

# CANONICAL STRUCTURE CONSTANTS FOR SIMPLE LIE ALGEBRAS

MEINOLF GECK AND ALEXANDER LANG

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra over  $\mathbb{C}$ . In the 1950s Chevalley showed that  $\mathfrak{g}$  admits particular bases, now called “Chevalley bases”, for which the corresponding structure constants are integers. Such bases are not unique but, using Lusztig’s theory of canonical bases, one can single out a “canonical” Chevalley basis which is unique up to a global sign. In this paper, we give explicit formulae for the structure constants with respect to such a basis.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra over  $\mathbb{C}$ . We shall assume that the reader is familiar with the basic aspects of the Cartan–Killing structure theory for  $\mathfrak{g}$ ; see, e.g., Bourbaki [2] or Humphreys [8]. Let  $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$  be a Cartan subalgebra and  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  be the dual space. For any  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  let  $\mathfrak{g}_\lambda$  be the subspace of all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $[h, x] = \lambda(h)x$  for  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ . Then the root system of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is the set of all non-zero  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  such that  $\mathfrak{g}_\lambda \neq \{0\}$ . We have the fundamental Cartan decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad \text{where} \quad \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha = 1 \quad (\alpha \in \Phi).$$

Let us choose elements  $0 \neq e_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . Then  $\{e_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$ , together with a basis of  $\mathfrak{h}$ , yields a basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . In order to completely describe the multiplication table for  $\mathfrak{g}$ , the main problem are the Lie brackets  $[e_\alpha, e_\beta]$  where  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ . If  $\beta = -\alpha$ , then  $[e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}] = c_\alpha h_\alpha$ , where  $0 \neq c_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $h_\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}$  is the co-root corresponding to  $\alpha$ . Now there is a partition of  $\Phi$  into positive and negative roots. By fixing elements  $e_\alpha$  for all positive roots  $\alpha \in \Phi$ , one can always choose  $e_{-\alpha}$  such that  $c_\alpha$  takes any desired value. (Usually one takes  $c_\alpha = 1$  but we will see that other choices are equally valuable.) Furthermore, it is known that  $[e_\alpha, e_\beta] = 0$  if  $\alpha + \beta \notin \Phi$  (e.g., if  $\alpha = \beta$ ); otherwise, we have

$$[e_\alpha, e_\beta] = N_{\alpha, \beta} e_{\alpha + \beta} \quad \text{where} \quad 0 \neq N_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

The constants  $N_{\alpha, \beta}$  are the main object of interest in this paper. So let now  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\beta \neq \pm\alpha$ . Then we set

$$p_{\alpha, \beta} := \max\{i \geq 0 \mid \beta + i\alpha \in \Phi\} \quad \text{and} \quad q_{\alpha, \beta} := \max\{i \geq 0 \mid \beta - i\alpha \in \Phi\}.$$

Thus, the sequence  $\beta - q_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha, \dots, \beta - \alpha, \beta, \beta + \alpha, \dots, \beta + p_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha$  is the “ $\alpha$ -string through  $\beta$ ”. All elements in that sequence are roots in  $\Phi$ . Chevalley [4] showed that one can always choose the elements  $e_\alpha$  such that

$$N_{\alpha, \beta} = \pm(q_{\alpha, \beta} + 1) \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi.$$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 20G40; Secondary 17B45.

*Key words and phrases*. Root systems, Lie algebras, structure constants.

This work is a contribution to the SFB-TRR 195 “Symbolic Tools in Mathematics and their Application” of the German Research Foundation (DFG).

In this case, we say that  $\{e_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$  (together with a suitable basis of  $\mathfrak{h}$  determined by that selection) is a ‘‘Chevalley basis’’ of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Note that such bases are not unique. One can replace each  $e_\alpha$  individually by  $\pm e_\alpha$ , and one still obtains a Chevalley basis. Now there is Lusztig’s theory [11] of canonical bases for quantised enveloping algebras. This gives rise to canonical bases in all finite-dimensional irreducible  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules. In particular, there is a canonical basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , viewed as a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module via the adjoint representation; see [12] and further references there to previous work of Lusztig on this subject (prior to [11]). In [6], this is presented in a completely elementary way, without reference to the general theory in [11] or [12]. The result is that, by an inductive procedure entirely within  $\mathfrak{g}$  itself, one can single out a ‘‘canonical’’ collection of the elements  $\{e_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$ , which is unique up to replacing all  $e_\alpha$  simultaneously by  $-e_\alpha$ . Hence, the resulting structure constants  $N_{\alpha,\beta}$  are also uniquely determined up to a global sign. The purpose of this paper is to find explicit formulae for them.

In Section 2, we recall some further facts from the structure theory of simple Lie algebras and define the ‘‘canonical’’ collection of the elements  $e_\alpha$  mentioned above. In Section 3 we give an explicit formula for the corresponding ‘‘canonical’’ structure constants  $N_{\alpha,\beta}$ , in the case where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is simply laced, that is, of type  $A_n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ),  $D_n$  ( $n \geq 3$ ) or  $E_n$  ( $n = 6, 7, 8$ ). The proof of the main result, Theorem 3.9, is by a general argument, not ‘‘case-by-case’’. In Section 4, we use the technique of ‘‘folding’’ to obtain analogous results for  $\mathfrak{g}$  of type  $B_n, C_n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ),  $G_2$  and  $F_4$ .

That technique is well-known in Lie theory; see, e.g., De Graaf [5, §5.15] or Kac [9, §7.9]. See also Mitzman [13] where this is used to construct integral forms of type 2 and 3 affine Lie algebras and their universal enveloping algebras. Lusztig [11] uses ‘‘admissible automorphisms’’ (= ‘‘folding’’ in the finite case) to reduce the study of canonical bases for quantised enveloping algebras in the non-symmetric case to the symmetric case. In Section 4 we will present the ‘‘folding’’ procedure for  $\mathfrak{g}$  in a way where the canonical basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is built in from the outset; this may be of independent interest. In particular, ‘‘folding’’ will be seen to be perfectly compatible with canonical bases.

## 2. THE $\epsilon$ -CANONICAL CHEVALLEY BASIS OF $\mathfrak{g}$

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a simple Lie algebra,  $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$  be a Cartan subalgebra and  $\Phi \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^*$  be the root system, as in Section 1. Let  $I$  be a finite index set and  $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$  be a set of simple roots of  $\Phi$ . Every  $\alpha \in \Phi$  can be written uniquely as  $\alpha = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i$  where  $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and either  $n_i \geq 0$  for all  $i \in I$  or  $n_i \leq 0$  for all  $i \in I$ . Correspondingly, we say that  $\alpha$  is a positive or a negative root, respectively. Thus,  $\alpha$  can be represented by an  $I$ -tuple  $(n_i)_{i \in I}$  where all  $n_i$  have the same sign. The integer  $\text{ht}(\alpha) := \sum_{i \in I} n_i$  is called the height of  $\alpha$ .

**2.1.** For every  $\alpha \in \Phi$  let  $h_\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}$  be the corresponding co-root. This is characterised as follows. It is known that  $[\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}]$  is a 1-dimensional subspace of  $\mathfrak{h}$ , and that  $\alpha$  is non-zero on  $[\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}]$ . Then  $h_\alpha$  is the unique element in that subspace on which  $\alpha$  takes the value 2. (See, e.g., Bourbaki [2, Ch. VIII, §2, no. 2].) If we now take any  $0 \neq e_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ , then there is an element  $e_{-\alpha} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$  such that  $[e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}] = \pm h_\alpha$ . Thus, the subspace  $\langle e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}, h_\alpha \rangle_{\mathbb{C}} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$  is a subalgebra isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ . (For example, in [2], it is assumed that  $[e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}] = -h_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha$ ; in [8], it is assumed that

$[e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}] = +h_\alpha$ . For us it will be convenient to keep the flexibility of choosing a sign for each  $\alpha \in \Phi$ .)

**2.2.** The root system  $\Phi$  has the following invariance property (which gives rise to the Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{g}$  but we will not need to formally introduce this). Then

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle := \beta(h_\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta - \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \alpha \in \Phi \quad \text{for all } \alpha, \beta \in \Phi.$$

This has the following consequence. Assume that  $m := \beta(h_\alpha) \neq 0$ . Then the  $\alpha$ -string through  $\beta$  contains the term  $\beta - m\alpha$ . Hence, if  $m < 0$ , then we will also have  $\beta + \alpha \in \Phi$ ; if  $m > 0$ , then we will also have  $\beta - \alpha \in \Phi$ . (For all this see, e.g., Bourbaki [1, Ch. VI, §1, no. 3] or [2, Ch. VIII, §2, no. 2].)


