

*Pacific  
Journal of  
Mathematics*

THE WEYL QUANTIZATION OF POISSON  $SU(2)$

ALBERT JEU-LIANG SHEU

Volume 173 No. 1

March 1996

## THE WEYL QUANTIZATION OF POISSON $SU(2)$

ALBERT JEU-LIANG SHEU

In this paper, we consider the problem of quantizing the canonical multiplicative Poisson structure on  $SU(2)$  by  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation, a notion introduced by Rieffel, and show that there is such a deformation which is also a coalgebra homomorphism. Parallel to the algebraic development of quantum group theory, Woronowicz successfully quantized the group structure of  $SU(2)$  (and other groups) through deformation in the context of Hopf  $C^*$ -algebras. It is known that there exists a  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization of the multiplicative Poisson structure on  $SU(2)$  which is 'compatible' with Woronowicz's deformation (of the group structure) on the  $C^*$ -algebra level. Although that deformation preserves the important symplectic leaf structure on  $SU(2)$  in a natural way, it does not preserve the group structure in the sense that it is not a coalgebra homomorphism. We show that the Weyl transformation introduced by Dubois-Violette gives a different  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization which is compatible with Woronowicz's deformation and does preserve the group structure.

### 1. Introduction.

In recent years, there has been a fast growing interest in the theory of deformation quantization (initiated in [Ge], [BFFLS]), which fits nicely with the concept of non-commutative geometry [C1]. There are many papers in this area using different approaches, either analytic, algebraic, geometric, or physical, and some of them have an extensive reference list [R5], [Wo2], [K], [Gi], [Dr], [We-X]. We refer readers to these sources for a broad overview.

It is known [Sh1] that there exists a  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization, a concept introduced by Rieffel [R1], of the multiplicative Poisson structure on  $SU(2)$  [Lu-We] which is compatible with Woronowicz's  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization of the group structure on  $SU(2)$  [Wo1], in the sense that the  $C^*$ -algebras obtained in these two processes are isomorphic. This result shows that on the algebra level, the multiplicative Poisson structure can be deformed in a way compatible with the deformed group structure of  $SU(2)$  during quantization.

However, Rieffel's **[R1]**, **[R2]**, **[R3]** and Woronowicz's **[Wo1]**, **[Wo2]** formulations of (deformation) quantization are different in one aspect, i.e. in Rieffel's formulation most of the smooth functions (on the Poisson manifold) must be explicitly deformed to specific operators (or elements in a  $C^*$ -algebra) for each Plank constant  $h$ , but Woronowicz's formulation only requires explicit deformation of (finitely many) generators of the commutative function algebra (of the manifold) so that the deformed generators satisfy some specific commutation relations. It is highly desirable to have a Rieffel's deformation of the Poisson  $SU(2)$  which when restricted to those generators satisfies Woronowicz's commutation relations. But the deformation found in **[Sh1]** does not seem to have this property. Furthermore, since the coalgebra structure gives the group (action) structure, it is also desired to have a deformation which respects the coalgebra structure. It is now known that the above deformation is not a coalgebra homomorphism **[Sh4]**.

In **[Du]**, an interesting correspondence called the Weyl transformation from regular functions on  $SU(2)$  to elements of the algebra  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  of "functions" on the twisted  $SU(2)$  **[Wo1]** is proposed, and is shown to be a coalgebra isomorphism. In this paper, we show that this Weyl transformation gives indeed a  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization of the Poisson  $SU(2)$ . One obvious advantage of this deformation is that its restriction to the generators of  $C(SU(2))$  gives exactly the deformed generators in Woronowicz's theory and hence establishes a direct link between Rieffel's and Woronowicz's deformation theories on the Poisson Lie group  $SU(2)$ . This strengthens our claim in **[Sh1]** that the group structure and the Poisson structure on  $SU(2)$  are not only compatible on the classical level, but also compatible on the quantum level, since now they are not only compatible globally (i.e. as algebras) but also locally (i.e. for individual functions on  $SU(2)$ ).

Comparing the deformation quantizations obtained here and in **[Sh1]**, we have the following remark. In **[Sh1]**, the deformation quantization is obtained by a (symplectic) "leaf-wise" quantization through pseudo-differential operators and hence is "leaf-preserving" in the sense to be explained in Section 5. This property allows us to view the quantization as giving some kind of singular foliation  $C^*$ -algebra **[Sh3]** resembling the important example of foliation operator algebras in non-commutative geometry **[C2]**. Moreover the approach used there, now, fits nicely in the far more general framework developed in **[R5]** which is involved with external  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -actions. All these show some advantage in that approach. However, that approach does not work well with the internal  $SU(2)$ -action or the comultiplication structure **[Sh4]**. On the other hand, the  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization obtained in this paper is compatible with Woronowicz's quantization of group

structure, and with the internal  $SU(2)$ -action and hence the comultiplication on  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  [Du]. But it applies to an algebra (consisting of regular functions) smaller than the algebra of smooth functions dealt with by the earlier approach, and it is not “leaf-preserving” with respect to the foliation of  $SU(2)$  by symplectic leaves.

The author would like to dedicate this paper to the memory of Professor John W. Bunce, an honorable colleague and mathematician whose contribution in the theory of  $C^*$ -algebras, for example, the Bunce-Deddens algebra, is already a fundamental part of the theory. After this paper was written, we received Bauval’s preprint [B] with similar results. However the concepts of universal Poisson algebra and leaf-wise deformation quantization introduced in this paper are not discussed there.

### 2. Quantum $SU(2)$ .

In this section, we shall realize the  $C^*$ -algebra family  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  of twisted  $SU(2)$ , introduced and studied by Woronowicz in [Wo1], as a continuous field of  $C^*$ -algebras.

Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be the universal  $C^*$ -algebra generated by  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\nu$ , subject to the relations

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha^* \alpha + \gamma \gamma^* &= 1, & \alpha \alpha^* + \nu^2 \gamma \gamma^* &= 1, \\ \alpha \gamma &= \nu \gamma \alpha, & \alpha \gamma^* &= \nu \gamma^* \alpha, \\ \gamma \gamma^* &= \gamma^* \gamma, & \nu \alpha &= \alpha \nu, & \nu \gamma &= \gamma \nu, \\ \nu^* &= \nu, & \nu \nu^* &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the  $C^*$ -algebra  $C^*(\nu)$  generated by  $\nu$  is a central subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}$ . It is well known that  $C([-1, 1])$  is the universal  $C^*$ -algebra generated by a self-adjoint element of norm bounded by 1, and hence there is a homomorphism from  $C([-1, 1])$  to  $\mathbf{A}$  identifying the identity function  $id : \mu \mapsto \mu$  with  $\nu$ . On the other hand, the universality of  $\mathbf{A}$  implies the existence of a homomorphism sending  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\nu$  to 1, 0, and  $id$  in  $C([-1, 1])$ , respectively. From this observation, it is clear that  $C^*(\nu) \cong C([-1, 1])$ .

