)$. Since $L(K_t^{(0)})\varphi \to \varphi$ as $t \to 0$ it follows that S_t converges to the identity as $t \to 0$. Hence we set $S_0 = I$. Now the main problem is to prove that the S_t have the semigroup property. But

$$(S_s S_t - S_{s+t})\varphi = L(K_s * K_t - K_{s+t})\varphi$$

so it is equivalent to prove that the K_t form a convolution semigroup. This can, however, be achieved by L_2 -arguments.

Proposition 3.4 The operators $S_t = L(K_t)$ form a holomorphic semigroup on $L_2(G; dg)$ whose generator is (the L_2 -closure of) H.

The semigroup property is established by first examining the real part of H which is both strongly elliptic and symmetric on $L_2(G; dg)$.

Lemma 3.5 Each closed symmetric strongly elliptic operator H on $L_2(G; dg)$ is selfadjoint and lower semibounded.

The semiboundedness is the important feature for the proof of the proposition. Its validity was conjectured at the end Section 6 of Ed Nelson's 1959 article [Nel59] on analytic vectors. Roe Goodman raised it again in Section 3 of his 1971 article [Goo71] on regularity properties of Lie group representations. Neither author appreciated that it was a straightforward corollary of Langlands' parametrix arguments. This was not observed until 1989. It was then pointed out in a short note I wrote with the late Ola Bratteli, Fred Goodman and Palle Jørgensen [BGJR89]. The main aim of the latter note was to establish a Lie group version of the classic Gårding inequality. This will be discussed further in Section 4.

The proof of the semiboundedness is based on resolvent arguments.

Proof of Lemma 3.5 Since the kernel K_t corresponding to H satisfies $||K_t||_1 \le a e^{\omega t}$ the Laplace transforms

$$L_{\lambda} = \int_0^\infty dt \, e^{-\lambda t} \, K_t$$

are well-defined for $\lambda > \omega$ and $||L_{\lambda}||_1 \leq a (\lambda - \omega)^{-1}$.

Moreover the operators R_{λ} defined by $R_{\lambda}\varphi = L_{\lambda} * \varphi$ are bounded on $L_2(G; dg)$ with $||R_{\lambda}\varphi||_2 \leq a (\lambda - \omega)^{-1} ||\varphi||_2$. But K_t satisfies the heat equation (12) by Proposition 3.1. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda I + H)R_{\lambda}\varphi &= \int_{0}^{\infty} dt \, e^{-\lambda t} ((\lambda I + H)K_{t}) * \varphi \\ &= \varphi + \int_{0}^{\infty} dt \, e^{-\lambda t} ((\lambda - \partial_{t})K_{t}) * \varphi = \varphi \end{aligned}$$

for all $\varphi \in C_c^{\infty}(G)$ and then by continuity $(\lambda I + H)R_{\lambda}\varphi = \varphi$ for all $\varphi \in L_2(G;dg)$. Therefore the range of $(\lambda I + H)$ is equal to $L_2(G;dg)$. This range condition together with the symmetry of H implies that H is self-adjoint.

Next one has $(\psi, \varphi) = ((\lambda I + H)R_{\lambda}\psi, \varphi) = (\psi, R^*_{\lambda}(\lambda I + H)\varphi)$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in D(H)$ and $\lambda > \omega$. Therefore $\varphi = R^*_{\lambda}(\lambda I + H)\varphi$ and

$$\|\varphi\|_2 = a \left(\lambda - \omega\right)^{-1} \|(\lambda I + H)\varphi\|_2$$

for all $\varphi \in D(H)$. Then it follows by spectral theory that the self-adjoint operator H is lower semibounded.

Now we are prepared to prove the proposition.

Proof of Proposition 3.4 First let H^{\dagger} be the formal adjoint of H, i.e. the strongly elliptic operator with coefficients $c^{\dagger}(\alpha) = (-1)^{|\alpha|}c(\alpha_*)$ where $\alpha_* = (i_n, \ldots, \alpha_1)$ when $\alpha = (i_1, \ldots, i_n)$. Then the real part $H_R = (H + H^{\dagger})/2$ of H is a symmetric strongly elliptic operator. Therefore Lemma 3.5 holds with H replaced by H_R . In particular the closure of H_R is lower semibounded. Therefore there is a $\nu \geq 0$ such that

$$((H\varphi,\varphi) + (\varphi,H\varphi))/2 \ge -\nu \|\varphi\|_2^2$$

for all $\varphi \in D(H)$. Next observe that if $\varphi_t \in D(H)$ satisfies the Cauchy equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varphi_t + H\varphi_t = 0 \tag{32}$$

for all t > 0 then

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\varphi_t\|_2^2 = -(H\varphi_t,\varphi_t) - (\varphi_t,H\varphi_t) \le 2\nu \,\|\varphi_t\|_2^2.$$

Therefore $t \mapsto e^{-\nu t} \|\varphi_t\|_2$ is a decreasing function. Now suppose $\varphi_t^{(1)}$ and $\varphi_t^{(2)}$ both satisfy (32) and $\varphi_t^{(1)} \to \varphi$, $\varphi_t^{(2)} \to \varphi$ as $t \to 0$. Then $\varphi_t^{(1)} - \varphi_t^{(2)}$ also satisfies the equation but $\varphi_t^{(1)} - \varphi_t^{(2)} \to 0$ as $t \to 0$. Hence, as a consequence of the foregoing decrease property, $\varphi_t^{(1)} = \varphi_t^{(2)}$, i.e. the solution of (32) is uniquely determined by the initial data $\varphi = \varphi_0$.

Now $S_t L_2(G; dg) \subseteq L_{2;m}(G; dg) \subseteq D(H)$ by Corollary 3.3. Therefore $\varphi_t = S_{t+s}\varphi$, with s > 0, satisfies (32) with initial data $\varphi_0 = S_s\varphi$ for all $\varphi \in L_2(G; dg)$. Moreover, $\varphi_t = S_t S_s\varphi$ satisfies the equation with the same initial data. Hence

$$(S_{t+s} - S_t S_s)\varphi = 0$$

for all $\varphi \in L_2(G; dg)$. This establishes that S is a semigroup. But the generator H_S of S is an extension of H on $L_{2;m}(G; dg)$. Then since $S_t L_{2;m}(G; dg) \subseteq L_{2;m}(G; dg)$ it follows that $L_{2;m}(G; dg)$ is a core of H_S . Therefore $H_S = H$.

Finally, the semigroup S is holomorphic if and only if $S_t L_2(G; dg) \subseteq D(H)$ and, in addition, one has bounds $||HS_t||_{2\to 2} \leq a t^{-1}$ on the L_2 -operator norm for all $t \in \langle 0, 1]$. But both these properties are a consquence of Corollary 3.3. In particular

$$HS_t\varphi = \int_G dg \left(HK_t\right) * \varphi$$

for all $\varphi \in L_2(G; dg)$ since $K_t \in L_{2;m}(G; dg)$. Then the L_1 -estimate of the corollary gives

$$\|HS_t\varphi\|_2 \le a \sup_{|\alpha| \le m} \|A^{\alpha}S_t\varphi\|_2 \le a' t^{-1} e^{\omega t} \|\varphi\|_2$$

for all t > 0. Hence S is holomorphic.

Finally consider a general continuous representation U of G on a Banach space χ . One can again associate with a fixed basis a_1, \ldots, a_d of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} the generators $A_{U;j}$ of the one-parameter groups $t \in \mathbf{R} \mapsto U(\exp(-ta_j))$ acting on χ and introduce the corresponding subspaces $\chi_n = \bigcap_{\{\alpha: |\alpha|=n\}} D((A_U)^{\alpha})$. The seminorms N_k are again defined on the χ_k by

$$N_k(\xi) = \sup_{\{\alpha: |\alpha|=k\}} \|(A_U)^{\alpha} \xi\|$$

and the norms $\|\cdot\|_k$ by $\|\xi\|_k = \sup_{\{0 \le l \le k\}} N_l(\xi)$. Now the strongly elliptic operator H is the closure of the operator defined on χ_m in terms of the c_α and the A_U . It again follows from the continuity of U that there exist $M \ge 1$ and $\rho \ge 0$ such that one has bounds

$$\|U(g)\| \le M e^{\rho|g|}$$

for all $g \in G$. But the kernel K_t associated with H acting on $L_1(G; dg)$ satisfies the weighted bounds of Corollary 3.2. Therefore the conclusions of Proposition 3.4 for left translations L of the group on $L_2(G; dg)$ transfer to the representation U on χ .

