

**The Killing Form**

- bilinear form  $B$  is invariant if  $\forall x,y \in \mathfrak{g}, B(ad_x y, z) = B(y, ad_x z) = 0$
- Lemma:  $B$  invariant &  $\mathfrak{g}$  nil ideal then  $\mathfrak{Z} = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid B(x, y) = 0\}$   
 note:  $\mathfrak{Z} = \mathfrak{K} = 0$  is general
- $B_{\mathfrak{g}}(x, y) = \text{Tr}(\text{ad}_x \text{ad}_y)$  for a representation  $R$   
 •  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a symmetric, invariant bilinear form only  
 • for  $\mathfrak{g}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{so}(n, \mathbb{C}) + i\mathfrak{so}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{so}(2n, \mathbb{R})$
- Then: if for some  $R, R_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is non-degenerate then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is reductive  
 • Then  $\mathfrak{g}(n, \mathbb{R}), \mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C}), \mathfrak{so}(n), \mathfrak{su}(n), \mathfrak{sp}(n, \mathbb{C})$  are reductive  
 •  $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C}), \mathfrak{so}(n, \mathbb{R}), \mathfrak{su}(n), \mathfrak{sp}(n, \mathbb{C})$  are semisimple  
 •  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{so}(3, \mathbb{R})$  is  $\mathfrak{so}(3, \mathbb{R}) \oplus i\mathfrak{so}(3, \mathbb{R})$   
 • for  $\mathfrak{g}(n) = \mathfrak{sp}(n, \mathbb{C}) \cong \mathfrak{u}(n)$  non-degenerate  
 decomposition follows from orthogonality in  $\mathfrak{H}_n$   
 $\mathfrak{Z}(\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})) = \mathfrak{Z}(\mathfrak{u}(n)) = 0$  for  $n \geq 3$

- Killing form  $K(x, y) = B_{\mathfrak{ad}}(x, y) = \text{tr}(ad_x ad_y)$   
 explicitly for  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ :  
 basis of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ :  $e = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, h = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$   
 $\Rightarrow [e, f] = h, [h, e] = 2e, [h, f] = -2f$   
 $\Rightarrow ad_e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, ad_f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, ad_h = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$   
 $\Rightarrow K = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 12 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow K = 4e_{11} - 8e_{22} + 12e_{33}$

- Cartan's criterion of a) solvability,  $\mathfrak{g}$  solvable iff  $K(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}) = 0$   
 b) semisimplicity,  $\mathfrak{g}$  semisimple iff  $K$  non-degenerate  
 Pf:  $\Rightarrow$  a) by Lie's theorem,  $\mathfrak{g}$  is solvable  $\Rightarrow ad_x$  is upper triangular  
 so  $\text{tr}(ad_x ad_y) = 0$   
 • b)  $\mathfrak{g}$  reductive &  $\forall x \in \mathfrak{g}, ad_x \neq 0$  so  $\text{rank} ad_x = \dim \mathfrak{g}$   
 $\therefore \mathfrak{g} \cap \ker ad_x = \{0\}$  is semisimple  
 • b)  $\Leftarrow$  Herstein's lemma  
 $K_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is the Killing form of  $\mathfrak{Z}$  which therefore vanishes  
 $\therefore \mathfrak{Z}$  is solvable  
 $\mathfrak{g}$  semisimple  $\iff \mathfrak{Z} = 0$  so  $K$  is non-degenerate  
 • a) relies on Jordan decomposition:  
 $A = V + N$ ,  $A \in \mathfrak{g}$ ,  $V \in \mathfrak{h}$ ,  $N \in \mathfrak{n}$   
 $\Rightarrow$  semisimple  $\iff$   $\forall x \in \mathfrak{g}, \text{tr}(x \text{ad}_V x) = \text{tr}(x \text{ad}_N x) = 0$   
 $\Rightarrow$   $\text{ad}_N = 0$  for some  $x$