Let  $\mathcal{I}_\mu = \{f \in C([-1, 1]) \mid f(\mu) = 0\}$  for  $\mu \in [-1, 1]$ . Then the surjective homomorphism  $\pi_\mu : \mathbf{A} \rightarrow C(S_\mu U(2))$  sending  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\nu$  to  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\mu$ , respectively, factors through  $\mathbf{A}/(\mathcal{I}_\mu \mathbf{A})$  and hence induces a homomorphism  $\pi'_\mu : \mathbf{A}/(\mathcal{I}_\mu \mathbf{A}) \rightarrow C(S_\mu U(2))$ . We use the same symbols  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$  to denote the generators of  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  for all  $\mu$ . Hopefully the context will clarify any possible ambiguity. When  $\mu = 1$ ,  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  is identified with  $C(SU(2))$  so that  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$  are identified with the canonical coordinate functions on  $SU(2)$  sending  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix}$  in  $SU(2)$  to  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$  respectively, and in this case,  $\alpha^* = \bar{\alpha}$ ,

$\gamma^* = \bar{\gamma}$ . But by the universality of  $C(S_\mu U(2))$ , there is a homomorphism sending  $\alpha, \gamma$  in  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  to the classes of  $\alpha, \gamma$  in  $\mathbf{A}/(\mathcal{I}_\mu \mathbf{A})$ , respectively, which can be easily seen to be an (the) inverse of  $\pi'_\mu$ . So we have  $\mathbf{A}/(\mathcal{I}_\mu \mathbf{A}) \cong C(S_\mu U(2))$ .

Thus by Proposition 1.2 of [R4], the family  $\{C(S_\mu U(2))\}_{\mu \in [-1,1]}$  is an upper semi-continuous field of  $C^*$ -algebras over  $[-1, 1]$  with  $\mu \mapsto \|\pi_\mu(a)\|$  upper semi-continuous for any  $a \in \mathbf{A}$ . Furthermore, since  $C([-1, 1])$  is unital,  $\mathbf{A} = C([-1, 1])\mathbf{A}$  is identified with a maximal algebra of cross sections of  $\{C(S_\mu U(2))\}_{\mu \in [-1,1]}$  by identifying  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$  with the map  $\mu \mapsto \{\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\}_{\mu \in [-1,1]}$ .

Next we would like to show the lower semi-continuity of the field  $\{C(S_\mu U(2))\}_{\mu \in [-1,1]}$ . In order to do so, it is helpful, as suggested in [R4], to have a concrete faithful representation of  $\mathbf{A}$  disintegrated into a field of representations of  $C(S_\mu U(2))$ .

First there is a well-known faithful representation  $\sigma_\mu$  of  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  with  $|\mu| < 1$  which realizes  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  in  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  as the operators

$$\sigma_\mu(\alpha) = 1 \otimes \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{1 - \mu^{2k}} e_{k,k+1} \right)$$

and

$$\sigma_\mu(\gamma) = \tau \otimes \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu^{k-1} e_{k,k} \right)$$

on the Hilbert space  $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \otimes \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ , where  $\tau$  is the multiplication operator on  $L^2(\mathbb{T})$  by the identity map  $e^{i\theta}$  on the unit circle  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $e_{i,j}$  is the matrix element on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$  sending the canonical basis  $\delta_k$  to  $\delta_i$  if  $k = j$  and to 0 if  $k \neq j$ . Since  $\sigma_\mu(\alpha)$  and  $\sigma_\mu(\gamma)$  are norm continuous in  $\mu$ , it is easy to see that  $\sigma_\mu(a)$  is norm continuous and hence  $\|\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\|$  is continuous in  $\mu \in (-1, 1)$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$ . So we only need to show the lower semi-continuity at  $\mu = 1$ .

In [Wo1], Woronowicz showed that  $\pi_\mu(\alpha^k \gamma^n \gamma^{*m})$  and  $\pi_\mu(\alpha^{*k} \gamma^n \gamma^{*m})$  form a linear basis of the smooth algebra  $C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$  of regular functions on the twisted pseudogroup  $S_\mu U(2)$  [V-So], i.e. the  $*$ -algebra generated by  $\alpha, \gamma$  (algebraically) in  $C(S_\mu U(2))$ , for  $\mu \in (0, 1]$ , and there exists a faithful state  $h_\mu$ , the Haar measure, on  $C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$  satisfying

$$(2) \quad h_\mu((\gamma^* \gamma)^m) = \frac{1 - \mu^2}{1 - \mu^{2m+2}}$$

and

$$(3) \quad h_\mu(\alpha^k \gamma^n \gamma^{*m}) = h_\mu(\alpha^{*k} \gamma^n \gamma^{*m}) = 0$$

for  $k \neq 0$ , or  $n \neq m$ , for  $0 < \mu < 1$ . Since  $h_\mu$  is faithful,  $C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$  is embedded in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  and the simple  $C^*$ -algebra  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  is represented faithfully by extensions of multiplication operators on  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ , through the GNS construction [P]. Let  $\sigma_\mu$  be these representations. Clearly  $\alpha^k \gamma^n \gamma^{*m}$  and  $\alpha^{*k} \gamma^n \gamma^{*m}$  with  $k, m, n$  nonnegative integers form a complete linearly independent set in each  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ .

The identification of a point  $(\alpha, \gamma)$  in the unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  with  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha - \bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma \ \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \in SU(2)$  gives an identification of the Lebesgue measure on the sphere with the Haar measure on  $SU(2)$  (up to the constant factor  $1/(8\pi^2)$ ). In fact, using the parametrization of  $\mathbb{S}^3$  by  $\Psi : \mathbb{D} \times [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3$  sending  $(\alpha, \theta)$  to  $(\alpha, \gamma) = (\alpha, \sqrt{1 - |\alpha|^2} e^{i\theta})$ , we can verify that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^3} \alpha^k \gamma^n \bar{\gamma}^m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \neq 0, \text{ or } n \neq m \\ \frac{2\pi^2}{n+1} & \text{if } k = 0 \text{ and } n = m. \end{cases}$$

So the normalized Haar measure  $h_1$  on  $SU(2)$  satisfies that

$$(4) \quad h_1(\alpha^k \gamma^n \bar{\gamma}^m) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \neq 0, \text{ or } n \neq m \\ \frac{1}{n+1} & \text{if } k = 0 \text{ and } n = m. \end{cases}$$

Similarly the above equation holds when  $\alpha$  is replaced by  $\bar{\alpha}$ . Note that the faithful Haar measure  $h_1$  on  $C(SU(2))$  gives rise to the canonical faithful representation  $\sigma_1$  of  $C(SU(2))$  on  $\mathcal{H}_1 = L^2(SU(2), h_1)$  by multiplication operators.

From Equations 2, 3, and 4, we have

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} h_\mu(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})) = h_1(\pi_1(\mathbf{a}))$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \langle \pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}), \pi_\mu(\mathbf{b}) \rangle_\mu &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} h_\mu(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{b})^* \pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})) = \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} h_\mu(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{b}^* \mathbf{a})) \\ (5) \quad &= h_1(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{b}^* \mathbf{a})) = h_1(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{b})^* \pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})) = \langle \pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}), \pi_\mu(\mathbf{b}) \rangle_1 \end{aligned}$$

for any linear combinations  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$  of  $\alpha^k \gamma^n \gamma^{*m}$ 's and  $\alpha^{*k} \gamma^n \gamma^{*m}$ 's, where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\mu$  is the inner product on  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ .

Observe that for any  $\mathbf{a}$  in the  $*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  generated by  $\nu, \alpha$  and  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{a}$  is a linear combination of monomials in  $\nu, \alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*$ , and  $\gamma^*$ , there are (finitely many) nonnegative integers  $k_i, k'_j, n_i, n'_j, m_i, m'_j$  (independent of

$\mu$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\pi_\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^k\boldsymbol{\gamma}^n\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{*m}) &= \sum_i f_i(\mu, \mu^{-1})\pi_\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{k_i}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{n_i}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{*m_i}) \\ &\quad + \sum_j g_j(\mu, \mu^{-1})\pi_\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{*k'_j}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{n'_j}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{*m'_j}) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\mu \in (0, 1]$  with  $f_i, g_j$  polynomials in two variables, because of the commutation relations in Equation 1. Similar formula holds for

$$\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\pi_\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{*k}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^n\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{*m}),$$

too. Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a linear space with basis  $B$  consisting of finitely many monomials of the form  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^k\boldsymbol{\gamma}^n\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{*m}$  or  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{*k}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^n\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{*m}$ , and let  $\mathcal{K}_\mu$  be  $\pi_\mu(\mathcal{K})$  embedded in  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ . By the above observation, it is easy to see that there is a suitably large  $\mathcal{K}'$  with basis  $B'$  consisting of monomials of the form  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^k\boldsymbol{\gamma}^n\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{*m}$  or  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{*k}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^n\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{*m}$  such that  $\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\pi_\mu(\mathcal{K}) \subset \pi_\mu(\mathcal{K}')$  and hence  $\sigma_\mu(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}))\mathcal{K}_\mu \subset \mathcal{K}'_\mu$ . With respect to the bases  $\pi_\mu(B)$  and  $\pi_\mu(B')$  embedded in  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ , the entries in the matrix representation of  $\sigma_\mu(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}))$  are polynomials  $f_{i,j}(\mu, \mu^{-1})$  which are clearly continuous in  $\mu \in (0, 1]$ . Since  $\mathcal{K}_\mu, \mathcal{K}'_\mu$  are finite dimensional with inner products satisfying Equation 5, we have

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \|\sigma_\mu(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}))\|_{B(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \mathcal{K}'_\mu)} = \|\sigma_1(\pi_1(\mathbf{a}))\|_{B(\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}'_1)}.$$

Since  $\|\pi_1(\mathbf{a})\| = \|\sigma_1(\pi_1(\mathbf{a}))\|_{B(\mathcal{H}_1)}$  can be approximated by

$$\|\sigma_1(\pi_1(\mathbf{a}))\|_{B(\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}'_1)}$$

with sufficiently large  $\mathcal{K}$  and

$$\|\sigma_\mu(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}))\|_{B(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \mathcal{K}'_\mu)} \leq \|\sigma_\mu(\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}))\|_{B(\mathcal{H}_\mu)} = \|\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\|,$$

we get  $\|\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\|$  lower semi-continuous at  $\mu = 1$ . Since linear combinations of monomials in  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}$  are dense in  $\mathbf{A}$ , the conclusion holds for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$ .

Summarizing, we have

**Theorem 1.** *The universal  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  is identified with a maximal algebra of cross sections of  $\{C(S_\mu U(2))\}_{\mu \in [-1, 1]}$  by the map  $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \{\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\}_{\mu \in [-1, 1]}$ . The family  $\{C(S_\mu U(2))\}_{\mu \in [-1, 1]}$  is an upper semi-continuous field of  $C^*$ -algebras over  $[-1, 1]$  with  $\mu \mapsto \|\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\|$  continuous in  $\mu \in (-1, 1]$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$ .*

After this paper was written up, the author learned that G. Nagy has obtained results which generalize the above theorem (c.f. [N]).

Since our goal is to find a deformation quantization of  $SU(2)$ , we are only interested in the behavior of  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  for  $\mu$  close to 1, and so in the rest of this paper we shall fix an  $\epsilon > 0$  and add

$$(6) \quad \nu \geq \epsilon$$

to the identities in Equation 1. We use the same notion  $\mathbf{A}$  to denote the corresponding universal  $C^*$ -algebra. Then it is easy to see that the above argument still works and  $\mathbf{A}$  is identified with a maximal algebra of cross sections of  $\{C(S_\mu U(2))\}_{\mu \in [\epsilon, 1]}$  by the map  $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \{\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\}_{\mu \in [\epsilon, 1]}$ . The family  $\{C(S_\mu U(2))\}_{\mu \in [\epsilon, 1]}$  is a continuous field of  $C^*$ -algebras over  $[\epsilon, 1]$  with  $\mu \mapsto \|\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a})\|$  continuous on  $[\epsilon, 1]$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$ . Note that the generator  $\nu$  is now invertible in  $\mathbf{A}$ . So we now use  $\mathcal{A}$  to denote the  $*$ -algebra generated by  $\nu, \nu^{-1}, \alpha$ , and  $\gamma$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ .

### 3. Weyl transformation.

Let  $\mathcal{I} = C([\epsilon, 1])$  be the  $C^*$ -subalgebra generated by  $\nu$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then we denote by  $\mathbf{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{I}} \mathbf{A}$  the tensor algebra  $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{A}$  modulo the ideal generated by  $\nu \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \nu$ . It is easy to see that  $f\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a} \otimes f\mathbf{b}$  in  $\mathbf{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{I}} \mathbf{A}$  for any  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{A}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{I}$ . As in [Wo1], by the universality of  $\mathbf{A}$  we can define the comultiplication  $\Phi : \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{I}} \mathbf{A}$  on the algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  as the  $C^*$ -algebra homomorphism determined by

$$\Phi(\alpha) = \alpha \otimes \alpha - \nu\gamma^* \otimes \gamma$$

and

$$\Phi(\gamma) = \gamma \otimes \alpha + \alpha^* \otimes \gamma.$$

Applying the commutation relation  $\alpha\gamma^* = \nu\gamma^*\alpha$  to the first factor in the tensor product, we can easily see that, for  $n \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq k \leq n$ ,

$$\Phi(\alpha^{n-k}\gamma^{*k}) = (\alpha \otimes \alpha - \nu\gamma^* \otimes \gamma)^{n-k} (\gamma^* \otimes \alpha^* + \alpha \otimes \gamma^*)^k$$

is of the form

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \alpha^{n-i}\gamma^{*i} \otimes \omega_{ik}^n$$

where  $\omega_{ik}^n$  is a finite  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear sum of monomials in the elements  $\nu, \nu^{-1}, \alpha, \alpha^*, \gamma$ , and  $\gamma^*$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ . (Although there may be several such representations of  $\omega_{ik}^n$ , we fix one for each  $\omega_{ik}^n$  throughout the discussion.) For example, we have

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_{00}^0 &= 1, & \omega_{00}^1 &= \alpha, \\ \omega_{10}^1 &= -\nu\gamma, & \omega_{11}^2 &= \alpha\alpha^* - \gamma\gamma^*, \\ \omega_{02}^2 &= \gamma^{*2}, & \omega_{12}^2 &= \nu\alpha^*\gamma^* + \nu^{-1}\alpha^*\gamma^*. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that  $\{\pi_\mu(\omega_{ik}^n) \mid n \geq 0, 0 \leq i, k \leq n\}$  is the set of matrix elements of all the canonical irreducible quantum group representations of  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  found in [Wo1].