Theorem 3.6 The operators $\{S_t^{(U)}\}_{t>0}$ defined by

$$S_t^{(U)} = U(K_t) = \int_G dg \, K_t(g) \, U(g)$$

form a holomorphic semigroup $S^{(U)}$ on the Banach space χ such that $S_t^{(U)}\chi \subseteq \chi_{\infty}$ for all t > 0. The generator of the semigroup is the closure of H on χ_m .

Proof The $S^{(U)}$ are well defined as bounded operators on χ by the bounds of Corollary 3.2. Then since S is a semigroup for the left regular representation L of G on $L_2(G; dg)$, by Proposition 3.4, the K_t must form a convolution semigroup, i.e. $K_{s+t} = K_s * K_t$ for all s, t > 0. Therefore $S^{(U)}$ is a continuous semigroup on χ . The remaining statements follow from the properties of the kernel K once one notes that

$$U(\exp(sa))S_t^{(U)}\xi = \int_G dg \, K_t(g)U(\exp(sa)g)\xi = \int_G dg \, K_t(\exp(-sa)g))U(g)\xi$$

for $a \in \mathfrak{g}$, all small s and all $\xi \in \chi$. Thus $A_U S_t^{(U)} \xi = U(AK_t) \xi$ for all $\xi \in \chi$ where the A_U are generators in the representation U and the A are the left regular representatives. Then by iteration $(A_U)^{\alpha} S_t^{(U)} = U(A^{\alpha} K_t) \xi$ for all α . Note that K_t is *m*-times left differentiable, again by Corollary 3.3, but in fact it is infinitely often differentiable by the remark following the proof of the corollary. Hence $S_t^{(U)} \chi \subseteq \chi_m \subseteq D(H)$. Since χ_m is $S^{(U)}$ -invariant it is a core of the semigroup generator. Thus the generator must be H. Finally the holomorphy of $S^{(U)}$ follows by the reasoning in the proof of Proposition 3.4.

One also has the following extension of Lemma 3.5.

Corollary 3.7 Assume χ is a Hilbert space, U a unitary representation and the strongly elliptic operator H corresponding to U is symmetric. Then H is self-adjoint and lower semibounded with a bound which is independent of the choice of unitary representation.

Proof Let K_t be the kernel corresponding to H and set $S_t^{(U)} = U(K_t)$. It follows by the proof of Lemma 3.5 that the generator of $S^{(U)}$ is equal to H and is self-adjoint. But ||U(g)|| = 1 for all $g \in G$ by unitarity where $|| \cdot ||$ the Hilbert space operator norm. Then $||S_t^{(U)}|| \leq ||K_t||_1 \leq a e^{\omega t}$ for all t > 0. Hence the generator of $S^{(U)}$ is self-adjoint and lower semibounded by spectral theory. The bound does not depend on U. It is equal to the bound on $L_2(G; dg)$.

Another consequence of Proposition 3.4 is that the parametrix function L_{λ} is the kernel of the resolvent of H on $L_2(G; dg)$. Explicitly

$$L_{\lambda} * \varphi = \int_{0}^{\infty} dt \, e^{-\lambda t} K_{t} * \varphi = \int_{0}^{\infty} dt \, S_{t} \varphi = (\lambda I + H)^{-1} \varphi$$

for all $\varphi \in L_2(G; dg)$ and $\lambda > \omega$. Then it follows by a similar calculation that $U(L_{\lambda})$ is the kernel of the generator of the semigroup $S^{(U)}$ on χ . Thus the functions K_t and L_{λ} determine the action of the semigroup and resolvent for all continuous representations of the group.

Theorem 3.6 encompasses two of the principal results of Langlands' 1960 thesis, Theorems 8 and 9. Elaborations of these theorems are given by Theorem I.5.1 and Theorem III.2.1 in my 1991 book [Rob91]. The common features of these earlier descriptions and the current presentation are the exponential map and the parametrix technique but the proofs differ in some features. For the interested reader we make a few remarks on the relations between the three versions.

In our current notation Theorem 8 of the thesis established that the closure of H in the continuous representation U generates a holomorphic semigroup $S^{(U)}$. Then Theorem 9 showed that the action of $S^{(U)}$ is given by a family of measures which form a convolution semigroup. Subsequently, after the statement of Theorem 10, it was shown that these measures are absolutely continuous with respect to Haar measure, i.e. the $S^{(U)}$ has a kernel $K^{(U)}$ in the current terminology. Theorem 10 derives the basic complex analytic properties of the semigroup. We have by passed Theorem 7 of the thesis which gives an identification of the adjoint of H in the representation U. In fact the identification is valid for the wider class of elliptic operators with coefficients satisfying (2). Strong ellipticity is not necessary. The proof, however, requires the parametrix expansion for the resolvent and a version of elliptic regularity for operators with continuous coefficients. This approach also leads to the alternative proof that $K_t \in L_{p,\infty}(G; dg)$ alluded to after the proof of Corollary 3.3. The original proof of the generator property in Theorem 8 of the thesis utilized Theorem 7 and, of course, required strong ellipticity. We have avoided these arguments for the sake of brevity. Bob cites Theorem 12.8.1 of Hille and Phillips book [HP57] in the derivation of the generator property although this appears to require some poetic license. Further details can be found in Sections I.4 and I.5 of [Rob91]. We note that the identification given by the missing Theorem 7 is a direct corollary of Theorem 3.6 if H is strongly elliptic.

The main distinction between the developments of the thesis and the current exposition is largely in emphasis. The primary focus of the thesis is the semigroup $S^{(U)}$ and the kernel $K^{(U)}$ is a secondary artefact. In the preceding analysis, however, the kernel plays the principal role and the semigroup is constructed from the kernel. The current presentation is based on three papers I coauthored [BGJR89] [Rob93] [ER96] some 30–35 years after Bob wrote his thesis. Nevertheless, the additional arguments are all from the late 1950s. For example, the uniqueness criteria for the Cauchy problem are discussed at length in Chapter III of Hille and Phillips 1957 book [HP57] and the characterization of holomorphy of S by a norm estimate on HS_t was a 1958 result of Yosida [Yos58]. Finally the characterization of cores of semigroup generators by semigroup invariance is essentially contained in Nelson's 1959 paper [Nel59].

We will return to the discussion of other properties that can be deduced by variations of these arguments in Section 4. But next we turn to the explanation of the last result, Theorem 10, of Langlands' thesis.

3.3 Differential and analytic structure

Theorem 10 of the thesis established the result highlighted in the introduction, the density of the analytic elements $\chi_a(U)$ of a general continuous representation U of a Lie group. Now

$$\chi_a(U) = \{\xi \in \chi_\infty : \sum_{k \ge 1} (s^k/k!) N_k(\xi) < \infty \text{ for some } s > 0\}$$

where the seminorms are defined in terms of the representatives A_U of the Lie algebra. The strategy of the thesis was to prove that $\chi_a(U)$ contains the dense subspace $\chi_a(H)$ of analytic elements of each strongly elliptic operator H, i.e. the subspace

$$\chi_a(H) = \{\xi \in \chi_\infty : \sum_{k \ge 1} (s^k/k!) \| H^k \xi \| < \infty \text{ for some } s > 0 \}.$$

The density of the latter subspace follows because H generates the holomorphic semigroup $S^{(U)}$, by Theorem 3.6. In particular it follows that

$$\chi_a(H) = \bigcap_{t>0} S_t^{(U)} \chi \; .$$

The density of $\chi_a(H)$ is then an immediate consequence since $S_t^{(U)} \to I$ as $t \to 0$. We give a different proof of this result based on arguments of a 1988 paper [BGJR88] whose principal focus was the integrability of representations of Lie algebras. This is the original problem which attracted my attention to the Lie group theory and led me to search out Bob's thesis. The proof uses real analytic arguments which replace the application of Eidelman's results on the analyticity of the solutions of parabolic equations cited in the thesis. This application is by Bob's own admission, quoted in the introduction, somewhat nebulous. The alternative proof which we next outline is given in greater detail in Chapter II of [Rob91]. It is a basically a straightforward exercise in functional analysis.

