



# Affine Springer Fibers and Level-Rank Duality

---

Minh-Tâm Quang Trinh

Yale University

- 1 Springer Theory
- 2 Deligne–Lusztig Theory
- 3 Level–Rank Duality

Mainly about joint work with Ting Xue:

[arXiv:2311.17106](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17106)

See also the extended abstract on my website, which we have submitted to FPSAC '25.

1 Springer Theory      Work over  $\mathbf{C}$ .

$\mathbf{G}$  connected reductive group

$\mathbf{B}$  Borel subgroup

An element  $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$  is *regular semisimple* iff  $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$  is a maximal torus.

In this case, the Springer fiber

$$\mathcal{F}l_\gamma = \{g\mathbf{B} \in \mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B} \mid \gamma \in \mathrm{Lie}(g\mathbf{B}g^{-1})\}$$

is a torsor for the Weyl group  $W$ .

That is,  $\mathcal{F}l_\gamma$  forms a  $W$ -bundle as we vary  $\gamma$  over the regular semisimple locus of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

$\mathbf{G}((z))$  loop group

$\mathbf{I}$  Iwahori subgroup of  $\mathbf{G}[[z]]$

The affine Springer fibers

$$\mathcal{F}l_\gamma = \{g\mathbf{I} \in \mathbf{G}((z))/\mathbf{I} \mid \gamma \in \text{Lie}(g\mathbf{I}g^{-1})\}$$

are *not* locally constant over the regular semisimple locus of  $\mathfrak{g}((z))$ , but only over certain subsets.

**Example** Take  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{SL}_2$ .

If  $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} & 1 \\ z & \end{pmatrix}$ , then  $\mathcal{F}l_\gamma$  is a single point.

If  $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} z & \\ & -z \end{pmatrix}$ , then  $\mathcal{F}l_\gamma$  is an *infinite* chain of  $\mathbf{P}^1$ 's.

Fix a maximal torus  $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{B}$  and a fraction  $d/m > 0$  in lowest terms.

Let  $\rho^\vee = \frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha \alpha^\vee \in X_*(\mathbf{A})$ , and let

$$\mathbf{C}^\times \curvearrowright \mathbf{G}((z)) : c \cdot g(z^{1/2}) = \text{Ad}(c^{d\rho^\vee})g(c^m z^{1/2}).$$

(Oblomkov–Yun)  $\mathcal{F}l_\gamma$  is locally constant over

$$\mathfrak{g}_{d/m}^{\text{rs}} = \{\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}((z))^{\text{rs}} \mid c \cdot \gamma = c^d \gamma\}.$$

Elements of  $\mathfrak{g}_{d/m}^{\text{rs}}$  are called *homogeneous of slope  $\frac{d}{m}$* .

**Example** Take  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{SL}_2$  upper-triangular.

The preceding examples: slopes  $\frac{1}{2}, 2$ .

Note that  $\mathfrak{g}_{d/m}^{\text{rs}}$  is stable under  $\mathbf{G}_0 := (\mathbf{G}((z))^{\mathbf{C}^\times})^\circ$ .

(Oblomkov–Yun) Take  $\mathbf{G}$  simply-connected, simple.

For  $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_{d/m}^{\text{rs}}$  with  $\mathcal{F}l_\gamma$  proper:

- A *perverse filtration*  $\mathbf{P}$  on  $H_{\mathbf{C}^\times}^*(\mathcal{F}l_\gamma)$ , arising from a Ngô-type global model.
- An action of a *rational Cherednik algebra* on

$$\mathcal{E}_\gamma := \sum_{i,j} x^i y^j \operatorname{gr}_i^{\mathbf{P}} H_{\mathbf{C}^\times}^j(\mathcal{F}l_\gamma)^{\pi_0(\mathbf{G}_0, \gamma)}|_{\epsilon \rightarrow 1},$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a generator of  $H_{\mathbf{C}^\times}(\textit{point})$ .

