

# CASIMIR ELEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH LEVI SUBALGEBRAS OF SIMPLE LIE ALGEBRAS AND THEIR APPLICATIONS

DMITRI I. PANYUSHEV

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a simple Lie algebra,  $\mathfrak{h}$  a Levi subalgebra, and  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{h})$  the Casimir element defined via the restriction of the Killing form on  $\mathfrak{g}$  to  $\mathfrak{h}$ . We study  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ -eigenvalues in  $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h}$  and related  $\mathfrak{h}$ -modules. Without loss of generality, one may assume that  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a maximal Levi. Then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is equipped with the natural  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i)$  such that  $\mathfrak{g}(0) = \mathfrak{h}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}(i)$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module for  $i \neq 0$ . We give explicit formulae for the  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ -eigenvalues in each  $\mathfrak{g}(i)$ ,  $i \neq 0$  and relate eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$  in  $\bigwedge^{\bullet} \mathfrak{g}(1)$  to the dimensions of abelian subspaces of  $\mathfrak{g}(1)$ . Then we prove that if  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}(1)$  is abelian, whereas  $\mathfrak{g}(1)$  is not, then  $\dim \mathfrak{a} \leq \dim \mathfrak{g}(1)/2$ . Moreover, if  $\dim \mathfrak{a} = (\dim \mathfrak{g}(1))/2$ , then  $\mathfrak{a}$  has an abelian complement. The  $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings of height  $\leq 2$  are closely related to involutions of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and we provide a connection of our theory to (an extension of) the “strange formula” of Freudenthal–de Vries.

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Casimir elements, Levi subalgebras and gradings	4
2. $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings and partitions of root systems	7
3. Eigenvalues of Casimir elements associated with $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings	9
4. Eigenvalues of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha}(0)$ in $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}(1)$ and abelian subspaces of $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}(1)$	14
5. Maximal abelian subspaces and applications	19
6. Variations on themes of the “strange formula”	24
Appendix A. The eigenvalues $\gamma_{\alpha}(i)$ for $\alpha \in \Pi$ with $d_{\alpha} \geq 2$	27
References	28

## INTRODUCTION

Let  $G$  be a simple algebraic group with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$  the enveloping algebra, and  $\Phi$  the Killing form on  $\mathfrak{g}$ . If  $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  is a reductive subalgebra, then  $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{h}}$  is non-degenerate and  $\mathfrak{m} := \mathfrak{h}^{\perp}$  is a complementary  $\mathfrak{h}$ -submodule of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , i.e.,  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$ . Using  $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{h}}$ , one defines

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B20, 17B22, 15A75.

*Key words and phrases.*  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading, root system, isotropy representation, abelian subspace.

This research is partially supported by the R.F.B.R. grant № 16-01-00818.

the Casimir element  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{h})$ , and our goal is to study  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$ -eigenvalues in  $\mathfrak{m}$  and related  $\mathfrak{h}$ -modules. In [17], we proved that (i) the  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$ -eigenvalues in  $\mathfrak{m}$  do not exceed  $1/2$  and (ii) if  $\mathfrak{h}$  is the fixed-point subalgebra of an involution, i.e.,  $[\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}] \subset \mathfrak{h}$ , then  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$  acts scalarly on  $\mathfrak{m}$ , as  $\frac{1}{2}\text{id}_\mathfrak{m}$ . First, we prove a complement to it. Namely, if  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$  does have an eigenvalue  $1/2$  in  $\mathfrak{m}$ , then  $[\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}] \subset \mathfrak{h}$  and thereby ‘ $1/2$ ’ is the only  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$ -eigenvalue on  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Then we stick to the case in which  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a Levi subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{h}$  be a Cartan subalgebra and  $\Delta$  (resp.  $\Delta_\mathfrak{h}$ ) the root system of  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$  (resp.  $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{t})$ ). Let  $\mathfrak{b}_\mathfrak{h}$  be a Borel subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{h}$  containing  $\mathfrak{t}$  and  $\mathfrak{b}$  a Borel subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{b}_\mathfrak{h}$ . This yields the sets of positive roots  $\Delta_\mathfrak{h}^+ \subset \Delta^+ \subset \Delta$  and decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{m}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}^+$ , where  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}_\mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}^+$ . Then  $\mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}^+$  is a standard parabolic subalgebra and  $\Delta^+ = \Delta_\mathfrak{h}^+ \cup \Delta(\mathfrak{m}^+)$ , where  $\Delta(\mathfrak{m}^+)$  is the set of  $\mathfrak{t}$ -weights of  $\mathfrak{m}^+ = \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$ . Let  $\Pi$  be the set of simple roots in  $\Delta^+$  and  $\Pi_\mathfrak{h} := \Pi \cap \Delta_\mathfrak{h}^+$ . If  $k = \#(\Pi \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{m}^+))$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is equipped with a natural  $\mathbb{Z}^k$ -grading. While studying  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$ -eigenvalues in  $\mathfrak{m}$ , one may assume that  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a maximal Levi, i.e.,  $k = 1$ , see Section 1.3 for details. For  $\Pi \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{m}^+) = \{\alpha\}$ , the corresponding  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading is called the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading. Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$  denote this grading, where  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$  and  $\mathfrak{m}^+ = \bigoplus_{i \geq 1} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i) =: \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(\geq 1)$ . In this case,  $\alpha$  is the lowest weight of the simple  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . Moreover, **each**  $\mathfrak{g}(i)$ ,  $i \neq 0$ , is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}(0)$ -module [3, Chap. 3, §3.5], [12, Theorem 0.1]. Then we write  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ ,  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}_\alpha$  in place of  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)}$ ,  $\mathfrak{b}_{\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)}$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}$ , respectively.

Using the partition of  $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{m})$  associated with the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading, we obtain explicit formulae for the  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalue in any  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ ,  $i \neq 0$ . Let  $\varphi_\alpha$  be the fundamental weight of  $\mathfrak{g}$  corresponding to  $\alpha$  and  $\Delta_\alpha(i)$  the set of roots of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ . The sum of all elements of  $\Delta_\alpha(i)$ , denoted  $|\Delta_\alpha(i)|$ , is a multiple of  $\varphi_\alpha$ , i.e.,  $|\Delta_\alpha(i)| = q_\alpha(i)\varphi_\alpha$  and  $q_\alpha(i) \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence  $|\Delta_\alpha(\geq 1)| = (\sum_{i \geq 1} q_\alpha(i))\varphi_\alpha =: q_\alpha\varphi_\alpha$  is the sum of all roots in the nilradical of  $\mathfrak{p}_\alpha$ . Set  $r_\alpha := \|\theta\|^2/\|\alpha\|^2 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , where  $\theta \in \Delta^+$  is the highest root, and let  $h^*$  be the dual Coxeter number of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $\gamma_\alpha(k)$  denote the  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalue on  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k)$ .

**Theorem 0.1.** *We have  $\gamma_\alpha(k) = \frac{k}{2h^*r_\alpha} \sum_{i \geq 1} q_\alpha(ki)$ . (In particular,  $\gamma_\alpha(1) = q_\alpha/2h^*r_\alpha$ .)*

We also obtain a series of relations between numbers  $\gamma_\alpha(i)$ ,  $q_\alpha(i)$ ,  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ . For instance, if  $d_\alpha = \max\{i \mid \Delta_\alpha(i) \neq \emptyset\}$ , then  $\gamma_\alpha(d_\alpha) = 1 - d_\alpha\gamma_\alpha(1)$  and  $q_\alpha + q_\alpha(d_\alpha) = 2h^*r_\alpha/d_\alpha$ .

Let  $\delta_\alpha(k)$  be the **maximal**  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalue in  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , so that  $\delta_\alpha(1) = \gamma_\alpha(1)$ . We relate the values  $\{\delta_\alpha(i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots\}$  to dimensions of abelian subspaces of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  as follows.

**Theorem 0.2.** *For each  $k = 1, 2, \dots, \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , we have  $\delta_\alpha(k) \leq k\gamma_\alpha(1)$ . This upper bound is attained for a given  $k$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  contains a  $k$ -dimensional abelian subspace.*

Similar results are obtained earlier for abelian subspaces of  $\mathfrak{g}$  [10] and for abelian subspaces related to certain  $\mathbb{Z}_m$ -gradings of  $\mathfrak{g}$  [17]. One of the applications is that if  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is not abelian (which exactly means that  $d_\alpha > 1$ ) and  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is an abelian subspace, then

$\dim \mathfrak{a} \leq (1/2) \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . A related result is that if there is an abelian subspace  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  of dimension  $(1/2) \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , then **(1)**  $\mathfrak{a}$  has an abelian complement; **(2)** all the numbers  $\{\delta_\alpha(i)\}$  can explicitly be computed. It appears here that the sequence  $\delta_\alpha(1), \dots, \delta_\alpha(m)$  has an interesting behaviour that is governed by a relation between  $q_\alpha$  and  $q_\alpha(1)$ . We also provide some methods for constructing abelian subspaces of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  and point out the maximal dimension of an abelian subspace in  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  for **all**  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings. The latter is related to a recent work of Elashvili et al. [5].

For an involution  $\sigma$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$  be the associated  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading and  $\mathcal{C}_0 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$  the Casimir element defined via  $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{g}_0}$ . Then the  $\mathcal{C}_0$ -eigenvalue on  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  equals  $1/2$  [17]. As  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  is an orthogonal  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -module, there is a natural  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -module  $\text{Spin}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$  related to the exterior algebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  [16], see Section 6 for details. Although  $\text{Spin}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$  is often reducible,  $\mathcal{C}_0$  acts scalarly on it, and the corresponding eigenvalue,  $\gamma_{\text{Spin}(\mathfrak{g}_1)}$ , is computed in [16, Theorem 7.7], cf. Section 6. Here we obtain another uniform expression.

**Theorem 0.3.** *For any involution ( $=\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading) of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , one has  $\gamma_{\text{Spin}(\mathfrak{g}_1)} = (\dim \mathfrak{g}_1)/16$ .*

The **inner** involutions are closely related to  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings with  $d_\alpha \leq 2$  [8], and in this case we give a proof of Theorem 0.3 that uses properties of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalues. However, the argument that exploits  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings does not extend to outer involutions. Our general proof invokes the "strange formula" of Freudenthal–de Vries, which asserts that  $(\rho, \rho) = (\dim \mathfrak{g})/24$  [6, 47.11], where  $2\rho = |\Delta^+|$ . On the other hand, the adjoint representation of  $\mathfrak{g}$  occurs as the isotropy representation related to the involution  $\tau$  of  $\mathfrak{g} \dot{+} \mathfrak{g}$  with  $\tau(x, y) = (y, x)$ . Although  $\mathfrak{g} \dot{+} \mathfrak{g}$  is not simple, one can state an analogue of Theorem 0.3 for  $(\mathfrak{g} \dot{+} \mathfrak{g}, \tau)$ , and we prove that that analogue is equivalent to the "strange formula". It is important here that, for the orthogonal  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}$ , one has  $\text{Spin}(\mathfrak{g}) = 2^{rk \mathfrak{g}/2} \mathcal{V}_\rho$ , where  $\mathcal{V}_\rho$  is the simple  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module with highest weight  $\rho$ . This result of Kostant appears in [9, p. 358], cf. also [11, Sect. 5]. To a great extent, our general study of 'Spin(V)' in [16] was motivated by that observation.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 1, we recall basic facts on Casimir elements, the Dynkin index of a simple subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and  $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings. In Section 2, we discuss some properties of  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings and numbers  $\{q_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$ . Section 3 contains our results on Theorem 0.1 and the  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalues in  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ . In Sections 4 and 5, we study maximal eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  in  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -modules  $\bigwedge^i \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ ) and their relationship to abelian subspaces of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . Section 6 is devoted to connections between  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -gradings and  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings with  $d_\alpha \leq 2$ . Here we discuss the "strange formula" and a generalisation of it to the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded situation. In Appendix A, we gather the tables of eigenvalues  $\gamma_\alpha(i)$  and numbers  $q_\alpha(i)$  for all  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings.

The ground field  $\mathbb{k}$  is algebraically closed and  $\text{char } \mathbb{k} = 0$ . We use ' $\dot{+}$ ' to denote the direct sum of Lie algebras.

## 1. CASIMIR ELEMENTS, LEVI SUBALGEBRAS AND GRADINGS

Unless otherwise stated,  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a simple Lie algebra with a fixed triangular decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$  and  $\Phi$  is the Killing form on  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then  $\Delta$  is the root system of  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$  and  $\Delta^+$  is the set of positive roots corresponding to  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$ . Let  $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$  be a set of simple roots in  $\Delta^+$ ,  $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$  the corresponding set of fundamental weights, and  $\theta$  the *highest root* in  $\Delta^+$ . We also write  $\varphi_\alpha$  for the fundamental weight corresponding to  $\alpha \in \Pi$ .

**1.1. The Casimir element associated with a reductive subalgebra.** Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be a reductive algebraic subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then  $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{h}}$  is non-degenerate [3, Chap. 1, § 6.3] and one defines the Casimir element  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ . Namely, if  $\{e_i\}$  and  $\{e'_i\}$  are the dual bases of  $\mathfrak{h}$  w.r.t.  $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{h}}$ , then  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}} := \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathfrak{h}} e'_i e_i \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{h})$ . As is well known,  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$  is a well-defined quadratic element of the centre of  $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$  and the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$  on finite-dimensional  $\mathfrak{h}$ -modules are non-negative rational numbers, cf. [3, Chap. 3, § 2.9]. We have  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$ , where  $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{h}^\perp$  is an  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module.

**Proposition 1.1** (cf. [17, Theorem 2.3]). (i)  $\text{tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}) = \dim \mathfrak{h}$ ;  
(ii) If  $x, y \in \mathfrak{h}$ , then  $\Phi(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}(x), y) = \text{tr}_{\mathfrak{h}}(\text{ad}(x)\text{ad}(y))$ ;  
(iii) Any  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ -eigenvalue in  $\mathfrak{m}$  is at most  $1/2$ . Moreover, if this bound is attained and  $\mathfrak{m}_{1/2} \neq 0$  is the corresponding eigenspace, then  $[\mathfrak{m}_{1/2}, \mathfrak{m}] \subset \mathfrak{h}$ .  
(iv) If  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading (i.e.,  $[\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}] \subset \mathfrak{h}$ ), then  $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_{1/2}$ .

The following is a useful complement to the above properties.

**Proposition 1.2.** Given  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$  as above, suppose that  $\mathfrak{m}_{1/2} \neq 0$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}_{1/2} = \mathfrak{m}$  and thereby the decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading.

*Proof.* Write  $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_{1/2} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$  is the sum of all other eigenspaces of  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}$  in  $\mathfrak{m}$ . One has  $\Phi(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}(x), y) = \Phi(x, \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}}(y))$  for all  $x, y$ . Hence  $\Phi(\mathfrak{m}_{1/2}, \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}) = 0$  and  $\Phi$  is non-degenerate on  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} := \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}_{1/2}$ . Therefore,  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$  is reductive and  $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\perp$  is a  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ -module. On the other hand,  $[\mathfrak{m}_{1/2}, \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}] \subset \mathfrak{h}$ , see Prop. 1.1(iii). Hence  $[\mathfrak{m}_{1/2}, \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}] = 0$ . Let  $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$  be the subalgebra of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$  generated by  $\mathfrak{m}_{1/2}$ . Then  $[\mathfrak{h}, \hat{\mathfrak{h}}] \subset \hat{\mathfrak{h}}$  and also  $[\mathfrak{m}_{1/2}, \hat{\mathfrak{h}}] \subset \hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$  is an ideal of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ . We can write  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} = \hat{\mathfrak{h}} \oplus \mathfrak{s}$ , where  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a complementary ideal. Then  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s} \oplus \hat{\mathfrak{h}} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$ ,  $[\mathfrak{s}, \hat{\mathfrak{h}}] = 0$ , and  $[\hat{\mathfrak{h}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}] = 0$ . Therefore  $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$  is an ideal of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Thus  $\hat{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{s} = \tilde{\mathfrak{m}} = 0$ .  $\square$

For  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}$ , one obtains the usual Casimir element  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ . Let  $(\ , \ )$  denote the *canonical bilinear form* on  $\mathfrak{t}^*$ , i.e., one induced by the restriction of  $\Phi$  to  $\mathfrak{t}$ , see [2, Chap. 6, § 1, n° 12] for its properties. If  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module with highest weight  $\lambda$ , then  $\mathcal{C}$  acts on  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$  scalarly with eigenvalue  $(\lambda, \lambda + 2\rho)$  [3, Chap. 3, Prop. 2.4]. Since  $\mathcal{C}(x) = x$  for any  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ , this means that  $(\theta, \theta + 2\rho) = 1$ . The latter is equivalent to that  $(\theta, \theta) = 1/h^*$ , where  $h^*$  is the dual Coxeter number of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , cf. e.g. [17, 1.1]. And the “strange formula” of Freudenthal–de Vries asserts that  $(\rho, \rho) = (\dim \mathfrak{g})/24$ , see [6, 47.11].

