

# ANNALES DE L'INSTITUT FOURIER

VELIMIR JURDJEVIC

IVAN KUPKA

## **Control systems on semi-simple Lie groups and their homogeneous spaces**

*Annales de l'institut Fourier*, tome 31, n° 4 (1981), p. 151-179

[http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIF\\_1981\\_\\_31\\_4\\_151\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIF_1981__31_4_151_0)

© Annales de l'institut Fourier, 1981, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'institut Fourier » (<http://annalif.ujf-grenoble.fr/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme  
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

## CONTROL SYSTEMS ON SEMI-SIMPLE LIE GROUPS AND THEIR HOMOGENEOUS SPACES (\*)

by V. JURDJEVIC and I. KUPKA

---

### INTRODUCTION

In essence, this paper deals with the accessibility problem for control systems described by ordinary differential equations. The main contribution of the paper is to give conditions for a class of such systems which ensure that the system can be steered from any initial state to any final state by an admissible control.

From the point of view of this paper, a control system, or a polysystem, is a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of vector fields on an  $n$ -dimensional manifold  $M$ . A trajectory of  $\mathcal{F}$  is a continuous curve  $x$  from an interval  $[0, T]$ ,  $T \geq 0$  of the real line into  $M$  such that for some partition  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n = T$  there exist vector fields  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  such that on each interval  $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$ ,  $x$  is an integral curve of  $X_i$ . The accessibility set of  $\mathcal{F}$  through a point  $q$  in  $M$  consists of all points  $w \in M$  for which there exists a trajectory  $x$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $x(0) = q$  and  $x(T) = w$ .  $\mathcal{F}$  is termed transitive if the accessibility set of  $\mathcal{F}$  through each point  $q \in M$  is equal to  $M$ .

Our main objective is to give conditions on  $\mathcal{F}$  which ensure that it is transitive. In this paper we concentrate our attention to systems  $\mathcal{F}$  which consist of right (resp. left) invariant vector fields on a Lie group  $G$ . The transitivity results which we obtain for such systems are directly applicable to the corresponding systems on homogeneous spaces of  $G$ .

(\*) *A.M.S. Classification* : 49E15|93B05|22E15-46.

The prototypes of such systems are the so-called bilinear systems in the control theory literature; these are systems of the form

$$(1) \quad \frac{dx}{dt} = Ax + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t)B_i x$$

where  $A$  and  $B_1, \dots, B_m$  are  $n \times n$  matrices with real entries,  $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$  and the controls  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  are unbounded. A very natural way to the accessibility properties of (1) is to consider the matrix differential equation :

$$(2) \quad \frac{dX}{dt} = \left( A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t)B_i \right) X(t)$$

where  $X \in GL_n(\mathbf{R})$ .

The vector fields  $X \rightarrow AX$  and  $X \rightarrow B_i X$   $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  are right invariant on  $GL_n(\mathbf{R})$  or on any closed subgroup  $G$  of  $GL_n(\mathbf{R})$  provided that  $A$  and  $B_1, \dots, B_m$  lie in the Lie algebra  $L(G)$  of  $G$ . The accessibility set of (1) through any point  $q \in \mathbf{R}^n$  is simply the action of the accessibility set through the identity of (2) applied to  $q$ .

When the controls  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$  consist of all piece-wise constant functions on  $[0, \infty)$  taking values in some set  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^m$ , then the set of accessibility of (2) through the identity is a semi-group in  $G$  generated

by  $\bigcup_{M \in \Gamma} \{e^{Mt} : t \geq 0\}$  where

$$(3) \quad \Gamma = \left\{ A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i B_i : u \in \Omega \right\}.$$

In the more general situation when  $\mathcal{F}$  is any family of right (resp. left) invariant vector fields on a group  $G$ , the situation is quite similar in that the accessibility set of  $\mathcal{F}$  through the identity is a semi-group generated by  $\bigcup_{M \in \Gamma} \{e^{Mt} : t \geq 0\}$  where  $\Gamma$  is the subset of the Lie algebra of  $G$  constituted by the values of the elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  at the identity. We call such semi-group  $S(\Gamma)$ , and our main problem in this paper is to find conditions on  $\Gamma$  such that  $S(\Gamma)$  is equal to  $G$ , for then  $\mathcal{F}$  is transitive on  $G$ .

The requirement that  $Lie(\Gamma)$ , the Lie algebra generated by the set  $\Gamma$ , be equal to  $L(G)$  means that the group generated by  $S(\Gamma)$  is equal to  $G$ .

However, there are many distinct semi-groups of  $G$  with this property and hence this condition is not a sufficient condition for transitivity.

Our results are based on the following technique. Rather than working with the family  $\mathcal{F}$  we work with  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ , which in this paper we call the Lie saturate of  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  is the largest (in the sense of set inclusion) family of vector fields such that :

i) The closures of the sets of accessibility of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  through each point  $q \in M$  are the same.

ii)  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  is contained in the Lie algebra generated by  $\mathcal{F}$ .

The most useful property of  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  is that when it spans the tangent space of  $M$  through each point in  $M$  then  $\mathcal{F}$  is transitive.

In this paper we construct a sequence of operations on a given system  $\mathcal{F}$  which permits us to conclude that  $\mathcal{LS}_q(\mathcal{F}) = T_q M \quad \forall q \in M$ .

In particular we use the following facts :

i) If  $V \subset \mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ , then  $\text{cov}(V)$ , the closed (in the  $C^\infty$  topology of vector fields on  $M$ ) convex positive cone spanned by  $V$  is contained in  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ , and

ii) If  $V$  and  $-V$  are contained in  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ , then the Lie algebra generated by  $V$  is contained in  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ .

In the context of invariant vector fields the above ideas admit the following description : If  $\Gamma(\mathcal{F})$  is the subset of  $L(G)$  defined by the values of the elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  at the identity, then  $\Gamma(\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F}))$ , which we in this paper simply call  $LS(\Gamma)$ , is the largest subset of  $L(G)$  such that

a) The closure of  $S(\Gamma) =$  the closure of  $S(LS(\Gamma))$ , and

b)  $LS(\Gamma)$  is contained in the Lie algebra generated by  $\Gamma$ .

In this setting,  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  spans the tangent space of  $G$  at each point if and only if  $LS(\Gamma) = L(G)$ .

In order to introduce our main results and to elucidate the techniques used, we next mention certain well known results of transitivity in the context of the preceding formalism.

a)  $G$  compact,  $\mathcal{F}$  either right or left invariant family. Then, if  $M \in L(G)$ ,

$$\{e^{Mt} : t \leq 0\} \subset \text{Cl}\{e^{Mt} : t \geq 0\}.$$

Hence,  $-\Gamma \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ , and thus by ii)  $\text{LS}(\Gamma) = \text{Lie}(\Gamma)$ , the Lie algebra generated by  $\Gamma$ . Thus,  $\Gamma$  is transitive if and only if  $\text{Lie}(\Gamma) = \text{L}(G)$  (V. J. Sussmann [6], Lobry [9]).

b) For systems of the form

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ X + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i Y_i : u \in \Omega \right\}$$

we have the following transitivity results. We distinguish between the bounded control case and the unbounded one.

b1) The bang-bang case  $\Omega = \{u : |u_i| = 1 \ i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{X, X \pm Y_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, m\} \subset \text{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  since  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is contained in  $\text{cov}(\mathcal{F})$ . If in addition  $X$  happens to be Poisson stable, then the negative trajectories of  $X$  lie in the closure of the positive trajectories of  $X$  and hence  $-X \in \text{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ . Thus,  $\text{cov}(\{-X\} \cup \mathcal{F}_0)$  is equal to the vector space generated by  $\{\pm X, \pm Y_1, \dots, \pm Y_m\}$ . Hence, in this case  $\text{LS}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$ , and thus  $\mathcal{F}$  is transitive whenever the Lie algebra spans the tangent space of  $M$  at each point [9].

b2) The unbounded controls case,  $\Omega = \mathbf{R}^m$ . In this case,  $\{X, \pm Y_1, \dots, \pm Y_m\}$  belongs to  $\text{cov} \mathcal{F}$ , and hence to  $\text{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ . If  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\pm Y_1, \dots, \pm Y_m\}$  then  $-\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}$ ; hence, by ii) above  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ , the Lie algebra generated by  $\mathcal{F}_0$ , is contained in  $\text{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{F}$  is transitive whenever  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F}_0)$  spans the tangent space of  $M$  at each point of  $M$ . In this connection, there are several papers aimed at proving that the set of all pairs  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  of vector fields on a manifold  $M$  whose Lie algebra generated by  $\{Y_1, Y_2\}$  spans the tangent space of  $M$  at each of its points is open and dense (for instance, [10]). Thus when  $m \geq 2$  transitivity of systems of the form  $\{X, \pm Y_1, \dots, \pm Y_m\}$  is generic. Certainly, this is the case where all the vector fields which define the system are invariant on a semi-simple Lie group  $G$ . In this sense, the most interesting case is the scalar control case, i.e., the case when  $m = 1$ .

This paper is essentially devoted to such a case, and it is a generalization of our previous paper [5] dealing with matrix systems in  $\text{SL}_n(\mathbf{R})$  to systems on a general semi-simple Lie group with a finite center.

In order to state our main results we will need several concepts related to semi-simple Lie algebras. Let  $L$  be a real semi-simple Lie algebra,  $L_c = L \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \mathbf{C}$  its complexification,  $\text{ad} : L \rightarrow \text{End}(L)$ ,  $\text{ad}_c : L_c \rightarrow \text{End}(L_c)$  the corresponding adjoint representations.

We shall say that an element  $B$  in  $L$  is *strongly-regular* if : 1) all

nonzero eigenvalues of  $\text{ad}_c B$  are simple. 2) The generalized zero-eigenspace  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{Ker ad}_c^n B$ , ( $\text{ad}_c^n B = \text{ad}_c B \circ \text{ad}_c^{n-1} B$ ), does not contain any nontrivial ideal of  $L_c$ . The set of all these elements is an open dense semi-algebraic subset of  $L$ .

We will use the following notations throughout the paper :  $\text{Sp}(B)$  will be the set of all nonzero eigenvalues of  $\text{ad } B$ ,  $\text{Sp}_+(B)$  [resp.  $\text{Sp}_-(B)$ ,  $\text{Sp}_0(B)$ ] the set of all those  $a \in \text{Sp}(B)$  such that  $\text{Re } a > 0$  (resp.  $\text{Re } a < 0$ ,  $\text{Re } a = 0$ ).

$L_c(a)$  will denote the  $a$ -eigenspace  $\text{Ker}(\text{ad}_c B - aI)$  of  $\text{ad}_c B$  and  $L(a) = (L_c(a) + L_c(\bar{a})) \cap L$  the corresponding « real eigenspace » ( $\bar{a}$  complex conjugate of  $a$ ). Then  $L(\bar{a}) = L(a)$ .  $L$  is the direct sum  $L(0) \oplus \{L(a) | a \in \text{Sp}(B), \text{Im } a \geq 0\}$ . Any  $A \in L$  has a unique decomposition  $A(0) + \Sigma A(a)$ ,  $A(0) \in L(0)$ ,  $A(a) \in L(a)$ .  $A(a)$  will be called the real  $a$ -component of  $A$ .

