

# Lie Algebras

D. Zack Garza

September 16, 2019

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Lecture 1</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Overview . . . . .	2
1.1.1	Chapter 2 . . . . .	2
1.1.2	Chapter 3-4 . . . . .	2
1.2	Classification . . . . .	2
1.3	Chapters 4-5 . . . . .	3
1.3.1	Chapter 6 . . . . .	3
1.3.2	Chapter 7 . . . . .	4
1.3.3	Topics . . . . .	4
1.4	Content . . . . .	4
1.5	Linear Lie Algebras . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Lecture 2</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Lie Algebras of Derivations . . . . .	7
2.2	Abstract Lie Algebras . . . . .	7
2.3	Ideals . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Lecture 3</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Homomorphisms and Representations . . . . .	9
3.2	Automorphisms . . . . .	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Lecture 4</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Solvability . . . . .	11
4.2	Nilpotency . . . . .	11
<b>5</b>	<b>Lecture 5</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	Chapter 2: Semisimple Lie Algebras . . . . .	13
<b>6</b>	<b>Lecture n+1</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Lecture n+2</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Lecture n+3</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Lecture n+4</b>	<b>18</b>
9.1	Cartan's Criteria . . . . .	20

9.2 Section 5.2 . . . . .	21
<b>10 Lecture 10?</b>	<b>21</b>
10.1 Inner Derivations . . . . .	23
<b>11 Friday Lecture</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>12 Monday September 16th</b>	<b>24</b>
12.1 Proof of Weyl's(?) Theorem . . . . .	24
12.1.1 Step 1: . . . . .	24
12.1.2 Step 2: . . . . .	27
12.1.3 Step 3: . . . . .	28
12.1.4 Step 4: The general case . . . . .	28
12.2 Preservation of Jordan Decomposition . . . . .	28

## 1 Lecture 1

The material for this class will roughly come from Humphrey, Chapters 1 to 5. There is also a useful appendix which has been uploaded to the ELC system online.

### 1.1 Overview


Here is a short overview of the topics we expect to cover:

#### 1.1.1 Chapter 2

- Ideals, solvability, and nilpotency
- Semisimple Lie algebras
  - These have a particularly nice structure and representation theory
- Determining if a Lie algebra is semisimple using Killing forms
- Weyl's theorem for complete reducibility for finite dimensional representations
- Root space decompositions


#### 1.1.2 Chapter 3-4

We will describe the following series of correspondences:



## 1.2 Classification

The classical Lie algebras can be essentially classified by certain classes of diagrams:



### 1.3 Chapters 4-5

These cover the following topics:

- Conjugacy classes of Cartan subalgebras
- The PBW theorem for the universal enveloping algebra
- Serre relations

#### 1.3.1 Chapter 6

Some important topics include:

- Weight space decompositions
- Finite dimensional modules
- Character and the Harish-Chandra theorem
- The Weyl character formula
  - This will be computed for the specific Lie algebras seen earlier

We will also see the type  $A_\ell$  algebra used for the first time; however, it differs from the other types in several important/significant ways.

## 1.3.2 Chapter 7

Skip!

## 1.3.3 Topics

Time permitting, we may also cover the following extra topics:

- Infinite dimensional Lie algebras [Carter 05]
- BGG Cat- $\mathcal{O}$  [Humphrey 08]

## 1.4 Content

Fix  $F$  a field of characteristic zero – note that prime characteristic is closer to a research topic.

**Definition 1.** A **Lie Algebra**  $\mathfrak{g}$  over  $F$  is an  $F$ -vector space with an operation denoted the Lie bracket,

$$\begin{aligned} [\cdot, \cdot] : \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \\ (x, y) &\mapsto [x, y]. \end{aligned}$$

satisfying the following properties:

- $[\cdot, \cdot]$  is bilinear
- $[x, x] = 0$
- The Jacobi identity:

$$[x, [y, z]] + [y, [x, z]] + [z, [x, y]] = 0.$$

**Exercise 1.** Show that  $[x, y] = -[y, x]$ .

**Definition 2.** Two Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}'$  are said to be isomorphic if  $\varphi([x, y]) = [\varphi(x), \varphi(y)]$ .

## 1.5 Linear Lie Algebras

Let  $V = \mathbb{F}^n$ , and define  $\text{End}(V) = \{f : V \rightarrow V \mid f \text{ is linear}\}$ . We can then define  $\mathfrak{gl}(n, V)$  by setting  $[x, y] = (x \circ y) - (y \circ x)$ .

**Exercise 2.** Verify that  $V$  is a Lie algebra.

**Definition 3.** Define

$$\mathfrak{sl}(n, V) = \{f \in \mathfrak{gl}(n, V) \mid \text{Tr}(f) = 0\}.$$

(Note the different in definition compared to the lie *group*  $\text{SL}(n, V)$ ).

**Definition 4.** A *subalgebra* of a Lie algebra is a vector subspace that is closed under the bracket.

**Definition 5.** The symplectic algebra

$$\mathfrak{sp}(2\ell, F) = \left\{ A \in \mathfrak{gl}(2\ell, F) \mid MA - A^T M = 0 \right\} \text{ where } M = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & I_n \\ \hline -I_n & 0 \end{array} \right).$$


**Definition 6.** The orthogonal algebra

$$\mathfrak{so}(2\ell, F) = \left\{ A \in \mathfrak{gl}(2\ell, F) \mid MA - A^T M = 0 \right\} \text{ where}$$

$$M = \begin{cases} \left( \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & 0 & \\ \hline 0 & 0 & I_n \\ \hline & -I_n & 0 \end{array} \right) & n = 2\ell + 1 \text{ odd,} \\ \left( \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & I_n \\ \hline -I_n & 0 \end{array} \right) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

**Proposition 7.** The dimensions of these algebras can be computed;

- The dimension of  $\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{F})$  is  $n^2$ , and has basis  $\{e_{i,j}\}$  the matrices if a 1 in the  $i, j$  position and



zero elsewhere.

- For type  $A_\ell$ , we have  $\dim \mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{F}) = (\ell + 1)^2 - 1$ .
- For type  $C_\ell$ , we have  $\dim \mathfrak{sp}(n, \mathbb{F}) = \ell^2 + 2 \left( \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{2} \right)$ , and so elements here

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B = B^t \\ C = C^t & A^t \end{pmatrix}.$$

- For type  $D_\ell$  we have


$$\dim \mathfrak{so}(2\ell, \mathbb{F}) = \dim \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & B = -B^t \\ C = -C^t & -A^t \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

which turns out to be  $2\ell^2 - \ell$ .