**1.2. The transition factor and the Dynkin index.** Let  $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  be a **simple** subalgebra and  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}$  the Killing form on  $\mathfrak{k}$ . Then  $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{k}}$  is proportional to  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}$ , i.e., there is  $F \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $\Phi(x, x) = F \cdot \Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}(x, x)$  for any  $x \in \mathfrak{k}$ . The transition factor  $F$  can be expressed via the other known objects. Consider an invariant bilinear form  $(\cdot | \cdot)_{\mathfrak{g}}$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$ , normalised as follows. Let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$  be the induced  $W$ -invariant bilinear form on  $\mathfrak{t}^*$ . Following Dynkin, we then require that  $\langle \theta, \theta \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = 2$ ; and likewise for  $(\cdot | \cdot)_{\mathfrak{k}}$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{k}}$ .

**Definition 1** (cf. [4, n° 7]). The *Dynkin index* of a simple subalgebra  $\mathfrak{k}$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$  is defined to be  $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}) := \frac{(x|x)_{\mathfrak{g}}}{(x|x)_{\mathfrak{k}}}$  for  $x \in \mathfrak{k}$ .

The following simple assertion is left to the reader. For a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form  $\Psi$  on  $\mathbb{V}$ , let  $\Psi^*$  denote the induced bilinear form on  $\mathbb{V}^*$ .

**Lemma 1.3.** *If  $\Psi_1$  and  $\Psi_2$  are two such forms and  $\Psi_1 = f\Psi_2$  for some  $f \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ , then  $\Psi_2^* = f\Psi_1^*$ .*

Using this, we give a formula for the transition factor  $F$  between  $\Phi$  and  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}$  or, rather, the transition factor  $T$  between the induced canonical bilinear forms  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $\mathfrak{t}^*$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathfrak{k}}$  on  $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{k}}^*$ , where  $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{k}}$  is a suitable Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{k}$  and we regard  $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{k}}^*$  as subspace of  $\mathfrak{t}^*$ .

**Proposition 1.4.** (i) *The transition factor between  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathfrak{k}}$  is  $T = \frac{1}{F} = \frac{h^*(\mathfrak{k})}{h^* \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})}$ .*  
(ii) *Furthermore,  $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}) = \frac{(\theta, \theta)}{(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta})}$ , where  $\bar{\theta}$  is the highest root of  $\mathfrak{k}$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Using Lemma 1.3 and Def. 1, we notice that  $T = \frac{1}{F}$  and  $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}) = \frac{\langle \nu, \nu \rangle_{\mathfrak{k}}}{\langle \nu, \nu \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}}$  for any  $\nu \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{k}}^*$ . Since  $(\theta, \theta) = 1/h^*$  and  $\langle \theta, \theta \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = 2$ , we have  $(\cdot, \cdot) = 2h^* \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$  and likewise for two forms on  $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{k}}^*$ . Then for any  $\nu \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{k}}^* \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ , we obtain

$$T = \frac{(\nu, \nu)}{(\nu, \nu)_{\mathfrak{k}}} = \frac{(\nu, \nu)}{\langle \nu, \nu \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}} \cdot \frac{\langle \nu, \nu \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}}{\langle \nu, \nu \rangle_{\mathfrak{k}}} \cdot \frac{\langle \nu, \nu \rangle_{\mathfrak{k}}}{(\nu, \nu)_{\mathfrak{k}}} = \frac{1}{2h^*} \frac{1}{\text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})} \cdot 2h^*(\mathfrak{k}) = \frac{h^*(\mathfrak{k})}{h^* \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})}.$$

(ii) Taking  $\nu = \bar{\theta}$ , we obtain

$$\text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}) = \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta} \rangle_{\mathfrak{k}}}{\langle \bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta} \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}} = \frac{2}{\langle \bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta} \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}} = \frac{\langle \theta, \theta \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}}{\langle \bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta} \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}} = \frac{(\theta, \theta)}{(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta})}. \quad \square$$

**1.3. Levi subalgebras and gradings.** By definition, a Levi subalgebra is the centraliser in  $\mathfrak{g}$  of a toral subalgebra (i.e., of the Lie algebra of an algebraic torus). If  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$  for a toral subalgebra  $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}$ , then  $\mathfrak{c} := \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{h})$  is the centre of  $\mathfrak{h}$  and  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{c} \dot{+} \mathfrak{s}$ , where  $\mathfrak{s} = [\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}]$ . For  $\mu \in \mathfrak{c}^*$ , set  $\mathfrak{m}(\mu) = \{x \in \mathfrak{m} \mid [c, x] = \mu(c)x \ \forall c \in \mathfrak{c}\}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}(\mu)$  is an  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module. By an old result of Kostant,  $\mathfrak{m}(\mu)$  is a **simple**  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module. See [12, p. 136] for a proof and historical remarks. (An alternate independent approach appears in [3, Chap. 3, §3.5].) As in the introduction, we assume that  $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{h}$  and  $\mathfrak{b}_{\mathfrak{h}} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ . This provides the decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{m}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{m}^+$  and partition  $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}^+ \cup \Delta(\mathfrak{m}^+) = \Delta^+$ . If  $\dim \mathfrak{c} = k$ , then one defines a  $\mathbb{Z}^k$ -grading of  $\mathfrak{g}$  as follows.

To simplify notation, assume that  $\Pi \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{m}^+) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\}$ . For  $\gamma \in \Delta$ , let  $\mathfrak{g}^\gamma$  denote the corresponding root space. If  $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i \in \Delta$ , then the  $\alpha_i$ -height of  $\gamma$  is  $\text{ht}_{\alpha_i}(\gamma) = a_i$  and  $\text{ht}(\gamma) = \sum_i a_i$  is the (usual) height of  $\gamma$ . For a  $k$ -tuple  $(j_1, \dots, j_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ , set

$$\Delta(j_1, \dots, j_k) = \{\gamma \in \Delta \mid \text{ht}_{\alpha_i}(\gamma) = j_i, 1 \leq i \leq k\} \text{ and } \mathfrak{g}(j_1, \dots, j_k) = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \Delta(j_1, \dots, j_k)} \mathfrak{g}^\gamma.$$

This yields a  $\mathbb{Z}^k$ -grading  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{j_1, \dots, j_k} \mathfrak{g}(j_1, \dots, j_k)$  with  $\mathfrak{g}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathfrak{h}$ . By the above result of Kostant, each  $\mathfrak{g}(j_1, \dots, j_k)$  with  $(j_1, \dots, j_k) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module. Indeed, if  $(\nu_i, \alpha_j) = \delta_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$  and  $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^k j_i \nu_i \in \mathfrak{c}^*$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}(j_1, \dots, j_k) = \mathfrak{m}(\mu)$ . If  $k = 1$  and  $\Pi \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{m}^+) = \{\alpha\}$ , then  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a maximal Levi and the corresponding  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading is called the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading. In this case, we write  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(j)$  in place of  $\mathfrak{g}(j)$ .

The passage from an arbitrary Levi subalgebra  $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  to a maximal Levi subalgebra of a simple subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  goes as follows. Suppose that we are to compute the  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$ -eigenvalue on a simple  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module  $V = \mathfrak{g}(j_1, \dots, j_k) \subset \mathfrak{m}^+$ . Here  $V^* = \mathfrak{g}(-j_1, \dots, -j_k) \subset \mathfrak{m}^-$  is the dual  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module and  $\Phi$  is non-degenerate on  $V \oplus V^*$ . Take

$$\mathfrak{q} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(ij_1, \dots, ij_k) \subset \mathfrak{g}.$$

It is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with  $\mathfrak{q}(i) = \mathfrak{g}(ij_1, \dots, ij_k)$ . Since  $\Phi|_\mathfrak{q}$  is non-degenerate,  $\mathfrak{q}$  is reductive. Furthermore, by [12, Sect. 1], the positive part  $\mathfrak{q}(\geq 1)$  is generated by  $V = \mathfrak{q}(1)$ . Since each  $\mathfrak{q}(i)$ ,  $i \neq 0$ , is a simple  $\mathfrak{q}(0)$ -module, the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading of  $\mathfrak{q}$  is determined by a sole simple root of  $\mathfrak{q}$ . Taking the corresponding simple ideal of  $\mathfrak{q}$ , one can write  $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{k} \dot{+} \mathfrak{l}$ , where  $\mathfrak{l}$  is reductive,  $\mathfrak{k}$  is simple, and there is a simple root  $\beta$  of  $\mathfrak{k}$  such that  $\mathfrak{q}(i) = \mathfrak{k}_\beta(i)$  for  $i \neq 0$ , while

$$(1.1) \quad \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{q}(0) = \mathfrak{k}_\beta(0) \dot{+} \mathfrak{l}.$$

Thus,  $\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)$  is a maximal Levi subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{k}$  and  $V = \mathfrak{k}_\beta(1)$  for the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \beta)$ -grading of  $\mathfrak{k}$ . Taking a basis for  $\mathfrak{h}$  adapted to the sum in (1.1), one can split  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$  as  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h} = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)} + \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\mathfrak{l}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{l}$  acts trivially on  $V$ , the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)}$  on  $V$  are the same. Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)}$  is the true Casimir element associated with  $(\Phi_\mathfrak{k})|_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)}$  and  $\Phi|_\mathfrak{k} = F \cdot \Phi_\mathfrak{k}$  (cf. Section 1.2), then  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)} = F \cdot \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)}$ . Here the factor  $F$  comes from the fact that the dual bases for  $\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)$  required in the Casimir elements  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$  (i.e., in  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)}$ ) and  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)}$  are being computed via the proportional bilinear forms  $\Phi|_\mathfrak{k}$  and  $\Phi_\mathfrak{k}$ , respectively. Thus,

*for any simple  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module  $V \subset \mathfrak{m}^+$ , there is a simple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra  $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  and a simple root  $\beta$  of  $\mathfrak{k}$  such that  $V = \mathfrak{k}_\beta(1)$  and then the  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{h}$ -eigenvalue in  $V$  equals  $F$  times the  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0)}$ -eigenvalue on  $V$ , where  $\Phi|_\mathfrak{k} = F \cdot \Phi_\mathfrak{k}$ .*

For this reason, we restrict ourselves with considering only maximal Levi subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and the corresponding  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings.



2.  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -GRADINGS AND PARTITIONS OF ROOT SYSTEMS

If  $\Delta$  has two root lengths, then  $\Pi_l$  is the set of **long** simple roots and  $\theta_s$  stands for the dominant **short** root. In the simply-laced case, we assume that  $\Pi_l = \Pi$  and  $\theta_s = \theta$ . Recall that  $\text{ht}_{\alpha_i}(\gamma)$  is the  $\alpha_i$ -height of  $\gamma \in \Delta$ . Given  $\alpha \in \Pi$ , set  $d_\alpha = \text{ht}_\alpha(\theta)$ ,  $\Delta_\alpha(i) = \{\gamma \mid \text{ht}_\alpha(\gamma) = i\}$ ,  $\Delta_\alpha^+(0) = \Delta^+ \cap \Delta_\alpha(0)$ , and

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{d_\alpha} \Delta_\alpha(i) = \{\gamma \mid (\gamma, \varphi_\alpha) > 0\}.$$

Then  $\Delta = \Delta_\alpha^+(0) \sqcup \mathcal{R}_\alpha$ , and  $\Delta_\alpha(i)$  is the set of  $\mathfrak{t}$ -weights of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ , where  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=-d_\alpha}^{d_\alpha} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$  is the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading. Since  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module for  $i \neq 0$ ,  $\Delta_\alpha(i)$  with  $i > 0$  contains a unique minimal root (= the lowest weight of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$  w.r.t.  $\Delta_\alpha^+(0)$ ) and a unique maximal root (= the highest weight).

As usual,  $\gamma^\vee = 2\gamma/(\gamma, \gamma)$  and  $\Delta^\vee = \{\gamma^\vee \mid \gamma \in \Delta\}$  is the *dual root system*. The set of simple roots in  $(\Delta^+)^\vee$  is  $\Pi^\vee$  and notation  $\text{ht}(\gamma^\vee)$  refers to the height of  $\gamma^\vee$  in  $\Delta^\vee$ . The fundamental weight  $\varphi_\alpha$  is *minuscule*, if  $(\varphi_\alpha, \gamma^\vee) \leq 1$  for any  $\gamma \in \Delta^+$ , i.e.,  $(\varphi_\alpha, \theta_s^\vee) = 1$ ; and  $\varphi_\alpha$  is *cominuscule*, if  $\text{ht}_\alpha(\theta) = 1$ , i.e.,  $d_\alpha = 1$ .

**Coxeter numbers.** Set  $h = h(\mathfrak{g}) := \text{ht}(\theta) + 1$ —the *Coxeter number* of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $h^* = h^*(\mathfrak{g}) := \text{ht}(\theta^\vee) + 1$ —the *dual Coxeter number* of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Since  $\theta_s^\vee$  is the highest root in  $\Delta^\vee$ , we have  $\text{ht}(\theta_s) + 1 = h^*(\mathfrak{g}^\vee)$ —the dual Coxeter number of the Langlands dual Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ . Note that  $h(\mathfrak{g}) = h(\mathfrak{g}^\vee)$ , hence  $h^* \leq h$ . However,  $h^*(\mathfrak{g})$  and  $h^*(\mathfrak{g}^\vee)$  can be different. Thus, there are up to three Coxeter numbers for  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^\vee)$ , which all coincide in the **ADE**-case.

If  $M \subset \Delta^+$ , then  $|M| = \sum_{\gamma \in M} \gamma$ , while  $\#M$  stands for the cardinality. As usual,  $2\rho = |\Delta^+|$  and hence  $(\rho, \gamma^\vee) = \text{ht}(\gamma^\vee)$  for any  $\gamma \in \Delta^+$ . The orthogonal projection of  $2\rho$  to the edge of the Weyl chamber corresponding to  $\varphi_\alpha$  can be written as  $q_\alpha \varphi_\alpha$  and it is clear that  $q_\alpha = \frac{(2\rho, \varphi_\alpha)}{(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)}$ . The numbers  $\{q_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$  are needed for the description of the Gorenstein highest weight vector varieties, see [14, 3.7], [15, Remark 1.5], or for computing cohomology of invertible sheaves on  $G/P_\alpha$ , where  $P_\alpha$  is the maximal parabolic subgroup for  $\alpha$ , see [1, 4.6].

Let  $W_\alpha$  be the subgroup of the Weyl group  $W$  generated by all **simple** reflections  $s_\beta$  with  $\beta \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\}$ . Then  $W_\alpha$  is the stabiliser of  $\varphi_\alpha$  in  $W$  and also is the Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ . Write  $w_{\alpha,0}$  is the longest element in  $W_\alpha$ . Recall that  $w_{\alpha,0}^2 = 1$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *One has  $q_\alpha \varphi_\alpha = |\mathcal{R}_\alpha|$  and  $q_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $2\rho = |\Delta_\alpha^+(0)| + |\mathcal{R}_\alpha|$  and  $(\mu, \varphi_\alpha) = 0$  for any  $\mu \in \Delta_\alpha^+(0)$ . Hence  $(2\rho, \varphi_\alpha) = (|\mathcal{R}_\alpha|, \varphi_\alpha)$ . Moreover,  $s_\beta(\mathcal{R}_\alpha) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha$  for any  $\beta \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\}$ . Therefore,  $|\mathcal{R}_\alpha|$  is proportional to  $\varphi_\alpha$ . Clearly,  $q_\alpha = (|\mathcal{R}_\alpha|, \alpha^\vee)$  is an integer.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.** *1°. For any  $\alpha \in \Pi$ , we have*

- (i)  $q_\alpha \leq h$ ; moreover,  $q_\alpha = h$  if and only if  $\varphi_\alpha$  is minuscule;
- (ii)  $q_\alpha \geq \text{rk } \mathfrak{g} + 1$  and this minimum is attained for some  $\alpha$ .