**2.3.** We set  $h_i := h_{\alpha_i}$  for  $i \in I$ . We have just seen that there are elements  $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_i}$  and  $f_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha_i}$  such that  $h_i = [e_i, f_i]$  for all  $i \in I$ . It is known that  $\mathfrak{g}$  is generated (as a Lie algebra) by the elements  $e_i, f_i$  ( $i \in I$ ). We call  $\{e_i, f_i, h_i \mid i \in I\}$  a system of *Chevalley generators* for  $\mathfrak{g}$ . (By the Isomorphism Theorem in [8, §14.2], any two such systems can be transformed into each other by an automorphisms of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .) The corresponding Cartan matrix is defined by  $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$  where

$$a_{ij} := \langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j \rangle = \alpha_j(h_i) \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in I.$$

Thus, we have  $[h_i, e_j] = a_{ij}e_j$  and  $[h_i, f_j] = -a_{ij}f_j$  for all  $i, j \in I$ . We also have  $[e_i, f_j] = 0$  for  $i \neq j$  in  $I$ .

Now it is known that  $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$  is an indecomposable (generalised) Cartan matrix of finite type (see [9, Chap. 4]). These matrices are encoded by the Dynkin diagrams in Table 1, as follows. The vertices of the diagram are labelled by the elements of  $I$ . Let  $i, j \in I, i \neq j$ . If  $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 0$ , then there is no edge between the vertices labelled by  $i$  and  $j$ . Now assume that  $a_{ij} \neq 0$ . Then we also have  $a_{ji} \neq 0$  and the notation can be chosen such that  $a_{ij} = -1$  and  $m := -a_{ji} \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . In this case, the vertices labelled by  $i, j$  will be joined by  $m$  edges; if  $m \geq 2$ , then we put an additional arrow pointing towards  $j$ .

TABLE 1. Dynkin diagrams of Cartan matrices of finite type



**2.4.** In the diagrams in Table 1 we also specify a function  $\epsilon: I \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\epsilon(i) = -\epsilon(j)$  whenever  $i \neq j$  and  $a_{ij} \neq 0$ . Note that, since the diagram is connected, there are exactly two such functions: if  $\epsilon$  is one of them, then the other

one is  $-\epsilon$ . (The conventions for the definition of  $\epsilon$  for types  $B_n, C_n, G_2, F_4$  will be explained in Section 4.) This function is an essential ingredient in the definition of a “canonical Chevalley basis” of  $\mathfrak{g}$  below.

**2.5.** The following remarks will be useful in identifying a Chevalley basis for  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let us choose, for each  $\alpha \in \Phi$ , elements  $e_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  and  $e_{-\alpha} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$  such that  $[e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}] = \pm h_\alpha$ . Furthermore, let  $\omega: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  be the unique automorphism such that  $\omega(e_i) = f_i$ ,  $\omega(f_i) = e_i$  and  $\omega(h_i) = -h_i$  for  $i \in I$ ; note that  $\omega^2 = \text{id}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ . (This exists by the Isomorphism Theorem [8, §14.2], or see [6, Remark 4.8].) Assume that

$$\omega(e_\alpha) = \pm e_{-\alpha} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Phi.$$

Now let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Then, by Chevalley [4, p. 23], we have  $N_{\alpha, \beta} N_{-\alpha, -\beta} = \pm(q_{\alpha, \beta} + 1)^2$ . Using the automorphism  $\omega$ , it follows that  $N_{-\alpha, -\beta} = \pm N_{\alpha, \beta}$  and, hence,

$$(*) \quad N_{\alpha, \beta}^2 = \pm(q_{\alpha, \beta} + 1)^2 \quad \text{whenever } \alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi.$$

So if we know for some reason that  $N_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $N_{\alpha, \beta} = \pm(q_{\alpha, \beta} + 1)$ . Assume now that this is the case; then  $B := \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \cup \{e_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$  is a *Chevalley basis* of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Since each  $h_\alpha$  is known to be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear combination of  $h_i$  ( $i \in I$ ), it follows that the complete multiplication table of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with respect to  $B$  has only entries in  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Thus, a Chevalley basis defines an “integral structure” of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

**2.6.** We can now describe Lusztig’s *canonical basis* of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , in the elementary version of [6]. Having fixed  $\epsilon: I \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  (see 2.4), there is a unique collection of elements  $\{0 \neq \mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$  such that the following relations hold, for any  $i \in I$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_i}^\epsilon &= \epsilon(i)e_i, & \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha_i}^\epsilon &= -\epsilon(i)f_i, \\ [e_i, \mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon] &= (q_{\alpha_i, \alpha} + 1)\mathbf{e}_{\alpha+\alpha_i}^\epsilon & \text{if } \alpha + \alpha_i \in \Phi, \\ [f_i, \mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon] &= (p_{\alpha_i, \alpha} + 1)\mathbf{e}_{\alpha-\alpha_i}^\epsilon & \text{if } \alpha - \alpha_i \in \Phi. \end{aligned}$$

See [6, §5]. If we replace  $\epsilon$  by  $-\epsilon$ , then  $\mathbf{e}_\alpha^{-\epsilon} = -\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon$  for all  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . So the passage from  $\epsilon$  to  $-\epsilon$  is given by a very simple rule. In this setting, it automatically follows that

$$\omega(\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon) = -\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon] = (-1)^{\text{ht}(\alpha)} h_\alpha \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Phi;$$

see [6, Theorem 5.7]. We call

$$\mathcal{B}^\epsilon = \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \cup \{\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$$

the  $\epsilon$ -*canonical Chevalley basis* of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . (The above rules provide an efficient algorithm for constructing  $\mathcal{B}^\epsilon$ ; see [7].) The structure constants with respect to the collection  $\{\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$  will be denoted by  $N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon$ ; thus we have

$$[\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon \mathbf{e}_{\alpha+\beta}^\epsilon \quad \text{if } \alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi.$$

It will be convenient to set  $N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon := 0$  for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  such that  $\alpha \neq \pm\beta$  and  $\alpha + \beta \notin \Phi$ . It is already known (see once more [6, Theorem 5.7]) that

$$N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon = \eta^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)(q_{\alpha, \beta} + 1) \quad \text{if } \alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi,$$

where  $\eta^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) = \pm 1$ . So  $\mathcal{B}^\epsilon$  indeed is a Chevalley basis. Our aim is to obtain explicit formulae for the signs  $\eta^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ , just in terms of the roots  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  and  $\epsilon$ .

**Example 2.7** (Type  $A_{n-1}$ ). Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n$  be the Lie algebra of  $n \times n$ -matrices with trace zero. Let  $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$  be the subalgebra consisting of all diagonal matrices with trace zero. It is known that  $\mathfrak{g}$  is simple and  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $\delta_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  be the map which sends a diagonal matrix to its  $i$ th diagonal entry; note that  $\delta_1 + \dots + \delta_n = 0$ . For  $i \neq j$  let  $e_{ij} \in \mathfrak{g}$  be the matrix with entry 1 at position  $(i, j)$ , and 0 everywhere else. Then a simple matrix calculation shows that

$$[h, e_{ij}] = (\delta_i(x) - \delta_j(x))e_{ij} \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathfrak{h},$$

and so  $e_{ij} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\delta_i - \delta_j}$ . It easily follows that  $\Phi = \{\delta_i - \delta_j \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n, i \neq j\}$ . Now set  $\alpha_i := \delta_i - \delta_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . Then  $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}\}$  is a system of simple roots for  $\Phi$ . For all  $i \neq j$  we have

$$\delta_i - \delta_j = \begin{cases} \alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} + \dots + \alpha_{j-1} & \text{if } i < j, \\ -(\alpha_j + \alpha_{j+1} + \dots + \alpha_{i-1}) & \text{if } i > j. \end{cases}$$

Now let  $I := \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ ; for  $i \in I$  we set

$$h_i := e_{ii} - e_{i+1, i+1} \in \mathfrak{h}, \quad e_i := e_{i, i+1} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_i}, \quad f_i := e_{i+1, i} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha_i}.$$

Then  $\{e_i, f_i, h_i \mid i \in I\}$  is a system of Chevalley generators for  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Since the Lie brackets  $[e_i, e_{kl}]$  are easily determined for all  $i$  and all  $k \neq l$ , one can directly verify in this case that

$$\boxed{\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon = -(-1)^{\text{ht}(\alpha)} \epsilon(i) e_{ij} \quad \text{if } \alpha = \delta_i - \delta_j, i \neq j.}$$

(For this purpose, one has to check that the relations in 2.6 hold; note that the absolute value of  $\text{ht}(\alpha)$  equals  $|i - j|$  if  $\alpha = \delta_i - \delta_j$ .) Let  $\alpha = \delta_i - \delta_j$  and  $\beta = \delta_j - \delta_k$  where  $i, j, k$  are pairwise different. Then  $\alpha + \beta = \delta_i - \delta_k$  and

$$\boxed{[\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = -\epsilon(j) \mathbf{e}_{\alpha+\beta}^\epsilon, \quad \text{that is,} \quad N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) = -\epsilon(j).}$$

Similar explicit descriptions have been determined by the second named author for all the classical Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{g}$  of type  $B_n, C_n, D_n$  in their natural matrix representations; see [10, Chap. 2].

