

CROSS-PROJECTIVE REPRESENTATIONS OF PAIRS OF ANTICOMMUTATIVE ALGEBRAS, ALLOYS AND FINITE-DIMENSIONAL IRREDUCIBLE REPRESENTATIONS OF SOME INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL LIE ALGEBRAS

DENIS V. JURIEV

math.RT/9806005

June 02, 1998

This article is devoted to some “strange” phenomena in representation theory, whose existence seems to be unexplainable to me. The discussed subjects are, perhaps, rather far from the wide roads of classical and modern researches, however, one might pay an attention to them as for themselves as for any associations, which they may provoke. Concerning the applications of the collected facts I as a realist suspect that everything being correctly imagined really exists somewhere and if any Theory is beyond our Practice one should follow the most practical advice that is proposed, namely, let try to make the least a bit wider and do not cut off the first.

1.1. Cross-projective representations of pairs of anticommutative algebras.

Definition 1. Let \mathfrak{A}_i ($i = 1, 2$) be two anticommutative algebras with brackets $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_i$. A *cross-projective representation* of the pair $(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathfrak{A}_2)$ in the linear space V is the pair (T_1, T_2) of mappings $T_i : \mathfrak{A}_i \mapsto \text{End}(V)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} [T_1(X), T_1(Y)] - T_1(\langle X, Y \rangle_1) &\equiv 0 \pmod{T_2(\mathfrak{A}_2),} \\ [T_2(A), T_2(B)] - T_2(\langle A, B \rangle_2) &\equiv 0 \pmod{T_1(\mathfrak{A}_1),} \end{aligned}$$

for all $X, Y \in \mathfrak{A}_1$, $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}_2$. Here $[\cdot, \cdot]$ is the commutator of operators.

The definition 1 is related to one of \mathfrak{A} -projective representations (see e.g. [1, 2]). Any \mathfrak{A} -projective representation of an anticommutative algebra \mathfrak{g} defines a cross-projective representation of the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{A}_{[\cdot, \cdot]})$ (here $\mathfrak{A}_{[\cdot, \cdot]}$ is the commutator Lie algebra of the associative algebra \mathfrak{A}).

Example 1. Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra decomposed into the direct sum $\mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$ of linear spaces supplied by the brackets $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_i$, which are projections of the commutator $[\cdot, \cdot]$ in \mathfrak{g} onto \mathfrak{g}_i along the complementary subspace. Then any representation T of \mathfrak{g} defines the cross-projective representation (T_1, T_2) ($T_i = T|_{\mathfrak{g}_i}$) of the pair $(\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2)$.

Remark 1. Definition 1 admits natural higher combinatorial generalizations if one use a set of arbitrary number of anticommutative algebras instead of their pair.

One may introduce the basic concepts of representation theory (reducible, irreducible, decomposable, etc. representations) for the cross-projective representations. Sometimes the problem of classification of irreducible finite-dimensional representations of a pair of anticommutative algebras is hugely wild, e.g. for a pair of abelian algebras $(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^m)$. However, we shall see below that this problem is slightly tamer for more nontrivial pairs.

Remark 2. Let (T_1, T_2) be a finite-dimensional representation of the pair $(\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2)$ in the space V then (T_1^\times, T_2^\times) ($T_i^\times(X) = T_i(X) - \frac{\text{tr } T_i(X)}{\dim V} E$, E is the unit matrix) is also a representation of this pair.

Remark 3. Let \mathfrak{g} be an anticommutative algebra then $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g})$ also possesses a natural structure of anticommutative algebra so that it is possible to associate cross-projective representations of the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}))$ with any anticommutative algebra \mathfrak{g} .

Note that cross-projective representations do not form neither tensor nor even abelian category. To improve the situation one should consider it from a different point of view.

1.2. Alloys and their representations.

Definition 2.

