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Introduction. Let $M$ be a smooth manifold of dimension $m$ and $s$ an integer such that $1 \leq s \leq m - 1$. Let $G_s(T_pM)$ be the set of $s$-dimensional linear subspaces in the tangent space $T_pM$ at $p$ and denote by $G_s(TM)$ the corresponding Grassmann bundle over $M$, i.e., $G_s(TM) = \bigcup_{p \in M} G_s(T_pM)$. Harvey-Lawson [4] introduces the notion of Grassmann geometries, which is described as follows. Give an arbitrary subset $C\mathcal{V}$ of $G_s(TM)$. An $s$-dimensional connected submanifold $S$ of $M$ is called a $C\mathcal{V}$-submanifold if at each point $p$ of $S$ the tangent space $T_pS$ belongs to $C\mathcal{V}$. The collection of $C\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds constitutes the $C\mathcal{V}$-geometry. Grassmann geometries are the collective name of such $C\mathcal{V}$-geometries.

We consider $C\mathcal{V}$-geometries of the following type. Assume that $M$ is a compact simply connected riemannian symmetric space and denote by $G$ the group of isometries on $M$. The Lie group $G$ acts transitively on $M$ and at the same time acts on $G_s(TM)$ via the differentials of isometries. As $C\mathcal{V}$ we take a $G$-orbit by this action. The $G$-orbit $C\mathcal{V}$ is a homogeneous bundle over $M$ with homogeneous fibres, i.e., $C\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{p \in M} C\mathcal{V}_p$, $C\mathcal{V}_p = C\mathcal{V} \cap G_s(T_pM)$, and $G$ acts transitively on the family of fibres $C\mathcal{V}_p$. Moreover the isotropy subgroup $K_p$ in $G$ at $p$ acts transitively on the fibre $C\mathcal{V}_p$. Roughly speaking, Grassmann geometries of this type correspond to classes of submanifolds with congruent tangent space. From this point of view the Grassmann geometries are important for us to study the submanifold theory of riemannian symmetric space.

In this article we especially treat the following $G$-orbits. Denote by $R$ the curvature tensor on $M$. An $s$-dimensional linear subspace $V$ in $T_pM$ is called strongly curvature-invariant if it satisfies that

\[(0.1) \quad R_p(V,V)V \subseteq V \quad \text{and} \quad R_p(V^\perp, V^\perp) V^\perp \subseteq V^\perp,
\]
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where $V^+$ denotes the orthogonal complement of $V$ in $T_pM$. As $\mathcal{C}^V$ we take the $G$-orbit at a strongly curvature-invariant subspace $V$, and consider the set $\mathcal{S}(M)$ of such $G$-orbits over all $s$. By the first condition of (0.1) such a $\mathcal{C}^V$-geometry has a unique complete totally geodesic $\mathcal{C}^V$-submanifold, except the difference by isometries. Therefore we have the following problem: Determine all $G$-orbits $\mathcal{C}^V$ in $\mathcal{S}(M)$ whose $\mathcal{C}^V$-geometries have non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{C}^V$-submanifolds. The motivation to study the $G$-orbits of this type is due to the following facts (1), (2):

(1) The fibres $\mathcal{C}^V_p$ are also symmetric spaces. In fact, taking a subspace $V$ in $\mathcal{C}^V_p$, by (0.1) we have a unique involutive isometry $t_p$ on $M$ such that $t_p(p)=p$, $(t_p)_*(x)=-x$ if $x \in V$ and $x$ if $x \in V^+$. Then the involutive inner automorphism $\tau$ of $G$ defined by $t_p$ preserves the isotropy subgroup $K_p$ and defines the isotropy subgroup in $K_p$ at $V$;

(2) A submanifold $S$ of $M$ is called a symmetric submanifold if at each point $p$ in $S$ there exists a unique isometry $t_p$ on $M$ such that $t_p(p)=p$, $t_p(S)=S$, $(t_p)_*(x)=-x$ if $x \in T_pM$ and $x$ if $x \in N_pM$, where $N_pM$ denotes the normal space. A symmetric submanifold is a submanifold with congruent tangent space. Therefore, to study the above problem is useful for the classification of symmetric submanifolds.

In the present paper we study this problem on the following situation: $M$ is an irreducible compact simply connected symmetric space of classical and inner type, and $\mathcal{C}^V$ is a $G$-orbit such that the restriction of $\tau$ to $K_p$ is also of inner type. Then the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of Killing vector fields on $M$ is compact, simple, and of classical type. To solve this problem we use a representation theoretic method of Lie algebra. In sections 1, 2 we explain how to use this. In sections 3, 4 we treat the cases that $\mathfrak{g}$ are of types $A$, $B$, respectively, where such $G$-orbits $\mathcal{C}^V$ are classified and for each $\mathcal{C}^V$ the above problem is solved.

In the forthcoming paper II we treat the cases that $\mathfrak{g}$ are of types $C$, $D$.

1. Main theorem and the outline of proof

Let $(M, V)$ be a pair of compact simply connected riemannian symmetric space $M$ and strongly curvature-invariant subspace $V$ of $T_pM$. Denote by $s_p$ the geodesic symmetry at $p$, and by $t_p$ an involutive isometry of $M$ defined in Introduction. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of Killing vector fields on $M$. Then $\mathfrak{g}$ is a compact semisimple Lie algebra and the isometries $s_p, t_p$ induce involutive automorphisms $\sigma, \tau$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ which commute each other and whose $(+1)$-eigenspaces, as Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, act faithfully on $(-1)$-eigenspaces. The $(-1)$-eigenspace of $\sigma$ is naturally identified with the tangent space $T_pM$. Through this identification the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ uniquely admits an inner product $\langle , \rangle$ which is preserved by $\sigma, \tau$ and for which the endomorphisms $\text{ad}(X), X \in \mathfrak{g}$, are skew symmetric. Such a quadruple $(\mathfrak{g}, \sigma, \tau, \langle , \rangle)$ is called orthogonal pairwise symmetric
Lie algebra, abbreviated with OPSLA.

Conversely, given an OPSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau, \langle , \rangle)\), we can construct a pair \((M, V)\) of compact simply connected riemannian symmetric space \(M\) and strongly curvature-invariant subspace \(V\) as follows. Let \(G\) be the simply connected compact Lie group with Lie algebra \(g\) and \(K\) the connected subgroup of \(G\) generated by the Lie subalgebra of \((+1)\)-eigenspace of \(\sigma\). Then \(M\) is the homogeneous space \(G/K\) and the riemannian metric on \(M\) is induced from the bi-invariant metric on \(G\) defined by \(\langle , \rangle\). Put \(p=K\) in \(M\) and denote by \(t_p\) an involutive isometry of \(M\) induced from an involutive automorphism of \(G\) defined by \(\tau\). Then \(t_p\) fixes the point \(p\) and the subspace \(V\) is the \((-1)\)-eigenspace of \((t_p)^*\).

Two pairs \((M, V), (M', V')\) are equivalent to each other if there exists an isometry \(\phi\) of \(M\) onto \(M'\) such that \(\phi g(V) = V'\), and two OPSLA's \((g, \sigma, \tau, \langle , \rangle), (g', \sigma', \tau', \langle , \rangle)\) are equivalent to each other if there exists an automorphism \(\rho\) of \(g\) onto \(g'\) such that \(\rho g = \sigma' \rho\), \(\rho \tau = \tau' \rho\), and \(\langle \rho(X), \rho(Y) \rangle = \langle X, Y \rangle\) for all \(X, Y \in g\). Denote by \(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{O}\) the sets of equivalence classes, respectively. Then the above constructions give a one-to-one correspondence between \(\mathcal{S}\) and \(\mathcal{O}\). (See Naitoh [9]). The set \(\mathcal{S}\) is regarded as the collection of all \(\mathcal{S}(M)\), where \(M\) moves over the isomorphism classes of compact simply connected riemannian symmetric space by isometries. The set \(\mathcal{O}\) corresponds to the isomorphism classes of semi-simple affine symmetric space by Berger [2], if we disregard the difference on the inner product \(\langle , \rangle\). (See Naitoh [9]).

We now assume that a compact simply connected riemannian symmetric space \(M\) is irreducible. Then the Lie algebra \(g\) is a compact simple Lie algebra or two copies of compact simple Lie algebra. In the latter case \(M\) is a compact simply connected simple Lie group. If \(M\) is irreducible, the riemannian metric is uniquely determined except a scalar multiple. So we may consider a triple \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) instead of an OPSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau, \langle , \rangle)\). Such a triple is called pairwise symmetric Lie algebra, abbreviated with PSLA. In the followings we always assume that \(M\) is irreducible.

A PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) is called a PSLA of inner type if \(\sigma\) is an inner involutive automorphism of \(g\) and the restriction of \(\tau\) to the subalgebra of \((+1)\)-eigenspace of \(\sigma\) is an inner involutive automorphism of the subalgebra, and otherwise it is called a PSLA of outer type. If a PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) is of inner type the Lie algebra \(g\) is simple since \(\sigma\) is inner.

We give examples of \(G\)-orbits \(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{V}\) in the cases that symmetric spaces \(M\) have rank one, except the Cayley plane.

**Example 1.** Let \(M\) be the \(m\)-dimensional riemannian sphere and \(V\) an \(r\)-dimensional subspace of \(T_pM\), where \(r \neq 0, m\). Then \(V\) is stongly curvature-invariant and \(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{V}\)-submanifolds mean \(r\)-dimensional connected submanifolds.
So the $\mathcal{V}$-geometry admits many non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds. Moreover the PSLA corresponding to $\mathcal{V}$ is of inner type if $m, r$ are even, and of outer type if otherwise.

**Example 2.** Let $M$ be the $n$-dimensional complex projective space.

(1) Let $V$ be an $r$-dimensional complex subspace of $T_p M$, where $r \neq 0, n$. Then $V$ is strongly curvature-invariant and $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds mean $r$-dimensional complex submanifolds. So the $\mathcal{V}$-geometry admits many non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds. Moreover the PSLA corresponding to $\mathcal{V}$ is of inner type.

(2) Let $V$ be an $n$-dimensional totally real subspace of $T_p M$. Then $V$ is strongly curvature-invariant and $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds mean $n$-dimensional totally real submanifolds. So the $\mathcal{V}$-geometry admits many non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds. Moreover the PSLA corresponding to $\mathcal{V}$ is of outer type.

**Example 3.** Let $M$ be the $n$-dimensional quaternion projective space.

(1) Let $V$ be an $r$-dimensional quaternionic subspace of $T_p M$, where $r \neq 0, n$. Then $V$ is strongly curvature-invariant and $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds mean $r$-dimensional quaternionic submanifolds, i.e., the tangent spaces of submanifolds are preserved by the quaternion structure on $M$. In this case $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds are always totally geodesic (Alekseevskii [1]). Moreover the PSLA corresponding to $\mathcal{V}$ is of inner type.

(2) Let $V$ be an $n$-dimensional totally complex subspace of $T_p M$. Then $V$ is strongly curvature-invariant and $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds mean $n$-dimensional totally complex submanifolds. So the $\mathcal{V}$-geometry admits non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds. Moreover the PSLA corresponding to $\mathcal{V}$ is of inner type.

We refer Naitoh-Takeuchi [12] for the existence of non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds in Example 1, Example 2, and Example 3 (2). Except the above examples, there are known examples of $\mathcal{V}$-geometries which admit non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds. (See Naitoh [9]). These examples are associated with PSLA's of outer type.

Our main theorem is now described as follows.

**Main Theorem.** Let $M$ be an irreducible compact simply connected riemannian symmetric space and $\mathcal{V}$ a $G$-orbit in $S(M)$ associated with $\text{PSLA} (\mathfrak{g}, \sigma, \tau)$ of inner type. Then $\mathfrak{g}$ is compact simple and the following hold for $\mathfrak{g}$ of classical type:

(1) Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of type $A_l, l \geq 1$. In this case the $\mathcal{V}$-geometry admits non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds if and only if it is one of the $\mathcal{V}$-geometries in Example 2,(1);

(2) Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of type $B_l, l \geq 2$. In this case the $\mathcal{V}$-geometry admits non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifolds if and only if it is one of the $\mathcal{V}$-geometries in Example 1 ($m : \text{even and } r : \text{even}$);
Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of type $C_{l+1}$, $l \geq 3$. In this case the $\mathcal{CV}$-geometry admits non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{CV}$-submanifolds if and only if it is one of the $\mathcal{CV}$-geometries in Example 3,(2);

(4) Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of type $D_l$, $l \geq 4$. In this case no $\mathcal{CV}$-geometry admits non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{CV}$-submanifolds.

**Corollary.** Let $M$, $\mathcal{CV}$ be the same as above. Assume moreover that $\mathcal{CV}$ is none of $G$-orbits in Example 1 ($m$: even and $r$: even), Example 2,(1), Example 3,(2). Then a symmetric submanifold which belongs to the $\mathcal{CV}$-geometry is always totally geodesic.

We here remark that the symmetric submanifolds are classified for the case that $M$ has rank one. (cf. See Naitoh-Takeuchi [12].)

In the rest of this section we explain the outline for the proof of this theorem. Let $M$ be an irreducible compact simply connected riemannian symmetric space and $\mathcal{CV}$ a $G$-orbit in $\mathcal{S}(M)$ with PSLA ($\mathfrak{g}$, $\sigma$, $\tau$). Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a $\mathcal{CV}$-submanifold. Take a point $p$ of $\mathcal{S}$ and put $V=T_p\mathcal{S}$. We may assume that $\sigma$, $\tau$ are induced from the involutive isometries $s_p$, $t_p$. Denote by $\mathfrak{f}$, $\mathfrak{p}$ the $(\pm 1)$-eigenspaces by $\sigma$, and by $\mathfrak{f}_\pm$ ($\mathfrak{p}_\pm$) the $(\pm 1)$-eigenspaces in $\mathfrak{f}$($\mathfrak{p}$) resp. by $\tau$. Then $\mathfrak{f}_+$ is a sub-algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and vector spaces $\mathfrak{f}_-$, $\mathfrak{p}_\pm$ are $\mathfrak{f}_+$-modules. Moreover we have the following identifications:

$$\mathfrak{p} = T_pM, \quad \mathfrak{p}_- = T_p\mathcal{S}, \quad \mathfrak{p}_+ = N_p\mathcal{S}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{f} = \Omega_p(M), \quad \mathfrak{f}_+ = \Omega^+_{\mathfrak{p}}(M), \quad \mathfrak{f}_- = \Omega^-_{\mathfrak{p}}(M)$$

where $\Omega_p(M)$ denotes the holonomy algebra of $M$ at $p$ and $\Omega^\pm_{\mathfrak{p}}(M)$ are subspaces of $\Omega_p(M)$ defined as follows:

$$\Omega^+_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) = \{ f \in \Omega_p(M); f(T_p\mathcal{S}) \subset T_p\mathcal{S}, f(N_p\mathcal{S}) \subset N_p\mathcal{S} \}$$

and

$$\Omega^-_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) = \{ f \in \Omega_p(M); f(T_p\mathcal{S}) \subset N_p\mathcal{S}, f(N_p\mathcal{S}) \subset T_p\mathcal{S} \} .$$

Denote by $\alpha$ the second fundamental form of $\mathcal{S}$ and by $A$ the shape operator, and for $x \in T_p\mathcal{S}$ define an endomorphism $T_x$ of $T_pM$ as follows: $T_x(y) = \alpha(x, y)$, $-A_x(x)$ according as $y \in T_p\mathcal{S}$ or $y \in N_p\mathcal{S}$, respectively. Then, since $\mathcal{S}$ is a $\mathcal{CV}$-submanifold, the endomorphisms $T_x$, $x \in T_p\mathcal{S}$, belong to $\Omega^-_{\mathfrak{p}}(M)$ (Naitoh [11]). So a linear map $T$ of $\mathfrak{p}_-$ to $\mathfrak{f}_-$ is defined by $T(x) = T_x$. It here follows by the symmetry of $\alpha$ that

$$[T(x), y] = T_x(y) = \alpha(x, y) = [T(y), x]$$

for $x, y \in \mathfrak{p}_- = T_p\mathcal{S}$. Define a linear map $\rho$ of $\mathfrak{p}_- \otimes \mathfrak{f}_-$ to $\wedge^2(\mathfrak{p}^\ast \otimes \mathfrak{f}_-)$ by $\rho(\lambda)(x, y) = [\lambda(x), y] - [\lambda(y), x]$ for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{p}^\ast \otimes \mathfrak{f}_-$ and $x, y \in \mathfrak{p}_-$.
$W, W^*$ denotes the dual space of $W$. Then $\rho$ is a $t_+\text{-homomorphism}$ and satisfies that $\rho(T) = 0$. Hence, by (1.1) we have the following

**Lemma 1.1 (Key Lemma).** If the $t_+\text{-homomorphism}$ $\rho$ is injective, a $CV\text{-submanifold}$ is always totally geodesic.