We also introduce the following spaces :

$$\begin{aligned} N_+ &= \Sigma \{L(a) | a \in \text{Sp}_+(B)\} & N_- &= \Sigma \{L(a) | a \in \text{Sp}_-(B)\} \\ K &= \Sigma \{L(a) | a \in \text{Sp}_0(B)\} + \Sigma \{[L(a), L(-a)] | a \in \text{Sp}_0(B)\} \\ L_+ &= N_+ \oplus K & L_- &= N_- \oplus K. \end{aligned}$$

All these spaces are subalgebras of  $L$ .  $K$  is reductive in  $L$  and semi-simple. It normalizes  $N_+$  and  $N_-$ . We also have the direct sum representations :

$$L = L_+ \oplus \mathcal{A} \oplus N_- \quad L = L_- \oplus \mathcal{A} \oplus N_+$$

where  $\mathcal{A} \subset L(0)$  is the centralizer of  $K + \mathbf{RB}$ . Call  $\pi_+$  (resp.  $\pi_-$ ) the projection  $L \rightarrow L$  with kernel  $\mathcal{A} \oplus N_-$  (resp.  $\mathcal{A} \oplus N_+$ ) and image  $L_+$  (resp.  $L_-$ ). It commutes with  $\text{ad}_c B$  and is in fact the unique projection with image  $L_+$  (resp.  $L_-$ ) commuting with  $\text{ad}_c B$ .

The next concept we need is :

**DEFINITION 0.** — *A subset  $\Gamma$  of  $L$  containing the space  $\mathbf{RB}$ ,  $B$  strongly regular, is said to satisfy the strong rank condition with respect to  $B$  if the Lie subalgebras of  $L$  generated respectively by  $\pi_+(\Gamma) + \mathbf{RB}$  and  $\pi_-(\Gamma) + \mathbf{RB}$  contain  $L_+$  and  $L_-$  respectively.*

This is also equivalent to the condition : let  $R_+(\Gamma)$  (resp.  $R_-(\Gamma)$ ) be the

set of all  $a \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B}) \cup \text{Sp}_0(\mathbf{B})$  (resp.  $\text{Sp}_-(\mathbf{B}) \cup \text{Sp}_0(\mathbf{B})$ ) such that there is an  $A \in \Gamma$  with  $A(a) \neq 0$ . Then the space  $\Sigma\{L(a)|a \in \mathbf{R}_+(\Gamma)\}$  (resp.  $\Sigma\{L(a)|a \in \mathbf{R}_-(\Gamma)\}$ ) should generate  $L_+$  (resp.  $L_-$ ).

Now we can state our theorem in the simple case where the statement is simpler.

**THEOREM 0.** — *Let  $G$  be a real connected Lie group with a finite center whose Lie algebra  $L$  is a real form of a simple Lie algebra  $L_c$ .*

*A subset  $\Gamma \subset L$  is transitive if:*

- 1)  $\Gamma$  contains a one dimensional space  $\mathbf{RB}$  where  $\mathbf{B}$  is strongly regular.
- 2)  $\Gamma$  satisfies the strong rank condition with respect to  $\mathbf{B}$ . (\*)

*Let  $s = \sup \{ \text{Re } a | a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B}) \}$ .*

3) *In the case where  $s \notin \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  there are  $a_1, a_2 \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  and  $A_1, A_2 \in \Gamma$  such that  $\text{Re } a_1 = s = -\text{Re } a_2$  and  $A_1(a_1) \neq 0, A_2(a_2) \neq 0$ .*

4) *In the case where  $s \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ , there are  $A_1, A_2 \in \Gamma$  such that  $\text{Trace}(\text{ad } A_1(s) \circ \text{ad } A_2(-s)) < 0$ .*

This theorem is a particular case of the next one, dealing with the semi-simple case. We could state it by decomposing  $L$  into its simple ideals and asking that the conditions of Theorem 0 be satisfied in each ideal. But this would mask the important role played by the restriction of the adjoint repr. of  $L$  to  $K$ .

Since  $\mathbf{B}$  normalizes  $K$ ,  $K + \mathbf{RB}$  is a subalgebra of  $L$ . In proposition 9-(0) we show that  $K + \mathbf{RB}$  is reductive in  $L$  and that  $L$  is the direct sum of the centralizer of  $K + \mathbf{RB}$  in  $L$  and the non trivial,  $\text{ad}(K + \mathbf{RB})$ -irreducible, submodules of  $L$ . A representation module is called trivial if the representation on the module is zero.

$$L = \mathcal{A} \oplus \bigoplus \{T | T \subset L, T \text{ non trivial, } \text{ad}(K + \mathbf{RB})\text{-irreducible}\}.$$

Also either  $T \subset N_+$  or  $T \subset K$  or  $T \subset N_-$ .

*Notation.* — If  $A \in L$ , we denote by  $A(T)$  the component of  $A$  in the irreducible module  $T$  with respect to the above direct sum decomposition.

(\*) In an interesting paper to be published in SIAM Journal of Control, Bornard and Gauthier have succeeded in replacing condition (2) by the usual rank condition in case  $G = \text{SL}(n; \mathbf{R})$  and  $\Gamma = \mathbf{R}_+A + \mathbf{RB}$ .

DEFINITION 1. — An  $\text{ad}(K + \mathbf{RB})$ -irreducible submodule  $T$  of  $L$  is called maximal (resp. minimal) if it is contained in the center of  $N_+$  (resp.  $N_-$ ). This is equivalent to each of the following properties

- (1)  $T$  is  $\text{ad } N_+$  (resp.  $\text{ad } N_-$ ) invariant
- (2)  $T$  is  $\text{ad } L_+$  (resp.  $\text{ad } L_-$ ) invariant.

THEOREM 1. — Let  $G$  be a real connected semi-simple Lie group with a finite center whose Lie algebra is called  $L$ .

A subset  $\Gamma \subset L$  is transitive if:

- 1)  $\Gamma$  contains a space  $\mathbf{RB}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$  strongly regular.
- 2)  $\Gamma$  satisfies the strong rank condition with respect to  $\mathbf{B}$ .
- 3) If  $T$  is a maximal or minimal submodule of  $L$ , which does not contain any  $L(x)$ ,  $x \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathbf{R}$ , then some  $A \in \Gamma$  should have a nonzero component  $A(T)$  in  $T$ .
- 4) If  $T$  is as in 3) but contains a space  $L(r)$ ,  $r \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathbf{R}$ , then there should exist  $A_1, A_2 \in \Gamma$  such that  $\text{Trace}(\text{ad } A_1(r) \circ \text{ad } A_2(-r)) < 0$ .

Remark. — Our methods prove easily the extension of theorem 1 to the case where : 1)  $G$  is a reductive connected real Lie group such that the integral subgroup generated by the semi-simple factor of Lie ( $G$ ) has finite center and 2)  $\Gamma$  satisfies the conditions 1-4 and moreover : 5) : the projection along the semi-simple factor of the positive cone generated by  $\Gamma$  onto the center of Lie ( $G$ ) is equal to this center.



# CHAPTER I

## GENERALITIES

### 0. Notations and Definitions.

Throughout this paper we will use the following notations :

$M$  :  $m$ -dimensional real  $C^\infty$  or  $C^\omega$  (analytic) connected manifold.

$TM$  : tangent bundle of  $M$ .

$T_qM$  : the tangent space of  $M$  at  $q \in M$ .

$F(M)$  : the vector space of all  $C^\infty$  or  $C^\omega$ , vector fields on  $M$ .

$\mathcal{D}(M)$  : the pseudo group of all local  $C^\infty$  or  $C^\omega$  diffeomorphisms of  $M$ . An element of  $\mathcal{D}(M)$  is a couple  $(U, \varphi)$  where  $U$  is an open subset of  $M$  and  $\varphi : U \rightarrow M$  is a  $C^\infty$  or  $C^\omega$  diffeomorphism.

$\text{Diff}(M)$  : the group of all  $C^\infty$  or  $C^\omega$  diffeomorphisms of  $M$ .

$\text{Cl}(M)$  : the class of all closed subsets of  $M$ .

If  $X \in F(M)$ , we recall the following elementary fact from the theory of differential equations : there exist an open subset  $\Delta_X$  of  $M \times \mathbf{R}$  which is a neighborhood of  $M \times \{0\}$ , and a function  $\Phi_X : \Delta_X \rightarrow M$  which satisfy :

a) if  $(q, s) \in \Delta_X$ , and if  $(\Phi_X(q, s), t) \in \Delta_X$ , then  $(q, s+t) \in \Delta_X$  and

$$\Phi_X(q, s+t) = \Phi_X(\Phi_X(q, s), t).$$

b)  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Phi_X = X \circ \Phi_X$  on  $\Delta_X$ .

c) For each  $(q, t) \in \Delta_X$  there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $q$  in  $M$  such that  $(U, \Phi_X|_{U \times \{t\}}) \in \mathcal{D}(M)$ .

To any  $X \in F(M)$  we attach the set  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  of all local diffeomorphisms  $(U, \varphi)$  where there exists  $t \in \mathbf{R}$  such that  $U \times \{t\} \in \Delta_X$  and  $\varphi = \Phi_X|_{U \times \{t\}}$ .

$\mathcal{P}(X)$  is a sub-pseudo group of  $\mathcal{D}(M)$ . Of particular interest in this exposition will be the subset  $\mathcal{P}_+(X)$  defined by all local diffeomorphisms  $(U, \varphi)$  where  $U \times \{t\} \in \Delta_X$  for some non-negative  $t \in \mathbf{R}$  and where  $\varphi = \Phi_X|_{U \times \{t\}}$ .  $\mathcal{P}_+(X)$  is a sub-pseudo semi-group of  $\mathcal{D}(M)$ .

**DEFINITION 0.** — *A subset of  $F(M)$  will be called a polysystem ([8]).*

DEFINITION 1. — If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a polysystem,  $\mathcal{P}_+(\mathcal{F})$  will denote the pseudo-sub-semi-group of  $\mathcal{D}(M)$  generated by  $\{\mathcal{P}_+(X), X \in \mathcal{F}\}$ .

DEFINITION 2. — a) The accessibility mapping of a polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$  is the mapping  $A_{\mathcal{F}}: M \rightarrow 2^M$  defined by: if  $q \in M$ ,  $A_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$  is the orbit  $\mathcal{P}_+(\mathcal{F})(q)$  of  $\mathcal{P}_+(\mathcal{F})$  at  $q$ .

b) The closed accessibility mapping of  $\mathcal{F}$  denoted by  $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is the mapping  $M \rightarrow \text{Cl}(M)$  defined by  $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(q) = \text{Cl } A_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$ .

DEFINITION 3. — a) Two polysystems  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are said to be weakly equivalent if  $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}} = \bar{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$ .

b) A polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$  is said to be saturated if for any polysystem  $\mathcal{G}$  which is weakly equivalent to  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ .

c) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a given polysystem we shall denote by  $\text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$  the set  $\cup\{\mathcal{G} : \mathcal{G} \text{ weakly equivalent to } \mathcal{F}\}$ , and we shall refer to it as the saturate of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

DEFINITION 4. — The normalizer of a polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$  is the set of all diffeomorphisms  $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(M)$  such that:  $\varphi[\bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(\varphi^{-1}(q))] \subset \bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$  for all  $q \in M$ . This set will be denoted by  $\text{Norm}(\mathcal{F})$ .

