

Lec 18: representations of \mathfrak{sl}_n & SL_n

1) Weyl character formula

1.0) Intro

Still, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{F})$ (w. $\text{char } \mathbb{F} = 0, \mathbb{F} = \overline{\mathbb{F}}$) & $\mathfrak{h} = \{\text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid \sum x_i = 0\}$

Recall that we have the weight lattice $\Lambda = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \langle \lambda, h_i \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ containing the dominant weights, Λ_+ , that classify the finite dimensional irreducible modules: $L(\lambda)$ w. $\lambda \in \Lambda_+$. A reasonable next question is to compute $\dim L(\lambda)$ or, even better, the dimensions of all weight spaces $L(\lambda)_\mu$ ($\mu \in \Lambda$). This is what characters are about

Notation: consider the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[\Lambda]$ of the weight lattice Λ . We write e^λ for the element of $\mathbb{Z}[\Lambda]$ corresponding to $\lambda \in \Lambda$. The Weyl group $W = S_n$ acts on \mathfrak{h}^* preserving $\Lambda (= \{\sum \lambda_i \varepsilon_i \mid \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}\})$ and hence on $\mathbb{Z}[\Lambda]$: $w e^\lambda = e^{w(\lambda)}$. This action is by ring automorphisms.

We also consider the completed version $\mathbb{Z}[[\Lambda]]$ consisting of all infinite linear combinations of $e^\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda$.

1.1) Definition & key results

Definition: Let M be a representation of \mathfrak{g} w. $M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} M_\lambda$ w. $\dim M_\lambda < \infty$. Below we will call such a representation a **weight module**.

The (formal) **character** of M , $\text{ch } M := \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (\dim M_\lambda) e^\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}[[\Lambda]]$.

Example: The Verma module $\Delta(\lambda)$ has weight basis $f^{\mathbb{R}} v_\lambda$ w. weights

$\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^N k_j \beta_j$ ($N = n(n-1)/2$), β_1, \dots, β_N are the positive roots. So

$$\text{ch } \Delta(\lambda) = \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_N \geq 0} e^{\lambda - \sum k_j \beta_j} = e^\lambda \prod_{j=1}^N (1 + e^{-\beta_j} + e^{-2\beta_j} + \dots) = e^\lambda \prod_{j=1}^N (1 - e^{-\beta_j})^{-1}$$

Our goal is to compute $\text{ch } L(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Recall, Sec. 1.2. of Lec 16, $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^n (\frac{n+1}{2} - i) \varepsilon_i \Rightarrow \langle \rho, h_i \rangle = 1, \forall i$, so $\rho \in \Lambda$.

Thm (Weyl character formula): Let $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Then

$$\text{ch } L(\lambda) = \frac{\sum_{w \in W} \text{sgn}(w) e^{w(\lambda + \rho)}}{e^\rho \prod_{j=1}^N (1 - e^{-\beta_j})} \quad (= \sum_{w \in W} \text{sgn}(w) \text{ch } \Delta(w \cdot \lambda))$$

Examples: 1) $L(0)$ is the trivial representation, and we recover $\text{ch triv} = e^0 (= 1)$.

2) Let $n=2$. Then $\text{ch } L(n) = [\dim L(n); = 1 \text{ for } i = n, n-2, \dots, -n \text{ and } 0, \text{ else}] = e^n + e^{n-2} + \dots + e^{-n} = \frac{e^{n+1} - e^{-(n+1)}}{e - e^{-1}}$. Since ρ is identified with $\langle \rho, h \rangle = 1$, & $\alpha \leftrightarrow 2$, this agrees with the theorem.

Exercise: For \mathfrak{g} -representations M, M' as in the definition above, and a finite dimensional \mathfrak{g} -representation V , we have

$$\text{ch}(M \oplus M') = \text{ch}(M) + \text{ch}(M'), \quad \text{ch}(V \otimes M) = \text{ch}(V) \text{ch}(M).$$

Rem: As other results in this course, Thm holds for all simple Lie algebras. For \mathfrak{sl}_n specifically, the r.h.s. can be interpreted as the Jacobi-Trudy formula for Schur polynomials.

