

CARTAN GEOMETRY AND INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL KEMPF–NESS THEORY

Tobias Diez^a, Akito Futaki^b and Tudor S. Ratiu^c

June 3, 2024

We pioneer the development of a rigorous infinite-dimensional framework for the Kempf–Ness theorem, addressing the significant challenge posed by the absence of a complexification for the symmetry group in infinite dimensions, e.g., the diffeomorphism group. We propose a novel approach, based on Cartan bundles, to generalize Kempf–Ness theory to infinite dimensions, invoking the fundamental role played by the Maurer–Cartan form. This approach allows us to define and study objects essential for the Kempf–Ness theorem, such as the complex model for orbits and the Kempf–Ness function, as well as establishing its convexity properties and defining a generalized Futaki character. We show how our framework can be applied to the study of various problems in Kähler geometry, deformation quantization, and gauge theory.

KEYWORDS: Kempf–Ness, momentum map, symplectic geometry, infinite-dimensional geometry, Kähler geometry, scalar curvature, symplectic connection, gauge theory

MSC 2020: 53D20, 58D27, (58D19, 22E65, 53C55, 53D55)

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	2
2	Infinite-dimensional GIT	6
2.1	Cartan bundles	6
2.2	Equivariance of the momentum map and the Calabi operator	9
2.3	Generalized Futaki invariant	11
2.4	Kempf–Ness function	14
2.5	Geodesics	18

^a School of Mathematical Sciences, CMA-Shanghai, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 800 Dongchuan Road, 200240 China. Partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 12350410357. diez@sjtu.edu.cn, research@tobiasdiez.de

^b Yau Mathematical Sciences Center, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China. futaki@tsinghua.edu.cn

^c School of Mathematical Sciences, CMA-Shanghai, and Ministry of Education Laboratory of Scientific Computing (MOE-LSC), Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 800 Dongchuan Road, 200240 China, and Section de Mathématiques, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, 1500 Lausanne, Switzerland.. Partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 12250710125 and NCCR SwissMAP grant of the Swiss National Science Foundation. ratiu@sjtu.edu.cn, tudor.ratiu@epfl.ch

2.6	Extremal elements	25
3	Kähler geometry	26
3.1	Constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics	36
3.2	Perturbed scalar curvature	40
3.3	Deformation quantization	42
3.4	Z-critical Kähler metrics	45
4	Gauge theory	47
4.1	Hermitian Yang–Mills connections	48
4.2	Z-critical connections	49

1 INTRODUCTION

The fruitful interplay between Hamiltonian systems with symmetry and complex geometry is of paramount importance in symplectic geometry. A particularly powerful tool in connecting these areas is the Kempf–Ness theorem [KN79] which describes the equivalence between the notions of quotient in symplectic and algebraic geometry. The theorem states that the symplectic quotient of a Hamiltonian action by a compact Lie group is isomorphic to the GIT quotient of the associated action of the complexified group.

While being landmarks in their own right, these rigorous results about finite-dimensional systems expand their full strength as a conceptual framework for the study of geometric partial differential equations. Often, a difficult system of PDEs contains non-evolutionary equations that can be formulated as a level-set constraint of a momentum map associated with an infinite-dimensional Lie group acting on an infinite-dimensional symplectic manifold (this is the case in, e.g., electromagnetism, Yang–Mills theory, and, in some sense, general relativity). When this is the case, the finite-dimensional techniques surrounding the Kempf–Ness theorem serve as a blueprint to come up with fundamental conjectures about obstructions and stability of solutions to the original system of PDEs. Examples include the work of Atiyah and Bott [AB83] on Yang–Mills connections on a Riemann surface, the Donaldson–Uhlenbeck–Yau correspondence [Don85; UY86] relating stable holomorphic vector bundles and Hermitian Yang–Mills connections, the Kobayashi–Hitchin correspondence [Hit79; Kob82] and the recent resolution of the Yau–Tian–Donaldson conjecture [CDS15b; Tia15]. All these examples are quite different in nature, but they all share the same abstract framework grounded in infinite-dimensional symplectic geometry.

In view of the wide success of this *conceptual* picture, it is perhaps astonishing that no *rigorous* infinite-dimensional framework is available yet. In this paper, we start the development of a general theory of the Kempf–Ness theorem in infinite dimensions with the goal to encompass the above-mentioned examples as specific cases. Passing to infinite dimensions, however, is quite challenging because the

symmetry group often does not admit a complexification. For example, the diffeomorphism group does not complexify. This major obstacle makes it unclear what the correct notion of stability and what the GIT quotient should be.

In this paper, we propose a solution to these problems using the framework of Cartan bundles. Our starting point is the observation that, in finite dimensions, the Maurer–Cartan form essentially determines the Lie group. Roughly speaking, a simply connected manifold endowed with a Lie-algebra valued 1-form satisfying the Maurer–Cartan equation (and possessing a few other natural properties) is locally a Lie group, see [Sha97, Theorem 8.7] for the precise statement. The Maurer–Cartan form is hence a fundamental object in the theory of Lie groups and this viewpoint is the basis of its extension to Cartan bundles. The framework of Cartan bundles translates, without much effort, to infinite dimensions. Only the (local) integration of a Cartan geometry to a Lie group is not available in infinite dimensions, although various partial integration results related to Cartan forms have recently been established in infinite dimensions, see [Nee06; MM24; GN]. Our main idea is to replace the complexification of the symmetry group in the GIT theory by an appropriate Cartan bundle.

The language of Cartan bundles allows us to rigorously define and study objects that are usually connected to the complexified action and that are essential for the Kempf–Ness theorem. For example, we define the notion of a Cartan model for the orbit through a point in a symplectic manifold endowed with a Hamiltonian action by a Lie group. This is just a Cartan version for the important notion of the orbit of the complexified action in the finite-dimensional case. Moreover, we introduce the Kempf–Ness function and establish its convexity properties along geodesics, see Theorem 2.14 and Proposition 2.15. We also define a generalized Futaki character as a character on the stabilizer of the Cartan action. We show that the generalized Futaki character is constant in a certain sense and that it obstructs the existence of zeros of the momentum map, see Theorem 2.10. An interesting feature of our theory is that it frees the GIT theory from its embedding in complex geometry and opens up the possibility to study the Kempf–Ness theorem in a more general context. For example, in Example 2.23 we show that our theory can be applied to information geometry, where the group of diffeomorphisms acts on the space of probability measures — a setting usually not associated with complex geometry.

As we discuss in the second part of the paper, our general results have immediate applications to various geometric PDEs. For example, Fujiki [Fuj92] and Donaldson [Don97] remarked that the existence problem of a constant scalar curvature Kähler (cscK for short) metric is equivalent to finding the zeros of a momentum map associated with the action of the Hamiltonian diffeomorphism group on an infinite-dimensional space. Moreover, Donaldson [Don99] also argued that a certain principal bundle \mathcal{P} over the space of Kähler metrics is a

natural candidate for a complexification of the Hamiltonian diffeomorphism group. We support this claim by showing that the bundle \mathcal{P} carries a natural flat Cartan connection; so (locally) it would be a Lie group if not for the infinite-dimensional nature of the problem. (This observation was actually the starting point of our investigation.) Applied to the cscK problem, our general theory recovers the Mabuchi K-energy as the Kempf–Ness function. Convexity of the Mabuchi K-energy along geodesics is a well-known result, see [Mab87b]. Moreover, the generalized Futaki character of the general theory yields the classical Futaki character [Fut83], which obstructs the existence of constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics. We emphasize that the novelty is not in the results themselves, or that they *formally* fit in a GIT setting, but in the conceptual and *rigorous infinite-dimensional framework* that allows us to derive them in a unified way with minimal assumptions. To illustrate the power of our theory, we also discuss applications to various other geometric PDEs, where we recover known results from the literature indicated below as well as obtain new conclusions.

- (i) Perturbation of the scalar curvature by Chern forms: [Bano6; Futo6; Futo8].
- (ii) Z-critical Kähler metrics: [Der23; DH23].
- (iii) Symplectic connections with applications to deformation quantization: [FO18; LaF19; FL20].
- (iv) Hermitian Yang–Mills connections: [Don85; UY86].
- (v) Z-critical Yang–Mills connections: [DMS20; CY21].

In each case, one first gives a momentum map interpretation of the PDE under study and then constructs an appropriate Cartan bundle. Our general theory then provides a package of results, such as the Kempf–Ness function, the generalized Futaki character, and the uniqueness of solutions modulo automorphisms. Some applications of our theory to concrete problems are often technically challenging and require a careful analysis (see, e.g., the recent study of the LYZ equation in [CY21]).

An overview of our results and their implications in various geometric settings is given in Table 1. This gives only a brief summary. It is not intended to provide a complete overview of the vast literature. More detailed discussions of the applications are given in Sections 3 and 4.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS The authors would like to thank Klas Modin and Cornelia Vizman for helpful discussions.

General result	cscK metrics	perturbed cscK metrics	Z-critical Kähler metrics	Symplectic connections	Hermitian YM connections	Z-critical YM connections
Generalized Futaki character Equation (2.17)	Futaki character [Fut83]	[Futo6]	[Der23]	[LaF19]	[FM85]	[CY21] though not explicit
Kempf–Ness function Theorem 2.14	Mabuchi K-energy [Mab87a]	New	[Der23]	[FL20]	Donaldson functional [Don85; UY86]	[CY21]
Stability* Definition 2.20	K-stability [Tia97; Dono2]	New	[Der23]	[FL20]	Slope stability of vector bundles	[DMS20; CY21]
Uniqueness of zeros of the momentum map in a complex orbit up to the action of the stabilizer Proposition 2.17*	[BB17]	New	New	[FL20]	Essential uniqueness of Hermitian YM connections [Don85]	[CY21] though not explicit
Extremal elements Equation (2.67)	extremal Kähler vector field [Fut88; FM95]	[Futo8]	[Der23]	[FO18]	New	New

Table 1: Applications of the general theory to various geometric problems.

*: In our general theory, stability and uniqueness of zeros of the momentum map are taken relative to *smooth* geodesic rays. In applications, existence and uniqueness of sufficiently smooth geodesic rays is often a difficult problem and it may be advantageous to reformulate it in terms of algebraic-geometric objects such as test configurations.

2 INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL GIT

2.1 Cartan bundles

Futaki [Fut83] introduced a character on the Lie algebra of holomorphic vector fields that is constant as a function of the Kähler form in a given Kähler class and that obstructs the existence of a constant scalar curvature Kähler form in that class. One of our goals is to generalize this philosophy and, in the general setting of a Hamiltonian action, construct a character on the stabilizer of the complexified action that is constant in a certain sense and that obstructs the existence of zeros of the momentum map.

Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold endowed with a Hamiltonian action by a Lie group G . Let $m \in M$. Assume, for the moment, that G has a complexification G^c acting on M . Let \mathfrak{g} be the Lie algebra of G , $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ its complexification, the Lie algebra of G^c . Morally speaking, for every ζ in the stabilizer $(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})_m$, we associate a G -invariant map $\tilde{F}_{\zeta}: G^c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and show that the induced map on the quotient $F_{\zeta}: G \backslash G^c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is constant. The map $(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})_m \ni \zeta \mapsto F_{\zeta} \in C^{\infty}(G \backslash G^c, \mathbb{R})$ is then the *generalized Futaki character*. As will be discussed in Section 3, this definition recovers the classical Futaki character by identifying $G \backslash G^c$ with the space of Kähler forms in a given Kähler class. The problem with the picture described above is that the group of interest G is the Lie group of symplectomorphisms, which may not admit a complexification G^c .

Hence, the main issues we have to face is to define the generalized Futaki character in the absence of a complexification G^c of the Lie group G . More precisely, we need an appropriate replacement for the bundle $G^c \rightarrow G \backslash G^c$. This is achieved using the theory of Cartan bundles, which are generalizations of Klein bundles $G \rightarrow H \backslash G$, where H is a closed subgroup of G . The main merit, from our point of view, is that the Cartan theory generalizes without much effort to infinite dimensions, while the (local) integration of a Cartan geometry to a Klein geometry is not available in infinite dimensions. As we will see, the framework of Cartan connections also provides a natural formalization of the constructions of Donaldson [Don99] in the example of Kähler geometry.

Recall from [Sha97] that a *Klein pair* $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ consists of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{a} and a Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{g} of \mathfrak{a} . Moreover, we suppose that there exists a Lie group G that integrates \mathfrak{g} and that there exists a representation Ad of G on \mathfrak{a} that restricts to the adjoint representation of G on \mathfrak{g} . In infinite dimensions, we assume that \mathfrak{g} is closed and, as a topological vector space, has a closed complement in \mathfrak{a} . We will refer to this setting by saying that $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ is a *Klein pair with group G* . Crucially, no integrability assumption is made for \mathfrak{a} . A *Cartan geometry* modeled on the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ with group G on a manifold B is a principal G -bundle $\pi: P \rightarrow B$ together with a G -equivariant 1-form $\theta \in \Omega^1(P, \mathfrak{a})$ that induces an isomorphism

$\theta_p: T_p P \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ for every $p \in P$ and that satisfies $\theta(\xi^*) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. Here, $\xi^* \in \mathfrak{X}(P)$ denotes the infinitesimal generator, or fundamental vector field, defined by ξ . The 1-form θ is called a *Cartan connection*. Contrary to the usual treatment in the literature, it will be convenient to work with a left principal G -bundle $\pi: P \rightarrow B$ instead of a right principal bundle, so that the equivariance property of θ reads $\theta_{g \cdot p}(g \cdot X) = \text{Ad}_g \theta_p(X)$ for all $p \in P$, $X \in T_p P$, and $g \in G$. The *curvature* of θ is the 2-form¹ $\Omega := d\theta - \frac{1}{2}[\theta \wedge \theta] \in \Omega^2(P, \mathfrak{a})$. A Cartan connection θ is said to be *torsion-free* if Ω takes values in \mathfrak{g} . A standard result in the theory of Cartan connections is that θ induces a bundle isomorphism $TB \rightarrow P \times_G (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g})$; see [Sha97, Theorem 3.15]. The reader should keep the example $A = G^c \rightarrow G \backslash G^c = B$, with θ being the Maurer–Cartan form, in mind. In fact, every Cartan geometry with vanishing curvature is locally isomorphic to a homogenous space in finite dimensions; see [Sha97, Theorem 5.1]. In infinite dimensions, this may no longer hold, as \mathfrak{a} may not integrate to a suitable Lie group A .

DEFINITION 2.1 Let M be a manifold and G a Lie group acting on M . A Cartan geometry (P, θ) modeled on the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ with group G is said to be an *orbit* through the point $m \in M$ if the following holds:

- (i) There exists a smooth G -equivariant map $\chi: P \rightarrow M$ such that m is in the image of χ .
- (ii) There exists a Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{a}_m \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ and a right Lie algebra action of \mathfrak{a}_m on P , denoted by $\zeta_p^* = p \cdot \zeta$ for $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$ and $p \in P$, which commutes with the G -action and which satisfies $T\chi(\zeta^*) = 0$. \diamond

Given a Cartan model (P, θ) which is an orbit through m , we get an induced fiberwise linear bundle map $\rho: \mathfrak{a} \times P \rightarrow \chi^* TM$ over P by setting

$$\rho(\xi, p) \equiv \rho_p(\xi) := T_p \chi(\theta_p^{-1}(\xi)) \in T_{\chi(p)} M. \quad (2.1)$$

Thinking of ρ as the infinitesimal action of \mathfrak{a} on M , we slightly abuse notation and write $\rho(\xi, p) \equiv \xi \cdot \chi(p)$ although $\rho(\xi, p)$ might really depend on p and not only on $\chi(p)$. Note that

$$(\text{Ad}_g \xi) \cdot \chi(g \cdot p) = \rho(\text{Ad}_g \xi, g \cdot p) = g \cdot \rho(\xi, p) = g \cdot (\xi \cdot \chi(p)) \quad (2.2)$$

for every $g \in G$, as one would expect from an infinitesimal action (but note that it only holds with respect to G). The standard example we have in mind is the following.

¹ Note the sign in front of the quadratic term, which is the opposite of the usual convention for *right* principal bundles. If α is an \mathfrak{a} -valued p -form and β an \mathfrak{a} -valued q -form on P , then $[\alpha \wedge \beta]$ denotes the \mathfrak{a} -valued $(p+q)$ -form on P obtained as in the usual theory of \mathbb{R} -valued forms, except that multiplication of real numbers is replaced by the Lie bracket.

EXAMPLE 2.2 Let A be a Lie group acting on the manifold M and $G \subseteq A$ a principal Lie subgroup, i.e., a Lie subgroup such that the quotient $G \backslash A$ is a manifold and $A \rightarrow G \backslash A$ is a principal G -bundle (this is automatic in finite dimensions). Then $A \rightarrow G \backslash A$ endowed with the right Maurer–Cartan form $\theta_a(\xi \cdot a) = \xi$ is a Cartan model for the A -orbit through every point $m \in M$ with $\chi(a) = a \cdot m$ and \mathfrak{a}_m being the Lie algebra of the stabilizer A_m acting by right translations on A . For all $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$, we have $\rho(\xi, a) = T_a\chi(\xi \cdot a) = \xi \cdot (a \cdot m)$. \diamond

The following provides the appropriate generalization of an action of G^c on a symplectic manifold M , now rephrased in terms of a Cartan geometry. Recall that a Lie algebra action Υ_m of \mathfrak{g} on a manifold M endowed with an almost complex structure j extends to an i - j -complex-linear map $\Upsilon_m^c: \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow T_m M$ given by $(\xi_1 + i\xi_2) \mapsto (\xi_1 + i\xi_2) \cdot m := \xi_1 \cdot m + j(\xi_2 \cdot m)$ for $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathfrak{g}$. The image $\Upsilon_m^c(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ is denoted by $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} \cdot m$.

DEFINITION 2.3 Let M be a manifold, G a Lie group acting on M , and j an almost complex structure on M . A Cartan geometry (P, θ) modeled on the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ with group G is said to be a *model for the complex orbit* through the point $m \in M$ if it is an orbit through m and

$$\text{Range } T_p\chi = \{\xi \cdot \chi(p) : \xi \in \mathfrak{a}\} = \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} \cdot \chi(p) = \text{Range } \Upsilon_{\chi(p)}^c \quad (2.3)$$

for all $p \in P$. \diamond

Note that \mathfrak{a} might be strictly smaller than $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and, in fact, may not even be a complex vector space. The important property is that its action ρ on M yields the same distribution as the complexified action Υ^c .

EXAMPLE 2.4 If the complexification G^c of G exists and acts holomorphically on M , then $G^c \rightarrow G \backslash G^c$ endowed with the right Maurer–Cartan form is a model for the complex orbit through every point $m \in M$. In this case, the underlying Klein pair is given by the embedding of \mathfrak{g} into $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ as the real part. \diamond

EXAMPLE 2.5 (Real GIT) Following Heinzner and Schwarz [HS07], consider a compact Lie group U whose complexification U^c acts holomorphically on a Kähler manifold (M, ω, j) . Moreover, let $A \subseteq U^c$ be a closed Lie subgroup such that the Cartan decomposition $U^c = \exp(i\mathfrak{u})U$ induces a diffeomorphism $A = \exp(\mathfrak{p})G$, where $G = U \cap A$ and $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq i\mathfrak{u}$ is a Ad_G -stable subspace. Then $A \rightarrow G \backslash A$ endowed with the Maurer–Cartan form is a Cartan bundle and the action induced via the inclusion $A \subseteq U^c$ realizes it as an orbit through any point $m \in M$. While the Cartan geometry of U^c yields a model for the *complex* U -orbit, the Cartan geometry of A may no longer be a model for the *complex* G -orbit. \diamond

DEFINITION 2.6 A duality of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is a vector space \mathfrak{g}^* together with a non-degenerate pairing $\kappa: \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. A duality of the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ is a map $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}: \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is Ad_G -invariant and that vanishes on $\mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}$. \diamond

Note that \mathfrak{g}^* is free to be chosen; it does not have to be the topological dual space of \mathfrak{g} . In many examples, one has $\mathfrak{g}^* = \mathfrak{g}$ with κ being the Killing form (in the finite-dimensional case) or some form of the L^2 -pairing (in the infinite-dimensional case). If $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathfrak{g} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is embedded as the real part, then a natural choice for the pairing $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is the imaginary part $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}} = \text{Im } \kappa_{\mathbb{C}}$ of the extension of κ to a Hermitian inner product $\kappa_{\mathbb{C}}: \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, namely

$$\kappa_{\mathbb{C}}(\xi_1 + i\xi_2, \eta_1 + i\eta_2) := \kappa(\xi_1, \eta_1) + i\kappa(\xi_2, \eta_1) - i\kappa(\xi_1, \eta_2) + \kappa(\xi_2, \eta_2). \quad (2.4)$$

REMARK 2.7 Note also that if a positive definite Hermitian form h is \mathbb{C} -anti-linear in the first component and \mathbb{C} -linear in the second component then h has a Riemannian metric g as its real part and a Kähler form ω as its imaginary part, i.e., $h = g + i\omega$. \diamond

2.2 Equivariance of the momentum map and the Calabi operator

Let G be a Lie group and (M, ω) a symplectic manifold with a G -Hamiltonian action whose momentum map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is defined with respect to some non-degenerate pairing $\kappa: \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. That is, J satisfies

$$\omega_m(\xi \cdot m, X) + \kappa(\text{T}_m J(X), \xi) = 0 \quad (2.5)$$

for all $m \in M$, $X \in \text{T}_m M$, and $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. Consider a Cartan model (P, θ) for the orbit through a chosen point $m \in M$ with modeling map $\chi: P \rightarrow M$ and infinitesimal action ρ as in Definition 2.1. For every $p \in P$, we define the *Calabi operator*

$$C_p := \text{T}_{\chi(p)} J \circ \rho_p: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad C_p(\xi) = \text{T}_{\chi(p)} J(\xi \cdot \chi(p)), \quad \xi \in \mathfrak{a}. \quad (2.6)$$

In the Kähler example discussed in Section 3, the Calabi operator coincides with the operator used by Calabi in his study of extremal Kähler metrics [Cal85].

