

# Category $\mathcal{O}$ , symplectic duality, and the Hikita conjecture

Nicholas Proudfoot

July 11, 2018

## 1 Introduction: The Springer resolution

Let  $G$  be a simple algebraic group,  $B \subset G$  a Borel subgroup and  $Y = G/B$  the flag variety. Then the cotangent bundle  $\tilde{X} = T^*Y \cong \{(gB, a) \in Y \times \mathcal{N} \mid g^{-1}ag \in \mathfrak{b}\}$  has a natural map to the nilpotent cone  $X = \mathcal{N}$ , called the **Springer resolution**.

The fibered product  $Z = \tilde{X} \times_X \tilde{X}$  is called the **Steinberg variety**. It has an alternative description as the union of conormal bundles to  $G$ -orbits on  $Y \times Y$ .

As an example, for  $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ ,  $\tilde{X} = T^*\mathbb{P}^1$ ,  $X = \mathbb{C}^2/\pm 1$  and  $Z = T^*\mathbb{P}^1 \cup_{\mathbb{P}^1} (\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ .

**Fact.** *All the irreducible components of  $Z$  have the same dimension  $\dim X$ .*

We also define  $\tilde{X}_+$  to be the union of conormal bundles to the  $B$ -orbits in  $Y$  inside  $\tilde{X}$ , for example, for  $Y = \mathbb{P}^1 = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\tilde{X}_+ = \mathbb{C} \cup T_\infty(\mathbb{P}^1)$ .

The top Borel-Moore homology  $H_{2d}^{BM}(Z)$  of the Steinberg variety has an algebra structure, given by, for  $\alpha, \beta \in H_{2d}^{BM}(Z)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \tilde{X} \times_X \tilde{X} & \\
 & \swarrow p_{12} & \downarrow p_{13} \quad \searrow p_{23} \\
 Z & & Z \\
 \alpha * \beta & = & (p_{13})_* ((p_{12}^* \alpha) * (p_{23}^* \beta)),
 \end{array}$$

where  $p_{ij}$  are the obvious projection maps.

The top Borel-Moore homology  $H_d^{BM}(\tilde{X}_+)$  becomes a module for this algebra by a similar construction.

**Theorem 1.1** (Lusztig, Ginzburg). *We have*

1.  $H_{2d}^{BM}(Z) \cong \mathbb{C}[W]$  as algebras,
2.  $H_d^{BM}(\tilde{X}_+) \cong \mathbb{C}[W]$  as modules.

One might ask: Why go through this complicated construction just to discover the group algebra and the regular representation of  $W$ ? The answer is that geometric constructions often help with categorizations, where the cohomology groups can be replaced by sheaves.

The group  $G$  acts on  $Y$ , which leads to a map  $U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \text{Diff}(Y) = \Gamma(Y, D_Y)$  to differential operators on  $Y$ .

**Fact.** *The map is surjective.*

Let  $U(\mathfrak{g})_0$  be the quotient of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  by the kernel of the map above. Then  $U(\mathfrak{g})_0 \cong \text{Diff}_Y$ .

**Theorem 1.2** (Beilinson-Bernstein). *The map*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 U(\mathfrak{g})_0 - \text{mod} & \xrightarrow{\text{Loc}} & D_Y - \text{mod} \\
 N & \mapsto & D_Y \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g})_0} N
 \end{array}$$

*is an equivalence of categories.*

Now that we have a  $D$ -module, we can consider its support, or even better, its microlocal support, which will be a cycle on  $\tilde{X}$  as opposed to a cycle on  $Y$ .

$$U(\mathfrak{g})_0 - \text{mod} \xrightarrow{Loc} D_Y - \text{mod} \xrightarrow{\text{microlocal supp}} \text{cycle on } \tilde{X}$$

What we really want though are cycles on  $\tilde{X}_+$ , so we look for a subcategory.

**Definition 1.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}_0$  be finitely generated  $U(\mathfrak{g})_0$ -modules that are locally finite for  $U(\mathfrak{b})$ .*

Then  $\mathcal{O}_0$  maps precisely to cycles on  $\tilde{X}_+$  by  $\text{microlocal supp} \circ \text{Loc}$ . The point of the local finiteness for  $U(\mathfrak{b})$  is that this means that the  $U(\mathfrak{b})$ -action integrates to a  $B$ -action which guarantees that the microlocal support lies in the union of the conormal bundles to  $B$ -orbits. Hence we have

$$K(\mathcal{O}_0) \otimes \mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\cong} H_d^{BM}(\tilde{X}_+),$$

so  $\mathcal{O}_0$  is the categorification we wanted.

Now we want to lift the convolution operators on  $H_d^{BM}(\tilde{X}_+)$  to functors acting on  $\mathcal{O}_0$ . So we look for suitable bimodules. Similarly to the previous diagram, we consider

$$U(\mathfrak{g})_0 - \text{bimod} \xrightarrow{Loc} D_Y \boxtimes D_Y^{opp} \rightarrow \text{cycles on } \tilde{X} \times \tilde{X},$$

but again, we want cycles on  $Z = \tilde{X} \times_X \tilde{X}$ , so we look for a subcategory again.

**Definition 1.4.** *Let  $HC_0$  be finitely generated  $U(\mathfrak{g})_0$ -bimodules that are locally finite for the adjoint action.*

Then  $HC_0$  maps precisely to cycles on  $Z$  by a similar argument as before.

