

Naturality and innerness for morphisms of compact groups and (restricted) Lie algebras

Alexandru Chirvasitu

Abstract

An extended derivation (endomorphism) of a (restricted) Lie algebra L is an assignment of a derivation (respectively) of L' for any (restricted) Lie morphism $f : L \rightarrow L'$, functorial in f in the obvious sense. We show that (a) the only extended endomorphisms of a restricted Lie algebra are the two obvious ones, assigning either the identity or the zero map of L' to every f ; and (b) if L is a Lie algebra in characteristic zero or a restricted Lie algebra in positive characteristic, then L is in canonical bijection with its space of extended derivations (so the latter are all, in a sense, inner). These results answer a number of questions of G. Bergman.

In a similar vein, we show that the individual components of an extended endomorphism of a compact connected group are either all trivial or all inner automorphisms.

Key words: Lie algebra; restricted Lie algebra; enveloping algebra; Hopf algebra; primitive element; comma category; inner; derivation; compact group; Lie group; coproduct; cocomplete; Bohr compactification

MSC 2020: 16S30; 16T05; 16W25; 17B40; 22C05; 22D45; 16S10; 22E60

Introduction

This note was prompted by a number of questions posed in [3]. That paper revolves around the notion of *innerness* for automorphisms, endomorphisms or other classes of maps between algebraic structures.

One intriguing piece of insight is that innerness (whatever it means in any given context) is automatic for *extended* morphisms (auto, endo, etc.): per [3, Definition 4], an extended endomorphism of an object $c \in \mathcal{C}$ of a category is an endomorphism of the forgetful functor

$$c \downarrow \mathcal{C} \ni (c \rightarrow d) \xrightarrow{U_{c,c}} d \in \mathcal{C} \quad (0-1)$$

from the *comma category* $c \downarrow \mathcal{C}$ consisting of morphisms in \mathcal{C} with domain c ([11, §II.6], [1, Exercise 3K]); the same goes for *automorphisms*. The paradigmatic results ([3, Theorems 1 and 2, Corollary 3]) say that for the category GP of groups and $G \in \text{GP}$

- The morphism attaching to $g \in G$ the natural automorphism of $U_{G,\text{GP}}$ (notation as in (0-1)) operating as conjugation by $f(g)$ for any

$$\left(G \xrightarrow{f} H \right) \in G \downarrow \text{GP} \quad (0-2)$$

is an isomorphism $G \cong \text{Aut}(U_{G,\text{GP}})$.

- The only other extended *endomorphism* of $U_{G, \mathbb{G}P}$ is the one operating trivially on H for every (0-2).

The specific questions that motivated this work are concentrated in [3, §8], which retraces some of this in the context of (restricted [9, §V.7 Definition 4]) Lie algebras and their *derivations*. The category \mathcal{C} of (0-1) is now that of Lie algebras over a field (perhaps restricted, when in positive characteristic), and along with endomorphisms of (0-1) one similarly considers *extended derivations* [3, Definition 10] of a Lie algebra L :

- a derivation ∂_f of the Lie algebra L' for every morphism $f : L \rightarrow L'$;
- with the ∂_f satisfying the obvious compatibility conditions, analogous to those required of extended morphisms.

With that in place,

- (a) (A paraphrase of) [3, Question 11] asks whether the extended derivations of a Lie algebra in characteristic 0 are precisely those of the form

$$\partial_{a,f}(l') := [f(a), l'], \quad \forall f : L \rightarrow L', \quad \forall l' \in L' \quad (0-3)$$

for $a \in L$;

- (b) And similarly for *restricted* Lie algebras in positive characteristic;
- (c) While [3, Question 13] asks whether restricted positive-characteristic Lie algebras have any non-obvious extended endomorphisms (the obvious assigning the identity or, respectively, the zero map on L' to every $L \rightarrow L'$).

We answer these in Theorems 1.2 and 1.4:

Theorem *Let L be either a Lie algebra over a field \mathbb{k} , or a restricted Lie algebra when \mathbb{k} has positive characteristic.*

- (a) *If $\text{char } \mathbb{k} = 0$, the map sending $a \in L$ to the extended derivation $(\partial_{a,f})_f$ of (0-3) is an isomorphism between L and the linear space of extended derivations of L .*
- (b) *The same holds in positive characteristic for restricted Lie algebras.*
- (c) *For Lie algebras (regardless of characteristic) the only extended endomorphisms are the two obvious ones:*

$$\begin{aligned} (L \rightarrow L') &\longmapsto \text{id}_{L'} && \text{and} \\ (L \rightarrow L') &\longmapsto 0. \end{aligned}$$

- (d) *The analogous statement holds for restricted Lie algebras in positive characteristic.*

■

Part (c) is already settled in [3, Theorem 12] and is included here only for completeness; the other three items answer the various questions of [3, §8] indicated above.

