

QUANTIZATION & AFFINITY

We have two goals this week. The first is to introduce quantizations of symplectic varieties, the second to introduce a good category of representations that may have a chance to be "affine" as in the Beilinson-Bernstein theorem. In the next lectures we will give examples.

§ Quantization

Defⁿ : A quantization of a Poisson variety $\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{\pi} S$ is a sheaf G_h of flat $\pi^{-1}S[[\hbar]]$ -algebras on \mathcal{X} , complete in the \hbar -adic topology, with an isom $\frac{G_h}{(\hbar)} \xrightarrow{\sim} G_{\mathcal{X}} \quad f \mapsto \bar{f}$ such that

$$\bullet \text{ for } f, g \in G_h \text{ we have } \overline{[f, g]} = \hbar \{ \bar{f}, \bar{g} \}.$$

where $\{, \}$ is the Poisson bracket on \mathcal{X} over S .

Example : $S = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}$, $\mathcal{X} = T^*V$ with V a vector space with usual symplectic form. Then $G_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n]$. A quantization is

$$W_{T^*V} = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n][[\hbar]] / \left([x_i, x_j] = 0 = [\xi_i, \xi_j], [x_i, \xi_j] = \delta_{ij} \hbar \right)$$

is a quantization of \mathcal{X} .

Example : $\mathcal{X} = T^*M$ for a smooth variety M . Let $W_{T^*M} = G_{T^*M}[[\hbar]]$ as a $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ -module and define multiplication by

$$f * g = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \frac{\hbar^{|\alpha|}}{\alpha!} \partial_{\xi}^{\alpha} f \partial_x^{\alpha} g$$

in some local coordinate system. This is a quantization of \mathcal{X} with its usual symplectic form.

There are 2 crucial differences between D_M & W_{T^*M} :

- the appearance of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ in W_{T^*M}
- D_M is a sheaf on M , W_{T^*M} on T^*M .

In fact, these two counterbalance one another.

It is basically a theorem of Kontsevich that quantizations exist. However, we want something more special and more tractable

Thm (Bezrukavnikov-Kaledin) Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ be a symplectic resolution of Y , an affine symplectic singularity. Let \mathcal{X} be the universal Poisson deformation of X , defined over $H^2(\widehat{X}, \mathbb{C})$.

Then there exists a canonical quantization $W_{\mathcal{X}}$ of \mathcal{X} such that:

for any quantization W_X of X , \exists a unique section

$$s: \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]] \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]] \hat{\otimes} \mathbb{C}[H^2(\widehat{X}, \mathbb{C})]$$

of the projection p such that $p^* W_{\mathcal{X}} \cong W_X$.

In other words, quantizations of X are classified by

$$[W_X] + \hbar H^2(X, \mathbb{C})[[\hbar]]$$

The attachment $\text{Quantization} \rightarrow [W_X] + \hbar H^2(X, \mathbb{C})[[\hbar]]$ is called the PERIOD map.

Proof: This is an algebraic version of Fedosov quantization. Formally locally the symplectic variety has functions of the form

$$A = \mathbb{C}[[x_1, \dots, x_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n]] \text{ with symplectic form } \Omega'$$

This is unique in the sense that if Ω is another symplectic form (e.g. usual one) on A then $\langle A, \Omega \rangle \cong \langle A, \Omega' \rangle$. So we can attach to X , a symplectic variety, $M_S \rightarrow X$ where a point of M_S is a pair (x, φ) with $\varphi: \widehat{G}_{x,x} \rightarrow A$ a symplectic IM. Thus M_S is a $\text{Symp}(A)$ -torsor over X .

The quantization of A is also unique:

$$D = \mathbb{C}[[x_1, \dots, x_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n, \hbar]] / \langle [x_i, x_j] = 0 = [\xi_i, \xi_j], [x_i, \xi_j] = \delta_{ij} \hbar \rangle$$

So given W_X , a quantization of X , we get $M_q \rightarrow X$ whose points

are (x, ψ) where $\psi: \widehat{W}_{x,x} \rightarrow D$ is a $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ algebra isomorphism. This is an $\text{Aut}(D)$ -torsor over X .

Now set $\text{Aut}_l(D) =$ automorphisms of D that are the identity on $D/\hbar^l D$, and let $\text{Aut}^l(D) = \text{Aut}(D)/\text{Aut}_{l+1}(D)$ for any $l \geq 0$. We have

$$\text{Aut}^0(D) = \text{Symp}(A)$$

Thus the problem becomes basically to lift the $\text{Aut}^0(D)$ -torsor \mathcal{M}_0 on X to the $\text{Aut}(D)$ -torsor \mathcal{M}_l on X . This is an obstruction theory problem whose solution is classified by $H^2(X, \mathbb{C})$ at each step $l \rightarrow l+1$. \square

Recall that when we studied $G_{T^*\mathcal{B}}$ we could twist differential operators by $H^2(T^*\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{C})$. Here we can twist by $H^2(T^*\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{C})[[\hbar]]!!$

Recall if Y is conical symplectic singularity then X inherits a \mathbb{C}^* -action with the property that $t \cdot \omega_X = t^n \omega_X$ (where n was the degree of the Poisson bracket on Y)

Defⁿ: A \mathbb{C}^* -equivariant quantization of X is a quantization of X together with a set of isomorphisms

$$a_t: T_t^{-1} W_X \xrightarrow{\sim} W_X \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{C}^*$$

s.t. $a_{t_1} \circ a_{t_2} = a_{t_1 t_2}$ and such that $a_t(\hbar) = t^n \hbar$.

