## WEIGHT SPACES AND IRREDUCIBLE REPRESENTATIONS OF SIMPLE LIE ALGEBRAS

F. W. LEMIRE

Let L denote a simple Lie algebra over an algebraically closed field K of characteristic zero. Harish-Chandra [2] has shown that to each one-dimensional representation  $(\lambda, K)$  of the Cartan subalgebra  $\mathfrak R$  of L we may associate an irreducible representation of L admitting  $\lambda$  as a "highest weight function". This has been generalized by the author [3] by showing that if  $\mathfrak C$  is the centralizer of  $\mathfrak R$  in U, the universal enveloping algebra of L, and  $(\gamma, K)$  is a one-dimensional representation of  $\mathfrak C$  we may again construct an irreducible representation of L admitting  $\gamma \downarrow \mathfrak R$  as a weight function. In this paper we make a further study of the relationship between the representations of L and their weight spaces.

1. Weight spaces of irreducible representations. It is well known that there exists a one-one correspondence between the representations of L and those of U which preserves irreducibility. Throughout this paper we will not distinguish between a representation of L and its unique extension to U.

DEFINITION 1. Let  $(\rho, V)$  be a representation of L. Then for each linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}^*$ , the dual linear space of the Cartan subalgebra, we define

$$V_{\lambda} = \{ v \in V \mid \rho(H)v = \lambda(H)v \ (\forall H \in \mathfrak{M}) \}.$$

Also we denote by  $[\rho:\lambda]$  the dimension of the subspace  $V_{\lambda}$ . If, in particular,  $[\rho:\lambda] > 0$  we call  $\lambda$  a weight function of the representation  $\rho$  and  $V_{\lambda}$  the corresponding weight space.

It is clear from the definitions of C and  $V_{\lambda}$  that for any element  $c \in C$ ,  $\rho(c)$  maps  $V_{\lambda}$  into  $V_{\lambda}$ .

DEFINITION 2. Let  $(\rho, V)$  be a representation of L and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{H}^*$ . Then we define a representation  $(\eta(\rho, \lambda), V_{\lambda})$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  by setting  $\eta(\rho, \lambda)(c) = \rho(c) \downarrow V_{\lambda}$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ .

LEMMA 1. If  $(\rho, V)$  is an irreducible representation of L and  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{IC}^*$  such that  $[\rho:\lambda] > 0$  then  $(\eta(\rho, \lambda), V_{\lambda})$  is a nontrivial, irreducible representation of  $\mathfrak{C}$ .

Presented to the Society, August 28, 1968 under the title Weight spaces and irreducible representations; received by the editors September 10, 1968.

PROOF. It suffices to show that for an arbitrary nonzero element  $v \in V_{\lambda}$  we have  $\eta(\rho, \lambda)(\mathfrak{C})(v) = V_{\lambda}$ , and this follows as a special case of equation (2.4) in a paper by Bouwer [1].

We now observe that the representation  $\eta(\rho, \lambda)$  determines  $\rho$  in the following sense.

LEMMA 2. Given two irreducible representations  $(\rho_1, V_1)$  and  $(\rho_2, V_2)$  of L such that there exists a linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}^*$  with  $[\rho_1:\lambda]$  and  $[\rho_2:\lambda] > 0$  and  $\eta(\rho_1,\lambda)$  equivalent to  $\eta(\rho_2,\lambda)$ , then  $\rho_1$  is equivalent to  $\rho_2$ .

**PROOF.** We first observe that if M is a maximal left ideal of C then there exists a unique maximal left ideal M' of U containing M. In fact, if M'' denotes the left ideal of U generated by M we can easily see that  $M'' \neq U$  and hence the existence of M' is established by a simple application of Zorn's Lemma. For the uniqueness it suffices to show that the left regular representation  $(\pi, U/M'')$  of U modulo M'' has a unique maximal  $\pi(U)$ -invariant subspace. Clearly U/M'' $=\sum \bigoplus (U/M'')_{\gamma}$  and if W is a  $\pi(U)$ -invariant subspace of U/M'' we have  $W = \sum \bigoplus (W \cap (U/M'')_{\gamma})$ . Since  $(U/M'')_{\lambda}$  is the representation space of an irreducible representation of  $\mathfrak C$  it follows that  $W\cap$  $(U/M'')_{\lambda} = (U/M'')_{\lambda}$  or  $W \cap (U/M'')_{\lambda} = \{0\}$ . In the first case  $1+M'' \in W$  and hence W=U/M''. Therefore every proper  $\pi(U)$ invariant subspace of U/M'' is a subspace of  $\sum_{\gamma\neq\lambda} \oplus (U/M'')_{\gamma}$  $\neq U/M''$ , and hence  $W_{\epsilon}$ , the sum of all proper  $\pi(U)$ -invariant subspaces of U/M'', is the unique maximal proper  $\pi(U)$ -invariant subspace of U/M''.

