A REFINEMENT OF THE COMPLEX CONVEXITY THEOREM VIA SYMPLECTIC TECHNIQUES

BERNHARD KRÖTZ AND MICHAEL OTTO
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Abstract. We apply techniques from symplectic geometry to extend and give a new proof of the complex convexity theorem of Gindikin-Krötz.

1. Introduction

Let $G$ be a semisimple Lie group and let $G = NAK$ be an Iwasawa decomposition. Let $X \in \mathfrak{a} = \text{Lie}(A)$ be such that $\text{Spec}(\text{ad}X) \subseteq -\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}$] and set $a = \exp(iX)$. It is known that $Ka \subseteq N_{\mathbb{C}}A_{\mathbb{C}}K_{\mathbb{C}}$. The main result of this paper asserts that

$$\exists \log \tilde{a}(Ka) = \text{conv}(W.X).$$

Here $\tilde{a} : N_{\mathbb{C}}A_{\mathbb{C}}K_{\mathbb{C}} \to A_{\mathbb{C}}$ denotes a middle projection and $\text{conv}(W.X)$ stands for the convex hull of the Weyl group orbit $W.X$. We note that the inclusion “$\subseteq$” in (1.1) is the complex convexity theorem from [5].

We prove (1.1) with symplectic methods. As a byproduct we obtain interesting new classes of compact Hamiltonian manifolds and Lagrangian submanifolds thereof.

Let us now be more specific about the used techniques. We first consider the case where $G$ is a complex group. In this situation we show that $B_{\mathbb{C}} = A_{\mathbb{C}}N_{\mathbb{C}}$ carries a natural structure of a Poisson Lie group. Locally, we can identify $B_{\mathbb{C}}$ inside of $G_{\mathbb{C}}/K_{\mathbb{C}}$ and consequently we obtain a local action of $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ on $B_{\mathbb{C}}$. Within this identification the symplectic leaf $P_a$ through $a = \exp(iX) \in B_{\mathbb{C}}$ becomes a local $K_{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit. Interestingly, the symplectic form on $P_a$ remains non-degenerate on the totally real $K$-orbit $M_a \subseteq P_a$. We then exhibit a Hamiltonian torus action on the compact symplectic manifold $M_a$ and show that (1.1) becomes a consequence of the Atiyah-Guillemin-Sternberg convexity theorem. Finally, the general case of arbitrary $G$ can be handled by descent to certain Lagrangian submanifolds $Q_a \subseteq M_a$ by means of the recently discovered convexity theorem [8].
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2. Notation and basic facts

In this section we recall some basic facts about semisimple Lie algebras and groups. We make an emphasis on the complexified Iwasawa decomposition. Furthermore we review some standard facts on the double complexification of a semisimple Lie algebra.

2.1. Iwasawa decomposition and complex crown. We let \( g \) denote a semisimple Lie algebra and let \( \mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{t} + \mathfrak{p} \) be a Cartan decomposition of \( g \).

For a maximal abelian subspace \( \mathfrak{a} \) of \( \mathfrak{p} \) let \( \Sigma = \Sigma(g, \mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \mathfrak{a}^* \) be the corresponding root system. Then \( g \) admits a root space decomposition

\[
\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Sigma} \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha},
\]

where \( \mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{z}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{a}) \) and \( \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha} = \{ X \in \mathfrak{g} : (\forall H \in \mathfrak{a}) \ [H, X] = \alpha(H)X \} \).

For a fixed positive system \( \Sigma^+ \) define \( \mathfrak{n} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha} \). Then we have the Iwasawa decomposition on the Lie algebra level:

\[
\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{t}.
\]

For any real Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{l} \) we write \( \mathfrak{l}_\mathbb{C} \) for its complexification.

In the following \( G_\mathbb{C} \) will denote a simply-connected Lie group with Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C} \). We write \( G, K, K_\mathbb{C}, A, A_\mathbb{C}, N_\mathbb{C} \) and \( N_\mathbb{C} \) for the analytic subgroups of \( G_\mathbb{C} \) corresponding to the subalgebras \( \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{k}_\mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{n} \) and \( \mathfrak{n}_\mathbb{C} \), respectively.

The Weyl group of \( \Sigma \) can be defined by \( \mathcal{W} = N_K(\mathfrak{a})/Z_K(\mathfrak{a}) \).

Following [1] we define a bounded and convex subset of \( \mathfrak{a} \) that plays a central role:

\[
(2.1) \quad \Omega = \{ X \in \mathfrak{a} : |\alpha(X)| < \frac{\pi}{2} \forall \alpha \in \Sigma \}.
\]

With \( \Omega \) we define a \( G - K_\mathbb{C} \)-double coset domain in \( G_\mathbb{C} \) by

\[
\tilde{\Xi} = G \exp(i\Omega)K_\mathbb{C}.
\]

We also write

\[
\Xi = \tilde{\Xi}/K_\mathbb{C}
\]

for the union of right \( K_\mathbb{C} \)-cosets of \( \tilde{\Xi} \) in the complex symmetric space \( G_\mathbb{C}/K_\mathbb{C} \). We refer to \( \Xi \) as the complex crown of the symmetric space \( G/K \). Note that \( \Xi \) is independent of the choice of \( \mathfrak{a} \), hence generically defined through \( G/K \).