Note that if J is (infinitesimally) equivariant, then $C_p(\xi) = -\text{ad}_{\xi}^* J(\chi(p))$ for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. This suggests the following definition.

DEFINITION 2.8 We say that J is \mathfrak{a} -equivariant relative to a pairing $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}: \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ if

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(C_p \xi, \eta) - \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(C_p \eta, \xi) = -\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(J(\chi(p)), [\xi, \eta]), \quad p \in P, \quad \xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{a} \quad (2.7)$$

and if the non-equivariance 1-cocycle $\sigma: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ of J satisfies

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(\sigma(g), \xi) = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

for all $g \in G$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$. \diamond

PROPOSITION 2.9 *Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra and $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ a subspace. Then on the Klein pair $\mathfrak{g} \subseteq \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{im} \equiv \mathfrak{a}$ define the duality $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}: \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$*

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mu, \xi_1 + i\xi_2) := -\kappa(\mu, \xi_2), \quad \mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*, \quad \xi_1 \in \mathfrak{g}, \quad \xi_2 \in \mathfrak{m}. \quad (2.9)$$

Let (P, θ) be a Cartan geometry relative to the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$, which is an orbit through m in an almost complex manifold (M, j) where j is an almost complex structure on M compatible with the symplectic structure ω . Assume that the infinitesimal action ρ is complex linear in the sense that

$$\rho(\xi_1 + i\xi_2, p) = \rho(\xi_1, p) + j\rho(\xi_2, p). \quad (2.10)$$

Then the momentum map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^$ is \mathfrak{a} -equivariant relative to $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}$ if and only if the non-equivariance 1-cocycle $\sigma: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ of J satisfies*

$$\kappa(\sigma(g), \xi) = 0 \quad (2.11)$$

for all $g \in G$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{m}$. ◇

Proof. Recall that the non-equivariance 2-cocycle $\Sigma: \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the momentum map J is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\xi, \eta) &:= \kappa(T_e\sigma(\xi), \eta) = \kappa(J(m), [\xi, \eta]) + \omega_m(\xi \cdot m, \eta \cdot m) \\ &= \kappa(J(m), [\xi, \eta]) + \kappa(T_m J(\xi \cdot m), \eta). \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Let $\xi = \xi_1 + i\xi_2$ and $\eta = \eta_1 + i\eta_2$ with $\xi_1, \eta_1 \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $\xi_2, \eta_2 \in \mathfrak{m}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(C_p\xi, \eta) + \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(J(\chi(p)), [\xi, \eta]) \\ &= -\kappa(C_p(\xi_1 + i\xi_2), \eta_2) - \kappa(J(\chi(p)), [\xi_1, \eta_2]) - \kappa(J(\chi(p)), [\xi_2, \eta_1]) \\ &= -\Sigma(\xi_1, \eta_2) - \kappa(C_p(i\xi_2), \eta_2) + \Sigma(\eta_1, \xi_2) - \kappa(C_p\eta_1, \xi_2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

On the other hand, by the complex linearity of the action ρ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(C_p(i\xi_2), \eta_2) &= \kappa(T_{\chi(p)}J(j\xi_2 \cdot \chi(p)), \eta_2) \\ &= -\omega(\eta_2 \cdot \chi(p), j\xi_2 \cdot \chi(p)) \\ &= \omega(j\eta_2 \cdot \chi(p), \xi_2 \cdot \chi(p)) \\ &= \kappa(C_p(i\eta_2), \xi_2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Hence, in summary,

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(C_p\xi, \eta) - \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(C_p\eta, \xi) + \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(J(\chi(p)), [\xi, \eta]) = -\Sigma(\xi_1, \eta_2) + \Sigma(\eta_1, \xi_2). \quad (2.15)$$

Since η_2 and ξ_2 are elements of \mathfrak{m} , the right-hand side vanishes if the non-

equivariance 1-cocycle $\sigma: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ of J satisfies $\kappa(\sigma(g), \xi) = 0$ for all $g \in G$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{m}$. The converse implication is immediate from equation (2.8). \square

Note that if $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}} = \text{Im } \kappa_{\mathbb{C}}$ as described above, then this is just saying that J has to be equivariant. Thus, here we are harvesting the benefits of allowing \mathfrak{a} to be strictly smaller than $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ in order to allow for non-equivariant momentum maps. In fact, as we will see below, this flexibility is needed in the example of Kähler geometry.

2.3 Generalized Futaki invariant

Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold with a G -Hamiltonian action possessing a momentum map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ with respect to some non-degenerate pairing $\kappa: \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For every $\zeta \in \mathfrak{g}_m$, the function

$$F_{\zeta}: G \ni g \mapsto \kappa(J(g \cdot m), \text{Ad}_g \zeta) \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.16)$$

is constant if J and κ are equivariant, namely, $F_{\zeta} = \kappa(J(m), \zeta)$. Moreover, $F: \mathfrak{g}_m \ni \zeta \mapsto F_{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}$ is a Lie algebra homomorphism since, for any $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{g}_m$, we have $F([\xi, \eta]) = -\omega_m(\xi \cdot m, \eta \cdot m) = 0$ using equivariance of J . Thus, to every orbit $G \cdot m$ we can assign the Lie algebra character $F: \mathfrak{g}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The generalized Futaki invariant is the extension of this character to a character on the stabilizer of a Cartan model for the orbit through m .

To define it, choose a Cartan model (P, θ) for the orbit through m using a map $\chi: P \rightarrow M$ as in Definition 2.1. Moreover, let $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}: \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a duality of the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ underlying P in the sense of Definition 2.6. For every $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$, the value $\theta_p(p \cdot \zeta) \in \mathfrak{a}$ depends equivariantly on $p \in P$. Thus, if J is equivariant, then the function

$$\tilde{F}_{\zeta}: P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad p \mapsto \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(J(\chi(p)), \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta)) \quad (2.17)$$

is G -invariant and hence descends to a function $F_{\zeta}: B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We call F_{ζ} the (generalized) *Futaki invariant* associated with $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$. If J is not equivariant, then we have to assume that J is \mathfrak{a} -equivariant¹.

The classical Futaki invariant in Kähler geometry is constant as a function of the Kähler form in a given Kähler class. As we discuss now, the generalized Futaki invariant defined for a general Cartan model is also constant under natural assumptions. This general result, in turn, sheds some light on what geometric properties lead to the fact that the classical Futaki invariant only depends on the Kähler class. Note, in particular, that we do not need to assume that the Cartan bundle is a model for the *complex* orbit. In fact, the result does not even make

¹ Actually, it would be enough to require that the non-equivariance 1-cocycle $\sigma: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ vanishes when paired with elements of the form $\theta_p(p \cdot \zeta) \in \mathfrak{a}$ with varying $p \in P$.

any reference to complex geometry.

THEOREM 2.10 *Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold and let G be a Lie group acting symplectically on M with momentum map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$. Let (P, θ) be a Cartan model for the orbit through $m \in M$ and κ_α a duality of the underlying Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$. Assume that J is \mathfrak{a} -equivariant and that θ is torsion-free. Choose $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$. If $\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}\theta$ takes values in \mathfrak{g} , then the generalized Futaki invariant F_ζ is locally constant, i.e., F_ζ is constant on the connected components of B . \diamond*

Conceptually, this theorem is a generalization of the basic fact that if a closed real-valued 1-form θ is invariant under an H -action, then for each $\zeta \in \mathfrak{h}$ the function $\theta(\zeta^*)$ is constant. In our setting, the $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g}$ part of the form θ is invariant under the stabilizer \mathfrak{a}_m , but θ is not necessarily closed. The resulting variation of $\theta(\zeta^*)$ is compensated by the variation of the map $J \circ \chi$. See also Remark 2.16.

In the special case when P is the complexification G^c of a finite-dimensional compact Lie group G acting holomorphically on a finite-dimensional Kähler manifold (cf. Example 2.4), Theorem 2.10 recovers the result of Wang [Wano4, Proposition 6].

Proof. Before starting the proof we recall a formula from Cartan geometry (see [Sha97]). Let (P, θ) be a Cartan geometry modeled on the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ with group G on a manifold B , F be a manifold, and $\rho: G \times F \rightarrow F$ a smooth left action. Then G acts freely on the left on $P \times F$ by $g \cdot (p, f) := (g \cdot p, \rho(g)f)$, so we can form the fiber bundle $P \times_G F \rightarrow B$ with typical fiber F . Let $\nabla_\xi s$ denote the universal covariant derivative induced by θ in the direction $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$ of a section s of the fiber bundle $P \times_G F \rightarrow B$; by definition,

$$\nabla_\xi s(b) := (\iota_p \circ T_p \tilde{s})(\theta_p^{-1}(\xi)), \quad \text{for all } b \in B, \xi \in \mathfrak{a}, \quad (2.18)$$

where $p \in \pi^{-1}(b)$, $\iota_p(f) = [p, f]$, and $\tilde{s}: P \rightarrow F$ is the G -equivariant map uniquely corresponding to s , i.e., $s(\pi(p)) = [p, \tilde{s}(p)]$.

We apply (2.18) in the following particular case: $F = \mathfrak{g}^*$, $\rho(g) = \text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}^* + \sigma(g)$, where $\sigma: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is the non-equivariance 1-cocycle of the momentum map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$. Then $J \circ \chi: P \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is G -equivariant (relative to ρ) so it plays the role of \tilde{s} in the previous considerations, i.e., it defines a section $s_J: B \rightarrow P \times_G \mathfrak{g}^*$ by $s_J(\pi(p)) = [p, (J \circ \chi)(p)]$. Thus, letting $b = \pi(p)$, we get for every $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$

$$\nabla_\xi s_J(b) = (\iota_p \circ T_{\chi(p)} J \circ T_p \chi)(\theta_p^{-1}(\xi)) = (\iota_p \circ C_p)(\xi), \quad (2.19)$$

using (2.1) and the definition of the Calabi operator (2.6).

On the other hand, for $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$, let G_ζ be the section of $P \times_G \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow B$ corresponding to the G -equivariant map $\tilde{G}_\zeta: P \ni p \mapsto \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta) \in \mathfrak{a}$, i.e., $G_\zeta(\pi(p)) = [p, \tilde{G}_\zeta(p)]$.

We apply again (2.18) and get

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\xi G_\zeta(b) &= \iota_p \left(T_p \tilde{G}_\zeta(\theta_p^{-1}(\xi)) \right) = \iota_p \left(\theta_p^{-1}(\xi)(\tilde{G}_\zeta) \right) \\ &= \iota_p(\theta_p^{-1}(\xi)(\theta(\zeta^*))) \in P \times_G \mathfrak{a},\end{aligned}\tag{2.20}$$

where $\theta_p^{-1}(\xi)(\tilde{G}_\zeta)$ denotes the action of the derivation $\theta_p^{-1}(\xi) \in T_p P$ on the \mathfrak{a} -valued function \tilde{G}_ζ . Viewing $p \mapsto \theta_p^{-1}(\xi)$ as a vector field on P , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{-1}(\xi)(\theta(\zeta^*)) &= d\theta(\theta^{-1}(\xi), \zeta^*) + \theta([\theta^{-1}(\xi), \zeta^*]) + \zeta^*(\theta(\theta^{-1}(\xi))) \\ &= \Omega(\theta^{-1}(\xi), \zeta^*) + [\xi, \theta(\zeta^*)] + (\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}\theta)(\theta^{-1}(\xi)) \in \mathfrak{a}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.21}$$

Thus, under the standing assumption that the torsion vanishes (i.e., the curvature $\Omega := d\theta - \frac{1}{2}[\theta \wedge \theta] \in \Omega^2(P, \mathfrak{a})$ takes values in \mathfrak{g}) and that $\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}\theta$ takes values in \mathfrak{g} , we find

$$\nabla_\xi G_\zeta(b) \pmod{\mathfrak{g}} = \iota_p[\xi, \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta)].\tag{2.22}$$

Introducing $\tilde{\kappa}_\mathfrak{a}: (P \times_G \mathfrak{g}^*) \times_M (P \times_G \mathfrak{a}) \ni ([p, \mu], [p, \eta]) \mapsto \kappa_\mathfrak{a}(\mu, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}$, the definition (2.17) of \tilde{F}_ζ takes the form

$$\tilde{F}_\zeta = \kappa_\mathfrak{a}(J \circ \chi, \tilde{G}_\zeta) \quad \text{and hence} \quad F_\zeta = \tilde{\kappa}_\mathfrak{a}(s_J, G_\zeta).\tag{2.23}$$

Using the non-equivariance property (2.7) of J , we get for $b = \pi(p)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\xi F_\zeta(b) &= \tilde{\kappa}_\mathfrak{a} \left(\nabla_\xi s_J(b), G_\zeta(b) \right) + \tilde{\kappa}_\mathfrak{a} \left(s_J(b), \nabla_\xi G_\zeta(b) \right) \\ &= \kappa_\mathfrak{a} \left(C_p \xi, \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta) \right) + \kappa_\mathfrak{a} \left(J(\chi(p)), [\xi, \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta)] \right) \\ &= \kappa_\mathfrak{a} \left(C_p \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta), \xi \right).\end{aligned}\tag{2.24}$$

On the other hand, the definition of C_p implies $C_p \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta) = T_{\chi(p)} J(T_p \chi(p \cdot \zeta))$. Since $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$, we have $T_p \chi(p \cdot \zeta) = 0$ and, hence, $\nabla_\xi F_\zeta = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$.

Since θ is an isomorphism, $\nabla_\xi F_\zeta = 0$ for all ξ implies that $T\tilde{F}_\zeta = 0$ by (2.18). But \tilde{F}_ζ is also G -invariant, so $F_\zeta: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is (locally) constant. \square

Thus, for connected B , the generalized Futaki invariant yields a map $F: \zeta \ni \mathfrak{a}_m \mapsto F_\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$, for every $m \in M$ if $\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}\theta$ takes values in \mathfrak{g} for all $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$.

PROPOSITION 2.11 *In the setting of Theorem 2.10, assume, in addition, that B is connected and that $\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}\theta$ takes values in \mathfrak{g} for all $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$. Then the map $F: \mathfrak{a}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \zeta \mapsto F_\zeta$ is a Lie algebra character. \diamond*

Proof. Let $\zeta, \eta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$. Using

$$d\theta(\zeta^*, \eta^*) = \mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}(\theta(\eta^*)) - \mathfrak{L}_{\eta^*}(\theta(\zeta^*)) - \theta([\zeta^*, \eta^*])\tag{2.25}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}(\theta(\eta^*)) = (\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}\theta)(\eta^*) + \theta([\zeta^*, \eta^*]) \quad (2.26)$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(\zeta^*, \eta^*) &= d\theta(\zeta^*, \eta^*) - [\theta(\zeta^*), \theta(\eta^*)] \\ &= (\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}\theta)(\eta^*) - (\mathfrak{L}_{\eta^*}\theta)(\zeta^*) + \theta([\zeta^*, \eta^*]) - [\theta(\zeta^*), \theta(\eta^*)], \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

where Ω is the curvature of θ . Since Ω and $\mathfrak{L}_{\zeta^*}\theta$ take values in \mathfrak{g} , we conclude

$$\theta([\zeta^*, \eta^*]) \pmod{\mathfrak{g}} = [\theta(\zeta^*), \theta(\eta^*)] \pmod{\mathfrak{g}}. \quad (2.28)$$

So, for every $p \in P$, we have from (2.17),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_{[\zeta, \eta]}(p) &= \kappa_\alpha\left(J(\chi(p)), \theta_p(p \cdot [\zeta, \eta])\right) \\ &= \kappa_\alpha\left(J(\chi(p)), \theta_p([\zeta^*, \eta^*]_p)\right) \\ &= \kappa_\alpha\left(J(\chi(p)), [\theta_p(p \cdot \zeta), \theta_p(p \cdot \eta)]\right) \\ &= -\kappa_\alpha\left(C_p\theta_p(p \cdot \zeta), \theta_p(p \cdot \eta)\right) + \kappa_\alpha\left(C_p\theta_p(p \cdot \eta), \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

where the last equality uses the α -equivariance of J , i.e., equation (2.7). Now, as in the proof of Theorem 2.10, we conclude that $C_p\theta_p(p \cdot \zeta)$ and $C_p\theta_p(p \cdot \eta)$ vanish, because $\zeta, \eta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$. Hence, $F_{[\zeta, \eta]} = 0$ as claimed. \square

REMARK 2.12 Note that we only required (P, θ) to be an orbit of M , and not necessarily a *complex* orbit, i.e., we did not make use of the property $\text{Range } T_p\chi = \mathfrak{g}\mathbb{C} \cdot \chi(p)$. \diamond

REMARK 2.13 With natural modifications, the above construction can be carried out in the slightly more general setting, where the structure group of the Cartan bundle is no longer equal to the group that acts on the symplectic manifold M . For example, one may allow for a Cartan G -bundle with a Lie group homomorphism $\Phi: G \rightarrow U$, where U acts symplectically on M . Such an extension is necessary to cover the example of real GIT discussed in Example 2.5. Another advantage of such a generalization is that one would obtain constructions that are functorial with respect to morphisms of Cartan geometries. We leave the details to the interested reader. \diamond

2.4 Kempf–Ness function

We start by recalling the standard definition of the Kempf–Ness function. Let G be a compact Lie group with complexification G^c . Assume that G^c acts linearly

on a finite-dimensional complex vector space V endowed with a G -invariant Hermitian form $V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Let M be a smooth G^c -invariant submanifold of the projective space $\mathbb{P}V$. Then the induced G -action on M is Hamiltonian with momentum map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$. For every $[v] \in M$, the lifted *Kempf–Ness function* $\Psi_{[v]}: G^c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\Psi_{[v]}(a) := \frac{1}{2} \log \|a \cdot v\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \log \|v\|^2. \quad (2.30)$$

A direct calculation shows that $T_a \Psi_{[v]}(\zeta \cdot a) = \operatorname{Im} \kappa_{\mathbb{C}}(J(a \cdot m), \zeta)$ for all $a \in G^c$ and $\zeta \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, where J is the momentum map for the Fubini–Study symplectic structure (extended complex-linearly to $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$), see [GRS18, Lemma 8.3]. In fact, this relation uniquely characterizes the Kempf–Ness function up to a constant (if G^c is connected), and is used to define the Kempf–Ness function for more general Kähler manifolds M endowed with a G^c -action. We can employ the same idea to define a Kempf–Ness function for Cartan geometries.

THEOREM 2.14 *Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold and let G be a Lie group acting symplectically on M with momentum map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$. Let (P, θ) be a Cartan model for an orbit through $m \in M$ via the map $\chi: P \rightarrow M$, with Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ and duality $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}$. Assume that J is \mathfrak{a} -equivariant. Then the following holds:*

(i) *The 1-form α on P defined by*

$$\alpha_p(X) = \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(J(\chi(p)), \theta_p(X)), \quad p \in P, X \in T_p P, \quad (2.31)$$

is basic and hence induces a 1-form $\check{\alpha}$ on B .

(ii) *We have*

$$d\alpha = -\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(J \circ \chi, \Omega), \quad (2.32)$$

where $\Omega := d\theta - \frac{1}{2}[\theta \wedge \theta] \in \Omega^2(P, \mathfrak{a})$ is the curvature of θ . In particular, if θ is torsion-free, then $d\alpha = 0 = d\check{\alpha}$.

(iii) *If B is simply-connected and θ is torsion-free, then there exists a function $\Psi_m: B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\check{\alpha} = d\Psi_m$. \diamond*

The function Ψ_m is unique up to a constant and we call it the *Kempf–Ness function* at m .