### 3. THE SIMPLY LACED CASE

We keep the notation of the previous section. Our aim will be to describe the structure constants  $N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon$  with respect to the  $\epsilon$ -canonical Chevalley basis

$$\mathcal{B}^\epsilon = \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \cup \{\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$$

of  $\mathfrak{g}$  (see 2.6). In this section, we shall deal with the case where  $A$  is *simply laced*, that is,  $a_{ij} \in \{0, \pm 1\}$  for all  $i \neq j$  in  $I$ .

*Remark 3.1.* Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . By the defining properties of the Lie bracket, we certainly have  $N_{\beta, \alpha}^\epsilon = -N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon$ . Now let  $\omega: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  be the automorphism in 2.5. As already mentioned in 2.6, we have  $\omega(\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon) = -\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon$  for all  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . This implies that  $N_{-\alpha, -\beta}^\epsilon = -N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon$ . Hence, in order to determine the structure constants  $N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon$ , it is sufficient to consider the case where  $\alpha$  is a positive root (but  $\beta$  may still be an arbitrary root).

**3.2.** Assume that  $A$  is simply laced. This is equivalent to saying that  $A$  is symmetric, and also to saying that  $A$  is of type  $A_n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ),  $D_n$  ( $n \geq 3$ ) or  $E_n$  ( $n = 6, 7, 8$ ). Assume now that this is the case. Then the following hold, where  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  are such that  $\alpha \neq \pm\beta$ .

- (a)  $0 \leq p_{\alpha,\beta} + q_{\alpha,\beta} \leq 1$  and  $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ .
- (b)  $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = 1 \Leftrightarrow \alpha - \beta \in \Phi$ , and  $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = -1 \Leftrightarrow \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ .
- (c)  $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \langle \beta, \alpha \rangle$ . (This immediately follows from (a) and (b).)
- (d) If  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ , then  $q_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$  and so  $N_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon = \pm 1$ .

(See, e.g., Bourbaki [1, Ch. VI, §1, no. 3] or the discussion in Carter [3, §3.4].)

**Example 3.3.** Assume that  $A$  is simply laced. Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ . Using the properties in 3.2, we obtain the following formula, which will be useful below. Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ . Write  $\alpha = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i$  and  $\beta = \sum_{j \in I} m_j \alpha_j$  where  $n_i, m_j \in I$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle &= \beta(h_\alpha) = \sum_{j \in I} m_j \alpha_j(h_\alpha) = \sum_{j \in I} m_j \langle \alpha, \alpha_j \rangle = \sum_{j \in I} m_j \langle \alpha_j, \alpha \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j \in I} m_j \alpha(h_j) = \sum_{i,j \in I} n_i m_j \alpha_i(h_j) = \sum_{i,j \in I} n_i m_j a_{ji} = \sum_{i,j \in I} a_{ij} n_i m_j. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.4.** Assume that  $A$  is simply laced. Let  $l \in I$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha_l + \alpha \in \Phi$  and  $\alpha_l + \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Also assume that  $\alpha \neq \pm \beta$  and  $\beta \neq \pm \alpha_l$ . Then we have either  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$  or  $\alpha_l + \beta \in \Phi$  (but not both). Accordingly, we have:

$$N_{\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta}^\epsilon = \begin{cases} N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon & \text{if } \alpha + \beta \in \Phi, \\ -N_{\alpha, \alpha_l + \beta}^\epsilon & \text{if } \alpha_l + \beta \in \Phi. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We have  $[\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l}^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon] = N_{\alpha_l, \alpha}^\epsilon \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l + \alpha}^\epsilon$ ,  $[\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l + \alpha}^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = N_{\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta}^\epsilon \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l + \alpha + \beta}^\epsilon$ . So, using the Jacobi identity and the anti-symmetry of the Lie bracket, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\alpha_l, \alpha}^\epsilon N_{\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta}^\epsilon \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l + \alpha + \beta}^\epsilon &= [[\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l}^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon], \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = -[[\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon], \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l}^\epsilon] - [[\mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l}^\epsilon], \mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon] \\ &= [\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l}^\epsilon, [\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon]] - [\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, [\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l}^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon]]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ , then  $[\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon \mathbf{e}_{\alpha + \beta}^\epsilon$ ; otherwise, this is 0 (since  $\alpha \neq \pm \beta$ ). Similarly, if  $\alpha_l + \beta \in \Phi$ , then  $[\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l}^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = N_{\alpha_l, \beta}^\epsilon \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_l + \beta}^\epsilon$ ; otherwise, this is 0 (since  $\beta \neq \pm \alpha_l$ ). Hence, since  $N_{\alpha_l, \alpha}^\epsilon = \epsilon(l)$  (see 2.6 and note that  $q_{\alpha_l, \alpha} = 0$  since  $A$  is simply laced), we obtain the following formula:

$$\epsilon(l) N_{\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta}^\epsilon = N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon N_{\alpha_l, \alpha + \beta}^\epsilon - N_{\alpha_l, \beta}^\epsilon N_{\alpha, \alpha_l + \beta}^\epsilon.$$

Since  $A$  is simply laced, all non-zero structure constants are  $\pm 1$ . Since the left hand side of the above identity is non-zero, we conclude that either  $N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon N_{\alpha_l, \alpha + \beta}^\epsilon = \pm 1$  or  $N_{\alpha_l, \beta}^\epsilon N_{\alpha, \alpha_l + \beta}^\epsilon = \pm 1$  (but not both). Hence, either  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$  or  $\alpha_l + \beta \in \Phi$  (but not both). Accordingly,  $\epsilon(l) N_{\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta}^\epsilon = N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon N_{\alpha_l, \alpha + \beta}^\epsilon \neq 0$  or  $\epsilon(l) N_{\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta}^\epsilon = -N_{\alpha_l, \beta}^\epsilon N_{\alpha, \alpha_l + \beta}^\epsilon \neq 0$ . In the first case,  $N_{\alpha_l, \alpha + \beta}^\epsilon = \epsilon(l)$ ; in the second case,  $N_{\alpha_l, \beta}^\epsilon = \epsilon(l)$ . This yields the desired formulae.  $\square$

**Definition 3.5** (Lang [10, §3.2.2]). For  $\alpha \in \Phi$  we set  $\text{sgn}(\alpha) := 1$  if  $\alpha$  is positive, and  $\text{sgn}(\alpha) := -1$  if  $\alpha$  is negative. Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Writing  $\alpha = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i$  and  $\beta = \sum_{j \in I} m_j \alpha_j$  with  $n_i, m_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define

$$\clubsuit \quad \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) := \text{sgn}(\alpha) \text{sgn}(\beta) \text{sgn}(\alpha + \beta) \prod_{i,j \in I} \epsilon(i)^{a_{ij} n_i m_j} = \pm 1.$$

Using the identity  $\langle \alpha_i, \beta \rangle = \beta(h_i) = \sum_{j \in I} \alpha_j(h_i) m_j = \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} m_j$ , we can re-write the above formula as

$$\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) = \text{sgn}(\alpha) \text{sgn}(\beta) \text{sgn}(\alpha + \beta) \prod_{i \in I} \epsilon(i)^{n_i \langle \alpha_i, \beta \rangle},$$

which will be useful in some arguments below.