Section 2 focuses on another instance of this same phenomenon, whereby functoriality begets innerness, but this time working in the category CGP_0 of compact connected topological groups (here always assumed Hausdorff). The partial analogue of [3, Corollary 3] is Theorem 2.1, and reads

Theorem For a compact connected group G , the individual components of a natural endomorphism of

$$G \downarrow \text{CGP}_0 \xrightarrow{U_{G, \text{CGP}_0}} \text{CGP}_0$$

are either all trivial or all inner automorphisms. ■

While very similar in character to the results discussed above, the proofs are by necessity quite different. [3] and the citing literature (e.g. [8, 14, 15]) tend to adopt universal-algebra-flavored approaches: the idea is to study the effect of (say) a natural endomorphism of (0-1) on the morphism

$$c \rightarrow \langle c, x \rangle$$

into the structure (set, group, etc.) that *freely adjoins* an element x . Such universal constructions do exist in the category CGP of compact groups; in category-theoretic language, CGP is, for instance, *cocomplete* [1, Definition 12.2]. To construct the *coproduct* [1, §10.63] (or *free product*) $G_1 * G_2$ of two compact groups one must

- form the usual group coproduct $G *_{\text{discrete}} G_2$;
- equip it with the coarsest group topology making the canonical embeddings

$$\iota_i : G_i \rightarrow G_1 *_{\text{discrete}} G_2$$

continuous (e.g. [6, introductory remarks]);

- and then take the *Bohr compactification* ([2, §III.9] or [10, §2.10]) thereof.

It is this last step that disturbs the usual procedure: freely appending an element x to a compact group G amounts to the above with

$$G_1 = G \quad \text{and} \quad G_2 = \text{Bohr compactification of } \mathbb{Z} \cong \langle x \rangle.$$

Words in $x^{\pm 1}$ and elements of G no longer constitute all of $\langle G, x \rangle$, but rather only a dense subgroup thereof; for that reason, arguments such as those in the proof of [3, Theorem 1] are no longer available.

Acknowledgements

This work is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2001128.

1 Lie algebras

We work with Lie algebras over fields, for which [9] is an excellent source. Having fixed a field k , L will typically denote

- a Lie algebra unless specified otherwise, or
- a *restricted Lie algebra* in characteristic p , in the sense of [9, §V.7 Definition 4] or [13, Definition 2.3.2].

We further write

- $U(L)$ for the universal enveloping algebra of a Lie k -algebra ([9, §V.1, Definition 1]), and

- $U_p(L)$ for the *restricted enveloping algebra* of the restricted Lie algebra L in characteristic p (\overline{U}_L in [9, §V.7 Theorem 12]).
- $Q(L)$ to denote either $U(L)$ or $U_p(L)$, as appropriate (so as to have uniform notation to refer to both cases).

Note that both $U(L)$ and $U_p(L)$ are naturally Hopf algebras over k [13, Example 1.5.4, Definition 2.3.2] and hence come equipped with counits ε , comultiplications Δ , etc. We will assume basic background on Hopf algebras as covered, for instance, in [13]. The Hopf algebra structure is uniquely determined by the requirement that the elements $x \in L$ be *primitive* [13, Definition 1.3.4], i.e.

$$\Delta(x) = x \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes x.$$

1.1 Derivations

To streamline the statement of Theorem 1.2, we introduce some terminology.

Definition 1.1 Let k be a field, and L either a Lie algebra (in characteristic zero) or a restricted Lie algebra in characteristic p , and $\langle L, x \rangle$ the (restricted) Lie algebra freely generated by L and a formal variable x .

An element $a \in Q(L)$

- is *constant-less* if it is annihilated by the counit $\varepsilon : Q(L) \rightarrow k$ of the Hopf algebra $Q(L)$.
- *induces a universal derivative* (or is *universally derivative* or a *universal derivative*) if, for a formal variable x , the commutator $[a, x] \in Q(\langle L, x \rangle)$ belongs to $\langle L, x \rangle$. \blacklozenge

Note that $L \subset Q(L)$ consists of constant-less universal derivatives. The following result gives the converse, answering [3, Question 11] negatively.

