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#### Abstract

In this talk for the Oberwolfach Arbeitsgemeinschaft "Geometric representation theory", we discuss the Borel-Weil-Bott theorem, the linkage principle, and the translation functors, following Chapters 5, 6, and 7 of Jantzen's book on representations of algebraic groups.


## Notation

| $k$ | algebraically closed field | $R$ | root system of $(G, T)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $G$ | reductive algebraic $k$-group | $R^{+}$ | set of positive roots |
| $T$ | maximal torus of $G$ | $X$ | character lattice of $T$ |
| $W$ | Weyl group of $(G, T)$ | $X^{+}$ | dominant weights |

## 1. The dot action and the affine Weyl group

The affine Weyl group of $G$ is the semidirect product

$$
W_{\mathrm{aff}} \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} W \ltimes \mathbb{Z} R
$$

where $W$ acts in the usual way on the root lattice $\mathbb{Z} R$. The two factors of the affine Weyl group act on $X$ : the ordinary Weyl group in the usual way and $\mathbb{Z} R$ by translation. These two actions are compatible and give rise to an action of $W_{\text {aff }}$ on $X$. For our application, however, a slight modification of this action is needed.

Let

$$
\rho \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in R^{+}} \alpha
$$

be the half-sum of the positive weights, or equivalently, the sum of the fundamental coweights. Let $\ell$ be a positive integer. The dot action of $W_{\text {aff }}$ on $X$ with parameter $\ell$ is obtained from the usual action of $W_{\text {aff }}$ by shifting the origin to $-\rho$ and scaling the action of $\mathbb{Z} R$ by $\ell$ :

$$
\left(w t_{\lambda}\right) \bullet \ell \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} w(\mu+\ell \lambda+\rho)-\rho,
$$

where $t_{\lambda}$ denotes translation by $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z} R$. The dot action of the ordinary Weyl group is independent of $\ell$ and we will therefore suppress it from the notation in that case.

One fundamental domain for the (induced) dot action on $X \otimes \mathbb{R}$ is the alcove $\bar{C}=\bar{C}_{\ell}$ consisting of the $\lambda \in X \otimes \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $\alpha \in R^{+}$,

$$
0 \leq\left\langle\lambda+\rho, \alpha^{\vee}\right\rangle \leq \ell .
$$

Let $\bar{C}_{\ell, \mathbb{Z}}=\bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}} \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \bar{C} \cap X$.

More generally, the facets of $X \otimes \mathbb{R}$ with respect to the dot action are the subsets $F$ consisting of the $\lambda$ such that

$$
\begin{cases}n_{\alpha} \ell<\left\langle\lambda+\rho, \alpha^{\vee}\right\rangle<\left(n_{\alpha}+1\right) \ell & \text { if } \alpha \in R_{0}^{+} \\ n_{\alpha} \ell=\left\langle\lambda+\rho, \alpha^{\vee}\right\rangle & \text { if } \alpha \in R_{1}^{+}\end{cases}
$$

where $R^{+}=R_{0}^{+} \sqcup R_{1}^{+}$is a partition of the positive roots and the $n_{\alpha}$ 's are integers. The (topological) closure $\bar{F}$ of $F$ is the set of points satisfying the above constraints but with all <'s replaced by $\leq$ 's. We similarly define the upper closure $\widehat{F}$ by replacing only the righthand $<$ 's with $\leq$ 's. Unlike the topological closure, the upper closure depends on the choice of positive roots; in the picture below, the arrow indicates the direction of the positive Weyl chamber.


Example 1. For $G=\mathrm{PGL}_{2}$ we have $X=\mathbb{Z}, R=\{ \pm 1\}, X^{\vee}=2 \mathbb{Z}, R^{\vee}=\{ \pm 2\}, \rho=\frac{1}{2}$, and

$$
C=(-1 / 2,(p-1) / 2), \quad \bar{C}=[-1 / 2,(p-1) / 2], \quad \widehat{C}=(-1 / 2,(p-1) / 2],
$$

where we form the upper closure with respect to the Weyl chamber $[0, \infty)$, that is, the positive root +1 .