Theorem 3.8 There exist a, b > 0 and $\omega \ge 0$ such that

$$\|S_t^{(U)}\xi\|_n \le a \, b^n \, n! \, t^{-n/m} \, e^{\omega t} \, \|\xi\|$$
(33)

for all $\xi \in \chi$, $n \in \{0, 1, 2...\}$ and t > 0. Therefore $S_t^{(U)}\chi \subseteq \chi_a(U)$ for all t > 0. Consequently $\chi_a(H) \subseteq \chi_a(U)$ and $\chi_a(U)$ is dense in χ .

Proof Throughout the proof we omit the index U. This should cause no confusion as all calculations are within the representation. We also use the convention that a, b, ω etc. are *n*-independent constants whose values might vary line by line. Any *n*-dependence is explicitly noted by suffices.

First observe that $S_t^{(U)}\chi \subseteq \chi_{\infty}$ for all t > 0 by Theorem 3.6. Therefore it is sufficient to derive the estimates (33) for all $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$. In particular if $\lambda \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ then $||S_t\xi||_n =$ $||S_{(1-\lambda)t}(S_{\lambda t}\xi)||_n$ with $S_{\lambda t}\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$ satisfying bounds $||S_{\lambda t}\xi|| \leq M e^{\omega \lambda t} ||\xi||$. Therefore the bounds (33) for general $\xi \in \chi$ follow from those for $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$, albeit with increased values of a, b and ω .

Secondly, it suffices to establish (33) for all $t \in \langle 0, t_0 \rangle$ for some $t_0 > 0$. This follows since $||S_t\xi||_n \leq (a b^n n!) ||S_{t-t_0}\xi||$ for $t > t_0$ as a consequence of the bounds for $t \leq t_0$. But $||S_{t-t_0}\xi|| \leq M e^{\omega(t-t_0)} ||\xi|| \leq M t^{-n/m} e^{\omega t} ||\xi||$ for $t > t_0$. Therefore one obtains the bounds (33) for all t > 0, again with increased values of a, b and ω . Hence the proof is now reduced to considering $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$ and small t > 0. The starting point is the following observation for small n.

Lemma 3.9 There is an a > 0 such that $||S_t \xi||_n \le a t^{-n/m} ||\xi||$ for all $\xi \in \chi$, $t \in (0, 1]$ and n = 0, 1, ..., m - 1.

Proof It follows from the L_1 -estimates of Corollary 3.3 that

$$||S_t\xi||_n = \sup_{\{\alpha: |\alpha| \le n\}} ||A^{\alpha}S_t\xi|| = \sup_{\{\alpha: |\alpha| \le n\}} ||U(A^{\alpha}K_t)\xi||$$
$$\leq M \sup_{\{\alpha: |\alpha| \le n\}} ||U_{\rho}A^{\alpha}K_t||_1 ||\xi|| \le a t^{-n/m} ||\xi||$$

by the (M, ρ) -continuity estimates for the representation.

If, however, $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$ then $||S_t \xi||_n$ is not singular at t = 0.

Lemma 3.10 There is a b > 0 such that $||S_t\xi||_n \le a (||H\xi|| + ||\xi||)$ for all $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$, $t \in (0, 1]$ and n = 0, 1, ..., m - 1.

Proof Since one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^{\alpha}(\lambda I + H)^{-1}\xi\| &\leq \int_{0}^{\infty} ds \, e^{-\lambda s} \, \|A^{\alpha}S_{s}\xi\| \\ &\leq \int_{0}^{\infty} ds \, e^{-\lambda s} \, \|U(A^{\alpha}K_{s})\xi\| \leq a \int_{0}^{\infty} ds \, e^{-(\lambda-\omega)s} s^{-n/m} \, \|\xi\| \end{aligned}$$

the statement of the lemma follows by replacing ξ by $(\lambda I + H)S_t\xi$ and choosing λ sufficiently large.

The rest of the proof consists of 'bootstrapping' the small *n*-estimates of Lemma 3.9 into universal estimates with the correct quantitative behaviour for small t > 0. This is achieved by recursive arguments.

Assume one has bounds

$$\|S_t\xi\|_n \le c_n \, t^{-n/m} \, \|\xi\| \tag{34}$$

with $c_n > 0$ for all $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$, $t \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ and all $n \leq k(m-1)$ for some $k \geq 1$. It follows from the lemma this assumption is indeed valid for k = 1, with $c_1 = \ldots = c_{m-1} = a$. Next we argue that similar bounds are valid for all $n \leq (k+1)(m-1)$ and we also obtain estimates on the corresponding c_n . A crucial part of the argument is the observation that the commutators $(ad A^{\alpha})(A^{\beta}) = A^{\alpha}A^{\beta} - A^{\beta}A^{\alpha}$ have the property

$$\|(\operatorname{ad} A^{\alpha})(A^{\beta})\xi\| \le a_{\alpha,\beta} \|\xi\|_{\alpha+\beta-1}$$

for all α, β and all $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$ as a result of the structure relations of \mathfrak{g} . In particular the commutator gives a unit reduction to the apparent operator order.

Let $A^{\alpha} = A^{\alpha_0} A^{\alpha_1}$ with $|\alpha| = n \ge m$ and $|\alpha_0| = m - 1$ so $|\alpha_1| = n - m + 1$. Then

$$A^{\alpha}S_{t}\xi = A^{\alpha_{0}}S_{s}(A^{\alpha_{1}}S_{t-s}\xi) + A^{\alpha_{0}}(\operatorname{ad} A^{\alpha_{1}})(S_{s})S_{t-s}\xi$$
$$= A^{\alpha_{0}}S_{s}(A^{\alpha_{1}}S_{t-s}\xi) - \int_{0}^{s} du \, A^{\alpha_{0}}S_{u}(\operatorname{ad} A^{\alpha_{1}})(H)S_{t-u}\xi$$

for all $s \in \langle 0, t \rangle$ and $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$. Since *H* is a polynomial in A^{β} with $|\beta| \leq m$ one then deduces from (34) that

$$||S_t\xi||_n \le a c_{n-m+1} s^{-(m-1)/m} (t-s)^{-(n-m+1)} ||\xi|| + b n \int_0^s dr \, r^{-(m-1)/m} \, ||S_{t-r}\xi||_n$$

where a, b > 0 are independent of n. Now it remains to solve these inequalities.

First set $s = \mu t$ with $\mu \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ and r = ut. Then

$$||S_t\xi||_n \le a c_{n-m+1} t^{-n/m} \mu^{-(m-1)/m} (1-\mu)^{-(n-m+1)} ||\xi|| + b n t^{1/m} \int_0^\mu du \, u^{-(m-1)/m} ||S_{t(1-u)}\xi||_n \, .$$

Second, choose $\mu = n^{-m}$. Then $\mu^{-(m-1)/m} = n^{m-1}$ and $(1 - \mu)^{-(n-m+1)} \leq b_m$ where $b_m = \sup_{n \geq m} (1 - n^{-m})^{-n/m} < \infty$. Therefore

$$||S_t\xi||_n \le a n^{m-1} c_{n-m+1} t^{-n/m} ||\xi|| + b n t^{1/m} \int_0^{n^{-m}} du \, u^{-(m-1)/m} \, ||S_{t(1-u)}\xi||_n \, .$$

But iteration of this inequality *p*-times gives

$$||S_t\xi||_n \le a \, n^{m-1} \, c_{n-m+1} \, t^{-n/m} \, ||\xi|| \, \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} (c \, t^{1/m})^l + R_{p,n}(t)$$

with c = bm independent of n and

$$R_{p,n}(t) = (b n t^{1/m})^p \int_0^{n^{-m}} du_1 u_1^{-(m-1)/m} \dots \int_0^{n^{-m}} du_p u_p^{-(m-1)/m} \|S_{t(1-u_1)\dots(1-u_p)}\xi\|_n .$$

But if $t < t_0$ with $c t_0 < 1$ then in the limit $p \to \infty$ one has

$$||S_t\xi||_n \le a \, n^{m-1} \, c_{n-m+1} \, t^{-n/m} \, ||\xi|| + \limsup_{p \to \infty} R_{p,n}(t)$$

for all $t < t_0$ and $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$. Next we argue that the limit of the remainder term is zero.