- For type  $B_\ell$ , we have  $\dim \mathfrak{so}(2\ell, \mathbb{F}) = 2\ell^2 - \ell + 2\ell = 2\ell^2 + \ell$ , with elements of the form

$$\left( \begin{array}{c|cc} 0 & M & N \\ \hline -N^t & A & C = C^t \\ -M^t & B = B^t & -A^t \end{array} \right).$$

**Exercise 3.** Use the relation  $MA = A^t M$  to reduce restrictions on the blocks.



**Theorem 8.** These are *all* of the isomorphisms between any of these types of algebras, in any dimension.

## 2 Lecture 2

Recall from last time that a Lie Algebra is a vector space with a bilinear bracket, which importantly satisfies the Jacobi identity:

$$[x, [y, z]] + [y, [x, z]] + [z, [x, y]] = \mathbf{0}.$$

Also recall the examples from last time:

- $A_\ell \iff \mathfrak{sl}(\ell + 1, F)$
- $B_\ell \iff \mathfrak{so}(2\ell + 1, F)$
- $C_\ell \iff \mathfrak{sp}(2\ell, F)$
- $D_\ell \iff \mathfrak{so}(2\ell, F)$

**Exercise 4.** Characterize these matrix subalgebras in terms of basis elements, and compute their dimensions.

## 2.1 Lie Algebras of Derivations

**Definition 9.** An  $F$ -algebra  $A$  is an  $F$ -vector space endowed with a bilinear map  $A^2 \rightarrow A$ ,  $(x, y) \mapsto xy$ .

**Definition 10.** An algebra is **associative** if  $x(yz) = (xy)z$ .

Modern interest: simple Lie algebras, which have a good representation theory. Take a look at Erdmann-Wildon (Springer) for an introductory look at 3-dimensional algebras.

**Definition 11.** Any map  $\delta : A^2 \rightarrow A$  that satisfies the Leibniz rule is called a **derivation** of  $A$ , where the rule is given by  $\delta(xy) = \delta(x)y + x\delta(y)$ .

**Definition 12.** We define  $\text{Der}(A) = \{\delta \mid \delta \text{ is a derivation}\}$ .

Any Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is an  $F$ -algebra, since  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  is bilinear. Moreover,  $\mathfrak{g}$  is associative iff  $[x, [y, z]] = 0$ .

**Exercise 5.** Show that  $\text{Der } \mathfrak{g} \leq \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})$  is a Lie subalgebra. One needs to check that  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathfrak{g} \implies [\delta_1, \delta_2] \in \mathfrak{g}$ .

**Exercise 6** (Turn in). Define the adjoint by  $\text{ad}_x : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}, y \mapsto [x, y]$ . Show that  $\text{ad}_x \in \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$ .

## 2.2 Abstract Lie Algebras

Fact: Every finite-dimensional Lie algebra is isomorphic to a linear Lie algebra, i.e. a subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ . Each isomorphism type can be specified by certain *structure constants* for the Lie bracket.

**Example 13.** Any  $F$ -vector space can be made into a Lie algebra by setting  $[x, y] = 0$ ; such algebras are referred to as *abelian*.

Attempting to classify Lie algebras of dimension at most 2.

- 1 dimensional: We can write  $\mathfrak{g} = Fx$ , and so  $[x, x] = 0 \implies [\cdot, \cdot] = 0$ . So every bracket must be zero, and thus every Lie algebra is abelian.
- 2 dimensional: Write  $\mathfrak{g} = Fx \oplus Fy$ , the only nontrivial bracket here is  $[x, y]$ . Some cases:
  - $[x, y] = 0 \implies \mathfrak{g}$  is abelian.
  - $[x, y] = ax + by \neq 0$ . Assume  $a \neq 0$  and set  $x' = ax + by, y' = \frac{y}{a}$ . Now compute  $[x', y'] = [ax + by, \frac{y}{a}] = [x, y] = ax + by = x'$ . Punchline:  $\mathfrak{g} \cong Fx' \oplus Fy', [x', y'] = x'$ .

We can fill in a table with all of the various combinations of brackets:

$[\cdot, \cdot]$	$x'$	$y'$
$x'$	0	$x'$
$y'$	$-x'$	0

**Example 14.** Let  $V = \mathbb{R}^3$ , and define  $[a, b] = a \times b$  to be the usual cross product.

**Exercise 7.** Look at notes for basis elements of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, F)$ ,

$$e = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$h = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$f = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Compute the matrices of  $\text{ad}(e), \text{ad}(h), \text{ad}(f)$  with respect to this basis.

## 2.3 Ideals

**Definition 15.** A subspace  $I \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$  is called an **ideal**, and we write  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$ , if  $x, y \in I \implies [x, y] \in I$ .

Note that there is no need to distinguish right, left, or two-sided ideals. This can be shown using  $[x, y] = -[y, x]$ .

**Exercise 8.** Check that the following are all ideals of  $\mathfrak{g}$ :

- $\{0\}, \mathfrak{g}$ .
- $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{z \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [x, z] = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathfrak{g}\}$
- The commutator (or derived) algebra  $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] = \{\sum_i [x_i, y_i] \mid x_i, y_i \in \mathfrak{g}\}$ .  
– Moreover,  $[\mathfrak{gl}(n, F), \mathfrak{gl}(n, F)] = \mathfrak{sl}(n, F)$ .

Fact: If  $I, J \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$ , then

- $I + J = \{x + y \mid x \in I, y \in J\} \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$
- $I \cap J \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$
- $[I, J] = \{\sum_i [x_i, y_i] \mid x_i \in I, y_i \in J\} \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$

**Definition 16.** A Lie algebra is **simple** if  $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] \neq 0$  (i.e. when  $\mathfrak{g}$  is not abelian) and has no non-trivial ideals. Note that this implies that  $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] = \mathfrak{g}$ .

**Theorem 17.** Suppose that  $\text{char } F \neq 2$ , then  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, F)$  is not simple.

*Proof.* Recall that we have a basis of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, F)$  given by  $B = \{e, h, f\}$  where

- $[e, f] = h,$
- $[h, e] = 2e,$
- $[h, f] = -2f.$

So think of  $[h, e] = \text{ad}_h(e)$ , so  $e$  is an eigenvector of this map with eigenvalues  $\{0, \pm 2\}$ . Since  $\text{char } F \neq 2$ , these are all distinct. Suppose  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, F)$  has a nontrivial ideal  $I$ ; then pick  $x = ae + bh + cf \in I$ . Then  $[e, x] = 0 - 2be + ch$ , and  $[e, [e, x]] = 0 - 0 + 2ce$ . Again since  $\text{char } F \neq 2$ , then if  $c \neq 0$  then  $e \in I$ . Now you can show that  $h \in I$  and  $f \in I$ , but then  $I = \mathfrak{sl}(2, F)$ , a contradiction. So  $c = 0$ .

Then  $x = bh \neq 0$ , so  $h \in I$ , and we can compute



$$\begin{aligned} 2e = [h, e] \in I &\implies e \in I, \\ 2f = [h, -f] \in I &\implies f \in I. \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $I = \mathfrak{sl}(2, F)$  and thus it is simple.

□

Note that there is a homework coming due next Monday, about 4 questions.

### 3 Lecture 3

Last time, we looked at ideals such as  $0, \mathfrak{g}, Z(\mathfrak{g})$ , and  $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ .

**Definition:** If  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  is an ideal, then the quotient  $\mathfrak{g}/I$  also yields a Lie algebra with the bracket given by  $[x + I, y + I] = [x, y] + I$ .

**Exercise:** Check that this is well-defined, so that if  $x + I = x' + I$  and  $y + I = y' + I$  then  $[x, y] + I = [x', y'] + I$ .