In [Du], a notion of Weyl transformation  $W_h$  is proposed. In the next section, we shall show that this transformation actually defines a  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization of the Poisson  $SU(2)$  in the sense of Rieffel [R1]. Here we recall its definition. It is well known that a regular function  $f$  on  $SU(2)$  can be written in a unique way as a linear combination  $\sum_{n,i,k} \hat{f}_{ik}^n \pi_1(\omega_{ik}^n)$  of the orthogonal matrix elements  $\pi_1(\omega_{ik}^n) \in L^2(SU(2))$  of the irreducible representations of  $SU(2)$ , where

$$\hat{f}_{ik}^n = \|\pi_1(\omega_{ik}^n)\|_2^{-2} \int_{SU(2)} f \pi_1(\omega_{ik}^n)$$

are the Fourier coefficients of  $f$ . The Weyl transformation defined in [Du] (see the remark following Theorem 2) when restricted to the case of  $SU(2)$  is the linear map  $W_h : C(SU(2))^\infty \rightarrow C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$  with  $\mu = e^{-h/2}$  and

$$(8) \quad W_h(f) = \sum_{n,i,k} \hat{f}_{ik}^n \pi_\mu(\omega_{ik}^n).$$

By Theorem 3.1 of [Du],  $W_h$  is a coalgebra isomorphism. Note that we may define a linear map  $W : C(SU(2))^\infty \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$  by

$$W(f) = \sum_{n,i,k} \hat{f}_{ik}^n \omega_{ik}^n$$

and then we have  $W_h = \pi_\mu \circ W$ .

Summarizing, we have

**Theorem 2** (Dubois-Violette and Woronowicz). *The Weyl transformation  $W_h : C(SU(2))^\infty \rightarrow C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$  defined by  $W_h = \pi_\mu \circ W$  where  $W : C(SU(2))^\infty \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$  is defined by*

$$W \left( \sum_{n,i,k} c_{ik}^n \pi_1(\omega_{ik}^n) \right) = \sum_{n,i,k} c_{ik}^n \omega_{ik}^n$$

*is a coalgebra isomorphism for each  $h = -2 \ln(\mu)$ . In particular,  $W_1 = \pi_1 \circ W$  is the identity map on  $C(SU(2))^\infty$ .*

We remark that in [Du], the term, Weyl transformation, is reserved for more restrictive transforms defined in the same way, but using only irreducible unitary representations to get the matrix elements  $\omega_{ik}^n$ . It can be shown that the irreducible representations  $\omega^n$  which we use here can be

unitarized by conjugating the matrices  $(\omega_{ik}^n)_{ik}$  by some invertible diagonal matrices with entries in  $C([\epsilon, 1])$  (actually polynomials of  $\nu$  and  $\nu^{-1}$ ). We denote the matrix elements of the irreducible unitary representations constructed in this way by  $u_{ik}^n$ .

The proof of our result on deformation quantization of Poisson  $SU(2)$ , namely, Theorem 3, does not depend on the choice of the representatives of irreducible representations in defining Weyl transformations. That is, we can define  $W_h$  using  $u_{ik}^n$ 's instead of  $\omega_{ik}^n$ 's. One reason for using only unitary irreducible representations to define Weyl transformations in [Du] is probably the claim made there saying that there are suitable "consistent" choices of the representatives of an irreducible unitary representation and its (presumably non-equivalent) conjugate irreducible unitary representation, the Weyl transformations will be  $*$ -preserving. This claim may actually be wrong since each of the unitary irreducible representations  $\pi_\mu(u^n)$  mentioned above and its conjugate representation are in the same equivalent class of representations, and there is no way to make "consistent" choices of representatives to make the Weyl transform  $*$ -preserving. So the claim in [Du] that the Weyl transformation is a  $*$ -coalgebra isomorphism is not true here.

#### 4. Universal Poisson algebras.

In this section, we consider the idea of noncommutative Poisson algebras for the convenience of later discussion. Usually, a Poisson algebra refers to a commutative algebra  $P$  with a Lie bracket  $\{\cdot, \cdot\} : P \times P \rightarrow P$  such that  $\{a, \cdot\}$  and  $\{\cdot, a\}$  are derivations of  $P$ , i.e.

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \{a, bc\} &= \{a, b\}c + b\{a, c\}, \\ \{ab, c\} &= \{a, c\}b + a\{b, c\}, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $a, b, c \in P$ . But this definition does not need the commutativity of  $P$  in order to make sense. In fact, a (noncommutative) algebra  $A$  endowed with the commutator bracket  $[a, b] = ab - ba$  for  $a, b \in A$  is an example. So in this paper, Poisson algebra need not be commutative.

We consider the concept of universal Poisson algebra  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  generated by elements in a set  $S$  (with no additional relations imposed). More precisely,  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  is a Poisson algebra endowed with an embedding (i.e. an injection)  $\iota : S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$  such that any function from  $S$  to a Poisson algebra  $A$  extends uniquely to a Poisson algebra homomorphism from  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  to  $A$ . Such a universal Poisson algebra is clearly unique up to isomorphism. Actually it exists and can be constructed in the following way. We take one representative from each congruence class of morphisms  $f : S \rightarrow A_f$ , where  $f$  is a function,  $A_f$  is a Poisson algebra which has no proper Poisson subalgebra containing  $f(S)$ , and two such morphisms  $f, g$  are congruent if there

is a Poisson algebra isomorphism  $h : A_f \rightarrow A_g$  such that  $g = h \circ f$ . Let  $P$  be the Poisson algebra direct product  $\prod_{[f]} A_f$  with exactly one  $A_f$  from each congruence class  $[f]$ . Then we define  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  to be the smallest Poisson subalgebra of  $P$  containing all  $\prod_{[f]} f(s)$ ,  $s \in S$ . Because the free (noncommutative) algebra generated by elements of  $S$  is such an  $A_f$  containing a faithful copy of  $S$ , the Poisson algebra  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  is well-defined and clearly satisfies the universality condition. It seems to be plausible but yet is not clear how to construct such universal Poisson algebra using the constructions of free Lie algebras and the enveloping algebras of Lie algebras.