Theorem 1.2 *Let k be a field and L either a Lie algebra over k (in characteristic zero) or a restricted Lie algebra (in characteristic p).*

- If k has characteristic zero then the only constant-less universally derivative elements of $U(L)$ are those of L .*
- Similarly, if k has characteristic p then the only constant-less universally derivative elements of $U_p(L)$ are those of L .*

Proof The two statements (and proofs) are very similar, so we treat only the first in detail. The phenomenon driving both arguments is the fact that L can be recovered as precisely the space of primitive elements in the Hopf algebra $Q(L)$.

(a) As hinted above, note first that in characteristic zero, the primitive elements $P(U(G))$ of $U(G)$ (for an arbitrary Lie algebra G) are precisely those of $G \subset U(G)$ [13, Proposition 5.5.3, part 2)]. Take $G = \langle L, x \rangle$. The hypothesis

$$[a, x] \in \langle L, x \rangle$$

(for some constant-less universal derivative $a \in U(L)$) implies that the commutator $[a, x]$ is primitive. This, in turn, implies that a is primitive. To see this, assume otherwise and write

$$\Delta(a) = a \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes a + \sum_i a_{i,1} \otimes a_{i,2}$$

where $a_{i,j}$ are

- constant-less elements of $U(L)$,
- with at least one non-zero term $a_{i,1} \otimes a_{i,2}$,
- and linearly independent $a_{i,2}$ (since we can always group the tensors so as to arrange for this).

Expanding $\Delta([a, x])$, the resulting term $a_{i,1} \otimes a_{i,2}x$ appears only once, and hence will not cancel. This contradicts the primitivity of $[a, x]$, concluding that indeed a must be primitive. But then, by the already-cited [13, Proposition 5.5.3, part 2)], $a \in L$.

(b) The argument goes through almost verbatim, the only difference being that this time around we use the fact that in characteristic p the primitive elements $P(U_p(L))$ of $U_p(L)$ are those of L . This is not quite what [13, Proposition 5.5.3, part 3)] says, but that proof can be adapted. The claim (that $P(U_p(L)) = L$) also follows from [16, Proposition 13.2.3]. ■

1.2 Endomorphisms

There is an endomorphism (as opposed to derivation) version of Theorem 1.2, which in turn answers [3, Question 13]. Before stating it, some more terminology.

Definition 1.3 Let L be an object of a category \mathcal{C} . A *universal endomorphism* of L in \mathcal{C} is an endomorphism of the forgetful functor

$$L \downarrow \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}. \quad \blacklozenge$$

These are the *extended inner endomorphisms* of [3, Definition 4]. The announced universal-endomorphism version of Theorem 1.2 now reads

Theorem 1.4 *Let k be a field and L either a Lie algebra over k (in characteristic zero) or a restricted Lie algebra (in characteristic p).*

- (a) *The only universal endomorphisms of L in the category LIE_k of Lie k -algebras are 0 and id.*
- (b) *Furthermore, if k has characteristic p then the only universal endomorphisms of L in the category $\text{LIE}_{k,p}$ of restricted Lie k -algebras are 0 and id.*

Proof As explained in [3, discussion preceding Theorem 12], a universal endomorphism as in the statement is determined by elements $a, b \in Q(L)$, acquiring the expression

$$M \ni m \mapsto \varphi(a)m\varphi(b), \quad (1-1)$$

where

- $\varphi : L \rightarrow M$ is a (restricted) Lie algebra morphism as well as the corresponding morphism $Q(L) \rightarrow Q(M)$ it induces, and
- it is understood that for all such φ , the right-hand side of (1-1) belongs to M .

One can package all of this into its universal (or generic) instance: take $\varphi : L \rightarrow M$ to be the inclusion

$$L \subseteq \langle L, x \rangle$$

for a formal variable x , and require that $axb \in \langle L, x \rangle$. Denote by ε the counit of the Hopf algebra $Q(L)$, and decompose

$$a = \varepsilon(a) + \bar{a}, \quad b = \varepsilon(b) + \bar{b}$$

for constant-less \bar{a} and \bar{b} ; the goal is to show that these two latter elements must vanish.