#### 3.1 Homomorphisms and Representations

**Definition 18.** A linear map  $\phi : \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_2$  is a *Lie homomorphism* if  $\phi[x, y] = [\phi(x), \phi(y)]$ .

**Remark.**  $\ker \phi \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}_1$  and  $\text{im } \phi \leq \mathfrak{g}_2$  is a subalgebra.

**Fact:** There is a canonical way to set up a 1-to-1 correspondence  $\{I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}\} \iff \{\text{hom } \phi : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}'\}$  where  $I \mapsto (x \mapsto x + I)$  and the inverse is given by  $\phi \mapsto \ker \phi$ .

**Theorem (Isomorphism theorem for Lie algebras):**

- If  $\phi : \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_2$  is a Lie algebra homomorphism, then  $\mathfrak{g}/\ker \phi \cong \text{im } \phi$
- If  $I, J \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  are ideals and  $I \subset J$  then  $J/I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}/I$  and  $(\mathfrak{g}/I)/(J/I) \cong \mathfrak{g}/J$ .
- If  $I, J \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  then  $(I + J)/J \cong I/(I \cap J)$ .

**Definition:** A *representation* of a Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a Lie algebra homomorphism  $\phi : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(V)$  into a linear Lie algebra for some vector space  $V$ .

We call  $V$  a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module with action  $g \cdot v = \phi(g)(v)$ .

**Example:** The *adjoint representation*:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ad} : \mathfrak{g} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}) \\ x &\mapsto [x, \cdot]. \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 19.** Any simple Lie algebra is isomorphic to a linear Lie algebra.

Proof: Since  $\mathfrak{g}$  is simple, the center  $Z(\mathfrak{g}) = 0$ . We can rewrite the center as

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\mathfrak{g}) &= \left\{ x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \text{ad}_{x(y)} = 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathfrak{g} \right\} \\ &= \ker \text{ad}_x. \end{aligned}$$

Using the first isomorphism theorem, we have  $\mathfrak{g}/Z(\mathfrak{g}) \cong \text{im ad} \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})$ . But  $\mathfrak{g}/Z(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{g}$  here, so we are done.

## 3.2 Automorphisms

Definition: An automorphism of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is an isomorphism  $\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ , and we define

$$\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{ \phi : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \mid \phi \text{ is an isomorphism} \}.$$

Proposition: If  $\delta \in \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$  is nilpotent, then

$$\exp(\delta) := \sum \frac{\delta^n}{n!} \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

This is well-defined because  $\delta$  is nilpotent, and a binomial formula holds:

$$\frac{\delta^n([x, y])}{n!} = \sum_{i=0}^n \left[ \frac{\delta^i(x)}{i!}, \frac{\delta^{n-i}(y)}{(n-i)!} \right].$$

and for  $n = 1$ ,  $\delta([x, y]) = [x, \delta(y)] + [\delta(x), y]$ .

Exercise: Show that

$$[(\exp \delta)(x), (\exp \delta)(y)] = \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \frac{\delta^n([x, y])}{n!}.$$

Example: Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{F})$  and define

$$s = \exp(\text{ad}_e) \exp(\text{ad}_{-f}) \exp(\text{ad}_e) \in \text{Aut} \mathfrak{g}.$$

where  $e, f$  are defined as (todo, see written notes).

Then define the Weyl group  $W = \langle s \rangle$ .

Exercise: Check that  $s(e) = -f, s(f) = -e, s(h) = -h$ , and so the order of  $s$  is 2 and  $W = \{1, s\}$ .

## 4 Lecture 4

### 4.1 Solvability

Idea: Define a semisimple Lie algebra

Definition: The derived series for  $\mathfrak{g}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{g}^{(0)} &= \mathfrak{g} \\ \mathfrak{g}^{(1)} &= [\mathfrak{g}^{(0)}, \mathfrak{g}^{(0)}] \\ &\dots \\ \mathfrak{g}^{(i+1)} &= [\mathfrak{g}^{(i)}, \mathfrak{g}^{(i)}].\end{aligned}$$

The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is *solvable* if there is some  $n$  for which  $\mathfrak{g}^{(n)} = 0$ .

Exercise (to turn in): Check that the Lie algebra of upper triangular matrices in  $\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{F})$ .

Example: Abelian Lie algebras are solvable

Example: Simple Lie algebras are *not* solvable.

Proposition: Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a Lie algebra, then

1. If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is solvable, then all subalgebras and all homomorphic images of  $\mathfrak{g}$  are also solvable.
2. If  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  and both  $I$  and  $\mathfrak{g}/I$  are solvable, then so is  $\mathfrak{g}$ .
3. If  $I, J \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  are solvable, then so is  $I + J$ .

Corollary (of part 3 above): Any Lie algebra has a unique maximal solvable ideal, which we denote the *radical*  $\text{Rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ .

Definition: A Lie algebra is semisimple if  $\text{Rad}(\mathfrak{g}) = 0$ .

Example: Any simple Lie algebra is semisimple.

Example: Using part (2) above, we can deduce that we can construct a semisimple Lie algebra from *any* Lie algebra: for any  $\mathfrak{g}$ , the quotient  $\mathfrak{g}/\text{Rad}(\mathfrak{g})$  is semisimple.

### 4.2 Nilpotency

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{g}^0 &= \mathfrak{g} \\ \mathfrak{g}^1 &= [\mathfrak{g}^0, \mathfrak{g}^0] \\ &\dots \\ \mathfrak{g}^{i+1} &= [\mathfrak{g}^i, \mathfrak{g}^i].\end{aligned}$$

Much like the previous case, we have

Example: Abelian Lie algebras are nilpotent.

Example: Nilpotent Lie algebras are solvable.

Example: The *strictly* upper triangular matrices (with zero on the diagonal) are nilpotent.

1. If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is nilpotent, then all subalgebras and all homomorphic images of  $\mathfrak{g}$  are also nilpotent.
2. If  $\mathfrak{g}/Z(\mathfrak{g})$  is nilpotent, then so is  $\mathfrak{g}$ .
3. If  $\mathfrak{g} \neq 0$  is nilpotent, then  $Z(\mathfrak{g}) \neq 0$ .

Claim: If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is nilpotent, then  $\text{ad}_x \in \text{End}(\mathfrak{g})$  is nilpotent for all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ .

Proof: This is because  $\mathfrak{g}^n = 0 \iff [\mathfrak{g}, [\mathfrak{g}, [\mathfrak{g}, \dots]]] = 0$ , and so for every  $x_i, y \in \mathfrak{g}$  we have  $[x_1, [x_2, \dots [x_n, y]]] = 0$ , and so  $\text{ad}_{x_1} \circ \text{ad}_{x_2} \circ \dots \text{ad}_{x_n} = 0$  which implies that  $\text{ad}_x^n = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ .

Theorem [Engel]: If  $\text{ad}_x$  is nilpotent for all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is nilpotent.