We may assume $t \leq t_0 < 1$ and $n \geq 1$. Therefore one immediately has bounds

$$R_{p,n}(t) \le (bt_0)^p \left(n \int_0^{n^{-m}} du \, u^{-(m-1)/m} \right)^p \sup_{t \in \langle 0,1]} \|S_t \xi\|_n = (ct_0)^p \sup_{t \in \langle 0,1]} \|S_t \xi\|_n \, .$$

Now $n \leq (k+1)(m-1) < (k+1)m$. Then, by a relatively straightforward extension of Lemma 3.10, one obtains bounds $\sup_{t \in (0,1]} ||S_t\xi||_n \leq a_k (||H^{k+1}\xi|| + ||\xi||)$, e.g. if the principal coefficients of H are real then H^{k+1} is strongly elliptic and the lemma is valid with H replaced by H^{k+1} and m replaced by (k+1)m. Hence

$$R_{p,n}(t) \le a_k \, (c \, t_0)^p \, (\|H^{k+1}\xi\| + \|\xi\|)$$

for all $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$. Thus $R_{p,n}(t) \to 0$ as $p \to \infty$ for all $t \in \langle 0, t_0 \rangle$ if $c t_0 < 1$. Combining these observations one concludes that

$$||S_t\xi||_n \le a \, n^{m-1} \, c_{n-m+1} \, t^{-n/m} \, ||\xi||$$

for all $t < t_0$, with t_0 sufficient small, and all $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$. Moreover, by induction, these estimates are valid for all $n \ge m - 1$.

Next if $k(m-1) \ge n > (k-1)(m-1)$ then by iteration

$$c_n \le a^{k-1} \left(\prod_{l=0}^{k-2} (n-l(m-1))^{m-1}\right) c_{n-(k-1)(m-1)} \le a^{k-1} n^n c_{m-1}$$

because the product has k - 1-factors each bounded by n^{m-1} . But k - 1 < n/(m-1) and $n^n \le e^n n!$. Thus the bounds take the form $a b^n n!$ for all $n \ge 1$.

Finally, since $N_n(\xi) \leq ||\xi||_n$ for all $\xi \in \chi_\infty$ one has

$$\sum_{k \ge 1} (s^k/k!) N_k(S_t\xi) \le \sum_{k \ge 1} (s^k/k!) \|S_t\xi\|_k \le a \sum_{k \ge 1} (bst^{-1/m})^k e^{\omega t} \|\xi\|$$

for all $\xi \in \chi$ and $bs < t^{1/m}$. Therefore $S_t \chi \subseteq \chi_a(U)$ for all t > 0.

Theorem 3.8 achieves the aim set out in the introduction, it establishes the density of the analytic elements for all continuous representations of a general Lie group. This property was the final conclusion, Theorem 10, of Langlands' 1960 thesis. It is also the final conclusion of our explanation of the results of the thesis. But we are not finished. To conclude we give a summary of consequences of the thesis results which have been subsequently established. Most of these results date from the Gaussian revolution in semigroup theory which started slowly in 1967 with Aronson's paper [Aro67] on bounds on solutions of parabolic equations and which peaked in the 1980s.

4 Consequences

The early results of Langlands on the differential and analytic structure of Lie groups have developed in two different, but related, frameworks. First, there has been considerable progress in the framework of strongly elliptic operators described above. Secondly, the theory has been generalized to a broader class of subelliptic operators. The latter operators are defined as polynomials in an algebraic basis of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , i.e., a linearly independent subset of $a_1, \ldots a_{d_1} \in \mathfrak{g}$ whose Lie algebra spans \mathfrak{g} . We will briefly describe some of the key features of the developments in the strongly elliptic setting and then comment on the more complicated subelliptic situation. We have seen in the foregoing that despite appearances the strongly elliptic theory remains largely commutative. The subelliptic theory, in contrast, contains a genuine noncommutative element.

The first topic of our discussion is extensions of the classical Gårding inequality to unitary representations of Lie groups. These inequalities characterize the notion of strong ellipticity and provide a basis for the definition of subellipticity for operators of general order.

Proposition 4.1 Let U be a unitary representation of G on a Hilbert space χ and H a strongly elliptic operator with ellipticity constant μ . Then for each $\lambda \in \langle 0, \mu \rangle$ there is a representation independent $\nu \geq 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{Re}(\varphi, H\varphi) \ge \lambda N_{m/2}(\varphi)^2 - \nu \|\varphi\|^2$$
(35)

for all $\varphi \in \chi_m$.

Proof Since *H* is strongly elliptic with ellipticity constant μ it follows that the real part of $H - \lambda A^{\alpha_*} A^{\alpha}$, with $|\alpha| = m/2$, is a symmetric strongly elliptic operator with ellipticity constant $\mu - \lambda$. Therefore it follows from Corollary 3.7 that $\operatorname{Re} H - \lambda A^{\alpha_*} A^{\alpha}$ is essentially self-adjoint and lower semibounded by $-\nu_{\alpha}I$ where $\nu_{\alpha} = \inf_{t>0} \log ||K_t^{(\alpha)}||_1$ and $K_t^{(\alpha)}$ is the kernel corresponding to the operator $\operatorname{Re} H - \lambda A^{\alpha_*} A^{\alpha}$. Hence

$$\operatorname{Re}(\varphi, H\varphi) \ge \lambda \, \|A^{\alpha}\varphi\|^2 - \nu_{\alpha} \, \|\varphi\|^2$$

for all $\varphi \in \chi_m$. But ν_{α} is independent of the particular unitary representation. Therefore (35) follows by taking the supremum over the α .

The inequality (35) is a Lie group version of the classic Gårding inequality for strongly elliptic divergence form operators with bounded continuous coefficients on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. But there are other possible formulations. For example,

$$\operatorname{Re}(\varphi, H\varphi) \ge \lambda \left(\varphi, \Delta^{m/2}\varphi\right) - \nu \|\varphi\|^2 \tag{36}$$

for all $\varphi \in \chi_m$ with Δ the Laplacian corresponding to the basis a_i in the representation U. The proof follows as before since $H - \lambda \Delta^{m/2}$ is strongly elliptic for all $\lambda \in \langle 0, \mu \rangle$.

Proposition 4.1 establishes that strong ellipticity of H implies the Gårding inequalities (35) for any unitary representation of G. Moreover, since the the strong ellipticity condition (1) is just a restriction on the coefficients c_{α} of the operator it also implies the Gårding inequalities for the unitary representation of \mathbf{R}^d by left translations on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Conversely assume that (35) is valid without the strong ellipticity restriction (1). Then choose $\varphi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$ with $\hat{\varphi}(x) = e^{i\eta \cdot x}\chi(x)$ where χ is a C^{∞} -function supported in a ball of radius r centred at the origin and we have again used the exponential map and the notation of Subsection 3.1. Evaluating (35) with φ for large η and small r then yields the strong ellipticity condition. These arguments are summarized by the following. **Corollary 4.2** The strong ellipticity condition (1) is equivalent to the Gårding inequality (35) in a unitary representation of G, or equivalent to (35) for left translations on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

A similar conclusion follows with the Gårding inequality (35) replaced by the alternative formulation (36). In particular both forms of the Gårding inequality are equivalent.

The second topic of discussion is a regularity property for all unitary representations of G which follows from the Gårding inequality and is of significance for a more detailed understanding of the analytic structure of the group representations.

Proposition 4.3 Adopt the assumptions of Proposition 4.1. Then there is a representation independent a > 0 such that

$$N_m(\varphi) \le a \left(\|H\varphi\| + \|\varphi\| \right) \tag{37}$$

for all $\varphi \in \chi_m$.