The argument is now similar to that in the proof of Theorem 1.2

$$\Delta(\bar{a}) = \bar{a} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \bar{a} + \dots$$

and similarly for \bar{b} , where the missing summands indicated by ‘ \dots ’ are simple tensors with constant-less tensorands.

Because $Q(\langle L, x \rangle)$ is the coproduct (over k) of $Q(L)$ and $k[x]$, if \bar{a} and \bar{b} are both non-vanishing then the term $\bar{a} \otimes x\bar{b}$ of $\Delta(axb) \in Q(\langle L, x \rangle)^{\otimes 2}$ will not cancel out, contradicting the fact that

$$axb \in \langle L, x \rangle \subset Q(\langle L, x \rangle)$$

is primitive, i.e.

$$\Delta(axb) = axb \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes axb.$$

It follows that at least one of a and b is scalar. Suppose it is b , so that we can absorb the constant into a and work with ax in place of the original axb . Now repeat the argument: if $\bar{a} \neq 0$ then the term $\bar{a} \otimes x$ will be present in $\Delta(ax)$, again contradicting the primitivity of ax .

In conclusion a and b are both scalar, as claimed. ■

Remark 1.5 Alternatively, once we find that one of a and b is scalar we can conclude using the fact that, according to [3, proof of Theorem 12], $ba = 1$; this was not used above. ◆

Part (a) of Theorem 1.4 recovers [3, Theorem 12], while part (b) answers [3, Question 13] negatively.

Remark 1.6 *Finite-dimensional* (rather than arbitrary) Lie algebras are much more interesting, as extended endomorphisms or automorphisms go.

By [4, §III.6.1, Theorem 1] the category $\text{LALG}_{f, \mathbb{k}}$ of finite-dimensional Lie algebras over the real or complex field \mathbb{k} is equivalent to that of *simply-connected* Lie groups over \mathbb{k} . Consequently, for any finite-dimensional Lie algebra $L \in \text{LALG}_{f, \mathbb{k}}$, the corresponding simply-connected Lie group G_L with Lie algebra L gives a wealth of “inner” automorphisms of the forgetful functor

$$L \downarrow \text{LALG}_{f, \mathbb{k}} \xrightarrow{U_L} \text{LALG}_{f, \mathbb{k}} :$$

an element $g \in G_L$ operates on the codomain L' of a morphism

$$L \xrightarrow{f} L' \text{ in } \text{LALG}_{f, \mathbb{k}} \tag{1-2}$$

via the adjoint action of $\tilde{f}(g)$, where

$$G_L \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} G_{L'}$$

is the lift of (1-2) to simply-connected Lie groups (once more, [4, §III.6.1, Theorem 1]). ◆

2 Compact groups

Some notation:

- CGP the category of compact (Hausdorff) topological groups;
- CGP_0 that of *connected* compact groups;

- And in general, for an object $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and a full subcategory $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, we write

$$c \downarrow \mathcal{C}' \xrightarrow{U_{c,\mathcal{C}'}} \mathcal{C}' \quad (2-1)$$

for the respective forgetful functor (as in (0-1), with \mathcal{C}' in place of \mathcal{C}).

The present section is concerned with the following (almost) “automatic innerness” for extended automorphisms of compact connected groups.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $G \in \text{CGP}_0$ be a compact connected group and $\alpha \in \text{End}(U_{G,\text{CGP}_0})$ a natural endomorphism of the forgetful functor defined as in (2-1), assigning an endomorphism $\alpha_f \in \text{End}(H)$ to*

$$f : G \rightarrow H, \quad H \text{ compact connected.} \quad (2-2)$$

One of the two following possibilities obtains:

- α is trivial, in the sense that α_f is the trivial endomorphism of H for every (2-2);
- or every α_f is an inner automorphism of H .

The proof requires some preparation.

Remark 2.2 Consider a full subcategory $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ (as in (2-1)). The application

$$\mathcal{C} \ni c \longmapsto \text{End}(U_{c,\mathcal{C}'})$$

is functorial (albeit taking values, in principle, in the category of set-theoretically *large* monoids).

