

INVARIANT DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS AND FCR FACTORS OF ENVELOPING ALGEBRAS

IAN M. MUSSON AND JEB F. WILLENBRING

Abstract. If \mathfrak{g} is a semisimple Lie algebra, we describe the prime factors of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ that have enough finite dimensional modules, and also determine, which finite dimensional $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules are modules over a given prime factor. As an application we study finite dimensional modules over some rings of invariant differential operators arising from Howe duality. We also provide a counterexample to a conjecture of Soergel.

1. Introduction

Let F denote an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. Given an F -algebra A , we say that A has enough finite dimensional representations if the intersection of the annihilators of the finite dimensional A -modules is zero. If in addition all finite dimensional representations are completely reducible A is an FCR algebra (see [KS94]).

Let \mathfrak{g} be a semisimple Lie algebra with enveloping algebra $U = U(\mathfrak{g})$. In this paper, we describe the prime factors of U that are FCR algebras, and also determine, in terms of highest weights, which finite dimensional U -modules are actually modules over a given prime factor. If A is a prime factor of U ; then any finite dimensional A -module is a \mathfrak{g} -module, and hence completely reducible. So the issue is whether or not A has enough finite dimensional modules. However we use the appellation "FCR" for brevity.

We apply our work to study finite dimensional modules over some rings of invariant differential operators. When \mathfrak{g} is \mathfrak{sl}_n we give a counterexample to conjecture 1 in [Soe90] concerning inclusions of ideals in U . We remark that the conjecture is related to one of two methods introduced by Soergel to study $\text{Spec } U$, and that the second method shows more promise, see [BJ01]) for recent progress.

We begin with some basic notation used to state the main theorem. Fix a Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} of \mathfrak{g} . To any prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of $S(\mathfrak{h})$, we can associate a prime ideal I of U , and a "tautological highest weight" λ (see [Soe90]). We recall the details in Section 3. Any prime

Date: June 18, 2019.

ideal of U has the form I for a suitable prime ideal in $S(\mathfrak{h})$. Set $U := U/I$.

Let R denote the root system corresponding to \mathfrak{h} with Weyl group W . Choose a set of positive roots, R^+ , such that $R = R^+ \sqcup -R^+$, and let $B = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ denote the simple roots in R^+ . Denote the dominant integral weights by P^+ .

We say that a prime ideal is dominant if $V(\mathfrak{p}) \setminus P^+$ is Zariski dense in $V(\mathfrak{p})$, where $V(\mathfrak{p})$ denotes the zero set of \mathfrak{p} in \mathfrak{h} .

Set $\lambda := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in R^+} \alpha$, and define the "dot action" of W on \mathfrak{h} as:

$$w \cdot \lambda := w(\lambda + \rho) \quad \text{for } w \in W$$

The dot action of W on \mathfrak{h} induces an action on $S(\mathfrak{h})$. Let (\cdot, \cdot) denote the Killing form on \mathfrak{g} : For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}$, let h_λ be the element of \mathfrak{h} determined by $(h_\lambda, h) = (\lambda, h)$ for all $h \in \mathfrak{h}$. The isomorphism $h \mapsto h_\lambda$ sending h to h_λ induces a bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) on \mathfrak{h} : For $\lambda \in R$ let $H_\lambda = \frac{2\lambda}{(\lambda, \lambda)}$ denote the coroot to λ , and set $\alpha = \frac{2\lambda}{(\lambda, \lambda)}$. Let $\alpha_i \in \mathfrak{h}$ be the fundamental weights, so that $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = \delta_{ij}$. We write H_i (resp. h_i) in place of H_{α_i} (resp. h_{α_i}).

The highest weight, λ , determines a subroot system, $R_\lambda = \{\alpha \in R \mid (\alpha, \lambda) \geq 0\}$. Let W_λ denote the Weyl group of R_λ . Let B_λ be the unique basis of simple roots in $R_\lambda^+ := R_\lambda \cap R^+$, and set $W_\lambda := \langle w_\beta \mid \beta \in B_\lambda \rangle$. The elements of W_λ are left coset representatives for W_λ in W . Thus, $W = W_\lambda \dot{\cup} W$.

Main Theorem.

- (1) If U is FCR then for some $w \in W$, $w \cdot \lambda$ is dominant.
- (2) Let \mathfrak{p} be a dominant ideal in $S(\mathfrak{h})$, and $w \in W$.

The following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) U_w is FCR
- (b) $I_w = I$
- (c) $w \in W_\lambda$ where $\lambda = \lambda$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove some results about root systems and the Weyl group which may be of independent interest. Then in Section 3 we collect some results about prime and primitive ideals in enveloping algebras. The main theorem is proved in Section 4, and the examples related to Howe duality are presented in Section 5.

2. Weyl group combinatorics

We introduce some notation. Let B_1 be a subset of B and R_1 be the subroot system of R with simple roots B_1 : Let W_1 be the Weyl group

of R_1 and set

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{2R_1^+} X :$$

For $w \in W$ define:

$$Q(w) = \sum_{2R^+} w \sum_{2R^+} :$$

Then we have ([W 98] Lemma 7.3.6),

$$w^{-1} = \frac{\sum X}{\sum Q(w)} : \quad (1)$$

The next result can be proved in a similar way.

Lemma 2.1. Suppose $w \in W$ is such that $w(R_1) = R_1$ and set

$$T(w) = f \sum_{2R_1^+} w \sum_{2R_1^+} g:$$

Then,

$$0 = w^{-1} 0 = \frac{\sum X}{\sum T(w)} :$$

Proposition 2.2. Suppose that $w \in W$ and $w(R_1) = R_1$. Then

$$\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ \sum X \\ \sum Q(w) \end{smallmatrix} \right) = 0;$$

with equality if and only if $w(B_1) = B_1$.

We introduce some notation needed for the proof of this result. If Q is a finite subset of h we set $\langle Q \rangle = \sum_{2Q} a$. Let

$$W_0 = f w \sum_{2W} w(R_1) = R_1 g;$$

and

$$T = f t \sum_{2W} w(B_1) = B_1 g;$$

Lemma 2.3. For $w \in W_0$ the following are equivalent,

- (1) $w(B_1) = B_1$,
- (2) $w(B_1) \subseteq R_1^+$,
- (3) $\ell(ws) > \ell(w)$ for all $s \in B_1$.

Proof. Clearly (1) implies (2). For the reverse implication, suppose $\sum_{2R_1^+} = \sum_{2B_1} c$. Define $ht(\cdot) = \sum c$. From (2) it follows that $ht(w(\cdot)) = ht(\cdot)$ and $w(R_1^+) = R_1^+$. This implies that $w^{-1} \in 2B_1$ for $s \in B_1$. Hence (1) holds. The equivalence of (2) and (3) follows from [Hu90] Lemma 1.6 a), b).

Corollary 2.4. Set $T = f w \sum_{2W} w(B_1) = B_1 g$. Then,

- (1) $W_0 = W_1 T$ is the semidirect product of the normal subgroup W_1 by T .
- (2) For $w \in W_1$ and $t \in T$ we have $\ell(wt) = \ell(w) + \ell(t)$.

Proof. (1) Since W_1 is generated by reflections, s with $s \in B_1$ and $ts^{-1} = s_{t(s)}$ for $t \in T$; it follows that T normalizes W_1 . From the implication (1) \Rightarrow (3) in Lemma 2.3 and [Hu90] Proposition 1.10 (c) we see that T is a transversal to W_1 in W_0 . It follows easily that $W_0 = W_1 T$ is the semidirect product of W_1 by T .

(2) This holds by [Hu90] Proposition 1.10 (c).

Recall that if $w \in W$ and $s \in B$ such that $\ell(ws) = \ell(w) + 1$ we have $Q(ws) = sQ(w) \sqcup g$ ([GW98] Corollary 7.3.4). If $w_1, w_2 \in W$ and $\ell(w_1 w_2) = \ell(w_1) + \ell(w_2)$, it follows by induction on $\ell(w_2)$ that $Q(w_1 w_2) = w_2^{-1} Q(w_1) \sqcup Q(w_2)$; a disjoint union. Now for $t \in T$ and $w \in W_1$ we have $\ell(wt) = \ell(w) + \ell(t)$ by Corollary 2.4. Since $t^0 = \emptyset$, it follows that

$$(\emptyset; \langle Q(wt) \rangle) = (\emptyset; \langle Q(w) \rangle) + (\emptyset; \langle Q(t) \rangle):$$

Hence Proposition 2.2 follows from the following result.

Lemma 2.5.

- (1) If $w \in W$ then $Q(w) = T(w)$. Consequently, if $w \neq 1$, then $(\emptyset; \langle Q(w) \rangle) > 0$.
- (2) If $t \in T$, then $(\emptyset; \langle Q(t) \rangle) = 0$

Proof. (1) Obviously $T(w) \subseteq Q(w)$, and it follows from [Hu90] Corollary 1.7 and Proposition 1.10 (b) that $\ell(w) = \#T(w)$, giving equality.

(2) Let v be the longest element of W_1 : Then v is the unique element of W_1 such that $v(R_1^+) = R_1^+$. Hence $v^2 = 1$, and if $t \in T$, then since $t^{-1}vt \in W_1$ and $t^{-1}vt(R_1^+) = R_1^+$ we have $tv = vt$.

Suppose $t \in T$, and set

$$Q^+ = \{f \in Q(t) \mid j(\emptyset; f) > 0\};$$

$$Q^- = \{f \in Q(t) \mid j(\emptyset; f) < 0\};$$

If $f \in Q(t)$, then $f \notin R_1^+$, so as $Q(v) = T(v)$, we have $v \in R^+$. It follows that $\forall v$ defines a bijection from Q^+ to Q^- such that for $f \in Q^+$,

$$(\emptyset; v \cdot f) = (v \cdot \emptyset; f) = (\emptyset; f):$$

The result follows easily from this fact.

Next we relate the dot action of W on S to the usual action.

Lemma 2.6. If $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $w \in W$ then,

$$w \cdot h = wh + \sum_{\alpha \in 2Q(w)} h(\alpha):$$

Proof. For $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} (w \cdot h)(\alpha) &= h(w^{-1} \cdot \alpha) \\ &= h(w^{-1}(\alpha + \sum_{\beta \in 2Q(w)} \beta)) \\ &= (wh)(\alpha) + h(w^{-1} \sum_{\beta \in 2Q(w)} \beta): \end{aligned}$$

We now apply equation (1).

3. FCR factors of Enveloping algebras.

We begin by recalling Soergel's work on prime ideals in the enveloping algebra $U = U(\mathfrak{g})$ where \mathfrak{g} is a semisimple Lie algebra. Let Z denote the center of U .

