NEW CONSTRUCTIONS OF EXCEPTIONAL SIMPLE LIE SUPERALGEBRAS IN LOW CHARACTERISTIC VIA TENSOR CATEGORIES
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Abstract. We present new constructions of several of the exceptional simple Lie superalgebras in characteristic $p = 3$ and $p = 5$ (cf. [BGL+09]) by considering the images of exceptional Lie algebras with a nilpotent derivation under the semisimplification functor from $\text{Rep}_{\alpha_p}$ to $\text{Ver}_p$.
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1. Introduction

In [BGL+09], the finite-dimensional modular Lie superalgebras over $\mathbb{K}$ with indecomposable Cartan matrix are classified, where $\mathbb{K}$ is an algebraically closed field. In particular, if the Cartan matrix is invertible, the Lie superalgebra is simple; otherwise, either the derived algebra or second derived algebra of the Lie superalgebra modulo its center is simple. In characteristic 5, the classification includes Lie superalgebras arising from reducing the classical simple Lie superalgebras over $\mathbb{C}$ modulo 5, the Brown superalgebras, and the Elduque superalgebra $\mathfrak{e}(5; 5)$. In characteristic 3, there are the mod 3 reductions of the classical simple Lie superalgebras. The remaining are the Brown superalgebras, the ten Elduque and Cunha superalgebras, and a characteristic 3 analog $\mathfrak{e}(5; 3)$ of $\mathfrak{e}(5; 5)$.

In this paper, we use the semisimplification of tensor categories to produce new constructions of the ten Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebras in characteristic 3, the Elduque Lie superalgebra in characteristic 5, and its characteristic 3 analog discovered in [BGL+09]. In particular, we can consider a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over $\mathbb{K}$ with a nilpotent derivation $d$ of order at most $p$, where $p > 2$ is the characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$; this can then be realized as a Lie algebra in the category $\text{Rep}\mathbb{K}[t]/(t^p)$ of $\mathbb{K}[t]/(t^p)$ modules by specializing $t$ to $d$. The semisimplification of this category is the Verlinde category $\text{Ver}_p$, which contains as a full subcategory the category of supervector spaces $\text{sVec}_{\mathbb{K}}$. Therefore, the image $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ under the semisimplification functor projected onto this full subcategory is a Lie algebra in $\text{sVec}_{\mathbb{K}}$, which is precisely a Lie superalgebra. For more details, one can refer to [Eti18; EO19; Ost15].
In every case, we start with one of the exceptional simple Lie algebras $\mathfrak{f}_4$, $\mathfrak{e}_6$, $\mathfrak{e}_7$, and $\mathfrak{e}_8$ and then choose an appropriate nilpotent element of order 3 or 5, and then semisimplify. The software SuperLie (cf. [Gro13]) greatly simplified verifying this process.

The original construction of the Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebras are based on symmetric composition algebras and the Elduque Supermagic Square, an analog of Freudenthal’s Magic Square where division algebras are used to construct the exceptional Lie superalgebras (cf. [Eld06; CE06; CE07a]). In [BGL06; Bou+20], explicit descriptions are given in terms of Cartan matrices and generators and relations. In either case, it can be difficult to work with descriptions of the Lie superalgebras, and we hope that the theoretical framework makes approaching these new constructions more tractable. Lastly, one can also use this approach to construct new representations of these Lie superalgebras by suitably semisimplifying a representation of the Lie algebra they came from; very little is known about the representation theory of these Lie superalgebras, so this may be particularly interesting.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to deeply thank his advisor, Pavel Etingof, for pointing out that these constructions were possible and for his patience and guidance. This paper is based upon work supported by The National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. 1842490 awarded to the author.

2. Contragredient Lie Superalgebras

The Lie superalgebras listed above can all be realized as contragredient Lie superalgebras, which means they arise from a Cartan matrix. We will use this formulation to prove that each Lie superalgebra we construct from semisimplification is isomorphic to the corresponding exceptional simple Lie superalgebra with Cartan matrix. For the reader’s convenience, we recall the basics on contragredient Lie superalgebras here.

Let $n$ be a positive integer, and let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an arbitrary $n \times n$ matrix of rank $s$ with entries in $\mathbb{Z}$, called the Cartan matrix. Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a vector space over $\mathbb{K}$ of dimension $2n - s$, where $\mathbb{K}$ is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p \geq 0$. Let $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a collection of $n$ linearly independent vectors in $\mathfrak{h}$, and let $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be vectors in $\mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\alpha_j(h_i) = a_{ij}$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, where the bar denotes the projection onto $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ if $p > 0$ and is the identity if $p = 0$. Let $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\} \subset (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^n$ be a collection of parities, and let $\text{par}(i)$ denote the parity of $i \in I$.

Then, we can construct the Lie superalgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, I)$ with generators $e_1, \ldots, e_n, f_1, \ldots, f_n$, called Chevalley generators, and $\mathfrak{h}$ such that the parity of $e_j$ and $f_j$ is $i_j \in I$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ and such that they are subject to the following relations:

\begin{equation}
[ e_i, f_j ] = \delta_{ij} h_i; \quad [ h, e_j ] = \alpha_j(h) e_j; \quad [ h, f_j ] = -\alpha_j(h) f_j; \quad [ \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h} ] = 0,
\end{equation}

for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $h \in \mathfrak{h}$. If $A$ has full rank (i.e. $\det A \neq 0$), then the $\{e_i, f_i, h_i\}$ generate $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, I)$; otherwise, they generate the derived subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, I)$. It can be shown that $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, I)$ admits a triangular decomposition of Lie subsuperalgebras $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, I) = \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+$, where $\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^-$ is the Lie subsuperalgebra generated by the $f_j$’s and $\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+$ is the Lie subsuperalgebra generated by the $e_i$’s. When we work with multiple different Cartan matrices, we shall denote $\mathfrak{h}$ by $\mathfrak{h}(A, I)$ (and similarly for other subalgebras). We shall refer to both $A$ and $(A, I)$ as the Cartan matrix of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, I)$ (or of any quotient of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, I)$). As usual, there is a root space
decomposition, which gives a $Q = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i$ grading where $\deg(e_i) = \alpha_i$, $\deg(f_i) = -\alpha_i$, and $\deg(h) = 0$.

We define the contragredient Lie superalgebra $g(A, I)$ to be the quotient $g(A, I) = \tilde{g}(A, I)/\mathfrak{r}$, where $\mathfrak{r}$ is the maximal graded ideal that trivially intersects $\mathfrak{h}$ (indeed, such an ideal is unique because the sum of any two such ideals also trivially intersects $\mathfrak{h}$). The quotienting preserves the triangular decomposition in the sense that $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{r} \cap \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^- \oplus \mathfrak{r} \cap \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+$. Hence, the triangular decomposition descends to a triangular decomposition on $g(A, I) = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$.

Similarly, we have a root space decomposition. The images of $\{e_i, f_i, h_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ under the projection map are still linearly independent, so we shall by abuse of notation use $\{e_i, f_i, h_i\}$ to refer to these images as well. These clearly generate $g(A, I)$.

If one takes $I$ to consist of solely zero parities, then the Lie superalgebra is purely even and we recover the definition of a contragredient Lie algebra. We point out that unlike the classical case, inequivalent choices of Cartan matrices $A$ and parity set $I$ can produce isomorphic Lie superalgebras. We can also do a similar construction where the entries of $A$ are arbitrary elements of $\mathbb{K}$ (cf. [CE07b]), but the definitions provided shall suffice for our purposes and are more convenient.

A Cartan matrix $A$ is indecomposable if there is no suitable permutation of rows and columns of $A$ that can make $A$ block diagonal. A Cartan matrix $A$ with entries in $\mathbb{Z}$ is called a generalized Cartan matrix (with respect to a parity set $I$) if it satisfies the following properties:

1. $a_{ii} = 2$ if $\text{par}(i) = 0$;
2. $a_{ii} \in \{0, 1\}$ if $\text{par}(i) = 1$;
3. if $a_{ii} = 2$ then $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ for all $j$;
4. $a_{ij} = 0$ $\iff$ $a_{ji} = 0$ for all $i \neq j$.

This is slightly different from the usual definition of a generalized Cartan matrix (cf. [HS07]) but it shall be convenient for our purposes; for instance, we can deduce the parity set from the Cartan matrix and shall henceforth suppress it in the notation. Lastly, we shall say $A$ is symmetrizable if it factors as the product of a diagonal matrix and a symmetric matrix.

Recall that a Kac-Moody Lie algebra over $\mathbb{K}$ is a contragredient Lie algebra with symmetrizable, generalized Cartan matrix (with respect to the purely even parity set). For Kac-Moody Lie algebras over $\mathbb{C}$ with Cartan matrix $A$, which include the simple Lie algebras, the defining relations of the ideal $\mathfrak{r}$ are well known; they are the Serre relations (cf. [Kac90]):

$$\text{(ad } e_i)^{1-a_{ij}}(e_j) = (\text{ad } f_i)^{1-a_{ij}}(f_j) = 0$$

for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$. Over $\mathbb{K}$ these relations also hold, but there may be others. In general, the defining relations are not easily determined. For the exceptional simple Lie superalgebras we consider, however, there exists an analog of the Serre relations (cf. Proposition 2.5.1 in [BGL06]).

For more details on the theory of contragredient Lie (super)algebras, one can refer to [Kac90, Ser11].
3. Constructing Lie Superalgebras from Lie Algebras Using Semisimplification

In this section, we describe how one can construct a Lie superalgebra from a Lie algebra using semisimplification, which will be the procedure used to construct the exceptional simple Lie superalgebras. From now on, we shall assume that $\mathbb{K}$ is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 2$.

3.1. Operadic Lie Algebras. Recall that a Lie algebra over $\mathbb{K}$ is a vector space $g$ endowed with a $\mathbb{K}$-bilinear map $[\cdot, \cdot] : g \times g \to g$ which is skew-symmetric (assuming char $\mathbb{K} \neq 2$) and satisfies the Jacobi identity. Categorically speaking, the category $\text{Vec}_\mathbb{K}$ of vector spaces over $\mathbb{K}$ is a symmetric tensor category endowed with the usual braiding $c_{X,Y} : X \otimes Y \to Y \otimes X$ given by interchanging $X$ and $Y$, a natural isomorphism in objects $X$ and $Y$. Then, a Lie algebra (in the category $\text{Vec}_\mathbb{K}$) is an object in $g$ equipped with a morphism $B : g \otimes g \to g$ such that the following relations of morphisms hold:

$$B \circ (1_g \otimes c_{g, g}) = 0,$$

$$B \circ (B \otimes 1_g) \circ (1_g \otimes (123)_{g^3} + (132)_{g^3}) = 0,$$

where the permutation $(123)_{g^3} : g^3 \to g^3$ is given by $(1_g \otimes c_{g,g}) \circ (c_{g,g} \otimes 1_g)$, and the permutation $(132)_{g^3} : g^3 \to g^3$ is given by $(c_{g,g} \otimes 1_g) \circ (1_g \otimes c_{g,g})$ (let us not concern ourselves with the associativity morphisms). The first relation corresponds to the skew-symmetry condition, and the second is the Jacobi identity. Using these as defining axioms, we can extend the definition to any symmetric tensor category $\mathcal{C}$ with braiding $c$, and call the pair $(g, B)$ an operadic Lie algebra in $\mathcal{C}$. We can also allow $g$ to be an ind-object in the category.

