What is a unipotent representation?

Lucas Mason-Brown

April 2021

Big unsolved problem (Gelfand)

Let G be a real reductive Lie group. Classify

$$\mathrm{Irr}_u(G) = \{\text{irreducible unitary representations of } G\}$$

Big unsolved problem (Gelfand)

Let G be a real reductive Lie group. Classify

$$\mathrm{Irr}_u(G) = \{\text{irreducible unitary representations of } G\}$$

Conjecture (Arthur, Vogan, Adams, Barbasch,...)

The classification of $\mathrm{Irr}_u(G)$ should reduce to the classification of a small finite subset

$$\mathrm{Unip}(G) \subset \mathrm{Irr}_u(G)$$

RHS built out of LHS by *parabolic induction*. LHS indexed by *nilpotent orbits*.

Goals

1. Propose a definition of unipotent representations of a complex reductive group (geometric and case-free)
2. Describe key properties of unipotent representations (unitarity, restriction to K, maximality of annihilators, etc.)
3. Define an enhancement of Barbasch-Vogan duality
4. Give a classification of unipotent representations
5. Speculate about applications to real reductive groups?

Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}_q &= \text{finite field with } q \text{ elements} \\ \mathsf{G} &= \text{connected reductive algebraic group} \\ &\quad\ \text{defined and split over } \mathbb{F}_q \\ \mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q) &= \mathbb{F}_q\text{-points of } \mathsf{G} \\ \mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)) &= \text{irreducible finite-dim reps of } \mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q) \end{aligned}$$

Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}_q &= \text{finite field with } q \text{ elements} \\ G &= \text{connected reductive algebraic group} \\ &\quad \text{defined and split over } \mathbb{F}_q \\ G(\mathbb{F}_q) &= \mathbb{F}_q\text{-points of } G \\ \mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(G(\mathbb{F}_q)) &= \text{irreducible finite-dim reps of } G(\mathbb{F}_q) \end{aligned}$$

Problem

Determine $\mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(G(\mathbb{F}_q))$ for arbitrary G.

Problem solved completely by Lusztig in early 1980s.

Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

Construction of representations:

- Choose a Fr-stable maximal torus $\mathsf{T} \subset \mathsf{G}$ and a character $\theta : \mathsf{T}(\mathbb{F}_q) \to \mathbb{C}^\times$.
- Deligne-Lusztig define a virtual representation $R_{\mathsf{T}}(\theta)$ of $\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ (obtained as the ℓ-adic cohomology of associated 'Deligne-Lusztig' variety)

Construction of representations:

- Choose a Fr-stable maximal torus $\mathsf{T} \subset \mathsf{G}$ and a character $\theta : \mathsf{T}(\mathbb{F}_q) \to \mathbb{C}^\times$.
- Deligne-Lusztig define a virtual representation $R_{\mathsf{T}}(\theta)$ of $\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ (obtained as the ℓ-adic cohomology of associated 'Deligne-Lusztig' variety)

Theorem (Deligne-Lusztig, 1976)

Every irreducible representation of $\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ appears in some $R_{\mathsf{T}}(\theta)$. Most $R_{\mathsf{T}}(\theta)$ are irreducible.

Unipotent Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

Definition (Deligne-Lusztig, 1976)

A unipotent representation of $\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is an irreducible representation appearing in some $R_{\mathsf{T}}(1)$. Write

$$\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)) \subset \mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q))$$

for the set of unipotent representations.

Unipotent Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

Definition (Deligne-Lusztig, 1976)

A unipotent representation of $\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is an irreducible representation appearing in some $R_{\mathsf{T}}(1)$. Write

$$\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)) \subset \mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q))$$

for the set of unipotent representations.

Since there are finitely-many conjugacy classes of maximal tori $\mathsf{T}(\mathbb{F}_q) \subset \mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$, there are finitely-many unipotent representations of $\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Unipotent Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

Definition (Deligne-Lusztig, 1976)

A unipotent representation of $\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is an irreducible representation appearing in some $R_{\mathsf{T}}(1)$. Write

$$\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)) \subset \mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q))$$

for the set of unipotent representations.

Since there are finitely-many conjugacy classes of maximal tori $\mathsf{T}(\mathbb{F}_q) \subset \mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$, there are finitely-many unipotent representations of $\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Theorem (Lusztig, 1984)

The classification of $\mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q))$ reduces to the classification of $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q))$.

