

A GUIDE TO
QUANTUM GROUPS

Vyjayanthi Chari
University of California, Riverside

Andrew Pressley
King's College, London



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Contents

Introduction	1
1 Poisson–Lie groups and Lie bialgebras	15
1.1 Poisson manifolds	16
A Definitions	16
B Functorial properties	18
C Symplectic leaves	18
1.2 Poisson–Lie groups	21
A Definitions	21
B Poisson homogeneous spaces	22
1.3 Lie bialgebras	24
A The Lie bialgebra of a Poisson–Lie group	24
B Manin triples	26
C Examples	28
D Derivations	32
1.4 Duals and doubles	33
A Duals of Lie bialgebras and Poisson–Lie groups	33
B The classical double	34
C Compact Poisson–Lie groups	35
1.5 Dressing actions and symplectic leaves	36
A Poisson actions	36
B Dressing transformations and symplectic leaves	37
C Symplectic leaves in compact Poisson–Lie groups	39
D The twisted case	41
1.6 Deformation of Poisson structures and quantization	43
A Deformations of Poisson algebras	43
B Weyl quantization	44
C Quantization as deformation	46
Bibliographical notes	48
2 Coboundary Poisson–Lie groups and the classical Yang–Baxter equation	50
2.1 Coboundary Lie bialgebras	50

A Definitions	50
B The classical Yang–Baxter equation	54
C Examples	55
D The classical double	58
2.2 Coboundary Poisson–Lie groups	59
A The Sklyanin bracket	60
B r -matrices and 2-cocycles	62
C The classical R -matrix	67
2.3 Classical integrable systems	68
A Complete integrability	68
B Lax pairs	69
C Integrable systems from r -matrices	71
D Toda systems	75
Bibliographical notes	77
3 Solutions of the classical Yang–Baxter equation	79
3.1 Constant solutions of the CYBE	80
A The parameter space of non-skew solutions	80
B Description of the solutions	81
C Examples	82
D Skew solutions and quasi-Frobenius Lie algebras	84
3.2 Solutions of the CYBE with spectral parameters	87
A Classification of the solutions	87
B Elliptic solutions	90
C Trigonometric solutions	91
D Rational solutions	95
Bibliographical notes	98
4 Quasitriangular Hopf algebras	100
4.1 Hopf algebras	101
A Definitions	101
B Examples	105
C Representations of Hopf algebras	108
D Topological Hopf algebras and duality	111
E Integration on Hopf algebras	115
F Hopf $*$ -algebras	117
4.2 Quasitriangular Hopf algebras	119

A Almost cocommutative Hopf algebras	119
B Quasitriangular Hopf algebras	123
C Ribbon Hopf algebras and quantum dimension	125
D The quantum double	127
E Twisting	129
F Sweedler's example	131
Bibliographical notes	133
5 Representations and quasitensor categories	135
5.1 Monoidal categories	136
A Abelian categories	136
B Monoidal categories	138
C Rigidity	139
D Examples	140
E Reconstruction theorems	147
5.2 Quasitensor categories	149
A Tensor categories	149
B Quasitensor categories	152
C Balancing	154
D Quasitensor categories and fusion rules	154
E Quasitensor categories in quantum field theory	157
5.3 Invariants of ribbon tangles	161
A Isotopy invariants and monoidal functors	161
B Tangle invariants	166
C Central elements	168
Bibliographical notes	168
6 Quantization of Lie bialgebras	170
6.1 Deformations of Hopf algebras	171
A Definitions	171
B Cohomology theory	173
C Rigidity theorems	176
6.2 Quantization	177
A (Co-) Poisson Hopf algebras	177
B Quantization	179
C Existence of quantizations	182
6.3 Quantized universal enveloping algebras	187
A Cocommutative QUE algebras	187
B Quasitriangular QUE algebras	188

C QUE duals and doubles	189
D The square of the antipode	190
6.4 The basic example	192
A Construction of the standard quantization	192
B Algebra structure	196
C PBW basis	199
D Quasitriangular structure	200
E Representations	203
F A non-standard quantization	206
6.5 Quantum Kac–Moody algebras	207
A The standard quantization	207
B The centre	212
C Multiparameter quantizations	212
Bibliographical notes	213
7 Quantized function algebras	215
7.1 The basic example	216
A Definition	216
B A basis of $\mathcal{F}_\hbar(SL_2(\mathbb{C}))$	220
C The R-matrix formulation	222
D Duality	223
E Representations	227
7.2 R-matrix quantization	228
A From R-matrices to bialgebras	228
B From bialgebras to Hopf algebras: the quantum determinant	231
C Solutions of the QYBE	233
7.3 Examples of quantized function algebras	234
A The general definition	234
B The quantum special linear group	235
C The quantum orthogonal and symplectic groups	236
D Multiparameter quantized function algebras	238
7.4 Differential calculus on quantum groups	240
A The de Rham complex of the quantum plane	240
B The de Rham complex of the quantum $m \times m$ matrices	242
C The de Rham complex of the quantum general linear group	244
D Invariant forms on quantum GL_m	245
7.5 Integrable lattice models	246
A Vertex models	246
B Transfer matrices	248

C Integrability	249
D Examples	251
Bibliographical notes	253
8 Structure of QUE algebras: the universal R-matrix	255
8.1 The braid group action	256
A The braid group	256
B Root vectors and the PBW basis	258
8.2 The quantum Weyl group	262
A The sl_2 case	262
B The relation with the universal R-matrix	263
C The general case	265
8.3 The quasitriangular structure	266
A The quantum double construction	266
B The sl_2 case	267
C The general case	271
D Multiplicative properties	274
E Uniqueness of the universal R-matrix	275
F The centre of U_h	275
G Matrix solutions of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation	276
Bibliographical notes	278
9 Specializations of QUE algebras	279
9.1 Rational forms	280
A The definition of U_q	280
B Some basic properties of U_q	282
C The Harish Chandra homomorphism and the centre of U_q	284
D A geometric realization	285
9.2 The non-restricted specialization	288
A The non-restricted integral form	289
B The centre	290
C The quantum coadjoint action	293
9.3 The restricted specialization	296
A The restricted integral form	297
B A remarkable finite-dimensional Hopf algebra	301
C A Frobenius map in characteristic zero	304
D The quiver approach	307