The rational Cherednik algebra is a deformation of  $\mathbf{C}W \ltimes \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})$ , to be denoted  $D_{d/m}^{\text{rat}}$ .

|        | $D_{d/m}^{\text{rat}}$  | $\operatorname{Ug}$  |
|--------|---|--|
| PBW    | $\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{a}] \otimes \mathbf{C}W \otimes \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{a}^*]$ | $\operatorname{Un}_- \otimes \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{a}] \otimes \operatorname{Un}_+$ |
| Verma  | $\Delta_{d/m}(\chi)$  | $\Delta(\lambda)$  |
| simple | $L_{d/m}(\chi)$   | $L(\lambda)$   |

**Problem** Give a formula for  $E_\gamma := \mathcal{E}_\gamma|_{y=-1}$ , the virtual  $D_{d/m}^{\text{rat}}$ -module formed by collapsing  $H^*$ .

**Idea** The monodromy of  $E_\gamma$  over a certain subset  $\mathfrak{c}_{d/m}^{\text{rs}} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{d/m}^{\text{rs}}$  commutes with the Cherednik action.

Roughly, a transverse slice to  $\mathbf{G}_0 \curvearrowright \mathfrak{g}_{d/m}^{\text{rs}}$ .

The monodromy seems to factor through an algebra from *Deligne–Lusztig theory*.

Deligne–Lusztig studied geometry over *finite fields*.

But up to Tate twist,

$$\mathrm{Gal}(\bar{\mathbf{F}}_q|\mathbf{F}_q) \simeq \hat{\mathbf{Z}} \simeq \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbf{C}((z))}|\mathbf{C}((z))).$$

Forms of  $\mathbf{G}$  are classified by Dynkin automorphisms in the same way over  $\mathbf{F}_q$  and over  $\mathbf{C}((z))$ .

Much of Oblomkov–Yun’s setup generalizes from  $\mathbf{G}$  to any of its forms  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}((z))}$ .

The tori  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$  generalize to forms  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{C}((z))}$ ,  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}((z)),\gamma}$ .

These have corresponding forms  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{F}_q}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{F}_q}$ .

2 Deligne–Lusztig Theory Work over  $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_q$  for good  $q$ .

Forms of  $\mathbf{G}$  over  $\mathbf{F}_q$  correspond to Frobenius maps

$$\textcolor{red}{F} \curvearrowright \mathbf{G}.$$

We say that  $\textcolor{red}{G} = \mathbf{G}^F$  is a *finite group of Lie type*.

$F$ -stable Levis  $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{G}$  correspond to Levis  $\textcolor{red}{L} \subseteq G$ .

Deligne–Lusztig introduced varieties  $Y_{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{G}}$  such that

$$G \curvearrowright H_c^*(Y_{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{G}}) \curvearrowright L.$$

Induction map  $\textcolor{red}{R}_L^{\textcolor{red}{G}} : K_0(L) \rightarrow K_0(G)$  defined by

$$R_L^G(\textcolor{blue}{\lambda}) = \sum_i (-1)^i H_c^i(Y_{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{G}})[\textcolor{blue}{\lambda}].$$

(Broué–Malle) For  $m$ -regular maximal tori  $\mathbf{T}$ , a specific algebra  $H_T^G(\mathbf{q})$  such that

$$H_T^G(\zeta_m) = \bar{\mathbf{Q}} W_T^G, \quad \text{where } W_T^G = N_G(T)/T.$$

They conjecture:

- 1  $H_T^G(q) \otimes \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_\ell \simeq \text{End}_G(H_c^*(Y_{\mathbf{B}}^G)[1_T]).$
- 2 As a virtual  $(G, H_T^G(q))$ -bimodule,

$$R_T^G(1_T) = \sum_{\substack{\rho \in \text{Irr}(G) \\ (\rho, R_T^G(1_T)) \neq 0}} \varepsilon_{T,\rho}(\rho \otimes \chi_{T,\rho,q}).$$

Above,  $\varepsilon_{T,\rho} \in \{\pm 1\}$  and  $\chi_{T,\rho} \in \text{Irr}(W_T^G).$

(And  $\chi_{T,\rho,q} \in K_0(H_T^G(q))$  corresponds to  $\chi_{T,\rho}.$ )

Back to  $\mathbf{C}((z)).$  Recall that

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{F}_q}, \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{F}_q} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{C}((z))}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}((z)), \gamma}.$$

The  $F$ -stable tori  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  are 1- and  $m$ -regular.

