

## BOUNDS FOR MULTIPLICITIES OF AUTOMORPHIC REPRESENTATIONS

PETER SARNAK AND XIAOXI XUE

1. Let  $G$  be a semisimple Lie group of noncompact type and  $\Gamma$  an arithmetic lattice in  $G$ . This paper is concerned with bounding from above the multiplicity  $m(\pi, \Gamma)$  with which  $\pi \in \hat{G}$  occurs in the decomposition of the regular representation of  $G$  on  $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G)$ . By arithmetic we mean that  $G$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$  (or a number field  $E/\mathbb{Q}$ ),  $\Gamma \subset G(\mathbb{Q})$  and there is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -embedding  $\rho: G \rightarrow GL(n, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $\rho(\Gamma)$  is commensurable with  $G(\mathbb{Z}) = \rho(G) \cap GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ . Using this realization, we obtain “congruence” subgroups  $\Gamma(q)$  of  $\Gamma$  by setting

$$\Delta(q) = \{g \in G(\mathbb{Z}) \mid g \equiv I(q)\} \tag{1}$$

and

$$\Gamma(q) = \rho^{-1}(\rho(\Gamma) \cap \Delta(q)). \tag{2}$$

Our main goal is to develop upper bounds for  $m(\pi, \Gamma(q))$  for  $\pi$  fixed and  $q \rightarrow \infty$ . Besides the intrinsic interest in this problem, there are two interesting applications.

(1) If  $\pi$  contributes to cohomology theory via Matsushima’s formula [B-W] (when  $\Gamma \backslash G$  is compact), our upper bounds give nontrivial upper bounds for the Betti numbers of  $\Gamma(q)$ .

(2) By combining these bounds with representation theory of the finite group  $G(\mathbb{Z})/\Delta(q)$ , we can, under certain circumstances, prove that for certain  $\pi \in \hat{G}$

$$m(\pi, \Gamma(q)) = 0. \tag{3}$$

That is an “arithmetic vanishing theorem”. These correspond to Ramanujan like bounds on the spectrum of  $\Gamma(q) \backslash G$  [S].

Fix cocompact  $\Gamma$  as above. The trivial upper bound is

$$m(\pi, \Gamma(q)) \ll V(q) \tag{4}$$

where  $V(q) = [\Gamma, \Gamma(q)]$ . The notation  $A(q) \ll B(q)$  means  $|A(q)| \leq cB(q)$  for some constant independent of  $q$ .

In fact, (4) is sharp if  $\pi$  is in the discrete series; see DeGeorge-Wallach [D-W]. On the other hand, (4) is way off when  $\pi$  is the trivial representation. What emerges from this work is the following simple conjecture which interpolates between these

Received 25 March 1991. Revision received 22 April 1991.