

# The Langlands philosophy and representation theory

David Vogan

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A Day of Mathematics in Taipei  
June 19, 2024

# Outline

What Langlands can do for me

Introduction to number theory

Analytic number theory

Automorphic forms

Langlands conjectures, a bit more precisely

What's better than a representation of  $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R})$ ?

End of this talk is beginning of promised talk.

# What happened to “Unitary dual”?

Announced title was, *What's the unitary dual look like?*

Unfortunately, I often prepare talks at the last minute.

On this occasion the last minute coincided with a (highly divisible) wedding anniversary; so burying myself in my computer seemed like a poor idea.

We celebrated our tenth anniversary at the Arbeitstagung in Bonn.  
My wife has not forgotten.

There was on my computer a set of slides on a  
(related!) topic, and so I have elected to use those.

Now the end of the talk can be a surprise to me as well as to you.

I beg your forgiveness for this deviation from plan, and hope that you find something to enjoy.

# Here's the punchline

$GL_n(\mathbb{R})$  is everybody's favorite reductive group.

Want to understand  $\widehat{GL_n(\mathbb{R})}$  = set of irr reps.

Studied by Gelfand, Harish-Chandra *et alia* 1950s), as part of **functional analysis**. That was **really hard**.

Langlands (1960s) studied  $\widehat{GL_n(\mathbb{R})}$  for **number theory**.

Langlands idea:  $\widehat{GL_n(\mathbb{R})} \overset{\approx?}{\leftrightarrow} n\text{-diml reps of } \text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{R})$ .

That is,  $\widehat{GL_n(\mathbb{R})} \overset{\approx?}{\leftrightarrow} \{n \times n \text{ matrices } J, J^2 = I\} / (\text{conjugation})$ .

FINALLY we have an algebra-friendly problem:

$$\widehat{GL_n(\mathbb{R})} \overset{\approx?}{\leftrightarrow} \{\text{decompositions } n = p + q\}.$$

This is a bit too simple to be true. **Plan today**:

1. look at the **origin** of Langlands' idea;
2. how Langlands **complicated** the idea so it can be true.
3. how to **complicate it even more** so it can be even truer.

# A one-minute introduction to number theory

Langlands without  
formulas

David Vogan

Introduction

Number theory

Analytic nbr theory

Automorphic forms

Langlands reprise

NOT Galois reps

What next?

**Number theory**  $\Leftrightarrow$  solutions in  $\mathbb{Q}$  to polynomial eqns.

Can always find solutions by enlarging the field, so

**Number theory**  $\Leftrightarrow$  understanding finite extensions of  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

$E =$  (separable) degree  $n$  extension of  $k$

$= n$ -dimensional vector space over  $k$ .

$$GL(E/k) = \{\text{invertible } k\text{-linear } E \rightarrow E\} \simeq GL_n(k).$$

Multiplication in  $E \rightsquigarrow E^\times \hookrightarrow GL_k(E)$  maximal abelian

Theorem.

separable extensions  $E_j \longleftrightarrow$  nice max abelian

$$\sum_j [E_j : k] = n \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad A \subset GL_n(k)$$

$$A = E_1^\times \times \cdots \times E_m^\times.$$

**Number theory**  $\Leftrightarrow$  group theory for  $GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$ .

# Another one-minute intro to number theory

Langlands without  
formulas

David Vogan

Introduction

Number theory

Analytic nbr theory

Automorphic forms

Langlands reprise

NOT Galois reps

What next?

**Number theory**  $\Leftrightarrow$  solutions in  $\mathbb{Q}$  to polynomial eqns.

What's hard about that is that there's no analysis.

Embed  $\mathbb{Q} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , study **real** solutions using analysis.

$x^2 + 4y^2 = -3$ : no real solutions, so no rational solutions.

Embed  $\mathbb{Q} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p$ , study  **$p$ -adic** solutions using analysis.

$x^2 + 4y^2 = 135$ : no solutions (mod 4), so no rational solutions.

**Adeles of  $\mathbb{Q}$**  is (restricted) direct product  $\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{R} \times \prod_p \mathbb{Q}_p$ .

$\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q}) =$  **loc compact ring**  $\supset \mathbb{Q} =$  **discrete cocompact subring**.

**arithmetic on  $\mathbb{Q}$**   $\Leftrightarrow$  **analysis on compact  $\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q})/\mathbb{Q}$** .