In particular, if  $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(M)$  is such that  $\varphi(q) \in \bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$  and  $\varphi^{-1}(q) \in \bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$  for all  $q \in M$ , then  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi^{-1}$  belong to  $\text{Norm}(\mathcal{F})$ .

LEMMA 0. — 1) The normalizer is a subsemigroup of  $\text{Diff}(M)$ .

2) It does not depend on  $\mathcal{F}$  but on  $\text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$ :

$$\text{Norm}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Norm}(\text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})).$$

The proof of this lemma is easy and left to the reader. The next lemma is trivial but useful.

LEMMA 1. — 1) The weak accessibility correspondance  $A : 2^{F(M)} \rightarrow \text{Map}(M, \text{Cl}(M))$  is order preserving for the inclusion order on  $2^{F(M)}$  and the order induced by the inclusion order on  $\text{Cl}(M)$ , in  $\text{Map}(M, \text{Cl}(M))$ .

2) If  $p, q \in M$  and  $p \in A_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$  then  $A_{\mathcal{F}}(p) \subset A_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$ .

### 1. Invariance of closed accessibility mapping under certain changes of the polysystem.

In the next proposition we collect facts, some of which are more or less known. The vector space  $F(M)$ , being a subset of the space  $C^\infty(M, TM)$

of all  $C^\infty$  mappings  $M \rightarrow TM$ , inherits the classical  $C^\infty$ -topology of that space. It is a locally-convex topology on  $F(M)$  and it is complete if  $F(M)$  is the set of all  $C^\infty$  vector-fields.

**PROPOSITION 0.** — 1) For any polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$ , the polysystem  $\mathcal{F}' = \{\varphi_*(X) \mid \varphi \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{F}), X \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is weakly equivalent to  $\mathcal{F}$ . In particular  $\varphi_*(\text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})) \subset \text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$  for all  $\varphi \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{F})$ .

2) Given a polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$ , the closed convex cone in  $F(M)$ , generated by  $\mathcal{F}$ , is weakly equivalent to  $\mathcal{F}$ .

The proof of this proposition is long but not difficult. Hence we omit it. Let us remark only that the proof of assertion 2 is based on the well known fact that weak convergence of controls implies the uniform convergence of trajectories.

## 2. A general procedure for checking whether a polysystem is transitive.

*Notation.* — Given a polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$ , let us denote by  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$  the Lie subalgebra of  $\mathcal{F}(M)$  generated by  $\mathcal{F}$ .

The procedure is based on the following quite easy proposition.

**PROPOSITION 1.** — Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a polysystem such that : 1) for all  $q \in M$ ,  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})(q) = T_qM$ . 2) for all  $q \in M$ ,  $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(q) = M$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is transitive on  $M$ .

*Proof.* — It is well known ([12], [7]) that condition 1 implies that the closure of the interior of  $P_+(\mathcal{F})q$  is  $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$  for any  $q \in M$ . Since  $\text{Lie}(-\mathcal{F}) = \text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$ ,  $\text{int}(P_+(-\mathcal{F})(q)) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $q \in M$ .

1) and 2) imply that for every  $q \in M$   $\text{int}(P_+(\mathcal{F})(q))$  is open dense in  $M$ . If  $p$  and  $q$  belong to  $M$ ,  $\text{int}(P_+(\mathcal{F})(p)) \cap \text{int}(P_+(-\mathcal{F})(q)) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $r$  be a point of this intersection. There is a  $\varphi \in P_+(\mathcal{F})$  and a  $\psi \in P_+(-\mathcal{F})$  such that  $\varphi(p) = r$  and  $\psi(q) = r$ . Hence  $\psi^{-1} \circ \varphi(p) = q$  but  $\psi^{-1} \in P_+(\mathcal{F})$ .

**DEFINITION 5.** — Given a polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$  we denote by  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  the polysystem  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F}) \cap \text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$ .

**COROLLARY TO PROPOSITION 1.** — A polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$  is transitive if  $\mathcal{LS}(\mathcal{F})(q) = T_qM$  for all  $q \in M$ .

PROPOSITION 2. — 1)  $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S} \circ \mathcal{L}\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}$ .

2)  $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$  is a convex cone in  $F(M)$ . It is closed if and only if  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$  is closed in  $F(M)$ .

3) The subset of all  $X \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$  such that  $-X \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$  is a Lie subalgebra of  $F(M)$  and it is the largest subalgebra of  $F(M)$  contained in  $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$ .

4) If  $X$  and  $-X$  belong to  $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$  and if  $X$  is complete then  $\exp(X)_*(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})) \subset \mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$ .

This proposition follows almost immediately from the definition and Proposition 0.

*Remark.* — In general if  $\varphi \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{F})$ ,  $\varphi_*(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}))$  is not contained in  $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$ .

The procedure to check if a given polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$  is transitive consists of the transfinite repetition of the following two steps.

*Step 1.* — Given  $\mathcal{F}$ , one constructs the closed convex cone  $\text{cov}(\mathcal{F})$  generated by  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $F(M)$ .

*Step 2.* — Given  $\mathcal{F}$ , one constructs the polysystem

$$\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F}) \cap \{\varphi_*(X) \mid \varphi \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{F}), X \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Starting from a polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$ , one constructs a transfinite sequence  $\{\mathcal{F}_\alpha \mid \alpha \text{ ordinal}\}$  of polysystems in  $F(M)$  as follows : if  $\alpha$  is an even or a limit ordinal,  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$  is step 1 applied to  $\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{F}_\beta$ ; if  $\alpha$  is an odd ordinal,  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$  is step 2 applied to  $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha-1}$ .

All these  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$  are contained in  $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$ . If this transfinite sequence becomes stationary at some ordinal  $\alpha$  and if for all  $q \in M$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(q) = T_q M$  then the procedure is successful and  $\mathcal{F}$  will be transitive.

In practice usually,  $\text{Norm}(\mathcal{F}_\alpha)$  is not known, just a subset of it. So when the procedure is applied in practice, step 2 is replaced by step 2'.

*Step 2'.* — Given  $\mathcal{F}$  and given a subset  $N$  of  $\text{Norm}(F)$  containing the identity, one constructs the polysystem

$$\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F}) \cap \{\varphi_*(X) \mid X \in \mathcal{F}, \varphi \in N\}.$$

This procedure seems very effective in many classical situations, for

example those mentioned in the introduction. It can also be used to prove the well known controllability results for the linear systems. As a way of illustration of the technique we outline this case in the following :

*Example 1* (The linear systems). — Let  $\mathcal{F} = \left\{ X + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i Y_i : u_i \in \mathbf{R} \right\}$  be a polysystem on  $M = \mathbf{R}^n$  where  $X$  is a linear field and where  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  are constant vector fields. Let  $X(q) = Aq$ , and let  $Y_i(q) = b_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$  where  $A$  is  $n \times n$  matrix and where  $b_1, \dots, b_m$  are vectors in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . A basis for  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$  is given by  $\{X\} \cup \{\text{ad}^k X(Y_i), k = 0, \dots, n-1, i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . We shall now show that  $\text{LS}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$ .

*Step 1.* —  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{X, \pm Y_1, \pm Y_2, \dots, \pm Y_m\}$  is weakly equivalent to  $\mathcal{F}$  because  $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \text{cov}(\mathcal{F})$ . For each integer  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  and for each real  $te^{Y_i t} \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{F})$ .

Thus,  $e_*^{Y_i t}(\mathcal{F}_1) = \{e_*^{Y_i t}(X), X, \pm Y_1, \dots, \pm Y_m\}$  is weakly equivalent to  $\mathcal{F}_1$ . Also,  $e_*^{Y_i t}(X) = \text{Id} \pm tAb_i = \text{Id} \pm t \text{ad} X(Y_i)$  where  $\text{Id}$  is the identity mapping on  $\mathbf{R}^n$ .

*Step 2.* — By passing to the closed convex cone generated by the fields  $e_*^{Y_i t}(\mathcal{F}_1)$  we get that

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = \{X, \pm Y_1, \dots, \pm Y_m, \pm \text{ad} X(Y_1), \dots, \pm \text{ad} X(Y_m)\}$$

is weakly equivalent to  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Now,  $e_*^{t \text{ad} X(Y_i)}(X) \in \text{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  for each  $t \in \mathbf{R}$  and each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . This shows that  $\text{ad}^2 X(Y_i) \in \text{LS}(\mathcal{F})$ , and hence it follows by an easy induction that  $\text{ad}^k X(Y_i) \in \text{LS}(\mathcal{F})$  for each integer  $k$  and for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . Thus,  $\text{LS}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$ .

Hence, the linear systems are transitive if and only if  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$  spans  $\mathbf{R}^n$  at each point  $q \in \mathbf{R}^n$ . And this happens exactly when

$$\{b_1, \dots, b_m, Ab_1, \dots, Ab_m, \dots, A^{n-1}b_1, \dots, A^{n-1}b_m\}$$

contains  $n$  linearly independent vectors. If  $B$  is the matrix whose columns are  $b_1, \dots, b_m$ , then the preceding rank condition is equivalent to saying that the rank of  $n \times (n \times m)$  matrix  $(B, AB \dots A^{n-1}B)$  is equal to  $n$ . Thus our methods give yet another proof of the celebrated rank condition for the linear systems.

### 3. Polysystems associated to group action.

A. Let  $G$  be a connected Lie group whose Lie algebra will be denoted by  $L$ . Let  $\theta : G \times M \rightarrow M$  be a  $C^\infty$  or  $C^\omega$  action of  $G$  on the manifold  $M$ .

$\theta$  induces a linear mapping  $\theta_* : L \rightarrow F(M)$ .

DEFINITION 4. — A polysystem  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $M$  will be called subordinated to the action  $\theta$  if  $\mathcal{F}$  is contained in the image of  $\theta_*$ . If  $\mathcal{F} = \theta_*(\Gamma)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  will be said induced by  $\Gamma$ .

DEFINITION 5. — In particular if  $M = G$  and  $\theta$  is either the left or the right translation action of  $G$  on itself, given a subset  $\Gamma$  of  $L$ , the polysystem induced by  $\Gamma$  under the right (resp. left) translation action will be called the left (resp. right) invariant polysystems induced by  $\Gamma$  and will be denoted by  $\Gamma_\ell$  (resp.  $\Gamma_r$ ).

The mapping  $G \rightarrow G, x \rightarrow x^{-1}$  transforms the left action into the right action. It transforms a left invariant polysystem  $\Gamma_\ell$  induced by  $\Gamma$  into the right invariant polysystem  $(-\Gamma)_r$  induced by  $-\Gamma$ . Hence one needs only to consider one type of action.

PROPOSITION 3. — Let  $\Gamma$  be a subset of  $L$  and let  $\bar{S}(\Gamma)$  denote the closed semi-group of  $G$  generated by the one-parameter semi-groups  $\{e^{tX} | t \in \mathbf{R}_+\}$  for all  $X \in \Gamma$ . Then :

1) For any  $g \in G$ ,  $A_{\Gamma_\ell}(g) = gS(\Gamma)$ ,  $A_{\Gamma_r}(g) = S(\Gamma)g$ . In particular  $A_{\Gamma_\ell}(e) = A_{\Gamma_r}(e) = S(\Gamma)$ .

