

COMPACT LIE GROUPS AND COMPLEX REDUCTIVE GROUPS

JOHN JONES, DMITRIY RUMYNIN, AND ADAM THOMAS

ABSTRACT. We show that the categories of compact Lie groups and complex reductive groups are equivalent as infinity categories. The groups are not assumed to be connected.

In this note we examine the categories

$$\mathcal{L}ie = \{\text{Compact Lie Groups}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}ed = \{\text{Complex Reductive Groups}\},$$

where the morphisms are group homomorphisms, preserving the additional structures. The categories $\mathcal{L}ie$ and $\mathcal{R}ed$ are *not equivalent*. Although the isomorphism classes are in one-to-one correspondence, the morphisms are not: just compare the automorphisms of SU_2 and $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$.

The aim of this note is to fix the aforementioned lack of equivalence by proving the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *There exists a complexification functor $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{L}ie \rightarrow \mathcal{R}ed$ with the following four properties.*

- (1) *The group $G \in \mathcal{L}ie$ is a maximal compact subgroup of $\mathcal{T}(G)$.*
- (2) *The functor \mathcal{T} is injective on morphisms.*
- (3) *The functor \mathcal{T} is essentially surjective on objects.*
- (4) *For all $H, G \in \mathcal{L}ie$ the embedding $\mathcal{T}_{H,G} : \text{hom}(H, G) \rightarrow \text{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ is a homotopy equivalence. Here the hom-sets are equipped with the compact open topology.*

Theorem 1 admits an interpretation (cf. [7, 1.1]) in a naive version of ∞ -categories, outlined by Lurie [6, Def. 1.1.1.6]. Let $\mathcal{T}op$ be the closed monoidal category of compactly generated, weakly Hausdorff topological spaces. Both $\mathcal{L}ie$ and $\mathcal{R}ed$ are categories, enriched in $\mathcal{T}op$: take the Lie group topology on the groups and the compact-open topology on the hom-sets. Given $X \in \mathcal{T}op$ we denote its weak homotopy type by $\llbracket X \rrbracket \in \text{Ho}(\mathcal{T}op)$. Given a category \mathcal{C} , enriched in $\mathcal{T}op$, we denote its homotopy category, enriched in $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{T}op)$, by $\llbracket \mathcal{C} \rrbracket$. This category has the same objects as \mathcal{C} and $\llbracket \mathcal{C} \rrbracket(X, Y) := \llbracket \mathcal{C}(X, Y) \rrbracket$. Theorem 1 essentially establishes an $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{T}op)$ -enriched equivalence $\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket$ of the enriched categories $\llbracket \mathcal{L}ie \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \mathcal{R}ed \rrbracket$. Alternatively, Theorem 1 yields an ∞ -equivalence of the ∞ -categories $\llbracket \mathcal{L}ie \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \mathcal{R}ed \rrbracket$.

Our secondary aim is to investigate how the complexification functor behaves on subgroups. Suppose $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}(G)$. Consider the sets

$$\mathbb{S}(G) := \{\text{compact subgroups of } G\}, \quad \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{G}) := \{\text{reductive subgroups of } \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Date: September 28, 2021.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 18M25, Secondary 22E46.

Key words and phrases. compact Lie group, reductive group, Tannaka formalism, infinity category.

We prove the following result, which refines and extends [2, Lemma 2.1] to not necessarily connected subgroups.

Theorem 2. *Suppose $G \in \mathcal{L}ie$ and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}(G) \in \mathcal{R}ed$ is its complexification. The complexification functor gives a function $\tau : \mathbb{S}(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{G})$ satisfying the following properties.*

- (1) *The group H is a maximal compact subgroup of $\tau(H)$.*
- (2) *The function τ yields a bijection of orbit sets $\bar{\tau} : \mathbb{S}(G)/G \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{G})/\mathcal{G}$ where G, \mathcal{G} act on $\mathbb{S}(G), \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{G})$ (respectively) by conjugation.*
- (3) *The manifold G/H is homotopy equivalent to the algebraic variety $\mathcal{G}/\tau(H)$.*
- (4) *H is the centraliser of an involution if and only if $\tau(H)$ is the centraliser of an involution.*

In Section 1 we prove Theorem 1 and in Section 2 we prove Theorem 2. The final section is reserved for comments.