**Example 3.6.** Assume that  $A$  is simply laced. Let  $i \in I$  and  $\beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha_i + \beta \in \Phi$ . We claim that  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_i, \beta) = \epsilon(i)$ . Indeed, we have  $n_i = 1$  and  $n_j = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ . It is known that  $\beta$  and  $\alpha_i + \beta$  have the same sign and so  $\text{sgn}(\beta)\text{sgn}(\alpha_i + \beta) = 1$ . Hence, since  $\text{sgn}(\alpha_i) = 1$ , we obtain  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_i, \beta) = \epsilon(i)^{\langle \alpha_i, \beta \rangle}$ . Since  $\alpha_i + \beta \in \Phi$  we have  $\langle \alpha_i, \beta \rangle = -1$  by 3.2(b). So  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_i, \beta) = \epsilon(i)$ .

In the following two results we show that  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$  satisfies relations analogous to those in Remark 3.1 and Lemma 3.4.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Assume that  $A$  is simply laced. If  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ , then  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\beta, \alpha) = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(-\alpha, -\beta) = -\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $\text{sgn}(-\alpha) = -\text{sgn}(\alpha)$ ,  $\text{sgn}(\beta) = -\text{sgn}(\beta)$  and  $\text{sgn}(-\alpha - \beta) = -\text{sgn}(\alpha + \beta)$ . Changing  $\alpha$  to  $-\alpha$  and  $\beta$  to  $-\beta$  does not change anything in the product over  $i, j \in I$  in the definition of  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ . Hence, we certainly have  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(-\alpha, -\beta) = -\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ . Now consider the relation between  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$  and  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\beta, \alpha)$ . Let  $c := \text{sgn}(\alpha)\text{sgn}(\beta)\text{sgn}(\alpha + \beta)$ . If  $i, j \in I$  are such that  $a_{ij} = a_{ji} \neq 0$ , then  $\epsilon(i) = -\epsilon(j)$ . Consequently, we can re-write  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$  as

$$\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) = c \prod_{i, j \in I} (-\epsilon(j))^{a_{ji}m_j n_i} = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\beta, \alpha) \prod_{i, j \in I} (-1)^{a_{ij}n_i m_j}.$$

By Example 3.3, the right hand side equals  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\beta, \alpha)(-1)^{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle}$ . Since  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ , we have  $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = -1$  by 3.2(b). Hence,  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) = -\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\beta, \alpha)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** *Assume that  $A$  is simply laced. Let  $l \in I$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha_l + \alpha \in \Phi$  and  $\alpha_l + \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Also assume that  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and  $\beta \neq \pm\alpha_l$ . By Lemma 3.4, we have either  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$  or  $\alpha_l + \beta \in \Phi$  (but not both). Then*

$$\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta) = \begin{cases} \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) & \text{if } \alpha + \beta \in \Phi, \\ -\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \alpha_l + \beta) & \text{if } \alpha_l + \beta \in \Phi. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Let  $c := \text{sgn}(\alpha)\text{sgn}(\beta)\text{sgn}(\alpha + \beta)$ . Since  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha_l + \alpha$  have the same sign, and  $\alpha + \beta$  and  $\alpha_l + \alpha + \beta$  have the same sign, we conclude that

$$\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta) = c \epsilon(l)^{(n_l+1)\langle \alpha_l, \beta \rangle} \prod_{i \in I \setminus \{l\}} \epsilon(i)^{n_i \langle \alpha_i, \beta \rangle} = \epsilon(l)^{\langle \alpha_l, \beta \rangle} \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta).$$

Assume first that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Since  $\alpha_l + \beta \notin \Phi$ , we have  $\langle \alpha_l, \beta \rangle = 0$  by 3.2. Hence,  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta) = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ , as claimed. Now assume that  $\alpha_l + \beta \in \Phi$ . Since  $\langle \alpha_l, \beta \rangle = -1$  by 3.2, we conclude that  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta) = \epsilon(l)\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ . On the other hand, since  $\beta$  and  $\alpha_l + \beta$  have the same sign, we obtain

$$\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \alpha_l + \beta) = c \prod_{i \in I} \epsilon(i)^{n_i \langle \alpha_i, \alpha_l + \beta \rangle} = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) \prod_{i \in I} \epsilon(i)^{\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_l \rangle}.$$

Let  $c' := \text{sgn}(\alpha)\text{sgn}(\alpha_l)\text{sgn}(\alpha_l + \alpha)$ . Then the product on the right hand side equals  $c' \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \alpha_l)$ . Since  $\alpha, \alpha_l + \alpha$  have the same sign and since  $\text{sgn}(\alpha_l) = 1$ , we have  $c' = 1$ . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.7 and Example 3.6, we have  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \alpha_l) = -\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_l, \alpha) = -\epsilon(l)$ . Hence,  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \alpha_l + \beta) = -\epsilon(l)\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) = -\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_l + \alpha, \beta)$ , as claimed.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.9.** *Assume that  $A$  is simply laced. Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Then  $[\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)\mathbf{e}_{\alpha+\beta}$  with  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$  as in ( $\clubsuit$ ).*

*Proof.* We must show that  $N_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$  whenever  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . By Remark 3.1 and Lemma 3.7, it is sufficient to consider the case where  $\alpha$  is a positive root (but  $\beta$  may be arbitrary). Assume now that  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$  (= set of positive roots). Then we proceed by induction on  $\text{ht}(\alpha)$ . If  $\text{ht}(\alpha) = 1$ , then  $\alpha = \alpha_i$  for some  $i \in I$ . In this case, the assertion holds by Example 3.6 and the formulae in 2.6. Now let  $\text{ht}(\alpha) > 1$ . It is well-known that we can find some  $l \in I$  such that  $\gamma := \alpha - \alpha_l \in \Phi^+$ . Then  $\alpha_l + \gamma \in \Phi$  and  $\alpha_l + \gamma + \beta = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Assume first that  $\gamma \neq \pm\beta$  and  $\beta \neq \pm\alpha_l$ . Then we can apply Lemma 3.4 and obtain

$$N_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon = N_{\alpha_l+\gamma,\beta}^\epsilon = \begin{cases} N_{\gamma,\beta}^\epsilon & \text{if } \gamma + \beta \in \Phi, \\ -N_{\gamma,\alpha_l+\beta}^\epsilon & \text{if } \alpha_l + \beta \in \Phi. \end{cases}$$

By induction, we already know that  $N_{\gamma,\beta}^\epsilon = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\gamma, \beta)$  in the first case, and  $N_{\gamma,\alpha_l+\beta}^\epsilon = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\gamma, \alpha_l + \beta)$  in the second case. Using Lemma 3.8, we conclude that the result equals  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$  in both cases, as desired.

It remains to deal with the cases where  $\gamma = \pm\beta$  or  $\beta = \pm\alpha_l$ . If  $\gamma = \beta$ , then  $\alpha_l + \gamma \in \Phi$  and  $\alpha_l + 2\gamma = \alpha_l + \gamma + \beta \in \Phi$ , contradiction to 3.2(a). On the hand, if  $\gamma = -\beta$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon &= N_{\alpha,-\gamma}^\epsilon = N_{\gamma,-\alpha}^\epsilon && \text{(by Remark 3.1),} \\ \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) &= \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, -\gamma) = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\gamma, -\alpha) && \text{(by Lemma 3.7).} \end{aligned}$$

Now note that, by induction, the two right hand sides are equal; hence, so are the left hand sides. Next, if  $\beta = \alpha_l$ , then  $\gamma + \alpha_l \in \Phi$  and  $\gamma + 2\alpha_l = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ , contradiction to 3.2(a). On the other hand, if  $\beta = -\alpha_l$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon &= N_{\alpha,-\alpha_l}^\epsilon = N_{\alpha_l,-\alpha}^\epsilon && \text{(again by Remark 3.1),} \\ \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) &= \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, -\alpha_l) = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_l, -\alpha) && \text{(again by Lemma 3.7).} \end{aligned}$$

By 2.6 and Example 3.6, the two right hand sides are both equal to  $\epsilon(l)$ .  $\square$

#### 4. FOLDING

We keep the general notation of the previous sections. We assume from now that the Cartan matrix  $A$  is simply laced; thus,  $A$  is of type  $A_n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ),  $D_n$  ( $n \geq 3$ ) or  $E_n$  ( $n = 6, 7, 8$ ). Furthermore, let  $I \rightarrow I$ ,  $i \mapsto i'$ , be a bijection such that

- (a)  $a_{ij} = a_{i'j'}$  for all  $i, j \in I$ .
- (b)  $a_{ii'} = 0$  for all  $i \in I$  such that  $i' \neq i$ .