Let  $a_i, b_j$  be some generators in  $S \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ . Then by repeated applications of Equation 9, we can check that  $\{a_1 a_2 \dots a_m, b_1 b_2 \dots b_n\}$  is a finite sum of monomials of the form  $s_1 s_2 \dots s_k \{s_0, s_0\} t_1 t_2 \dots t_l$  with  $s_i, t_j$  generators in  $S$ . In fact,

$$\{a_1 a_2 \dots a_m, b_1 b_2 \dots b_n\} = \sum a_1 a_2 \dots a_{i-1} b_1 b_2 \dots b_{j-1} \{a_i, b_j\} b_{j+1} \dots b_n a_{i+1} \dots a_m.$$

Note that, for each pair of monomials  $a = a_1 a_2 \dots a_m$  and  $b = b_1 b_2 \dots b_n$ , this finite sum expression of their Poisson bracket is not unique. But we shall fix one summation formula

$$(10) \quad p(a, b) = \sum s_1 s_2 \dots s_k \{s_0, t_0\} t_1 t_2 \dots t_l$$

for each pair of monomials  $a, b$  in the generators of  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  where  $s, t$  are finite sequences of generators in  $S$  of various lengths. Note that by the universality of  $\mathcal{P}(S)$ , given any surjection  $F : S \rightarrow X$  with  $X$  a set of algebra generators of a Poisson algebra  $A$ , then for any pair of monomials  $x, y$  in elements of  $X$ , we can find monomials  $a, b$  in elements of  $S$  such that

$$\{x, y\} = \phi(p(a, b)),$$

where  $\phi$  is the unique Poisson algebra homomorphism from  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  to  $A$  extending the function  $F$ . In fact, any monomials  $a$  and  $b$  with  $\phi(a) = x$  and  $\phi(b) = y$  satisfy  $\phi(p(a, b)) = \phi(\{a, b\}) = \{\phi(a), \phi(b)\} = \{x, y\}$ .

### 5. Weyl quantization of Poisson $SU(2)$ .

It was shown in [Lu-We] that there is a Poisson structure on  $SU(2)$  compatible with the group structure, in the sense that the multiplication  $m : SU(2) \times SU(2) \rightarrow SU(2)$  is a Poisson map where  $SU(2) \times SU(2)$  is endowed with the product Poisson structure. We refer readers to [We] for the theory of Poisson manifolds.

We first give a definition of a C\*-algebraic deformation quantization in Rieffel's sense [R1].

**Definition 1.** Given a Poisson manifold  $(M, \{\cdot, \cdot\})$  and a smooth Poisson algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  (of functions on  $M$ ), i.e. a (sup-norm) dense Poisson \*-subalgebra of  $C_b^\infty(M) \subset C_b(M)$ , a family of linear surjections  $\rho_h : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_h$  with  $0 \leq h < \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$  is called a C\*-algebraic deformation quantization of  $\mathcal{A}$  if

(1) each  $\mathcal{A}_h$  is a \*-subalgebra of a C\*-algebra  $A_h$  with  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}$  and  $\rho_0$  the identity map,

(2)  $\|\rho_h(f)\|$  is continuous in  $h \in [0, \delta]$  for any fixed  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

(3)  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|\rho_h(f^*) - \rho_h(f)^*\| = 0$  for any  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

(4)  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|\rho_h(f)\rho_h(g) - \rho_h(fg)\| = 0$  for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

(5)  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|(ih)^{-1}[\rho_h(f), \rho_h(g)] - \rho_h(\{f, g\})\| = 0$  for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$ .

In the following, with  $\mu = e^{-h/2}$ , we take  $A_h = C(S_\mu U(2))$  and  $\mathcal{A}_h = C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$ , the \*-algebra generated by  $\alpha, \gamma$  in  $C(S_\mu U(2))$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0$  is the algebra of regular functions on  $SU(2)$ . We claim that

$$\rho_h = W_h : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_h \subset C(S_\mu U(2))$$

defines a C\*-algebraic deformation quantization of  $\mathcal{A}_0$ .

Clearly (1) in Definition 1 is satisfied, and Theorem 1 implies that  $\|W_h(f)\| = \|\pi_\mu(W(f))\|$  is continuous in  $\mu \in [\epsilon, 1]$  and hence in  $h \in [0, -\ln(\epsilon)]$ , which is condition (2) in Definition 1.

Since  $W(f)W(g) - W(fg)$  is in  $\mathcal{A}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|W_h(f)W_h(g) - W_h(fg)\| &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \|\pi_\mu(W(f)W(g) - W(fg))\| \\ &= \|\pi_1(W(f)W(g) - W(fg))\| = \|\pi_1(W(f))\pi_1(W(g)) - \pi_1(W(fg))\| \\ &= \|fg - fg\| = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. So condition (3) is satisfied.

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|W_h(\bar{f}) - W_h(f)^*\| &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \|\pi_\mu(W(\bar{f})) - \pi_\mu(W(f)^*)\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \|\pi_\mu(W(\bar{f}) - W(f)^*)\| = \|\pi_1(W(\bar{f}) - W(f)^*)\| \\ &= \|\pi_1(W(\bar{f})) - \pi_1(W(f))^*\| = \|\bar{f} - f^*\| = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, since  $W(\bar{f}) - W(f)^*$  is in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\pi_1$  is a \*-homomorphism. (Note that  $W$  and  $W_h$  are not \*-preserving except for  $h = 0$ .) So condition (4) is verified.

Now it remains to show condition (5). First we get some basic result on the limit behaviour of  $(ih)^{-1}[\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}), \pi_\mu(\mathbf{b})]$  for generators  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}, \gamma, \bar{\gamma}\}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Recall that the Poisson 2-tensor  $\pi$  on  $SU(2)$  is given by

$$\pi \left( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right) = 2^{-1}i \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & -\bar{\alpha} \end{bmatrix} \wedge \begin{bmatrix} -c\alpha & -\bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma & -c\bar{\alpha} \end{bmatrix}$$

(up to a constant factor) where  $c = \frac{1 - |\alpha|^2}{|\alpha|^2} = \frac{|\gamma|^2}{|\alpha|^2}$  [Sh2]. Let us make explicit the brackets of the generators  $\alpha$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\bar{\gamma}$  of  $C(SU(2))^\infty$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \{\alpha, \gamma\} &= \pi \left( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right) \cdot (d\alpha \wedge d\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}i\gamma\alpha, \\ \{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\} &= \pi \left( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right) \cdot (d\alpha \wedge d\bar{\alpha}) = -i\gamma\gamma^*, \\ \{\alpha, \bar{\gamma}\} &= \pi \left( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right) \cdot (d\alpha \wedge d\bar{\gamma}) = \frac{1}{2}i\bar{\gamma}\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\{\gamma, \bar{\gamma}\} = \pi \left( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right) \cdot (d\gamma \wedge d\bar{\gamma}) = 0.$$

The others can be gotten from these three since the Poisson bracket on  $SU(2)$  commutes with the conjugation and is alternating.

For each pair  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  of generators  $\alpha$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\bar{\gamma}$ , we fix an element  $\psi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying

$$\pi_1(\psi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})) = \{\pi_1(\mathbf{a}), \pi_1(\mathbf{b})\}.$$

(For the convenience of presentation, we choose the obvious lifts  $\psi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  of  $\{\pi_1(\mathbf{a}), \pi_1(\mathbf{b})\}$  suggested by the above formulae for brackets of generators in  $C(SU(2))^\infty$ , although the choice of  $\psi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  does not affect the following claim, Equation 11, which we need later.) For example, we set  $\psi(\alpha, \gamma) = \frac{1}{2}i\gamma\alpha$ .

We claim that

$$(11) \quad \lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \|(i\hbar)^{-1}[\pi_\mu(\mathbf{a}), \pi_\mu(\mathbf{b})] - \pi_\mu(\psi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}))\| = 0$$

for any pair  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  of generators  $\alpha$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\bar{\gamma}$ .