If R is a ring we let $\text{Spec}(R)$ denote the prime spectrum of R . For $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } S$, define an ideal in $\text{Spec } U$ as follows: Let $F := \text{Quot}(S(\mathfrak{h})/\mathfrak{p})$ (the quotient field of the commutative domain defined by \mathfrak{p}). We will let $\mathfrak{g}_F = F \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}$ denote the Lie algebra obtained from \mathfrak{g} by extension of scalars. We write ρ_F for the F -linear map from \mathfrak{h}_F to F whose restriction to \mathfrak{h} is:

$$\rho_F|_{\mathfrak{h}}: S(\mathfrak{h})/\mathfrak{p} \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{h})/\mathfrak{p} \otimes F:$$


Let $L(\lambda)$ be the simple highest weight module for \mathfrak{g}_F with highest weight λ . If I is the annihilator of $L(\lambda)$ in $U(\mathfrak{g})$ we define $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda) = I$. The maximal ideals in S have the form $\mathfrak{p}, M := \{f \in S \mid f(\lambda) = 0\}$ for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}$, and we write I instead of I_M , so that I is the annihilator of the simple module $L(\lambda)$ with highest weight λ .

Remark 3.1. When $\lambda = 0$ we have:

$$R = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in M} R_{\mathfrak{p}} \quad n \geq 1 \quad \text{for some } n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}:$$

For $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } U$, let $\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{p} \setminus Z$ ($\mathbb{Z} \subset \text{Spec } Z$). Lastly, ρ denotes a map induced by the Harish-Chandra isomorphism $Z \xrightarrow{\sim} S^W \subset S$. Then

(by [Soe90], Section 2.1) we have the following commutative diagram :



By [Soe90] Section 2.2, these maps are continuous in the Jacobson topology on prime ideals.

Note that the sets R , W , B depend only on the coset $\pi^{-1}(h) = \pi^{-1}(h) + P(R) \cong P(R)/h \cong P(R)$. For a coset $\pi^{-1}(h)$, let $B = B$ for any $\pi^{-1}(h)$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi^{-1}(h) &= \{f \in R \mid j(\pi^{-1}(h); -) = 0; \exists g \in B \text{ s.t. } f = g\}; \text{ and} \\
 \pi^{-1}(h)^+ &= \{f \in R \mid j(\pi^{-1}(h); -) > 0; \exists g \in B \text{ s.t. } f = g\};
 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2 ([Jan83] Satz. 5.16.). If $w \in W$ then for all $\pi^{-1}(h) \in P(R)$ we have $I = I_w$.

We recall the definition of the π -invariant for primitive ideals. Set:

$$\pi(w) = \{ \pi^{-1}(h) \in B \mid j(\pi^{-1}(h); -) = 0 \};$$

Next define $X = \{ \pi(w) \mid w \in W \}$, and write 2^B for the poset of subsets of B ordered by inclusion. We have:

Theorem 3.3 ([Jan83] 5.7). Let $\pi^{-1}(h) \in P(R)$ and $\pi^{-1}(h)^+ \in 2^B$. Then there is a well defined order reversing map:

$$\pi : X \rightarrow 2^B$$

such that $\pi(\pi^{-1}(h)) = \pi^{-1}(h)^+$.

Lemma 3.4. Let D be a dense subset of an affine algebraic set X . Let:

$$X = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3 \cup \dots \cup X_r$$

be the decomposition of X into irreducible components. Then $D \cap X_i$ is dense in X_i for each i .

Proof. Consider i such that $1 \leq i \leq r$. There exists a function $p_i \in O(X)$ which vanishes on X_j for all $j \neq i$ and p_i is not identically zero on X_i . Let $f \in O(X_i)$ be a function that vanishes on $D \cap X_i$. We will show that f is identically zero on X_i . We may extend f to a function $g \in O(X)$. The function gp_i vanishes on D and so is identically zero

on X . On X_i , $gp_i = fp_i$. This means that f vanishes on the set $D^0 = \{x \in X_i \mid p_i(x) \notin 0g\}$, which is dense in X_i . Therefore, f vanishes on X_i .

4. Proof of the main result.

In general, it is unknown when a prime ideal I is contained in a given primitive ideal I . However for $\mathfrak{p} \in P^+$ the answer is easy.

Theorem 4.1. For $\mathfrak{p} \in P^+$, $I = I_i \cap W : \setminus V(\mathfrak{p}) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. By Harish-Chandra's theorem we have $Z = S^W$. The maximal ideals in S^W are in one-to-one correspondence with points in the orbit space, $h \in W$. The embedding $S^W \hookrightarrow S$ induces the canonical map, $h \mapsto h \in W$, which we write as $(\mathfrak{p}) = [h]$. This map agrees with the restriction of \mathfrak{p} to the set of maximal ideal in S .

(\Rightarrow): Suppose $I \subsetneq I$. Then, $(\mathfrak{p}) = (I) \subsetneq (I) = (\mathfrak{M})$. Applying $V(\cdot)$ reverses inclusions, so we have $V((\mathfrak{p})) \supsetneq V((\mathfrak{M}))$. By definition, $[h] = V((\mathfrak{M}))$. That is to say that there exists $w \in W$ such that $w : \mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{p})$.

(\Leftarrow): On the other hand if $w : \mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{p})$, then $I \subsetneq I_w$. This implies, by a result of Dixmier [Dix70] (or [Jan83] Corollary 5.21) that $I \subsetneq I$.

Definition 4.2. Set $(\mathfrak{p}) := \{f \in \mathfrak{p} \mid f \in I\}$, and for each $w \in W$; set $(\mathfrak{p}; w) := \{f \in \mathfrak{p} \mid fw : \mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{p})\}$.

Note that, $I \subsetneq I$ and equality holds if and only if U is FCR. Also, by Theorem 4.1 we have:

$$(\mathfrak{p}) = \bigcup_{w \in W} (\mathfrak{p}; w):$$

Proposition 4.3. If \mathfrak{p} is dominant then U is FCR.