2) If  $\Gamma, \Delta \subset L$ ,  $\Gamma_\ell$  and  $\Delta_\ell$  (resp.  $\Gamma_r$  and  $\Delta_r$ ) are weakly equivalent if and only if  $\bar{S}(\Gamma) = \bar{S}(\Delta)$ . We will say then that  $\Gamma$  and  $\Delta$  are weakly equivalent.

3) The union,  $\text{Sat}(\Gamma)$ , of all subsets of  $L$  weakly equivalent to  $\Gamma$  induces both

$\text{Sat}(\Gamma_\ell) \cap \{\text{Left invariant vector fields on } G\}$  and

$\text{Sat}(\Gamma_r) \cap \{\text{Right invariant vector fields on } G\}$ .

4)  $\text{Sat}(\Gamma) = \{X | X \in L, e^{tX} \in \bar{S}(\Gamma) \text{ for all } t \geq 0\}$ . It is a closed convex cone.

5) If  $\rho_\ell$  (resp.  $\rho_r$ ) :  $G \rightarrow \text{Diff}(G)$  denotes the homomorphism associated

to the left (resp. right) translation action, then

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_r^{-1}(\text{Norm}(\Gamma_r)) &= \{g \mid g \in G, g\bar{S}(\Gamma)g^{-1} \supset \bar{S}(\Gamma)\} \\ \rho_l^{-1}(\text{Norm}(\Gamma_r)) &= \{g \mid g \in G, g\bar{S}(\Gamma)g^{-1} \subset \bar{S}(\Gamma)\}.\end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION 4. — Let  $\theta : G \times M \rightarrow M$  be a  $C^\infty$  or  $C^0$  action of  $G$  on  $M$ ,  $\Gamma$  a subset of  $L$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \theta_*(\Gamma)$  the induced polysystem. Then

- 1)  $P_+(\mathcal{F})$  is the pseudo-semi-group generated by  $\rho_\theta(S(\Gamma))$  where  $\rho_\theta : G \rightarrow \text{Diff}(M)$  is the homomorphism associated to the action  $\theta$ .
- 2) For any  $q \in M$ ,  $A_{\mathcal{F}}(q) \supset \theta(S(\Gamma) \times \{q\})$ .
- 3)  $\theta_*(\text{Sat}(\Gamma)) \subset \text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$ .

COROLLARY. — If  $G$  is transitive on  $M$ , and  $\Gamma$  is transitive on  $G$ , then  $\mathcal{F} = \theta_*(\Gamma)$  is transitive on  $M$ .

Proposition 4 is straightforward. Proposition 3 is a direct consequence of proposition 0.

B. A criterion for the transitivity of right and left invariant polysystems.

DEFINITION 6. — Given a subset  $\Gamma$  of  $L$ , we call LS saturation of  $\Gamma$  and we denote by  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$ , the intersection  $\text{Sat}(\Gamma) \cap \text{Lie}(\Gamma)$  where  $\text{Lie}(\Gamma)$  is the Lie subalgebra  $L$  generated by  $\Gamma$ .

PROPOSITION 5. — (0) Given  $\Gamma \subset L$ ,  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$  induces both  $\mathcal{L}\text{S}(\Gamma_l)$  and  $\mathcal{L}\text{S}(\Gamma_r)$ .

- 1)  $\text{LS} \circ \text{LS} = \text{LS}$ .
- 2)  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$  is a closed convex cone.
- 3) The subset of all  $X \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  such that  $-X \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  is a Lie subalgebra of  $L$  and is the largest subalgebra of  $L$  contained in  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$ . It is also the largest vector subspace of  $L$  contained in  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$ .
- 4) If  $X$  and  $-X$  belong to  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$  then  $e^{\text{ad}X}(\text{LS}(\Gamma)) \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  where  $\text{ad} : L \rightarrow \text{End}(L)$  is the adjoint representation of  $L$ .
- 5) If  $X \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  and  $X$  is compact, then  $\text{RX} \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ .

Proof. — (0) is obvious. 1-2-3-4 follow immediately from Proposition 2. As for 5,  $X$  compact means that the group  $\{e^{tX} \mid t \in \mathbf{R}\}$  is relatively compact in  $G$ . Then the semi-group  $\{e^{tX} \mid t \in \mathbf{R}_+\}$  is relatively compact in  $G$ . Its closure  $\bar{T}$  is then a compact semi-group in  $G$ . Hence it is a group

and  $T \supset \{e^{tX} | t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ . Since  $\bar{S}(\Gamma)$  is closed,  $T \subset \bar{S}(\Gamma)$ .  $\bar{S}(\Gamma) \supset \{e^{tX} | t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ . By Proposition 3-4) this implies that  $-X \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ .

**PROPOSITION 6.** — *Given a subset  $\Gamma$  of  $L$ , the right (resp. left) invariant polysystem  $\Gamma_r$  (resp.  $\Gamma_l$ ) induced by  $\Gamma$  on  $G$  is transitive if  $\text{LS}(\Gamma) = L$ .*

This proposition is a consequence of the corollary to Proposition 1 and of the assertion (0) of Proposition 5.

**DEFINITION 7.** — *Given a subset  $\Gamma$  of  $L$  we call  $\text{End}(\Gamma)$  the subset of  $\text{End}(L)$  of all linear endomorphisms  $A : L \rightarrow L$  such that  $A(\Gamma) \subset \Gamma$ .  $\text{End}(\Gamma) \neq \emptyset$  for  $\text{Id}_L \in \text{End}(\Gamma)$ .*

**LEMMA 2.** — 1)  $\text{End}(\Gamma)$  is a sub-semi-group of  $\text{End}(L)$ .

2) If  $\Gamma$  is a closed convex cone,  $\text{End}(\Gamma)$  is a closed convex cone.

3) If  $\Gamma$  is a closed convex cone, any projection operator  $P : L \rightarrow L$  such that  $\text{Ker } P \subset \Gamma$  belongs to  $\text{End}(\Gamma)$ .

4) If  $\Gamma$  is LS-saturated (i.e.  $\Gamma = \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ ) and if  $H$  is the integral subgroup generated by the largest Lie subalgebra contained in  $\Gamma$ , then  $\text{adj } H \subset \text{End}(\Gamma)$ : that is if  $h \in H$ ,  $h\Gamma h^{-1} \subset \Gamma$ .

**Remark.** — Since  $h^{-1} \in H$ ,  $h^{-1}\Gamma h \subset \Gamma$  and hence  $h\Gamma h^{-1} = \Gamma$ .

The proof of this lemma is easy and left to the reader.



## CHAPTER II

### 0. Some preliminary results and definitions.

Let  $L$  denote a real finite dimensional semi-simple Lie algebra,  $L_c = L \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \mathbf{C}$  its complexification,  $\sigma : L_c \rightarrow L_c$  the anti-involution of  $L_c$  associated to  $L$  ( $\sigma = \text{Id} \otimes \text{conjugate}$ ). Let  $\text{ad} : L \rightarrow \text{End}(L)$ ,  $\text{ad}_c : L_c \rightarrow \text{End}(L_c)$ , denote the adjoint representations and  $\text{Kil} : L \times L \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $\text{Kil}_c : L_c \times L_c \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  the respective Killing forms  $\text{Kil}_c(X, Y) = \text{Trace}(\text{ad}_c X \circ \text{ad}_c Y)$ .

The next proposition collects some known facts about semi-simple Lie algebra.

**PROPOSITION 7.** — *Let  $B \in L$  be such that : 1) all nonzero eigenvalues of  $\text{ad}_c B$  are simple.*

2)  $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \text{Ker ad}_c^n B$  does not contain any ideal of  $L$  other than 0.

$$(\text{ad}_c^n B = \underbrace{\text{ad}_c B \circ \text{ad}_c B \circ \dots \circ \text{ad}_c B}_{n \text{ times}}).$$

Let  $\text{Sp}(B) = \{a | a \in \mathbf{C}, a \neq 0, \text{Ker}(\text{ad}_c B - a \text{Id}) \neq \{0\}\}$ ,

$$L_c(a) = \text{Ker}(\text{ad}_c B - a \text{Id})$$

the eigenspace of  $a$  and  $L_c(0) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \text{Ker ad}_c^n B$  the generalized eigenspace of 0.

Then :

1)  $L_c = L_c(0) \oplus \bigoplus_{a \in \text{Sp}(B)} L_c(a)$  (direct sum !).

2)  $L_c(0)$  is stable under  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma\{L_c(a)\} = L_c(\bar{a})$  ( $\bar{a}$  complex conjugate of  $a$ ).

3)  $L = L(0) \oplus \bigoplus \{L(a) | a \in \text{Sp}(B), \text{Im } a \geq 0\}$  where

$$L(0) = L_c(0) \cap L, \quad L(a) = (L_c(a) \oplus L_c(\bar{a})) \cap L.$$

4)  $L_c(0) = \text{Ker ad}_c B$  and it is a Cartan algebra of  $L_c$ .

5) For any  $a, b \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  such that  $a + b \rightarrow 0$ :

$$[\mathbf{L}_c(a), \mathbf{L}_c(b)] = \begin{cases} \mathbf{L}_c(a+b) \\ \text{or} \\ \{0\} \end{cases},$$

$$[\mathbf{L}(a), \mathbf{L}(b)] = \begin{cases} \mathbf{L}(a+b) + \mathbf{L}(a+\bar{b}) \\ \text{or} \\ \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

6)  $\text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  is invariant under conjugation and under the symmetry  $a \rightarrow -a$ .

7)  $[\mathbf{L}_c(a), \mathbf{L}_c(-a)]$  is a one dimensional vector space contained in  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  for every  $a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ . The union

$$\cup \{[\mathbf{L}_c(a), \mathbf{L}_c(-a)] \mid a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})\}$$

generates  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  as a vector space.

*Proof.* — 1), 2), 3) are trivial. By Theorem 1.9.3 of [3] or Prop. 10, Chap. 7 of [1], applied to the commutative algebra  $\mathbf{CB}$ , we see that  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  is a subalgebra,  $[\mathbf{L}_c(0), \mathbf{L}_c(a)] \subset \mathbf{L}_c(a)$  and  $[\mathbf{L}_c(a), \mathbf{L}_c(b)] \subset \mathbf{L}_c(a+b)$ , where by definition  $\mathbf{L}_c(d)$  is taken to be  $\{0\}$  if  $d \notin \{0\} \cup \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ . It follows immediately that  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  is orthogonal to  $\bigoplus \{\mathbf{L}_c(a) \mid a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})\}$  with respect to  $\text{Kil}_c$  (see Prop. 1.9.5 of [3]):  $\text{Kil}_c$  being non-degenerate, its restriction to  $\mathbf{L}_c(0) \times \mathbf{L}_c(0)$  is non-degenerate. This implies that  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  is reductive (see Prop. 1.7.3 of [3] or Prop. 3.2 of [2]). Hence  $\mathbf{L}_c(0) = \mathbf{Z} \oplus [\mathbf{L}_c(0), \mathbf{L}_c(0)]$  where  $\mathbf{Z}$  is the center of  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$ .

