A NEW CONSTRUCTION OF ISOSPECTRAL RIEMANNIAN NILMANIFOLDS WITH EXAMPLES

Ruth Gornet

Abstract. We present a new construction for obtaining pairs of higher-step isospectral Riemannian nilmanifolds and compare several resulting new examples. In particular, we present new examples of manifolds that are isospectral on functions, but not isospectral on one-forms.

§1 Introduction.

The *spectrum* of a closed Riemannian manifold (M, g), denoted $spec(M, g)$, is the collection of eigenvalues with multiplicities of the associated Laplace–Beltrami operator acting on smooth functions. Two Riemannian manifolds (M, g) and (M', g') are said to be *isospectral* if $spec(M, g) = spec(M', g')$. A basic question in spectral geometry is determining what geometric information is contained in the spectrum of a Riemannian manifold.

Despite considerable research in the area, only a few geometric properties are known to be spectrally determined; for example, dimension, volume, and total scalar curvature. Examples of isospectral manifolds provide us with the only means for determining properties not determined by the spectrum.

Most previous constructions for producing isospectral manifolds are based solely on representation theory. In fact, most known examples can be explained by Sunada's method [S] or its generalizations [GW1],[DG2]. (See [B2] for a general overview.) All manifolds constructed by these methods are *strongly isospectral;* that is, all natural, strongly elliptic, self-adjoint operators on the manifolds are isospectral. In particular, these manifolds share the same p-form spectrum. The *p-form spectrum* of a manifold is the eigenvalue spectrum of the Laplace-Beltrami operator extended to act on smooth p-forms for p a positive integer.

The primary goal of this paper is the development of a new construction for producing pairs of isospectral nilmanifolds. Two-step nilmanifolds have been a rich source of examples of isospectral manifolds. Moreover, their geometry has been studied in some detail. (See [DG1],[BG],[O],[P1],[P2],[P3],[GW1],[GW2],[G1],[G2], and [E].) This new construction uses techniques from Riemannian geometry, Lie groups, and representation theory to produce

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 58G25, 22E27; Secondary 53C30.

Key words and phrases. Isospectral manifolds; Spectrum of the Laplacian on forms; Nilpotent Lie groups; Cocompact, discrete subgroups; Quasi-regular representations; Square-integrable representations.

Research at MSRI supported in part by NSF grant DMS-9022140. Research at MSRI and Texas Tech supported in part by NSF grant DMS-9409209.

pairs of isospectral nilmanifolds of arbitrary step. The higher-step examples have a much richer geometry, exhibiting many properties not previously found.

While representation theory is used as a tool, this construction differs from previous ones in that the resulting pairs of isospectral manifolds need not be isospectral on one-forms, and so do not fall under the traditional Sunada setup. This property was previously exhibited by pairs of isospectral Heisenberg manifolds constructed by Gordon and Wilson [GW2], [G2]. And for any choice of P, Ikeda [I2] has constructed examples of isospectral lens spaces that are isospectral on p-forms for $p = 0, 1, \cdots, P$ but not isospectral on $(P+1)$-forms. These are the only known examples.

The only other examples of isospectral manifolds that do not fall under the traditional Sunada construction are bounded domains of Urakwa [U], and nonlocally isometric examples of Szabo [Sz2], Gordon [G3], [G4], and Gordon–Wilson [GW3].

Recent results of Pesce [P4] now explain the Ikeda and Urakawa examples in a Sunada-like setting. This setting requires a genericity assumption that excludes nilmanifolds. Moreover, the construction presented here generalizes the method used by Gordon–Wilson to construct the Heisenberg examples.

Consequently, outside of the nonlocally isometric examples mentioned above, the construction below subsumes all known examples of isospectral manifolds that do not fall under a Sunada setup.

After establishing notation in Section 2, the new construction for producing pairs of higher-step isospectral nilmanifolds is presented in Section 3. In Section 4, we use the new construction to produce pairs of isospectral three-step nilmanifolds with the following combinations of properties.

Table I: New Examples of Isospectral Manifolds

Pair of 3-Step Isospectral Nilmanifolds	$\forall p$ Same p-form Spectrum	Rep. Equiv. Fundamental Groups	Isomorphic Fundamental Groups	Same Length Spectrum	Same Marked Length Spectrum
I(7 dim)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
II(5 dim)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
III\IV(7\5 dim)	No	No	No	No	No
V(7 dim)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

The properties listed in the above table are defined as follows. Two cocompact (i.e. $\Gamma\backslash G$ compact), discrete subgroups Γ_1 and Γ_2 of a Lie group G are called *representation equivalent* if the associated quasi-regular representations are unitarily equivalent. (See Section 2 for details.) The *length spectrum* of a Riemannian manifold is the set of lengths of closed geodesics, counted with multiplicity. The multiplicity of a length is defined as the number of distinct free homotopy classes in which the length occurs. (Note: other definitions of multiplicity also appear in the literature.) The pairs of isospectral manifolds above have the same lengths of closed geodesics. However, the length spectra often differ in the multiplicities that occur. The *marked length spectrum* takes into account not only the lengths of the closed geodesics but also the free homotopy classes in which the geodesics occur.

In Section 4 we compare the quasi-regular representations and the fundamental groups of Examples I through V. We also compare the p-form spectrum, but the calculations are left to an Appendix. The length spectrum and marked length spectrum of these examples will be examined in [Gt4].

Example I is the first example of a pair of *nonisomorphic,* representation equivalent, cocompact, discrete subgroups of a nilpotent Lie group. It is also the first example of a pair of representation equivalent cocompact, discrete subgroups of a solvable Lie group producing Riemannian manifolds that do not have the same length spectrum. This example has implications in representation theory on nilpotent Lie groups and motivated [Gt1] and [Gt2].

We prove in the Appendix that the manifolds in Examples III, IV and V are not isospectral on one-forms. Outside of the traditional Sunada setup, no general method is known for comparing the one-form spectrum of manifolds. The methods illustrated in the Appendix are new, as previously used techniques could not be applied to the higher-step examples. The only previous examples of manifolds that are isospectral on functions but not isospectral on p-forms for all p are the lens spaces and Heisenberg manifolds mentioned above.

Example V is the first example of a pair of Riemannian manifolds with the same marked length spectrum, but not the same spectrum on one-forms. This example contrasts with two-step results relating the marked length spectrum and the p-form spectrum [E]. This example will be studied in detail in [Gt4].

Most of the contents of this paper are contained in the author's thesis at Washington University in St. Louis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The author wishes to express deep gratitude to her advisor, Carolyn S. Gordon, for all of her suggestions, encouragement and support.

§2 Background and Notation.

Let G be a simply connected Lie group and let Γ be a cocompact, discrete subgroup of G. A Riemannian metric g is *left invariant* if the left translations of G are isometries. The left invariant metric g projects to a Riemannian metric on $\Gamma\backslash G$, which we also denote by g. Note that a left invariant metric is determined by a choice of orthonormal basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G.

As G is unimodular, the Laplace–Beltrami operator of $(\Gamma\backslash G, g)$ may be written

$$\Delta = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} {E_i}^2, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\{E_1, \cdots, E_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G.

The Laplace-Beltrami operator acting on smooth p-forms is defined by $\Delta = d\delta + \delta d$. Here δ is the metric adjoint of d. Equivalently $\delta = (-1)^{n(p+1)+1} * d*$, where $*$ is the Hodge-$*$ operator. We denote the *p-form spectrum* of a Riemannian manifold (M, g) by *p-spec*(M, g).

The quasi-regular representation ρ_Γ of G on $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ is defined as follows: for all x in G and f in $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$,

$$\rho_\Gamma(x)f = f \circ R_x.$$

Here R_x denotes the right action of x on $\Gamma\backslash G$. The quasi-regular representation is known to be unitary.

We say Γ_1 and Γ_2 are *representation equivalent* if ρ_{Γ_1} and ρ_{Γ_2} are unitarily equivalent; that is, Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent if there exists a unitary isomorphism $T : L^2(\Gamma_1\backslash G) \to L^2(\Gamma_2\backslash G)$ such that $T(\rho_{\Gamma_1}(x)f) = \rho_{\Gamma_2}(x)Tf$ for every x in G and every f in $L^2(\Gamma_1\backslash G)$.

Proposition 2.2 (Gordon–Wilson [GW1]**).** *Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be cocompact, discrete subgroups of a simply connected Lie group G. Let g be a left invariant metric on G. If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent, then*

$$p\text{-}spec(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = p\text{-}spec(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$$

for $p = 0, 1, \cdots, dim(G)$.

Remark. Pairs of isospectral manifolds constructed using the traditional Sunada method are of the form $(\Gamma_1\backslash M, g)$ and $(\Gamma_2\backslash M, g)$ where Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent, cocompact, discrete subgroups of a group G acting by isometries on a Riemannian manifold (M, g).

For a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, denote by $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ the derived algebra $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. That is, $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ is the Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ generated by all elements of the form $[X, Y]$ for X, Y in $\mathfrak{g}$. Inductively, define $\mathfrak{g}^{(k+1)} = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^{(k)}]$. A Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is said to be *k-step nilpotent* if $\mathfrak{g}^{(k)} \equiv 0$ but $\mathfrak{g}^{(k-1)} \not\equiv 0$. A Lie group G is called *k-step nilpotent* if its Lie algebra is.

Let $G^{(k)} = exp(\mathfrak{g}^{(k)})$ denote the kth derived subgroup of G. We denote the center of G by $Z(G)$ and the center of $\mathfrak{g}$ by $\mathfrak{z}$. Note that if G is k-step nilpotent, then $G^{(k-1)} \subset Z(G)$.

Let *exp* denote the Lie algebra exponential from $\mathfrak{g}$ to G. The Campbell–Baker–Hausdorff formula gives us the group operation of G in terms of $\mathfrak{g}$. Namely, for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$:

$$exp(X)exp(Y) = exp(X + Y + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] + \frac{1}{12}[X, [X, Y]] + \frac{1}{12}[Y, [Y, X]] + \cdots),$$

where the remaining terms are higher-order brackets. Note that for two-step nilpotent Lie groups, only the first three terms in the right-hand side are nonzero. For three-step groups, only the first five terms are nonzero. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent and G is simply connected, then *exp* is a diffeomorphism from $\mathfrak{g}$ onto G. Denote its inverse by *log*.

Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be cocompact, discrete subgroups of nilpotent Lie groups G_1 and G_2 respectively. Any abstract group isomorphism $\Phi : \Gamma_1 \to \Gamma_2$ extends uniquely to a Lie group isomorphism $\Phi : G_1 \to G_2$.

Let Γ be a cocompact, discrete subgroup of a nilpotent Lie group G with left invariant metric g. The locally homogeneous space $(\Gamma\backslash G, g)$ is called a *Riemannian nilmanifold.* If G is an abelian Lie group, then Γ is merely a lattice of full rank in G, and in this case $log\Gamma$ is also a lattice in $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{Q}} = span_{\mathbf{Q}}\{log\Gamma\}$. This is a *rational* Lie algebra; that is, there exists a basis of $\mathfrak{g}$ made up of elements of $log\Gamma$ such that the structure constants are rational. A Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ is called *rational* if $\mathfrak{h}$ is spanned by $\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Note that the notion of rational depends on Γ. If $H = exp(\mathfrak{h})$ is the connected Lie subgroup of G with rational Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$, then $\Gamma \cap H$ is a cocompact, discrete subgroup of H. The $\mathfrak{g}^{(k)}$ are always rational Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$.