The following is then standard:

Corollary: The \mathbb{C}^* -equivariant quantizations of X are parametrized by

$$H^2(X, \mathbb{C}) = [\omega_X] + \hbar H^2(X, \mathbb{C}) \longleftrightarrow [\omega_X] + \hbar H^2(X, \mathbb{C})[[\hbar]]$$

So we recover the Lie theoretic parametrization. Whenever we are in the \mathbb{C}^* -equivariant situation we will write W_X^λ for the \mathbb{C}^* -equivariant quantization corresponding to $\lambda \in H^2(X, \mathbb{C})$.

§ MODULE CATEGORIES

There is no hope that we can find classical representation theory categories directly as W_X -modules. This is simply because of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ appearing. We want to get rid of that, and to do so we use \mathbb{C}^* again.

As part of this process, suppose we want to quantise a point $\rightsquigarrow \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$. We'd then like to take something like "graded" $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ -modules and then take the degree 0 weight space: but this produces objects like $\hbar \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ which would then go to zero: so we remove that problem by passing to $\mathbb{C}((\hbar)) = \mathbb{C}[[\hbar^{-1}, \hbar]]$.

Defⁿ: Given W_X , a quantization of X , set $\tilde{W}_X = W_X[[\hbar^{-1}]]$. Let $\tilde{W}_X(m) = \hbar^{-m} W_X \subseteq \tilde{W}_X$ (so $\tilde{W}_X(m) \subset \tilde{W}_X(m+1)$)

Note now that in the case $X = T^*V$ we get $\mathcal{D}_V \rightarrow \pi_x \tilde{W}_{T^*V}$ via

$$x_i \mapsto x_i, \quad \partial_i \mapsto \hbar^{-1} \xi_i \quad \text{where } \pi: T^*V \rightarrow V \text{ is projection.}$$

In particular we get a functor $I: \mathcal{D}_V\text{-mod} \rightarrow \tilde{W}_{T^*V}\text{-mod}$ by

$$N \mapsto \tilde{W}_{T^*V} \otimes_{\pi^{-1}\mathcal{D}_V} \pi^{-1}N =: \tilde{N}$$

If in addition N had a filtration, then \tilde{N} has a lattice $\tilde{N}(0)$ i.e. $\tilde{N}(0) \subset \tilde{N}$ a $W_{T^*V} = \tilde{W}_{T^*V}(0)$ -module s.t.

$$\tilde{W}_{T^*V} \otimes_{\tilde{W}_{T^*V}(0)} \tilde{N}(0) \xrightarrow{\text{mult}^{-1}} \tilde{N}$$

viz. $\tilde{N}(0) = \sum_k \tilde{W}_{T^*V}(-k) \otimes F^{k+l} N$ (for any l we get a lattice)

Defⁿ: $W_X\text{-mod}_g$ is the full subcategory of \tilde{W}_X -modules N admit a coherent W_X -lattice $N(0)$ (locally finitely generated)

Observe if $N \in W_X\text{-mod}_g$, then $N(0)/\hbar N(0)$ is G_X coherent (and conversely)

so this is a replacement for the category of \mathcal{D} -modules with good filtrations (we never specify the lattice, just as we never specify the filtration).

Defⁿ: Suppose that X has a \mathbb{C}^* -action with $t \cdot \omega_x = t^n \omega_x$ for some positive integer n . Then $(W_x, \mathbb{C}^*)\text{-mod}_g$ is the category of \mathbb{C}^* -equivariant \tilde{W}_x -modules that admit a \mathbb{C}^* -equivariant coherent W_x -lattice.

This is a category we should love:

SANITY CHECK: Let $X = T^*M$ with \mathbb{C}^* -action given by inverse dilation in cotangent (as earlier) so that $t \cdot \omega_x = t \omega_x$. Then for any $\lambda \in H^2(T^*M, \mathbb{C}) = H^2(M, \mathbb{C})$

$$(W_{T^*M}^\lambda, \mathbb{C}^*)\text{-mod}_g \xleftrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{D}_M^{\lambda + \Omega^{1/2}}\text{-mod}$$

Proof: The first thing to explain is the shift by "half forms": this arises because $\mathcal{D}_x^{\text{op}} \cong \Omega \otimes \mathcal{D}_x \otimes \Omega^{-1}$. When we replace W_{T^*M} with $W_{T^*M}^{\text{op}}$ it's another quantization but the parameter $[\omega_x] + \lambda$ changes to $[\omega_x] - \lambda$. Then we deduce in ptc that if $\lambda = 0$, we should have an isomorphism $W_{T^*M} \cong W_{T^*M}^{\text{op}}$ and hence $(\mathcal{D}_x^\lambda)^{\text{op}} = (\mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{D}_x \otimes \mathcal{L}^{-1})^{\text{op}} = \mathcal{L}^{-1} \otimes \Omega \otimes \mathcal{D}_x \otimes \Omega^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{L}$ is the only candidate i.e. $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{L}^{-1} \otimes \Omega$ i.e. $\mathcal{L}^2 \cong \Omega$.

The functors are $I: \mathcal{D}_M^\lambda\text{-mod} \rightarrow (\tilde{W}_{T^*M}^{\lambda + \Omega^{1/2}}, \mathbb{C}^*)\text{-mod}_g$ and

$$(\pi_x -)^{\mathbb{C}^*}: (\tilde{W}_{T^*M}^{\lambda + \Omega^{1/2}}, \mathbb{C}^*)\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_M^\lambda\text{-mod}.$$

The crucial point to check is that $(\pi_x \tilde{W}_{T^*M}^{\lambda + \Omega^{1/2}})^{\mathbb{C}^*} = \mathcal{D}_M^\lambda$ and this follows from the mapping that we've seen

$$x_i \mapsto x_i, \partial_i \mapsto \hbar^{-1} \xi_i. \quad \square$$