2°. For any  $\alpha \in \Pi_l$ , one has  $q_\alpha \leq h^*$ ; moreover,  $q_\alpha = h^*$  if and only if  $\varphi_\alpha$  is cominuscule.

3°. Suppose that  $\theta$  is fundamental and  $\hat{\alpha} \in \Pi$  is such that  $(\theta, \hat{\alpha}) \neq 0$ . Then  $\hat{\alpha} \in \Pi_l$ ,  $d_{\hat{\alpha}} = 2$ , and  $q_{\hat{\alpha}} = h^* - 1$ .

4°. If  $\theta \neq \theta_s$  and  $(\theta_s, \alpha) \neq 0$ , then  $q_\alpha = h - 1$ .

*Proof.* Part 1°(i) and the first half of (ii) are proved in [15, Appendix]. For the sake of completeness, we provide the full argument.

Clearly,  $W_\alpha$  preserves each  $\Delta_\alpha(i)$  and  $w_{\alpha,0}$  takes the unique minimal element of each  $\Delta_\alpha(i)$ ,  $i > 0$ , to the unique maximal one.

1°. We have  $w_{\alpha,0}(\mathcal{R}_\alpha) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha$  and  $w_{\alpha,0}(\Delta_\alpha^+(0)) = -\Delta_\alpha^+(0)$ . Hence  $\rho + w_{\alpha,0}\rho = |\mathcal{R}_\alpha|$  and, for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha$ , we have

$$(\rho, \gamma^\vee) + (\rho, w_{\alpha,0}(\gamma^\vee)) = (|\mathcal{R}_\alpha|, \gamma^\vee) = q_\alpha(\varphi_\alpha, \gamma^\vee).$$

That is,  $\text{ht}(\gamma^\vee) + \text{ht}(w_{\alpha,0}(\gamma^\vee)) = q_\alpha(\varphi_\alpha, \gamma^\vee)$ . Taking  $\gamma = \alpha$ , one obtains

$$(2.1) \quad 1 + \text{ht}(w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha^\vee)) = q_\alpha.$$

Since  $\text{ht}(\gamma^\vee) \leq h - 1$  for any  $\gamma^\vee \in \Delta^\vee$ , we have  $q_\alpha \leq h$ . Furthermore,  $q_\alpha = h$  if and only if  $w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha^\vee)$  is the highest root in  $\Delta^\vee$ . In this case, the equality  $1 = (\varphi_\alpha, \alpha^\vee) = (\varphi_\alpha, w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha^\vee))$  implies that  $(\varphi_\alpha, \gamma^\vee) \leq 1$  for any  $\gamma \in \Delta^+$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_\alpha$  is minuscule. On the other side,  $w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha^\vee)$  is the co-root of maximal height among the roots  $\gamma$  such that  $(\varphi_\alpha, \gamma^\vee) = 1$ . Since this set contains the co-root  $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^\vee$ , we have  $\text{ht}(w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha^\vee)) \geq n = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$ .

The existence of  $\alpha$  such that  $q_\alpha = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g} + 1$  can be checked case-by-case. If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of type  $\mathbf{D}_n$  or  $\mathbf{E}_n$ , then the branching node of the Dynkin diagram will do. For  $\mathbf{BCFG}$ , one takes the unique long simple root that is adjacent to a short root. For  $\mathbf{A}_n$ , all simple roots yield  $q_\alpha = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g} + 1 = h(\mathfrak{g})$ .


2°. If  $\alpha \in \Pi_l$ , then  $\text{ht}(w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha^\vee)) \leq \text{ht}(\theta^\vee) = h^* - 1$ , and the equality occurs if and only if  $w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha) = \theta$ . In this case,  $\theta \in \Delta_\alpha(1)$ . Hence  $\text{ht}_\alpha(\theta) = \text{ht}_\alpha(\alpha) = 1$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_\alpha$  is cominuscule.

3°. Here  $(\theta^\vee, \hat{\alpha}) = (\theta, \hat{\alpha}^\vee) = 1$ , hence  $\hat{\alpha} \in \Pi_l$ . Then  $2 = (\theta, \theta^\vee) = d_{\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{\alpha}, \theta^\vee) = d_{\hat{\alpha}}$ . Next,  $w_{\hat{\alpha},0}(\hat{\alpha})$  is the maximal root whose  $\hat{\alpha}$ -height equals 1, i.e.,  $w_{\hat{\alpha},0}(\hat{\alpha}) = \theta - \hat{\alpha}$ . Then  $\text{ht}(w_{\hat{\alpha},0}(\hat{\alpha}^\vee)) = \text{ht}((\theta - \hat{\alpha})^\vee) = \text{ht}(\theta^\vee - \hat{\alpha}^\vee) = h^* - 2$  and it follows from (2.1) that  $q_{\hat{\alpha}} = h^* - 1$ .

4°. Here  $\alpha \in \Pi_s$  and  $\alpha^\vee$  is the unique long simple root in  $\Pi^\vee$  such that  $(\alpha^\vee, \theta_s^\vee) \neq 0$ . As in the previous part, the  $\alpha^\vee$ -height of  $\theta_s^\vee$  equals 2 and  $w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha^\vee) = \theta_s^\vee - \alpha^\vee$ . Since  $\text{ht}(\theta_s^\vee - \alpha^\vee) = h - 2$ , we obtain  $q_\alpha = \text{ht}(\theta_s^\vee - \alpha^\vee) + 1 = h - 1$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.3.** For the reader's convenience, we list the numbers  $\{q_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Pi\}$ ,  $h$ , and  $h^*$  for all simple  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The numbering of simple roots follows [3, Table 1]; in particular, for  $\mathbf{E}_6$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_7$ , and  $\mathbf{E}_8$ , the numbering is





respectively. We also write  $q_i$  for  $q_{\alpha_i}$ .

- (1) For  $\mathbf{A}_n$ , one has  $q_i = n + 1 = h = h^*$  for all  $i$ ;
- (2) For  $\mathbf{B}_n$ , one has  $q_i = 2n - i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$  and  $q_n = 2n$ ; here  $h = 2n, h^* = 2n - 1$ ;
- (3) For  $\mathbf{C}_n$ , one has  $q_i = 2n - i + 1$  for all  $i$ ; here  $h = 2n, h^* = n + 1$ ;
- (4) For  $\mathbf{D}_n$ , one has  $q_i = 2n - i - 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$  and  $q_{n-1} = q_n = 2n - 2 = h$ .
- (5) For  $\mathbf{E}_6$ ,  $h = h^* = 12$  and the numbers  $\{q_i\}$  are: 
$$12-9-7-9-12$$
$$11$$
- (6) For  $\mathbf{E}_7$ ,  $h = h^* = 18$  and the numbers  $\{q_i\}$  are: 
$$18-13-10-8-11-17$$
$$14$$
- (7) For  $\mathbf{E}_8$ ,  $h = h^* = 30$  and the numbers  $\{q_i\}$  are: 
$$29-19-14-11-9-13-23$$
$$17$$
- (8) For  $\mathbf{F}_4$ , one has  $q_1 = 11 = h - 1$ ,  $q_2 = 7$ ,  $q_3 = 5$ , and  $q_4 = 8 = h^* - 1$ ;
- (9) For  $\mathbf{G}_2$ , one has  $q_1 = 5 = h - 1$  and  $q_2 = 3 = h^* - 1$ .

*Remark 2.4.* (1) Since  $\Delta_\alpha(i)$  is the set of weights of a  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module, we have  $|\Delta_\alpha(i)| = q_\alpha(i)\varphi_\alpha$ , where  $q_\alpha(i) > 0$  for  $i > 0$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{d_\alpha} q_\alpha(i) = q_\alpha$ . This provides a refinement of the numbers  $\{q_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Pi\}$ , which we use in Section 3.

(2) We frequently use the fact that  $\#\{\gamma \in \Delta^+ \mid (\theta, \gamma) > 0\} = 2h^* - 3$ , see [20, Prop. 1].

### 3. EIGENVALUES OF CASIMIR ELEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -GRADINGS

In this section, we fix  $\alpha \in \Pi$  and work with the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ . Recall that the centre of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$  is one-dimensional (and is spanned by  $\varphi_\alpha$  upon the identification of  $\mathfrak{t}$  and  $\mathfrak{t}^*$ ), each  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ ,  $i \geq 1$ , is a **simple**  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module, and the set of  $\mathfrak{t}$ -weights of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$  is  $\Delta_\alpha(i)$ , cf. Section 2. The *height* of the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading is  $d_\alpha = \max_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \{j \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(j) \neq 0\}$ . The Casimir element in  $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0))$  corresponding to the restriction of  $\Phi$  to  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ . Write  $\gamma_\alpha(i)$  for the eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  on  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ . To keep track of the length of simple roots, we need  $r_\alpha = (\theta, \theta)/(\alpha, \alpha)$ . Hence  $r_\alpha = 1$  if and only if  $\alpha \in \Pi_l$ . Note that  $(\alpha, \alpha) = 1/(h^*r_\alpha)$  and  $(\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = 1/(2h^*r_\alpha)$ .

In the rest of this section, we write  $d$  for  $d_\alpha = \text{ht}_\alpha(\theta)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *For any  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading, we have  $\gamma_\alpha(1) = \frac{q_\alpha}{2h^*r_\alpha}$  and  $\gamma_\alpha(d) = 1 - \frac{dq_\alpha}{2h^*r_\alpha}$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $2\rho_\alpha(0) = |\Delta_\alpha^+(0)|$ . Then  $2\rho = 2\rho_\alpha(0) + |\mathcal{R}_\alpha| = 2\rho_\alpha(0) + q_\alpha\varphi_\alpha$ . By general principle, if  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module with the highest weight  $\lambda$ , then the  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalue on  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$  equals  $(\lambda, \lambda + 2\rho_\alpha(0))$ , see [3, Ch. 3, Prop. 2.4].

- In our case,  $\alpha$  is the lowest weight in  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , hence  $w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha)$  is the highest weight. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_\alpha(1) &= (w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha), w_{\alpha,0}(\alpha) + 2\rho_\alpha(0)) = (\alpha, \alpha - 2\rho_\alpha(0)) = (\alpha, \alpha - 2\rho) + (\alpha, |\mathcal{R}_\alpha|) \\ &= (\alpha, |\mathcal{R}_\alpha|) = q_\alpha(\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = \frac{q_\alpha}{2}(\alpha, \alpha) = \frac{q_\alpha}{2h^*r_\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

- Since  $\theta$  is the highest weight of the  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(d)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_\alpha(d) &= (\theta, \theta + 2\rho_\alpha(0)) = (\theta, \theta + 2\rho) - (\theta, q_\alpha\varphi_\alpha) = 1 - q_\alpha(\theta, \varphi_\alpha) \\ &= 1 - q_\alpha d \cdot (\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = 1 - \frac{q_\alpha d}{2h^*r_\alpha}. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 3.2.** *We have*

- (i)  $d\gamma_\alpha(1) + \gamma_\alpha(d) = 1$  and hence  $1/2d \leq \gamma_\alpha(1) < 1/d$ ;
- (ii) if  $d = 1$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_\alpha$  is cominuscule, then  $\gamma_\alpha(1) = 1/2$ ;
- (iii) if  $\theta$  is a multiple of a fundamental weight and  $(\hat{\alpha}, \theta) \neq 0$ , then  $\gamma_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) = (h^* - 1)/2h^*$ .

*Proof.* (i) The first equality is clear. Since  $\gamma_\alpha(d) > 0$ , one obtains  $\gamma_\alpha(1) < 1/d$ . On the other hand, any  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalue in  $\bigoplus_{i \neq 0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$  is at most  $1/2$ , see Prop. 1.1. Hence  $\gamma_\alpha(d) \leq 1/2$  and then  $\gamma_\alpha(1) \geq 1/2d$ .

(ii) This follows from (i) with  $d = 1$ .

(iii) If  $\theta$  is **fundamental**, then  $\hat{\alpha} \in \Pi_l$  and  $q_{\hat{\alpha}} = h^* - 1$ , see Theorem 2.2(3°). Hence the assertion on  $\gamma_{\hat{\alpha}}(1)$ . For a more general situation in which  $\theta$  is a multiple of a fundamental weight, we use the fact that  $\Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(2) = \{\theta\}$  and  $\Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) = \{\mu \in \Delta^+ \mid (\mu, \theta^\vee) = 1\}$ . Then  $\#\Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) = 2h^* - 4$  (cf. Remark 2.4(2)) and  $\Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(1)$  is a union of pairs  $\{\mu, \theta - \mu\}$ . Therefore  $|\Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(1)| = (h^* - 2)\theta$  and  $|\mathcal{R}_{\hat{\alpha}}| = (h^* - 1)\theta$ . As in the proof of Theorem 3.1,  $\gamma_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) = (\hat{\alpha}, |\mathcal{R}_{\hat{\alpha}}|) = (h^* - 1)(\hat{\alpha}, \theta) = (h^* - 1)(\theta, \theta)(\hat{\alpha}, \theta^\vee)/2 = (h^* - 1)/2h^*$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.** If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is classical, then  $d \in \{1, 2\}$  for all  $\alpha \in \Pi$ . Therefore, Theorem 3.1 describes all eigenvalues of all  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ .

To obtain a general formula for any  $\gamma_\alpha(i)$ , we use the refinement  $\{q_\alpha(i)\}$  of numbers  $\{q_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Pi\}$ , see Remark 2.4(1). Suppose that  $1 \leq k \leq d$  and we are going to compute  $\gamma_\alpha(k)$ . Consider the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]} := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(ki) \subset \mathfrak{g}$ , i.e.,  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}(i) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(ki)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  share the same 0-th part and thereby the same Cartan subalgebra  $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ .

**Lemma 3.4.**  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  is semisimple and the root system of  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  relative to  $\mathfrak{t}$  is  $\bigsqcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_\alpha(ki)$ .

*Proof.* The centre of  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  (if any) belongs to the centre of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ . As the centre of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$  is one-dimensional and it acts non-trivially on  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k)$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  must be semisimple. The rest is clear.  $\square$

The passage from  $\mathfrak{g}$  to  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  is a particular case of the general construction outlined in Section 1.3 (a passage from  $\mathfrak{g}$  to  $\mathfrak{q}$ ). Because this time we begin with a  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading, it is possible to say more on the relevant details and the factor  $F$ . As a result, we end up with an explicit formula for  $\gamma_\alpha(k)$ . Each graded part  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}(i) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(ki)$  of  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module. Therefore, the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading of  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  is given by a simple root of  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$ . Clearly, this root, say  $\beta$ , is just the unique minimal root in  $\Delta_\alpha(k)$ . Although  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  is not necessarily simple, one can write  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]} = \mathfrak{k} \dot{+} \mathfrak{s}$ , where  $\mathfrak{k}$  is **simple**,  $\mathfrak{s}$  is semisimple, and  $\beta$  is a simple root of  $\mathfrak{k}$ . In this case, the whole of  $\mathfrak{s}$  lies in  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ . Therefore  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0) = \mathfrak{k}_\beta(0) \dot{+} \mathfrak{s}$  and  $\mathfrak{k}_\beta(i) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(ki)$  for  $i \neq 0$ . Let  $\bar{\varphi}_\beta$  be the fundamental weight of  $\mathfrak{k}$  (= of  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$ ) corresponding to  $\beta$ .