A. Let \mathfrak{g} be a linear space decomposed into the sum $\mathfrak{g}_1 \uplus \dots \uplus \mathfrak{g}_n$ of its subspaces \mathfrak{g}_i (the sum is not direct in general). Let us consider the subspace W of $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g})$ of the form $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}_1) \uplus \dots \uplus \bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}_n)$. The linear space \mathfrak{g} supplied by the partial anticommutative binary operation $[\cdot, \cdot] : W \mapsto \mathfrak{g}$ is called an *alloy*.

B. A *representation* T of the alloy $(\mathfrak{g}, [\cdot, \cdot])$ in the linear space V is the mapping $T : \mathfrak{g} \mapsto \text{End}(V)$ such that $[T(X), T(Y)] = T([X, Y])$ for all pairs (X, Y) from W . Here $[\cdot, \cdot]$ is the commutator of operators in the right hand side of the identity.

Remark 4. The definition may be naturally generalized to arbitrary subspaces W of $\bigwedge^2(V)$ instead of ones of a specific form considered above.

Note that each Lie composite (see e.g. [1, 3]) may be considered as an alloy.

Theorem 1. Let (T_1, T_2) be a strict cross-projective representation of the pair of anticommutative algebras $(\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2)$ such that $T_1(\mathfrak{g}_1) \cap T_2(\mathfrak{g}_2) = 0$. Then $T = T_1 \oplus T_2$ realizes a strict representation of a uniquely defined alloy $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$ such that projections of the binary operation $[\cdot, \cdot]$ in \mathfrak{g} on \mathfrak{g}_i along the complementary subspaces coincide with the binary operations in the anticommutative algebras \mathfrak{g}_i .

Remark 5. If one omits the condition of transversality of images of T_1 and T_2 or the condition of strictness of representations then it will be possible to construct an alloy but the least will not be uniquely defined.

Proposition 1. The representations of a fixed alloy \mathfrak{g} form a tensor abelian category.

1.3. Quaternary algebras and their alloyability.

Proposition 2. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$ be an alloy then \mathfrak{g}_i are supplied by the structure of both binary and quaternary algebras. The quaternary operation $\langle \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot \rangle_i : \bigwedge^2(\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}_i)) \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_i$ is constructed in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \langle U, V, X, Y \rangle_1 &= \lambda_2(\lambda_1(U, V), \lambda_1(X, Y)), \\ \langle A, B, C, D \rangle_2 &= \lambda_1(\lambda_2(A, B), \lambda_2(C, D)), \end{aligned}$$

where $U, V, X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}_1$, $A, B, C, D \in \mathfrak{g}_2$ and λ_i are projections of the operation $[\cdot, \cdot]$ in the alloy \mathfrak{g} restricted to \mathfrak{g}_i and projected along \mathfrak{g}_i onto the complementary subspace.

Corollary. Any strict cross-projective representation (T_1, T_2) of the pair of anticommutative algebras $(\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2)$ such that $T_1(\mathfrak{g}_1) \cap T_2(\mathfrak{g}_2) = 0$ supplies both algebras by additional quaternary operations.

Remark 6. In general, the quaternary operations are not correlated with binary operations in any way.

Corollary is a manifestation of an interesting phenomena that a relation of two objects (anticommutative algebras here) in their mutual representation (cross-projective representation here) supplies them by additional abstract algebraic structures (quaternary operations here).

Remark 7. Note that for any quaternary algebra \mathfrak{g} the following statements hold:

- $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g})$ is a quaternary algebra;
- $\bigwedge^2(\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}))$ is an extension of \mathfrak{g} , i.e. there exists a homomorphism $\pi : \bigwedge^2(\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g})) \mapsto \mathfrak{g}$ of quaternary algebras (defined just by the quaternary operation $\langle \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ in \mathfrak{g}).