9.4 Automorphisms and real forms	309
A Automorphisms	309
B Real forms	309
Bibliographical notes	311
10 Representations of QUE algebras: the generic case	313
10.1 Classification of finite-dimensional representations	313
A Highest weight modules	313
B The determinant formula	319
C Specialization: the non-root of unity case	324
D R-matrices associated to representations of U_q	327
E Unitary representations	329
10.2 Quantum invariant theory	332
A Hecke and Birman–Murakami–Wenzl algebras	332
B Quantum Brauer–Frobenius–Schur duality	334
C Another realization of Hecke algebras	336
Bibliographical notes	337
11 Representations of QUE algebras: the root of unity case	338
11.1 The non-restricted case	339
A Parametrization of the irreducible representations of U_ϵ	339
B Some explicit constructions	344
C Intertwiners and the QYBE	348
11.2 The restricted case	351
A Highest weight representations	351
B A tensor product theorem	357
C Quasitensor structure	359
D Some conjectures	359
11.3 Tilting modules and the fusion tensor product	361
A Tilting modules	361
B Quantum dimensions	365
C Tensor products	367
D The categorical formulation	370
Bibliographical notes	372

12 Infinite-dimensional quantum groups	374
12.1 Yangians and their representations	375
A Three realizations	375
B Basic properties	380
C Classification of the finite-dimensional representations	383
D Evaluation representations	386
E The sl_2 case	388
12.2 Quantum affine algebras	392
A Another realization: quantum loop algebras	392
B Finite-dimensional representations of quantum loop algebras	394
C Evaluation representations	399
12.3 Frobenius–Schur duality for Yangians and quantum affine algebras	403
A Affine Hecke algebras and their degenerations	403
B Representations of affine Hecke algebras	405
C Duality for $U_\epsilon(sl_{n+1}(\mathbf{C}))$ – revisited	408
D Quantum affine algebras and affine Hecke algebras	410
E Yangians and degenerate affine Hecke algebras	413
12.4 Yangians and infinite-dimensional classical groups	414
A Tame representations	415
B The relation with Yangians	416
12.5 Rational and trigonometric solutions of the QYBE	417
A Yangians and rational solutions	418
B Quantum affine algebras and trigonometric solutions	423
Bibliographical notes	426
13 Quantum harmonic analysis	428
13.1 Compact quantum groups and their representations	430
A Definitions	430
B Highest weight representations	433
C The sl_2 case	435
D The general case: tensor products	437
E The twisted case and quantum tori	439
F Representations at roots of unity	442
13.2 Quantum homogeneous spaces	445
A Quantum G -spaces	445
B Quantum flag manifolds and Schubert varieties	447
C Quantum spheres	448

13.3 Compact matrix quantum groups	451
A C^* completions and compact matrix quantum groups	451
B The Haar integral on compact quantum groups	454
13.4 A non-compact quantum group	459
A The quantum euclidean group	459
B Representation theory	462
C Invariant integration on the quantum euclidean group	463
13.5 q -special functions	465
A Little q -Jacobi polynomials and quantum SU_2	466
B Big q -Jacobi polynomials and quantum spheres	467
C q -Bessel functions and the quantum euclidean group	469
Bibliographical notes	473
14 Canonical bases	475
14.1 Crystal bases	476
A Gelfand–Tsetlin bases	476
B Crystal bases	478
C Globalization	480
D Crystal graphs and tensor products	481
14.2 Lusztig's canonical bases	486
A The algebraic construction	486
B The topological construction	488
C Some combinatorial formulas	490
Bibliographical notes	492
15 Quantum group invariants of knots and 3-manifolds	494
15.1 Knots and 3-manifolds: a quick review	495
A From braids to links	496
B From links to 3-manifolds	502
15.2 Link invariants from quantum groups	504
A Link invariants from R -matrices	504
B Link invariants from vertex models	510
15.3 Modular Hopf algebras and 3-manifold invariants	517
A Modular Hopf algebras	517
B The construction of 3-manifold invariants	522
Bibliographical notes	525

16 Quasi-Hopf algebras and the Knizhnik–Zamolodchikov equation	527
16.1 Quasi-Hopf algebras	528
A Definitions	529
B An example from conformal field theory	533
C Quasi-Hopf QUE algebras	534
16.2 The Kohno–Drinfel'd monodromy theorem	537
A Braid groups and configuration spaces	537
B The Knizhnik–Zamolodchikov equation	539
C The KZ equation and affine Lie algebras	541
D Quantization and the KZ equation	543
E The monodromy theorem	549
16.3 Affine Lie algebras and quantum groups	550
A The category \mathcal{O}_κ	551
B The tensor product	552
C The equivalence theorem	555
16.4 Quasi-Hopf algebras and Grothendieck's esquisse	556
A $\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$ and pro-finite fundamental groups	557
B The Grothendieck–Teichmüller group and quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras	559
Bibliographical notes	560
Appendix Kac–Moody algebras	562
A 1 Generalized Cartan matrices	562
A 2 Kac–Moody algebras	562
A 3 The invariant bilinear form	563
A 4 Roots	563
A 5 The Weyl group	564
A 6 Root vectors	565
A 7 Affine Lie algebras	565
A 8 Highest weight modules	566
References	567
Index of notation	638
General index	643

Introduction

Quantum groups first arose in the physics literature, particularly in the work of L. D. Faddeev and the Leningrad school, from the 'inverse scattering method', which had been developed to construct and solve 'integrable' quantum systems. They have excited great interest in the past few years because of their unexpected connections with such, at first sight, unrelated parts of mathematics as the construction of knot invariants and the representation theory of algebraic groups in characteristic p .