1. PROPERTIES OF COMPLEXIFICATION

For $G \in \mathcal{L}ie$ consider the tensor category $\mathcal{C}_G = G\text{-Mod}$ of finite-dimensional complex representations of G and the forgetful functor $F_G : \mathcal{C}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}$, where $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the category of finite-dimensional complex vector spaces. We define the complexification functor $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{L}ie \rightarrow \mathcal{R}ed$ via the Tannaka reconstruction, that is $\mathcal{T}(G) := \text{Aut}_{\otimes}(F_G)$. In other words, an element of $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is a family of linear maps

$$(x_V)_{V \in \mathcal{C}_G}, \quad x_V \in \text{hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, V)$$

defined for each representation V of G satisfying the following three properties

$$(1) \quad fx_V = x_Wf, \quad x_{V \otimes W} = x_V \otimes x_W \quad \text{and} \quad x_I = \text{Id}_I.$$

Here $f \in \mathcal{C}_G(V, W)$ and I is the trivial representation. It is not clear from this description why $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is a set. We will clarify this point later.

A homomorphism $f : H \rightarrow G$ defines a pull-back functor $f^* : \mathcal{C}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_H$, which allows us to define \mathcal{T} on morphisms

$$(2) \quad \text{Aut}_{\otimes}(F_H) \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\otimes}(F_G), \quad (x_U)_{U \in \mathcal{C}_H} \mapsto (x_{f^*V})_{V \in \mathcal{C}_G}.$$

We need to explain why $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is not only a set but also an algebraic group. Let U_1, \dots, U_k be simple G_1 -modules whose highest weights generate the cone of dominant weights of G_1 . Let W be the direct sum of all distinct irreducible direct summands of the induced modules $\text{Ind}_{G_1}^G U_i$. The representation W generates \mathcal{C}_G , in the sense that \mathcal{C}_G is the only full subcategory closed under isomorphisms, tensor products, direct sums and summands that contains W . Hence, a collection $(x_U)_{U \in \mathcal{C}_G}$ is uniquely determined by $x_W \in \text{GL}(W)$. It follows that $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is a set and the map

$$\varphi : \mathcal{T}(G) \longrightarrow \text{GL}(W), \quad (x_V)_{V \in \mathcal{C}_G} \mapsto x_W$$

identifies $\mathcal{T}(G)$ with a subgroup of $\text{GL}(W)$.

It follows from [3, Theorem 2.11 and Proposition 2.20] that $\text{im}(\varphi)$ is Zariski closed. This equips $\mathcal{T}(G)$ with the algebraic group structure such that any $V \in \mathcal{C}_G$ is a rational representation of $\mathcal{T}(G)$ and the category of rational representations of $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is equivalent to \mathcal{C}_G . Since \mathcal{C}_G is semisimple, the algebraic group $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is reductive and \mathcal{T} is a functor $\mathcal{L}ie \rightarrow \mathcal{R}ed$, as claimed.

Each consecutive subsection is a proof of the corresponding part of Theorem 1.

1.1. **G is a maximal compact subgroup of $\mathcal{T}(G)$.** We have a natural injective group homomorphism

$$(3) \quad \iota_G : G \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(G), \quad g \mapsto (\rho_V(g))_V, \quad V = (V, \rho_V) \in \mathcal{C}_G.$$

The topology on $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is the subspace topology, induced from $\mathrm{GL}(W)$. Since $\rho_W : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(W)$ is continuous, the homomorphism ι_G is continuous too. Thus, G is naturally a compact subgroup of $\mathcal{T}(G)$.