Proof. If $P^+ \setminus V(\mathfrak{p})$ is dense in $V(\mathfrak{p})$ then by [Joe90] Proposition 1, $I = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in P^+ \setminus V(\mathfrak{p})} I$. Thus by the remark after Definition 4.2, it suffices to show that $P^+ \setminus V(\mathfrak{p}) \subsetneq (\mathfrak{p})$ because this will imply $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in P^+ \setminus V(\mathfrak{p})} I \subsetneq I$. The former inclusion follows since if $\mathfrak{p} \in P^+ \setminus V(\mathfrak{p})$ then $\mathfrak{p} \not\subset M$, so $I \subsetneq I$, because \mathfrak{p} preserves inclusions.

Proposition 4.4. If \mathfrak{p} is dominant and $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}$, then $B \subsetneq B$.

Proof. Let $B = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$. It suffices to show that if $\mathfrak{p} \in R \setminus R^+$ and $\mathfrak{p} = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathfrak{p}_i$ ($c_i \in \mathbb{Z}; c_i \geq 0$) then $c_i > 0$ implies $\mathfrak{p}_i \in R$. Now $\mathfrak{p} \in R$ means $H = m^0 \mathfrak{p}$ for some $m^0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose that $c_i > 0$.

If $\alpha \in V(\mathfrak{a}) \setminus P^+$ we have $\alpha_j = (H_j) \in N$. Also, $h = \sum_{j=1}^P c_j \alpha_j$. We can write $H_j = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{r_{ij}}{s} H_i$ where $s, r_{ij} \in N$, $s > 0$ are such that $\frac{r_{ij}}{s} = c_j \frac{(j; i)}{(i; j)}$. Then, $m^0 = (H) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{r_{ij}}{s} \alpha_j$. Hence, if $c_i > 0$, $r_i > 0$ then $0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{m^0 s}{r_i} = m$.

For $0 \leq p \leq m$, let $\mathfrak{a}_{ip} := V(H_i - p)$. The above establishes that $V(\mathfrak{a}) \setminus P^+ \subseteq \bigcup_{p=0}^m \mathfrak{a}_{ip}$. Since \mathfrak{a} is dominant, $V(\mathfrak{a}) = \bigcup_{p=0}^m \mathfrak{a}_{ip}$, but $V(\mathfrak{a})$ is irreducible so $V(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{a}_{ip}$ for some p . This means $H_i - p \in N$, so $i \in R$.

To prove an important special case of the main theorem, we will weaken the notion of a dominant ideal as follows: We will say that \mathfrak{a} is weakly dominant if $V(\mathfrak{a}) \setminus P^+ \neq \emptyset$. Consider \mathfrak{a} such that \mathfrak{a} and w are weakly dominant. We will show that $w \in W$.

Before proceeding however, observe that for any ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq S(h)$ and $w \in W$ we have:

$$V(w\mathfrak{a}) = wV(\mathfrak{a}); \quad \text{and} \quad V(w:\mathfrak{a}) = w:V(\mathfrak{a});$$

Furthermore, if \mathfrak{a}^0 is an ideal such that $V(\mathfrak{a}^0) = V(\mathfrak{a}) + \mathfrak{a}$, then for any $w \in W$, $V(w\mathfrak{a}^0) = w:V(\mathfrak{a}) + \mathfrak{a}$. In addition $H_n \in \mathfrak{a}^0$ implies $H_n \in (\mathfrak{a}; -) \in \mathfrak{a}^0$.

Theorem 4.5. If \mathfrak{a} and w are both weakly dominant ideals in $S(h)$, then $w \in W$, where $w := \mathfrak{a}$ is the tautological highest weight corresponding to \mathfrak{a} .

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha \in P^+ \setminus V(\mathfrak{a})$ and $\beta \in P^+ \setminus V(w:\mathfrak{a})$. Since $\alpha \in B$ we have $H_n \in \mathfrak{a}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume to the contrary that $w \notin W$ is such that there exists $\alpha \in B$ such that $w = \alpha$ for $\alpha \in R^+$. Because $\alpha \in P^+ \setminus V(\mathfrak{a})$, it follows that $(H_n) = 0$, and $(H) \in N$. This implies that $n \in N$. Similarly $H_m \in w:\mathfrak{a}$ for some $m \in N$.

Let \mathfrak{a}^0 be the ideal in $S(h)$ defined by the closed algebraic set $V(\mathfrak{a}) + \mathfrak{a}$. Then $H_n \in (\mathfrak{a}; -) \in \mathfrak{a}^0$, and so $w(H_n \in (\mathfrak{a}; -)) = H_n + n + (\mathfrak{a}; -) \in w\mathfrak{a}^0$. Since $\beta \in V(w:\mathfrak{a}) = w:V(\mathfrak{a}) = V(w\mathfrak{a}^0)$, we have, $\beta + \mathfrak{a} \in V(w\mathfrak{a}^0)$. Therefore,

$$(\beta + \mathfrak{a})(H_n + n + (\mathfrak{a}; -)) = 0;$$

since an element of $w\mathfrak{a}^0$ evaluates as 0 on $V(w\mathfrak{a}^0)$. This means that:

$$m + (\mathfrak{a}; -) + n + (\mathfrak{a}; -) = 0;$$

But this is a contradiction because $(\mathfrak{a}; -) > 0$ for all $\alpha \in R^+$.

In what follows, we apply the results of Section 2 with B_1 replaced by B etc.