# What's analysis look like on the adeles?

Adeles of  $\mathbb{Q}$        $\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{R} \times \prod_p \mathbb{Q}_p$ .

$\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q}) =$  **loc compact ring**  $\supset \mathbb{Q} =$  **discrete cocompact subring**.

Like  $\mathbb{R} \supset \mathbb{Z}$  but with more number-theoretic content.

Since  $(\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q}), +)$  loc compact abelian, have a **dual group**

$$\widehat{\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q})} =_{\text{def}} \{\chi: \mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow U(1) \text{ continuous, } \chi(a+b) = \chi(a)\chi(b)\},$$

**Haar measures**  $da$  on  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $d\chi$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ , and **Fourier transform**

$$\widehat{\cdot}: S(\mathbb{A}) \xrightarrow{\sim} S(\widehat{\mathbb{A}}), \quad \widehat{F}(\chi) = \int_{\mathbb{A}} F(a)\chi(a)da.$$

**Theorem.** Fix **nontrivial** character  $\chi_1 \in \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$  **trivial** on  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

For  $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$  define  $\chi_\xi(a) =_{\text{def}} \chi_1(\xi \cdot a)$ .

1.  $\xi \mapsto \chi_\xi$  is an **isomorphism**  $\mathbb{A} \simeq \widehat{\mathbb{A}}$ .
2.  $\{\chi_\xi \mid \xi \in \mathbb{Q}\} \simeq \widehat{\mathbb{A}/\mathbb{Q}}$ .

Nice basis of **functions on**  $\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{Q})/\mathbb{Q}$  indexed by  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

# A one-minute intro to automorphic forms

Wasn't there a reductive group here somewhere?

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{separable extensions } E_j & & \text{nice max abelian} \\ \sum_j [E_j : k] = n & \longleftrightarrow & A \subset GL_n(k) \\ & & A = E_1^\times \times \cdots \times E_m^\times. \end{array}$$

Number theory  $\leftrightarrow$  group theory for  $GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$ .

To do analysis in this world, use locally compact group

$$GL_n(\mathbb{A}) = \prod_v GL_n(\mathbb{Q}_v).$$

Diagonal embedding is

$$GL_n(\mathbb{Q}) \hookrightarrow GL_n(\mathbb{A}),$$

discrete subgroup that's nearly cocompact.

arithm on  $GL_n(\mathbb{Q}) \leftrightarrow$  analysis on nearly cpt  
space  $GL_n(\mathbb{A})/GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$ .

Automorphic forms = nice fns on  $GL_n(\mathbb{A})/GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$ .



# Automorphic representations

$GL_n(\mathbb{A}) = \prod_v GL_n(\mathbb{Q}_v)$  locally compact group.

**Number theory**  $\leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Q}) =$  nice fns on  $GL_n(\mathbb{A})/GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$ .

$\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Q}) =$  **vector space** where  $GL_n(\mathbb{A})$  acts: **representation!**

**Automorphic rep** = irr rep of  $GL_n(\mathbb{A})$  on  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Q})$ .

Irr rep of product = tensor product of irr reps.

**Any** irr rep  $\pi \in \widehat{GL_n(\mathbb{A})}$  is  $\pi = \otimes_v \pi_v$ ,  $\pi_v \in \widehat{GL_n(\mathbb{Q}_v)}$ .

$\pi$  **automorphic**  $\iff \otimes_v \pi_v$  has  **$GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$ -fixed vector**.

Analogous to “matching chars” in reciprocity laws of class field theory.

# Langlands philosophy, take one

$\text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}_v) \hookrightarrow \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}) \text{ mod conjugacy.}$

Langlands' philosophy  $\rightsquigarrow$  conjectural maps:

$(n\text{-diml reps of } \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}_v)) \xrightarrow{\text{local}} \widehat{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q}_v), \quad \sigma_v \mapsto \pi_v(\sigma_v).$

$(n\text{-diml reps of } \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q})) \xrightarrow{\text{global}} (\text{automorphic reps of } GL_n)$   
 $\sigma \text{ } n\text{-diml of } \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}) \rightsquigarrow \text{automorphic } \pi(\sigma) = \otimes_v \pi_v(\sigma).$

**Local/global compatibility:**  $\pi_v(\sigma) = \pi_v(\sigma|_{\text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}_v)}).$

Offers indirect “answer” to question of which local Galois group representations can be assembled to global ones...