If  $\rho : \mathbf{L}_c(0) \rightarrow \text{End}(\mathbf{L}_c)$  is the restriction to  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  of  $\text{ad}_c$ , the spaces  $\mathbf{L}_c(a)$ ,  $a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  are  $\rho$ -invariant. Since they are one dimensional  $\rho([\mathbf{L}_c(0), \mathbf{L}_c(0)])\mathbf{L}_c(a) = \{0\}$  for every  $a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ . This shows that  $[\mathbf{L}_c(0), \mathbf{L}_c(0)]$  is an ideal in  $\mathbf{L}_c$ . By condition 2 on  $\mathbf{B}$ , it is  $\{0\}$ .  $\mathbf{L}_c(0) = \mathbf{Z}$ . Since  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbf{L}_c(0)$ ,  $\mathbf{Z} = \text{Ker ad}_c \mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$  is its own normalizer. Hence  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  is a Cartan algebra (see 1.9.1 of [3]).

Let  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)^*$  be the dual space of  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  and  $\Delta \subset \mathbf{L}_c(0)^*$  be the set of roots of  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$  (see 1.9.10 of [3]). Condition 1 on  $\mathbf{B}$  implies that the mapping  $\Delta \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ,  $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha(\mathbf{B})$  is a bijection of  $\Delta$  onto  $\text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  (see Thm. 1.10.2 of [3]). Thus, Theorem 1.10.2 and Proposition 1.10.7 of [3] imply 5, 6, 7.

*Notation.* — Because of the bijection  $\Delta \rightarrow \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  ( $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha(\mathbf{B})$ ) we will indifferently use the notations  $\mathbf{L}_c(\alpha)$ ,  $\mathbf{L}(\alpha)$  instead of  $\mathbf{L}_c(\alpha(\mathbf{B}))$ ,  $\mathbf{L}(\alpha(\mathbf{B}))$ .

*Remark.* — If  $B$  satisfies the further condition : 3) For any  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \Delta$  such that  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma \neq 0$ , then  $\alpha(B) + \beta(B) + \gamma(B) \neq 0$ , property 5) above can be replaced by the stronger :

8) For any  $a, b \in \text{Sp}(B)$  such that  $a + b \in \text{Sp}(B)$ ,

$$[L_c(a), L_c(b)] = L_c(a+b).$$

This is a consequence of Prop. 1.10.7-(V) of [3].

**PROPOSITION 8.** — *The assumptions and notations are the same as in Proposition 7. Moreover let  $G$  be a real connected semi-simple Lie group with finite center having  $L$  as Lie algebra.*

1) If  $a \in \text{Sp}(B) \cap \mathbf{R}\sqrt{-1}$  and  $X \in L_c(a)$ ,  $X \neq 0$ , then the element  $\sqrt{-1}[X, \sigma X]$  belongs to  $L(0)$  and is compact.

*In other words every element in  $[L(a), L(-a)]$  is compact.*

2) If  $a \in \text{Sp}(B) \cap \mathbf{R}$ ,  $X \in L(a)$ ,  $Y \in L(-a)$  and  $\text{Kil}(X, Y) < 0$ , then  $X + Y$  is a compact element in  $G$ .

*Proof.* — Let  $\text{Int}(L)$  be the adjoint group of  $L$ . It is sufficient to consider the case  $G = \text{Int}(L)$ . In fact if  $G$  is any connected group with Lie algebra  $L$ , let  $\text{adj} : G \rightarrow \text{Int}(L)$  be the adjoint representation of  $G$ .  $\text{adj}$  is surjective and its kernel is the center of  $G$ . If this center is finite,  $\text{adj}$  is a finite covering map. Hence a subset  $K \subset G$  is compact if and only if  $\text{adj}(K)$  is compact. This shows that an  $X \in L$  is compact in  $\text{Int}(L)$ .

An element  $X \in L$  will be compact in  $\text{Int}(L)$  if and only if all eigenvalues of  $\text{ad}X$  are purely imaginary.

Now (see [11]) there is a unique anti-involution  $\tau : L_c \rightarrow L_c$  called the Weyl anti-involution such that  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  commute and  $\tau(L_c(a)) = L_c(-a)$  for all  $a \in \text{Sp}(B)$  and the form  $H : L_c \times L_c \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ,  $H(X, Y) = \text{Kil}_c(X, \tau(Y))$  is hermitian negative-definite. Then :

$$H(\sigma X, \sigma Y) = \text{Kil}_c(\sigma X, \tau \sigma(Y)) = \text{Kil}_c(\sigma X, \sigma \tau(Y)) = \overline{\text{Kil}_c(X, \tau(Y))},$$

$$H(\sigma X, \sigma Y) = \overline{H(X, Y)}.$$

Hence  $H$  is real negative-definite on  $L \times L$ .

If  $Z \in L_c$  the adjoint of  $\text{ad}_c Z$  with respect to  $H$  is  $-\text{ad}_c \tau(Z)$ . In case 1), let  $Z = \sqrt{-1}[X, \sigma X]$ . It is easy to see that  $\sigma(Z) = Z$ . Hence

$$Z \in L(0), \quad \tau(X) \in L_c(-a) = L_c(\bar{a}) = \sigma L_c(a)$$

since  $a \in \mathbf{R}\sqrt{-1}$ . So  $\tau(X) = u\sigma X$  where  $u \in \mathbf{C}$ .

$$\tau(Z) = -\sqrt{-1}[\tau(X), \tau\sigma(X)] = -\sqrt{-1}[\tau(X), \sigma\tau(X)] = |u|^2 Z.$$

Since  $\tau^2(Z) = Z$ ,  $\tau(Z) = Z$ . Then  $\text{ad } Z$  is antisymmetric with respect to  $H$ . Its spectrum lies on  $\mathbf{R}\sqrt{-1}$ .

In case 2) let  $Z = X + Y$ .  $\tau(X) \in L_c(-a)$ . Since

$$\sigma\tau(X) = \tau\sigma(X) = \tau(X), \quad \tau(X) \in L(-a).$$

Hence  $\tau(X) = uY$  where  $u \in \mathbf{R}$ .

$$H(X, X) = \text{Kil}(X, \tau X) = u \text{Kil}(X, Y).$$

Since  $H(X, X) < 0$ ,  $u > 0$ . If  $u = 1$ ,  $\tau(Z) = Z$  and as above  $Z$  is compact. If  $u \neq 1$ , let  $T = [X, Y]$ . Then (see 1.10.2 in [3]),  $[T, X] = tX$ ,  $[T, Y] = -tY$  where  $t \in \mathbf{R}$ . Let  $v = \frac{1}{t} \log u$  and  $Z_1 = e^{v \text{ad } T}(Z)$ . It is easy to see that  $\tau(Z_1) = Z_1$ . Hence the spectrum of  $\text{ad } Z_1$  lies in  $\mathbf{R}\sqrt{-1}$ . But  $\text{ad } Z_1$  is conjugate to  $\text{ad } Z$ :  $\text{ad } Z_1 = e^{v \text{ad } T} \circ \text{ad } Z \circ e^{-v \text{ad } T}$ . This proves 2).

In the proposition and its proof  $\text{ad}_c : L_c \rightarrow \text{End}(L_c)$  (resp.  $\text{ad} : L \rightarrow \text{End}(L)$ ) denotes the adjoint representation of  $L_c$  (resp.  $L$ ).

*Proposition 9.* — (0)  $K_c + \mathbf{CB}$  (resp.  $K + \mathbf{RB}$ ) is a subalgebra, reductive in  $L_c$  (resp.  $L$ ). Hence an  $\text{ad}_c(K_c + \mathbf{CB})$  (resp.  $\text{ad}(K + \mathbf{RB})$ )-submodule of  $L_c$  (resp.  $L$ ) is irreducible if and only if it is  $\text{ad}_c K_c$  (resp.  $\text{ad } K$ )-irreducible and  $\text{ad}_c B$  (resp.  $\text{ad } B$ )-stable. Moreover :

(i) Any  $\text{ad}_c(K_c + \mathbf{CB})$  (resp.  $\text{ad}(K + \mathbf{RB})$ )-submodule  $M$  of  $L$  is the direct sum of  $M \cap \mathcal{A}$  and its non trivial,  $\text{ad}_c(K_c + \mathbf{CB})$  (resp.  $\text{ad}(K + \mathbf{RB})$ )-irreducible submodules. ( $\mathcal{A}$  is the centralizer of  $K_c + \mathbf{CB}$  (resp.  $K + \mathbf{RB}$ ) in  $L_c$  (resp.  $L$ )).

(ii) For any  $a \in \text{Sp}(B)$ , the  $\text{ad}_c K_c$  (resp.  $\text{ad } K$ )-module generated by  $L_c(a)$  (resp.  $L(a)$ ) is irreducible.

(1) Let  $\mathbf{R}_0$  be a conjugation invariant subset of  $\text{Sp}_0(B)$  such that  $\Sigma\{L(a) | a \in \mathbf{R}_0\}$  generates  $K$ . If  $a, b \in \text{Sp}(B)$  and the  $\text{ad } K$ -module generated by  $L(a)$  contains  $L(b)$ , then there exist  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in \mathbf{R}_0$  such that

(i)  $a = b_0 + a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n$  where  $b_0 = b$  or  $\bar{b}$ ,

(ii) if  $b_j = b_0 + a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_j$ ,  $b_j \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  and  $[\text{L}_c(b_{j-1}), \text{L}_c(a_j)] = \text{L}_c(b_j)$  for all  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .

(2) Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a conjugation invariant subset of  $\text{Sp}_-(\mathbf{B}) \cup \text{Sp}_0(\mathbf{B})$  (resp.  $\text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B}) \cup \text{Sp}_0(\mathbf{B})$ ) such that  $\Sigma \{\text{L}(a) \mid a \in \mathbf{R}\}$  generates  $\text{L}_-$  (resp.  $\text{L}_+$ ). If  $a \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B})$  (resp.  $\text{Sp}_-(\mathbf{B})$ ) and  $a$  is not maximal (resp. minimal), then there are  $b_0, b \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B})$  (resp.  $\text{Sp}_-(\mathbf{B})$ ) such that :

- (i)  $\text{Re } b_0 > \text{Re } a$ , (resp.  $\text{Re } b_0 < \text{Re } a$ ).
- (ii)  $\text{L}_c(b)$  belongs to the  $\text{ad } \text{K}_c$ -module generated by  $\text{L}_c(a)$ .
- (iii)  $b - b_0 \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $[\text{L}_c(b - b_0), \text{L}_c(b_0)] = \text{L}_c(b)$ .

*Proof.* — (0) It is sufficient to give the proof in the complex case since, in the real case, it is identical up to the notations. If  $\text{K}_c = 0$ , the statement (0) is trivial. We shall assume that  $\text{K}_c \neq 0$ .