Classification of Unipotent Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

- Let G be the associated complex reductive algebraic group, and let $G^\vee$ be the dual group.

Classification of Unipotent Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

- Let G be the associated complex reductive algebraic group, and let $G^\vee$ be the dual group.
- If $\mathcal{O}^\vee \subset \mathcal{N}^\vee$ is a *special* nilpotent orbit, there is a canonically defined quotient group

$$\pi_1^{G^\vee}(\mathcal{O}^\vee) \twoheadrightarrow \overline{A}(\mathcal{O}^\vee)$$

Classification of Unipotent Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type

- Let G be the associated complex reductive algebraic group, and let $G^\vee$ be the dual group.
- If $\mathcal{O}^\vee \subset \mathcal{N}^\vee$ is a *special* nilpotent orbit, there is a canonically defined quotient group

$$\pi_1^{G^\vee}(\mathcal{O}^\vee) \twoheadrightarrow \overline{A}(\mathcal{O}^\vee)$$

Theorem (Lusztig, 1984)

There is a natural bijection between $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathrm{G}(\mathbb{F}_q))$ and the set of triples

$$(\mathcal{O}^\vee = \text{special nilp}, \ C = \text{conj class in } \overline{A}, \ \xi = \text{irrep of } \overline{A}^C)$$

In particular, the classification is *independent of q*.

Recap

There is a finite set of irreducibles

$$\mathrm{Unip}(G(\mathbb{F}_q)) \subset \mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(G(\mathbb{F}_q))$$

such that

1. $\mathrm{Unip}(G(\mathbb{F}_q))$ is classified by certain geometric data related to nilpotent orbits, and
2. The classification of $\mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(G(\mathbb{F}_q))$ reduces to the classification of $\mathrm{Unip}(G(\mathbb{F}_q))$ (analagous to the Jordan decomposition of matrices).

Replace

$$\mathbb{F}_q \rightsquigarrow k \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$$
$$G(\mathbb{F}_q) \rightsquigarrow G(k)$$
$$\mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(G(\mathbb{F}_q)) \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Irr}_u(G(k))$$

Replace

$$\mathbb{F}_q \rightsquigarrow k \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$$
$$\mathrm{G}(\mathbb{F}_q) \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{G}(k)$$
$$\mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(\mathrm{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)) \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Irr}_u(\mathrm{G}(k))$$

Problem (Gelfand, 1930s)

Determine $\mathrm{Irr}_u(\mathrm{G}(k))$ for arbitrary G.

- Problem remains *unsolved* in general.
- Answer known in special cases: connected compact groups (Weyl, 1920s), $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ (Bargmann, 1947), $GL_n(k)$ (Vogan, 1986), complex classical groups (Barbasch, 1989), some low-rank groups...

One possible strategy for solving this problem is to try to *imititate* the approach for $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$:

Conjecture (Vogan, 1987)

There is a finite subset $\mathrm{Unip}(G(k)) \subset \mathrm{Irr}(G(k))$ which completes the following analogy

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Unip}(G(k)) & \text{is to} & \mathrm{Irr}_u(G(k)) \\ & \text{as} & \\ \mathrm{Unip}(G(\mathbb{F}_q)) & \text{is to} & \mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(G(\mathbb{F}_q)) \end{array}$$

One possible strategy for solving this problem is to try to *imititate* the approach for $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$:

Conjecture (Vogan, 1987)

There is a finite subset $\mathrm{Unip}(G(k)) \subset \mathrm{Irr}(G(k))$ which completes the following analogy

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Unip}(G(k)) & \text{is to} & \mathrm{Irr}_u(G(k)) \\ & \text{as} & \\ \mathrm{Unip}(G(\mathbb{F}_q)) & \text{is to} & \mathrm{Irr}_{fd}(G(\mathbb{F}_q)) \end{array}$$

What does this mean?