Recall that the category of supervector spaces $s\text{Vec}_\mathbb{K}$ consists of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-graded vector spaces and morphisms, with braiding $c_{X,Y}$ given by the Koszul sign rule:

$$c_{X,Y}(x \otimes y) = (-1)^{|x||y|}(y \otimes x),$$

(3.1)

where $x, y$ are homogeneous (i.e. purely even or purely odd). We call a Lie algebra in the category of supervector spaces $s\text{Vec}_\mathbb{K}$ a Lie superalgebra.

Remark 3.1. One should note that in characteristic 3, the usual definition of a Lie superalgebra and the definition given above do not coincide, as for an odd element $x$, the relation $[x, [x, x]] = 0$ required for a Lie superalgebra does not follow from the Jacobi identity. However, this will not be a major concern for our considerations.

In a general symmetric tensor category we do not have the notion of elements or vectors in an object. However, for the purposes of this paper, we will be working with Lie algebras in the representation category of a certain finite group scheme, so we can refer to vectors in objects of this category by applying the forgetful functor into $\text{Vec}_\mathbb{K}$. Furthermore, using vectors will make it easier to talk about and describe the bracket.

For more details on operadic Lie algebras, one can consult [Eti18].
3.2. The Verlinde Category. We want to use the language of Lie algebras in a symmetric tensor category. To do so, we need to pick suitable symmetric tensor categories. Let \( \mathbb{K}\alpha_p = \mathbb{K}[t]/(t^p) \), where \( \mathbb{K} \) is an algebraically closed field of characteristic \( p \), and let \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \) denote the category of finite-dimensional representations of \( \mathbb{K}\alpha_p \). As \( \mathbb{K}\alpha_p \) is a Hopf algebra with comultiplication defined by letting \( t \) be primitive, \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \) is a symmetric tensor category with braiding given by the usual braiding of vector spaces (there is a forgetful functor from \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \) to \( \text{Vec}_K \)). Hence, an example of a Lie algebra \( (\mathfrak{g}, B) \) in \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \) is a Lie algebra in \( \text{Vec}_K \) equipped with a nilpotent element \( x \in \mathfrak{g} \) of order at most \( p \); then \( \mathfrak{g} \) is a \( \mathbb{K}\alpha_p \)-representation by letting \( t \) act as \( \text{ad} \) \( x \), and \( B \) is naturally a morphism in \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \) by the Jacobi identity (as a Lie algebra in \( \text{Vec}_K \)). More generally, we can take \( t \) to be any nilpotent derivation of order at most \( p \) (not necessarily inner).

The category \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \) is not semisimple; indeed, it contains non-simple indecomposable objects. The pairwise non-isomorphic indecomposable objects are given by the representations \( J_n = \mathbb{K}^n \) where \( t \) acts as the nilpotent Jordan block of size \( n \) \((1 \leq n \leq p)\). If \( v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n \) is a basis of \( J_n \) such that \( t.v_i = v_{i+1} \), we shall use the notation \( v_1 \mapsto v_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto v_n \) to refer to that particular object \( J_n \).

The semisimplification of this category is the Verlinde category \( \text{Ver}_p \). Recall that in essence, the semisimplification of a symmetric tensor category is the symmetric tensor category obtained by declaring all indecomposable objects to be simple, except those with zero dimension, which are removed (for more details, see [EO19]). More importantly, there is a semisimplification functor from a symmetric tensor category \( \mathcal{C} \) to its a semisimplification \( \overline{\mathcal{C}} \), and it is symmetric and monoidal. We will denote the images of objects under this functor with an overline over the original object.

Therefore, the simple objects in \( \text{Ver}_p \) are \( L_1, \ldots, L_{p-1} \), which are the images of \( J_1, \ldots, J_{p-1} \) under the semisimplification functor, respectively, i.e. \( L_i = \overline{J_i} \). If \( v_1 \mapsto v_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto v_i \) denotes a \( J_i \), we shall refer to the corresponding copy of \( L_i \) by \( v_1 \mapsto v_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto v_i \) (for \( i < p \)). Note that \( L_p \) is sent to the zero object as it is \( p \)-dimensional, so its categorical dimension is 0. It is well known that the tensor product is given by the truncated Clebsch-Gordan rule, which is similar to the usual Clebsch-Gordan rule of \( \mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{l}_2(\mathbb{C}) \)-modules (the truncation comes from the terms in red):

\[
L_m \otimes L_n = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\min(m,n,p-m,p-n)} L_{|m-n|+2i-1}.
\]

In particular, we notice that \( 1 := L_1 \) is the unit object with respect to tensor product. More importantly, we have the following proposition:

**Proposition 3.2.** The category \( s\text{Vec}_K \) is symmetric tensor equivalent to the subcategory generated by the objects \( L_1 \) and \( L_{p-1} \) in \( \text{Ver}_p \).

**Proof.** This follows from results in [Ost15], but we offer a direct, linear algebraic proof. We have \( L_{p-1} \otimes L_{p-1} = L_1 \) by the truncated Clebsch-Gordan rule. Therefore, one needs to check that the induced braiding on \( \text{Ver}_p \) from \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \) under the semisimplification functor (let us use \( c \) to denote both the braiding and its image) restricts to this subcategory appropriately.

In \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \), \( J_{p-1} \) be given by the basis \( v_1 \mapsto v_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto v_{p-1} \). It is known that in \( \text{Rep}\alpha_p \), \( J_{p-1} \otimes J_{p-1} = J_1 \oplus (p-2)J_p \) (cf. [Gre62]). One such decomposition is as follows.
each $1 \leq i \leq p - 2$, a copy of $J_p$ arises from the submodule generated by the vector $v_i \otimes v_1$. It is clear that $t^p.(v_i \otimes v_1) = 0$ but $t^{p-1}.(v_i \otimes v_1)$ is nonzero, so these do indeed give a copy of $J_p$. Since $t^p = 0$, these copies of $J_p$ are automatically split. The copy of $J_1$ arises as the span of the vector $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^i v_i \otimes v_{p-i}$. To see that this copy of $J_1$ is split, let us define the degree of $v_i \otimes v_j$ to be $i + j$. This gives a grading on $J_{p-1} \otimes J_{p-1}$, where the action of $t$ increases the grading by 1, and the copies of $J_1$ above are graded submodules. Suppose the copy of $J_1$ intersected the span of the copies of $J_p$, meaning it lies in the graded subspace spanned by $t^{p-1}.(v_i \otimes v_1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq p - 2$. The vector $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^i v_i \otimes v_{p-i}$ has degree $p$, but homogeneous vectors in this graded subspace all have degree greater than or equal to $p + 1$. By way of contradiction, we deduce that $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^i v_i \otimes v_{p-i}$ spans a split summand.

The copies of $J_p$ vanish in the semisimplification, so let’s just look at the copy of $J_1$ spanned by the vector $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^i v_i \otimes v_{p-i}$. Since $p$ is odd, this sum has an even number of terms, and the braiding map $c_{J_1 J_1} : J_1 \otimes J_1 \to J_1 \otimes J_1$ will negate this element. Therefore, in the semisimplification, we have $L_1 \otimes L_{p-1} = L_1$, and the image of the braiding $c_{J_1 J_1}$ under the semisimplification functor is $c_{L_1 L_{p-1}} : L_1 \otimes L_{p-1} \to L_1 \otimes L_{p-1}$ is multiplication by $-1$.

Therefore, the image of $c$ under the semisimplification functor restricted to the subcategory generated by $L_1$ and $L_{p-1}$ behaves as described in equation (3.1). □

Hence, from now on, we can safely refer to the full subcategory generated by $L_1$ and $L_{p-1}$ as $sVec_k$. By functoriality, if we are given a Lie algebra $(g, B)$ in $Rep\alpha_p$, the projection $(\overline{g}, \overline{B})$ of its semisimplification in $Ver_p$ is a Lie algebra in $sVec_k$, which is a Lie superalgebra. Therefore, we can produce Lie superalgebras over fields of characteristic $p$ from Lie algebras over fields of characteristic $p$ by specifying a nilpotent element of order at most $p$.

Remark 3.3. To get a Lie superalgebra in characteristic $3$, one must quotient out by the further relation that $[x, [x, x]] = 0$ for odd $x$. For instance, consider the free Lie algebra $g$ on $x, y$ modulo degree 4; this is a Lie algebra with basis $\{x, y, [x, y], [x, [x, y]], [y, [x, y]]\}$. Define the derivation $d$ by $d(x) = y$ and $d(y) = 0$. Then, $g$ can be realized as an object $\mathfrak{g}$ in $Rep\alpha_3$ with respect to $d$, where we have a copy of $J_1$ for $[x, y]$ and copies of $J_2$ given by $x \mapsto y$ and $[x, [x, y]] \mapsto -[y, [x, y]]$; semisimplifying gives a three-dimensional operadic Lie superalgebra with odd generator $z$ and basis $\{z, [z, z], [z, [z, z]]\}$.

3.3. Explicit Description of Semisimplification in Characteristic 3. The language of symmetric tensor categories is naturally suited for talking about semisimplification. However, since it is relatively new, we offer an explicit description of what happens to the Lie bracket under semisimplification using linear algebra. We will use this language in our proofs below.

Let $g$ be a Lie algebra in $Rep\alpha_3$ with respect to some derivation $d$ such that $d^3 = 0$. We can pick a non-canonical decomposition $g = n_1 J_1 \oplus n_2 J_2 \oplus n_3 J_3$. For each copy of $J_1$, we pick a basis $x_i$, where $1 \leq i \leq n_1$. For each copy of $J_2$, we pick a basis $x_i \mapsto x_i'$, where $1 + n_1 \leq i \leq n_1 + n_2$. Finally, for each copy of $J_3$, we pick a basis $x_i \mapsto x_i''$, for $1 + n_1 + n_2 \leq i \leq n_1 + n_2 + n_3$. The collection $\{x_i, x_j, x_j', x_k, x_k', x_k''\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n_1$, $1 + n_1 \leq j \leq n_1 + n_2$, $1 + n_1 + n_3 \leq k \leq n_1 + n_2 + n_3$ is a basis of $g$.

After semisimplification, the $J_3$ terms vanish, and the $J_1$ terms and $J_2$ terms give $L_1$ terms and $L_2$ terms, respectively, which collectively give rise to a basis of the Lie superalgebra $\overline{g}$. In particular, for $1 \leq i \leq n_1$, the copy of $J_1$ corresponding to $x_i$ gives an even basis vector $y_i$. 
Proposition 3.4. Let $C(i,j,k)$ denote the structure constants of the basis \{y_i\} of $\mathfrak{g}$ above, i.e. $[y_i,y_j] = \sum_k C(i,j,k)y_k$. Then,

1. if $i,j,k \leq n_1$, or $1 \leq i \leq n_1$ and $j, k > n_1$, or $j < n_1$ and $i, k > n_1$, then $C(i,j,k)$ is the coefficient of $x_k$ in $[x_i,x_j]$;
2. if $i,j > n_1$ and $k \leq n_1$, then $C(i,j,k)$ is the coefficient of $x_k$ in $-[x_i,x_j] + [x_i',x_j]$;
3. in all other cases, $C(i,j,k) = 0$.

Proof. The proofs of 1) and 3) are easy. The proof of 2) is a consequence of the proof of Proposition 3.2.

Let's do this calculation explicitly for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_3$. Let $e_{ij}$ refer to the elementary matrix with a 1 in the $(i,j)$ entry and zero elsewhere. Then, with respect to the adjoint action of $e_{23}$, $\mathfrak{g}$ is an object in $\text{Rep} \alpha_3$. We choose the following decomposition: $e_{11}$, $e_{11} + e_{22} + e_{33}$ as copies of $J_1$; $e_{12} \mapsto -e_{13}$ and $e_{31} \mapsto e_{21}$ as copies of $J_2$; and $e_{32} \mapsto e_{22} - e_{33} \mapsto e_{23}$ as a copy of $J_3$. Then, the basis vectors of $\mathfrak{g}$ are $y_1 = e_{11}$, $y_2 = e_{11} + e_{22} + e_{33}$, $y_3 = e_{12} \mapsto -e_{13}$, and $y_4 = e_{31} \mapsto e_{21}$.