**The Cartan Decomposition**

- $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  is semisimple or nilpotent if  $ad_x$  is an operator on  $\mathfrak{g}$
- Then: if  $\mathfrak{g}$  semisimple then any  $x, y, z \in \mathfrak{g}$  can be written  
 $x, y, z$  semisimple &  $x, z$  nilpotent  
 $\Rightarrow [x, y] = 0$  &  $[x, z] = 0$  then  $[x, y, z] = 0$   
 •  $\mathfrak{H}$  is a general form of the Jordan decomposition  
 • Then any semisimple  $\in$  Lie algebra has non-trivial semisimple elements  
 otherwise all nilpotent + Engel's theorem

- $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is a Cartan subalgebra if  $\mathfrak{h}$  is commutative & has only semisimple elements
- Note: from now on  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a complex, semisimple Lie algebra
- Then: if  $\mathfrak{g}$  hermitian  $\mathfrak{K}, B$  is non-degenerate, invariant, symmetric, bilinear form  
 1)  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$  for  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  diagonalizable,  $\mathfrak{g}_1 \in \mathfrak{K}$ ,  $ad_x \in \mathfrak{so}(n) \times \mathfrak{su}(n)$   
 in particular  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$

- 2)  $[\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1] \subset \mathfrak{g}_1$
- 3)  $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{a}$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{p}$  orthogonal w.r.t  $B$
- 4)  $\mathfrak{H}$ ,  $B$  defines non-degenerate  $\mathfrak{g}_0 \cong \mathfrak{g}_1 \cong \mathfrak{C}$   
 Pf: 1) by definition,  $ad_x$  diagonalizable for  $x \in \mathfrak{h}$   
 simultaneously so does hermitian elements  
 1) let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$  with  $(ad_x - \lambda I)^2 = 0$  for  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_1$   
 consider  $[\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1] = \mathfrak{g}_1$ ,  $\forall x \in \mathfrak{g}_0, y \in \mathfrak{g}_1$   
 $(ad_x - \lambda I)^2 y = (ad_x - \lambda I)(y + [x, y]) = 0$   
 so  $(ad_x - \lambda I)^2 y + \lambda [x, y] = 0$   
 $\iff \lambda [x, y] + \lambda^2 y = 0$  for  $x \in \mathfrak{h}$ ,  $y \in \mathfrak{g}_1$   
 2)  $B([x, y], z) + B(x, [y, z]) = 0 = B([x, y], z) + B(x, [y, z])$   
 so  $B([x, y], z) = 0$

- Lemma: 1)  $B$  restricted to  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is non-degenerate  
 2)  $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{a}$ ,  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a reductive subalgebra

- Cartan subalgebra  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is hermitian and equal to its real part  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h})$   
 $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}) = \{x \in \mathfrak{h} \mid [x, y] = 0 \forall y \in \mathfrak{h}\}$   
 but from  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}) \cap \mathfrak{h}$   
 so  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is a Cartan subalgebra

- Then: maximal hermitian subalgebras are Cartan  
 Pf:  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$  decomposes of some maximal hermitian  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$   
 $\forall x \in \mathfrak{g}_0, ad_x \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is nilpotent:  
 otherwise  $ad_x \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} \implies x \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$   
 then  $\mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$  so  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$  would be hermitian  
 contradiction to maximality of  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$   
 Engel's theorem  $\implies \mathfrak{g}_1$  is nilpotent }  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is commutative  
 Lemma  $\implies \mathfrak{g}_0$  is reductive  
 $ad_x$  nilpotent  $\implies ad_x$  only nilpotent  $\forall y \in \mathfrak{g}_1$   
 so  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}) \cap \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} = 0$   
 Then non-degeneracy of Killing form  $\implies \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} = 0$   
 so  $\forall x, y, x \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is semisimple  $\therefore \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}) \cap \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}}$  is hermitian  
 thus  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h})$  is Cartan

- Cor: all complex semisimple  $\mathfrak{g}$  contain a Cartan subalgebra  
 • Then: for a complex, semisimple  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  
 $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{p} \oplus \mathfrak{q}$  where  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a Cartan subalgebra  
 with "real part"  $\mathfrak{h} = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid x = -x^{\dagger}\}$   
 and "imaginary"  $\mathfrak{p} = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid x = i x^{\dagger}\}$