**Proposition 3.5.**  $\varphi_\alpha = k \frac{(\alpha, \alpha)}{(\beta, \beta)} \cdot \bar{\varphi}_\beta$ .

*Proof.* Since either of the weights  $\varphi_\alpha$  and  $\bar{\varphi}_\beta$  generates the one-dimensional centre of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ , these are proportional. By the assumption,  $(\varphi_\alpha, \alpha^\vee) = 1$  and  $(\bar{\varphi}_\beta, \beta^\vee) = 1$ . On the other hand, since  $\beta$  is a root in  $\Delta_\alpha(k)$ , we have  $(\varphi_\alpha, \beta^\vee) = k(\varphi_\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \frac{2}{(\beta, \beta)} = k \cdot \frac{(\alpha, \alpha)}{(\beta, \beta)}$ . Hence  $\varphi_\alpha / \bar{\varphi}_\beta = k \cdot \frac{(\alpha, \alpha)}{(\beta, \beta)}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.6.** For any  $\alpha \in \Pi$  and  $1 \leq k \leq d$ , one has  $\gamma_\alpha(k) = \frac{k}{2h^*r_\alpha} \sum_{i \geq 1} q_\alpha(ki)$ . In particular,

$$\gamma_\alpha(d) = \frac{dq_\alpha(d)}{2h^*r_\alpha}.$$

*Proof.* As above, we consider  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]} = \mathfrak{k} \dot{+} \mathfrak{s}$  and the simple root  $\beta$  of  $\mathfrak{k}$  such that  $\mathfrak{k}_\beta(i) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(ki)$ . For the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \beta)$ -grading of the simple algebra  $\mathfrak{k}$ , we consider the same relevant objects as for  $(\mathfrak{g}, \alpha)$ . To distinguish them, the former will be marked by ‘bar’ (cf.  $\varphi_\alpha$  versus  $\bar{\varphi}_\beta$ ). This includes  $\bar{q}_\beta, \bar{\mathcal{R}}_\beta, \bar{r}_\beta$ , etc. (see below).

• Since  $\bigsqcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_\alpha(ki) = \bigsqcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_\beta(i)$  is the partition of the root system of  $(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$  corresponding to  $\beta$ , we have  $|\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\beta| = \sum_{i \geq 1} |\Delta_\alpha(ki)| = \bar{q}_\beta \bar{\varphi}_\beta$ . On the other hand, this sum equals  $\sum_{i \geq 1} q_\alpha(ki) \varphi_\alpha$ . Invoking Proposition 3.5, we obtain

$$\bar{q}_\beta = k \frac{(\alpha, \alpha)}{(\beta, \beta)} \sum_{i \geq 1} q_\alpha(ki).$$

Let  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\beta(0) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{k})$  be Casimir element associated with the Levi subalgebra  $\mathfrak{k}_\beta(0) \subset \mathfrak{k}$ . It is important to understand that  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\beta(0)$  is defined via the use of the Killing form  $\Phi_\mathfrak{k}$  on  $\mathfrak{k}$ . Let  $\bar{\gamma}_\beta(i)$  denote the eigenvalue of  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\beta(0)$  on  $\mathfrak{k}_\beta(i)$ . Set  $\bar{r}_\beta = (\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta}) / (\beta, \beta)$ , where  $\bar{\theta}$  is the highest root of  $\mathfrak{k}$ . By Theorem 3.1 applied to  $\mathfrak{k}$  and  $\beta$ , we have  $\bar{\gamma}_\beta(1) = \frac{\bar{q}_\beta}{2h^*(\mathfrak{k}) \cdot \bar{r}_\beta}$ .

• Our next step is to compare  $\gamma_\alpha(k)$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_\beta(1)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0) = \mathfrak{k}_\beta(0) \dot{+} \mathfrak{s}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}$  acts trivially on each  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(ki)$ , one can safely remove from  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  the summands corresponding to the dual bases for  $\mathfrak{s}$ , while computing  $\gamma_\alpha(ki)$ . This “almost” yields  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_\beta(0)$ . The only

difference is that the dual bases for  $\mathfrak{k}$  occurring in two Casimir elements are defined via the use of different Killing forms ( $\Phi$  and  $\Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}$ , respectively). Hence the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha}(0)$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_{\beta}(0)$  on all  $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}(ki)$  are proportional. More precisely, since the eigenvalues are computed via the use of the canonical bilinear form on  $\mathfrak{t}^*$  and  $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{k}}^*$ , respectively, the transition factor equals the ratio of these two canonical forms. By Proposition 1.4(i), this factor equals  $T = \frac{h^*(\mathfrak{k})}{h^* \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})}$ . Gathering together previous formulae, we obtain

$$(3.1) \quad \gamma_{\alpha}(k) = T \cdot \overline{\gamma}_{\beta}(1) = \frac{h^*(\mathfrak{k})}{h^* \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})} \cdot \frac{\overline{q}_{\beta}}{2h^*(\mathfrak{k}) \cdot \overline{r}_{\beta}} = \frac{k \cdot (\alpha, \alpha) \sum_{i \geq 1} q_{\alpha}(ki)}{2h^* \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}) \cdot \overline{r}_{\beta} \cdot (\beta, \beta)}.$$

Proposition 1.4(ii) says that  $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}) = (\theta, \theta) / (\overline{\theta}, \overline{\theta})$ . Hence  $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}) \cdot \overline{r}_{\beta} \cdot (\beta, \beta) = (\theta, \theta)$ , and one simplifies Eq. (3.1) to

$$\frac{k \cdot (\alpha, \alpha) \sum_{i \geq 1} q_{\alpha}(ki)}{2h^* \cdot (\theta, \theta)} = \frac{k}{2h^* r_{\alpha}} \sum_{i \geq 1} q_{\alpha}(ki),$$

as required.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.** *For any  $\alpha \in \Pi$ , one has  $d(q_{\alpha} + q_{\alpha}(d)) = 2h^* r_{\alpha}$  and  $2h^* r_{\alpha} / d \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular, if  $d = 2$ , then  $q_{\alpha} + q_{\alpha}(2) = h^* r_{\alpha}$ .*

*Proof.* Theorems 3.1 and 3.6 provide two different formulae for  $\gamma_{\alpha}(d)$ , which yields everything.  $\square$

To apply Theorem 3.6, one has to know the integers  $\{q_{\alpha}(j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ . Corollary 3.7 allows us to compute  $q_{\alpha}(d)$  and thereby settles the problem for  $d = 2$ . For  $d > 2$ , there are some relations between  $\{q_{\alpha}(i) \mid i = 1, \dots, d\}$ , which allows us to solve this problem.

**Proposition 3.8.** *If  $d \geq 2$  and  $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$ , then  $q_{\alpha}(i) = q_{\alpha}(d - i)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider  $\mathfrak{g}^{[d]} = \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}(-d) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}(0) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}(d)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{g}^{[d]}$  is the fixed point subalgebra of an automorphism  $\psi \in \text{Int}(\mathfrak{g})$  of order  $d$ . If  $\zeta = \sqrt[d]{1}$  is primitive and  $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$ , then the eigenspace of  $\psi$  corresponding to  $\zeta^i$  is  $\mathfrak{g}_i := \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}(i) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}(i - d)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{g}^{[d]}$  is semisimple (Lemma 3.4), the sum of weights of the  $\mathfrak{g}^{[d]}$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}_i$  equals 0. That is,

$$|\Delta_{\alpha}(i)| + |\Delta_{\alpha}(i - d)| = (q_{\alpha}(i) - q_{\alpha}(d - i))\varphi_{\alpha} = 0. \quad \square$$

*Remark 3.9.* If  $d = 3$ , then  $q_{\alpha}(1) = q_{\alpha}(2)$ . That is, Corollary 3.7 and Proposition 3.8 are sufficient for computing the numbers  $\{q_{\alpha}(j)\}$ . For  $d \geq 4$ , one can also consider all  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]}$  with  $k > d/2$ , which yields more relations. For instance, if  $d = 4$  and  $k = 3$ , then one get the relation  $q_{\alpha}(4) + q_{\alpha}(1) = q_{\alpha}(2)$ . All these extra relations are sufficient for leisure calculations of all  $\{q_{\alpha}(j)\}$ . Note that the maximal possible value  $d = 6$  is attained only for  $\mathbf{E}_8$  (once).

For future use, we record the following by-product of the above theory.

**Proposition 3.10.** *For any  $\alpha \in \Pi$ , we have  $2\gamma_\alpha(1) > \gamma_\alpha(2)$ . Moreover, if  $d$  is odd, then  $\gamma_\alpha(1) > \gamma_\alpha(2)$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $\gamma_\alpha(1) = \frac{\sum_{i \geq 1} q_\alpha(i)}{2h^*r_\alpha} = \frac{q_\alpha}{2h^*r_\alpha}$  and  $\gamma_\alpha(2) = \frac{2 \sum_{i \geq 1} q_\alpha(2i)}{2h^*r_\alpha}$ , which yields the first inequality. For  $d$  odd, it follows from Proposition 3.8 that  $2 \sum_{i \geq 1} q_\alpha(2i) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} q_\alpha(i) < q_\alpha$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.11.** If  $d = d_\alpha$  is even, then it can happen that  $2\gamma_\alpha(1) > \gamma_\alpha(2) > \gamma_\alpha(1)$ . For instance, look up  $(\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_5)$  or  $(\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_6)$  or  $(\mathbf{F}_4, \alpha_2)$  in tables in Appendix A.

Another interesting relation is

**Proposition 3.12.** *If  $k > d/2$  and  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]} = \mathfrak{k} \dot{+} \mathfrak{s}$  as above, then  $\frac{q_\alpha(k)}{\gamma_\alpha(k)} = \frac{2h^*}{k} \cdot \frac{(\beta, \beta)}{(\alpha, \alpha)} \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})$ .*

*In particular, for  $k = d$ , one obtains  $\frac{q_\alpha(d)}{\gamma_\alpha(d)} = \frac{2h^*r_\alpha}{d}$ .*

*Proof.* 1) If  $k > d/2$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}^{[k]} = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(-k) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k)$  has only three summands and  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k)$  is commutative. That is,  $\overline{\varphi}_\beta$  is cominuscule and  $|\Delta_\alpha(k)| = h^*(\mathfrak{k}) \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\beta$ . Hence the eigenvalue of  $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_\beta(0)$  on  $\mathfrak{k}_\beta(1) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k)$  equals  $1/2$ , see Corollary 3.2. Using the transition factor  $T = \frac{h^*(\mathfrak{k})}{h^* \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})}$  (cf. Theorem 3.6), we obtain

$$(3.2) \quad \gamma_\alpha(k) = \frac{h^*(\mathfrak{k})}{2h^* \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})}.$$

On the other hand,  $|\Delta_\alpha(k)| = q_\alpha(k)\varphi_\alpha = h^*(\mathfrak{k})\overline{\varphi}_\beta$ . Hence  $h^*(\mathfrak{k})\overline{\varphi}_\beta = q_\alpha(k) \cdot k \cdot \frac{(\alpha, \alpha)}{(\beta, \beta)} \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\beta$  and

$$(3.3) \quad q_\alpha(k) = \frac{h^*(\mathfrak{k})}{k} \cdot \frac{(\beta, \beta)}{(\alpha, \alpha)}.$$

Combining Eq. (3.2) and (3.3) yields the first assertion.

2) If  $k = d$ , then  $\beta$  is the minimal root in  $\Delta_\alpha(d)$ , which is  $W_\alpha$ -conjugate to  $\theta$ , the maximal root in  $\Delta_\alpha(d)$ . Hence  $\beta$  is long and  $\overline{\theta} = \theta$ . Therefore,  $(\beta, \beta)/(\alpha, \alpha) = r_\alpha$  and  $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{h} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g}) = 1$ , cf. Proposition 1.4.  $\square$

**Remark.** Comparing Proposition 3.12 and Corollary 3.7, we see that  $\frac{q_\alpha(d)}{\gamma_\alpha(d)} = q_\alpha + q_\alpha(d)$  is an integer.

**Example 3.13.** (1) Consider the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha_2)$ -grading of  $\mathbf{E}_8$ . Here  $d = 3$  and  $q_2 = 19$  (see Example 2.3). By Theorem 3.1,  $\gamma_{\alpha_2}(1) = 19/60$  and  $\gamma_{\alpha_2}(3) = 3/60$ . Then Corollary 3.7 shows that  $q_2(3) = (60/3) - 19 = 1$ . Hence  $q_2(1) = q_2(2) = 9$ . Now, using Theorem 3.6, we compute that  $\gamma_{\alpha_2}(2) = 18/60$ .

(2) Take the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha_2)$ -grading of  $\mathbf{F}_4$ . Here  $r_{\alpha_2} = 2$ ,  $d = 4$ , and  $q_2 = 7$ . By Theorem 3.1,  $\gamma_{\alpha_2}(1) = 7/36$  and  $\gamma_{\alpha_2}(4) = 1 - (4 \cdot 7/36) = 8/36$ . Then Corollary 3.7 shows that  $q_2(4) = (2 \cdot 9 \cdot 2/4) - 7 = 2$ . Since  $q_2(1) = q_2(3)$  and  $q_2(4) + q_2(1) = q_2(2)$ , one computes the remaining  $q_2(j)$ 's. Finally, Theorem 3.6 implies that  $\gamma_{\alpha_2}(2) = 10/36$  and  $\gamma_{\alpha_2}(3) = 3/36$ .

The complete calculations of the eigenvalues  $\{\gamma_\alpha(i)\}$  and integers  $\{q_\alpha(i)\}$  for all  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings are gathered in Appendix A.

#### 4. EIGENVALUES OF $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ IN $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ AND ABELIAN SUBSPACES OF $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$

In this section, we relate eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  to dimensions of abelian subspaces (= commutative subalgebras) of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . The key role is played by the inequality  $\gamma_\alpha(2) < 2\gamma_\alpha(1)$ , see Prop. 3.10. As an application of our theory, we prove that if  $d_\alpha > 1$  and  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is an abelian subspace, i.e.,  $[\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}] = 0$ , then  $\dim \mathfrak{a} \leq \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)/2$ . Our results up to Proposition 4.6 are parallel to results of [17, Sect. 4] that concern the case of  $\mathbb{Z}_m$ -gradings. Furthermore, most proofs therein can readily be adapted to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded setting. For this reason, we omit some details.

Let us recall some basic facts on the complexes  $(\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}, \partial)$  and  $(\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}, d)$ . We identify  $\mathfrak{g}$  with  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ , using  $\Phi$ , and consider  $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$  with the usual differentials:

$$d : \bigwedge^l \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \bigwedge^{l+1} \mathfrak{g} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial : \bigwedge^l \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \bigwedge^{l-1} \mathfrak{g}.$$

Here

$$\partial(x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_l) := \sum_{i < j} (-1)^{i+j-1} [x_i, x_j] \wedge x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{x}_i \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{x}_j \wedge \dots \wedge x_l$$

for  $l \geq 2$  and  $\partial(x_1) = 0$ . In particular,  $\partial(x_1 \wedge x_2) = [x_1, x_2]$ .

We regard  $\Phi$  as having been extended, in the usual way, via determinants, from  $\mathfrak{g}$  to  $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$ . More precisely, denoting the extension of  $\Phi$  to  $\bigwedge^l \mathfrak{g}$  by  $\Phi^{(l)}$ , we have

$$\Phi^{(l)}(x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_l, y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_l) := \det \|\Phi(x_i, y_j)\|.$$

Then  $d = -\partial^t$ . For  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ , let  $\varepsilon(x)$  be the exterior product operator and  $i(x)$  the interior product operator in  $\bigwedge \mathfrak{g}$ . That is,

$$\varepsilon(x) \cdot x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_l := x \wedge x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_l,$$

$$i(x) \cdot x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_l := \sum_{i=1}^l (-1)^{i-1} \Phi(x, x_i) x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{x}_i \wedge \dots \wedge x_l.$$

Let  $\vartheta$  denote the natural extension of the adjoint representation of  $\mathfrak{g}$  to  $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$ :

$$\vartheta(x) \cdot x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_l := \sum_{i=1}^l x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge [x, x_i] \wedge \dots \wedge x_l.$$



These operators satisfy the following relations for all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ :

$$(4.1) \quad [d, \vartheta(x)] = 0, \quad [\partial, \vartheta(x)] = 0, \quad \varepsilon(x)\partial + \partial\varepsilon(x) = \vartheta(x).$$

Let  $e_1, \dots, e_N$  be a basis for  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $e'_1, \dots, e'_N$  the dual basis. After Koszul [13, 3.4], it is known that

$$(4.2) \quad d = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon(e'_i) \vartheta(e_i).$$

Combining Eq. (4.1) and (4.2) yields

$$2(d\partial + \partial d) = \sum_{i=1}^N \vartheta(e'_i) \vartheta(e_i) = \vartheta(\mathcal{C}),$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the Casimir element for  $\mathfrak{g}$ . In the general  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded situation, we choose a basis  $\mathbb{B} = (e_1, \dots, e_N)$  compatible with grading, which means that  $\mathbb{B} \cap \mathfrak{g}(i)$  is a basis for  $\mathfrak{g}(i)$  for each  $i$ . Let  $\mathbb{B}' = (e'_1, \dots, e'_N)$  be the dual basis. Since  $\mathfrak{g}(i)^* \simeq \mathfrak{g}(-i)$ , we have  $(\mathbb{B} \cap \mathfrak{g}(i))' = \mathbb{B}' \cap \mathfrak{g}(-i)$  is a basis for  $\mathfrak{g}(-i)$ . Any compatible basis yields a splitting of the differential:  $d = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} d_i$ , where

$$d_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j: e_j \in \mathfrak{g}(i)} \varepsilon(e'_j) \vartheta(e_j).$$

Note that  $d_i(\mathfrak{g}(j)) \subset \begin{cases} \mathfrak{g}(i) \otimes \mathfrak{g}(j-i), & i \neq j/2 \\ \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}(i), & i = j/2 \end{cases} \subset \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$ . In particular,  $d_1(\mathfrak{g}(2)) \subset \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}(1)$ .