Applying the formula, we have: $[y_1,y_2] = 0$, $[y_1,y_3] = y_3$, and $[y_1,y_4] = -y_4$. We can also compute $[y_3,y_4]$. Both of these vectors are odd, so we look at $-[e_{12}, e_{21}] + [-e_{13}, e_{31}] = (e_{22} - e_{11}) - (e_{11} - e_{33}) = e_{11} + e_{22} + e_{33}$, so $[y_3,y_4] = y_2$. Therefore, the resulting Lie superalgebra is $\mathfrak{gl}_{1|1}$.

3.4. An Example. Let us consider a more complicated example. Consider $\mathfrak{g}_2$, the 14-dimensional exceptional simple Lie algebra of rank 2. It has Cartan matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and Dynkin diagram:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\circ & \bigcirc \\
\beta & \alpha \\
\end{array}
$$

where $\alpha$ corresponds to the index 1 and $\beta$ to the index 2. Its root system can be visualized geometrically as the following:
In characteristic 3, \( g_2 \) has non-equivalent reductions from \( g_2 \) over \( \mathbb{C} \). For instance, it can be viewed via the Cartan matrix definition, which gives a 10-dimensional simple Lie algebra (note that this Cartan matrix is not symmetrizable in characteristic 3). It can also be viewed as the reduction of \( g_2 \) in characteristic 0 using the Kostant \( Z \)-form (cf. [Hum94]). For our example, we will take \( g_2 \) to be the reduction of the following basis of \( g_2 \) over \( \mathbb{C} \) to \( K \):

\[
\{ e_\alpha, e_\beta, [e_\alpha, e_\beta], (\text{ad } e_\alpha)^2(e_\beta), (\text{ad } e_\alpha)^3(e_\beta), [[e_\alpha, e_\beta], (\text{ad } e_\alpha)^2(e_\beta)] \}
\]

for the upper triangular subalgebra; the corresponding basis for the lower triangular subalgebra; and the Cartan subalgebra with basis \( \{ h_\alpha, h_\beta \} \).

With this definition, \( g \) is not simple but rather has a four-dimensional ideal \( I \) spanned by the root spaces corresponding to the roots \( 2\beta + 3\alpha \) and \( \beta + 3\alpha \) and their negatives. Indeed, the Kac-Moody Lie algebra definition will give a 10-dimensional simple Lie algebra. This is also known as the Brown algebra \( \text{br}(2; 0) \).

Now, let’s produce an example of semisimplification. For each positive root \( \gamma \), let \( \{ e_\gamma, h_\gamma, f_\gamma \} \) denote the corresponding \( \text{sl}_2 \)-triple. By the Serre relations, \( e_\beta \) is nilpotent of degree 2, so we can realize \( g_2 \) as an object in \( \text{Rep} \alpha_3 \). Under this realization, a direct sum decomposition into indecomposables, compatible with the root grading, is as follows: a copy of \( J_3 \) corresponding to \( f_\beta \mapsto h_\beta \mapsto -2e_\beta \); four copies of \( J_2 \) corresponding to \( e_\alpha \mapsto e_{\beta + \alpha} \), \( e_{\beta + 3\alpha} \mapsto e_{2\beta + 3\alpha} \), \( f_{\beta + \alpha} \mapsto f_\alpha \), \( f_{2\beta + 3\alpha} \mapsto f_{\beta + 3\alpha} \); and three copies of \( J_1 \), spanned by \( e_{\beta + 2\alpha}, f_{\beta + 2\alpha}, \) and \( h_{\beta + 2\alpha} \). Therefore, \( g_2 = 3J_1 \oplus 4J_2 \oplus J_3 \). Notice that the ideal \( I \) is also an object in the category and moreover it is a split summand of \( g_2 \) in \( \text{Rep} \alpha_3 \).

In the semisimplification, the \( J_3 \) term vanishes and we are left with a Lie superalgebra \( \overline{g}_2 \) of superdimension (3|4). Because \( I \) is an ideal and a split summand, \( \overline{T} \) is a subobject of \( \overline{g}_2 \), so by the tensoriality of the semisimplification functor, \( \overline{T} \) is an ideal of \( \overline{g}_2 \). It is clear that the even part of \( \overline{g}_2 \) is the Lie algebra \( \text{sl}_2 \), as it is the image of the \( \text{sl}_2 \)-triple corresponding to the root \( \beta + 2\alpha \). The odd part is then an \( \text{sl}_2 \)-module visualized below. Specifically, before semisimplification, the action of \( e_{\beta + 2\alpha} \) on the \( J_2 \)'s is labeled by the horizontal arrows (up to a multiple, which may be zero), and reversing the arrows gives the action of \( f_{\beta + 2\alpha} \) (again, up to a multiple); the vertical arrows themselves are the \( e_\beta \) action as usual:

\[
\begin{align*}
& e_{-\beta - 3\alpha} \quad e_{-\beta - \alpha} \quad e_\alpha \quad e_{\beta + 3\alpha} \\
\downarrow & \quad \downarrow & \quad \downarrow & \quad \downarrow \\
& e_{-\beta - 3\alpha} \quad e_{-\alpha} \quad e_{\beta + \alpha} \quad e_{2\beta + 3\alpha}
\end{align*}
\]
Here, we write $e_{-\gamma}$ to denote $f_\gamma$ to make it clear what happens to root spaces. This descends to the corresponding $L_2$’s in the semisimplification. It turns out that this is a nonsplit extension of the natural module, spanned by the middle two copies of $L_2$, with two copies of the trivial representation, spanned by the outer two copies of $L_2$, which also are a basis of the ideal $\mathcal{T}$.

Let us compute some brackets in the odd part. The bracket $[e_\alpha \mapsto e_{\beta + \alpha}, e_\alpha \mapsto e_{\beta + \alpha}]$ is given by:

$$[e_\alpha \mapsto e_{\beta + \alpha}, e_\alpha \mapsto e_{\beta + \alpha}] = -[e_\alpha, e_{\beta + \alpha}] + [e_{\beta + \alpha}, e_\alpha] = -2e_{2\beta + \alpha}$$

A similar argument goes through for the $f$ counterpart. Finally, we have

$$[e_\alpha \mapsto e_{\beta + \alpha}, f_\beta + \alpha \mapsto f_\alpha] = -[e_\alpha, f_\alpha] + [e_{\beta + \alpha}, f_\beta + \alpha] = -h_\alpha + h_{\beta + \alpha} = -h_{\beta + 2\alpha}.$$}

These computations show that $\mathfrak{g}_{2}/\mathcal{T}$ is $\mathfrak{osp}_{1|2}$ (alternatively, semisimplifying $\mathfrak{br}(2;0)$ gives $\mathfrak{osp}_{1|2}$).

If one chooses the definition of $\mathfrak{g}_2$ over $\mathbb{K}$ to be the one arising from reducing the Chevalley basis (cf. [Hum94]), then there is a 7-dimensional ideal $S$ isomorphic to $\mathfrak{psl}_3$ generated by the root vectors associated to the short roots $\alpha, \beta + \alpha, \beta + 2\alpha$. Specifically, in $S$ we have copies of $J_1$ corresponding to $h_\alpha, e_{\beta + 2\alpha},$ and $f_{\beta + 2\alpha}$, and copies of $J_2$ corresponding to $e_\alpha \mapsto e_{\alpha + \beta}$ and $f_{\alpha + \beta} \mapsto -f_\alpha$. With respect to the adjoint action of $e_\beta$, this is a split ideal in $\mathfrak{g}_2$ in $\text{Rep} \alpha_3$. Complementary to $S$ there is also a copy of $J_3$ associated to the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $\{f_\beta, h_\beta, e_\beta\}$. Finally, $e_{\beta + 3\alpha} \mapsto -e_{2\beta + 3\alpha}$ and $f_{2\beta + 3\alpha} \mapsto f_{\beta + 3\alpha}$ give copies of $J_2$. Hence, we can write $\mathfrak{g}_2 = S \oplus J_3 \oplus 2J_2$. When we semisimplify $\mathfrak{g}_2$, we again get a Lie superalgebra of superdimension $(3|4)$, which is isomorphic to the one obtained by using the first reduction. This time, the two-dimensional ideal $\mathcal{T}$ is spanned by $e_\alpha \mapsto e_{\alpha + \beta}$ and $f_{\alpha + \beta} \mapsto -f_\alpha$.

3.5. Main Theorem. We now state the main theorem of this paper. Let us first introduce some notation. Let $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ be an exceptional Lie algebra with Cartan matrix $A$ of rank $n > 2$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ (i.e. $\mathfrak{f}_4$, $\mathfrak{e}_6$, $\mathfrak{e}_7$, $\mathfrak{e}_8$). Let $\{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_l\}$ be a subset of boundary nodes of the Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{g}(A)$, and let $\{j_1, \ldots, j_l\}$ be the indices such that $j_r$ is the node connected to $i_r$ for each $r$. The following picture of the Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{e}_7$ illustrates an example:

![Dynkin diagram of e_7](image)

The boundary nodes are 1, 2, and 7. The nodes 2 and 7, colored in blue, are the chosen subset of boundary nodes, and the nodes 4 and 6, colored in red, are the nodes attached to the boundary nodes 2 and 7, respectively. Hence, $l = 2$ and $\{i_1, i_2\} = \{2, 7\}$ and $\{j_1, j_2\} = \{4, 6\}$.

Notice that the determinant of $A$ is always nonzero, so $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ is generated by $\{e_{i_r}, f_{j_r}\}$, and $\mathfrak{h}(A)$ has a basis $\{h_1, \ldots, h_n\}$. Let $\bar{A} = (\bar{a}_{ij})$ be the $(n - l) \times (n - l)$ matrix obtained from $A$ by setting $a_{j_r,i_r} = 0$ for all $r$ and deleting the row and column attached to $i_r$ for all $1 \leq r \leq l$. Note that the $e_{i_r}$’s pairwise commute, as do the $f_{i_r}$’s.
Before proceeding, it is useful to review the constructions in §4 and look closely at the Cartan matrices of the exceptional Lie algebra and the exceptional Lie superalgebra it semisimplifies to. The key idea is that we have a copy of $J_2$ given by $e_{jr} \mapsto [e_{ir}, e_{jr}]$ for each $1 \leq r \leq l$, and in the semisimplification these merge to form an odd generator. Now, let’s state some supporting lemmas.

**Lemma 3.5.** The determinant of $\tilde{A}$ is nonzero.

**Proof.** Since there are a finite number of exceptional Lie algebras and a finite number of boundary nodes, there are only a finite number of possibilities of $\tilde{A}$. Using a computer program, we compute the determinant of all of these, and it is never zero. However, this can tediously also be done by hand, as there are not too many cases. $\square$

As a consequence, the Chevalley generators generate $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})$, and the dimension of its Cartan subalgebra is $n - l$.