Definition 3. Two quaternary algebras \mathfrak{g}_i ($i = 1, 2$) with operations $\langle \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot \rangle_i : \bigwedge^2(\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}_i)) \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_i$ will be called *alloyable* iff they possess a mutual factorization

$$\begin{aligned} \langle U, V, X, Y \rangle_1 &= \lambda_2(\lambda_1(U, V), \lambda_1(X, Y)), \\ \langle A, B, C, D \rangle_2 &= \lambda_1(\lambda_2(A, B), \lambda_2(C, D)), \end{aligned}$$

where $U, V, X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}_1$, $A, B, C, D \in \mathfrak{g}_2$, $\lambda_1 : \bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}_1) \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_2$ and $\lambda_2 : \bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}_2) \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_1$.

Remark 8. The problem of an alloyability of two quaternary algebras may be considered as a certain specific algebraic counterpart of the Kolmogorov-Arnold problem for functions of several variables [4,5].

Proposition 3. For any quaternary algebra \mathfrak{g}_1 there exists an alloyable quaternary algebra \mathfrak{g}_2 .

Proof. One may consider $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g}_1)$ as \mathfrak{g}_2 .

The proposition 3 means that the relation of alloyability R_A on the class \mathcal{Q} of quaternary algebras in nondegenerate. Note that the dimension of the space \mathcal{Q}_n of quaternary algebras of dimension n is equal to $\frac{1}{8}(n+1)n^2(n-1)(n-2)$ whereas the dimension of the graph of the relation R_A in $\mathcal{Q}_n \oplus \mathcal{Q}_m$ is equal to $\frac{1}{2}nm(n+m-2)$ so the condition of alloyability is rather strong. I suspect that the problem of classification of pairs of alloyable quaternary algebras is wild.

Remark 9. Let \mathfrak{g} be an anticommutative algebra with the bracket $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ supplied by the additional structure of a quaternary algebra with the operation $\langle \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ then $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g})$ is also an anticommutative algebra supplied by such additional structure (remarks 3,7). The quaternary operations in \mathfrak{g} and $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g})$ are alloyable, their factorizations λ_1, λ_2 coupled with the anticommutative binary operations in \mathfrak{g} and $\bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g})$ define the structure of an alloy in the space $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \bigwedge^2(\mathfrak{g})$.

Note that in any anticommutative algebra \mathfrak{g} with the binary operation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ one may construct an additional quaternary operation $\langle \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ as

$$\langle A, B, C, D \rangle = \langle \langle A, B \rangle, \langle C, D \rangle \rangle.$$

If the space \mathfrak{g} possesses two brackets $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) then one may construct six quaternary operations $\langle \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{ij}^k$ ($i, j, k = 1, 2$) as

$$\langle A, B, C, D \rangle_{ij}^k = \langle \langle A, B \rangle_i, \langle C, D \rangle_j \rangle_k + (i \leftrightarrow j).$$

1.4. Universal envelopping Lie algebras of alloys and their representations. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \uplus \dots \uplus \mathfrak{g}_n$ be an alloy. The Lie algebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ will be called the envelopping Lie algebra for the alloy \mathfrak{g} iff there exists a monomorphism of \mathfrak{g} into $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ (the least is considered as an alloy) in the category of alloys. The universal object in the category of envelopping Lie algebras for the alloy \mathfrak{g} will be denoted by $\mathbf{L}(\mathfrak{g})$ and called *the universal envelopping Lie algebra* of alloy \mathfrak{g} .

Theorem 2. *The representations of alloy \mathfrak{g} define the representations of the universal envelopping Lie algebra $\mathbf{L}(\mathfrak{g})$ and vice versa.*

Remark 10. The universal envelopping Lie algebras of alloys are infinite-dimensional as a rule.

Note that the infinite-dimensional Lie algebras $\mathbf{L}(\mathfrak{g})$ are essentially wild, however, the theory of their *finite-dimensional* representations may be a bit timer (as a rule time infinite-dimensional Lie algebras have only trivial in some sense finite-dimensional representations). This statement will be illustrated by examples below.