The key technical result for  $\mathfrak{g}(1)$  and  $d_1$  is

**Proposition 4.1.** (i) Let  $(e_1, \dots, e_s)$  be a basis for  $\mathfrak{g}(1)$  and  $(e'_1, \dots, e'_s)$  the dual basis for  $\mathfrak{g}(-1)$ . For any  $y, z \in \mathfrak{g}(1)$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^s [e_i, y] \wedge [e'_i, z] = -d_1([y, z]).$$

(ii) For any  $x \in \mathfrak{g}(2)$  and  $u, v \in \mathfrak{g}(-1)$ , we have  $\Phi^{(2)}(d_1(x), u \wedge v) = -\Phi(x, \partial(u \wedge v))$ .

*Proof.* The argument is essentially the same as in the proof of the similar results for  $\mathbb{Z}_m$ -gradings, see Proposition 4.1 and Eq. (4.4) in [17].  $\square$

The above assertion holds for any  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading. Below, we again assume that  $\mathfrak{g}(i) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$  for some  $\alpha \in \Pi$  and consider related eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** Any  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalue in  $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is at most  $2\gamma_\alpha(1)$ . The eigenspace for  $2\gamma_\alpha(1)$  is spanned by the bi-vectors  $y \wedge z$  such that  $[y, z] = 0$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)(y \wedge z) = (\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)y) \wedge z + y \wedge (\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)z) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^s [e_i, y] \wedge [e'_i, z] = 2\gamma_\alpha(1) \cdot y \wedge z - 2\mathbf{d}_1([y, z]).$$

By [10, Prop. 4] and [17, Theorem 3.2], the maximal eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  in  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is attained on decomposable polyvectors. So, we may assume that  $y \wedge z$  is a  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvector.

- Assume that  $[y, z] \neq 0$ . Since  $[y, z] = \partial(y \wedge z)$  and  $\partial$  is  $\mathfrak{g}$ -equivariant, the  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalues of  $y \wedge z$  and  $[y, z]$  are equal. As  $[y, z] \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2)$ , its eigenvalue equals  $\gamma_\alpha(2)$ . We also know that  $\gamma_\alpha(2) < 2\gamma_\alpha(1)$ , see Proposition 3.10.

- If  $[y, z] = 0$ , then  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)(y \wedge z) = 2\gamma_\alpha(1) \cdot y \wedge z$ . □

Actually, there is a more precise result for  $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}_2 = \text{span}\{y \wedge z \in \bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \mid [y, z] = 0\}$ . Then*

- (i)  $\mathcal{A}_2 = \text{Ker}(\partial|_{\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)})$ ;
- (ii)  $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) = \mathcal{A}_2 \oplus \mathbf{d}_1(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2))$ ; hence  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  has at most two eigenvalues in  $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .

*Proof.* (i) If  $u = \sum_i y_i \wedge z_i$ , then

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)u = 2\gamma_\alpha(1) \cdot u - 2 \sum_i \mathbf{d}_1([y_i, z_i]) = 2\gamma_\alpha(1) \cdot u - 2\mathbf{d}_1(\partial u).$$

Therefore, if  $\partial(u) = 0$ , then  $u \in \mathcal{A}_2$  in view of Proposition 4.2. Hence  $\text{Ker}(\partial|_{\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)}) \subset \mathcal{A}_2$ , and the opposite inclusion is obvious.

(ii) Since  $\mathbf{d}_1 : \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2) \rightarrow \bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -equivariant, the eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  in  $\mathbf{d}_1(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2))$ , which is  $\gamma_\alpha(2)$ , is strictly less than  $2\gamma_\alpha(1)$ . Therefore, we have  $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) = \mathcal{A}_2 \oplus \mathbf{d}_1(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2)) \oplus \mathbb{U}$  with some  $\mathbb{U}$ . Then it follows from (i) that  $\partial(\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)) = \partial(\mathbf{d}_1(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2))) \oplus \partial\mathbb{U}$  and  $\dim \partial(\mathbf{d}_1(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2))) = \dim(\mathbf{d}_1(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2)))$ . Using Proposition 4.1(ii), we see that  $\dim(\mathbf{d}_1(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2))) = \dim \partial(\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(-1)) = \dim(\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1))$ . Hence  $\partial\mathbb{U} = 0$  and then  $\mathbb{U} = 0$ . □

*Remark 4.4.* It follows from Theorem 4.3 that

$$\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \simeq \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2) \iff \mathcal{A}_2 = 0 \iff \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \text{ has no 2-dim abelian subspaces.}$$

This possibility does materialise for the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings  $(\mathbf{B}_n, \alpha_n)$  and  $(\mathbf{G}_2, \alpha_1)$ .

The following is a natural generalisation of Proposition 4.2.

**Theorem 4.5.** *For any  $k \geq 1$ , the maximal eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  in  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is at most  $k\gamma_\alpha(1)$ . This bound is attained if and only if  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  contains a  $k$ -dimensional commutative subalgebra. In that case, the eigenspace belonging to  $k\gamma_\alpha(1)$  is spanned by the polyvectors  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{a}$ , where  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is  $k$ -dimensional and  $[\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}] = 0$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of the similar result related to  $\mathbb{Z}_m$ -gradings goes through *mutatis mutandis* (cf. [17, Theorem 4.4]). Following ideas of Kostant [10], one has to use a compact real form of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and a related Hermitian inner product on  $\mathfrak{g}$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{A}_k$  be the subspace of  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  spanned by the “ $k$ -dimensional commutative subalgebras”, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \text{span}\{y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_k \mid y_i \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \text{ \& } [y_i, y_j] = 0 \ \forall i, j\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{A}_k$  is a  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -submodule of  $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .

**Proposition 4.6.**  *$\mathcal{A}$  is a multiplicity-free  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module.*

*Proof.* Set  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0) = \mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ . If  $\lambda$  is a highest weight in  $\mathcal{A}$  w.r.t.  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ , then there is a  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable abelian subspace  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  such that the set of  $\mathfrak{t}$ -roots of  $\mathfrak{a}$  is  $\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}} = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l\}$  and  $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^l \mu_i$ ; and vice versa. The  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -invariance of  $\mathfrak{a}$  means that  $\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}$  is an *upper*  $\Delta_\alpha^+(0)$ -ideal in the sense that if  $\mu_i + \eta \in \Delta^+$  for some  $\eta \in \Delta_\alpha^+(0)$ , then  $\mu_i + \eta \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}$ .

Assume that there are two  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable commutative subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  whose dominant weights coincide. That is,  $\mathfrak{a} \sim \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}} = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l\}$ ,  $\mathfrak{a}' \sim \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}'} = \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m\}$ , and  $\sum \mu_i = \sum \nu_j$ . Removing the common elements of these two sets, we have

$$|\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}} \setminus \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}'}| = |\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}'} \setminus \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}|$$

Hence  $(|\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}} \setminus \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}'}|, |\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}'} \setminus \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}|) > 0$  and there are  $\mu_i \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}} \setminus \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}'}, \nu_j \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}'} \setminus \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}$  such that  $(\mu_i, \nu_j) > 0$ . Then  $\mu_i - \nu_j \in \Delta_\alpha(0)$ , since  $\text{ht}_\alpha(\mu_i) = \text{ht}_\alpha(\nu_j)$ . If, for instance,  $\nu_j - \mu_i$  is positive, then  $\nu_j \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}$ . A contradiction!  $\square$

If  $d_\alpha = 1$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is commutative. Conversely, if  $d_\alpha \geq 2$ , then  $[\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1), \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)] = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2)$ , i.e.,  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is **not** commutative. From our theory, we derive a more precise assertion.

**Theorem 4.7.** *For any  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , one has*

- either  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is abelian (which happens if and only if  $d_\alpha = 1$ );
- or  $\dim \mathfrak{a} \leq \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  for any abelian subspace  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that if  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  contains an abelian subspace  $\mathfrak{a}$  such that  $\dim \mathfrak{a} > \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is abelian.

Set  $m = \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  and let  $\delta_\alpha(k)$  be the maximal eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$  on  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . Then  $\delta_\alpha(1) = \gamma_\alpha(1)$  and we have proved that  $\delta_\alpha(k) \leq k\gamma_\alpha(1)$  for any  $k$ . Note that  $\delta_\alpha(m)$  is just the eigenvalue on the 1-dimensional module  $\bigwedge^m \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .

Write  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0) = \mathfrak{s} \oplus \langle h_\alpha \rangle$ , where  $\mathfrak{s}$  is semisimple and  $h_\alpha$  is the element of the centre that has the eigenvalue  $k$  on  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k)$ . Then  $h_\alpha$  also has eigenvalue  $k$  on  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . We have

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{C}_\alpha(0) = \mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{s} + h_\alpha h'_\alpha = \mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{s} + h_\alpha^2 / (h_\alpha, h_\alpha).$$

Since  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  and  $\bigwedge^{m-k} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  are isomorphic as  $\mathfrak{s}$ -modules, their  $\mathcal{C}_\mathfrak{s}$ -eigenvalues coincide; the difference in  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalues comes the presence of the last summand.

An easy observation is that if the summand  $h_\alpha^2/(h_\alpha, h_\alpha)$  has the eigenvalue  $\chi$  on  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , then its eigenvalue on  $\bigwedge^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is  $k^2\chi$ .

Assume that  $k < m/2$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  has a commutative subalgebra of dimension  $m - k$ . Then it has a  $k$ -dimensional commutative subalgebra, too. Hence  $\delta_\alpha(k) = k\gamma_\alpha(1)$  and  $\delta_\alpha(m - k) = (m - k)\gamma_\alpha(1)$ . Let  $F_i$  be the maximal eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{C}_s$  on  $\bigwedge^i \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . Then  $F_i = F_{m-i}$  and, using the decomposition in (4.3), we can write

$$\begin{cases} \delta_\alpha(k) &= F_k + k^2\chi = k\gamma_\alpha(1), \\ \delta_\alpha(m - k) &= F_k + (m - k)^2\chi = (m - k)\gamma_\alpha(1). \end{cases}$$

Taking the difference yields  $m(m - 2k)\chi = (m - 2k)\gamma_\alpha(1)$ . Note also that  $F_0 = F_m = 0$ , since  $\bigwedge^m \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is a trivial  $\mathfrak{s}$ -module. Hence  $\delta_\alpha(m) = m^2\chi = m\gamma_\alpha(1)$ . By Theorem 4.5, this means that  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is commutative.  $\square$

*Remark 4.8.* It was recently noticed that, for any nilpotent element  $e \in \mathfrak{g}$  and the associated Dynkin  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading (so that  $e \in \mathfrak{g}(2)$ ), one has  $\dim \mathfrak{a} \leq (\dim \mathfrak{g}(1))/2$  whenever  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}(1)$  and  $[\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}] = 0$ , see [5, Prop. 3.1]. In this case,  $\dim \mathfrak{g}(1)$  is necessarily even. However, there are  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings of height  $\geq 2$  that are not Dynkin gradings, and it can also happen that  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is odd.

In fact, conversations with A.G. Elashvili on results of [5] revived my memory of [17] and triggered my interest to eigenvalues of the Casimir elements related to Levi subalgebras and  $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings.

*Remark 4.9.* For an arbitrary  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , it can happen that  $\mathfrak{g}(1)$  is not abelian, but  $\dim \mathfrak{a} > \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}(1)$  for some abelian  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}(1)$ . Suppose that a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i)$  is given by a function  $\mathbf{f} : \Pi \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , i.e.,  $\mathfrak{g}^\alpha \subset \mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{f}(\alpha))$ , cf. [3, Ch. 3, §3.5]. Set  $\Pi_1 = \{\alpha \mid \mathbf{f}(\alpha) = 1\}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{g}(1) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Pi_1} \mathcal{V}(\alpha)$ , where  $\mathcal{V}(\alpha)$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}(0)$ -module with **lowest** weight  $\alpha$ . The set of weights of  $\mathcal{V}(\alpha)$  is

$$\{\gamma \in \Delta^+ \mid \text{ht}_\alpha(\gamma) = 1 \ \& \ \text{ht}_\beta(\gamma) = 0 \ \forall \beta \in \Pi_1 \setminus \{\alpha\}\}.$$

Take, for instance,  $\Pi_1 = \{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}$  for  $\mathbf{A}_6$ . Then both  $\mathcal{V}(\alpha_2)$  and  $\mathcal{V}(\alpha_4)$  are abelian, of different dimension, but  $0 \neq [\mathcal{V}(\alpha_2), \mathcal{V}(\alpha_4)] = \mathcal{V}(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4) \subset \mathfrak{g}(2)$ . Here  $6 = \dim \mathcal{V}_{\alpha_4} > \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}(1) = 5$ .

Below, we elaborate on some numerology related to the numbers  $q_\alpha(i)$ ,  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ ,  $(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)$ ,  $\delta_\alpha(m)$ , etc. Recall that  $m = \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .

Let  $C = (c_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha, \beta \in \Pi}$  be the inverse of the Cartan matrix of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then  $\varphi_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} c_{\alpha\beta} \beta$ . Therefore,  $(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = c_{\alpha\alpha}(\varphi_\alpha, \alpha) = c_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha, \alpha)/2 = c_{\alpha\alpha}/2h^*r_\alpha$ .

**Proposition 4.10.** *For any  $\alpha \in \Pi$ , we have  $\delta_\alpha(m) = q_\alpha(1)^2(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)$ .*

*Proof.* The weight of the 1-dimensional  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module  $\bigwedge^m \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is  $|\Delta_\alpha(1)| = q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha$ . Since  $(\varphi_\alpha, 2\rho) = q_\alpha(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\alpha(m) &= (q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha, q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha + 2\rho_\alpha(0)) = q_\alpha(1)(\varphi_\alpha, |\Delta_\alpha(0)| + |\Delta_\alpha(1)|) \\ &= q_\alpha(1)(\varphi_\alpha, 2\rho - \sum_{i \geq 2} |\Delta_\alpha(i)|) = q_\alpha(1)(\varphi_\alpha, 2\rho - (q_\alpha - q_\alpha(1))\varphi_\alpha) \\ &= q_\alpha(1)(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) \cdot (q_\alpha - (q_\alpha - q_\alpha(1))) = q_\alpha(1)^2 \cdot (\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 4.11.**

- (i) If  $\varphi_\alpha$  is cominuscule, then  $(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = m/2(h^*)^2$ ,  $\delta_\alpha(m) = m/2$ , and  $m = c_{\alpha\alpha}h^*$ .
- (ii) If  $\theta$  is fundamental and  $(\hat{\alpha}, \theta) \neq 0$ , then  $(\varphi_{\hat{\alpha}}, \varphi_{\hat{\alpha}}) = 1/h^*$  and  $\delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(m) = (h^* - 2)^2/h^*$ .

*Proof.* (i) Here  $r_\alpha = 1$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is commutative, hence  $q_\alpha = q_\alpha(1) = h^*$ ,  $\gamma_\alpha(1) = 1/2$ , and  $\delta_\alpha(k) = k/2$  for every  $k$ . Then  $(h^*)^2(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = m/2$ , and we are done.