**Lemma 3.6.** The element $e = \sum_{r=1}^{l} e_{ir}$ is nilpotent of degree at most 3 and $\tilde{g}(A)$ can be realized as a Lie algebra in $\text{Rep} \alpha_3$ w.r.t. $\text{ad} e$.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, by suitably reordering the indices, we may assume that $i_1 = 1, i_2 = 2, \ldots, i_l = l$ and $j_1 = 1 + l, j_2 = 2 + l, \ldots, j_l = 2l$. Then, by the Serre relations, we have $[e_i, e_j] = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$ and $1 \leq j \neq i + l \leq n$ and $[e_i, e_{i+l}] \neq 0$ but $[e_i, [e_i, e_{i+l}]] = 0$. It follows that in characteristic 3, $\text{ad} e = \text{ad} e_1 + \cdots + \text{ad} e_l$ is nilpotent of degree 3. This shows that $\tilde{g}(A)$ can be realized as an object in $\text{Rep} \alpha_3$. $\square$

For the remainder of this section, we shall assume that the indices are reordered as in the proof of Lemma 3.6.

**Lemma 3.7.** There exists a basis $B$ of $\tilde{g}(A)$ in which $\text{ad} e$ acts by the direct sum of Jordan blocks, and the generators $e_i, f_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) of $\tilde{g}(A)$ together with a suitable basis of the Cartan subalgebra $\tilde{h}(A)$ of $\tilde{g}(A)$ collectively form a subset of $B$.

**Proof.** We will construct such a basis. It is useful to extend the action of $e$ to an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $\{e, f, h\}$, where $f = f_1 + f_2 + \cdots + f_l$ and $h = [e, f] = h_1 + h_2 + \cdots + h_l$. We have the following indecomposables in $\tilde{g}(A)$:

\begin{align*}
J_1 &: \{e_{1+2l}, \ldots, e_n\}, \\
J_1 &: \{f_{1+2l}, \ldots, f_n\}, \\
J_2 &: \{e_{1+l} \mapsto [e, e_{1+l}], \ldots, e_{2l} \mapsto [e, e_{2l}]\}.
\end{align*}

Since $a_{ir,jr} = -1$ for all $r$, we also have:

\begin{align*}
J_2 &: \{[f, f_{1+l}] \mapsto f_{1+l}, \ldots, [f, f_{2l}] \mapsto f_{2l}\}.
\end{align*}

We then have the following $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triples giving $J_3$'s:

\begin{align*}
J_3 &: \{f_1 \mapsto h_1 \mapsto e_1, \ldots, f_l \mapsto h_l \mapsto e_l\}.
\end{align*}

Finally, we can consider the remaining part of the Cartan subalgebra. We have

\begin{align*}
J_1 &: \{h_{1+2l}, \ldots, h_n\},
\end{align*}
We claim that the sum $W$ of these copies of $J_i$ is a direct sum. First, note that each $J_i$ is $Q$-homogeneous even though $e$ is not because $[e, e_{i+t}] = [e_t, e_{i+t}]$, $[f, f_{i+t}] = [f_t, f_{i+t}]$, $[e_i, e_j] = [f_i, f_j] = 0$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq l$ by the Serre relations. Then, because each root space here is 1-dimensional and because \( \{h_1, \ldots, h_l; h_{1+t} - h_1, \ldots, h_t - h_1, h_{2l+1}, \ldots, h_n\} \) is a basis of the Cartan subalgebra, this tells us that their sum is direct.

Now, we argue that $W$ is a direct summand of $g(A)$ in $\text{Rep} \alpha_3$. First, note that $W$ is $Q$-homogeneous because each $J_i$ is. This means that the height grading on $g(A)$ also restricts to $W$. Let $g_i$ denote the subspace of height $i$ in $g(A)$. Then, $W$ contains $g_{-1}, g_0, g_1$ and has trivial intersection with $g_i$ for $|i| > 2$. Let $W'$ be the span of the root spaces that do not intersect $W$. $W'$ is also $Q$-homogeneous and graded by height, has trivial intersection with each of $g_{-1}, g_0, g_1$, and contains $g_i$ for $|i| > 2$. Clearly, $g(A) = W \oplus W'$ as vector spaces; we need to show that $W'$ is ad-invariant.

To do so, consider any $x \in W'$, and let $x = \sum_{|i| \geq 2} x_i$ be a height decomposition with $x_i \in g_i$. Now, note that $e$ raises height by 1 on homogeneous vectors, so for $i \leq -4$ and $i \geq 2$, $[x, x_i] \in W'$. Therefore, it suffices to assume that $x$ is of the form $x = x_{-3} + x_{-2}$.

The terms $[e, x_{-2}]$ and $[e, x_{-3}]$ have different heights, so we can look at them individually. Let’s start with $[e, x_{-2}]$. This has height $-1$, so it lies in $W$. Hence, we can write $[e, x_{-2}] = \sum_{l=1}^{n} c_l f_l$ for suitable $c_l$. Suppose $[e, x_{-2}] \neq 0$. By the $Q$-grading and because $e = \sum_{k=1}^{l} e_k$, this means we can write $x_{-2} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{ki} [f_k, f_i]$. However, by the Serre relations, $[f_k, f_i] = 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq l$ and $1 \neq i \leq n$. Hence, $x_{-2} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} c_{k,k+1} [f_k, f_{k+1}]$ which lies in $W$, a contradiction if $x_{-2} \neq 0$. Therefore, $[e, x_{-2}] = 0$.

So we can actually assume that $x$ is homogeneous of height $-3$. Then, we can write $[e, x] = w + w'$, where $w \in W, w' \in W'$ both have height $-2$. In particular, $w$ is of the form $w = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i [f_i, f_{i+t}]$ for suitable $d_i$. On the other hand, the root decomposition of $w'$ can only involve the root spaces of height $-2$ with root not equal to $-\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+t}$ for any $i$ such that $1 \leq i \leq l$. By the Serre relations, it follows that $w' = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i [f_k, f_{k+1}]$ where $y_{ij}$ lies in the root space with root $-\alpha_i + \alpha_j$. Now note that if $-(\alpha_k + \alpha_i + \alpha_{i+t})$ is a root for $1 \leq i, k \leq l$, then the associated root space is one-dimensional. This root space is spanned by $[f_k, [f_i, f_{i+t}]]$ because $[f_i, f_{i+t}]$ is nonzero and $f_i$ and $f_k$ commute by the Serre relations (alternatively, one can appeal to the simplicity of $g(A)$). Hence, appealing to the $Q$-grading again, we deduce $x$ is of the form:

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{l} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_{kij} + \sum_{k=1}^{l} \sum_{i=1}^{l} d_{ki} [f_k, [f_i, f_{i+t}]].$$

where $y_{kij}$ lies in the root space associated to the root $-(\alpha_k + \alpha_i + \alpha_j)$ and $d_{ki}$ are suitable constants. The bracket of the first sum with $e$ is $w'$ and the bracket of the second sum with $e$ is $w$. However, $[f_k, [f_i, f_{i+t}]] = 0$ for $1 \leq k, i \leq l$ by the Serre relations, so the second sum is zero, which means that $w = 0$. And therefore $[e, x] = w' \in W'$. This shows the claim. Now, the basis $B$ is the basis of $W$ prescribed above together with any Jordan basis of $W'$.

\[\blacksquare\]

**Remark 3.8.** We want to emphasize that at no point in the proof of Lemma 3.7 did we appeal to the simplicity of $g(A)$. This will be important for Conjecture 4.13.
Let’s work out an explicit example. Consider the Dynkin diagram of \( \mathfrak{e}_6 \), labeled as follows:

![Dynkin diagram](image)

Suppose we semisimplify \( \mathfrak{e}_6 \) with respect to \( e_1 + e_2 \). Then, \( l = 2 \), \( \{i_1, i_2\} = \{1, 2\} \), and \( \{j_1, j_2\} = 3, 4 \). As described in the lemma, we have the following split indecomposables, whose basis vectors commute with \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \), and therefore \( e = e_1 + e_2 \):

\[
J_1 : \ \{e_5, e_6, f_5, f_6, h_5, h_6\}
\]

We also have these indecomposables, as their basis vectors commute with \( e = e_1 + e_2 \):

\[
J_1 : \ \{h_3 - h_1, h_4 - h_2\}.
\]

These indecomposables arise because 3 is connected to 1 by a single arrow and 4 is connected to 2 by a single arrow in the Dynkin diagram:

\[
J_2 : \ \{e_3 \mapsto [e_1, e_3], e_4 \mapsto [e_2, e_4]\},
\]

\[
J_2 : \ \{[f_1, f_3] \mapsto f_3, [f_2, f_4] \mapsto f_4\}.
\]

Finally, we have two \( \mathfrak{sl}_2 \)-triples associated to \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \).

\[
J_3 : \ \{f_1 \mapsto h_1 \mapsto e_1, f_2 \mapsto h_2 \mapsto e_2\}.
\]

Notice how all the Chevalley generators are present in this decomposition and that each subspace is \( Q \)-homogeneous. This concludes the example.

Now, we shall fix such a decomposition of \( \mathfrak{g}(A) \) into indecomposables as in Lemma 3.7. Each Chevalley generator \( e_i, f_i \) lies in a copy of \( J_1, J_2 \), or \( J_3 \); in the semisimplification, the image of each of these indecomposables will be an \( L_1 \) or \( L_2 \) or 0. Notice that those that do not lie in \( J_3 \) contain precisely one generator; therefore, we shall refer to the basis vector associated to each of these (in the language of §3.3 and Proposition 3.4) as the image of the corresponding generator.

Let \( \mathfrak{g}(A)^{gen} \) denote the subquotient of \( \mathfrak{g}(A) \) generated by the images of the generators, modulo the additional relation that \([x, [x, x]] = 0\) for all odd \( x \) (recall that this is not automatic in characteristic 3). We note that when \([x, [x, x]]\) is nonzero, it is never in the Cartan subalgebra because it is odd.

Now, recall the Lie algebra \( \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A) \) defined in §2 and its generators and relations in (2.1). In particular, its upper triangular and lower triangular subalgebras are freely generated. We claim the following:

**Lemma 3.9.** There exists a surjective homomorphism from \( \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(\tilde{A}) \) to \( \mathfrak{g}(A)^{gen} \).

**Proof.** Referencing the proof of Lemma 3.7, let us label the images of generators in the semisimplification. For \( 1 + l \leq i \leq n - l \), let \( \tilde{e}_i \) denote the basis vector of \( \mathfrak{g}(A)^{gen} \) associated to the copy of \( L_1 \) for \( e_{i+l} \) (resp. for the \( f \)'s and \( h \)'s); for \( 1 \leq i \leq l \), let \( \tilde{e}_i \) denote the basis vector of \( \mathfrak{g}(A)^{gen} \) associated to the copy of \( L_2 \) for \( e_{i+l} \mapsto [e, e_{i+1}] \) (resp. for the \( f \)'s), and let
\[\tilde{h}_i\] denote the basis vector of \(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A)^{\text{gen}}\) associated to the copy of \(L_1\) for \(\tilde{h}_{i+l} - \tilde{h}_i\). Then, we have generators \(\{\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{h}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n-l}\) in \(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A)^{\text{gen}}\). The first \(l\) indices are odd, and the last \(n - 2l\) are even.

For \(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A)\), let us use the capital letters \(E, F, H\) instead of \(e, f, h\) to avoid conflict of notation with the generators of \(\mathfrak{g}(A)\). By Lemma \ref{lemma}, \(\{E_i, F_i, H_i\}\) generate \(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A)\). Again, by definition of \(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A)\), \(\tilde{A}\) is an \((n-l) \times (n-l)\) matrix, where the first \(l\) indices are of odd parity and the last \(n - 2l\) are of even parity. We claim that the surjection is given by the map \(E_i \mapsto \tilde{e}_i, F_i \mapsto \tilde{f}_i\) and \(H_i \mapsto \tilde{h}_i\).