Suppose that G is not maximal in $\mathcal{T}(G)$. Then it is properly contained in another compact subgroup H . Applying \mathcal{T} to the embedding $f : G \hookrightarrow H$, we get the following homomorphisms of groups

$$G \xrightarrow{f} H \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{T}(G) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}(f)} \mathcal{T}(H).$$

The Tannakian formalism tells us that the pull-back functors $(df)^*$ and $(\mathcal{T}(f)d)^*$ are equivalences of categories. It follows that the pull-back functors d^* and f^* are equivalences of categories. This is impossible for a proper subgroup G of H because the compact group G can be recovered from \mathcal{C}_G together with its \star -structure by the Tannaka-Krein Reconstruction [4].

1.2. **Injective on Morphisms.** The map $\mathcal{T}_{H,G} : \mathrm{hom}(H, G) \rightarrow \mathrm{hom}(\mathcal{T}(H), \mathcal{T}(G))$ is injective because, as is clear from (2) and (3), the restriction of $\mathcal{T}(f) : \mathcal{T}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(G)$ to the compact group H is $f : H \rightarrow G \subset \mathcal{T}(G)$.

1.3. **Surjectivity on Objects.** Let \mathcal{G} be a reductive group. It has a maximal compact subgroup G by the Malcev-Iwasawa Theorem [8, Thm 32.5]. The pull-back $\mathcal{C}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_G$ gives a homomorphism of algebraic groups $f : \mathcal{T}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$.

To show that f is an isomorphism of algebraic groups it suffices to show that f is an isomorphism of abstract groups. The homomorphism f is an isomorphism on the identity components $\mathcal{T}(G)_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1$ because G_1 is a maximal compact subgroup of both connected reductive groups $\mathcal{T}(G)_1$ and \mathcal{G}_1 . It is also an isomorphism on the component groups $\pi_0(\mathcal{T}(G)) \rightarrow \pi_0(\mathcal{G})$ because $\mathcal{T}(G) \cong G \times \mathbb{R}^n \cong \mathcal{G}$ as topological spaces by the Malcev-Iwasawa Theorem [8, Thm 32.5].

1.4. **Homotopy Equivalence on Morphisms.** Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}(G)$ and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{T}(H)$. We need to prove that the embedding $\mathcal{T}_{H,G} : \mathrm{hom}(H, G) \rightarrow \mathrm{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ is a homotopy equivalence for all $H, G \in \mathcal{L}ie$. The group G_1 acts on the topological space $\mathrm{hom}(H, G)$ by conjugation:

$$(4) \quad g \cdot \phi := \gamma(g)\phi : h \mapsto g\phi(h)g^{-1}, \quad \text{for } g \in G_1, \phi \in \mathrm{hom}(H, G).$$

The orbits of this action are compact and connected because they are images of the compact connected group G_1 . Thus, they are connected components of $\mathrm{hom}(H, G)$.

Now consider the conjugation action of \mathcal{G} on $\mathrm{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$, given by the same formula (4). The following standard rigidity results hold because G is the group of points over \mathbb{R} of the compact real form of \mathcal{G} :

- The orbit maps $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathrm{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ are smooth. [1, Lemma 3.5]
- The natural map of orbit spaces

$$q : \mathrm{hom}(H, G)/G \rightarrow \mathrm{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})/\mathcal{G}, \quad G \cdot \phi \mapsto \mathcal{G} \cdot \mathcal{T}(\phi)$$

is a bijection. [9, Proposition 10.2]

The restrictions of the orbit maps to \mathcal{G}_1 are smooth as well. Hence the \mathcal{G}_1 -orbits are open and connected, so they are connected components of $\text{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$. Consider the finite group $\Gamma := \pi_0(G) \cong \pi_0(\mathcal{G})$. Notice that $\text{hom}(H, G)/G = (\text{hom}(H, G)/G_1)/\Gamma$ and $\text{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})/\mathcal{G} = (\text{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})/\mathcal{G}_1)/\Gamma$. We claim that the map of Γ -sets

$$\widehat{q} : \text{hom}(H, G)/G_1 \rightarrow \text{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})/\mathcal{G}_1, \quad G_1 \cdot \phi \mapsto \mathcal{G}_1 \cdot \mathcal{T}(\phi)$$

is a bijection. Surjectivity of \widehat{q} follows from surjectivity of q .