(ii) Here  $q_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) = h^* - 2$  (cf. the proof of Corollary 3.2(iii)) and  $\varphi_{\hat{\alpha}} = \theta$ , i.e.,  $(\varphi_{\hat{\alpha}}, \varphi_{\hat{\alpha}}) = 1/h^*$ . Note also that here  $c_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\alpha}} = \text{ht}_{\hat{\alpha}}(\theta) = 2$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.12.** For any  $\alpha \in \Pi$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\text{ht}_\alpha(|\Delta_\alpha(k)|) = k \cdot \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k) = c_{\alpha\alpha}q_\alpha(k).$$

*Proof.* Since  $(\nu, \varphi_\alpha) = k(\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)$  for any  $\nu \in \Delta_\alpha(k)$  and  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k) = \#\Delta_\alpha(k)$ , we have  $(|\Delta_\alpha(k)|, \varphi_\alpha) = k \cdot \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k)(\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)$ . On the other hand,

$$(|\Delta_\alpha(k)|, \varphi_\alpha) = (\text{ht}_\alpha(|\Delta_\alpha(k)|)\alpha + \dots, \varphi_\alpha) = \text{ht}_\alpha(|\Delta_\alpha(k)|) \cdot (\alpha, \varphi_\alpha),$$

which gives the first equality. Likewise,

$$(|\Delta_\alpha(k)|, \varphi_\alpha) = q_\alpha(k) \cdot (\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = q_\alpha(k) \cdot c_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha, \varphi_\alpha). \quad \square$$

**Corollary 4.13.** The ratio  $(k \cdot \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(k))/q_\alpha(k) = c_{\alpha\alpha}$  does not depend on  $k$ . In particular, any linear relation between the  $q_\alpha(i)$ 's translates into a linear relation between the  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ 's.

**Example.** By Proposition 3.8, one has  $q_\alpha(d-i) = q_\alpha(i)$ . Hence  $(d-i) \cdot \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(d-i) = i \cdot \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$ . In particular,  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(d-1) = \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)/(d-1)$ .

## 5. MAXIMAL ABELIAN SUBSPACES AND APPLICATIONS

We say that  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  has an *abelian subspace of half-dimension*, if there is  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  such that  $[\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}] = 0$  and  $\dim \mathfrak{a} = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . First we discuss some consequences of this property.

**Proposition 5.1.** Suppose that  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  has an abelian subspace of half-dimension,  $m = \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , and  $k \leq m/2$ . Then  $\delta_\alpha(k) = k\gamma_\alpha(1)$  and

$$(5.1) \quad \delta_\alpha(m-k) = k\gamma_\alpha(1) + (m-2k) \frac{q_\alpha(1)}{2h^*r_\alpha}.$$

*Proof.* The first relation follows from Theorem 4.5. Next, we know that  $\delta_\alpha(k) = F_k + k^2\chi$ , see the proof of Theorem 4.7. Hence  $F_k = k\gamma_\alpha(1) - k^2\chi$ . Since  $F_k = F_{m-k}$ , we obtain

$$(5.2) \quad \delta_\alpha(m-k) = F_{m-k} + (m-k)^2\chi = F_k + (m-k)^2\chi = k\gamma_\alpha(1) + m(m-2k)\chi.$$

As  $F_0 = F_m = 0$ , we compute  $\chi$  and  $\delta_\alpha(m)$  using the numerology of Section 4:

$$m^2\chi = \delta_\alpha(m) = q_\alpha(1)^2 \cdot (\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = q_\alpha(1)^2 \cdot c_{\alpha\alpha} \cdot (\alpha, \alpha)/2 = \frac{mq_\alpha(1)}{2h^*r_\alpha}.$$

Here the relation  $q_\alpha(1) \cdot c_{\alpha\alpha} = \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is used, see Prop. 4.12. Thus,  $m\chi = \frac{q_\alpha(1)}{2h^*r_\alpha}$  and plugging this into Eq. (5.2) yields Eq. (5.1).  $\square$

**Remark.** We obtain here a formula for  $\delta_\alpha(i)$  for **all**  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . More generally, if  $\max(\dim \mathfrak{a}) = r \leq m/2$ , then the same argument yields  $\delta_\alpha(i)$  for  $i \leq r$  and  $i \geq m-r$ .

**Corollary 5.2.** *Under the above assumptions,*

- (i) *if  $q_\alpha > 2q_\alpha(1)$ , then  $\max_i \{\delta_\alpha(i)\} = \delta_\alpha(m/2)$  and the sequence  $\{\delta_\alpha(i)\}$  is unimodal;*
- (ii) *if  $q_\alpha = 2q_\alpha(1)$ , then the sequence  $\{\delta_\alpha(i)\}$  stabilises after  $i = m/2$ ;*
- (iii) *if  $q_\alpha < 2q_\alpha(1)$ , then  $\max_i \{\delta_\alpha(i)\} = \delta_\alpha(m)$  and the sequence  $\{\delta_\alpha(i)\}$  strictly increases.*

Furthermore, if  $d_\alpha \geq 3$ , then case (i) always occurs.

*Proof.* The sequence  $\{\delta_\alpha(i)\}$  clearly increases for  $1 \leq i \leq m/2$ . By Theorem 3.1, one has  $\gamma_\alpha(1) = q_\alpha/2h^*r_\alpha$ . Hence the coefficient of  $k$  in Eq. (5.1) equals  $(q_\alpha - 2q_\alpha(1))/2h^*r_\alpha$ . This settles (i)–(iii).

By Proposition 3.8,  $q_\alpha(1) = q_\alpha(d_\alpha - 1)$  for  $d_\alpha \geq 2$ . Hence  $q_\alpha > 2q_\alpha(1)$  whenever  $d_\alpha \geq 3$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.3.** 1) If  $d_\alpha = 2$ , then all three possibilities may occur, cf. the good cases  $(\mathbf{D}_n, \alpha_i)$  for  $2 \leq i \leq n-2$  and sufficiently large  $n$ . (Use data from Table 2.)

2) Suppose that  $\theta$  is fundamental, i.e.,  $\theta = \varphi_{\hat{\alpha}}$ . Then  $\hat{\alpha} \in \Pi_l$ ,  $d_{\hat{\alpha}} = 2$ , and  $\Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(2) = \{\theta\}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(\geq 1)$  is a Heisenberg Lie algebra, see [7, Sect. 2],  $\mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(1)$  has an abelian subspace of half-dimension and the above computation applies. Here  $m = 2h^* - 4$ ,  $q_{\hat{\alpha}} = h^* - 1$ , and  $q_{\hat{\alpha}}(2) = 1$ . Since  $\theta$  is fundamental,  $h^* \geq 4$  and hence  $q_{\hat{\alpha}} < 2q_{\hat{\alpha}}(1)$ . Then  $\gamma_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) = (h^* - 1)/2h^*$  and  $\chi = 1/(4h^*)$ . Thus, for  $k \leq m/2 = h^* - 2$ , we obtain  $\delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(k) = k \frac{(h^* - 1)}{2h^*}$  and

$$\delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(m-k) = k \frac{(h^* - 1)}{2h^*} + \frac{m(m-2k)}{4h^*} = \frac{(h^* - 2)^2}{h^*} - k \frac{h^* - 3}{2h^*}.$$

3) For  $\mathbf{C}_n$  and  $n \geq 2$ , we have  $\theta = 2\varphi_1$  and  $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha_1$  is short. Here one computes that  $2q_{\alpha_1}(1) > q_{\alpha_1}$  for  $n > 2$  and  $\chi = 1/(4h^*)$ .

Another application of our theory, especially of Theorem 4.5, is the following result.

**Theorem 5.4.** *If  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  is an abelian subspace and  $\dim \mathfrak{a} = (1/2) \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , then there is an abelian subspace  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$  such that  $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{a}} = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .*



*Proof.* As above,  $m = \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  and  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0) = \mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ .

1. Assume that  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable abelian subspace. In particular,  $\mathfrak{a}$  is  $\mathfrak{t}$ -stable. Therefore, there is a unique  $\mathfrak{t}$ -stable complement  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$  to  $\mathfrak{a}$  in  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . Then  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$  is  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable. Choose nonzero (poly)vectors  $y \in \bigwedge^{m/2} \mathfrak{a}$  and  $\tilde{y} \in \bigwedge^{m/2} \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$ . Then  $y$  (resp.  $\tilde{y}$ ) is a highest (resp. lowest) weight vector in the  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$ -module  $\bigwedge^{m/2} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . If  $\text{wt}(\cdot)$  stands for the  $\mathfrak{t}$ -weight of a (poly)vector, then

$$\text{wt}(y) + \text{wt}(\tilde{y}) = |\Delta_\alpha(1)| = q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha.$$

As was already computed in Proposition 4.10,

$$\delta_\alpha(m) = (q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha, q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha + 2\rho_\alpha(0)) = q_\alpha(1)^2(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) = \frac{mq_\alpha(1)}{2h^*r_\alpha}.$$

Since  $y$  is a highest weight vector in  $\bigwedge^{m/2} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  and  $\mathfrak{a}$  is an abelian subspace,

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)(y) = (\text{wt}(y), \text{wt}(y) + 2\rho_\alpha(0)) \cdot y = \frac{m}{2}\gamma_\alpha(1) \cdot y.$$

On the other hand,  $\text{wt}(\tilde{y})$  is anti-dominant w.r.t.  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ . Hence the weight  $w_{\alpha,0}(\text{wt}(\tilde{y}))$  is already dominant and the  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)$ -eigenvalue of  $\tilde{y}$  equals

$$\begin{aligned} (w_{\alpha,0}(\text{wt}(\tilde{y})), w_{\alpha,0}(\text{wt}(\tilde{y})) + 2\rho_\alpha(0)) &= (\text{wt}(\tilde{y}), \text{wt}(\tilde{y}) - 2\rho_\alpha(0)) \\ &= (q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha - \text{wt}(y), q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha - \text{wt}(y) - 2\rho_\alpha(0)) \\ &= q_\alpha(1)^2(\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) - 2(q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha, \text{wt}(y) + \rho_\alpha(0)) + (\text{wt}(y), \text{wt}(y) + 2\rho_\alpha(0)) \\ &= \frac{mq_\alpha(1)}{2h^*r_\alpha} - 2(q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha, \text{wt}(y)) + \frac{m}{2}\gamma_\alpha(1) \\ &= \frac{mq_\alpha(1)}{2h^*r_\alpha} - 2q_\alpha(1) \cdot \frac{m}{2} \cdot (\varphi_\alpha, \alpha) + \frac{m}{2}\gamma_\alpha(1) = \frac{m}{2}\gamma_\alpha(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the facts that  $(\varphi_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(0)) = 0$  and  $(\varphi_\alpha, \gamma) = (\varphi_\alpha, \alpha) = (\alpha, \alpha)/2$  for any  $\gamma \in \Delta_\alpha(1)$ . By Theorem 4.5, the equality  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(0)(\tilde{y}) = \frac{m}{2}\gamma_\alpha(1) \cdot \tilde{y}$  for an  $m/2$ -vector  $\tilde{y}$  means that the  $m/2$ -dimensional subspace  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$  is abelian.

2. If  $\mathfrak{a}$  is not  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable, then we consider the  $B_\alpha(0)$ -orbit of  $\{\mathfrak{a}\}$  in the Grassmannian of  $m/2$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . By the Borel fixed-point theorem, the closure of this orbit contains a  $B_\alpha(0)$ -fixed point, i.e., a  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable (abelian) subspace, say  $\mathfrak{a}_1$ . If  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1$  is the complementary abelian subspace for  $\mathfrak{a}_1$ , as in part 1, then, by continuity, it is also a complementary subspace for some element of the orbit  $B_\alpha(0) \cdot \{\mathfrak{a}\}$ .  $\square$

Previous results show that it is helpful to know whether  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  has an abelian subspace of half-dimension, if  $d_\alpha > 1$ . We say that  $\alpha \in \Pi$  is *good* if this is the case; otherwise,  $\alpha$  is *bad*. In many cases, a  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -grading is also the Dynkin grading associated with a *strictly odd* nilpotent element of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , see [5, Sect. 1]. Then the relevant good cases have been determined in [5]. However, some work is still needed for the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings that are not Dynkin. For instance, if  $\mathfrak{g}$  is exceptional, then one has to handle the possibilities  $(\mathbf{E}_7, \alpha_3 \text{ or } \alpha_7)$  and

$(\mathbf{E}_6, \alpha_2 \text{ or } \alpha_4)$ . Combining our computations with [5], we describe below the bad cases for all  $\mathfrak{g}$ . For each bad case, the maximal dimension of an abelian subspace,  $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\max}$ , is given. Note that in order to compute  $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\max}$ , it suffices to consider only  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable abelian subspaces of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , cf. part 2) in the proof of Theorem 5.4.

- For the classical series, we have  $d_\alpha \leq 2$ . If  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$  or  $\mathfrak{so}_{2n}$ , then all  $\alpha \in \Pi$  with  $d_\alpha = 2$  are good. If  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$ ,  $n \geq 3$ , then the bad cases occur for  $\alpha_i$  with  $3 \leq i \leq n$ . Here  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_i}(1) = 2i(n-i) + i$  and  $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\max} = i(n-i) + 1$ . Note also that, for  $\mathfrak{so}_{2n}$  and  $\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$ , the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha_i)$ -grading is Dynkin and associated with a strictly odd nilpotent if and only if  $i$  is even (and  $d_{\alpha_i} = 2$ ).

- For the exceptional algebras, we gather the bad cases in Table 1, where we write  $m_\alpha$  for  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .

TABLE 1. Exceptional Lie algebras, the bad cases

$\mathfrak{g}$	$\alpha$	$d_\alpha$	$m_\alpha$	$\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\max}$	[5]	$\mathfrak{g}$	$\alpha$	$d_\alpha$	$m_\alpha$	$\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\max}$	[5]
$\mathbf{E}_7$	$\alpha_3$	3	30	12	-	$\mathbf{E}_8$	$\alpha_3$	4	48	16	+
	$\alpha_7$	2	35	15	-		$\alpha_4$	5	40	16	+
$\mathbf{F}_4$	$\alpha_1$	2	8	2	+		$\alpha_7$	2	64	22	+
	$\alpha_2$	4	6	2	+		$\alpha_8$	3	56	21	+

The data in Table 1 also mean that the non-Dynkin cases  $(\mathbf{E}_6, \alpha_2 \text{ or } \alpha_4)$  are good, cf. also Example 5.9(2). The signs  $+/-$  indicate whether that item represents a Dynkin grading (= is considered in [5]).

Our methods for constructing abelian subspaces of  $\mathfrak{g}(1)$ , partly for arbitrary  $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings, are described below. This provides another approach to some of calculations in [5] and also natural descriptions of abelian subspaces of maximal dimension.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=-2}^2 \mathfrak{g}(i)$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading of height 2 and  $\mathfrak{b}(0)$  a Borel subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}(0)$ . If  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a  $\mathfrak{b}(0)$ -stable abelian subspace of  $\mathfrak{g}(1)$ , then  $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2)$  is an abelian  $\mathfrak{b}$ -ideal of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , where  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}(0) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(1) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2)$ . In particular, if  $\dim \mathfrak{a}$  is maximal, then  $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2)$  is a maximal abelian  $\mathfrak{b}$ -ideal.*

Since the maximal abelian  $\mathfrak{b}$ -ideals are known [19, Sect. 4], one readily obtains an upper bound on  $\dim \mathfrak{a}$ . Actually, this allows us to determine  $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\max}$  for all  $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings of height 2. The next observation applies to  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings of any height.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Given  $\alpha \in \Pi$ , suppose that  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2) \cap \mathfrak{g}_\beta(2) = \{0\}$  for some  $\beta \in \Pi$ . Then  $\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\beta} := \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \cap \mathfrak{g}_\beta(1)$  is abelian. Moreover, if also  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \cap \mathfrak{g}_\beta(2) = \{0\}$ , then  $\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\beta}$  is a  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable abelian subspace of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .*

The proof is straightforward and left to the reader.

There are interesting instances of such phenomenon and we provide below some illustrations to our method. It turns out *a posteriori* that the two assumptions of the above proposition imply that  $d_\beta < d_\alpha$ . However, even if Proposition 5.6 applies, then the abelian subspace  $\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\beta}$  does not necessarily have the maximal dimension.