To prove this, we need to check the relations in \ref{2.1}. We will check these using the language of \ref{3.3} and Proposition \ref{3.3}. Since these involve the bracket of two generators, let us split this into four cases based on the parity of each generator:

1. Let \(1 \leq i, j \leq l\). The indices \(i, j\) both have odd parity. Then, the bracket \([\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_j]\) is given by the bracket 
\[-[e_{i+l}, f_{j+l}] + [e, e_{i+l}], [f, f_{j+l}] = -\delta_{ij}h_{i+l} + [e, e_{i+l}], [f, f_{j+l}]\]

To compute the second bracket, we have by repeated applications of the Jacobi identity and the relations:
\[
[[[e, e_{i+l}], [f, f_{j+l}]], e_{i+l}] + [e, [e_{i+l}, [f, f_{j+l}]]] = \left[[[e, f_{j+l}], e_{i+l}] + [e, [e_{i+l}, f_{j+l}]], f_{j+l}\right] + [e_{i+l}, [f, f_{j+l}], e_{i+l}] = \delta_{ij}a_{i+l}a_{i, i+l} + \delta_{ij}a_{i, i+l} = -\delta_{ij}(h_{i+l} - h_i),
\]

since \(a_{i+l} = a_{i, i+l} = -1\). Therefore, 
\[-\delta_{ij}h_{i+l} + (\delta_{ij}(h_{i+l} - h_i)) = \delta_{ij}(h_{i+l} - h_i)\]
in characteristic 3, and we deduce 
\([\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_j] = \delta_{ij}(h_{i+l} - h_i) = \delta_{ij}\tilde{h}_i\). Now, let’s check that 
\([\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{e}_j] = \tilde{a}_{ij}\tilde{e}_j\). Since \(\tilde{h}_i = h_{i+l} - h_i\) and \(\tilde{e}_j = e_{j+l} \mapsto [e, e_{j+l}]\), we need to compute the action of \(h_{i+l} - h_i\) on both \(e_{j+l}\) and \([e, e_{j+l}]\):
\[
[h_{i+l} - h_i, e_{j+l}] = (a_{i+l,j+l} - a_{i,j+l})e_{j+l};
[h_{i+l} - h_i, [e, e_{j+l}]] = [h_{i+l} - h_i, [e, e_{j+l}]]
= [[h_{i+l} - h_i, e_{j+l}], e_{j+l}] + [e_{j+l}, [h_{i+l} - h_i, e_{j+l}]]
= (a_{i+l,j} - a_{ij} + a_{i+l,j+l} - a_{i,j+l})[e, e_{j+l}].
\]

If \(i \neq j\), \(a_{i+l,j+l} = a_{ij}\) and \(a_{ij} = a_{i+l} = a_{i,j+l} = 0\), and the coefficient of the RHS simplifies to \(a_{ij}\) in both equations. If \(i = j\), then \(a_{i+l,j+l} = a_{ii} = 2\) and \(a_{i+l} = a_{i,i+l} = -1\), and again the coefficient of the RHS simplifies to 0 = \(a_{ii}\) in both equations (remember we are in characteristic 3). This shows that 
\([\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{e}_j] = a_{ij}\tilde{e}_j\). A similar argument goes through for the other relation 
\([\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{f}_j] = -\tilde{a}_{ij}\tilde{f}_j\).

Finally, the Cartan subalgebra will continue to be commutative, so the last relation holds as well. Therefore, we deduce that the relations in \ref{2.1} hold between generators that correspond to indices of odd parity.

2. Let \(1 \leq i \leq l\) and \(1 + l \leq j \leq n - l\). The index \(i\) has odd parity and the index \(j\) has even parity. We proceed similarly to the first case. First, we notice 
\([\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_j] = 0\) as this must lie in the Cartan subalgebra, which is purely even, but the first vector
is odd and the second vector is even. And indeed, the condition on $i$ and $j$ ensures $i \neq j$, so we do have $[\tilde{e}_i, f_j] = \delta_{ij}\tilde{h}_i$ in this case.

Next, let’s check $[\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{e}_j] = \tilde{a}_{ij}\tilde{e}_j$. Since $\tilde{h}_i = h_{i+l} - h_i$ and $\tilde{e}_j = e_{j+l}$, we compute $[h_{i+l} - h_i, e_{j+l}] = (a_{i+l,j+l} - a_{i,j+l})e_{j+l} = a_{i+l,j+l}e_{j+l} = \tilde{a}_{ij}e_{j+l}$, from which the desired result follows. A similar argument shows that $[\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{f}_j] = -\tilde{a}_{ij}f_j$. Finally, the last relation holds again as the commutativity of the Cartan subalgebra is preserved. This shows relations 2.1 in this case.

(3) Let $1 + l \leq i \leq n - l$ and $1 \leq j \leq l$. The index $i$ has even parity and the index $j$ has odd parity. A similar argument to the previous case shows $[\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_j] = \delta_{ij}\tilde{h}_i = 0$. Now, let’s compute $[\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{e}_j]$. Since $\tilde{h}_i = h_{i+l}$ and $\tilde{e}_j = e_{j+l} \mapsto [e, e_{j+l}]$, we check the action of $h_{i+l}$. Therefore, we have

$$[h_{i+l}, e_{j+l}] = a_{i+l,j+l}e_{j+l};$$

$$[h_{i+l}, [e, e_{j+l}]] = [h_{i+l}, [e, e_{j+l}]]$$

$$= [h_{i+l}, e_{j+l}] + [e, [h_{i+l}, e_{j+l}]]$$

$$= (a_{i+l,j} + a_{i+l,j+l})e_{j+l} = a_{i+l,j+l}[e, e_{j+l}]$$

$$= \tilde{a}_{ij}e_{j+l},$$

from which we deduce $[\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{e}_j] = \tilde{a}_{ij}\tilde{e}_j$. A similar argument shows $[\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{f}_j] = -\tilde{a}_{ij}\tilde{f}_j$. Finally, the last relation holds again as the commutativity of the Cartan subalgebra is preserved. This shows relations 2.1 in this case.

(4) $1 + l \leq i, j \leq n - l$. The indices $i, j$ both have even parity. This is the easiest case, and the relations in 2.1 follow immediately.

We deduce that the generators $\{\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{h}_i\}$ satisfy the same relations (and actually, they satisfy more relations) as the generators $\{E_i, F_i, H_i\}$ of $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})$. This gives the desired surjection. □

We can now state the main theorem. If $V = V_+ \oplus V_-$ is a supervector space with even part $V_+$ and odd part $V_-$, let $\text{sdim} V = (\dim V_+ \dim V_-)$ denote its superdimension. Two supervector spaces have the same superdimension if the dimension of the even parts agree and the dimensions of the odd parts agree.

**Theorem 3.10.** If $\text{sdim} \tilde{g}(\tilde{A}) = \text{sdim} g(\tilde{A})$, then $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})^{\text{gen}} = \tilde{g}(\tilde{A})$ and $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})$ is isomorphic to $g(\tilde{A})$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 3.9, we know there is a surjective, $Q$-grading-preserving homomorphism from $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})$ to $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})^{\text{gen}}$, and both have a Cartan subalgebra of the same rank. Therefore, the kernel of this homomorphism is graded and trivially intersects the Cartan subalgebra, and so this gives a well-defined surjection from $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})^{\text{gen}}$ to $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})$. On the other hand, if the dimension of $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})^{\text{gen}}$ is less than the dimension of $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})$, the surjection cannot exist. Therefore, we deduce $\tilde{g}(\tilde{A})^{\text{gen}} = \tilde{g}(\tilde{A})$, and by comparing superdimensions, we deduce that this map must be an isomorphism. □

**Remark 3.11.** It would be interesting to see how this theorem can be generalized (see Conjecture 4.13), both for higher characteristic and more general Cartan matrices. For
instance, it also appears to be true for type $A_n$ (and for $B_n, C_n, D_n$ with suitable restrictions on the boundary nodes).

3.6. Other Examples of Semisimplification. In this section, we offer some other examples of semisimplification, both for completeness and to highlight some potential pitfalls. For instance, in the proof of Theorem 3.10 we carefully showed that certain relations were satisfied, although at first glance these were the “obvious” relations to be satisfied; in general, this cannot be expected.

3.6.1. Example 1. Consider the additive group scheme $\mathbb{G}_a$ over $\mathbb{C}$. The representation category $\text{Rep} \mathbb{G}_a$ is a symmetric tensor category, and its objects are described by nilpotent representations of the algebra $\mathbb{C}[t]$. Any such representation is the direct sum of Jordan blocks, and the tensor product of Jordan blocks is described by the usual Clebsch-Gordan rule. It follows that the semisimplification of this category is $\text{Rep} SL_2(\mathbb{C})$, where the Jordan block of dimension $n$ semisimplifies to the $n$-dimensional representation of $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ (we are effectively deleting the maps between Jordan blocks of different size and nilpotent endomorphisms, cf. [EO19]).

Any Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ in $\text{Rep} \mathbb{G}_a$ is therefore a Lie algebra equipped with a nilpotent derivation $d$, and semisimplifying gives a Lie algebra $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ with an action of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is semisimple, then $d$ is inner and we can write $d(x) = [e, x]$ for some $e \in \mathfrak{g}$. By the Jacobson-Morozov lemma, $e$ can be included in an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $\{e, f, h\}$, and the semisimplification of $\mathfrak{g}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g}$ with the action of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ prescribed by this triple.

On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is not semisimple, the action of $d$ may not extend to an action of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ by derivations (even if $d$ is inner). This can result in $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ not being isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g}$ unlike the previous case, and in fact, $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ may even be abelian. In general, $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the associated graded algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ under the Deligne filtration by $d$, which on a vector space $V$ is defined by $F_k V = \sum_{j-i=k} \ker d^j \cap \text{im} d^i$. If $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ is semisimple, this filtration extends to a grading by eigenvalues of $h$, so $\text{gr}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{g}$. But when $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ is not semisimple, it may not extend to such a grading, and hence we may not have such an isomorphism.

Here is an explicit example. Consider the three-dimensional Heisenberg Lie algebra spanned by $x, y, z$ with $z = [x, y]$ the central element. Let $d$ be the derivation given by $ad \, x$. This does not extend to an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ action, and the semisimplification is abelian, which we’ll explicitly check: using the notation of Jordan blocks from §3.2 in the obvious way for characteristic 0, we have a copy of $J_1$ spanned by $x$ and a copy of $J_2$ given by $y \mapsto z$. The bracket $[x, y] = z$ and the bracket $[x, z] = 0$ are encapsulated by a morphism $J_1 \otimes J_2 \rightarrow J_2$ which is negligible, so it becomes zero in the semisimplification.

3.6.2. Example 2 (Duflo-Serganova, cf. [DS08]). Consider the representation category $\mathcal{C} = \text{Rep} \mathbb{G}_a^{0|1}$. A Lie algebra in $\mathcal{C}$ is a Lie superalgebra with an odd derivation $d$ such that $d^2 = 0$. The semisimplification of $\mathcal{C}$ is $s\text{Vec}_C$ and the semisimplification of $\mathfrak{g}$ is the cohomology of $d$, which is a new Lie superalgebra.

3.6.3. Example 3 (Entova-Aizenbud and Serganova, cf. [EAS20]). Consider the representation category $\mathcal{C}$ of the supergroup scheme $\mathbb{G}_a^{1|1}$. A Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ is a Lie superalgebra with an odd, nilpotent derivation $d$. The semisimplification of $\mathcal{C}$ is $\text{Rep} \mathfrak{osp}_{1|2}$, and $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a Lie superalgebra with an action of $\mathfrak{osp}_{1|2}$. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is quasireductive and $d = ad \, e$ is inner, where $e$ is a neat element (i.e. $[e, e]$ acts as the sum of odd dimensional Jordan blocks in every
finite-dimensional representation of \( g \), then it is shown that \( \overline{g} = g \) and \( e \) extends to action of \( \text{osp}_{1|2} \). However, this is nontrivial and only true under these conditions. This is in a sense a super analog of Example 1 above.