The first condition means that  $i \mapsto i'$  corresponds to a symmetry of the Dynkin diagram of  $A$ ; the second condition means that, if  $i \neq i'$ , then the nodes labelled by  $i$  and  $i'$  are not connected in the Dynkin diagram. Let  $d \geq 1$  denote the order of the bijection  $i \mapsto i'$  (as an element of the symmetric group on  $I$ ). The non-trivial possibilities are listed in Table 2. (The last column will be explained below.) Note that there is also a non-trivial symmetry of order 2 for  $A$  of type  $A_{2n}$  ( $n \geq 1$ ), but condition (b) is not satisfied in this case. By the Isomorphism Theorem in [8, §14.2], there is a Lie algebra automorphism  $\tau: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  such that

$$\tau(e_i) = e_{i'}, \quad \tau(f_i) = f_{i'} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(h_i) = h_{i'} \quad \text{for all } i \in I.$$

Since the permutation  $i \mapsto i'$  ( $i \in I$ ) has order  $d$ , we also have  $\tau^d = \text{id}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ .



TABLE 2. Diagram automorphisms

Type of $A$	$d$	orbits of $i \mapsto i'$	$\tilde{A}$
$A_{2n-1}$ ( $n \geq 2$ )	2	$\{n\}, \{n-1, n+1\}, \{n-2, n+2\}, \dots, \{1, 2n-1\}$	$C_n$
$D_{n+1}$ ( $n \geq 3$ )	2	$\{1, 2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \dots, \{n+1\}$	$B_n$
$D_4$	3	$\{3\}, \{1, 2, 4\}$	$G_2$
$E_6$	2	$\{2\}, \{4\}, \{3, 5\}, \{1, 6\}$	$F_4$

**4.1.** Let  $\tilde{I}$  be a set of representatives for the orbits of the bijection  $i \mapsto i'$  of  $I$ . Note that we can choose  $\tilde{I}$  such that the subdiagram (of the original diagram of  $A$ ) formed by the nodes in  $\tilde{I}$  is connected. (For example, this holds if we select the first element listed in each orbit in the 3rd column of Table 2.) For each  $i \in I$ , let  $d_i$  be the size of the orbit of  $i$ . (Since  $d = 1$  or  $d$  is a prime, we have  $d_i = 1$  or  $d_i = d$ .) Now define

$$\tilde{A} = (\tilde{a}_{ij})_{i,j \in \tilde{I}} \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{a}_{ij} := \begin{cases} d_i a_{ij} & \text{if } d_i > d_j = 1, \\ a_{ij} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then a case-by-case verification shows that  $\tilde{A}$  (for  $d > 1$ ) is an indecomposable Cartan matrix of the type specified in the last column of Table 2. If we order the rows and columns of  $\tilde{A}$  according to the list of orbits in the 2nd column, then the diagram of  $\tilde{A}$  corresponds exactly to the one with the same name in Table 1.

Let  $\epsilon: I \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  be the function defined in Table 1 for  $A$  of type  $A_{2n-1}$ ,  $D_{n+1}$  and  $E_6$ . Then we notice that  $\epsilon$  is constant on the orbits of  $I$ . So, by restriction, we obtain analogous functions  $\tilde{\epsilon}: \tilde{I} \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  for  $\tilde{A}$  of type  $B_n$ ,  $C_n$ ,  $G_2$  and  $F_4$ , as specified in Table 1.

We will now show that the automorphism  $\tau: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  is compatible with the various constructions in the previous sections. First note that  $\tau$  restricts to the linear map  $\tau_{\mathfrak{h}}: \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}$  such that  $h_i \mapsto h_{i'}$  ( $i \in I$ ). Let  $\tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*: \mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$  be the contragredient dual map, that is,  $\tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\lambda) = \lambda \circ \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^{-1}$  for  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *For any  $\alpha \in \Phi$ , we have  $\alpha' := \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\alpha) \in \Phi$ . The map  $\alpha \mapsto \alpha'$  is a permutation of  $\Phi$  such that  $\alpha'_j = \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\alpha_j) = \alpha_{j'}$  for all  $j \in I$ . Since  $\alpha \mapsto \alpha'$  is linear, we have  $\text{ht}(\alpha) = \text{ht}(\alpha')$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha \in \Phi$  and  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}$ . Note that, by the definition  $\tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ , we have  $\alpha'(\tau(h)) = \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\alpha)(\tau(h)) = \alpha(h)$  for  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ , and so

$$[\tau(h), \tau(x)] = \tau([h, x]) = \tau(\alpha(h)x) = \alpha(h)\tau(x) = \alpha'(\tau(h))\tau(x).$$

Since  $\mathfrak{h} = \{\tau(h) \mid h \in \mathfrak{h}\}$ , this shows that  $\tau(x) \in \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha'}$ . So, since  $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \neq \{0\}$ , we also have  $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha'} \neq \{0\}$  and, hence,  $\alpha' \in \Phi$ . Finally, let  $\alpha = \alpha_j$  for some  $j \in I$ . Then

$$\alpha'_j(h_{i'}) = \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\alpha_j)(h_{i'}) = \alpha_j(\tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^{-1}(h_{i'})) = \alpha_j(h_i) = a_{ij} = a_{i'j'} = \alpha_{j'}(h_{i'})$$

for all  $i \in I$ . Since  $\{h_{i'} \mid i \in I\}$  is a basis of  $\mathfrak{h}$ , this yields  $\alpha'_j = \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\alpha_j) = \alpha_{j'}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{B}^{\epsilon} = \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \cup \{e_{\alpha}^{\epsilon} \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$  be the  $\epsilon$ -canonical Chevalley basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$  (as in 2.6). Then we have*

$$\tau(e_{\alpha}^{\epsilon}) = e_{\alpha'}^{\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(h_{\alpha}) = h_{\alpha'} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Phi.$$

Furthermore,  $N_{\alpha, \beta}^{\epsilon} = N_{\alpha', \beta'}^{\epsilon}$  if  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ .

*Proof.* Since  $[\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon] = (-1)^{\text{ht}(\alpha)} h_\alpha$ , it suffices to prove the assertion about  $\tau(\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon)$ . First assume that  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ . Then we proceed by induction on the height  $\text{ht}(\alpha)$ . If  $\text{ht}(\alpha) = 1$ , then  $\alpha = \alpha_i$  for some  $i \in I$ . By inspection of Table 2, we see that  $\epsilon(i) = \epsilon(i')$ . So we obtain

$$\tau(\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_i}^\epsilon) = \tau(\epsilon(i)e_i) = \epsilon(i)\tau(e_i) = \epsilon(i)e_{i'} = \epsilon(i)\epsilon(i')\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_{i'}} = \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_{i'}}^\epsilon,$$

as required. Now let  $\text{ht}(\alpha) > 1$ . Then, as is well-known, there exists some  $i \in I$  such that  $\beta := \alpha - \alpha_i \in \Phi^+$ . By induction, we already know that  $\tau(\mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon) = \mathbf{e}_{\beta'}^\epsilon$ . We have  $[e_i, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = (q_{\alpha_i, \beta} + 1)\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon$ . Since  $A$  is simply laced, we have  $q_{\alpha, \beta} = 0$ ; see 3.2(a). This yields

$$\tau(\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon) = \tau([e_i, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon]) = [\tau(e_i), \tau(\mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon)] = [e_{i'}, \mathbf{e}_{\beta'}^\epsilon].$$

Since  $\alpha_{i'} + \beta' = \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\alpha_i) + \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\beta) = \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\alpha_i + \beta) = \tau_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\alpha) = \alpha' \in \Phi$ , the right hand side of the above identity equals  $(q_{\alpha_{i'}, \beta'} + 1)\mathbf{e}_{\alpha'}^\epsilon$ . But, again, we have  $q_{\alpha_{i'}, \beta'} = 0$  and so  $\tau(\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon) = \mathbf{e}_{\alpha'}^\epsilon$ , as desired.

Thus, the assertion holds for all  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ . In order to deal with negative roots, we consider the automorphism  $\omega: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  in 2.5; we have  $\omega(e_i) = f_i$ ,  $\omega(f_i) = e_i$  and  $\omega(h_i) = -h_i$  for  $i \in I$ . One easily sees that  $\omega$  and  $\tau$  commute with each other. By 2.6, we have  $\omega(\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon) = -\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon$  for all  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . Now let  $\alpha \in \Phi^-$ . Then  $-\alpha \in \Phi^+$  and so we already know that  $\tau(\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon) = \mathbf{e}_{(-\alpha)'}^\epsilon = \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha'}^\epsilon$ . Hence, since  $\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon = -\omega(\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon)$ , we obtain

$$\tau(\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon) = -(\tau \circ \omega)(\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon) = -(\omega \circ \tau)(\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon) = -\omega(\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha'}^\epsilon) = \mathbf{e}_{\alpha'}^\epsilon,$$

as required. The assertion about  $N_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon$  is now clear since  $\tau$  is a homomorphism.  $\square$

**4.4.** We set  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} := \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \tilde{\tau}(x) = x\}$ ; clearly, this is a Lie subalgebra of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . For any  $i \in I$  we denote by  $\underline{i}$  the orbit of  $i$  under the permutation  $i \mapsto i'$  of  $I$ ; let  $d_i := |\underline{i}|$ . Recall from 4.1 that  $\tilde{I}$  is a (certain) set of representatives of those orbits. Let  $i \in \tilde{I}$  and  $\underline{i} = \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$  be the orbit of  $i$  where  $r = d_i$ ; then we set

$$\tilde{e}_i := e_{i_1} + \dots + e_{i_r}, \quad \tilde{f}_i := f_{i_1} + \dots + f_{i_r}, \quad \tilde{h}_i := h_{i_1} + \dots + h_{i_r}.$$

These elements only depend on the orbit of  $i$ ; furthermore,  $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{h}_i \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  for all  $i \in \tilde{I}$ . A straightforward computation, using the relations in 2.3 and the definition of  $\tilde{A} = (\tilde{a}_{ij})_{i, j \in \tilde{I}}$  in 4.1, shows that

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i] &= \tilde{h}_i & \text{and} & & [\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_j] &= 0 & \text{for } i, j \in I \text{ such that } i \neq j, \\ [\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{e}_j] &= \tilde{a}_{ij}\tilde{e}_j & \text{and} & & [\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{f}_j] &= -\tilde{a}_{ij}\tilde{f}_j & \text{for all } i, j \in \tilde{I}. \end{aligned}$$

Also note that  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} := \langle \tilde{h}_i \mid i \in \tilde{I} \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  is an abelian subalgebra (since  $[h_i, h_j] = 0$  for all  $i, j \in I$ ).

**4.5.** For any  $\alpha \in \Phi$ , we denote by  $\underline{\alpha}$  the orbit of  $\alpha$  under the permutation  $\alpha \mapsto \alpha'$  of  $\Phi$ ; again, we have  $|\underline{\alpha}| \in \{1, d\}$ . We set

$$\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon := \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon \in \mathfrak{g}.$$

By Proposition 4.3, we have  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . Also note that we certainly have  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon = \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\beta^\epsilon$  for all  $\beta \in \underline{\alpha}$ . So let  $\tilde{\Phi}$  be a set of representatives for the orbits of  $\Phi$  under the permutation  $\alpha \mapsto \alpha'$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}^\epsilon = \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \cup \{\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$  is a basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and

since  $\tau$  is an automorphism of finite order which permutes the elements of  $\mathcal{B}^\epsilon$  (see again Proposition 4.3), it easily follows by an elementary argument that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon := \{\tilde{h}_i \mid i \in \tilde{I}\} \cup \{\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon \mid \alpha \in \tilde{\Phi}\} \quad \text{is a basis of } \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

Note that the elements of  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon$  are integral linear combinations of elements of the basis  $\mathcal{B}^\epsilon$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Hence, since the complete multiplication table of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{B}^\epsilon$  has only entries in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , it is already clear that the complete multiplication table of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  with respect to  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon$  will only have entries in  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Now the following facts are standard; see, e.g., De Graaf [5, §5.15], Kac [9, §7.9] or Mitzman [13, §3.2].

- (a) The Lie algebra  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  is simple and  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  is a Cartan subalgebra.
- (b) A system of Chevalley generators for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  is given by  $\{\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{h}_i \mid i \in \tilde{I}\}$ ; the corresponding Cartan matrix is  $\tilde{A}$  (of the type specified in Table 2).

We shall deal with the roots for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  in a way that is somewhat different from [5], [9] or [13]. This will also lead to an explicit description of the co-roots in Corollary 4.7 below. Note that, in [5] and [9], the definition of co-roots is not consistent with the general theory. (See the formulae in [5, (5.18)] or [9, (7.9.3)].)

For  $\alpha \in \Phi$  we denote by  $\tilde{\alpha}: \tilde{\mathfrak{h}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  the restriction of  $\alpha$  to the subspace  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} \subseteq \mathfrak{h}$ . Note that all roots in the orbit  $\underline{\alpha}$  have the same restriction to  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ . (This immediately follows from the formula  $\alpha'(\tau(h)) = \tau_\mathfrak{h}^*(\alpha)(h) = \alpha(h)$ .) A priori, it could happen that two roots have the same restriction to  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$  even if they are not in the same orbit. But the following result shows that this can not happen.

**Lemma 4.6.** *The roots of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  with respect to  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$  are given by the set  $\{\tilde{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Phi\} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ , where  $\tilde{\alpha} = \tilde{\beta}$  if and only if  $\underline{\alpha} = \underline{\beta}$ . We have  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\tilde{\alpha}} = \langle \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon \rangle_{\mathbb{C}}$  for all  $\alpha \in \tilde{\Phi}$ .*

*Proof.* We claim that  $[\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon] = \alpha(\tilde{h}_i)\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon$  for  $i \in \tilde{I}$  and  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . To see this, note again that  $\alpha'(\tau(h)) = \tau(h)$  for  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$  (by the definition of  $\tau_\mathfrak{h}^*$ ). Hence, since  $\tau(\tilde{h}_i) = \tilde{h}_i$ , we have  $\alpha'(\tilde{h}_i) = \alpha(\tilde{h}_i)$ , and so  $\beta(\tilde{h}_i) = \alpha(\tilde{h}_i)$  for all  $\beta \in \underline{\alpha}$ . It follows that

$$[\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon] = \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} [\tilde{h}_i, \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon] = \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} \beta(\tilde{h}_i)\mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon = \alpha(\tilde{h}_i) \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} \mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon = \alpha(\tilde{h}_i)\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon,$$

as desired. This means that  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\tilde{\alpha}} =$  weight space of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  for  $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ . Since  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ , we must have  $\tilde{\alpha} \neq 0$ ; thus,  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is a root of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . Since the weight spaces corresponding to roots are 1-dimensional, we conclude that  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\tilde{\alpha}} = \langle \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon \rangle_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Since  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon$  is a basis of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ , it follows that  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{h}} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \tilde{\Phi}} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\tilde{\alpha}}$  is the Cartan decomposition of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ ; in particular, we must have  $\tilde{\alpha} \neq \tilde{\beta}$  if  $\underline{\alpha} \neq \underline{\beta}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.7.** *In the above setting, the following holds.*

- (a) Let  $\alpha \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ . Then  $\alpha \pm \alpha' \notin \Phi$  and  $\alpha \pm \alpha'' \notin \Phi$ .
- (b) The co-root corresponding to  $\alpha \in \tilde{\Phi}$  is given by  $\tilde{h}_\alpha^\epsilon := \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} h_\beta \in \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ . Thus, we have  $\tilde{h}_\alpha^\epsilon \in [\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{-\alpha}]$  and  $\tilde{\alpha}(\tilde{h}_\alpha^\epsilon) = 2$ .

*Proof.* (a) Assume that  $\beta := \alpha + \alpha' \in \Phi$ . Since  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  have the same restriction to  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ , it follows that  $\tilde{\beta} = 2\tilde{\alpha}$  is a root of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ , contradiction since the root system of a simple Lie algebra is reduced. Now assume that  $\gamma := \alpha - \alpha' \in \Phi$ . Then  $\tilde{\gamma} = 0$  is a root of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ , again a contradiction. The proofs for  $\alpha \pm \alpha''$  are analogous.

(b) By Proposition 4.3, it is clear that  $\tilde{h}_\alpha \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . Now let  $\beta, \gamma \in \underline{\alpha}$ . If  $\beta \neq \gamma$ , then  $\beta = \gamma'$  or  $\beta = \gamma''$ . Hence, (a) implies that  $\beta - \gamma \notin \Phi$  and so  $[\mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_{-\gamma}^\epsilon] = 0$ . This yields

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon] = \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} \sum_{\gamma \in \underline{\alpha}} [\mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_{-\gamma}^\epsilon] = \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} [\mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_{-\beta}^\epsilon] = \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} (-1)^{\text{ht}(\beta)} h_\beta,$$

where the last equality holds by 2.6. Since all roots in  $\underline{\alpha}$  have the same height, the right hand side equals  $(-1)^{\text{ht}(\alpha)} \tilde{h}_\alpha$ ; thus,  $\tilde{h}_\alpha \in [\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{-\alpha}]$ . Now consider  $\tilde{\alpha}(\tilde{h}_\alpha^\epsilon) = \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} \alpha(h_\beta)$ . Let  $\beta \in \underline{\alpha}$ . If  $\beta = \alpha$ , then  $\alpha(h_\beta) = \alpha(h_\alpha) = 2$ . If  $\beta \neq \alpha$ , then  $\beta = \alpha'$  or  $\beta = \alpha''$ . Assume, if possible, that  $\alpha(h_\beta) \neq 0$ . Then the invariance property in 2.2 implies that  $\alpha \pm \beta \in \Phi$ , that is,  $\alpha \pm \alpha' \in \Phi$  or  $\alpha \pm \alpha'' \in \Phi$ , contradiction to (a). Hence,  $\tilde{\alpha}(\tilde{h}_\alpha^\epsilon) = \alpha(h_\alpha) = 2$ .  $\square$

TABLE 3. Roots of type  $D_4$  (see Example 4.8)

orbits in $\Phi^+$	$\tilde{\alpha}$
$\{1000, 0100, 0001\}$	$\tilde{\alpha}_1$
$\{0010\}$	$\tilde{\alpha}_3$
$\{1010, 0110, 0011\}$	$\tilde{\alpha}_1 + \tilde{\alpha}_3$
$\{1110, 1011, 0111\}$	$2\tilde{\alpha}_1 + \tilde{\alpha}_3$
$\{1111\}$	$3\tilde{\alpha}_1 + \tilde{\alpha}_3$
$\{1121\}$	$3\tilde{\alpha}_1 + 2\tilde{\alpha}_3$

**Example 4.8.** Let  $A$  be of type  $D_4$ , where  $I = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and  $1' = 2, 2' = 4, 4' = 1, 3' = 3$ . Let  $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$  be a system of simple roots in  $\Phi$ . We take  $\tilde{I} = \{1, 3\}$ ; then we have two linearly independent restrictions  $\{\tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_3\}$ . Table 3 shows the orbits of  $\alpha \mapsto \alpha'$  on the 12 positive roots in  $\Phi$ , and expressions for  $\tilde{\alpha}$  as linear combinations of  $\tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_3$ . (In that table, we simply write 1011 instead of  $\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4$ , for example.) In the second column, we recognise a root system of type  $G_2$ , as expected from Table 2.

Here is a key property of the signs  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$  in Definition 3.5.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Let  $S(\alpha, \beta)$  be the set of all pairs  $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$  where  $\alpha_0 \in \underline{\alpha}$ ,  $\beta_0 \in \underline{\beta}$  and  $\alpha_0 + \beta_0 \in \Phi$ . Then  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$  for all  $(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta)$ .*

*Proof.* First note that, by Theorem 3.9 and Proposition 4.3, we certainly have

$$(*) \quad \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha'_0, \beta'_0) \quad \text{for all } (\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta).$$

Also note that  $\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\beta}_0 = \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta}$  for all  $(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta)$ . Hence, by Lemma 4.6,

$$(\dagger) \quad (\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha_0 + \beta_0 \in \underline{\alpha + \beta} \quad (\text{orbit of } \alpha + \beta).$$

Now we distinguish four cases.

*Case 1.* Assume that  $\alpha = \alpha'$ . Then  $\alpha + \beta_0 \in \Phi$  for all  $\beta_0 \in \underline{\beta}$ . So  $S(\alpha, \beta) = \{(\alpha, \beta_0) \mid \beta_0 \in \underline{\beta}\}$  and the desired property follows from (\*).

*Case 2.* Assume that  $\beta = \beta'$ . This is completely analogous to Case 1.

*Case 3.* Assume that  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$  and  $\beta \neq \beta'$  but  $\alpha + \beta = \alpha' + \beta'$ . The latter condition means that the orbit of  $\alpha + \beta$  is just  $\{\alpha + \beta\}$ . Now assume, if possible, that

$(\alpha, \beta') \in S(\alpha, \beta)$ . Then  $(\dagger)$  would imply  $\alpha + \beta' \in \{\alpha + \beta\}$ , contradiction. Hence, we have  $\alpha + \beta' \notin \Phi$ . Similarly, one sees that  $\alpha + \beta'' \notin \Phi$  if  $d = 3$ . Consequently, we have  $S(\alpha, \beta) = \{(\alpha, \beta), (\alpha', \beta')\}$  (if  $d = 2$ ) or  $S(\alpha, \beta) = \{(\alpha, \beta), (\alpha', \beta'), (\alpha'', \beta'')\}$  (if  $d = 3$ ). So the desired assertion follows again from  $(*)$ .

*Case 4.* Assume that  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$  and  $\beta \neq \beta'$  and  $\alpha + \beta \neq \alpha' + \beta'$ . First let  $d = 2$ . Then  $\underline{\alpha} = \{\alpha, \alpha'\}$  and  $\underline{\beta} = \{\beta, \beta'\}$ . If we had  $\alpha + \beta' \in \Phi$ , then  $(\dagger)$  would imply that  $\alpha + \beta'$  belongs to the orbit of  $\alpha + \beta$ , contradiction because that orbit is  $\{\alpha + \beta, \alpha' + \beta'\}$ . Hence,  $\alpha + \beta' \notin \Phi$ . Similarly, one sees that  $\alpha' + \beta \notin \Phi$ . Consequently, we have  $S(\alpha, \beta) = \{(\alpha, \beta), (\alpha', \beta')\}$  and so, again, the desired property follows from  $(*)$ .

Finally, assume that  $d = 3$ , so we are in the situation of Example 4.8. By inspection of Table 3, one sees that one of  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta$  must be equal to  $\pm\alpha_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ . If  $\alpha = \pm\alpha_i$  or  $\beta = \pm\alpha_i$ , then the desired assertion follows from Example 3.6 and Lemma 3.7. So assume now that  $\alpha + \beta = \pm\alpha_i$ . Using  $(*)$  and Lemma 3.7, it is enough to consider the case where  $\alpha + \beta = \alpha_1$ . An inspection of Table 3 gives only two possibilities:

$$(\alpha, \beta) = (1110, -0110) \quad \text{or} \quad (\alpha, \beta) = (1011, -0011).$$

In the first case,  $\underline{\alpha} = \{1110, 0111, 1011\}$  and  $\underline{\beta} = \{-0110, -0011, -1010\}$ ; furthermore,  $|S(\alpha, \beta)| = 6$ . Using the formula in Definition 3.5 one finds that  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 1$  for all  $(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta)$ . The second case is analogous.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.10.** *The set  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon = \{\tilde{h}_i \mid i \in \tilde{I}\} \cup \{\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon \mid \alpha \in \tilde{\Phi}\}$  is the  $\tilde{\epsilon}$ -canonical Chevalley basis of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ , where  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  is the restriction of  $\epsilon$  to  $\tilde{I}$ . Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta}$  is a root for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . Replacing  $\beta$  by  $\beta'$  or  $\beta''$  if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Then we have*

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\beta^\epsilon] = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)(\tilde{q}_{\alpha, \beta} + 1)\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha + \beta}^\epsilon,$$

where  $\tilde{q}_{\alpha, \beta} := \max\{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \tilde{\beta} - m\tilde{\alpha} \text{ is a root for } \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}\}$  and  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta) = \pm 1$  is as in Theorem 3.9.