This homomorphism $\rho$ is called the homomorphism associated with the $G\text{-orbit}$ $CV$. We study on the injectivity of the complexification of $\rho$, which is a $t_+\text{-homomorphism}$ of $(p^C)^* \otimes p^C$ to $\wedge^2(p^C)^* \otimes p^C$ and is denoted by the same notation $\rho$. Here $(*)^C$ denotes the complexification of $(*)$.

We first see a weight space decomposition of the $t_+\text{-module}$ $(p^C)^* \otimes p^C$. Let $(g, \sigma, \tau)$ be a PSLA of inner type. Let $h$ be a maximal abelian subalgebra of $g$ and take a fundamental root system $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_t\}$ in $\sqrt{-1} h$ with respect to the Cartan subalgebra $h^C$. Let $\{H_1, \ldots, H_t\}$ in $\sqrt{-1} h$ be the dual vectors of $\Pi$, i.e., $<\alpha_i, H_j> = \delta_{ij}$ for all $i, j$. Then, since $\sigma$ is inner, we may assume that $\sigma = \exp \text{ad}(\pi \sqrt{-1} H_i)$ for some $i$ (cf. Murakami [8]). We denote this $H_i$ by $H_\sigma$. Let $t$ be the semisimple part of $t$. Either of the following cases is possible; Case (a): $t = t_+$ or Case (b): $t = c \oplus t_+$, where $c = \sqrt{-1} RH_i$. In Case (a) put $h_\sigma = h$. Then $h^C_\sigma$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $t^C_\sigma$ and the subset $\Pi_\sigma = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \ldots, \alpha_t\}$ in $\sqrt{-1} h_\sigma$ gives a fundamental root system of $t^C_\sigma$ with respect to $h^C_\sigma$, where $\alpha_0$ is the minus multiple of the highest root of $\Pi$. In Case (b) the subalgebra $h$ is decomposed into the sum of center $c$ and maximal abelian subalgebra $h_\sigma$ in $t_+$, where $h^C_\sigma$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $t^C_\sigma$. The subset $\Pi_\sigma = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \ldots, \alpha_t\}$ in $\sqrt{-1} h_\sigma$ gives a fundamental root system of $t^C_\sigma$ with respect to this Cartan subalgebra.

We now decompose $t_+$ into the sum of simple ideals $t_j, 1 \leq j \leq r$ and put $h_j = h_\sigma \cap t_j$, and then decompose $\Pi_\sigma$ into the sum of fundamental root systems $\Pi_j = \{\alpha_{i_1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i_{r(j)}}\}$ of $t^C_j$ with respect to the Cartan subalgebras $h^C_j$. Denote by $\{K_{i_1}, \ldots, K_{i_{r(j)}}\}$ the dual vectors of $\Pi_j$ in $\sqrt{-1} h_j$. Since the restriction $\tau$ of $\tau$ to $t$ is inner, we may assume that

$$\tau = \exp \text{ad}(\pi \sqrt{-1} \sum K_{i_{r(j)}})$$

for some dual vectors $K_{i_{r(j)}}$, where the summation $\sum$ does not necessarily move over all $j$. Put $-\alpha_0 = \sum h_k \alpha_k$, where $m_k, 1 \leq k \leq l$, are positive integers. Then, the following holds.

**Lemma 1.2 (cf. C. Yen [13]).** (1) In Case (a) an involutive automorphism of $t$ given in the form (1.2) can be extended to an involutive automorphism of $g$ if and only if the following condition

$$\sum_j m_j \alpha_j \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$$

is satisfied. Then every extended automorphism is involutive.
In Case (b) an involutive automorphism of \( \mathfrak{l} \) given in the form (1.2) can be always extended to an involutive automorphism of \( \mathfrak{g} \). Then an extended involutive automorphism is given in the following form:

\[
\exp \text{ad}(\pi \sqrt{-1}(\sum K_{i,c} + Z))
\]

for some \( Z \in \sqrt{-1} \mathfrak{c} \).

Denote by \( \tau_0 \) the extended involutive automorphism of \( \mathfrak{g} \) given in the above lemma: \( \tau_0 = \exp \text{ad}(\pi \sqrt{-1} K_{\tau_0}) \), where \( K_{\tau_0} = \sum K_{i,c} \) in Case (a) and \( K_{\tau_0} = \sum K_{i,c} + Z \) in Case (b). Then, since the \( \mathfrak{l} \)-module \( \mathfrak{p} \) is irreducible, it follows by Schur’s lemma that \( \tau = \tau_0 \) or \( \tau = \tau_0 \sigma \). According to each case we put \( H_s = K_{\tau_0} \) or \( H_s = K_{\tau_0} + H_{\tau} \).

Let \( \Delta \) be the set of roots of \( \mathfrak{g}^c \) with respect to \( \mathfrak{h}^c \) and set

\[
\Delta_+ = \{ \alpha \in \Delta; \langle \alpha, H_s \rangle \text{ and } \langle \alpha, H_s \rangle: \text{even} \}, \\
\Delta_- = \{ \alpha \in \Delta; \langle \alpha, H_s \rangle: \text{even and } \langle \alpha, H_s \rangle: \text{odd} \}, \\
\Delta_p = \{ \alpha \in \Delta; \langle \alpha, H_s \rangle: \text{odd and } \langle \alpha, H_s \rangle: \text{even} \}, \\
\Delta_{p-} = \{ \alpha \in \Delta; \langle \alpha, H_s \rangle \text{ and } \langle \alpha, H_s \rangle: \text{odd} \}.
\]

Then \( \Delta_+ \) is the set of roots of \( \mathfrak{g}_+ \) with respect to \( \mathfrak{h}^c \), and \( \Delta_{-}, \Delta_{p}, \Delta_{p-} \) are the sets of weights of the \( \mathfrak{l}_+ \)-modules \( \mathfrak{p}_+, \mathfrak{p}_- \) with respect to \( \mathfrak{h}^c \), respectively. Taking root vectors \( X_{\alpha}, \alpha \in \Delta \), we have the following decompositions:

\[
\mathfrak{f}_+ = \mathfrak{h}^c \oplus \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} C X_{\alpha}, \quad \mathfrak{f}_- = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_-} C X_{\alpha}, \\
\mathfrak{p}_+ = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_p} C X_{\alpha}, \quad \mathfrak{p}_- = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_{p-}} C X_{\alpha}.
\]

Let \( \omega_{\alpha}, \alpha \in \Delta \), be the dual forms of \( X_{\alpha}, \alpha \in \Delta \). Then the set \( \Lambda \) of weights of the \( \mathfrak{l}_+ \)-module \( (\mathfrak{p}_-) \otimes \mathfrak{f}_+ \) is given by the set \( \{ -\alpha + \beta; \alpha \in \Delta_{p-}, \beta \in \Delta_{+} \} \) and a basis of weight vectors is given by \( \omega_{\alpha} \otimes X_{\beta}, \alpha \in \Delta_{p-}, \beta \in \Delta_{+} \).

We now take a total order \( \prec \) on \( \sqrt{-1} \mathfrak{h} \) such that \( \Pi \) is the system of simple roots in \( \Delta \) and denote by \( \Delta^+ \) the set of positive roots in \( \Delta \). Then \( \Delta_+ \cap \Delta^+ \), denoted by \( \Delta_+^+ \), is the set of positive roots in \( \Delta_{+} \). Denote by \( \varphi \) the representation of \( \mathfrak{p}_+ \) on the vector space \( (\mathfrak{p}_-) \otimes \mathfrak{f}_+ \). A vector \( u \) in \( (\mathfrak{p}_-) \otimes \mathfrak{f}_+ \) is called maximal if it holds that \( \varphi(X_\gamma) \cdot u = 0 \) for all \( \gamma \in \Delta_+^+ \). A maximal weight vector gives the highest weight vector of an irreducible submodule. By virtue of Schur’s lemma, to see the injectivity of the \( \mathfrak{l}_+ \)-homomorphism \( \rho \) associated with the PSLA \( (\mathfrak{g}, \sigma, \tau) \), we may see whether \( \rho(u) \) are zero or not for all maximal weight vectors \( u \).

Our procedure is done as follows. Let \( u \) be a maximal vector with weight \( \lambda \in \Lambda \). If \( u \) is represented as a proper linear combination of \( r \) weight vectors \( \omega_{\alpha_i} \otimes X_{\beta_i}, 1 \leq i \leq r \), such that \( \lambda = -\alpha_i + \beta_i \), the integer \( r \) is called the length of \( u \) and is denoted by \( l(u) \). Dividing into the cases that \( l(u)=1, l(u)=2, \) and
\( l(u) \geq 3 \), we will see whether \( \rho(u) \) vanishes or not. In the next section we prepare some conditions to see this.

### 2. Some conditions for the non-vanishing of \( \rho(u) \)

Let \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) be a PSLA of inner type and \( \rho \) the \( \tau^- \)-homomorphism associated with the PSLA. We retain the notations in the previous section. Let \( u \) be a maximal vector with a weight \( \lambda \) in \( \Delta \) and \( \Lambda \) represent \( u \) as follows:\n
\[
u = \sum_{s \in \Gamma_p} a_s \omega_s \otimes X_{\lambda + s,}\n\]

where \( a_s (\alpha \in \Gamma_p) \) are nonzero complex numbers and \( \Gamma_p^- \) is a subset in \( \Delta_p^- \). Put \( \Gamma_p^- = \lambda + \Gamma_p^- \cap \Delta_p^- \). We define complex numbers \( N_{\alpha, \beta} \) for \( \alpha, \beta \in \Delta \) as follows: \( N_{\alpha, \beta} \) is the complex number such that \( [X_{\alpha}, X_{\beta}] = N_{\alpha, \beta} X_{\alpha + \beta} \) if \( \alpha + \beta \) is a root, and \( N_{\alpha, \beta} \) is zero if \( \alpha + \beta \) is not a root. Then it follows that

\[
\rho(u) = \sum_1 a_s N_{\lambda + s, \beta} (\omega_s \wedge \omega_\beta) \otimes X_{\lambda + s + \beta} \\
= \sum_2 a_s N_{\lambda + s, \beta} (\omega_s \wedge \omega_\beta) \otimes X_{\lambda + s + \beta} \\
+ \sum_3 (a_s N_{\lambda + s, \beta} - a_s' N_{\lambda + s, \beta}')(\omega_s \wedge \omega_\beta') \otimes X_{\lambda + s + \beta'}.
\]

Here \( \sum_1 \) means the summation for \( \alpha \in \Gamma_p^- \), \( \delta \in \Delta_p^- \) such that \( \lambda + \alpha + \delta \) is a root in \( \Delta \), and \( \sum_2 \) means the summation for \( \alpha \in \Gamma_p \), \( \delta \in \Delta_p^- \cap \Gamma_p^- \) such that \( \lambda + \alpha + \delta \) is a root, and \( \sum_3 \) means the summation for \( \alpha, \alpha' \in \Gamma_p^- \) such that \( \lambda + \alpha + \alpha' \) is a root and such that \( \alpha < \alpha' \) for the fixed total order \( \prec \) on \( \sqrt{-1} \mathbb{H} \). Noting that the weight vectors \( (\omega_s \wedge \omega_\beta) \otimes X_{\lambda + s + \beta} \) which appear in the summations \( \sum_2 \), \( \sum_3 \) are linearly independent, we have the following

**Proposition 2.1.** The vector \( \rho(u) \) vanishes if and only if the following conditions (1), (2) are satisfied:

1. \( \delta + \beta \) is not a root for any \( \delta \in \Delta_p^- \cap \Gamma_p^- \) and any \( \beta \in \Gamma_\tau^- \);
2. For distinct vectors \( \alpha, \alpha' \in \Gamma_p^- \) such that \( \lambda + \alpha + \alpha' \) is a root, it holds that

\[
a_\alpha N_{\alpha', \lambda + \alpha} = a_\alpha' N_{\alpha, \lambda + \alpha'}.
\]

By using this proposition we show some conditions for the nonvanishing of \( \rho(u) \).

**Lemma 2.2.** Assume that the weight \( \lambda \) is a root in \( \Delta \). Then \( \rho(u) \) does not vanish if it holds that \( -\Gamma_p^- \cap \Gamma_p^- = \emptyset \). Particularly if \( -\Gamma_p^- \cap \Gamma_p^- = \emptyset \), it does not vanish.

**Proof.** By the above condition there exists a vector \( \alpha_0 \) in \( \Gamma_p^- \) such that \( -\alpha_0 \in \Gamma_p^- \). In Proposition 2.1, (1) put \( \delta = -\alpha_0, \beta = \lambda + \alpha_0 \). Then \( \delta + \beta \) is equal to \( \lambda \), which is a root. Hence \( \rho(u) \) does not vanish. \( \square \)

**Lemma 2.3.** Assume that \( l(u) = 1 \) and put \( \Gamma_p^- = \{\alpha\} \) and \( \Gamma_\tau^- = \{\beta\} \). Then \( \rho(u) \) does not vanish if and only if there exists a vector \( \delta \) in \( \Delta_p^- \setminus \{\alpha\} \) such that \( \delta + \beta \) is a root.
Proof. In this case the condition (2) in Proposition 2.1 is always satisfied. Hence our claim is obvious. □

We now consider the following condition (*) on $\Gamma_f$. This consists of the conditions (*1), (*2):

(*1) For $\beta, \beta'$ in $\Gamma_f$, such that $\beta < \beta'$, there exists a positive root $\gamma$ in $\Delta^+_f$ such that $\beta + \gamma = \beta'$;

(*2) For any $\gamma$ in $\Delta^+_f$, there exists at most one root $\beta$ in $\Gamma_f$ such that $\beta + \gamma \in \Gamma_f$.