In their original form, quantum groups are associative algebras whose defining relations are expressed in terms of a matrix of constants (depending on the integrable system under consideration) called a quantum R-matrix. It was realized independently by V. G. Drinfel'd and M. Jimbo around 1985 that these algebras are Hopf algebras, which, in many cases, are deformations of 'universal enveloping algebras' of Lie algebras. A little later, Yu. I. Manin and S. L. Woronowicz independently constructed non-commutative deformations of the algebra of functions on the groups $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ and SU_2 , respectively, and showed that many of the classical results about algebraic and topological groups admit analogues in the non-commutative case.

Thus, although many of the fundamental papers on quantum groups are written in the language of integrable systems, their properties are accessible by more conventional mathematical techniques, such as the theory of topological and algebraic groups and Lie algebras. Our aim in this book is to present the theory of quantum groups from this latter point of view. In fact, we shall concentrate on the study of the 'Lie algebras' of quantum groups, which seems to be the approach which has proved most powerful, particularly in applications, but we shall also discuss, in rather less detail, their relation with 'non-commutative algebraic geometry and topology'.

We shall now describe what a quantum group is, beginning by trying to explain the motivation for the use of the adjective 'quantum'.

In classical mechanics, the phase space M of a dynamical system is a *Poisson manifold*. This means that the space $\mathcal{F}(M)$ of (differentiable) complex-valued functions on M is equipped with a Lie bracket $\{ , \} : \mathcal{F}(M) \times \mathcal{F}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(M)$ (satisfying certain additional conditions), called the Poisson bracket. The dynamical equations defining the time evolution of the system are equivalent to the equations

$$\frac{d}{dt} f(m(t)) = \{ \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}, f \}(m(t))$$

for $f \in \mathcal{F}(M)$, where \mathcal{H}_{cl} is a fixed function on M called the (classical)

hamiltonian, and $m(t) \in M$ is the 'state' of the system at time t . For example, for a single particle moving along the real line, M is the cotangent bundle $T^*(\mathbb{R})$, and if q is the coordinate on \mathbb{R} ('position') and p the coordinate in the fibre direction ('momentum'), the Poisson bracket is

$$\{f_1, f_2\} = \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial p} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial q} - \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial p} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial q}.$$

In particular, the Poisson bracket of the coordinate functions is

$$(1) \quad \{p, q\} = 1.$$

In quantum mechanics, the space M is replaced by the set of rays in a complex Hilbert space V , and the space $\mathcal{F}(M)$ of functions on M by the algebra $\text{Op}(V)$ of (not necessarily bounded) operators on V . The time evolution of an operator A is given by

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = [\mathcal{H}_{\text{qu}}, A]$$

for some operator $\mathcal{H}_{\text{qu}} \in \text{Op}(V)$, called the (quantum) hamiltonian. For example, in the case of a single particle moving along the real line, V is the space $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ of square-integrable functions of q , and the operators P and Q corresponding to the coordinate functions p and q are given by

$$P = -\sqrt{-1}h \frac{\partial}{\partial q}, \quad Q = \text{multiplication by } q,$$

where h is $1/2\pi$ times Planck's constant. Note that

$$(2) \quad [P, Q] = -\sqrt{-1}h \text{id}_V.$$

The question is: how to pass from the classical to the quantum description of a system. This is the problem of *quantization*. Ideally, one would like a map \mathcal{Q} which assigns to each function $f \in \mathcal{F}(M)$ an operator $\mathcal{Q}(f)$ on V . Moreover, since time evolution in the classical and quantum descriptions is given by taking the Poisson bracket and commutator with the hamiltonian, respectively, \mathcal{Q} should satisfy the relation

$$\mathcal{Q}\{f_1, f_2\} = \frac{[\mathcal{Q}(f_1), \mathcal{Q}(f_2)]}{-\sqrt{-1}h}$$

(the normalization comes from (1) and (2)). Unfortunately, it is known that, even for the simplest case of a single particle moving along the real line, no such map \mathcal{Q} exists.

There is, however, an alternative formulation of the quantization problem, introduced by J. E. Moyal in 1949. This begins by noting that the fundamental difference between the classical and quantum descriptions is that

$\mathcal{F}(M)$ is a commutative algebra, whereas $\text{Op}(V)$ is non-commutative (when $\dim(V) > 1$). Moyal's idea is to try to reproduce the results of quantum mechanics by replacing the usual product on $\mathcal{F}(M)$ by a non-commutative product $*_h$, depending on a parameter h , such that $*_h$ becomes the usual product as $h \rightarrow 0$, just as 'quantum mechanics becomes classical mechanics as Planck's constant tends to zero', and such that

$$(3) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_1 *_h f_2 - f_2 *_h f_1}{h} = \{f_1, f_2\}.$$

If we think of $\mathcal{F}(M)$ with the Moyal product $*_h$ as a non-commutative algebra of functions $\mathcal{F}_h(M)$, we find ourselves in the realm of non-commutative geometry in the sense of A. Connes. The philosophy here is that any 'space' is determined by the algebra of functions on it (with the usual product). For example, every affine algebraic variety over \mathbb{C} is determined (up to isomorphism) by the commutative algebra of regular functions on it, whereas every compact topological space is determined by its commutative C^* -algebra of complex-valued continuous functions. More precisely, the category of 'spaces' in these examples is dual to the category of the corresponding algebras. Thus, a non-commutative algebra should be viewed as the space of functions on a 'non-commutative space', and we can say that Moyal's construction gives a deformation of the classical phase space M to a family of non-commutative (or 'quantum') spaces M_h such that $\mathcal{F}_h(M)$ is the algebra of functions on M_h .