Lemma 4.6. Assume that \mathcal{B} is dominant and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}'$. Then if $w \in W$, $w(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R}$ and $w(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}^+$ then

$$w \cdot h_0 = w h_0 + c;$$

for some $c > 0$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.6,

$$w \cdot h_0 = w h_0 + h_0 \left(\sum_{\alpha \in Q(w)} \alpha \right);$$

Since \mathcal{B} is dominant $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}'$ by Proposition 4.4. Therefore by Proposition 2.2, $c = h_0 \left(\sum_{\alpha \in Q(w)} \alpha \right) > 0$.

In the next result we assume that \mathcal{B} is dominant, and let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}'$. By Proposition 4.4 there is a subset I of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}'_I$.

Lemma 4.7. If $w \in W$ and $w : \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}'$ then $w(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{B}$.

Proof. Suppose that $w : \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}'$. We proceed in two steps.

Step 1. $w(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R}$: Indeed, if $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$, then $h_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $w = 1$ then by Lemma 2.6, \mathcal{M} contains

$$w : (h_\alpha + m) = h_\alpha + \sum_{\alpha \in Q(w)} \alpha (; -) m;$$

and this implies that $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$.

Step 2: Since the α_i ($i \in I$) belong to \mathcal{R} there are non-negative rational numbers a_i ($i \in I$) such that:

$$h_i = a_i \alpha_i$$

similarly, $h_0 = a_0 \alpha_0$ for some non-negative $a_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$. By Lemma 2.1 we have

$$w \cdot h_0 = h_0 + \sum_{\alpha \in T(w)} \alpha = h_0 + \sum_{i \in I} b_i \alpha_i$$

for non-negative integers b_i . Hence,

$$w h_0 = h_0 + \sum_{i \in I} b_i h_i; \quad (2)$$

Assume for a contradiction that $w(\mathcal{B}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{B}$. Then by Lemma 4.6,

$$w \cdot h_0 = w h_0 + c \quad (3)$$

for some $c > 0$. Since $w : \quad = \quad$, it follows from equations (2) and (3) that \quad contains,

$$\begin{aligned} w : (h \circ a) &= wh \circ a \quad c \\ &= h \circ \quad b_i h_i \quad a \quad c : \\ &\quad i \in I \end{aligned}$$

However, $h_i \quad a_i \quad 2 \quad$ for $i \in I$, so

$$h \circ \quad b_i a_i \quad a \quad c \quad 2 \quad : \\ i \in I$$

Since $h \circ a \quad 2 \quad$ we deduce that

$$\quad b_i a_i + c \quad 2 \quad : \\ i \in I$$

This is a contradiction since $c > 0$ and $b_i, a_i \quad 0$ for all $i \in I$.

Theorem 4.8. If $U \circ$ is FCR there exists a dominant ideal \quad in $S(h)$ such that $\quad^0 = w : \quad$ for some $w \in W$ (where $\quad = \quad$ is the tautological highest weight of \quad).

Proof. Let

$$X \quad = \quad \overline{(\quad^0)} = X_1 \sqcup \quad \sqcup \quad X$$

denote the decomposition of X into irreducible components. Set $Y_i := (\quad^0) \setminus X_i$. Since $U \circ$ is FCR, and $(\quad^0) = \quad Y_i$,

$$I \circ = \quad \setminus \quad I = \quad \setminus \quad I : \\ 2 \quad (\quad^0) \quad i=1 \quad 2 Y_i \quad T$$

Because $I \circ$ is prime, we have that $I \circ = \quad_{2 Y_i} I$, for some i . Let \quad denote the ideal of elements vanishing on X_i . Note that Y_i is dense in X_i for each i since (\quad^0) is dense in X (see Lemma 3.4). Therefore $I \circ = I$ by [Soe90] Proposition 1. This implies that $(I \circ) = (I)$, and therefore by [Soe90] Theorem 1 part (i) we have $\quad^0 = w : \quad$ for some $w \in W$.

Because $(\quad) \setminus X_i$ is dense in X_i , and $(\quad) \subset P^+$; it follows that $P^+ \setminus (\quad)$ is also dense in X_i . Therefore \quad is dominant. Since $I = I_w$; the proof of [Soe90] Theorem 1 part (ii) shows that there exists $w_1 \in W$ such that $w \quad = w_1$ and $I = I_{w_1}$. It follows from Lemma 4.7 that $w_1^{-1} w(B) = B$. Hence to prove the result it is enough to show that $w_1 \in W$:

Write $w_1 = uv$ with $u \in W$, $v \in W$. By Lemma 3.2 we have $I_{w_1} = I_v$. Hence $I = I_v$. By Theorem 3.3 $(v) = (1)$; and this implies that $v = 1$; so $w_1 = u \in W$.

Lemma 4.9. Suppose $\lambda_1 \in \text{Spec } S$ and let λ_1 respectively be the tautological highest weights.

- (1) If $\lambda_1 = v\lambda_1$ with $v \in W$ then $B_{\lambda_1} = vB_{\lambda_1}$.
- (2) If in addition, $u \in W^{-1}$ then $uv \in W$.

Proof. (1) From remark 3.1 we see that

$$v(R_{\lambda_1}) = f \in R_{\lambda_1} \text{ for some } f \in \mathbb{Z}g$$

and one can check that $v(R_{\lambda_1}) = R_{\lambda_1}$. Since $v \in W$,

$$vB_{\lambda_1} \cap R_{\lambda_1}^+ = R_{\lambda_1}^+.$$

This fact implies that $vR_{\lambda_1}^+ = R_{\lambda_1}^+$, and therefore $R_{\lambda_1} \setminus N vB_{\lambda_1} = R_{\lambda_1}^+$. Since there is a unique choice of simple roots in $R_{\lambda_1}^+$, the result follows.

