

# A BGG-TYPE RESOLUTION FOR TENSOR MODULES OVER GENERAL LINEAR SUPERALGEBRA

SHUN-JEN CHENG<sup>†</sup>, JAE-HOON KWON<sup>††</sup>, AND NGAU LAM<sup>†††</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** We construct a Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand type resolution in terms of direct sums of Kac modules for the finite-dimensional irreducible tensor representations of the general linear superalgebra. As a consequence it follows that the unique maximal submodule of a corresponding reducible Kac module is generated by its proper singular vector.

**Key words:** Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand resolution, singular vector, Kac module, general linear superalgebra.

**Mathematics Subject Classifications (2000):** 17B67.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The classical result of Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand [BGG] resolves a finite-dimensional irreducible module over a finite-dimensional semi-simple Lie algebra in terms of direct sums of Verma modules. Such a resolution is sometimes called a strong BGG resolution. In [L, RC] it was shown that the finite-dimensional simple modules may also be resolved in terms of direct sums of generalized Verma modules.

While BGG resolutions have been known to exist for integrable representations over Kac-Moody algebras (see e.g. [RCW, K]), virtually nothing is known even for finite-dimensional simple Lie superalgebras. However, what seems to be known to experts is that, in general, the finite-dimensional simple modules over a finite-dimensional simple Lie superalgebra cannot be resolved in terms of Verma modules. For example, even the natural representation of the Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{sl}(1|2)$  (or  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|2)$ ) cannot have a resolution in terms of Verma modules (see Example 5.1).

It is therefore surprising that resolutions for a large class of finite-dimensional representations of the general linear superalgebra  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$  in terms of Kac modules do exist. The purpose of this article is to construct such a resolution for every irreducible tensor module (see Section 2.3) of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ .

Roughly the idea of the construction is to exploit the connection between the irreducible tensor representations of the Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$  and the polynomial representations of the general linear algebra  $\mathfrak{gl}(m+n)$  in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This allows us to construct a “weak” resolution. The strong resolution is then obtained from the weak version using Brundan’s Kazhdan-Lusztig theory of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$  [B].

---

<sup>†</sup>Partially supported by an NSC-grant of the ROC and an Academia Sinica Investigator grant.

<sup>††</sup>Partially supported by KRF-grant 2005-070-C00004.

<sup>†††</sup>Partially supported by an NSC-grant 96-2115-M-006-008-MY3 of the ROC.

All vector spaces, algebras and tensor products are over the complex number field  $\mathbb{C}$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , and set  $I(m|n) = \{-m, \dots, -1, 1, \dots, n\}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $I(m|\infty) = \{-m, \dots, -1\} \cup \mathbb{N}$  for  $n = \infty$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_{m|n}$  denote the set of partitions  $\lambda = (\lambda_{-m}, \dots, \lambda_{-1}, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$  with  $\lambda_1 \leq n$ . The set  $\mathcal{P}_{m|\infty}$  is the set of all partitions. For a partition  $\lambda$ , we use  $\lambda'$ ,  $\ell(\lambda)$ , and  $|\lambda|$  to denote its conjugate, length, and size, respectively.

**2.1. The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{gl}(m+n)$ .** We let  $\mathbb{C}^{m+n}$  stand for the complex space of dimension  $m+n$  with the standard basis  $\{e_i | i \in I(m|n)\}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(m+n)$  be the general linear algebra which acts naturally on  $\mathbb{C}^{m+n}$ . In the case of  $n = \infty$ , we let  $\mathfrak{g}$  consist of linear transformations vanishing on all but finitely many  $e_j$ 's. Denote by  $\{E_{ij} | i, j \in I(m|n)\}$  the set of elementary matrices in  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then  $\{E_{jj} | j \in I(m|n)\}$  spans the standard Cartan subalgebra  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}_n$ , while  $\{E_{ij} | i \leq j\}$  spans the standard Borel subalgebra. For  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  we denote by  $L(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda)$  the irreducible highest weight  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module with highest weight  $\lambda$ .

Let  $\epsilon_j \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  be determined by  $\langle \epsilon_j, E_{ii} \rangle = \delta_{ij}$  for  $i, j \in I(m|n)$ . Let  $\alpha_i = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1}$ , for  $i \in I(m|n)$  such that  $i+1 \in I(m|n)$ , and  $\alpha_{-1} = \epsilon_{-1} - \epsilon_1$ . Then the set  $\{\alpha_i\}$  is a set of simple roots of  $\mathfrak{g}' = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ , and we denote the set of positive and negative roots by  $\Delta^\pm$ , respectively. Let  $\Delta_0^\pm = \Delta^\pm \cap \left(\sum_{i \neq -1} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i\right)$  and  $\Delta^\pm(0) = \Delta^\pm \setminus \Delta_0^\pm$ .

Let  $\{\alpha_i^\vee\}$  denote the corresponding simple coroots and let  $\{e_i, f_i, \alpha_i^\vee\}$  be the corresponding Chevalley generators of  $\mathfrak{g}'$ . Let  $\rho_c \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  be determined by  $\langle \rho_c, E_{jj} \rangle = -j$  for  $j < 0$ , and  $\langle \rho_c, E_{jj} \rangle = 1 - j$  for  $j > 0$ .