Proof. Let α be the 1-form defined above. Since the non-equivariance cocycle of J vanishes when paired with \mathfrak{a} , the G -invariance of α follows from the G -equivariance of θ and χ . Moreover, for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, we have $\alpha_p(\xi \cdot p) = \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(J(\chi(p)), \theta_p(\xi \cdot p)) = 0$ since $\theta_p(\xi \cdot p) = \xi$ and $\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}$ vanishes on \mathfrak{g} . So α is basic and thus descends to a 1-form $\check{\alpha}$ on B .

For the second part, abbreviate $s := J \circ \chi : P \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$. Then $\alpha_p(X) = \kappa_\alpha(s(p), \theta_p(X))$, and it thus suffices to calculate ds and $d\theta$. For the first, we have

$$T_p s(\theta_p^{-1}(\xi)) = T_{\chi(p)} J(T_p \chi(\theta_p^{-1}(\xi))) = T_{\chi(p)} J(\xi \cdot \chi(p)) = C_p \xi \quad (2.33)$$

for every $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$. For the second, $d\theta = \Omega + \frac{1}{2}[\theta \wedge \theta]$, where Ω is the curvature of θ . Let $X_1, X_2 \in T_p P$ and choose $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathfrak{a}$ such that $\theta_p(X_i) = \xi_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$d\theta(X_1, X_2) = \Omega(X_1, X_2) + [\xi_1, \xi_2]. \quad (2.34)$$

Combining these two calculations, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & (d\alpha)_p(X_1, X_2) - \kappa_\alpha(J(\chi(p)), \Omega_p(X_1, X_2)) \\ &= \kappa_\alpha(ds \wedge \theta)_p(X_1, X_2) + \kappa_\alpha(s(p), (d\theta - \Omega)_p(X_1, X_2)) \\ &= \kappa_\alpha(C_p \xi_1, \xi_2) - \kappa_\alpha(C_p \xi_2, \xi_1) + \kappa_\alpha(J(\chi(p)), [\xi_1, \xi_2]) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

due to the \mathfrak{a} -equivariance of J . □

PROPOSITION 2.15 *In the setting of Theorem 2.14 (iii), the following holds:*

- (i) *A point $b \in B$ is a critical point of Ψ_m if and only if for some (and hence for all) $p \in \pi^{-1}(b)$ the functional $J(\chi(p))$ vanishes when paired with elements of \mathfrak{a} .*
- (ii) *For every $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$, let $\gamma_\xi : [0, \delta] \rightarrow P$ be the integral curve of the vector field $\theta^{-1}(\xi)$. Assume that $\pi(\gamma_\xi(0))$ is a critical point of Ψ_m . Then*

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \right|_{t=0} \Psi_m(\pi(\gamma_\xi(t))) = \kappa_\alpha(C_p \xi, \xi). \quad (2.36)$$

- (iii) *In addition, assume that we are in the setting of Proposition 2.9 so that we consider an orbit through a point m in an almost complex manifold (M, j) and that $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{im}] \subseteq \mathfrak{im}$. We also assume that the almost complex structure j is compatible with the symplectic form ω , i.e., $g(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, j\cdot)$ is a Riemannian metric. Then:*

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \right|_{t=0} \Psi_m(\pi(\gamma_\xi(t))) = -\kappa(C_p(i \operatorname{Im} \xi), \operatorname{Im} \xi) = \|(\operatorname{Im} \xi) \cdot \chi(p)\|^2, \quad (2.37)$$

where the norm is taken with respect to g .

Moreover, if $\xi \in \mathfrak{im}$, then Ψ_m is convex along $\pi \circ \gamma_\xi$:

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \right|_t \Psi_m(\pi(\gamma_\xi(t))) = \|\xi \cdot \chi(\gamma_\xi(t))\|^2. \quad (2.38)$$

◇

In the classical case $P = G^c \rightarrow B := G^c/G$, every tangent vector at the identity coset $[e]$ is identified with an element of \mathfrak{ig} . So the condition that ξ has to be imaginary in the last statement is no real restriction and the proposition entails that Ψ_m is convex along the geodesics in G^c/G in arbitrary directions. In Section 2.5, we will discuss the geodesics in the base of a Cartan geometry in more detail and will see that the Kempf–Ness function is convex along geodesics.

Proof. The first part follows from the fact that $d\Psi_m = \check{\alpha}$ and from the formula (2.31) for α .

For the second part, let $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$ and let γ_ξ be an integral curve of $\theta^{-1}(\xi)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Psi_m \left(\pi(\gamma_\xi(t)) \right) &= T_{\pi(\gamma_\xi(t))} \Psi_m \left(T_{\gamma_\xi(t)} \pi(\dot{\gamma}_\xi(t)) \right) \\ &= \alpha_{\gamma_\xi(t)}(\dot{\gamma}_\xi(t)) \\ &= \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}} \left(J(\chi(\gamma_\xi(t))), \theta_{\gamma_\xi(t)}(\dot{\gamma}_\xi(t)) \right) \\ &= \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(J(\chi(\gamma_\xi(t))), \xi). \end{aligned} \tag{2.39}$$

Using the definition (2.6) of the Calabi operator, we conclude

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Big|_t \Psi_m \left(\pi(\gamma_\xi(t)) \right) = \kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(C_{\gamma_\xi(t)} \xi, \xi). \tag{2.40}$$

For the last part, assume that $\gamma_\xi(0) = p$ projects onto a critical point of Ψ_m and that we are in the setting of Proposition 2.9. Decomposing $\xi = \xi_1 + i\xi_2$ with $\xi_1 \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $\xi_2 \in \mathfrak{m}$, we have

$$\kappa_{\mathfrak{a}}(C_p \xi, \xi) = -\kappa(C_p \xi_1, \xi_2) - \kappa(C_p(i\xi_2), \xi_2) \tag{2.41}$$

Then, using the first part of the proposition, $J(\chi(p))$ vanishes when paired with \mathfrak{m} under κ . This implies that the first summand vanishes since $C_p \xi_1 = -\text{ad}_{\xi_1}^* J(\chi(p))$ and the commutator $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ lies in \mathfrak{m} by assumption. As we have seen in (2.14), $\kappa(C_p(i\xi_2), \xi_2) = -\omega(\xi_2 \cdot \chi(p), j\xi_2 \cdot \chi(p)) = -\|\xi_2 \cdot \chi(p)\|^2$, which proves the second equality in (2.37), cf. also [DR24, Eq. 3.32]. Finally, (2.38) follows directly from (2.40) by similar arguments. \square

REMARK 2.16 If the closed 1-form α defined Theorem 2.14, satisfies $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta^*} \alpha = 0$ for all $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$ then one directly obtains a different proof of Theorem 2.10. This line of thought goes back at least to the work of Bourguignon. The invariance of α holds in the Kähler examples due to the properties of the curvature. However, in our abstract setting, $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta^*} \alpha = 0$ follows instead from Theorems 2.10 and 2.14. \diamond

PROPOSITION 2.17 *In the setting of Proposition 2.9, assume that the Lie algebra action of \mathfrak{a}_m is integrated to an action of a regular¹ Lie group Z on P and that $\text{Ker } T_p \chi = p \cdot \mathfrak{a}_m$.*

Let $\gamma_\xi: [0, 1] \rightarrow P$ be an integral curve of $\theta^{-1}(\xi)$ for $\xi \in \text{im}$. If $\gamma_\xi(0)$ and $\gamma_\xi(1)$ are zeros of $J \circ \chi$, then there exists $z \in Z$ such that $\gamma_\xi(0) = \gamma_\xi(1) \cdot z$. \diamond

Proof. Since $J \circ \chi$ vanishes at the end points of γ_ξ , equation (2.39) implies that $\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \Psi_m(\pi(\gamma_\xi(t))) = 0 = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1} \Psi_m(\pi(\gamma_\xi(t)))$. Moreover, Ψ_m is convex along $\pi \circ \gamma_\xi$ by Proposition 2.15 (iii). But a convex function with vanishing derivatives at the end points has vanishing derivative everywhere. Hence, using (2.38), we get $\xi \cdot \chi(\gamma_\xi(t)) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Equivalently,

$$0 = \xi \cdot \chi(\gamma_\xi(t)) = T_{\gamma_\xi(t)} \chi \left(\theta_{\gamma_\xi(t)}^{-1}(\xi) \right). \quad (2.42)$$

By assumption, there exists a curve $\zeta(t) \in \mathfrak{a}_m$ with $\gamma_\xi(t) \cdot \zeta(t) = \theta_{\gamma_\xi(t)}^{-1}(\xi)$. Since Z is a regular Lie group, we can find a curve $z(t) \in Z$ starting at the identity with $\zeta(t) \cdot z(t) = -\dot{z}(t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_t (\gamma_\xi(t) \cdot z(t)) &= \dot{\gamma}_\xi(t) \cdot z(t) + \gamma_\xi(t) \cdot \dot{z}(t) \\ &= \theta_{\gamma_\xi(t)}^{-1}(\xi) \cdot z(t) - \gamma_\xi(t) \cdot \zeta(t) \cdot z(t) \\ &= \theta_{\gamma_\xi(t)}^{-1}(\xi) \cdot z(t) - \theta_{\gamma_\xi(t)}^{-1}(\xi) \cdot z(t) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

Hence $\gamma_\xi(0) = \gamma_\xi(1) \cdot z(1)$. \square

2.5 Geodesics

A Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ with group G is called *reductive* if there exists a G -invariant topological complement \mathfrak{m} of \mathfrak{g} in \mathfrak{a} , i.e., $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$ as a topological vector space and $\text{Ad}_g \mathfrak{m} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ for all $g \in G$. In particular, $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{m}] \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$. For a Cartan geometry (P, θ) modeled on a reductive Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$, the Cartan connection θ decomposes as $\theta = \theta_{\mathfrak{g}} + \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}$ where $\theta_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\theta_{\mathfrak{m}}$ take values in \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{m} , respectively. One easily checks that $\theta_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is an ordinary principal connection on the G -bundle P and $\theta_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a G -equivariant and horizontal 1-form on P (with values in \mathfrak{m}). Thus, we may regard $\theta_{\mathfrak{m}}$ also as a 1-form on the base manifold B of P with values in $P \times_G \mathfrak{m}$. Moreover, the bundle isomorphism $TB \simeq P \times_G (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g})$ mentioned above takes the simple form

$$TB \ni (b, Z) \mapsto [p, \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(\hat{Z}_p)] \in P \times_G \mathfrak{m}, \quad (2.44)$$

¹ Roughly speaking, a Lie group G is called *regular* if every curve in its Lie algebra integrates to an evolution curve in G . We refer to [KM97, Section 38] or [Nee06, Section III] for a precise definition.

where $p \in \pi^{-1}(b)$ and $\hat{Z}_p \in T_p P$ is any lift of $Z \in T_b B$. Note that this is just $\theta_m \in \Omega^1(B, P \times_G \mathfrak{m})$ in disguise. Due to this property, θ_m is called the *solder form*.

If B is finite-dimensional (equivalently, \mathfrak{m} is finite-dimensional) and the representation $\text{Ad}: G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathfrak{m})$ is injective, then we can identify P with the frame bundle of B and θ_m with the tautological form, see [Sha97, Appendix A.2]. In fact, a choice of basis of \mathfrak{m} yields a correspondence between local sections of P and local frames of B via (2.44). Without the injectivity assumption on the representation, multiple sections of P may correspond to the same frame of B . It is not obvious how to generalize this identification to the infinite-dimensional setting, and, in fact, even the notion of a frame bundle is not clear in this setting. Changing the perspective, we may however use this identification as the *raison d'être* for the following definition.

DEFINITION 2.18 Let B be an infinite-dimensional manifold and G an infinite-dimensional Lie group. A G -structure on B is a Cartan geometry $P \rightarrow B$ modeled on a reductive Klein pair with group G . \diamond

Many classical concepts from the finite-dimensional theory of G -structures carry over to this setting when reformulated in terms of Cartan geometries. In particular, the principal connection $\theta_{\mathfrak{g}}$ induces a connection on every vector bundle associated with P (in infinite dimensions, it is perhaps best to formulate this in terms of the so-called connector, see [KM97, Section 37.26]). In particular, we obtain an affine connection on the tangent bundle TB via the bundle isomorphism (2.44), and thus it makes sense to talk about geodesics in B . Explicitly, the *covariant derivative* $\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} X$ of a vector field X along a curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow B$ is defined by

$$\theta_m(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} X(t)) = \iota_p(T_p \tilde{X}(\hat{\gamma}_p)), \quad (2.45)$$

where $p \in \pi^{-1}(\gamma(t))$ and $\hat{\gamma}_p \in T_p P$ is the horizontal lift of $\dot{\gamma}(t) \in T_{\gamma(t)} B$. Moreover, $\tilde{X}: \gamma^* P \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ satisfying $[p, \tilde{X}(t, p)] = \theta_m(X(t))$ is the G -equivariant map corresponding to X under the isomorphism (2.44). We call γ a *geodesic* if $\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = 0$. As in the finite-dimensional case, we have a close relationship between geodesics and the flows of the θ -constant vector fields on P .

PROPOSITION 2.19 Let $\pi: P \rightarrow B$ be a G -structure on B . Assume that, for every $\xi \in \mathfrak{m}$, the horizontal vector field $\theta^{-1}(\xi)$ on P has a smooth local flow FL_t^ξ . Then, for every $[p, \xi] \in P \times_G \mathfrak{m}$, the curve $t \mapsto \pi(\text{FL}_t^\xi(p))$ is a geodesic in B . Conversely, if G is regular, then every geodesic in B is of this form for a unique $[p, \xi] \in P \times_G \mathfrak{m}$. \diamond

Proof. The proof is analogous to the finite-dimensional case, see [KN63, Proposition III.6.3] or [RS17, Proposition 2.1.22].

For $\xi \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $p \in P$, let $\hat{\gamma}(t) = \text{FL}_t^\xi(p)$ and $\gamma(t) = \pi(\hat{\gamma}(t))$ for $t \in I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ an interval containing 0. Note that γ depends only on the equivalence class $[p, \xi]$

and not on the choice of p and ξ . Moreover, $\hat{\gamma}$ is a horizontal lift of γ with $\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\gamma}(t) = \theta_{\hat{\gamma}(t)}^{-1}(\xi)$. Hence, the map $\gamma^*P \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ corresponding to $\dot{\gamma}$ is constant along horizontal curves. Thus, by (2.45), $\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}\dot{\gamma} = 0$, so γ is a geodesic.

Conversely, let $\gamma: I \rightarrow B$ be a geodesic defined on an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ containing 0. Since G is regular, for every $p \in \pi^{-1}(\gamma(0))$, there exists a unique horizontal lift $\hat{\gamma}: I \rightarrow P$ of γ with $\hat{\gamma}(0) = p$, see [KM97, Theorem 39.1]. Since γ is a geodesic, we have $\theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(\dot{\gamma}(t)) = [\hat{\gamma}(t), \xi]$ for some constant $\xi \in \mathfrak{m}$. Thus, $\hat{\gamma}$ is an integral curve of $\theta^{-1}(\xi)$. \square

If $P \rightarrow B$ is a Cartan geometry, not necessarily modeled on a reductive Klein pair, then we can still consider the projection of integral curves γ_ξ of the vector fields $\theta^{-1}(\xi)$ for $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$. Such curves are called *generalized geodesics* or *generalized circles*, see [Sha97, Definition 5.4.16]. Reformulated in this terminology, Theorem 2.14 expresses that the Kempf–Ness function is convex along generalized geodesics.

For a (generalized) geodesic ray γ_ξ , we define its slope by

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_m(\pi(\gamma_\xi(t)))}{t}. \quad (2.46)$$

In the Kähler setting, this definition appears in Donaldson [Don99, page 32, Conjecture/Question 12, (2)]. In view of the work of Phong and Sturm [PS07], a test configuration gives rise to a geodesic and the slope for this geodesic coincides with the Donaldson–Futaki invariant together with the Lelong number of the central fiber. When the central fiber is reduced the Lelong number is 0. So we may regard the slope as the “Mumford weight”. Thus, instead of “slope”, one could call it “weight”, or “Mumford weight”, or “GIT weight”.

DEFINITION 2.20 A Cartan model for the complex orbit through $m \in M$ is said to be *stable* (resp. *semistable*) if the slope of any geodesic ray is positive (resp. non-negative). A Cartan model for the complex orbit through $m \in M$ is said to be *unstable* if it is not semistable. \diamond

Since geodesics cannot be compactified, it is not straightforward how to define test configurations in our general framework. Instead, we might consider Tits buildings. A more comprehensive exploration of this idea is left for future work.

In many cases, the base manifold B of a Cartan geometry carries a natural Riemannian metric, so it is natural to ask whether the geodesics of this metric are the same as the Cartan geodesics. Let (P, θ) be a Cartan geometry modeled on a reductive Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ with splitting $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$. We assume that \mathfrak{m} carries an Ad_G -invariant, positive-definite, symmetric bilinear form $\Xi_{\mathfrak{m}}: \mathfrak{m} \times \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. These properties ensure that $\Xi_{\mathfrak{m}}$ induces a (weak)¹ Riemannian metric Ξ on B

via the isomorphism $TB \simeq P \times_G \mathfrak{m}$ induced by the Cartan connection:

$$\Xi_b(Z_1, Z_2) = \Xi_{\mathfrak{m}}(\theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(\hat{Z}_1), \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(\hat{Z}_2)), \quad (2.47)$$

where $b \in B$, $Z_1, Z_2 \in T_b B$, $p \in \pi^{-1}(b)$, and $\hat{Z}_i \in T_p P$ is a lift of Z_i . The Cartan covariant derivative defined in (2.45) has, in general, a non-vanishing torsion and thus does not coincide with the Levi-Civita connection of Ξ . However, the geodesics of the Cartan connection and the Levi-Civita connection in fact coincide under natural assumptions.

PROPOSITION 2.21 *Let (P, θ) be a Cartan geometry modeled on a reductive Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ with splitting $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$. Assume that \mathfrak{m} carries an Ad_G -invariant, positive-definite, symmetric bilinear form $\Xi_{\mathfrak{m}}: \mathfrak{m} \times \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and let Ξ be the induced Riemannian metric on B . Suppose that there exists a 1-form α on B with values in $P \times_G \mathfrak{g}$ such that*

$$\Omega_{\mathfrak{m}} + \frac{1}{2}[\theta_{\mathfrak{m}} \wedge \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}} = [\alpha \wedge \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}], \quad (2.48)$$

where the subscript in the second term indicates that we take the \mathfrak{m} -component of the commutator. Then the Levi-Civita connection ∇^{LC} of Ξ is given by

$$\theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(\nabla_X^{\text{LC}} Y) = \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(\nabla_X^{\theta} Y) - [\alpha(X), \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(Y)], \quad (2.49)$$

where ∇^{θ} is the Cartan covariant derivative associated with θ as defined in (2.45). In particular, if θ is torsion-free, then

$$\theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(\nabla_X^{\text{LC}} Y) = \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(\nabla_X^{\theta} Y) - \frac{1}{2}[\theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(X), \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}(Y)]_{\mathfrak{m}} \quad (2.50)$$

and the geodesics of ∇^{LC} and ∇^{θ} coincide. \diamond

Proof. The \mathfrak{m} -component of the curvature Ω of θ is given by

$$\Omega_{\mathfrak{m}} = d\theta_{\mathfrak{m}} - [\theta_{\mathfrak{g}} \wedge \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}] - \frac{1}{2}[\theta_{\mathfrak{m}} \wedge \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}, \quad (2.51)$$

where $\tau = d\theta_{\mathfrak{m}} - [\theta_{\mathfrak{g}} \wedge \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}]$ is the torsion of the affine connection induced by $\theta_{\mathfrak{g}}$, see, e.g., [RS17, Proposition 2.1.19]. By assumption, there exists a 1-form α on B with values in $P \times_G \mathfrak{g}$ such that $\tau = [\alpha \wedge \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}]$. Consider the Cartan connection

$$\bar{\theta} = \theta_{\mathfrak{g}} + \alpha + \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}. \quad (2.52)$$

It has torsion $\bar{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{m}} = -\frac{1}{2}[\theta_{\mathfrak{m}} \wedge \theta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Moreover, the torsion $\bar{\tau}$ of the affine connection

¹ The metric is weak in the sense that the induced musical map $\sharp: T_b B \rightarrow T_b^* B$ is only injective and not necessarily an isomorphism. One complication for weak metrics is that the Koszul formula only yields uniqueness of the Levi-Civita connection, but not its existence.