Lemma 2.4. Assume that $l(u) \geq 2$ and that $\Gamma_f$ satisfies the condition (*). Then $\rho(u)$ does not vanish if there exist two vectors $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 (\alpha_0 < \alpha_1)$ in $\Gamma_f$ such that $\alpha_0 + \beta_1 = \beta_0 + \alpha_1$ is a root in $\Delta$ and $\alpha_0 + \beta_0$ is not a root in $\Delta$, where $\alpha_i = \beta_i - \lambda$, $i=0,1$.

Proof. Represent $u$ as above, i.e., $u = \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_f} a_\alpha \omega_\alpha \otimes X_\alpha$, where $\beta = \lambda + \alpha$. By the condition (*1) take a positive root $\gamma$ in $\Delta^+_f$ such that $\beta_1 = \beta_0 + \gamma$. Then the condition (*2) implies that a vector $\beta$ in $\Gamma_f$ such that $\gamma + \beta \in \Gamma_f$ is only $\beta_0$.

Denote by $\varphi$ the representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ on the vector space $(\mathfrak{g}^*)^\otimes \mathfrak{g}^\vee$. Since $u$ is a maximal vector, it follows that

$$0 = \varphi(X_\gamma) \cdot u = - \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_f} a_\alpha N_{\gamma, \alpha - \gamma} \omega_\alpha \otimes X_\beta + \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_f} a_\alpha N_{\gamma, \beta} \omega_\alpha \otimes X_{\beta + \gamma}$$

$$= (a_{\alpha_1} N_{\gamma, \alpha_0} + a_{\alpha_0} N_{\gamma, \beta_0}) \omega_{\alpha_0} \otimes X_{\beta_1}$$

and so

$$a_{\alpha_1} N_{\gamma, \alpha_0} = a_{\alpha_0} N_{\gamma, \beta_0}. \quad (2.1)$$

We now show that $a_{\alpha_0} N_{\alpha_1, \beta_0} = a_{\alpha_1} N_{\alpha_0, \beta_0}$. If so, the vector $\rho(u)$ does not vanish by Proposition 2.1, (2). Because $\lambda + \alpha_0 + \alpha_1$ is equal to $\beta_0 + \alpha_1$, which is a root.

We first note that $N_{\alpha_1, \beta_0} = N_{\alpha_0 + \tau, \beta_0} [X_{\alpha_1}, X_{\beta_0}] = N_{\alpha_1, \beta_0} - X_{\alpha_1 + \beta_0}$, and $[X_{\alpha_0}, X_\gamma] = N_{\alpha_0, \gamma} X_{\alpha_1}$. Then, since $\alpha_0 + \beta_0$ is not a root, it follows that

$$N_{\alpha_1, \beta_0} X_{\alpha_1 + \beta_0} = (1/N_{\alpha_0, \gamma}) [X_{\alpha_0}, X_\gamma], X_{\beta_0}$$

$$= -(1/N_{\alpha_0, \gamma}) ([X_{\gamma}, X_{\beta_0}], X_{\alpha_0}) + ([X_{\beta_0}, X_{\alpha_0}], X_\gamma)$$

$$= -(1/N_{\alpha_0, \gamma}) N_{\gamma, \beta_0} N_{\beta_1, \alpha_0} X_{\beta_1 + \alpha_0}$$

and so $N_{\alpha_1, \beta_0} N_{\alpha_0, \gamma} = - N_{\gamma, \beta_0} N_{\beta_1, \alpha_0}$. This, together with (2.1), implies that $a_{\alpha_0} N_{\alpha_1, \beta_0} = - a_{\alpha_1} N_{\alpha_0, \beta_0}$. □

We now explain how to apply these lemmas for three cases.

Case (1): $l(u)=1$. In this case a maximal weight vector $u$ is represented
as follows: \( u = a \omega \otimes X_\beta \), where \( \alpha \) is the minus multiple of a dominant weight of the \( \mathfrak{g} \)-module \( \mathfrak{g}^\mathfrak{+} \) and \( \beta \) is a dominant weight of the \( \mathfrak{g} \)-module \( \mathfrak{g}^- \). Conversely a weight vector \( u \) constructed by such \( \alpha, \beta \) is maximal. The non-vanishing of \( \rho(u) \) is completely determined by Lemma 2.3.

**Case (2):** \( l(u) = 2 \). In this case a maximal weight vector \( u \) is represented as follows: \( u = a \omega \otimes X_\beta + b \omega' \otimes X_{\beta'} \). The maximal condition of \( u \) is described as follows: For \( \gamma \in \Delta_+^* \),

\[
0 = \varphi(X_\gamma) - u
\]

\[
= -a N_{\gamma - \gamma} \omega \otimes X_\beta + a N_{\gamma + \gamma} \omega \otimes X_{\beta + \gamma}
\]

\[
-b b N_{\gamma - \gamma} \omega' \otimes X_{\beta'} + b N_{\gamma + \gamma} \omega' \otimes X_{\beta' + \gamma}
\]

where terms which contain \( \omega_\delta, X_\delta \) are regarded as zero if \( \delta \) is not a root. Suppose that \( \alpha' > \alpha \) and put \( \mu = \alpha' - \alpha = \beta' - \beta > 0 \).

We first assume that \( \mu \) is not a root in \( \Delta \). In this case, vectors \( \omega \otimes X_\beta, \omega \otimes X_{\beta + \gamma}, \omega' \otimes X_{\beta'}, \omega' \otimes X_{\beta' + \gamma} \) are linearly independent if they appear. Hence the vectors \( \alpha - \gamma, \beta + \gamma, \alpha' - \gamma, \beta' + \gamma \) are not roots for \( \gamma \in \Delta_+^* \). This implies that \( \alpha, \alpha' \) are the minus multiple of dominant weights in \( \Delta_p^- \) and that \( \beta, \beta' \) are dominant weights in \( \Delta_p^- \). Conversely a weight vector \( u \) constructed by such \( \alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \) is maximal and \( \mu \) is not a root. Such a \( u \) is said to be decomposable.

We next assume that \( \mu \) is a root in \( \Delta \), and thus in \( \Delta_+^* \). By the same way as above, it follows that \( \alpha - \gamma, \beta + \gamma, \alpha' - \gamma, \beta' + \gamma \) are not roots for \( \gamma \in \Delta_+^* \) such that \( \gamma \neq \mu \). Set \( \gamma = \mu \). Then, by (2.2), it follows that

\[
0 = -a N_{\mu - \mu} \omega \otimes X_\beta + b N_{\mu, \mu} \omega \otimes X_{\beta + \mu}
\]

\[
+(a N_{\mu, \beta} - b N_{\mu, \mu}) \omega' \otimes X_{\beta'}
\]

where vectors \( \omega \otimes X_\beta, \omega \otimes X_{\beta + \mu}, \omega' \otimes X_{\beta' + \mu} \) are linearly independent if they appear. Hence the vectors \( \alpha - \mu, \beta + \mu \) are not roots and it holds that \( a N_{\mu, \beta} = b N_{\mu, \mu} \). These imply the following: \( \alpha \) is the minus multiple of a dominant weight in \( \Delta_p^- \); \( \beta' \) is a dominant weight in \( \Delta_t^- \); \( \alpha' - \gamma, \beta + \gamma \) are not weights for \( \gamma \in \Delta_+^* \). Then \( u \) is given in the following form:

\[
u = a (\omega \otimes X_\beta + (N_{\mu, \beta} / N_{\mu, \mu}) \omega' \otimes X_{\beta'})
\]

Conversely a weight vector \( u \) constructed by such \( (\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta'; \mu) \) is maximal. Such a \( u \) is said to be indecomposable.

We now consider the non-vanishing of \( \rho(u) \) for a maximal weight vector \( u \) with length 2. Our procedure is done as follows: Suppose that \( u \) is indecomposable. Then \( \Gamma_t \) satisfies the condition \((*)\). We find out all objects \( (\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta'; \mu) \) and then apply Lemma 2.2 or 2.4. Even there is a case that we can apply neither of these lemmas, using case by case arguments, we can
check that there is a maximal weight vector \( v \) in Case (1) such that \( \rho(v) \) is vanishing, or Proposition 2.1 (1) does not hold. Hence in the former case we can see that \( \rho \) is not injective, and in the latter case we can see that \( \rho(u) \) is non-vanishing. Suppose next that \( u \) is decomposable. We find out all objects \((\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta')\) and then apply Lemma 2.2. (In this case we can not apply Lemma 2.4 because of the condition (*).) Even if we can not apply Lemma 2.2, we can check the same facts as the indecomposable case. Hence our procedure is completed.

**Case (3):** \( l(u) \geq 3 \). It is not difficult to determine the weight spaces with \( \text{dim} \geq 3 \) explicitly by using case by case argument, and we can use the same arguments as in Case (2).

We last explain about the notion "family of PSLA's". Let \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) be a PSLA. From this PSLA we can construct the following new PSLA's: \((g, \sigma, \tau\sigma), (g, \tau, \sigma), (g, \tau, \tau\sigma), (g, \sigma\tau, \sigma), \) and \((g, \sigma\tau, \tau)\). The collection of these PSLA's is said to be a family. For PSLA's in the same family, the subalgebras \( \mathfrak{l}_+ \) coincide and the collections of subspaces \( \mathfrak{l}_-, \mathfrak{p}_+, \mathfrak{p}_- \) coincide except order.

Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family. By arguments in §1, if a PSLA in \( \mathcal{F} \) is of inner type, all PSLA's in \( \mathcal{F} \) are also of inner type. We then say that \( \mathcal{F} \) is of inner type. Otherwise, we say that \( \mathcal{F} \) is of outer type.

Two families \( \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \) are said to be equivalent to each other if there exist a PSLA in \( \mathcal{F} \) and a PSLA in \( \mathcal{F}' \) which are equivalent to each other. Then the PSLA's in \( \mathcal{F} \) equivalently correspond to the PSLA's in \( \mathcal{F}' \).

In the following sections we will first see the equivalence of families and the equivalence of PSLA's in each family, and next see the injectivity of \( \rho \) for each PSLA.

### 3. The PSLA's with Lie algebra \( g \) of type \( A_l \)

Let \( g \) be the Lie algebra of type \( A_l \), that is, the Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{su}(l+1) \) of skew hermitian matrices of degree \( l+1 \) with trace 0. Then the Dynkin diagram of the fundamental root system \( \Pi \) is given as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\circ & - & \circ & - & \cdots & - & \circ \\
\alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_l
\end{array}
\]

\(-\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_l\)

Put

\[
\theta_i = \exp(\sqrt{-1} \pi H_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq l.
\]
\[
\theta_{jk} = \exp(\sqrt{-1} \pi (H_j + H_k)), \quad 1 \leq j < k \leq l
\]

and let \( \mathcal{M}_{ij}, 1 \leq j < i \leq l \), and \( \mathcal{M}_{ij; k}, 1 \leq j < k \leq l \), be the families which contain the PSLA's \((g, \theta_i, \theta_j), (g, \theta_i, \theta_{jk})\), respectively.
Lemma 3.1. A PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) of inner type is equivalent to a PSLA which belongs to one of the families \(\mathcal{A}_{ij}\) or \(\mathcal{A}_{i;jk}\), by an inner automorphism of \(g\).

Proof. We may assume that \(\sigma=\theta_i\). Then \(t=c+\tau\). We divide into the following cases: (1) \(i=1\), (2) \(i=l\), and (3) \(1<i<l\).

Case (1): \(i=1\). The Dynkin diagram of \(\Pi_i\) is given as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha_2 \hspace{1cm} \alpha_3 \hspace{1cm} \alpha_l
\end{array}
\]

Hence we may assume that the restriction \(\tau\) of \(\tau\) is given in the following form:

\[\tau=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi K_j), \quad 2 \leq j \leq l.\]

Put \(K_j=a_i H_i+H_j\) for some \(a_i \in \mathbb{R}\). Since \(\langle K_j, \alpha_k \rangle=\delta_{jk}\) for \(2 \leq k \leq l\), it follows that \(K_j=a_i H_i+H_j\) and thus \(\tau=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi H_j)\). This implies that \(\tau=\tau_0=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi H_j)\) or \(\tau=\tau_0 \sigma\). Hence the PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) belongs to \(\mathcal{A}_{ij}\).

Case (2): \(i=l\). By the same way as Case (1), the PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) belongs to \(\mathcal{A}_{ij}\), where \(1 \leq j \leq l-1\).

Case (3): \(1<i<l\). The Dynkin diagram of \(\Pi_i\) is given as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha_1 \hspace{1cm} \alpha_2 \hspace{1cm} \alpha_{i-1} \hspace{1cm} \alpha_{i+1} \hspace{1cm} \alpha_l
\end{array}
\]

We may assume that the restriction \(\tau\) of \(\tau\) is one of the following cases (a), (b), (c).

(a) \(\bar{\tau}=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi K_j), 1 \leq j \leq i-1\): It follows that \(K_j=a_i H_i+H_j\) for some \(a_i \in \mathbb{R}\) and thus \(\tau=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi H_j)\). This implies that \(\tau=\tau_0=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi H_j)\) or \(\tau=\tau_0 \sigma\). Hence the PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) belongs to \(\mathcal{A}_{ij}\).

(b) \(\tau=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi K_j), i+1 \leq k \leq l\): By the same way of (a), the PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) belongs to \(\mathcal{A}_{ji}\).

(c) \(\tau=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi(K_j+K_k)), 1 \leq j < k \leq l\): It follows that \(K_j+K_k=a_i H_i+H_j+H_k\) and thus \(\tau=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi(H_j+H_k))\). This implies that \(\tau=\tau_0=\exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1}\pi(H_j+H_k))\) or \(\tau=\tau_0 \sigma\). Hence the PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\) belongs to \(\mathcal{A}_{i;jk}\).

If \(l=1\), there exists no PSLA of inner type. So we suppose that \(l \geq 2\). From the above proof, we can see that the subalgebra \(t_+\) for \(\mathcal{A}_{ij}\) has the 2-dimensional center and that the subalgebra \(t_+\) for \(\mathcal{A}_{i;jk}\) has the 3-dimensional center. Hence the families \(\mathcal{A}_{ij}\) are never equivalent to the families \(\mathcal{A}_{i;jk}\). We first see the equivalence among the families \(\mathcal{A}_{ij}\) and then the equivalence among the PSLA's which belong to each \(\mathcal{A}_{ij}\).

Let \(V\) be an \((l+1)\)-dimensional euclidean space which contains \(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{h}\) as a subspace, and \(\{e_1, \cdots, e_{l+1}\}\) an orthonormal basis which satisfies that \(\alpha_i=e_i-e_{i+1}\) for all \(i\). Then it holds that

\[H_i=e_i+\cdots+e_{i-1} - \frac{i}{l+1} \sum_{s=1}^{l+1} e_s\]
for all \( i \). Let \( W(\Delta) \) be the Weyl group of the root system \( \Delta \). Then \( W(\Delta) \)
equals the group of permutations of \( e_1, \ldots, e_{l+1} \) and each element in \( W(\Delta) \) induces an inner automorphism of \( g \). For an integer \( k \) such that \( 1 \leq k \leq l+1 \), let \( \omega^k_1 \) be the element in \( W(\Delta) \) defined by the permutation
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 2 & \cdots & k-1 & k & k+1 & \cdots & l+1 \\
k & k-1 & \cdots & 2 & 1 & k+1 & \cdots & l+1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
For integers \( j, k \) such that \( j, k \geq 1 \) and \( j+k \leq l+1 \), let \( \omega^{j+k}_1 \) be the element in \( W(\Delta) \) defined by the permutation
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & \cdots & j & j+1 & \cdots & j+k & j+k+1 & \cdots & l+1 \\
k+1 & \cdots & j+k & 1 & \cdots & k & j+k+1 & \cdots & l+1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
Then it follows that
\[
\begin{align*}
\omega^i_1(H_i) &= H_k - H_{k-i} \quad (1 \leq i < k), \\
\omega^i_1(H_i) &= H_i \quad (k \leq i \leq l+1),
\end{align*}
\]
where we regard \( H_{l+1} \) as 0, and it follows that
\[
\begin{align*}
\omega^{j+k}_1(H_j) &= H_{j+k} - H_k, \\
\omega^{j+k}_1(H_i) &= H_i \quad (j+k \leq i \leq l+1).
\end{align*}
\]
Let \( \varphi^i_j, \varphi^{j+k}_1 \) be inner automorphisms of \( g \) induced by \( \omega^i_1, \omega^{j+k}_1 \), respectively.

For a family \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) put \( i = j + k \) and \( l+1 = i + r \). Then \( j, k, r \geq 1 \) and the following holds.

**Proposition 3.2.** Two families \( \mathcal{A}_{ij}, \mathcal{A}_{ij'} \) are equivalent to each other if and only if the triples \((j, k, r), (j', k', r')\) coincide except order.

Proof. Consider the PSLA \((g, \theta_i, \theta_j)\) in \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) and the PSLA \((g, \theta_i', \theta_j')\) in \( \mathcal{A}_{ij'} \). Then it follows that \( \dim \mathfrak{f} = 2jk \), \( \dim \mathfrak{p}_+ = 2kr \), \( \dim \mathfrak{p}_- = 2jr \) and that \( \dim \mathfrak{q} = 2j'k', \dim \mathfrak{p}_+ = 2k'r' \), \( \dim \mathfrak{p}_- = 2j'r' \). (See (3.3) later.)

If \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) is equivalent to \( \mathcal{A}_{ij'}, \) triples \((jk, kr, rj)\) and \((j'k', k'r', r'j')\) coincide except order. This implies that triples \((j, k, r), (j', k', r')\) coincide except order.

To prove the converse we may prove the following equivalences:

1. \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \cong \mathcal{A}_{ik} \) and \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \cong \mathcal{A}_{jr+k, r} \)

where \( \mathcal{A}_{ij}, \mathcal{A}_{jr+k, r} \) have triples \((k, j, r), (r, k, j)\), respectively.

1. Consider the inner automorphism \( \varphi^{j+k}_1 \). Then it follows that \( \varphi^{j+k}_1 \theta_i = \theta_i \), \( \varphi^{j+k}_1 \theta_j = \theta_j \theta_k \varphi^{j+k}_1 \). This implies that \((g, \theta_i, \theta_j)\) is equivalent to \((g, \theta_i, \theta_j \theta_k)\) and thus \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) is equivalent to \( \mathcal{A}_{ik} \).

2. Consider the inner automorphism \( \varphi^{j+1}_0 \). Then it follows that \( \varphi^{j+1}_0 \theta_i = \theta_i \varphi^{j+1}_0, \varphi^{j+1}_0 \theta_j = \theta_{k+r} \varphi^{j+1}_0 \). This implies that \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) is equivalent to \( \mathcal{A}_{k+r, r} \). □
By virtue of this proposition we may consider only the families \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) with triple \((j, k, r)\) such that \( j \leq k \leq r \). Such a family is said to be a proper family of type AI and a family without the above condition is said to be simply a family of type AI.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) be a proper family of type AI with triple \((j, k, r)\) and set \((g, \sigma, \tau) = (g, \theta_i, \theta_j)\). Then the following hold:

1. If \( j < k < r \), all the PSLA's in \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) are non-equivalent to each other;
2. If \( j = k < r \), only the following equivalences hold:
   
   \[
   (3.1) \quad (g, \sigma, \tau) \cong (g, \sigma, \sigma \tau), \quad (g, \tau, \sigma) \cong (g, \sigma \tau, \tau);
   
   (3) If \( j < k = r \), only the following equivalences hold:
   
   \[
   (3.2) \quad (g, \sigma, \tau) \cong (g, \sigma \tau, \tau), \quad (g, \sigma, \tau) \cong (g, \sigma, \sigma) \cong (g, \tau, \sigma) \cong (g, \sigma \tau, \tau);
   
   (4) If \( j = k = r \), all the PSLA's in \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) are equivalent to each other.

Proof. (1) Since \( \dim f_1 < \dim p_- < \dim p_+ \), Our claim is obvious.

   (2) The equivalences (3.1) follow since \( \varphi_i^k \theta_i = \theta_i \varphi_i^k \) and \( \varphi_i^k \theta_j = \theta_j \theta_i \varphi_i^k \).

   (3) Consider the inner automorphism \((\varphi_i^k)^{-1} \varphi_i^k \) instead of \( \varphi_i^k \) in (2). Then our claim follows by the same way as (2).

   (4) The equivalences (3.1), (3.2) hold for \( k < r \) and \( j < k \), respectively. Hence our claim is obvious. \( \square \)

In the followings the equivalences (3.1) are said to be of first type and the equivalences (3.2) of second type.

We next see the equivalence among families \( \mathcal{A}_{i; jk} \) and then the equivalence among the PSLA's which belong to each \( \mathcal{A}_{i; jk} \). For \( \mathcal{A}_{i; jk} \) put \( j = a, i = j + b, k = i + c, l + 1 = k + d \). Then \( a, b, c, d \geq 1 \) and the following holds.

**Proposition 3.4.** Two families \( \mathcal{A}_{i; jk}, \mathcal{A}_{i'; j'k'} \) are equivalent to each other if and only if the quadruples \((a, b, c, d), (a', b', c', d')\) coincide except order.

Proof. Consider the PSLA's \((g, \theta_i, \theta_jk)\) and \((g, \theta_i', \theta_j'k')\). Then it follows that \( \dim f_1 = 2(ab + cd) \), \( \dim p_- = 2(bc + ad) \), \( \dim p_+ = 2(ac + bd) \) and that \( \dim f' = 2(a' b' + c' d') \), \( \dim p'_- = 2(b' c' + a' d') \), \( \dim p'_+ = 2(a' c' + b' d') \). (See (3.8) later.)

If \( \mathcal{A}_{i; jk}, \mathcal{A}_{i'; j'k'} \) are equivalent to each other, triples \((ab + cd, bc + ad, ac + bd)\) and \((a' b' + c' d', b' c' + a' d', a' c' + b' d')\) coincide except order. This implies that quadruples \((a, b, c, d), (a', b', c', d')\) coincide except order.
To prove the converse we may see the following equivalences:

1. $\mathcal{A}_i; jk \cong \mathcal{A}_i; kk$
2. $\mathcal{A}_i; jk \cong \mathcal{A}_{k-j}; k-i, k$
3. $\mathcal{A}_i; jk \cong \mathcal{A}_{d+c}; d, d+c+b$

where $\mathcal{A}_i; kk$, $\mathcal{A}_{k-j}; k-i, k$, $\mathcal{A}_{d+c}; d, d+c+b$ have the quadruples $(b, a, c, d)$, $(c, b, a, d)$, $(d, c, b, a)$, respectively.

(1) Consider the inner automorphism $\phi_l^b$. Then it gives the equivalence of $(g, \theta, \theta)$ onto $(g, \theta, \theta)$, $\theta$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_i; jk$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{A}_i; kk$.

(2) Consider the inner automorphism $\phi_l^b$. Then it gives the equivalence of $(g, \theta, \theta)$ onto $(g, \theta, \theta)$, $\theta$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_i; jk$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{A}_{k-j}; k-i, k$.

(3) In the same way as Proposition 3.2, (2), the equivalence (3) is obtained by the automorphism $\phi_l^{d+c+1}$. □

By virtue of this proposition we may consider only the families $\mathcal{A}_i; jk$ with quadruple $(a, b, c, d)$ such that $a\leq b\leq c\leq d$. Such a family is said to be a proper family of type $\mathcal{A}I$ and a family without the above condition is said to be simply a family of type $\mathcal{A}I$.

**Proposition 3.5.** Let $\mathcal{A}_i; jk$ be a proper family of type $\mathcal{A}I$ with quadruple $(a, b, c, d)$ and set $(g, \sigma, \tau) = (g, \theta, \theta)$. Then the following hold:

1. If $a < b < c < d$, all the PSLA's in $\mathcal{A}_i; jk$ are non-equivalent to each other;
2. If $a = b < c \leq d$ or $a \leq b < c = d$, only the equivalences of first type hold;
3. If $a < b = c < d$, only the equivalences of second type hold;
4. If $a = b = c < d$, $a < b = c = d$, or $a = b = c = d$, all the PSLA's in $\mathcal{A}_i; jk$ are equivalent to each other.

**Proof.**

1. It follows that $\dim \mathfrak{f} > \dim \mathfrak{p}_+ = \dim \mathfrak{p}_+$. Hence our claim is obvious.

2. Assume first that $a = b < c \leq d$ and consider the inner automorphism $\phi_l^{b}$. Then it follows that $\phi_l^{b} \theta = \theta$, $\phi_l^{b}$ and $\phi_l^{b} \theta = \theta$, $\theta$ and $\phi_l^{b} \theta = \theta$, $\theta$. Hence the equivalences of first type are obtained.

Assume next that $a \leq b < c = d$ and consider the inner automorphism $\phi = (\phi_l^{d+c})^{-1} \phi_l^{d+c} \phi_l^{d+c+1}$. The equivalences of first type are similarly obtained.

For both cases it holds that $\dim \mathfrak{f} > \dim \mathfrak{p}_+ = \dim \mathfrak{p}_+$. This shows the non-equivalences for other pairs in $\mathcal{A}_i; jk$.

3. Consider the inner automorphism $\phi = (\phi_l^{b})^{-1} \phi_l^{b} \phi_l^{b}$. Then it gives the equivalences of second type. The non-equivalences for other pairs in $\mathcal{A}_i; jk$ follow by the fact that $\dim \mathfrak{f} > \dim \mathfrak{p}_+ = \dim \mathfrak{p}_+$.

4. The equivalences of (2) hold for $b \leq c$ and those of (3) hold for $a \leq b = c \leq d$. Hence our claim is obvious. □

We now see the injectivity of the $\mathfrak{f}_+$-homomorphism $\rho$ associated with each PSLA.
Fix a positive integer \( r \) and denote by \( \mathbb{Z}' \) the set of ordered \( r \)-tuples of integers. Set

\[
R = R_1 = \{ \pm (0 \cdots 0 \ 1 \cdots 1 \ 0 \cdots 0) \in \mathbb{Z}'; \ a \geq 0, b \geq 0, c \geq 0 \},
\]
\[
R^2 = \{ (\frac{a}{b}); \alpha, \beta \in R \}.
\]

The set \( R \) is considered as follows: Represent the roots of type \( A_t \) by linear combinations of the fundamental root system and identify them with the \( l \)-tuples of coefficients. Suppose that \( r \leq l \). Then \( R \) (resp. \( R - \{(0 \cdots 0)\} \)) is the set of \( r \)-tuples of coefficients which are taken out from positions fixed consecutively, provided that \( r \neq l \) (resp. \( r = l \)). Moreover denote by \( R^2[(i)_i] \) (resp. \( R^2[(i)_{ij}] \)) the subset in \( R^2 \) of pairs \( (\alpha, \beta) \) such that the \( i \)-components of \( \alpha, \beta \) are \( a, b \) (resp. such that the \( i \)-components of \( \alpha, \beta \) are \( a, b \) and the \( j \)-components are \( c, d \), and for \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}' \) denote by \( R^2[\lambda] \) the subset in \( R^2[\lambda] \) of pairs \( (\alpha, \beta) \) satisfying that \( \lambda = -\alpha + \beta \). Then we can check the following lemma by a usual argument.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let \( \lambda \) be an \( r \)-tuples in \( \mathbb{Z}' \). Then the following hold:

1. The following each set has at most 2 elements: \( R^2[(i)_i], R^2[(\tau')], R^2[(\tau)_{ij}] \);
2. The set \( R^2[(i)_i] \) (resp. \( R^2[\lambda] \)) has at most 1 element if \( \lambda \neq (0 \cdots 0) \), and has just \( r \) elements with form

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{resp. } \begin{pmatrix}
1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix})
\]

if \( \lambda = (0 \cdots 0) \);

3. The set \( R^2[(\tau')], R_{ij} \) has at most 1 element if \( \lambda \neq (1 \cdots 1) \), and has just \( r - 1 \) elements with form

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 \\
1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

if \( \lambda = (1 \cdots 1) \).

In the following we represent a root of type \( A_t \) by a linear combination of the fundamental root system \( \Pi \) and identify it with an \( l \)-tuple of coefficients.

**Case AI:** The families \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \) with triple \((j, k, r)\)

Put \( \sigma = \theta_i \) and \( \tau = \theta_j \). Then, for each PSLA in \( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \), the corresponding symmetric space \( M \) and the totally geodesic \( C^V \)-submanifold \( N \) are given as follows: \( M \) is locally described.)

(a) \( C^V = (g, \sigma, \tau): M = SU(l+1)/S(U(j+k) \times U(r)). \)
In this case \( N = S SU(j+r) \)

(b) \( C^V = (g, \sigma, \sigma \tau): M = SU(l+1)/S(U(j+k) \times U(r)). \)
In this case $N = \mathfrak{su}(k+r)/\mathfrak{o}(u(k) \oplus u(r))$;
(c) $\mathcal{C}_V = (g, \tau, \sigma): M = SU(l+1)/SU(j) \times U(k+r)$.
In this case $N = \mathfrak{su}(j+r)/\mathfrak{o}(u(j) \oplus u(r))$;
(d) $\mathcal{C}_V = (g, \tau, \sigma): M = SU(l+1)/SU(j) \times U(k+r)$.
In this case $N = \mathfrak{su}(k+r)/\mathfrak{o}(u(k) \oplus u(r))$;
(e) $\mathcal{C}_V = (g, \sigma, \tau): M = SU(j+1)/SU(j) \times U(k+r)$.
In this case $N = \mathfrak{su}(k+r)/\mathfrak{o}(u(k) \oplus u(r))$;
(f) $\mathcal{C}_V = (g, \sigma, \tau): M = SU(j+1)/SU(j) \times U(k+r)$.
In this case $N = \mathfrak{su}(j+k)/\mathfrak{o}(u(j) \oplus u(k))$.

For the PSLA $(g, \sigma, \tau)$, the subsets $\Delta^+, \Delta^-, \Delta^+_p, \Delta^-_p$ of $\Delta^+$ are given as follows: (Here $\Delta^-_p = \Delta^- \cap \Delta^+$.)

(3.3) $\Delta^+ = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = \delta_j = 0 \}
\quad = \left\{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta = (0 \cdots 01 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0) \right\}$,
\quad $\Delta^- = \{ \delta \in \Delta^-; \delta_i = 0, \delta_j = 1 \}
\quad = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta = (0 \cdots 01 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0) \}$,
\quad $\Delta^+_p = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 1, \delta_j = 0 \}
\quad = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta = (0 \cdots 01 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0) \}$,
\quad $\Delta^-_p = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = \delta_j = 1 \}
\quad = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta = (0 \cdots 01 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0) \}$.