In fact, by noting that

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \frac{2i(1 - \mu)}{i\hbar} = 1$$

and using the commutation relations in Equation 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| (ih)^{-1} [\pi_\mu(\alpha), \pi_\mu(\gamma)] - \pi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2} i\gamma\alpha \right) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu([\alpha, \gamma]) - \pi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2} i\gamma\alpha \right) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu(\alpha\gamma - \gamma\alpha) - \pi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2} i\gamma\alpha \right) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu((\nu - 1)\gamma\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} i\pi_\mu(\gamma\alpha) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| -(2i)^{-1} \pi_\mu(\gamma\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} i\pi_\mu(\gamma\alpha) \right\| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| (ih)^{-1} [\pi_\mu(\alpha), \pi_\mu(\alpha^*)] - \pi_\mu(-i\gamma\gamma^*) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu([\alpha, \alpha^*]) - \pi_\mu(-i\gamma\gamma^*) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu(\alpha\alpha^* - \alpha^*\alpha) + \pi_\mu(i\gamma\gamma^*) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu((1 - \nu^2)\gamma\gamma^*) + \pi_\mu(i\gamma\gamma^*) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i)^{-1} (1 + \mu) \pi_\mu(\gamma\gamma^*) + \pi_\mu(i\gamma\gamma^*) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| \pi_\mu(((2i)^{-1} (1 + \mu) + i)\gamma\gamma^*) \right\| = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| (ih)^{-1} [\pi_\mu(\alpha), \pi_\mu(\gamma^*)] - \pi_\mu \left( \frac{1}{2} i\gamma^*\alpha \right) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu([\alpha, \gamma^*]) - \frac{1}{2} i\pi_\mu(\gamma^*\alpha) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu(\alpha\gamma^* - \gamma^*\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} i\pi_\mu(\gamma^*\alpha) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| (2i(1 - \mu))^{-1} \pi_\mu((\nu - 1)\gamma^*\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} i\pi_\mu(\gamma^*\alpha) \right\| \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \left\| -(2i)^{-1} \pi_\mu(\gamma^*\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} i\pi_\mu(\gamma^*\alpha) \right\| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly Equation 11 holds for the pair  $(\gamma, \bar{\gamma})$  since  $[\gamma, \bar{\gamma}] = 0$  in  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  for each  $\mu \neq 1$  and  $\psi(\gamma, \bar{\gamma}) = 0$ . Now Equation 11 holds for other pairs of generators, too, since all the Poisson brackets involved here commute with the adjoint operation and are alternating. So we get Equation 11 verified.

Consider the universal Poisson algebras  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  with four free generators in  $S = \{\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\alpha}^*, \tilde{\gamma}^*\}$ . Let  $\phi$  ( resp.  $\phi_\mu$ ) be the Poisson algebra homomorphism from  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  to the Poisson algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  ( resp.  $C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$ ) extending the map sending  $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\alpha}^*, \tilde{\gamma}^*$  to  $\alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*, \gamma^*$ , ( resp.  $\alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*, \gamma^*$ ) respectively. We note that

$$(12) \quad \phi_\mu = \pi_\mu \circ \phi$$

on the subalgebra generated by  $S$  in  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  for all  $\mu$  since  $\pi_\mu, \phi_\mu$ , and  $\phi$  are algebra homomorphisms, and on  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  for  $\mu < 1$  since the Poisson brackets on  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  with  $\mu < 1$  come from the algebra commutator bracket and hence  $\pi_\mu, \phi_\mu$ , and  $\phi$  are Poisson algebra homomorphisms. For each monomial  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*$ , and  $\gamma^*$ , we fix a unique monomial  $\tilde{x}$  in elements of  $S$  such that  $\phi(\tilde{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  be monomials in  $\alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*$ , and  $\gamma^*$  with  $a = \tilde{x}$ , and  $b = \tilde{y}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \{\pi_\mu(\eta\mathbf{x}), \pi_\mu(\zeta\mathbf{y})\}_\mu &= \eta(\mu)\zeta(\mu)\{\pi_\mu(\phi(a)), \pi_\mu(\phi(b))\}_\mu \\ &= \eta(\mu)\zeta(\mu)\{\phi_\mu(a), \phi_\mu(b)\}_\mu = \eta(\mu)\zeta(\mu)\phi_\mu(\{a, b\}) \\ &= \eta(\mu)\zeta(\mu)\phi_\mu(p(a, b)) = \eta(\mu)\zeta(\mu)\phi_\mu\left(\sum_{s,t} s_1 s_2 \dots s_k \{s_0, t_0\} t_1 t_2 \dots t_l\right) \\ &= \eta(\mu)\zeta(\mu) \sum_{s,t} \phi_\mu(s_1 \dots s_k) \{\phi_\mu(s_0), \phi_\mu(t_0)\}_\mu \phi_\mu(t_1 \dots t_l) \\ &= \eta(\mu)\zeta(\mu) \sum_{s,t} \pi_\mu(\phi(s_1 \dots s_k)) \{\pi_\mu(\phi(s_0)), \pi_\mu(\phi(t_0))\}_\mu \pi_\mu(\phi(t_1 \dots t_l)) \\ &= \eta(\mu)\zeta(\mu) \sum_{s,t} \pi_\mu(\mathbf{s}) \{\pi_\mu(\mathbf{s}_0), \pi_\mu(\mathbf{t}_0)\}_\mu \pi_\mu(\mathbf{t}) \end{aligned}$$

by the fact that  $\phi_\mu$  is a Poisson algebra homomorphism for any  $\mu$ , where  $s_i, t_j$  are in  $S$  as defined in Equation 10,  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\mu$  is the Poisson bracket on  $\mathcal{A}_h = C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$ ,  $\mathbf{s} = \phi(s_1 \dots s_k)$  and  $\mathbf{t} = \phi(t_1 \dots t_l)$  are monomials in  $\alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*$ , and  $\gamma^*$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and  $\mathbf{s}_0 = \phi(s_0)$  and  $\mathbf{t}_0 = \phi(t_0)$  are from  $\{\alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*, \gamma^*\}$ . In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\pi_1(\eta\mathbf{x}), \pi_1(\zeta\mathbf{y})\}_1 \\ &= \eta(1)\zeta(1) \sum_{s,t} \pi_1(\mathbf{s}) \{\pi_1(\mathbf{s}_0), \pi_1(\mathbf{t}_0)\}_1 \pi_1(\mathbf{t}) \\ &= \eta(1)\zeta(1) \sum_{s,t} \pi_1(\mathbf{s}) \pi_1(\psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0)) \pi_1(\mathbf{t}) \\ (13) \quad &= \pi_1\left(\sum_{s,t} \eta(1)\zeta(1) \mathbf{s} \psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0) \mathbf{t}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that each  $\omega_{ik}^n$  is a finite sum  $\sum \eta \mathbf{x}$  of monomials  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*$ , and  $\gamma^*$  with coefficients  $\eta \in C([\epsilon, 1]) \subset \mathbf{A}$ . So any two elements  $f$  and  $g$  of  $\mathcal{A}_0 = C(SU(2))^\infty$  are now written as finite sums  $\sum_i \pi_1(\eta_i \mathbf{x}_i)$  and  $\sum_j \pi_1(\zeta_j \mathbf{y}_j)$  with  $\eta_i, \zeta_j \in C([\epsilon, 1])$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_j$  monomials.