$\nabla^{\bar{\theta}}$ induced by $\bar{\theta}_g = \theta_g + \alpha$ is zero. Unraveling the definitions, we find that $\nabla_X^{\bar{\theta}} Y = \nabla_X^\theta Y - [\alpha(X), \theta_m(Y)]$. Moreover, for vector fields X, Y, Z on B with $\bar{\theta}$ -horizontal lifts $\hat{X}, \hat{Y}, \hat{Z}$ to P , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z\Xi(X, Y) &= \hat{Z}\Xi_m(\theta_m(\hat{X}), \theta_m(\hat{Y})) \\ &= \Xi_m(\hat{Z}(\theta_m(\hat{X})), \theta_m(\hat{Y})) + \Xi_m(\theta_m(\hat{X}), \hat{Z}(\theta_m(\hat{Y}))) \\ &= \Xi_m(\theta_m(\nabla_Z^{\bar{\theta}} X), \theta_m(\hat{Y})) + \Xi_m(\theta_m(\hat{X}), \nabla_Z^{\bar{\theta}} \theta_m(\hat{Y})) \\ &= \Xi(\nabla_Z^{\bar{\theta}} X, Y) + \Xi(X, \nabla_Z^{\bar{\theta}} Y). \end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

Hence, $\nabla^{\bar{\theta}}$ is metric, and thus it is the Levi-Civita connection of Ξ .

Finally, if $\Omega_m = 0$, then we can choose $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\theta_m$ and obtain (2.50). In this case, $\nabla_X^{\text{LC}} X = \nabla_X^\theta X$ so that both connections have the same geodesics. \square

Note that this discussion of geodesics does not at all invoke the role of the Cartan bundle as a local model for a (complexified) orbit. In fact, it also gives a slightly different geometric interpretation of some constructions in [Mod17; KMM21]. Let us first discuss the case of a homogenous space, and then apply it to Wasserstein geometry.

EXAMPLE 2.22 (Homogenous space) Let $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ be a Klein pair with group G and assume that \mathfrak{a} integrates to a Lie group A with an exponential map. Furthermore, suppose that G is a principal Lie subgroup of A , i.e., the left action of G on A yields a principal G -bundle $A \rightarrow G \backslash A$ (this is no longer automatic in the infinite-dimensional setting, see [Nee06, Problem IX.3]). Then right A -invariant Cartan connections on $A \rightarrow G \backslash A$ are in bijective correspondence with Ad_G -equivariant isomorphisms $\lambda: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ and $\check{\lambda}: \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g}$ fitting into the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{g} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{a} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \lambda & & \downarrow \check{\lambda} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{g} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{a} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow 0. \end{array} \tag{2.54}$$

The associated Cartan connection θ is given by $\theta_a(\xi \cdot a) = \lambda(\xi)$ for $a \in A$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$. For $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$, the constant vector field $\theta^{-1}(\xi)$ on A has the form $\theta^{-1}(\xi)_a = \lambda^{-1}(\xi) \cdot a$ and the integral curve starting at a is given by the 1-parameter subgroup $t \mapsto \exp(t\lambda^{-1}(\xi)) \cdot a$. The projection of this curve to $G \backslash A$ is a generalized geodesic. If λ is the identity, then θ is the Maurer–Cartan form of A and $\theta^{-1}(\xi)$ is the right invariant vector field on A corresponding to $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$.

Assume now that we have a reductive decomposition $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$. Then λ is necessarily of the form $\lambda(\eta + \xi) = \eta + \tilde{\lambda}(\xi) + \check{\lambda}(\xi)$, $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}$, $\xi \in \mathfrak{m}$, for some Ad_G -equivariant linear map $\tilde{\lambda}: \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ and an Ad_G -equivariant isomorphism $\check{\lambda}: \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}$. Then the unique geodesic starting at the identity coset in the direction

$[e, \xi] \in A \times_G \mathfrak{m}$ is given by $t \mapsto \left[\exp\left(t\check{\lambda}^{-1}(\xi) - t\check{\lambda}(\check{\lambda}^{-1}(\xi))\right) \right]$. \diamond

EXAMPLE 2.23 (Information Geometry) Let (M, g) be a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension n . Denote the volume form of g by μ and the space of smooth volume forms on M with total volume 1 by \mathcal{B} . The diffeomorphism group $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{D}iff(M)$ fibers by the push-forward map over \mathcal{B} , that is, $\pi: \phi \ni \mathcal{D}iff(M) \mapsto \phi_*\mu = (\phi^{-1})^*\mu \in \mathcal{B}$. The structure group of this principal bundle is the group $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \mu)$ of volume-preserving diffeomorphism and $\psi \in \mathcal{D}iff(M, \mu)$ acts on \mathcal{P} by $\phi \mapsto \phi \circ \psi^{-1}$. It is tempting to use the Maurer–Cartan form on \mathcal{P} together with the Helmholtz–Hodge decomposition of vector fields on M into divergence-free and gradient parts to define a Cartan connection on \mathcal{P} . However, only metric-preserving diffeomorphisms leave the Helmholtz decomposition invariant; this renders the construction of a Cartan connection along these lines difficult.

Instead, we start with the following weighted Helmholtz decomposition of vector fields on M . For every $\phi \in \mathcal{D}iff(M)$ and a vector field X on M , we can decompose ϕ_*X into a divergence-free part $X^{\phi_*\mu-\text{div}}$ and a gradient part X^{grad} with respect to the volume form $\phi_*\mu$ as

$$\phi_*X = X^{\phi_*\mu-\text{div}} + X^{\text{grad}}, \quad \text{div}_{\phi_*\mu} X^{\phi_*\mu-\text{div}} = 0. \quad (2.55)$$

Equivalently, we can write $X = \phi^*X^{\phi_*\mu-\text{div}} + \phi^*X^{\text{grad}}$, where $\phi^*X^{\phi_*\mu-\text{div}}$ is now divergence-free with respect to μ . In other words, every vector field X uniquely decomposes as follows:

$$X = X^{\text{div}} + \phi^* \text{grad} f, \quad X^{\text{div}} \in \mathfrak{X}(M, \mu), \quad f \in C_0^\infty(M). \quad (2.56)$$

Note that both X^{div} and f also depend on ϕ . In fact, if we regard both objects as functions of X and ϕ , then we get the following equivariance properties under the action of $\psi \in \mathcal{D}iff(M, \mu)$:

$$X^{\text{div}}(\psi_*X, \phi \circ \psi^{-1}) = \psi_*X^{\text{div}}(X, \phi), \quad f(\psi_*X, \phi \circ \psi^{-1}) = f(X, \phi). \quad (2.57)$$

Using this decomposition, we define a Cartan connection on \mathcal{P} by

$$\theta_\phi(T\phi \circ X) = (X^{\text{div}}, f), \quad \phi \in \mathcal{P}, \quad X = X^{\text{div}} + \phi^* \text{grad} f \in \mathfrak{X}(M), \quad (2.58)$$

relative to the Klein pair $\mathfrak{X}(M, \mu) \subset \mathfrak{X}(M, \mu) \oplus C_0^\infty(M)$. The equivariance properties above show that θ is indeed equivariant if we let $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \mu)$ act trivially on $C_0^\infty(M)$ (and by push-forward on $\mathfrak{X}(M, \mu)$). In particular, this is now a reductive Cartan geometry.

Note that $\theta_\phi^{-1}(0, f) = \text{grad} f \circ \phi$. The geodesics of the Cartan connection are hence curves $\mu(t) = (\text{FL}_t^{\text{grad} f})_*\mu$ for a time-independent $f \in C_0^\infty(M)$. By passing

to the densities $\rho(t) = \mu(t)/\mu$, the geodesic equation can be cast into the more familiar form of the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}_\mu(\rho \operatorname{grad} f) = 0. \quad (2.59)$$

Above, we have absorbed the pull-back by ϕ in the decomposition (2.56) in the Cartan connection itself. Alternatively, we can keep the pull-back explicit and try to define a different Cartan connection as follows. Consider again the Klein pair $\mathfrak{X}(M, \mu) \subset \mathfrak{X}(M, \mu) \oplus C_0^\infty(M)$, but this time with the action of $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \mu)$ by push-forward on both components. Otto [Ott01] showed that the tangent space to \mathcal{B} at ν can naturally be identified with $C_0^\infty(M)$ using the parametrization¹

$$C_0^\infty(M) \ni f \mapsto -\mathfrak{L}_{\operatorname{grad} f} \nu \in T_\nu \mathcal{B}. \quad (2.61)$$

Note that $T_\phi(T\phi \circ X) = -\mathfrak{L}_{\operatorname{grad} f}(\phi_* \mu) = -\mathfrak{L}_{\operatorname{grad} f} \nu$ if $X = \phi^* \operatorname{grad} f$ and $\nu = \phi_* \mu$. Using this identity, we can reinterpret the identification (2.61) as the $C_0^\infty(M)$ -component of a Cartan connection $\bar{\theta}$ on \mathcal{P} by setting

$$\left(\bar{\theta}_{C_0^\infty(M)} \right)_\phi (T\phi \circ X) = f \circ \phi, \quad \phi \in \mathcal{P}, \quad X = X^{\operatorname{div}} + \phi^* \operatorname{grad} f \in \mathfrak{X}(M). \quad (2.62)$$

It would be now natural to complete this to a Cartan connection by choosing the $\mathfrak{X}(M, \mu)$ -component in such a way that the geodesics coincide with the Wasserstein geodesics. Following [Loto8, Lemma 4], the Levi-Civita connection $\bar{\nabla}$ on \mathcal{B} corresponding to the Wasserstein metric is given, under the identification (2.61), by the map

$$\bar{\nabla}_g : f \mapsto G_\nu d_\nu^*((\nabla^j g) \cdot (\nabla_i \nabla_j f) dx^i), \quad (2.63)$$

where d_ν^* is the adjoint of d in $L^2(M, \nu)$, G_ν is the Green operator of the Laplacian $d_\nu^* d$ and $g \in C_0^\infty(M)$ gives the direction of the derivative. Hence, in order for this affine connection to come from a Cartan connection, one would need write $\bar{\nabla}_g(f)$ as the application of a divergence-free vector field on f . In particular, $\bar{\nabla}_g$ would need to be a first-order differential operator. However, the appearance of the Green operator in the expression of $\bar{\nabla}_g$ makes this impossible and one only obtains a *pseudo-differential operator* of order 1.

Thus, there is no Cartan connection $\bar{\theta}$ on \mathcal{P} with the $C_0^\infty(M)$ -component given above, whose geodesics coincide with the Wasserstein geodesics. The structure group $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \mu)$ of the Cartan bundle \mathcal{P} is too small to serve as the holonomy group of the Wasserstein metric. In order to fit the Wasserstein metric into the framework

¹ Expressed relative to the density function $\rho = \nu/\mu$, this parametrization is written as

$$f \mapsto -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_i (\rho \nabla^i f). \quad (2.60)$$

of Cartan geometry, one would need to enlarge the structure group of the Cartan bundle to a Lie group whose Lie algebra contains the pseudo-differential operator $\bar{\nabla}_g$. This may be possible, based on the work [ARS86], and it is an interesting direction for future research.

◇

2.6 Extremal elements

In Kähler geometry, the extremal vector field is closely related to the Futaki invariant. We will now show that the same is true in the context of Cartan geometries. Our treatment of the material here is inspired by, and follows in spirit, the original treatment of Futaki and Mabuchi [FM95].

Let (P, θ) be a Cartan geometry modeled on a reductive Klein pair $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{g})$ with group G . We assume that \mathfrak{a} carries an Ad_G -invariant bilinear form $\Xi: \mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which vanishes on \mathfrak{g} and is (weakly) non-degenerate on $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g}$. These properties ensure that Ξ produces a (weak) Riemannian metric Ξ on B via the isomorphism $TB \simeq P \times_G (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{g})$ induced by the Cartan connection. We can pull back this metric along the action of \mathfrak{a}_m to obtain, for every $p \in P$, a bilinear form

$$\Xi_p: \mathfrak{a}_m \times \mathfrak{a}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto \Xi(\theta_p(p \cdot \zeta_1), \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta_2)). \quad (2.64)$$

The equivariance properties ensure that Ξ_p depends only on the point $b := \pi(p) \in B$; we will write Ξ_b for Ξ_p in this case.

LEMMA 2.24 *For $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathfrak{a}_m$, the covariant derivative of the function $b \mapsto \Xi_b(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ is given by*

$$\nabla_\xi(\Xi_{(\cdot)}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2))(b) = \Xi([\xi, \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta_1)], \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta_2)) + \Xi(\theta_p(p \cdot \zeta_1), [\xi, \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta_2)]) \quad (2.65)$$

for $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$ and $p \in \pi^{-1}(b)$. In particular, if Ξ is $\text{ad}_\mathfrak{a}$ -invariant and B path-connected, then $\Xi_b(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ is independent of $b \in B$. ◇

Proof. Let $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathfrak{a}_m$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$. Then, abbreviating $s_\zeta(p) = \theta(p \cdot \zeta) \in \mathfrak{a}$ and using (2.22), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\xi(\Xi_{(\cdot)}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2))(b) &= \Xi(\nabla_\xi s_{\zeta_1}(p), s_{\zeta_2}(p)) + \Xi(s_{\zeta_1}(p), \nabla_\xi s_{\zeta_2}(p)) \\ &= \Xi([\xi, s_{\zeta_1}(p)], s_{\zeta_2}(p)) + \Xi(s_{\zeta_1}(p), [\xi, s_{\zeta_2}(p)]), \end{aligned} \quad (2.66)$$

because Ξ vanishes on \mathfrak{g} . The second statement follows from the first by the path-connectedness of B . □

If the assumptions of the lemma are satisfied, then we obtain a constant bilinear form $\Xi_m \equiv \Xi_b: \mathfrak{a}_m \times \mathfrak{a}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assuming that Ξ_m is strongly non-degenerate, we

can define an extremal element of \mathfrak{a}_m as the unique one corresponding to the Futaki functional $F: \mathfrak{a}_m \ni \zeta \mapsto F_\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ under Ξ_m .

DEFINITION 2.25 An element $\zeta_m \in \mathfrak{a}_m$ is called *extremal* if

$$F_\zeta = \Xi_m(\zeta_m, \zeta) \quad (2.67)$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathfrak{a}_m$. \diamond

By definition, this condition is equivalent to

$$\kappa_\alpha(J(\chi(p)), \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta)) = \Xi(\theta_p(p \cdot \zeta_m), \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta)) \quad (2.68)$$

for some (and hence all) $p \in P$. Thus, up to the pull-back by the map $\zeta \mapsto \theta_p(p \cdot \zeta)$, an extremal element is the same as the projection of $J(\chi(p))$ onto \mathfrak{a}_m .

3 KÄHLER GEOMETRY

Let (M, ω) be a finite-dimensional symplectic manifold, assumed to be compact, for simplicity. Denote by \mathcal{I} the space of all almost complex structures on M compatible with ω . Then \mathcal{I} is an open contractible subset, in the sense of [DR24, Section 2.1], of the Fréchet space $\Gamma^\infty(M, \text{End}(TM))$, see [DR24, Equation (5.7)]. For a given $j \in \mathcal{I}$, define \mathcal{P} to be the space of all tuples (σ, ϕ) , where σ is a symplectic form on M compatible with j and $\phi \in \mathcal{D}iff(M)$, satisfying $\phi^*\omega = \sigma$. Then, if j is integrable which we assume from now on, \mathcal{P} is a Fréchet principal bundle with structure group $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ over the space \mathcal{K} of Kähler forms in the same class as ω . Since σ is uniquely determined by ϕ , we may regard \mathcal{P} as a submanifold of $\mathcal{D}iff(M)$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\phi \in \mathcal{D}iff(M) : \sigma_\phi := \phi^*\omega \in \mathcal{K}\}. \quad (3.1)$$

We also put

$$j_\phi := \phi_*j = T\phi \circ j \circ T\phi^{-1}, \quad d^c_\phi f := j_\phi df. \quad (3.2)$$

The action of $\psi \in \mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ on \mathcal{P} is given by $\phi \mapsto \psi \circ \phi$. Donaldson [Don99] endowed \mathcal{P} with a natural principal connection as follows. First note that every $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}$ is of the form $\sigma = \omega + d d^c \varrho$ for some $\varrho \in C^\infty(M)$, where $d^c f := j df$. This identifies the tangent space $T_\sigma \mathcal{K}$ with $C^\infty(M)/\mathbb{R} \simeq C_0^\infty(M)$. Under this identification, tangent vectors at $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$ are of the form $X \circ \phi$ with $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ satisfying

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \left(\text{FL}_t^X \circ \phi \right)^* \omega = \phi^* \mathfrak{L}_X \omega = d d^c \varrho_{\phi, X}, \quad (3.3)$$

for some $\varrho_{\phi, X} \in C_0^\infty(M)$. Note that $\varrho_{\phi, X}$ is uniquely determined by this equation and, geometrically, it is the projection of $X \circ \phi \in T_\phi \mathcal{P}$ down to a tangent vector in

$T_{\phi^*\omega}\mathcal{K} \simeq C_0^\infty(M)$. Hence, a tangent vector X to \mathcal{P} at ϕ satisfies the constraint that $X \lrcorner \omega - \phi_* d^c \varrho_{\phi, X}$ is closed, where $\phi_* = (\phi^*)^{-1}$. We can take the ω -dual of this closed 1-form and obtain a symplectic vector field. It is now easy to verify that this prescription defines a connection on \mathcal{P} . Our first basic observation is that this connection defined by Donaldson can be extended to a Cartan connection for the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega), \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega))$ in the following way.

We begin by clarifying our conventions for the Lie algebra structure of this Klein pair. In the following, it will be convenient to regard the Lie algebra of vector fields as the left Lie algebra associated with the Lie group of diffeomorphisms. Thus, its Lie bracket is minus the usual Lie bracket of vector fields. Hence, on $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$ we define the bracket by

$$[X + iY, X' + iY'] = -[X, X'] - i[X, Y'] - i[Y, X'] + [Y, Y']. \quad (3.4)$$

This choice is consistent with having the adjoint action of $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ on $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$ given by push-forward. Next, since $j_\phi = \phi_* j$, we have

$$\phi_*(d^c f) = \phi_*(j df) = d^{c\phi}(\phi_* f) \quad (3.5)$$

and the vector field X has the decomposition

$$X = \omega^\sharp(X \lrcorner \omega - \phi_* d^c \varrho_{\phi, X}) + \omega^\sharp j_\phi(d\phi_* \varrho_{\phi, X}). \quad (3.6)$$

Motivated by this, the Cartan connection is given by the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.1 *The assignment*

$$\theta_\phi(X \circ \phi) = \omega^\sharp(X \lrcorner \omega - \phi_* d^c \varrho_{\phi, X}) - i\omega^\sharp(d\phi_* \varrho_{\phi, X}) \quad (3.7)$$

defines a Cartan connection on \mathcal{P} relative to the Klein pair given by the subalgebra $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)$ in $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$ with group $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$. \diamond

Proof. If X is a symplectic vector field, then $\varrho_{\phi, X} = 0$ and consequently

$$\theta_\phi(X \circ \phi) = \omega^\sharp(X \lrcorner \omega) = X. \quad (3.8)$$

Moreover, for every $\psi \in \mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$, we have

$$d d^c \varrho_{\psi \circ \phi, \psi_* X} = (\psi \circ \phi)^* \mathfrak{L}_{\psi_* X} \omega = \phi^* \mathfrak{L}_X \omega = d d^c \varrho_{\phi, X}. \quad (3.9)$$

Hence, $\varrho_{\psi \circ \phi, \psi_* X} = \varrho_{\phi, X}$ and

$$\theta_{\psi \circ \phi}(T\psi \circ X \circ \phi) = \theta_{\psi \circ \phi}((\psi_* X) \circ \psi \circ \phi) = \psi_*(\theta_\phi(X \circ \phi)). \quad (3.10)$$

This verifies that the form θ is equivariant with respect to the action of $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$

on \mathcal{P} and $\mathfrak{X}(M)$. Finally, the decomposition (3.6) shows that $\theta_\phi: T_\phi\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i\mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$ is an isomorphism. \square

The isomorphism $\mathcal{P} \times_{\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)} \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega) \simeq T\mathcal{K}$ induced by the imaginary part of the Cartan connection is given by

$$[\phi, X_f] \mapsto d d^c \phi^* f \in T_{\phi^*\omega}\mathcal{K}. \quad (3.11)$$

Note that \mathcal{I} carries an almost complex structure given by $j_j(A) = -jA$. The sign is chosen in such a way that j is compatible with the symplectic forms on \mathcal{I} considered below, that is, the Riemannian metric associated is positive definite (it is the L^2 -inner product), cf. [DR24, Equations (5.1) and (5.2)].

Now the choice of sign in the second term of (3.7) is motivated by the requirement that we want the infinitesimal action (2.1) associated with θ to coincide with the natural action

$$(X + iY) \cdot j := X \cdot j + j_j(Y \cdot j) = -\mathfrak{L}_X j + j \mathfrak{L}_Y j, \quad X \in \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega), Y \in \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega). \quad (3.12)$$

In fact, define $\chi: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ by $\chi(\phi) = \phi_* j = j_\phi$. Then χ is equivariant with respect to the action of $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ on \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{I} . For integrable j , we have

$$T_\phi \chi(X \circ \phi) = -\mathfrak{L}_X(\phi_* j) = \theta_\phi(X) \cdot \chi(\phi), \quad (3.13)$$

where the second equality follows from a straightforward calculation using $j \mathfrak{L}_Y j = \mathfrak{L}_{jY} j$ (see [Gau17, Lemma 1.1.1]). The latter equation also shows that elements of $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)_\mathbb{C} \cdot j$ are of the form $\mathfrak{L}_Z j$ for some vector field Z , cf. [Gau17, Proposition 9.1.1. (ii)]. Hence $\text{Range } T_\phi \chi = \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)_\mathbb{C} \cdot \chi(\phi)$. For every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}iff(M)$ that preserves j , we clearly have $\chi(\phi \circ \varphi) = \chi(\phi)$. In other words, χ is invariant under the natural right action of $\mathcal{D}iff(M, j)$. Moreover, every real j -holomorphic vector field Z on a compact Kähler manifold can be uniquely written as a sum $Z = X - jY$ with $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$. This realizes the space of j -holomorphic vector fields as subalgebra of $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i\mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$ forming the kernel of $T\chi$, cf. [DR24, Corollary 5.15]. In summary, this proves the following statement.

PROPOSITION 3.2 *For every integrable $j \in \mathcal{I}$, the Cartan bundle (\mathcal{P}, θ) provides a model for the complex orbit through j in the sense of Definition 2.3. \diamond*

We wish to emphasize that we have a rather interesting structure for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i\mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$ in the Klein pair. It is neither the complexification of $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)$ nor of $\mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$. In particular, it is *not natural* to view \mathcal{P} as a complexification of $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ nor of $\mathcal{H}am(M, \omega)$ unless the first Betti number vanishes. In particular, \mathcal{P} is not an "infinitesimal Lie group which complexifies $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ " in the terminology of [Don99, p. 20].

PROPOSITION 3.3 *The Cartan connection θ has zero curvature. Moreover, the Lie derivative of θ with respect to any holomorphic vector field vanishes. \diamond*

Proof. As described above, a tangent vector at $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$ is given by a vector field X on M satisfying the relation

$$\mathfrak{L}_X \omega = \phi_* \mathfrak{d} \mathfrak{d}^c \varrho_{\phi, X} = \mathfrak{d} j_\phi \mathfrak{d} \phi_* \varrho_{\phi, X} \quad (3.14)$$

for some smooth function $\varrho_{\phi, X}$, where $j_\phi = \phi_* j$. As in (3.6), X can be written as

$$X = \omega^\#(X \lrcorner \omega - \phi_* \mathfrak{d}^c \varrho_{\phi, X}) + \omega^\# j_\phi (\mathfrak{d} \phi_* \varrho_{\phi, X}). \quad (3.15)$$

We put

$$U_{\phi, X} = \omega^\#(X \lrcorner \omega - \phi_* \mathfrak{d}^c \varrho_{\phi, X}) \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$V_{\phi, X} = -\omega^\#(\mathfrak{d} \phi_* \varrho_{\phi, X}). \quad (3.17)$$

Then $X = U_{\phi, X} - j_\phi V_{\phi, X}$ and, using (3.7), we get

$$\theta_\phi(X \circ \phi) = U_{\phi, X} + iV_{\phi, X} \in \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i\mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega). \quad (3.18)$$

Conversely, if $U_X \in \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)$ and $V_X \in \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$, then we can define a vector field \bar{X} on \mathcal{P} by

$$\bar{X}_\phi = (U_X - j_\phi V_X) \circ \phi. \quad (3.19)$$

Since $\theta_\phi(\bar{X}_\phi) = U_X + iV_X$ is constant as a function of ϕ , we refer to \bar{X} as a θ -constant vector field.

If $U_X, U_Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)$ and $V_X, V_Y \in \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$, then the Lie bracket of the corresponding θ -constant vector fields is given by

$$[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}]_\phi \circ \phi^{-1} = [U_X, U_Y] - j_\phi [U_X, V_Y] + j_\phi [U_Y, V_X] + [V_Y, V_X]. \quad (3.20)$$

For the proof of this identity, it is helpful to abbreviate $X(\phi) = U_X - j_\phi V_X$ and

$Y(\phi) = U_Y - j_\phi V_Y$. For every smooth function \mathcal{F} on \mathcal{P} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{X}(\bar{Y}(\mathcal{F}))(\phi) &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_0 \mathcal{F} \left(\text{FL}_s^Y \left(\text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right) \circ \text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right) \\
 &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_0 \mathcal{F} \left(\text{FL}_s^Y \left(\text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right) \circ \phi \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_0 \mathcal{F} \left(\text{FL}_s^{Y(\phi)} \circ \text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right) \\
 &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 (d\mathcal{F})_\phi \left(Y \left(\text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right) \circ \phi \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_0 \mathcal{F} \left(\text{FL}_s^{Y(\phi)} \circ \text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Using the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula

$$\text{FL}_{-s}^Y \circ \text{FL}_{-t}^X \circ \text{FL}_s^Y \circ \text{FL}_t^X = \text{FL}_{st}^{[X,Y]} + O((st)^2)$$

for vector fields on M , see, e.g., [BB19, Theorem 1.38], we thus find

$$[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}]_\phi \circ \phi^{-1} = [X(\phi), Y(\phi)] + \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 Y \left(\text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right) - \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 X \left(\text{FL}_t^{Y(\phi)} \circ \phi \right). \tag{3.22}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 Y \left(\text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right) &= - \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \left(\text{FL}_t^{X(\phi)} \circ \phi \right)_* j(V_Y) \\
 &= \mathfrak{L}_{X(\phi)} j_\phi(V_Y) \\
 &= [U_X - j_\phi V_X, j_\phi V_Y] - j_\phi [U_X - j_\phi V_X, V_Y].
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Inserting this into (3.22), expanding terms, and using the vanishing of the Nijenhuis tensor of j_ϕ yields (3.20).

To conclude that the curvature of θ vanishes, we have to show that $\theta([\bar{X}, \bar{Y}]) + [\theta(\bar{X}), \theta(\bar{Y})] = 0$. First, by (3.4),

$$[\theta(\bar{X}), \theta(\bar{Y})] = -[U_X, U_Y] + [V_X, V_Y] - i([U_X, V_Y] + [V_X, U_Y]). \tag{3.24}$$

On the other hand, we conclude from (3.20) that

$$\theta([\bar{X}, \bar{Y}]) = [U_X, U_Y] - [V_X, V_Y] + i([U_X, V_Y] + [V_X, U_Y]). \tag{3.25}$$

They clearly sum up to zero, which proves the vanishing of the curvature.

Next, let Z^* be the vector field on \mathcal{P} induced by the j -holomorphic vector

field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. That is, $\mathrm{FL}_t^{Z^*}(\phi) = \phi \circ \mathrm{FL}_t^Z$. Let \bar{X} be the θ -constant vector field corresponding to $U \in \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)$ and $V \in \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$, i.e., $\bar{X}_\phi \circ \phi^{-1} = U - j_\phi V$. Since Z preserves j , we find

$$\begin{aligned} [Z^*, \bar{X}]_\phi &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \mathrm{TFL}_{-t}^{Z^*}(\bar{X}_{\mathrm{FL}_t^{Z^*}(\phi)}) = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \bar{X}_{\phi \circ \mathrm{FL}_t^Z} \circ \mathrm{FL}_{-t}^Z \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 (U - j_{\phi \circ \mathrm{FL}_t^Z} V) \circ \phi = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Hence,

$$(\mathfrak{L}_{Z^*} \theta)(\bar{X}) = \mathfrak{L}_{Z^*}(\theta(\bar{X})) - \theta([Z^*, \bar{X}]) = 0, \quad (3.27)$$

where we used that $\theta(\bar{X})$ is a constant function on \mathcal{P} . This completes the proof. \square

Alternative proof. We give a second proof of Proposition 3.3 which uses horizontal lifts of constant vector fields on \mathcal{K} instead of θ -constant vector fields as above. This proof is more in the spirit of the original calculation of the curvature of the affine connection by Donaldson [Dong99], see also Remark 3.4.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}$ and $X \circ \varphi \in \mathrm{T}_\varphi \mathcal{P}$. In order to calculate the curvature of θ , it is convenient to extend the tangent vector $X \circ \varphi$ to a vector field on \mathcal{P} . For this purpose, recall that there exists a unique function $\varrho_{\varphi, X} \in C_0^\infty(M)$ such that $\phi^* \mathfrak{L}_X \omega = d d^c \varrho_{\varphi, X}$. In the following, we will keep φ fixed and abbreviate $\varrho_{\varphi, X}$ by ϱ_X . For every $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$, define a vector field $X(\phi)$ on M by the relation

$$\phi^*(X(\phi) \lrcorner \omega) = d^c \varrho_X. \quad (3.28)$$

Note that ϱ_X does not depend on ϕ but only on the initially chosen point φ . Then, a vector field \tilde{X} on \mathcal{P} is defined by $\tilde{X}_\phi = X(\phi) \circ \phi$ for every $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$. This vector field is indeed tangent to \mathcal{P} because the associated function $\varrho_{\phi, \tilde{X}(\phi)}$ exists and is determined by

$$d d^c \varrho_{\phi, \tilde{X}(\phi)} = \phi^* \mathfrak{L}_{\tilde{X}(\phi)} \omega = d d^c \varrho_X. \quad (3.29)$$

Hence, $\varrho_{\phi, \tilde{X}(\phi)} = \varrho_X$. Recall that the function ϱ_X geometrically corresponds to the projection of $X \circ \varphi$ to a tangent vector in $\mathrm{T}_{\varphi^* \omega} \mathcal{K}$. Thus, the two tangent vectors $X \circ \varphi$ and \tilde{X}_φ differ only by a vertical vector. So, while \tilde{X} being not quite an extension of $X \circ \varphi$, this difference will not affect the calculation of the curvature because the curvature of θ vanishes when one of the arguments is vertical.

Before we proceed with the curvature calculation, we collect some useful properties of the vector field \tilde{X} . Using $\varrho_{\phi, \tilde{X}(\phi)} = \varrho_X$ and (3.28), we find

$$\theta_\phi(\tilde{X}_\phi) = \omega^\sharp(X(\phi) \lrcorner \omega - \phi_* d^c \varrho_X) - i \omega^\sharp(d\phi_* \varrho_X) = -i \omega^\sharp(d\phi_* \varrho_X). \quad (3.30)$$

This shows that \tilde{X} is the horizontal lift of the constant vector field on \mathcal{K} determined by ϱ_X . Moreover, the defining relation (3.28) of $X(\phi)$ can be rewritten as

$$X(\phi) \lrcorner \omega = \phi_* d^c \varrho_X = d^{c\phi}(\phi_* \varrho_X). \quad (3.31)$$

Using $\omega^\sharp(d^{c\phi} f) = -j_\phi X_f$, where X_f is the Hamiltonian vector field of f , we equivalently have $X(\phi) = -j_\phi X_{\phi_* \varrho_X}$. If $Y \circ \varphi \in T_\varphi \mathcal{P}$ is another tangent vector, then we can construct a vector field \tilde{Y} on \mathcal{P} in the same way. Then, the Lie bracket of \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} as vector fields on \mathcal{P} is given by

$$[\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}]_\phi = -X_{\{\phi_* \varrho_X, \phi_* \varrho_Y\}} \circ \phi. \quad (3.32)$$

For the proof of this identity, we need a bit of preparation.

First, note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} X(\phi)(\phi_* \varrho_Y) &= X(\phi) \lrcorner d(\phi_* \varrho_Y) = \omega(X(\phi), X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y}) \\ &= \omega(X_{\phi_* \varrho_X}, j_\phi X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y}) = \omega(Y(\phi), X_{\phi_* \varrho_X}) = Y(\phi)(\phi_* \varrho_X). \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Second, since j_ϕ is integrable, the commutator of the two vector fields $X(\phi)$ and $Y(\phi)$ on M is given by

$$[X(\phi), Y(\phi)] = -j_\phi [X(\phi), X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y}] - j_\phi [X_{\phi_* \varrho_X}, Y(\phi)] + [X_{\phi_* \varrho_X}, X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y}]. \quad (3.34)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} [X(\phi), X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y}] \lrcorner \omega &= \mathfrak{L}_{X(\phi)}(X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y} \lrcorner \omega) - X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y} \lrcorner \mathfrak{L}_{X(\phi)} \omega \\ &= -d(X(\phi)(\phi_* \varrho_Y)) - X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y} \lrcorner d d^{c\phi} \phi_* \varrho_X. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

Using (3.33) and $j_\phi(Z \lrcorner \alpha) = (j_\phi Z) \lrcorner (j_\phi \alpha)$, we thus find

$$\begin{aligned} &j_\phi [X(\phi), X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y}] + j_\phi [X_{\phi_* \varrho_X}, Y(\phi)] \\ &= j_\phi \omega^\sharp(X_{\phi_* \varrho_X} \lrcorner d d^{c\phi} \phi_* \varrho_Y - X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y} \lrcorner d d^{c\phi} \phi_* \varrho_X) \\ &= \omega^\sharp((j_\phi X_{\phi_* \varrho_X}) \lrcorner j_\phi dj_\phi d\phi_* \varrho_Y - (j_\phi X_{\phi_* \varrho_Y}) \lrcorner j_\phi dj_\phi d\phi_* \varrho_X) \\ &= \omega^\sharp(X(\phi) \lrcorner d^{c\phi} d\phi_* \varrho_Y - Y(\phi) \lrcorner d^{c\phi} d\phi_* \varrho_X). \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [X(\phi), Y(\phi)] \lrcorner \omega &= \mathfrak{L}_{X(\phi)}(Y(\phi) \lrcorner \omega) - Y(\phi) \lrcorner \mathfrak{L}_{X(\phi)} \omega \\ &= \mathfrak{L}_{X(\phi)} d^{c\phi}(\phi_* \varrho_Y) - Y(\phi) \lrcorner d d^{c\phi}(\phi_* \varrho_X). \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

Thus, using $d^{c\phi} d = -d d^{c\phi}$, (3.34), (3.36), and (3.37), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
 [X(\phi), Y(\phi)] &= \omega^\sharp(Y(\phi) \lrcorner d^{c\phi} d\phi_* \varrho_X - X(\phi) \lrcorner d^{c\phi} d\phi_* \varrho_Y) \\
 &\quad + X_{\{\phi_* \varrho_X, \phi_* \varrho_Y\}} \\
 &= \omega^\sharp \mathfrak{L}_{Y(\phi)} d^{c\phi}(\phi_* \varrho_X) - \omega^\sharp \mathfrak{L}_{X(\phi)} d^{c\phi}(\phi_* \varrho_Y) \\
 &\quad + 2[X(\phi), Y(\phi)] + X_{\{\phi_* \varrho_X, \phi_* \varrho_Y\}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

With these preparations, we are ready to calculate the commutator of the vector fields \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} on \mathcal{P} and verify the claimed identity (3.32). Using (3.22) (applied to \tilde{X} instead of \tilde{X}) and the identity

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 X(\text{FL}_t^{Y(\phi)} \circ \phi) = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 \omega^\sharp((\text{FL}_t^{Y(\phi)})_* \phi_* d^c \varrho_X) = -\omega^\sharp(\mathfrak{L}_{Y(\phi)} d^{c\phi}(\phi_* \varrho_X)), \tag{3.39}$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned}
 [\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}]_\phi \circ \phi^{-1} &= [X(\phi), Y(\phi)] \\
 &\quad + \omega^\sharp(\mathfrak{L}_{Y(\phi)} d^{c\phi}(\phi_* \varrho_X)) - \omega^\sharp(\mathfrak{L}_{X(\phi)} d^{c\phi}(\phi_* \varrho_Y)) \\
 &= -X_{\{\phi_* \varrho_X, \phi_* \varrho_Y\}},
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

where we used (3.38) in the last step. This completes the proof of (3.32).

Now, we can calculate the curvature Ω of θ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Omega_\varphi(X \circ \varphi, Y \circ \varphi) &= \Omega_\varphi(\tilde{X}_\varphi, \tilde{Y}_\varphi) \\
 &= \tilde{X}_\varphi(\theta(\tilde{Y})) - \tilde{Y}_\varphi(\theta(\tilde{X})) - \theta_\varphi([\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}]) \\
 &\quad - [\theta_\varphi(\tilde{X}), \theta_\varphi(\tilde{Y})] \\
 &= i\omega^\sharp(d \mathfrak{L}_{X(\varphi)}(\varphi_* \varrho_Y) - d \mathfrak{L}_{Y(\varphi)}(\varphi_* \varrho_X)) \\
 &\quad + X_{\{\varphi_* \varrho_X, \varphi_* \varrho_Y\}} - [X_{\varphi_* \varrho_X}, X_{\varphi_* \varrho_Y}],
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

where we recall the convention (3.4) of the Lie bracket on the Klein pair (which is used in the last equality). The imaginary part vanishes due to (3.33), so we conclude that θ is flat.

Next, we prove the second statement of the proposition. Let Z^* be the vector field on \mathcal{P} induced by the j -holomorphic vector field Z on M , i.e., $Z^*_\phi = T\phi \circ Z$. First, note that if X is a symplectic vector field, then

$$\mathfrak{L}_{Z^*} \theta(X^*) = \mathfrak{L}_{Z^*}(\theta(X^*)) - \theta([Z^*, X^*]) = 0, \tag{3.42}$$

because $\theta(X^*) = X$ is constant on \mathcal{P} and because the left and right actions of $\text{Diff}(M, \omega)$ and of $\text{Diff}(M, j)$ on \mathcal{P} commute. Thus, in order to show that the Lie

derivative of θ with respect to a holomorphic vector field vanishes, it suffices again to test this only against the horizontal vector field \tilde{X} . A similar calculation as above shows that

$$[Z^*, \tilde{X}]_\phi \circ \phi^{-1} = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_0 X(\phi \circ \text{FL}_t^Z) = -\omega^\# \phi_* d^c(\mathfrak{L}_{Z\rho_X}). \quad (3.43)$$

Since $\mathfrak{L}_{\omega^\#(d^c f)}\omega = d d^c f$, we find $\theta_\phi([Z^*, \tilde{X}]) = i\omega^\#(d\phi_* \mathfrak{L}_{Z\rho_X})$. Thus,

$$\mathfrak{L}_{Z^*}\theta(\tilde{X}) = \mathfrak{L}_{Z^*}(\theta(\tilde{X})) - \theta([Z^*, \tilde{X}]) = 0. \quad (3.44)$$

This finishes the proof. \square

In finite dimensions, every flat Cartan geometry is locally isomorphic, as a Cartan geometry, to a Klein bundle $A \rightarrow G/A$ for a Lie group A , endowed with its Maurer–Cartan form, see [Sha97, Theorem 5.5.1]. However, this integration result does not hold in infinite dimensions. The flat Cartan bundle (\mathcal{P}, θ) is the best possible “integration” of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$.

REMARK 3.4 (Associated affine connection) Since the curvature of the Cartan connection vanishes, the curvature of the associated affine connection (seen as a horizontal 2-form on \mathcal{P} with values in $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)$) is given by

$$R = \frac{1}{2}[\text{Im } \theta \wedge \text{Im } \theta]. \quad (3.45)$$

In other words,

$$R_\phi(X \circ \phi, Y \circ \phi) \circ \phi^{-1} = [X_{\phi_*\rho_{\phi,X}}, Y_{\phi_*\rho_{\phi,Y}}] = X_{\{\phi_*\rho_{\phi,X}, \phi_*\rho_{\phi,Y}\}}. \quad (3.46)$$

We may also view R as a $(3, 1)$ -tensor on \mathcal{K} and then under the isomorphism (3.11) obtain

$$R_\sigma(\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3) = -\{\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}_\sigma, \rho_3\}_\sigma, \quad \sigma \in \mathcal{K}, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in C_0^\infty(M). \quad (3.47)$$

This gives an alternate proof of the expression for the curvature of [Don99, Theorem 1]. \diamond

REMARK 3.5 (Complex structure on $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$) Since the situation is the same at any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$, it suffices to choose $\phi = \text{id}$. Let $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega)$. As $X \lrcorner \omega$ is closed, we can write, using the Hodge decomposition,

$$X \lrcorner \omega = \alpha_X + d\tau_X,$$

with α_X a harmonic 1-form and τ_X a smooth function. On a Kähler manifold, we have the decomposition for the complexification of the space \mathbb{H}^1 of harmonic

1-forms

$$\mathbb{H}^1 \otimes \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{H}^{1,0} \oplus \overline{\mathbb{H}^{1,0}}, \quad (3.48)$$

and \mathbb{H}^1 can be identified with $\mathbb{H}^{1,0}$. Hence,

$$\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega) \cong \omega^\sharp \mathbb{H}^{0,1} \oplus (\mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega) \otimes \mathbb{C}). \quad (3.49)$$

Thus, $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$ has a natural complex structure. Of course, the complex structure of $\omega^\sharp \mathbb{H}^{0,1}$ is induced from j as its $(0, 1)$ -forms. \diamond

REMARK 3.6 In the subsections below, we consider different symplectic structures on \mathcal{I} which are preserved by the natural $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ action. Since \mathcal{I} is contractible there is a (non-equivariant) momentum map \mathcal{J} for the action of $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ on those symplectic structures on \mathcal{I} , see, e.g., [DR24, Proposition 2.1]. Due to the simple form of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$, the condition that the momentum map is \mathfrak{a} -invariant is equivalent to the equivariance of the momentum map for the action of the subgroup of Hamiltonian diffeomorphism, see Proposition 2.9. This equivariance property holds in the cases considered below. Thus, taking M in the statement of Theorem 2.10 to be \mathcal{I} , Theorem 2.10 can be applied in the subsections below. \diamond

REMARK 3.7 (Futaki character) By the arguments in the previous section, the Futaki invariant descends from \mathcal{P} to the base \mathcal{K} . Furthermore, the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{P}$ has a natural horizontal distribution consisting of all $X \in T\mathcal{P}$ such that $\theta(X)$ is purely imaginary in $\mathfrak{X}(M, \omega) \oplus i \mathfrak{ham}(M, \omega)$. Thus, by (2.17), the Futaki invariant $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\zeta: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the connected component of $\text{id}_M \in \mathcal{P}$ can be expressed as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\zeta(\text{id}_M) = -\langle \mathcal{J}(j), \omega^\sharp d\rho_\zeta \rangle, \quad (3.50)$$

where $j = \chi(\text{id}_M)$ and $d d^c \rho_\zeta = \mathcal{Q}_\zeta \omega$. Note that the momentum map \mathcal{J} is paired with a *Hamiltonian* vector field and hence the Futaki invariant only depends on the momentum map for the subgroup of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms. \diamond

REMARK 3.8 Proposition 2.17 applies for the following reason. Suppose $\chi(\text{id}_M) = j$. Then \mathfrak{a}_j is the Lie algebra of all holomorphic vector fields with respect to j . For every $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $\text{Ker } T_\phi \chi = \phi_* \mathfrak{a}_j$ because ϕ is a biholomorphism of (M, j) to $(M, \phi_* j)$. On the other hand, $\phi \cdot \mathfrak{a}_j$ consists of all tangent vectors to the curves $\phi(c(t))$ at $t = 0$, where the tangent vector of $c(t)$ at $t = 0$ lies in \mathfrak{a}_j . Thus $\text{Ker } T_\phi \chi$ and $\phi \cdot \mathfrak{a}_j$ coincide. \diamond

REMARK 3.9 (Geodesics) Recall that the space \mathcal{K} of all Kähler forms in the cohomology class $[\omega]$ consists of Kähler forms that can be written as $\omega_\rho := \omega + d d^c \rho$. Tangent vectors are smooth functions u modulo constant functions, as discussed before (3.3). It is convenient to normalize u to satisfy $\int_M u \omega_\rho^n = 0$. The norm-squared of the canonical Riemannian metric of \mathcal{K} is given by $u \mapsto \int_M u^2 \omega_\rho^n$.

Then, a sufficiently smooth curve $\rho(t)$ in \mathcal{K} , $a \leq t \leq b$, is a metric geodesic if

$$\ddot{\rho} - \|\bar{\partial}\dot{\rho}\|^2 = 0, \quad (3.51)$$

see [Don99, p. 17]. By Propositions 2.19 and 2.21, these geodesic curves arise exactly as projections of integral curves of certain θ -constant vector fields on \mathcal{P} . That is, metric geodesics on \mathcal{K} correspond to geodesics of the Cartan connection. \diamond

3.1 Constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics

In this subsection, we consider the problem of finding constant scalar curvature metrics in the Kähler class \mathcal{K} . After the resolution of the existence problem of Kähler-Einstein metrics in the negative case by Aubin [Aub76] and Yau [Yau78] and the zero case by Yau [Yau78], it was conjectured by Yau [Yau93] that the existence of general cscK metrics should be characterized by an algebraic condition related to geometric invariant theory (GIT for short). A notion, called K-stability, inspired by ideas from GIT, was formulated by Tian [Tia97] for the study of the existence of positive Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds, using special degenerations, and by Donaldson [Don02] for the general cscK metrics on polarized Kähler manifolds, using test configurations. Recall that a pair (M, L) of a compact complex manifold M and an ample line bundle L is called a polarized manifold. A test configuration (or special degeneration) is a \mathbb{C}^* -equivariant degeneration of (M, L) . K-stability is tested by the sign of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant (or generalized Futaki invariant, i.e., an algebraic reformulation of the Futaki invariant valid for singular varieties) of the central fiber of the degeneration. The Yau–Tian–Donaldson conjecture asserts that the existence of cscK metrics on a polarized Kähler manifold should be equivalent to K-polystability of the polarized manifold. This conjecture has been confirmed by Chen, Donaldson, and Sun [CDS15a] and Tian [Tia15] for the positive Kähler-Einstein case on Fano manifolds and later by [DS16; CSW18; BBJ21; Li22; LXZ22] using other methods. The key tool of the proofs of [CDS15a; Tia15; DS16; CSW18] is the theory of Gromov–Hausdorff convergence. On the other hand, the proof of Berman, Boucksom, and Jonsson [BBJ21] is based on the variational method (not using Gromov–Hausdorff convergence) and the notion called uniform stability was assumed. Uniform stability implies that the automorphism group is discrete. For a non-discrete automorphism group G , Li [Li22] relaxed the condition to G -uniform stability. In [LXZ22], it is shown that when G contains the maximal torus of the full automorphism group, then G -uniform stability is equivalent to K-stability and, as a conclusion, [BBJ21; Li22] give an alternate proof for positive Kähler-Einstein metrics.

For an arbitrary Kähler manifold, Berman, Darvas, and Lu [BDL20] have proven that the existence of a cscK metric implies K-polystability. However, the converse is still open.

The existence problem of cscK metrics fits into the symplectic framework as shown by Fujiki [Fuj92] and Donaldson [Don97]. In particular, their work showed that cscK metrics are the zeros of a momentum map on an infinite-dimensional symplectic manifold. This picture, combined with the usual finite-dimensional Kempf–Ness theory, gave a philosophical motivation for the Yau–Tian–Donaldson conjecture, and, moreover, is generally regarded to give the right strategy for its proof. However, until now, no proper infinite-dimensional framework has been available to put these ideas into a rigorous setting.

Now we apply Theorem 2.10 to the Fujiki–Donaldson picture. In this case, we consider a compact symplectic manifold (M, ω) and the infinite dimensional space \mathcal{I} of ω -compatible complex structures endowed with a suitable Kähler structure described below. The scalar curvature is the momentum map with respect to the action of the Hamiltonian diffeomorphism group. The same conclusion is also obtained in [DR24, Corollary 5.7] under the sign conventions of the momentum map (2.5) and the sign convention of the symplectic form and the complex structure as described in Proposition 2.15 (iii). Thus, we can apply Theorem 2.10 and Proposition 2.15 to obtain the Futaki invariant and the Mabuchi K-energy as follows.

We identify the space of Hamiltonian vector fields with the space of average-zero Hamiltonian functions $C_0^\infty(M)$. Using the symplectic structure of \mathcal{I} described below, the momentum map image $J(j)$ of $j \in \mathcal{I}$ is expressed as the L^2 -pairing of the scalar curvature S_j of the Kähler manifold (M, ω, j) with the Hamiltonian functions. In Remark 3.7, the Hamiltonian vector field $\omega^\# d\rho_\zeta$ is identified with $\rho_\zeta - \int_M \rho_\zeta \mu_\omega / \int_M \mu_\omega$. Thus, defining

$$u_0 := \int_M u \mu_\omega / \int_M \mu_\omega \in \mathbb{R} \quad (3.52)$$

for $u \in C^\infty(M)$ and noting that κ_a is the negative of the L^2 -pairing, Theorem 2.10 and Remark 3.7 yield

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\zeta(\text{id}_M) = - \int_M S_j (\rho_\zeta - (\rho_\zeta)_0) \mu_\omega = - \int_M (S_j - (S_j)_0) \rho_\zeta \mu_\omega. \quad (3.53)$$

This recovers the Futaki invariant as defined in [Fut83]. If there is an extremal

metric such that $\text{grad } S$ is a non-zero holomorphic vector field, then

$$-\int_M (S - S_0)S\omega^n = -\int_M (S - S_0)^2\omega^n < 0, \quad (3.54)$$

where $n = \dim M/2$. This indicates that if a cscK metric does not exist, then (M, L) should be K-unstable. Of course, an extremal Kähler metric may not exist, and this is not a rigorous proof.

To describe the symplectic structure of \mathcal{I} , assume that $j \in \mathcal{I}$ acts on the cotangent bundle rather than the tangent bundle. Fixing $j \in \mathcal{I}$, we decompose the complexified cotangent bundle into holomorphic and anti-holomorphic parts, i.e., the $\pm\sqrt{-1}$ -eigenspaces of j :

$$T^*M \otimes \mathbb{C} = T_j^{*'}M \oplus T_j^{*''}M, \quad T_j^{*''}M = \overline{T_j^{*'}M}. \quad (3.55)$$

Taking an arbitrary $j' \in \mathcal{I}$, we also have the decomposition with respect to j' :

$$T^*M \otimes \mathbb{C} = T_{j'}^{*'}M \oplus T_{j'}^{*''}M, \quad T_{j'}^{*''}M = \overline{T_{j'}^{*'}M}. \quad (3.56)$$

If j' is sufficiently close to j , then $T_{j'}^{*'}M$ can be expressed as a graph over $T_j^{*'}M$, namely,

$$T_{j'}^{*'}M = \left\{ \alpha + \mu(\alpha) : \alpha \in T_j^{*'}M \right\} \quad (3.57)$$

for some homomorphism μ of $T_j^{*'}M$ into $T_j^{*''}M$, i.e.,

$$\mu \in \Gamma(\text{Hom}(T_j^{*'}M, T_j^{*''}M)) \cong \Gamma(T_j^{*'}M \otimes T_j^{*''}M) \cong \Gamma(T_j^{*'}M \otimes T_j^*M), \quad (3.58)$$

where the second isomorphism is given by the Kähler metric defined by the pair (ω, j) . This can be expressed in the notation of tensor calculus with indices as

$$\mu^i_{\bar{k}} \mapsto g^{j\bar{k}}\mu^i_{\bar{k}} =: \mu^{ij}, \quad (3.59)$$

where we chose a local holomorphic coordinate system (z^1, \dots, z^n) on (M, j) and ω is written as $\omega = \sqrt{-1} g_{i\bar{j}} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^{\bar{j}}$. Then one can see that μ lies in the symmetric part $\Gamma(\text{Sym}(T_j^*M \otimes T_j^*M))$ of $\Gamma(T_j^*M \otimes T_j^*M)$, see, e.g., [Futo6]. Hence, the tangent space $T_j\mathcal{I}$ to \mathcal{I} at j is a subspace of $\text{Sym}(T_j^*M \otimes T_j^*M)$. Then the L^2 -inner product on $\text{Sym}(T_j^*M \otimes T_j^*M)$ endows \mathcal{I} with a Kähler structure. Taking its imaginary part, we obtain a symplectic structure on \mathcal{I} .

Since κ_a is minus the L^2 inner product in this case, the Kempf–Ness functional

defined in Theorem 2.14 takes the form:

$$E(\varrho) = - \int_0^1 dt \int_M \dot{v}_t (S(\omega_{v_t}) - S_0) \omega_{v_t}^n, \quad \varrho \in C_0^\infty(M), \quad (3.60)$$

where $v_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1$, is a smooth path between 0 and ϱ such that $\omega_{v_t} := \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}v_t > 0$, $S(\omega_{v_t})$ is the scalar curvature of the Kähler form ω_{v_t} , and S_0 is its average, cf. (3.52). In this way, we recover the K-energy functional of Mabuchi [Mab87a], which is convex along geodesics.

Tian [Tia94] gave a more explicit expression of the K-energy:

$$E(\varrho) = \text{Ent}(\varrho) + S_0 \text{AM}(\varrho) - n \text{AM}_{\text{Ric}(\omega)}(\varrho), \quad (3.61)$$

where

$$\text{Ent}(\varrho) = \int_M \log(\omega_\varrho^n / \omega^n) \omega_\varrho^n, \quad (3.62)$$

$$\text{AM}_\omega(\varrho) = \text{AM}(\varrho) = \frac{1}{(n+1)} \sum_{j=0}^n \int_M \varrho \omega_\varrho^j \wedge \omega^{n-j}, \quad (3.63)$$

and

$$\text{AM}_\chi(\varrho) = \frac{1}{nV} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_M \varrho \chi \wedge \omega_\varrho^{j-1} \wedge \omega^{n-j}, \quad (3.64)$$

for closed $(1,1)$ -forms χ . $\text{Ent}(\varrho)$ is called the entropy and $\text{AM}(\varrho)$ is called the Monge–Ampère energy. See also [FN01] for an intrinsic derivation of (3.61).

Mabuchi also introduced geodesics in \mathcal{K} and showed the convexity of the K-energy along the geodesics ([Mab87b], see also [Sem92; Don99]). The slope of $E(\varrho)$ was studied by Donaldson [Don99] and Chen and Tang [CT08]. Phong and Sturm [PS07] showed that for each test configuration there corresponds a weak geodesic ray. Boucksom, Hisamoto, and Jonsson [BHJ17] showed that the slopes of each term of (3.61) is expressed by an algebraic invariant related to the minimal model program in algebraic geometry. The slopes obtained in this way are called non-Archimedean functionals. The uniform stability assumed in [BBJ21; Li22] is expressed in terms of non-Archimedean functionals. It is known that the slope of the K-energy on a Fano manifold is the Donaldson–Futaki invariant when the central fiber is reduced.

Let G be the maximal compact subgroup of the automorphism group of M . Then \mathfrak{a}_j is equal to $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Applying Lemma 2.24, we obtain the following intrinsic bilinear form.

THEOREM 3.10 *Choose any G -invariant Kähler metric. For any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, we consider*

the Hamiltonian function u_X with respect to the Kähler form ω with normalization $\int_M u_X \omega^n = 0$. The L^2 -inner product of the normalized Hamiltonian functions is independent of the choice of the G -invariant metric and also independent of the choice of the maximal compact subgroup G . \diamond

This recovers the bilinear form obtained in [FM95]. Furthermore, the extremal element defined in (2.67) is the extremal Kähler vector field, see [Fut88, Theorem 3.3.3], [FM95].

REMARK 3.11 (Calabi operator) The action $\rho(\xi)$ is given by the infinitesimal action of $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$ on \mathcal{I} at $j \in \mathcal{I}$, where we assume $\rho(\xi_1 + i\xi_2) = \rho(\xi_1) + j\rho(\xi_2)$. Let us take $\xi = X_u$, the Hamiltonian vector field defined by the smooth function u . Then, writing $X_u = X' + X'' \in \Gamma^\infty(T'M \oplus T''M)$, the infinitesimal action ρ at j is expressed as

$$\mathfrak{L}_X j = 2\sqrt{-1}\nabla_j'' X' - 2\sqrt{-1}\nabla_j' X'', \quad (3.65)$$

where ∇_j' and ∇_j'' are, respectively, the $(1, 0)$ -part and $(0, 1)$ -part of the covariant derivative ∇_j , see [Futo6, Lemma 2.3]. If j_ε is a curve in \mathcal{I} such that $\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\Big|_0 j_\varepsilon = \mathfrak{L}_{X_u} j$, where $X_u \lrcorner \omega = -du$ with $u \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$, then the Calabi operator defined in (2.6) takes here the form

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\Big|_0 S(j_\varepsilon) = -\nabla''^* \nabla''^* \nabla'' \nabla'' u. \quad (3.66)$$

The right-hand side is the operator used by Calabi in his study of extremal Kähler metrics [Cal85]. However, in Calabi's paper, the variation of the scalar curvature was considered with the complex structure j fixed and the Kähler form ω varying in the fixed cohomology class. \diamond

3.2 Perturbed scalar curvature

In this subsection, we perturb the scalar curvature of compact Kähler manifolds by incorporating it with higher Chern forms, based on [Futo6]. We show that the perturbed scalar curvature becomes a momentum map, with respect to a perturbed symplectic structure, on the space \mathcal{I} of all complex structures on a fixed symplectic manifold (M, ω) , $\dim M = 2n$. This extends results of Fujiki and Donaldson on the unperturbed case.

We modify the Kähler structure on \mathcal{I} as follows. Denote by c_n the $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ -invariant polynomial corresponding to the n -th Chern class in the Chern-Weil theory, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(t_1 A_1 + \cdots + t_n A_n) = \\ \cdots + n! t_1 \cdots t_n c_n(A_1, \dots, A_n) + \cdots, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_n(A, \dots, A) = \det A. \quad (3.67)$$

Note also that the coefficient of t^k in $\det(I + tA)$ corresponds to the k -th Chern class; in particular, the coefficient of t is the trace. Fix a small $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\mu, \nu \in \Gamma(\text{Sym}(T'M \otimes T'M)) \cong T_j\mathcal{I}$, we define

$$(\mu, \nu)_t = n \int_M c_n \left(\mu^i_{\bar{\ell}} \bar{\nu}_{jk} \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} dz^k \wedge dz^{\bar{\ell}}, \omega \otimes I + t \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \Theta, \dots, \omega \otimes I + t \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \Theta \right)$$

where $\Theta = \bar{\partial}(g^{-1}\partial g)$ is the curvature matrix of the Levi-Civita connection of (M, ω, j) . Here, the objects that are plugged into c_n are 2-forms with values in the endomorphism bundle and then c_n is applied to these endomorphisms.

By the remark above, when $t = 0$,

$$(\mu, \nu)_0 = L^2 \text{ inner product of } \mu \text{ and } \nu; \quad (3.68)$$

this is used in the previous subsection to define the symplectic structure on \mathcal{I} . Thus, for small t , the imaginary part of $(\mu, \nu)_t$ defines a perturbed symplectic structure on \mathcal{I} .

DEFINITION 3.12 The t -perturbed scalar curvature (or simply perturbed scalar curvature) $S(j, t)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S(j, t) \omega^n &= c_1(j) \wedge \omega^{n-1} + t c_2(j) \wedge \omega^{n-2} + \dots + t^{n-1} c_n(j) \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \left(\det \left(\omega \otimes I + t \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \Theta \right) - \omega^n \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_i(j)$ is the i -th Chern form of (M, ω, j) . ◇

It is shown in [Futo6] that the action of the Hamiltonian symplectomorphism group $\mathcal{H}am(M, \omega)$ on the Kähler manifold $(\mathcal{I}, (\cdot, \cdot)_t)$ admits the equivariant momentum map

$$J_t: j \ni \mathcal{I} \mapsto -S(j, t) \in C^\infty(M)/\mathbb{R} \quad (3.69)$$

with the sign convention of (2.5). Obviously,

$$J_t^{-1}(0) = \{j \in \mathcal{I} : S(j, t) \text{ is constant}\}. \quad (3.70)$$

In other words, the zeros of the momentum map are those j 's for which

$$c_1(j) \wedge \omega^{n-1} + t c_2(j) \wedge \omega^{n-2} + \dots + t^{n-1} c_n(j) \quad (3.71)$$

is a harmonic form, i.e., a multiple of ω^n . Using Theorem 2.10 as well as the

arguments in [Bano6], we obtain the Futaki invariant in this perturbed case

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\zeta}(\omega, 1) = - \int_M (S(j, t) - S(j, t)_0) \varrho_{\zeta} \mu_{\omega}. \quad (3.72)$$

This recovers the result of [Futo6]. The coefficient of t^k in $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\zeta}$ of (3.72) can be re-written as

$$f_k(\zeta) = \int_M \varrho_{\zeta} F_k \wedge \omega^{n-k+1} \quad (3.73)$$

where, writing $Hc_k(\omega)$ for the harmonic part of $c_k(\omega)$, we have

$$c_k(\omega) - Hc_k(\omega) = \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} F_k \quad (3.74)$$

with $F_k \in \Omega^{k-1, k-1}(M)$, see [Futo5; Futo6] and [Bano6] for details. This f_k is an obstruction to the existence of $\omega \in \mathcal{K}$ for which the k -th Chern form $c_k(\omega)$ is harmonic. Note that f_1 coincides with the cscK obstruction in the previous subsection. This result is due to Bando [Bano6]. In [Futo8], the perturbed version of extremal Kähler metrics and the Calabi-Lichnerowicz-Matsushima type decomposition theorem has been studied. The Kempf–Ness functional can be defined as in (3.60), but not much has been done so far in this perturbed case.

3.3 Deformation quantization

A deformation quantization is a formal associative deformation of a Poisson algebra $(C^{\infty}(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ into the space $C^{\infty}(M)[[\nu]]$ of formal power series in ν with a composition law $*$, called the *star product*, with the following property. The constant function 1 is a unit and if we write for $f, g \in C^{\infty}(M)$

$$f * g = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} C_r(f, g) \nu^r,$$

then $*$ is required to satisfy

$$C_0(f, g) = fg, \quad C_1(f, g) - C_1(g, f) = \{f, g\},$$

where the C_r 's are required to be bidifferential operators.

For symplectic manifolds, the existence of star products was shown by De Wilde and Lecomte [DL83], Fedosov [Fed94], and Omori, Maeda, and Yoshioka [OMY91]. For general Poisson manifolds, the existence of star products was shown by Kontsevitch [Kono3]. In this subsection, we are concerned with the star product constructed by Fedosov.

A star product on a compact symplectic manifold (M, ω) of dimension $2n$ is called *closed* (in the sense of Connes, Flato, and Sternheimer [CFS92]) if

$$\int_M F * H \mu_\omega = \int_M H * F \mu_\omega$$

for all $F, H \in C^\infty(M)[[\nu]]$.

A *symplectic connection* ∇ on a compact symplectic manifold (M, ω) is a torsion free affine connection such that $\nabla\omega = 0$. There always exists a symplectic connection on any symplectic manifold. Unlike the Levi-Civita connection on a Riemannian manifold, a symplectic connection is not unique on a symplectic manifold. Given two symplectic connections ∇ and ∇' , let

$$S(X, Y) := \nabla_X Y - \nabla'_X Y. \quad (3.75)$$

Then $\omega(S(X, Y), Z)$ is totally symmetric in X, Y, Z . Conversely, if ∇ is a symplectic connection and $\omega(S(X, Y), Z)$ is totally symmetric, then $\nabla' := \nabla + S$ is a symplectic connection. Thus, on a symplectic manifold (M, ω) , the space of symplectic connections, denoted by $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$, is an affine space modeled on the set of all smooth sections $\Gamma(S^3(T^*M))$ of symmetric covariant 3-tensors. Hence, we may identify $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$ with

$$\mathcal{E}(M, \omega) \cong \nabla + \Gamma(S^3(T^*M)). \quad (3.76)$$

On $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$ there is a natural symplectic structure $\Omega^\mathcal{E}$ whose value at ∇ is given by

$$\Omega_\nabla^\mathcal{E}(\underline{A}, \underline{B}) = \int_M \omega^{i_1 j_1} \omega^{i_2 j_2} \omega^{i_3 j_3} \underline{A}_{i_1 i_2 i_3} \underline{B}_{j_1 j_2 j_3} \mu_\omega$$

for $\underline{A}, \underline{B} \in T_\nabla \mathcal{E}(M, \omega) \cong \Gamma(S^3(T^*M))$, see [CG05]. Since $\Omega_\nabla^\mathcal{E}$ is independent of ∇ we may omit ∇ and write $\Omega^\mathcal{E}$. There is a natural action of the group $\mathcal{D}iff(M, \omega)$ of symplectomorphisms on $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$, which is given for a symplectomorphism φ by

$$(\varphi(\nabla))_X Y = \varphi_*(\nabla_{\varphi_*^{-1}X}(\varphi_*^{-1}Y)) \quad (3.77)$$

for any $\nabla \in \mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$ and any smooth vector fields X and Y on M . This action preserves the symplectic structure $\Omega^\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$. In particular, the group $\mathcal{H}am(M, \omega)$ of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms acts on $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$ as symplectomorphisms.

Let X_f be the Hamiltonian vector field on M defined by a smooth function f

on M . Then the induced infinitesimal action of $-X_f$ on $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$ is computed as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathfrak{L}_{X_f} \nabla)_Y Z &= [X_f, \nabla_Y Z] - \nabla_{[X_f, Y]} Z - \nabla_Y [X_f, Z] \\ &= R^\nabla(X_f, Y)Z + (\nabla \nabla X_f)(Y, Z). \end{aligned} \quad (3.78)$$

For $\nabla \in \mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$, we define the *Cahen–Gutt momentum map* $J(\nabla)$ by

$$J(\nabla) = \nabla_p \nabla_q \text{Ric}(\nabla)^{pq} - \frac{1}{2} \text{Ric}(\nabla)_{pq} \text{Ric}(\nabla)^{pq} + \frac{1}{4} \text{R}(\nabla, \omega)_{pqrs} \text{R}(\nabla, \omega)^{pqrs}, \quad (3.79)$$

where

$$\text{R}(\nabla, \omega)(X, Y, Z, W) = \omega(R(X, Y)Z, W) \quad (3.80)$$

and

$$\text{Ric}(X, Y) = -\text{Tr}(Z \mapsto R(X, Z)Y). \quad (3.81)$$

THEOREM 3.13 (Cahen and Gutt [CG05] and Diez and Ratiu [DR24]) *The function J on $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$ given by (3.79) is an equivariant momentum map for the action of $\text{Ham}(M, \omega)$. Moreover, the action of the group of symplectomorphisms on $\mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$ has a non-equivariant momentum map. \diamond*

Thus, the zeros of the momentum map are the symplectic connections ∇ for which $J(\nabla)$ is constant.

REMARK 3.14 An important observation is that if the Fedosov star product is closed, then the Cahen–Gutt momentum $J(\nabla)$ is constant, see [LaF15; LaF19]. \diamond

Now we assume that M is a compact Kähler manifold and that ω is a fixed symplectic form. We set, as before, \mathcal{I} to be the set of all integrable complex structures j such that (M, ω, j) is a Kähler manifold. Let $lv: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(M, \omega)$ be the *Levi-Civita map* sending j to the Levi-Civita connection ∇^j of the Kähler manifold (M, ω, j) . Then $lv^* \Omega^\mathcal{E}$ gives a new symplectic structure on \mathcal{I} if it is non-degenerate. A condition for non-degeneracy, under suitable assumptions on the Ricci curvature, is given in [LaF19, Proposition 17]. In the following, we assume that $lv^* \Omega^\mathcal{E}$ is symplectic. Then, by Remark 3.6, we can apply Theorem 2.10 and recover the following result.

THEOREM 3.15 ([LaF19, Theorem 1; FO18]) *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold. Then*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\zeta(\omega, 1) = - \int_M (J(\nabla^j) - J(\nabla^j)_0) \varrho_\zeta \mu_\omega, \quad j = \chi(\omega, 1) \quad (3.82)$$

is independent of the choice of $\omega \in \mathcal{K}$. In particular, if $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\zeta(\omega, 1)$ is not identically zero as a function of ζ , then there is no closed Fedosov star-product for $\omega \in \mathcal{K}$. \diamond

The last statement follows from Remark 3.14.

In [FO18] it has been shown that for a real smooth function f , $\mathfrak{L}_{X_f} \nabla^j = 0$ if and only if $\mathfrak{L}_{X_f} j = 0$. In this case, X_f is a holomorphic Killing vector field. Note also that the momentum map $J(\nabla)$ defined in (3.79) is written in the Kähler case as

$$J(\nabla) = \Delta S - \frac{1}{2} |\text{Ric}|^2 + \frac{1}{4} |\mathbb{R}|^2.$$

If a vector field Y generates a Hamiltonian isometric S^1 -action, i.e., $Y \lrcorner \omega = -dv_Y$ for the Hamiltonian function v_Y , then adapting the cohomology formula of Odaka [Oda13] and Wang [Wan12] to our context, we obtain the version of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant Fut for a test configuration $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{L})$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \text{Fut}(\text{grad}^{(1,0)} v_Y) \\ &= \frac{-2}{n+1} \kappa(M, L) \cup c_1(\mathcal{L})^{n+1} + 2n \left(c_2(\mathcal{M}) - \frac{1}{2} c_1^2(\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}/\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1}^{-1}) \right) \cup c_1(\mathcal{L})^{n-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.83)$$

where $\kappa(M, L)$ is the average of the Cahen–Gutt momentum

$$\kappa(M, L) := n(n-1) \frac{(c_2 - \frac{1}{2} c_1^2)(M) \cup c_1(L)^{n-2}}{c_1(L)^n}, \quad (3.84)$$

and the cup products \cup are taken on the total space of \mathcal{M} , which has dimension $n+1$ in (3.83), and on M , which has dimension n in (3.84), see [FL20]. This suggests that one could define K -stability related to the study of a Kähler metric with constant Cahen–Gutt momentum, at least if one can restrict to smooth test configurations. The Kempf–Ness functional can be also defined as in (3.60), but nothing has been done so far in the literature in this Cahen–Gutt momentum map case.

Replacing the role of the scalar curvature by $J(\nabla)$, many results in Kähler geometry can be carried over to the geometry of the Cahen–Gutt momentum map, see, e.g., [FO18; LaF19]. For example, one can define a Cahen–Gutt version of extremal Kähler metrics and prove the same structure theorem as the Calabi extremal Kähler metrics, see [FO18, Theorem 4.7] and [DR24, Theorem 6.9].

3.4 Z -critical Kähler metrics

In this subsection, we connect Dervan’s work [Der23] to our general results of Section 2. Let (M, L) be a smooth polarized variety of dimension n , with L an ample line bundle. Let \mathcal{K} be the set of Kähler forms in the class $c_1(L)$. Suppose we are given $\rho = (\rho_0, \dots, \rho_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ with $\rho_n = \sqrt{-1}$, and $\Theta \in \bigoplus_{j=0}^n H^{j,j}(M, \mathbb{C})$ of the form $\Theta = 1 + \Theta'$ where $\Theta' \in \bigoplus_{j>0} H^{j,j}(M, \mathbb{C})$. We define the *central charge*

$Z(M, L): \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$Z_k(M, L) = \sum_{\ell=1}^n \rho_\ell k^\ell \int_M L^\ell \cup \sum_{j=0}^n a_j (-K_M)^j \cup \Theta \quad (3.85)$$

where $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$ with $a_0 = a_1 = 1$. Here, K_M is the canonical bundle of M and we use the convention $K_M^0 = 1$. We define the *phase* $\varphi_k(M, L)$ to be the argument of $Z_k(M, L)$. Hereafter we often omit k and write $Z(M, L)$ and $\varphi(M, L)$, or simply Z and φ .

We fix a representative $\theta \in \Theta$. For $\omega \in \mathcal{K}$, we define

$$\tilde{Z}(\omega) = \sum_{\ell=1}^n \rho_\ell k^\ell \sum_{j=0}^n a_j \tilde{Z}^{\ell,j} \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{C}) \quad (3.86)$$

where

$$\tilde{Z}^{\ell,j} = \frac{\omega^\ell \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^j \wedge \theta}{\omega^n} - \frac{j}{\ell+1} \Delta \left(\frac{\omega^{\ell+1} \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^{j-1} \wedge \theta}{\omega^n} \right). \quad (3.87)$$

Here $\text{Ric } \omega$ denotes the Ricci form of ω and Δ the Laplacian. Note that

$$\int_M \tilde{Z}(\omega) \omega^n = Z(M, L). \quad (3.88)$$

We say that $\omega \in \mathcal{K}$ is a Z -critical Kähler metric if

$$\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(M,L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Re}(e^{-i\varphi(M,L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) > 0. \quad (3.89)$$

Notice that the first condition is equivalent to $\arg \tilde{Z}(\omega) = \arg Z(M, L) \pmod{\pi}$.

Fix $\omega \in \mathcal{K}$ and consider it as a symplectic form. As before, let \mathcal{I} be the set of all ω -compatible complex structures j such that (M, ω, j) is a Kähler manifold. Dervan constructs a Kähler structure Ω_ϵ , $\epsilon = \frac{1}{k}$, on \mathcal{I} when k is large, i.e., for the large volume limit. Unlike the L^2 -inner product in the previous subsections, the construction of Ω_ϵ is more nonlinear and we will not reproduce it here, see [Der23, Equation (3.11)]. Dervan shows that $\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\epsilon} \tilde{Z})$ is a momentum map for the action of the group of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms. The Futaki invariant of Theorem 2.10 (and Remark 3.7) in this case is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\zeta(\omega, 1) = - \int_M (\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\epsilon} \tilde{Z}) - \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\epsilon} \tilde{Z})_0) \varrho_\zeta \mu_\omega. \quad (3.90)$$

The vanishing of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\zeta(\omega, 1)$ is a necessary condition for the existence of Z -critical Kähler metrics; in this way, we recover [Der23, Corollary 3.7]. A special form of

$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\zeta(\omega, 1)$ has been considered by Leung [Leu98]. The Kempf–Ness functional can be defined again as in (3.60).

Instead of treating only K_M , the higher Chern classes can also be treated, see [Der23, Section 4] and [DH23].

4 GAUGE THEORY

Let $E \rightarrow M$ be a C^∞ complex vector bundle over a compact Kähler manifold (M, ω) , h_0 a fixed Hermitian metric of E , and \mathcal{G} the group of unitary gauge transformations of E with respect to h_0 . Let $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$ be the space of h_0 -unitary connections A of E such that the curvature F_A is type $(1, 1)$. Thus, $F_A^{0,2} = \bar{\partial}_A \circ \bar{\partial}_A = 0$ and A defines a holomorphic structure on E , see [DK97, Theorem 2.1.53]. Here we denote by d_A the covariant derivative with respect to $A \in \mathcal{A}(h_0)$; $\bar{\partial}_A$ is the type $(0, 1)$ -part of d_A . Then \mathcal{G} acts on $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$ by $d_{g(A)} = g \circ d_A \circ g^{-1}$ so that $g(A) = A - d_A g \cdot g^{-1}$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Here we used the same letter A to denote the connection form with respect to a chosen unitary frame. We also denote by \mathcal{G}^c the space of complex gauge transformations of E ; thus \mathcal{G}^c is the complexification of \mathcal{G} .

We take the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{g}^c, \mathfrak{g})$, where \mathfrak{g} is the Lie algebra of \mathcal{G} and \mathfrak{g}^c is the complexification of \mathfrak{g} . In this case, \mathfrak{g}^c integrates to the complex gauge group \mathcal{G}^c of E . We take as the Cartan bundle \mathcal{P} modeled on the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{g}^c, \mathfrak{g})$ with group \mathcal{G} the principal bundle $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{G}^c \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \backslash \mathcal{G}^c$ with the left \mathcal{G} -action. With the right Maurer–Cartan form θ on \mathcal{G}^c , the pair (\mathcal{P}, θ) is a Cartan geometry modeled on the Klein pair $(\mathfrak{g}^c, \mathfrak{g})$. Alternatively, one can consider the space of pairs (h, g) , where h is a Hermitian metric on E and $g \in \mathcal{G}^c$, satisfying $h(x, y) = h_0(gx, gy)$. The left action of \mathcal{G} on \mathcal{P} is given by $k \cdot (h, g) = (h, kg)$. Then \mathcal{P} is a principal \mathcal{G} -bundle over the homogenous space $\mathcal{G} \backslash \mathcal{G}^c$ and \mathcal{P} is diffeomorphic to \mathcal{G}^c . Note the formal similarity of the latter definition of \mathcal{P} to the Cartan bundle in Kähler geometry introduced in Section 3. Since any two Hermitian metrics are related by a complex gauge transformation, the base $\mathcal{G} \backslash \mathcal{G}^c$ is identified with the space of Hermitian metrics on E . In particular, $\mathcal{G} \backslash \mathcal{G}^c$ is simply connected.

Fix $A \in \mathcal{A}(h_0)$. There is a smooth map $\chi: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(h_0)$ induced by the action of \mathcal{G}^c on $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$. To describe this action, let $A = A^{1,0} + A^{0,1}$ be the decomposition of $A \in \mathcal{A}(h_0)$ into its $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ -components so that $A^{1,0} = -(A^{0,1})^*$, where $*$ denotes the transpose-conjugate with respect to h_0 . For $g \in \mathcal{G}^c$, define the partial connection by $\bar{\partial}_{g(A)} := g \circ \bar{\partial}_A \circ g^{-1}$ or, equivalently, by

$$g(A)^{0,1} = A^{0,1} - \bar{\partial}_A^* g \cdot g^{-1}. \quad (4.1)$$

In these formulas, \circ is the composition of operators and \cdot denotes matrix

multiplication. A partial connection defines a unique unitary connection $g(A)$ by

$$g(A)^{1,0} := -(g(A)^{0,1})^* = A^{1,0} + (\bar{\partial}_A^* g \cdot g^{-1})^*, \quad (4.2)$$

see [DK97, Lemma 2.1.54]. If g is a unitary gauge transformation in \mathcal{G} , then $d_{g(A)} = g \circ d_A \circ g^{-1}$ or, equivalently,

$$g(A) = A + g d_A(g^{-1}) = A - d_A g \cdot g^{-1}. \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, the \mathcal{G}^c -action on $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$ is a natural extension of the \mathcal{G} -action.

Since a unitary connection is uniquely determined by a partial connection, the tangent space $T_A \mathcal{A}(h_0)$ can be identified with $\Omega^{0,1}(\text{End}(E))$ and there is an almost complex structure on $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$ defined by the multiplication by i on $\Omega^{0,1}(\text{End}(E))$. It is easy to see that the Cartan bundle (\mathcal{P}, θ) provides a model for the complex orbit through A in the sense of Definition 2.1. Note that θ is torsion free.

4.1 Hermitian Yang–Mills connections

Keeping the same notations, let h_0 be a Hermitian metric of a holomorphic vector bundle $E \rightarrow M$ over a compact $2n$ -dimensional Kähler manifold (M, ω) and $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$ the space of h_0 -unitary connections. There is a symplectic form Ω on $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$ defined by

$$\Omega(\xi, \eta) = - \int_M \text{Tr}(\xi \wedge \eta) \omega^{n-1} \quad (4.4)$$

for $\xi, \eta \in T_A \mathcal{A}(h_0) = \Omega^{0,1}(\text{End}(E))$. It is well known [AB83; Don85; DK97] and easy to show that

$$J(A) = F_A \wedge \omega^{n-1} - \lambda \text{id } \omega^n \quad (4.5)$$

is a momentum map on the symplectic manifold $(\mathcal{A}(h_0), \Omega)$ for the action of the unitary gauge transformations \mathcal{G} for any purely imaginary constant λ . Thus, by Theorem 2.10, the Futaki functional $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ on the stabilizer $(\mathfrak{g}^c)_A$ of $A = \chi(h_0, 1)$ of the action of \mathfrak{g}^c , defined by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\zeta) = - \text{Im} \int_M \text{Tr}(\zeta(F_A \wedge \omega^{n-1} - \lambda \text{id } \omega^n)), \quad \zeta \in (\mathfrak{g}^c)_A \quad (4.6)$$

is independent of the Hermitian metric h_0 . Note that the unitary connection A determines a holomorphic structure $\bar{\partial}_A$ on E and thus the infinitesimal complex gauge transformation ζ in the stabilizer of A is just a holomorphic endomorphism of E with respect to $\bar{\partial}_A$.

Choosing λ to be the topological invariant determined by

$$-2\pi i r \lambda = c_1(E)[\omega]^{n-1} \quad (4.7)$$

with $r = \text{rank}(E)$, the Chern connection A of a Hermitian metric h is called a *Hermitian Yang–Mills connection* (or h is called a *Hermitian–Einstein metric*) if its curvature F_A satisfies

$$F_A \omega^{n-1} = \lambda \text{id } \omega^n. \quad (4.8)$$

Thus $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is an obstruction to the existence of Hermitian Yang–Mills connections. However, it is well known that if a Hermitian Yang–Mills connection exists on an irreducible holomorphic vector bundle E , then E is simple, meaning that any holomorphic section ζ of the endomorphism bundle of E is a multiple of the identity. Therefore, when trying to prove existence of Hermitian Yang–Mills solutions, it is necessary to assume that E is simple (and even slope stable). With this natural assumption, the obstruction (4.6) always vanishes.

Note, in passing, that we have the following criterion for the vanishing of the Futaki character which follows from Kodaira–Serre duality.

PROPOSITION 4.1 *The Futaki character (4.6) vanishes if and only if $F_A \omega^{n-1} - \lambda \omega^n$ is trivial in $H^{n,n}(M) = H^{2n}(M, \mathbb{C})$. \diamond*

The Kempf–Ness functional defined in Section 2 recovers in this case the *Donaldson functional*, seen as a functional on the space of Hermitian metrics. The Donaldson functional has been effectively used by Donaldson [Don85] for the existence problem of Hermitian Yang–Mills connections on algebraic surfaces and was the precursor of the Mabuchi K-energy. See [UY86] for the higher dimensional result.

We remark that the above arguments still work even if the Hermitian metric is indefinite. García-Fernández and Molina [GM23] used (4.6) for indefinite metrics as an obstruction to the existence of solutions of the Hull–Strominger system. See also [GRT20; GRT24].

4.2 Z -critical connections

In this subsection, we apply our results of Section 2 to the setting of Dervan, McCarthy, and Sektnan [DMS20]. Let $E \rightarrow M$ be a holomorphic vector bundle over a compact Kähler manifold (M, ω) . A polynomial central charge $Z_k(E)$ of E is

$$Z_k(E) = \int_M \sum_{d=0}^n \rho_d k^d [\omega]^d \cup \text{ch}(E) \cup U \quad (4.9)$$

where $(\rho_0, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_n) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}$ with $\text{Im } \rho_n > 0$, $\text{Re } \rho_{n-1} < 0$, and $U = 1 + N$ with $N \in H^{>0}(M, \mathbb{R})$ are given data. Here, $\text{ch}(E) \in H^*(M)$ denotes the Chern character

of E . For each E with $Z_k(E) \neq 0$, we define the phase

$$\varphi_k(E) := \arg Z_k(E). \quad (4.10)$$

We often omit k , and write $Z(E)$ and $\varphi(E)$ when no confusion is likely to occur. Let $\tilde{U} \in \Omega^*(M, \mathbb{R})$ be a closed form representing $U \in H^*(M, \mathbb{R})$. For a Hermitian metric h of E with Chern connection A , we denote by $\tilde{\text{ch}}(A) = \exp\left(\frac{i}{2\pi} F_A\right)$ the endomorphism-valued differential form whose trace represents the Chern character $\text{ch}(E)$. We define an endomorphism-valued (n, n) -form $\tilde{Z}_k(A)$ by

$$\tilde{Z}_k(A) = \left[\sum_{d=0}^n \rho_d k^d \omega^d \wedge \tilde{\text{ch}}(A) \wedge \tilde{U} \right]_{n,n}, \quad (4.11)$$

where on the right-hand side above we only select the (n, n) -form component of the differential form in the brackets with various mixed degrees. Obviously,

$$0 = \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_k(E)} \tilde{Z}_k(E)) = \int_M \text{Tr} \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_k(E)} \tilde{Z}_k(A)). \quad (4.12)$$

We say that A is a Z -critical (or Z_k -critical) connection if

$$\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_k(E)} \tilde{Z}_k(A)) = 0, \quad (4.13)$$

where the imaginary part means $-i$ -times the h -skew Hermitian part.

Fix a Hermitian metric h_0 and let $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$ be the space of all h_0 -unitary connections. Define a Hermitian pairing on $T_A \mathcal{A}(h_0) = \Omega^{0,1}(\text{End}(E))$ by

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A = -i \int_M \text{Tr} \left[\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(E)} \tilde{Z}'(A) \wedge \xi \wedge \eta^*) \right]_{\text{sym}} \quad (4.14)$$

where $\tilde{Z}'(A)$ denotes the derivative of $\tilde{Z}(A)$ with respect to $\frac{i}{2\pi} F_A$, considered as a variable, and where sym denotes the graded symmetric product of endomorphism valued forms

$$[B_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge B_j]_{\text{sym}} = \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_j} (-1)^{\text{gradsgn } \sigma} B_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge B_{\sigma(j)}; \quad (4.15)$$

here, gradsgn means the sign resulting from the permutation of the differential forms B_i 's. Then the imaginary part

$$\Omega_A(\xi, \eta) = \text{Im} \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A \quad (4.16)$$

is a symplectic form on $\mathcal{A}(h_0)$ provided $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A$ is positive definite. When this latter condition is satisfied, A is called a *subsolution*. When A is a subsolution, then the PDE for A being a Z -critical connection becomes elliptic, see [DMS20, Lemma 2.36 and Proposition 2.43]. By [DMS20, Theorem 2.45], the map

$$A \mapsto 2\pi i \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(E)} \tilde{Z}(A)) \quad (4.17)$$

is a momentum map for the \mathcal{G} -action on $(\mathcal{A}(h_0), \Omega)$. Thus, by Theorem 2.10, the Futaki functional $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ on $H^0(M, \operatorname{End}(E))$, defined in this case by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\zeta) := 2\pi \int_M \operatorname{Tr}(\zeta \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(E)} \tilde{Z}(A))), \quad (4.18)$$

is independent of the Hermitian metric h_0 . Clearly, the non-vanishing of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is an obstruction to the existence of a Hermitian metric h whose Chern connection A is a Z -critical connection. By Theorem 2.14 (iii), we can also obtain the Kempf–Ness functional just as the Donaldson functional, [CY21].

A holomorphic vector bundle $E \rightarrow (M, \omega)$ with $Z_k(E) \neq 0$ for all $k \gg 0$ is said to be *asymptotically Z -stable* if for all proper non-zero subsheaves $F \subset E$ there exists some k_0 such that $\varphi_k(F) < \varphi_k(E)$ for all $k \geq k_0$. By [DMS20, Lemma 2.18], any asymptotically Z -stable bundle is simple. Thus, by (4.12), $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ vanishes on any asymptotically Z -stable bundle.

In the special case where E is a line bundle L , the central charge is

$$Z_k(L) = i^{n+1} \int_M e^{-ik[\omega]} \operatorname{ch}(L). \quad (4.19)$$

Moreover, in this case, a Z -critical connection is a solution of

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi} \tilde{Z}_k(A)) = \frac{1}{n!} \operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-i\varphi} \left(\omega - \frac{FA}{2\pi} \right) \right) = 0. \quad (4.20)$$

This equation is called the LYZ equation after [LYZ00], which was formulated as the mirror to the special Lagrangian equation; its solutions are called the deformed Yang–Mills connections. This subject has been well-studied and there are many interesting papers, but most relevant to our setting are [CY21; CS22]. Since the endomorphism bundle of a line bundle is trivial, its holomorphic sections are constant functions. Thus, the obstruction (4.18) vanishes. The Kempf–Ness functional is explicitly described using the Calabi–Yau functional and is studied in terms of geodesics in [CY21].

REFERENCES

- [ARS86] M. Adams, T. Ratiu, and R. Schmid. “A Lie group structure for pseudodifferential operators”. *Math. Ann.* 273.4 (1986), pp. 529–552.
- [AB83] M. F. Atiyah and R. Bott. “The Yang-Mills equations over Riemann surfaces”. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* 308.1505 (1983), pp. 523–615.
- [Aub76] T. Aubin. “Equations du type Monge-Ampère sur les variétés kähleriennes compactes”. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 283.3 (1976), pp. 119–121.
- [Bano06] S. Bando. “An obstruction for Chern class forms to be harmonic”. *Kodai Math. J.* 29.3 (2006), pp. 337–345.
- [BB17] R. J. Berman and B. Berndtsson. “Convexity of the K -energy on the space of Kähler metrics and uniqueness of extremal metrics”. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 30.4 (2017), pp. 1165–1196. arXiv: 1405.0401.
- [BBJ21] R. J. Berman, S. Boucksom, and M. Jonsson. “A variational approach to the Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture”. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 34.3 (2021), pp. 605–652.
- [BDL20] R. J. Berman, T. Darvas, and C. H. Lu. “Regularity of weak minimizers of the K -energy and applications to properness and K -stability”. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* 53.2 (2020), pp. 267–289.
- [BB19] S. Biagi and A. Bonfiglioli. *An Introduction to the Geometrical Analysis of Vector Fields. With applications to maximum principles and Lie groups*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte Ltd, 2019. 1452 pp.
- [BHJ17] S. Boucksom, T. Hisamoto, and M. Jonsson. “Uniform K -stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs”. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* 67.2 (2017), pp. 743–841.
- [CG05] M. Cahen and S. Gutt. “Moment map for the space of symplectic connections”. In: *Liber Amicorum Richard Delanghe: Een Veelzijdig Wiskundige*. Ed. by F. Brackx, H. D. Schepper, and R. Delanghe. Academia Press, 2005, pp. 27–36.
- [Cal85] E. Calabi. “Extremal Kähler metrics II”. In: *Differential Geometry and Complex Analysis*. Springer, Berlin, 1985, pp. 95–114.
- [CDS15a] X. Chen, S. Donaldson, and S. Sun. “Kähler-Einstein metric on Fano manifolds. III: limits with cone angle approaches 2π and completion of the main proof”. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 28.1 (2015), pp. 235–278.

- [CDS15b] X. Chen, S. Donaldson, and S. Sun. “Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. I: Approximation of metrics with cone singularities”. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 28.1 (2015), pp. 183–197.
- [CSW18] X. Chen, S. Sun, and B. Wang. “Kähler-Ricci flow, Kähler-Einstein metric, and K-stability”. *Geom. Topol.* 22.6 (2018), pp. 3145–3173.
- [CTo8] X. Chen and Y. Tang. “Test configuration and geodesic rays”. In: *Géométrie différentielle, physique mathématique, mathématiques et société (I). Volume en l'honneur de Jean Pierre Bourguignon*. Paris: Société Mathématique de France, 2008, pp. 139–167. arXiv: 0707.4149 [math.DG].
- [CS22] T. C. Collins and Y. Shi. “Stability and the deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation”. In: *Differential Geometry, Calabi-Yau Theory, and General Relativity. Part 2. Lectures and Articles Celebrating the 70th Birthday of Shing-Tung Yau, Harvard University, Cambridge, Ma, USA, May 2019*. Somerville, MA: International Press, 2022, pp. 1–38. arXiv: 2004.04831.
- [CY21] T. C. Collins and S.-T. Yau. “Moment maps, nonlinear PDE and stability in mirror symmetry, I: Geodesics”. *Annals of PDE* 7.1 (2021), p. 73.
- [CFS92] A. Connes, M. Flato, and D. Sternheimer. “Closed star products and cyclic cohomology”. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 24.1 (1992), pp. 1–12.
- [DS16] V. Datar and G. Székelyhidi. “Kähler-Einstein metrics along the smooth continuity method”. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 26.4 (2016), pp. 975–1010.
- [DL83] M. De Wilde and P. Lecomte. “Existence of star-products and of formal deformations of the Poisson Lie Algebra of arbitrary symplectic manifolds”. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 7 (1983), pp. 487–496.
- [Der23] R. Dervan. “Stability conditions for polarised varieties”. *Forum Math. Sigma* 11 (2023), Paper No. e104, 57pp.
- [DMS20] R. Dervan, J. B. McCarthy, and L. M. Sektnan. “Z-critical connections and Bridgeland stability conditions” (2020). arXiv: 2012.10426.
- [DH23] R. Dervan and M. Hallam. “The universal structure of moment maps in complex geometry” (2023). arXiv: 2304.01149 [math.DG].
- [DR24] T. Diez and T. Ratiu. “Norm-squared of the momentum map in infinite dimensions with applications to Kähler geometry and symplectic connections” (2024). arXiv: 2405.13308.
- [Don85] S. K. Donaldson. “Anti self-dual Yang-Mills connections over complex algebraic surfaces and stable vector bundles”. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 53-50.1 (1985), pp. 1–26.

- [Don97] S. K. Donaldson. “Remarks on gauge theory, complex geometry and 4-manifold topology”. In: *Fields Medallists’ Lectures*. Ed. by M. Atiyah and D. Jagolnitzer. Vol. 5. World Sci. Ser. 20th Century Math. 5. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1997, pp. 384–403.
- [Don99] S. K. Donaldson. “Symmetric spaces, Kähler geometry and Hamiltonian dynamics”. In: *Northern California symplectic geometry seminar*. American Mathematical Society, 1999, pp. 13–33.
- [DK97] S. K. Donaldson and P. B. Kronheimer. *The Geometry of Four-Manifolds*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [Don02] S. Donaldson. “Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties”. *J. Differ. Geom.* 62 (2002), pp. 289–349.
- [Fed94] B. Fedosov. “A simple geometrical construction of deformation quantization”. *J. Differ. Geom.* 40 (1994), pp. 213–238.
- [Fuj92] A. Fujiki. “Moduli space of polarized algebraic manifolds and Kähler metrics”. *Sugaku Expositions* 5.2 (1992), pp. 173–191.
- [Fut83] A. Futaki. “An obstruction to the existence of Einstein Kähler metrics”. *Invent. Math.* 73.3 (1983), pp. 437–443.
- [Fut88] A. Futaki. *Kähler-Einstein Metrics and Integral Invariants*. Vol. 1314. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988, pp. iv+140.
- [Futo5] A. Futaki. “Stability, integral invariants and canonical Kähler metrics”. *Proc. 9-th Internat. Conf. on Differential Geometry and its Applications, Prague, 2004* (2005), pp. 45–58.
- [Futo6] A. Futaki. “Harmonic total Chern forms and stability”. *Kodai Math. J.* 29.3 (2006). arXiv: math/0603706 [math].
- [Futo8] A. Futaki. “Holomorphic vector fields and perturbed extremal Kähler metrics”. *J. Symplect. Geom.* 6.2 (2008), pp. 127–138.
- [FL20] A. Futaki and L. La Fuente-Gravy. “Deformation quantization and Kähler geometry with moment map”. In: *Proceedings of the International Consortium of Chinese Mathematicians 2018*. Int. Press, Boston, MA, 2020, pp. 31–66. arXiv: 1904.11749v2 [math.SG].
- [FM95] A. Futaki and T. Mabuchi. “Bilinear forms and extremal Kähler vector fields associated with Kähler classes”. *Math. Ann.* 301.1 (1995), pp. 199–210.
- [FM85] A. Futaki and S. Morita. “Invariant polynomials of the automorphism group of a compact complex manifold”. *J. Differential Geom.* 21.1 (1985), pp. 135–142.

- [FN01] A. Futaki and Y. Nakagawa. “Characters of automorphism groups associated with Kähler classes and functionals with cocycle conditions”. *Kodai Math. J.* 24 (2001), pp. 1–14.
- [FO18] A. Futaki and H. Ono. “Cahen-Gutt moment map, closed Fedosov star product and structure of the automorphism group”. *J. Symplectic Geom.* 18.1 (2018), pp. 123–145. arXiv: 1802.10292 [math].
- [GM23] M. García-Fernandez and R. Molina. “Futaki Invariants and Yau’s Conjecture on the Hull-Strominger system” (2023). arXiv: 2303.05274.
- [GRT20] M. García-Fernandez, R. Rubio, and C. Tipler. “Holomorphic string algebroids”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 373 (2020), pp. 7347–7382.
- [GRT24] M. García-Fernandez, R. Rubio, and C. Tipler. “Gauge theory for string algebroids” (2024). arXiv: 2004.11399.
- [Gau17] P. Gauduchon. *Calabi’s Extremal Kähler Metrics: An Elementary Introduction*. 2017. URL: <https://web.archive.org/web/20210108083652/https://cims.nyu.edu/~rodion/lib/P.%20Gauduchon.%20Calabi%20extremal%20K%3A4hler%20metrics:%20An%20elementary%20introduction%20-%202017.pdf>.
- [GRS18] V. Georgoulas, J. W. Robbin, and D. A. Salamon. *The Moment-Weight Inequality and the Hilbert-Mumford Criterion. GIT from the Differential Geometric Viewpoint*. Vol. 2297. Lect. Notes Math. Cham: Springer, 2018. arXiv: 1311.0410.
- [GN] H. Glöckner and K.-H. Neeb. *Infinite-dimensional Lie Groups. General Theory and Main Examples*. Springer. To appear.
- [HS07] P. Heinzner and G. W. Schwarz. “Cartan decomposition of the moment map”. *Math. Ann.* 337.1 (2007), pp. 197–232.
- [Hit79] N. Hitchin. “Non-linear problems in geometry”. In: *Conference Held at Katata, September 3–8, 1979. Proceedings of the 6th International Taniguchi Symposium*. 1979.
- [KN79] G. Kempf and L. Ness. “The length of vectors in representation spaces”. In: *Algebraic Geometry (Proc. Summer Meeting, Univ. Copenhagen, Copenhagen, 1978)*. Vol. 732. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 1979, pp. 233–243.
- [KMM21] B. Khesin, G. Misiolek, and K. Modin. “Geometric hydrodynamics and infinite-dimensional Newton’s equations”. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 58.3 (2021), pp. 377–442. arXiv: 2001.01143 [math-ph].
- [Kob82] S. Kobayashi. “Curvature and stability of vector bundles”. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.* 58.4 (1982), pp. 158–162.

- [KN63] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu. *Foundations of Differential Geometry*. Vol. 1. Wiley, 1963.
- [Kon03] M. Kontsevitch. “Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds”. *Letters in Math. Phys.* 66 (2003), pp. 157–216.
- [KM97] A. Kriegl and P. W. Michor. *The Convenient Setting of Global Analysis*. Vol. 53. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [LaF15] L. La Fuente-Gravy. “Infinite dimensional moment map geometry and closed Fedosov’s star products”. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* 49.1 (2015), pp. 1–22. arXiv: 1502.06496v3 [math.SG].
- [LaF19] L. La Fuente-Gravy. “Futaki invariant for Fedosov’s star products”. *J. Symplectic Geom.* 17.5 (2019), pp. 1317–1330. arXiv: 1612.02946v1 [math.SG].
- [Leu98] N. C. Leung. “Bando Futaki invariants and Kähler Einstein metric”. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 6.4 (1998), pp. 799–808.
- [LYZ00] N. C. Leung, S.-T. Yau, and E. Zaslow. “From special Lagrangian to Hermitian-Yang-Mills via Fourier-Mukai transform”. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 4.6 (2000), pp. 1319–1341.
- [Li22] C. Li. “G-uniform stability and Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano varieties”. *Invent. Math.* 227.2 (2022), pp. 661–744.
- [LXZ22] Y. Liu, C. Xu, and Z. Zhuang. “Finite generation for valuations computing stability thresholds and applications to K-stability”. *Ann. of Math.* 196 (2022), pp. 507–566.
- [Loto8] J. Lott. “Some geometric calculations on Wasserstein space”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 277.2 (2008), pp. 423–437.
- [Mab87a] T. Mabuchi. “K-energy maps integrating Futaki invariants”. *Tohoku Math. J.* 38 (1987), pp. 245–257.
- [Mab87b] T. Mabuchi. “Some symplectic geometry on compact Kähler manifolds. I”. *Osaka J. Math.* 24 (1987), pp. 227–252.
- [MM24] J. Michor and P. W. Michor. “Geometry of infinite dimensional Cartan Developments” (2024). arXiv: 2404.05416.
- [Mod17] K. Modin. “Geometry of matrix decompositions seen through optimal transport and information geometry”. *J. Geom. Mech.* 9.3 (2017), pp. 335–390. arXiv: 1601.01875 [math].
- [Nee06] K.-H. Neeb. “Towards a Lie theory of locally convex groups”. *Japan. J. Math.* 1.2 (2006), pp. 291–468.

- [Oda13] Y. Odaka. “A generalization of the Ross-Thomas slope theory”. *Osaka J. Math.* 50.1 (2013), pp. 171–185.
- [OMY91] H. Omori, Y. Maeda, and A. Yoshioka. “Weyl manifolds and deformation quantization”. *Adv. in Math.* 85 (1991), pp. 224–255.
- [Otto01] F. Otto. “The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation”. *Commun. Part. Diff. Eq.* 26.1-2 (2001), pp. 101–174.
- [PS07] D. H. Phong and J. Sturm. “Test configurations for K-stability and geodesic rays”. *J. Symplectic Geom.* 5.2 (2007), pp. 221–247.
- [RS17] G. Rudolph and M. Schmidt. *Differential Geometry and Mathematical Physics. Part II. Fibre Bundles, Topology and Gauge Fields*. Springer, 2017.
- [Sem92] S. Semmes. “Complex Monge-Ampère and symplectic manifolds”. *Amer. J. Math.* 114 (1992), pp. 495–550.
- [Sha97] R. W. Sharpe. *Differential Geometry. Cartan’s Generalization of Klein’s Erlangen Program*. Vol. 166. Grad. Texts Math. 166. New York: Berlin: Springer, 1997. 421 pp.
- [Tia94] G. Tian. “The K-energy of hypersurfaces and stability”. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 2 (1994), pp. 239–265.
- [Tia97] G. Tian. “Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature”. *Invent. Math.* 130 (1997), pp. 1–37.
- [Tia15] G. Tian. “K-Stability and Kähler-Einstein metrics”. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 68.7 (2015), pp. 1085–1156.
- [UY86] K. Uhlenbeck and S. T. Yau. “On the existence of Hermitian-Yang-Mills connections in stable vector bundles”. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 39.S1 (1986), S257–S293.
- [Wano4] X. Wang. “Moment map, Futaki invariant and stability of projective manifolds”. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 12.5 (2004), pp. 1009–1238.
- [Wan12] X. Wang. “Height and GIT weight”. *Math. Res. Lett.* 19.4 (2012), pp. 909–926.
- [Yau78] S.-T. Yau. “On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation I”. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 31 (1978), pp. 339–441.
- [Yau93] S.-T. Yau. “Open problems in geometry”. *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* 54 (1993), pp. 1–28.