The category of quantum spaces, then, might be defined as the category dual to the category of associative, but not necessarily commutative, algebras. To define the notion of a quantum group, let us first return for a moment to the classical situation. If G is a group, the multiplication $\mu : G \times G \rightarrow G$ of G induces a homomorphism $\mu^* = \Delta : \mathcal{F}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(G \times G)$ of algebras of functions. Now, if we define the algebra $\mathcal{F}(G)$ and the tensor product appropriately, $\mathcal{F}(G \times G)$ will be isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}(G) \otimes \mathcal{F}(G)$ as an algebra. For example, if G is an affine algebraic group over \mathbb{C} , and $\mathcal{F}(G)$ is the algebra of regular functions on G , the ordinary algebraic tensor product will do. Thus, we have a comultiplication $\Delta : \mathcal{F}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(G) \otimes \mathcal{F}(G)$. (The reason for this terminology is that the multiplication on $\mathcal{F}(G)$ can be viewed as a map $\mathcal{F}(G) \otimes \mathcal{F}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(G)$.) Similarly, the inverse map $\iota : G \rightarrow G$ induces a map $\iota^* = S : \mathcal{F}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(G)$, called the antipode, and evaluation at the identity element of G is a homomorphism $\epsilon : \mathcal{F}(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, called the counit. The maps Δ , S and ϵ satisfy certain compatibility properties which reflect the defining properties of the inverse and the associativity of multiplication in G , and combine to give $\mathcal{F}(G)$ the structure of a *Hopf algebra*.

We might therefore define the category of quantum groups to be the category dual to the category of (not necessarily commutative) Hopf algebras. (We said 'might' here, and in our tentative definition of a quantum space, because,

to ensure that the categories of quantum spaces and quantum groups have reasonable properties, it would be necessary to impose some restrictions on the class of algebras which are acceptable as 'quantized algebras of functions'. Manin suggests that one should work with 'Koszul algebras', but we shall not discuss this point here.) As is common practice in the literature, we shall often abuse terminology by referring to a Hopf algebra itself as a quantum group.

As the preceding discussion suggests, one way to try to construct non-classical examples of quantum groups is to look for deformations, in the category of Hopf algebras, of classical algebras of functions $\mathcal{F}(G)$. Just as the classical Poisson bracket can be recovered as the 'first order part' of Moyal's deformation (see (3)), so it turns out that the existence of a deformation $\mathcal{F}_\hbar(G)$ of $\mathcal{F}(G)$ automatically endows the group G itself with extra structure, namely that of a *Poisson-Lie group*. This is a Poisson structure on G which is compatible with the group structure in a certain sense. Conversely, to construct deformations of $\mathcal{F}(G)$, it is natural to begin by describing the possible Poisson-Lie group structures on G and then to attempt to extend these 'first order deformations' to full deformations. This is the approach taken in this book. Poisson-Lie groups are also of interest in their own right, for they form the natural setting for the study of classical integrable systems with symmetry.

There is another Hopf algebra associated to any Lie group G , namely the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ of its Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . This is essentially the *dual* of $\mathcal{F}(G)$ in the category of Hopf algebras. In general, the vector space dual A^* of any finite-dimensional Hopf algebra A is also a Hopf algebra: the multiplication $A^* \otimes A^* \rightarrow A^*$ is dual to the comultiplication $\Delta : A \rightarrow A \otimes A$ of A , and the comultiplication of A^* is dual to the multiplication of A . Note that A^* is commutative if and only if A is cocommutative, i.e. if and only if $\Delta(A)$ is contained in the symmetric part of $A \otimes A$. If, as is usually the case in examples of interest, A is infinite dimensional, this duality often continues to hold provided the dual and tensor product are defined appropriately. To a deformation $\mathcal{F}_\hbar(G)$ of $\mathcal{F}(G)$ through (not necessarily commutative) Hopf algebras therefore corresponds a deformation $U_\hbar(\mathfrak{g})$ of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ through (not necessarily cocommutative) Hopf algebras.

In fact, only non-cocommutative deformations of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ are of interest, since any deformation of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ through cocommutative Hopf algebras is necessarily of the form $U(\mathfrak{g}_\hbar)$ for some deformation \mathfrak{g}_\hbar of \mathfrak{g} through Lie algebras. However, many interesting Lie algebras have no non-trivial deformations. This is the case, for example, if \mathfrak{g} is a (finite-dimensional) complex semisimple Lie algebra, such as the Lie algebra $sl_2(\mathbb{C})$ of 2×2 complex matrices of trace zero. This follows from the fact that the condition of semisimplicity is open, so that any small deformation of \mathfrak{g} will still be semisimple, whereas the semisimple Lie algebras are discretely parametrized (by their Dynkin diagrams, for example).

The first example of a non-cocommutative deformation of this type was discovered by P. P. Kulish and E. K. Sklyanin in 1981 in the case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ (although the importance of its Hopf structure was not realized until later). Note that $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ has a basis

$$(4) \quad \bar{X}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{X}^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{H} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

whose Lie brackets are given by

$$(5a) \quad [\bar{X}^+, \bar{X}^-] = \bar{H}, \quad [\bar{H}, \bar{X}^\pm] = \pm 2\bar{X}^\pm.$$

The comultiplication is given on these basis elements by

$$(5b) \quad \Delta(\bar{H}) = \bar{H} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \bar{H}, \quad \Delta(\bar{X}^\pm) = \bar{X}^\pm \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \bar{X}^\pm,$$

an assignment which extends uniquely to an algebra homomorphism $\Delta : U(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})) \otimes U(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}))$. The deformation $U_h(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}))$ is generated by elements H, X^\pm , which satisfy the relations

$$(6a) \quad X^+X^- - X^-X^+ = \frac{e^{hH} - e^{-hH}}{e^h - e^{-h}}, \quad HX^\pm - X^\pm H = \pm 2X^\pm.$$

It has a non-cocommutative comultiplication given on generators by

$$(6b) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta(H) &= H \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes H, \\ \Delta(X^+) &= X^+ \otimes e^{hH} + 1 \otimes X^+, \quad \Delta(X^-) = X^- \otimes 1 + e^{-hH} \otimes X^-. \end{aligned}$$

Formally, at least, it is clear that (6a) and (6b) go over into (5a) and (5b) as $h \rightarrow 0$. The Hopf algebra defined in (6a,b) is called 'quantum $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ '. (See Chapter 6 for the formulas for the antipode and counit of $U_h(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}))$, and for a way to make sense of expressions such as e^{hH} .)