It is known that \( \tilde{\Xi} \) is an open and left \( G \)-invariant subset of \( N_\mathbb{C}A_\mathbb{C}K_\mathbb{C} \) (cf. [9] for a short proof).

Next we consider the open and dense cell \( N_\mathbb{C}A_\mathbb{C}K_\mathbb{C} \subseteq G_\mathbb{C} \) in more detail. Define \( F = K_\mathbb{C} \cap A_\mathbb{C} \) and recall that \( F = K \cap \exp(i\mathfrak{a}) \) is a finite 2-group. Standard techniques imply that the mapping

\[
(2.2) \quad N_\mathbb{C} \times [A_\mathbb{C} \times_F K_\mathbb{C}] \rightarrow N_\mathbb{C}A_\mathbb{C}K_\mathbb{C}, \quad (n, [a, k]) \mapsto nak
\]

is a biholomorphism. In particular (2.2) induces a holomorphic map \( \tilde{n} : N_\mathbb{C}A_\mathbb{C}K_\mathbb{C} \rightarrow N_\mathbb{C} \) and a multi-valued holomorphic mapping \( \tilde{a} : N_\mathbb{C}A_\mathbb{C}K_\mathbb{C} \rightarrow A_\mathbb{C} \) such that \( x \in \tilde{n}(x)\tilde{a}(x)K_\mathbb{C} \) for all \( x \in N_\mathbb{C}A_\mathbb{C}K_\mathbb{C} \).

Set \( B_\mathbb{C} = N_\mathbb{C}A_\mathbb{C} \). Clearly, \( b_\mathbb{C} = a_\mathbb{C} + n_\mathbb{C} \) is the Lie algebra of \( B_\mathbb{C} \). We define a multi-valued holomorphic map \( \tilde{b} : N_\mathbb{C}A_\mathbb{C}K_\mathbb{C} \rightarrow B_\mathbb{C} \) by \( \tilde{b}(x) = \tilde{n}(x)\tilde{a}(x) \).

Recall that \( \Xi \) is contractible, and hence simply connected. It follows that the restriction \( \tilde{a}|_\Xi \) has a unique single-valued holomorphic lift \( \log \tilde{a} : \tilde{\Xi} \rightarrow a_\mathbb{C} \) such that
log $\hat{a}(1) = 0$. Consequently, $\hat{b}|_{\mathfrak{g}}$ lifts to a single-valued holomorphic map $\hat{\Xi} \rightarrow B_C$ which shall also be denoted by $\hat{b}$.

Remark 2.1. The map $\Xi \rightarrow B_C$ induced from $\hat{\Xi} \rightarrow B_C$ is a biholomorphism onto its open image. In particular, the left $K$-action on $\Xi$ gives rise to a $K$-action on the image $\hat{b}(\Xi)$.

2.2. **Double complexification of a Lie algebra.** For the remainder of this section we will assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ carries a complex structure, say $j$. Then $\mathfrak{g}$ can be viewed as the complexification of its compact real form $\mathfrak{k}$ and the Cartan decomposition becomes $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} + j\mathfrak{k}$. The Cartan involution $\theta$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ coincides with the complex conjugation $\bar{\cdot} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ with respect to $\mathfrak{k}$.

A second complexification yields $\mathfrak{g}_C$, which carries another complex structure $i : \mathfrak{g}_C \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_C$.

The following map $\varphi$ defines a real Lie algebra isomorphism:

$$\varphi : \mathfrak{g}_C \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}, \quad X + iY \mapsto (X + jY, \bar{X} + j\bar{Y}).$$

Under $\varphi$ we have the following identifications:

\begin{align*}
(2.3) \quad & \mathfrak{k}_C = \{(Z, Z) : Z \in \mathfrak{g}\}, \\
(2.4) \quad & \mathfrak{a}_C = \{(Z, -Z) : Z \in \mathfrak{a} + j\mathfrak{a}\}, \\
(2.5) \quad & \mathfrak{n}_C = \{(X + jY, \theta(X - jY)) : X, Y \in \mathfrak{n}\} = \mathfrak{n} \times \bar{\mathfrak{n}},
\end{align*}

where $\bar{\mathfrak{n}} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha}$.

3. **The complex convexity theorem for complex groups**

The objective of this section is to provide a symplectic proof of the complex convexity theorem in the case of $G$ complex. If $G$ is complex, then we can endow $B_C$ with a natural structure of a Poisson Lie group. The symplectic leaves become local $K_C$-orbits. We show that the totally real $K$-orbit in each leaf is again a symplectic manifold. With that we obtain compact symplectic manifolds with appropriate Hamiltonian torus actions. The complex convexity theorem then becomes a consequence of the Atiyah-Guillemin-Sternberg convexity theorem.