Set  $\{\sigma_v\}$  of  $n$ -diml reps of  $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}_v)$  **assemble** to  $n$ -diml rep  $\sigma$  of  $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q})$   $\iff$  tensor product of corresponding  $GL_n(\mathbb{Q}_v)$  reps has  $GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$  fixed vector.

N.B.: the maps  $\xrightarrow{\text{local}}$  and  $\xrightarrow{\text{global}}$  **aren't surjective!**

# What makes the Langlands conjectures true?

Langlands without  
formulas

David Vogan

Number theory  $\leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Q}) =$  nice fns on  $GL_n(\mathbb{A})/GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$

supports conjectural **global** correspondence

$\sigma$   $n$ -diml of  $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}) \rightsquigarrow$  automorphic  $\pi(\sigma) = \otimes_v \pi_v(\sigma)$ ,

suggests image includes “most” automorphic reps.

Nature of embeddings  $GL_n(\mathbb{Q}) \hookrightarrow GL_n(\mathbb{Q}_v)$  supports

{comps  $\pi_v$  of automorphic  $\pi$ }  $\supset$  “most of”  $\widehat{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q}_v)$ .

Now a **local** correspondence

$(n\text{-diml reps of } \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}_v)) \xrightarrow{\text{local}} \widehat{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q}_v), \quad \sigma_v \mapsto \pi_v(\sigma_v)$

**needs to be defined**, with image including “most” of  $\widehat{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q}_v)$ ,  
for **local/global** compatibility to make sense.

Introduction

Number theory

Analytic nbr theory

Automorphic forms

Langlands reprise

NOT Galois reps

What next?

# What makes the Langlands conjectures false?

Galois grps are **compact**, so sets of reps are **discrete**.

Predicted sets of automorphic representations and  $GL_n(\mathbb{Q}_v)$  representations are therefore **discrete**.

$GL_n(\mathbb{Q}_v)$ ,  $GL_n(\mathbb{A})/GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$  are both **noncompact** (like  $\mathbb{R}$ )...

... so have **continuous** spectra (like Fourier transform for  $\mathbb{R}$ ).

Langlands understood this difficulty very well.

**Class field theory** (case of  $GL_1$  for Langlands' conjectures) already sees this difficulty.

Langlands followed **Andre Weil's** resolution: replace  $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}_v)$  by closely related **noncompact Weil group**  $W_v$ .

Seems to work **perfectly** for **nonarchimedean**  $\mathbb{Q}_v$ ...

... but less well for  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{C}$ .

# Where do automorphic forms come from?

Langlands without  
formulas

David Vogan

Introduction

Number theory

Analytic nbr theory

Automorphic forms

Langlands reprise

NOT Galois reps

What next?

Automorphic forms tied to **L-functions**: meromorphic functions, analytic behavior  $\Leftrightarrow$  interesting number theory.

Fundamental example is **Riemann zeta function**.

**Emil Artin** gave a **construction** (for number fields)

representation of Galois group  $\rightarrow$  L-function.

This is part of the basis of Langlands' conjectures:

**Galois reps**  $\Leftrightarrow$  **L-functions**  $\Leftrightarrow$  **automorphic forms**.

Another source of L-functions is **varieties/number fields**.

Connection with Artin L-functions looks like this:

variety  $X/F \rightarrow$  cohomology  $H^*(X) \rightarrow$  rep of  $\text{Gal}(F)$  on  $H^*(X)$ .

This is a good way to think, but the arrows don't really work...

...Artin uses **cplx** reps, so want cohom with **cplx** coeffs.

But  $\text{Gal}(F)$  **does not act** on such cohomology.

# What does this suggest about Langlands?

$$\text{aut form on } GL(n) \longleftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} n\text{-diml cohom space} \\ \text{of alg variety}/\mathbb{Q} \end{array} \longleftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} n\text{-diml rep} \\ \text{of Gal}(\mathbb{Q}) \end{array}$$

Local version at  $\mathbb{R}$  is

$$\text{rep of } GL_n(\mathbb{R}) \longleftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} n\text{-diml cohom space} \\ \text{of alg variety}/\mathbb{R} \end{array} \longleftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} n\text{-diml rep} \\ \text{of Gal}(\mathbb{R}) \end{array}$$

In both settings, first problem is that **red arrows don't work**.

To address that, Langlands needed a structure on an  $n$ -diml cplx vector space  $V$  **related to cohom of alg variety**.