4. Exceptional Simple Lie Superalgebras in Characteristic 3

In this section, we use Theorem 3.10 above to construct exceptional simple Lie superalgebras via semisimplification. More accurately, we construct the corresponding Kac-Moody Lie superalgebra that yields the simple Lie superalgebra after potentially quotienting by the center. We are able to construct all ten simple Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebras. We shall use the notation \( g(a, b) \) to denote them, where \( g \) denotes the Lie superalgebra occupying the \((a, b)\)-th slot in the Elduque-Freudenthal magic super square (cf. \cite{CE07a, Eld06, CE06}). We are also able to construct the Elduque Lie superalgebra.

For completeness, we include a description of the even part and odd part of each Lie superalgebra. We shall use the notation \( L(\omega_i) \) to denote the irreducible representation of a simple Lie algebra of highest weight a fundamental weight \( \omega_i \), whose labels shall follow that of Bourbaki (cf. \cite{Bou08}). The even parts of the Lie superalgebras we construct are usually simple Lie algebras, and the odd parts are usually some fundamental representation.

4.1. **Construction** \( g(1, 6) \) from \( f_4 \). In this section, we will construct the Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebra \( g(1, 6) \). This is a contragredient Lie superalgebra of superdimension \((21|14)\) with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
2 & -1 & 0 \\
-1 & 2 & -2 \\
0 & -1 & 0
\end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{0, 0, 1\}.
\]

The even part of \( g(1, 6) \) is \( \text{sp}_6 \) and the odd part is the fundamental representation \( L(\omega_3) \). Applying our main theorem, we consider the Lie algebra with Cartan matrix

\[
B = \begin{pmatrix}
2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 2 & -2 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 2
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

This is the Cartan matrix of the 52-dimensional simple Lie algebra \( f_4 \). The Lie algebra \( f_4 \) has the following Dynkin diagram, labeled in accordance with the Cartan matrix:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

\( f_4 \) can be realized as an object in \( \text{Rep} \alpha_3 \) with respect to the adjoint action of \( e_4 \) and decomposes as \( 21J_1 \oplus 14J_2 \oplus J_3 \), which can be checked using the software \textit{SuperLie}. Therefore, comparing dimensions, by Theorem 3.10 we have:

**Theorem 4.1.** The semisimplification of \( f_4 \) as an object in \( \text{Rep} \alpha_3 \) under the adjoint action of \( e_4 \) is \( g(1, 6) \).
4.2. Lie Superalgebras Arising from $\mathfrak{e}_6$. Recall that $\mathfrak{e}_6$ is the 78 dimensional Lie algebra with Cartan matrix:

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

In characteristic 3, $\mathfrak{e}_6$ is not simple but rather has a one-dimensional center in the Cartan subalgebra. When we quotient out by the center, we get the simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{p}e_6$. It has the following Dynkin diagram, labeled in accordance with the Cartan matrix:

![Dynkin diagram](image)

4.2.1. Constructing $\mathfrak{g}(2,3)$. In this section, we will construct the Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(2,3)$. This is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{1, 1, 1\}.$$  

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension $(11|14)$ and contains a one-dimensional center. Its even part is $\mathfrak{gl}_3 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2$ and its odd part is $\mathfrak{psl}(3) \otimes K^2$; here $\mathfrak{gl}_3$ acts on $\mathfrak{psl}(3)$ by the adjoint representation and $K^2$ is the natural representation of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$. By comparing Cartan matrices, we realize $\mathfrak{e}_6$ as an object in $\text{Rep} \alpha_3$ with respect to $e_1 + e_2 + e_6$, where it decomposes as $\mathfrak{e}_6 = 11J_1 \oplus 14J_2 \oplus 13J_3$. Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.2.** The semisimplification of $\mathfrak{e}_6$ as an object in $\text{Rep} \alpha_3$ under the adjoint action of $e_1 + e_2 + e_6$ is $\mathfrak{g}(2,3)$.

It follows that when we semisimplify $\mathfrak{p}e_6$, we get $\mathfrak{pg}(2,3)$, which is simple.

4.2.2. Constructing $\mathfrak{g}(3,3)$. In this section, we will construct the Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(3,3)$. This is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{0, 0, 1, 1\}.$$  

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension $(22|16)$ and contains a one-dimensional center. The even subalgebra is $\mathfrak{so}_7 \oplus Kd$, and the odd part, as a module of the even subalgebra, is
$L(\omega_3)^+ \oplus L(\omega_3)^-$, where in particular $L(\omega_3)$ is the spinor representation of $\mathfrak{so}_7$, and $d$ acts by $+1$ on the first copy and $-1$ on the second copy.

By comparing Cartan matrices, we realize $\mathfrak{e}_6$ as an object in $\text{Rep}\, \alpha_3$ with respect to $e_1 + e_2$, where it decomposes as $\mathfrak{e}_6 = 22J_1 \oplus 16J_2 \oplus 8J_3$. Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.3.** The semisimplification of $\mathfrak{e}_6$ as an object in $\text{Rep}\, \alpha_3$ under the adjoint action of $e_1 + e_2$ is $\mathfrak{g}(3, 3)$.

It follows that when we semisimplify $\mathfrak{pe}_6$, we get $\mathfrak{pg}(3, 3)$, which is simple.

4.2.3. **Constructing $\mathfrak{g}(2, 6)$.** In this section, we will construct the Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(2, 6)$. This is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \\
\end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{0, 0, 1, 0, 0\}.
\]

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension $(35|20)$ and contains a one-dimensional center. The even subalgebra is $\mathfrak{gl}_6$ and the odd part is the module $L(\omega_3)$. By comparing Cartan matrices, we realize $\mathfrak{e}_6$ as an object in $\text{Rep}\, \alpha_3$ with respect to $e_2$, where it decomposes as $\mathfrak{e}_6 = 35J_1 \oplus 20J_2 \oplus J_3$. Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.4.** The semisimplification of $\mathfrak{e}_6$ as an object in $\text{Rep}\, \alpha_3$ under the adjoint action of $e_2$ is $\mathfrak{g}(2, 6)$.

It follows that when we semisimplify $\mathfrak{pe}_6$, we get $\mathfrak{pg}(2, 6)$, which is simple.

4.3. **Lie Superalgebras Arising from $\mathfrak{e}_7$.** Recall that $\mathfrak{e}_7$ is the 133 dimensional simple Lie algebra with Cartan matrix:

\[
B = \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

It has the following Dynkin diagram, labeled in accordance with the Cartan matrix:
4.3.1. Constructing $g(4, 3)$. In this section, we will construct the Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebra $g(4, 3)$. This is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{1, 1, 0, 1\}.$$

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension $(24|26)$. It has an even subalgebra $sp_6 \oplus sl_2$ and the module $L(\omega_2) \otimes K^2$ of the even subalgebra is its odd part, where $K^2$ is the natural representation of $sl_2$. By comparing Cartan matrices, we realize $e_7$ as an object in $Rep \alpha_3$ with respect to $e_1 + e_2 + e_7$, where it decomposes as $e_7 = 24J_1 \oplus 26J_2 \oplus 19J_3$. Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.5.** The semisimplification of $e_7$ as an object in $Rep \alpha_3$ under the adjoint action of $e_1 + e_2 + e_7$ is $g(4, 3)$.

4.3.2. Constructing $g(4, 6)$. In this section, we will construct the Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebra $g(4, 6)$. This is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{0, 1, 0, 0, 0\}.$$

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension $(66|32)$. Its even subalgebra is $so_{12}$ and its odd part is the module $L(\omega_4) \otimes K^2$, where $K^2$ is the natural representation of $sl_2$. By comparing Cartan matrices, we realize $e_7$ as an object in $Rep \alpha_3$ with respect to $e_1$, where it decomposes as $e_7 = 66J_1 \oplus 32J_2 \oplus J_3$. Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.6.** The semisimplification of $e_7$ as an object in $Rep \alpha_3$ under the adjoint action of $e_1$ is $g(4, 6)$.

4.3.3. Constructing $el(5; 3)$. In this section, we will construct the Elduque superalgebra $el(5; 3)$. This is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{0, 1, 0, 0, 1\}.$$

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension $(39|32)$. Its even subalgebra is $so_{12} \oplus sl_2$ and its odd part is $L(\omega_4) \otimes K^2$, where $K^2$ is the natural representation of $sl_2$. By comparing Cartan
matrices, we realize \( e_7 \) as an object in \( \text{Rep} \alpha_3 \) with respect to \( e_1 + e_7 \), where it decomposes as \( e_7 = 39J_1 \oplus 32J_2 \oplus 10J_3 \). Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.7.** The semisimplification of \( e_7 \) as an object in \( \text{Rep} \alpha_3 \) under the adjoint action of \( e_1 + e_7 \) is \( \mathfrak{sl}(5; 3) \).

4.4. Lie Superalgebras Arising From \( e_8 \). Recall that \( e_8 \) is the 248 dimensional simple Lie algebra with Cartan matrix:

\[
B = \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2
\end{pmatrix}
\]

It has the following Dynkin diagram, labeled in accordance with the Cartan matrix:

4.4.1. **Constructing \( g(8, 3) \).** \( g(8, 3) \) is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0
\end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{1, 1, 0, 0, 1\}.
\]

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension \((55|50)\). Its even subalgebra is \( f_4 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2 \) and its odd part is the module \( L(\omega_4) \otimes \mathbb{K}^2 \), where \( \mathbb{K}^2 \) is the natural representation of \( \mathfrak{sl}_2 \). By comparing Cartan matrices, we realize \( e_8 \) as an object in \( \text{Rep} \alpha_3 \) with respect to \( e_1 + e_2 + e_8 \), where it decomposes as \( e_8 = 55J_1 \oplus 50J_2 \oplus 31J_3 \). Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.8.** The semisimplification of \( e_8 \) as an object in \( \text{Rep} \alpha_3 \) under the adjoint action of \( e_1 + e_2 + e_8 \) is \( g(8, 3) \).

4.4.2. **Constructing \( g(6, 6) \).** \( g(6, 6) \) is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:
A = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \\
\end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0\}.

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension (78\,|\,64). Its even subalgebra is $\mathfrak{so}_{13}$ and its odd part is the spinor representation $L(\omega_6)$. By comparing Cartan matrices, we realize $\mathfrak{e}_8$ as an object in $\text{Rep} \, \alpha_3$ with respect to $e_1 + e_2$, where it decomposes as $\mathfrak{e}_8 = 78J_1 \oplus 64J_2 \oplus 14J_3$. Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.9.** The semisimplification of $\mathfrak{e}_8$ as an object in $\text{Rep} \, \alpha_3$ under the adjoint action of $e_1 + e_2$ is $\mathfrak{g}(6, 6)$.

4.4.3. **Constructing $\mathfrak{g}(8, 6)$.** $\mathfrak{g}(8, 6)$ is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0\}.$$

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension (133\,|\,56). Its even subalgebra is $\mathfrak{sp}_8$ and its odd part is the module $L(\omega_3)$. By comparing Cartan matrices, we realize $\mathfrak{e}_8$ as an object in $\text{Rep} \, \alpha_3$ with respect to $e_1$, where it decomposes as $\mathfrak{e}_8 = 133J_1 \oplus 56J_2 \oplus J_3$. Then, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10 is satisfied, and we have:

**Theorem 4.10.** The semisimplification of $\mathfrak{e}_8$ as an object in $\text{Rep} \, \alpha_3$ under the adjoint action of $e_1$ is $\mathfrak{g}(8, 6)$.