3.1. **The Poisson Lie group $B_C$.** Throughout this section $\mathfrak{g}$ denotes a complex semisimple Lie algebra. Our first task is to define a bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathfrak{g}_C = \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ which gives $(\mathfrak{g}_C, \mathfrak{b}_C, \mathfrak{t}_C)$ the structure of a Manin triple. To that end let $\kappa$ be the Killing form of the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Then define on $\mathfrak{g}_C = \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ a bilinear form by

$$\langle (X, Y), (X', Y') \rangle = \Re \kappa(X, X') - \Re \kappa(Y, Y')$$

for $(X, Y), (X', Y') \in \mathfrak{g}_C$. Let us point out that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is real but not complex bilinear.

**Proposition 3.1.** The bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathfrak{g}_C = \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ has the following properties:

(i) $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is symmetric, non-degenerate and $G_C$-invariant.

(ii) $\langle \mathfrak{b}_C, \mathfrak{b}_C \rangle = \{0\}$ and $\langle \mathfrak{t}_C, \mathfrak{t}_C \rangle = \{0\}$.

**Proof.** (i) is immediate from the definition. Moving on to (ii) we observe that the relations $\langle \mathfrak{t}_C, \mathfrak{t}_C \rangle = \{0\}$ and $\langle \mathfrak{a}_C, \mathfrak{a}_C \rangle = \{0\}$ are straightforward from the identifications (2.3)-(2.5). Finally, the fact that root spaces $\mathfrak{g}^\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{g}^\beta$ are $\kappa$-orthogonal if $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$ implies $\langle \mathfrak{n}_C, \mathfrak{a}_C + \mathfrak{n}_C \rangle = \{0\}$. \qed
Notice that Proposition 3.1 just says that \(\langle , \rangle\) turns \((g_C, b_C, \mathfrak{t}_C)\) into a Manin triple. Accordingly \(B_C\) becomes a Poisson Lie group whose symplectic leaves are local \(K_C\)-orbits (cf. [1]). Here we shall only be interested in the leaves through points \(a = \exp(iX)\) for \(X \in \Omega\). Denote the leaf containing \(a\) by \(P_a\). Then
\[
P_a = \{\hat{b}(ka) \in B_C : \ k \in K_C, ka \in N_C A_C K_C\},
\]
where \(\{\cdot\}_0\) refers to the connected component of \(\{\cdot\}\) containing \(a\).

For an element \(Z \in \mathfrak{t}_C\) we write \(\hat{Z}\) for the corresponding vector field on \(P_a\), i.e. if \(b = \hat{b}(ka) \in P_a\), then
\[
\hat{Z}_b = \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} \hat{b}(\exp(tZ)ka) .
\]

Write \(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{t}_C} : g_C \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_C\) and \(\text{pr}_{b_C} : g_C \rightarrow b_C\) for the projections along \(b_C\), resp. \(\mathfrak{t}_C\).

We note that \(T_b P_a = \{\hat{Z}_b : Z \in \mathfrak{t}_C\}\). The symplectic form \(\tilde{\omega}\) on \(P_a\) is then given by
\[
(3.1)\quad \tilde{\omega}_b(\check{Y}_b, \check{Z}_b) = \langle \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{t}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y), \text{Ad}(b^{-1})Z \rangle = -\langle \text{pr}_{b_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y), \text{Ad}(b^{-1})Z \rangle ,
\]
for \(Y, Z \in \mathfrak{t}_C\) (cf. (4)). The second equality in (3.1) follows from Proposition 3.1.

3.2. The totally real \(K\)-orbit in the symplectic leaf. Our interest is not so much with \(P_a\) as it is with its totally real submanifold
\[
M_a = \hat{b}(K a) .
\]
Then \(\tilde{\omega}\) induces a closed 2-form \(\omega\) on \(M_a\) by \(\omega = \tilde{\omega}|_{TM_a \times TM_a}\). A priori it is not clear that \(\omega\) is non-degenerate, i.e. that \((M_a, \omega)\) is a symplectic manifold. This will be shown now. We start with a simple algebraic fact.

