

# Working title: Mirković–Vybornov fusion in Beilinson–Drinfeld Grassmannian

October 2020

## 1 Introduction

The BD Grassmannian. The convolution Grassmannian. Distinguished orbits, slices therein. Mirković–Vybornov.

## 2 Notation

Let  $\mathrm{Gr}$  denote the ordinary affine Grassmannian,  $\mathcal{G}$  the Beilinson–Drinfeld affine Grassmannian, and  $\mathfrak{G}$  the convolution affine Grassmannian.

*Definition 1.* Say  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  are **disjoint** if  $(\mu_1)_i \neq 0 \Rightarrow (\mu_2)_i = 0$  and  $(\mu_2)_i \neq 0 \Rightarrow (\mu_1)_i = 0$ .

Anne: I propose “anodyne” as another candidate for the above property after Kapranov–Shechtman.

## 3 Main results

*Claim 1.*  $\widetilde{T}_x^a \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(\overline{\mathrm{Gr}^\lambda} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_\mu)$  (this does depend on  $b!$  we get something like a springer fibre where the action of [what] on either side has eigenvalues a permutation of  $b$ .)

*Claim 2.* Let  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{BD}}^\mu = G_1((t^{-1}))t^\mu$ . Then  $S^{\mu_1+\mu_2}$  is contained in  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{BD}}^\mu$  if  $\mu$  is dominant. **Joel: And  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  are dominant also?** Anne: Roger has a proof.

*Claim 3.* Let  $a = (0, s)$  and suppose  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  are disjoint “transverse”. Let  $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ . Then  $X \in \widetilde{T}_x^a$  is a  $\mu \times \mu$  block matrix, with  $(\mu_1)_k \times (\mu_1)_k$  diagonal block conjugate to a  $(\mu_1)_k$  Jordan block and  $(\mu_2)_k \times (\mu_2)_k$  diagonal block conjugate to  $(\mu_2)_k$  Jordan block plus  $sI$ .

*Question 1.* If  $\mu_i$  is not a permutation of  $\lambda_i$  and  $\lambda_i$  are not “homogeneous” how do we proceed? E.g. if  $\mu_1 = (3, 0, 2)$ ,  $\mu_2 = (0, 2, 0)$  and  $\lambda_1 = (4, 1)$ ,  $\lambda_2 = (2, 0, 0)$ .

*Question 2.* If  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  are not disjoint how do we proceed? E.g. if  $\mu_1 = (2, 2, 0)$ ,  $\mu_2 = (1, 0, 2)$ ;  $\mu_1 = (2, 2, 1)$ ,  $\mu_2 = (1, 0, 1)$ .

## 4 Convolution vs BD

Fix  $G = \mathbf{GL}(U) \cong \mathbf{GL}_m \mathbb{C}$  and  $\{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$  a basis of  $U$ . Recall  $\mathrm{Gr} = G(\mathcal{K})/G(\mathcal{O})$  where  $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O} \dots$

*Definition 2* (Beilinson–Drinfeld loop Grassmannians). Denoted  $\mathcal{G}_{C^{(n)}}$  with  $C$  a smooth curve (or formal neighbourhood of a finite subset thereof) and  $C^{(n)}$  its  $n$ th symmetric power. It is a reduced ind-scheme  $\mathcal{G}_{C^{(n)}} \rightarrow C^{(n)}$  with fibres of  $C$ -lattices  $\mathcal{G}_b = \{(b, \mathcal{L}) : b \in C^{(n)}\}$  made up of vector bundles such that  $\mathcal{L} \cong U \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$  off  $b$  (i.e. over  $C - \underline{b}$ ). The standard lattice is the pair  $(\emptyset, \mathcal{L}_0)$  with  $\mathcal{L}_0 = U \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$ .

Not sure what  $\mathcal{O}_C$  means  
Notation

**The case  $n = 1$ .** Fix  $b \in C$  and  $t$  a choice of formal parameter. Then  $\mathcal{G}_b \cong \mathrm{Gr}$ .

Why is this called “its group-theoretic realization”

Furthermore, in this case,  $C$ -lattices  $(b, \mathcal{L})$  are identified with  $\mathcal{O}$ -submodules  $L = \Gamma(\hat{b}, \mathcal{L})$  of  $U_{\mathcal{K}} = U \otimes \mathcal{K}$  such that  $L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{K} \cong U_{\mathcal{K}}$ .

Under this identification, we associate to a given  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  the lattice (a priori a  $\mathcal{O}$ -submodule)  $L_{\lambda} = \bigoplus_1^m t^{\lambda_i} e_i \mathcal{O}$ . Nb. our lattices will be contained in the standard lattice  $L_0$  whereas MVy’s lattices contain.

Connected components of  $\mathrm{Gr}$  are

$G(\mathcal{O})$ -orbits are indexed by coweights  $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n)$  of  $G$ . In terms of lattices

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda} = \left\{ L \supset L_0 \mid t|_{L/L_0} \in \mathbb{O}_{\lambda} \right\} \quad (1)$$

in the connected component  $\mathrm{Gr}_N$  are indexed

[MV07] define a map

$$\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathfrak{G} \quad (2)$$

- Their slice  $T_x$  or  $T_{\lambda}$
- Their embedding  $T_x \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}_N$
- $N$ -dim  $D$
- The map  $\tilde{\mathbf{m}} : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^n \rightarrow \mathrm{End}(D)$
- The map  $\mathbf{m} : \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$  sending  $(x, F_{\bullet})$  to  $x$
- The map  $\pi : \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}$  sending  $\mathcal{L}_{\bullet}$  to  $\mathcal{L}_n$

The special case  $b = \vec{0}$ . In this case  $0$  in the affine quiver variety goes to the point  $L_{\lambda}$  in the affine Grassmannian, and the preimage of zero in the smooth quiver variety (= the core?) is identified with the preimage of  $L_{\lambda}$  in the BD Grassmannian.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{L}(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) & \longrightarrow & \pi^{-1}(L_{\lambda}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L_{\lambda} \end{array}$$

MVy write: “we believe that one should be able to generalize this to arbitrary  $b$ ” and that’s where we come in!