It is clear that  $\mathbf{B}$  normalizes  $\text{K}_c$ . Since  $\text{K}_c$  is reductive in  $\text{L}_c$ ,

$$\text{K}_c + \mathbf{CB} = \text{K}_c \oplus \mathbf{D}$$

where  $\mathbf{D}$  is  $\text{ad } \text{K}_c$ -stable and  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbf{D} = 1$ . As  $[\text{K}_c, \text{K}_c + \mathbf{CB}] \subset \text{K}_c$ ,  $\mathbf{D}$  commutes with  $\text{K}_c$ .  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_2 + \mathbf{B}_1$ , where  $\mathbf{B}_1$  is a basis vector of  $\mathbf{D}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_2 \in \text{K}_c$ . Since  $\text{ad}_c \mathbf{B}_2 \mid \text{K}_c = \text{ad}_c \mathbf{B} \mid \text{K}_c$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_2$  is semi-simple. Since  $\mathbf{B}_2$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  commute,  $\mathbf{B}_1$  is semi-simple. This shows that  $\text{K}_c + \mathbf{CB}$  is reductive in  $\text{L}_c$ .

Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be any  $\text{ad}_c(\text{K} + \mathbf{CB})$  submodule of  $\text{L}_c$ . If  $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathcal{A} \neq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathcal{A}$  has a unique  $\text{ad}_c(\text{K}_c + \mathbf{CB})$ -stable complement  $\bar{\mathbf{M}}$  :  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M} \cap \mathcal{A} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{M}}$ . If  $\mathbf{T}$  is a non-trivial  $\text{Ad}_c(\text{K}_c + \mathbf{CB})$ -irréductible submodule of  $\mathbf{M}$ , then  $\mathbf{T} \subset \bar{\mathbf{M}}$ . Hence we can assume that  $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathcal{A} = 0$ .

$$\mathbf{M} = \Sigma \{\mathbf{T} \mid \mathbf{T} \subset \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{T} \text{ ad}_c(\text{K}_c + \mathbf{CB})\text{-irreducible}\}.$$

Each  $\mathbf{T}$  is a direct sum of eigenspaces of  $\text{ad}_c \mathbf{B}$ . So either  $\mathbf{T} \subset \text{K}_c$  or  $\mathbf{T} \subset \text{N}_{+c} \oplus \text{N}_{-c}$ . Hence

$$\mathbf{M} = \Sigma \{\mathbf{T} \mid \mathbf{T} \subset \mathbf{M} \cap \text{K}_c\} \oplus \Sigma \{\mathbf{T} \mid \mathbf{T} \subset \mathbf{M} \cap (\text{N}_{+c} + \text{N}_{-c})\}.$$

If  $\mathbf{T} \subset \text{K}_c \cap \mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}$  is one of the simple summands of  $\text{K}_c$ . So the first sum is direct. In  $(\text{N}_{+c} + \text{N}_{-c})$ ,  $\text{ad}_c \mathbf{B}$  has only simple eigenvalues. Hence the second sum is also direct.

In particular, let  $\mathbf{M}$  be the  $\text{ad } \text{K}_c$ -module generated by  $\text{L}_c(a)$ ,

$a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ .  $\mathbf{M}$  is also an  $\text{ad}_c(\mathbf{K}_c + \mathbf{CB})$ -module and  $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathcal{A} = 0$ . (ii) is an immediate consequence of (i).

(1) Let  $\mathbf{T}_c$  be the  $\text{ad } \mathbf{K}_c$ -module generated by  $\mathbf{L}_c(a)$ . The  $\text{ad } \mathbf{K}$ -module generated by  $\mathbf{L}(a)$  is  $(\mathbf{T}_c + \sigma(\mathbf{T}_c)) \cap \mathbf{L}$ . Since the complex space generated by  $\mathbf{L}(b)$  in  $\mathbf{L}_c$  is  $\mathbf{L}_c(b) \oplus \mathbf{L}_c(\bar{b})$ , at least one of  $\mathbf{L}_c(b)$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_c(\bar{b})$  is in  $\mathbf{T}_c$ . (1) follows from (0), (ii).

(2) The Weyl involution commuting with  $\sigma$ , shows that  $\Sigma\{\mathbf{L}_c(a) \mid -a \in \mathbf{R}\}$  generates  $\mathbf{N}_{+c}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{N}_{-c}$ ). Since  $a$  is not maximal (resp. minimal), the  $\text{ad } \mathbf{L}_+$  (resp.  $\text{ad } \mathbf{L}_-$ )-module  $\mathbf{M}$  generated by  $\mathbf{L}(a)$  contains at least one  $\mathbf{L}(x)$  with  $\text{Re } x > \text{Re } a$  (resp.  $\text{Re } x < \text{Re } a$ ). Then the  $\text{ad}_c \mathbf{L}_{+c}$  (resp.  $\text{ad}_c \mathbf{L}_{-c}$ )-module  $\mathbf{M}_c$  generated by  $\mathbf{L}_c(a)$  contains an  $\mathbf{L}_c(u)$  with  $\text{Re } u > \text{Re } a$  (resp.  $\text{Re } u < \text{Re } a$ ). If  $\mathbf{T}_c$  is the  $\text{ad}_c \mathbf{K}_c$ -module generated by  $\mathbf{L}_c(a)$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_c$  is the  $\text{ad } \mathbf{N}_{+c}$  (resp.  $\text{ad } \mathbf{N}_{-c}$ )-module generated by  $\mathbf{T}_c$ . Hence there is a  $b \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  and an  $a_0 \in \mathbf{R}$  such that  $\mathbf{L}_c(b) \subset \mathbf{T}_c$  and

$$[\mathbf{L}_c(b), \mathbf{L}_c(-a_0)] \neq 0.$$

If  $b_0 = b - a_0$ ,  $b_0 \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ ,  $\text{Re } b_0 > \text{Re } a$  and

$$[\mathbf{L}_c(b - b_0), \mathbf{L}_c(b_0)] = [\mathbf{L}_c(a_0), [\mathbf{L}_c(-a_0), \mathbf{L}_c(b)]] = \mathbf{L}_c(b).$$

**PROPOSITION 10.** — If  $\mathbf{L}_c$  is simple the set of all maximal (resp. minimal)  $a \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B})$  (resp.  $\text{Sp}_-(\mathbf{B})$ ) is the set

$$\{a \mid a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B}), \text{Re } a = m\} \quad \{\text{resp. } \{a \mid a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B}), \text{Re } a = -m\}$$

where  $m = \sup \{\text{Re } a \mid a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})\}$ . The space  $\Sigma\{\mathbf{L}_c(a) \mid \text{Re } a = m\}$  (resp.  $\Sigma\{\mathbf{L}_c(a) \mid \text{Re } a = -m\}$ ) is a irreducible  $\text{ad } \mathbf{K}_c$ -module ( $\mathbf{K}_c = \mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \mathbf{C}$  is the complexification of  $\mathbf{K}$ ).

*Proof.* — Let, as before,  $\Delta \subset \mathbf{L}_c(0)^*$  be the set of roots of  $\mathbf{L}_c(0)$ . On  $\Delta$  we put a total order relation as follows:  $\alpha \gg \beta$  if either  $\text{Re } \alpha(\mathbf{B}) > \text{Re } \beta(\mathbf{B})$  or  $\text{Re } \alpha(\mathbf{B}) = \text{Re } \beta(\mathbf{B})$  and  $\text{Im } \alpha(\mathbf{B}) > \text{Im } \beta(\mathbf{B})$ . This order is compatible with the additive structure of  $\Delta$ .

$\mathbf{L}_c$  being simple the  $\text{ad}_c$  representation is simple. By 7.1.6 and 7.2.2 of [3] there is a unique root  $\lambda$  which is maximal for the preceding order. For any  $\alpha \in \Delta_+$ , the set of positive roots, there is a sequence  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in \Delta_+$  (possibly with repetition) such that

$$\alpha = \lambda - \alpha_1 - \dots - \alpha_m \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda - \alpha_1 - \dots - \alpha_j \in \Delta_+$$

for all  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . For all  $\alpha \in \Delta$   $\operatorname{Re} \alpha(\mathbf{B}) \leq \operatorname{Re} \lambda(\mathbf{B})$ . If  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha(\mathbf{B}) = \operatorname{Re} \lambda(\mathbf{B})$  then  $\sum_{j=1}^m \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j(\mathbf{B}) = 0$ . Since  $\alpha_j \in \Delta_+$   $\operatorname{Re} \alpha_j(\mathbf{B}) \geq 0$ . Hence,  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha_j(\mathbf{B}) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . Then

$$L_c(\alpha_j(\mathbf{B})) \subset K_c \quad \text{and} \quad L_c(\lambda(\mathbf{B})) = \prod_{j=1}^m \operatorname{ad} X_j(L_c(\lambda(\mathbf{B})))$$

where  $X_j \in L_c(-\alpha_j(\mathbf{B}))$ . As before in the proof of 1) of Prop. 9 if we choose

$$Y_j \in L_c(\alpha_j(\mathbf{B})) - \{0\}, \quad L_c(\lambda(\mathbf{B})) = \prod_{j=m}^1 \operatorname{ad} Y_j(L_c(\alpha_j(\mathbf{B}))).$$

This proves the case of maximal. The case of minimal is similar.

LEMMA 3. — *If  $r \in \operatorname{Sp}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathbf{R}$  and  $r$  is not maximal (resp. minimal) there is an  $a \in \operatorname{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  such that  $\operatorname{Re} a > r$  (resp.  $\operatorname{Re} a < r$ ) and*

$$[L_c(-a), L_c(r)] = L_c(r-a) \neq \{0\}.$$

*Proof:* Let  $r = \rho(\mathbf{B})$ ,  $\rho \in \Delta$ , set of the roots of  $L_c(0)$ . Then by Proposition 9, there exist  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \Delta$  and  $\beta \in \Delta$  such that: 1)  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha_j(\mathbf{B}) = 0$ ,  $2 \leq j \leq n$ ,  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha_1(\mathbf{B}) < 0$ . 2)  $\beta + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n = \rho$ . 3) For every  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ,  $\beta + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_j \in \Delta$ .

Let  $\sigma^* : L_c(0)^* \rightarrow L_c(0)^*$  be the mapping  $\varphi \rightarrow \overline{\varphi \circ \sigma}$ . Then  $\sigma^*(\Delta) = \Delta$  and «  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha(\mathbf{B}) = 0$  » is equivalent to  $\sigma^* \alpha + \alpha = 0$ . Let  $\langle \rangle$  the scalar product on  $L_c(0)^*$  induced by the restriction of  $\operatorname{Kil}_c$  to  $L_c(0) \times L_c(0)$ . Then for any  $\varphi, \psi \in L_c(0)^*$ ,  $\langle \sigma^* \varphi, \sigma^* \psi \rangle = \overline{\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle}$ .

Since  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha(\mathbf{B}) < 0$ , if  $\rho - \alpha_1 \in \Delta$  then we can take  $a = \rho(\mathbf{B}) - \alpha_1(\mathbf{B})$ . If  $\rho - \alpha_1 \notin \Delta$  then by 1.10.7(ii)-(iv) of [3],  $\langle \rho, \alpha_1 \rangle < 0$ . Since  $\rho(\mathbf{B})$  is real  $\sigma^* \rho = \rho$  and hence  $\langle \rho, \sigma^* \alpha_1 \rangle < 0$ .

Now  $2\langle \beta, \rho \rangle = \langle \beta + \sigma^* \beta, \rho \rangle$  and since

$$\beta = \rho - \alpha_1 - \dots - \alpha_n, \quad \sigma^* \beta = \rho - \sigma^* \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_n$$

so  $2\langle \beta, \rho \rangle = \langle \rho - \alpha_1 - \sigma^* \alpha, \rho \rangle = \langle \rho, \rho \rangle - \langle \rho, \alpha_1 \rangle - \langle \rho, \sigma^* \alpha_1 \rangle$ . This shows that  $\frac{2\langle \beta, \rho \rangle}{\langle \rho, \rho \rangle} > 0$ . By 1.10.7 (ii) of [3],  $\beta - \rho \in \Delta$ . Hence we can choose  $a = \beta(\mathbf{B})$ .

**1. Some basic propositions.**

We will keep the notations of part (0). In this section let  $\Gamma$  be a subset of  $L$  containing a one dimensional space  $\mathbf{RB}$  with  $B$  strongly regular.

Due to the decomposition  $L_c = L_c(0) \oplus \bigoplus_{a \in \text{Sp}(B)} L_c(a)$ , every  $A \in L_c$  can be written in a unique way  $A = A_0 + \sum A_a$ ,  $A_0 \in L_c(0)$ ,  $A_a \in L_c(a)$ .  $A_a$  will be called the complex  $a$ -component of  $A$ . If  $A \in L$ , the relation between the real  $a$ -component  $A(a) \in L(a)$  and  $A_a$  is:  $A(a) = A_a + \sigma A_a$  and  $\sigma A_a = A_{\bar{a}}$ . Hence  $A_a \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow A(a) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow A_{\bar{a}} \neq 0$ .

**PROPOSITION 11.** — *Let  $A \in \Gamma$  and  $A = A_0 + \sum A_a$  be the decomposition of  $A$ . Let  $r = \sup \{\text{Re } a \mid a \in \text{Sp}(B), A_a \neq 0\}$  (resp.  $r = \inf \{\text{Re } a \mid a \in \text{Sp}(B), A_a \neq 0\}$ ). Then :*

a) if  $r \notin \text{Sp}(B)$ ,  $\text{LS}(\Gamma) \supset \Sigma\{L(a) \mid \text{Re } a = r, A_a \neq 0\}$  ;

b) if  $r \in \text{Sp}(B)$ ,  $\text{LS}(\Gamma) \supset \mathbf{R}_+ A_r = \mathbf{R}_+ A(r)$ . Also for any  $a \in \text{Sp}(B)$  such that  $A_a \neq 0$  and  $\text{Re } a = r$ ,

$$\text{LS}(\Gamma) \ni A_r \pm (A_a + \sigma A_a) \text{ and } \text{LS}(\Gamma) \ni A_r \pm \sqrt{-1}(A_a - \sigma A_a);$$

c) if  $r \in \text{Sp}(B)$  and  $L(r) \subset \Gamma$  then

$$\text{LS}(\Gamma) \supset \Sigma\{L(a) \mid A_a \neq 0, \text{Re } a = r\}$$
 ;

d) if  $A \in \Gamma$  and  $-A \in \Gamma$ , then  $\text{LS}(\Gamma) \supset \Sigma\{L(a) \mid A_a \neq 0\}$ .

*Proof.* — It is sufficient to consider the case  $r = \sup \{\text{Re } a \mid A_a \neq 0\}$ . The case of  $\inf$  is similar or it can be deduced from the  $\sup$  case using Weyl's involution.

By Lemma 2-4) of Chapter I,  $e^{v \text{ ad } B}(A) \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  for all  $v \in \mathbf{R}$ . Since  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$  is a convex closed cone, for any  $T > 0$  and any non-negative continuous function  $g$  on the real line :

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} e^{-rv} g(v) e^{v \text{ ad } B}(A) dv \in \text{LS}(\Gamma).$$

If  $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} e^{-rv} g(v) e^{v \text{ ad } B}(A) dv$  exists, it belongs to  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$ .



Calling  $e^{v \operatorname{ad} B}(A)$ ,  $A(v)$ , for simplicity

$$A(v) = A_1(v) + A_2(v) \quad \text{where} \quad A_1(v) = \sum_{\operatorname{Re} a=r} e^{av} A_a,$$

$$A_2(v) = \sum_{\operatorname{Re} a < r} e^{av} A_a. \quad \text{Let}$$

$$\varepsilon = \inf \{r - \operatorname{Re} a \mid a \in \operatorname{Sp}(B), \operatorname{Re} a < r\}.$$

Then  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $e^{-rv} A_2(v) = O(e^{-\varepsilon v})$  as  $v \rightarrow +\infty$ .

If we take  $g$  a quasi-periodic positive function, then :

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} e^{-rv} g(v) A_1(v) dv = \sum_{\operatorname{Re} a=r} c(\operatorname{Im} a, g) A_a$$

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} e^{-rv} g(v) A_2(v) dv = O(e^{-\varepsilon T})$$

where  $c(\lambda, g) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \int_T^{2T} e^{i\lambda v} g(v) dv$  is a Fourier coefficient of  $g$ .

This shows that  $\sum_{\operatorname{Re} a=r} c(\operatorname{Im} a, g) A_a \in \operatorname{LS}(\Gamma)$ , for any quasi-periodic positive  $g$ .

If we choose  $g = 1 + \eta \cos(\mu v)$  (resp.  $g = 1 + \eta \sin(\mu v)$ ) with  $|\eta| \leq 1$  and  $\mu \in \mathbf{R}_+$  we get :

$$c(g, \lambda) = \begin{cases} 1 & \lambda = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \eta & |\lambda| = \mu \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{resp.} \quad c(g, \lambda) = \begin{cases} 1 & \lambda = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \eta \sqrt{-1} & \lambda = \mu \\ -\frac{1}{2} \eta \sqrt{-1} & \lambda = -\mu \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence if  $r \notin \operatorname{Sp}(B)$ , taking  $\mu = \operatorname{Im} a$  for  $a \in \operatorname{Sp}(B)$  with  $\operatorname{Re} a = r$  we get that  $\eta(A_a + \sigma A_a)$  and  $\sqrt{-1} \eta(A_a - \sigma A_a)$  belong to  $\operatorname{LS}(\Gamma)$  for all  $\eta$   $|\eta| \leq 1$ . Since  $\{A_a + \sigma A_a, \sqrt{-1}(A_a - \sigma A_a)\}$  is a basis of  $L(a)$  if  $A_a \neq 0$ , we get that  $L(a) \subset \operatorname{LS}(\Gamma)$ . This is  $a$ .

If  $r \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ , taking  $\eta = 0$  we get  $A_r \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ . Then taking  $\mu = \text{Im } a$ ,  $a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ ,  $\text{Re } a = r$ , as above, we get the rest of b). c) and d) are consequences of a) and b) and of the fact that  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$  is a closed convex cone.

LEMMA 5. — Let  $r$  be a positive real number set

$$E = \Sigma\{L(a) \mid |\text{Re } a| > r, a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})\}$$

and

$$F = \Sigma\{L(a) \mid |\text{Re } a| \leq r, a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})\} + L(0).$$

Assume that  $\text{LS}(\Gamma) \supset E$ . Let  $P : L \rightarrow L$  be the projection with kernel  $E$  and image  $F$ . Then for any  $Z \in E$ ,  $P \circ \text{ad } Z \circ P \in \text{End}(\text{LS}(\Gamma))$ .

Proof. — By Lemma 2-1), 3) and Prop. 5-4), for any  $Z \in E$ ,  $P \circ e^{\text{ad } Z} \circ P \in \text{End}(\Gamma)$ .

Choose  $Z \in L(a)$ ,  $a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$   $|\text{Re } a| > r$ . Then by Prop. 7-5), for any integer  $n \geq 1$ , and any  $x \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ :

$$\text{ad}^n Z(L(x)) \subset \sum_{p+q=n} L(x+pa+q\bar{a}).$$

If  $|\text{Re } x| < r$ ,  $\text{Re}(x+pa+q\bar{a}) > (n-1)r$  if  $\text{Re } a > r$  and  $\text{Re}(x+pa+q\bar{a}) < -(n-1)r$  if  $\text{Re } a < -r$ , for all  $n \geq 2$ . As

$$e^{\text{ad } Z} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \text{ad}^n Z, \quad P \circ e^{\text{ad } Z} \circ P = P + P \circ \text{ad } Z \circ P.$$

Now for any  $Z \in L(a)$  and any  $v \in \mathbf{R}$ ,

$$P + vP \circ \text{ad } Z \circ P = P \circ e^{\text{ad } vZ} \circ P \in \text{LS}(\Gamma).$$

Then  $P \circ \text{ad } Z \circ P = \lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{v} (P + vP \circ \text{ad } Z \circ P) \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ . Since  $\text{End}(\text{LS}(\Gamma))$  is a convex cone and any  $Z \in E$  is a sum of  $Z(a)$ ,  $Z(a) \in L(a)$ , with  $\text{Re } a > r$ , we get the lemma.

PROPOSITION 12. — We use the same notations and assumptions as in Lemma 5.

1) Given any  $a \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  with  $|\text{Re } a| \leq r$ , assume there is a  $b \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  and an  $A \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  such that  $|\text{Re } b| > r$ ,  $a - b \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ ,  $[L_c(a-b), L_c(b)] \neq 0$  and  $A_{a-b} \neq 0$ . Then  $L(a) \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ .

2) Given any  $e \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  with  $|\text{Re } e| \leq r$ , assume there is an  $f \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  and an  $A \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  such that  $A_e \neq 0$ ,  $|\text{Re } f| > r$  and  $[L_c(e), L_c(-f)] \neq 0$ . Then  $L(e) \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ .

*Proof of 1).* — If  $|\text{Re}(a-b)| > r$ ,  $L(a-b) \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  and by prop. 7-5  $L(a) \subset [L(a-b), L(b)] \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ . If  $|\text{Re}(a-b)| \leq r$ , apply lemma 5. For any  $Z \in L(b)$ ,  $P[Z, P(A)] \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ . From Proposition 11-d) it follows that  $\text{LS}(\Gamma) \supset \Sigma \{L(x) \mid (P[Z, P(A)])_x \neq 0\}$ . Let  $X$  be a generator of  $L_c(b)$ . Then  $L(b) = \{uX + \bar{u}\sigma X \mid u \in \mathbb{C}\}$ . Taking  $Z = uX + \bar{u}\sigma X$ ,  $(P[Z, P(A)])_a = u[X, A_{a-b}] + \bar{u}[\sigma X, A_c]$  where  $c = a - \bar{b}$  and  $A_c = 0$  if  $c \notin \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ .

From the Assumption and Prop. 7-5)  $[X, A_{a-b}] \neq 0$ . As  $\dim L_c(a) = 1$ ,  $[\sigma X, A_c] = z[X, A_{a-b}]$  where  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . Hence

$$(P[Z, P(A)])_a = (u + zu\bar{u})[X, A_{a-b}].$$

For a suitable choice of  $u$ ,  $(P[Z, P(A)])_a \neq 0$ . This proves 1).