For $G=\mathrm{Sp}_{4}$ we have $X=\mathbb{Z}^{2}$, the simple roots are $e_{1}-e_{2}$ and $2 e_{2}$, the other positive roots are $e_{1}+e_{2}$ and $2 e_{1}, \rho=2 e_{1}+e_{2}$, and the positive Weyl chamber is a cone with apex the origin and walls the $x$-axis and the line $x=y$. The chamber $\bar{C}$ is an isosceles right-angled triangle, pointing up with horizontal hypotenuse of length $p$ and leftmost vertex at $(-2,-1)$. In the picture below, $p=5$.


These examples show that not every facet of $\left(W_{\text {aff }} \bullet_{p}\right)$ need intersect $X$. In particular, if $p$ is very small then a facet of maximal dimension need not intersect $X$; this happens in the previous example if $p=2$ or 3 .

## 2. Borel-Weil-Bott

We have seen that a weight $\lambda \in X$ is dominant if and only if $\mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda) \neq 0$, and that in this case, $\mathrm{H}^{>0}(\lambda)=0$. What can be said about the cohomologies of the line bundles associated to a general weight, not necessarily dominant? The Borel-Weil-Bott theorem states roughly that the dot action of a simple reflection increments cohomology by one degree.

In what follows, if char $k=p>0$ then let $\bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}=\bar{C}_{p, \mathbb{Z}}$ and if char $k=0$ then let

$$
\bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}} \xlongequal{\text { def }}\left\{\lambda \in X \mid\left\langle\lambda+\rho, \alpha^{\vee}\right\rangle>0 \text { for all } \alpha \in R^{+}\right\}=-\rho+(X \otimes \mathbb{R})^{+} .
$$

Theorem 2 (Borel-Weil-Bott). Let $\lambda \in \bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}$.
(1) If $\lambda \notin X^{+}$then $\mathrm{H}^{i}(w \bullet \lambda)=0$ for all $i \geq 0$ and $w \in W$.
(2) If $\lambda \in X^{+}$then $\mathrm{H}^{i}(w \bullet \lambda)=\mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)$ for $i=\ell(w)$ and 0 otherwise.

If char $k=0$ then every element of $X$ is of the form $w \bullet \lambda$ for some $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in X^{+}$and the Borel-Weil-Bott theorem therefore computes completely the cohomologies in this case.

Classically, in characteristic zero, it was an important part of the statement that $\mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)$ is simple for $\lambda$ dominant. We can deduce this in all characteristics using Serre duality.
Corollary 3. If $\lambda \in \bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ then $\mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)$ is simple.
Proof. The proof of the corollary rests on Serre duality, which we quickly review. The dualizing sheaf on $G / B$ is $\mathcal{L}(-2 \rho)$, and $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)^{*} \simeq \mathcal{L}(-\lambda)$. So in this setting, Serre duality gives an isomorphism

$$
\mathrm{H}^{i}(\lambda)^{*} \simeq \mathrm{H}^{\left|R^{+}\right|-i}(-\lambda-2 \rho) .
$$

In particular, letting $w_{0}$ denote the longest element of the Weyl group, since $-w_{0}$ preserves the positive Weyl chamber, $w_{0} \rho=-\rho$, and it follows that

$$
w_{0} \bullet\left(-w_{0} \lambda\right)=-\lambda-2 \rho .
$$

These facts imply that

$$
\mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)^{*} \simeq \mathrm{H}^{\left|R^{+}\right|}\left(w_{0} \bullet\left(-w_{0} \lambda\right)\right)
$$

Since $-w_{0} \bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}=\bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we can apply Borel-Weil-Bott to show that

$$
\mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)^{*} \simeq \mathrm{H}^{0}\left(-w_{0} \lambda\right)
$$

Combining this isomorphism with the Weyl-module description of simple modules yields

$$
\operatorname{soc}_{G} \mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda) \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} L(\lambda) \simeq V(\lambda) / \operatorname{rad}_{G} V(\lambda) \simeq \mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda) / \operatorname{rad}_{G} \mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)
$$

If $\operatorname{rad}_{G} \mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)$ were nonzero then it would have to contain some $L(\mu)$, and the only possibility is $L(\lambda)$, the maximal semisimple submodule of $\mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)$. But since $L(\lambda)$ has multiplicity one in $\mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)$ this is impossible and $\operatorname{rad}_{G} \mathrm{H}^{0}(\lambda)=0$.