Proof Let $H_1 = H^{\dagger}H$. Then H_1 is a strongly elliptic operator with ellipticity constant $\mu_1 \ge \mu^2$. Then for each $\lambda \in \langle 0, \mu \rangle$ there is a $\nu \ge 0$ such that

$$\|H\varphi\|^2 = \operatorname{Re}(\varphi, H_1\varphi) \ge \lambda^2 N_m(\varphi)^2 - \nu^2 \|\varphi\|^2$$

for all $\varphi \in \chi_m$ by (35) applied to H_1 . The value of ν is independent of the particular unitary representation. Thus

$$N_m(\varphi)^2 \le \lambda^{-2} \|H\varphi\|^2 + \nu^2 \|\varphi\|^2 \le (\lambda^{-1} \|H\varphi\| + \nu \|\varphi\|)^2$$

for all $\varphi \in \chi_m$. Now set $a = \lambda^{-1} \vee \nu$.

The regularity property (37) was first established for Laplacians and unitary representations by Nelson [Nel59], Section 6, by an algebraic calculation. (A simplified version of Nelson's result is given by [Rob88a], Lemma 1.7.) It should be emphasized that the property is not valid for all representations. For example, if one considers the representation of \mathbf{R}^d by left translations on $L_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and sets $H = \Delta$, the standard Laplacian operator, then Calderón [Cal61] has shown that (37) is valid for all $p \in \langle 1, \infty \rangle$. Nevertheless it fails if p = 1 or $p = \infty$. There are locally integrable functions ξ such that $\Delta \xi$ is also locally integrable but the mixed derivatives $\partial_i \partial_j \xi$ are not. This pathology has a long history going back at least to Petrini's 1908 paper [Pet08]. It was, however, still a topical problem in the 60s and the L_1 and L_{∞} counterexamples can be found in [Orn62] and [LM64], respectively. The situation is even more complicated. The Euclidean group is also represented by left translations on the spaces $C(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and, more generally, $C^k(\mathbf{R}^d)$. But (37) fails on $C^k(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for all integers $k \geq 1$.

The third topic we address is a characterization of the analytic elements for general group representations following suggestions of Roe Goodman [Goo69a] [Goo69b]. This characterization is in terms of fractional powers of the strongly elliptic operators H and its proof depends on the regularity property although the conclusion is independent of the property. We next give a brief description of this result.

The earlier discussion of the analytic elements compared two series with general terms $N_k(\xi)/k!$ and $||H^k\xi||/k!$, respectively. Convergence of the first series characterized the

analytic elements $\chi_a(U)$ of the representation U and convergence of the second characterized the analytic elements $\chi_a(H)$ of the strongly elliptic operator H. The arguments of Section 3 established that $\chi_a(H) \subseteq \chi_a(U)$ and consequently $\chi_a(U)$ is dense in the representation space U. But $N_k(\xi)$ involves k-derivatives whilst $||H^k\xi||$ involves km-derivatives. As Goodman pointed out it is more appropriate to compare the series with terms $N_k(\xi)/k!$ and $||H^k\xi||/(km)!$. The latter series is, however, related to the series characterizing the analytic elements of the fractional power $H^{1/m}$ of H. The general theory of fractional powers of semigroup generators was developed in the late 1950s and a summary of the basic properties can be found in Chapter IX of Yosida's book [Yos80] on functional analysis or Chapter 1 of Triebel's book on interpolation theory [Tri78]. For current purposes it suffices to know that if H generates a uniform bounded semigroup then the fractional powers H^{γ} with $\gamma \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ are well-defined and generate uniformly bounded holomorphic semigroups. But by the arguments of Section 3 each strongly elliptic operator H corresponding to a group representation generates a continuous semigroup S satisfying operator bounds $||S_t|| \leq a e^{\nu t}$ for some $\nu \geq 0$ and all t > 0. Therefore the uniform boundedness property can be arranged by replacing H with $H + \nu I$. This replacement does not change the space of analytic elements of H. Hence in the following discussion we will assume that $H^{1/m}$ is well-defined and satisfies the standard properties of fractional powers, e.g. $(H^{1/m})^k = (H^k)^{1/m} = H^{k/m}$. Then the analytic elements $\chi_a(H^{1/m})$ of $H^{1/m}$ are defined as the $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$ such that

$$\chi_a(H^{1/m}) = \{\xi \in \chi_\infty : \sum_{k \ge 1} ||H^{k/m}\xi||/k! < \infty\}.$$

In fact one does not need to consider fractional powers to analyze this subspace.

Lemma 4.4 The following conditions are equivalent:

I. $\xi \in \chi_a(H^{1/m}),$ II. $\sum_{k\geq 1} ||H^k\xi||/(km)! < \infty.$

Proof I \Rightarrow II If the series defining $\chi_a(H^{1/m})$ is finite then Condition II is evident. II \Rightarrow I Since $H^{1/m}$ generates a continuous semigroup there is a C > 0 such that

$$||H^{l/m}\xi|| \le C (||H\xi|| + ||\xi||)$$

for all $\xi \in D(H)$ and all $l \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$. Therefore

$$\sum_{k\geq 1} \|H^{k/m}\xi\|/k! \le m C \sum_{k\geq 0} \left(\|H^{k+1}\xi\| + \|H^k\xi\|\right) / (km)! < \infty$$

for all ξ satisfying Condition II.

The final conclusion of Goodman's observations on fractional powers is a complete characterization of the analytic elements for an arbitrary group representation.

Theorem 4.5 If H is a strongly elliptic operator associated with the Banach space representation (χ, U) then $\chi_a(U) = \chi_a(H^{1/m})$.

This result was established in several stages.

First Goodman [Goo69a] established the characterization for all unitary representations and H a Laplacian by a modification of Nelson's theory of operator dominance [Nel59].

Secondly, Goodman's paper also had a brief but intriguing appendix contributed by Nelson that gave an elegant argument indicating a similar characterization was valid for all Banach space representations of the group satisfying the regularity condition (37). The conclusion of Nelson's suggestion was stated for Laplacians in Corollary A.1 of [Goo69a] although Nelson remarked that his arguments applied to higher orders.

Thirdly, I extended the Goodman–Nelson result to general representations by a longish detour through the interpolation spaces between the C^k -subspaces χ_k of the representation space. My first foray in this direction [Rob88b] was again for Laplacians. I was aware of Langlands' thesis at that time but was not ambitious enough to extend the interpolation arguments to higher order operators. This final step was described in Chapter II of my book [Rob91]. The reason behind the use of the interpolation arguments was quite simple. The analytic properties were not affected by transferring to the interpolation spaces but the regularity properties were improved.

The conclusion of the first two stages are summarized by the following proposition.

Proposition 4.6 (Goodman–Nelson) Let H be a strongly elliptic operator associated with the Banach space representation (χ, U) satisfying $N_m(\xi) \leq a (||H\xi|| + ||\xi||)$ for some a > 0and all $\xi \in \chi_m$. It follows that $\chi_a(U) = \chi_a(H^{1/m})$.

Note that the proposition applies to unitary representations because unitarity implies the regularity assumption by Proposition 4.3. Goodman's proof for unitary representations was based on Nelson's original theory of operator domination [Nel59] but the argument advanced by Nelson for representations satisfying the regularity assumption was an extension of this theory. The inclusion $\chi_a(U) \subseteq \chi_a(H^{1/m})$ is quite elementary and does not depend on domination theory. For example, if $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$ then there is a C > 0 such that $||H^k\xi|| \leq C^k ||\xi||_{km}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Therefore if $\xi \in \chi_a(U)$ it follows from Lemma 4.4 that $\xi \in \chi_a(H^{1/m})$. The proof of the converse inclusion is, however, more delicate. Nelson's method was based on a recursive argument involving the structure relations of the Lie algebra somewhat similar to the reasoning used in Subsection 3.3. The argument depends critically on the regularity condition. This allows one to estimate products A^{β} with $|\beta| = m$ by a single H, e.g. if $A^{\alpha} = A^{\beta}A^{\gamma}$ with $|\beta| = m$ then $||A^{\alpha}\xi|| \leq C (||HA^{\gamma}\xi|| + ||A^{\gamma}\xi||)$. Then one can commute the factor H to the right of the A^{γ} and the additional commutator term is a sum of products A^{δ} with $|\delta| \leq |\alpha| - 1$, i.e. it is a lower order correction. This is the start of the recursive argument. In the simplest case, $G = \mathbf{R}^d$, all the A commute and the regularity condition $\|\xi\|_m \leq C(\|H\xi\| + \|\xi\|)$ iterates in this manner to give $\|\xi\|_{km} \leq (2C)^k(\|H^k\xi\| + \|\xi\|)$. Hence if $\xi \in \chi_a(H^{1/m})$ then $\sum_{k\geq 1} \|\xi\|_{km}/(km)! < \infty$ by Lemma 4.4 and this suffices to deduce that $\xi \in \chi_a(U)$. Details of the general case are more complicated since one has to control the lower order terms which arise from the lack of commutation. Details are given in Chapter II of [Rob91]. We will not persevere with the argument but instead explain how to deduce Theorem 4.5 from Proposition 4.6.