Let \mathfrak{g} be an alloy and $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathfrak{g})$ be the category of all finite-dimensional envelopping Lie algebras for \mathfrak{g} (the elements of $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathfrak{g})$ are Lie algebras $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ with the fixed imbedding $\iota : \mathfrak{g} \mapsto \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$). Let us denote by $\mathcal{FR}(\mathfrak{h})$ the category of finite-dimensional representations of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{h} . If $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_1, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_2 \in \mathcal{L}_0(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\pi_i \in \mathcal{FR}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) then put $\pi_1 \sim_{\text{def}} \pi_2$ iff $\pi_1|_{\mathfrak{g}} = \pi_2|_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Proposition 4. *$\mathcal{FR}(\mathbf{L}(\mathfrak{g}))$ is a tensor category, which may be represented as*

$$\mathcal{FR}(\mathbf{L}(\mathfrak{g})) = \bigoplus_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \in \mathcal{L}_0(\mathfrak{g})} \mathcal{FR}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) / \sim.$$

The proposition 4 means that the representations of different Lie algebras $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ (supplied by with the fixed imbeddings of \mathfrak{g} into them) allow mutual tensor products.

1.5. Examples. Let us consider a four-dimensional alloy $\mathfrak{asl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ generated by the elements e_0, f_{\pm} and e_1 with brackets $[e_0, f_{\pm}] = \pm f_{\pm}$, $[f_+, f_-] = 2e_0 + e_1$. This is an alloy related to a cross-projective representation of a pair $(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}), \mathbb{C})$ in general position (up to an automorphism of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$).

Theorem 3. *Any irreducible finite-dimensional e_0 -diagonal representation of the alloy $\mathfrak{asl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ has the form*

$$\begin{aligned} f_+ &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ & \ddots & A_N \\ \mathbf{0} & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & f_- &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & \mathbf{0} \\ B_1 & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0} & B_N & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ e_0 &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & & \mathbf{0} \\ & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0} & & C_N \end{pmatrix}, & e_1 &\mapsto [f_+, f_-] - 2e_0, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_i = (\gamma - i)E$ (E is the $n_i \times n_i$ -dimensional unit matrix), A_i, B_i are $n_{i-1} \times n_i$ - and $n_i \times n_{i-1}$ -dimensional matrices, respectively. The condition of irreducibility puts some relations on the numbers n_i (the dimensions of blocks), namely

$$n_0 = n_N = 1, \quad n_i \leq n_{i-1} + n_{i+1}$$

as well as additional relations on matrices A_i and B_i , namely that the pair of $n_i \times n_i$ matrices $A_{i+1}B_{i+1}$ and B_iA_i algebraically generate the whole matrix algebra $\text{Mat}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ for all i .

Remark 11 (An exercise). It is a nice exercise to classify the irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ of small dimensions and to calculate the decompositions of their tensor products. My own calculations gave me a lot of pleasure.

Remark 12. It is important that the finite-dimensional irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ have the continuous moduli. I suspect that such situation is typical for representations of algebras and differs it from the theory of finite-dimensional representations of finite-dimensional Lie algebras.

REFERENCES

- [1] Juriev D., Topics in hidden symmetries. V: funct-an/9611003.
- [2] Juriev D.V., Approximate representations and Virasoro algebra: math.RT/9805001.
- [3] Juriev D.V., q_R -conformal symmetries in two-dimensional nonlocal quantum field theory, categorical representation theory and Virasoro algebra: q-alg/9712009.
- [4] Kolmogorov A.N., On a representation of continuous functions of several variables as superpositions of continuous functions of the less number of variables. Doklady AN SSSR. 108(2) (1956) 179-182.
- [5] Arnold V.I., On a representation of continuous functions of three variables as superpositions of continuous functions of two variables. Metem.Sb. 48(1) (1959) 3-74, [E] 56(3) (1962) 382.