**Lemma 3.2.** With respect to \(\langle , \rangle\) one has \(\mathfrak{t}^\perp = \mathfrak{t}_C + b\).

**Proof.** Because of the non-degeneracy of \(\langle , \rangle\), it is sufficient to verify that \(\mathfrak{t}_C + b \subseteq \mathfrak{t}^\perp\). Clearly, \(\mathfrak{t}_C \subseteq \mathfrak{t}^\perp\) since \(\mathfrak{t}_C\) is isotropic. As \(b = a + n\), it thus remains to show that \(\langle \mathfrak{t}, a \rangle = \{0\}\) and \(\langle \mathfrak{t}, n \rangle = \{0\}\). Now \(\langle \mathfrak{t}, a \rangle = \{0\}\) follows from (2.3)-(2.4) and \(\Re\kappa(\mathfrak{t}, a) = \{0\}\). Finally we show that \(\langle \mathfrak{t}, n \rangle = \{0\}\). For that fix an arbitrary element \(W = (\sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} Y_\alpha, \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} \bar{Y}_\alpha)\) of \(n \subseteq g \times g\): here \(Y_\alpha \in g^a\). Likewise let \(U = (V + \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} (Z_\alpha + \bar{Z}_\alpha), V + \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} (Z_\alpha + \bar{Z}_\alpha))\) be an element of \(\mathfrak{t} \subseteq g \times g\): here \(V \in \mathfrak{m}\) and \(Z_\alpha \in g^a\).

As \(m \perp_{\alpha} g^a\) and \(g^a \perp_{\alpha} g^\beta\) for \(\alpha \neq \beta\), we obtain
\[
\langle U, W \rangle = \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} \Re\kappa (Z_\alpha + \bar{Z}_\alpha, Y_\alpha) - \Re\kappa (Z_\alpha + \bar{Z}_\alpha, \bar{Y}_\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} \Re\kappa (Z_\alpha, Y_\alpha) - \Re\kappa (Z_\alpha, \bar{Y}_\alpha) = 0 .
\]

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \(\square\)

**Lemma 3.3.** At any point \(b \in M_a\), the bilinear form \(\omega_b : T_b M_a \times T_b M_a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is non-degenerate.

**Proof.** Let \(b = \hat{b}(ka) \in M_a\). Then \(b = kak'\) for some \(k \in K, k' \in K_C\). Note that \(T_b M_a = \{\hat{Y}_b : Y \in \mathfrak{t}\}\).

Assume that there is an \(U \in \mathfrak{t}\) such that \(\omega_b(\hat{U}_b, \hat{Y}_b) = 0\) for all \(Y \in \mathfrak{t}\), i.e.
\[
\langle \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{t}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})U), \text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y \rangle = 0 \quad \forall \ Y \in \mathfrak{t} .
\]
We first show that \( \tilde{U}_b = 0 \). Set \( Z = \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{t}_C} \left( \text{Ad}(b^{-1})U \right) \). Then \( \text{Ad}(b)Z \in \mathfrak{t}^\perp \). Thus Lemma 3.2 implies that
\[
(3.2) \quad Z \in \text{Ad}(b^{-1})(\mathfrak{t}_C + \mathfrak{b}).
\]
On the other hand, by definition,
\[
(3.3) \quad Z \in \text{Ad}(b^{-1})\mathfrak{t} + \mathfrak{b}_C = \text{Ad}(b^{-1})(\mathfrak{t} + \mathfrak{b}_C).
\]
From (3.2) and (3.3) it follows that
\[
Z \in \text{Ad}(b^{-1})(\mathfrak{t}_C + \mathfrak{b}) \cap \text{Ad}(b^{-1})(\mathfrak{t} + \mathfrak{b}_C) = \text{Ad}(b^{-1})\mathfrak{g}.
\]
Moreover, since \( Z \) is an image point of \( \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{t}_C} \),
\[
Z \in \text{Ad}(b^{-1})\mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{t}_C,
\]
i.e.
\[
\text{Ad}(b)Z \in \mathfrak{g} \cap \text{Ad}(b)\mathfrak{t}_C.
\]
As \( b = \text{Ad}(k) \), we now get
\[
\text{Ad}(b)Z \in \mathfrak{g} \cap \text{Ad}(k)\text{Ad}(a)\mathfrak{t}_C = \text{Ad}(k)(\mathfrak{g} \cap \text{Ad}(a)\mathfrak{t}_C).
\]
Using standard techniques (see [1] or [9], Lemma 2), it follows from (2.1) that
\[
\mathfrak{g} \cap \text{Ad}(a)\mathfrak{t}_C = \mathfrak{Z}_t(X).
\]
Hence \( \text{Ad}(b)Z \in \text{Ad}(k)\mathfrak{Z}_t(X) \).