In the sequel we use this repeatedly, and mostly tacitly. This functoriality will usually make an appearance (with, say, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}' = \text{CGP}$ or $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}' = \text{CGP}_0$) in the following form: given an endomorphism

$$\alpha \in \text{End}(U_{c,\mathcal{C}'})$$

and a morphism $f : c \rightarrow d$ with codomain $d \in \mathcal{C}'$, the component α_f is itself the identity component

$$\beta_{\text{id}} = \alpha_f \text{ of some } \beta \in \text{End}(U_{d,\mathcal{C}'})$$

induced by α . ◆

Proposition 2.3 (a) *For a compact connected group $G \in \text{CGP}_0$, a non-trivial natural endomorphism of the forgetful functor*

$$G \downarrow \text{CGP}_0 \xrightarrow{U_{G,\text{CGP}_0}} \text{CGP}_0$$

is automatically a natural automorphism.

(b) *The same goes for the forgetful functor $U_{G,\text{CGP}}$.*

Proof We focus on (a) to fix ideas; the other proof is largely parallel.

(1) **Each α_f is either trivial or injective.** Per Remark 2.2, we may as well take $f = \text{id}$.

Let $g \in G$ be an element not annihilated by α_{id} , and consider a morphism

$$G \xrightarrow{f} H \text{ in CGP.} \quad (2-3)$$

chosen judiciously (more on this momentarily). We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ G & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\text{id}}} & G & \xrightarrow{f} & H. \\ & \searrow f & & \nearrow \alpha_f & \\ & & H & & \end{array} \quad (2-4)$$

Suppose now that

- $f(\alpha_{\text{id}}(g))$ is non-trivial;
- as is $f(g')$ for an arbitrary $1 \neq g' \in \ker \alpha_{\text{id}}$;
- and H is a compact, connected, *simple* Lie group: one with no non-trivial proper normal subgroups or equivalently [7, Theorem 9.90], no such subgroups that are *closed*.

That such f exist is easily seen, and relegated to Lemma 2.4. The upper path in (2-4) fails to annihilate $g \in G$, hence so does the lower. H being simple, α_f must be one-to-one (because it cannot be trivial). But this means that the lower composition in (2-4) fails to annihilate g' , contradicting the fact that the upper path does.

The contradiction stems from our assumption that there are non-trivial $g' \in \ker \alpha_{\text{id}}$, so that map must in fact be injective.

(2) **Each α_f is either trivial or surjective.** Once more, take $f = \text{id}$. Assume, this time around, that α_{id} is neither trivial nor onto.

The subgroup $\alpha_{\text{id}}(G) \leq G$ is then proper but non-trivial. Because compact groups are inverse limits of their Lie quotients [7, Corollary 2.36], we can find such a quotient (2-3) so that the image

$$\alpha_f(H) = f(\alpha_{\text{id}}(G)) \leq H = f(G) \quad (2-5)$$

is both proper and non-trivial (the first equality follows from the commutativity of (2-4)). But then

- α_f cannot be trivial, since its image is not;
- hence must be injective by part (1);
- and thus also surjective, because it is a one-to-one map of compact *Lie* groups: it restricts to an isomorphism on every connected component for dimension reasons, and a compact Lie group has finitely many connected components.

This latter remark, though, contradicts the properness of (2-5).

(3) **Finishing the proof.** This, so far, shows that the *individual* components α_f of α are each either trivial or bijective. It remains to argue that we cannot have a mixture of these: if α_{id} is trivial (bijective) then so, respectively, is every α_f .

Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & G \times H & & \\
 & \iota \nearrow & & \searrow \pi & \\
 G & & & & H \\
 \alpha_{\text{id}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_\iota & & \downarrow \alpha_{\text{TRIV}} \\
 G & & G \times H & & H \\
 & \iota \searrow & & \nearrow \pi & \\
 & & G \times H & &
 \end{array} \tag{2-6}$$

(with ι and π the obvious inclusion and projection).

By claims (1) and (2), if at least one of α_{id} and α_{TRIV} is non-trivial, then α_ι must be bijective. This, in turn, would entail both

- the injectivity of α_{id} ;
- and the surjectivity of α_{TRIV} .

Suppose first that α_{id} is trivial. By (2-4), the only way for α_f to be non-trivial (and hence injective by (1)) is for $f : G \rightarrow H$ itself to be trivial, so that α_f is the α_{TRIV} of (2-6).

Similarly, (2-4) and the assumed bijectivity of α_{id} force $f = \text{TRIV}$ whenever α_f is trivial; we are then again in the context of (2-6).

As just observed, then, either case entails either the injectivity of one of the maps α_{id} or the surjectivity of α_f , so that map's (α_{id} or α_f) triviality also forces the respective group to be trivial and hence the map in question is also an automorphism.