If $l \geq 3$, the dominant weights in $\Delta^+_{\tau}, \Delta^+_p, \Delta^-_p$ are given by (3.4), (3.5), (3.6), respectively:

(3.4) $\quad (1 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0), -(0 \cdots 01 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0)$.
(3.5) $\quad (0 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots \bar{i}), -(0 \cdots 0 1 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0)$.
(3.6) $\quad (1 \cdots \bar{i} 1 \cdots 1), -(0 \cdots 0 1 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0)$.

If $l = 2$, the subset $\Delta^+_{\tau}$ is empty and so the weights in $\Delta^+_{\tau}, \Delta^+_p, \Delta^-_p$ are all dominant.

We now see the injectivity of $\rho$ for Case (c): $\mathcal{C}_V = (g, \tau, \sigma)$. Note that in this case $\rho$ is a homomorphism of $(\mathfrak{p} \otimes \mathfrak{f})^* \otimes \mathfrak{f}$ to $\Lambda^2(\mathfrak{p} \otimes \mathfrak{f})^* \otimes \mathfrak{f}$.

We first suppose that $l \geq 3$. Then the minus multiple of dominant weights in $\Delta^-_p$ are given by $(\alpha_1), (\alpha_2)$ and the dominant weights in $\Delta^+_p$ are given by $(\beta_1), (\beta_2)$:

$(\alpha_1) - (1 \cdots \bar{i} 1 \cdots 1), \quad (\alpha_2) - (0 \cdots 0 1 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0)$.
$(\beta_1) - (0 \cdots 0 1 \cdots \bar{i} 1 \cdots 1), \quad (\beta_2) - (0 \cdots 0 1 \cdots \bar{i} 0 \cdots 0)$. 
Case (1): \( l(u) = 1 \). Represent \( u \) as follows: \( u = a \omega_0 \otimes X_\beta \). Then the pair \((\alpha, \beta)\) is one of pairs \(((\alpha s), (\beta t))\), where \( i, s = 1, 2 \). Applying Lemma 2.3 to each pair, we obtain that \( \rho(u) = 0 \) for pairs \(((\alpha 1), (\beta 1)) (j=1), ((\alpha 2), (\beta 2)) (j=1) \) and \( \rho(u) \neq 0 \) for the other pairs.

Case (2): \( l(u) = 2 \). Note that in this case there exists no decomposable maximal weight vector. Hence we suppose that \( u \) is indecomposable. As in §2 consider the object \((\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta'; \mu)\) associated with \( u \). Since this object is determined by \( \alpha, \beta', \mu \), we consider the triple \((\alpha, \beta'; \mu)\) instead of it. Consider the following elements in \( \Delta_+ \):

\[
(\mu 1) \ (0 \cdots 0 \cdots 0 \cdots 01), \quad (\mu 2) \ (0 \cdots 0 \cdots 010 \cdots 0).
\]

Then the triples \((\alpha, \beta'; \mu)\) are given in the following:

1. \(((\alpha 1), (\beta 1); (\mu 1)), i \neq l \);  
2. \(((\alpha 1), (\beta 2); (\mu 1)), i = l-1 \);  
3. \(((\alpha 2), (\beta 1); (\mu 2)), i = l-1 \);  
4. \(((\alpha 2), (\beta 2); (\mu 2)), i \neq l \).

Lemma 2.4 is available for cases (1), (4) and Lemma 2.2 is available for cases (2), (3). So it follows that \( \rho(u) \neq 0 \).

Case (3): \( l(u) \geq 3 \). We see the weight spaces with \( \dim \geq 3 \). Let \( \lambda \) be a weight in \( \Lambda \) and let \( \alpha, \beta \) be roots such that \( \lambda = -\alpha + \beta \), where \( \alpha \in \Delta_- \) and \( \beta \in \Delta_+ \). Denote by \( a_k, b_k, \lambda_k (1 \leq k \leq l) \) the \( k \)-th components of \( \alpha, \beta, \lambda \), respectively. Since \( a_j = \pm 1 \) and \( b_j = 0 \), it follows that \( \lambda_j = \mp 1 \). Suppose that \( \lambda_j = 1 \). (For the case that \( \lambda_j = -1 \) we can similarly do the argument mentioned below.) Then it follows by (3.3) that \( \lambda_i = 0, 2 \).

If \( \lambda_i = 0 \), the pair \((\alpha, \beta)\) has the form \( \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \). If the weight space for \( \lambda \) has the dimension more than 3, it follows by Lemma 3.6 that \( \lambda = (0 \cdots 01 \cdots 1 \cdots 10 \cdots 0) \), and the pair \((\alpha, \beta)\) has the form

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & -1 \\
0 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & -1 
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Hence for a maximal vector \( u \) in this weight space, it follows by Lemma 2.2 that \( \rho(u) \neq 0 \).

If \( \lambda_i = 2 \), the pair \((\alpha, \beta)\) has the form \( \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & -1 \end{pmatrix} \). By Lemma 3.6, the weight space for this \( \lambda \) has at most dimension 2.

We next suppose that \( l = 2 \). Then it holds that

\[
\Delta^+_\pm = \{ (10) \}, \quad \Delta^+_{\pm} = \{ (01) \}, \quad \Delta^+_{\pm} = \{ (11) \}.
\]

So a weight \( \lambda \) in \( \Lambda \) is one of \( \pm (10), \pm (12) \) and each weight space has dimension 1. Hence we may consider Case (1): \( l(u) = 1 \). By Lemma 2.3 it holds that
\( \rho(u) = 0 \) for \( \lambda = \pm (12) \) and \( \rho(u) \neq 0 \) for the other \( \lambda \).

Summing up the above arguments, we have the following result for the PSLA of Case (c); the homomorphism \( \rho \) is not injective if and only if \( j = 1 \). For the other cases we have similar results; \( \rho \) is not injective only for the following cases: Cases (a), (b), \( i = l \); Case (d), \( j = 1 \); Cases (e), (f), \( j = i - 1 \). These cases imply the cases of Example 2, (1) in §1.

**Theorem 3.7.** Let \( CV \) be the G-orbit which corresponds to a PSLA in a family of type AI. Then the \( CV \)-geometry admits non-totally geodesic \( CV \)-submanifolds if and only if it is one of the \( CV \)-geometries in Example 2, (1).

**Case AII:** The families \( \mathcal{A}_{i+j} \) with quadruple \((a, b, c, d)\)

Put \( \sigma = \theta_i \) and \( \tau = \theta_j \). Then, for each PSLA in \( \mathcal{A}_{i+j} \), the corresponding symmetric space \( M \) and the totally geodesic \( CV \)-submanifold \( N \) are given in the following: (\( N \) is locally described.)

(a) \( CV = (\sigma, \sigma, \tau): M = SU(l+1)/S(U(a+b) \times U(c+d)) \).
   In this case \( N = \mathfrak{su}(a+c)/\mathfrak{s}(u(a) \oplus u(c)) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(b+d)/\mathfrak{s}(u(b) \oplus u(d)) \);

(b) \( CV = (\sigma, \sigma, \sigma): M = SU(l+1)/S(U(a+b) \times U(c+d)) \).
   In this case \( N = \mathfrak{su}(b+c)/\mathfrak{s}(u(b) \oplus u(c)) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(a+d)/\mathfrak{s}(u(a) \oplus u(d)) \);

(c) \( CV = (\sigma, \tau, \sigma): M = SU(l+1)/S(U(b+c) \times U(a+d)) \).
   In this case \( N = \mathfrak{su}(a+b)/\mathfrak{s}(u(a) \oplus u(b)) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(c+d)/\mathfrak{s}(u(c) \oplus u(d)) \);

(d) \( CV = (\sigma, \tau, \sigma): M = SU(l+1)/S(U(b+c) \times U(a+d)) \).
   In this case \( N = \mathfrak{su}(b+c)/\mathfrak{s}(u(b) \oplus u(c)) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(a+d)/\mathfrak{s}(u(a) \oplus u(d)) \);

(e) \( CV = (\sigma, \sigma, \tau): M = SU(l+1)/S(U(a+c) \times U(b+d)) \).
   In this case \( N = \mathfrak{su}(a+b)/\mathfrak{s}(u(a) \oplus u(b)) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(c+d)/\mathfrak{s}(u(c) \oplus u(d)) \);

(f) \( CV = (\sigma, \sigma, \tau): M = SU(l+1)/S(U(a+c) \times U(b+d)) \).
   In this case \( N = \mathfrak{su}(a+b)/\mathfrak{s}(u(a) \oplus u(b)) \oplus \mathfrak{su}(c+d)/\mathfrak{s}(u(c) \oplus u(d)) \).

For the PSLA \((\sigma, \tau, \sigma)\), the subsets \( \Delta^+_{1x}, \delta_{p+} \) of \( \Delta^+ \) are given as follows:

\[
\Delta^+_{1x} = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 0, (\delta_j, \delta_k) = (0,0), (1,1) \}
\]

\[
= \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta = (0...01...0...0...0...0) \}
\]

\[
\Delta^+_{p+} = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 1, (\delta_j, \delta_k) = (0,0), (1,1) \}
\]
If \( l \geq 4 \), the dominant weights in \( \Delta_{t-}, \Delta_{p+}, \Delta_{p-} \) are given by (3.9), (3.10), (3.11), respectively:

(3.9) \[
\begin{align*}
(1 \ldots 1 \ldots 1 \ldots 1 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), & \quad -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 1), & \quad -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0).
\end{align*}
\]

(3.10) \[
\begin{align*}
(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 1 \ldots 1), & \quad -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(1 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), & \quad -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0).
\end{align*}
\]

(3.11) \[
\begin{align*}
(1 \ldots 1 \ldots 1 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), & \quad -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), & \quad -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0).
\end{align*}
\]

If \( l = 3 \), the subset \( \Delta_{t+} \) is empty and so the weights in \( \Delta_{t-}, \Delta_{p+}, \Delta_{p-} \) are all dominant.

We now see the injectivity of \( \rho \) for Case (a): \( \mathcal{V} = (g, \sigma, \tau) \). In this case \( \rho \) is a homomorphism of \( (\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{e})^* \) to \( \wedge^2(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{e})^* \).

We first suppose that \( l \geq 4 \). Then the minus multiple of dominant weights in \( \Delta_{p-} \) are given by \((\alpha 1) - (\alpha 4)\) and the dominant weights in \( \Delta_{t-} \) are given by \((\beta 1) - (\beta 4)\):

\[
\begin{align*}
(\alpha 1) & = -(1 \ldots 1 \ldots 1 \ldots 1 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\alpha 2) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\alpha 3) & = -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 1 \ldots 1 \ldots 1), \\
(\alpha 4) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\beta 1) & = (1 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\beta 2) & = -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\beta 3) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 1 \ldots 1), \\
(\beta 4) & = -(0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0).
\end{align*}
\]

**Case (1):** \( l(u) = 1 \). Represent \( u \) as follows: \( u = a \omega_\alpha \otimes X_\beta \). Then the pair \((\alpha, \beta)\) is one of pairs \( ((\alpha r), (\beta s)) \), where \( r, s = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). Applying Lemma 2.3 for each pair, we obtain that \( \rho(u) \neq 0 \) for all the pairs.

**Case (2):** \( l(u) = 2 \). We first suppose that \( u \) is indecomposable. Consider the following elements in \( \Delta_{t+} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
(\mu 1) & = (10 \ldots 0 \ldots 1 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\mu 2) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\mu 3) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\mu 4) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\mu 5) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\mu 6) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\mu 7) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0), \\
(\mu 8) & = (0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0).
\end{align*}
\]
Then such the triples \((\alpha, \beta'; \mu)\) as Case (2) of Case AI are given in the following:

1. \(((\alpha_1), (\beta_1); (\mu_1)), j \geq 2;\)
2. \(((\alpha_1), (\beta_2); (\mu_1)), j = 2;\)
3. \(((\alpha_1), (\beta_3); (\mu_2)), k_\text{-}i = 2;\)
4. \(((\alpha_1), (\beta_4); (\mu_2)), k_\text{-}i \geq 2;\)
5. \(((\alpha_2), (\beta_1); (\mu_3)), j = 2;\)
6. \(((\alpha_2), (\beta_2); (\mu_3)), j \geq 2;\)
7. \(((\alpha_2), (\beta_3); (\mu_4)), k_\text{-}i \geq 2;\)
8. \(((\alpha_2), (\beta_4); (\mu_4)), k_\text{-}i = 2;\)
9. \(((\alpha_3), (\beta_1); (\mu_5)), i_\text{-}j = 2;\)
10. \(((\alpha_3), (\beta_2); (\mu_5)), i_\text{-}j \geq 2;\)
11. \(((\alpha_3), (\beta_3); (\mu_6)), k \leq l_\text{-}1;\)
12. \(((\alpha_3), (\beta_4); (\mu_6)), k = l_\text{-}1;\)
13. \(((\alpha_4), (\beta_1); (\mu_7)), i_\text{-}j \geq 2;\)
14. \(((\alpha_4), (\beta_2); (\mu_7)), i_\text{-}j = 2;\)
15. \(((\alpha_4), (\beta_3); (\mu_8)), k = l_\text{-}1;\)
16. \(((\alpha_4), (\beta_4); (\mu_8)), k \leq l_\text{-}1.\)

Lemma 2.4 is available for cases (1), (4), (6), (7), (10), (11), (13), (16) and Lemma 2.2 is available for the other cases. So it follows that \(\rho(\omega) \neq \theta.\)

We next suppose that \(u\) is decomposable. Put \(u = a\omega_1 \otimes X_{\beta_1} + b\omega_2 \otimes X_{\beta_2}.\) Then the following two cases are considerable:

1. \(\lambda = (1 \cdots i \cdots k \cdots 1),\) where \(i = j + 1, k = i + 1\) and the pairs \((\alpha_i, \beta_i)\) are \(((\alpha_1), (\beta_3)), (\alpha_3), (\beta_1));\)
2. \(\lambda = (0 \cdots 0 \cdots 0 \cdots 0),\) where \(j = 1, k = l\) and the pairs \((\alpha_i, \beta_i)\) are \(((\alpha_2), (\beta_1)), ((\alpha_4), (\beta_3))\).

In these cases the weights \(\lambda\) are roots and Lemma 2.2 is available. So it follows that \(\rho(u) \neq 0.\)

**Case (3):** \(l(u) \geq 3.\) We see the weight spaces with \(\dim \geq 3.\) Let \(\lambda\) be a weight in \(\Lambda\) and let \(\alpha, \beta\) be weights such that \(\lambda = -\alpha + \beta,\) where \(\alpha \in \Delta_\text{p},\) and \(\beta \in \Delta_\text{r}.\) Denote by \(a_k, b_k, \lambda_k (1 \leq k \leq l)\) the \(k\)-th components of \(\alpha, \beta, \lambda,\) respectively. Since \(a_i = \pm 1\) and \(b_i = 0,\) it follows that \(\lambda_i = \mp 1.\) Suppose that \(\lambda_i = 1.\) (For the case that \(\lambda_i = -1\) we can similarly do the arguments mentioned below.) Then it follows by (3.8) that \(\lambda_j = 0, \pm 1, 2.\)

**Case (i):** \(\lambda_j = 0.\) Then it moreover follows by (3.8) that \(\lambda_k = 0, 2.\)

If \(\lambda_k = 0,\) the pair \(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}\) has either of the forms

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & \cdots & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
-1 & \cdots & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

If the weight space for \(\lambda\) has the dimension more than 3, it follows by Lemma 3.6 that \(\lambda = (0 \cdots 0 \cdots 01 \cdots 1 \cdots 10 \cdots 0 \cdots 0),\) and the pair \(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}\) has either of the forms

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(3.12)
Hence for a maximal vector \( u \) in this weight space, it follows by Lemma 2.2 that \( \rho(u) \neq 0 \).

If \( \lambda_k = 2 \), the pair \( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} \) has the form \( \begin{pmatrix} 0 \ldots 0 \\ 0 \ldots 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ j & \ldots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 1 & \ldots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \). By Lemma 3.6, the weight space with this \( \lambda \) has at most dimension 2.

Case (ii): \( \lambda_j = 1 \). Then it moreover follows by (3.8) that \( \lambda_k = \pm 1 \).

If \( \lambda_k = 1 \), the pair \( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} \) has either of the forms

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  -1 & \ldots & -1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
  0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
  0 & \ldots & j & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 \\
  0 & \ldots & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

If the weight space for \( \lambda \) has the dimension more than 3, it follows by Lemma 3.6 that \( \lambda = (0 \ldots 01 \ldots 1 \ldots 1 \ldots 10 \ldots 0) \), and the pair \( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} \) has either of the forms

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  0 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
  0 & \ldots & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(3.13)

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  0 & \ldots & 0 & -1 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & 0 \\
  0 & \ldots & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Hence for a maximal vector \( u \) in this weight space, it follows by Lemma 2.2 that \( \rho(u) \neq 0 \).

If \( \lambda_k = -1 \), the pair \( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} \) has the form \( \begin{pmatrix} 0 \ldots 0 \\ 0 \ldots 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ -1 & \ldots & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 1 & \ldots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \). By Lemma 3.6 the weight space for this \( \lambda \) has at most dimension 2.

Case (iii): \( \lambda_j = -1 \) (resp. \( \lambda_j = 2 \)). The pair \( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} \) has the form

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  0 & \ldots & j & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & -1 \\
  -1 & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & 0
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{(resp.)} \quad \begin{pmatrix}
  -1 & \ldots & -1 & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
  1 & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

By Lemma 3.6, the weight spaces with these \( \lambda \) have at most dimension 2.

We next suppose that \( l = 3 \). It holds that

\[
\Delta^+_t = \{(100), (001)\}, \quad \Delta^+_y = \{(010), (111)\},
\]

\[
\Delta^+_y = \{(110), (011)\}.
\]

So a weight \( \lambda \) in \( \Lambda \) is one of \( \pm (010), \pm (11-1), \pm (-111), \pm (210), \pm (111), \pm (012) \), and the weight spaces for \( \lambda = \pm (010), \pm (111) \) have dimension 2 and the weight spaces for the other \( \lambda \) have dimension 1. Lemma 2.3 is available for the cases with dimension 1 and Lemma 2.2 is available for the cases with dimension 2. Hence it follows that \( \rho(u) \neq 0 \) for all maximal weight vectors \( u \).
Summing up the above arguments, we have the following result for the PSLA of Case (a); the homomorphism $\rho$ is always injective. Similarly for the other cases $\rho$ is injective.

**Theorem 3.8.** Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the $G$-orbit which corresponds to a PSLA in a family of type $\text{AII}$. Then the $\mathcal{V}$-geometry does not admit a non-totally geodesic $\mathcal{V}$-submanifold.

4. The PSLA's with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of type $B_l$

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of type $B_l$, $l \geq 2$, that is, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(2l+1)$ of real skew symmetric matrices of degree $2l+1$. Then the Dynkin diagram of the fundamental root system $\Pi$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\circ & - & - & - & - & - & - & \circ \\
\alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \cdots & \alpha_l & \cdots & \cdots & \alpha_l & \circ \\
\end{array}$$

$-\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + \cdots + 2\alpha_l$

Put $\theta, \theta_j$ as in §3 and let $\mathcal{B}_j$, $1 \leq j < i \leq l$, and $\mathcal{B}_{i,j}$, $1 \leq j < i < k \leq l$, be the families which contain the PSLA's $(\mathfrak{g}, \theta, \theta_j, \sigma_j)$, $(\mathfrak{g}, \theta_j, \theta_{j+k})$, respectively.

**Lemma 4.1.** A PSLA $(\mathfrak{g}, \sigma, \tau)$ of inner type is equivalent to a PSLA which belongs to one of the families $\mathcal{B}_i$, or $\mathcal{B}_{i,j}$, by an inner automorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Proof. We may assume that $\sigma = \theta_i$. We divide into the following cases: (1) $i = 1$, (2) $i = 2$, and (3) $2 < i \leq l$.

Case (1): $i = 1$. In this case $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{c} + \mathfrak{t}$, and the Dynkin diagram of $\Pi_i$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\circ & - & - & - & - & - & - & \circ \\
\alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \cdots & \alpha_l & \cdots & \cdots & \alpha_l & \circ \\
\end{array}$$

Hence we may assume that the restriction $\tau$ of $\tau$ is given as follows: $\tau = \exp \text{ad} (\sqrt{-1} \pi K_j)$, where $2 \leq j \leq l$. Put $K_j = a_i H_1 + \cdots + a_i H_l$. Since $\langle K_j, \alpha_i \rangle = \delta_{jk}$ for $2 \leq k \leq l$, it follows that $K_j = a_i H_1 + H_j$, and thus $\tau = \exp \text{ad} (\sqrt{-1} \pi H_j)$. This implies that $\tau = \tau_0 = \exp \text{ad} (\sqrt{-1} \pi H_i)$ or $\tau = \tau_0 \sigma$. So the PSLA $(\mathfrak{g}, \sigma, \tau)$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}_j$.

Case (2): $i = 2$. In this case $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{t}$, and the Dynkin diagram of $\Pi_i$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\circ & \circ & - & - & - & - & - & \circ \\
\alpha_0 & \alpha_1 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \alpha_l & \circ \\
\end{array}$$

If we put $\tau = \exp \text{ad} (\sqrt{-1} \pi K)$, the following cases are considerable: (i) $K = K_0$; (ii) $K = K_1$; (iii) $K = K_j$, $3 \leq j \leq l$; (iv) $K = K_0 + K_1$; (v) $K = K_0 + K_j$, $3 \leq j \leq l$; (vi) $K = K_1 + K_j$, $3 \leq j \leq l$; (vii) $K = K_0 + K_1 + K_j$, $3 \leq j \leq l$. By Lemma 1.2 (1), only
the cases (iii), (iv), (vii) have involutive extensions of \( \tau \). Using the fact that \( \langle K_r, \alpha_s \rangle = \delta_{rs} \) for \( r, s = 0, 1, 3, \ldots, l \), we represent the vectors \( K_r \) by the vectors \( H_1, \ldots, H_l \).

For Case (iii) it follows that \( K_j = -H_2 + H_j \) and thus \( \tau = \exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1} \pi H_j) \). This implies that \( \tau = \tau_0 = \exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1} \pi H_j) \), or \( \tau = \tau_0 \sigma \). So the PSLA \( (g, \sigma, \tau) \) belongs to \( \mathcal{B}_j \).

For Case (iv) it follows that \( K_0 + K_1 = H_1 - H_2 \) and thus \( \tau = \exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1} \pi H_1) \). This implies that \( \tau = \tau_0 = \exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1} \pi H_1) \), or \( \tau = \tau_0 \sigma \). So the PSLA \( (g, \sigma, \tau) \) belongs to \( \mathcal{B}_1 \).

For Case (vii) it follows that \( K_0 + K_1 + K_j = H_1 - 2H_2 + H_j \) and thus \( \tau = \exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1} \pi (H_1 + H_j)) \). This implies that \( \tau = \tau_0 = \exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1} \pi (H_1 + H_j)) \), or \( \tau = \tau_0 \sigma \). So the PSLA \( (g, \sigma, \tau) \) belongs to \( \mathcal{B}_1 \).

Case (3): \( 2 < i \leq l \). In this case \( \mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{t}_i \) and the Dynkin diagram of \( \Pi_\alpha \) is given as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\circ & - & \cdots & - & \circ & \circ \\
\alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_{i-1} & \alpha_{i+1} & \alpha_{i+2} & \alpha_{i-1} & \alpha_i \\
\end{array}
\]

If we put \( \tau = \exp \text{ad}(\sqrt{-1} \pi K) \), the following cases are considerable: (i) \( K = K_j \), \( 0 \leq j \leq i-1 \); (ii) \( K = K_k \), \( i \leq k \leq l \); (iii) \( K = K_j + K_k \), \( 0 \leq j \leq i-1, i \leq k \leq l \).

Here the cases that \( j = 0, 1 \) don’t occur by Lemma 1.2 (1). Similarly to Case (2), the PSLA \( (g, \sigma, \tau) \) belongs to \( \mathcal{B}_{ij} \), \( \mathcal{B}_{ki}, \mathcal{B}_{i: k} \) according to Cases (i), (ii), (iii).

From the above proof, we can see that the subalgebras \( \mathfrak{t}_\alpha \) for \( \mathcal{B}_{ij} \) are different from those for \( \mathcal{B}_{ij} \). Hence the families \( \mathcal{B}_{ij} \) are never equivalent to the families \( \mathcal{B}_{i: k} \).

We first see the equivalences among the families \( \mathcal{B}_{ij} \) and the equivalences among the PSLA’s which belong to each \( \mathcal{B}_{ij} \).

Put \( V = \sqrt{-1} H \) and take an orthonormal basis \( \{e_1, \ldots, e_l\} \) such that \( \alpha_i = e_i - e_{i+1} \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq l-1 \), and \( \alpha_1 = e_1 \). Then it holds that \( H_i = e_i + \cdots + e_i \) for all \( i \), and the Weyl group \( W(\Delta) \) is generated by the permutations of \( e_i, \ldots, e_l \) and the mappings \( w_i, 1 \leq i \leq l: w_i(e_i) = -e_i \) and \( w_j(e_j) = e_j \) for \( j \neq i \). Define elements \( w^k_i(1 \leq k \leq l) \) and \( w^k_i(j, k \geq 1, j + k \leq l) \) in \( W(\Delta) \) in the same way as in §3. Then it follows that

\[
\begin{align*}
w^k_i(H_i) &= H_k - H_{k-i} \quad (1 \leq i < k), \\
w^k_i(H_i) &= H_i \quad (k \leq i \leq l), \\
w^k_i(H_j) &= H_{j+k} - H_k, \\
w^k_i(H_i) &= H_i \quad (j + k \leq i \leq l).
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( \varphi^k_i, \varphi^k_i \) be inner automorphisms of \( g \) induced by \( w^k_i, w^k_i \), respectively.
For a family \( D_{ij} \) put \( i=j+k \) and \( l+1=i+r \). Then \( j, k, r \geq 1 \) and the following holds.

**Proposition 4.2.** Two families \( D_{ij}, D_{i'j'} \) are equivalent to each other if and only if \( r=r' \) and the pairs \( (j, k), (j', k') \) coincide except order.

**Proof.** Consider the PSLA \( (g, \theta_i, \theta_j) \) in \( D_{ij} \) and the PSLA \( (g, \theta_{i'}, \theta_{j'}) \) in \( D_{i'j'} \). Then it follows that \( \mathfrak{f}_+ = \mathfrak{so}(2j) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2k) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(2r-1) \) and \( \mathfrak{f}_+ = \mathfrak{so}(2j') \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2k') \otimes \mathfrak{so}(2r'-1) \).

Suppose that \( D_{ij} \) is equivalent to \( D_{i'j'} \). Since \( \mathfrak{f}_+ \) is isomorphic to \( \mathfrak{f}_+ \), it follows that \( r=r' \) and pairs \( (j, k), (j', k') \) coincide except order.

To prove the converse we may prove the following equivalence: \( D_{ij} \cong D_{i,k} \) where \( D_{i,k} \) has the triple \( (k, j, r) \). This is similarly given by \( \varphi_i^k \) as Proposition 3.2.

By virtue of this proposition we may consider only the families \( D_{ij} \) with triple \( (j, k, r) \) such that \( j \leq k \). Such a family is said to be a **proper family of type BI** and a family without the above condition is said to be simply a family of type BI.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let \( D_{ij} \) be a proper family of type BI with triple \( (j, k, r) \) and set \( (g, \sigma, \tau) = (g, \theta_i, \theta_j) \). Then the following hold:

1. \( j<k \), all the PSLA's in \( D_{ij} \) are non-equivalent to each other;
2. \( j=k \), only the equivalences of first type hold.

**Proof.** We note that \( \dim \mathfrak{f}_- = 4jk \), \( \dim \mathfrak{p}_+ = 2k(2r-1) \), \( \dim \mathfrak{p}_- = 2j(2r-1) \). (See (4.1) later.) Thus \( \mathfrak{p}_- \) are not isomorphic to \( \mathfrak{f}_- \).

1. In this case it moreover follows that \( \dim \mathfrak{p}_- < \dim \mathfrak{f}_+ \). Hence our claim is obvious.

2. Consider the inner automorphism \( \varphi_i^k \). By the same way as Proposition 3.3 (2), the equivalences of first type are obtained. The non-equivalences for the other pairs are obtained by the above note.

We next see the equivalences among families \( D_{i; j,k} \) and the equivalences among the PSLA's which belong to each \( D_{i; j,k} \).

For a family \( D_{i; j,k} \) put \( j=a, i=j+b, k=i+c, l+1=k+d \). Then \( a, b, c, d \geq 1 \) and the following holds.

**Proposition 4.4.** Two families \( D_{i; j,k}, D_{i'; j',k'} \) are equivalent to each other if and only if \( d=d' \) and the triples \( (a, b, c), (a', b', c') \) coincide except order.

**Proof.** Consider the PSLA's \( (g, \theta_i, \theta_{j,k}), (g, \theta_{i'}, \theta_{j',k'}) \). Then it follows that \( \mathfrak{f}_+ = \mathfrak{so}(2a) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2b) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2c) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2d-1) \) and \( \mathfrak{f}_+ = \mathfrak{so}(2a') \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2b') \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2c') \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2d'-1) \).
Suppose that $B_i:jk$ are equivalent to $B_{i'}:j'k'$. Since $l_+$ is isomorphic to $l'_+$, it follows that $d=d'$ and triples $(a, b, c), (a', b', c')$ coincide except order.

To prove the converse we may show the following equivalences:

\[(1) \; B_i:jk \cong B_i:jh \quad \text{and} \quad (2) \; B_i:jk \cong B_{k-j}:k-i,j.\]

Similarly to Proposition 3.4, these equivalences are obtained by the inner automorphisms $\varphi_i^a, \varphi_i^b, \varphi_i^c$, respectively. □

By virtue of this proposition we may consider only the families $B_i:jk$ with quadruple $(a, b, c, d)$ such that $a \leq b \leq c$. Such a family is said to be a proper family of type $BII$ and a family without the above condition is said to be simply a family of type $BII$.

**Proposition 4.5.** Let $B_i:jk$ be a proper family of type $BII$ with quadruple $(a, b, c, d)$ and set $(g, \sigma, \tau)=(g, \theta_i, \theta_{jk})$. Then the following hold:

1. If $a<b<c$, all the PSLA's in $B_i:jk$ are non-equivalent to each other;
2. If $a=b<c$, only the equivalences of first type hold;
3. If $a=b=c$, only the equivalences of second type hold;
4. If $a=b=c=d$, all the PSLA's in $B_i:jk$ are equivalent to each other.