In light of Lusztig (1984), one expects:

1. $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$ is classified by certain geometric objects related to nilpotent orbits, and
2. The classification of $\mathrm{Irr}_u(\mathsf{G}(k))$ reduces to the classification of $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$

In light of Lusztig (1984), one expects:

1. $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$ is classified by certain geometric objects related to nilpotent orbits, and
2. The classification of $\mathrm{Irr}_u(\mathsf{G}(k))$ reduces to the classification of $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$

Vogan describes some additional expected properties of $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$. Briefly:

In light of Lusztig (1984), one expects:

1. $\mathrm{Unip}(G(k))$ is classified by certain geometric objects related to nilpotent orbits, and
2. The classification of $\mathrm{Irr}_u(G(k))$ reduces to the classification of $\mathrm{Unip}(G(k))$

Vogan describes some additional expected properties of $\mathrm{Unip}(G(k))$. Briefly:

3. Annihilators are maximal, completely prime

In light of Lusztig (1984), one expects:

1. $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$ is classified by certain geometric objects related to nilpotent orbits, and
2. The classification of $\mathrm{Irr}_u(\mathsf{G}(k))$ reduces to the classification of $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$

Vogan describes some additional expected properties of $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$. Briefly:

3. Annihilators are maximal, completely prime
4. Restriction to K has a very special form (global sections of certain K-eqvt vector bundles)

In light of Lusztig (1984), one expects:

1. $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$ is classified by certain geometric objects related to nilpotent orbits, and
2. The classification of $\mathrm{Irr}_u(\mathsf{G}(k))$ reduces to the classification of $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$

Vogan describes some additional expected properties of $\mathrm{Unip}(\mathsf{G}(k))$. Briefly:

3. Annihilators are maximal, completely prime
4. Restriction to K has a very special form (global sections of certain K-eqvt vector bundles)
5. Infinitesimal characters are 'as small as possible' in their translation families.

Harish-Chandra Bimodules

Restrict to the case of $k = \mathbb{C}$. Let $G := \mathsf{G}(\mathbb{C})$.

Harish-Chandra Bimodules

Restrict to the case of $k = \mathbb{C}$. Let $G := \mathsf{G}(\mathbb{C})$.

- Well-known equivalence

$$\mathrm{Rep}(G) \simeq \mathrm{HC}(G)$$

($\mathrm{HC}(G)$ is category of *Harish-Chandra bimodules*).

Harish-Chandra Bimodules

Restrict to the case of $k = \mathbb{C}$. Let $G := \mathsf{G}(\mathbb{C})$.

- Well-known equivalence

$$\mathrm{Rep}(G) \simeq \mathrm{HC}(G)$$

  ($\mathrm{HC}(G)$ is category of *Harish-Chandra bimodules*).
- If $M \in \mathrm{HC}(G)$, can define left and right annihilators

$$\mathrm{Ann}_L(M) \subset U(\mathfrak{g}) \qquad \mathrm{Ann}_R(M) \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$$

  and associated variety

$$V(M) = V(\mathrm{Ann}_L(M)) = V(\mathrm{Ann}_R(M)) \subset \mathcal{N}$$

Harish-Chandra Bimodules

Restrict to the case of $k = \mathbb{C}$. Let $G := \mathsf{G}(\mathbb{C})$.

- Well-known equivalence

$$\mathrm{Rep}(G) \simeq \mathrm{HC}(G)$$

  ($\mathrm{HC}(G)$ is category of *Harish-Chandra bimodules*).

- If $M \in \mathrm{HC}(G)$, can define left and right annihilators

$$\mathrm{Ann}_L(M) \subset U(\mathfrak{g}) \qquad \mathrm{Ann}_R(M) \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$$

  and associated variety

$$V(M) = V(\mathrm{Ann}_L(M)) = V(\mathrm{Ann}_R(M)) \subset \mathcal{N}$$

- If M is irreducible, then $\mathrm{Ann}_L(M), \mathrm{Ann}_R(M)$ are primitive, and $V(M) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$.

Special Unipotent Representations

Barbasch-Vogan define an important subset of $\mathrm{Unip}(G)$

Special Unipotent Representations

Barbasch-Vogan define an important subset of $\mathrm{Unip}(G)$

- Barbasch-Vogan duality:

$$d : \mathcal{N}^{\vee}/G^{\vee} \to \mathcal{N}/G$$

Special Unipotent Representations

Barbasch-Vogan define an important subset of $\mathrm{Unip}(G)$

- Barbasch-Vogan duality:

$$d : \mathcal{N}^\vee/G^\vee \to \mathcal{N}/G$$

- Dual orbit $\mathcal{O}^\vee$ determines infl char for $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\mathcal{O}^\vee \mapsto (e^\vee, f^\vee, h^\vee) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}h^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}^\vee \simeq \mathfrak{h}^*$$

Special Unipotent Representations

Barbasch-Vogan define an important subset of $\mathrm{Unip}(G)$

- Barbasch-Vogan duality:

$$d : \mathcal{N}^\vee / G^\vee \to \mathcal{N} / G$$

- Dual orbit $\mathcal{O}^\vee$ determines infl char for $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\mathcal{O}^\vee \mapsto (e^\vee, f^\vee, h^\vee) \mapsto \frac{1}{2} h^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}^\vee \simeq \mathfrak{h}^*$$

- And hence a unique maximal ideal $J_{\frac{1}{2}h^\vee} \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$.