The Hopf algebra dual to $U_h(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}))$, the 'algebra $\mathcal{F}_h(SL_2(\mathbb{C}))$ of functions on quantum $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ ', was discovered by L. D. Faddeev and L. A. Takhtajan in 1985. It is the associative algebra generated by elements a, b, c, d with the following multiplicative relations:

$$(7) \quad ab = e^{-h}ba, \quad ac = e^{-h}ca, \quad bd = e^{-h}db, \quad cd = e^{-h}dc,$$

$$(8) \quad bc = cb, \quad ad - da + (e^h - e^{-h})bc = 0,$$

$$(9) \quad ad - e^{-h}bc = 1,$$

and comultiplication

$$\Delta(a) = a \otimes a + b \otimes c, \quad \Delta(b) = a \otimes b + b \otimes d,$$

$$\Delta(c) = c \otimes a + d \otimes c, \quad \Delta(d) = c \otimes b + d \otimes d.$$

Note that, when $h \rightarrow 0$, the relations (7), (8) and (9) just say that the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

has commuting entries and determinant one. Thus, $\mathcal{F}_h(SL_2(\mathbf{C}))$ is a deformation of the algebra of functions on the group $SL_2(\mathbf{C})$ of 2×2 complex matrices of determinant one.

As we mentioned at the beginning of this introduction, the algebra structure of $\mathcal{F}_h(G)$ can be described by a matrix of constants, namely

$$(10) \quad R = e^{-h/2} \begin{pmatrix} e^h & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^h - e^{-h} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^h \end{pmatrix}.$$

In fact, if

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix},$$

the relations (7) and (8) are equivalent to

$$(11) \quad (T \otimes 1)(1 \otimes T)R = R(1 \otimes T)(T \otimes 1).$$

Note that $T \otimes 1$ and $1 \otimes T$ do not commute, since the entries of T do not commute (if $h \neq 0$); note also that R is most naturally viewed as an element of $\text{End}(\mathbf{C}^2 \otimes \mathbf{C}^2)$. It is in the form (11) that quantum groups usually appear in the theory of integrable systems.

For the dual Hopf algebra $U_h(sl_2(\mathbf{C}))$, the quantum R-matrix expresses, as one would expect, the non-cocommutativity of the comultiplication. Namely, let $\Delta^{\text{op}}(x)$ be the result of interchanging the order of the factors in $\Delta(x)$, for any $x \in U_h(sl_2(\mathbf{C}))$. It turns out that there is an invertible element $\mathcal{R} \in U_h(sl_2(\mathbf{C})) \otimes U_h(sl_2(\mathbf{C}))$, called the 'universal R-matrix', such that

$$\Delta^{\text{op}}(x) = \mathcal{R}\Delta(x)\mathcal{R}^{-1}$$

for all $x \in U_h(sl_2(\mathbf{C}))$ (actually, \mathcal{R} is a formal infinite sum of elements of the algebraic tensor product). The relation between \mathcal{R} and R is very simple: the reader will easily verify that, if we replace \bar{X}^\pm and \bar{H} by X^\pm and H in (4), we obtain a matrix representation of $U_h(sl_2(\mathbf{C}))$; applying this representation to \mathcal{R} gives the matrix R .

Quantum groups might have remained a curiosity to the mathematical community at large but for their surprising connections with other parts of

mathematics, most notably the theory of invariants of links and 3-manifolds, and the representation theory of Lie algebras in characteristic p .

The former depends on the classical relation between braids and links. Recall that a *braid on m strands* is a collection of m non-intersecting strings in \mathbb{R}^3 joining m fixed points in a plane to m fixed points in another parallel plane. Joining corresponding points in the two planes in a standard way associates to any braid a link (called its 'closure'), i.e. a collection of non-intersecting circles in \mathbb{R}^3 . Joining braids end to end makes the set of isotopy classes of braids into a group \mathcal{B}_m . The relation with quantum groups arises because there is a simple way to associate to any quantum R-matrix $R \in \text{End}(V \otimes V)$ a representation ρ_m of \mathcal{B}_m on $V^{\otimes m}$ for all $m \geq 2$. This depends on the fact that R satisfies the *quantum Yang-Baxter equation*

$$R_{12}R_{13}R_{23} = R_{23}R_{13}R_{12};$$

here, R_{12} means $R \otimes \text{id} \in \text{End}(V^{\otimes 3})$, etc. To obtain an invariant of links, one needs a family of 'traces' $tr_m : \text{End}(V^{\otimes m}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $tr_m(\rho_m(b)) = tr_n(\rho_n(b'))$ whenever the closures of the braids $b \in \mathcal{B}_m$ and $b' \in \mathcal{B}_n$ are equivalent links. Thanks to a classical theorem of A. Markov, it is known precisely which pairs (b, b') have the latter property (and for this reason, the tr_m are usually called 'Markov traces'). Using the quantum R-matrix (10) and a suitable Markov trace, one obtains in this way the celebrated *Jones polynomial*. In fact, this is essentially Jones's original construction, except that he obtained his R-matrix by using a 'Hecke algebra' instead of a quantum group (but we shall see that Hecke algebras should probably be regarded as 'quantum' objects).