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  be such that  $\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta}$  is a root for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . Then

$$(a) \quad [\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\beta^\epsilon] = \sum_{\alpha_0 \in \underline{\alpha}} \sum_{\beta_0 \in \underline{\beta}} [\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_0}^\epsilon, \mathbf{e}_{\beta_0}^\epsilon] = \sum_{(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta)} N_{\alpha_0, \beta_0}^\epsilon \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_0 + \beta_0}^\epsilon,$$

with  $S(\alpha, \beta)$  as in Lemma 4.9. Since  $\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta}$  is a root for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ , the left hand side of (a) is non-zero. So there must exist some  $(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta)$  such that  $\alpha_0 + \beta_0 \in \Phi$ . Note that then we also have  $(\alpha'_0, \beta'_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta)$  and  $(\alpha''_0, \beta''_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta)$ . Hence, replacing  $\beta$  by  $\beta'$  or  $\beta''$  if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . In this case, we can write

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\beta^\epsilon] = \tilde{N}_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha + \beta}^\epsilon \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{N}_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon \in \mathbb{C}.$$

As a first step, we show that  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon$  is a Chevalley basis of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . (This will determine the absolute value of  $\tilde{N}_{\alpha, \beta}^\epsilon$ .) For this purpose, we use the criterion in 2.5 and consider the automorphism  $\omega: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ . As already noted in the proof of Proposition 4.3, the maps  $\omega$  and  $\tau$  commute with each other. Hence,  $\omega(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) = \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  and so  $\omega$  restricts to an automorphism of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  which we denote by the same symbol. One immediately checks that  $\omega(\tilde{e}_i) = \tilde{f}_i$ ,  $\omega(\tilde{f}_i) = \tilde{e}_i$  and  $\omega(\tilde{h}_i) = -\tilde{h}_i$  for  $i \in \tilde{I}$ . So, by 2.6, we have

$\omega(\mathbf{e}_\alpha^\epsilon) = -\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon$  for all  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . Hence, we obtain

$$\omega(\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon) = \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} \omega(\mathbf{e}_\beta^\epsilon) = \sum_{\beta \in \underline{\alpha}} -\mathbf{e}_{-\beta}^\epsilon = -\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon.$$

By Corollary 4.7(b) (and its proof), we also have  $[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{-\alpha}^\epsilon] = (-1)^{\text{ht}(\alpha)} \tilde{h}_\alpha$ . Hence, the conditions in 2.5 are satisfied and so  $(\tilde{N}_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon)^2 = \pm(\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} + 1)^2$  whenever  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Finally, we already noted in 4.5 that the complete multiplication table of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  with respect to  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon$  has only entries in  $\mathbb{Q}$ ; in particular,  $\tilde{N}_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$  and, hence,  $\tilde{N}_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon = \pm(\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} + 1)$ , as required. (The above argument essentially appeared already in the proof of [13, Theorem 3.2.26].)

Now let again  $\alpha, \beta \in \tilde{\Phi}$  be arbitrary such that  $\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta}$  is a root for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . As before, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . Since  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon$  is a Chevalley basis, there is a sign  $\xi = \pm 1$  such that  $\tilde{N}_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon = \xi(\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} + 1)$ . Then

$$(b) \quad [\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\beta^\epsilon] = \tilde{N}_{\alpha,\beta}^\epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha+\beta}^\epsilon = \xi(\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} + 1) \sum_{\gamma \in \underline{\alpha+\beta}} \mathbf{e}_\gamma^\epsilon.$$

In order to determine  $\xi = \pm 1$ , we compare the two expressions (a) and (b). All coefficients of basis elements in those expressions are in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and (b) shows that they all have the same sign, given by  $\xi$ . On the other hand, by Theorem 3.9 and Lemma 4.9, all coefficients  $N_{\alpha_0,\beta_0}$  in the sum in (a) are equal to  $\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ . Hence, there are no cancellations in (a) and so  $\xi = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ ; furthermore,

$$(c) \quad \tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} + 1 = |\{(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in S(\alpha, \beta) \mid \alpha_0 + \beta_0 = \alpha + \beta\}|.$$

Thus, we have shown that

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\beta^\epsilon] = \hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)(\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} + 1)\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha+\beta}^\epsilon \quad \text{whenever } \alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi.$$

Finally, we show that  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\epsilon$  is the  $\tilde{\epsilon}$ -canonical Chevalley basis of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ ; recall the conditions from 2.6. First let  $i \in \tilde{I}$ . Then  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha_i}^\epsilon = \sum_{j \in \underline{i}} \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_j}^\epsilon = \sum_{j \in \underline{i}} \epsilon(j)e_j$ . Since  $\epsilon$  is constant on the orbits of the permutation  $i \mapsto i'$ , we conclude that  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha_i}^\epsilon = \tilde{\epsilon}(i)\tilde{e}_i$ . The argument for  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{-\alpha_i}^\epsilon$  is completely analogous. Now let also  $\alpha \in \tilde{\Phi}$  be such that  $\tilde{\alpha}_i + \tilde{\alpha}$  is a root for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ ; as before, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha_i + \alpha \in \Phi$ . By the above formula we know that

$$[\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon] = \epsilon(i)[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha_i}^\epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon] = \epsilon(i)\hat{\eta}^\epsilon(\alpha_i, \alpha)(\tilde{q}_{\alpha_i,\alpha} + 1)\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha_i+\alpha}^\epsilon = (\tilde{q}_{\alpha_i,\alpha} + 1)\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\alpha_i+\alpha}^\epsilon,$$

where the last equality holds by Example 3.6. The argument for  $[\tilde{f}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\alpha^\epsilon]$  is completely analogous (assuming that  $\tilde{\alpha} - \tilde{\alpha}_i$  is a root for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ ).  $\square$

*Remark 4.11.* Let  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ . By the detailed discussion in the proof of [5, Lemma 5.15.9], one can explicitly work out the number  $\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta}$  according to formula (c) in the above proof. Examples: If  $\alpha = \alpha'$  or  $\beta = \beta'$ , then  $\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$ . Now assume that  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$  and  $\beta \neq \beta'$ . If  $\alpha + \beta = \alpha' + \beta'$ , then  $\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} = d - 1$  where  $d$  is the order of  $\tau$ ; if  $\alpha + \beta \neq \alpha' + \beta'$  and  $d = 2$ , then  $\tilde{q}_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$ . This actually covers all cases for  $d = 2$ . If  $d = 3$ , then we are in the situation of Example 4.8; the structure constants for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  in this case are explicitly listed in Table 1 (p. 3246) of [6].

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. BOURBAKI, *Groupes et algèbres de Lie, chap. 4, 5 et 6*, Hermann, Paris, 1968.
- [2] N. BOURBAKI, *Groupes et algèbres de Lie, chap. 7 et 8*, Hermann, Paris, 1975.
- [3] R. W. CARTER, *Simple groups of Lie type*, Wiley, New York, 1972; reprinted 1989 as Wiley Classics Library Edition.
- [4] C. CHEVALLEY, Sur certains groupes simples, *Tohoku Math. J.* **7** (1955), 14–66.
- [5] W. A. DE GRAAF, *Lie algebras: Theory and Algorithms*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 56, Elsevier 2000.
- [6] M. GECK, On the construction of semisimple Lie algebras and Chevalley groups, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **145** (2017), 3233–3247.
- [7] M. GECK, ChevLie: Constructing Lie algebras and Chevalley groups, *J. Softw. Algebra Geom.* **10** (2020), 41–49; see also <https://github.com/geckmf/ChevLie.jl>.
- [8] J. E. HUMPHREYS, *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 9, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1972.
- [9] V. KAC, *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras*, Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [10] A. LANG, Kanonische Strukturkonstanten in einfachen Lie-Algebren, Master-Arbeit, Universität Stuttgart, 2023.
- [11] G. LUSZTIG, *Introduction to quantum groups*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2010, Reprint of the 1994 edition.
- [12] G. LUSZTIG, The canonical basis of the quantum adjoint representation, *J. Comb. Alg.* **1** (2017), 45–57.
- [13] D. MITZMAN, *Integral bases for affine Lie algebras and their universal enveloping algebras*, *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 40, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1985.
- [14] R. Steinberg, *Lectures on Chevalley groups*. Mimeographed notes, Department of Math., Yale University, 1967. Now available as vol. 66 of the University Lecture Series, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 2016.

LEHRSTUHL FÜR ALGEBRA, UNIVERSITÄT STUTTGART, PFAFFENWALDRING 57, D–70569  
STUTTGART, GERMANY

*Email address:* `meinolf.geck@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de`

*Email address:* `alexander@lang-stb.de`