To prove injectivity we need to write down the decomposition in the Malcev-Iwasawa Theorem explicitly. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the Lie algebra of \mathcal{G} , \mathfrak{g} its Lie subalgebra corresponding to the Lie algebra of G . Then $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$ as adjoint G -modules where multiplication by i is an isomorphism of G -modules $\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow i\mathfrak{g}$. The decomposition is the map

$$(5) \quad \mu : G \times i\mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{\cong \text{ as spaces}} \mathcal{G}, \quad (g, \alpha) \mapsto \exp(\alpha)g.$$

Now suppose $\mathcal{G}_1 \cdot \mathcal{T}(\psi) = \mathcal{G}_1 \cdot \mathcal{T}(\phi)$. Then, there exists $\exp(\alpha)g \in \mathcal{G}_1$ with unique $\alpha \in i\mathfrak{g}$, $g \in G_1$ such that $\mathcal{T}(\psi) = \exp(\alpha)g \cdot \mathcal{T}(\phi) = \exp(\alpha)\mathcal{T}(g \cdot \phi)$. We will show that $\psi = g \cdot \phi$ and, consequently, $G_1 \cdot \psi = G_1 \cdot \phi$.

Denote the Lie algebra of H by \mathfrak{h} . We can differentiate the equality $\mathcal{T}(\psi) = \exp(\alpha)\mathcal{T}(g \cdot \phi)$ to conclude that the adjoint operator $[\alpha, -]$ maps one image of \mathfrak{h} in \mathfrak{g} to another image of \mathfrak{h} . Since $[\alpha, \mathfrak{g}] \subseteq i\mathfrak{g}$, it follows that $[\alpha, -]$ commutes with the image of \mathfrak{h} and $\exp(\alpha)$ commutes with the image of H . Thus, $\psi = g \cdot \phi$.

Thus, we can choose orbit representatives ϕ_i to match the components

$$\text{hom}(H, G) = \coprod_{i \in I} G_1 \cdot \phi_i \quad \text{and} \quad \text{hom}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_1 \cdot \mathcal{T}(\phi_i).$$

It remains to observe that the embedding

$$\eta : G_1/K = G_1 \cdot \phi_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1/\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{G}_1 \cdot \mathcal{T}(\phi_i), \quad g \cdot \phi_i \mapsto g \cdot \mathcal{T}(\phi_i)$$

is a homotopy equivalence. Note that \mathcal{K} is the centraliser of the image of $\mathcal{T}(\phi_i)$ and K is the centraliser of the image of ϕ_i . Since K is a maximal compact subgroup of \mathcal{K} , it follows from [7, Lemma 2.5] that η is a homotopy equivalence.

2. COMPLEXIFICATION AND SUBGROUPS

Let $H \in \mathbb{S}(G)$. We define τ by $\tau(H) := \text{im}(\mathcal{T}(f))$, where $f : H \rightarrow G$ is the inclusion. It is clearly a reductive subgroup of \mathcal{G} .

2.1. Subgroups H and $\mathcal{H} = \tau(H)$. We prove that $\mathcal{T}(f)$ is injective and the first part follows directly from this fact. Suppose $\mathcal{T}(f)$ is not injective. Then it has a non-trivial kernel \mathcal{K} , which cannot be unipotent. So \mathcal{K} contains a non-trivial maximal compact subgroup K . Some conjugate of hKh^{-1} for $h \in \mathcal{H}$ must be a subgroup of H . Since $\mathcal{T}(f)|_H = f$, we find a non-trivial element in the kernel of f , a contradiction.