Special Unipotent Representations

Barbasch-Vogan define an important subset of $\mathrm{Unip}(G)$

- Barbasch-Vogan duality:

$$d : \mathcal{N}^\vee / G^\vee \to \mathcal{N}/G$$

- Dual orbit $\mathcal{O}^\vee$ determines infl char for $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\mathcal{O}^\vee \mapsto (e^\vee, f^\vee, h^\vee) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}h^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}^\vee \simeq \mathfrak{h}^*$$

- And hence a unique maximal ideal $J_{\frac{1}{2}h^\vee} \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$.
- $V(J_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{O}^\vee}) = \overline{d(\mathcal{O}^\vee)}$.

Special Unipotent Representations

Definition (Barbasch-Vogan, 1985)

The *special unipotent ideal* attached to $\mathcal{O}^\vee$ is the maximal ideal $J_{\frac{1}{2}h^\vee} \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$. A *special unipotent representation* attached to $\mathcal{O}^\vee$ is an irreducible HC bimodule M such that

$$\mathrm{Ann}_L(M) = \mathrm{Ann}_R(M) = J_{\frac{1}{2}h^\vee}$$

Write

$$\mathrm{Unip}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}(G) \subset \mathrm{Irr}(G)$$

for the set of special unipotent representations attached to $\mathcal{O}^\vee$ and

$$\mathrm{Unip}^{\mathrm{s}}(G) := \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{O}^\vee} \mathrm{Unip}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}(G)$$

Special Unipotent Representations

$\mathrm{Unip}^s(G)$ are known to satisfy many of Vogan's desiderata.

Special Unipotent Representations

$\mathrm{Unip}^{s}(G)$ are known to satisfy many of Vogan's desiderata.

- Infinitesimal characters are 'as small as possible.'

Special Unipotent Representations

$\mathrm{Unip}^{\mathrm{s}}(G)$ are known to satisfy many of Vogan's desiderata.

- Infinitesimal characters are 'as small as possible.'
- Annihilators are maximal.

Special Unipotent Representations

$\mathrm{Unip}^{s}(G)$ are known to satisfy many of Vogan's desiderata.

- Infinitesimal characters are 'as small as possible.'
- Annihilators are maximal.
- Unitary (Barbasch, Barbasch-Ciobotaru).

Special Unipotent Representations

$\mathrm{Unip}^{\mathrm{s}}(G)$ are known to satisfy many of Vogan's desiderata.

- Infinitesimal characters are 'as small as possible.'
- Annihilators are maximal.
- Unitary (Barbasch, Barbasch-Ciobotaru).
- Classified by geometric objects related to nilpotent orbits:

Theorem (Barbasch-Vogan, 1985)

There is a natural bijection

$$\mathrm{Unip}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}(G) \simeq \overline{A}(\mathcal{O}^\vee)^\wedge$$

Special Unipotent Representations

Problem

Let $G = Sp(2n)$ and let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be the minimal nilpotent orbit.

- Joseph ideal $J \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$. Maximal, completely prime, $V(J) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$.
- Oscillator representations $M^{\pm}$. Unitary, irreducible, $\mathrm{Ann}_L(M^{\pm}) = \mathrm{Ann}_R(M^{\pm}) = J$.
- Since $\mathcal{O}$ is *rigid*, $M^{\pm}$ cannot be induced.
- Since $\mathcal{O}$ is not special, $M^{\pm} \notin \mathrm{Unip}^s(G)$.

Special Unipotent Representations

Problem

Let $G = Sp(2n)$ and let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be the minimal nilpotent orbit.

- Joseph ideal $J \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$. Maximal, completely prime, $V(J) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$.
- Oscillator representations $M^{\pm}$. Unitary, irreducible, $\mathrm{Ann}_L(M^{\pm}) = \mathrm{Ann}_R(M^{\pm}) = J$.
- Since $\mathcal{O}$ is *rigid*, $M^{\pm}$ cannot be induced.
- Since $\mathcal{O}$ is not special, $M^{\pm} \notin \mathrm{Unip}^s(G)$.

