

The quantum group $GL_{\hbar}(2)$

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

1992 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 25 L1239

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/25/22/003>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.59

The article was downloaded on 01/06/2010 at 17:31

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The quantum group $GL_h(2)$

B A Kupershmidt

University of Tennessee Space Institute, Tullahoma, TN 37388, USA

Received 27 July 1992

Abstract. Among all quantum group structures on the space $\text{Mat}(2)$ of 2×2 matrices, how many have a central quantum determinant, so that one can define quantum $SL(2)$ out of quantum $GL(2)$? Up to isomorphism, there are two such structures, $GL_q(2)$ and $GL_h(2)$. The former is well known, the latter is described in this paper.

Quantum groups are multiplying like rabbits after rain. Restricting oneself to quantum deformations of the space $\text{Mat}(n)$ of $n \times n$ matrices, the variety is still large and growing. In some of these deformations, like $GL_q(n)$, the quantum determinant is central, while in others, like $GL_{p,q}(n)$, it is not. If one imposes the natural requirement that the quantum deformation of $GL(n)$ is restricted to that of $SL(n)$, this amounts to the property of quantum determinant being central. For the case $n = 2$, it is possible to classify *all* such deformations. Up to isomorphism, there exist just two: the well known $GL_q(2)$ (Drinfel'd 1986) and $GL_h(2)$ (or $\text{Mat}_h(2)$), given on generators of a matrix $M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ by the relations:

$$\begin{aligned} ba &= ab + h(a^2 - ad + bc) - h^2ac \\ ca &= ac - hc^2 \\ da &= ad + h(ac - cd) - h^2c^2(1) \\ cb &= bc - h(ac + cd) \\ db &= bd + h(ad - bc - d^2) + h^2ac \\ dc &= cd + hc^2 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where h is a deformation parameter. The quantum determinant

$$\det_h(M) = \mathcal{D} = ad - bc + hac = da - cb - hca \tag{2}$$

is central.

The formulae (1), (2) can be arrived at via the following route. Let us start by classifying all multiplicative Poisson brackets on $\text{Mat}(2)$ for which the determinant

det is central. It is easy to show that all multiplicative Poisson brackets on $\text{Mat}(2)$ result from the condition of being Poisson symmetries of a pair of Poisson planes

$$\{x, y\} = P_2(x, y) \tag{3a}$$

$$\{\xi, \xi\} = Q_2(\xi, \eta) \quad \{\eta, \eta\} = Q_2'(\xi, \eta) \quad \{\xi, \eta\} = Q_2''(\xi, \eta) \tag{3b}$$

where P_2, Q_2, \dots are quadratic polynomials. (A similar property holds for all matrix groups and supergroups.) By a linear change of coordinates, the Poisson bracket (3a) can be reduced to one of the two canonical forms:

$$\{x, y\} = xy \tag{4a}$$

and

$$\{x, y\} = y^2 \tag{5a}$$

depending upon whether the roots of P_2 are distinct or not. (If P_2 vanishes then the det is central iff $Q_2 = Q_2' = Q_2'' = 0$.) In these coordinates, the det is central iff the Poisson brackets (3b) take the form, respectively,

$$\{\xi, \xi\} = \{\eta, \eta\} = 0 \quad \{\xi, \eta\} = \eta\xi \tag{4b}$$

and

$$\{\xi, \xi\} = 2\xi\eta \quad \{\eta, \eta\} = \{\xi, \eta\} = 0. \tag{5b}$$

Upon quantization, the Poisson brackets (4) and (5) become, respectively,

$$xy = q^{-1}yx \quad \xi^2 = \eta^2 = 0 \quad \xi\eta = -q\eta\xi \tag{6}$$

and

$$xy = yx + h y^2 \quad \xi^2 = h\xi\eta \quad \eta^2 = 0 \quad \eta\xi = -\xi\eta. \tag{7}$$

The quantum symmetries of (6) lead to the familiar $\text{Mat}_q(2)$ (Manin 1988). The quantum symmetries of (7) result in formulae (1). Formula (2) for the quantum determinant follows from the standard definition

$$\xi'\eta' = \mathcal{D}\xi\eta \quad \begin{pmatrix} \xi' \\ \eta' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, the quantum determinant is multiplicative. Set

$$\widetilde{M} = \begin{pmatrix} d + hc & -b + h(d - a + hc) \\ -c & a - hc \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\widetilde{M} = \widetilde{M}M = \mathcal{D}\mathbf{1}.$$

From this one deduces by the Takeuchi method that \mathcal{D} is central:

$$\mathcal{D}M = (M\widetilde{M})M = M(\widetilde{M}M) = M\mathcal{D}.$$

Hence,

$$M^{-1} = \mathcal{D}^{-1}\widetilde{M} = \widetilde{M}\mathcal{D}^{-1}.$$

Further properties of $\text{Mat}_h(2)$ follow.