The application to 3-manifolds is based on the well-known fact that every compact, oriented, connected 3-manifold without boundary can be obtained, up to homeomorphism, by performing surgery on a link in the 3-dimensional sphere. One shows that a cleverly chosen combination of the quantum invariants of this link depends only on the 3-manifold, and not on the choice of the link along which surgery is performed.

The application of quantum groups to representations of Lie algebras in characteristic p is no less remarkable. It makes use of a certain 'standard' deformation $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ of $U(\mathfrak{g})$, where \mathfrak{g} is any finite-dimensional complex semisimple Lie algebra (and which reduces, when $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$, to the algebra found by Kulish and Sklyanin). To describe the relation with characteristic p , it is convenient to replace the deformation parameter h by $\epsilon = e^h$, and to write $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ for $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$. It then turns out that the representation theory of $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ depends crucially on whether ϵ is a root of unity or not. In the latter case, the theory is essentially the same as the representation theory of \mathfrak{g} itself (over \mathbb{C}), but in the former it resembles the modular representation theory of \mathfrak{g} . This is more than an analogy: if ϵ is a primitive p th root of unity, where p is a prime, there is a ring homomorphism from $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ to the enveloping algebra $U_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathfrak{g})$

of \mathfrak{g} over the field \mathbb{F}_p of p elements (this is obtained essentially by replacing ϵ by $1 \in \mathbb{F}_p$), and, under certain additional conditions, representations of $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ can be ‘specialized’ to give representations of $U_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathfrak{g})$. Thus, both the modular representation theory of \mathfrak{g} and the characteristic zero theory are reflected in the representation theory of the family of Hopf algebras $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ (over \mathbb{C}). Using this relation, substantial progress has been made toward the solution of several long-standing conjectures in the modular theory.

We should also mention the roles played by quantum groups in physics, which go well beyond their origins in inverse scattering theory. Perhaps the most interesting of these is the relation between quantum groups and conformal and quantum field theories. The first evidence of this was the experimental observation that the ‘fusion rules’ of certain conformal field theories can be reproduced by considering the decomposition of tensor products of representations of the quantum groups $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ when ϵ is a root of unity. Further evidence came from a remarkable theorem of T. Kohno and Drinfel’d on the relation between the Knizhnik–Zamolodchikov (KZ) equation and $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$. The KZ equation is a system of first order partial differential equations for a function of m complex variables with values in the tensor product $V^{\otimes m}$, where V is a representation of \mathfrak{g} . The KZ system has regular singularities along the hyperplanes $z_i = z_j$ in \mathbb{C}^m , for all $i \neq j$, and can be viewed as a connection on a bundle over the complement \mathcal{D}_m of these hyperplanes, with fibre $V^{\otimes m}$. Moreover, this connection has a symmetry property which means that there is an induced connection on a bundle over the space \mathcal{C}_m of orbits of the obvious action of the symmetric group Σ_m on \mathcal{D}_m . The crucial property of the KZ equation is that this connection is flat, which implies that the monodromy of its solutions defines a representation of the fundamental group of \mathcal{C}_m on $V^{\otimes m}$. The latter group is exactly the braid group \mathcal{B}_m that we discussed above, where we noted that a representation of \mathcal{B}_m on $V^{\otimes m}$ could also be obtained by using a quantum R-matrix. According to Kohno and Drinfel’d, if we use the R-matrix given by the action of the universal R-matrix of $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ on $V \otimes V$, where h is ‘generic’, these two representations of \mathcal{B}_m coincide.

The importance of the KZ equation in conformal field theory is that it is satisfied by the ‘ m -point functions’ of the theory. Thus, the Kohno–Drinfel’d theorem indicates a connection between $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ and conformal field theory. This has recently been extended by D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig, who have shown that the KZ equation is intimately related to the category of representations of the ‘specialized’ algebras $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ when ϵ is a root of unity. This result provides an ‘explanation’ for the coincidence between the fusion rules arising in conformal field theory and those arising from quantum groups at roots of unity.

These and other examples to be discussed in this book show that the theory of quantum groups occupies an important place in the mainstream of mathematics and mathematical physics.

We now describe the contents of the book systematically. In Chapter 1, we give the definition and basic properties of Poisson–Lie groups, and of their infinitesimal counterparts, Lie bialgebras. We describe, among other examples, a standard family of Lie bialgebra structures on every (finite-dimensional) complex simple Lie algebra. These induce Poisson–Lie group structures on the associated compact Lie group K . Like all Poisson manifolds, K has a canonical decomposition into symplectic submanifolds, called its *symplectic leaves*, and it turns out that they have a beautiful description in terms of the so-called Bruhat decomposition of K .

In the last section of this chapter, we describe the formulation of quantization as a deformation of Poisson structure. We discuss only the simplest example of a single particle moving along the real line, since our aim is mainly to motivate the treatment of the deformation theory of Hopf algebras in Chapter 6.

Chapter 2 returns to the discussion of Lie bialgebras. We show that Lie bialgebra structures on a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} can be constructed from solutions of the ‘classical Yang–Baxter equation’ (CYBE), and that in some cases, for example when \mathfrak{g} is complex semisimple, all Lie bialgebra structures arise in this way. We also discuss the relation between the CYBE and classical integrable systems.

Chapter 2 shows the importance of the problem of classifying the solutions of the CYBE. In Chapter 3, we give an essentially complete description of the solutions with values in $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$, where \mathfrak{g} is a complex simple Lie algebra. The discussion requires more familiarity with Lie theory than the other early chapters of the book, and, since most of the results will not be needed later, we recommend that this chapter be omitted on a first reading.