Next suppose  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are two maximal left ideals of  $\mathfrak C$  such that the left regular representations of  $\mathfrak C$  modulo  $M_1$  and  $\mathfrak C$  modulo  $M_2$  are equivalent. Then we claim that the left regular representations of U modulo  $M_1'$  and U modulo  $M_2'$  are equivalent. Indeed by assumption we have a  $\mathfrak C$ -linear map  $\phi \colon \mathfrak C/M_1 \to \mathfrak C/M_2$ . Let  $\phi(1+M_1)=x+M_2$  and define  $\phi' \colon U/M_1' \to U/M_2'$  by setting  $\phi'(u+M_1')=ux+M_2'$ . It is then readily checked that  $\phi'$  establishes the required equivalence.

Finally assume  $(\rho_1, V_1)$  and  $(\rho_2, V_2)$  are two irreducible representations of L such that there exists a linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}^*$  with  $[\rho_i:\lambda] > 0$  and the representations  $(\eta(\rho_1,\lambda), (V_1)_{\lambda})$  and  $(\eta(\rho_2,\lambda), (V_2)_{\lambda})$  are equivalent. Choose nonzero elements  $v_i \in (V_i)_{\lambda}$  and define  $M_i = \{c \in \mathcal{C} \mid \eta(\rho_i, \lambda)(c)v_i = 0\}$  for i = 1, 2. Clearly  $M_i$  is a maximal left ideal in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $(\eta(\rho_i, \lambda), (V_i)_{\lambda})$  is equivalent to the left regular representation of  $\mathcal{C}$  modulo  $M_i$ . By assumption then the left regular representations of  $\mathcal{C}$  modulo  $M_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  modulo  $M_2$  are equivalent. As above, this implies that the left regular representations of U modulo  $M_1$  and U modulo  $M_2$  are equivalent. Then, by the unique-

ness of  $M_i'$  we have  $M_i' = \{u \in U | \rho_i(u)v_i = 0\}$  and  $(\rho_i, V_i)$  is equivalent to the left regular representation of U modulo  $M_i'$ . Therefore  $(\rho_1, V_1)$  is equivalent to  $(\rho_2, V_2)$ .

The result of Lemma 2 suggests a closer look at the irreducible representations of C.

DEFINITION 3. A nontrivial representation  $(\eta, W)$  of  $\mathfrak{C}$  is said to be  $\lambda$ -weighted for some linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}^*$  iff it is irreducible and  $\eta(H-\lambda(H)\cdot 1)=0$  for all  $H\in \mathfrak{R}$ .

LEMMA 3. Every  $\lambda$ -weighted representation of  $\mathfrak C$  is equivalent to a representation of the form  $(\eta(\rho, \lambda), V_{\lambda})$  for some irreducible representation  $(\rho, V)$  of L with  $[\rho:\lambda] > 0$ .

PROOF. Let  $(\eta, W)$  be a  $\lambda$ -weighted representation of  $\mathfrak C$  and select a nonzero element  $w \in W$ . Set  $M = \{c \in \mathfrak C \mid \eta(c)w = 0\}$ . Clearly M is a maximal left ideal of  $\mathfrak C$ . Now we claim that the left regular representation of U modulo M' (the unique maximal left ideal of U containing M) is the required irreducible representation. This follows immediately on observing that  $M' \cap \mathfrak C = M$ . To prove this latter fact we note that  $M \subseteq M' \cap \mathfrak C$  by definition of M'. Then take any  $x \in M' \cap \mathfrak C$  and assume  $x \notin M$ . By the maximality of M in  $\mathfrak C$  there exists an element  $y \in \mathfrak C$  such that  $yx-1 \in M$  and hence  $1 \in M'$ . This contradiction implies that  $M = M' \cap \mathfrak C$ .

