

## Lie Groups, Problem Set # 2 Solutions

This week's problems were all from the book, namely Section 2.1, problems 5, 6 and 9, and 2.2, problems 4, 5 and 7.

Problem 2.1.5: (a) First note that  $ij = k = -ji$ , so for any complex number  $\alpha$ ,  $j\alpha = \bar{\alpha}j$  and  $\alpha j = j\bar{\alpha}$ . If  $q_1 = \alpha + j\beta$  and  $q_2 = \gamma + j\delta$ , then  $\bar{q}_1 = \bar{\alpha} + \bar{\beta}j = \bar{\alpha} - j\beta$ , whose matrix is the adjoint of the matrix of  $q_1$ . Likewise,  $q_1q_2 = \alpha\gamma + j\beta\gamma + \alpha j\delta + j\beta j\delta = (\alpha\gamma - \bar{\beta}\delta) + j(\beta\gamma + \bar{\alpha}\delta)$ , whose matrix is  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha\gamma - \bar{\beta}\delta & -\bar{\beta}\bar{\gamma} - \alpha\bar{\delta} \\ \beta\gamma + \bar{\alpha}\delta & \bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma} - \beta\bar{\delta} \end{pmatrix}$ , which is the product of the matrix of  $q_1$  and the matrix of  $q_2$ . Since quaternionic multiplication is mapped to multiplication of complex matrices, this gives a homomorphism from  $Sp(1)$  (aka the unit quaternions) to the matrices of the given form with  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ , and the homomorphism is clearly 1-1. But by example 2 the image is precisely  $SU(2)$ .

(b) If  $\bar{\gamma} = -\gamma$ , then the matrix of  $\gamma$  (call it  $M_\gamma$ ) is anti-Hermitian, so it has pure imaginary eigenvalues and orthogonal eigenvectors. By choosing the phases of the two eigenvectors correctly, we can write  $M_\gamma = \lambda PDP^{-1}$ , where  $P \in SU(2)$ ,  $\lambda$  is real and positive and  $D = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}$ . Likewise, we can write  $M_j = P_0DP_0^{-1}$ , so  $D = P_0^{-1}M_jP_0$ . We then have  $M_\gamma = \lambda PP_0^{-1}M_jP_0P^{-1}$ . If we take  $\alpha$  to be the quaternion whose matrix is  $\sqrt{\lambda}P_0P^{-1}$ , then  $M_\gamma = M_{\bar{\alpha}}M_jM_\alpha$ , so  $\gamma = \bar{\alpha}j\alpha$ .

Note that  $\alpha$  is not uniquely defined. Replacing  $\alpha' = e^{j\phi}\alpha$  would work as well. This ambiguity corresponds to the phase freedom we have in choosing the eigenvectors of  $M_\gamma$ .

Problem 2.1.6: (a)  $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{h}(3, \mathbb{R})$  is just the upper triangular matrices, since if  $X$  is not upper-triangular, then  $\exp(tX) \approx 1 + tX$  is not in the group for small  $t$ . Notice that the three basis vectors for  $\mathfrak{n}$  (call them  $e_\alpha$ ,  $e_\beta$  and  $e_\gamma$ ) have all pairwise products equal to zero, except  $e_\alpha e_\beta$ , which equals  $e_\gamma$ . In particular, the bracket of any two matrices is a multiple of  $e_\gamma \in \mathfrak{h}(3, \mathbb{R})$ . (b) If  $X \in \mathfrak{n}$ , then  $X^3 = 0$ , and  $\exp(X) = 1 + X + X^2/2$  is in  $H(3, R)$ . Likewise, if  $a \in H(3, R)$ , then  $(a - 1)^3 = 0$ , so  $\log(a) = a - 1 - (a - 1)^2/2$ , which is easily seen to be in  $\mathfrak{h}(3, R)$ . (c) The brackets in  $\mathfrak{n}$  are:  $[e_\alpha, e_\beta] = e_\gamma$ ,  $[e_\alpha, e_\gamma] = [e_\beta, e_\gamma] = 0$ . Note that  $[X, [Y, Z]] = 0$  for any  $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{n}$ . If  $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y_1 & y_3 \\ 0 & 0 & y_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & x_3 \\ 0 & 0 & x_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , then  $Ad(\exp(X))Y = Y + [X, Y] = Y + (y_1x_2 - y_2x_1)e_\gamma$ , since all higher-order brackets are zero. The adjoint orbit of  $Y$  is therefore: (i)  $Y$  itself, if  $y_1 = y_2 = 0$ . In this case  $Y$  is proportional to  $e_\gamma$ , and commutes with all elements of the group. (ii)  $Y$  plus an arbitrary multiple of  $e_\gamma$ , if

$y_1 \neq 0$  or  $y_2 \neq 0$ .

Problem 2.1.9: (a) In the Gram-Schmidt process we construct an orthogonal basis  $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$  from an arbitrary basis  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ . In such a way that each  $w_k$  equals  $v_k$  minus a linear combination of the previous  $w_j$ 's. Turning things around, each  $v_k$  equals  $w_k$  plus a linear combination of the previous  $w_j$ 's. Let  $W$  be a matrix whose columns are the  $w$ 's, and  $V$  be a matrix whose columns are the  $v$ 's. Then we have  $V = W\tilde{b}$ , where  $\tilde{b}$  is an upper triangular matrix with 1's on the diagonal. We can further write  $W = Ud$ , where  $d$  is diagonal, with positive entries, and the columns of  $U$  are orthonormal. Setting  $b = d\tilde{b}$ , we have  $V = Ub$ , with  $U \in O(n)$  and  $b \in B$ .