Proof. We note that

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathfrak{f}_- &= (\Delta(2a+2b)/\Delta(2a) \oplus \Delta(2b))/\Delta(2a+2d-1)/\Delta(2c) \oplus \Delta(2d-1)), \\
\mathfrak{p}_+ &= (\Delta(2b+2c)/\Delta(2b) \oplus \Delta(2c))/\Delta(2a+2d-1)/\Delta(2a) \oplus \Delta(2d-1)), \\
\mathfrak{p}_- &= (\Delta(2a+2c)/\Delta(2a) \oplus \Delta(2c))/\Delta(2b+2d-1)/\Delta(2b) \oplus \Delta(2d-1)).
\end{align*}
\]

(1) In this case $\mathfrak{f}_-, \mathfrak{p}_+, \mathfrak{p}_-$ are not isomorphic to each other. Hence our claim is obvious.

(2) Similarly to Proposition 3.5 (2), the equivalences of first type are obtained by the inner automorphism $\varphi_i^b$. Also by the above note, $\mathfrak{p}_\pm$ are not isomorphic to $\mathfrak{f}_-$. This implies the non-equivalences of the other pairs.

(3) Similarly to Proposition 3.5 (3), the equivalences of second type are obtained by the inner automorphism $(\varphi_i^b)^{-1} \varphi_i^b \varphi_i^b$. Also by the above note, $\mathfrak{f}_-, \mathfrak{p}_-$ are not isomorphic to $\mathfrak{p}_+$. This implies the non-equivalences of the other pairs.

(4) Similarly to Proposition 3.4 (4), the equivalences of first and second types hold. Hence our claim is obvious. □

We now see the injectivity of the $l_+$-homomorphism $\rho$ for each PSLA.

Similarly to §3, fix a positive integer $r$ and set

\[
R_1 = \{\pm(0\cdots01\cdots10\cdots0) \in \mathbb{Z}^r; \; a \geq 0, \; b \geq 0, \; c \geq 0\},
\]

\[
R_2 = \{\pm(0\cdots01\cdots12\cdots2) \in \mathbb{Z}^r; \; a \geq 0, \; b \geq 0, \; c > 0\}.
\]
Moreover let $R^2[([i])_1], R^2[([i])_0], R^2[([i])_0]$ be subsets of $R^2$ defined as in §3. Then we can check the following lemma by a usual argument.

**Lemma 4.6.** Let $\lambda$ be an $r$-tuples in $Z'$. Then the following hold:

1. The following each set has at most 2 elements:
   
   
   \[ R^2[([i])_1], R^2[([i])_0], R^2[([i])_0], R^2[([i])_0], R^2[([i])_0], R^2[([i])_0], R^2[([i])_0], R^2[([i])_0] \]

2. For the sets $R^2[([i])_1]$ and $R^2[([i])_0]$ Lemma 3.6 (2) and (3) hold respectively;

3. The set $R^2[([i])_0]$ has at most 1 element if $\lambda=(0 \cdots 0)$, and has just $r-1$ elements with form

   \[
   \begin{pmatrix}
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
   \end{pmatrix},
   \quad \text{(resp.} \begin{pmatrix}
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 2 \\
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 2
   \end{pmatrix})
   \]

   if $\lambda=(0 \cdots 0)$;

4. The set $R^2[([i])_0]$ has at most 1 element if $\lambda=(2 \cdots 2)$, and has just $r-1$ elements with form

   \[
   \begin{pmatrix}
   -1 & \cdots & -1 & -2 & \cdots & -2 \\
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
   \end{pmatrix}
   \]

   if $\lambda=(2 \cdots 2)$;

5. The set $R^2[([i])_0]$ has at most 1 element if $\lambda=(0 \cdots 0)$, and has just $r$ elements with forms

   \[
   \begin{pmatrix}
   0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & a \\
   0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & b
   \end{pmatrix},
   \begin{pmatrix}
   0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & a \\
   0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & b
   \end{pmatrix}
   \]

   if $\lambda=(0 \cdots 0)$;

6. The set $R^2[([i])_0]$ has at most 2 elements if $\lambda=(0 \cdots 0)$, and has just $2r-1$ elements with forms

   \[
   \begin{pmatrix}
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
   \end{pmatrix},
   \begin{pmatrix}
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 2 \\
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 2
   \end{pmatrix}
   \]

   if $\lambda=(0 \cdots 0)$;

7. The set $R^2[([i])_0]$ has at most 2 elements if $\lambda=(2 \cdots 2)$, and has just $2r-1$ elements with forms

   \[
   \begin{pmatrix}
   -1 & \cdots & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 2
   \end{pmatrix},
   \begin{pmatrix}
   -1 & \cdots & -1 & -2 & \cdots & -2 \\
   1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
   \end{pmatrix}
   \]
if \( \lambda = (2 \ldots 2) \).

In the following we represent a root of type \( B_i \) by a linear combination of the fundamental root system \( \Pi \) and identify it with an \( l \)-tuple of coefficients.

**Case BI:** The families \( \mathcal{B}_{ij} \) with triple \((j, k, r)\)

Put \( \sigma = \theta_j \) and \( \tau = \theta_j \). Then, for each PSLA in \( \mathcal{B}_{ij} \), the corresponding symmetric space \( M \) and the totally geodesic \( \mathcal{U} \)-submanifold \( N \) are given as follows: (\( N \) is locally described.)

(a) \( \mathcal{U} = (g, \sigma, \tau) : M = \text{SO}(2l+1)/\text{S}(O(2j+2k) \times O(2r-1)). \)

(b) \( \mathcal{U} = (g, \sigma, \sigma \tau) : M = \text{SU}(2l+1)/\text{S}(O(2j+2k) \times O(2r-1)). \)

(c) \( \mathcal{U} = (g, \tau, \sigma) : M = \text{SO}(2l+1)/\text{S}(O(2j) \times O(2k+2r-1)). \)

(d) \( \mathcal{U} = (g, \tau, \sigma \tau) : M = \text{SO}(2l+1)/\text{S}(O(2j+2k) \times O(2r-1)). \)

(e) \( \mathcal{U} = (g, \sigma \tau, \sigma) : M = \text{SO}(2l+1)/\text{S}(O(2k+2r-1)). \)

(f) \( \mathcal{U} = (g, \sigma \tau, \tau) : M = \text{SO}(2l+1)/\text{S}(O(2j+2k) \times O(2r-1)). \)

For the PSLA \((g, \sigma, \tau)\), the subsets \( \Delta^+_i, \Delta^-_i, \Delta^+_p, \Delta^-_p \) of \( \Delta^+ \) are given as follows:

\[
\Delta^+_i = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 0, 2 \}
\]

\[
= \left\{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta = \begin{pmatrix}
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
\end{pmatrix}
\right\}
\]

\[
\Delta^-_i = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 0, 2, \delta_j = 1 \}
\]

\[
= \left\{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta = \begin{pmatrix}
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
\end{pmatrix}
\right\}
\]

\[
\Delta^+_p = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 1, \delta_j = 0, 2 \}
\]

\[
= \left\{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta = \begin{pmatrix}
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 10 \ldots 0 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
(0 \ldots 01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2 & \ldots & i \\
\end{pmatrix}
\right\}
\]

\[
\Delta^-_p = \{ \delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = \delta_j = 1 \}
\]
If \( l \geq 3 \), the dominant weights in \( \Delta_{t^-}, \Delta_{p^+}, \Delta_{p^-} \) are given by (4.2), (4.3), (4.4), respectively:

\[
(4.2) \begin{cases} 
(1 \cdots 1 2 \cdots 2), & (1 \cdots 1 0 \cdots 0) \quad (i = j + 1), \\
-(1 0 \cdots 1 2 \cdots 2) \quad (j = 1), & -(1 2 \cdots 2) \quad (j = 1, i = 2).
\end{cases}
\]

\[
(4.3) \begin{cases} 
(0 \cdots 1 2 \cdots 2), & -(0 \cdots 1 0 \cdots 0) \quad (i = j + 1), \\
(1 \cdots 1 2 \cdots 2), & -(1 \cdots 1 0 \cdots 0) \quad (j = 1).
\end{cases}
\]

If \( l = 2 \), the subset \( \Delta_{t^+} \) is empty and so the weights in \( \Delta_{t^-}, \Delta_{p^+}, \Delta_{p^-} \) are all dominant.

We now see the injectivity of \( \rho \) for Case (a): \( C \mathcal{V} = (g, \sigma, \tau) \). In this case \( \rho \) is a homomorphism of \( (p^c)^* \otimes \mathfrak{c}^c \) to \( \wedge^2 (p^c)^* \otimes p^c \).

We first suppose that \( l \geq 3 \). Then the minus multiple of dominant weights in \( \Delta_{p^-} \) are given by \( (\alpha_1), (\alpha_2) \) and the dominant weights in \( \Delta_{t^-} \) are given by

\[
(\alpha_1) - (1 \cdots 1 2 \cdots 2), \quad (\alpha_2) (1 \cdots 1 0 \cdots 0) \quad (i = j + 1), \\
(\beta_1) (1 \cdots 1 2 \cdots 2), \quad (\beta_2) (1 \cdots 1 0 \cdots 0) \quad (i = j + 1), \\
(\beta_3) (1 \cdots 1 2 \cdots 2), \quad (\beta_4) (1 \cdots 1 0 \cdots 0) \quad (j = 1, i = 2).
\]

**Case (1):** \( l(u) = 1 \). Represent \( u \) as follows: \( u = a \omega_\alpha \otimes X_\beta \). Then the pair \( (\alpha, \beta) \) is one of the pairs \( ((\alpha s), (\beta t)) \), where \( s = 1, 2 \) and \( r = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). Applying Lemma 2.3 for each pair, we obtain that \( \rho(u) = 0 \) for pairs \( ((\alpha 1), (\beta 1)) (i = l), ((\alpha 1), (\beta 2)) (i = l, i = j + 1), ((\alpha 2), (\beta 3)) (i = l, j = 1) \) and \( \rho(u) = 0 \) for the other cases.

**Case (2):** \( l(u) = 2 \). We first suppose that \( u \) is indecomposable. Consider the following elements in \( \Delta_{t^-} \):

\[
(\mu_1) (10 \cdots 1 0 \cdots 0) \quad (j \geq 2), \quad (\mu_2) (1 \cdots 1 2 \cdots 2) \quad (j = 2).
\]

Then such the triples \( (\alpha, \beta', \mu) \) as in §3 (Case (2) of type AI) are given in the following:

(1) \( ((\alpha 1), (\beta 1); (\mu 1)), j \geq 2 \),
(2) \( ((\alpha 1), (\beta 1); (\mu 2)), j = 2 \),
(3) \( ((\alpha 1), (\beta 2); (\mu 1)), i = j + 1, j \geq 2 \),
(4) \( ((\alpha 1), (\beta 2); (\mu 2)), i = j + 1, j = 2 \).

Lemma 2.4 is available for all cases and so it follows that \( \rho(u) = 0 \).

We next suppose that \( u \) is decomposable. Put \( u = a \omega_\alpha \otimes X_{\beta_1} + b \omega_\beta \otimes X_{\beta_2} \).
Then the following two cases are considerable:

(1) $\lambda = (01 \ldots 12 \ldots 2)$, where $j=1$ and the pairs $(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ are $((\alpha_1), (\beta_3)), ((\alpha_2), (\beta_1))$;

(2) $\lambda = -(0^i0 \ldots 0)$, where $j=1, i=2$ and the pairs $(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ are $((\alpha_1), (\beta_4)), ((\alpha_2), (\beta_2))$.

In these cases the weights $\lambda$ are roots and Lemma 2.2 is available except the above case (1) ($i=1$). So it follows that $\rho(u) \neq 0$ except the exceptional case. By virtue of Case (1) we do not need to consider the exceptional case.

Case (3): $l(u) \geq 3$. We see the weight spaces with $\dim \geq 3$. Let $\lambda$ be a weight in $\Lambda$ and let $\alpha, \beta$ be weights such that $\lambda = \alpha + \beta$, where $\alpha \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\beta \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{r}}$. Denote by $a_k, b_k, \lambda_k (1 \leq k \leq l)$ the $k$-th components of $\alpha, \beta, \lambda$, respectively. Since $a_j = \pm 1$ and $b_j = \pm 1$, it follows that $\lambda_j = 0, \pm 2$.

If $\lambda_j = 0$, it moreover follows by (4.1) that $\lambda_j = \pm 1$. We see only the case that $\lambda_j = 1$. Because we can similarly see the case that $\lambda_j = -1$. By (4.1), the pair $(\alpha, \beta)$ has either of the forms $\left(\begin{array}{c} -1 \cdots -1 \\ -1 \cdots 0 \\ \end{array}\right), \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \cdots 1 \\ 1 \cdots 2 \cdots 2 \\ \end{array}\right)$. If the weight space for $\lambda$ has the dimension more than 3, it follows by Lemma 4.6 that $\lambda = (0 \cdots 0 \cdots 01 \cdots 1 \cdots 10 \cdots 0)$ or $(0 \cdots 0 \cdots 01 \cdots 1 \cdots 12 \cdots 2)$, and for the former (resp. the latter) the pair $(\alpha, \beta)$ has either of the forms

(4.5)

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \cdots & -1 \cdots & 10 \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \cdots & -10 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \cdots & 1 & \cdots & 12 & \cdots & 2 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \cdots & 12 & \cdots & 2 & \cdots & 2
\end{pmatrix}
\]

resp.

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \cdots & -1 \cdots & 1 -2 \cdots & -2 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \cdots & -10 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \cdots & 12 & \cdots & 2 & \cdots & 2
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Suppose that $u$ belongs to this weight space. If $i \neq l$, it follows by Lemma 2.2 that $\rho(u) \neq 0$. If $i = l$, we can not apply Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.4. But, by virtue of Case (1), we do not need to consider this case.

Suppose that $\lambda_j = 2$. (For the case that $\lambda_j = -2$ we can similarly do the argument mentioned below.) Then it moreover follows by (4.1) that $\lambda_j = 1, 3$.

For each case the pair $(\alpha, \beta)$ has the following form, respectively: $\left(\begin{array}{c} -1 \cdots -1 \\ 1 \cdots 2 \cdots 2 \\ \end{array}\right)$, $\left(\begin{array}{c} -1 \cdots -1 \\ 1 \cdots 0 \cdots 0 \\ \end{array}\right)$. By Lemma 4.6, the weight spaces with these $\lambda$ have at most
We next suppose that $l=2$. In this case it holds that
\[ \Delta^+ = \{(10), (12)\}, \quad \Delta^- = \{(11)\}. \]
So a weight $\lambda$ in $\Lambda$ is one of $\pm(01)$, $\pm(21)$, $\pm(23)$, and the weight spaces for $\lambda=\pm(01)$ have dimension 2 and the weight spaces for the other $\lambda$ have dimension 1. Lemma 2.3 is available for the cases with dimension 1 and it consequently follows that $\rho(u)=0$ for these cases. By virtue of the cases with dimension 1, we do not need to consider other cases.

Summing up the above arguments, we have the following result for the PSLA of Case (a); the homomorphism $\rho$ is not injective if and only if $i=l$, i.e., $r=1$. For the other cases we have similar results; $\rho$ is not injective only for Cases (b), $i=l$. These cases imply the cases of Example 1 ($m$: even and $r$: even) in §1.