The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  has a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradation determined by the eigenvalues of the operator  $\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i < 0} E_{ii} - \sum_{j > 0} E_{jj}\right)$ . We have

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{+1}.$$

Note that  $\mathfrak{g}_0 \cong \mathfrak{gl}(m) \oplus \mathfrak{gl}(n)$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_{-1} \cong \mathbb{C}^{m*} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$  as  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -modules. Set  $\mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{+1}$  and let  $L^0(\lambda)$  be the irreducible representation of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  with highest weight  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ . We extend  $L^0(\lambda)$  trivially to a  $\mathfrak{p}$ -module, for which we also write  $L^0(\lambda)$ . Denote the generalized Verma module by

$$V(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda) := \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}} L^0(\lambda).$$

**2.2. The Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ .** Now we let  $\mathbb{C}^{m|n}$  stand for the complex superspace of dimension  $(m|n)$  with the standard basis  $\{\bar{e}_i | i \in I(m|n)\}$ . We assume that  $\deg \bar{e}_i = 0$  and  $1$  if  $i < 0$  and  $i > 0$ , respectively. Let  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$  be the general linear superalgebra acting naturally on  $\mathbb{C}^{m|n}$ . For  $n = \infty$ , we use a similar convention as before. Denote by  $\{\bar{E}_{ij} | i, j \in I(m|n)\}$  the set of elementary matrices in  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ . Then  $\{\bar{E}_{jj} | j \in I(m|n)\}$  spans the standard Cartan subalgebra  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}} = \bar{\mathfrak{h}}_n$ , while  $\{\bar{E}_{ij} | i \leq j\}$  spans the standard Borel subalgebra  $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ . For  $\lambda \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ , we denote by  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)$  the irreducible highest weight  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -module with highest weight  $\lambda$ .

Let  $\delta_j \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*$  be determined by  $\langle \delta_j, \bar{E}_{ii} \rangle = \delta_{ij}$  and let  $\rho_s \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*$  be determined by  $\langle \rho_s, \bar{E}_{jj} \rangle = -j$  for  $i, j \in I(m|n)$ . Let  $\beta_i = \delta_i - \delta_{i+1}$  for  $i \in I(m|n)$  such that  $i+1 \in I(m|n)$ , and  $\beta_{-1} = \delta_{-1} - \delta_1$ . Then  $\{\beta_i\}$  is a set of simple roots of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}' = [\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \bar{\mathfrak{g}}]$ .

The Lie superalgebra  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$  also has a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradation determined by the eigenvalues of the operator  $\frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i<0} \bar{E}_{ii} - \sum_{j>0} \bar{E}_{jj} \right)$ . We have

$$\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1} \oplus \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0 \oplus \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{+1}.$$

Note that  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0 \cong \mathfrak{g}_0$  and  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1} \cong \mathbb{C}^{m^*} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$  as  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -modules. We set  $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} := \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0 \oplus \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{+1}$ . Given  $\lambda \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ , we may extend  $L^0(\lambda)$  trivially to a  $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module, which we also denote by  $L^0(\lambda)$ . Define the *Kac module* to be

$$V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda) := \text{Ind}_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}} L^0(\lambda).$$

**Definition 1.** A  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -module  $V$  is said to have a *Kac flag* if it has a filtration of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules of the form

$$0 = V_0 \subseteq V_1 \subseteq V_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq V_{l-1} \subseteq V_l = V,$$

such that  $V_j/V_{j-1}$  is isomorphic to a Kac module for  $j = 1, \dots, l$ .

**Definition 2.** Let  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Given a sequence of integers of the form

$$(2.1.a) \quad \mu = (\mu_{-m}, \dots, \mu_{-1}, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots),$$

with  $\mu_k = 0$  for  $k \gg 0$  when  $n = \infty$ , and

$$(2.1.b) \quad \mu = (\mu_{-m}, \dots, \mu_{-1}, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n),$$

when  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we may interpret it as  $\sum_{i \geq -m, i \neq 0} \lambda_i \epsilon_i \in \mathfrak{h}_n^*$  or  $\sum_{i \geq -m, i \neq 0} \lambda_i \delta_i \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}_n^*$ . Suppose now that  $\mu$  as in (2.1) such that  $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots)$  is a partition. We define  $\mu^\natural$  to be the integer sequence

$$(2.2) \quad \mu^\natural := (\mu_{-m}, \dots, \mu_{-1}, \mu'_1, \mu'_2, \dots).$$

Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  be the set of integer sequences of the form (2.1) with  $\mu_j \geq \mu_{j+1}$ , for all  $j < n$  with  $j \neq 0, -1$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}_{m|n} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  consist of those  $\mu$ 's such that  $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots)$  is a partition. For  $\mu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|n}$ ,  $\mu^\natural$  is well-defined, and the map  $\mu \rightarrow \mu^\natural$  is a bijection on  $\mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ .

**2.3. Irreducible tensor  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ -modules.** The tensor powers of  $\mathbb{C}^{m|n}$  are completely reducible as  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules. Indeed the irreducible representations that appear in these decompositions are as follows. An irreducible representation of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$  appears as a component of  $(\mathbb{C}^{m|n})^{\otimes k}$  if and only if it is of the form  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$ , where  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$  with  $|\lambda| = k$  [S, BR]. We call these irreducible  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules *irreducible tensor  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules*.

Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|\infty}$ . Clearly as  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -modules  $L(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda)$  and  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$  are direct sums of  $L^0(\eta)$  with  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ . We have the following description of irreducible tensor  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Assume that  $n = \infty$ . For  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|\infty}$  and  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ , the  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -module  $L^0(\eta)$  is an irreducible component of  $L(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda)$  if and only if the  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -module  $L^0(\eta^\natural)$  is an irreducible component of  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$ . Furthermore, their multiplicities coincide.*

*Proof.* This is an immediate consequence of the well-known fact that the character of  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$  is given by the so-called Hook Schur function associated with  $\lambda^\natural$  [BR, Theorem 6.10].  $\square$

*Remark 2.1.* For a partition  $\lambda$  with  $\ell(\lambda) \leq m+n$  and  $k \geq 0$ , it is easy to see that  $\Lambda^k(\mathfrak{g}_{-1}) \otimes L(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda)$  as a  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -module decomposes into a direct sum of irreducible  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -modules with highest weights belonging to  $\mathcal{X}_{m|n}$ . Similarly, for  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$  and  $k \geq 0$ ,  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1}) \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$  as a  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -module decomposes into a direct sum of irreducible  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -modules of the form  $L^0(\mu)$  with  $\mu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|n}$ .

### 3. EIGENVALUES OF CASIMIR OPERATORS

Throughout this section, we assume that  $n = \infty$  unless otherwise specified.

We fix a symmetric bilinear form  $(\cdot|\cdot)_c$  on  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad (\lambda|\epsilon_i)_c = \langle \lambda, E_{ii} \rangle, \quad \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*, i \in I(m|n).$$

By defining  $(\alpha_i^\vee|\alpha_j^\vee)_c := (\alpha_i|\alpha_j)_c$  for simple coroots  $\alpha_i^\vee$  and  $\alpha_j^\vee$ , we obtain a symmetric bilinear form on the Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}'$ , which can be extended to a non-degenerate invariant symmetric bilinear form on  $\mathfrak{g}'$  such that

$$(3.2) \quad (e_i|f_j)_c = \delta_{ij}.$$

Since every root space  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  is one-dimensional, we can choose a basis  $\{u_\alpha\}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in \Delta^+$  and a dual basis  $\{u^\alpha\}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$  with respect to  $(\cdot|\cdot)_c$ .

Let  $V = \bigoplus_\mu V_\mu$  be a highest weight  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module, where  $V_\mu$  denotes the  $\mu$ -weight space of  $V$ . Define  $\Gamma_1 : V \rightarrow V$  to be the linear map that acts as the scalar  $(\mu + 2\rho_c|\mu)_c$  on  $V_\mu$ . Let  $\Gamma_2 := 2 \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} u^\alpha u_\alpha$ . The *Casimir operator* (cf. [J]) is defined to be

$$\Omega := \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2.$$

It follows from (3.1) and (3.2) that  $\Omega$  commutes with the action of  $\mathfrak{g}$  on  $V$  (cf. [J, Proposition 3.6]). Thus, if  $V$  is generated by a highest weight vector with highest weight  $\lambda$ , then  $\Omega$  acts on  $V$  as the scalar  $(\lambda + 2\rho_c|\lambda)_c$ .

To produce the Casimir operator for  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$  we fix a symmetric bilinear form  $(\cdot|\cdot)_s$  on  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*$  satisfying

$$(\lambda|\delta_i)_s = -\text{sign}(i)\langle \lambda, E_{ii} \rangle, \quad \lambda \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*, i \in I(m|n).$$

An analogous argument allows us to generalize the construction above and define the Casimir operator  $\bar{\Omega}$  of the Lie superalgebra  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$  that acts on a highest weight module with highest weight  $\gamma \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*$  as the scalar  $(\gamma + 2\rho_s|\gamma)_s$ . We omit the details.

We will need the Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m+\infty)$  in the sequel. For each  $\alpha_j$ , define simple reflection  $\sigma_j$  by

$$\sigma_j(\mu) := \mu - \langle \mu, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle \alpha_j,$$

where  $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ . Let  $W$  be the subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$  generated by the  $\sigma_j$ 's. For each  $w \in W$ , we let  $l(w)$  denote the length of  $w$ . We have an action on  $\mathfrak{h}$  given by  $\sigma_j(h) = h - \langle \alpha_j, h \rangle \alpha_j^\vee$  for  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ , so that  $\langle w(\mu), w(h) \rangle = \langle \mu, h \rangle$  for  $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  and  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ . We also define

$$w \circ \mu := w(\mu + \rho_c) - \rho_c, \quad w \in W, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*.$$

Consider  $W_0$  the subgroup of  $W$  generated by  $\sigma_j$  with  $j \neq -1$ . Let

$$W^0 := \{ w \in W \mid w(\Delta^-) \cap \Delta^+ \subseteq \Delta^+(0) \}.$$

It is well-known that  $W = W_0 W^0$  and  $W^0$  is the set of the minimal length representatives of the right coset space  $W_0 \backslash W$  (cf. [K, 1.3.17]). For  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , set

$$W_k^0 := \{ w \in W^0 \mid l(w) = k \}.$$

Given  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|\infty}$ , we have  $\langle \lambda, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  for all  $j$ . Since  $w \in W^0$  implies that  $w^{-1}(\Delta_0^+) \subseteq \Delta^+$ , we obtain  $\langle w \circ \lambda, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , for all  $j \neq -1$ , and  $w \circ \lambda \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ .

The following proposition is well-known from the theory of standard modules over generalized Kac-Moody algebras (see e.g. [J, Proposition 3.11]).

**Proposition 3.1.** *For  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|\infty}$  and  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ , the irreducible  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -module  $L^0(\eta)$  is a component of  $\Lambda^k(\mathfrak{g}_{-1}) \otimes L(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda)$  with  $(\eta + 2\rho_c|\eta)_c = (\lambda + 2\rho_c|\lambda)_c$  if and only if there exists  $w \in W_k^0$  with  $w \circ \lambda = \eta$ . Furthermore each such  $L^0(\eta)$  appears with multiplicity one.*

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|\infty}$  and  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ ,  $L^0(\eta)$  is an irreducible  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -module in  $\Lambda^k(\mathfrak{g}_{-1}) \otimes L(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda)$  if and only if  $L^0(\eta^\natural)$  is an irreducible  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -module in  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1}) \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$ . Furthermore, the multiplicities are the same.*

*Proof.* The symmetric [H, Theorem 2.1.2] and skew-symmetric [H, Theorem 4.1.4]  $(\mathfrak{gl}, \mathfrak{gl})$ -Howe dualities give the precise decompositions of  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1}) \cong S^k(\mathbb{C}^{m*} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$  and  $\Lambda^k(\mathfrak{g}_{-1}) \cong \Lambda^k(\mathbb{C}^{m*} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$  as  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -modules, respectively. From these decompositions one sees that  $L^0(\eta)$  is an irreducible component in  $\Lambda^k(\mathfrak{g}_{-1})$  if and only if  $L^0(\eta^\natural)$  is an irreducible component in  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1})$ . This fact combined with Proposition 2.1 and the compatibility of  $\natural$  under tensor products completes the proof.  $\square$

We need the following combinatorial lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N)$  be a partition with  $\ell(\lambda) \leq N$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq N$  the sets  $\{\lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} \mid \lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} > 0\}$  and  $\{-\lambda_i + i - \frac{1}{2} \mid \lambda_i - i + \frac{1}{2} < 0\}$  are disjoint. Moreover,  $\{\lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} \mid \lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} > 0\} \cup \{-\lambda_i + i - \frac{1}{2} \mid \lambda_i - i + \frac{1}{2} < 0\}$  is a permutation of the set  $\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \dots, N - \frac{1}{2}\}$ .*

*Proof.* The sets  $\{\lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} \mid \lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} > 0\}$ ,  $\{-\lambda_i + i - \frac{1}{2} \mid \lambda_i - i + \frac{1}{2} < 0\}$ ,  $\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \dots, N - \frac{1}{2}\}$  are denoted by  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$ , respectively. We first observe that the sequence  $\{\lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2}\}_{i=1}^N$  is strictly decreasing, while  $\{-\lambda_i + i - \frac{1}{2}\}_{i=1}^N$  is strictly increasing. Also  $A$  and  $B$  are subsets of  $C$ . Since  $\lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} > 0$  if and only if  $\lambda_i - i + \frac{1}{2} > 0$ , we have  $i < j$  for all  $\lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} \in A$  and  $-\lambda_j + j - \frac{1}{2} \in B$ . Furthermore, the sum of the cardinality of  $A$  and the cardinality of  $B$  equals the cardinality of  $C$ . So it is enough to show  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ . Suppose that  $\lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} \in A$  and  $-\lambda_j + j - \frac{1}{2} \in B$  with  $\lambda'_i - i + \frac{1}{2} = -\lambda_j + j - \frac{1}{2}$ . We have  $i < j$  and  $\lambda'_i + \lambda_j = i + j - 1$ . If  $\lambda'_i \geq j$ , we have  $\lambda'_i + \lambda_j \geq j + i > j + i - 1$ . If  $\lambda'_i < j$ , we have  $\lambda'_i + \lambda_j < j + (i - 1) = j + i - 1$ . In either case,  $\lambda'_i + \lambda_j \neq i + j - 1$ . Thus we have  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *For  $\mu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ , we have  $(\mu + 2\rho_c|\mu)_c = (\mu^\natural + 2\rho_s|\mu^\natural)_s$ .*

*Proof.* A direct calculation shows that the lemma is equivalent to the following identity for a partition  $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots)$ :

$$\sum_{j>0} \mu_j^2 - \sum_{j>0} 2(j-1)\mu_j = \sum_{j>0} 2j\mu'_j - \sum_{j>0} (\mu'_j)^2.$$

This identity is equivalent to

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^N \left[ \left( \mu_j - \left( j - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)^2 + \left( \mu'_j - \left( j - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)^2 \right] = 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \left( j - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2,$$

where  $N \geq \max(\ell(\mu), \ell(\mu'))$ . However (3.3) follows readily from Lemma 3.2 applied to the partitions  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2.** *For  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|\infty}$  and  $\mu \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ , the irreducible  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -module  $L^0(\mu)$  is a component of  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1}) \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$  with  $(\mu + 2\rho_s|\mu)_s = (\lambda^\natural + 2\rho_s|\lambda^\natural)_s$  if and only if there exists  $w \in W_k^0$  with  $\mu = (w \circ \lambda)^\natural$ . Furthermore, each such  $L^0(\mu)$  appears with multiplicity one.*

*Proof.* Let  $L^0(\mu)$  be an irreducible  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -module in  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1}) \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$ . By Remark 2.1, we have  $\mu = \eta^\natural$  for some  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ . By Lemma 3.1,  $L^0(\eta)$  is an irreducible component of  $\Lambda^k(\mathfrak{g}_{-1}) \otimes L(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda)$  with the same multiplicity. By Lemma 3.3, if  $(\mu + 2\rho_s|\mu)_s = (\lambda^\natural + 2\rho_s|\lambda^\natural)_s$ , then we have  $(\eta + 2\rho_c|\eta)_c = (\lambda + 2\rho_c|\lambda)_c$ . Furthermore by Proposition 3.1,  $\eta = w \circ \lambda$  for some  $w \in W_k^0$ , and the multiplicity of  $L^0(\mu)$  is one.

Conversely, if  $\mu = (w \circ \lambda)^\natural$  for some  $w \in W_k^0$ , then by Lemma 3.3 we get

$$(\mu + 2\rho_s|\mu)_s = (\lambda^\natural + 2\rho_s|\lambda^\natural)_s.$$

By Proposition 3.1,  $L^0(w \circ \lambda)$  appears in  $\Lambda^k(\mathfrak{g}_{-1}) \otimes L(\mathfrak{g}, \lambda)$  with multiplicity one. Hence by Lemma 3.1  $L^0(\mu)$  also appears in  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1}) \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$  with multiplicity one.  $\square$

#### 4. WEAK BGG-TYPE RESOLUTIONS FOR IRREDUCIBLE TENSOR $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ -MODULES

Since  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$  is a  $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module,  $D_k := U(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}) \otimes_{U(\bar{\mathfrak{p}})} \Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{p}})$  is a  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -module with  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$  acting on the first factor, for  $k \geq 0$ . Define the sequence

$$(4.1) \quad \dots \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} D_k \xrightarrow{\partial_k} D_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{k-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\partial_1} D_0 \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $\epsilon$  is the augmentation map from  $U(\bar{\mathfrak{g}})$  to  $\mathbb{C}$  and

$$\partial_k(a \otimes \bar{x}_1 \bar{x}_2 \cdots \bar{x}_k) := \sum_{j=1}^k a x_j \otimes \bar{x}_1 \cdots \widehat{\bar{x}}_j \cdots \bar{x}_k,$$

for  $a \in U(\bar{\mathfrak{g}})$  and  $x_i \in \bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ . Here  $\bar{x}_j$  denotes the image of  $x_j$  in  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$  under the natural map. One easily checks that the  $\partial_k$ 's are well-defined  $U(\bar{\mathfrak{g}})$ -maps and (4.1) is a chain complex. The exactness of (4.1) follows, for example, from the exactness of the dual of the Koszul complex [K, Appendix D.13] (see also [KK]).

For  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$  and  $k \geq 0$ ,  $Y_k := D_k \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$  is a  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -module. Tensoring (4.1) with  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$  we obtain an exact sequence [GL, K, J]

$$(4.2) \quad \dots \xrightarrow{d_{k+1}} Y_k \xrightarrow{d_k} Y_{k-1} \xrightarrow{d_{k-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{d_1} Y_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $d_k := \partial_k \otimes 1$  for  $k > 0$  and  $d_0 := \epsilon \otimes 1$ .

Let  $V$  be a  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -module, on which the action of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{+1}$  is locally nilpotent. We define

$$V^c := \{ v \in V \mid (\bar{\Omega} - c)^l v = 0 \text{ for } l \gg 0 \},$$

i.e.  $V^c$  is the generalized  $\bar{\Omega}$ -eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ . Clearly we have  $V = \bigoplus_{c \in \mathbb{C}} V^c$ . Put

$$c_\lambda = (\lambda^\natural + 2\rho_s | \lambda^\natural)_s.$$

The restriction of (4.2) to the generalized  $c_\lambda$ -eigenspace of  $\bar{\Omega}$  produces a resolution of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules

$$(4.3) \quad \cdots \xrightarrow{d_{k+1}} Y_k^{c_\lambda} \xrightarrow{d_k} Y_{k-1}^{c_\lambda} \xrightarrow{d_{k-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_1} Y_0^{c_\lambda} \xrightarrow{d_0} L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural) \longrightarrow 0.$$

**Proposition 4.1.** *Assume that  $n = \infty$ . For  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|\infty}$ , we have a resolution of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules of the form*

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{d_{k+1}} Z_k \xrightarrow{d_k} Z_{k-1} \xrightarrow{d_{k-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_1} Z_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural) \longrightarrow 0$$

such that each  $Z_k$  has a Kac flag. Furthermore,  $Z_k \cong \bigoplus_{w \in W_k^0} V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, (w \circ \lambda)^\natural)$  as  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1} + \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -modules.

*Proof.* Observe that  $Y_k \cong U(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}) \otimes_{U(\bar{\mathfrak{p}})} (\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{p}}) \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural))$ . Suppose that as  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -module, we have  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{p}}) \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural) \cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{J}} L^0(\mu)$  for some multiset of weights  $\mathcal{J}$ . The  $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module  $\Lambda^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{p}}) \otimes L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural)$  has a composition series, where the multiset of composition factors is precisely the multiset of  $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module  $L^0(\mu)$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{J}$ . Thus  $Y_k$  has a Kac flag and  $Y_k \cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{J}} V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)$  as  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1} + \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -modules. Now  $\bar{\Omega}$  acts on  $V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)$  as the scalar  $(\mu + 2\rho_s | \mu)_s$ , and hence  $Z_k = Y_k^{c_\lambda} \cong \bigoplus_{\mu} V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)$ , where the summation is over all  $\mu \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(\mu + 2\rho_s | \mu)_s = (\lambda^\natural + 2\rho_s | \lambda^\natural)_s$ . Proposition 3.2 now says that this set is precisely  $\{ (w \circ \lambda)^\natural \mid w \in W_k^0 \}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.1.** *Assume that  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$ , we have a resolution of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules of the form*

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{d_{k+1}} Z_{k,n} \xrightarrow{d_k} Z_{k-1,n} \xrightarrow{d_{k-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_1} Z_{0,n} \xrightarrow{d_0} L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural) \longrightarrow 0$$

such that each  $Z_{k,n}$  has a Kac flag. Furthermore,  $Z_{k,n} \cong \bigoplus_{w \in W_k^0} V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, (w \circ \lambda)^\natural)$  as  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{-1} + \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -modules. Here, by definition we have  $V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \nu^\natural) = 0$  for  $\nu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$  with  $\nu_1 > n$ .

*Proof.* The corollary follows from applying the truncation functor  $\mathfrak{tt}_n$  [CWZ, Definition 4.4] upon the resolution in Proposition 4.1 and using the facts that the truncation functor is an exact functor and is compatible with both irreducible and Kac modules [CWZ, Corollary 4.6].  $\square$

## 5. STRONG BGG-TYPE RESOLUTIONS FOR IRREDUCIBLE TENSOR $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ -MODULES

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  recall the definition of the super Bruhat ordering for  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  in [B, §2-b], which we denote by  $\preceq$ . This gives a partial ordering on  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$ . We can restrict  $\preceq$  to  $\mathcal{X}_{m|n}$ , which can be defined for  $\mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$  as well (cf. [CWZ, Section 2.3]). Now we may also regard  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  as weights of  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(m+n)$ . In doing so the usual Bruhat

ordering of  $\mathfrak{g}$  determines a partial ordering  $\leq$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  (see e.g. [CWZ, Section 2.2]), which restricts to  $\mathcal{X}_{m|n}$ , and which in turn can be defined for  $\mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$  as well. We have the following.

**Lemma 5.1.** [CWZ, Lemma 6.6] *Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ . Then  $\lambda \preceq \mu$  if and only if  $\lambda^\natural \leq \mu^\natural$ .*

In the remainder of this section we assume that  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  unless otherwise specified.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda, \mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$ . Suppose that  $\mu \not\preceq \lambda$ . Then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}}(V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu), V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}}(V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu), V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)) \neq 0$ . Then  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)$  is a composition factor of the Kac module  $V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)$ . It follows from [B, Corollary 3.36 (i)] and [B, Theorem 4.37] that  $\mu \preceq \lambda$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$ . Suppose that  $M$  is a finite-dimensional  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -module with a Kac flag*

$$0 = M_0 \subseteq M_1 \subseteq M_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq M_l = M,$$

*and  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}}(M_i/M_{i-1}, V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)) = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . Then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}}(M, V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Since  $M$  is finite-dimensional we have  $M_i/M_{i-1} \cong V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu_i)$  with  $\mu_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  for all  $i$ . Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/M_1 \rightarrow 0.$$

Noting that  $M/M_1$  has a Kac flag of length  $l - 1$ , the lemma follows easily from the long exact sequence and induction on  $l$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|n}$ . Suppose that  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are not comparable under the super Bruhat ordering. Then*

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda), V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Consider  $P(\lambda)$  the projective cover (in the category of finite-dimensional  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules) of  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)$ . We have an exact sequence

$$(5.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow P(\lambda) \rightarrow V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda) \rightarrow 0.$$

Now  $P(\lambda)$  has a Kac flag [Z, Proposition 2.5] and hence so has  $K$ . By [B, Theorem 4.37],  $P(\lambda)$  is a tilting module and if  $V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \gamma)$  with  $\gamma \neq \lambda$  appears in a Kac flag of  $P(\lambda)$ , then  $\gamma \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  and  $\gamma \succ \lambda$ .

Now the induced long exact sequence from (5.1) gives rise to the following exact sequence

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}}(K, V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda), V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since all  $V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \gamma)$  that appears in the Kac flag of  $K$  are such that  $\gamma \succ \lambda$ , we see that  $\gamma \not\preceq \mu$  by hypothesis. Thus by Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3,  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}}(K, V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)) = 0$ , and the lemma follows.  $\square$



**Theorem 5.1.** *For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$ , we have a resolution of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules of the form*

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{d_{k+1}} Z_{k,n} \xrightarrow{d_k} Z_{k-1,n} \xrightarrow{d_{k-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_1} Z_{0,n} \xrightarrow{d_0} L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural) \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $Z_{k,n} \cong \bigoplus_{w \in W_k^0} V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, (w \circ \lambda)^\natural)$  as  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules. As before, by definition, we have  $V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \nu^\natural) = 0$  for  $\nu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$  with  $\nu_1 > n$ .

*Proof.* We have a natural embedding of  $\mathcal{X}_{m|N} \xrightarrow{\iota_{N,N+1}} \mathcal{X}_{m|N+1}$  for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Also we have the truncation map  $\mathcal{X}_{m|N+1} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{N+1,N}} \mathcal{X}_{m|N}$  [CWZ, Section 6.6] that sends an element  $\lambda = (\lambda_{-m}, \dots, \lambda_{N+1})$  to  $\lambda = (\lambda_{-m}, \dots, \lambda_N)$ , if  $\lambda_{N+1} = 0$ , and to  $\emptyset$ , otherwise. The usual Bruhat orderings of  $\mathcal{X}_{m|N}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_{m|N+1}$  are compatible in the following sense:

- (i) For  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|N}$ , one has  $\lambda \leq \mu$  if and only if  $\iota_{N,N+1}(\lambda) \leq \iota_{N,N+1}(\mu)$ .
- (ii) For  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{X}_{m|N+1}$  with  $\text{Tr}_{N+1,N}(\lambda) \neq \emptyset, \text{Tr}_{N+1,N}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$ , one has  $\lambda \leq \mu$  if and only if  $\text{Tr}_{N+1,N}(\lambda) \leq \text{Tr}_{N+1,N}(\mu)$ .

Thus the Bruhat ordering of  $\mathcal{X}_{m|N}$  is compatible with that of  $\mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ .

We view  $\lambda$  as a weight of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m+\infty)$  and so as an element in  $\mathcal{X}_{m|\infty}$ . For a fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , it is not hard to see that the weights  $\{w \circ \lambda \mid w \in W_j^0\}$  form a finite set and they all may be regarded as lying in the same  $\mathcal{X}_{m|N}$ , for  $N \gg 0$ . Thus we may regard them all as weights of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m+N)$  for some  $N \gg 0$ . But for such weights, it is well-known from classical theory of semi-simple Lie algebras that they are not comparable under the usual Bruhat ordering (see e.g. [K, Lemma 1.3.16]). Thus viewing them as weights of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m+\infty)$ , they are not comparable under the Bruhat ordering, either. Hence, by Lemma 5.1, the weights  $(w \circ \lambda)^\natural$  are not comparable under the super Bruhat ordering of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|\infty)$ . The theorem now follows from a similar compatibility of the super Bruhat orderings of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|\infty)$  and of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ , Lemma 5.4 and Corollary 4.1.  $\square$

*Remark 5.1.* Note that  $W$  above is the infinite Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m+\infty)$ , even though we are considering the finite-dimensional Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ .

*Remark 5.2.* Theorem 5.1 has the counterpart in the case of  $n = \infty$  as well.

Recall that for  $\lambda, \mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  with  $\lambda \succ \mu$  there is a *relative length function* defined in [B, §3-g], which we denote by  $\bar{\ell}(\mu, \lambda)$ . Fix  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$  so that  $\lambda^\natural \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$ . For  $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  with  $\lambda^\natural \succ \mu$  define an *absolute length function* by

$$\bar{\ell}(\mu) := \bar{\ell}(\mu, \lambda^\natural).$$

We can now formulate Theorem 5.1 intrinsically without referring to the infinite Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m+\infty)$  as follows.

**Theorem 5.2.** *For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$ , we have a resolution of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules of the form*

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{d_{k+1}} Z_{k,n} \xrightarrow{d_k} Z_{k-1,n} \xrightarrow{d_{k-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_1} Z_{0,n} \xrightarrow{d_0} L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^\natural) \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $Z_{k,n} \cong \bigoplus_{\bar{\ell}(\mu)=k} V(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu)$  as  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules.

*Proof.* For  $\nu, \mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  recall Brundan's Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials  $l_{\mu\nu}(q)$  of [B, (2.18)]. By [B, Theorem 4.51] and [Z, Theorem 5.1] we have the following cohomological interpretation:

$$l_{\mu\nu}(-q^{-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \dim [\mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0} (L^0(\mu), \mathrm{H}^i(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{+1}; L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \nu)))] q^i.$$

The calculation of the  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{+1}$ -cohomology groups in [CZ, Corollary 4.14] now implies that

$$l_{\mu\lambda^{\natural}}(-q^{-1}) = \begin{cases} q^k, & \text{if there exists } w \in W_k^0 \text{ with } \mu = (w \circ \lambda)^{\natural} \text{ and } (w \circ \lambda)_1 \leq n, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From [B, Corollary 3.45] we conclude that for such  $\mu$  we have  $k = \bar{\ell}(\mu)$ . On the other hand if  $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  with  $\bar{\ell}(\mu) = k$ , then [B, Corollary 3.45] implies that  $l_{\mu\lambda^{\natural}}(-q^{-1}) \neq 0$  and hence  $\mu$  is of the form  $(w \circ \lambda)^{\natural}$  with  $w \in W_k^0$ . Thus for  $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{m|n}$  the condition that there exists  $w \in W_k^0$  with  $\mu = (w \circ \lambda)^{\natural}$  is equivalent to the condition that  $\bar{\ell}(\mu) = k$ . This together with Theorem 5.1 completes the proof.  $\square$

We record the following corollary of the proof of Theorem 5.2.

**Corollary 5.1.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$ . As a  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ -module we have, for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,*

$$\mathrm{H}^k(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_{+1}; L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^{\natural})) \cong \bigoplus_{\bar{\ell}(\mu)=k} L^0(\mu).$$

We conclude with an example, which shows that finite-dimensional irreducible representations over a simple Lie superalgebra cannot be resolved in terms of direct sums Verma modules in general.

**Example 5.1.** Let  $\lambda \in \bar{\mathfrak{h}}^*$  and let  $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$  denote the one-dimensional  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}}$ -module that transforms by  $\lambda$ . We extend  $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$  trivially to a  $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ -module and denote by  $M(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda) = \mathrm{Ind}_{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}} \mathbb{C}_\lambda$  the Verma module of highest weight  $\lambda$ . Suppose that  $L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)$  can be resolved in terms of Verma modules. Then we have an exact sequence of  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ -modules of the form

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} M(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu_i) \xrightarrow{\psi} M(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda) \xrightarrow{\phi} L(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda) \longrightarrow 0,$$

and  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}}(M(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \mu_i), M(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)) \neq 0$ , for all  $i \in I$ . It follows that there exist singular vectors  $v_i$  of weight  $\mu_i$  in  $M(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)$ .  $\mathrm{Im} \psi = \mathrm{Ker} \phi$  implies that the unique maximal submodule of  $M(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)$  must be generated by the proper singular vectors of  $M(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda)$ .