The braid group of  $W_T^G$  is  $\pi_1(\mathbf{c}_{d/m}^{\text{rs}}).$

Conjecture (T–Xue)

- 1 The monodromy of  $E_\gamma$  factors through  $H_T^G(1).$
- 2 Defining  $D_{d/m}^{\text{rat}}$  in terms of  $W_A^G,$

$$E_\gamma = \sum_{\substack{\rho \in \text{Irr}(G) \\ (\rho, R_A^G(1_A)) \neq 0 \\ (\rho, R_T^G(1_T)) \neq 0}} \varepsilon_{T,\rho}(\Delta_{d/m}(\chi_{A,\rho}) \otimes \chi_{T,\rho,1})$$

as a virtual  $(D_{d/m}^{\text{rat}}, H_T^G(1))$ -bimodule.

Theorem (T–Xue) True in these cases:

- $m$  is the (twisted) Coxeter number of  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}((z))}$ .
- $(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}((z))}, m) = ({}^2A_2, 2), (C_2, 2), (G_2, 3), (G_2, 2)$ .

True in even more cases, assuming a conjecture of OY.

Example Take  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}((z))}$  split,  $m$  its Coxeter number.

$\chi_{A,\rho}$  runs over “wedge” characters of  $W$ .

$\chi_{T,\rho}$  runs over all characters of  $W_T^G = \mathbf{Z}/m\mathbf{Z}$ .

The virtual  $D_{d/m}^{\text{rat}}$ -module is

$$\sum_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} (-1)^k [\Delta_{d/m}(\chi_{\wedge^k(\mathbf{a})})] = [L_{d/m}(1_W)],$$

using the BGG resolution of Berest–Etingof–Ginzburg.

3 Level–Rank Duality Compare  $E_\gamma$  given by

$$(1) \quad \sum_{\rho} \varepsilon_{T,\rho}(\Delta_{d/m}(\chi_{A,\rho}) \otimes \chi_{T,\rho,1})$$

with  $R_A^G(1_A) \otimes R_T^G(1_T)$  given by

$$(2) \quad \sum_{\rho} \varepsilon_{T,\rho}(\chi_{A,\rho,q} \otimes \chi_{T,\rho,q}).$$

Under the *Knizhnik–Zamolodchik functor*

$$\mathbf{KZ} : \text{Rep}(D_{d/m}^{\text{rat}}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(H_A^G(\zeta_m)),$$

which sends  $\mathbf{KZ}(\Delta_{d/m}(\chi)) = \chi_{\zeta_m}$  for all  $\chi$ .

$$\mathbf{F}_q : (q, q) :: \mathbf{C}((z)) : (\zeta_m, \zeta_1).$$

The “reciprocity” in (2) led us to a new phenomenon in the Harish–Chandra theory of  $\mathbf{G}$ .

Let  $\text{Uch}(G)$  be the set of *unipotent* irreps of  $G$ , which occur in  $R_T^G(1_T)$  for some maximal torus  $\mathbf{T}$ .

(Broué–Malle–Michel) Fix a positive integer  $l$ .

- A Levi  $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{G}$  is  *$l$ -split* iff  $\mathbf{L} = Z_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})^\circ$ , where

$\mathbf{S}$  is a torus with  $|S|$  a power of  $\Phi_l(q)$ .

- $\lambda \in \text{Uch}(L)$  is  *$l$ -cuspidal* iff  $(\lambda, R_M^G(\mu)) = 0$  for any  $l$ -split  $M \neq L$  and  $\mu$ .

As we run over pairs  $(\mathbf{L}, \lambda)$  up to conjugacy,

$$\text{Uch}(G) = \coprod \text{Uch}(G)_{\mathbf{L}, \lambda},$$

where  $\text{Uch}(G)_{\mathbf{L}, \lambda} = \{\rho \mid (\rho, R_L^G(\lambda)) \neq 0\}$ .

For  $l = 1$ , these are classical *Harish-Chandra series*.