*Remark 5.7.* (i) Note that  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \cap \mathfrak{g}_\beta(1) \neq \{0\}$  for **all** pairs  $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset \Pi$ . For, take the unique chain in the Dynkin diagram joining  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The sum of simple roots in this chain is a root, denoted by  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ , and it is clear that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta} \in \Delta_\alpha(1) \cap \Delta_\beta(1)$ . Clearly,  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0) \cap \mathfrak{g}_\beta(0)$  is a Levi subalgebra in  $\mathfrak{p}_\alpha \cap \mathfrak{p}_\beta$  and the set of simple roots of  $\mathfrak{h}$  is  $\Pi \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}$ . By [12, Theorem 0.1] (cf. Section 1.3),  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i) \cap \mathfrak{g}_\beta(j)$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module for any  $(i, j)$ . Obviously,  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}$  is the lowest weight of the  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module  $\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\beta}$ , so it is an easy task to compute  $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\beta}$  for any pair  $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset \Pi$ .

(ii) if  $d_\beta = 1$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}_\beta(1)$  is a maximal abelian  $\mathfrak{b}$ -ideal and the assumptions of Proposition 5.6 are satisfied.

(iii) Another possibility for applying Proposition 5.6 is that in which  $d_\alpha \geq 3$  (hence  $\mathfrak{g}$  is exceptional) and  $\beta = \hat{\alpha}$  is the unique simple root such that  $(\theta, \hat{\alpha}) \neq 0$ . Then  $\Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(2) = \{\theta\}$ , while  $\text{ht}_\alpha(\theta) \geq 3$ . Hence  $\Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(2) \cap (\Delta_\alpha(1) \cup \Delta_\alpha(2)) = \emptyset$ .

**Example 5.8.** 1) Let  $\theta$  be a multiple of a fundamental weight (i.e.,  $\Delta$  is not of type  $\mathbf{A}_n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ) and, as usual,  $(\theta, \hat{\alpha}) \neq 0$ . For the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \hat{\alpha})$ -grading, one has  $d_{\hat{\alpha}} = 2$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(2) = \mathfrak{g}^\theta$ , and  $\mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(\geq 1)$  is a Heisenberg Lie algebra. Here  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) = 2h^* - 4$  and it follows from [18, Sect. 3] that, for any maximal abelian  $\mathfrak{b}$ -ideal  $\mathcal{J}$ , we have  $\dim(\mathcal{J} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(\geq 1)) = h^* - 1$ . Hence  $\dim(\mathcal{J} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(1)) = h^* - 2 = (1/2) \dim \mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(1)$ . Thus,  $\mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) \cap \mathcal{J}$  is an abelian  $\mathfrak{b}_{\hat{\alpha}}(0)$ -stable subspace of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  of half-dimension for **any** maximal abelian ideal  $\mathcal{J}$ . Actually, different  $\mathcal{J}$ 's yield different subspaces  $\mathfrak{g}_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) \cap \mathcal{J}$ .

2) If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is exceptional, then  $\hat{\alpha}$  is an **extreme** root in the Dynkin diagram. Let  $\alpha \in \Pi$  be the unique root adjacent to  $\hat{\alpha}$ . Then  $1 = (\theta, \hat{\alpha}^\vee) = d_{\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\alpha}^\vee) + d_\alpha(\alpha, \hat{\alpha}^\vee) = 4 - d_\alpha$ . Hence  $d_\alpha = 3$  and therefore  $\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\hat{\alpha}}$  is a  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha(0)$ -stable abelian subspace of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , cf. Proposition 5.6 and Remark 5.7(iii). We claim that  $(\mathfrak{g}, \alpha)$  is a good case. For, in this case,  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)' = \mathfrak{sl}_2 \dot{+} \mathfrak{q}$ , where  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$  corresponds to  $\hat{\alpha}$  and the simple roots of the semisimple algebra  $\mathfrak{q}$  are  $\Pi \setminus \{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}\}$ . Here  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \simeq \mathbb{k}^2 \otimes V$  as  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)'$ -module, where  $\mathbb{k}^2$  is the standard  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -module and  $V$  is a  $\mathfrak{q}$ -module. Therefore, if  $\gamma \in \Delta_\alpha(1)$ , then  $\text{ht}_{\hat{\alpha}}(\gamma) \in \{0, 1\}$ ; and if  $\text{ht}_{\hat{\alpha}}(\gamma) = 0$ , then  $\gamma + \hat{\alpha} \in \Delta_\alpha(1)$ , and vice versa. It follows that  $\Delta_\alpha(1) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\alpha}}(1) = \{\gamma \in \Delta_\alpha(1) \mid \text{ht}_{\hat{\alpha}}(\gamma) = 1\}$  contains exactly half of the roots in  $\Delta_\alpha(1)$ . Thus,  $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\hat{\alpha}} = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ .

3) For  $\mathbf{E}_n$ , one verifies that if  $\beta \in \Pi$  is **any** extreme root of the Dynkin diagram and  $\alpha$  is the unique root adjacent to  $\beta$ , then  $\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\beta}$  is abelian and  $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha,\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ . The last equality is again explained by the fact that here  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)' \simeq \mathfrak{sl}_2 \dot{+} \mathfrak{q}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \simeq \mathbb{k}^2 \otimes V$ .

**Example 5.9.** 1) For  $(\mathbf{F}_4, \alpha_1)$ , we have  $d_{\alpha_1} = 2$ ,  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_1}(1) = 8$ , and  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_1}(2) = 7$ . If  $\mathcal{J}$  is an abelian  $\mathfrak{b}$ -ideal, then  $\dim \mathcal{J} \leq 9$ . Hence  $\dim \mathfrak{a} \leq 9 - 7 = 2$ . Actually,  $\dim(\mathcal{J} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_1}(1)) = 2$ , if  $\dim \mathcal{J} = 9$ .

2) For  $(\mathbf{E}_6, \alpha_2)$ , we have  $d_{\alpha_2} = 2$  and  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_2}(1) = 20$ . Here  $d_{\alpha_1} = 1$  and hence  $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_1}(1)$  is a (maximal) abelian  $\mathfrak{b}$ -ideal. Since  $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_1}(1) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_2}(1)) = 10$ , this is a good case.

3) For  $(\mathbf{E}_7, \alpha_7)$ , we have  $d_{\alpha_7} = 2$ ,  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_7}(1) = 35$ , and  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_7}(2) = 7$ . Here  $d_{\alpha_1} = 1$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_1}(1)$  is the maximal abelian ideal of maximal dimension 27. In this case,  $\Pi \setminus \{\alpha_1, \alpha_7\}$  is the Dynkin diagram of type  $\mathbf{A}_5$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_7}(1) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_1}(1)$  is the simple  $SL_6$ -module  $\bigwedge^2(\mathbb{k}^6)$ , of dimension 15. The minimal (resp. maximal) root in  $\Delta_{\alpha_7}(1) \cap \Delta_{\alpha_1}(1)$  is  $\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & 1 & \end{smallmatrix}$  (resp.  $\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ & & & & & 1 \end{smallmatrix}$ ). For the other maximal abelian ideals  $\mathcal{J}$ , one obtains  $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_1}(1) \cap \mathcal{J}) \leq 15$ .

*Remark 5.10.* If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is exceptional and  $d_\alpha \geq 3$ , then one can always find  $\beta \in \Pi$  such that  $d_\beta < d_\alpha$ , Proposition 5.6 applies, and  $\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, \beta}$  has the required dimension, i.e.,  $(1/2) \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$  in the good cases and the numbers  $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\max}$  from Table 1 in the bad cases. For instance, one takes

- for  $\mathbf{E}_6$ :  $\beta = \alpha_6$  if  $\alpha = \alpha_3$ ;
- for  $\mathbf{E}_7$ :  $\beta = \alpha_6$  if  $\alpha = \alpha_3$  or  $\alpha_5$ ;  $\beta = \alpha_7$  if  $\alpha = \alpha_4$ ;
- for  $\mathbf{E}_8$ :  $\beta = \alpha_1$  if  $\alpha = \alpha_2$  or  $\alpha_3$  or  $\alpha_8$ ;  $\beta = \alpha_7$  if  $\alpha = \alpha_4$  or  $\alpha_6$ ;  $\beta = \alpha_8$  if  $\alpha = \alpha_5$ ;
- for  $\mathbf{F}_4$ :  $\beta = \alpha_4$  if  $\alpha = \alpha_2$  or  $\alpha_3$ .

## 6. VARIATIONS ON THEMES OF THE "STRANGE FORMULA"

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a reductive algebraic Lie algebra. For any orthogonal  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $\mathcal{V}$ , there is another  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module, denoted  $\text{Spin}(\mathcal{V})$ . Roughly speaking, one takes the spinor representation of  $\mathfrak{so}(\mathcal{V})$  and restricts it to  $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{so}(\mathcal{V})$ . It has the property that

$$\bigwedge^\bullet \mathcal{V} \simeq \begin{cases} \text{Spin}(\mathcal{V}) \otimes \text{Spin}(\mathcal{V}), & \text{if } \dim \mathcal{V} \text{ is even} \\ 2(\text{Spin}(\mathcal{V}) \otimes \text{Spin}(\mathcal{V})), & \text{if } \dim \mathcal{V} \text{ is odd} \end{cases},$$

see [16, Section 2]. Moreover, extracting further a numerical factor from the  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $\text{Spin}(\mathcal{V})$ , one can uniformly write  $\text{Spin}(\mathcal{V}) = 2^{[m(0)/2]} \text{Spin}_0(\mathcal{V})$  and then

$$\bigwedge^\bullet \mathcal{V} \simeq 2^{m(0)} \cdot (\text{Spin}_0(\mathcal{V}) \otimes \text{Spin}_0(\mathcal{V})),$$

where  $m(0)$  is the multiplicity of the zero weight in  $\mathcal{V}$ . There are only few orthogonal simple  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules  $\mathcal{V}$  such that  $\text{Spin}_0(\mathcal{V})$  is again simple, see [16, Section 3]. A notable example is that  $\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathcal{V}_\rho$  for any simple Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ , cf. Introduction.

From now on,  $\mathfrak{g}$  is again a simple Lie algebra. Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading. The corresponding involution of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is denoted by  $\sigma$ . Write  $\mathcal{C}_0 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$  for the Casimir element associated with  $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{g}_0}$ . Then the  $\mathcal{C}_0$ -eigenvalue on  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  equals  $1/2$ , see [17] and Proposition 1.1.

The  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  is orthogonal, and we are interested now in the Spin-construction for  $\mathcal{V} = \mathfrak{g}_1$ . Then  $m(0) = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g} - \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}_0$ , and  $m(0) = 0$  if and only if  $\sigma$  is an inner involution. Hence  $\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1) = \text{Spin}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$  whenever  $\sigma$  is inner. There is an explicit description of the irreducible constituents of  $\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)$  in [16, Sections 5, 6]. This also implies that  $\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)$  is always reducible if  $\sigma$  is inner. Although  $\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)$  can be highly reducible, it is proved in [16, Theorem 7.7] that  $\mathcal{C}_0$  acts scalarly on  $\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)$  and the corresponding eigenvalue is

$$\gamma_{\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)} = (\rho, \rho) - (\rho_0, \rho_0),$$

where  $\rho_0$  is the half-sum of positive roots of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ . Of course, we adjust here the Cartan subalgebras,  $\mathfrak{t}_0 \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\mathfrak{t}_0 \subset \mathfrak{t}$ . Then we can assume that  $\mathfrak{t}_0^* \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ , etc. In this section, we show that the  $\mathcal{C}_0$ -eigenvalue  $\gamma_{\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)}$  has another nice uniform expression and that this is related to the “strange formula of Freudenthal–de Vries” ( $=\mathbf{sfFdV}$ ).

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $\sigma$  be an inner involution of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$  the corresponding  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading. Then*

$$\gamma_{\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)} = (\dim \mathfrak{g}_1)/16.$$

*Proof.* Our argument relies on the theory developed in Section 3 and a relationship between involutions ( $= \mathbb{Z}_2$ -gradings) and  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings of height at most 2.

Suppose that  $d_\alpha = \text{ht}_\alpha(\theta) \leq 2$  and let  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=-d}^d \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(i)$  be the corresponding  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading. Letting  $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(-2) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(2)$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(-1) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1)$ , we obtain a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading (obvious). Since  $\text{rk } \mathfrak{g} = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}_0$ , this involution is inner. The point is that **all inner** involutions of  $\mathfrak{g}$  are obtained in this way, as follows from Kac’s description in [8], cf. also [3, Ch. 3, §3.7]. Different simple roots  $\alpha, \beta$  with  $d_\alpha = d_\beta = 2$  lead to “one and the same”  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading if and only if there is an automorphism of the extended Dynkin diagram of  $\mathfrak{g}$  that takes  $\alpha$  to  $\beta$ . If  $d_\alpha = 1$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(0)$  is not semisimple, whereas  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is semisimple for  $d_\alpha = 2$ . The subalgebras  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  corresponding to  $\alpha$  with  $d_\alpha = 2$  are indicated in Tables 2 and 3.

We can express  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1 = \rho - \rho_0$  via the data related to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading. That is,  $\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2}(|\Delta_\alpha^+(0)| + |\Delta_\alpha(2)|)$  and  $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}|\Delta_\alpha(1)| = \frac{1}{2}q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha$ . Since  $(\varphi_\alpha, \mu) = 0$  for any  $\mu \in \Delta_\alpha^+(0)$ , we have  $(\rho_1, |\Delta_\alpha^+(0)|) = 0$  and therefore

$$(\rho, \rho) - (\rho_0, \rho_0) = (\rho_1, 2\rho_0 + \rho_1) = (\rho_1, |\Delta_\alpha(2)| + \rho_1) = \frac{1}{4}(q_\alpha(1)\varphi_\alpha, (q_\alpha(1) + 2q_\alpha(2))\varphi_\alpha).$$

Now,  $q_\alpha(1) + 2q_\alpha(2) = q_\alpha + q_\alpha(2) = h^*r_\alpha$ , see Corollary 3.7 with  $d_\alpha = 2$ . For  $d_\alpha = 1$ , one has  $r_\alpha = 1$  and again  $q_\alpha(1) + 2q_\alpha(2) = q_\alpha = h^*$ , see Theorem 2.2(2°). So, if  $d_\alpha \leq 2$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)} &= \frac{h^*r_\alpha}{4}(|\Delta_\alpha(1)|, \varphi_\alpha) = \frac{h^*r_\alpha}{4} \sum_{\mu \in \Delta_\alpha(1)} (\mu, \varphi_\alpha) = \frac{h^*r_\alpha}{4} \sum_{\mu \in \Delta_\alpha(1)} (\alpha, \varphi_\alpha) \\ &= \frac{h^*r_\alpha}{4} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) \frac{(\alpha, \alpha)}{2} = \frac{1}{8} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha(1) = \frac{1}{16} \dim \mathfrak{g}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the fact that  $\text{ht}_\alpha(\mu) = 1$  for any  $\mu \in \Delta_\alpha(1)$  and hence  $(\mu, \varphi_\alpha) = (\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)$ .  $\square$

Actually, the previous result holds for any involution of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , see below. This can be regarded as both an application and generalisation of the **sfFdv**. However, whereas the proof of Theorem 6.1 does not refer to the **sfFdv**, the general argument below, which applies to arbitrary involutions, explicitly relies on the **sfFdv**.

**Theorem 6.2.** *For any involution of a simple Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ , we have  $\gamma_{\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)} = (\dim \mathfrak{g}_1)/16$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $\mathfrak{g}_0 = (\bigoplus_i \mathfrak{h}_i) \oplus \mathfrak{c}$  as the sum of simple ideals  $\{\mathfrak{h}_i\}$  and possible centre  $\mathfrak{c}$ . To prove the assertion, we need basically the following three facts on  $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}_0}$ :

- $\text{tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{C}_0) = \dim \mathfrak{g}_0$ , see [17] and Proposition 1.1(i);
- the  $\mathcal{C}_0$ -eigenvalue on  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  equals  $1/2$ , see Proposition 1.1(iv);
- the usual **sfFdv** for  $\mathfrak{g}$  and for the simple ideals of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}_i}$  be the “canonical” Casimir element for  $\mathfrak{h}_i$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}_i}$  has the eigenvalue 1 on  $\mathfrak{h}_i$ . Since  $\mathfrak{h}_i$  is an ideal of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ , there is a transition factor,  $T_i$ , between the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{h}_i}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_0$  on the  $\mathfrak{h}_i$ -modules, cf. the proof of Theorem 3.6. Actually, we even know that  $T_i = \frac{h^*(\mathfrak{h}_i)}{h^* \cdot \text{ind}(\mathfrak{h}_i \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{g})}$ , but this precise value is of no importance in the rest of the argument. Since the  $\mathcal{C}_0$ -eigenvalue on  $\mathfrak{h}_i$  is  $T_i$ , we have  $\text{tr}_{\mathfrak{h}_i} \mathcal{C}_0 = T_i \cdot \dim \mathfrak{h}_i$ . Hence

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = \text{tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{C}_0) = \text{tr}_{\mathfrak{g}_1}(\mathcal{C}_0) + \text{tr}_{\mathfrak{g}_0}(\mathcal{C}_0) = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}_1 + \sum_i T_i \cdot \dim \mathfrak{h}_i.$$

On the other hand, let  $\rho_i$  be the half-sum of the positive roots of  $\mathfrak{h}_i$ . Then  $\rho_0 = \sum_i \rho_i$ ,  $(\rho_i, \rho_j) = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ , and  $(\rho_i, \rho_i) = T_i \cdot (\dim \mathfrak{h}_i/24)$  in view of the **sfFdv** for  $\mathfrak{h}_i$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}_1)} &= (\rho, \rho) - (\rho_0, \rho_0) = \frac{1}{24} \dim \mathfrak{g} - \frac{1}{24} (\sum_i T_i \dim \mathfrak{h}_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{24} \dim \mathfrak{g} - \frac{1}{24} (\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 - \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathfrak{g}_1) = \frac{1}{16} \dim \mathfrak{g}_1. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 6.3.* The adjoint representation of  $\mathfrak{g}$  can be regarded as the isotropy representation related to the permutation,  $\tau$ , of the summands in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g} \dot{+} \mathfrak{g}$ . Here  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  is not simple, but  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0 \simeq \mathfrak{g}$  is. In this situation, there is an analogue of Theorem 6.2 for  $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tau)$ , and we demonstrate below that it is equivalent to the **sfFdv** for  $\mathfrak{g}$ . In other words, under proper adjustments of bilinear forms and  $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0}$ , the formula of Theorem 6.2 for  $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tau)$  transforms into the **sfFdv** for  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and vice versa. One of the main reasons is that, for the orthogonal  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}$ , one has  $\text{Spin}_0(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathcal{V}_{\rho}$ , see [9, (5.9)] and [16, (2.5)].

Recall that  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$  and  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t}$ . Then  $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}} = \mathfrak{b} \dot{+} \mathfrak{b}$  and  $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}} = \mathfrak{t} \dot{+} \mathfrak{t}$ . In what follows, various objects related to the two factors of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  will be marked with the superscripts ‘(1)’ and ‘(2)’. As above,  $\Phi$  is the Killing form on  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $(\ , \ )$  is the induced (canonical) bilinear form on  $\mathfrak{t}^*$ . Let  $\tilde{\Phi} = \Phi^{(1)} \dot{+} \Phi^{(2)}$  be the invariant bilinear form on  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ . The induced bilinear form on  $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  is denoted by  $(\ , \ )^\sim$ . Then the Casimir element  $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0}$  is defined via the restriction of  $\tilde{\Phi}$  to  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ . We have  $\tilde{\rho} = \rho^{(1)} + \rho^{(2)}$  and these two summands are orthogonal w.r.t.  $(\ , \ )^\sim$ ; hence  $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\rho})^\sim = (\rho^{(1)}, \rho^{(1)})^\sim + (\rho^{(2)}, \rho^{(2)})^\sim = 2(\rho, \rho)$ . The Cartan subalgebra  $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_0$  of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0$  is



diagonally imbedded in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}$ , hence so are the roots of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0$  in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_0^*$ . In particular, both components of  $\tilde{\rho}_0$  are equal to  $\rho$ . Identifying  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0$  with  $\mathfrak{g}$  via the projection to the first component, one readily obtains that  $\tilde{\Phi}|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0} = 2\Phi$ . It then follows from Lemma 1.3 that one obtains the relation with the **inverse** coefficient for the corresponding canonical bilinear forms. This yields our key equality

$$(\tilde{\rho}_0, \tilde{\rho}_0)^\sim = \frac{1}{2}(\rho, \rho).$$

Afterwards, using the **sfFdv** for  $\mathfrak{g}$ , we obtain

$$(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\rho})^\sim - (\tilde{\rho}_0, \tilde{\rho}_0)^\sim = 2(\rho, \rho) - \frac{1}{2}(\rho, \rho) = \frac{3}{2}(\rho, \rho) = \frac{1}{16} \dim \mathfrak{g} = \frac{1}{16} \dim \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_1.$$

And by [16, Theorem 7.7], the  $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0}$ -eigenvalue on  $\text{Spin}_0(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_1)$  equals  $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\rho})^\sim - (\tilde{\rho}_0, \tilde{\rho}_0)^\sim$ . Thus, the equality of Theorem 6.2 remains true for the involution  $\tau$  of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ , and we have just shown that this equality is equivalent to the **sfFdv**.

This certainly means that it is of great interest to find a proof of Theorem 6.2 and its analogue for the semisimple Lie algebra  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g} + \mathfrak{g}$  that is independent of the **sfFdv**.

#### APPENDIX A. THE EIGENVALUES $\gamma_\alpha(i)$ FOR $\alpha \in \Pi$ WITH $d_\alpha \geq 2$

Tables 2–6 below provide the eigenvalues  $\{\gamma_\alpha(i)\}$  and integers  $\{q_\alpha(i)\}$  for the  $(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ -gradings of all simple Lie algebras with  $d_\alpha \geq 2$ . For, if  $d_\alpha = 1$ , then  $\gamma_\alpha(1) = 1/2$  and  $q_\alpha = q_\alpha(1) = h^*$ . In the last column of Tables 2 and 3, we point out the fixed-point (semisimple) subalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  for the corresponding inner involution of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , cf. Section 6.

TABLE 2. Classical Lie algebras,  $d_\alpha = 2$

$\mathfrak{g}, \alpha$	$\gamma_\alpha(1)$	$\gamma_\alpha(2)$	$q_\alpha(1)$	$q_\alpha(2)$	$h^*$	$r_\alpha$	$\mathfrak{g}_0$
$\mathbf{B}_n, \alpha_i$	$\frac{2n-i}{2(2n-1)}$	$\frac{i-1}{2n-1}$	$2n-2i+1$	$i-1$	$2n-1$	1	$\mathbf{D}_i \times \mathbf{B}_{n-i} \quad 2 \leq i \leq n-1$
$\mathbf{B}_n, \alpha_n$	$\frac{n}{2(2n-1)}$	$\frac{2n-2}{2(2n-1)}$	2	$2n-2$	$2n-1$	2	$\mathbf{D}_n$
$\mathbf{C}_n, \alpha_i$	$\frac{2n+1-i}{4(n+1)}$	$\frac{i+1}{2(n+1)}$	$2n-2i$	$i+1$	$n+1$	2	$\mathbf{C}_i \times \mathbf{C}_{n-i} \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1$
$\mathbf{D}_n, \alpha_i$	$\frac{2n-1-i}{2(2n-2)}$	$\frac{i-1}{2n-2}$	$2n-2i$	$i-1$	$2n-2$	1	$\mathbf{D}_i \times \mathbf{D}_{n-i} \quad 2 \leq i \leq n-2$

Recall that the numbering of simple roots follows [3].

**Acknowledgements.** Part of this work was done while it was still possible for me to enjoy a friendly environment of the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik (Bonn).

TABLE 3. Exceptional Lie algebras,  $d_\alpha = 2$ 

$\mathfrak{g}, \alpha$	$\gamma_\alpha(1)$	$\gamma_\alpha(2)$	$q_\alpha(1)$	$q_\alpha(2)$	$h^*$	$r_\alpha$	$\mathfrak{g}_0$
$\mathbf{E}_6, \alpha_2$	9/24	6/24	6	3	12	1	$\mathbf{A}_5 \times \mathbf{A}_1$
$\mathbf{E}_6, \alpha_6$	11/24	2/24	10	1	12	1	$\mathbf{A}_5 \times \mathbf{A}_1$
$\mathbf{E}_7, \alpha_2$	13/36	10/36	8	5	18	1	$\mathbf{D}_6 \times \mathbf{A}_1$
$\mathbf{E}_7, \alpha_6$	17/36	2/36	16	1	18	1	$\mathbf{D}_6 \times \mathbf{A}_1$
$\mathbf{E}_7, \alpha_7$	14/36	8/36	10	4	18	1	$\mathbf{A}_7$
$\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_1$	29/60	2/60	28	1	30	1	$\mathbf{E}_7 \times \mathbf{A}_1$
$\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_7$	23/60	14/60	16	7	30	1	$\mathbf{D}_8$
$\mathbf{F}_4, \alpha_1$	11/36	14/36	4	7	9	2	$\mathbf{B}_4$
$\mathbf{F}_4, \alpha_4$	4/9	1/9	7	1	9	1	$\mathbf{C}_3 \times \mathbf{A}_1$
$\mathbf{G}_2, \alpha_2$	3/8	2/8	2	1	4	1	$\mathbf{A}_1 \times \mathbf{A}_1$

TABLE 4. Exceptional Lie algebras,  $d_\alpha = 3$ 

$\mathfrak{g}, \alpha$	$\gamma_\alpha(1)$	$\gamma_\alpha(2)$	$\gamma_\alpha(3)$	$q_\alpha(1)$	$q_\alpha(2)$	$q_\alpha(3)$	$h^*$	$r_\alpha$
$\mathbf{E}_6, \alpha_3$	7/24	6/24	3/24	3	3	1	12	1
$\mathbf{E}_7, \alpha_3$	5/18	4/18	3/18	4	4	2	18	1
$\mathbf{E}_7, \alpha_5$	11/36	10/36	3/36	5	5	1	18	1
$\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_2$	19/60	18/60	3/60	9	9	1	30	1
$\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_8$	17/60	14/60	9/60	7	7	3	30	1
$\mathbf{F}_4, \alpha_3$	5/18	4/18	3/18	2	2	1	9	1
$\mathbf{G}_2, \alpha_1$	5/24	2/24	9/24	1	1	3	4	3

TABLE 5. Exceptional Lie algebras,  $d_\alpha = 4$ 

$\mathfrak{g}, \alpha$	$\gamma_\alpha(1)$	$\gamma_\alpha(2)$	$\gamma_\alpha(3)$	$\gamma_\alpha(4)$	$q_\alpha(1)$	$q_\alpha(2)$	$q_\alpha(3)$	$q_\alpha(4)$	$h^*$	$r_\alpha$
$\mathbf{E}_7, \alpha_4$	4/18	4/18	3/18	2/18	2	3	2	1	18	1
$\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_3$	7/30	6/30	6/30	2/30	4	5	4	1	30	1
$\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_6$	13/60	14/60	9/60	8/60	3	5	3	2	30	1
$\mathbf{F}_4, \alpha_2$	7/36	10/36	3/36	8/36	1	3	1	2	9	2

## REFERENCES

- [1] D.N. AKHIEZER. “Lie group actions in complex analysis”, Aspects of Math. **E27**, Braunschweig: Vieweg-Verlag, 1995.
- [2] N. BOURBAKI. “Groupes et algèbres de Lie”, Chapitres 4,5 et 6, Paris: Hermann 1975.

TABLE 6. Exceptional Lie algebras,  $d_\alpha \geq 5$ 

$\mathfrak{g}, \alpha$	$\gamma_\alpha(1)$	$\gamma_\alpha(2)$	$\gamma_\alpha(3)$	$\gamma_\alpha(4)$	$\gamma_\alpha(5)$	$\gamma_\alpha(6)$	$q_\alpha(i)$	$d_\alpha$
$\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_4$	11/60	10/60	9/60	8/60	5/60	—	2, 3, 3, 2, 1	5
$\mathbf{E}_8, \alpha_5$	9/60	10/60	9/60	8/60	5/60	6/60	1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1	6

- [3] V.V. GORBATSEVICH, A.L. ONISHCHIK and E.B. VINBERG. “Lie Groups and Lie Algebras” III (Encyclopaedia Math. Sci., vol. 41) Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer 1994.
- [4] Е.Б. ДЫНКИН. Полупростые подалгебры полупростых алгебр Ли, *Матем. Сборник*, т.30, № 2 (1952), 349–462 (Russian). English translation: E.B. DYNKIN. Semisimple subalgebras of semisimple Lie algebras, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.*, II Ser., 6 (1957), 111–244.
- [5] A.G.ELASHVILI, M. JIBLADZE and V.G. КАС. On Dynkin gradings in simple Lie algebras, In: M. Gorelik, V. Hinich, A. Melnikov (Eds.): “Representations and Nilpotent Orbits of Lie Algebraic Systems: In Honour of the 75th Birthday of Tony Joseph”, *Progr. Math.* 330, 111–131, Birkhäuser Basel, 2019.
- [6] H. FREUDENTHAL and H. DE VRIES. “Linear Lie groups”, New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- [7] A. JOSEPH. The minimal orbit in a simple Lie algebra and its associated maximal ideal, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, 9 (1976), no. 1, 1–29.
- [8] В.Г. КАЦ. Автоморфизмы конечного порядка полупростых алгебр Ли, *Функц. анализ и его прилож.*, т.3, вып. 3 (1969), 94–96 (Russian). English translation: V.G. KATS. Automorphisms of finite order of semisimple Lie algebras, *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, 3 (1969), 252–254.
- [9] B. KOSTANT. Lie algebra cohomology and the generalized Borel-Weil theorem, *Ann. Math.*, 74 (1961), 329–387.
- [10] B. KOSTANT. Eigenvalues of the Laplacian and commutative Lie subalgebras, *Topology*, 3, suppl. 2, (1965), 147–159.
- [11] B. KOSTANT. Clifford algebra analogue of the Hopf–Koszul–Samelson theorem, the  $\rho$ -decomposition  $C(\mathfrak{g}) = \text{End } V_\rho \otimes C(P)$ , and the  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module structure of  $\wedge \mathfrak{g}$ , *Adv. Math.*, 125 (1997), 275–350.
- [12] B. KOSTANT. Root systems for Levi factors and Borel-de Siebenthal theory. In: “Symmetry and spaces”, 129–152, *Progr. Math.*, 278, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2010.
- [13] J.-L. KOSZUL. Homologie et cohomologie des algèbres de Lie, *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 78 (1950), 65–127.
- [14] Д.И. ПАНЮШЕВ. Строение канонического модуля и горенштейновость для некоторых квазиоднородных многообразий, *Матем. сборник*, т.137, № 1 (1988), 76–89 (Russian). English translation: D. PANYUSHEV. The structure of the canonical module and the Gorenstein property for some prehomogeneous varieties, *Math. USSR-Sbornik*, 65 (1990), 81–95.
- [15] D. PANYUSHEV. On actions of a maximal torus on orbits of highest weight vectors, *J. Algebra*, 212 (1999), 683–702.
- [16] D. PANYUSHEV. The exterior algebra and ‘Spin’ of an orthogonal  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module, *Transformation Groups*, 6 (2001), 371–396.
- [17] D. PANYUSHEV. Isotropy representations, eigenvalues of a Casimir element, and commutative Lie subalgebras, *J. London Math. Soc.*, 64 (2001), 61–80.
- [18] D. PANYUSHEV. Abelian ideals of a Borel subalgebra and root systems, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 16, no. 12 (2014), 2693–2708.
- [19] D. PANYUSHEV and G. RÖHRLE. Spherical orbits and Abelian ideals, *Adv. Math.* 159 (2001), 229–246.

- [20] R. SUTER. Coxeter and dual Coxeter numbers, *Comm. Algebra*, **26** (1998), 147–153.

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS OF THE R.A.S., BOLSHOI KARETNYI PER. 19,  
127051 MOSCOW, RUSSIA

*E-mail address:* panyushev@iitp.ru