Recall the Mirković–Vybornov immersion [MV07, Theorems 1.2 and 5.3].

**Theorem 1.** (*[MV07, Theorem 1.2 and 5.3]*) *There exists an algebraic immersion  $\tilde{\psi}$*

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}^{-1}(T_\lambda) \cap \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{n,a,E,\tilde{\mu}} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_b^{n,a}(P)$$

## 5 Statements and Proofs of Results

Anne: Maybe split for now into a Notation section and a Proofs section

Define

$$S_{\mu_1, \mu_2} = N((t^{-1}))t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2}$$

and

$$W_\mu = G_1[[t^{-1}]]t^\mu.$$

Let  $|\lambda| = |\lambda_1 + \lambda_2|$  and  $|\mu| = |\mu_1 + \mu_2|$ .

Anne: Why not  $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$  and recall  $|\nu|$  in general.

**Lemma 1** (Proof in Proposition 2.6 of KWWY). *Suppose  $\mu$  is dominant. Then*

$$N((t^{-1}))t^\mu = N_1[[t^{-1}]]t^\mu.$$

**Lemma 2.** *For dominant  $\mu_1, \mu_2$ , we have*

$$S_{\mu_1, \mu_2} \subset W_{\mu_1 + \mu_2}.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mu_1, \mu_2} &= N((t^{-1}))t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2} \\ &\subset T_1[[t^{-1}]]N((t^{-1}))t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2} \\ &= T_1[[t^{-1}]]N_1[[t^{-1}]]t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2} \\ &= B_1[[t^{-1}]]t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2} \\ &= B_1[[t^{-1}]]t^{\mu_1 + \mu_2} \\ &\subset G_1[[t^{-1}]]t^{\mu_1 + \mu_2} \\ &= W_{\mu_1 + \mu_2} \end{aligned}$$

where  $B_1[[t^{-1}]]t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2} = B_1[[t^{-1}]]t^{\mu_1 + \mu_2}$  since

$$\frac{t}{t-s} = 1 + \frac{s}{t} + \frac{s^2}{t^2} + \cdots \in B_1[[t^{-1}]].$$

□

Define  $\text{Gr}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} \subset \text{Gr}_{BD}$  to be the family with generic fibre  $\text{Gr}^{\lambda_1} \times \text{Gr}^{\lambda_2}$  and 0-fibre  $\text{Gr}^{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}$ .

Define  $\mathbb{O}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}$  to be matrices  $X$  of size  $|\lambda| \times |\lambda|$  such that

$$X|_{E_0} \in \mathbb{O}_{\lambda_1} \text{ and } (X - sI)|_{E_s} \in \mathbb{O}_{\lambda_2}$$

Let

$$\mu = (\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}, \dots, \mu^{(n)}).$$

Define  $\mathbb{T}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}$  to be  $|\mu| \times |\mu|$  matrices  $X$  such that  $X$  consists of block matrices where the size of the  $i$ -th diagonal block is  $|\mu^{(i)}| \times |\mu^{(i)}|$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

**Theorem 2.** *We have an isomorphism*

$$\overline{\text{Gr}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}} \cap S_{\mu_1, \mu_2} \cong \overline{\mathbb{O}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}} \cap \mathbb{T}_{\mu_1, \mu_2} \cap \mathfrak{n}.$$

Anne: Rather, corollary?

*Proof.* We will prove this similarly to how the usual Mirković–Vybomov isomorphism is proven.

Step 1: Define a map  $\mathbb{T}_{\mu_1, \mu_2} \cap \mathcal{N} \rightarrow G_1[t^{-1}, (t-s)^{-1}]t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2}$ .

$$A \mapsto t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2} + a(t, t-s) \mapsto (L_1 \subset L_2) : (t-s)|_{L_2/L_1} = A|_{E_s}, t|_{L_1/L_0} = A|_{E_0}$$

Question: 1. is the middle matrix similar to a block matrix? 2. is the composition of these maps some intermediate level of MVy's  $\psi$ 's

BD Gr as lattices?  $(L_1, L_2) \in \text{Gr} \times \text{Gr}$  corresponds to  $L$  such that  $L \otimes \mathbb{C}[[t]] \cong L_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}[[t]]$  and  $L \otimes \mathbb{C}[[t-s]] \cong L_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}[[t-s]]$  where  $\otimes = \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[t]}$  or  $\otimes_{\mathbb{C}[t-s]}$  respectively even though Roger believes  $\mathbb{C}[t] = \mathbb{C}[t-s]$ .

Step 2: If  $A \in \mathbb{T}_{\mu_1, \mu_2} \cap \mathfrak{n}$  then  $A$  is sent to  $(N_-)_1[t^{-1}, (t-s)^{-1}]t^{\mu_1}(t-s)^{\mu_2}$ .

Anne: Requires MVyBD!

Step 3: Conversely, given  $L \in W_{\mu_1 + \mu_2}$ , want to show surjectivity.

□

Last meeting's todos:

- make sure that the image of our map is in the  $G_1$  orbit
- more generally, define the map, check that the map is well-defined
- Anne: say what little  $a$  is, i.e. insert the MVy theorem as stated in CK, or thesis
- Roger: check it

## References

- [MV07] Ivan Mirković and Maxim Vybornov. Quiver varieties and beilinson-drinfeld grassmannians of type a. [arXiv preprint arXiv:0712.4160](#), 2007.  
2, 3