From
\[
\text{Ad}(b^{-1})U \in Z + \mathfrak{b}_C
\]
we conclude
\[
U \in \text{Ad}(b)Z + \mathfrak{b}_C \subseteq \text{Ad}(k)\mathfrak{Z}_t(X) + \mathfrak{b}_C.
\]
Since \( U \) was assumed to lie in \( \mathfrak{t} \), we finally get
\[
U \in \text{Ad}(k)\mathfrak{Z}_t(X).
\]
But this just means that \( \tilde{U}_b = 0 \), concluding the proof that \( \omega_b \) is non-degenerate. \( \square \)

### 3.3. Hamiltonian torus action on the totally real leaf \( M_a \)

It follows from Lemma 3.3 that \( (M_a, \omega) \) is a compact symplectic manifold. Clearly, the torus \( T = \exp(ja) \) acts on \( M_a \) as \( K \) does. We wish to show that the action of \( T \) on \( M_a \) is Hamiltonian and identify the corresponding moment map \( \Phi : M_a \to \mathfrak{t}^* \), where \( \mathfrak{t} = ja \) is the Lie algebra of \( T \). We will identify \( \mathfrak{t}^* \) with \( \mathfrak{a} \) via the linear isomorphism
\[
(3.4) \quad \mathfrak{a} \mapsto \mathfrak{t}^*, \quad Y \mapsto (Z \mapsto \langle iY, Z \rangle).
\]

We shall write \( \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{a}_C} : \mathfrak{g}_C \to \mathfrak{a}_C \) for the projection along \( \mathfrak{t}_C + \mathfrak{n}_C \).

**Proposition 3.4.** The action of the torus \( T = \exp(ja) \) on \( M_a \) is Hamiltonian with momentum map
\[
\Phi : M_a \to \mathfrak{t}^* \simeq \mathfrak{a}, \quad \tilde{b}(ka) \mapsto \Im \log \tilde{a}(ka).
\]

**Proof.** We first show that \( T = \exp(ja) \) acts on \( M_a \) by symplectomorphisms. For that we first notice that \( T \) normalizes \( B_C \). Hence the action of \( T \) on \( M_a \subseteq B_C \) is given by conjugation, i.e.
\[
T \times M_a \to M_a, \quad (t, b) \mapsto tbt^{-1}.
\]
Moreover, for each \( t \in T \) the map \( \text{Ad}(t) \) commutes both with \( \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{t}_C} \) and \( \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{b}_C} \). Combining these facts, it is then straightforward from (3.1) that \( T \) acts indeed symplectically on \( M_a \).
Next we show that
\[(3.5) \quad \omega(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}) = 0 \quad \forall Y, Z \in \mathfrak{t}.
\]
Fix \(b \in M_a\). From the definition (3.1) we obtain that
\[\omega_b(\tilde{Y}_b, \tilde{Z}_b) = \langle \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{n}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y), \text{Ad}(b^{-1})Z \rangle.
\]
Now for \(Y, Z \in \mathfrak{t}\) we have \(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y \in \mathfrak{y} + \mathfrak{n}_C\) and \(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Z \in \mathfrak{z} + \mathfrak{n}_C\). From Proposition 3.1 we know \(\langle \mathfrak{n}_C, \mathfrak{n}_C \rangle = \{0\}\) and \(\langle \mathfrak{t}_C, \mathfrak{t}_C \rangle = \{0\}\). Hence, to prove (3.5) it suffices to show \(\langle t, \mathfrak{n}_C \rangle = \{0\}\).
Let \(U = (jZ, j\tilde{Z}) \in \mathfrak{t}\) and \(V = (\sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} X_\alpha + jY_\alpha, \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} \tilde{X}_\alpha + j\tilde{Y}_\alpha) \in \mathfrak{n}_C\), where \(Z \in \mathfrak{a}\) and \(X_\alpha, Y_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^{\alpha}\). Then,
\[
\langle U, V \rangle = \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+} \Re j\kappa(Z, X_\alpha + jY_\alpha) - \Re j\kappa(Z, \tilde{X}_\alpha + j\tilde{Y}_\alpha) = 0,
\]
since \(\mathfrak{g}^{\alpha} \perp \mathfrak{g}^\beta\) for \(\alpha + \beta \neq 0\).

Having established (3.5) the symplectic action of \(T\) on \(M_a\) will be Hamiltonian with moment map \(\Phi\) if \(\iota(\tilde{Z})\omega = d\Phi_Z\) holds for all \(Z \in \mathfrak{t}\). Fix \(b \in M_a\) and \(Y \in \mathfrak{t}\). With the identification (3.2) we then compute
\[
d\Phi_Z(b)(\tilde{Y}_b) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \Phi_Z(b(\exp(tY)b), b) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \langle i\Phi(\tilde{b}(\exp(tY)b)), Z \rangle = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \langle i\Phi(\tilde{b}(b\exp(t\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y))), Z \rangle = \langle i\Re \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{n}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y), Z \rangle = \langle \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{a}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y), Z \rangle.
\]
For the last equality we have used the fact that \(\mathfrak{a} \perp \mathfrak{t}\) with respect to \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\) (cf. Lemma 3.2).