2.2. Bijection. Since $\tau(xHx^{-1}) = x\tau(H)x^{-1}$, the map $\bar{\tau}$ is injective.

Now pick $\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{G})$ and its maximal compact subgroup K . It is contained in a maximal compact subgroup G' of \mathcal{G} . By the Malcev-Iwasawa Theorem, $G = gG'g^{-1}$ for some $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence, $gKg^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}(g)$ and $\bar{\tau}([gKg^{-1}]) = [K]$.

2.3. Homotopy Equivalence. We will show that the map $\eta : G/H \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ given by $\eta(gH) \mapsto g\mathcal{H}$ is a homotopy equivalence. If G is connected, this is [7, Lemma 2.5]. In general, any connected component of \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H} has a form $\mathcal{G}_1 g\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}$ for some $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Since $\pi_0(G) = \pi_0(\mathcal{G})$, there exists $x \in H \cap \mathcal{G}g$ so that $\mathcal{G}_1 g\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}_1 x\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}_1/(x\mathcal{H}x^{-1})$ and we can use [7, Lemma 2.5] to settle the general case.

2.4. Centralisers of Involutions. If $H = C_G(x)$, then clearly $\mathcal{H} = C_{\mathcal{G}}(x)$.

Let $\mathcal{H} = C_{\mathcal{G}}(g)$. The finite group $\langle g \rangle \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{G})$ is conjugate to $\tau(\langle x \rangle)$ for some involution $x \in G$. The maximal compact subgroup of $C_{\mathcal{G}}(g)$ is $C_G(x)$. Moreover, H is conjugate to $C_G(x)$ in G , so H is the centraliser of an involution.

3. FURTHER COMMENTS

3.1. Tannakian Formalism and Compact Groups. There is no useful functor $\mathcal{R}ed \rightarrow \mathcal{L}ie$ because there is no non-trivial homomorphism from $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ to a compact group. To reconstruct a compact group, we need to use the Tannaka-Krein Reconstruction [4]. This requires a \star -tensor category structure on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{G}\text{-Mod}$. Given a representation (V, ρ) , the data defines a representation $(\bar{V}, \bar{\rho})$ on the conjugate vector space $\bar{V} = V$ via the action $\alpha \cdot v = \bar{\alpha}v$. Given an automorphism $(x_V) \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\otimes}(F_{\mathcal{G}})$, we define its \star -conjugate by

$$(x_V)^{\star} := (y_V) \text{ where } y_{\bar{V}} = x_V.$$

This reconstructs a compact group $\mathcal{T}_c(\mathcal{G}) = \{x \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\otimes}(F_{\mathcal{G}}) \mid x^{\star} = x\}$. However, there is no canonical \star -structure on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}$, which can be only constructed by choosing a maximal compact subgroup G . For example, choose two hermitian forms on \mathbb{C}^2 that give different unitary subgroups of $\mathcal{G} = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. The corresponding \star -structures on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}$ will be different.

3.2. Intersections. Consider two subgroups $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{G})$ and their maximal compact subgroups H and K . What is the relation between the intersections $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}$ and $H \cap K$?

The ∞ -equivalence tells us that the homotopy intersection groups $H \cap^h K$ and $\mathcal{H} \cap^h \mathcal{K}$ are homotopy equivalent. The homotopy intersection is a subgroup of the group of continuous paths

$$H \cap^h K := \{\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow G \mid \gamma(0) \in H, \gamma(1) \in K\}$$

with pointwise multiplication. However the following proposition shows that the homotopy intersection is not particularly helpful.