Remark: This can be confusing if  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a linear algebra, we can consider elements  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  and ask if it is the case  $x$  being nilpotent (as an endomorphism) iff  $\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{g}$  is nilpotent? False, a counterexample is  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , where there exists an  $x$  which is *not* nilpotent while  $\text{ad}_x$  is nilpotent, which contradicts the above theorem.

Proof:

Lemma: Let  $\mathfrak{g} \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}(V)$  be a Lie subalgebra for some finite dimensional vector space  $V$ . If  $x$  is nilpotent as an endomorphism on  $V$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ , then there exists a nonzero vector  $v \in V$  such that  $\mathfrak{g}v = 0$ , so  $x \in \mathfrak{g} \implies x(v) = 0$ .

Proof of lemma Use induction on  $\dim \mathfrak{g}$ , splitting into two separate base cases: - Case  $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 0$ , then  $\mathfrak{g} = \{0\}$ . - Case  $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 1$ , left as an exercise.

Inductive step: Let  $A$  be a maximal proper subalgebra and define  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}/A)$  where  $a \mapsto (x + A \mapsto [a, x] + A)$ . We need to check that  $\phi$  is a homomorphism, this just follows from using the Jacobi identity.

We also need to show that  $\text{im } \phi \leq \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}/A)$  is a Lie subalgebra, and  $\dim \text{im } \phi < \dim \mathfrak{g}$ . The claim is that  $\phi(a) \in \text{End}(\mathfrak{g}/A)$  is nilpotent for all  $a \in A$ . By the inductive hypothesis, there is a nonzero coset  $y + A \in \mathfrak{g}/A$  such that  $(\text{im } \phi) \cdot (y + A) = A$ . Since  $y \notin A$ , then  $\phi(a)(y + A) = A$  for all  $a \in A$ , and so  $[a, y] \in A$ .

We want to show that  $A$  is a subalgebra of codimension 1, and  $A \oplus F_y \leq \mathfrak{g}$  is a Lie subalgebra. This is because  $[a_1 + c_1y, a_2 + c_2y] = [a_1, a_2] + c_2[a_1, y] - c_2[a_2, y] + c_1c_2[y, y]$ . The last term is zero, the middle two terms are in  $A$ , and because  $A$  is closed under the bracket, the first term is in  $A$  as well.

But then  $A \oplus F_y$  is a larger subalgebra than  $A$ , which was maximal, so it must be everything. So  $A \oplus F_y = \mathfrak{g}$ . So  $A \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  because  $[a_1, a_2 + cy]$  is in  $A$ ,  $A \oplus F_y = \mathfrak{g}$  respectively, and this equals  $[a_1, a_2] + c[a_1, y]$ , where both terms are in  $A$ .

Proof to be continued on Friday!

## 5 Lecture 5

Last time: we had a theorem that said that if  $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$  and every  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  is nilpotent, then there exists a nonzero  $v \in V$  such that  $\mathfrak{g}v = 0$ .

We proceeded by induction on the dimension of  $V$ , constructing  $\text{im } \phi \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}/A)$ , and showed that  $\mathfrak{g} = A \oplus F_y$ . Now consider

$$W = \{v \in V \mid Av = 0\},$$

which is  $\mathfrak{g}$ -invariant, so  $\mathfrak{g}(W) \subseteq W$ , or for all  $a \in A, x \in \mathfrak{g}, v \in W$ , we have  $a \curvearrowright x(v) = 0$ . This is true because  $a \curvearrowright x = x \circ a + [a, x] \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ . But  $V$  is killed by any element in  $A$ , and both of these terms are in  $A$ . In particular, the  $y$  appearing in  $Fy$  also satisfies  $y \in W$ . Consider  $y|_W \in \text{End}(W)$ , and we want to apply the inductive hypothesis to  $Fy|_W \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ .

We need to check that  $y|_W \in \text{End}(V)$ , which is true exactly because  $y$  is nilpotent. So we can construct a nonzero  $v \in W \subset V$  such that  $y(v) = 0$ , and so  $\mathfrak{g}v = 0$ .

Claim:  $\phi(a) \in \text{End}(\mathfrak{g}/A)$  is nilpotent. Each  $a \in A \subset \mathfrak{g}$  is nilpotent by assumption. Define the maps for left multiplication by  $a$ ,  $m_\ell : x \mapsto ax$ , and the right multiplication  $m_r : x \mapsto xa$ . These are nilpotent, and since  $m_\ell, m_r$  commute, the difference  $m_\ell - m_r$  is nilpotent, and this is exactly  $\text{ad}_a$ . But then  $\phi(a)$  is nilpotent.

Good proof for using all of the definitions!

Now we can see what the consequences of having such a nonzero vector are. This theorem implies Engel's theorem, which says that if  $\text{ad}_x \in \text{End}(\mathfrak{g})$  is nilpotent for every  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is nilpotent.

Proof: By induction on dimension. The base case is easy. For the inductive step, the previous theorem applies to  $\text{ad}_\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})$ . So we can produce the nonzero  $v \in \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\text{ad}_\mathfrak{g}v = 0$ . Then  $[x, v] = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ , so either  $v \in Z(\mathfrak{g})$  or  $Z(\mathfrak{g}) \neq 0$ . In either case,  $\mathfrak{g}/Z(\mathfrak{g})$  has smaller dimension. Since  $\text{ad}_x$  is nilpotent, so is  $\text{ad}_x + Z(\mathfrak{g})$ , and so  $\mathfrak{g}/Z(\mathfrak{g})$  is nilpotent. By an earlier proposition, since the quotient is nilpotent, so is the total space.  $\square$

Let  $\mathfrak{N}(F)$  be the subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{gl}(F)$  consisting of strictly upper triangular matrices. We have a corollary: if  $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}(n, F)$  is a Lie subalgebra such every  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  is nilpotent as an endomorphism of  $F$ , then the matrices of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with respect to some bases of in  $\mathfrak{N}(n, F)$ .

The proof is by induction on  $n$ , where the base case is easy. For the inductive step, we use the previous theorem to get a  $v_1$  such that  $x(v_1) = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $\bar{V} = F^n/Fv_1 \cong F^{n-1}$ , and define  $\phi : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(\bar{V})$  where  $x \mapsto (\bar{y} \mapsto \overline{y(x)})$ .

Then  $\text{im } \phi \leq \mathfrak{gl}(n-1, F)$  as a subalgebra, and every  $\phi(x) \in \text{End}(F^{n-1})$  is nilpotent, since  $x$  was nilpotent on the larger space. But (see notes) then  $x$  can be written as a strictly upper-triangular matrix.

## 5.1 Chapter 2: Semisimple Lie Algebras

We now assume  $\text{char } F = 0$  and  $\bar{F} = F$ .

Theorem: If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a solvable Lie subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$  for some finite dimensional  $V$ , then  $V$  contains a common eigenvector for a  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ , i.e. a  $\lambda : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow F, x \mapsto \lambda(x)$  such that  $x(v) = \lambda(x)v$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ .

Proof: We will use induction on the dimension of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . For the inductive step:

Claim 1: There is an ideal  $A \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\mathfrak{g} = A \oplus Fy$  for some  $y \neq 0$ , so  $A$  is a subalgebra of a solvable Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  and thus solvable itself. By hypothesis, we can produce a  $w \in V \setminus \{0\}$ , and thus a functional  $\lambda : A \rightarrow F$  such that  $aw = \lambda(a)w$  for all  $a \in A$ . So we define

$$V_\lambda = \{v \in V \mid av = \lambda(a)v \forall a \in A\}$$

where  $w \in V_\lambda$ .

Claim 2:  $y(V_\lambda) \subseteq V_\lambda$ , or  $y|_{V_\lambda} \in \text{End}(V_\lambda)$ .

Thus  $F(y|_{V_\lambda}) \leq \mathfrak{gl}(V_\lambda)$  is a Lie algebra of dimension 1, and thus solvable. By the inductive hypothesis, we can find a  $v \in V_\lambda$  and some  $\mu \in F$  such that  $y(v) = \mu v$ . An arbitrary element  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  can be written as  $x = a + cy$  for some  $a \in A, c \in F$  and it acts by  $x(v) = a(v) + cy(v) = \lambda(a)v + c\mu v = (\lambda(a) + c\mu)v \in V_\lambda$ .

## 6 Lecture n+1

Todo

## 7 Lecture n+2

Definition (Jordan Decomposition)

Let  $X \in \text{End}(V)$  for  $V$  finite dimensional. Then,

- (a) There exists a unique  $X_s, X_n \in \text{End}(V)$  such that  $X = X_s + X_n$  where  $X_s$  is semisimple,  $X_n$  is nilpotent, and  $[X_s, X_n] = 0$ .
- (b) There exists a  $p(t), q(t) \in t\mathbb{F}[t]$  such that  $X_s = p(X), X_n = q(X)$ .

(Polynomials with no constant term.)

Proof of (a): Assume  $X_s = X_s + X_n = X'_s + X'_n$ , so both have bracket zero. Assuming that (b) holds, we have  $X_s = p(X)$ , and so

$$[X, X_s] = [X_s + X'_n, X'_s] = [X'_s, X'_s] + [X'_s, X'_n] = 0 \implies [p(X), X'_s] = 0 = [X_s, X'_s]$$

Using fact (c) from last time, then  $X_s, X'_s$  can be diagonalized simultaneously, and so  $X_s - X'_s$  is semisimple.

On the other hand, if  $X'_n, X_n$  are nilpotent, and since these commute,  $X_n - X'_n$  is nilpotent. But then this is a Jordan decomposition of the zero map, i.e.

$$0 = X - X = (X_s - X'_s) + (X_n + X'_n)$$

where the first term is semisimple and the second is nilpotent. Then each term is both semisimple and nilpotent, so they must be zero, which is what we wanted to show.

Proof of part (b): Let  $m(t) = \prod_{i=1}^r (t - \lambda_i)^{m_i}$  be the minimal polynomial of  $X$ , where each  $m_i \geq 1$  and the  $\lambda_i$  are distinct. Then the primary composition of  $V$  is given by

$$V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r V_i, \quad V_i = \ker(X - \lambda_i I_V)^{m_i} \neq 0, \quad X(V_i) \subseteq V_i$$

Claim: There exists a polynomial  $p \in F[t]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \lambda_i \pmod{(t - \lambda_i)^{m_i}} \quad \forall i, \\ p &= 0 \pmod{t}. \end{aligned}$$

$$p(x) \sim \begin{pmatrix} \boxed{\lambda_1 I_{v_1}} & & & \\ & \boxed{\lambda_2 I_{v_2}} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \boxed{\lambda_r I_{v_r}} \end{pmatrix}$$

Figure 1: ???

The existence follows from the Chinese Remainder Theorem.

What is  $p(x) \curvearrowright V_i$ ? This acts by scalar multiplication by  $\lambda_i$  for all  $i$ . (Check). Because of the restrictive conditions,  $p(x)$  has no constant term.

So  $p(X) = X_s$  is the semisimple part we want. Now just set  $q(t) = t - p(t)$ , then  $X_n := q(X) = X - X_s$  is nilpotent.

Example: The Jordan Decomposition is invariant under taking adjoints.

If we have  $X = X_s + X_n$ , then  $\text{ad}_X \in \text{End}(\text{End}(V))$ . It can be shown that  $(\text{ad}_X)_s + (\text{ad}_X)_n = \text{ad}(X_s) + \text{ad}(X_n)$ .

Let  $e_{ii}$  be the elementary matrix with a 1 in the  $i, j$  position. You can write  $\text{ad}_X$  as a  $4 \times 4$  matrix (see image).

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$X = X_S + X_n$$

$$= \begin{matrix} e_{11} \\ e_{12} \\ e_{21} \\ e_{22} \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\rightarrow \text{JNF} \left( \begin{array}{c|ccc} 0 & & & \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & \ddots & 0 \end{array} \right)$$



$$= \begin{matrix} e_{11} \\ e_{12} \\ e_{21} \\ e_{22} \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\rightarrow \text{JNF} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & \ddots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

You can check that  $(\text{ad}_X)_S = 0$ ,  $\text{ad}(X_S) = 0$ , and  $(\text{ad}_X)_n$  is the Jordan form given above.

Lemma:

- (a)  $x \in \text{End}(V) \implies \text{ad}(x)_S = \text{ad}(x_S)$  and  $\text{ad}(x)_n = \text{ad}(x_n)$ .
- (b) If  $A$  is a finite dimensional  $\mathbb{F}$ -algebra, then  $\delta \in \text{Der}(A) \implies \delta_S, \delta_n \in \text{Der}(A)$  as well.

Proof of (a):

Check that  $\text{ad}(x) = \text{ad}(x_S) + \text{ad}(x_n)$ . Then for  $y \in \text{End}(V)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{ad}(x))(y) &= [x, y] \\ &= [x_S + x_n, y] \\ &= [x_S, y] + [x_n, y] \\ &= (\text{ad}(x_S))(y) + (\text{ad}(x_n))(y). \end{aligned}$$

Using theorem 3.3,  $x_n$  nilpotent  $\implies \text{ad}(x_n)$  is also nilpotent. So write  $x_S = \sum \lambda_i e_{ii}$  with the eigenvalues on the diagonal. Then  $\text{ad}x_S(e_{ij}) = (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)e_{ij}$  for all  $i, j$ . But then  $\text{ad}x_S$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\delta - (\lambda + \mu)I)^n([x, y]) \\
 &= \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \left[ (\delta - \lambda I)^i(x), (\delta - \mu I)^{n-i}(y) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 2: Image

a matrix with  $\lambda_i - \lambda_j$  in the  $i, j$  position and zeros elsewhere. By the uniqueness of the Jordan decomposition, the statement follows.

Proof of (b):

Since  $\delta \in \text{Der}(A)$ , the primary decomposition with respect to  $\delta$  is given by

$$A = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in F} A_\lambda \quad \text{where } A_\lambda = \left\{ a \in A \mid (\delta - \lambda I)^k a = 0 \text{ for some } k \gg 0 \right\}.$$

So  $\delta_s \sim A_\lambda$  by scalar multiplication (by  $\lambda$ ). Then for  $\lambda, \mu \in F$ , we have

So  $[A_x, A_y] \subseteq A_{\lambda+\mu}$  for all  $x, y \in A$ . But then

and so  $\delta_s \in \text{Der}(A)$ , and  $\delta_n = \delta - \delta_s \in \text{Der}(A)$  as well.