1.2) Characters of $L(\lambda)$'s vs characters of $\Delta(\mu)$'s

Recall that $W \curvearrowright \Lambda$ via $w \cdot \lambda = w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$ & Λ is equipped w. partial order: $\lambda \leq \mu$ if $\lambda - \mu \in \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\text{positive roots})$. The goal of this section is to prove

Proposition: $\lambda \in \Lambda \Rightarrow \text{ch } L(\lambda) = \text{ch } \Delta(\lambda) + \sum_{\mu \in W \cdot \lambda, \mu < \lambda} a_{\mu} \text{ch } \Delta(\mu)$ ($a_{\mu} \in \mathbb{Z}$)

Proof:

Step 1: Let M be a weight \mathfrak{g} -module & $N \subset M$ be a submodule. Then $N, M/N$ are weight modules &

$$\dim M_{\mu} = \dim N_{\mu} + \dim (M/N)_{\mu} \quad \forall \mu \in \Lambda \quad (1)$$

(exercise; cf. the proof of Proposition 2 in Sec 1.3 of Lec 6).

Step 2: consider a sequence $0 = N^0 \subsetneq N^1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq N^{\ell} = \Delta(\mu)$ of subreps.

We claim that $\ell \leq \sum_{\nu \in W \cdot \mu, \nu \leq \mu} \dim \Delta(\mu)_{\nu}$ (2)

Set $L^i := N^i / N^{i-1}$ ($\neq 0$), $i=1, \dots, \ell$. By (1), $\forall \nu \in \Lambda \Rightarrow$

$$\dim \Delta(\mu)_{\nu} = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \dim L^i_{\nu} \quad (3)$$

So (2) will follow if we show that $\forall i \exists w_i \in W \mid L^i_{w_i \cdot \mu} \neq 0$, automatically $w_i \cdot \mu \leq \mu$. Since $L^i_{\nu} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \Delta(\mu)_{\nu} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \nu \leq \mu$, L^i has a highest weight, say $\nu_i \rightsquigarrow$ nonzero $\Delta(\nu_i) \xrightarrow{\varphi_i} L^i$. Note that the center Z of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ acts on $\Delta(\nu_i), \Delta(\mu)$ via $X_{\nu_i}, X_{\mu}: Z \rightarrow F$, respectively (w. $X_{\mu}(z) = HC_z(\mu)$). Since $\varphi_i \neq 0 \Rightarrow X_{\nu_i} = X_{\mu}$. By Corollary in Sec 1.2 of Lec 6, $\exists w_i \mid \nu_i = w_i \cdot \mu$. This proves (2).

Step 3: Take $0 = N^0 \subsetneq N^1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq N^{\ell} = \Delta(\mu)$ w. maximal possible ℓ (a.k.a. Jordan-Hölder filtration), it exists by Step 2. Automatically,

each L^i is irreducible. And thx to nonzero $\varphi_i: \Delta(w_i \cdot \mu) \rightarrow L^i \Rightarrow L^i \simeq L(w_i \cdot \mu)$.

Step 4: (3) $\Rightarrow \text{ch } \Delta(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^e \text{ch } L(w_i \cdot \mu)$ w. $w_i \cdot \mu \leq \mu$. Since $\dim \Delta(\mu)_\mu = 1$, we have $w_i \cdot \mu = \mu$ for exactly one i & $w_j \cdot \mu < \mu \forall j \neq i$.

So we get $\text{ch } \Delta(\mu) = \text{ch } L(\mu) + \sum_{\nu \in W \cdot \mu, \nu < \mu} b_\nu \text{ch } L(\nu)$ ($b_\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$) (4)

Step 5: Let μ_1, \dots, μ_k be an ordering of all elements of $W \cdot \mu$ s.t. $\mu_i \leq \mu_j \Rightarrow i \geq j$ (at least one such exists). Applying (4) for all μ_i , we see that $(\text{ch } \Delta(\mu_i))_{i=1}^k$ is obtained from $(\text{ch } L(\mu_i))_{i=1}^k$ by applying an upper triangular matrix w. 1's on diagonal. Inverting this matrix, we arrive at an expression of $(\text{ch } L(\mu_i))_{i=1}^k$ via $(\text{ch } \Delta(\mu_i))_{i=1}^k$, yielding the claim of the proposition. \square

1.3) Proof of Weyl character formula.

Recall (Proposition in Sec 1.2 of Lec 15): \forall fin. dim. \mathfrak{g} -rep. $V \Rightarrow$

$$\dim V_\mu = \dim V_{w\mu} \quad \forall w \in W, \mu \in \Lambda$$

We apply this to $V = L(\lambda)$ w. $\lambda \in \Lambda_+$ to get

$$\text{ch } L(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}[\Lambda]^W \quad (5)$$

(for the usual action of W on Λ). Now the Weyl character formula follows from (5), Proposition in Sec 1.2 & the next claim

Lemma: Let $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ & $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}[\Lambda]^W$ be s.t.

$$\theta = \text{ch } \Delta(\lambda) + \sum_{\mu \in W \cdot \lambda \setminus \{\lambda\}} a_\mu \text{ch } \Delta(\mu).$$

Then

$$\theta = \frac{\sum_{w \in W} \text{sgn}(w) e^{w(\lambda + \rho)}}{e^\rho \prod_{j=1}^N (1 - e^{-\beta_j})}$$

Proof:

Recall (Example in Sec 1.1) that

$$\text{ch } \Delta(\mu) = e^\mu \prod_{j=1}^N (1 - e^{-\beta_j})^{-1}$$

where β_1, \dots, β_N are all positive roots

Step 1: we claim that $\eta := e^\rho \prod_{j=1}^N (1 - e^{-\beta_j})$ satisfies $w\eta = \text{sgn}(w)\eta$ $\forall w \in W$. This will follow if we show $s_i \eta = -\eta \forall i$.

Notice that $s_i = (i, i+1)$ sends a root to a root, that $s_i \alpha_i = -\alpha_i$

($\alpha_i = \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}$) & if $\beta \neq \alpha_i \Rightarrow s_i \beta$ is a positive root. So

$$s_i \prod_{j=1}^N (1 - e^{\beta_j}) = s_i \left((1 - e^{-\alpha_i}) \prod_{\substack{\beta \neq \alpha_i \\ \beta \neq \alpha_i}} (1 - e^{-\beta}) \right) = (1 - e^{\alpha_i}) \prod_{\beta \neq \alpha_i} (1 - e^{-\beta})$$

Recall (Sec 1.2 of Lec 16) that $s_i \rho = \rho - \alpha_i$. So

$$s_i \eta = e^{\rho - \alpha_i} (1 - e^{\alpha_i}) \prod_{\beta \neq \alpha_i} (1 - e^{-\beta}) = e^\rho (e^{-\alpha_i} - 1) \prod_{\beta \neq \alpha_i} (1 - e^{-\beta}) = -\eta$$

Step 2: Note that $\mathbb{Z}[\Lambda]$ (Laurent polynomials) is a domain. It's enough to show $\eta \theta = \sum_{w \in W} \text{sgn}(w) e^{w(\lambda + \rho)}$. Note that θ is W -invariant & η is W -sgn-invariant. So $\eta \theta$ is W -sgn-invariant.

On the other hand, $\eta \theta = \eta (\text{ch } \Delta(\lambda) + \sum_{w \neq 1} a_w \text{ch } \Delta(w \cdot \lambda)) = [\text{Example in Sec 1.1}] = e^\rho (e^\lambda + \sum_{w \neq 1} a_w e^{w \cdot \lambda}) = e^{\lambda + \rho} + \sum_{w \neq 1} a_w e^{w(\lambda + \rho)}$. And since $\eta \theta$ is W -sgn-invariant, this forces $a_w = \text{sgn}(w)$ proving the lemma. \square

1.4) $\text{ch } L(\lambda)$ for λ non-dominant.

One can ask about computing the characters of $L(\lambda)$ w.

general $\lambda \in \Lambda$, equivalently about computing the coefficients

a_w in $\text{ch } L(\lambda) = \text{ch } \Delta(\lambda) + \sum_{\mu \in W \cdot \lambda, \mu < \lambda} a_w \text{ch } \Delta(\mu)$. Here are remarkable features of this question.

1) The answer for a_w is known but it's not expressed using elementary combinatorics, which is the case for dominant λ . Instead one needs "Kazhdan-Lusztig combinatorics." Moreover, in most cases in Representation theory, where characters don't have elementary description but can be computed, the answer is expressed in a similar way.

2) This looks like a completely algebraic question. Yet both the conjectural answer (Kazhdan-Lusztig '79) & "20th century proofs" (closely related proofs due to Beilinson-Bernstein & Brylinski-Kashiwara 81; and a later quite different proof by Soergel 90) require geometry (of the flag variety). Kazhdan-Lusztig, Beilinson-Bernstein & Brylinski-Kashiwara works are among the pioneering papers in Geometric Representation theory (initiated by Deligne-Lusztig & Springer in 76). Only in 2012 Elias & Williamson found an elementary (but not easy) proof based on "Hodge theory w/o geometry."