

$\lambda(h_\gamma)v^+ = \langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle v^+ \neq 0$ . On the other hand, as  $\text{ad}$  is alternating, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \neq x_\gamma \cdot y_\gamma \cdot v^+ &= \text{ad}(v^+ \wedge v^- \wedge v_{\mu_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{\mu_{n-3}}) \cdot y_\gamma \cdot v^+ \\ &= \text{ad}(y_\gamma \cdot v^+ \wedge v^+ \wedge v_{\mu_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{\mu_{n-3}}) \cdot v^-. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $\text{ad}(y_\gamma \cdot v^+ \wedge v^+ \wedge v_{\mu_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{\mu_{n-3}}) \neq 0$ . By Lemma 3.1 the weight of this element is  $2\lambda + \sum_{i=1}^{n-3} \mu_i - \gamma$ , which is equal to  $\lambda - \sigma_0\lambda$  by the definition of  $\gamma$ . Therefore  $\lambda - \sigma_0\lambda \in \Phi \cup \{0\}$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $\lambda - \sigma_0\lambda \notin \Phi$ , hence  $\lambda - \sigma_0\lambda = 0$ . Since  $-\sigma_0\lambda$  is also a dominant weight,  $\lambda = 0$ , which is a contradiction to the assumption that  $V$  is faithful.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4:**  $H_0 \neq \{0\}$

*Proof:* If  $n > 3$ , the assertion follows from Lemma 3.3. Let  $n = 3$ . Since the nonzero element  $\text{ad}(v^+ \wedge v^-)$  lies in  $L_{\lambda + \sigma_0\lambda}$  by Lemma 3.1,  $\lambda + \sigma_0\lambda \in \Phi \cup \{0\}$ . But  $\sigma_0(\lambda + \sigma_0\lambda) = \sigma_0\lambda + \sigma_0^2\lambda = \lambda + \sigma_0\lambda$ , hence  $\lambda + \sigma_0\lambda = 0$  because  $\sigma_0$  maps the positive roots into the negative ones. This means that  $\text{ad}(v^+ \wedge v^-) \in H_0$ .  $\square$

*We continue to show C2.*

Let  $L = \sum_{i=1}^m L_i$ , where  $L_i$ ,  $i \in \underline{m}$  are the simple ideals of  $L$ . Further  $H_i := H \cap L_i$ ,  $\Phi_i \subseteq \Phi$  the root system of  $L_i$  relative to  $H_i$  and  $\Delta_i := \Delta \cap \Phi_i$ .  $\Delta_i$  is a base of  $\Phi_i$  (see Theorem A6 and Remark A1)

**Lemma 3.5:** *Let  $(L, V, \text{ad})$  be a good triple. Then for each  $i \in \underline{m}$  there exists  $\alpha \in \Delta_i$  with  $\lambda - \sigma_0\lambda - \alpha \in \Phi$ .*

*Proof:* Set  $\Delta_{0,i} := \{\alpha \in \Delta_i \mid \alpha(H_0) \neq \{0\}\}$ . Then for each  $i$ :  $\Delta_{0,i} \neq \emptyset$ . If  $\Delta_{0,i} = \emptyset$  for some  $i \in \underline{m}$ , say  $i = 1$ , then  $H_0 \subseteq \bigoplus_{i=2}^m H_i$ . Set  $M := \bigoplus_{i=2}^m L_i$ . We show that  $\text{ad}(V \wedge \cdots \wedge V) \subseteq M$ , which contradicts the surjectivity of  $\text{ad}$ . Since  $v^+ \wedge v^-$  generates  $V \wedge V$ , it suffices to show that

$$\text{ad}(v^+ \wedge v^- \wedge V \wedge \cdots \wedge V) \subseteq M. \quad (3.2)$$

Let  $z = \text{ad}(v^+ \wedge v^- \wedge v_{\mu_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{\mu_{n-3}}) \neq 0$ . If  $z \in H_0$ , then  $z \in M$ ; if  $z \notin H_0$ , then  $z \in L_\gamma$  for some root  $\gamma$ . By Lemma 3.3,  $\{0\} \neq [z, L_{-\gamma}] \subseteq H_0$ , this in turn gives  $z \in M$ . Hence (3.2) is true and  $\Delta_{0,i} \neq \emptyset$ .

*We claim that for each  $i$  there exists an  $\alpha \in \Delta_{0,i}$  such that  $x_\alpha \cdot v^- \neq 0$  or  $y_\alpha \cdot v^+ \neq 0$ .*

If  $n = 3$ , then  $\text{ad}(v^+ \wedge v^-)$  is the only nonzero element in  $H_0$  up to scalar. By the definition of  $\Delta_{0,i}$  we have for all its elements  $\alpha$ :

$$\text{ad}(v^+ \wedge x_\alpha \cdot v^-) = [x_\alpha, \text{ad}(v^+ \wedge v^-)]$$