An **integral Langlands parameter for  $GL_n(\mathbb{R})$**  is

1. complex vector space  $V$  of dimension  $n$ ;
2. involution  $y \in \text{Aut}(V)$  of order (one or) two;
3. bigrading  $\{V_{p,q} \mid p, q \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , such that  $y(V_{p,q}) = V_{q,p}$ .

This is close to **Hodge structure** on cohom of **smooth**  $X/\mathbb{R}$ .

Langlands proved **local Langlands conjecture**:

$$\text{THM : irr reps of } GL_n(\mathbb{R}) \longleftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{equivalence classes} \\ \text{of Langlands params} \end{array} .$$

# Why wasn't that the last slide?

Recall that an **integral Langlands parameter for  $GL_n(\mathbb{R})$**  is

(Adams-Barbasch-V 1992)

1. complex vector space  $V$  of dimension  $n$ ;
  2. involution  $y \in \text{Aut}(V)$  of order (one or) two;
  3. bigrading  $\{V_{p,q} \mid p, q \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , such that  $y(V_{p,q}) = V_{q,p}$ .
- and this is close to **Hodge structure** on cohom of **smooth**  $X/\mathbb{R}$ .

Two reasons to keep going:

aesthetic: non-smooth  $X$  lack such Hodge structure;

practical: (Langlands params/ $\mathbb{R}$ ) lacks interesting geometry.

An **integral geometric parameter for  $GL_n(\mathbb{R})$**  is

1. complex vector space  $V$  of dimension  $n$ ;
  2. involution  $y \in \text{Aut}(V)$  of order (one or) two;
  3. filtration  $\{\cdots F_{p-1}V \subset F_pV \subset F_{p+1}V \cdots\}$
- and this is in the spirit of the **Hodge filtration** on cohom of **any**  $X/\mathbb{R}$ .

Linear algebra exercise:

$$(y, (V_{p,q})) \mapsto (y, \sum_{p' < p, q} V_{p',q})$$

is a bijection from equiv classes of **integral Langlands params** to equiv classes of **geom params**.

COROLLARY : irr reps of  $GL_n(\mathbb{R}) \longleftrightarrow$  equivalence classes of geometric params

# What do you do with this?

$GL_n(\mathbb{R})$  reps correspond to **integral geometric params**:

1. complex vector space  $V$  of dimension  $n$ ;
2. involution  $y \in \text{Aut}(V)$  of order (one or) two;
3. filtration  $\{\cdots F_{p-1}V \subset F_pV \subset F_{p+1}V \cdots\}$

**Equiv class** of filtrations  $\leftrightarrow$  collection of nonnegative integers

$$m_p = \dim(F_p V / F_{p-1} V), \quad \sum m_p = n.$$

**Set** of filtrations  $\leftrightarrow$  (complex projective) partial flag variety

$$GL_n(\mathbb{C}) / P_{(m_p)} \quad (P_{(m_p)} = \text{parabolic subgroup}).$$

**Equiv class** of involutions  $\leftrightarrow$  nonneg pairs  $(a, b)$ ,  $a + b = n$ .

**Set** of involutions  $\leftrightarrow GL_n(\mathbb{C}) / (GL_a(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_b(\mathbb{C}))$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{equiv classes of} & & \text{orbits of } GL_a \times GL_b \text{ on} \\ \text{integral geom params} & \longleftrightarrow & \text{flag variety } GL_n / P_{(m_p)} \end{array}$$

This is the beginning of detailed study of reps of  $GL_n(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{intersection cohom} & & \text{characters of irr reps.} \\ \text{of orbit closures} & \longleftrightarrow & \end{array}$$

Left side was computed by **George Lusztig**.



# Footnotes

Here are some details that didn't fit on earlier slides.

How to remove qualifier **integral** from def of Langlands params: Langlands, "On the classification of irreducible representations of real algebraic groups," 1970.

How to define Langlands params for **any reductive  $G$** : **same**.

How to **define geometric params for any reductive  $G$** : Adams-Barbasch-Vogan, *The Langlands Classification and Irreducible Characters for Real Reductive Groups*, 1992.

Intersection cohomology of symmetric subgroup orbit closures: Lusztig-V, "Singularities of closures of  $K$ -orbits on flag manifolds," 1983.

Computing **unitary** representations using geometric params: Adams-van Leeuwen-Trapa-Vogan, "Unitary representations of real reductive groups," 2020.

**Computer implementation**: du Cloux-van Leeuwen, atlas software, <http://www.liegroups.org/software/>.