Before we proceed to finish the proof, we observe that if elements  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  satisfy  $\pi_1(\mathbf{a}) = \pi_1(\mathbf{b})$  then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|W_h(\pi_1(\mathbf{a})) - \pi_\mu(\mathbf{b})\| &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \|\pi_\mu(W(\pi_1(\mathbf{a})) - \mathbf{b})\| \\ &= \|\pi_1(W(\pi_1(\mathbf{a})) - \mathbf{b})\| = \|\pi_1(\mathbf{a}) - \pi_1(\mathbf{b})\| = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. With this in mind, we get, for  $f = \sum_i \pi_1(\eta_i \mathbf{x}_i)$  and  $g = \sum_j \pi_1(\zeta_j \mathbf{y}_j)$ ,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| W_h(\{f, g\}) - \pi_\mu \left( \sum_{i,j} \sum_{s,t} \eta_i \zeta_j \mathbf{s} \psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0) \mathbf{t} \right) \right\| = 0$$

because

$$\begin{aligned} W_h(\{f, g\}) &= W_h \left( \sum_{i,j} \{ \pi_1(\eta_i \mathbf{x}_i), \pi_1(\zeta_j \mathbf{y}_j) \} \right) \\ &= W_h \left( \pi_1 \left( \sum_{i,j} \sum_{s,t} \eta_i(1) \zeta_j(1) \mathbf{s} \psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0) \mathbf{t} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

by Equation 13. Here, in each summand,  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}_0$  all depend on the corresponding pair  $(i, j)$ . Now in order to prove condition (5), we only need to show

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| (ih)^{-1} \{W_h(f), W_h(g)\}_\mu - \pi_\mu \left( \sum_{i,j} \sum_{s,t} \eta_i(\mu) \zeta_j(\mu) \mathbf{s} \psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0) \mathbf{t} \right) \right\| = 0,$$

which is verified in

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| (ih)^{-1} \{W_h(f), W_h(g)\}_\mu - \pi_\mu \left( \sum_{i,j} \sum_{s,t} \eta_i \zeta_j \mathbf{s} \psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0) \mathbf{t} \right) \right\| \\
 &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| (ih)^{-1} \sum_{i,j} \{ \pi_\mu(\eta_i \mathbf{x}_i), \pi_\mu(\zeta_j \mathbf{y}_j) \}_\mu \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \sum_{i,j} \sum_{s,t} \eta_i(\mu) \zeta_j(\mu) \pi_\mu(\mathbf{s}) \pi_\mu(\psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0)) \pi_\mu(\mathbf{t}) \right\| \\
 &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| (ih)^{-1} \sum_{i,j} \eta_i(\mu) \zeta_j(\mu) \sum_{s,t} \pi_\mu(\mathbf{s}) \{ \pi_\mu(\mathbf{s}_0), \pi_\mu(\mathbf{t}_0) \}_\mu \pi_\mu(\mathbf{t}) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \sum_{i,j} \sum_{s,t} \eta_i(\mu) \zeta_j(\mu) \pi_\mu(\mathbf{s}) \pi_\mu(\psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0)) \pi_\mu(\mathbf{t}) \right\| \\
 &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left\| \sum_{i,j} \sum_{s,t} \eta_i(\mu) \zeta_j(\mu) \pi_\mu(\mathbf{s}) ((ih)^{-1} \{ \pi_\mu(\mathbf{s}_0), \pi_\mu(\mathbf{t}_0) \}_\mu \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \pi_\mu(\psi(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{t}_0)) \pi_\mu(\mathbf{t}) \right\| = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

by Equation 11.

**Theorem 3.** *The Weyl transformations  $W_h : C(SU(2))^\infty \rightarrow C(S_\mu U(2))^\infty$  form a  $C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization of the Poisson algebra  $C(SU(2))^\infty$  of regular functions on the Poisson Lie group  $SU(2)$ .*

It is not hard to check that the above proof works well for a quite general class of transformations, and in particular, if we replace  $\omega_{ik}^n$ 's by  $\mathbf{u}_{ik}^n$ 's in defining the Weyl transformations, Theorem 3 still holds. The same technique used in this paper seems to work for other Poisson Lie groups, especially the twisted  $SU(n)$ 's, on which the author is currently investigating.

We remark that this Weyl deformation quantization of Poisson  $SU(2)$  is not a “leaf-preserving” quantization (with respect to the canonical symplectic foliation [We] of the Poisson  $SU(2)$ ) in contrast with the deformation quantization  $\mathcal{W}_h : C^\infty(SU(2)) \rightarrow C(S_\mu U(2))$  found in [Sh1], which is leaf-preserving in the sense that if  $f = g$  on a symplectic leaf  $L$  of  $SU(2)$  then  $\pi_L(\mathcal{W}_h(f)) = \pi_L(\mathcal{W}_h(g))$  where  $\pi_L$  is the irreducible representation of the  $C^*$ -algebra  $C(S_\mu U(2))$  naturally associated with the leaf  $L$  [V-So]. In fact, we can actually find explicitly a regular function  $f$  on  $SU(2)$  vanishing on

a specific symplectic leaf  $L$  such that  $\pi_L(W_h(f)) \neq 0$  for all  $h \neq 0$ . For example,

$$f = \alpha\bar{\alpha} - \gamma\bar{\gamma} + 2\bar{\gamma}^2 - 1$$

is a regular function on  $SU(2)$  vanishing on the symplectic leaf

$$L_0 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\bar{\gamma} \\ \gamma & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \in SU(2) : |\alpha| < 1 \text{ and } \gamma > 0 \right\}.$$

But

$$\pi_{L_0}(W_h(f)) = (1 - \mu^2) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu^{2(k-1)} e_{k,k} \neq 0$$

for all  $h \neq 0$ . Finally, we note that this example is still valid when the Weyl transformation is defined by using  $u_{ik}^n$ 's instead of  $\omega_{ik}^n$ 's, so the unitarized version is still not leaf-preserving.

## References

- [B] A. Bauval, *Quantum group- and Poisson- deformation of  $SU(2)$* , preprint.
- [BFFLS] F. Bayen, M. Flato, C. Fronsdal, A. Lichnerowicz and D. Sternheimer, *Deformation theory and quantization*, I, II, Ann. Physics, **110** (1978), 61-110, 111-151.
- [C1] A. Connes, *Non-commutative differential geometry*, I and II, Publ. I.H.E.S., **62** (1985), 257-360.
- [C2] ———, *A survey of foliation and operator algebras*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. Vol. 38, Part I, AMS, Providence, 1982, 521-628.
- [Dr] V.G. Drinfeld, *Quantum groups*, Proc. I.C.M. Berkeley 1986, Vol. 1, 789-820, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1987.
- [Du] M. Dubois-Violette, *On the theory of quantum groups*, Lett. Math. Phys., **19** (1990), 121-126.
- [Ge] M. Gerstenhaber, *On the deformation of rings and algebras*, Ann. Math., **79** (1964), 59-103.
- [Gi] A. Giaquinto, *Deformation Methods in quantum groups*, preprint.
- [K] H.T. Koelink, *On \*-representations of the Hopf \*-algebra associated with the quantum group  $U_q(n)$* , Compositio Mathematica, **77** (1991), 199-231.
- [Lu-We] J.H. Lu and A. Weinstein, *Poisson Lie groups, dressing transformations and Bruhat decompositions*, J. Diff. Geom., **31** (1990), 501-526.
- [N] G. Nagy, *On the Haar measure of the quantum  $SU(N)$  group*, Comm. Math. Phys., **153** (1993), 217-228.
- [P] G.K. Pedersen, *C\*-algebras and their Automorphism Groups*, Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [R1] M.A. Rieffel, *Deformation quantization and operator algebras*, in "Proc. Symp. Pure Math., Vol. 51", AMS, Providence, 1990, 411-423.
- [R2] ———, *Deformation quantization of Heisenberg manifolds*, Comm. Math. Phys., **122** (1989), 531-562.

- [R3] ———, *Lie group convolution algebras as deformation quantization of linear Poisson structures*, Amer. J. Math., **112** (1990), 657-686.
- [R4] ———, *Continuous fields of  $C^*$ -algebras coming from group cocycles and actions*, Math. Ann., **283** (1989), 631-643.
- [R5] ———, *Deformation quantization for actions of  $\mathbb{R}^d$* , Memoirs AMS, **106(506)** (1993).
- [Sh1] A.J.L. Sheu, *Quantization of the Poisson  $SU(2)$  and its Poisson homogeneous space - the 2-sphere*, Comm. Math. Phys., **135** (1991), 217-232.
- [Sh2] ———, *Quantum Poisson  $SU(2)$  and quantum Poisson spheres*, in "Deformation Theory and Quantum Groups with Applications to Mathematical Physics", M. Gerstenhaber and J.D. Stasheff (Eds.), Contemporary Math. Vol. 134, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1992, 247-258.
- [Sh3] ———, *Some examples of singular foliation  $C^*$ -algebras*, in "Current Topics in Operator Algebras", H. Araki et al (Eds.), World Scientific, Singapore, 1991, 326-340.
- [Sh4] ———, *Leaf-preserving quantizations of Poisson  $SU(2)$  are not coalgebra homomorphisms*, Comm Math Phys., **172** (1995), 287-292.
- [V-So] L.L. Vaksman and Ya.S. Soibelman, *Algebra of functions on the quantum group  $SU(2)$* , Func. Anal. Appl., **22** (1988), 170-181.
- [We] A. Weinstein, *The local structure of Poisson manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom., **18** (1983), 523-557.
- [We-X] A. Weinstein and P. Xu, *Extensions of symplectic groupoids and quantization*, J. Reine. Angew. Math., **417** (1991), 159-189.
- [Wo1] S.L. Woronowicz, *Twisted  $SU(2)$  group: an example of a non-commutative differential calculus*, Publ. RIMS., **23** (1987), 117-181.
- [Wo2] ———, *Compact matrix pseudogroups*, Comm. Math. Phys., **111** (1987), 613-665.

Received September 1, 1993. The author was partially supported by NSF-Grant DMS-9002895.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS  
 LAWRENCE, KS 66045-2142  
*E-mail address:* sheu@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu

## PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Founded by

E. F. Beckenbach (1906-1982)

F. Wolf (1904-1989)

### EDITORS

Sun-Yung A. Chang (Managing Editor)  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
pacific@math.ucla.edu

F. Michael Christ  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
christ@math.ucla.edu

Nicholas Ercolani  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721  
ercolani@math.arizona.edu

Robert Finn  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305  
finn@gauss.stanford.edu

Steven Kerckhoff  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305  
spk@gauss.stanford.edu

Martin Scharlemann  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106  
mgscharl@math.ucsb.edu

Gang Tian  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
tian@math.mit.edu

V. S. Varadarajan  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
vsv@math.ucla.edu

Dan Voiculescu  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
dvv@math.berkeley.edu

### SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

---

The supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its contents or policies.

---

Manuscripts must be prepared in accordance with the instructions provided on the inside back cover.

The table of contents and the abstracts of the papers in the current issue, as well as other information about the Pacific Journal of Mathematics, may be found on the Internet at <http://www.msri.org>.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* (ISSN 0030-8730) is published monthly except for July and August. Regular subscription rate: \$245.00 a year (10 issues). Special rate: \$123.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions. Subscriptions, back issues published within the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163, U.S.A. Prior back issues are obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

---

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics at the University of California, c/o Department of Mathematics, 981 Evans Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720 (ISSN 0030-8730) is published monthly except for July and August. Second-class postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 6143 Berkeley, CA 94704-0163.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS at University of California,  
Berkeley, CA 94720, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

This publication was typeset using AMS-LATEX,  
the American Mathematical Society's TEX macro system.  
Copyright © 1995 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Volume 173    No. 1    March 1996

---

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Isometric immersions of $H_1^n$ into $H_1^{n+1}$  | 1   |
| KINETSU ABE   |     |
| Rotationally symmetric hypersurfaces with prescribed mean curvature   | 29  |
| MARIE-FRANÇOISE BIDAUT-VÉRON  |     |
| The covers of a Noetherian module   | 69  |
| JIAN-JUN CHUAI  |     |
| On the odd primary cohomology of higher projective planes   | 77  |
| MARK FOSKEY and MICHAEL DAVID SLACK   |     |
| Unit indices of some imaginary composite quadratic fields. II   | 93  |
| MIKIHITO HIRABAYASHI  |     |
| Mixed automorphic vector bundles on Shimura varieties   | 105 |
| MIN HO LEE  |     |
| Trace ideal criteria for Toeplitz and Hankel operators on the weighted Bergman spaces with exponential type weights | 127 |
| PENG LIN and RICHARD ROCHBERG   |     |
| On quadratic reciprocity over function fields   | 147 |
| KATHY DONOVAN MERRILL and LYNNE WALLING   |     |
| $(A_2)$ -conditions and Carleson inequalities in Bergman spaces   | 151 |
| TAKAHIKO NAKAZI and MASAHIRO YAMADA   |     |
| A note on a paper of E. Boasso and A. Larotonda: "A spectral theory for solvable Lie algebras of operators"         | 173 |
| C. OTT  |     |
| Tensor products with anisotropic principal series representations of free groups                                    | 181 |
| CARLO PENSAVALLE and TIM STEGER   |     |
| On Ricci deformation of a Riemannian metric on manifold with boundary   | 203 |
| YING SHEN   |     |
| The Weyl quantization of Poisson $SU(2)$  | 223 |
| ALBERT JEU-LIANG SHEU   |     |
| Weyl's law for $SL(3, \mathbb{Z}) \backslash SL(3, \mathbb{R}) / SO(3, \mathbb{R})$                                 | 241 |
| ERIC GEORGE STADE and DOROTHY IRENE WALLACE (ANDREOLI)  |     |
| Minimal hyperspheres in two-point homogeneous spaces  | 263 |
| PER TOMTER  |     |
| Subalgebras of little Lipschitz algebras  | 283 |
| NIKOLAI ISAAC WEAVER  |     |



0030-8730(1996)173:1;1-E