(i) The ring of regular functions on $\text{Mat}_h(2)$ has the PBW property: the monomials $\{a^n b^m c^k d^l \mid n, m, k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ form a basis. This is easily checked with the help of the Diamond lemma (Bergman 1978).

(ii) The powers of M are also quantum matrices, with the deformation parameter kh :

$$M^k \in \text{Mat}_{kh}(2) \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{8}$$

This is similar to the other case: $\{M \in \text{Mat}_q(2)\} \Rightarrow \{M^k \in \text{Mat}_{qk}(2)\}$ (Corrigan *et al* 1990). As in that case,

$$\det_{kh}(M^k) = [\det_h(M)]^k \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{9}$$

(If in formulae (7) one replaces $\xi^2 = h\xi\eta$ by $\xi^2 = -h\xi\eta$, properties (8) and (9) will still hold although \det_h will no longer be central, and these facts remain true for $\text{Mat}_h(n)$.)

(iii) The elements c and $a-d$ are normalizing. Hence, one can self-consistently reduce $\text{Mat}_h(2)$ to the upper-triangular case by setting $c = 0$. Further reductions are possible: $a = d$; $a = d^{-1}$; $a = d, b = 0$; $a = d = 1$. Notice that the generators a, c, d form a closed subalgebra.

(iv) The ring of invariants (i.e. the polynomial centre) of $\mathbb{C}[\text{Mat}_h(2)]$ is generated by $\mathcal{D} = \det_h(M)$. The field of invariants is generated by \mathcal{D} and

$$\text{Cas}_2(M) = c^{-1}(a - d) = (a - d)c^{-1}. \tag{10}$$

For this invariant, one has a companion formula to (9):

$$\text{Cas}_2(M^k) = \text{Cas}_2(M) + (k - 1)h \quad 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{11}$$

For the case $M \in \text{Mat}_q(2)$ one has similar statements, with (10) being replaced by (Kupershmidt 1991)

$$\text{Cas}_2(M) = c^{-1}b = bc^{-1} \tag{10'}$$

and (11) being replaced by

$$\text{Cas}_2(M^k) = q^{1-k} \text{Cas}_2(M) \quad 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{11'}$$

(v) Similar to the case of $\text{Mat}_q(2)$ (Ewen *et al* 1991), one has quantum analogues of the Cayley–Hamilton theorem:

$$X^2 M^2 = (a + d - hc)XM - \mathcal{D}\mathbf{1} \quad X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -h \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{12a}$$

$$M^2 Y^2 = MY(a + d + hc) - \mathcal{D}\mathbf{1} \quad Y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & h \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{12b}$$

(vi) If

$$M^k = \begin{pmatrix} a_k & b_k \\ c_k & d_k \end{pmatrix}$$

we define quantum traces as

$$t_k^\pm = t_k^\pm(M^k) = a_k + d_k \pm khc_k \tag{13}$$

so that

$$t_k^+ = \text{tr}(M^k Y^k) \quad t_k^- = \text{tr}(X^k M^k).$$

From (12a) and (12b) we deduce, as in the case of $\text{Mat}_q(2)$ (Kupershmidt 1992), that

$$t_{k+2}^- = t_1^- t_{k+1}^- - \mathcal{D}t_k^- \tag{14a}$$

$$t_{k+2}^+ = t_{k+1}^+ t_1^+ - \mathcal{D}t_k^+. \tag{14b}$$

Since

$$t_{-1}^\pm = \mathcal{D}^{-1}t_1^\pm$$

it follows that all the t_k^\pm commute between themselves, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and similarly for the t_k^- . Also,

$$ct_k^+ = t_k^- c. \tag{15}$$

Suppose now that

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

is a matrix whose entries commute with those of M . Define

$$\text{Tr}_h(S) = s_{11} + s_{22} - 2hs_{21}. \tag{16}$$

Then

$$\text{Tr}_h(M S M^{-1}) = \text{Tr}_h(S). \tag{17}$$

(vii) In the quasiclassical limit $h \rightarrow 0$, formulae (1) yield the following multiplicative Poisson brackets on $\text{GL}(2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \{a, b\} &= ad - bc - a^2 & \{a, c\} &= c^2 & \{a, d\} &= c(d - a) \\ \{b, c\} &= c(d + a) & \{b, d\} &= d^2 + bc - ad & \{c, d\} &= -c^2. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Denoting $\overline{f} = df|_e$ for any $f \in \text{Fun}(\text{GL}(2))$ (e is the unit element of $\text{GL}(2)$), we can extract from (18) the bi-algebra structure on $\mathfrak{gl}(2)$, by the formula (Drinfel'd 1986)

$$[\overline{f}, \overline{g}] = \overline{\{f, g\}}.$$

The resulting commutators on $\mathfrak{gl}(2)^*$ are

$$\begin{aligned} [\bar{a}, \bar{b}] &= \bar{d} - \bar{a} & [\bar{a}, \bar{c}] &= 0 & [\bar{a}, \bar{d}] &= 0 \\ [\bar{b}, \bar{c}] &= 2\bar{c} & [\bar{b}, \bar{d}] &= \bar{d} - \bar{a} & [\bar{c}, \bar{d}] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In the notation

$$I = \bar{a} + \bar{d} \quad H = \bar{a} - \bar{d} \quad E = \bar{b} \quad F = \bar{c}$$

formulae (19) become

$$[E, F] = 2F \quad [E, H] = 2H \quad [F, H] = 0 \quad [I, \text{anything}] = 0. \quad (20)$$