The Kirillov theory of irreducible unitary representations of nilpotent groups gives us a correspondence between irreducible unitary representations of G and elements of $\mathfrak{g}^*$, the dual of $\mathfrak{g}$. In particular, fix $\tau \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a rational subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ that is maximal with respect to the property that $\tau([\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}]) \equiv 0$. The subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ is called a *polarization* of τ. Let $H = exp(\mathfrak{h})$ be the connected subgroup of G with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$.

Define a character $\overline{\tau}$ of H by

$$\overline{\tau}(h) = e^{2\pi i \tau(log(h))} \tag{2.3}$$

for all h in H. Define π_τ to be the irreducible representation of G induced by the representation $\overline{\tau}$ of H. Denote by $\mathcal{H}_\tau$ the representation space of π_τ. Two such irreducible representations π_τ and $\pi_{\tau'}$ are unitarily equivalent if and only if $\tau' = \tau \circ Ad(x)$ for some x in G. Here $Ad(x)$ is the adjoint map from $\mathfrak{g}$ to $\mathfrak{g}$.

For τ in $\mathfrak{g}^*$, the *coadjoint orbit* of τ is

$$O(\tau) = \{\tau \circ Ad(x) : x \in G\}.$$

Hence π_τ and $\pi_{\tau'}$ are unitarily equivalent if and only if τ and τ' lie in the same coadjoint orbit of $\mathfrak{g}^*$.

As G is nilpotent, every irreducible representation of G is unitarily equivalent to π_τ for some $\tau \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, and the quasi-regular representation ρ_Γ is completely reducible. Thus the representation space $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ is unitarily isomorphic to

$$L^2(\Gamma\backslash G) \cong \bigoplus_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} m(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau$$

for some $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$. Here $m(\tau)$ denotes the multiplicity of H_τ, and we assume $\mathcal{T}$ contains at most one element of each coadjoint orbit of $\mathfrak{g}^*$.

A good reference for representation theory on nilpotent Lie groups is [CG].

§3 A New Construction of Isospectral Nilmanifolds.

Let G be a simply connected, k-step nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Define $\bar{G}$ to be the simply connected, (k–1)-step nilpotent Lie group $G/G^{(k-1)}$. For Γ a cocompact, discrete subgroup of G, denote by $\bar{\Gamma}$ the image of Γ under the canonical projection from G onto $\bar{G}$. The group $\bar{\Gamma}$ is then a cocompact, discrete subgroup of $\bar{G}$. For a left invariant metric g on G, we associate a left invariant metric $\bar{g}$ on $\bar{G}$ by restricting g to an orthogonal complement of $\mathfrak{g}^{(k-1)}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$.

We call the (k–1)-step nilmanifold $(\bar{\Gamma}\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ the *quotient nilmanifold of* $(\Gamma\backslash G, g)$. By using the definition of $\bar{g}$, one easily sees that the projection $(\Gamma\backslash G, g) \to (\bar{\Gamma}\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ is a Riemannian submersion.

The Lie algebra $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ of $\bar{G}$ is just $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}^{(k-1)}$. We denote elements of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ by $\bar{U}$, where $\bar{U}$ is the image of U under the canonical projection from $\mathfrak{g}$ onto $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Definition 3.1. *Let G be a simply connected nilpotent Lie group. We say G is strictly nonsingular if the following property holds: for every z in $Z(G)$ and every noncentral x in G there exists an element a in G such that*

$$[x, a] = z.$$

Here $[x, a]$ denotes the commutator $[x, a] = xax^{-1}a^{-1}$.

Equivalently, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is strictly nonsingular if for every noncentral X in $\mathfrak{g}$,

$$\mathfrak{z} \subset ad(X)(\mathfrak{g}).$$

That is, for every X in $\mathfrak{g} - \mathfrak{z}$ and every Z in $\mathfrak{z}$ there exists a vector Y in $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $[X, Y] = Z$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let G be a simply connected, strictly nonsingular nilpotent Lie group with left invariant metric g. If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are cocompact, discrete subgroups of G such that*

$$\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G) \quad \text{and} \quad spec(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g}) = spec(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g}),$$

then

$$spec(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = spec(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g).$$

Remark. The above construction is a generalization of the construction used by Gordon and Wilson to obtain pairs of isospectral Heisenberg manifolds [GW2]. If we let the Lie group G be a simply connected, strictly nonsingular, two-step nilpotent Lie group with a one-dimensional center, then $G = H_n$ for some n, where H_n denotes the $(2n+1)$-dimensional Heisenberg group.

Proof of Theorem 3.2.

We use the notation of Section 2.

For $i = 1, 2$, let $\mathcal{T}_i$ be a subset of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ such that

$$L^2(\Gamma_i \backslash G) \cong \bigoplus_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau.$$

Recall that $m_i(\tau)$ denotes the multiplicity of π_τ in the quasi-regular representation of G on $L^2(\Gamma_i \backslash G)$, and we assume that $\mathcal{T}_i$ contains at most one element of each coadjoint orbit of $\mathfrak{g}^*$.

We decompose the index set $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{T}_i' \cup \mathcal{T}_i''$ by letting

$$\mathcal{T}_i' = \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(\mathfrak{z}) \equiv 0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_i'' = \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(\mathfrak{z}) \not\equiv 0\}.$$

We likewise decompose the representation space $L^2(\Gamma_i \backslash G)$ by letting

$$\mathcal{H}_i' = \bigoplus_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i'} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_i'' = \bigoplus_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i''} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau.$$

As representation spaces $L^2(\Gamma_i \backslash G) = \mathcal{H}_i' \oplus \mathcal{H}_i''$.

Clearly $spec(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g) = spec'(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g) \cup spec''(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$, where $spec'(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$ and $spec''(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$ are defined as the spectrum of the Laplacian restricted to acting on $\mathcal{H}_i'$, and $\mathcal{H}_i''$, respectively. The multiplicity of an eigenvalue in $spec(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$ is equal to the sum of its multiplicities in $spec'(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$ and $spec''(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$.

Lemma 3.3. *The Laplacian of $(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_i'$ is precisely the Laplacian of $(\bar{\Gamma}_i \backslash \bar{G}, \bar{g})$ acting on $L^2(\bar{\Gamma}_i \backslash \bar{G})$. Thus $spec(\bar{\Gamma}_i \backslash \bar{G}, \bar{g}) = spec'(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

Lemma 3.4. *The representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1''$ and $\mathcal{H}_2''$ are unitarily equivalent, hence $spec''(\Gamma_1 \backslash G, g) = spec''(\Gamma_2 \backslash G, g)$.*

Theorem 3.2 now follows.

The proof of Lemma 3.3 is essentially an extension of the first part of the proof used by Gordon–Wilson to construct pairs of isospectral Heisenberg manifolds. (See [GW2], Theorem 4.1) The details are included here for completeness and because of a difference in notation.

Proof of Lemma 3.3.

Let $\{Z_1, Z_2, \cdots, Z_T\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{z} = \mathfrak{g}^{(k-1)}$. Extend it to $\{E_1, E_2, \cdots, E_N, Z_1, Z_2, \cdots, Z_T\}$, an orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. By (2.1), the Laplace-Beltrami operator of (G, g) is

$$\Delta = -\sum_{n=1}^{N} {E_n}^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{K} {Z_k}^2.$$

View functions in $L^2(\Gamma_i \backslash G)$ as left Γ_i-invariant functions of G. The subspace $\mathcal{H}_i'$ is then those functions in $L^2(\Gamma_i \backslash G)$ that are independent of the center, which correspond to functions in $L^2(\bar{\Gamma}_i \backslash \bar{G})$ in a natural way. So when we restrict Δ to $\mathcal{H}_i'$, we have

$$\Delta = -\sum_{n=1}^{N} {E_n}^2,$$

which corresponds to the Laplacian of $(\bar{\Gamma}_i \backslash \bar{G}, \bar{g})$.

The Laplacian of $(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_i'$ is then precisely the Laplacian of $(\bar{\Gamma}_i \backslash \bar{G}, \bar{g})$ acting on $L^2(\bar{\Gamma}_i \backslash \bar{G})$, so $spec(\bar{\Gamma}_i \backslash \bar{G}, \bar{g}) = spec'(\Gamma_i \backslash G, g)$, as desired. ∎

Before proving Lemma 3.4, we must introduce some of the theory of square integrable representations of nilpotent Lie groups.

Definition 3.5. *Let G be a locally compact, unimodular group with center $Z(G)$. We say that an irreducible unitary representation π of G on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is square integrable if there are nonzero vectors x_1 and x_2 in $\mathcal{H}$ such that*

$$\int_{G/Z(G)} |(\pi(s)x_1, x_2)|^2 d\overline{\mu}(\overline{s}) < \infty.$$

Here $d\overline{\mu}(\overline{s})$ denotes integration over $G/Z(G)$ with respect to a choice of Haar measure $\overline{\mu}$ on $G/Z(G)$. As the center acts trivially, the integrand may be viewed as a function of $G/Z(G)$.

Let $\mathfrak{z}^{\perp}$ be the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ defined by $\mathfrak{z}^{\perp} = \{\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^* : \mu(\mathfrak{z}) \equiv 0\}$. Note that $\mathfrak{z}^{\perp} \cong (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{z})^*$. For $\tau \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, let b_τ denote the skew-symmetric, bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{z}$ defined by $b_\tau(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) = \tau([X, Y])$ for all $\bar{X}, \bar{Y}$ in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{z}$. Here X and Y are any elements of $\mathfrak{g}$ that project onto $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ respectively.

Theorem 3.6 (Moore–Wolf [MW]**).** *For a linear functional τ in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ with coadjoint orbit $O(\tau)$ and corresponding irreducible unitary representation π_τ, the following three conditions are equivalent:*
(1) π_τ is square integrable.
(2) $O(\tau) = \tau + \mathfrak{z}^\perp$.
(3) b_τ is nondegenerate on $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{z}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.4.

Fix $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i''$. Let $Z \in \mathfrak{z}$ be such that $\tau(Z) \neq 0$. By strict nonsingularity, for all noncentral $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ there exists $Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that $[X, Y] = Z$. Hence $b_\tau(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) = \tau([X, Y]) \neq 0$. So b_τ is nondegenerate. By Theorem 3.6, π_τ is square integrable. Note that b_τ nondegenerate implies that $N = dim(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{z})$ is even.

Recall from Section 2 that π_τ is independent of the choice of τ in $O(\tau)$. By Theorem 3.6, as π_τ is square integrable, the coadjoint orbit $O(\tau)$ is uniquely determined by the restriction of τ to the center. We may thus assume $\tau \in \mathfrak{z}^*$.

Let α be a volume form on $G/Z(G)$. That is, let α be a fixed, alternating, N-linear form over $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{z}$. As b_τ is nondegenerate, ${b_\tau}^{(\frac{1}{2}N)} = b_\tau \wedge \cdots \wedge b_\tau$ is also a volume form on $G/Z(G)$ and hence a scalar multiple of α. Define $P_\alpha(\tau)$ by

$$P_\alpha(\tau)\alpha = b_\tau \wedge \cdots \wedge b_\tau.$$

The polynomial P_α is homogeneous of degree $\frac{1}{2}N$ on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ and depends only on the choice of volume form α.

Let $\mathfrak{z}^*$ denote the dual of $\mathfrak{z}$. Let $L = \Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G)$ and let $L^* \subset \mathfrak{z}^*$ be the dual lattice of L.

We now use the following occurrence and multiplicity condition, also due to Moore and Wolf.

Theorem 3.7 (Moore–Wolf [MW]**).** *Let G be a nilpotent Lie group and Γ a cocompact, discrete subgroup of G. Let $L = \Gamma \cap Z(G)$. Fix a volume form α_Γ on $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{z}$ so that $\bar{\Gamma}\backslash\bar{G}$ has volume one. Let τ be a nonzero element of $\mathfrak{z}^*$ such that π_τ is square integrable. The representation π_τ occurs in the quasi-regular representation of G on $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ if and only if $\tau \in L^*$. Moreover, its multiplicity $m(\tau)$ is $|P_{\alpha_\Gamma}(\tau)|$.*

By Theorem 3.7, the square integrable representation π_τ occurs in the quasi-regular representation of G on $L^2(\Gamma_i\backslash G)$ if and only if τ is contained in L^*. Thus for $i = 1, 2$ the coadjoint orbits represented in $\mathcal{T}_i''$ correspond to the elements of L^*. We may assume $\mathcal{T}_1'' = \mathcal{T}_2''$.

As the Riemannian metrics of $(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ and $(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ arise from the same left invariant metric $\bar{g}$ on $\bar{G}$, we know that the Riemannian volume forms of $(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ and $(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ arise from the same left invariant volume form on $\bar{G}$. We will denote this volume form and its projections onto $(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ and $(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ by Ω.

Let α_{Γ_1} and α_{Γ_2} be as in Theorem 3.7. The volume forms α_{Γ_i} are then scalar multiples of Ω. For $i = 1, 2$, let $\alpha_{\Gamma_i} = p_i\Omega$.

So

$$\int_{\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}} \alpha_{\Gamma_1} = 1 = \int_{\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}} \alpha_{\Gamma_2}$$

$$p_1 \int_{\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}} \Omega = p_2 \int_{\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}} \Omega$$

$$p_1\, Vol\, (\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g}) = p_2\, Vol\, (\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$$

By hypothesis, $spec(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g}) = spec(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$, and the spectrum of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is known to determine the volume of a closed manifold. Thus $Vol\, (\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g}) = Vol\, (\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$, which implies $p_1 = p_2$, and so $\alpha_{\Gamma_1} = \alpha_{\Gamma_2}$.

As the definition of $P_{\alpha_{\Gamma_i}}$ depends only on the volume form α_{Γ_i}, we must have

$$P_{\alpha_{\Gamma_1}}(\tau) = P_{\alpha_{\Gamma_2}}(\tau)$$

for all τ in $\mathcal{T}_1'' = \mathcal{T}_2''$. Hence $m_1(\tau) = m_2(\tau)$ for all τ in $\mathcal{T}_1'' = \mathcal{T}_2''$.

Thus the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1''$ and $\mathcal{H}_2''$ are unitarily equivalent, and by Proposition 2.2

$$spec''(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = spec''(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g),$$

as desired.

The proofs of Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.2 are now complete. ■

Corollary 3.8. *Let G be a simply connected, strictly nonsingular nilpotent Lie group. Two cocompact, discrete subgroups Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent subgroups of G if and only if $\bar{\Gamma}_1$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_2$ are representation equivalent subgroups of $\bar{G}$ and $\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G)$.*

Proof of Corollary 3.8.

Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be cocompact, discrete subgroups of G. As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we decompose the representation spaces of ρ_{Γ_1} and ρ_{Γ_2} as

$$L^2(\Gamma_i\backslash G) = \mathcal{H}_i' \oplus \mathcal{H}_i'',$$

for $i = 1, 2$.

If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent, then the square integrable representations occurring in the quasi-regular representations must correspond. We showed in the proof of Lemma 3.4 that the square integrable representations occurring in ρ_{Γ_1} and ρ_{Γ_2} are precisely the irreducible representations appearing in $\mathcal{H}_i''$. Thus Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent subgroups of G if and only if the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1'$ and $\mathcal{H}_2'$ are unitarily equivalent and the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1''$ and $\mathcal{H}_2''$ are unitarily equivalent.

For $i = 1, 2$ the irreducible components of the representation of G on $\mathcal{H}_i'$ correspond to the linear functionals in $\mathcal{T}_i$ that are zero on the center of $\mathfrak{g}$. As these functionals may be viewed as functionals on $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$, we may likewise view the irreducible components as representations of $\bar{G}$. Hence the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1'$ and $\mathcal{H}_2'$ may be viewed as the quasi-regular representations of $\bar{G}$ on $L^2(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G})$ and $L^2(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G})$, respectively. Thus Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent subgroups of G if and only if $\bar{\Gamma}_1$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_2$ are representation equivalent subgroups of $\bar{G}$ and the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1''$ and $\mathcal{H}_2''$ are unitarily equivalent.

Theorem 3.7 tells us that the irreducible representations occurring in $\mathcal{H}_i''$ correspond to the elements of the dual lattice of $\Gamma_i \cap Z(G)$. So if the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1''$ and $\mathcal{H}_2''$ are unitarily equivalent, then the duals of $\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G)$ and $\Gamma_2 \cap Z(G)$ must coincide. Hence $\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G)$. The proof of the forward direction is now complete.

The reverse direction follows from Proposition 2.2 applied to the quotient nilmanifolds and Lemma 3.4. ■

§4 New Examples of Isospectral Nilmanifolds.

Using Theorem 3.2, we construct and compare five new pairs of isospectral nilmanifolds. A summary of the properties of these examples is listed in Section 1, Table I. In this Section we compare the quasi-regular representations and the fundamental groups of these examples. The p-form spectra of these examples are also compared, but the calculations are left to the Appendix. The methods used in the Appendix are new, as previously used techniques could not be applied to compare the p-form spectrum of these higher-step examples. The length spectra and marked length spectra of these examples will be studied in [Gt4].

With the exception of the column comparing the representation equivalence of the fundamental groups, all of the properties listed in Table I are geometric invariants. Hence a "No" in any one of these columns demonstrates that an Example is nontrivial.

Before proceeding, we need the following.

Definition 4.1. *Let Φ be a Lie group automorphism of G. Let Γ be a cocompact, discrete subgroup of G. We say Φ is an almost inner automorphism if for all elements x of G there exists a_x in G such that $\Phi(x) = a_x x a_x^{-1}$.*

Theorem 4.2 (Gordon–Wilson [GW1]**).** *Let G be a nilpotent Lie group and let Γ be a cocompact, discrete subgroup of G. If Φ is an almost inner automorphism of G, then Γ and $\Phi(\Gamma)$ are representation equivalent.*

Example I.

Consider the simply connected, strictly nonsingular, three-step nilpotent Lie group G with Lie algebra

$$\mathfrak{g} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2, Z_1, Z_2, W\}$$

and Lie brackets

$$[X_1, Y_1] = [X_2, Y_2] = Z_1$$

$$[X_1, Y_2] = Z_2$$

$$[X_1, Z_1] = [X_2, Z_2] = [Y_1, Y_2] = W$$

and all other basis brackets zero.

Let Γ_1 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(2X_1), exp(2X_2), exp(Y_1), exp(Y_2), exp(Z_1), exp(Z_2), exp(W)\}.$$

Let Γ_2 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(2X_1), exp(2X_2), exp(Y_1), exp(Y_2 + \frac{1}{2}Z_2), exp(Z_1), exp(Z_2), exp(W)\}.$$

Note that $\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G) = \{exp(jW) : j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$.

Now $\bar{\Gamma}_2 = \Phi(\bar{\Gamma}_1)$ where Φ is the almost inner automorphism of $\bar{G}$ given on the Lie algebra level by

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{X}_1 &\to \bar{X}_1, \\
\bar{X}_2 &\to \bar{X}_2, \\
\bar{Y}_1 &\to \bar{Y}_1, \\
\bar{Y}_2 &\to \bar{Y}_2 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{Z}_2, \\
\bar{Z}_1 &\to \bar{Z}_1, \\
\bar{Z}_2 &\to \bar{Z}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.2, $\bar{\Gamma}_1$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_2$ are representation equivalent subgroups of $\bar{G}$. By Corollary 3.8, Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent subgroups of G.

By Proposition 2.2, for any choice of left invariant metric g of G, !x we have $p\text{-}spec(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = p\text{-}spec(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$, for $p = 0, 1, \cdots, 7$.

Proposition 4.3 ([Gt1]). *The subgroups Γ_1 and Γ_2 are not isomorphic as groups.*

Remark. The author previously established the representation equivalence of Γ_1 and Γ_2 in [Gt1] by using a direct calculation. This example was presented in [Gt1] as the first example of a pair of nonisomorphic, representation equivalent subgroups of a solvable Lie group. Note that a nilpotent Lie group is necessarily solvable. Also, this example was presented in [Gt2] as the first example of a pair of representation equivalent subgroups of a solvable Lie group producing nilmanifolds with unequal length spectra. Contrast this example with what must happen in the two-step case.

Definition 4.4. *Let G be a two-step nilpotent Lie group and let Γ be a cocompact, discrete subgroup of G. We call the automorphism Φ of G a Γ-equivalence if for all γ in Γ there exists a_γ in G and γ'_γ in $\Gamma \cap G^{(1)}$ such that $\Phi(\gamma) = a_\gamma \gamma a_\gamma^{-1} \gamma'_\gamma$.*

Theorem 4.5 ([Gt1], [Gt2]). *Let G be a two-step nilpotent Lie group. Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be cocompact, discrete subgroups of G. The subgroups Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent if and only if there exists Φ, a Γ_1-equivalence of G, such that $\Phi(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$. Thus if Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent, they are necessarily isomorphic. In addition, if Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent, then $(\Gamma_1 \backslash G, g)$ and $(\Gamma_2 \backslash G, g)$ have the same length spectrum for any choice of left invariant metric g of G.*

Example II.

Consider the simply connected, strictly nonsingular, three-step nilpotent Lie group G with Lie algebra

$$\mathfrak{g} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{X_1, Y_1, Y_2, Z, W\}$$

and Lie brackets

$$[X_1, Y_1] = Z$$

$$[X_1, Z] = [Y_1, Y_2] = W$$

and all other basis brackets zero.

Let Γ_1 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(2X_1), exp(Y_1), exp(Y_2), exp(Z), exp(W)\}.$$

Let Γ_2 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(2X_1), exp(Y_1 + \frac{1}{2}Z), exp(Y_2), exp(Z), exp(W)\}.$$

Note that $\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G) = \{exp(jW) : j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$.

Now $\bar{\Gamma}_2 = \Phi(\bar{\Gamma}_1)$ where Φ is the inner automorphism of $\bar{G}$ given on the Lie algebra level by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1 &\to \bar{X}_1, \\ \bar{Y}_1 &\to \bar{Y}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{Z}, \\ \bar{Y}_2 &\to \bar{Y}_2, \\ \bar{Z} &\to \bar{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that an inner automorphism is necessarily almost inner.

By Theorem 4.2, $\bar{\Gamma}_1$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_2$ are representation equivalent subgroups of $\bar{G}$. By Corollary 3.8, Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent subgroups of G.

By Proposition 2.2, *p-spec*$(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) =$ *p-spec*$(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ for $p = 0, 1, \cdots, 5$, for any choice of left invariant metric g of G.

Here Γ_1 and Γ_2 are isomorphic. Indeed, a simple calculation shows that the isomorphism Ψ given on the Lie algebra level by

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &\to X_1 + \frac{1}{2}Y_2, \\ Y_1 &\to Y_1 + \frac{1}{2}Z, \\ Y_2 &\to Y_2, \\ Z &\to Z, \\ W &\to W, \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism of G such that $\Psi(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$.

Proposition 4.6. *No isomorphism between Γ_1 and Γ_2 will project to a $\bar{\Gamma}_1$-equivalence of $\bar{G}$.*

Remark. Example I illustrates that in the higher-step case, the representation equivalence of Γ_1 and Γ_2 and the isomorphism class of Γ_1 and Γ_2 need not be related. Example II shows that, in contrast to Theorem 4.5, even in the case where Γ_1 and Γ_2 are isomorphic, knowing the isomorphisms between Γ_1 and Γ_2 is not enough to use Corollary 3.8 to establish whether or not Γ_1 and Γ_2 are representation equivalent.

Proof of Proposition 4.6.

Let Ψ be an isomorphism from Γ_1 to Γ_2. Extend it to the Lie group isomorphism $\Psi : G \to G$ such that $\Psi(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$.

On the Lie algebra level, any such isomorphism must preserve the following ideals of $\mathfrak{g}$:

(1) $\mathfrak{g}^{(2)} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{W\}$,
(2) $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{Z, W\}$,
(3) $\mathfrak{A} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{Y_2, Z, W\}$, and
(4) $\mathfrak{C} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{Y_1, Y_2, Z, W\}$, the centralizer of $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$.
To see (3), note that $ad(U)(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{g}^{(2)}$ if and only if $U \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Note that the generators of Γ_1 and Γ_2 presented above are canonical in the sense that every element of Γ_1 may be expressed uniquely as

$$exp(2n_1X_1)exp(m_1Y_1)exp(m_2Y_2)exp(kZ)exp(jW),$$

for integers n_1, m_1, m_2, k, j. Similarly for Γ_2.

As $\Psi(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$, generators of Γ_1 must go to generators of Γ_2, and these generators must be expressible in terms of the canonical generators of Γ_2, given above.

Combining this fact with properties (1) through (4), we obtain:

$\Psi_*(W) = \pm W$, by (1).
$\Psi_*(Z) = \pm Z + h_0W$ using (2).
$\Psi_*(Y_2) = \pm Y_2 \bmod \mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$, using (3).
$\Psi_*(Y_1) = \pm(Y_1 + \frac{1}{2}Z) + h_1Y_2 + h_2Z \bmod \mathfrak{g}^{(2)}$ using (4).
$\Psi_*(X_1) = \pm X_1 + \frac{1}{2}h_3Y_1 + \frac{1}{2}h_4Y_2 \bmod \mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$,
where $h_0,\ h_1,\ h_2,\ h_3$ and h_4 are integers.

Finally, we use the fact that Ψ_* is a Lie algebra isomorphism. By examining the W coefficient of $\Psi_*([X_1, Y_1]) = [\Psi_*(X_1), \Psi_*(Y_1)]$ we have the equation

$$h_0 = \pm\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}h_1h_3 \pm h_2 \pm \frac{1}{2}h_4.$$

Thus either $h_3 \neq 0$ or $h_4 \neq 0$.

As $\bar{Y}_1$ and $\bar{Y}_2$ are not in $[\bar{X}_1, \bar{\mathfrak{g}}]$ and not in $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$, we see that the projection of Ψ cannot possibly be a $\bar{\Gamma}_1$-equivalence. ■

Example III.

Consider again the seven-dimensional Lie group G presented in Example I.

We again let Γ_1 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(2X_1), exp(2X_2), exp(Y_1), exp(Y_2), exp(Z_1), exp(Z_2), exp(W)\},$$

and let Γ_2 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(X_1), exp(X_2), exp(2Y_1), exp(2Y_2), exp(Z_1), exp(Z_2), exp(W)\}.$$

Note that $\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G) = \{exp(jW) : j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$.

Let g be the left invariant metric on G defined by letting

$$\{X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2, Z_1, Z_2, W\}$$

be an orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Now $\bar{\Gamma}_2 = \Phi(\bar{\Gamma}_1)$ where Φ is the automorphism of $\bar{G}$ given on the Lie algebra level by

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{X}_1 &\to \bar{Y}_2, \\
\bar{X}_2 &\to \bar{Y}_1, \\
\bar{Y}_1 &\to \bar{X}_2, \\
\bar{Y}_2 &\to \bar{X}_1, \\
\bar{Z}_1 &\to -\bar{Z}_1, \\
\bar{Z}_2 &\to -\bar{Z}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

The automorphism Φ is also an isometry of $(\bar{G}, \bar{g})$, and an isometry must preserve the spectrum. Thus $spec(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g}) = spec(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$. By Theorem 3.2, $spec(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = spec(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$.

Proposition 4.7. *The manifolds $(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ and $(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ are not isospectral on one-forms.*

The proof of Proposition 4.7 is left to the Appendix. Note that Proposition 4.7 and Proposition 2.2 together imply that Γ_1 and Γ_2 are not representation equivalent subgroups of G.

Proposition 4.8. *The subgroups Γ_1 and Γ_2 are not isomorphic as groups.*

Proof of Proposition 4.8.

If there existed a group isomorphism between Γ_1 and Γ_2, it would extend to a Lie group automorphism Ψ of G such that $\Psi(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$.

Each of the following ideals of $\mathfrak{g}$ must be preserved by the Lie algebra automorphism Ψ_* :
(1) $\mathfrak{g}^{(2)} = \mathfrak{z} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{W\}$,
(2) $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{Z_1, Z_2, W\}$,
(3) $\mathfrak{C} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{Y_1, Y_2, Z_1, Z_2, W\}$, the centralizer of $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$, and
(4) $\mathfrak{A} = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{X_2, Y_1, Z_1, Z_2, W\}$.
To see (4), note that the image of $ad(U)$ has dimension less than three if and only if $U \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Now $\Psi(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$. Consequently, generators of Γ_1 must go to generators of Γ_2, and these generators must be expressible in terms of the canonical generators of Γ_2, given above. Combining this fact with properties (1) through (4), we obtain:

$\Psi_*(Y_1) = \pm 2Y_1 \mod \mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ by (3) and (4).
$\Psi_*(Y_2) = \pm 2Y_2 \mod span_{\mathbf{R}}\{Y_1, Z_1, Z_2, W\}$ by (3).
$\Psi_*(W) = \pm W$ by (1).
But then $\Psi_*([Y_1, Y_2]) \neq [\Psi_*(Y_1), \Psi_*(Y_2)]$. ■

Example IV.

Consider again the five-dimensional Lie group G presented in Example II.

We again let Γ_1 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(2X_1), exp(Y_1), exp(Y_2), exp(Z), exp(W)\},$$

and let Γ_2 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(X_1), exp(2Y_1), exp(Y_2), exp(Z), exp(W)\}.$$

Note that $\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G) = \{exp(jW) : j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$.

Let g be the left invariant metric on G defined by letting

$$\{X_1, Y_1, Y_2, Z, W\}$$

be an orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Now $\bar{\Gamma}_2 = \Phi(\bar{\Gamma}_1)$ where Φ is the automorphism of $\bar{G}$ given on the Lie alegebra level by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1 &\to \bar{Y}_1, \\ \bar{Y}_1 &\to \bar{X}_1, \\ \bar{Y}_2 &\to \bar{Y}_2, \\ \bar{Z} &\to -\bar{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

The automorphism Φ is clearly an isometry of $(\bar{G}, \bar{g})$, and an isometry preserves the spectrum. Thus $spec(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g}) = spec(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$. By Theorem 3.2, $spec(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = spec(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$.

Proposition 4.9. *The manifolds $(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ and $(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ are not isospectral on one-forms.*

The proof of Proposition 4.9 is left to the Appendix.

Proposition 4.10. *The subgroups Γ_1 and Γ_2 are not isomorphic as groups.*

Remark. The combination of properties exhibited by Examples III and IV are similar to properties exhibited by pairs of isospectral Heisenberg manifolds constructed by Gordon and Wilson [GW2, G2].

Proof of Proposition 4.10.

If there existed a group isomorphism between Γ_1 and Γ_2, it would extend to a Lie group automorphism Ψ of G such that $\Psi(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$.

As before, generators of Γ_1 must go to generators of Γ_2, and these generators must be expressible in terms of the canonical generators of Γ_2, given above. Combining this with properties (1) through (4) from the proof of Proposition 4.6, we have

$\Psi_*(Y_1) = \pm 2Y_1 \mod span_{\mathbf{R}}\{Y_2, Z, W\}$.

$\Psi_*(Y_2) = \pm Y_2 \mod \mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$.

$\Psi_*(W) = \pm W$.

But then $\Psi_*([Y_1, Y_2]) \neq [\Psi_*(Y_1), \Psi_*(Y_2)]$. ∎

Example V.

Consider again the seven-dimensional Lie group G presented in Example I.

We fix a left invariant metric on G by letting $\{E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4, E_5, E_6, E_7\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{g}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1 &= X_1 - \frac{1}{2}X_2 - \frac{1}{4}Y_2, \\
E_2 &= X_2 - \frac{1}{4}Y_1, \\
E_3 &= Y_1, \\
E_4 &= Y_1 + Y_2, \\
E_5 &= Z_1, \\
E_6 &= \frac{1}{2}Z_1 + Z_2, \\
E_7 &= W.
\end{aligned}$$

Let Φ be the automorphism of G defined on the Lie algebra level by

$$\begin{aligned}
&X_1 \to -X_1 + X_2 + \frac{1}{4}Y_1 + \frac{1}{2}Y_2,\\
&X_2 \to X_2 - \frac{1}{2}Y_1 + \frac{1}{4}Z_1,\\
&Y_1 \to -Y_1,\\
&Y_2 \to 2Y_1 + Y_2 + Z_2,\\
&Z_1 \to Z_1 + \frac{1}{2}W,\\
&Z_2 \to -Z_1 - Z_2 + \frac{1}{4}W,\\
&W \to -W.
\end{aligned}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that $\Phi_*([U,V]) = [\Phi_*(U), \Phi_*(V)]$ for all U, V in $\mathfrak{g}$. Thus Φ is indeed a Lie group automorphism.

Let Γ_1 be the cocompact, discrete subgroup of G generated by

$$\{exp(2X_1), exp(2X_2), exp(Y_1), exp(Y_2), exp(Z_1), exp(Z_2), exp(W)\},$$

and let $\Gamma_2 = \Phi(\Gamma_1)$. Note that $\Gamma_1 \cap Z(G) = \Gamma_2 \cap Z(G) = \{exp(jW) : j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$.

Let $\bar{\Phi}$ be the projection of Φ onto $\bar{G}$. Then $\bar{\Phi}$ factors as $\bar{\Phi} = \Psi_1 \circ \Psi_2$ where Ψ_1 is the automorphism of $\bar{G}$ given on the Lie algebra level by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{X}_1 \to -\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2 + \frac{1}{4}\bar{Y}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{Y}_2,\\
&\bar{X}_2 \to \bar{X}_2 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{Y}_1,\\
&\bar{Y}_1 \to -\bar{Y}_1,\\
&\bar{Y}_2 \to 2\bar{Y}_1 + \bar{Y}_2,\\
&\bar{Z}_1 \to \bar{Z}_1,\\
&\bar{Z}_2 \to -\bar{Z}_1 - \bar{Z}_2,
\end{aligned}$$

and Ψ_2 is the automorphism of $\bar{G}$ given on the Lie algebra level by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{X}_1 \to \bar{X}_1,\\
&\bar{X}_2 \to \bar{X}_2 + \frac{1}{4}\bar{Z}_1,\\
&\bar{Y}_1 \to \bar{Y}_1,\\
&\bar{Y}_2 \to \bar{Y}_2 - \bar{Z}_1 - \bar{Z}_2,\\
&\bar{Z}_1 \to \bar{Z}_1,\\
&\bar{Z}_2 \to \bar{Z}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

By rewriting Ψ_1 in terms of the orthonormal basis $\{\bar{E}_1, \bar{E}_2, \bar{E}_3, \bar{E}_4, \bar{E}_5, \bar{E}_6\}$ of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$, one easily sees that $\Psi_1(\bar{E}_i) = \pm\bar{E}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 6$. Thus the automorphism Ψ_1 is also an isometry of $\bar{G}$ and must preserve the spectrum. A simple calculation shows that Ψ_2 is an almost inner automorphism of $\bar{G}$, which by Theorem 4.2 also preserves the spectrum. Thus $spec(\bar{\Gamma}_1\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g}) = spec(\bar{\Gamma}_2\backslash\bar{G}, \bar{g})$. By Theorem 3.2, $spec(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = spec(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$.

Proposition 4.11. *The manifolds $(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ and $(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ are not isospectral on one-forms.*

The proof of Proposition 4.11 is left to the Appendix.

Remark. We will show in [Gt4] that the automorphism Φ marks the length spectrum of these examples. This is the first example of a pair of manifolds with the same marked length spectrum but not the same spectrum on one-forms.

Appendix: Comparing the p-form spectrum of nilmanifolds.

In this appendix, we show that the pairs of isospectral manifolds in Examples III, IV, and V are not isospectral on one-forms.

Recall that on smooth p-forms, the Laplace-Beltrami operator is defined as

$$\Delta = d\delta + \delta d.$$

Here δ is the metric adjoint of d. Equivalently, $\delta = (-1)^{n(p+1)+1} * d *$ where $*$ is the Hodge-$*$ operator. Let $E^p(M)$ denote the exterior algebra of smooth differential p-forms on M. Then for $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $\tau \in E^p(M)$, Gordon and Wilson [GW1] showed that

$$\Delta(f\tau) = (\Delta f)\tau + f(\Delta\tau) - 2\nabla_{grad\ f}\tau. \tag{A.1}$$

For G a simply connected Lie group with cocompact, discrete subgroup Γ, view $E^p(\Gamma\backslash G)$ as

$$E^p(\Gamma\backslash G) = C^\infty(\Gamma\backslash G) \otimes \Lambda^p(\mathfrak{g}^*).$$

Here elements of $\Lambda^p(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ are viewed both as left invariant p-forms of G and also as elements of $E^p(\Gamma\backslash G)$.

Proposition 4.7. *The nilmanifolds* $(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ *and* $(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ *as presented in Example III are not isospectral on one-forms.*

Outline of Proof.

Step 1: We decompose $1\text{-}spec(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ into four components:

$$1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g) \cup 1\text{-}spec^{II}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g) \cup 1\text{-}spec^{III}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g) \cup 1\text{-}spec^{IV}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g).$$

The multiplicity of an eigenvalue in $1\text{-}spec(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ is the sum of its multiplicities in each of the four components.

Step 2: Using representation theory, we show

$$1\text{-}spec^{IV}(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = 1\text{-}spec^{IV}(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$$

and

$$1\text{-}spec^{III}(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = 1\text{-}spec^{III}(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g).$$

Step 3: We show that the multiplicity of every eigenvalue in $1\text{-}spec^{II}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ is congruent to 0 modulo 4.

Step 4: Finally, we show that the eigenvalue $\pi^2 + 1$ does not occur in $1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ but occurs with multiplicity 2 in $1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$.

The result now follows. ∎

Proof of Proposition 4.7.

Step 1.

Using the notation of Section 2, for $i = 1, 2$, let $\mathcal{T}_i$ be a subset of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ such that

$$L^2(\Gamma_i\backslash G) \cong \bigoplus_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_i} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau.$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{T}_i^I \cup \mathcal{T}_i^{II} \cup \mathcal{T}_i^{III} \cup \mathcal{T}_i^{IV}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_i^{I} &= \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(Z_1) = \tau(Z_2) = \tau(W) = 0\},\\
\mathcal{T}_i^{II} &= \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(Z_2) \neq 0, \tau(Z_1) = \tau(W) = 0\},\\
\mathcal{T}_i^{III} &= \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(Z_1) \neq 0, \tau(W) = 0\},\\
\mathcal{T}_i^{IV} &= \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(W) \neq 0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{H}_i^I = \bigoplus_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_i^I} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau, \qquad \mathcal{H}_i^{II} = \bigoplus_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_i^{II}} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau,$$
$$\mathcal{H}_i^{III} = \bigoplus_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_i^{III}} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau, \qquad \mathcal{H}_i^{IV} = \bigoplus_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_i^{IV}} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau.$$

As representation spaces,

$$L^2(\Gamma_i\backslash G) = \mathcal{H}_i^I \oplus \mathcal{H}_i^{II} \oplus \mathcal{H}_i^{III} \oplus \mathcal{H}_i^{IV}.$$

Decompose 1-*spec*$(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ as

$$1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_i\backslash G,g) \cup 1\text{-}spec^{II}(\Gamma_i\backslash G,g) \cup 1\text{-}spec^{III}(\Gamma_i\backslash G,g) \cup 1\text{-}spec^{IV}(\Gamma_i\backslash G,g),$$

where 1-*spec*$^I(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ is defined as the spectrum of the Laplacian acting on $\mathcal{H}_i^I \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. Define 1-*spec*$^{II}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$, 1-*spec*$^{III}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$, and 1-*spec*$^{IV}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ similarly. The multiplicity of an eigenvalue in 1-*spec*$(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ is equal to the sum of its multiplicities in each of the four components.

Step 2.

By Lemma 3.4, the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1^{IV}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^{IV}$ are unitarily equivalent and

$$1\text{-}spec^{IV}(\Gamma_1\backslash G,g) = 1\text{-}spec^{IV}(\Gamma_2\backslash G,g).$$

We now show that the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1^{III}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^{III}$ are unitarily equivalent.

The irreducible representations of G corresponding to elements of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ that are zero on the center may be viewed as irreducible representations of $\bar{G} = G/Z(G)$. It is easy to see that such representations of G are unitarily equivalent if and only if the corresponding representations of $\bar{G}$ are unitarily equivalent.

For all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i^{III}, \tau(\mathfrak{z}) = 0$. We may thus use the following Proposition to calculate the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1^{III}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^{III}$.

Proposition A.2 (see Pesce [P2]**).** *Let N be a simply connected, two-step nilpotent Lie group with Γ a cocompact, discrete subgroup of N. Let $\tau \in \mathfrak{N}^*$. Define $\mathfrak{N}_\tau = \{Y \in \mathfrak{N} : \tau([Y,\mathfrak{N}]) \equiv 0\}$. Then the irreducible representation π_τ appears in the quasi-regular representation of N on $L^2(\Gamma\backslash N)$ if and only if $\tau(log\Gamma \cap \mathfrak{N}_\tau) \subset \mathbf{Z}$. The multiplicity of π_τ is one if $\tau(\mathfrak{N}^{(1)}) \equiv 0$. Define a nondegenerate, skew-symmetric bilinear form on $\mathfrak{N}/\mathfrak{N}_\tau$ by $B_\tau(U,V) = \tau([U,V])$ for all $U,V \in \mathfrak{N}/\mathfrak{N}_\tau$. Then if $\tau(\mathfrak{N}^{(1)}) \not\equiv 0$, the multiplicity of*

π_τ is equal to $\sqrt{detB_\tau}$, where the determinant is calculated with respect to any basis of $\mathcal{L}_\tau = log\Gamma/(log\Gamma \cap \mathfrak{N}_\tau)$.

Remark. The occurrence condition above actually follows directly from a more general occurrence and multiplicity theorem due independently to Richardson [R] and Howe [H].

Let $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \omega\}$ be the dual basis to the orthonormal basis $\{X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2, Z_1, Z_2, W\}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$.

If $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i^{III}$, then

$$\tau = A_1\alpha_1 + A_2\alpha_2 + B_1\beta_1 + B_2\beta_2 + C_1\zeta_1 + C_2\zeta_2$$

for some $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2 \in \mathbf{R}$ with $C_1 \neq 0$.

Now $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{\bar{Z}_1, \bar{Z}_2\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} log\bar{\Gamma}_1 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau &= log\bar{\Gamma}_2 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau \\ &= log(exp(\mathbf{Z}\bar{Z}_1)exp(\mathbf{Z}\bar{Z}_2)) \\ &= span_{\mathbf{Z}}\{\bar{Z}_1, \bar{Z}_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

So $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_i \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau) \subset \mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $C_1 \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbf{Z}$. By Proposition A.2, we see that $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i^{III}$ if and only if $C_1 \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbf{Z}$. Moreover, distinct values of C_1 and C_2 determine distinct coadjoint orbits of $\mathfrak{g}^*$. As these conditions are the same for both $\mathcal{T}_1^{III}$ and $\mathcal{T}_2^{III}$, we may assume $\mathcal{T}_1^{III} = \mathcal{T}_2^{III}$.

We now calculate multiplicities.

A basis for $\mathcal{L}_{1\tau} = log\bar{\Gamma}_1/(log\bar{\Gamma}_1 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau)$ is $\{2\bar{X}_1, 2\bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_2\}$. A basis for $\mathcal{L}_{2\tau} = log\bar{\Gamma}_2/(log\bar{\Gamma}_2 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau)$ is $\{\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, 2\bar{Y}_1, 2\bar{Y}_2\}$. In both cases, $\sqrt{detB_\tau} = 4{C_1}^2$. Thus for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1^{III} = \mathcal{T}_2^{III}$, the multiplicities $m_1(\tau)$ and $m_2(\tau)$ are equal. Hence the representations of $\bar{G}$ are unitarily equivalent, so the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1^{III}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^{III}$ are unitarily equivalent.

By Proposition 2.2,

$$1\text{-}spec^{III}(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = 1\text{-}spec^{III}(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g),$$

as desired.

Step 3.

We now show that for any eigenvalue in $1\text{-}spec^{II}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$, its multiplicity in $1\text{-}spec^{II}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ is always congruent to 0 modulo 4.

We first compute the multiplicity of the irreducible representations occurring here, using the same technique as in Step 2.

For all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i^{II}$, $\tau = A_1\alpha_1 + A_2\alpha_2 + B_1\beta_1 + B_2\beta_2 + C_2\zeta_2$ for some $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2, C_2 \in \mathbf{R}$ with $C_2 \neq 0$. We may again use Proposition A.2.

Now $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau = span_{\mathbf{R}}\{\bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}_1, \bar{Z}_1, \bar{Z}_2\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} log\bar{\Gamma}_1 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau &= log(exp(2\mathbf{Z}\bar{X}_2)exp(\mathbf{Z}\bar{Y}_1)exp(\mathbf{Z}\bar{Z}_1)exp(\mathbf{Z}\bar{Z}_2)) \\ &= span_{\mathbf{Z}}\{2\bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}_1, \bar{Z}_1, \bar{Z}_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

So $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_1 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau) \subset \mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $A_2 \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z},\ B_1 \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbf{Z}$.

However,

$$\begin{aligned} log\bar{\Gamma}_2 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau &= log(exp(\mathbf{Z}\bar{X}_2)exp(2\mathbf{Z}\bar{Y}_1)exp(\mathbf{Z}\bar{Z}_1)exp(\mathbf{Z}\bar{Z}_2)) \\ &= span_{\mathbf{Z}}\{\bar{X}_2, 2\bar{Y}_1, \bar{Z}_1, \bar{Z}_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

So $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_2 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau) \subset \mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $A_2 \in \mathbf{Z},\ B_1 \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbf{Z}$.

We now calculate $m_i(\tau)$. A basis for $\mathcal{L}_{1\tau} = log\bar{\Gamma}_1/(log\bar{\Gamma}_1 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau)$ is $\{2\bar{X}_1, \bar{Y}_2\}$. A basis for $\mathcal{L}_{2\tau} = log\bar{\Gamma}_2/(log\bar{\Gamma}_2 \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau)$ is $\{\bar{X}_1, 2\bar{Y}_2\}$. In both cases $\sqrt{detB_\tau} = 2|C_2|$.

Thus if τ is in $\mathcal{T}_i^{II}$, the irreducible representation π_τ occurs in the representation of G on $\mathcal{H}_i^{II}$ with multiplicity $2|C_2|$. As the integer $C_2 \neq 0$, the multiplicity must be even. Hence any eigenvalue of Δ acting on $\mathcal{H}_i^{II} \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ must occur in 1-$spec^{II}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ with multiplicity congruent to 0 modulo 2.

We now use the following.

Proposition A.3 (Gordon–Wilson, [GW1]**).** *Let G be a simply connected Lie group with left invariant metric g, and let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be cocompact, discrete subgroups of G. Let $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ be invariant subspaces of ρ_{Γ_1} and ρ_{Γ_2}, respectively. Denote by p-$spec'(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ the spectrum of Δ restricted to acting on $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \Lambda^p(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. Assume there exists an automorphism Φ of G such that*
(1) Φ is also an isometry of (G, g), and
(2) ρ_{Γ_1} restricted to $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\rho_{\Gamma_2} \circ \Phi$ restricted to $\mathcal{H}_2$ are unitarily equivalent, then

$$p\text{-}spec'(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = p\text{-}spec'(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g).$$

Here $\rho_{\Gamma_2} \circ \Phi$ is defined by $((\rho_{\Gamma_2} \circ \Phi)(x))f = f \circ R_{\Phi(x)}$ for x in G and f in $L^2(\Gamma_1\backslash G)$.

Let Φ be the Lie group automorphism of G defined on the Lie algebra level by

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &\to -X_1 \\ X_2 &\to X_2 \\ Y_1 &\to -Y_1 \\ Y_2 &\to Y_2 \\ Z_1 &\to Z_1 \\ Z_2 &\to -Z_2 \\ W &\to -W \end{aligned}$$

The automorphism Φ is also an isometry of (G, g). Note that $\tau \circ \Phi_* = -A_1\alpha_1 + A_2\alpha_2 - B_1\beta_1 + B_2\beta_2 - C_2\zeta_2$. Clearly, if τ satisfies Condition $(*)$ or $(**)$, then so does $\tau \circ \Phi_*$. A straightforward calculation shows that since $C_2 \neq 0$, the functionals τ and $\tau \circ \Phi_*$ are not in the same coadjoint orbit of $\mathfrak{g}^*$, so π_τ and $\pi_{\tau\circ\Phi_*}$ are not unitarily equivalent. Thus if π_τ occurs in $\mathcal{H}_i^{II}$ with multiplicity $2|C_2|$ then so does $\pi_{\tau\circ\Phi_*}$, also with multiplicity $2|C_2|$.

Note that by (2.3) $\pi_{\tau\circ\Phi_*} = \pi_\tau \circ \Phi$. Using Proposition A.3, any eigenvalue of Δ acting on $\mathcal{H}_\tau \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ must also occur as an eigenvalue of Δ acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\tau\circ\Phi_*} \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. And each of the representation spaces $\mathcal{H}_\tau$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\tau\circ\Phi_*}$ occurs in $\mathcal{H}_i^{II}$ with multiplicity $2|C_2|$. Consequently, the multiplicity of any eigenvalue in $spec^{II}(\Gamma_i\backslash G, g)$ is a multiple of $4|C_2|$, which is clearly congruent to 0 modulo 4, as desired.

Step 4.

We now show that the eigenvalue $\pi^2 + 1$ does not occur in 1-$spec^I(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ but occurs with multiplicity 2 in 1-$spec^I(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$.

For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1^I$ or $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2^I$, $\tau(\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}) \equiv 0$. We again use Proposition A.2 to calculate the irreducible representations occurring here. We write $\tau = A_1\alpha_1 + A_2\alpha_2 + B_1\beta_1 + B_2\beta_2$ for some $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \in \mathbf{R}$.

Now $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau = \bar{\mathfrak{g}}$, so $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_i \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau) \subset \mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_i) \subset \mathbf{Z}$.

Thus, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1^I$ if and only if

$$(*) \qquad A_1, A_2 \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z} \text{ and } B_1, B_2 \in \mathbf{Z},$$

and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2^I$ if and only if

$$(**) \qquad A_1, A_2 \in \mathbf{Z} \text{ and } B_1, B_2 \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_\tau$ be the associated representation space of π_τ. Then $\mathcal{H}_\tau$ may be viewed as the one-dimensional subspace of $L^2(\Gamma_i\backslash G)$ generated by (see Section 2):

$$F_\tau(exp(x_1X_1)exp(x_2X_2)exp(y_1Y_1)exp(y_2Y_2)exp(z_1Z_1)exp(z_2Z_2)exp(wW)) \\ = exp\{2\pi i\tau(x_1X_1 + x_2X_2 + y_1Y_1 + y_2Y_2)\}.$$

That is, $\mathcal{H}_\tau = \mathbf{C}F_\tau$.

We now calculate Δ acting on $\mathcal{H}_\tau \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. Note that if we let $\mathbf{C}\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ denote $\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ with complex coefficients, then

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*) = F_\tau \otimes \mathbf{C}\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*).$$

Let $F_\tau \otimes \mu \in F_\tau \otimes \mathbf{C}\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. Then $\mu = a_1\alpha_1 + a_2\alpha_2 + b_1\beta_1 + b_2\beta_2 + z_1\zeta_1 + z_2\zeta_2 + w\omega$ for some $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, z_1, z_2, w \in \mathbf{C}$.

As F_τ is independent of z_1, z_2, and w we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta F_\tau &= -X_1^2 F_\tau - X_2^2 F_\tau - Y_1^2 F_\tau - Y_2^2 F_\tau \\ &= 4\pi^2 (A_1^2 + A_2^2 + B_1^2 + B_2^2) F_\tau \\ &= 4\pi^2 S^2 F_\tau\end{aligned}$$

where $S^2 = A_1^2 + A_2^2 + B_1^2 + B_2^2$.

Let $*$ denote the Hodge-$*$ operator. One easily sees that $d * \mu = 0$ for all $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. Hence $\delta\mu = \pm * d * \mu = 0$ for all $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. Consequently $\Delta = \delta d$ on $\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$.

For $\mu \in \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$, $d\mu(U,V) = -\mu([U,V])$ for all $U, V \in \mathfrak{g}$. Using this fact together with the definition of δ as the metric adjoint of d, one easily computes that $\Delta\alpha_1 = \Delta\alpha_2 = \Delta\beta_1 = \Delta\beta_2 = 0$, $\Delta\zeta_1 = 2\zeta_1, \Delta\zeta_2 = \zeta_2$, and $\Delta\omega = 3\omega$.

To calculate $\Delta(F_\tau \otimes \mu)$, it remains to calculate

$$\nabla_{gradF_\tau}\mu = 2\pi i F_\tau (A_1 \nabla_{X_1}\mu + A_2 \nabla_{X_2}\mu + B_1 \nabla_{Y_1}\mu + B_2 \nabla_{Y_2}\mu).$$

For Lie algebras with a left invariant metric, the covariant derivatives can be calculated via the following equation:

$$< \nabla_U V, U' > = \frac{1}{2} < [U', U], V > + \frac{1}{2} < [U', V], U > + \frac{1}{2} < [U, V], U' >,$$

for U, V, U' left invariant vector fields of $\mathfrak{g}$. A simple calculation shows that $\nabla_U(V^\flat) = (\nabla_U V)^\flat$, where $V^\flat$ denotes the dual of V in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ with respect to our choice of orthonormal basis; that is, $V^\flat(U) =< V, U >$ for all U in $\mathfrak{g}^*$.

We thus obtain the following chart:

$\nabla_U \mu$	α_1	α_2	β_1	β_2	ζ_1	ζ_2	ω
X_1	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}\zeta_1$	$\frac{1}{2}\zeta_2$	$-\frac{1}{2}\beta_1 + \frac{1}{2}\omega$	$-\frac{1}{2}\beta_2$	$-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_1$
X_2	0	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}\zeta_1$	$-\frac{1}{2}\beta_2$	$\frac{1}{2}\omega$	$-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_2$
Y_1	$-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_1$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}\omega$	$\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}\beta_2$
Y_2	$-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_2$	$-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_1$	$-\frac{1}{2}\omega$	0	$\frac{1}{2}\alpha_2$	$\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$	$\frac{1}{2}\beta_1$

Using (A.1) and the above information, a straightforward calculation shows that if we let $E_\tau =$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 4\pi^2S^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2\pi iB_1 & -2\pi iB_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 4\pi^2S^2 & 0 & 0 & -2\pi iB_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4\pi^2S^2 & 0 & 2\pi iA_1 & 0 & -2\pi iB_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 4\pi^2S^2 & 2\pi iA_2 & 2\pi iA_1 & 2\pi iB_1 \\ 2\pi iB_1 & 2\pi iB_2 & -2\pi iA_1 & -2\pi iA_2 & 4\pi^2S^2+2 & 0 & 2\pi iA_1 \\ 2\pi iB_2 & 0 & 0 & -2\pi iA_1 & 0 & 4\pi^2S^2+1 & 2\pi iA_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 2\pi iB_2 & -2\pi iB_1 & -2\pi iA_1 & -2\pi iA_2 & 4\pi^2S^2+3 \end{pmatrix},$$

then $\Delta(F_\tau \otimes \mu) = \lambda(F_\tau \otimes \mu)$ if and only if λ is an eigenvalue of the matrix E_τ.

We now calculate necessary conditions on $\tau = A_1\alpha_1 + A_2\alpha_2 + B_1\beta_1 + B_2\beta_2$ so that $\pi^2 + 1$ is an eigenvalue of E_τ. As $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1^I$ or $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2^I$, we know $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \in \mathbf{Q}$. If $det(E_\tau - (\pi^2+1)I_7) = 0$, then π is the root of a polynomial with rational coefficients. However π is transcendental. Thus the coefficients of the powers of π must be zero.

A straightforward calculation shows that π^{14} is the highest power of π occurring in the polynomial, and the coefficient of π^{14} is equal to $(4S^2-1)^7$. Thus if π^2+1 is an eigenvalue of E_τ, then $S^2 = \frac{1}{4}$. Recall $S^2 = A_1^2 + A_2^2 + B_1^2 + B_2^2$.

For τ in $\mathcal{T}_1^I$, $S^2 = \frac{1}{4}$ if and only if (see $(*)$) $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$ or $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\alpha_2$. And for τ in $\mathcal{T}_2^I$, $S^2 = \frac{1}{4}$ if and only if (see $(**)$) $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\beta_1$ or $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\beta_2$.

For $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1, \tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\alpha_2$, or $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\beta_2$, a simple calculation shows that $det(E_\tau - (\pi^2+1)I_7) \neq 0$. Thus, the eigenvalue π^2+1 does not arise from the Laplacian acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1} \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$, $\mathcal{H}_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\alpha_2} \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$, or $\mathcal{H}_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\beta_2} \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$, and

$$\pi^2 + 1 \notin 1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g).$$

However for $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\beta_1$, $det(E_\tau - (\pi^2+1)I_7) = 0$. Thus π^2+1 is an eigenvalue for the Laplacian acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\beta_1} \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. Indeed, the eigenspace of π^2+1 in $\mathcal{H}^I \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ is

$$span_{\mathbf{C}}\{F_{\frac{1}{2}\beta_1} \otimes \zeta_2\ ,\ F_{-\frac{1}{2}\beta_1} \otimes \zeta_2\},$$

which has dimension 2.

Thus $\pi^2 + 1 \in 1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ with multiplicity 2, as desired.

The proof of Proposition 4.7 is now complete. ∎

Proposition 4.9. *The nilmanifolds $(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ and $(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ as presented in Example IV are not isospectral on one-forms.*

Proof of Proposition 4.9.

Again using the notation of Section 2, for $i = 1, 2$, let $\mathcal{T}_i$ be a subset of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ such that

$$L^2(\Gamma_i \backslash G) \cong \bigoplus_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau.$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{T}_i' \cup \mathcal{T}_i'' \cup \mathcal{T}_i'''$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_i' &= \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}) \equiv 0\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_i'' &= \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(\mathfrak{g}^{(2)}) \equiv 0, \tau(\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}) \not\equiv 0\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_i''' &= \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i : \tau(\mathfrak{g}^{(2)}) \not\equiv 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 4.7, decompose the representation spaces and spectrum accordingly.

By Lemma 3.4, the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1'''$ and $\mathcal{H}_2'''$ are unitarily equivalent and

$$1\text{-}spec'''(\Gamma_1 \backslash G, g) = 1\text{-}spec'''(\Gamma_2 \backslash G, g).$$

A calculation almost identical to Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 4.7 shows that the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1''$ and $\mathcal{H}_2''$ are unitarily equivalent. Thus

$$1\text{-}spec''(\Gamma_1 \backslash G, g) = 1\text{-}spec''(\Gamma_2 \backslash G, g).$$

It remains to show that $1\text{-}spec'(\Gamma_1 \backslash G, g) \neq 1\text{-}spec'(\Gamma_2 \backslash G, g)$. The proof of this corresponds to Step 4 in the proof of Proposition 4.7.

Let $\{\alpha_1, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma, \omega\}$ be the dual to the orthonormal basis $\{X_1, Y_1, Y_2, Z, W\}$ given in Example IV. For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i'$, $\tau = A_1\alpha_1 + B_1\beta_1 + B_2\beta_2$ for some $A_1, B_1, B_2 \in \mathbf{R}$. We again use Proposition A.2.

Now $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau = \bar{\mathfrak{g}}$. Hence $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_i \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau) \subset \mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_i) \subset \mathbf{Z}$.

Thus, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1^I$ if and only if

$$(*) \qquad A_1 \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad B_1, B_2 \in \mathbf{Z},$$

and, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2^I$ if and only if

$$(**) \qquad A_1, B_2 \in \mathbf{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad B_1 \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_\tau$ be the associated representation space of π_τ. As in the proof of Proposition 4.7, $\mathcal{H}_\tau \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*) = F_\tau \otimes \mathbf{C}\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} F_\tau(exp(x_1X_1)exp(y_1Y_1)exp(y_2Y_2)exp(zZ)exp(wW)) \\ = exp\{2\pi i\tau(x_1X_1 + y_1Y_1 + y_2Y_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $F_\tau \otimes \mu \in F_\tau \otimes \mathbf{C}\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ with $\mu = a_1\alpha_1 + b_1\beta_1 + b_2\beta_2 + z\zeta + w\omega$ for some $a_1, b_1, b_2, z, w \in \mathbf{C}$.

Then $\Delta F_\tau = 4\pi^2 S^2 F_\tau$ where $S^2 = A_1^2 + B_1^2 + B_2^2$. And $\Delta\alpha_1 = \Delta\beta_1 = \Delta\beta_2 = 0$, $\Delta\zeta = \zeta$ and $\Delta\omega = 2\omega$. We also obtain the following chart:

$\nabla_U \mu$	α_1	β_1	β_2	ζ	ω
X_1	0	$\frac{1}{2}\zeta$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}\beta_1 + \frac{1}{2}\omega$	$-\frac{1}{2}\zeta$
Y_1	$-\frac{1}{2}\zeta$	0	$\frac{1}{2}\omega$	$\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$	$-\frac{1}{2}\beta_2$
Y_2	0	$-\frac{1}{2}\omega$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}\beta_1$

Using (A.1) and the above information, if we let

$$E_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 4\pi^2 S^2 & 0 & 0 & -2\pi i B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4\pi^2 S^2 & 0 & 2\pi i A_1 & -2\pi i B_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 4\pi^2 S^2 & 0 & 2\pi i B_1 \\ 2\pi i B_1 & -2\pi i A_1 & 0 & 4\pi^2 S^2 + 1 & 2\pi i A_1 \\ 0 & 2\pi i B_2 & -2\pi i B_1 & -2\pi i A_1 & 4\pi^2 S^2 + 2 \end{pmatrix},$$

then $\Delta(F_\tau \otimes \mu) = \lambda(F_\tau \otimes \mu)$ if and only if λ is an eigenvalue of the matrix E_τ.

We calculate necessary conditions on $\tau = A_1\alpha_1 + B_1\beta_1 + B_2\beta_2$ so that $\pi^2 + 1$ is an eigenvalue of E_τ. As we assumed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1'$ or $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2'$, we know $A_1, B_1, B_2 \in \mathbf{Q}$. If $det(E_\tau - (\pi^2+1)I_5) = 0$, then π is the root of a polynomial with rational coefficients. However π is transcendental. Thus the coefficients of the powers of π must be zero.

A straightforward calculation shows that π^{10} is the highest power of π occurring in the polynomial, and the coefficient of π^{10} is equal to $(4S^2 - 1)^5$. Thus if $\pi^2 + 1$ is an eigenvalue of E_τ, then $S^2 = \frac{1}{4}$. Recall $S^2 = A_1^2 + B_1^2 + B_2^2$.

For τ in $\mathcal{T}_1'$, $S^2 = \frac{1}{4}$ if and only if (see $(*)$) $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$. And for τ in $\mathcal{T}_2'$, $S^2 = \frac{1}{4}$ if and only if (see $(**)$) $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\beta_1$.

For $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$, $det(E_\tau - (\pi^2+1)I_5) = 0$. The eigenspace of $\pi^2 + 1$ in $\mathcal{H}' \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ is

$$span_{\mathbf{C}}\{F_{\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1} \otimes (\pi i\beta_1 + \zeta + \pi i\omega),\ F_{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1} \otimes (\pi i\beta_1 - \zeta + \pi i\omega)\},$$

which has dimension 2. Thus $\pi^2 + 1 \in 1\text{-}spec'(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ with multiplicity two.

However, for $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{2}\beta_1$, $det(E_\tau - (\pi^2+1)I_5) \neq 0$. Thus $\pi^2 + 1$ cannot occur in $1\text{-}spec'(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ and

$$1\text{-}spec'(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) \neq 1\text{-}spec'(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g),$$

as desired.

The proof of Proposition 4.9 is now complete. ■

Proposition 4.11. *The nilmanifolds* $(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$ *and* $(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$ *as presented in Example V are not isospectral on one-forms.*

Proof of Proposition 4.11.

Using the notation of Section 2, for $i = 1, 2$, let $\mathcal{T}_i$ be a subset of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ such that

$$L^2(\Gamma_i\backslash G) \cong \bigoplus_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_i} m_i(\tau)\mathcal{H}_\tau.$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{T}_i^I \cup \mathcal{T}_i^{II} \cup \mathcal{T}_i^{III} \cup \mathcal{T}_i^{IV}$ be defined as in the proof of Proposition 4.7, and decompose the representation spaces and spectrum accordingly.

By Lemma 3.4, the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1^{IV}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^{IV}$ are unitarily equivalent and

$$1\text{-}spec^{IV}(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = 1\text{-}spec^{IV}(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g).$$

A calculation almost identical to that in Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 4.7 shows that the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1^{III}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^{III}$ are unitarily equivalent. Thus

$$1\text{-}spec^{III}(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = 1\text{-}spec^{III}(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g).$$

A calculation almost identical to that in Step 3 in the proof of Proposition 4.7 shows that the representations of G on $\mathcal{H}_1^{II}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^{II}$ are unitarily equivalent. Thus

$$1\text{-}spec^{II}(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) = 1\text{-}spec^{II}(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g).$$

It remains to show that $1\text{-}spec^{I}(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) \neq 1\text{-}spec^{I}(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$.

For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1^I$ or $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2^I$, $\tau(\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}) \equiv 0$. We again use Proposition A.2 to calculate the irreducible representations occurring here. Let $\{\epsilon_1, \cdots, \epsilon_7\}$ be the dual to the orthonormal basis $\{E_1, \cdots, E_7\}$ given in Example V. Then $\tau = A_1\epsilon_1 + A_2\epsilon_2 + A_3\epsilon_3 + A_4\epsilon_4$ for some $A_1, \cdots, A_4 \in \mathbf{R}$.

Now $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau = \bar{\mathfrak{g}}$. Hence $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_i \cap \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\tau) \subset \mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $\tau(log\bar{\Gamma}_i) \subset \mathbf{Z}$.

Thus, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1^I$ if and only if

$$(*) \qquad 2A_1 + A_2 - \frac{1}{4}A_3 + \frac{1}{2}A_4 \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad 2A_2 + \frac{1}{2}A_3 \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad \text{and} \quad A_3, A_4 \in \mathbf{Z}.$$

And $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2^I$ if and only if

$$(**) \qquad 2A_1 + A_2 + \frac{1}{4}A_3 + \frac{1}{2}A_4 \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad 2A_2 + \frac{1}{2}A_3 \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad \text{and} \quad A_3, A_4 \in \mathbf{Z}.$$

Note that the only distinction between the two conditions is in the sign of $\frac{1}{4}A_3$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_\tau$ be the associated representation space of π_τ. As in the proof of Proposition 4.7, $\mathcal{H}_\tau \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*) = F_\tau \otimes \mathbf{C}\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} &F_\tau(exp(e_1E_1)exp(e_2E_2)exp(e_3E_3)exp(e_4E_4)exp(e_5E_5)exp(e_6E_6)exp(e_7E_7)) \\ &\qquad = exp\{2\pi i\tau(e_1E_1 + e_2E_2 + e_3E_3 + e_4E_4)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $F_\tau \otimes \mu \in F_\tau \otimes \mathbf{C}\Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ with $\mu = a_1\epsilon_1 + a_2\epsilon_2 + a_3\epsilon_3 + a_4\epsilon_4 + a_5\epsilon_5 + a_6\epsilon_6 + a_7\epsilon_7$ for some $a_i \in \mathbf{C}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, 7$. As in the proof of Proposition 4.7, $\Delta F_\tau = 4\pi^2S^2F_\tau$ where $S^2 = A_1^2 + A_2^2 + A_3^2 + A_4^2$. Also, $\Delta\epsilon_1 = \Delta\epsilon_2 = \Delta\epsilon_3 = \Delta\epsilon_4 = 0$, $\Delta\epsilon_5 = 2\epsilon_5$, $\Delta\epsilon_6 = \epsilon_6 + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon_7$, and $\Delta\epsilon_7 = \frac{1}{4}\epsilon_6 + (3 + \frac{1}{256} + \frac{3}{16})\epsilon_7$. And we obtain the following chart:

$\nabla_U\mu$	ϵ_1	ϵ_2	ϵ_3	ϵ_4	ϵ_5	ϵ_6	ϵ_7
E_1	0	$-\frac{1}{32}\epsilon_7$	$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_5 + \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_7$	$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_6 + \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_7$	$-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_3 + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_7$	$-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_4$	$\frac{1}{32}\epsilon_2 - \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_3 - \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_4 - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_5$
E_2	$\frac{1}{32}\epsilon_7$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_5 - \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_7$	$-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_4$	$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_7$	$-\frac{1}{32}\epsilon_1 + \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_4 - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_6$
E_3	$-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_5 - \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_7$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_7$	$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_1$	0	$\frac{1}{8}\epsilon_1 - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_4$
E_4	$-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_6 - \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_7$	$-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_5 + \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_7$	$-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_7$	0	$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_2$	$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_1$	$\frac{1}{8}\epsilon_1 - \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_2 + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_3$

Using (A.1) and the above information, a straightforward calculation shows that if we let E_τ be the skew-Hermitian matrix defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 4\pi^2S^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2\pi iA_3 & 2\pi iA_4 & \pi i(-\frac{1}{8}A_2 + \frac{1}{2}A_3 + \frac{1}{2}A_4) \\ & 4\pi^2S^2 & 0 & 0 & 2\pi iA_4 & 0 & \pi i(\frac{1}{8}A_1 - \frac{1}{2}A_4) \\ & & 4\pi^2S^2 & 0 & -2\pi iA_1 & 0 & \pi i(-\frac{1}{2}A_1 + 2A_4) \\ & & & 4\pi^2S^2 & -2\pi iA_2 & -2\pi iA_1 & \pi i(-\frac{1}{2}A_1 + \frac{1}{2}A_2 - 2A_3) \\ & & & & 4\pi^2S^2 + 2 & 0 & -2\pi iA_1 \\ & & & & & 4\pi^2S^2 + 1 & -2\pi iA_2 + \frac{1}{4} \\ & & & & & & 4\pi^2S^2 + \frac{817}{256} \end{pmatrix}$$

then $\Delta(F_\tau \otimes \mu) = \lambda(F_\tau \otimes \mu)$ if and only if λ is an eigenvalue of the matrix E_τ.

Let

$$\lambda = \frac{17}{4}\pi^2 + 1 + \sqrt{\frac{17}{4}\pi^2 + 1}.$$

We now calculate necessary conditions on $\tau = A_1\epsilon_1 + A_2\epsilon_2 + A_3\epsilon_3 + A_4\epsilon_4$ so that λ is an eigenvalue of E_τ. As $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1^I$ or $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2^I$, we know $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 \in \mathbf{Q}$.

By a computation using Maple or Mathematica, if $det(E_\tau - \lambda I_7) = 0$, then π is the root of a polynomial with rational coefficients. However π is transcendental. Thus the coefficients of the powers of π must be zero.

A straightforward calculation shows that π^{14} is the highest power of π occurring in the polynomial, and the coefficient of π^{14} is equal to $(4S^2 - \frac{17}{4})^7$. Thus if λ is an eigenvalue of E_τ, then $S^2 = \frac{17}{16}$. Recall that $S^2 = A_1^2 + A_2^2 + A_3^2 + A_4^2$.

For τ in $\mathcal{T}_1^I$, $S^2 = \frac{17}{16}$ if and only if (see $(*)$) $\tau = \pm(\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3)$ or $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_1 \pm \epsilon_4$. And for τ in $\mathcal{T}_2^I$, $S^2 = \frac{17}{16}$ if and only if (see $(**)$) $\tau = \pm(\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3)$ or $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_1 \pm \epsilon_4$. Note that the only difference is in the sign of ϵ_3.

For $\tau = \pm(\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3)$ or $\tau = \pm\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_1 \pm \epsilon_4$, a calculation using Maple or Mathematica shows that $det(E_\tau - \lambda I_7) \neq 0$. Thus $\frac{17}{4}\pi^2 + 1 + \sqrt{\frac{17}{4}\pi^2 + 1} \notin 1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g)$.

However, for $\tau = \pm(\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3)$, $det(E_\tau - \lambda I_7) = 0$. Thus $\frac{17}{4}\pi^2 + 1 + \sqrt{\frac{17}{4}\pi^2 + 1}$ is an eigenvalue for the Laplacian acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\pm(\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3)} \otimes \Lambda^1(\mathfrak{g}^*)$, and $\frac{17}{4}\pi^2 + 1 + \sqrt{\frac{17}{4}\pi^2 + 1} \in 1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g)$.

Consequently
$$1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_1\backslash G, g) \neq 1\text{-}spec^I(\Gamma_2\backslash G, g),$$
as desired.

The proof of Proposition 4.11 is now complete. ∎

References

[B1] P. Bérard, *Spectral Geometry: Direct and Inverse Problems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1207, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.

[B2] ———, *Variétes Riemanniennes isospectrales non isométriques*, Astérisque **177–178** (1989), 127–154.

[BWb] P. Bérard and D.L. Webb, *One cannot hear the orientability of surfaces*, preprint (1994).

[BGM] M. Berger, P. Gauduchon, and E. Mazet, *Le spectre d'une variété Riemannienne*, Lecture notes in Mathematics, vol. 194, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.

[BG] R. Brooks and C. Gordon, *Isospectral families of conformally equivalent Riemannian metrics*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **23 no. 2** (1990), 433–436.

[BT] R. Brooks and R. Tse, *Isospectral surfaces of small genus*, Nagoya Math. J. **107** (1987), 13–24.

[Bu] P. Buser, *Isospectral Riemann surfaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **36** (1986), 167–192.

[C] I. Chavel, *Eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry*, Acad. Press, 1984.

[CS] J.H. Conway and N.J. Sloane, *Four-dimensional lattices with the same theta series*, Internat. Math. Research Notices (Duke Math. J.) no. 4 (1992), 93–96.

[CG] L. Corwin and F.P. Greenleaf, *Representations of Nilpotent Lie Groups and Their Applications; Part 1: Basic Theory and Examples*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1990.

[DG1] D. DeTurck and C. S. Gordon, *Isospectral Deformations I: Riemannian structures on two-step nilspaces*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **40** (1987), 367–387.

[DG2] ———, *Isospectral Deformations II: trace formulas, metrics, and potentials*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **42** (1989), 1067–1095.

[E] P. Eberlein, *Geometry of two-step nilpotent groups with a left invariant metric*, Ann. Sci. de l'Ecole Norm. Sup. (1993) (to appear).

[GHL] S. Gallot, D. Hulin, and J. Lafontaine, *Riemannian Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.

[G1] C.S. Gordon, *The Laplace spectra versus the length spectra of Riemannian manifolds*, Contemporary Mathematics **51** (1986), 63–79.

[G2] ———, *Riemannian manifolds isospectral on functions but not on 1-forms*, J. Diff. Geom. **24** (1986), 79–96.

[G3] ———, *Isospectral closed Riemannian manifolds which are not locally isometric*, J. Diff. Geom. **37** (1993), 639–649.

[G4] ———, *Isospectral closed Riemannian manifolds which are not locally isometric:II*, in Contemporary Mathematics, volume on Spectral Geometry; R. Brooks, C.S. Gordon, P. Perry, eds., AMS (1994) (to appear).

[GO] C.S. Gordon and He Ouyang, *Continuous families of quasi-regular representations of nilpotent Lie groups*, preprint (1992).

[GWb1] C.S. Gordon and D. Webb, *Isospectral convex domains in the hyperbolic plane*, Proc. AMS **120 No. 3** (1994), 981–983.

[GWb2] ———, *Isospectral convex domains in Euclidean space*, Math. Research Letters (1994) (to appear).

[GWW] C.S. Gordon, D. Webb, and S. Wolpert, *Isospectral plane domains and surfaces via Riemannian orbifolds*, Invent. Math. **110** (1992), 1–22.

[GW1] C.S. Gordon and E.N.Wilson, *Isospectral deformations of compact solvmanifolds*, J. Differential Geometry **19** (1984), 241–256.

[GW2] ———, *The spectrum of the Laplacian on Riemannian Heisenberg manifolds*, Mich. Math. J. **33** (1986), 253–271.

[GW3] ———, private communication, article in preparation.

[Gt1] Ruth Gornet, *Equivalence of quasi-regular representations of two and three-step nilpotent Lie groups*, J. of Functional Analysis **119 No. 1** (Jan. 1994), 121–137.

[Gt2] ———, *The length spectrum and representation theory on two and three-step nilpotent Lie groups*, in Contemporary Mathematics, volume on Spectral Geometry; R. Brooks, C.S. Gordon, P. Perry, eds., AMS (1994) (to appear).

[Gt3] ———, *Spectral geometry on higher-step Riemannian nilmanifolds*, Ph.D. Thesis, Washington University in St. Louis (1993).

[Gt4] ———, *The marked length spectrum, the Laplace spectrum, and the p-form spectrum of Riemannian nilmanifolds*, in preparation (1994).

[GK] V. Guillemin and D. Kazhdan, *Proc. Symp. Pure Math., Geometry of the Laplace Operator*, vol. 36, Amer. Math. Soc., 1980, pp. 153–180.

[H] R. Howe, *On Frobenius reciprocity for unipotent algebraic groups over Q*, Amer. J. of Math. **93** (1971), 163–172.

[I1] A. Ikeda, *Isospectral problem for spherical space forms*, in "Spectra of Riemannian Manifolds," ed. by M. Berger, S. Murakami and T. Ochiai (1983), Kaigai Publications, 57–63.

[I2] ———, *Riemannian manifolds p-isospectral but not $(p+1)$-isospectral*, preprint (1989).

[K] M. Kac, *Can one hear the shape of a drum?*, Amer. Math. Monthly **73 part II** (1966), 1–23.

[M] J. Milnor, *Eigenvalues of the Laplace operator on certain manifolds*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **51** (1964), 542.

[MW] C. C. Moore and J. A. Wolf, *Square integrable representations of nilpotent groups*, Trans. of AMS **185** (1973), 445–462.

[O] He Ouyang, *On isospectral rigidity of deformations on two-step nilmanifolds*, preprint (1991).

[P1] Hubert Pesce, *Déformations isospectrales de certaines nilvariétés et finitude spectrale des variétés de Heisenberg*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **25** (1992), 515–538.

[P2] ———, *Calcul du spectre d'une nilvariété de rang deux et applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **339** (1993), 433–461.

[P3] ———, *Une formule de Poisson pour les variétés de Heisenberg*, C.R. Acad. Sci. (to appear).

[P4] ———, *Representations de groupes et variétés riemanniennes isospectrales*, in Contemporary Mathematics, volume on Spectral Geometry; R. Brooks, C.S. Gordon, P. Perry, eds., AMS (1994) (to appear).

[Ra] M.S. Raghunathan, *Discrete Subgroups of Lie Groups*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1972.

[R] L.F. Richardson, *Decomposition of the L^2-space of a general compact nilmanifold*, Amer. J. Math. **93** (1970), 173–190.

[S] T. Sunada, *Riemannian coverings and isospectral manifolds*, Ann. of Math. **121** (1985), 169–186.

[Sz1] Z. Szabo, *Spectral theory for operator families on Riemannian manifolds*, preprint (1991).

[Sz2] ———, *Locally nonisometric yet strongly isospectral manifolds*, in preparation.

[U] H. Urakawa, *Bounded domains which are isospectral but not congruent*, Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup. **15** (1982), 441-456.

[V] M. F. Vignéras, *Variétés Riemanniennes isospectrales et non isométriques*, Ann. of Math. **112** (1980), 21–32.

Ruth Gornet; Texas Tech University; Department of Mathematics; Lubbock, Texas 79409-1042; email: gornet@math.ttu.edu September 1994