(2) If $\lambda_1 \in B_{\lambda_1}$, then $v \in B_{\lambda_1}$ by part (1). Hence $uv \in R_{\lambda_1}^+$ for all such λ_1 , so $uv \in W$.

Proof of the Main Theorem. (1) this follows from Theorem 4.8.

For (2) assume λ_1 is dominant, and $w \in W$.

- (b) \Rightarrow (a): If $I_{w\lambda_1} = I_{\lambda_1}$, then $U_{w\lambda_1}$ is FCR by Proposition 4.3.
- (c) \Rightarrow (b): If $w \in W$, then $I_{\lambda_1} = I_{w\lambda_1}$ by Lemma 3.2. Thus, $I_{\lambda_1} = I_{w\lambda_1}$ by [Soe90] Theorem 1 part (ii).
- (a) \Rightarrow (c): Suppose that $U_{w\lambda_1}$ is FCR. By Theorem 4.8, there is a dominant prime λ_1 , and $u \in W^{-1}$ such that $w\lambda_1 = u\lambda_1$. If $v = u^{-1}w$, then λ_1 and $v\lambda_1$ are dominant, so by Theorem 4.5, $v \in W$. By Lemma 4.9 we have $w = uv \in W$.

Lemma 4.10. If λ_1 is dominant and $I_{\lambda_1} = I_{v\lambda_1}$ for $v \in W$ then $I_{\lambda_1} = I_{v\lambda_1}$.

Proof. If $I_{\lambda_1} = I_{v\lambda_1}$ then by [Soe90] Theorem 1, there is a $w \in W$ with $w\lambda_1 = \lambda_1$ such that $I_{w\lambda_1} = I_{v\lambda_1}$, where $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1$. By Lemma 4.7, $w(B_{\lambda_1}) = B_{\lambda_1}$, so $w \in W$. Therefore $I_{w\lambda_1} = I_{\lambda_1}$. It follows that $v \in W$ and so by the main theorem $I_{\lambda_1} = I_{v\lambda_1}$.

5. Invariant differential operators

An interesting class of examples arises from dual pairs ([GW 98] Section 4.5, [How 89], [LS89]). The application of our method is fairly routine, so we give only the most interesting examples rather than conduct an exhaustive study.

Let $M_{p \times k}$ denote the set of $p \times k$ matrices over F , and consider cases A, B, C as follows.

Case	K	V	Action of K on V	\mathfrak{g}
A	$GL_k(\mathbb{F})$	$M_{p,k} \oplus M_{q,k}$	$(g; (a;b)) \curvearrowright (ag^{-1}; gb)$	\mathfrak{gl}_{p+q}
B	$O_k(\mathbb{F})$	$M_{k,n}$	$(g;a) \curvearrowright ga$	\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}
C	$Sp_k(\mathbb{F})$	$M_{k,n}$	$(g;a) \curvearrowright ga$	\mathfrak{so}_{2n}

In case A we set $n = p + q$. If $p = 0$ (resp. $q = 0$) we set $V = M_{k,q}$ (resp. $V = M_{p,k}$). In all cases the algebra of invariant differential operators $D(V)^K$ is generated (as an associative algebra) by a Lie algebra isomorphic to \mathfrak{g} . Hence there is a surjective homomorphism

$$\rho : U(\mathfrak{g}) \twoheadrightarrow D(V)^K : \quad (4)$$

The image of ρ under ρ is described explicitly on pages 69{70 of [LS89].

Let T be a maximal torus of K . In [MR], it is shown that if zero is not a T -weight of V then $D(V)^K$ is FCR. This hypothesis is the situation in cases A and C of the above table and in case B for even k . In the case of odd k , the algebra $D(V)^K$ has no finite dimensional modules. This fact is an easy consequence of Theorem 4.1.

There is a multiplicity free decomposition of $O(V)$ as a $F[K] \otimes U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module ([GW 98] Theorem 4.5.14). Furthermore, as a $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, $O(V)$ is a direct sum of simple highest weight modules. Let

$$O(V) = \bigoplus_{\lambda} L(\lambda) \quad \text{has a } \mathfrak{g}\text{-submodule isomorphic to } L(\lambda) \mathfrak{g} :$$

If \mathfrak{p} is a radical ideal of S , and $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_t$ are the prime ideals of S that are minimal over \mathfrak{p} , we set $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^t \mathfrak{p}_i$.

Lemma 5.1. If \mathfrak{p} is the ideal of S such that $V(\mathfrak{p}) = \overline{V(\mathfrak{p})}$, the Zariski closure of $V(\mathfrak{p})$, then

$$\ker \rho = I : \quad (5)$$

Proof. Suppose that $\overline{V(\mathfrak{p})} = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_t$ is the decomposition of $\overline{V(\mathfrak{p})}$ into irreducible components, and for $1 \leq i \leq t$, let \mathfrak{p}_i be the prime ideals of S such that $V(\mathfrak{p}_i) = X_i$. By Lemma 3.4, $V(\mathfrak{p}) = \overline{V(\mathfrak{p})} \setminus X_i$ is dense in X_i , and so by ([Soe90] Proposition 1) we have:

$$I_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{p}_i} \text{ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g})} L(\lambda)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq t$. Therefore, since $O(V)$ is a faithful $D(V)^K$ -module and $\bigcap_{i=1}^t \ker \pi_i$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \ker \pi &= \bigcap_{i=1}^t \ker \pi_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^t \{u \in O(V) \mid \pi_i(u) = 0\} \\ &= \bigcap_{i=1}^t \text{ann}_{U(g)} L(\lambda_i) \\ &= \bigcap_{i=1}^t \text{ann}_{U(g)} L(\lambda_i) \\ &= I : \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.2. If $n \leq k$ then $U(g) = D(V)^K$.