Conclusion

$\mathrm{Unip}^s(G) \subsetneq \mathrm{Unip}(G)$

Special Unipotent Representations

Problem

Let $G = Sp(2n)$ and let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be the minimal nilpotent orbit.

- Joseph ideal $J \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$. Maximal, completely prime, $V(J) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$.
- Oscillator representations $M^{\pm}$. Unitary, irreducible, $\mathrm{Ann}_L(M^{\pm}) = \mathrm{Ann}_R(M^{\pm}) = J$.
- Since $\mathcal{O}$ is *rigid*, $M^{\pm}$ cannot be induced.
- Since $\mathcal{O}$ is not special, $M^{\pm} \notin \mathrm{Unip}^s(G)$.

Conclusion

$\mathrm{Unip}^s(G) \subsetneq \mathrm{Unip}(G)$

I will propose a natural definition of $\mathrm{Unip}(G)$ which generalizes BV.

Nilpotent Covers

Unipotent representations of G will be parameterized by *nilpotent covers*.

Nilpotent Covers

Unipotent representations of G will be parameterized by *nilpotent covers*.

- A nilpotent cover is a triple consisting of a nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$, a homogeneous space $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ for G, and a finite G-equivariant map $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}$.

Nilpotent Covers

Unipotent representations of G will be parameterized by *nilpotent covers*.

- A nilpotent cover is a triple consisting of a nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$, a homogeneous space $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ for G, and a finite G-equivariant map $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}$.
- Choose $e \in \mathcal{O}$ and $x \in \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ over e. Then

$$\pi_1^G(\mathcal{O}) \simeq G_e/G_e^o$$

and

$$\pi_1^G(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) \simeq G_x/G_x^o \subseteq G_e/G_e^o \simeq \pi_1^G(\mathcal{O})$$

This defines a Galois correspondence between nilpotent covers of $\mathcal{O}$ (up to isomorphism) and subgroups of $\pi_1^G(\mathcal{O})$ (up to conjugacy).

Nilpotent Covers

Unipotent representations of G will be parameterized by *nilpotent covers*.

- A nilpotent cover is a triple consisting of a nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$, a homogeneous space $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ for G, and a finite G-equivariant map $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}$.
- Choose $e \in \mathcal{O}$ and $x \in \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ over e. Then

$$\pi_1^G(\mathcal{O}) \simeq G_e/G_e^o$$

and

$$\pi_1^G(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) \simeq G_x/G_x^o \subseteq G_e/G_e^o \simeq \pi_1^G(\mathcal{O})$$

This defines a Galois correspondence between nilpotent covers of $\mathcal{O}$ (up to isomorphism) and subgroups of $\pi_1^G(\mathcal{O})$ (up to conjugacy).

Quantizations of Nilpotent Covers

- There is a G-eqvt symplectic form $\omega \in \Omega^2(\mathcal{O})$ (Kostant), inducing a G-eqvt symplectic form $p^*\omega \in \Omega^2(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$.

Quantizations of Nilpotent Covers

- There is a G-eqvt symplectic form $\omega \in \Omega^2(\mathcal{O})$ (Kostant), inducing a G-eqvt symplectic form $p^*\omega \in \Omega^2(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$.
- Symplectic form induces graded G eqvt Poisson bracket on $\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$

Definition

A *quantization* of $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is a pair $(\mathcal{A}, \theta)$ consisting of a filtered algebra $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$[\mathcal{A}_{\leq m}, \mathcal{A}_{\leq n}] \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\leq m+n-1}$$

and an isomorphism of graded Poisson algebras

$$\theta : \mathrm{gr}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$$

Quantizations of Nilpotent Covers

Every $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ defines

1. A Levi subgroup $L \subset G$.
2. A finite group W acting on $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ by reflections.

Theorem (Loseu, Matvieievskyi)

There is a canonical bijection

$$\{\text{quantizations of } \widetilde{\mathbb{O}}\} \simeq \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})/W$$

Quantizations of Nilpotent Covers

Every $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ defines

1. A Levi subgroup $L \subset G$.
2. A finite group W acting on $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ by reflections.