Summary: if one of α_{id} and α_f is trivial while the other is bijective, the maps are both bijective; this concludes the proof. ■

The following result is presumably well known, but we isolate it here for reference in the proof of Proposition 2.3.

Lemma 2.4 *For any finite set $F \subseteq G$ of non-trivial elements of a compact group there is a morphism $f : G \rightarrow PSU(n)$ to some projective special unitary group with $f(g) \neq 1$ for $g \in F$.*

If G is Lie then f can be chosen injective.

Proof because G is the inverse limit of its Lie quotient groups [7, Corollary 2.36], we certainly have a morphism f to a *unitary* group with these properties; it is thus enough to assume that $G = U(m)$.

Next, $U(m)$ further embeds into $SU(2m)$ via

$$U(m) \ni x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{x} \end{pmatrix} \in SU(2m)$$

(with the overline denoting complex conjugation), so that we can in fact set $G = S(N)$.

Denoting by ρ the N -dimensional defining representation of $SU(N)$, the representation $\rho \oplus \bar{\rho}^{\otimes 2}$ gives an embedding

$$SU(N) \longrightarrow SU(n), \quad n := N + N^2$$

with the property that the center $\mathbb{Z}/N \subset SU(N)$ intersects that of $SU(n)$ trivially, so that further surjecting onto $PSU(n)$ finally gives the desired embedding (of G , now assumed Lie, into $PSU(n)$). ■

We will take it for granted that the automorphism groups of the unitary $U(n)$ are

$$\text{Aut}(U(n)) \cong PSU(n) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/2, \quad (2-7)$$

where

- the *projective* special unitary group $PSU(n)$ is

$$PSU(n) = U(n)/(\text{central circle } \mathbb{S}^1) \cong SU(n)/(\text{central } \mathbb{Z}/n)$$

is the *inner* automorphism group, acting on $U(n)$ by conjugation;

- and the generator of $\mathbb{Z}/2$ is complex conjugation.

This is fairly standard, though a statement specifically to this effect seems difficult to locate in the literature. The proof is certainly no more difficult than that of the analogous result for $SU(n)$, which in turn follows from the classification of the automorphisms of the complexified Lie algebra

$$\mathfrak{sl}(n) = \mathfrak{su}(n) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C},$$

described, say, in [9, §IX.5].

Proposition 2.5 *Let $G \in \text{CGP}_0$ be a compact connected group and α an automorphism of the forgetful functor U_{G, CGP_0}*

For $f : G \rightarrow H$ the automorphism $\alpha_f \in \text{Aut}(H)$ is inner.

Proof Note that it is enough to prove α_{id} itself inner: every α_f as in the statement is the identity component of an automorphism of U_{H, CGP_0} induced by α .

The proof runs through a number of intermediate steps.

- (1) **The circle:** $G = \mathbb{S}^1$. In this case α_{id} is either the identity (which we claim is the case) or the other automorphism: $z \mapsto z^{-1}$. Consider, now, the central embedding

$$\mathbb{S}^1 \xrightarrow[\cong]{f} (\text{diagonal matrices}) \subset U(n)$$

into a unitary group and the corresponding element α_f of $\text{Aut}(U(n))$.

Because the image of f is central in $U(n)$, further composition with an arbitrary conjugation

$$Ad_u := u(-)u^* \in \text{Aut}(U(n)), \quad u \in U(n)$$

will leave f invariant, so the naturality of α gives a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ U(n) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_f} & U(n) & \xrightarrow{Ad_u} & U(n). \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & U(n) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_f} & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \end{array}$$

In other words, α_f lies in the centralizer of $PSU(n)$ in (2-7). That centralizer is easily seen to be trivial, so that $\alpha_f = \text{id}$ and $\alpha_{\text{id}} = \text{id}$ by the commutativity of (2-4).

- (2) **Unitary groups.** We are assuming now that $G = U(n)$. The preceding point shows that the automorphism α_{\det} associated to the determinant morphism

$$U(n) \xrightarrow{\det} \mathbb{S}^1$$

is trivial. But then, once more by the commutativity of (2-4) (with $G = U(n)$, $H = \mathbb{S}^1$ and $f = \det$), this means that $\alpha_{\text{id}} \in \text{Aut}(U(n))$ fixes determinants (rather than inverting them), and hence must be inner by (2-7).