Proposition 3. *There is a homeomorphism $H \cap^h K \cong H \times (1 \cap^h K)$.*

Proof. The key maps to construct the left-to-right homeomorphism are

$$H \xleftarrow{\pi_1} H \cap^h K \xrightarrow{\pi_2} (1 \cap^h K), \quad \pi_1(\gamma) = \gamma(0), \quad \pi_2(\gamma) = \gamma(0)^{-1} \cdot \gamma.$$

The right-to-left homeomorphism is multiplication. □

Our motivation for studying intersections comes from our interest in the relation between the locally symmetric spaces $K \backslash G/H$ and $\mathcal{K} \backslash \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. This relation is beyond the scope of the present paper, but we make the following useful observation.

Proposition 4. *If $H, K \in \mathbb{S}(G)$, then $\tau(H \cap K) = \tau(H) \cap \tau(K)$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the Lie algebra of \mathcal{G} , \mathfrak{g} its Lie subalgebra, corresponding to the Lie algebra of G . For $H, K \in \mathbb{S}(G)$, let us denote their corresponding Lie subalgebras by \mathfrak{h} and \mathfrak{k} . The Malcev-Iwasawa map μ , defined in (5), gives an explicit formula for the map τ

$$\tau(H) = \mu(H \times i\mathfrak{h}) = \{\exp(\beta)h, \mid h \in H, \beta \in i\mathfrak{h}\}.$$

The proposition follows from this formula: both $\tau(H \cap K)$ and $\tau(H) \cap \tau(K)$ are equal to

$$\{\exp(\beta)h \mid h \in H \cap K, \beta \in i(\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{k})\}$$

since the presentation of an element of G as $\mu(g, \alpha) = \exp(\alpha)g$ is unique. \square

We say that a reductive subgroup $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{G})$ is *G-controlled*, if it is of the form $\tau(H)$ for some $H \in \mathbb{S}(G)$. The intersections of *G-controlled* subgroups can be understood by the next two corollaries of Proposition 4.

Corollary 5. *$H \cap K$ is a maximal compact subgroup of $\tau(H) \cap \tau(K)$.*

Corollary 6. *Intersection of two *G-controlled* reductive subgroups is reductive.*

3.3. All Compact Groups. Every compact group is a projective limit of compact Lie groups. This suggests an extension of the functor $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{L}ie \rightarrow \mathcal{R}ed$ to a functor from compact groups to pro-reductive groups.

Tannaka reconstruction is an alternative way to think of such a functor. If G is a compact group, we get an affine group scheme $\mathcal{T}(G)$. It would be interesting to investigate both functors further from the viewpoint of ∞ -categories.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Brion, *Homomorphisms of algebraic groups: representability and rigidity*, arXiv:2101.12460 (2021).
- [2] T. Burness, M. Liebeck, A. Shalev, *The length and depth of compact Lie groups*, *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, **294** (2019), 1457–1476.
- [3] P. Deligne, J. S. Milne, *Tannakian categories*, in *Hodge Cycles, Motives, and Shimura Varieties*, LNM 900, 1982, pp. 101–228.
- [4] S. Doplicher, J. Roberts, *A new duality theory for compact groups*, *Invent. Math.* **98** (1989), 157–218.
- [5] G. P. Hochschild, *Basic Theory of Algebraic Groups and Lie Algebras*, Graduate Texts in Math., Springer, 1981.
- [6] J. Lurie, *Higher Topos Theory*, *Annals of Math. Studies* 170, Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [7] D. Rumynin, J. Taylor, *Real representations of C_2 -graded groups: the linear and hermitian theories*, *Higher Structures*, to appear, arXiv:2008.07846 (2020).
- [8] M. Stroppel, *Locally Compact Groups*, EMS Textbooks in Math., EMS, 2006.
- [9] E. Vinberg, *On invariants of a set of matrices*, *J. Lie Theory* **6** (1996), 249–269.

Email address: jdsjones200@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, COVENTRY, CV4 7AL, UK

Email address: D.Rumynin@warwick.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, COVENTRY, CV4 7AL, UK
ASSOCIATED MEMBER OF LABORATORY OF ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY, NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, RUSSIA

Email address: adam.r.thomas@warwick.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, COVENTRY, CV4 7AL, UK