4.4.4. **Constructing $\mathfrak{g}(3, 6)$.** $\mathfrak{g}(3, 6)$ is a contragredient Lie superalgebra with a Cartan matrix and parity set:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & -2 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \\
\end{pmatrix}; \quad I = \{1, 1, 1, 0\}.$$

This is a Lie superalgebra of superdimension (36\,|\,40). Its even subalgebra is $\mathfrak{sp}_8$ and its odd part is $L(\omega_3)$. We can construct this Lie superalgebra from $\mathfrak{e}_8$, but this will slightly differ from the main approach above. Let $x = e_1 + e_2 + e_6 + e_8$. Then, it is easily checked that with respect to the adjoint action of $x$, $\mathfrak{e}_8$ is an object in $\text{Rep} \, \alpha_3$, where it decomposes as $\mathfrak{e}_8 = 36J_1 + 40J_2 + 44J_3$. We shall show that:
Theorem 4.11. The semisimplification of $e_8$ as an object in $\text{Rep} \, \alpha_3$ under the adjoint action of $e_1 + e_2 + e_6 + e_8$ is $g(3, 6)$.

Proof. The main theorem does not go through because the node corresponding to $e_6$ on the Dynkin diagram is not a boundary node, so we will proceed manually using the language of §3.3 and Proposition 3.4. However, they key point that the generators $e_1, e_2, e_6, e_8$ pairwise commute still holds. Let us first consider what happens to the positive generators. Because of the new situation, we will also need to consider root vectors that are not attached to simple roots. Let:

1. $e_9 := [x, e_3] = [e_1, e_3],$
2. $e_{10} := [x, e_4] = [e_2, e_4],$
3. $e_{13} := [x, e_5] = [e_5, e_6],$
4. $e_{14} := [e_6, e_7],$
5. $e_{15} := [-e_8, e_7],$
6. $e_{22} := [e_8, [e_6, e_7]],$

and similarly for $f$; these new indices are chosen in accordance with labeling in the SuperLie software and do not have any other meaning. In particular, note that $e_{14} - e_{15} = [x, e_7].$

Let’s consider the upper triangular subalgebra, completed to a split subobject (by symmetry, this will tell us what happens to the lower triangular subalgebra). We have the following copies of $J_3$: $f_1 \mapsto h_1 \mapsto e_1, f_2 \mapsto h_2 \mapsto e_2, f_6 \mapsto h_6 \mapsto e_6, f_8 \mapsto h_8 \mapsto e_8,$ $e_7 \mapsto e_{14} - e_{15} \mapsto -e_{22};$ these will vanish in the semisimplification, and in particular the information attached to the generator $e_7$ is annihilated. The remaining generators yield odd generators, as we have the following copies of $J_2$: $e_3 \mapsto e_9, e_4 \mapsto e_{10},$ and $e_5 \mapsto -e_{13}.$

In the semisimplification, the images of these odd generators do not generate the image (in fact, it is easily seen that, along with their $f$ counterparts, they generate the rank 3 Lie superalgebra $g(2, 3)$ above). However, $g(3, 6)$ is of rank 4 and contains $g(2, 3)$ as a subalgebra, which we know by just looking at their Cartan matrices, so we should be able to find another indecomposable whose image will serve as our final generator (it should span a split copy of $J_1$). In fact, the vector that will serve as our generator is $e_{14} + e_{15}$ and its lower triangular counterpart $-f_{14} - f_{15},$ which together form an $sl_4$-triple (in characteristic 3) with $h_6 - h_7 + h_8, e_{14} + e_{15}$ should be treated as the positive generator. Hence, in the semisimplification, we define the following vectors, where the LHS is the vector and the RHS is the subspace it spans:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{e}_1 &:= e_3 \mapsto e_9; \quad \tilde{e}_2 := e_4 \mapsto e_{10}; \quad \tilde{e}_3 := e_5 \mapsto -e_{13}; \quad \tilde{e}_4 := e_{14} + e_{15} \\
\tilde{f}_1 &:= f_9 \mapsto f_3; \quad \tilde{f}_2 := f_{10} \mapsto f_4; \quad \tilde{f}_3 := -f_{13} \mapsto f_5; \quad \tilde{f}_4 := -f_{14} - e_{15} \\
\tilde{h}_1 &:= h_3; \quad \tilde{h}_2 := h_4; \quad \tilde{h}_3 := h_5; \quad \tilde{h}_4 := h_6 - h_7 + h_8.
\end{align*}
\]

Now, using SuperLie, we can check that the collection of vectors $\{\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{h}_i\}$ do indeed generate the semisimplification. Furthermore, direct computations show that they satisfy the same relations as their counterparts in $g(3, 6),$ so this means we have a morphism from $g(3, 6)$ to the semisimplification. Then, by comparing dimensions, we deduce that they are isomorphic. As a remark, we do not need to even know that the generators generate the image, as the Lie superalgebra $g(3, 6)$ is simple. \qed
For completeness, we briefly describe another construction of \( \mathfrak{g}(3, 6) \). Recall that as a Lie algebra-module pair, \( \mathfrak{e}_8 \) splits as the 120-dimensional simple Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{so}_{16} \) and its 128-dimensional spinor representation \( L(\omega_8) \). In our notation, the subalgebra \( \mathfrak{so}_{16} \) is generated by \( e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6, e_7, e_8 \) and

\[
e_{100} := [[[e_1, e_3], [e_4, e_5]], [[e_2, e_4], [e_5, e_6]], [[[e_1, e_3], [e_2, e_4]], [[e_6, e_7], [e_5, [e_3, e_4]]]],
\]

and their \( f \) counterparts (again, the choice of index here is just based on the program SuperLie and otherwise has no meaning).

Let \( e_{27} := [[e_6, e_5], [e_4, e_3]] \) and similarly for \( f_{27} \). Then, \( \mathfrak{sp}_8 \) is a subalgebra of \( \mathfrak{so}_{16} \) generated by \( e_{100} - f_5, e_8 - f_4, e_7 - f_3, e_{27} \) and \( f_{100} - e_5, f_8 - e_4, f_7 - e_3, f_{27} \), where the first 4 correspond to the simple roots in the usual order and the last 4 the negatives of the simple roots. Then, one can take an \( \mathfrak{sl}_2 \)-triple in \( \mathfrak{so}_{16} \subseteq \mathfrak{e}_8 \) that centralizes \( \mathfrak{sp}_8 \); semisimplifying with respect to say the positive root vector in this triple gives the desired \( \mathfrak{g}(3, 6) \).

4.4.5. Summary. In this section, we summarize and extend the results above. Here we have the appropriate Dynkin diagrams for easy reference, where \( \mathfrak{e}_6 \subseteq \mathfrak{e}_7 \subseteq \mathfrak{e}_8 \) in the obvious way:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathfrak{f}_4 & : & 1 & \rightarrow 2 & \rightarrow 3 & \rightarrow 4 \\
\mathfrak{e}_8 & : & 1 & \rightarrow 3 & \rightarrow 4 & \rightarrow 5 & \rightarrow 6 & \rightarrow 7 & \rightarrow 8 
\end{align*}
\]

In table below, we state results by specifying the starting Lie algebra, the nilpotent element used to semisimplify, and the resulting Lie superalgebra. We include all possible combinations of boundary nodes and some examples that do not follow from the main theorem as well. Nilpotent elements that give the same semisimplification are listed in the same row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lie algebra</th>
<th>Nilpotent element</th>
<th>Lie superalgebra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{f}_4 )</td>
<td>( e_1 )</td>
<td>see ((\star)) below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_4 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(1, 6) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_1 + e_4 )</td>
<td>see ((\star)) below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{e}_6 )</td>
<td>( e_1, e_2, e_6 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(2, 6) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_1 + e_2, e_2 + e_6, e_1 + e_6 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(3, 3) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_1 + e_2 + e_6 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(2, 3) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{e}_7 )</td>
<td>( e_1, e_2, e_7 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(4, 6) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_1 + e_2, e_2 + e_7, e_1 + e_7 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{c}(5; 3) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_1 + e_2 + e_7 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(4, 3) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_2 + e_5 + e_7 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{f}_4; \text{see } (\star) ) below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_1 + e_2 + e_5 + e_7 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(1, 6) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{e}_8 )</td>
<td>( e_1, e_2, e_8 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(8, 6) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_1 + e_2, e_2 + e_8, e_1 + e_8 )</td>
<td>( \mathfrak{g}(6, 6) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table continued from previous page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lie algebra</th>
<th>Nilpotent element(s)</th>
<th>Lie superalgebra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$e_1 + e_2 + e_8$</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{g}(8,3)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_1 + e_2 + e_6 + e_8$</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{g}(3,6)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) This is an interesting case not discussed in the paper, as we get a purely even Lie algebra, and why this is the case is not clear from the Cartan matrix. It suggests an idea of iterating semisimplification, as we can either semisimplify $e_7$ to get $\mathfrak{f}_4$ and then semisimplify again to get $\mathfrak{g}(1,6)$, or we can semisimplify $e_7$ to directly get $\mathfrak{g}(1,6)$.

(*) Semisimplifying $\mathfrak{f}_4$, which say has Cartan matrix $A$, with respect to $e_1$ gives a Lie superalgebra $\widehat{\mathfrak{f}}_4$ of superdimension of $(15|8)$, whereas the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}({\tilde{A}}) = \mathfrak{sl}_3|1$ as described in the setup for Theorem 3.10 is of superdimension $(9|6)$. Hence, Theorem 3.10 does not apply. However, it can be computed by hand that $\widehat{\mathfrak{f}}_4^{\text{gen}}$ is of superdimension $(9|6)$ and is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_3|1$. A similar statement applies when we semisimplify $\mathfrak{f}_4$ with $e_1 + e_4$. Although these may seem like edge cases, we believe there is a more general conjecture which captures these cases and the main theorem simultaneously, which we discuss in §4.5 in Conjecture 4.13.

One may notice that for $e_6, e_7, e_8$, when we picked fewer than three generators to sum, it did not matter which generators we picked to semisimplify, but rather only how many we picked. These are actually instances of a more general phenomenon. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be an exceptional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{f}_4, e_6, e_7, e_8$, and let $I$ be any subset of the nodes of the associated Dynkin diagram such that no two nodes in $I$ are adjacent in the Dynkin diagram. Color the nodes in $I$ black, and all other nodes white. Finally, let $e_I := \sum_{i \in I} e_i$.

A legal swap of the colored Dynkin diagram is defined as any recoloring of the diagram of the following form: if $i$ and $j$ are two adjacent nodes connected by a single edge, with $i$ colored black, and $j$ colored white, and no other node adjacent to $j$ is black, swap the colors of $i$ and $j$. It is clear that the legal swaps generate a groupoid under composition; we will call its elements legal recolorings. Let $\sigma(I)$ denote the set of nodes colored black after applying the legal recoloring $\sigma$.

Here are some examples of legal swaps:

![Legal Swaps Example](image-url)

Here are some examples of illegal swaps:

![Illegal Swaps Example](image-url)
Theorem 4.12. Let $I$ be a configuration of black nodes as above, and let $\sigma$ be a legal recoloring. Then, $\mathfrak{g}$ can be realized as an object in $\text{Rep}\,\alpha_3$ in two ways: with respect to $e_I$, denoted $\mathfrak{g}_I$, or with respect to $e_{\sigma(I)}$, denoted $\mathfrak{g}_{\sigma(I)}$. Furthermore, the semisimplifications $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}_I$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}_{\sigma(I)}$ are isomorphic as Lie superalgebras.