## 8 Lecture n+3

Todo

## 9 Lecture n+4

Review of bilinear forms: let  $V = \mathbb{F}^n$ .

Definition: A bilinear form  $\beta : V^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  can be represented by a matrix  $B$  with respect to a basis  $\{\mathbf{v}_i\}$  such that

$$\beta\left(\sum a_i \mathbf{v}_i, \sum b_i \mathbf{v}_i\right) = (a_1 \ a_2 \ \cdots) B (b_1 \ b_2 \ \cdots)$$

- $\beta$  is *symmetric* iff  $\beta(a, b) = \beta(b, a)$ .
- $\beta$  is *symplectic* iff  $\beta(a, b) = -\beta(b, a)$ .
- $\beta$  is *isotropic* iff  $\beta(a, a) = 0$ .

$$S_S([x, y])$$

||

$$(\lambda + \mu)[x, y] = [\lambda x, y] + [x, \mu y]$$

||

$$[S_S(x), y] + [x, S_S(y)]$$

Figure 3: Image

For a subspace  $U \leq V$ , define

$$U^\perp := \{v \in V \mid \beta(u, v) = 0 \forall u \in U\}.$$

Note: in general, left/right orthogonality are distinguished, but these will be identical when  $\beta$  is symmetric/symplectic.

The form  $\beta$  is said to be *non-degenerate* iff  $V^\perp = 0$  iff  $\det B \neq 0$ .

Assume  $F$  is an algebraically closed field, so  $\bar{F} = F$ , and  $\text{char} F \neq 2$ , then

- If  $\beta$  is non-degenerate and symmetric, then  $B \sim I_n$
- If  $\beta$  is non-degenerate and symplectic, then  $B \sim [0, I_{n/2}; I_{n/2}, 0]$ .

Remark:

$\mathfrak{so}(n, \mathbb{F}) = \{x \in \mathfrak{gl}(n, F) \mid \beta(x(u), v) = -\beta(u, x(v))\}$ , where  $B$  has the matrix  $[0, I; I, 0]$  if  $n$  is odd, or this matrix with a 1 in the top-left corner if  $n$  is even.

Similarly,  $\mathfrak{sp}(2m, \mathbb{F})$  can be described this way with the matrix  $[0, -I_m; -I_m, 0]$ .

Overview: The Killing form is defined as  $\kappa : \mathfrak{g}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  where  $\kappa(x, y) = \text{tr}(\text{ad}_x \circ \text{ad}_y)$ .

Then we have **Cartan's Criteria**:

- $\mathfrak{g}$  solvable  $\iff \kappa(x, y) = 0 \forall x \in [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}], y \in \mathfrak{g}$ .
- $\mathfrak{g}$  semisimple  $\iff \kappa$  is non-degenerate.

Note that if  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, then  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_i I_i$  with each  $I_i \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  and simple.

## 9.1 Cartan's Criteria

Some facts:

1.  $\kappa$  is symmetric
2. If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is finite dimensional, then  $\kappa$  is associative, i.e  $\kappa([x, y], z) = \kappa(x, [y, z])$ .

Exercise: Show that if  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$ , then  $I^\perp \leq \mathfrak{g}$  is an ideal.

Proof of (2): In section 4.3, it was shown that  $\text{tr}([a, b] \circ c) = \text{tr}(a \circ [b, c])$  for all  $a, b, c \in \text{End}(V)$  (provided  $V$  is finite dimensional).

So

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa([x, y], z) &= \text{tr}(\text{ad}_{[x, y]} \circ \text{ad}_z) \\ &= \text{tr}([\text{ad}_x, \text{ad}_y] \circ \text{ad}_z) \\ &= \text{tr}(\text{ad}_x \circ [\text{ad}_y, \text{ad}_z]) \\ &= \text{tr}(\text{ad}_x \circ \text{ad}_{[y, z]}) \\ &= \text{tr}(x, [y, z]).. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem:  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple iff  $\kappa$  is nondegenerate.

Proof:  $\implies$  : We want to show that  $\mathfrak{g}^\perp = 0$ . Note that  $[\mathfrak{g}^\perp, \mathfrak{g}^\perp] \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ , and so for all  $x \in [\mathfrak{g}^\perp, \mathfrak{g}^\perp]$  and for any  $y \in \mathfrak{g}^\perp$ , we have

$$\kappa(x, y) = \text{tr}(\text{ad}_x \circ \text{ad}_y) = 0$$

by the const(?) of  $\mathfrak{g}^\perp$ . This implies  $\mathfrak{g}^\perp$  is solvable.

Using fact (2), we have  $\mathfrak{g}^\perp \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  and thus  $\mathfrak{g}^\perp \subseteq \text{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ , which is 0 since because  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple. So either  $\mathfrak{g}^\perp = 0$  or  $\kappa$  is nondegenerate.

Used the fact that the radical was a maximal solvable ideal.

$\impliedby$  : We want to show that for all  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  where  $[I, I] = 0$ , we have  $I^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^\perp$ .

For  $x \in I, y \in \mathfrak{g}$ , we have

$$(\text{ad}_x \circ \text{ad}_y)^2 = \mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{\text{ad}_y} \mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{\text{ad}_x} I \xrightarrow{\text{ad}_y} I \xrightarrow{\text{ad}_x} 0$$

And thus  $\text{tr}(\text{ad}_x \circ \text{ad}_y) = 0$  and  $I \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^\perp$ .

Suppose that  $\mathfrak{g}$  is *not* semisimple. Then there exists a solvable ideal  $J \neq 0$  such that the last term  $J^i$  in the derived series is an ideal  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $[I, I] = 0$ , forcing  $J^i \subset \mathfrak{g}^\perp = 0$ , which is a contradiction.

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim I_i \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_{I_i} & \\ & \end{pmatrix}$$

Figure 4: Image

## 9.2 Section 5.2

Theorem: If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, then

- There exist ideals  $I_i \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  which are simple Lie algebras satisfying  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus I_i$ . Note that  $[I_i, I_j] \subseteq I_i \cap I_j = 0$ , since direct summands intersect only trivially.
- Every simple  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  is one of these  $I_i$ .
- $\kappa_{I_i} = \kappa_{\mathfrak{g}}|_{I_i \times I_i}$ , so

Remark:  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple  $\iff \mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_i I_i$  for some simple Lie algebras  $I_i$ .

$\Leftarrow$  : For all  $i$ ,  $S := \text{rad } \mathfrak{g}$ ,  $I_i \trianglelefteq I_i$  is a solvable ideal. This implies that it is 0, since  $I_i$  is simple.

By definition, simple Lie algebras are not abelian.

Supposing that  $S = I_i$ , we would then have  $[S, S] \neq 0$  since  $[I_i, I_i] \neq 0$  by definition. But  $[S, S] \neq S$  because  $S$  is solvable, which says that  $S$  is not simple (a contradiction).