On the other hand,
\[
\langle \iota(\tilde{Z})\omega \rangle(b)(\tilde{Y}_b) = \omega_b(\tilde{Z}_b, \tilde{Y}_b) = \langle \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{n}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Z), \text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y \rangle = \langle \text{Ad}(b^{-1})Z, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{n}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y) \rangle = \langle \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{a}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y) \rangle = \langle Z, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{a}_C}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Y) \rangle.
\]
The last two equations hold because \(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})Z \in \mathfrak{z} + \mathfrak{n}_C\), and \(\langle t, \mathfrak{n}_C \rangle = \{0\}\). \(\square\)

Remark 3.5. The manifold \(M_a\) is \(K\)-diffeomorphic but not \(K\)-symplectomorphic to a co-adjoint orbit for the group \(K\). To explain this let us first consider the adjoint orbit
\[O_X = \text{Ad}(K)(jX) \subset \mathfrak{k}.
\]
After identifying \(\mathfrak{k}\) with \(\mathfrak{k}^*\) via the Cartan-Killing form, we may view \(O_X\) as a co-adjoint orbit endowed with its natural Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form (in the sequel denoted by \(\omega_{\text{orb}}\)). Clearly, \(M_a\) is \(K\)-diffeomorphic to \(O_X\), say by a map \(F : M_a \rightarrow O_X\). Write \(\Phi_{\text{orb}} : O_X \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^*\) for the moment map associated to the natural \(T\)-action on \(O_X\).
By Proposition 3.3 we know that $T$ acts on $M_a$ by symplectomorphisms; further one deduces that the moment maps $\Phi$ and $\Phi_{\text{orb}}$ coincide on the set of $T$-fixed points. Therefore one can apply [6], Prop. 4.1, and deform $F$ into a $T$-equivariant symplectic diffeomorphism $\tilde{F} : (M_a, \omega) \to (\mathcal{O}_X, \omega_{\text{orb}})$.

However, $K$ does not act on $M_a$ by symplectomorphisms and hence $M_a$ is not $K$-symplectomorphic to the coadjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_X$.

3.4. **Symplectic proof of the complex convexity theorem.** As $M_a$ is compact and the action of $T$ on $(M_a, \omega)$ is Hamiltonian, the Atiyah-Guillemin-Sternberg convexity theorem [2, 7] asserts

$$\Phi(M_a) = \text{conv}(\Phi(\text{Fix}(M_a))) .$$

In this formula $\text{conv}(\cdot)$ denotes the convex hull of $(\cdot)$ and $\text{Fix}(M_a)$ stands for the $T$-fixed points in $M_a$. Standard structure theory implies that $\text{Fix}(M_a) = \mathcal{W}.a$. We have thus proved:

**Theorem 3.6.** Let $G$ be a complex semisimple Lie group and let $X \in \Omega$. Then

$$\Im(\log \tilde{a}(\exp(iX))) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{W}.X) .$$

4. **The complex convexity theorem for non-complex groups**

For real groups the totally real $K$-orbits are no longer symplectic manifolds. However, they can be viewed as fixed point sets of an involution $\tau$ on the compact symplectic manifold $M_a$ as introduced in Chapter 3. We will define $\tau$ and show that it is compatible with the action of $T$ in a way that the symplectic convexity theorem from [6] can be applied.

Let $\mathfrak{g}_0$ be a non-compact real form of the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. It is no loss of generality if we assume that $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is $\theta$-invariant. With $\mathfrak{t}_0 = \mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_0 = \mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{p}$ we then obtain a Cartan decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{t}_0 + \mathfrak{p}_0$ of $\mathfrak{g}_0$. We fix a maximal abelian subalgebra $\mathfrak{a}_0$ of $\mathfrak{p}_0$ which is contained in $\mathfrak{a}$. Write $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{a}_0)$ for the corresponding restricted root system and set

$$\Omega_0 = \{ X \in \mathfrak{a}_0 : |\alpha(X)| < \frac{\pi}{2} \forall \alpha \in \Sigma_0 \} .$$

As $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma|_{\mathfrak{a}_0} \setminus \{0\}$ we record that

\begin{equation}
\Omega_0 = \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}_0 .
\end{equation}

It is no loss of generality to assume that $\Sigma_0^+ = \Sigma^+|_{\mathfrak{a}_0} \setminus \{0\}$ defines a positive system of $\Sigma_0^+$. We form the nilpotent Lie algebra $\mathfrak{n}_0 = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Sigma_0^+} \mathfrak{g}_0^\alpha$ and record that $\mathfrak{n}_0 = \mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{n}$.

The analytic subgroups of $G$ with Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}_0$, $\mathfrak{t}_0$, $\mathfrak{a}_0$ and $\mathfrak{n}_0$ will be denoted by $G_0$, $K_0$, $A_0$ and $N_0$. If $\Xi_0 = G_0 \exp(i\Omega_0)(K_0)_C/(K_0)_C$ denotes the crown of $G_0/K_0$, then (4.1) yields a holomorphic $G_0$-equivariant embedding

\begin{equation}
\Xi_0 \hookrightarrow \Xi .
\end{equation}

As described at the end of Subsection 2.1, there exists a map $\log \tilde{a} : \tilde{\Xi}_0 = (N_0)_C(A_0)_C(K_0)_C \to (a_0)_C$ with $\log \tilde{a}_0(1) = 0$. Note that $\log \tilde{a}_0 = \log \tilde{a}|_{\mathfrak{g}_0}$.

Let $\sigma$ denote the Cartan involution on $\mathfrak{g}_0$. We also write $\sigma$ for the doubly complex linear extension of $\sigma$ to $\mathfrak{g}_C$. Likewise $\theta$ also stands for the complex linear extension of $\theta$ to $\mathfrak{g}_C$. We will be interested in the involution $\tau = \theta \circ \sigma = \sigma \circ \theta$ on $\mathfrak{g}_C$ (which is the complex linear extension of the complex conjugation on $\mathfrak{g}$ with respect to $\mathfrak{g}_0$).
All these involutions on $g_C$ can be lifted to involutions on $G_C/K_C$ and on $B_C$, and we use the same letters to denote the lifts.

Fix $X \in \Omega_0$, set $a = \exp(iX)$ and recall the definition of the symplectic manifold $M_a = \tilde{b}(K_a)$ from Chapter 3. Notice that $M_a$ is $\tau$-invariant and that $a \in M_a$ is $\tau$-fixed. As we assumed that $G$ is simply connected, the same holds for $K$, and one deduces that the $\tau$-fixed point set $Q_a$ of $M_a$ is connected. In particular, $Q_a = \tilde{b}(K_0a)$. We also have a Hamiltonian action by the torus $T_0 = \exp(ja_0)$ on $M_a$.

The following lemma describes certain compatibility properties of the actions of $T_0$ and $\tau$ on $M_a$.

**Lemma 4.1.** Consider the Hamiltonian torus action of $T_0 = \exp(ja_0)$ on $M_a$ with momentum map $\Phi : M_a \to \mathfrak{t}_0^*$. Then the following assertions hold:

1. $t \circ \tau = \tau \circ t^{-1}$ for all $t \in T_0$.
2. $\Phi \circ \tau = \Phi$.
3. $Q_a$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of $M_a$.

**Proof.** Let $b = \tilde{b}(ka) \in M_a$ and $t \in T_0$,

$$t \cdot \tau(b) = t \cdot \tilde{b}(\tau(k)a) = \tilde{b}(t \cdot \tau(k)a) = \tilde{b}(\tau(t^{-1}k)a) = \tau(t^{-1}b).$$

We need to introduce some additional notation. Let

$$n^+ := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Sigma_0^+} g^\alpha \subseteq n, \quad n^- := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Sigma_0^-} g^{-\alpha}, \quad n^0 := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Sigma_0^0} g^\alpha.$$

We denote by $N_C^+, N_C^-, N_C^0$ the analytic subgroups of $G_C$ with Lie algebras $n_C^+$, $n_C^-$ and $n_C^0$, respectively. Notice that $n = n^0 + n^+$ and therefore $N_C = N_C^+ N_C^0$. It is important to observe that $\tau(N_C^+) = N_C^+$ but $\tau(N_C^0) \cap N_C^0 = \{1\}$.

Write $i$ for a $\tau$-invariant complement of $a_0 + ia_0$ in $a_C$. Then $a_C = a_0 + ia_0 + i$. Now let $x = \tilde{b}k$ for some $k \in K$. Then $x$, $\tau(x) \in N_C A_C K_C$ and

$$x = n_+ n_0 b t' k, \quad \tau(x) = n'_+ n'_0 b' t' k'$$

with elements $n_+, n'_+ \in N_C^+$, $n_0, n'_0 \in N_C^0$, $b, b' \in \exp(a_0 + ia_0)$, $t', t' \in \exp(i)$ and $k, k' \in K_C$.

Clearly, (2) will be proved if we can show that $b^2 = (b')^2$ (which forces $b = b'$ by the existence of the logarithm $\log \tilde{a} : \Xi \to a_C$; cf. Subsection 2.1). This will be established in the sequel.

It follows from (4.3) that

$$\tau(x) = n'_+ n'_0 b' t' k' = \tau(n_+) \tau(n_0) b t^{-1} \tau(k).$$

Since $\tau$ leaves $K_C$ invariant and $\theta$ fixes each element of $K_C$, we obtain

$$\tau(x) \theta(\tau(x))^{-1} = n'_+ n'_0 (b')^2 \theta(n'_0)^{-1} \theta(n'_+)^{-1}$$

(4.4)

$$= \tau(n_+) \tau(n_0) b^2 \theta(\tau(n_0))^{-1} \theta(\tau(n_+))^{-1}.$$

(4.5)