The Casimir element is (cf formula (10))

$$\text{Cas} = F^{-1}H = HF^{-1} = \bar{c}^{-1}(\bar{a} - \bar{d}) = (\bar{a} - \bar{d})\bar{c}^{-1}. \quad (21)$$

(viii) Let G be a semisimple Lie group with the Lie algebra \mathcal{G} . The ring of regular functions on G , $\mathbb{C}[G]$, consists of matrix elements of finite-dimensional representations $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(V)$ of G , i.e. of functions $\langle l, \rho(g)(v) \rangle$, $g \in G$, $l \in V^*$, $v \in V$. Let $r \in \Lambda^2(\mathcal{G})$ be a classical r -matrix, so that

$$[r^{12}, r^{13}] + [r^{12}, r^{23}] + [r^{13}, r^{23}] = 0. \quad (22)$$

Then the Poisson bracket

$$\begin{aligned} &\{ \langle l_1, \rho_1(g)(v_1) \rangle, \langle l_2, \rho_2(g)(v_2) \rangle \} \\ &= \langle l_1 \otimes l_2, [(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)_*(r), \rho_1(g) \otimes \rho_2(g)](v_1 \otimes v_2) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

defines a multiplicative Poisson bracket on G . (See Drinfel'd 1986.) When $G = \text{GL}(n)$, one can take $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ as the defining representation. Then formula (23) simplifies to

$$\{ M_i^\alpha, M_j^\beta \} = \sum_{kl} r^{kl} [(I_k M)_i^\alpha (I_l M)_j^\beta - (M I_k)_i^\alpha (M I_l)_j^\beta] \quad (24)$$

where $r = \sum r^{kl} I_k \otimes I_l$ is the coordinate expression of the r -matrix in a basis of \mathcal{G} . For the case at hand, formulae (18) can be written in the form (24) with the r -matrix

$$r = h \otimes e - e \otimes h \quad (25)$$

where $h = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, $e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ are elements of the basis of $[\mathfrak{sl}(2) \text{ and}] \mathfrak{gl}(2)$. The r -matrix (25) satisfies the classical Yang-Baxter equation (CYBE) (22).

(ix) Many different generalizations are possible for the case of $\text{Mat}(n)$, $n > 2$ (and also for \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded groups $\text{Mat}(n|m)$). For example, for $n = 3$, apart from obvious versions of formula (25) (depending upon various embeddings of $\text{sl}(2)$ into $\text{sl}(3)$), one also has the r -matrix

$$r = -h_1 \wedge (e_1 + 2e_2) + \theta h_2 \wedge (2e_1 + e_2) \quad \theta \in \mathbb{C} \quad (26)$$

which does not satisfy the CYBE (22). (Here $h_i = E_{ii} - E_{ii+1}$, $e_1 = E_{12}$, $e_2 = E_{23}$ in the usual notation.) This situation originates in the symmetries of the three-dimensional Poisson space (Dufour and Haraki 1991)

$$\{x_i, x_{i+1}\} = \partial P / \partial x_{i+2} \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}_3 \quad (27)$$

where

$$P = x_2^2 x_3 + \theta x_1 x_3^2. \quad (28)$$

In contrast, the r -matrix

$$r = (\alpha_1 h_1 + \alpha_2 h_2) \wedge E_{13} + \epsilon (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) e_1 \wedge e_2 \quad \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{C} \quad \epsilon = 0, 1 \quad (29)$$

does satisfy the CYBE (22).

References

- Bergman G 1978 *Adv. Math.* **29** 178–218
 Corrigan E, Fairlie D B, Fletcher P and Sasaki R 1990 *J. Math. Phys.* **31** 776–80
 Drinfel'd V G 1986 *Proc. Int. Congr. on Mathematics (Berkeley, 1986)* pp 798–820
 Dufour J-P and Haraki A 1991 *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **312** 137
 Ewen H, Ogievetsky O and Wess J 1991 *Lett. Math. Phys.* 297–305
 Kupershmidt B A 1991 *Mechanics, Analysis and Geometry: 200 Years After Lagrange* ed M Francaviglia (Amsterdam: Elsevier) pp 171–99
 — 1992 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** L915–9
 Manin Yu I 1988 *Quantum Groups and Non-Commutative Geometry* (Montréal: CRM)