Generalizing our discussion for maximal tori:

Broué–Malle define a Hecke algebra  $H_{L, \lambda}^G(\mathbf{q})$  such that

$$H_{L, \lambda}^G(\zeta_l) = \bar{\mathbf{Q}} W_{L, \lambda}^G, \text{ where } W_{L, \lambda}^G = N_G(L, \lambda)/L.$$

They conjecture:

- 1  $H_{L, \lambda}^G(q) \otimes \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_\ell = \text{End}_G(H_c^*(Y_{\mathbf{P}}^G)[\lambda]).$
- 2 As a virtual  $(G, H_{L, \lambda}^G(q))$ -bimodule,

$$R_L^G(\lambda) = \sum_{\rho \in \text{Uch}(G)_{L, \lambda}} \varepsilon_{L, \lambda, \rho} (\rho \otimes \chi_{L, \lambda, \rho, q})$$

where  $\varepsilon_{L, \lambda, \rho} \in \{\pm 1\}$  and  $\chi_{L, \lambda, \rho} \in \text{Irr}(W_{L, \lambda}^G).$



If  $m \neq l$ , then  $H_{L,\lambda}^G(\zeta_m)$  need not be semisimple. Via the *decomposition map*

$$\chi \mapsto \chi_{\zeta_m} : \text{Irr}(W_{L,\lambda}^G) \rightarrow K_0(H_{L,\lambda}^G(\zeta_m)),$$

we partition  $\text{Irr}(W_{L,\lambda}^G)$  into  $(H_{L,\lambda}^G, \zeta_m)$ -blocks.

**Conjecture (T–Xue)** Fix  $l, m$ .

Fix an  $l$ -cuspidal  $(\mathbf{L}, \lambda)$  and  $m$ -cuspidal  $(\mathbf{M}, \mu)$ .

1 The set

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\chi_{L,\lambda,\rho} \mid \rho \in \text{Uch}(G)_{\mathbf{L},\lambda} \cap \text{Uch}(G)_{\mathbf{M},\mu}\}, \\ \text{resp. } & \{\chi_{M,\mu,\rho} \mid \rho \in \text{Uch}(G)_{\mathbf{L},\lambda} \cap \text{Uch}(G)_{\mathbf{M},\mu}\}, \end{aligned}$$

is a union of  $(H_{L,\lambda}^G, \zeta_m)$ -, resp.  $(H_{M,\mu}^G, \zeta_l)$ -blocks.

2 The  $\rho$ -indexing induces a matching on blocks.

**Theorem (T–Xue)** (1), (2) are compatible with block sizes for essentially all  $G, l, m$  with  $\mathbf{G}$  exceptional.

**Conjecture (T–Xue)** In the preceding setup:

3 Via KZ functors, the bijection in (2) lifts to a derived equivalence between category-O blocks of appropriate rational Cherednik algebras.

**Theorem (T–Xue)** (1), (2), (3) hold for  $G = \text{GL}_n$  when  $l, m$  are coprime.

We have  $W_{L,\lambda}^{\mathrm{GL}_n} \simeq S_N \ltimes \mathbf{Z}_l^N$  for some  $N$ , *etc.*

$$\mathrm{Rep}(H_{L,\lambda}^{\mathrm{GL}_n}(\zeta_m)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Rep}(H_{M\mu}^{\mathrm{GL}_n}(\zeta_l))$$

can be interpreted in terms of *higher-level Fock spaces*

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\vec{s} \in \mathbf{Z}^l \\ |\vec{s}|=s}} \Lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^{\vec{s}} \xleftarrow{\sim} \Lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^s \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{\substack{\vec{r} \in \mathbf{Z}^m \\ |\vec{r}|=s}} \Lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^{\vec{r}}.$$

Above,  $\Lambda_{\mathbf{q}}^{\vec{s}} \simeq \bigoplus_N K_0(S_N \ltimes \mathbf{Z}_l^N) \otimes \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{q})$ , *etc.*

*Thank you for listening.*

Use the *level-rank duality* studied by Frenkel, Uglov, Chuang–Miyachi, Rouquier–Shan–Varagnolo–Vasserot, Loseu, Webster.

Our conjectures generalize level-rank duality from  $\mathrm{GL}_n$  to arbitrary  $G$ .