Note that the Gram-Schmidt process is deterministic. Each basis  $\{v_j\}$  is associated with exactly one pair  $(U, b)$ , and of course each pair  $(U, b)$  is associated with one basis – the columns of  $V = Ub$ . This shows that every invertible matrix can be uniquely written as the product of an orthogonal matrix and an upper-triangular matrix with positive diagonal entries.

(b) Since  $b$  has positive determinant, each element of  $GL(n, \mathbb{R})_+$  is associated with a unique pair  $(U, b)$  with  $U \in SO(n)$  and  $b \in B$ . Note that  $B$  is convex, and hence contractible (and connected). Likewise,  $SO(n)$  is connected. Given  $V_0 = U_0b_0$  and  $V_1 = U_1b_1$ , just pick a path  $U_t$  from  $U_0$  to  $U_1$  and a path  $b_t$  from  $b_0$  to  $b_1$  and set  $V_t = U_t b_t$ . As for analyticity, we know that  $\exp : so(n) \rightarrow SO(n)$  is onto. Pick elements  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  in  $so(n)$  such that  $\exp(X_0) = U_0$  and  $\exp(X_1) = U_1$ , and let  $U_t = \exp(tX_0 + (1-t)X_1)$ . Then pick  $b_t = t(b_1) + (1-t)b_0$ .

Problem 2.2.4: (a) The only sub-algebras of  $so(3)$  are either 1-dimensional (with a trivial bracket), or the full 3-dimensional algebra. To see this, recall that the bracket in  $so(3)$  is essentially the same thing as the cross product in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . If  $X$  and  $Y$  are linearly independent, then  $[X, Y]$  corresponds to a vector orthogonal to both  $\vec{X}$  and  $\vec{Y}$ , and hence linearly independent of  $\{\vec{X}, \vec{Y}\}$ . Thus if any algebra has dimension greater than 1, it must have dimension 3.

(b) Even though  $sl(2, C)$  is the complexification of  $so(3)$ , the set of available Lie sub-algebras is actually MORE than the complexification of the answer to (a). There exist 2-dimensional subalgebras, all of which are conjugate to the span of  $H$  and  $X_+$ . To see that these are the ONLY 2-dimensional subalgebras, we argue as follows:

Suppose we have a basis for a 2-D subalgebra, spanned by matrices  $A$  and  $B$ . Then  $[A, B]$  is a linear combination of  $A$  and  $B$ . By calling this combination our second basis vector and rescaling our vectors, we can assume that  $[A, B] = 2B$ . If  $B$  is semi-simple and has eigenvalues  $\pm\lambda$ , then  $\exp(2\pi B/\lambda) = 1$ , so  $Ad(\exp(2\pi B/\lambda))A = A$ . But by Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff,  $Ad(\exp(Bt))A = A + 2Bt$ . So  $B$  must not be semi-simple,

which implies it must be nilpotent, hence conjugate to  $X_+$ . The equation  $[A, B] = 2B$  then implies that  $A = H$  plus a multiple of  $B$ , so our algebra is spanned by  $H$  and  $X_+$ .

Problem 2.2.5. First consider the 1-dimensional sub-algebras. This is basically classifying  $2 \times 2$  traceless non-zero real matrices up to scaling and conjugation. There are three classes, up to conjugacy by  $SL(2, R)$ : (i) Those with real eigenvalues (and real eigenvectors), conjugate to (a multiple of)  $H$ , (ii) Those with imaginary eigenvalues, conjugate (with a real change-of-basis) to a multiple of  $X_- - X_+$ , and the non-diagonalizable elements, conjugate to  $X_+$ . Next, the 2-dimensional sub-algebras. As with  $sl(2, \mathbb{C})$ , we have the span of  $A$  and  $B$ , with  $[A, B] = 2B$  and  $B = X_+$  (up to conjugacy). But then  $A = H$  plus a multiple of  $X_+$ , so we have the span of  $H, X_+$ . In other words, all 2-dimensional sub-algebras are conjugate to the upper triangulars. (b) As abstract algebras, all 1-dimensional sub-algebras are isomorphic, and there is only one 2-dimensional algebra (up to conjugation), so all 2D sub-algebras are isomorphic.

Problem 2.2.7. If  $a(t)$  is a family of automorphisms, then  $a(x \cdot y) = (ax) \cdot (ay)$ . Taking a derivative with respect to  $t$  at  $t = 0$  and  $a = \text{identity}$ , we get  $D(x \cdot y) = (Dx) \cdot y + x \cdot (Dy)$ , where  $D = a'(0)$ . Thus  $D$  is a derivation. Conversely, suppose that  $D$  is a derivation. Let  $a(t) = \exp(Dt)$ , so  $a' = aD$ . Then  $d/dt[(a(x \cdot y) - (ax) \cdot (ay))] = aD(x \cdot y) - (aDx) \cdot (ay) - (ax) \cdot (aDy) = a(Dx \cdot y + x \cdot Dy) - a(Dx \cdot y) - a(x \cdot Dy) = 0$ , so  $a(x \cdot y) - (ax) \cdot (ay)$  is constant. Since it is zero at  $t = 0$ , it is zero for all  $t$ .