**Theorem 1.5.** *We have*

1.  $HC_0$  is a tensor category acting on  $\mathcal{O}_0$ ,
2. Taking support intertwines  $\otimes^L$  and  $*$ ,
3. There are bimodules  $\{H_w | w \in W\}$  such that
  - (a) The functor  $\Theta_w : D^b(\mathcal{O}_0) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{O}_0)$  given by  $H_w \otimes^L -$  is an equivalence
  - (b)  $\Theta_w \circ \Theta_{w'} = \Theta_{ww'}$  when  $l(w) + l(w') = l(ww')$ .

so there is an action of the braid group of  $W$  on  $D^b(\mathcal{O}_0)$  categorifying the  $W$ -action on  $K(\mathcal{O}_0)$ .

## 2 Symplectic resolutions

The general philosophy is that the above representation theory should happen in the setting of an arbitrary symplectic resolution.

**Definition 2.1.** *A **Conical symplectic resolution** is a resolution of singularities  $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  with a  $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -action and a symplectic form  $\omega \in \Omega^2(\tilde{X})$  satisfying:*

1.  $\mathbb{C}[X] = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{C}[X]^n$  with  $\mathbb{C}[x]^0 = \mathbb{C}$ ,
2.  $X$  is normal,
3.  $s \cdot \omega = s^2 \omega$

Some examples of symplectic resolutions are:

1.  $\tilde{X} = T^*G/B, X = \mathcal{N}$ ,
2.  $\tilde{X} = \text{Hilb}_n(\mathbb{C}^2), X = \text{Sym}^n \mathbb{C}^2$
3. Quiver varieties

4. Slices in the affine grassmannian
5. Hypertoric varieties
6. Higgs/Coulomb branches of moduli spaces

We will need an “extra”  $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -action on  $\tilde{X}$ , commuting with  $S$ , preserving  $\omega$  and we also want  $|\tilde{X}^{\mathbb{C}^\times}| < \infty$ . For example, any generic cocharacter  $\mathbb{C}^\times \rightarrow G$  will do for the action of  $G$  on  $G/B$ . Note: such a  $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -action might not exist, so this is an additional assumption.

Let  $Z = \tilde{X} \times_X \tilde{X}$  and  $\tilde{X}_+ = \{p \in \tilde{X} \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t \cdot p \text{ exists}\}$ . Then  $H_{2d}^{BM}(Z)$  acts on  $H_d^{BM}(\tilde{X}_+)$  as before. We again want to define a category that has  $H_d^{BM}(\tilde{X}_+)$  as its Grothendieck group. We will use quantizations to do this.

**Definition 2.2.** A *quantization* of  $\tilde{X}$  is a sheaf  $\mathcal{A}$  of filtered algebras on  $\tilde{X}$  with  $[\mathcal{A}^i, \mathcal{A}^j] \subset \mathcal{A}^{i+j-2}$  and an isomorphism between  $gr\mathcal{A}$  and the structure sheaf of  $X$  as graded Poisson algebras.

**Remark 2.3.** The Poisson structure on  $gr\mathcal{A}$  is given by lifting, commuting and projecting and has degree  $-2$ . The structure sheaf also has a Poisson bracket of degree  $-2$  given by  $\omega$ .

Let  $A = \Gamma(\tilde{X}, \mathcal{A})$ , so  $A$  is filtered with  $grA = \mathbb{C}[X]$ . One example is  $\tilde{X} = T^*(G/B)$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = \pi^{-1}\mathcal{D}_{G/B}$  given by pulling back  $D$ -modules from  $G/B$ . Then  $A$  is differential operators on  $G/B$  and is therefore isomorphic to  $U(\mathfrak{g})_0$ .

The following should be understood as an analogue of Beilinson-Bernstein localization:

**Theorem 2.4** (Braden, Licata, Proudfoot, Webster). *The functor  $A\text{-mod} \xrightarrow{Loc} \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$  sending  $N \mapsto \mathcal{A} \otimes_A N$  is an equivalence of categories for “most” quantizations.*

Recall that we used the support cycles to identify the appropriate subcategory before, we try to replicate this again, we have a map  $\mathcal{A}\text{-mod} \xrightarrow{supp} \text{cycles on } \tilde{X}$ , but we only want to hit  $\tilde{X}_+$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be the subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$  consisting of objects that are locally finite for the action of  $A_+ \subset A$ , where  $A_+$  is the sum of the non-negative weight spaces for the extra grading (one should think of this as the analogue of  $U(\mathfrak{b})$ ).

**Proposition 2.6** (Braden, Licata, Proudfoot, Webster). *We have*

$$K(\mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong H_d^{BM}(\tilde{X}_+)$$

Finally we use  $A$ -bimodules to categorify the convolution operators. We again have maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A\text{-bimod} & \xrightarrow{Loc} & \mathcal{A}\text{-bimod} \xrightarrow{supp} \text{cycles on } \tilde{X} \times_X \tilde{X} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ HC & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \text{cycles on } Z \end{array}$$

**Theorem 2.7** (Braden, Proudfoot, Webster). *We have*

1.  $HC$  is a tensor category acting on  $\mathcal{O}$
2.  $supp$  intertwines  $\otimes$  with  $*$
3. There are nice  $HC$ -bimodules that fit together into a generalized braid group action on  $D^b(\mathcal{O})$ .