Theorem (Loseu, Matvieievskyi)

There is a canonical bijection

$$\{\text{quantizations of } \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}\} \simeq \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})/W$$

Quantizations of Nilpotent Covers

Example

Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be the principal nilpotent orbit. Then

$$L = T \qquad W = W(G)$$

Conclusion:

$$\mathfrak{t}^*/W(G) \simeq \{\text{quantizations of } \mathcal{N}\}$$

In this case, bijection is very easy to describe.

$$\lambda \longmapsto U(\mathfrak{g})/\langle \ker \chi_\lambda \rangle$$

Canonical Quantizations

Observation

If $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ is an eqvt nilpotent cover, there is a distinguished quantization corresponding to $0 \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})/W$. We call this quantization the *canonical quantization* and denote it by $\mathcal{A}_0$.

Canonical Quantizations

Observation

If $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ is an eqvt nilpotent cover, there is a distinguished quantization corresponding to $0 \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})/W$. We call this quantization the *canonical quantization* and denote it by $\mathcal{A}_0$.

The canonical quantization has many distinguishing properties (Loseu, MB, Matvieievskyi):

Canonical Quantizations

Observation

If $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ is an eqvt nilpotent cover, there is a distinguished quantization corresponding to $0 \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})/W$. We call this quantization the *canonical quantization* and denote it by $\mathcal{A}_0$.

The canonical quantization has many distinguishing properties (Loseu, MB, Matvieievskyi):

- $\mathcal{A}_0$ is the unique *even* quantization of $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$.

Canonical Quantizations

Observation

If $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is an eqvt nilpotent cover, there is a distinguished quantization corresponding to $0 \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})/W$. We call this quantization the *canonical quantization* and denote it by $\mathcal{A}_0$.

The canonical quantization has many distinguishing properties (Loseu, MB, Matvieievskyi):

- $\mathcal{A}_0$ is the unique *even* quantization of $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$.
- $\mathcal{A}_0$ has a large automorphism group (all Poisson automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$ lift to filtered automorphisms of $\mathcal{A}_0$).

Canonical Quantizations

Observation

If $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ is an eqvt nilpotent cover, there is a distinguished quantization corresponding to $0 \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})/W$. We call this quantization the *canonical quantization* and denote it by $\mathcal{A}_0$.

The canonical quantization has many distinguishing properties (Loseu, MB, Matvieievskyi):

- $\mathcal{A}_0$ is the unique *even* quantization of $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$.
- $\mathcal{A}_0$ has a large automorphism group (all Poisson automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}]$ lift to filtered automorphisms of $\mathcal{A}_0$).
- $\mathcal{A}_0$ is G-eqvt (i.e. G-action on $\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}]$ lifts to $\mathcal{A}_0$).

Unipotent Ideals

The G-action on $\mathcal{A}_0$ is *Hamiltonian*, i.e. there is a *(quantum) co-moment map*

$$\Phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathcal{A}_0$$

lifting the *(classical) co-moment map*

$$S(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}^*] \to \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$$

Unipotent Ideals

The G-action on $\mathcal{A}_0$ is *Hamiltonian*, i.e. there is a *(quantum) co-moment map*

$$\Phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathcal{A}_0$$

lifting the *(classical) co-moment map*

$$S(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}^*] \to \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$$

Definition (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

The *unipotent ideal* attached to $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is the primitive ideal

$$J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) := \ker\left(\Phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathcal{A}_0\right) \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$$

Unipotent Ideals

Two important examples:

Example

Let $\mathcal{O} = \{0\}$. Then $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbb{C}$, $\Phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathbb{C}$ is the augmentation map, and $J(\mathcal{O})$ is the augmentation ideal. In particular $\lambda(\mathcal{O}) = \rho$.

Unipotent Ideals

Two important examples:

Example

Let $\mathcal{O} = \{0\}$. Then $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbb{C}$, $\Phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathbb{C}$ is the augmentation map, and $J(\mathcal{O})$ is the augmentation ideal. In particular $\lambda(\mathcal{O}) = \rho$.

Example

Let $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{prin}}$. Then $\mathcal{A}_0 = U(\mathfrak{g})/\langle \ker \gamma_0 \rangle$, $\Phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathcal{A}_0$ is the quotient map, and $J(\mathcal{O}) = \langle \ker \gamma_0 \rangle$. In particular, $\lambda(\mathcal{O}) = 0$.

Unipotent Ideals

Example

Let $G = SL(2)$ and let $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\text{prin}}$ be the 2-fold G-eqvt cover.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{C}^2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{N} \end{array}$$

The Weyl algebra $\mathbb{C}[x, \partial x]$ is the *unique* quantization of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Has a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action (by negation). There is a surjection $\Phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[x, \partial x]^{\mathbb{Z}_2}$

$$e \mapsto \frac{1}{2}x^2 \quad f \mapsto -\frac{1}{2}\partial x^2 \quad h \mapsto x\partial x + \frac{1}{2}$$

with kernel $\Omega + \frac{3}{4}$. Recall $\gamma_\lambda(\Omega) = \lambda^2 - 2\lambda$. Hence, $\lambda(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Properties of Unipotent Ideals

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

The following are true:

(i) $V(J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$

(ii) $J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ is completely prime

(iii) $J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ is maximal.

(iv) $m_{\overline{\mathcal{O}}}(J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})) = 1$ if and only if $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}$ is Galois.

Properties of Unipotent Ideals

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

The following are true:

(i) $V(J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$

(ii) $J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ is completely prime

(iii) $J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ is maximal.

(iv) $m_{\overline{\mathcal{O}}}(J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})) = 1$ if and only if $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}$ is Galois.

Unipotent Ideals for $G = Sp(4)$



Unipotent Ideals for $G = Sp(4)$



Unipotent Ideals for $G = Sp(8)$

The unipotent ideals $J(\widetilde{\mathbb{O}})$ are the maximal ideals with the following infl chars:

$\tilde{\mathbb{O}}$	$\lambda(\tilde{\mathbb{O}})$	$\tilde{\mathbb{O}}$	$\lambda(\tilde{\mathbb{O}})$	$\tilde{\mathbb{O}}$	$\lambda(\tilde{\mathbb{O}})$
(8)	$(0,0,0,0)$	$(42^2)_2$	$(1,1,\frac{1}{2},0)$	$(3^22)_2$	$(\frac{3}{2},1,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$
$(8)_2$	$(\frac{1}{2},0,0,0)$	$(42^2)_2$	$(\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$	(3^21^2)	$(2,1,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$
(62)	$(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},0,0)$	$(42^2)_2$	$(\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},0)$	(2^4)	$(\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$
$(62)_2$	$(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},0)$	$(42^2)_4$	$(\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$	$(2^4)_2$	$(2,1,1,0)$
$(62)_2$	$(1,0,0,0)$	(421^2)	$(2,1,0,0)$	(2^31^2)	$(\frac{5}{2},\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$
$(62)_2$	$(1,\frac{1}{2},0,0)$	$(421^2)_2$	$(2,1,0,0)$	$(2^31^2)_2$	$(\frac{5}{2},\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$
$(62)_4$	$(1,\frac{1}{2},0,0)$	$(421^2)_2$	$(2,1,0,0)$	(2^21^4)	$(3,2,1,0)$
(61^2)	$(\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},0,0)$	$(421^2)_2$	$(2,1,\frac{1}{2},0)$	$(2^21^4)_2$	$(3,2,1,0)$
$(61^2)_2$	$(\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},0,0)$	$(421^2)_4$	$(2,1,\frac{1}{2},0)$	(21^6)	$(\frac{7}{2},\frac{5}{2},\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2})$
(4^2)	$(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$	(41^4)	$(\frac{5}{2},\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},0)$	$(21^6)_2$	$(\frac{7}{2},\frac{5}{2},\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2})$
$(4^2)_2$	$(1,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},0)$	$(41^4)_2$	$(\frac{5}{2},\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2},0)$	(1^8)	$(4,3,2,1)$
(42^2)	$(1,1,0,0)$	(3^22)	$(1,1,1,0)$		

Blue = special unipotent. Note: all such appear.

Classification of Unipotent Ideals

Definition (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

Suppose $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^1$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^2$ are eqvt covers of $\mathcal{O}$. We say $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^1$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^2$ are equivalent if the affine varieties $\mathrm{Spec}([\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^1])$ and $\mathrm{Spec}([\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^2])$ have the same codimension 2 singularities. Denote the equivalence classes by $[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$.

Classification of Unipotent Ideals

Definition (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

Suppose $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^1$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^2$ are eqvt covers of $\mathcal{O}$. We say $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^1$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^2$ are equivalent if the affine varieties $\mathrm{Spec}([\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^1])$ and $\mathrm{Spec}([\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^2])$ have the same codimension 2 singularities. Denote the equivalence classes by $[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$.