First, it is not surprising that the regularity condition is not necessary. The Goodman– Nelson arguments essentially use this condition to make a term by term comparison of the exponential series characterizing $\chi_a(H^{1/m})$ with the series characterizing $\chi_a(U)$. But such a comparison is clearly stronger than necessary for the inclusion $\chi_a(H^{1/m}) \subseteq \chi_a(U)$. I was aware of this problem by the early 1970s but only realized how to solve it some 10–15 years later. In the meantime my interests were directed to quite different topics. My idea in the mid 1980s was to exploit the theory of interpolation spaces and reduce the problem to a similar problem for an auxiliary representation on a Banach space intermediate to the C^k -subspaces χ_k . In fact it suffices to consider a space intermediate to χ and χ_1 .

The second observation is that each of the subspaces χ_k is invariant under the representation U. Hence $U_k = U|_{\chi_k}$ is a representation of G on χ_k . Moreover the C^l -subspaces $\chi_{k;l}$ of U_k are equal to the C^{k+l} -subspaces of U, i.e. $\chi_{k;l} = \chi_{k+l}$. Next by a standard procedure of real interpolation (see, for example, [Rob91] Section II.4.1) one can introduce a family of Banach spaces χ_{γ} , with $\gamma \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$, such that each space is invariant under Uand $\chi_1 \subseteq \chi_{\gamma} \subseteq \chi$. Let U_{γ} denote the corresponding representations. The embeddings are continuous and one has bounds $c \|\xi\| \leq \|\xi\|_{\gamma} \leq C \|\xi\|_1$ for some c, C > 0 and all $\xi \in \chi_1$. Consequently, the C^k -subspaces of the representation U_{γ} satisfy $c \|\xi\|_k \leq \|\xi\|_{\gamma;k} \leq C \|\xi\|_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$ and all $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$. Therefore $\chi_a(U) = \chi_a(U_{\gamma})$. Although there is still a term by term comparison of the two relevant series there is a slippage of one term in the comparison which does not affect the conclusion.

Now consider the comparison of the powers of H. For simplicity we use H as a common notation for the operators associated with each of the representations U, U_{γ} and U_1 . Then one has $c \|H^k \xi\| \leq \|H^k \xi\|_{\gamma} \leq C \|H^k \xi\|_1$ for all $\xi \in \chi_{\infty}$. But since $\|\xi\|_1 \leq a (\|H\xi\| + \|\xi\|)$ it follows that $\|H^k \xi\|_1 \leq a (\|H^{k+1}\xi\| + \|H^k\xi\|)$. Hence the series $\|H^k \xi\|/(km)!$ and $\|H^k \xi\|_{\gamma}/(km)!$ are simultaneously convergent. Therefore $\chi_a(H^{1/m}) = \chi_{\gamma;a}(H^{1/m})$. Combining these conclusions one obtains the reduction result.

Lemma 4.7 $\chi_a(U) = \chi_a(H^{1/m})$ if and only if $\chi_{\gamma;a}(U_{\gamma}) = \chi_{\gamma;a}(H^{1/m})$ for some $\gamma \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$.

It might appear that this manipulation with the interpolation spaces has achieved very little. The problem for the representation (χ, U) has been identified with the analogous problem for the representation $(\chi_{\gamma}, U_{\gamma})$. But the redeeming feature, the magic of the interpolation argument, is that the latter representation satisfies the regularity condition necessary for the Goodman–Nelson result, Proposition 4.6. Explicitly, there is an $a_{\gamma} > 0$ such that

$$\|\xi\|_{\gamma;m} \le a_{\gamma} \left(\|H\xi\|_{\gamma} + \|\xi\|_{\gamma} \right) \tag{38}$$

for all $\xi \in \chi_{\gamma;m}$. Therefore $\chi_{\gamma;a}(U_{\gamma}) = \chi_{\gamma;a}(H^{1/m})$ by Proposition 4.6 and consequently $\chi_a(U) = \chi_a(H^{1/m})$ by Lemma 4.7. Thus the statement of Theorem 4.5 is established. The only problem remaining is to explain why the regularity property (38) is valid for the intermediate representations $(\chi_{\gamma}, U_{\gamma})$ even if it is not valid for the representations (χ, U) and (χ_1, U_1) . This is a convoluted story.

Interpolation has a long history starting with the work of Riesz in 1926. But in the late 1950s there was an explosion of interest in the subject motivated by problems of partial differential operators, approximation theory and singular integration. Many of the new developments concerned the classical spaces of functions over \mathbf{R}^d but there were also new ideas on abstract methods of interpolation. One of the main motivations for the construction of new function spaces was indeed the regularity condition (38) (see [Tri83] pages 38–40). This led to the construction of various families of spaces satisfying the regularity condition intermediate to the C^k -spaces $L_{p;k}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ associated with left translations on the L_p -spaces. So the proof of Theorem 4.5 for the \mathbf{R}^d -theory could have been completed by appealing to the results described, for example, in the books of Triebel [Tri78] [Tri83]. Unfortunately, there was no equivalent theory for representations of Lie groups, although Peetre gave some partial results in [Pee70]. Nevertheless the methods required to describe the general situation were available. In particular there was a detailed description of interpolation methods for semigroups acting on abstract Banach spaces in the book by Butzer and Berens [BB67] on approximation theory. This theory was largely based on ideas of Peetre on methods of real interpolation between general Banach spaces. We now sketch its application to the representation (χ, U) of the Lie group G.

First, if χ_1 is the C¹-subspace of the representation space χ then $\chi_{\gamma,p} = (\chi, \chi_1)_{\gamma,p}$ is defined as the space of $\xi \in \chi$ such that the seminorm $N_{\gamma,p}(\xi) = (\int_0^\infty dt \, t^{-1} \, (t^{-\gamma} \kappa_t(\xi))^p)^{1/p}$ is finite where $\kappa_t(\xi) = \inf_{\xi_1 \in \chi_1} (\|\xi - \xi_1\| + t \|\xi_1\|_1)$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$. The interpolation function κ_t gauges the relevant importance of the representation space χ and the C^1 subspace χ_1 . Consequently γ gives a measure of the smoothness of ξ with the choice of p giving an extra gradation. If $\xi \in \chi_1$ then $\kappa_t(\xi)$ tends to zero as $t \to 0$. Secondly, if S is the continuous semigroup generated by the strongly elliptic operator H associated with (χ, U) then $\chi^S_{\gamma, p}$ is defined as the subspace of $\xi \in \chi$ for which the seminorm $N^S_{\gamma, p}(\xi) =$ $(\int_0^\infty dt t^{-1} (t^{-\gamma} || (I - S_t) \xi ||)^p)^{1/p}$ is finite. Since the semigroup S is holomorphic it also follows that $\chi^S_{\gamma,p}$ is the subspace of ξ for which the seminorm $(\int_0^\infty dt \, t^{-1} \, (t^{1-\gamma} \| HS_t \xi \|)^p)^{1/p}$ is finite. In these definitions the γ and p measure the smoothing properties of the semigroup S for small t. The only apparent group connection between $\chi_{\gamma,p}$ and $\chi^S_{\gamma,p}$ is the first space involves the C^1 -subspace χ_1 of the representation space whilst the second depends indirectly on the representation U through the strongly elliptic operator H. Nevertheless the two intermediate spaces both give a measure of smoothness and the striking conclusion is that they are equal, modulo a slight change of parameter. Specifically, $\chi_{\gamma,p} = \chi^S_{(\gamma/m),p}$ with equivalence of the natural norms. In fact there is even a third chacterization of these spaces directly involving the representation U. The space $\chi_{\gamma,p}$ consists of the $\xi \in \chi$ for which the seminorm $\int_{\mathcal{O}} dg |g|^{-d} (|g|^{-\gamma} || (I - U(g)\xi ||)^p)$ is finite where \mathcal{O} is an open neighbourhood of the identity in G. These results are given by Proposition II.4.3 and Theorem II.6.1 of [Rob91] although they were well known for $G = \mathbf{R}^d$ much earlier.

Once one has the identification $\chi_{\gamma,p} = \chi_{(\gamma/m),p}^S$ it is relatively straightforward to deduce the regularity property (38) for the intermediate spaces $\chi_{\gamma} = \chi_{\gamma,p}$. One key observation is that $\xi_1 = S_t \xi \in \chi_1$ for each $\xi \in \chi$. Therefore the decomposition $\xi = (\xi - \xi_1) + \xi_1$ takes the form $\xi = (I - S_t)\xi + S_t\xi$ and allows one to estimate $\kappa_t(\xi)$ in terms of $||(I - S_t)\xi||$ and $||S_t\xi||_1$. The details are given in Theorem II.4.5 of [Rob91] but the ideas are just borrowed from the \mathbf{R}^d -theory developed in the 1960s which can be found in [BB67] or [Tri78] among many other places.

This completes our discussion of the characterization of analytic elements, Theorem 4.5, and our summary of the developments concerning the higher order strongly elliptic operators introduced by Langlands. The most striking aspect of these results is their universal nature, e.g. $\chi_a(U) = \chi_a(H^{1/m})$ for all the suitably normalized *m*-th order operators *H* independent of the group structure. The conclusions are basically locally and are independent of the Lie algebraic details. One can obtain more detailed global results by specializing to second-order operators such as Laplacians or to restricted classes of groups. But the global analysis requires the introduction of quite different techniques, e.g. generalized Nash inequalities [Rob91] or Harnack inequalities [VSCC92]. The conclusions are also sensitive to the large scale geometry of the group. A detailed analysis of these properties for groups of polynomial growth can be found in [DER03]. We conclude with a brief discussion of a slightly different topic, general order subelliptic operators.

The subelliptic theory is formulated in a similar manner to the strongly elliptic theory but the vector space basis a_1, \ldots, a_d of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is replaced by an algebraic subbasis a_1, \ldots, a_{d_1} , i.e. a linearly independent set of elements which generate \mathfrak{g} algebraically. Then one can define differential operators as polynomials of the representatives A_k of the a_k in the subbasis. The properties of second-order subelliptic operators, so-called 'sums of squares', have been extensively studied since Hörmander's fundamental 1967 paper [Hör67]. If, however, one tries to develop the structure of higher order subelliptic operators following the outlines of the strongly elliptic theory one immediately encounters several new obstacles.

The first substantial obstacle is to find a replacement for the strong ellipticity condition (1). This is an \mathbb{R}^d -condition on the coefficients which does not reflect the restraints imposed by the subellipticity condition. Secondly, it is not at all clear that there is an alternative version of the parametrix arguments. This problem is related to the previous difficulty. The parametrix expansion for operators associated with the group G is the analogue of perturbation theory with the unperturbed system given by operators corresponding to \mathbb{R}^d . The basic idea is to introduce a 'simpler' group G_0 , related to G but with a streamlined algebraic structure dictated by the subelliptic basis, as a replacement for \mathbb{R}^d .

First, however, define the subelliptic distance $|g|_1$ as the shortest length of the absolutely continuous paths from g to e following the directions of the algebraic subbasis. It is not evident that one can find connecting paths of this type for each $g \in G$ but this is a result of Caratheodory's early research into thermodynamics [Car09]. Moreover, it follows that a ball of radius δ measured with respect to this distance behaves as δ^D as $\delta \to 0$ where D is an integer, the local subelliptic dimension. It can be calculated as follows. Let \mathfrak{g}_1 denote the linear span of the algebraic basis a_1, \ldots, a_{d_1} and \mathfrak{g}_j the span of the algebraic basis together with the corresponding multiple commutators of order less than or equal to j. Then $\mathfrak{g}_1 \subset \mathfrak{g}_2 \subset \ldots \subset \mathfrak{g}_r = \mathfrak{g}$ where r is an integer, the rank of the algebraic basis. Next set $\mathfrak{g}'_1 = \mathfrak{g}_1$, and \mathfrak{g}'_j the vector space complement of \mathfrak{g}_{j-1} in \mathfrak{g}_j . This yields the direct sum decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}'_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}'_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{g}'_r$ of the Lie algebra. Then D is given by $D = \sum_{i=1}^r j (\dim \mathfrak{g}'_i)$.

Secondly, the group G_0 is is defined by a contraction procedure. Define γ as the family of maps of \mathfrak{g} into \mathfrak{g} such that $\gamma_t(a) = t^k a$ for all $a = \mathfrak{g}'_k$ and t > 0. Then \mathfrak{g}_0 is defined as the vector space \mathfrak{g} equipped with the Lie bracket

$$[a,b]_0 = \lim_{t \to 0} \gamma_t^{-1}([\gamma_t(a), \gamma_t(b)]) .$$

It follows that \mathfrak{g}_0 is a nilpotent Lie algebra and a_1, \ldots, a_{d_1} is an algebraic basis of \mathfrak{g}_0 of rank r. Moreover, the dilations γ_t are automorphisms of \mathfrak{g}_0 . Then G_0 is defined as the connected, simply connected, Lie group with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_0 . It is this group which acts as the local approximation to G in the subelliptic theory. The simplifying feature of G_0 is the existence of the dilations γ_t which allow scaling arguments to extend local properties globally. Note that if a_1, \ldots, a_{d_1} is a vector space basis of \mathfrak{g} then $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{g}$ and $\gamma_t(a) = ta$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{g}$. Therefore $\gamma_t^{-1}([\gamma_t(a), \gamma_t(b)]) = t[a, b] \to 0$ as $t \to 0$ and \mathfrak{g}_0 is abelian. Thus $G_0 = \mathbb{R}^d$ in conformity with the earlier strongly elliptic case.

Thirdly, the notion of subellipticity of the operator $H = \sum_{\alpha:|\alpha| \le m} c_{\alpha} A^{\alpha}$, where the multi-indices α only involve the indices $\{1, \ldots, d_1\}$ of the subbasis, is defined in a manner that simulates the definition of strong ellipticity. Since Corollary 4.2 establishes that strong

ellipticity is equivalent to the Gårding inequality (35) for left translations on $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ we define the operator H to be subelliptic on G if an analogous inequality is satisfied on $C_c(G_0)$. Explicitly, H is subelliptic on G if

$$\operatorname{Re}(\varphi, H\varphi) \ge \lambda \, N'_{m/2}(\varphi)^2 - \nu \, \|\varphi\|^2 \tag{39}$$

for all $\varphi \in C_c^{\infty}(G_0)$ where N'_k is the seminorm given by restricting the supremum in the earlier definition of N_k to multi-indices in the subelliptic directions a_1, \ldots, a_{d_1} . Therefore H is subelliptic on G if and only if it is subelliptic on G_0 . This definition removes the first obstacle cited above.

Next, as a preliminary to developing a parametrix formalism for the subelliptic operators in general representations of G, one must first analyze the operators in the left regular representation of G_0 on $L_2(G_0)$. In the strongly elliptic case with $G_0 = \mathbb{R}^d$ this was accomplished in Section 2 largely by techniques of Fourier analysis. In the subcoercive case the situation is more complicated. It is, however, facilitated by the nilpotent structure and the homogeneity properties with respect to dilations. In particular one establishes that each closed subelliptic operator H generates a continuous semigroup S on the L_p -spaces over G_0 with a kernel satisfying m-th order Gaussian bounds similar to those given by (31) but with |g| replaced by $|g|_1$ and d replaced by D. Subsequently the properties of H for the nilpotent group G_0 are extended to the corresponding operator on the group G by the parametrix arguments. The reasoning is not substantially different. Although the conclusions for the semigroup structure in the subelliptic case are directly analogous to those of the strongly elliptic case their implications for the differential and analytic structure are considerably weaker. One striking difference is the failure of the Goodman characterization of the analytic functions in terms of fractional powers of the elliptic operators.

If the semigroup S generated by the *m*-th order subelliptic operator H is uniformly bounded one can define $H^{1/m}$ as before and the characterization of the subspace of analytic elements $\chi_a(H^{1/m})$ given by Lemma 4.4 is still valid. Hence $\chi'_a(U) \subseteq \chi_a(H^{1/m})$ where $\chi'_a(U)$ is the subspace of analytic elements of the representation U defined with the subelliptic seminorms N'_k . It is not, however, true that $\chi'_a(U) = \chi_a(H^{1/m})$ even for second-order operators and unitary representations. Example 8.7 of [ER94a] gives a counterexample based on the left regular representation of the group of rotations on \mathbb{R}^3 and the standard Laplacian. Nevertheless many regularity results have been established in the subelliptic case. Details can be found in [ER94b] [ER95] and [ERS97].

Finally we note that there is a third class of elliptic operators which can be analyzed by Langlands' methods, weighted strongly elliptic operators. Subellipticity is based on the idea that there is a certain subset of preferred directions. In the weighted theory all directions are allowed but some have greater weight, or preference, than others. An extensive analysis of this class of operators, along the foregoing lines, can be found in [ER94c]. In particular there is an analogous theory of holomorphic semigroups generated by weighted operators. Again this leads to a good understanding of the corresponding differential structure and the structure of the weighted analytic elements. For example the characterization of the analytic elements in terms of the corresponding elements of fractional powers remains valid. Nevertheless there are significant differences introduced by the weighting. In conclusion the structural properties of the analytic elements in the broader context of subelliptic operators or weighted elliptic operators still pose intriguing open problems 60 years after Langlands' thesis work.

References

- [Aro67] ARONSON, D. G., Bounds for the fundamental solution of a parabolic equation. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **73** (1967), 890–896.
- [BB67] BUTZER, P. L., and BERENS, H., Semi-groups of operators and approximation. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 145. Springer-Verlag, Berlin etc., 1967.
- [BGJR88] BRATTELI, O., GOODMAN, F. M., JØRGENSEN, P. E. T., and ROBINSON, D. W., The heat semigroup and integrability of Lie algebras. J. Funct. Anal. 79 (1988), 351–397.
- [BGJR89] BRATTELI, O., GOODMAN, F. M., JØRGENSEN, P. E. T., and ROBINSON, D. W., Unitary representations of Lie groups and Gårding's inequality. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 107 (1989), 627–632.
- [BR87] BRATTELI, O., and ROBINSON, D. W., Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics, vol. 1. Second edition. Springer-Verlag, New York etc., 1987.
- [BR97] —, Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics, vol. 2. Second edition. Springer-Verlag, New York etc., 1997.
- [Cal61] CALDERÓN, A.-P., Lebesgue spaces of differentiable functions and distributions. In *Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 4 of Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 33–49. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1961.
- [Car09] CARATHEODORY, C., Untersuchungen über die Grundlagen der Thermodynamic. Math. Ann. 67 (1909), 355–386.
- [CD58] CARTIER, P., and DIXMIER, J., Vecteurs analytiques dans les représentations de groupes de Lie. Amer. J. Math. 80 (1958), 131–145.
- [DER03] DUNGEY, N., ELST, A. F. M. TER, and ROBINSON, D. W., Analysis on Lie groups with polynomial growth, vol. 214 of Progress in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, 2003.
- [Eid56] EIDELMAN, S., On the fundamental solutions of parabolic systems. *Mat. Sbornik N.S.* **38(80)** (1956), 51–92.
- [ER94a] ELST, A. F. M. TER, and ROBINSON, D. W., Subelliptic operators on Lie groups: regularity. J. Austr. Math. Soc. (Series A) 57 (1994), 179–229.
- [ER94b] —, Subcoercivity and subelliptic operators on Lie groups I: Free nilpotent groups. *Potential Anal.* **3** (1994), 283–337.
- [ER94c] _____, Weighted strongly elliptic operators on Lie groups. J. Funct. Anal. 125 (1994), 548–603.
- [ER95] _____, Subcoercivity and subelliptic operators on Lie groups II: The general case. *Potential Anal.* 4 (1995), 205–243.

- [ER96] _____, Elliptic operators on Lie groups. Acta Appl. Math. 44 (1996), 133–150.
- [ERS97] ELST, A. F. M. TER, ROBINSON, D. W., and SIKORA, A., Heat kernels and Riesz transforms on nilpotent Lie groups. *Coll. Math.* **74** (1997), 191–218.
- [Fri64] FRIEDMAN, A., Partial differential equations of parabolic type. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.
- [Går47] GÅRDING, L., Note on continuous representations of Lie groups. *Proc. Nat.* Acad. Sc. U.S.A. **33** (1947), 331–332.
- [Går60] —, Vecteurs analytiques dans les représentations des groupes de Lie. Bull. Soc. Math. France 88 (1960), 73–93.
- [Goo69a] GOODMAN, R., Analytic domination by fractional powers of a positive operator. J. Funct. Anal. 3 (1969), 246–264.
- [Goo69b] —, Analytic and entire vectors for representations of Lie groups. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 143 (1969), 55–76.
- [Goo71] _____, Some regularity theorems for operators in an enveloping algebra. J. Diff. Eq. 10 (1971), 448–470.
- [HC53] HARISH-CHANDRA, Representations of a semisimple Lie group on a Banach space. I. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **75** (1953), 185–243.
- [Hil50] HILLE, E., Lie theory of semi-groups of linear transformations. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 56 (1950), 89–114.
- [Hör67] HÖRMANDER, L., Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. *Acta Math.* **119** (1967), 147–171.
- [HP57] HILLE, E., and PHILLIPS, R. S., Functional Analysis and Semigroups, vol. 31 of American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1957.
- [Lan60a] LANGLANDS, R. P., On Lie semi-groups. Canad. J. Math. 12 (1960), 686–693.
- [Lan60b] _____, Some holomorphic semi-groups. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **46** (1960), 361–363.
- [Lev07] LEVI, E. E., Sulle equazioni lineari totalmente ellittiche alle derivate parziali. Rend. del Circ. Mat. Palermo 24 (1907), 275–317.
- [LM64] LEEUW, K. DE, and MIRKIL, H., A priori estimates for differential operators in L_{∞} norm. *Illinois J. Math.* 8 (1964), 112–124.
- [Nel59] NELSON, E., Analytic vectors. Ann. Math. 70 (1959), 572–615.
- [NS59] NELSON, E., and STINESPRING, W. F., Representation of elliptic operators in an enveloping algebra. *Amer. J. Math.* **81** (1959), 547–560.

- [Orn62] ORNSTEIN, D., A non-inequality for differential operators in the L_1 norm. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **11** (1962), 40–49.
- [Pee70] PEETRE, J., Non-commutative interpolation. Matematiche (Catania) 25 (1970), 159–173.
- [Pet08] PETRINI, H., Les dérivées premières et secondes du potentiel. Acta Math. **31** (1908), 127–332.
- [Rob88a] ROBINSON, D. W., The differential and integral structure of representations of Lie groups. J. Operator Theory 19 (1988), 95–128.
- [Rob88b] _____, Lie groups and Lipschitz spaces. Duke Math. J. 57 (1988), 357–395.
- [Rob91] —, *Elliptic operators and Lie groups*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, Oxford etc., 1991.
- [Rob93] —, Strongly elliptic and subelliptic operators on Lie groups. In Quantum and non-commutative analysis (Kyoto, 1992), vol. 16 of Math. Phys. Stud., 435–453. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1993.
- [Tri78] TRIEBEL, H., Interpolation theory, function spaces, differential operators. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [Tri83] TRIEBEL, H., Theory of function spaces. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1983.
- [VSCC92] VAROPOULOS, N. T., SALOFF-COSTE, L., and COULHON, T., Analysis and geometry on groups. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics 100. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [Yos58] YOSIDA, K., On the differentiability of semigroups of linear operators. *Proc. Japan Acad.* **34** (1958), 337–340.
- [Yos80] —, Functional Analysis. Sixth edition, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 123. Springer-Verlag, New York etc., 1980.

Derek W. Robinson Mathematical Sciences Institute (CMA) Australian National University Canberra, ACT 0200 Australia derek.robinson@anu.edu.au