Finally combining the results of this section we have

THEOREM 1. For any fixed linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}^*$  there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of equivalence classes of irreducible representations  $(\rho, V)$  of L with  $[\rho:\lambda] > 0$  and the set of equivalence classes of  $\lambda$ -weighted representations of  $\mathbb{C}$ .

- 2. Relations between weight spaces. Two natural questions now arise:
- (1) Suppose  $(\rho, V)$  is an irreducible representation of L such that  $[\rho:\lambda_1]>0$  and  $[\rho:\lambda_2]>0$  for two different linear functionals  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2\in \mathfrak{R}^*$ . Then how are the representations  $\eta(\rho,\lambda_1)$  and  $\eta(\rho,\lambda_2)$  related?
- (2) Conversely, let  $(\eta_i, W_i)$  be a  $\lambda_i$ -weighted representation of e for i = 1, 2. If  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ , under what conditions does there exist a common irreducible representation  $(\rho, V)$  of L such that  $\eta_i$  is equivalent to  $\eta(\rho, \lambda_i)$  for i = 1, 2?

Unfortunately we have been unable to provide a "C-internal" answer to these questions; however, we do have the following straightforward result which we will use in the next section for somewhat more satisfactory results in a restricted case.

THEOREM 2. Let  $(\eta_i, W_i)$  be a  $\lambda_i$ -weighted representation of  $\mathbb C$  and let  $M_i$  denote a maximal left ideal of  $\mathbb C$  such that  $\eta_i$  is equivalent to the left regular representation of  $\mathbb C$  modulo  $M_i$  for i=1, 2. Then there exists an irreducible representation  $(\rho, V)$  of L such that  $\eta_i$  is equivalent to  $\eta(\rho, \lambda_i)$  (i=1, 2) iff there exists an element  $x \in U - M_2'$  such that  $M_1' x \subseteq M_2'$ .

PROOF. If there exists an element  $x \in U - M_2'$  such that  $M_1' x \subseteq M_2'$  then the map  $\phi: U/M_1' \to U/M_2'$  defined by  $\phi(u+M_1') = ux+M_2'$  is a linear isomorphism which establishes the equivalence between the left regular representation of U modulo  $M_1'$  and of U modulo  $M_2'$ . Let  $(\rho, V)$  be any representation in this equivalence class; it is clear that  $\eta_i$  is equivalent to  $\eta(\rho, \lambda_i)$  of i=1, 2.

Conversely if there exists an irreducible representation  $(\rho, V)$  of L such that  $\eta_i$  is equivalent to  $\eta(\rho, \lambda_i)$  then  $M_i$  can be considered to be the left annihilator ideal of some nonzero element  $v_i \in V_{\lambda_i}$ —i.e.  $M_i = \{c \in \mathcal{C} \mid \rho(c)v_i = 0\}$ —for i = 1, 2. Moreover, as in §1 we have  $M'_i = \{u \in U \mid \rho(u)v_i = 0\}$  for i = 1, 2. Since  $\rho$  is assumped to be irreducible there exists an element  $x \in U$  such that  $\rho(x)v_2 = v_1$  and hence  $x \notin M'_2$  and  $M'_1 x \subseteq M'_2$ .

3. One-dimensional weight spaces. In the case of all finite-dimensional irreducible representations or, more generally, all irreducible representations ( $\rho$ , V) of L admitting a "highest weight", it is well known that there always exists at least one linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}^*$  such that  $[\rho:\lambda]=1$ . On the other hand, if  $(\rho, V)$  is an irreducible representation of L for which there exists a linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}^*$  with  $[\rho:\lambda]=1$  then, as above,  $\rho$  is determined by  $\eta(\rho,\lambda)$  and moreover  $\eta(\rho,\lambda)$  may be regarded as an algebra homomorphism from  $\mathfrak{C}$  into K. This particular class of representations of L was studied by the author in a previous paper [3]. Unfortunately, it is possible for inequivalent one-dimensional representations of  $\mathfrak{C}$  to yield equivalent representations of L. The next two theorems are aimed at shedding some light on the relationship between one-dimensional representations of  $\mathfrak{C}$  which yield equivalent representations of L.