Note that $n'_0 (b')^2 \theta(n'_0)^{-1}$ and $\tau(n_0) b^2 \theta(\tau(n_0))^{-1}$ belong to the reductive group $Z_{G_C}(A_0)$, and recall that $\tau(N_C^+)$ and $\theta(N_C^0) = N_C^-$. Hence (4.4)-(4.5) combined with the Bruhat decomposition of $G_C$ with respect to the parabolic subgroup $Z_{G_C}(A_0) N_C^0$ forces that $n'_+ = \tau(n_+)$. But then we have

$$n'_0 (b')^2 \theta(n'_0)^{-1} = \tau(n_0) b^2 \theta(\tau(n_0))^{-1}$$

(4.6)
in \( Z_{G_c}(A_0) \). The components of \( A_{0,c} \), the center of \( Z_{G_c}(A_0) \), on both sides must coincide, therefore

\[
(b')^2 = b^2.
\]

(3): Consider \( U, V \in \mathfrak{t}_0, k_0 \in K_0 \) and \( b = \tilde{b}(k_0 a) \in Q_a \). From the formula (3.1) for the symplectic form \( \omega \) on \( M_a \) we get

\[
\omega_b(\tilde{U}_b, \tilde{V}_b) = \langle \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{c}_0}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})U), \text{Ad}(b^{-1})V \rangle.
\]

Now, both \( \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{c}_0}(\text{Ad}(b^{-1})U) \) and \( \text{Ad}(b^{-1})V \) lie in \( \mathfrak{g}_0 + i\mathfrak{g}_0 \). But for general elements \( X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathfrak{g}_0 \) we have

\[
\langle X_1 + iX_2, Y_1 + iY_2 \rangle = \Re \kappa(X_1 + jX_2, Y_1 + jY_2) - \Re \kappa(\bar{X}_1 + j\bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}_1 + j\bar{Y}_2)
\]

\[
= \Re \kappa(X_1, Y_1) - \Re \kappa(X_2, Y_2) - \Re \kappa(\bar{X}_1, \bar{Y}_1) + \Re \kappa(\bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}_2)
\]

\[
+ \Re \kappa(X_1, jY_2) + \Re \kappa(jX_2, Y_1) - \Re \kappa(\bar{X}_1, j\bar{Y}_2) + \Re \kappa(j\bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}_1)
\]

\[
= 0.
\]

The last equality is due to the invariance of \( \kappa \) and the fact that \( X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathfrak{g}_0 \). This shows that \( \omega_b(\tilde{U}_b, \tilde{V}_b) = 0 \), i.e. \( T_b(Q_a) \) is isotropic.

We recall the following symplectic convexity theorem [3].

**Theorem 4.2.** Let \( M \) be a compact connected symplectic manifold with Hamiltonian torus action \( T \times M \to M \) and momentum map \( \Phi : M \to \mathfrak{t}^* \). In addition, let \( \tau : M \to M \) be an involutive diffeomorphism with fixed point set \( Q \) such that

1. \( t \circ \tau = \tau \circ t^{-1} \) for all \( t \in T \).
2. \( \Phi \circ \tau = \Phi \).
3. \( Q \) is a Lagrangian submanifold of \( M \).

Denote the \( T \)-fixed subsets of \( M \) and \( Q \) by \( \text{Fix}(M) \) and \( \text{Fix}(Q) \), respectively. Then,

\[
\Phi(Q) = \Phi(M) = \text{conv}(\Phi(\text{Fix}(M))) = \text{conv}(\Phi(\text{Fix}(Q))).
\]

Moreover, the same assertions hold if \( Q \) is replaced with any of its connected components.

With this result at hand we are now able to prove the complex convexity result for non-complex groups. Write \( \mathcal{W}_0 \) for the Weyl group of \( \Sigma_0 \).

**Theorem 4.3.** Let \( G_0 \) be a non-compact connected semisimple Lie group with Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{g}_0 \). Fix an element \( X \in \Omega_0 \). Then

\[
\exists \log \hat{a}_0(K_0 \exp(iX)) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{W}_0.X).
\]

**Proof.** Define \( a = \exp(iX) \). The left-hand side in equality (4.6) coincides with \( \Phi(Q_a) \), where \( \Phi = \exists \circ \log \circ \hat{a} \) is the momentum map on \( M_a \). Lemma [1] says that conditions [1-3] in Theorem 4.2 are satisfied. Therefore,

\[
\exists \log \hat{a}_0(K_0 \exp(iX)) = \Phi(Q_a) = \text{conv}(\Phi(\text{Fix}(Q_a))).
\]

Standard structure theory shows that \( \text{Fix}(Q_a) = \tilde{b}(\mathcal{W}_0 \exp(iX)) \). This implies \( \Phi(\text{Fix}(Q_a)) = \mathcal{W}_0.X \), and finishes the proof.

**Remark 4.4.** The involution \( \tau \) on \( M_a \) is in general not anti-symplectic. To be more precise, one can show that \( \tau \) is anti-symplectic if and only if \( \mathfrak{g}_0 \) is quasi-split. In this more structured situation one does not need the full strength of Theorem 4.2; one can use a well-known theorem of Duistermaat instead [3].
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