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

The map $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \mapsto J(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ defines a bijection

$$\{\text{equivalence class of covers}\} \simeq \{\text{unipotent ideals}\}$$

Classification of Unipotent Ideals

Example

Let $G = SL(2)$.

$\{0\}$	$\mathcal{O}$	$\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$
J_1	J_0	$J_{\frac{1}{2}}$

Classification of Unipotent Ideals

Example

Let $G = SL(2)$.

$\{0\}$	$\mathcal{O}$	$\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$
J_1	J_0	$J_{\frac{1}{2}}$

Example

Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the minimal orbit (for any G). Unless $\dim(\mathcal{O}) = 2$, $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{O}])$ has *no* codim 2 singularities. Hence, all covers of $\mathcal{O}$ are equivalent. Corresponding ideal is Joseph ideal.

Enhanced BV Duality

Want to show that all special unipotent ideals are unipotent.

Enhanced BV Duality

Want to show that all special unipotent ideals are unipotent.

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

There is an injective map

$$\widetilde{d} : \{\mathcal{O}^\vee\} \hookrightarrow \{[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]\}$$

with the following properties:

(i) $\widetilde{d}(\mathcal{O}^\vee)$ covers $d(\mathcal{O}^\vee)$

(ii) $\frac{1}{2}h^\vee =$ infl char of $J(\widetilde{d}(\mathcal{O}^\vee))$.

Enhanced BV Duality

Want to show that all special unipotent ideals are unipotent.

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

There is an injective map

$$\widetilde{d} : \{\mathcal{O}^\vee\} \hookrightarrow \{[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]\}$$

with the following properties:

(i) $\widetilde{d}(\mathcal{O}^\vee)$ covers $d(\mathcal{O}^\vee)$

(ii) $\frac{1}{2}h^\vee =$ infl char of $J(\widetilde{d}(\mathcal{O}^\vee))$.

Since unipotent ideals are maximal, this shows that special unipotent $\implies$ unipotent.

New Definition of Unipotent Representations

Definition (Loseu-MB-Matvievskyi)

A *unipotent representation* attached to $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ is an irreducible HC bimodule M such that

$$\mathrm{Ann}_L(M) = \mathrm{Ann}_R(M) = I_0(\widetilde{\mathbb{O}})$$

Write

$$\mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}}(G) \subset \mathrm{Irr}(G)$$

for the set of unipotent representations attached to $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ and

$$\mathrm{Unip}(G) := \bigsqcup_{\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}} \mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}}(G)$$

Properties of Unipotent Representations

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

If G is linear classical all representations in $\mathrm{Unip}(G)$ are unitary.

Properties of Unipotent Representations

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

If G is linear classical all representations in $\mathrm{Unip}(G)$ are unitary.

Let G and $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ be arbitrary. We prove a conjecture of Vogan:

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

Let $V \in \mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}}(G)$. Then there is a distinguished good filtration on V giving rise to an isomorphism of G-representations

$$V \simeq_G \Gamma(\mathbb{O}, \mathrm{gr}(V))$$

Classification of Unipotent Representations

- Want to classify $\mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}}(G)$ for arbitrary G, $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$

Classification of Unipotent Representations

- Want to classify $\mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}}(G)$ for arbitrary G, $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$
- Replace $\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}$ with maximal cover in its equivalence class $[\widetilde{\mathbb{O}}]$ (always exists!)

Classification of Unipotent Representations

- Want to classify $\mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}}(G)$ for arbitrary G, $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$
- Replace $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ with maximal cover in its equivalence class $[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$ (always exists!)
- Consider the finite group

$$\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) := \mathrm{Gal}(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}/\mathcal{O})$$

Classification of Unipotent Representations

- Want to classify $\mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}}(G)$ for arbitrary G, $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$
- Replace $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ with maximal cover in its equivalence class $[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$ (always exists!)
- Consider the finite group

$$\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) := \mathrm{Gal}(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}/\mathcal{O})$$

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

There is a natural bijection

$$\mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}}(G) \simeq \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})^{\wedge}$$

Classification of Unipotent Representations

- Want to classify $\mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}}(G)$ for arbitrary G, $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$
- Replace $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ with maximal cover in its equivalence class $[\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}]$ (always exists!)
- Consider the finite group

$$\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) := \mathrm{Gal}(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}/\mathcal{O})$$

Theorem (Loseu-MB-Matvieievskyi)

There is a natural bijection

$$\mathrm{Unip}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}}(G) \simeq \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})^{\wedge}$$