Chapter 4 begins with a summary of the general results about Hopf algebras we shall need. We have already mentioned that quantum groups are usually non-cocommutative as Hopf algebras. However, they (or their duals) are often ‘quasitriangular’: this means that the comultiplication of the Hopf algebra A is conjugate to the opposite comultiplication by an invertible element \mathcal{R} of $A \otimes A$, called its universal R -matrix. The element \mathcal{R} satisfies certain additional conditions, including the quantum Yang–Baxter equation (QYBE). We discuss the general properties of quasitriangular Hopf algebras and their relation with the QYBE.

One of the most important general properties of a Hopf algebra A is that there is a natural way to make the tensor product of two representations of A into another representation of A . This means that the category \mathbf{rep}_A of representations of A is a *monoidal category*. If A has additional properties, these will be reflected in \mathbf{rep}_A and vice versa. For example, if A is quasitriangular, \mathbf{rep}_A is a quasitensor category, which means roughly that the tensor product operation is associative and commutative up to isomorphism. We discuss the basic properties of quasitensor categories in Chapter 5, and give a number of examples arising from algebra, topology and physics.

The idea that the properties of a Hopf algebra are encoded in, and might be recovered from, its representations is called *Tannaka–Krein duality*, and this will be a guiding principle throughout this book. We prove a Tannaka–Krein type theorem valid for a large class of Hopf algebras.

We meet our first examples of quantum groups in Chapters 6 and 7. We begin by discussing the general theory of deformations of Hopf algebras, concentrating on universal enveloping algebras and function algebras. We show that any deformation $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ gives rise to a Lie bialgebra structure on \mathfrak{g} , and that every finite-dimensional Lie bialgebra arises as the ‘classical limit’ of some deformation in this way. To make sense of formulas such as those in (6a,b), one interprets $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ as an algebra over the ring $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ of formal power series in an indeterminate h .

In Chapter 6, we ‘derive’ the deformation $U_h(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}))$ described above and show that it can be extended to a deformation of the universal enveloping algebra of any symmetrizable Kac–Moody algebra, using the fact that such algebras are generated by certain $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ subalgebras.

In Chapter 7, we construct deformations of the algebras of functions on the classical complex Lie groups using the quantum R-matrix method outlined above. We also discuss the duality relation between these quantized function algebras and the quantized universal enveloping algebras of Chapter 6. For a large class of quantum R-matrices, we construct an analogue of the de Rham complex, which can be viewed as a theory of ‘differential calculus’ on the associated quantum group. In the final section of this chapter, we discuss the relation between the quantum Yang–Baxter equation and certain models in statistical mechanics, where the QYBE plays the role of an integrability condition.

In Chapter 8, we obtain a formula for the universal R-matrix of the quantum groups $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ defined in Chapter 6, assuming that \mathfrak{g} is finite dimensional. We make use of an action of a (generalized) braid group on any quantum group of this type, which is analogous to the well-known action of (a finite covering of) the Weyl group of \mathfrak{g} on $U(\mathfrak{g})$ in the classical situation.

Chapters 9, 10 and 11 are devoted to the structure and representation theory of the ‘specialization’ $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$, where $\epsilon \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. The definition of $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ requires some effort, for $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$ is defined over the algebra of formal power series in h , so that the only specialization which appears to make sense is $h = 0$. In fact, as we show in Chapter 9, the specialization to $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ can be carried out in two ways, called ‘restricted’ and ‘non-restricted’. The two specializations coincide if ϵ is not a root of unity, but not otherwise. We also study the relation, hinted at above, between $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ when ϵ is a root of unity and Lie algebras in characteristic p .

In Chapter 10, we give the classification of the finite-dimensional irreducible representations of $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ when \mathfrak{g} is a finite-dimensional complex simple Lie algebra and ϵ is not a root of unity. It turns out that, up to a rather trivial twisting by certain outer automorphisms, the parametrization, and even the

characters, of such representations are exactly the same as in the classical case.

There are some differences when compared with the classical situation, however. We show, in particular, that in the quantum analogue of the classical Frobenius–Schur duality between representations of the (special or general) linear groups and symmetric groups, the role of the symmetric group is played by a *Hecke algebra*.

In Chapter 11, we study the representation theory at a root of unity. For the restricted specialization $U_\epsilon^{\text{res}}(\mathfrak{g})$, the finite-dimensional irreducible representations are discretely parametrized as in the classical case (in characteristic zero), but their structure (and dimensions) are different in general. On the other hand, for the non-restricted specialization $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$, we can say, oversimplifying a little, that there is an irreducible representation of $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ associated to each point of the Lie group G with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , and that representations which are associated to points of the same conjugacy class are equivalent up to twisting by an element of a certain infinite-dimensional group of automorphisms of $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$.

The tensor product of two irreducible representations of $U_\epsilon^{\text{res}}(\mathfrak{g})$, when ϵ is a root of unity, is not in general completely reducible. However, essentially by discarding those indecomposable pieces of the tensor product which are not irreducible, we obtain a ‘truncated’ tensor product which has very interesting properties. We show that the resulting truncated representation ring is an example of a *fusion ring*, a new algebraic structure first encountered in conformal field theory. As we mentioned earlier in this introduction, this coincidence was one of the first indications of the connection between quantum groups and conformal and quantum field theories.

In Chapter 12, we return to the case of generic ϵ , but consider quantizations of some infinite-dimensional groups, namely quantum affine algebras and Yangians. It is important to classify the finite-dimensional irreducible representations of these quantum groups, for to such a representation one can associate a solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation with *spectral parameters*:

$$R_{12}(u_1 - u_2)R_{13}(u_1 - u_3)R_{23}(u_2 - u_3) = R_{23}(u_2 - u_3)R_{13}(u_1 - u_3)R_{12}(u_1 - u_2).$$

Here, $R(u)$ is a function of a complex variable u with values in $\text{End}(V \otimes V)$; it is a rational or trigonometric function of u according as V is a representation of a Yangian or a quantum affine algebra, respectively.