Proof. Under the condition that $n \leq k$, the set of highest weights in $O(V)$ is dense, corresponds to the ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (0)$. Therefore the ideal $\ker \pi = I = (0)$.

In light of this fact, we consider the case where $n > k$.

Our next aim is to describe the irreducible constituents of $O(V)$ as a K -module and as a $U(g)$ -module. With this goal in mind we set up some standard notation.

By a partition we will mean a finite sequence of weakly decreasing non-negative integers. We will denote partitions by lower case Greek letters. The length of a partition is denoted $\ell(\lambda) = \max\{i \mid \lambda_i > 0\}$. The conjugate of a partition λ is a partition λ' whose i^{th} part is given by j^{th} part of λ is λ'_j . Note that $\ell(\lambda) = \lambda'_1$.

We first address case A. Given non-negative integer partitions λ and μ with $\ell(\lambda) = p$, $\ell(\mu) = q$, and $\ell(\lambda) + \ell(\mu) = k$, let $V_{(\lambda; \mu)}$ denote the irreducible $\mathfrak{gl}_n(F)$ module with highest weight:

$$(\lambda; \mu)_g = \left(\underbrace{k - \lambda_1, \dots, k - \lambda_p}_{n}, \underbrace{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_q}_q \right) :$$

We will use the standard coordinates for weights of \mathfrak{g} and K , as is done in Chapter 2 of [GW 98].

Let $V^{(\lambda; \mu)}$ denote the irreducible representation of GL_k with highest weight:

$$(\lambda; \mu)_K = \left(\underbrace{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p, 0, \dots, 0}_k, \underbrace{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_q, 0, \dots, 0}_q \right) :$$

Under the joint action of K and g we have the multiplicity free decomposition:

$$O(V) = \bigoplus_{(\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q)} V(\lambda; \mu);$$

where the direct sum is over the set

$$W_k(p; q) = \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : \lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n), \mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n), \lambda_i + \mu_i = p_i + q_i, \text{ and } \lambda_i + \mu_i \leq k \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n \};$$

(see [EW 04]).

For $(\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q)$, the highest weight of $V(\lambda; \mu)$ is $(\lambda; \mu)_K$ and the highest weight of the g -module $V(\lambda; \mu)$ is $(\lambda; \mu)_g$.

Define $Z_k(p; q) = \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \}$, and let $Z_k(p; q)$ denote the Zariski closure of these weights.

Define:

$$Z_k(p; q) = \begin{cases} \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } m = 0; \\ \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } m = n - k; \\ \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } 0 < m < n - k. \end{cases}$$

We describe the irreducible components of $Z_k(p; q)$. We have $Z_k(p; q) = F^n$, if $n = k$. If $n > k$ then there are two cases:

Case 1: If $k < n - 2k$, then

$$Z_k(p; q) = \bigcup_{m \in W_k(p; q)} V(\lambda; \mu)$$

where:

$$W_k(p; q) = \begin{cases} \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } p = n - k; \\ \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } n - k = p - k; \\ \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } k = p - n. \end{cases}$$

Case 2: If $2k = n$ then

$$Z_k(p; q) = \bigcup_{m \in W_k(p; q)} V(\lambda; \mu)$$

where:

$$W_k(p; q) = \begin{cases} \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } p = k; \\ \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } k = p - n - k; \\ \{ (\lambda; \mu) \in W_k(p; q) : (\lambda; \mu)_g \in \mathfrak{h}^* \} & \text{if } p = n - k. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 5.3. If n and k are fixed, then for $0 \leq i < j \leq n - k$ we have $I_i = I_j$. Moreover, I_0 and I_{n-k} are dominant.

Proof. To see that λ_0 is dominant note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k N T_i V(\lambda_0) = \sum_{i=1}^k F T_i \lambda_0$$

Similarly λ_{n-k} is dominant. Now set $t = n - k$ and $\lambda = \lambda_{n-k}$, so that:

$$\lambda = (H_1; H_2; \dots; t) \mathbb{Z}$$

and let $\mu = \lambda$. For $0 \leq i \leq t$ we have to find $w_i \in W$ such that $w_i \lambda = \mu$.

For $1 \leq i \leq n$, define $w_i \in W = S_n$ by:

$$w_i(j) = \begin{cases} j & \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq i \\ j+k & \text{for } i+1 \leq j \leq n-k \\ j+i+k-1 & \text{for } n-k+1 \leq j \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Then, it is easy to see that $w_i \lambda = \mu$, and that $w \in W$. The result follows from the main theorem.

Remark 5.4. Explicit generators for I_0 are given in [Pro04] using Capelli identities.

We now turn our attention to Case B.

There is a multiplicity free decomposition under the joint action of K and g given by

$$O(V) = \sum_{\lambda \in M} V_{\lambda} \otimes V_{\lambda};$$

where we index the summands by the partitions λ in the set:

$$M = \{ \lambda \mid \lambda \text{ is a partition such that } \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \leq k \text{ and } \lambda_1 \leq n \}$$

The highest weight of the sp_{2n} -module, V_{λ} is given by:

$$\left(\frac{k}{2}; \frac{k}{2}; \frac{k}{2}; \dots; \frac{k}{2}; 1 \right)$$

(see [EW 04]) in the standard coordinates for sp_{2n} (see [GW 98]).

For k odd, we can see using Theorem 4.1 that $D(V)^K$ has no finite dimensional modules. Suppose that $k = 2p$ is even. We describe the Zariski closure, Z , in \mathfrak{h} of the set of weights of $O(V)$ as a g -module. To do this fix i with $1 \leq i \leq p$ and set $r = n - p - i$; $s = n - p + i$. Then define

$$\lambda_i = (H_1; H_2; \dots; r H_i; H_{r+1}; H_{r+1}; \dots; s H_i; H_{s+1}; H_{s+1}; \dots; n H_{p+1})$$

We also set

$$I_0 = (H_1; \dots, H_{p-1}; H_{n-p} + H_{n-p+1} + \dots + H_n \mid p):$$

Note that if $0 \leq i \leq j \leq p$ neither of the ideals I_i, I_j is contained in the other. The decomposition of Z into irreducible components is given by

$$Z = \bigcup_{i=0}^p V(I_i):$$

To see this note that $V(I_i)$ is the Zariski closure of the set of weights corresponding to partitions with $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = k$ and $\alpha = p + i$:

Note that $\dim S_{\alpha} = p - i$. Let $I_i = I_{\alpha}$ for $0 \leq i \leq p$:

Recall the homomorphism from equation (4).

Lemma 5.5. We have $\ker \phi = I_0$:

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, $\ker \phi = \bigcap_{i=0}^p I_i$. Since $\ker \phi$ is prime, it follows that $I_i \subseteq \ker \phi = I_0$ for some i . Hence $I_i \setminus Z \subseteq I_0 \setminus Z$, that is $I_i \setminus Z \subseteq I_0 \setminus Z$. If $i \neq 0$ then since S is a finitely generated Z -module we would have:

$$\begin{aligned} p - i &= \dim S_{\alpha} = \dim (Z \setminus I_i) \\ &= \dim (Z \setminus I_0) = p \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

We show next that $U = I_0$ is FCR. To do this define

$$w = (H_{p+1}; \dots, H_n \mid p)$$

and define $w \in W$ so that if $a = (a_1; \dots, a_n) \in \mathfrak{h}$, we have $w(a) = b$ where:

$$b_i = \begin{cases} a_{i+p}; & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n-p; \\ a_{i+p-n}; & \text{for } n-p+1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that w is dominant, $w \in W_0$ and $w \in W$ where $W_0 = \{w \in W \mid w(\mathfrak{h}) \subseteq \mathfrak{h}\}$. Thus by the main theorem, $I_0 = U$ and U is FCR. We expect that

$$I_0 \subsetneq I_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq I_p \subsetneq I$$

with all inclusions strict. We can show this in a special case, and this is enough to give a counterexample to Conjecture 1 in [Soe90].

Example 5.6. For $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_6$ there is a prime ideal I of S and $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{h}$ such that

- (1) $I \subsetneq I$;
- (2) For all $v \in W$ with $I \subsetneq I_v$, we have $\mathfrak{h} \notin V(I_v)$.

Proof. We take $n = 3$; and $p = 1$ and let I_0, I_1 and \mathfrak{g} be as above. Then $\mathfrak{g} = (H_2; H_3)$; $I = I_0$; and $I_1 = I$ with $\mathfrak{g} = (1; 2; 2)$: By (4) there is a surjective map

$$\pi: U \rightarrow D(V)^K$$

with $\text{Ker } \pi = I_0 \setminus I_1$: By Lemmas 5.1 and 5.5, $I_0 = I_1$.

Now suppose that $I = I_v$: By Lemma 4.10 we have $I = I_v$: Hence by the Main Theorem v2 where $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}$. We have $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 6$; so it is easy to check directly that $\mathfrak{g} \neq v$:

References

- [BJ01] Walter Borho and Anthony Joseph. Sheets and topology of primitive spectra for semisimple Lie algebras. *J. Algebra*, 259(1):310{311, 2003.; Corrigendum to *J. Algebra* 244 (2001), no. 1, 76{167.
- [Dix70] Jacques Dixmier. Ideaux primitifs dans l'algèbre enveloppante d'une algèbre de Lie semisimple complexe. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A-B*, 271A:134{A136, 1970.
- [EW 04] Thomas J. Enright and Jeb F. Willenbring. Hilbert series, Howe duality and branching for classical groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 159(1):337{375, 2004.
- [GW 98] R. Goodman and N.R. Wallach. Representations and invariants of the classical groups. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [How 89] R. Howe. Remarks on classical invariant theory. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 313(2):539{570, 1989.
- [Hu90] J.E. Humphreys, Reflection groups and Coxeter groups. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [Jan83] Jens Carsten Jantzen. Einhüllende Algebren halbeinfacher Lie-Algebren, volume 3 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [KS94] H. Kraft and L.W. Small. Invariant algebras and completely reducible representations. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 1(3):297{307, 1994.
- [LS89] T. Levasseur and J.T. Stafford. Rings of differential operators on classical rings of invariants. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 81(412):vi+117, 1989.
- [MR] Ian M. Musson and Sonia L. Rueda. Finite dimensional representations of invariant differential operators. *arXiv math.RT/0305279*; To appear in *Transactions of the AMS*.
- [Pro04] Victor Protsak. Rank ideals and Capelli identities. *J. Algebra* 273 (2004), no. 2, 686{699.
- [Soe90] Wolfgang Soergel. The prime spectrum of the enveloping algebra of a reductive Lie algebra. *Math. Z.*, 204(4):559{581, 1990.