Remark 4. The $\rho$-shift arises in many places in the representation theory of reductive groups. In a slightly different setting, $p$-adic reductive groups, one defines the normalized parabolic induction (say, from a Borel subgroup with split maximal torus) of a representation as the twist of the parabolic induction by the square root of the modulus character of $B\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$. This correction term is precisely the inflation of the unramified character of $T\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$ corresponding to $\rho$.

Remark 5. We cannot improve on the Borel-Weil-Bott theorem in characteristic $p$ by relaxing the hypothesis that $\lambda \in \bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. It is known [Jan03, II.5.18] that for any simple root $\alpha$,

$$
\mathrm{H}^{1}\left(-p^{n} \alpha\right) \neq 0 .
$$

On the other hand, as soon as the Dynkin diagram of $G$ has a connected component with two or more vertices, $-p^{n} \alpha$ does not lie in $s \bullet X^{+}$for any simple reflection $s$. Indeed, the only simple reflection that could move $-p^{n} \alpha$ to be dominant is $s_{\alpha}$, and

$$
s_{\alpha} \bullet\left(-p^{n} \alpha\right)=\left(p^{n}-1\right) \alpha
$$

since $s_{\alpha} \rho=\rho-\alpha$. But this element is not dominant: we can find simple roots $\alpha$ and $\beta$ so that $\left\langle\alpha, \beta^{\vee}\right\rangle<0$ by our hypothesis on $G$.

## 3. Linkage principle

Let $\operatorname{Rep}(G)$ be the category of finite-dimensional ${ }^{1}$ algebraic representations of $G$. When char $k=0$, this category decomposes as a direct sum over $X^{+}$:

$$
\operatorname{Rep}(G)=\sum_{\lambda \in X^{+}} \operatorname{Rep}_{\lambda}(G)
$$

where $\operatorname{Rep}_{\lambda}(G)$ is the category of $L(\lambda)$-isotypic modules. In this section we'll give a related decomposition of $G$-Mod when $p \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \operatorname{char} k>0$, which we assume from now on. The decomposition is a consequence of the following theorem, of which we will prove a special case in Section 5.

Theorem 6 (Linkage principle). Let $\lambda, \mu \in X^{+}$. If $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(L(\lambda), L(\mu)) \neq 0$ then $\lambda \in W_{\text {aff }} \bullet_{p} \mu$.
Consequently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Rep}(G)=\bigoplus_{\gamma \in X /\left(W_{\mathrm{aff}}, \bullet_{p}\right)} \operatorname{Rep}_{\gamma}(G) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\operatorname{Rep}_{\gamma}(G)$ is the Serre subcategory generated by the simple modules $L(\mu)$ with $\mu \in$ $\gamma \cap X^{+}$. In other words, $V \in \operatorname{Rep}_{\gamma}(G)$ if and only if every composition factor of $V$ has highest weight in $\mu \in \gamma \cap X^{+}$.

Remark 7. It is tempting to call each subcategory $\operatorname{Rep}_{\gamma}(G)$ a block of $\operatorname{Rep}(G)$. However, this terminology is not strictly correct because it can happen that $\operatorname{Rep}_{\gamma}(G)$ decomposes further. Here is the general result, due to Donkin [Don80]. As a block is uniquely determined, and in fact generated by, the simple modules it contains, we can identify blocks with subsets of $X^{+}$. The subsets of $X^{+}$corresponding to blocks are of the following form [Jan03, II.7.2]. Given $\lambda \in X^{+}$, let

$$
r \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \min _{\alpha \in R} \operatorname{ord}_{p}\left\langle\lambda+\rho, \alpha^{\vee}\right\rangle
$$

and make the subset $W_{\text {aff }} \bullet_{p^{r}} \lambda \cap X^{+}$. (Since $\left\langle\lambda+\rho, \alpha^{\vee}\right\rangle>0$, the constant $r$ is finite.)

[^0]
## 4. Translation functors

As before, assume that $p \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \operatorname{char} k>0$. The decomposition (1) reduces the study of $\operatorname{Rep}(G)$ to the study of the finitely-many categories $\operatorname{Rep}_{\gamma}(G)$, which, however, may be quite complicated. In this section we will see that these categories are related to each other by so-called translation functors.

The decomposition (1) gives rise to functors

$$
\operatorname{pr}_{\lambda}: \operatorname{Rep}(G) \rightarrow \operatorname{Rep}_{\lambda}(G) \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \operatorname{Rep}_{\gamma}(G),
$$

where $\lambda \in X^{+}$and $\gamma \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} W_{\text {aff }} \bullet_{p} \lambda$. Namely, we define $\operatorname{pr}_{\lambda} V$ to be the sum of the submodules of $V$ all of whose composition factors have highest weight in $\gamma$.

Definition 8. Let $\lambda, \mu \in \bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and let $X^{+} \cap W(\mu-\lambda)=\{\nu\}$. Define the translation functor $T_{\lambda}^{\mu}$ from $\lambda$ to $\mu$ as

$$
T_{\lambda}^{\mu} V \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \operatorname{pr}_{\mu}\left(L(\nu) \otimes \operatorname{pr}_{\lambda} V\right)
$$

In many cases, translation functors are equivalences of categories.
Theorem 9. If $\lambda, \mu \in \bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ belong to the same facet then $T_{\lambda}^{\mu}: \operatorname{Rep}_{\lambda}(G) \rightarrow \operatorname{Rep}_{\mu}(G)$ is an equivalence of categories.

Although weights in different facets need not yield isomorphic categories, we can compare their categories if one facet is in the closure of another: translation functors propagate information from facets of larger dimension.
Proposition 10. Let $\lambda, \mu \in \bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and let $F$ be the facet of $\left(W_{\text {aff }}, \bullet_{p}\right)$ containing $\lambda$. Say $\mu \in \bar{F}$.
(1) For all $w \in W_{\text {aff }}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
T_{\lambda}^{\mu}\left(\mathrm{H}^{i}\left(w \bullet_{p} \lambda\right)\right) \simeq \mathrm{H}^{i}\left(w \bullet_{p} \mu\right) .
$$

(2) For all $w \in W_{\text {aff }}$ such that $w \bullet_{p} \lambda \in X^{+}$,

$$
T_{\lambda}^{\mu} L\left(w \bullet_{p} \lambda\right)= \begin{cases}L\left(w \bullet_{p} \mu\right) & \text { if } w \bullet \mu \in \widehat{F^{\prime}}\left(\text { where } F^{\prime} \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} w \bullet F\right) \\ 0 & \text { if not. }\end{cases}
$$

Finally, we finish with a discussion of characters. Recall that the Euler characteristics

$$
\chi(\lambda) \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \sum_{i}(-1)^{i} \operatorname{ch~}^{i}(\lambda)
$$

with $\lambda \in X^{+}$form a basis for the space $\mathbb{Z}[X]^{W}$ in which formal characters live. In particular, every formal character is a linear combination of such $\chi(\lambda)$.

Proposition 11. Let $\lambda, \mu \in \bar{C}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and let $w \in W_{\text {aff }}$ such that $w \bullet_{p} \lambda \in X^{+}$and $w \bullet_{p} \mu$ is in the upper closure of the facet containing $w \bullet_{p} \lambda$. If

$$
\operatorname{ch} L\left(w \bullet_{p} \lambda\right)=\sum_{w^{\prime} \in W_{\mathrm{aff}}} a_{w, w^{\prime}} \chi\left(w^{\prime} \bullet_{p} \lambda\right)
$$

then

$$
\operatorname{ch} L\left(w \bullet_{p} \mu\right)=\sum_{w^{\prime} \in W_{\mathrm{aff}}} a_{w, w^{\prime}} \chi\left(w^{\prime} \bullet_{p} \mu\right) .
$$

Remark 12. We call any subcategory $\operatorname{Rep}_{\lambda}(G)$ with $\lambda$ in a facet $F$ of maximal dimension a principal block. The results above reduce some problems to the principal block. This strategy is not entirely successful, however, both because the upper closure of $F$ is smaller than its topological closure, and because if $p$ is very small then $F \cap X$ can sometimes be empty, as we saw in Example 1.

## 5. Proof of linkage principle

In this section we'll prove the linkage principle in the special case where the derived subgroup of $G$ is simply connected ${ }^{2}$ and $X / \mathbb{Z} R$ has no $p$-torsion, following Riche [Ric, §2.4]. The proof consists of analyzing separately two kinds of central characters, infinitesimal and global.

The rough idea is quite simple. If $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\mu)$ had different central characters then any extension of one by the other would split. But since $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(L(\lambda), L(\mu)) \neq 0$, the central characters must agree. This agreement forces $\lambda$ and $\mu$ to be linked.