*Proof of 2).* — Since  $[L_c(e), L_c(-f)] \neq 0$ ,  $L_c(e-f) \neq 0$ . If  $|\text{Re}(e-f)| \leq r$ , part 1 applied to  $a = e - f$  and  $b = -f$  shows that  $L(e-f) \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ . If  $|\text{Re}(e-f)| > r$ ,  $L(e-f) \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  already.

By prop. 5-3),  $[L(e-f), L(f)] \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ . By [4]-20.5.12,

$$[L_c(e-f), L_c(f)] = [[L_c(e), L_c(-f)], L_c(f)] \neq 0.$$

Hence  $L(e) \subset [L(e-f), L(f)] \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ .

LEMMA 6. — Assume that  $a, b \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$ ,  $L(a) \subset \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  and  $[L_c(b), L_c(-a)] \neq 0$ . If there is an  $U \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  such that  $U_{b-a} \neq 0$ , then there is an  $A \in \text{LS}(\Gamma)$  such that  $A_b \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* — Let  $a$  be complex first. Choose a basis vector  $X$  of  $L_c(a)$ . Call  $Z : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow L(a)$  the function  $Z(v) = vX + \bar{v}\sigma X$ . By Proposition 5-4) and Lemma 2-4),  $A(v) = e^{\text{ad } Z(v)}(A)$  belongs to  $\text{LS}(\Gamma)$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Since  $Z(v)$  is nilpotent, the function  $A(v) : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow L$  is polynomial in  $\text{Re } v$  and  $\text{Im } v$ . The homogeneous component of degree 1 of  $A(v)_a$  is  $v[X, A_{b-a}] + \bar{v}[\sigma X, A_{b-a}]$ . By the assumption this component is not zero. Hence the polynomial  $A(v)_a$  is not identically 0. So for an open dense set of  $v$ 's in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $A(v)_a \neq 0$ .

## 2. Proof of the theorems.

Theorem 0 follows from Theorem 1 and Proposition 10.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* — We can assume that  $\Gamma = \text{LS}(\Gamma)$ . Denote by  $\text{R}_+(\Gamma)$  (resp.  $\text{R}_-(\Gamma), \text{R}_0(\Gamma)$ ) the set of all

$$a \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B}) \cup \text{Sp}_0(\mathbf{B}) \quad (\text{resp. } \text{Sp}_-(\mathbf{B}) \cup \text{Sp}_0(\mathbf{B}), \text{Sp}_0(\mathbf{B}))$$

such that there exists an  $A \in \Gamma$  with  $A(a) \neq 0$ .

The proof will be an induction. We shall assume that there is a positive  $r$  such that  $\Gamma \supset \Sigma\{L(a) \mid |\text{Re } a| > r\}$  and show that  $\Gamma \supset \Sigma\{L(a) \mid |\text{Re } a| = r\}$ . As before let  $P: L \rightarrow L$  be the projection with kernel  $\Sigma\{L(a) \mid |\text{Re } a| > r\}$  and image  $\Sigma\{L(a) \mid |\text{Re } a| \leq r\} + L(0)$ . For the proof we need two lemmas:

**LEMMA 7.** — *Assume that either  $r \notin \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  or  $r \in \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  and  $L(r) \subset \Gamma$  or there is no  $A \in \Gamma$  with  $A(r) \neq 0$ . Let  $a \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B})$  and  $\text{Re } a = r$ . If the ad  $\mathbf{K}$ -module generated by  $L(a)$  contains an  $L(b)$  such that  $L(b) \subset \Gamma$ , then  $L(a) \subset \Gamma$ .*

**LEMMA 8.** — *Assume that  $r \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B})$  and that either  $r$  is maximal or it is not but there is an  $A \in \Gamma$  such that  $A(r) \neq 0$ . Then  $L(r) \subset \Gamma$ .*

*Proof of the induction step.* — It is sufficient to show that  $\Gamma \supset \Sigma\{L(a) \mid \text{Re } a = r\}$ . The case of  $-r$  is symmetric.

Lemma 8 shows that either  $r \notin \text{Sp}(\mathbf{B})$  or  $L(r) \subset \Gamma$  or there is no  $A \in \Gamma$  such that  $A(r) \neq 0$ . Take an  $a \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B})$  with  $\text{Re } a = r$ .

*Case 1.* —  $a$  is maximal. By Proposition 11-a), b), c),

$$\Gamma \supset \Sigma\{L(x) \mid \text{Re } x = r \text{ and } \exists A \in \Gamma \text{ with } A_x \neq 0\}.$$

By condition 3 of Thm. 1, the ad  $\mathbf{K}$ -module generated by  $L(a)$  contains an  $L(b)$  such that  $L(b) \subset \Gamma$ . By Lemma 7,  $L(a) \subset \Gamma$ .

*Case 2.* —  $a$  is not maximal. By prop. 9-2 there are  $b_0, b \in \text{Sp}_+(\mathbf{B})$  such that: 1)  $\text{Re } b_0 > \text{Re } b = \text{Re } a = r$ , 2)  $L(b)$  is contained in the ad  $\mathbf{K}$ -module generated by  $L(a)$ . 3)  $b - b_0 \in \text{R}_-(\Gamma)$ .

This last condition shows that there is an  $A \in \Gamma$  such that  $A_{b-b_0} \neq 0$ . Then prop. 12-1 implies that  $L(b) \subset \Gamma$ . By lemma 7,  $L(a) \subset \Gamma$ .

The induction shows that  $\Sigma\{L(a)|\operatorname{Re} a \neq 0\} \subset \Gamma$ . Hence

$$\Sigma\{[L(a),L(-a)]|\operatorname{Re} a \neq 0\} \subset \Gamma.$$

Now  $L = K + \Sigma\{L(a)+[L(a),L(-a)]||\operatorname{Re} a| \neq 0\}$ . Let  $Q : L \rightarrow L$  be a projection with kernel in  $\Gamma$  and image in  $K$ ,  $K = H_K \oplus \sum_{\operatorname{Re} a=0} L(a)$  where

$$H_K = L(0) \cap K = \sum_{\operatorname{Re} a=0} [L(a),L(-a)].$$

By Proposition 8-1),  $[L(-a),L(-a)]$  is made up of compact elements for every  $a \in \operatorname{Sp}_0(B)$ . Since  $H_K$  is a commutative algebra, all elements in  $H_K$  are compact. Let  $A \in \Gamma$ . Then  $Q(A) \in \Gamma$ .  $Q(A) = A_0 + \sum_{\operatorname{Re} a=0} A(a)$ ,  $A_0 \in H_K$ ,  $A(a) \in L(a)$ . Proposition 11-b) shows that  $A_0 \in \Gamma$ . Since  $A_0$  is compact,  $\mathbf{R}A_0 \subset \Gamma$ . By proposition 11-b), c),  $\mathbf{R}A(a) \subset \Gamma$ . In particular for every  $a \in \mathbf{R}_0(\Gamma)$ ,  $L(a) \subset \Gamma$ . Since  $\Sigma\{L(a)|a \in \mathbf{R}_0(\Gamma)\}$  generates  $K$ ,  $K \subset \Gamma$ . This shows that  $\Gamma = L$  and  $\Gamma$  is transitive.

*Proof of Lemma 7.* — By Proposition 9-2) there is a sequence  $b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n$  such that : 1)  $b_n = a$ , 2)  $b_{j+1} - b_j = a_j \in \mathbf{R}_0(\Gamma)$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$ , 3)  $L_c(b_{j+1}) = [L_c(b_j),L_c(a_j)]$ , 4)  $b_0 = b$  or  $b_0 = \bar{b}$ . We show by induction on  $j$  that  $L(b_j) \subset \Gamma$ .

For  $j = 0$ ,  $L(b_0) = L(b) \subset \Gamma$ . Since  $a_j \in \mathbf{R}_0(\Gamma)$ , there is a  $U \in \Gamma$  such that  $U_{a_j} \neq 0$ . If  $L(b_j) \subset \Gamma$ , by Lemma 6 there is an  $A \in \Gamma$  with  $A_{b_{j+1}} \neq 0$ . By Proposition 11-a), b), c), since  $\operatorname{Re} b_{j+1} = r$ ,  $L(b_{j+1}) \subset \Gamma$ .

*Proof of Lemma 8.* — If  $r$  is maximal, by condition 4 of Theorem 1 there are  $A_1, A_2 \in \Gamma$  such that  $\operatorname{Trace} (\operatorname{ad} A_1(r) \circ \operatorname{ad} A_2(-r)) < 0$ . Now  $P(A_1), P(A_2) \in \Gamma$ . Hence by Proposition 11-b)  $A_1(r), A_2(-r) \in \Gamma$ . For any real positive  $u, v$ ,  $uA_1(r) + vA_2(-r) \in \Gamma$  and it is a compact element by Proposition 8-2). Hence  $\Gamma \supset \{uA_1(r)+vA_2(-r)|u,v \in \mathbf{R}, uv > 0\}$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is convex,  $\Gamma \supset L(r) + L(-r)$ .

If  $r$  is not maximal, by Lemma 3 there is an  $a \in \operatorname{Sp}(B)$ ,  $\operatorname{Re} a > r$  such that  $[L_c(r),L_c(-a)] \neq 0$ . By Proposition 12-2 applied to  $e = r$ ,  $f = a$ ,  $L(r) \subset \Gamma$ .

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] N. BOURBAKI, *Algèbre de Lie*, Chap. VII-VIII, Hermann.
- [2] A. BOREL-G. MOSTOW, On semi-simple automorphisms of Lie algebras, *Ann. of Math.*, vol. 61 (1955), 389-405.
- [3] J. DIXMIER, *Enveloping algebras*, North-Holland.
- [4] H. FREUDENTHAL, *Linear Lie groups*, Academic Press.
- [5] V. JURDJEVIC and I. KUPKA, Control systems subordinated to a group action : Accessibility, *Journal of Diff. Equations*, 39, 2 (1981), 186-211.
- [6] V. JURDJEVIC and H. SUSSMANN, Control systems on Lie groups, *Journal of Diff. Equations*, (12) (1972), 313-329.
- [7] A. KRENER, A generalization of Chow's theorem and the bang-bang theorem to non-linear control systems, *SIAM J. Control*, 11 (1973), 670-676.
- [8] C. LOBRY, Contrôlabilité des systèmes non-linéaires, *SIAM Journal on Control*, 8 (1970), 573-605.
- [9] C. LOBRY, Contrôlabilité des systèmes non-linéaires, Proceedings of « Outils et modèles mathématiques pour l'automatique et l'analyse de systèmes », C.N.R.S., Mai 1980, Centre Paul Langevin (CAES-CNRS), Aussois, France.
- [10] B. LEVITT and H. SUSSMANN, On controllability by means of two vector fields, *SIAM Journal on Control*, 13 (1975), 1271-1281.
- [11] G. MOSTOW, Lie algebras and Lie groups, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, n° 14.
- [12] H. SUSSMANN and V. JURDJEVIC, Controllability of non-linear systems, *Journal of Diff. Equations*, 12 (1972), 95-116.

Manuscrit reçu le 3 novembre 1980.

V. JURDJEVIC,

Department of Mathematics  
University of Toronto  
Toronto (Canada).

I. KUPKA,

Laboratoire de Mathématiques Pures,  
Institut Fourier  
Université Scientifique et Médicale de Grenoble  
Saint-Martin d'Hères (France).

---