Note that  $[\text{rad } \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] \subseteq \bigoplus [\text{rad } \mathfrak{g}, I_i] = 0$ , which forces  $\text{rad } \mathfrak{g} \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{g})$ . Since  $I_i$  is simple,  $Z(I_i) = 0$  for all  $i$ . But  $Z(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigoplus Z(I_i) = 0$ , and this forces  $\text{rad } (\mathfrak{g}) \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{g}) \implies \text{rad } \mathfrak{g} = 0$ . So  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple.

Next time – starting the representation theory with  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{F})$ .

## 10 Lecture 10?

Recall the killing form:



Figure 5: Image

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa : \text{lieg}^2 &\rightarrow \mathbb{F} \\ (x, y) &\mapsto \text{tr}(\text{ad}_x \circ \text{ad}_y). \end{aligned}$$

and Cartan's criteria:

1.  $\mathfrak{g}$  is solvable  $\iff \kappa(x, y) = 0 \ \forall x \in \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}], \ y \in \mathfrak{g}$ .
2.  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple  $\iff \kappa$  is non-degenerate.

Theorem: If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, then

- a.  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n I_i$  for some  $I_i \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  which are all simple.
- b. Every simple ideal  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  is one of the  $I_i$ .
- c.  $\kappa_{I_i} = \kappa_{\mathfrak{g}}|_{I_i \times I_i}$ .

Proof of (a): Use induction on  $\dim \mathfrak{g}$ . If  $\mathfrak{g}$  has no nonzero proper ideals, then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is simple and we're done.

Otherwise, let  $I_1$  be a minimal nonzero ideal of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then  $I_1^\perp \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  is also an ideal, and thus  $I := I_1 \cap I_1^\perp \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$  is as well. Then for all  $x \in [I, I]$ , we must have  $\kappa(x, y) = 0$  for any  $y \in I \subseteq I_1^\perp$ . So  $I$  is solvable, and thus  $I = 0$ . So  $\mathfrak{g} = I_1 \oplus I_1^\perp$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{ad } x &\sim \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_x & B_x \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) & \kappa_{\mathfrak{g}}(x, y) &= \text{tr} \left( \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_x & B_x \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_y & B_y \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \right) \\
 \text{ad } y &\sim \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_y & B_y \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) & &= \text{tr} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_x A_y & B_x B_y \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \\
 & & &= \text{tr}(A_x A_y) \\
 & & &= \chi_{\mathcal{I}_i}(x, y)
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 6: Image

Note that any ideal of  $I_1^\perp$  is also an ideal of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , which implies that  $\text{rad}(I_1^\perp) \subseteq \text{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ , which is zero since  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, and thus  $I_1^\perp$  is semisimple as well.

By the inductive hypothesis,  $I_1^\perp = I_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus I_n$  where each  $I_j \trianglelefteq I_i^\perp$  is simple. Then  $I_j \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g} \implies [I_1, I_j] \subset I_1 \cap I_j$ , since  $I_1$  has no contribution. But this is a subset of  $I_1 \cap I_1^\perp = 0$ .  $\square$

Proof of (b): If  $I \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$ , then  $[I, \mathfrak{g}] \trianglelefteq I$  because  $[[I, \mathfrak{g}], I] \subseteq [I, I] \subseteq [I, \mathfrak{g}]$ .

Since  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple,  $0 = \text{rad}(\mathfrak{g}) \supseteq Z(\mathfrak{g})$ . So  $[I, \mathfrak{g}] \neq 0$ , and thus  $[I, \mathfrak{g}] = I$  since  $I$  is simple. But then  $[I, \mathfrak{g}] = \bigoplus [I, I_i]$  is simple as well. So only one direct summand can survive, since otherwise this would produce at least 2 nontrivial ideals, and  $[I, \mathfrak{g}] = [I, I_i]$  for some  $i$ .

So for all  $j \neq i$ , we must have  $I_j \cap I = I_j \cap [I, I_i] = 0$ , and so  $I \subseteq I_i$ . But then  $I = I_i$  since  $I_i$  itself is simple, and we're done.

Proof of (c):

(Without using the simplicity of  $I_i$ )

For  $x, y \in I_i$ , we have

## 10.1 Inner Derivations

Recall that  $\text{ad } \mathfrak{g} \subseteq \text{Der } \mathfrak{g}$ , and in fact (lemma) this is an ideal.

Theorem: If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, then  $\text{ad } \mathfrak{g} = \text{Der } \mathfrak{g}$ .

Proof of lemma:

For all  $\delta \in \text{Der } \mathfrak{g}$  and all  $x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\delta, \text{ad}_x](y) &= \delta([x, y]) - [x, \delta(y)] \\ &= [\delta(x), y] \\ &= [\text{ad}_{\delta(x)}](y), \end{aligned}$$

and so  $[\delta, \text{ad}_x] \subseteq \text{ad } \mathfrak{g}$ .  $\square$

Proof of theorem:

If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, then  $0 = \text{rad } \mathfrak{g} \supseteq Z(\mathfrak{g}) = \ker \text{ad}$ . Thus  $\text{ad } \mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{g} / \ker \text{ad} \cong \mathfrak{g}$  is also semisimple.

This means that  $\kappa_{\text{ad } \mathfrak{g}}$  is non-degenerate, and thus  $\text{ad } \mathfrak{g} \cap (\text{ad } \mathfrak{g})^\perp = 0$ , where  $(\text{ad } \mathfrak{g})^\perp \leq \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$ .

(Note that the non-degeneracy of  $\kappa$  already forces  $(\text{ad } \mathfrak{g})^\perp = 0$ .)

Then  $[(\text{ad } \mathfrak{g})^\perp, \text{ad } \mathfrak{g}] = 0$ , and so for all  $\delta \in (\text{ad } \mathfrak{g})^\perp$ , we have  $\delta(x) = [\delta, \text{ad}_x]$  by the lemma, but we've shown that this is zero.

But then  $\delta$  must be zero because  $\text{ad}$  is an isomorphism, and in particular it is injective. This means that  $(\text{ad } \mathfrak{g})^\perp = 0$ , and thus  $\text{ad } \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}$ .  $\square$

We can use this to define an abstract Jordan decomposition by pulling back decompositions on adjoints:

## 11 Friday Lecture

Todo

## 12 Monday September 16th

Let  $S = \exp(\text{ade}) \circ \exp(\text{ad} - f) \circ \exp(\text{ade}i)$ , which has the following matrix:

Where  $\exp(\text{ade}) = 1 + \text{ade} + \frac{1}{2}(\text{ade})^2$ , which would have the form

Theorem: If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, then any finite dimensional  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $V$  is completely reducible, i.e. it splits into a direct sum of simple modules.

### 12.1 Proof of Weyl's(?) Theorem

If  $V$  itself is simple, then we're done, so suppose it is not.

Assume there exists a nonzero submodule  $U \subsetneq V$ . It suffices to show that  $V = U \oplus U'$  for some  $U'$ .