Proof. It suffices to assume that $\sigma$ is a legal swap that swaps the colors of the adjacent nodes $i$ and $j$, where $i$ is black and $j$ is white. By the initial configuration $I$ and the definition of a legal swap, the proof that $e_I$ is nilpotent of degree at most three goes through just like the proof of Lemma 3.6.

Now, let $G$ be a split simple linear algebraic group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. $G$ acts on $\mathfrak{g}$ by the adjoint representation as Lie algebra automorphisms, and nilpotent elements are partitioned into orbits. Hence, it suffices to show that $e_I$ and $e_{\sigma(I)}$ lie in the same nilpotent orbit.

The Dynkin subdiagram formed by nodes $i$ and $j$ corresponds to a subgroup $H$ of type $A_2$ (i.e. $\text{SL}_3$ or $\text{PGL}_3$) in $G$, and there is a Weyl group element $w \in N(T)/T$, where $T$ is a maximal torus in $H$, that permutes them. We can find a coset representative $g \in H$ that corresponds to $w$ such that its conjugation action on $\mathfrak{g}$ will send $e_i$ to $e_j$. The element $g$ then lifts to an element $\tilde{g}$ in $G$, and because no other black nodes are connected to $i$ or $j$, the conjugation action of $\tilde{g}$ will not change any other $e_k$ for $k \neq i \in I$. This shows the claim.

Combining this theorem with Theorem 3.10 tells us the semisimplification with respect to a large class of elements. For instance, we deduce that semisimplifying $\mathfrak{e}_8$ with respect to any $e_i$, regardless of whether $i$ corresponds to a boundary node or not, gives $\mathfrak{g}(8,6)$.

4.5. Some Remarks.

4.5.1. Kac-Moody Lie Algebras. Although we were able to construct these Lie superalgebras by semisimplifying the exceptional Lie algebras, it is natural to see what Lie superalgebras we get when we enlarge the class of Cartan matrices we consider.

Let $A$ be a purely even, symmetrizable, indecomposable, generalized Cartan matrix of size $n$ with nonzero determinant whose off-diagonal entries are between $1 - p = -2$ and 0, inclusive. Let $D$ be the corresponding Dynkin diagram, and call a node in the diagram a boundary node if it is connected to exactly one other node in the diagram via a single edge. Let $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_l\}$ be a subset of the boundary nodes of $D$ such that no two nodes in $I$ share an adjacent node, and let $J = \{j_1, \ldots, j_l\}$ be the corresponding adjacent nodes, respectively (the elements of $J$ are necessarily distinct). Let $\tilde{A}$ be the $(n - l) \times (n - l)$ matrix obtained from $A$ by setting $a_{jj} = 0$ for $j \in J$ and deleting the $i$-th row and column from $A$ for $i \in I$. Finally, let $e_I = \sum_{i \in I} e_i$. Then, we have the following conjecture for characteristic 3:

Conjecture 4.13. Under the preceding hypotheses, $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ can be realized as an object in $\text{Rep}\,\alpha_3$ with respect to $e_I$. Furthermore, if $\tilde{A}$ has nonzero determinant, then $\mathfrak{g}(A)^{\text{gen}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g}(\tilde{A})$. Furthermore, if $\sigma$ is any legal recoloring of $I$, then the previous statement also holds for $e_{\sigma(I)}$ in place of $e_I$.

Most of the work for the first statement of the conjecture has already been done when proving Theorem 3.10; in fact, if we assume that if for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ that each subspace of height $n$ in $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ and in $\mathfrak{g}(A)^{\text{gen}}$ have the same dimension, then the proof actually goes through...
directly. However, loosening this dimension requirement would be interesting because it does not appear to be necessary in our computations. In any case, there should be a surjection from $\overline{\mathfrak{g}(A)}^{ren}$ to $\mathfrak{g}(\tilde{A})$. The difficulty lies in showing that the former has no nontrivial ideal that intersects the Cartan subalgebra. The second statement of the conjecture should follow from the proof of Theorem 4.12.

The reason for considering nonzero determinants is because then the Chevalley generators generate the Lie superalgebras, and the proof of 3.10 can then be used. However, it should be a straightforward modification for zero determinant as well; one may have to consider the derived algebra instead.

It would be interesting to develop an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-equivariant theory of Kac-Moody Lie algebras, or more generally, a Kac-Moody Lie algebra in the category of $\text{Rep}_{\alpha}$; then one can see what happens in the semisimplification in $\text{Ver}_\mathfrak{p}$ and in $\text{sVec}_K$. Lastly, it would be interesting to see what happens when we study this procedure for affine Lie algebras.

4.5.2. Other Exceptional Lie Superalgebras. There are some other exceptional Lie superalgebras in characteristic 3 that we did not attempt to construct, like the Brown Lie superalgebras, the exceptional Lie superalgebras $G(3)$ and $F(4)$, which are also known as $\mathfrak{ag}(2)$ and $\mathfrak{ab}(3)$ in the literature. One may attempt to construct these in this fashion as well (however, unlike the Elduque and Cunha Lie superalgebras, there are straightforward constructions for these).

4.5.3. Applications to Representation Theory. Lastly, one can use the representation theory of exceptional Lie algebras to study representation theory of these exceptional Lie superalgebras. In particular, one can start with a representation of an exceptional Lie algebra in $\text{Rep}_{\alpha_3}$ and semisimplify it to construct representations of the corresponding Lie superalgebra. Although these can be probably classified by a highest-weight argument, this approach will give a construction to determine the size of these representations, which to our knowledge is virtually unknown.

5. An Exceptional Lie Superalgebra in Characteristic 5

In this section, we construct the Elduque Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{e}(5; 5)$ of superdimension $(55|32)$ by semisimplifying $\mathfrak{e}_8$. The even subalgebra is the orthogonal Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}_{11}$, and the odd part is the 32-dimensional spinor representation $L(\omega_5)$. The Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{e}(5; 3)$ constructed earlier is a characteristic 3 analog of this discovered in [BGL+09], in the sense that there is a suitable choice of Cartan matrix that creates both, depending on the characteristic. Our main theorem has not been extended to characteristic 5, so we will construct this in a fashion similar to the alternate construction of $\mathfrak{g}(3, 6)$ described above.

As remarked earlier, $\mathfrak{e}_8$ splits as the 120-dimensional simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$ and its 128-dimensional spinor representation $L(\omega_8)$. First, let’s consider the subalgebra $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$. Recall from §4.4.4 that the root vectors $e_1, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6, e_7, e_8$ and $e_{100}$, which along with their $f$ counterparts generate $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$. Visually, the Dynkin diagram looks like:
Let $V = \mathbb{K}^{16}$, and let $x = e_2 + e_3 + e_4$. By definition, $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$ is the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}_{16} = V \otimes V^*$ that preserves the nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form $B$ (for instance, consider the form given by $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_8 \\ I_8 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$). This gives a matrix realization of $x \in \mathfrak{so}_{16}$, which acts on $V$ by matrix multiplication. In particular, as a matrix $x$ is nilpotent of degree 5, so $V$ can be realized as an object in $\text{Rep}\alpha_5$ with respect to matrix multiplication action by $x$. It is easily checked that $V = 11J_1 \oplus J_5$, such that the $11J_1$ and the $J_5$ are orthogonal to each other, and the restriction of the form to each piece is nondegenerate. One way to see this is that $e_2 + e_3, e_4, f_2 + f_3, f_4$ generate $\mathfrak{so}_5 = \mathfrak{sp}_4$ as a subalgebra, and $e_2 + e_3 + e_4$ acts as a Jordan block of size 4 on the four-dimensional representation of $\mathfrak{sp}_4$ and hence as a Jordan block of size 5 on the five-dimensional representation of $\mathfrak{so}_5$ (and once embedded in $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$, it acts trivially on its orthogonal complement, which is 11-dimensional).

This in turn means that $\mathfrak{gl}_{16}$ and $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$ can be realized as objects in $\text{Rep}\alpha_5$ with respect the adjoint action of $x$. Then, when we semisimplify, $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$ becomes $\mathfrak{so}_{11}$. To see this (in more generality), let us view our bilinear form $B$ as an isomorphism from $B : V \rightarrow V^*$. This is a morphism in the category because $B$ is stabilized by $x$ as $x$ lies in $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$. This gives us the following composite map $\phi : \mathfrak{gl}(V) \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ given by $\phi = (1_V \otimes B^{-1}) \circ (1_V \otimes V + c_V \otimes V) \circ (1_V \otimes B)$. Since the outside morphisms are isomorphisms and the middle morphism is twice a projector, the kernel of $\phi$ is a split summand of $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$. The kernel of the middle map is $\wedge^2(V)$, and we can identify it with the kernel of $\phi$. On the other hand, the kernel of $\phi$ is the definition of $\mathfrak{so}(B, V)$, so via the form $B$, we can say $\mathfrak{so}(B, V) = \wedge^2(V)$.

When we semisimplify, $\overline{B}$ is a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form on $\overline{V}$, and $\wedge^2(\overline{V}) = \wedge^2(\overline{V})$ (because it is the degree 2 piece of the exterior algebra; for degrees greater than or equal to the characteristic, this may not necessarily be true). We deduce $\wedge^2(\overline{V}) = \mathfrak{so}(\overline{B}, \overline{V})$. So in our case, $\overline{\mathfrak{so}_{16}} = \mathfrak{so}_{11}$.

Now, let’s check what happens to $L(\omega_8)$, which we view as a subspace of $\mathfrak{e}_8$. The adjoint action of $x$ on $\mathfrak{e}_8$ is still nilpotent of degree 5, so $\mathfrak{e}_8 = \mathfrak{so}_{16} \oplus L(\omega_8)$ is a splitting in $\text{Rep}\alpha_5$. It can be checked using the software SuperLie that $L(\omega_8) = 32J_4$ in $\text{Rep}\alpha_5$, so its semisimplification is purely odd of dimension 32. We claim that the semisimplification is actually the spinor representation $L(\omega_5)$ of $\mathfrak{so}_{11}$.

By the description above, the action of $\mathfrak{so}_{16}$ restricts to an action of $\mathfrak{so}_{11} \times \mathfrak{so}_5$ on the spinor representation $L(\omega_8)$. It is well-known that as an $\mathfrak{so}_{11} \times \mathfrak{so}_5$-module $L(\omega_8) = L(\omega_5) \otimes L(\omega_2)$ is the tensor product of the corresponding spinor representations. The module $L(\omega_5)$ in a suitable basis is $32J_1$, and $L(\omega_2)$ in a suitable basis is $J_4$. After semisimplification, the claim follows.

Therefore, we deduce that the semisimplification of $\mathfrak{e}_8$ with respect to the adjoint action of $x$ decomposes as $55L_1 \oplus 32L_4$ in $\text{Ver}_5$, so it can be identified with a Lie superalgebra. The even part is the simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}_{11}$, and the odd part is its simple module $L(\omega_5)$.
Therefore, by the classification in [BGL+09], this must be the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{el}(5; 5)$. We have proved the following theorem:

**Theorem 5.1.** The semisimplification of $\mathfrak{e}_8$ as an object in $\text{Rep}\mathfrak{a}_5$ under the adjoint action of $e_2 + e_3 + e_4$ is a Lie algebra in $\text{Ver}_5$ of the form $55L_1 \oplus 32L_4$; in particular, this means it is a Lie superalgebra, and that Lie superalgebra is the Elduque Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{el}(5; 5)$.
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