We also describe some surprising connections between quantum affine algebras and Yangians, and the classical representation theory of p -adic groups.

In Chapter 13, we return to quantized algebras of functions. Classically, the algebra $\mathcal{F}(G)$ is commutative, so all of its irreducible representations are one-dimensional; in fact, there is a one-dimensional representation of $\mathcal{F}(G)$

associated to each point of G (given simply by evaluating a function at the point). However, $\mathcal{F}_h(G)$ is non-commutative in general, and the representation theory of $\mathcal{F}_h(G)$ replaces, to some extent, the study of G as a point set.

We study the case where G is a complex simple Lie group, and replace $\mathcal{F}_h(G)$ by a suitable specialization $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(G)$. We classify the representations which are unitary with respect to a conjugate-linear involution on $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(G)$ whose classical limit is the involution which defines the compact real form of G (for such representations to exist, it is necessary that $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$).

There is a natural C^* -norm on $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(G)$, and the C^* -completion $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon(G)$ of $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(G)$ can be regarded as a quantization of the algebra of continuous functions on G . This makes contact with the theory of *compact matrix quantum groups* (or *matrix pseudogroups*) of Woronowicz. Compact quantum groups are closely related to 'Kac algebras', the theory of which is the culmination of a long effort to generalize Pontryagin duality to locally compact groups which are not necessarily abelian. Apart from a number of technical differences, perhaps the most important structural difference between the two theories is that in the theory of Kac algebras the existence of a Haar integral is postulated, whereas this is one of Woronowicz's main theorems about compact quantum groups. We give a simple definition of the Haar integral by making use of the representation theory of $U_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$.

In the final section of this chapter, we show that several q -special functions are related to the representations of compact or non-compact quantum groups. This was first noticed by L. L. Vaksman and Ya. S. Soibelman in 1986, who showed that the 'little q -Jacobi polynomials' are essentially the matrix elements of the irreducible unitary representations of $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(SL_2(\mathbb{C}))$. Thus, almost 150 years after the birth of the theory of q -special functions, their representation-theoretic meaning was found.

In Chapter 14, we show how the results of Chapters 9 and 10 can be used to give a solution to a classical problem in the theory of complex semisimple Lie algebras, namely that of giving a basis of any finite-dimensional irreducible representation of such an algebra \mathfrak{g} which is in some sense canonical. If \mathfrak{g} is of type A, B, C or D, one solution to this problem is given by the Gel'fand-Tsetlin basis, although this cannot be extended to the algebras of exceptional type. We describe a solution to this problem, due independently to M. Kashiwara and Lusztig, for arbitrary \mathfrak{g} in the quantum case, which, specializing to $\hbar = 0$, also solves the classical problem. As a by-product, one obtains a graphical algorithm for decomposing the tensor product of two irreducible representations of \mathfrak{g} . It is perhaps worth emphasizing that this construction cannot be carried out purely in the classical setting: one must pass to the quantum case and then specialize.

Chapter 15 describes the application of quantum groups to the construction of invariants of links and 3-manifolds, outlined above. This is due to

N. Yu. Reshetikhin and V. G. Turaev, but strongly motivated by the work of V. F. R. Jones and E. Witten.

The final Chapter 16 describes a generalization, due to Drinfel'd, of the notion of a Hopf algebra, called a quasi-Hopf algebra. The category of quasi-Hopf algebras is in some ways simpler than the category of Hopf algebras because of the existence of a kind of 'gauge symmetry' on the former category, which often allows one to 'twist' a given quasi-Hopf algebra into a simpler one with the 'same' representation theory.

One of the main results of Chapter 16 is the theorem of Kohno and Drinfel'd mentioned earlier. This is proved by using the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equation to construct a certain quasi-Hopf algebra which is isomorphic to a twist of the QUE algebra $U_h(\mathfrak{g})$. We give an introduction to Kazhdan and Lusztig's generalization of this theorem, including the construction of their new tensor product of representations of affine Lie algebras.

We also describe briefly some recent work of Drinfel'd relating quasi-Hopf algebras to the absolute Galois group of \mathbb{Q} . This can be regarded as the fulfilment of part of A. Grothendieck's 'Esquisse d'un programme'.

The book concludes with an Appendix, which establishes the notation relating to complex simple Lie algebras (and, more generally, to Kac-Moody algebras), which will be used throughout the book.

As a distinct area of study, the theory of quantum groups is still less than 10 years old, and it is perhaps still possible to give an account of all its main lines of development from a single point of view. One of the peculiarities of our subject is that, even though most of the foundational results were stated by Drinfel'd in his 1986 talk at the International Congress of Mathematicians, for many of them there is no detailed exposition in print. On the other hand, the results obtained since 1986, including those due to Drinfel'd himself, are generally well-covered in journal articles. Although we certainly do not claim to have filled all the gaps in the existing literature, our aim has been to provide a full account of the foundations, while for the more advanced topics we have usually been content to state the most important results and give a sketch of the main ideas of the proof, together with detailed references to the literature. We have tried not to assume too much familiarity on the part of the reader with the classical theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras, at least in the first half of the book. We hope that, as a result, the book will serve as an introductory text for those readers meeting quantum groups for the first time, and will provide more experienced readers with a survey of all the major developments in the subject, together with a guide to where the details can be found. This approach has made it necessary to include a rather extensive bibliography, and, although we have tried to make this reasonably complete, some gaps are inevitable, and we apologise to those authors whose relevant work has inadvertently been omitted.

We have learned about quantum groups from many sources, but we would like to thank in particular V. G. Drinfel'd for two inspirational lectures at Luminy in 1988 which ignited our interest in the subject, N. Yu. Reshetikhin for drawing our attention to some of the relevant work in the physics literature, C. de Concini and V. G. Kac for explaining to us their work on quantum groups at roots of unity, and S. Donkin for help with the relation between roots of unity and modular Lie algebras.