#### 12.1.1 Step 1:

If  $\dim V = 2$  and  $\dim U = 1$ .



$$\mathfrak{g} \subseteq \text{End}(V)$$

$$x \xrightarrow{\text{ad}} \text{ad } x$$

$$\parallel \text{JD}$$

$$\parallel \text{JD}$$

$$x_s \mapsto \text{ad } x_s = (\text{ad } x)_s$$

+

$$x_n \mapsto \text{ad } x_n = (\text{ad } x)_n$$



Can recover some  $x_s$  and  $x_n$  from the adjoints

Figure 7: Image

$$\begin{pmatrix} & & -1 \\ & -1 & \\ -1 & & \end{pmatrix}$$

Figure 8: Image

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & 2 & \\ & \cdot & -1 \\ & & \cdot \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ & \cdot & \cdot \\ & & \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

Figure 9: Image




Figure 10: Image

Then  $U, V/U$  are both trivial modules. So  $g \curvearrowright u = 0$  for all  $u \in U$ . But then  $g \curvearrowright (v + U) = U$  for all  $v \in V$ , since  $g \curvearrowright v \in U$ .

So for all  $x, y \in \mathfrak{lieg}$  and all  $v \in V$ , we have  $[x, y] \curvearrowright v = x \curvearrowright (y \curvearrowright v) - y \curvearrowright (x \curvearrowright v)$ . But both of the terms in parenthesis are in  $U$ , and all elements in  $\mathfrak{g}$  kill elements in  $U$ , so this is zero. So  $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] \curvearrowright V$  trivially.

Exercise: If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple, then  $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] = \mathfrak{g}$ .

So  $\mathfrak{g} \curvearrowright V$  trivially. Thus any  $U'$  that is a complementary subspace of  $U$  will be a submodule of  $V$ .

### 12.1.2 Step 2:

Suppose  $U$  is simple and  $\dim U > 1$ , so  $\dim V/U = 1$ .

Let  $\Omega$  be the Casimir element on  $U$  (faithful representation?). Then  $\Omega u = \check{c}$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{F}$ , and so  $\Omega(U) \subseteq U$ .

Since  $\Omega : V \curvearrowright$  is a homomorphism,  $\ker \Omega \subseteq V$  is a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -submodule. Then  $\dim V/U = 1 \implies V/U$  is a trivial module. So  $\mathfrak{g} \curvearrowright V/U = 0$ , i.e.  $\mathfrak{g} \curvearrowright V \subseteq U$ .

Then  $\Omega(v) = \sum_i x_i \curvearrowright (y_i \curvearrowright v) \in U$  for all  $v \in V$ . What is the matrix of  $\Omega$ ?

In particular,  $\text{Tr}(\Omega|_{V/U}) = 0$ . So  $\text{Tr}(\Omega) = \text{Tr}(\Omega|_U)$ . From 6.2, we know that  $\text{Tr}(\Omega) \neq 0 \implies c \neq 0$ , where  $c$  is the scalar appearing above. So  $\ker \Omega$  is 1-dimensional, and  $\ker \Omega \cap U = \{0\}$ .

So take  $U' = \ker \Omega$ .

### 12.1.3 Step 3:

Suppose  $U$  is *not* simple, but  $\dim V/U = 1$ .

We will induct on the dimension of  $U$ . Pick a proper nonzero submodule  $\bar{U} \subsetneq U$ , so that  $\dim U/\bar{U} < \dim U$ . Now  $V/U \cong (V/\bar{U})/(U/\bar{U})$  by an isomorphism theorem. So  $U/\bar{U}$  is a submodule of  $V/\bar{U}$  of codimension 1. Applying the inductive hypothesis, we obtain  $V/\bar{U} = U/\bar{U} \oplus \bar{V}/\bar{U}$  for some  $\bar{V}$  such that  $U \subseteq \bar{V} \subseteq V$ .

In particular, since  $U \subseteq \bar{V}$  has codimension 1,  $\dim \bar{U} < \dim U$ . So apply the inductive hypothesis again:  $\bar{V} = \bar{U} \oplus U'$  for some  $U'$ , and  $V = U \oplus U'$ .

### 12.1.4 Step 4: The general case

Recall that  $\text{hom}(V, U)$  is a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module where

$$(g \curvearrowright \phi)(v) = g \curvearrowright \phi(v) - \phi(g \curvearrowright v).$$

Define

$$S = \{\phi \in \text{hom}(V, U) \mid \phi|_U \in F1_U\}.$$

Then  $S \leq \text{hom}(V, U)$  as a submodule. Define  $T = \{\phi \in S \mid \phi|_U = 0\}$ . Then  $T \leq S$  as a submodule, and  $\mathfrak{g}(S) \subseteq T$ .

Now each  $\phi \in S$  is determined (mod  $T$ ) by the scalar  $\phi|_U$ . Note that  $\dim(S/T) = 1$ . By steps 1-3, we know that  $S = T \oplus T'$  for some  $T' \subseteq S$  of dimension 1. Then  $T' = \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}(f)$  for some nonzero map  $f : V \rightarrow U$  such that  $f(u) = cu$  for some  $c \neq 0$ .

Then  $\mathfrak{g}(T \oplus T') = \mathfrak{g}(S) \subseteq T \implies \mathfrak{g}(T') = 0$ . So for all  $g \in \mathfrak{g}$ , we have  $0 = (g \curvearrowright f)(v) = f \curvearrowright f(v) - f(g \curvearrowright v)$ . Then  $f : V \rightarrow U$  is a lie algebra homomorphism,  $\ker f = U'$ , and thus  $V = U \oplus U'$ .  $\square$

Some consequences of Weyl's theorem:

## 12.2 Preservation of Jordan Decomposition

Recall that when  $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$  is a linear lie algebra, then for  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  we have:

Jordan Decomposition:  $x = x_s + x_n$  where  $x_s, x_n \in \text{End}(V)$ .

Abstract Jordan Decomposition:

$$h = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Figure 11: Image

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{g} &\xrightarrow{\text{ad}} \text{ad}(\mathfrak{g}) \\ x &\mapsto \text{ad}x \\ x_s &\leftarrow (\text{ad}x)_s \\ x_n &\leftarrow (\text{ad}x)_n. \end{aligned}$$

and so  $x = x'_s + x'_n$  for some  $x'$ . The theorem will be that these recover the usual Jordan decomposition.

Theorem: If  $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$  is semisimple and  $V$  is finite dimensional, then  $x_s, x_n \in \mathfrak{g}$ , and  $x_s = x'_s, x'_n$ .

Corollary: If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple and finite dimensional and  $\phi : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(V)$  is a finite dimensional representation, then if  $x = x_s + x_n$  is the abstract Jordan decomposition, then  $\phi(x) = \phi(x_s) + \phi(x_n)$  is the Jordan decomposition in  $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ .

Example: If  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is semisimple and finite dimensional, and  $h$  is diagonal, then by JD  $h = h + 0$ ,  $\phi(h) = \phi(h) + 0$ . Then  $h \curvearrowright V$  semisimply, or  $V = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} V_\lambda$ , where  $V_\lambda = \{v \in V \mid h \curvearrowright v = \lambda v\}$  are the eigenspaces.