**Theorem 4.7.** Let $CV$ be the $G$-orbit which corresponds to a PSLA in a family of type $BI$. Then the $CV$-geometry admits non-totally geodesic $CV$-submanifolds if and only if it is one of the $CV$-geometries in Example 1 ($m$: even and $r$: even).

**Case BII:** The families $B_{i,j,k}$ with quadruple $(a, b, c, d)$

Put $\sigma=\theta_i$ and $\tau=\theta_{j,k}$. Then, for each PSLA in $B_{i,j,k}$, the corresponding symmetric space $M$ and the totally geodesic $CV$-submanifold $N$ are given in the following: ($N$ is locally described.)

(a) $CV = (g, \sigma, \tau): M = SO(2l+1)/S(O(2a+2b) \times O(2c+2d-1))$.

In this case $N = (\mathfrak{s}(2a+2c)/\mathfrak{g}(2a) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2c)) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}(2b+2d-1)/\mathfrak{g}(2b) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2d-1))$;

(b) $CV = (g, \sigma, \sigma\tau): M = SO(2l+1)/S(O(2a+2b) \times O(2c+2d-1))$.

In this case $N = (\mathfrak{s}(2b+2c)/\mathfrak{g}(2b) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2c)) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}(2a+2d-1)/\mathfrak{g}(2a) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2d-1))$;

(c) $CV = (g, \tau, \sigma): M = SO(2l+1)/S(O(2b+2c) \times O(2a+2d-1))$.

In this case $N = (\mathfrak{s}(2a+2c)/\mathfrak{g}(2a) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2c)) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}(2b+2d-1)/\mathfrak{g}(2b) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2d-1))$;

(d) $CV = (g, \tau, \sigma): M = SO(2l+1)/S(O(2b+2c) \times O(2a+2d-1))$.

In this case $N = (\mathfrak{s}(2a+2b)/\mathfrak{g}(2a) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2b)) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}(2c+2d-1)/\mathfrak{g}(2c) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2d-1))$;

(e) $CV = (g, \sigma, \tau): M = SO(2l+1)/S(O(2a+2b) \times O(2b+2d-1))$.

In this case $N = (\mathfrak{s}(2b+2c)/\mathfrak{g}(2b) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2c)) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}(2a+2d-1)/\mathfrak{g}(2a) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2d-1))$;

(f) $CV = (g, \sigma, \tau): M = SO(2l+1)/S(O(2a+2b) \times O(2b+2d-1))$.

In this case $N = (\mathfrak{s}(2a+2b)/\mathfrak{g}(2a) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2b)) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}(2c+2d-1)/\mathfrak{g}(2c) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2d-1))$.

For the PSLA $(g, \sigma, \tau)$, the subsets $\Delta^{+}_{t_{\pm}}, \Delta^{+}_{\psi_{\pm}}$ of $\Delta^{+}$ are given as follows:
\[(4.6) \quad \Delta^+_t = \{\delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 0, 2, (\delta_j, \delta_k) = (0, 0) (0, 2), (2, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2)\} \]

\[\begin{align*}
\Delta^+_t = \{\delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i &= 0, 2, (\delta_j, \delta_k) = (0, 0) (0, 2), (2, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2)\} \\
\end{align*}\]

\[\Delta^+_t = \{\delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 0, 2, (\delta_j, \delta_k) = (0, 0) (0, 2), (2, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2)\} \]

\[\Delta^+_t = \{\delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 0, 2, (\delta_j, \delta_k) = (0, 0) (0, 2), (2, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2)\} \]

\[\Delta^+_t = \{\delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 0, 2, (\delta_j, \delta_k) = (0, 0) (0, 2), (2, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2)\} \]

\[\Delta^+_t = \{\delta \in \Delta^+; \delta_i = 0, 2, (\delta_j, \delta_k) = (0, 0) (0, 2), (2, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2)\} \]

If \(l \geq 4\), the dominant weights in \(\Delta^+_t, \Delta^+_p, \Delta^-_p\) are given by (4.7), (4.8), (4.9), respectively:

\[ (0 \cdots 0 \cdot 1 \cdot 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0), \quad (1 \cdots 1 \cdot 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \]

\[ (1 \cdots 1 \cdot 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \quad (i = j + 1), \quad -(0 \cdots 0 \cdot 1 \cdot 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \quad (k = i + 1), \]

\[ -(1 \cdots 1 \cdot 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \quad (j = 1), \quad -(0 \cdots 0 \cdot 1 \cdot 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \quad (j = 1, i = 2). \]

\[ (0 \cdots 0 \cdot 1 \cdots 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0), \quad (1 \cdots 1 \cdot 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \]

\[ -(0 \cdots 0 \cdot 1 \cdots 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \quad (i = j + 1), \quad -(0 \cdots 0 \cdot 1 \cdots 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \quad (k = i + 1), \]

\[ -(1 \cdots 1 \cdot 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \quad (j = 1), \quad -(0 \cdots 0 \cdot 1 \cdots 2 \cdots k \cdots 2 \cdots 0) \quad (i = j + 1, k = i + 1). \]
(0...01...1...j<k...k...k...12...2),  (1...1...1...j<k...k...k...12...2),
(4.9)  -(0...01...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (i = j+1),  (1...1...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (k = i+1),
-((1...1...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (j = 1),  -((1...1...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (j = 1, k = i+1).

If l=3, the subset Δι+ is empty and so the weights in Δι−, Δι+, Δι− are all
dominant.

We now see the injectivity of ρ for Case (a): CΣ=(g, σ, τ). In this case ρ is a homomorphism of (pΣ)*⊗\tau to \wedge 2(pΣ)*⊗pΣ.

We first suppose that l≥4. Then the minus multiple of dominant weights in Δι− are given by (α1)~(α6) and the dominant weights in Δι− are given by (β1)~(β6):

(α1)  -(0...01...1...j<k...k...k...12...2),  (α2)  -(1...1...1...j<k...k...k...12...2),
(α3)  (0...01...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (i = j+1),  (α4)  -(1...1...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (k = i+1),
(α5)  (1...1...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (j = 1),  (α6)  (1...1...1...j<k...k...k...12...2)  (j = 1, k = i+1),
(β1)  (0...01...1...j<k...k...k...12...2),  (β2)  (1...1...1...j<k...k...k...12...2),
(β3)  (1...1...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (i = j+1),  (β4)  -(0...01...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (k = i+1),
(β5)  -(1...1...1...j<k...k...k...10...0)  (j = 1),  (β6)  -(1...1...1...j<k...k...k...12...2)  (j = 1, i = 2).

Case (1): l(u)=1. Represent u as follows: u=a ω_i⊗X_p. Then the pair (α, β) is one of the pairs ((α r), (β s)), where r, s=1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Applying Lemma 2.3 for each pair, we obtain that ρ(u)≠0 for all the pairs.

Case (2): l(u)=2. We first suppose that u is indecomposable. Consider the following elements in Δι+:

(μ1)  (0...01...1...j<k...k...k...10...0),  (μ2)  (0...0...0...01...1...j<k...k...k...10...0),
(μ3)  (0...01...1...j<k...k...k...12...2),  (μ4)  (10...0...0...01...1...j<k...k...k...10...0),
(μ5)  (0...0...0...01...1...j<k...k...k...12...2),  (μ6)  (12...2...2...2)  (j = 2),
(μ7)  (0...0...01...12...2)  (k = i+2).

Then such the triples (α, β; μ) as in §3 (Case (2) of type AI) are given in the following:

(1)  ((α1), (β2); (μ1)), i−j≥2,  (2)  ((α1), (β5); (μ1)), j = 1, i−j≥2,
(3)  ((α1), (β1); (μ2)), k≠l,  (4)  ((α1), (β4); (μ2)), k≠l, k = i+1,
(5)  ((α1), (β2); (μ3)), i−j = 2,  (6)  ((α1), (β3); (μ3)), j = 1, i−j = 2,
(7)  ((α2), (β2); (μ4)), j≥2,  (8)  ((α2), (β3); (μ4)), j≥2, i = j+1,
(9)  ((α2), (β1); (μ5)), k−i≥2,  (10)  ((α2), (β2); (μ6)), j = 2,
(11)  ((α2), (β3); (μ6)), j = 2, i = j+1,  (12)  ((α2), (β1); (μ7)), k−i = 2,
(13)  ((α3), (β1); (μ2)), i = j+1, k≠l,  (14)  ((α3), (β4); (μ2)), i = j+1, k = i+1, k≠l,
Lemma 2.4 is available for all cases and thus it follows that $\rho(u) \neq 0$.

We next suppose that $u$ is decomposable. Put $u = a \omega_{\alpha_1} \otimes X_{\beta_1} + b \omega_{\alpha_2} \otimes X_{\beta_2}$. Then the weight $\lambda$ is a root and Lemma 2.2 is available except the following cases (1), (2):

1. $\lambda = (1 \cdots 1)$, where $i = j+1, k = l$, and the pairs $(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ are $((\alpha_1), (\beta_3)), (\alpha_3), (\beta_1))$.

2. $\lambda = - (1 \cdots 1)$, where $j = 1, i = 2, k = l$, and the pairs $(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ are $((\alpha_1), (\beta_6)), (\alpha_3), (\beta_3))$.

For the exceptional cases the condition (1) of Proposition 2.1 does not hold. Hence it follows that $\rho(u) \neq 0$.

Case (3): $l(u) \geq 3$. We see the weight spaces with dim $\geq 3$. Let $\lambda$ be a weight in $\Lambda$ and let $\alpha, \beta$ be roots such that $\lambda = - \alpha + \beta$, where $\alpha \in \Delta_\beta + \beta \in \Delta_\alpha$. Denote by $a_k, b_k, \lambda_k (1 \leq k \leq l)$ the $k$-th components of $\alpha, \beta, \lambda$, respectively. Since $a_i = \pm 1$ and $b_i = 0, \pm 2$, it follows by (4.1) that $\lambda_i = \pm 1, \pm 3$. Consider only the cases that $\lambda_i = 1, 3$. (For the cases that $\lambda_i = -1, -3$, we can similarly do the argument mentioned below.)

Suppose that $\lambda_i = 3$. Then it moreover follows by (4.1) that $\lambda_j = 1, 2$. For each case the pair $(\alpha / \beta)$ has the following form, respectively:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 \\
1 & 2 & \cdots & 2 & \cdots & 2
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & \cdots & -1 & * \\
1 & 2 & \cdots & 2 & \cdots & 2
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

By Lemma 4.6, the weight space with this $\lambda$ has at most dimension 2.

Suppose that $\lambda_i = 1$. Then it moreover follows by (4.1) that $\lambda_j = 0, \pm 1, 2$. If $\lambda_j = -1$ (resp. $\lambda_j = 2$), the pair $(\alpha / \beta)$ has the following form:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 \\
-1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & \cdots & -1 & * \\
1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

By Lemma 4.6, the weight space with this $\lambda$ has at most dimension 2.

Consider the case that $\lambda_j = 1$. Then it moreover follows by (4.1) that $\lambda_k = \pm 1, 2, 3$. If $\lambda_k = -1$ (resp. $\lambda_k = 3$), the pair $(\alpha / \beta)$ has the form

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & \cdots & -1 & k & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & \cdots & -1 & k & \cdots & 2 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

By Lemma 4.6, the weight space with this $\lambda$ has at most dimension 2. If $\lambda_k = 1$, the pair $(\alpha / \beta)$ has
one of the following forms:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & i \cdots -1 & i \cdots -1 & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
1 & 0 \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & i \cdots -1 & i \cdots -1 & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
1 & 1 \cdots & 1 & 0 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & i \cdots -1 & i \cdots -1 & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
1 & 2 \cdots & 2 & 0 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

If the weight space for \( \lambda \) has the dimension more than 3, it follows by Lemma 4.6 that

\[
\lambda = (0 \cdots 01 \cdots 1 \cdots 1 \cdots 10 \cdots 0),
\]

\[
(0 \cdots 01 \cdots 1 \cdots 1 \cdots 11 \cdots 2).
\]

For the former \( \lambda \) the pair \((\alpha, \beta)\) has one of the following forms:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & i \cdots -1 & i \cdots -1 & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
1 & 0 \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & i \cdots -1 & i \cdots -1 & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
1 & 1 \cdots & 1 & 0 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & i \cdots -1 & i \cdots -1 & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
1 & 2 \cdots & 2 & 0 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
1 & 0 \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(For the latter \( \lambda \) we can similarly see the form of \((\alpha, \beta)\).) Hence it follows by Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.1 (1) that \( \rho(\mathbf{u}) \neq 0 \) for a maximal vector \( \mathbf{u} \) in the weight space with weight \( \lambda \). Proposition 2.1 (1) is applied to the case that \( \lambda = (0 \cdots 01 \cdots 1 \cdots 1 \cdots 11 \cdots 1) \).

Consider the case that \( \lambda_j = 0 \). Then it moreover follows by (4.1) that \( \lambda_k = 0, 2 \). If \( \lambda_k = 0 \), the pair \((\alpha, \beta)\) has one of the following forms:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

If the weight space for \( \lambda \) has the dimension more than 3, it follows by Lemma 4.6 that

\[
\lambda = (0 \cdots 01 \cdots 1 \cdots 1 \cdots 10 \cdots 0),
\]

and the pair \((\alpha, \beta)\) has one of the following forms:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \vdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
Hence it follows by Lemma 2.2 that $p(u) \neq 0$ for a maximal vector $u$ in this weight space. If $\lambda = 2$, the pair $\left( \alpha \beta \right)$ has one of the forms:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \ldots & 0 & -1 & \ldots & -1 & -2 & \ldots & -2 \\
0 & \ldots & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

and the pair $\left( \alpha \beta \right)$ has one of the following forms:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \ldots & 0 & -1 & \ldots & -1 & -2 & \ldots & -2 \\
0 & \ldots & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

Hence it follows by Lemma 2.2 that $p(u) \neq 0$ for a maximal vector $u$ in this weight space.

We next suppose that $l = 3$. Then it holds that

$$
\Delta_{1-}^+ = \{(100), (001), (122)\}, \Delta_{1-}^- = \{(110), (011), (112)\}.
$$

So a weight $\lambda$ in $\Lambda$ is one of the following: $\pm (010), \pm (11-1), \pm (-111), \pm (210), \pm (111), \pm (012), \pm (212), \pm (113), \pm (133), \pm (232), \pm (234)$. The weight spaces for $\lambda = \pm (111)$ have dimension 4 and the weight spaces for $\lambda = \pm (010), \pm (012)$ have dimension 3 and the weight spaces for the other $\lambda$ have dimension 1. Lemma 2.3 is available for the cases with dimension 1 and Lemma 2.2 is
available for the cases with dimension 3 and the cases with dimension 4 except the following two; The exceptions are the cases that a maximal vector $u$ has length 2 and is associated with two pairs

$$\pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

in $R^2$ according to $\lambda = \pm (111)$. For these cases Proposition 2.1 (1) does not hold. Hence it follows that $\rho(u) \neq 0$ for all cases.

Summing up the above arguments, we have the following result for the PSLA of Case (a); the homomorphism $\rho$ is always injective. Similarly for the other cases $\rho$ is always injective.

**Theorem 4.8.** Let $V$ be the $G$-orbit which corresponds to a PSLA in a family of type $BII$. Then the $V$-geometry does not admit non-totally geodesic $V$-submanifolds.
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