Now consider  $\lambda = \delta_{-1}$  and  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{gl}(1|2)$  or  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{sl}(1|2)$ . In the sequel we will suppress  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ . One can show by a direct calculation that the only proper singular vectors in the Verma module  $M(\delta_{-1})$  are scalar multiples of either  $\bar{E}_{2,1}v$  or  $\bar{E}_{1,-1}\bar{E}_{2,1}v$ , where  $v$  is a highest weight vector of  $M(\delta_{-1})$ . If  $M_1$  is the submodule of  $M(\delta_{-1})$  generated by  $\bar{E}_{2,1}v$ , then  $M_1$  is the submodule generated by all proper singular vectors of  $M(\delta_{-1})$ . But  $\dim(M(\delta_{-1})/M_1) = 4$  by the PBW Theorem and, since  $\dim L(\delta_{-1}) = 3$ , it follows that  $M_1$  cannot be the unique maximal submodule of  $M(\delta_{-1})$ . Thus  $L(\delta_{-1})$  cannot have a resolution in terms of Verma modules. We note that  $M(\delta_{-1})/M_1$  is isomorphic to the Kac module of highest weight  $\delta_{-1}$  and  $\bar{E}_{1,-1}\bar{E}_{2,-1}v$  is a singular vector in  $M(\delta_{-1})/M_1$ .

Theorem 5.1, the fact that  $H^1(\overline{\mathfrak{g}}_{+1}; L(\overline{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^{\natural}))$  is irreducible, and the discussion in Example 5.1 imply the following.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{m|n}$ . The unique maximal submodule of a reducible  $V(\overline{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^{\natural})$  is generated by the proper singular vector of  $V(\overline{\mathfrak{g}}, \lambda^{\natural})$ .*

## REFERENCES

- [BGG] I. Bernstein, I. Gelfand and S. Gelfand: *Differential operators on the base affine space and a study of  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules*. Lie groups and their representations (Proc. Summer School, Bolyai Janos Math. Soc., Budapest, 1971), pp. 21–64. Halsted, New York, 1975.
- [B] J. Brundan: *Kazhdan-Lusztig Polynomials and Character Formulae for the Lie Superalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}(m|n)$* , J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (2003) 185–231.
- [BR] A. Berele and A. Regev: *Hook Young diagrams with applications to combinatorics and representations of Lie superalgebras*, Adv. Math. **64** (1987) 118–175.
- [CWZ] S.-J. Cheng, W. Wang and R. B. Zhang: *Super Duality and Kazhdan-Lusztig Polynomials*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear, math.RT/0409016.
- [CZ] S.-J. Cheng and R. B. Zhang: *Analogue of Kostant’s  $u$ -cohomology formula for the general linear superalgebra*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **2004** (2004) 31–53.
- [GL] H. Garland and J. Lepowsky: *Lie Algebra Homology and the Macdonald-Kac Formulas*, Invent. Math. **34** (1976) 37–76.
- [H] R. Howe: *Remarks on classical invariant theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **313** (1989), 539–570. *Perspectives on Invariant Theory: Schur Duality, Multiplicity-free Actions and Beyond*, The Schur Lectures, Israel Math. Conf. Proc. **8**, Tel Aviv (1992) 1–182.
- [J] E. Jurisich: *An Exposition of Generalized Kac-Moody Algebras*. Lie algebras and their representations (Seoul, 1995) 121–159, Contemp. Math. **194**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.
- [K] S. Kumar: *Kac-Moody groups, their flag varieties and representation theory*. Progress in Mathematics, **204**. Birkhauser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2002.
- [KK] S. J. Kang and J. H. Kwon: *Graded Lie superalgebras, supertrace formula, and orbit Lie superalgebra*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **81** (2000), 675–724.
- [L] J. Lepowsky: *A generalization of the Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand resolution*, J. Algebra **49** (1977) 496–511.
- [RC] A. Rocha-Caridi: *Splitting Criteria for  $\mathfrak{g}$ -Modules Induced from a Parabolic and the Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand Resolution of a Finite Dimensional Irreducible  $\mathfrak{g}$ -Module*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **262** (1980) 335–366.
- [RCW] A. Rocha-Caridi and N. Wallach: *Projective modules over graded Lie algebras I*, Math. Z. **180** (1982) 151–177.
- [S] A. Sergeev: *The Tensor Algebra of the Identity Representation as a Module over the Lie Superalgebras  $gl(n, m)$  and  $Q(n)$* , Math. USSR Sbornik **51** (1985) 419–427.
- [Z] Y. M. Zou: *Categories of finite-dimensional weight modules over type I classical Lie superalgebras*. J. Algebra **180** (1996) 459–482.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, ACADEMIA SINICA, TAIPEI, TAIWAN 11529

*E-mail address:* chengsj@math.sinica.edu.tw

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SEOUL, 90, CHEONNONG-DONG, DONGDAEMUN-GU, SEOUL 130-743, KOREA

*E-mail address:* jhkwon@uos.ac.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL CHENG-KUNG UNIVERSITY, TAINAN, TAIWAN 70101

*E-mail address:* nlam@mail.ncku.edu.tw