Start with the infinitesimal character. Let $U(-)$ denote the universal enveloping algebra. The decomposition $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{b}^{+}$together with the Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt theorem gives a linear projection $\phi: U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{t})$ with kernel $\mathfrak{b} U(\mathfrak{g})+U(\mathfrak{g}) \mathfrak{b}^{+}$. The restriction of $\phi$ to $U(\mathfrak{g})^{G}$ is an isomorphism

$$
U(\mathfrak{g})^{G} \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{t})^{(W, \bullet)}
$$

called the Harish-Chandra isomorphism. ${ }^{3}$ Here the superscript $(W, \bullet)$ denotes the dot-action invariants of the Weyl group. Every $G$-module $V$ inherits, by differentiation, the structure of a $U(\mathfrak{g})$-module, and the actions are compatible in the sense that

$$
\pi(g) \mathrm{d} \pi(X)(v)=\pi(\operatorname{ad}(g)(X))(v)
$$

for all $g \in G, X \in \mathfrak{g}$, and $v \in V$, where $\pi: G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V)$ denotes the $G$-action and $\mathrm{d} \pi: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow$ $\mathfrak{g l}(V)$ its differential. It follows that the restriction of $\mathrm{d} \pi$ to $U(\mathfrak{g})^{G}$ maps to the $G$-equivariant endomorphisms of $V$. In particular, if $V$ is simple then this restriction is a character of $U(\mathfrak{g})^{G}$, which by the Harish-Chandra isomorphism can be identified with a character of $U(\mathfrak{t})^{(W, \bullet)}$. We call this restriction the infinitesimal central character of $V$. A character of $U(\mathfrak{t})^{(W, \bullet)}$ is just a point of the quotient $\mathfrak{t}^{*} /(W, \bullet)$, which we can identify with $(X \otimes k) /(W, \bullet)$ via the differential map. When $V=L(\lambda)$, it should not come as a surprise that the infinitesimal central character is the class of (the differential of) $\lambda$. It follows that $\lambda$ and $\mu$ have the same image in $(X \otimes k) /(W, \bullet)$. In other words, there is $w \in W$ such that

$$
\lambda-w \bullet \mu \in p X
$$

The global central character is simpler: restrict $L(\lambda)$ to $Z(G)$. The resulting character is an element of the dual group of $Z(G)$, namely $X / \mathbb{Z} R$. Since $\lambda$ and $\mu$ agree in this group,

$$
\lambda-\mu \in \mathbb{Z} R .
$$

We can now complete the proof. Since $\mu-w \bullet \mu \in \mathbb{Z} R$ for any $\mu \in X$ and $w \in W$,

$$
\lambda-w \bullet \mu \in \mathbb{Z} R \cap p X
$$

[^1]for some $w \in W$. But since $X / \mathbb{Z} R$ has no $p$-torsion, $\mathbb{Z} R \cap p X=p \mathbb{Z} R$. Hence $\lambda=w \bullet_{p} \mu$ for some $w \in W_{\text {aff }}$.
Remark 13. In the classical statement of the Harish-Chandra isomorphism, the algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})^{G}$ is replaced by the center $Z(U(\mathfrak{g}))$. In positive characteristic, however, the center is too large. Here $\mathfrak{g}$ has an additional structure of a restricted Lie algebra: an operation $x \mapsto x^{[p]}$ satisfying certain axioms, but which can be defined as the usual $p$ th power in a fixed linear representation of $\mathfrak{g}$. It turns out that for all $x \in \mathfrak{g}$,
$$
\xi(x) \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} x^{p}-x^{[p]} \in Z(U(\mathfrak{g}))
$$
and that furthermore, the image under $\xi: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow Z(U(\mathfrak{g}))$ of a linearly independent set is algebraically independent [Jan98, 2.3]. Hence $Z(U(\mathfrak{g}))$ contains at least $\operatorname{dim}(G)$ algebraically independent elements, so it is much larger than $\left.U(\mathfrak{t})^{(W, \bullet}\right)$.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The assumption of finite-dimensionality is not essential here.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The case of general $G$ can probably be reduced to the simply-connected case, so the second hypothesis is the essential one.
    ${ }^{3}$ It seems that this map is an isomorphism only when the derived subgroup of $G$ is simply connected; I don't understand why this assumption is needed, however. [?]