- (3) **Arbitrary connected compact G .** We know from the preceding discussion that every

$$\alpha_f \in \text{Aut}(U(n)), \quad f : G \rightarrow U(n)$$

induced by α is inner, i.e. conjugation by some $u_f \in U(n)$. But then the commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & G & & \\ & \nearrow^{\alpha_{\text{id}}} & & \searrow^f & \\ G & & & & U(n). \\ & \searrow_f & & \nearrow_{\alpha_f} & \\ & & U(n) & & \end{array}$$

means that u_f , regarded as an automorphism of the carrier space $V \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ of the G -representation f , implements an isomorphism between f and the α_{id} -twisted representation $f \circ \alpha_{\text{id}}$.

This holds for arbitrary representations f of G , so α_{id} is an automorphism of the latter leaving invariant (the isomorphism classes of) all of its irreducible representations. For *connected* G this implies that α_{id} must be inner [12, Corollary 2].

This concludes the proof. ■

Remark 2.6 While I do not know whether **Theorem 2.1** holds for disconnected compact groups, the argument in the proof of **Proposition 2.5** certainly does not go through: it uses the connectedness of G crucially, in concluding via [12, Corollary 2] that automorphisms that preserve the isomorphism classes of all (or equivalently, all irreducible) representations are inner.

For *finite* groups, for instance, the automorphisms with this preservation property are precisely the ones termed *class-preserving* in the rich literature on the topic: an equivalent characterization is that they leave every conjugacy class invariant.

The reader can consult, for instance, [5] and their references ([18, 17], and so on) for extensive discussions and examples of finite groups which admit *outer* class-preserving automorphisms. ◆

At this point, not much is left to do:

Proof of Theorem 2.1 By **Proposition 2.3**, the statement reduces to the already-proven **Proposition 2.5**. ■

References

- [1] Jiří Adámek, Horst Herrlich, and George E. Strecker. *Abstract and concrete categories*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1990. The joy of cats, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [2] J. F. Berglund, H. D. Junghenn, and P. Milnes. *Compact right topological semigroups and generalizations of almost periodicity*, volume 663 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 1978.

- [3] George M. Bergman. An inner automorphism is only an inner automorphism, but an inner endomorphism can be something strange. *Publ. Mat.*, 56(1):91–126, 2012.
- [4] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 1–3*. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. Translated from the French, Reprint of the 1989 English translation.
- [5] Peter A. Brooksbank and Matthew S. Mizuhara. On groups with a class-preserving outer automorphism. *Involve*, 7(2):171–179, 2014.
- [6] Temple H. Fay and Barbara V. Smith-Thomas. Remarks on the free product of two Hausdorff groups. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 33(1):57–65, 1979/80.
- [7] Karl H. Hofmann and Sidney A. Morris. *The structure of compact groups—a primer for the student—a handbook for the expert*, volume 25 of *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. De Gruyter, Berlin, [2020] ©2020. Fourth edition [of 1646190].
- [8] Pieter Hofstra, Jason Parker, and Philip Scott. Isotropy of algebraic theories. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS XXXIV)*, volume 341 of *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, pages 201–217. Elsevier Sci. B. V., Amsterdam, 2018.
- [9] Nathan Jacobson. *Lie algebras*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1979. Republication of the 1962 original.
- [10] Eberhard Kaniuth. *A course in commutative Banach algebras*, volume 246 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2009.
- [11] Saunders MacLane. *Categories for the working mathematician*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1971.
- [12] John R. McMullen. On the dual object of a compact connected group. *Math. Z.*, 185(4):539–552, 1984.
- [13] Susan Montgomery. *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*, volume 82 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993.
- [14] Jason Parker. Inner automorphisms of presheaves of groups, 2021. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.13989v1>.
- [15] Jason Parker. Isotropy groups of free racks and quandles. *J. Algebra Appl.*, 21(8):Paper No. 2250163, 30, 2022.
- [16] Moss E. Sweedler. *Hopf algebras*. Mathematics Lecture Note Series. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1969.
- [17] G. E. Wall. Finite groups with class-preserving outer automorphisms. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 22:315–320 (1948), 1947.
- [18] Manoj K. Yadav. Class preserving automorphisms of finite p -groups: a survey. In *Groups St Andrews 2009 in Bath. Volume 2*, volume 388 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 569–579. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2011.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260-2900, USA
E-mail address: achirvas@buffalo.edu