THEOREM 3. Let  $(\eta_i, K)$  be a  $\lambda_i$ -weighted one-dimensional representation of  $\mathbb{C}$  for i = 1, 2. If there exists an irreducible representation  $(\rho, V)$  of L such that  $\eta_i$  is equivalent to  $\eta(\rho, \lambda_i)$  for i = 1, 2 then there exist elements  $x, y \in U$  such that  $yx \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\eta_2(yx) = 1$  and  $\eta_1(c) = \eta_2(ycx)$  for all  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ .

PROOF. Choose  $0 \neq v_i \in V_{\lambda_i}$ . Then  $M_i = \{c \in \mathbb{C} \mid \rho(c)v_i = 0\}$  is a maximal left ideal of  $\mathbb{C}$  such that  $\eta_i$  is equivalent to the left regular representation of  $\mathbb{C}$  modulo  $M_i$ . By Theorem 2 there exists an element  $x \in U - M_2'$  such that  $M_1'x \subseteq M_2'$ . Since  $x \in M_2'$  there exists an element  $y \in U$  such that  $yx - 1 \in M_2'$ . Then clearly  $yx \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\eta_2(yx) = 1$ . Finally, since  $\eta_2(y(c - \eta_1(c) \cdot 1)x) = 0$ ,  $\eta_1(c) = \eta_2(ycx)$  for all  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ .

As a partial converse to Theorem 3 we have:

THEOREM 4. Let  $(\eta_i, K)$  be a one-dimensional  $\lambda_i$ -weighted representation of  $\mathbb{C}$  and denote  $\operatorname{Ker}(\eta_i)$  by  $M_i$  for i=1, 2. If there exists an element  $x \in U - M_2'$  such that for all  $y \in U$  satisfying  $yx \in \mathbb{C}$  we have  $\eta_2(ycx) = \eta_1(c)\eta_2(yx)$  for all  $c \in \mathbb{C}$  then there exists an irreducible representation  $(\rho, V)$  of L such that  $\eta_i$  is equivalent to  $\eta(\rho, \lambda_i)$  for i=1, 2.

PROOF. We first observe that the set

$$\{u \in U \mid (\forall y \in U : yu \in \mathcal{C}) yu \in M_i\}$$

is a maximal left ideal of U containing  $M_i$  and hence is equal to  $M'_i$ . Let  $(\pi, U/M'_2)$  denote the left regular representation of U modulo  $M'_2$ . For all  $c \in \mathbb{C}$  we have  $cx \equiv \eta_1(c)x \mod M'_2$ . Suppose, to the contrary, that  $cx - \eta_1(c)x \in M'_2$ . By maximality of  $M'_2$ , there exists an element  $y \in U$  such that  $y(cx - \eta_1(c)x) - 1 \in M'_2$ —i.e.  $\eta_2(ycx - \eta_1(c)yx) = 1$ . However, by assumption  $\eta_2(ycx - \eta_1(c)yx) = 0$ . This contradiction implies that  $cx - \eta_1(c)x \in M'_2$ . Therefore  $\eta_1$  is equivalent to  $\eta(\pi, \lambda_1)$ .

4. Some interesting questions. Having established the close relationship between the representations of L and those of C, we are now interested in looking at the irreducible representations of C and the structure of C. In this regard we have far more questions than answers. In previous papers [3], [4] we have shown that C is a finitely generated subalgebra of C and if C and if C and if the associated irreducible representation C and C then the associated irreducible representation C as for all C.

From these observed facts we face the following questions:

- (1) Are all  $\lambda$ -weighted (resp. irreducible) representations of  $\mathfrak{C}$  finite-dimensional?
- (2) Are all irreducible representations of  $\mathfrak{C}$   $\lambda$ -weighted for some linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}^*$ ?
- (3) If  $(\eta, W)$  is a finite-dimensional  $\lambda_0$ -weighted representation of L, does there exist a linear functional  $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}^*$  such that  $[\rho:\lambda] = 1$ ?

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- 1. I. Z. Bouwer, Standard representations of simple Lie algebras, Canad. J. Math. 20 (1968), 344-361.
- 2. Harish-Chandra, On some applications of the universal enveloping algebra of a semisimple Lie algebra, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 70 (1951), 28-96.
- 3. F. W. Lemire, Irreducible representations of a simple Lie algebra admitting a one-dimensional weight space, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 19 (1968), 1161-1164.
- 4. —, Note on weight spaces of irreducible linear representations, Canad. Math. Bull. 11 (1968), 399-403.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA