COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

# Implosion for hyperkähler manifolds

Andrew Dancer, Frances Kirwan and Andrew Swann

Compositio Math. **149** (2013), 1592–1630.

doi:10.1112/S0010437X13007203



FOUNDATION
COMPOSITIO
MATHEMATICA

LONDON
MATHEMATICAL
SOCIETY

Compositio Math. 149 (2013) 1592–1630
doi:10.1112/S0010437X13007203

# Implosion for hyperkähler manifolds

Andrew Dancer, Frances Kirwan and Andrew Swann

Abstract

We introduce an analogue in hyperkähler geometry of the symplectic implosion, in the case of $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ actions. Our space is a stratified hyperkähler space which can be defined in terms of quiver diagrams. It also has a description as a non-reductive geometric invariant theory quotient.

## Introduction

Guillemin *et al.* [GJS02] introduced the idea of symplectic implosion of a symplectic manifold $M$ with a Hamiltonian action of a compact group $K$. The implosion $M_{\mathrm{impl}}$ carries an action of a maximal torus $T$ of $K$, such that the symplectic reductions of $M$ by $K$ agree with the symplectic reductions of the implosion by $T$. In this sense the implosion is an abelianisation of the original Hamiltonian action; the price to be paid for this is that the implosion is usually quite singular, although it has a stratified symplectic structure.

The construction of symplectic implosions can be reduced to the problem of imploding the cotangent bundle $T^*K$, which thus acts as a universal implosion. The imploded space $(T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}}$ carries a torus action such that the symplectic reductions are the coadjoint orbits of $K$. The universal symplectic implosion $(T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}}$ also has an algebro-geometric description as the canonical affine completion of the quotient $K_{\mathbb{C}}/N$ of the complexified group $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by a maximal unipotent subgroup $N$.

Our aim here is to explore a hyperkähler analogue of the universal implosion. In this paper we concentrate on the case of $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ actions, where there is a construction involving quiver diagrams, leaving the case of other compact groups $K$ to a future paper. We produce a stratified hyperkähler space $Q$ whose strata correspond to quiver diagrams of suitable types. These strata are hyperkähler manifolds which can be described in terms of open sets in complex symplectic quotients of the cotangent bundle of $K_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ by subgroups containing commutators of parabolic subgroups. There is a maximal torus action, and hyperkähler quotients by this action give the Kostant varieties, which are the closures in $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})^*$ of coadjoint orbits of $K_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$. We recall that by the work of Kronheimer [Kro90a, Kro90b], Biquard [Biq96] and Kovalev [Kov96] all coadjoint orbits of complex reductive groups admit hyperkähler structures.

We are led to our construction by algebro-geometric considerations, namely, the wish to produce a variety that is an affine completion of a complex symplectic quotient of the cotangent bundle $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by the maximal unipotent subgroup $N$ of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$. The upshot is that torus quotients yield not single complex coadjoint orbits but rather their canonical affine completions which are Kostant varieties. In particular, the torus reduction at a triple $(0, \tau_2, \tau_3)$, where $\tau_2 + i\tau_3$ is regular, will give Kronheimer's hyperkähler structure on the coadjoint orbit of $\tau_2 + i\tau_3$ [Kro90b].

Received 14 September 2012, accepted in final form 18 January 2013, published online 28 June 2013.
*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification* 53C26, 53D20, 14L24 (primary).
*Keywords:* symplectic implosion, quiver diagram, hyperkähler quotient, non-reductive geometric invariant theory, Kostant variety.

However, torus reduction at the origin yields not a point (as in the symplectic case) but rather the nilpotent variety.

Given a hyperkähler manifold $M$ with a hyperkähler Hamiltonian $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ action, we can construct its hyperkähler implosion as the hyperkähler quotient $(M \times Q)/\!\!/\!\!/ \mathrm{SU}(n)$, by analogy with symplectic implosion. However, the connection between non-abelian and abelian quotients is more involved than in the symplectic case. While the torus quotient of the hyperkähler implosion at a triple $(0, \tau_2, \tau_3)$ with $\tau_2 + i\tau_3$ regular coincides with Kronheimer's definition of the hyperkähler reduction of $M$ by $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ at this level [Kro90b], reducing at level zero will give the hyperkähler quotient of the product of $M$ and the nilpotent variety. To recover the usual hyperkähler quotient we must take just the closed stratum in this space, corresponding to the semisimple stratum (i.e. the point zero) in the nilpotent variety.

We now describe the plan of the paper. In § 1 we briefly review the theory of symplectic implosion. In § 2 we recall some relevant points from hyperkähler geometry, and introduce various complex-symplectic spaces which will arise as ingredients for building the hyperkähler implosion. In § 3 we recall the theory of Kostant varieties and the Grothendieck–Springer resolution. Section 4 shows that we may use symplectic quivers associated to actions of products of special linear groups to give a new model of the symplectic implosion when $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$. In § 5, motivated by this construction, we consider hyperkähler quiver varieties and in § 6 we stratify them in terms of quiver diagrams. This gives an approach to hyperkähler implosion in the case of $\mathrm{SU}(n)$. We analyse the structure of these strata in terms of parabolic subgroups, and identify the implosion with a non-reductive quotient, in § 7. Finally in § 8 we work out various examples and show how Kostant varieties arise as torus quotients.

## 1. Symplectic implosion

We first review the theory of symplectic implosion, due to Guillemin *et al.* [GJS02]. Given a symplectic manifold $M$ with a Hamiltonian symplectic action of a compact Lie group $K$ with maximal torus $T$, the imploded space $M_{\mathrm{impl}}$ is a stratified symplectic space with a Hamiltonian action of the maximal torus $T$ of $K$. For convenience we fix an invariant inner product on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ of $K$, which allows us to identify $\mathfrak{k}$ with its dual $\mathfrak{k}^*$, and we fix a positive Weyl chamber in the Cartan algebra $\mathfrak{t}$ of $T$. Then we have an identification of reduced spaces

$$M/\!\!/\!\!/^s_\lambda K = M_{\mathrm{impl}}/\!\!/\!\!/^s_\lambda T \tag{1.1}$$

for all $\lambda$ in the closure of the fixed positive Weyl chamber in $\mathfrak{t}^*$, where $/\!\!/\!\!/^s_\lambda$ denotes symplectic reduction at level $\lambda$. Note that $\lambda$ need not be central for $K$; we recall that for general $\lambda$ the symplectic reduction $M/\!\!/\!\!/^s_\lambda K$ is the space $(M \times \mathsf{O}_{-\lambda})/\!\!/\!\!/^s_0 K$, where $\mathsf{O}_\lambda$ is the coadjoint orbit of $K$ through $\lambda$ with its canonical symplectic structure. This reduction may be identified with $\mu^{-1}(\lambda)/\mathrm{Stab}_K(\lambda)$ where $\mu\colon M \to \mathfrak{k}^*$ is the moment map for the $K$-action on $M$ and $\mathrm{Stab}_K(\lambda)$ is the stabiliser in $K$ of $\lambda \in \mathfrak{k}^*$ under the coadjoint action of $K$.

A particularly important example of implosion is when we take $M$ to be the cotangent bundle $T^*K$ (which may be identified with $K_{\mathbb{C}}$). Now $T^*K/\!\!/\!\!/^s_\lambda K$ is just the coadjoint orbit $\mathsf{O}_\lambda$ so the imploded space must satisfy

$$(T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}}/\!\!/\!\!/^s_\lambda T = \mathsf{O}_\lambda$$

for $\lambda$ in the closed positive Weyl chamber $\mathfrak{t}^*_+$. Explicitly, $(T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}}$ is obtained from $K \times \mathfrak{t}^*_+$, by identifying $(k_1, \xi)$ with $(k_2, \xi)$ if $k_1, k_2$ are related by the translation action of an element of the commutator subgroup of $\mathrm{Stab}_K(\xi)$. So if $\xi$ is in the interior of the chamber, its stabiliser is a



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

torus and we do not perform any identifications. In particular, an open dense subset of $(T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}}$ is just the product of $K$ with the interior of the Weyl chamber.

In fact this example gives us a universal imploded space. As $T^*K$ has a Hamiltonian $K \times K$-action its implosion inherits a Hamiltonian $K \times T$-action. Now for a general symplectic manifold $M$ with a Hamiltonian $K$-action we obtain the imploded space $M_{\mathrm{impl}}$ as the symplectic reduction $(M \times (T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}})/\!\!/\!\!/_0^s K$, which has an induced Hamiltonian $T$-action as required.

Implosion also has an interpretation as an algebro-geometric quotient. More precisely, the space $(T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}}$ can be identified with an affine variety which is the quotient

$$K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/\!\!/N = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(K_{\mathbb{C}})^N),$$

in the sense of geometric invariant theory (GIT), of the complex reductive group $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ (which is the complexification of $K$) by its maximal unipotent subgroup $N$ [DK07, MFK94]. This variety has a stratification by quotients of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by commutators of parabolic subgroups; the open stratum is just $K_{\mathbb{C}}/N$ and $K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/\!\!/N$ is the canonical affine completion of the quasi-affine variety $K_{\mathbb{C}}/N$.

## 2. Towards hyperkähler implosion

We now discuss some issues in constructing a hyperkähler analogue of the symplectic implosion.

**2.1** In the symplectic case the key example for implosion was the cotangent bundle $T^*K$ of a compact Lie group. It was shown by Kronheimer [Kro86] that the cotangent bundle $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$ of the complexification of $K$ admits a hyperkähler structure. (For further aspects of the geometry of this space, especially the moment geometry, see [DS96].) In fact Kronheimer showed that $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$ may be identified with the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{(K)}$ of solutions to the Nahm equations

$$\frac{dT_i}{dt} + [T_0, T_i] = [T_j, T_k], \quad (ijk) \text{ cyclic permutation of } (123),$$

(that is, the anti-self-dual-Yang–Mills equations with $\mathbb{R}^3$ translation invariance imposed) where $T_i$ (for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$) takes values in $\mathfrak{k}$ and is smooth on the interval $[0, 1]$. Two solutions are identified if they are equivalent under the gauge action

$$T_0 \mapsto gT_0g^{-1} - \dot{g}g^{-1}, \quad T_i \mapsto gT_ig^{-1} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3),$$

where $g\colon [0, 1] \mapsto K$ with $g(0) = g(1) = 1 \in K$. The Nahm equations may be viewed as the vanishing condition for a hyperkähler moment map for the action of this group of gauge transformations on an infinite-dimensional flat quaternionic space of $\mathfrak{k}$-valued functions on $[0, 1]$. In this way $\mathcal{M}_{(K)}$ acquires a hyperkähler structure. The complex-symplectic structure defined by the hyperkähler structure on $\mathcal{M}_{(K)}$ is just the standard complex-symplectic form on $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$.

We have an action of $K \times K$ on $\mathcal{M}_{(K)} \cong T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$, defined by taking gauge transformations which are no longer constrained to be the identity at $t = 0, 1$. This action preserves the hyperkähler structure, and complexifies to a holomorphic action of $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times K_{\mathbb{C}}$. Viewing $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$ as $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$, the left and right actions are given by

$$(g, \xi) \mapsto (h_L g h_R^{-1}, Ad(h_R)^*\xi). \tag{2.1}$$

There is also an action of $\mathrm{SO}(3)$, given for $(a_{ij}) \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$ by

$$T_i \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^{3} a_{ij} T_j,$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which is isometric but rotates the two-sphere of complex structures associated to the hyperkähler structure, so that all the complex structures are equivalent. In terms of the above procedure for identifying the moduli space with $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$, the choice of complex structures corresponds to the choice in the splitting of the Nahm equations into a real and a complex equation. For the standard choice of complex structures $(\mathsf{I}, \mathsf{J}, \mathsf{K})$ with corresponding symplectic forms $(\omega_{\mathsf{I}}, \omega_{\mathsf{J}}, \omega_{\mathsf{K}})$ the complex-symplectic form is $\omega_{\mathsf{J}} + \mathbf{i}\omega_{\mathsf{K}}$.

**2.2** We have already recalled that the symplectic implosion of $T^*K \cong K_{\mathbb{C}}$ can be identified with the non-reductive GIT quotient $K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N$ and has a stratification into strata $K_{\mathbb{C}}/[P,P]$ where $P$ ranges over the standard parabolic subgroups of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$. The open stratum, for which $P$ is the Borel subgroup $B$ of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ associated to the choice of positive Weyl chamber $\mathfrak{t}_+$, is $K_{\mathbb{C}}/N$ where $N = [B,B]$ is a maximal unipotent subgroup of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$.

In the hyperkähler setting, it is natural therefore to consider complex-symplectic quotients of $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by $N$ and more generally by commutators of parabolic subgroups $P \supseteq B$, acting on the right.

The complex-symplectic moment map for the right action of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ on $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$ is just the $I$-holomorphic moment map

$$(g, \xi) \mapsto \xi,$$

which of course is equivariant for the right action and invariant for the left action as described in (2.1). So the complex-symplectic quotient by the maximal unipotent group $N$ at level 0 is $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_N \mathfrak{n}^\circ$, where the annihilator $\mathfrak{n}^\circ$ in $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{n}$ of $N$ may be identified with the Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ of $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Here we use a fixed invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{k}$ to identify $\mathfrak{k}$ with $\mathfrak{k}^*$ and to identify $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$; when $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$ this identification is given by the pairing $(A, B) \mapsto \mathrm{tr}(AB)$ on the Lie algebra of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$.

The complex-symplectic form $\omega_{\mathsf{J}} + \mathbf{i}\omega_{\mathsf{K}}$ on $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$ descends to the complex-symplectic quotient $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_N \mathfrak{n}^\circ$. We can also perform complex-symplectic quotients by commutators $[P,P]$ of general parabolics $P$. We obtain quotients $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_{[P,P]} [\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$, which may be identified with the cotangent bundles $T^*(K_{\mathbb{C}}/[P,P])$ of the strata of the symplectic implosion.

Of course, these quotients carry a complex-symplectic action of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ induced from the left action on $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$. As the maximal torus $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ normalises $N$ (and $[P,P]$) we also have a surviving right action of $T_{\mathbb{C}}$. So these quotients have a complex-symplectic action of $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times T_{\mathbb{C}}$.

**2.3** On the other hand the symplectic implosion is given by the non-reductive GIT quotient $K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N$ which contains $K_{\mathbb{C}}/N$ as an open subset. So when searching for a candidate for the universal hyperkähler implosion we might look for a quotient in the sense of GIT of $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^\circ$ by the action of $N$. However, classical GIT [MFK94] only deals with actions of reductive groups, and the unipotent group $N$ is not reductive. There is no difficulty in constructing a non-reductive GIT quotient $K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N$ of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by $N$, since the algebra $\mathcal{O}(K_{\mathbb{C}})^N$ of $N$-invariant regular functions on $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ is finitely generated and so we can define $K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N$ to be the associated affine variety

$$K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(K_{\mathbb{C}})^N).$$

This means that if $X$ is any complex affine variety on which $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ acts then the algebra of invariants

$$\mathcal{O}(X)^N \cong (\mathcal{O}(X) \otimes \mathcal{O}(K_{\mathbb{C}})^N)^{K_{\mathbb{C}}}$$

is finitely generated and we have a non-reductive GIT quotient

$$X/\!\!/N = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(X)^N) \cong (X \times (K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N))/\!\!/K_{\mathbb{C}}.$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Unfortunately the $N$ action

$$(g, \xi) \mapsto (gn^{-1}, n\xi n^{-1})$$

on $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^{\circ}$ does not extend to a $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ action, so constructing a non-reductive quotient $(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^{\circ})/\!\!/N$ is not so straightforward (but see [DK07]). However, we will prove in this paper that when $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$ the algebra $\mathcal{O}(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^{\circ})^N$ is finitely generated, and that

$$(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^{\circ})/\!\!/N = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^{\circ})^N)$$

can be identified with a hyperkähler quotient of a flat space $\mathbb{H}^m$ by a compact group action using quiver diagrams. This hyperkähler quotient is a stratified hyperkähler space with a hyperkähler torus action, and is a complex affine variety for any choice of complex structure. It also includes the quotients $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_{[P,P]} [\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^{\circ}$ discussed above, in particular $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_N \mathfrak{n}^{\circ}$. It is also the canonical affine completion of $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_N \mathfrak{n}^{\circ}$.

## 3. Kostant varieties

Let us now discuss some links with geometric representation theory (cf. [CG97] for background).

We have already observed that we expect the universal hyperkähler implosion to be a non-reductive GIT quotient

$$(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^{\circ})/\!\!/N = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^{\circ})^N)$$

with the actions of the maximal torus $T$ of $K$ and its complexification $T_{\mathbb{C}} = B/N$ induced from the action of the Borel subgroup $B$ on $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{n}^{\circ}$. We also will be concerned with the geometric quotient $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_N \mathfrak{n}^{\circ}$. In this section we shall study quotients and complex-symplectic reductions of these spaces by tori.

First consider the space $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}} = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B \mathfrak{n}^{\circ} = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B \mathfrak{b}$, where $B$ is the Borel subgroup with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{b}$. Now $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}$ may be identified via $(Q, X) \mapsto (QXQ^{-1}, QB/B)$ with the correspondence space

$$\{(X, \mathfrak{b}) \in \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathcal{B} : X \in \mathfrak{b}\},$$

where $\mathcal{B} = K_{\mathbb{C}}/B$ is the variety of Borel subalgebras in $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Projection onto the second factor realises $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}$ as a vector bundle over $\mathcal{B}$. Projection onto the first factor, on the other hand, gives a map

$$\mu : \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}} = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B \mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}},$$
$$\mu : (Q, X) \mapsto QXQ^{-1},$$

called the Grothendieck simultaneous resolution. This map is a closed and proper surjection (since $\mathcal{B}$ is compact). Over regular elements of $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$ it is finite-to-one, of degree $|W|$, where $W$ is the Weyl group.

We also have a map

$$\rho : \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathbb{C}^r \simeq \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}/W,$$

where $r = \mathrm{rank}\, \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$. This map is defined by choosing generators $p_1, \ldots, p_r$ for the ring of invariant polynomials on $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and setting

$$\rho(X) = (p_1(X), \ldots, p_r(X)).$$

Now let us fix $X_0 \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and consider the subset of $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}$ given by

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0) = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B (X_0 + \mathfrak{n}).$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This has the structure of an affine bundle over $\mathcal{B} = K_{\mathbb{C}}/B$ (when $X_0 = 0$ it is the cotangent bundle $T^*\mathcal{B}$).

LEMMA 3.1. *We have a surjection*

$$\mu\colon \bigcup_{w\in W} \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(w.X_0) \to \rho^{-1}(\chi),$$

*where* $\chi = \rho(X_0)$.

*Proof.* This follows from the commutative diagram [CG97, (3.1.41)] below.




Here $\nu$ is the map that sends $X$ to its component $X_0$ in the Cartan algebra, and $\pi$ is just the quotient by the Weyl action.

Explicitly, we can argue as follows. If $p_i$ is an invariant polynomial as above, then, letting $X = X_0 + Y$ where $Y \in \mathfrak{n}$, we have

$$p_i \circ \mu(Q, X) = p_i(QXQ^{-1}) = p_i(X) = p_i(X_0)$$

where the last equality comes from [CG97, Corollary 3.1.43]. So $\mu(\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0))$ is contained in the fibre $\rho^{-1}(\chi)$ of $\rho$, where $\chi = \rho(X_0)$. This argument shows $\mu(\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(w.X_0))$ is also contained in $\rho^{-1}(\chi)$, where $w$ is an element of the Weyl group $W$.

Conversely, if $\rho(X) = \chi$, write $X = \mu(Q, X') = QX'Q^{-1}$ for some $(Q, X') \in K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{b}$. Write $X' = X_{ss} + Y$, where $X_{ss} \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{n}$. As above $\rho(X_{ss}) = \rho(X') = \rho(X) = \chi = \rho(X_0)$, so $X_{ss}, X_0 \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$ are equivalent under the Weyl group action. □

We recall some facts, due to Kostant [Kos63], concerning the *Kostant varieties* $V_\chi = \rho^{-1}(\chi)$ (see [CG97, § 6.7]).

(i) Each Kostant variety $V_\chi$ is an irreducible normal affine variety of complex dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}} - r = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}} - \dim \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

(ii) Each Kostant variety $V_\chi$ is a union of finitely many orbits for the adjoint action of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$.

(iii) There is a unique open dense orbit $V_\chi^{\mathrm{reg}}$, and this consists of the regular (in the Lie algebra sense) elements in $V_\chi$.

(iv) The complement of the open dense orbit $V_\chi^{\mathrm{reg}}$ is of complex codimension at least 2 in $V_\chi$ [Kos63, Theorem 0.8], and hence $\mathcal{O}(V_\chi^{\mathrm{reg}})$ is finitely generated and $V_\chi$ is the canonical affine completion $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(V_\chi^{\mathrm{reg}}))$ of the quasi-affine variety $V_\chi^{\mathrm{reg}}$.

(v) There is a unique closed orbit; this consists of the semisimple elements in $V_\chi$ and has minimal dimension among the orbits in $V_\chi$.

(vi) A Kostant variety $V_\chi$ consists of a single orbit if and only if it contains a regular semisimple element.

Note also that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0) = 2 \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{n} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}} - r = \dim V_\chi$.



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We know $\mu$ maps $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0)$ into $V_\chi$. However, the above discussion of Lemma 3.1 shows its image is not contained in a proper subvariety of $V_\chi$. Therefore, the image contains a Zariski-open and hence dense set in $V_\chi$. However, $\mu$ is closed on $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and hence on the closed subset $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0)$, so the image is all of $V_\chi$. This map is in fact injective over regular elements (the fibre for $\mu\colon \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$ over regulars is finite-to-one with the fibres coming from the Weyl group). So we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *We have a surjection*

$$\mu\colon \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0) \to V_\chi$$

*onto the Kostant variety, which is injective over regular elements.*

By analogy with symplectic implosion we expect that hyperkähler quotients of the universal hyperkähler implosion by the maximal torus $T$ in $K$ should be closely related to coadjoint orbits of the complexified group $K_{\mathbb{C}}$. Reduction at $(0, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$ should correspond to the complex-symplectic quotient by $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ at level $X_0 = \zeta_2 + \mathbf{i}\zeta_3$. So let us consider the quotients $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0) = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B (X_0 + \mathfrak{n})$ and also the GIT quotient

$$(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times (X_0 + \mathfrak{n}))/\!\!/B. \tag{3.3}$$

From above, $\hat{\mu}\colon (Q, X) \mapsto QXQ^{-1}$ gives a $B$-invariant map from $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times (X_0 + \mathfrak{n})$ onto $V_\chi$ where $\chi = \rho(X_0)$. This descends to the map $\mu\colon \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0) = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B (X_0 + \mathfrak{n}) \to V_\chi$.

If $X_0$ is regular semisimple, then, from (v) above, $V_\chi$ is just the orbit through $X_0$. Moreover in this case we have an isomorphism

$$\mu\colon K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B (X_0 + \mathfrak{n}) \to V_\chi,$$

hence the fibres of $\hat{\mu}$ are exactly the $B$-orbits. So (3.3) is a geometric quotient and our hyperkähler quotient is just $V_\chi = K_{\mathbb{C}}/T_{\mathbb{C}}$.

If $X_0$ is not regular semisimple, then $V_\chi$ will contain more than one orbit. As mentioned above in (iii), the regular elements will form an open dense set, but the smaller strata in its closure will consist of non-regular elements.

Now $\hat{\mu}\colon (Q, X) \mapsto QXQ^{-1}$ still defines a $B$-invariant map from $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times (X_0 + \mathfrak{n})$ onto $V_\chi$, inducing $\mu\colon \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0) \to V_\chi$. This time $\mu$ is no longer an isomorphism, but it is injective over the set $V_\chi^{\mathrm{reg}}$ of regular elements, hence injective over the complement of a set of codimension greater than or equal to 2 in $V_\chi$.

Clearly a polynomial $f$ on $V_\chi$ induces a $B$-invariant polynomial $\tilde{f}$ on $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times (X_0 + \mathfrak{n})$ via $\tilde{f}(Q, X) = f(QXQ^{-1})$. Conversely, a $B$-invariant polynomial on $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times (X_0 + \mathfrak{n})$ will induce a polynomial on $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0) = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B (X_0 + \mathfrak{n})$ and hence a polynomial on $V_\chi^{\mathrm{reg}}$. This will extend over the locus of non-regular points (which has codimension at least 2) to give a polynomial on $V_\chi$.

Hence $V_\chi$ is the GIT quotient $(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times (X_0 + \mathfrak{n}))/\!\!/B$. Thus if, as we expect, the universal hyperkähler implosion can be identified with a non-reductive GIT quotient $(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{b})/\!\!/N$, then its complex-symplectic GIT reduction by the torus $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ at level $X_0$ is $V_\chi$.

The space $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0) = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B (X_0 + \mathfrak{n})$, on the other hand, is an affine bundle over $\mathcal{B}$ and is a desingularisation of the Kostant variety $V_\chi$.

*Example* 3.4. In the particular case $X_0 = 0$, then $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0)$ is just $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B \mathfrak{n}$, which is the cotangent bundle $T^*\mathcal{B} = T^*(K_{\mathbb{C}}/B)$. Now the restriction of $\mu$ to $\tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(0)$ is the Springer resolution

$$\mu\colon T^*\mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{N},$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $\mathcal{N} = V_0 = \rho^{-1}(0)$ is the nilpotent variety in $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Both these spaces appear as hyperkähler spaces in the work of Nakajima [Nak94].

If $K = \mathrm{SU}(2)$ then $T^*\mathcal{B}$ is $T^*\mathbb{P}^1$, the resolution of the nilpotent cone which is the GIT quotient at level zero (see Example 8.5 below).

*Remark* 3.5. If our candidate for the universal hyperkähler implosion were the geometric quotient $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_N \mathfrak{n}^\circ = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_N \mathfrak{b}$ instead of the non-reductive GIT quotient $(K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{b})/\!\!/N$, then a naive complex-symplectic reduction at level $X_0$ (taking a geometric rather than GIT quotient) would give the Springer resolution $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_B (X_0 + \mathfrak{n}) = \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathbb{C}}(X_0)$ rather than the Kostant variety $V_\chi$.

## 4. Symplectic quivers

In this section we shall present a new model for the universal symplectic implosion for $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$, in terms of *symplectic quiver representations*. This will also introduce some ideas which will be useful in the next section, when we introduce a quiver description of the universal hyperkähler implosion for $\mathrm{SU}(n)$.

A *symplectic quiver representation* is a diagram of vector spaces and linear maps

$$0 = V_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_0} V_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} V_2 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\alpha_{r-2}} V_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\alpha_{r-1}} V_r = \mathbb{C}^n. \tag{4.1}$$

We say that the vector spaces $V_i$ have dimension vector $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_r)$ if $n_i = \dim V_i$. Let

$$R(\mathbf{n}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \mathrm{Hom}(V_{i-1}, V_i)$$

be the space of all such diagrams with $V_i = \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. We will say that the representation is *ordered* if $0 \leqslant n_1 \leqslant n_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_r = n$ and *strictly ordered* if $0 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_r = n$.

We shall be interested in the GIT quotient of $R(\mathbf{n})$ by an action of

$$\mathrm{SL} := \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(V_i).$$

This is a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL} := \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{GL}(V_i)$ and for both groups $g = (g_1, \ldots, g_{r-1})$ acts by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i &\mapsto g_{i+1}\alpha_i g_i^{-1} \quad (i = 1, \ldots, r-2), \\ \alpha_{r-1} &\mapsto \alpha_{r-1} g_{r-1}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

There is also, of course, a commuting action of $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \mathrm{GL}(V_r)$ by left multiplication of $\alpha_{r-1}$.

We shall particularly consider the case of full flag representations $\mathbf{n} = (1, 2, \ldots, n-1, n)$, but their analysis will require the study of the more general quiver representations (4.1) for general ordered $\mathbf{n}$.

The points in the GIT quotient $R(\mathbf{n})/\!\!/ \mathrm{SL} = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(R(\mathbf{n})^{\mathrm{SL}}))$ correspond to the closed orbits for the SL action on the affine variety $R(\mathbf{n})$. The term *polystable* is often used to describe points of $R(\mathbf{n})$ which lie in closed SL-orbits. If in addition the stabiliser is finite, the point is called *stable*.

We first look at length 2 quivers.

LEMMA 4.2. *A length two diagram*

$$V \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathbb{C}^n$$

*gives a closed* $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ *orbit if and only if* $\alpha$ *is either* 0 *or injective.*



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Proof.* Write $V = \ker \alpha \oplus U$ for some $U$.

Then

$$\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} : \ \ker \alpha \oplus U \to \mathbb{C}^n$$

which transforms as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_2 g_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

under the action of $g = \operatorname{diag}(g_1, g_2) \in \mathrm{SL}(V)$. If $\ker \alpha \neq 0$ and $U \neq 0$, then $\operatorname{diag}(\lambda^{-k}, \lambda^{\ell}) \in \mathrm{SL}(V)$ where $\ell = \dim \ker \alpha$ and $k = \dim U$, and the corresponding one-parameter group has 0 as its limit. Thus, if the orbit is closed, either $\ker \alpha = 0$ and $\alpha$ is injective or $\alpha = 0$.

If $\alpha = 0$ then the orbit is clearly closed. If $\alpha$ is injective, consider the action of any one-parameter group of $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ (in the sense of GIT, i.e. the image of a homomorphism $\mathbb{C}^* \to \mathrm{SL}(V)$). Write $V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} E(\mu_i)$ as a direct sum of weight spaces. As the one-parameter group is in $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ we have $\sum_i \mu_i \dim E(\mu_i) = 0$. Now $\alpha = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} a_i$ with each $a_i$ non-zero and under the action of the one-parameter group we have $a_i \mapsto \lambda^{\mu_i} a_i$. This has a limit as $\lambda \to \infty$ only if $\mu_i \leqslant 0$ for each $i$. However, the special linear condition then gives $\mu_i = 0$ for each $i$. Thus by the Mumford numerical criterion [MFK94] $\alpha$ is stable and hence polystable. □

To deal with the general case, we consider the following length 2 situation for a double quiver. Spaces of such double quivers will also give hyperkähler varieties, and will be studied further in the next section.

Lemma 4.3. *A configuration*

$$V \underset{\beta}{\overset{\alpha}{\rightleftarrows}} W \tag{4.4}$$

*of vector spaces $V, W$ and linear maps $\alpha, \beta$ gives a closed orbit under the* $\mathrm{SL}(V)$*-action*

$$\alpha \mapsto \alpha g^{-1}, \quad \beta \mapsto g\beta$$

*if and only if:*

(i) *$\alpha$ is injective; or*

(ii) *$\beta$ is surjective; or*

(iii) *$V = \ker \alpha \oplus \operatorname{im} \beta$.*

*Proof.* Suppose $(\alpha, \beta)$ is SL-polystable. Choose a direct sum decomposition $V = U_1 \oplus U_2 \oplus U_3 \oplus U_4$ such that

$$\ker \alpha \cap \operatorname{im} \beta = U_1, \quad \ker \alpha = U_1 \oplus U_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{im} \beta = U_1 \oplus U_3.$$

Then we may write

$$\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & a_3 & a_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \beta = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ 0 \\ b_3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A block-diagonal element $\operatorname{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_4) \in \mathrm{SL}(V)$ acts as

$$\alpha \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & a_3 g_3^{-1} & a_4 g_4^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \beta \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} g_1 b_1 \\ 0 \\ g_3 b_3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If $U_2$ is non-zero, then we may choose $g_1 \in \mathrm{GL}(U_1)$ and $g_4 \in \mathrm{GL}(U_4)$ freely and take $g_2 = \lambda$, $g_3 = 1$, where $\lambda^k \det g_1 \det g_4 = 1$, and $k = \dim U_2$. In particular, we may choose a one-parameter group of this form such that $g_1 \to 0$ and $g_4^{-1} \to 0$. Closure of the orbit implies that $b_1 = 0$ and $a_4 = 0$. However, $b_1$ is onto and $a_4$ is injective, so $U_1 = 0 = U_4$ and $V = \ker \alpha \oplus \operatorname{im} \beta$.

If $U_2 = 0$ and $U_1, U_4$ are both non-zero, then we may consider $g = \operatorname{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_4) \in \mathrm{SL}(V)$ with $g_3 = 1$. Now if $g_1 \to 0$, we have $g_4^{-1} \to 0$ too and closure of the orbit implies $b_1 = 0 = a_4$, contradicting the assumption that $U_1, U_4$ are non-zero.

So we see that $U_2 = 0$ implies either $U_1 = U_2 = 0$, giving $\alpha$ injective, or $U_2 = U_4 = 0$, giving $\beta$ surjective.

We note that the proof of Lemma 4.2 shows that the case when $\alpha$ is injective gives a stable configuration. For the case when $\beta$ is surjective, note that stability of (4.4) is equivalent to stability of the dual diagram

$$V^* \underset{\alpha^*}{\overset{\beta^*}{\rightleftarrows}} W^*$$

and that $\beta$ surjective is equivalent to $\beta^*$ injective.

Finally, for stability of the mixed case when $V = \ker \alpha \oplus \operatorname{im} \beta$, we may assume $\ker \alpha$ is non-trivial and $\beta$ is not surjective. Consider the endomorphism $X = \alpha\beta$ of $W$. This is invariant under the action of $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ and we have $\operatorname{rank} X = \operatorname{rank} \alpha = \operatorname{rank} \beta$.

Suppose $g_t \in \mathrm{SL}(V)$ is a one-parameter group and that $g_t(\alpha, \beta) \to (\alpha', \beta')$. We have $\operatorname{rank} \alpha' \leqslant \operatorname{rank} \alpha$ and $\operatorname{rank} \beta' \leqslant \operatorname{rank} \beta$. However, $\alpha'\beta' = X$, so $\operatorname{rank} X \leqslant \min\{\operatorname{rank} \alpha', \operatorname{rank} \beta'\}$ giving $\operatorname{rank} \alpha' = \operatorname{rank} \alpha$ and $\operatorname{rank} \beta' = \operatorname{rank} \beta$. Also observe that $\ker \beta' = \ker \beta = \ker X$, by our direct sum decomposition. It now follows that $\beta' = g\beta$ for some $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$. Since $\beta$ is not surjective, we may in fact choose $g \in \mathrm{SL}(V)$. Now $X = \alpha\beta = \alpha'\beta' = \alpha' g \beta$ implies $\alpha = \alpha' g$ on $\operatorname{im} \beta$. However, $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$ have the same rank as $\beta$, and $\alpha$ is injective on $\operatorname{im} \beta$, so $\ker(\alpha' g)$ is a complementary subspace to $\operatorname{im} \beta$. Choosing $h \in \mathrm{SL}(V)$ extending the identity on $\operatorname{im} \beta$ and with $h \ker \alpha = \ker(\alpha' g)$, we get that $\alpha' = \alpha(gh)^{-1}$, $\beta' = gh\beta$ and so $(\alpha', \beta')$ lies in the $\mathrm{SL}(V)$-orbit of $(\alpha, \beta)$. □

THEOREM 4.5. *The symplectic quiver representation $\alpha \in R(\mathbf{n})$ (4.1) is* SL*-polystable only if at each stage $i = 1, \ldots, r-1$ we have either:*

(i) *$\alpha_i$ is injective; or*

(ii) *$V_i = \operatorname{im} \alpha_{i-1} \oplus \ker \alpha_i$; or*

(iii) *$\alpha_{i-1}$ is surjective.*

Note that if $\mathbf{n}$ is strictly ordered, then the final possibility cannot occur.

*Proof.* The necessity follows from Lemma 4.3 applied to $V = V_i$, $W = V_{i+1} \oplus V_{i-1}$ and the maps $\alpha = (\alpha_i, 0)$, $\alpha(x) := (\alpha_i(x), 0)$ and $\beta = (0, \alpha_{i-1})$, $\beta(x, y) := \alpha_{i-1}(y)$. □

We shall now consider full flag quivers, that is, those where $V_i = \mathbb{C}^i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. To describe the GIT quotient by $\mathrm{SL} = \prod_{i=2}^{n-1} \mathrm{SL}(i, \mathbb{C})$ we need to analyse the quotient by SL of the set of such quivers satisfying the conditions given by Theorem 4.5; in the course of the analysis we shall see that the condition of Theorem 4.5 is sufficient as well as necessary for polystability.

First, observe that we may decompose each vector space $\mathbb{C}^i$ as

$$\mathbb{C}^i = \ker \alpha_i \oplus \mathbb{C}^{m_i}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\mathbb{C}^{m_i} = \mathbb{C}^i$ if $\alpha_i$ is injective and we take $\mathbb{C}^{m_i} = \operatorname{im} \alpha_{i-1}$ otherwise. We put $m_n = n$. Note that $\operatorname{rank} \alpha_i = m_i$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$. Further, observe that this actually gives a decomposition of



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

our quiver into two subquivers, namely

$$\mathbb{C}^{m_1} \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_1} \mathbb{C}^{m_2} \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_{n-2}} \mathbb{C}^{m_{n-1}} \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_{n-1}} \mathbb{C}^n, \tag{4.7}$$

where $\bar{\alpha}_i$ denotes the restriction of $\alpha_i$ to $\mathbb{C}^{m_i}$, and the quiver with trivial maps

$$\ker \alpha_1 \xrightarrow{0} \ker \alpha_2 \xrightarrow{0} \cdots \xrightarrow{0} \ker \alpha_{n-1} \xrightarrow{0} 0.$$

Note that we may use the SL action to standardise the decomposition (4.6), and we have a residual action of $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{GL}(m_i, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}(i - m_i, \mathbb{C}))$ preserving the decomposition. The $\mathrm{GL}(i - m_i, \mathbb{C})$ action on the quiver with zero maps is trivial.

If $\alpha_i$ is not injective, then, since $\mathbb{C}^i = \ker \alpha_i \oplus \operatorname{im} \alpha_{i-1}$ we see that $\operatorname{rank} \alpha_i = \operatorname{rank} \alpha_{i-1}$. We deduce that

$$m_i = i, \quad \text{if } \alpha_i \text{ is injective,} \tag{4.8}$$

$$m_i = m_{i-1}, \quad \text{if } \alpha_i \text{ is not injective.} \tag{4.9}$$

Now all the information is contained in the quiver (4.7) with $\mathrm{SL}(m_i, \mathbb{C})$ acting for $m_i = i$ and $\mathrm{GL}(m_i, \mathbb{C})$ acting for $m_i < i$. All the restricted maps $\bar{\alpha}_i$ are injective, so $m_{i-1} \leqslant m_i$ for each $i$. When $m_i = m_{i-1}$, this gives $m_i \leqslant i - 1 < i$, so we have a $\mathrm{GL}(m_i, \mathbb{C})$ action on $\mathbb{C}^{m_i}$. We may use up this action by standardising $\bar{\alpha}_i$ to be the identity. We may therefore remove this edge of the quiver, a process we call *contraction*.

After performing all such contractions, we arrive at a length $r$ quiver where $m_1 < m_2 < \cdots < m_{r-1} < m_r = n$ and all maps $\bar{\alpha}_i$ are injective. The residual action is $\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(m_i, \mathbb{C})$. For each $j$, we have $\bar{\alpha}_{r-1}\bar{\alpha}_{r-2} \ldots \bar{\alpha}_j g_j^{-1} = (\bar{\alpha}_{r-1} g_{r-1}^{-1}) \prod_{i=r-2}^{j} g_{i+1} \bar{\alpha}_i g_i^{-1}$, so if this quiver tends to a limit under the action of a one-parameter subgroup $(g_i(t))_{i=1}^{r-1}$, then the injective map $\bar{\alpha}_{r-1}\bar{\alpha}_{r-2} \ldots \bar{\alpha}_j g_j^{-1}(t)$ must tend to a limit also. Now the argument of the last section of Lemma 4.2 shows that $g_j(t)$ is trivial. So there are no destabilising one-parameter subgroups and we have that the quiver is polystable.

Alternatively, we may use the action of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(m_i, \mathbb{C})$ to put the maps $\bar{\alpha}_i$ into a form where the only non-zero entries are the $(j, j)$ terms for $j = 1, \ldots, m_i$. Moreover the $(j, j)$ terms may be chosen to be arbitrary non-zero scalars. It is now straightforward to check that these scalars may be chosen so that the real moment map for the action of $\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SU}(m_i)$ vanishes, i.e. so that the trace-free part of $\alpha_{i-1}\alpha_{i-1}^* - \alpha_i^* \alpha_i$ is zero for $i = 1, \ldots, r - 1$, where (and henceforth) $\alpha^*$ denotes $\overline{\alpha}^T$. Thus there exists some $h \in \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ such that the $\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(m_i, \mathbb{C})$ orbit through the image of the quiver under the action of $h$ is closed, and it follows that the orbit through the original quiver is closed too. So the condition of Theorem 4.5 is sufficient for polystability.

Our discussion now shows that we have a stratification of the GIT quotient by $\prod_{i=2}^{n-1} \mathrm{SL}(i, \mathbb{C})$ of the space of full flag quivers. There are $2^{n-1}$ strata, corresponding to the strictly increasing sequences of positive integers ending with $n$, or equivalently to the ordered partitions of $n$. We may also, of course, view the strata as being indexed by the standard parabolic subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$.

We next analyse these strata.

Lemma 4.10. *If $0 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_r = n$ then the space of quivers*

$$0 \longrightarrow V_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_1} V_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_{r-2}} V_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_{r-1}} V_r = \mathbb{C}^n$$

*with $\dim V_j = n_j$ and all $\bar{\alpha}_i$ injective, modulo the action of $\mathrm{SL} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(V_i)$, is*

$$\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})/[P, P],$$

*where $P$ is the parabolic associated to the flag $(V_1, \ldots, V_r)$.*



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*This statement also holds for quivers*

$$0 \longleftarrow V_1 \xleftarrow{\beta_1} V_2 \xleftarrow{\beta_2} \cdots \xleftarrow{\beta_{r-2}} V_{r-1} \xleftarrow{\beta_{r-1}} V_r = \mathbb{C}^n,$$

*where the maps* $\beta_i \colon V_{i+1} \to V_i$ *are surjective.*

*Proof.* We prove this for the case of $\beta_i$ surjective, and the case of $\alpha_i$ injective follows by dualising.

We may choose bases for the $V_i$ so that

$$\beta_i = (0_{n_i \times k_i} \mid I_{n_i \times n_i}),$$

where $n_i = \dim V_i$ and $k_i = n_{i+1} - n_i$ is the dimension of the kernel of $\beta_i$. Explicitly, once we have chosen such a basis $e_1, \ldots, e_{n_i}$ for $V_i$, we can choose a basis $e'_j$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n_{i+1}$, for $V_{i+1}$ so that the first $n_{i+1} - n_i$ elements are a basis for $\ker \beta_i$ and for the remaining $n_i$ elements we have $\beta_i \colon e'_j \mapsto e_j$. We may view this as using the action of $\mathrm{SL} \times \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \prod_{i=1}^r \mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$ to standardise the $\beta_i$.

How much freedom do we have in choosing such bases? Since $\beta_i$ transforms by $\beta_i \mapsto g_i \beta_i g_{i+1}^{-1}$, if $\beta_i$ is in the above standard form, then $\beta_i = g_i \beta_i g_{i+1}^{-1}$ if and only if

$$g_{i+1} = \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ 0 & g_i \end{pmatrix},$$

where the top left block is $k_i \times k_i$ and the bottom right is $n_i \times n_i$. Moreover $g_1$ is an arbitrary element of $\mathrm{SL}(n_1, \mathbb{C})$. We see inductively that the freedom in $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ is the commutator of the parabolic group $P$ associated to the flag of dimensions $(n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_r = n)$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$. □

We conclude that the GIT quotient of the space of full flag quivers by SL gives us a description of the symplectic implosion for $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$.

THEOREM 4.11. *The GIT quotient of the space of full flag quivers by* $\mathrm{SL} = \prod_{i=2}^{n-1} \mathrm{SL}(i, \mathbb{C})$ *is the symplectic implosion for* $\mathrm{SU}(n)$. *The stratification by quiver diagrams as above corresponds to the stratification of the implosion as the disjoint union over the standard parabolic subgroups* $P$ *of* $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ *of the varieties* $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})/[P, P]$.

*Proof.* We have already identified the strata of the GIT quotient of the space of full flag quivers with the strata of the implosion. Now observe that the complement of the open stratum $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})/N$ (where $N$ is the maximal unipotent, i.e. the commutator of the Borel subgroup) is of complex codimension strictly greater than one. The universal symplectic implosion and the GIT quotient of the space of full flag quivers therefore have the same coordinate ring $\mathcal{O}(\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}))^N$, and as they are both affine varieties they are now isomorphic. □

We recall the embedding [GJS02] of the symplectic implosion

$$K_{\mathbb{C}} /\!\!/ N \subset E,$$

where $E$ is the direct sum of $K$-modules $E = \oplus V_\varpi$, and $V_\varpi$ is the $K$-module with highest weight $\varpi$. We take the sum over a minimal generating set for the monoid of dominant weights. In our case $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$ so these are just the exterior powers of the standard representation $\mathbb{C}^n$. We denote a highest weight vector of $V_\varpi$ by $v_\varpi$.

Now we can define a map from the space of quivers to the space $E = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n-1} \wedge^j \mathbb{C}^n$ by sending $\alpha$ to the element of $E$ with $j$th component

$$\wedge^j (\alpha_{n-1} \cdots \alpha_{j+1} \alpha_j) \operatorname{vol}_j \in \wedge^j \mathbb{C}^n, \tag{4.12}$$

where $\operatorname{vol}_j$ denotes the standard generator of $\wedge^j \mathbb{C}^j$.



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Note that under the action of $\mathrm{SL} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(i, \mathbb{C})$, the composition $\alpha_{n-1} \cdots \alpha_{j+1}\alpha_j$ gets postmultiplied by $g_j^{-1}$; but $g_j \in \mathrm{SL}(j, \mathbb{C})$, so the $j$th exterior power is invariant. Hence our map descends to the GIT quotient by SL, and thus gives an explicit isomorphism of the GIT quotient to its image $K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N$ in $E$.

As $\mathbb{C}^j = \ker \alpha_j \oplus \mathbb{C}^{m_j}$, and the restriction of $\alpha_j$ to $\mathbb{C}^{m_j}$ is injective, we see that the map $\wedge^j(\alpha_{n-1} \cdots \alpha_{j+1}\alpha_j)$ is zero if and only if $m_j < j$; i.e. $\alpha_j$ is not injective. Now, from (4.8) to (4.9), we see that knowing for which indices this occurs determines the full sequence of $m_j$, and hence which stratum we are in. So the $2^{n-1}$ strata correspond to the possibilities for which components of (4.12) are zero.

Recall also that the symplectic implosion may be realised as the closure $\overline{K_{\mathbb{C}}v}$, where $v = \sum v_\varpi$ is the sum of the highest weight vectors. Using the Iwasawa decomposition $K_{\mathbb{C}} = KAN$ and recalling that $N$ fixes $v$, we see that $\overline{K_{\mathbb{C}}v} = K(\overline{T_{\mathbb{C}}v})$, the sweep under the compact group $K$ of a toric variety $\overline{T_{\mathbb{C}}v}$. In terms of the quiver model, recall from above we may use the action of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(m_i, \mathbb{C})$ to put the maps $\bar{\alpha}_i$ into a form where the only non-zero entries are the $(j, j)$ terms for $j = 1, \ldots, m_i$, and that these terms may be set to be arbitrary non-zero scalars. Taking all these scalars to be 1, we arrive at the stratification in Lemma 4.10. If instead we take all the scalars for $\bar{\alpha}_i$ to be equal to a non-zero scalar $\sigma_i$, then the freedom in putting $\bar{\alpha}_i$ into this form is the parabolic $P$ rather than its commutator. This gives a description of the strata as $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{r-1}$-bundles over the *compact* flag variety $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})/P$. This is, of course, just reflecting the fact that $P = [P, P].T_{\mathbb{C}}^{r-1}$. Fixing basepoints in the flag varieties and taking all the strata together gives the toric variety $\overline{T_{\mathbb{C}}v}$.

## 5. Hyperkähler quiver diagrams

We now turn our attention to hyperkähler quiver diagrams. For $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$ actions this gives us a finite-dimensional approach to constructing the universal hyperkähler implosion. This uses work on quiver varieties due to Nakajima [Nak94] and Kobak and Swann [KS96] (see also Bielawski [Bie98a, Bie98b]). We want to produce a hyperkähler stratified space with a torus action whose hyperkähler reductions by this action give Kostant varieties.

Choose integers $0 \leqslant n_1 \leqslant n_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_r = n$ and consider the flat hyperkähler space

$$M = M(\mathbf{n}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathbb{H}^{n_i n_{i+1}} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{n_i}, \mathbb{C}^{n_{i+1}}) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{n_{i+1}}, \mathbb{C}^{n_i}) \tag{5.1}$$

with the hyperkähler action of $\mathrm{U}(n_1) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{U}(n_r)$

$$\alpha_i \mapsto g_{i+1}\alpha_i g_i^{-1}, \quad \beta_i \mapsto g_i\beta_i g_{i+1}^{-1} \quad (i = 1, \ldots, r-1),$$

with $g_i \in \mathrm{U}(n_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Here $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_i$ denote elements of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{n_i}, \mathbb{C}^{n_{i+1}})$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{n_{i+1}}, \mathbb{C}^{n_i})$ respectively, and right quaternion multiplication is given by

$$(\alpha_i, \beta_i)\mathbf{j} = (-\beta_i^*, \alpha_i^*). \tag{5.2}$$

We may write $(\alpha, \beta) \in M(\mathbf{n})$ as a quiver diagram:

$$0 \underset{\beta_0}{\overset{\alpha_0}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_1} \underset{\beta_1}{\overset{\alpha_1}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_2} \underset{\beta_2}{\overset{\alpha_2}{\rightleftarrows}} \cdots \underset{\beta_{r-2}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-2}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_{r-1}} \underset{\beta_{r-1}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-1}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_r} = \mathbb{C}^n,$$

where $\alpha_0 = \beta_0 = 0$. For brevity, we will often call such a diagram a quiver. If each $\beta_i$ is zero we recover a symplectic quiver diagram.



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $\tilde{H}$ be the subgroup, isomorphic to $\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{U}(n_i)$, given by setting $g_r = 1$ and let

$$\tilde{\mu}\colon M \to \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{H}) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 = \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathfrak{u}(n_i)\right) \otimes (\mathbb{R} + \mathbb{C})$$

$$\tilde{\mu}(\alpha, \beta) = ((\alpha_i\alpha_i^* - \beta_i^*\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}\beta_{i+1}^* - \alpha_{i+1}^*\alpha_{i+1})\mathbf{i},\, \alpha_i\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}\alpha_{i+1})_{i=1}^{r-1}$$

be the hyperkähler moment map. Hyperkähler quotients $\tilde{\mu}^{-1}(c)/\tilde{H}$ of $M$ by $\tilde{H}$ (with $c \in \mathrm{Lie}(Z(\tilde{H})) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$ where $Z(\tilde{H}) \cong T^{r-1}$ is the centre of $\tilde{H}$) will admit a residual hyperkähler action of $\mathrm{U}(n_r) = \mathrm{U}(n)$, although in fact only $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ acts (almost) effectively as the diagonal central $\mathrm{U}(1)$ acts trivially. Also the general theory [DS97] (inspired by the symplectic results of [SL91]) tell us that the quotients will be unions of locally open hyperkähler manifolds.

It is proved in [KS96] (see also [KP81]) that when we have a full flag (that is, when $r = n$ and $n_j = j$ for each $j$, so that the centre of $\tilde{H}$ can be identified with the maximal torus $T$ of $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$) then the hyperkähler quotient $\tilde{\mu}^{-1}(0)/\tilde{H}$ of $M$ by $\tilde{H}$ can be identified with the nilpotent cone in $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Of course the nilpotent cone in $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the closure of a generic nilpotent coadjoint orbit. On the other hand it is proved in [Nak94] that cotangent bundles of generalised flag varieties (which are diffeomorphic to semisimple orbits of $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$) may be obtained as hyperkähler quotients $\tilde{\mu}^{-1}(c)/\tilde{H}$ of $M$ by $\tilde{H}$ for generic non-zero $c$.

Now we may instead reduce in stages by first reducing with respect to the group $H = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SU}(n_i)$ to obtain a hyperkähler space $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/H$, which has a residual action of the torus $T^{r-1}$ as well as an action of $\mathrm{SU}(n_r) = \mathrm{SU}(n)$, with the hyperkähler quotients of $Q$ by $T^{r-1}$ coinciding with the hyperkähler quotients of $M$ by $\tilde{H}$. This makes the following definition reasonable.

Definition 5.3. The *universal hyperkähler implosion for* $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ will be the hyperkähler quotient $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/H$, where $M$, $H$ are as above with $n_j = j$, for $j = 1, \ldots, n$ (i.e. the case of a full flag quiver).

Note that as $Q$ is a hyperkähler reduction by $H$ at level 0, it inherits an $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ action that rotates the two-sphere of complex structures: this action is induced from multiplication by unit quaternions on $M = \mathbb{H}^{\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} n_i n_{i+1}}$ on the other side from that on which $H$ acts and includes the transformation (5.2). We denote these group actions on $M$, $Q$, etc., by

$$\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}. \tag{5.4}$$

Let us take a more detailed look at the structure of $Q$, in the general case where the flag is not necessarily full.

The components of the complex moment map $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}$ for the $H$ action on $M$ are the trace-free parts of $\alpha_i\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}\alpha_{i+1}$ for $0 \leqslant i \leqslant r-2$, because we are performing a reduction by special unitary rather than unitary groups. Hence, the complex moment map equation $\mu_{\mathbb{C}} = 0$ can be expressed as the requirement that

$$\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i\alpha_i = \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I \quad (i = 1, \ldots, r-1), \tag{5.5}$$

for some complex scalars $\lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}}, \ldots, \lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Similarly the real moment map equation $\mu_{\mathbb{R}} = 0$ can be expressed as

$$\alpha_{i-1}\alpha_{i-1}^* - \beta_{i-1}^*\beta_{i-1} + \beta_i\beta_i^* - \alpha_i^*\alpha_i = \lambda_i^{\mathbb{R}} I \quad (i = 1, \ldots, r-1), \tag{5.6}$$

where $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{R}}$ are real scalars.

The hyperkähler quotient $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/H = (\mu_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0))/H$ is the symplectic quotient of the affine variety $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0) \subset M$ by the compact group $H$. The work of Kempf and Ness [KN79]



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(cf. [Kir85, Tho06]) shows that $Q$ can be canonically identified with the GIT quotient $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)/\!\!/H_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ by the complexification

$$H_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$$

of $H$. This identification proceeds via the $H$-invariant composition

$$\mu_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0) \to \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0) \to \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)/\!\!/H_{\mathbb{C}}$$

of the inclusion of $\mu_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ in $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ with the natural map $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0) \to \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)/\!\!/H_{\mathbb{C}}$. The action of $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ is given by

$$\alpha_i \mapsto g_{i+1}\alpha_i g_i^{-1}, \quad \beta_i \mapsto g_i\beta_i g_{i+1}^{-1} \quad (i = 1, \dots r-2),$$
$$\alpha_{r-1} \mapsto \alpha_{r-1}g_{r-1}^{-1}, \quad \beta_{r-1} \mapsto g_{r-1}\beta_{r-1},$$

where $g_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$. Alternatively, one may first perform the hyperkähler quotient by taking the Kähler or GIT quotient $\mu_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}(0)/H = M/\!\!/H_{\mathbb{C}}$, and considering the level set cut out by the image of $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$.

In this GIT picture, we have a residual action of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \mathrm{SL}(n_r, \mathbb{C})$ on the quotient $Q$ given by

$$\alpha_{r-1} \mapsto g_r\alpha_{r-1}, \quad \beta_{r-1} \mapsto \beta_{r-1}g_r^{-1}.$$

Explicitly, we see that the action of the $g_i$ (for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r-1$) just conjugates the left-hand side of (5.5), so preserves the equations. This action commutes with the residual action of $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}/H_{\mathbb{C}}$ which we can identify with $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{r-1}$ (and with the maximal torus $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ in the case of a full flag, via the basis of $\mathfrak{t}$ given by the simple roots). Again, we note that if all $\beta_i$ are zero then the complex moment map equations hold trivially and we recover the symplectic quiver situation of § 4.

For each quiver diagram $(\alpha, \beta) \in M(\mathbf{n})$, we define

$$X = \alpha_{r-1}\beta_{r-1} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

This element is invariant under the action of $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and transforms by conjugation under the residual $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \mathrm{GL}(n_r, \mathbb{C})$ action. In fact, it is the complex-symplectic moment map for the action of $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ on $M(\mathbf{n})$. We get an $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{r-1}$-invariant and $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$-equivariant map $Q \to \mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ induced by

$$(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto (X)_0 = X - \frac{1}{n}\,\mathrm{tr}(X)I_n \tag{5.7}$$

where $I_n$ is the $n \times n$-identity matrix, which is the complex-symplectic moment map for the action of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ on $M(\mathbf{n})$.

We start by obtaining information on the eigenvalues of $X$ and other endomorphisms derived from final segments of the quiver. Define

$$X_k = \alpha_{r-1}\alpha_{r-2} \dots \alpha_{r-k}\beta_{r-k} \dots \beta_{r-2}\beta_{r-1} \quad (1 \leqslant k \leqslant r-1) \tag{5.8}$$

so that $X = X_1$.

Lemma 5.9. *For $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$, satisfying (5.5), we have*

$$X_k X = X_{k+1} - (\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \dots + \lambda_{r-k}^{\mathbb{C}})X_k. \tag{5.10}$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Proof.* This is a straightforward consequence of (5.5). We have

$$\begin{aligned} X_k X &= \alpha_{r-1}\cdots\alpha_{r-k}\beta_{r-k}\ldots\beta_{r-2}\beta_{r-1}\alpha_{r-1}\beta_{r-1} \\ &= \alpha_{r-1}\ldots\alpha_{r-k}\beta_{r-k}\cdots\beta_{r-2}(\alpha_{r-2}\beta_{r-2}-\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}})\beta_{r-1} \\ &= \alpha_{r-1}\cdots\alpha_{r-k}\beta_{r-k}\cdots\beta_{r-2}\alpha_{r-2}\beta_{r-2}\beta_{r-1}-\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}}X_k. \end{aligned}$$

We repeat this process, using the equations successively to shuffle the $\alpha$ term from $X$ forward until it meets the other $\alpha$ terms. Each such shuffle means we pick up a $-\lambda_j^{\mathbb{C}}X_k$ term. After $k$ such operations, we have the desired result. □

Putting $\nu_i=\sum_{j=i}^{r-1}\lambda_j^{\mathbb{C}}$, so that $X_k(X+\nu_{r-k})=X_{k+1}$, we find inductively

$$X(X+\nu_{r-1})\cdots(X+\nu_1)=0. \tag{5.11}$$

We thus have an annihilating polynomial for $X$ in terms of the $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$; in particular, if all $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ are zero, then $X$ is nilpotent (cf. [KS96]).

To gain more information, we decompose $\mathbb{C}^n$ as the direct sum $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell}\ker(X-\tau_j I)^{m_j}$, where

$$(x-\tau_1)^{m_1}\ldots(x-\tau_\ell)^{m_\ell},$$

is the characteristic polynomial of $X$ and the $\tau_j$ are distinct. More generally, for each $i$, we decompose

$$\mathbb{C}^{n_i}=\bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_i}\ker(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}-\tau_{i,j}I)^{m_{ij}} \tag{5.12}$$

where the $\tau_{i,j}$ for $1\leqslant j\leqslant\ell_i$ are the eigenvalues of $\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}$, with associated generalised eigenspaces given by the summands on the right-hand side of (5.12).

Since $(\alpha,\beta)\in\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$, equation (5.5) shows that $\beta_i(\alpha_i\beta_i-\tau I)=(\beta_i\alpha_i-\tau I)\beta_i=(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}-(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}+\tau)I)\beta_i$, for any scalar $\tau$. Thus

$$\beta_i(\alpha_i\beta_i-\tau I)^m=(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}-(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}+\tau)I)^m\beta_i,$$

for each $m$, and $\beta_i$ restricts to a map

$$\beta_i\colon\ \ker(\alpha_i\beta_i-\tau I)^m\to\ker(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}-(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}+\tau)I)^m. \tag{5.13}$$

A similar calculation shows that $\alpha_i$ restricts to a map

$$\alpha_i\colon\ \ker(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}-(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}+\tau)I)^m\to\ker(\alpha_i\beta_i-\tau I)^m. \tag{5.14}$$

We obtain an endomorphism $\alpha_i\beta_i$ of $\ker(\alpha_i\beta_i-\tau I)^m$, which is an isomorphism unless $\tau=0$. Similarly the composition $\beta_i\alpha_i$ is an isomorphism of $\ker(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}-(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}+\tau)I)^m=\ker(\beta_i\alpha_i-\tau I)^m$ onto itself unless $\tau=0$. Therefore the maps (5.13) and (5.14) are bijective unless $\tau=0$.

We deduce that $\tau\neq0$ is an eigenvalue of $\alpha_i\beta_i$ if and only if $\tau+\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}\neq\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an eigenvalue of $\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}$. Moreover $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_i$ define isomorphisms between the associated generalised eigenspaces. In addition, if the dimension vector $(n_1,\ldots,n_r)$ is strictly ordered, $0<n_1<n_2<\cdots<n_r=n$, then $\alpha_i\beta_i\in\mathrm{End}(V_{i+1})$ has zero as an eigenvalue, and $\alpha_i$, $\beta_i$ restrict to maps between the associated generalised 0-eigenspace and the generalised eigenspace for $\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}$ associated to $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ (this latter space may, of course, be zero).

This gives us the following lemma.

LEMMA 5.15. *Suppose the dimension vector* $\mathbf{n}$ *is strictly ordered. Then for* $(\alpha,\beta)\subset M(\mathbf{n})$ *satisfying (5.5), the trace-free endomorphism* $(X)_0=(\alpha_{r-1}\beta_{r-1})_0$, *defined at (5.7), has*



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*eigenvalues* $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_r$, *where*

$$\kappa_j = \frac{1}{n}\big(n_1\lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}} + n_2\lambda_2^{\mathbb{C}} + \cdots + n_{j-1}\lambda_{j-1}^{\mathbb{C}} \\ - (n-n_j)\lambda_j^{\mathbb{C}} - (n-n_{j+1})\lambda_{j+1}^{\mathbb{C}} - \cdots - (n-n_{r-1})\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}}\big).$$

*The eigenvalue* $\kappa_j$ *occurs with algebraic multiplicity at least* $n_j - n_{j-1}$. *If* $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_r$ *are all distinct, the multiplicity of* $\kappa_j$ *is exactly* $n_j - n_{j-1}$.

*Moreover, if* $i \leqslant j$ *then*

$$\kappa_{j+1} - \kappa_i = \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \cdots + \lambda_j^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

It follows from the argument above that we can use generalised eigenspaces to decompose our quiver as a direct sum of quivers with maps $\alpha_{i,j}, \beta_{i,j}$,

$$V_i^j \underset{\beta_{i,j}}{\overset{\alpha_{i,j}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_{i+1}^j,$$

satisfying $\alpha_{i,j}\beta_{i,j} - \beta_{i+1,j}\alpha_{i+1,j} = \lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and such that $\alpha_{i,j}\beta_{i,j}$ has only one eigenvalue $\tau_{i+1,j}$.

Suppose for some $j$ we have that $\alpha_{k,j}$ and $\beta_{k,j}$ are isomorphisms for $i < k < s$ but not for $k = i$ or $k = s$. Then $\tau_{i+1,j} = 0$, $\tau_{s+1,j} = 0$ and Lemma 5.15 implies that $\sum_{k=i+1}^{s} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}} = 0$.

On the other hand, if $\tau_{i+1,j}$ is non-zero, then $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\beta_{i,j}$ are isomorphisms.

*Remark* 5.16. Whenever $\alpha_{i,j}$ is an isomorphism and $i < r-1$, then (5.5) implies that $\beta_{i,j} = (\alpha_{i,j})^{-1}(\lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \beta_{i+1,j}\alpha_{i+1,j})$. We may now perform a contraction of the subquiver analogous to that in the symplectic case, by replacing

$$V_{i-1}^j \underset{\beta_{i-1,j}}{\overset{\alpha_{i-1,j}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_i^j \underset{\beta_{i,j}}{\overset{\alpha_{i,j}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_{i+1}^j \underset{\beta_{i+1,j}}{\overset{\alpha_{i+1,j}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_{i+2}^j$$

with

$$V_{i-1}^j \underset{\beta_{i-1,j}}{\overset{\alpha_{i-1,j}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_i^j \underset{(\alpha_{i,j})^{-1}\beta_{i+1,j}}{\overset{\alpha_{i+1,j}\alpha_{i,j}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_{i+2}^j.$$

The complex moment map equations for the contracted quiver are now satisfied with

$$\alpha_{i-1,j}\beta_{i-1,j} - (\alpha_{i,j})^{-1}\beta_{i+1,j}\alpha_{i+1,j}\alpha_{i,j} = \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Conversely, given $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}}$ we may recover $\beta_{i,j}$ from the contracted quiver and reverse the process.

Observe that in the situation described above where $\alpha_{k,j}$ and $\beta_{k,j}$ are isomorphisms for $i < k < s$ but not for $k = i$ or $k = s$, then iterating the above procedure and using the relation $\sum_{k=i+1}^{s} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}} = 0$ implies (suppressing the $j$ index) that $\alpha_i\beta_i\beta_{i+1}\dots\beta_{s-1} = \beta_{i+1}\dots\beta_s\alpha_s$.

Note that given an identification of $V_{i+1}^j$ with $V_i^j$, we may apply the action of $\mathrm{SL}(V_{i,j})$ to set $\alpha_{i,j}$ to be a non-zero scalar multiple $aI$ of the identity. If we have a $\mathrm{GL}(V_{i,j})$ action available we may set $a = 1$.

*Example* 5.17. Suppose a quiver

$$0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^m \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^m \rightleftarrows \cdots \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^m \rightleftarrows 0,$$

where there are $p$ copies of $\mathbb{C}^m$, satisfies the complex moment map equations for $\prod_{k=1}^{p} \mathrm{SL}(m, \mathbb{C})$, with $\sum_{k=1}^{p} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}} = 0$ but $\sum_{k=i}^{p} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}} \neq 0$ for $i > 1$, and contracts to the zero quiver

$$0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^m \rightleftarrows 0.$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Then it lies in the $\prod_{k=1}^{p} \mathrm{SL}(m,\mathbb{C})$-orbit of a quiver of the form

$$0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^m \underset{b_1}{\overset{a_1}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^m \rightleftarrows \cdots \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^m \underset{b_{p-1}}{\overset{a_{p-1}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^m \rightleftarrows 0$$

where the maps $\mathbb{C}^m \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^m$ are multiplication by scalars $a_j$ and $b_j$ satisfying $a_j b_j = \sum_{k=j+1}^{p} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}}$.

*Remark* 5.18. Suppose $\alpha_{r-1,j}$ is an isomorphism. Then we may use the complex moment map equation to write $\beta_{r-1,j} = (\alpha_{r-2,j}\beta_{r-2,j} - \lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}})\alpha_{r-1,j}^{-1}$. We may contract the right-hand end of the subquiver to get

$$\cdots \rightleftarrows V_{r-3,j} \underset{\beta_{r-3,j}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-3,j}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_{r-2,j} \underset{\beta_{r-2,j}(\alpha_{r-1,j})^{-1}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-1,j}\alpha_{r-2,j}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_{r,j}$$

satisfying the complex moment map equations at $(\lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}}, \ldots, \lambda_{r-2}^{\mathbb{C}})$.

If we are primarily interested in quivers with strictly ordered dimension vector so that Lemma 5.15 applies, then Remarks 5.16 and 5.18 imply that for many purposes it is enough to consider the case when $\tau_{i+1,j} = 0$ for all $i$; that is, when $X = \alpha_{r-1}\beta_{r-1}$ is nilpotent and all $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ are zero, so that the quiver satisfies the complex moment map equations $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathbb{C}} = 0$, then

$$\alpha_i\beta_i = \beta_{i+1}\alpha_{i+1}, \tag{5.19}$$

for $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{GL}(n_i,\mathbb{C})$. In this situation we have the following result from [KS96].

PROPOSITION 5.20. *For any dimension vector* $\mathbf{n}$, *the orbit under the action of* $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{GL}(n_i,\mathbb{C})$ *of a quiver*

$$0 = V_0 \underset{\beta_0}{\overset{\alpha_0}{\rightleftarrows}} V_1 \underset{\beta_1}{\overset{\alpha_1}{\rightleftarrows}} V_2 \underset{\beta_2}{\overset{\alpha_2}{\rightleftarrows}} \cdots \underset{\beta_{r-2}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-2}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_{r-1} \underset{\beta_{r-1}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-1}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_r = \mathbb{C}^n,$$

*with* $\dim V_j = n_j$, *which satisfies the complex moment map equations (5.19) for* $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$, *is closed if and only if it is the direct sum of a quiver*

$$0 = V_0^{(*)} \underset{\beta_0^{(*)}}{\overset{\alpha_0^{(*)}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_1^{(*)} \underset{\beta_1^{(*)}}{\overset{\alpha_1^{(*)}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_2^{(*)} \underset{\beta_2^{(*)}}{\overset{\alpha_2^{(*)}}{\rightleftarrows}} \cdots \underset{\beta_{r-2}^{(*)}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-2}^{(*)}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_{r-1}^{(*)} \underset{\beta_{r-1}^{(*)}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-1}^{(*)}}{\rightleftarrows}} V_r^{(*)} = \mathbb{C}^n,$$

*where* $\alpha_j^{(*)}$ *is injective and* $\beta_j^{(*)}$ *is surjective for* $1 \leqslant j < r$ *(so for some* $k$, $V_j^{(*)} = 0$ *for* $0 \leqslant j \leqslant k$*) and a quiver*

$$0 = V_0^{(0)} \rightleftarrows V_1^{(0)} \rightleftarrows V_2^{(0)} \rightleftarrows \cdots \rightleftarrows V_{r-1}^{(0)} \rightleftarrows V_r^{(0)} = 0$$

*in which all maps are* 0.

*Proof.* The arguments of [KS96, Theorem 2.1] show that for $(\alpha,\beta) \in \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ the closed $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit condition corresponds to having direct sums $V_i = \ker \alpha_i \oplus \operatorname{im} \beta_i$. The complex moment map equations (5.19) imply that this is a direct sum decomposition into subquivers, so the maps are zero on the subquiver with $V_i^{(0)} = \ker \alpha_i$, and have the desired injectivity/surjectivity on the subquiver with $V_i^{(*)} = \operatorname{im} \beta_i$. □

*Remark* 5.21. Let us now decompose a strictly ordered quiver representation into a sum of subquivers determined by the generalised eigenspaces of the compositions $\alpha_i\beta_i$. These subquivers may be contracted as in Remarks 5.16 and 5.18 to shorter quivers with each $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} = 0$. The contracted subquivers thus satisfy the complex moment map equations (5.19) for the groups $\prod_i \mathrm{GL}(V_{i,j})$ which correspond in their situations to $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$. They lie in closed orbits for these groups which play the role of $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$ *provided that* each subquiver lies in a closed orbit for the



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

action of $\prod_i \mathrm{GL}(V_{i,j})$. If this is the case, we may now apply Proposition 5.20 to the contracted subquivers and deduce, with the help of Example 5.17, that the original quiver is the direct sum of a quiver in which every $\alpha_i$ is injective and every $\beta_i$ is surjective and quivers of the form

$$0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^m \underset{b_1}{\overset{a_1}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^m \underset{b_2}{\overset{a_1}{\rightleftarrows}} \cdots \underset{b_{p-2}}{\overset{a_{p-2}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^m \underset{b_{p-1}}{\overset{a_{p-1}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^m \rightleftarrows 0, \tag{5.22}$$

where the maps are multiplication by non-zero scalars $a_j$ and $b_j$ satisfying

$$a_j b_j = \sum_{k=j+1}^{p} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}}. \tag{5.23}$$

Unfortunately, if the original quiver lies in a closed $H_{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit but not a closed $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit, we cannot deduce directly that the subquivers lie in closed orbits for the action of $\prod_i \mathrm{GL}(V_{i,j})$. However, we will see that we can get around this difficulty by making suitable choices of complex structures.

*Remark* 5.24. Note that for a quiver of the form (5.22) we may use the $\mathrm{GL}(m,\mathbb{C})^p$ action to set the $a_i = 1$, so the $b_i$ are now determined by the equations. Such a quiver will be left invariant by any $g \in \mathrm{GL}(m,\mathbb{C})^p$ with $g_1 = \cdots = g_p \in \mathrm{GL}(m,\mathbb{C})$, and hence for each such summand we will pick up a residual circle action on the injective/surjective quiver.

We introduce some notation that will also be useful later for describing an augmentation process for quivers.

Definition 5.25. Let $S$ be a relation on $\{1,\dots,r-1\}$. This is the same as a subset of $\{1,\dots,r-1\}\times\{1,\dots,r-1\}$.

Such an $S$ is a *subrelation* of another relation $S'$ if $(i,j)\in S$ implies $(i,j)\in S'$ for all $i,j\in\{1,\dots,r-1\}$.

Note that any $S$ defines a subrelation $\leqslant_S$ of $\leqslant$ by

$$\leqslant_S = \{(i,j)\in S : i\leqslant j\}.$$

This is the maximal subrelation of $\leqslant$ contained in $S$.

Definition 5.26. To any relation $S$ on $\{1,\dots,r-1\}$ we associate the subtorus $T_S$ of $\tilde{T} = T^{r-1} = \mathbb{R}^{r-1}/\mathbb{Z}^{r-1}$ whose Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{t}_S = \mathrm{Span}\{e_{ij} = \sum_{k=i}^{j} e_k : i \leqslant_S j\}$. We have an exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow H \longrightarrow \tilde{H} \xrightarrow{\varphi} \tilde{T} \longrightarrow 1,$$

where the $i$th component of $\varphi$ is the determinant map $\mathrm{U}(n_i)\to S^1$. We define $H_S$ to be the pre-image

$$H_S = H_S(\mathbf{n}) = \varphi^{-1}(T_S).$$

In particular, $H_\varnothing = H$ and $H_\leqslant = \tilde{H}$.

Given any $\lambda = (\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_{r-1}) \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^{r-1}$, we define a relation $\leqslant_\lambda$ on $\{1,\dots,r-1\}$ by

$$i \leqslant_\lambda j \iff \left( i\leqslant j \text{ and } \sum_{k=i}^{j} \lambda_k = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3 \right).$$

Proposition 5.27. *Suppose $(\alpha,\beta)\in M(\mathbf{n})$ satisfies the hyperkähler moment map equations (5.5)–(5.6) for $H$. Assume that $\mathbf{n}$ is strictly ordered. Then the group $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$ of (5.4) contains an element that moves $(\alpha,\beta)$ to a quiver that is a direct sum of subquivers: one, $(\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta})$, with*



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*all the $\tilde{\alpha}$ injective and all the $\tilde{\beta}$ surjective; and the others of the scalar form (5.22), with $a_i$, $b_i$ non-zero satisfying (5.23).*

*Proof.* Let $\lambda_j = (\lambda_j^{\mathbb{R}}, \lambda_j^{\mathbb{C}}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R}^3$ be the values from the hyperkähler moment map equations. Then

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{r-1}) \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^{r-1} \cong \mathfrak{t}^{r-1} \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$$

can be identified with the value of the hyperkähler moment map for the action of the centre $T^{r-1} = Z(\tilde{H})$ of $\tilde{H}$.

The group $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$ acts on $\lambda_k$ as an $\mathrm{SO}(3)$-rotation. Applying a generic element we may therefore ensure that

$$i \leqslant_\lambda j \iff \left( i \leqslant j \text{ and } \sum_{k=i}^{j} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}} = 0 \right). \tag{5.28}$$

This implies that the rotated quiver $(\alpha, \beta)$ satisfies the full hyperkähler moment map equations (at level 0) for the subgroup $H_{\leqslant_\lambda}$ of $\tilde{H}$. Its orbit under the action of the complexification $(H_{\leqslant_\lambda})_{\mathbb{C}}$ is thus closed. Decomposing with respect to generalised eigenspaces and arguing as in Remark 5.21, we see that each contracted subquiver is closed under the action of $\prod_i \mathrm{GL}(V_{i,j})$. By Remark 5.21, these subquivers have the claimed form. □

Now we have seen that injective/surjective quivers are relevant, we make the following observation about stabilisers.

LEMMA 5.29. *If a quiver $(\alpha, \beta) \in M(\mathbf{n})$ has the property that for all $i$, either $\alpha_i$ is injective or $\beta_i$ is surjective, then the stabiliser for the $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$ action is trivial.*

*Proof.* If $g \in \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{GL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$ stabilises the quiver, then we have

$$g_{i+1}\alpha_i = \alpha_i g_i, \quad g_i\beta_i = \beta_i g_{i+1},$$

for $i = 1, \dots, r-2$, with $\alpha_{r-1} = \alpha_{r-1}g_{r-1}$ and $g_{r-1}\beta_{r-1} = \beta_{r-1}$. Our injectivity/surjectivity assumption now means we can work inductively down from the top of the quiver to deduce each $g_i$ is the identity element. □

LEMMA 5.30. *Let $S$ be any relation on $\{1, \dots, r-1\}$. Suppose that a quiver $(\alpha, \beta) \in M(\mathbf{n})$ has each $\alpha_i$ injective and each $\beta_i$ surjective. Then it is stable in the sense of GIT for the action of the complexification $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $H_S$.*

*In the case $H_S = H$, this is true under the weaker assumption that all $\alpha_i$ are injective or all $\beta_i$ surjective.*

*Proof.* Note that, by the argument of Lemma 5.29, the stabiliser in $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{GL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$ is trivial. Moreover for $1 \leqslant k < r$ the maps

$$\wedge^{n_k}(\alpha_{r-1}\alpha_{r-2} \dots \alpha_k) \colon \wedge^{n_k} \mathbb{C}^{n_k} \to \wedge^{n_k} \mathbb{C}^n$$

and

$$\wedge^{n_k}(\beta_k \dots \beta_{r-2}\beta_{r-1}) \colon \wedge^{n_k} \mathbb{C}^n \to \wedge^{n_k} \mathbb{C}^{n_k}$$

are both non-zero, and under the action of $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$ one of them is multiplied by a character, while the other is multiplied by its inverse. This means that these maps are non-zero for every quiver in the closure of the $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit, and hence that every quiver in the closure of the $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit also has each $\alpha_i$ injective and each $\beta_i$ surjective, and hence has trivial stabiliser. So the orbit is closed of maximal dimension, as required.



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If $H_S = H$, this argument works under the weaker assumption as the exterior power maps are all invariant under the $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ action. □

Returning to the endomorphism $X = \alpha_{r-1}\beta_{r-1}$ associated to a quiver $(\alpha, \beta)$, we now note that (5.11) is actually the minimum polynomial of $X$ if we impose appropriate non-degeneracy conditions on the quiver diagram.

Proposition 5.31. *Suppose $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^r_{>0}$ is strictly ordered and $(\alpha, \beta) \in M(\mathbf{n})$ satisfies the complex moment map equations (5.5) for $H_{\mathbb{C}}$. If each $\alpha_i$ is injective and each $\beta_i$ surjective, then no polynomial of degree less than $r$ annihilates $X$, and hence*

$$x(x + \nu_{r-1}) \dots (x + \nu_1)$$

*is the minimum polynomial of $X$.*

*Proof.* It follows from (5.10) that if $p(x)$ is a degree $k$ monic polynomial, then $p(X)$ is a linear combination of $X_k$, $X_{k-1}, \dots, X_1 = X$ and $I$, with the coefficient of $X_k$ being 1. We write $p(X) = X_k + c_{k-1}X_{k-1} + \dots + c_1X + c_0I$.

We may choose vectors $w_i$ in $V_r$ for $i = 2, \dots, r$ such that, for each $i$, the vector $w_i$ is killed by $\beta_{i-1}\beta_i \dots \beta_{r-1}$ but not by $\beta_i \dots \beta_{r-1}$. To see this, let $x_i$ be a non-zero element of $\ker \beta_{i-1}$ and then, using surjectivity of the $\beta_j$, let $w_i$ satisfy $\beta_i \dots \beta_{r-1}w_i = x_i$.

If the $\alpha_i$ are injective, then, recalling the definition (5.8) of $X_k$, we see that $X_j$ kills $w_i$ if and only if $j \geqslant r - i + 1$.

Now if $k \leqslant r - 1$ and

$$p(X) = X_k + c_{k-1}X_{k-1} + \dots + c_1X + c_0 = 0,$$

then successively applying this equation to $w_r, w_{r-1}, \dots, w_2$ yields that each of $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}$ is zero. Hence $X_k$ is zero, which is impossible since (using injectivity of $\alpha_i$ and surjectivity of $\beta_i$) we have that the rank of $X_k$ equals $n_{r-k} = \dim V_{r-k}$. □

Actually we can get all the coadjoint orbits by considering quivers of this type.

Proposition 5.32. *Every element of $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ may be obtained from a quiver*

$$0 \underset{\beta_0}{\overset{\alpha_0}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_1} \underset{\beta_1}{\overset{\alpha_1}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_2} \underset{\beta_2}{\overset{\alpha_2}{\rightleftarrows}} \dots \underset{\beta_{r-2}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-2}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_{r-1}} \underset{\beta_{r-1}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-1}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_r} = \mathbb{C}^n$$

*with $0 < n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_r = n$, all $\alpha_i$ injective, all $\beta_i$ surjective and satisfying the complex moment map equations (5.5) for $H_{\mathbb{C}}$.*

*Proof.* Observe first of all that every element in $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ may be realised as the trace-free part $(X)_0$ of some $X$ in $\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ with a zero eigenvalue: if $\lambda$ is an eigenvalue of $Y \in \mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ then we can take $X = Y - \lambda I$. It is enough therefore to show that each $X \in \mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ with a zero eigenvalue may be obtained from a quiver of the desired form. We prove this by induction on $n$.

Let $X$ be such an element of $\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})$; then put $m = \operatorname{rank} X$ and choose an isomorphism $\phi\colon \operatorname{im} X \to \mathbb{C}^m$. Then, taking $\beta = \phi \circ X\colon \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^m$ and $\alpha = \phi^{-1}\colon \mathbb{C}^m \to \operatorname{im} X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, we obtain $X = \alpha\beta$ with $\alpha$ injective and $\beta$ surjective.

Let $Y = \beta\alpha \in \mathfrak{gl}(m, \mathbb{C})$ and pick an eigenvalue $\mu$ of $Y$. By the inductive hypothesis there is a quiver diagram in some $M(0 < n_1 < \dots < n_{r-1} = m)$ with all $\alpha_i$ injective, all $\beta_i$ surjective, satisfying the complex moment map equations for $\prod_{i=1}^{r-2} \mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$ and such that $\alpha_{r-2}\beta_{r-2} = Y - \mu I$. This equation gives $\alpha_{r-2}\beta_{r-2} - \beta\alpha = -\mu I$, and so, putting $\alpha_{r-1} = \alpha$, $\beta_{r-1} = \beta$, we obtain a quiver of the required form. □



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

## 6. Stratification for quiver diagrams

Let $\mathbf{n} = (0 = n_0 \leqslant n_1 \leqslant n_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_r = n)$ and consider the space $M = M(\mathbf{n})$, defined at (5.1), of hyperkähler quiver diagrams

$$0 \underset{\beta_0}{\overset{\alpha_0}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_1} \underset{\beta_1}{\overset{\alpha_1}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_2} \underset{\beta_2}{\overset{\alpha_2}{\rightleftarrows}} \cdots \underset{\beta_{r-2}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-2}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_{r-1}} \underset{\beta_{r-1}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-1}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_r} = \mathbb{C}^n. \tag{6.1}$$

Given a relation $S$ on $\{1, \ldots, r-1\}$, we wish to describe the structure of $Q_S = M/\!\!/\!\!/H_S$, where $H_S = \varphi^{-1}(T_S)$ is the subgroup of $\tilde{H} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{U}(n_i)$ specified in Definition 5.26.

DEFINITION 6.2. A quiver diagram $(\alpha, \beta) \in M$ will be called *hyperkähler stable* if, after applying some element of the group $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$ defined in (5.4), each $\alpha_i$ is injective and each $\beta_i$ is surjective.

The hyperkähler stable quivers form an open subset $M^{\mathrm{hks}}$ of $M$, and, by Lemma 5.29, $H_S$ acts freely on the intersection of $M^{\mathrm{hks}}$ with the solution space of the hyperkähler moment map equations (since $H_S$ is contained in its complexification with respect to any complex structure, and the definition of hyperkähler stable means that for each quiver in $M^{\mathrm{hks}}$ we may choose a complex structure to which Lemma 5.29 applies). It follows that the hyperkähler quotient $M^{\mathrm{hks}}/\!\!/\!\!/H_S$ is an open subset $Q_S^{\mathrm{hks}}$ of $Q_S = M/\!\!/\!\!/H_S$.

LEMMA 6.3. *The space $Q_S^{\mathrm{hks}}$ is a hyperkähler manifold.*

*Proof.* Since $Q_S^{\mathrm{hks}}$ is an open subset of a hyperkähler quotient by $H_S$ it is enough to check that it is non-singular. This follows from the freeness of the $H_S$ action on $M^{\mathrm{hks}}$. □

*Remark* 6.4. The non-singularity result in Lemma 6.3 also follows from Lemmas 5.29 and 5.30 since (by the work of Kempf and Ness [KN79, Tho06]) for any choice of complex structures we can identify $Q_S^{\mathrm{hks}}$ locally with the GIT quotient by $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$ of the affine subvariety of the affine space $M$ defined by the complex moment map equations. Moreover the $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$ action is free on the neighbourhood where the identification takes place, and the subvariety is non-singular at any point whose stabiliser in $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$ is trivial (or even finite).

LEMMA 6.5. *Suppose that, after applying some element of the group $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$, a quiver has the form (6.1) with each $\alpha_i$ injective. Then it is hyperkähler stable.*

*Proof.* If a quiver $(\alpha, \beta)$ has all $\alpha_i$ injective, then the same is true for a real Zariski open set of such quivers in its orbit under the action of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$. Now, the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$-action includes the right-multiplication by $\mathbf{j}$ given in (5.2). We conclude that there is an open dense subset of the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$-orbit where $\beta^*$ is injective, which is the same as saying that $\beta$ is surjective. Thus the quiver is hyperkähler stable. □

For the stratification results, we will describe an augmentation process for quiver diagrams. Note that $M(1,1) = \mathbb{H}$ with $a + \mathbf{j}b$ corresponding to the quiver $\mathbb{C} \underset{b}{\overset{a}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}$, whose maps are multiplication by $a$ and $b$, respectively. Given any integer $d > 0$ and indices $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j < r$, we have the element $e_{ij} = \sum_{k=i}^{j} e_k \in \mathbb{Z}^r \subset \mathbb{R}^r$, as in Definition 5.26, and may use the multiple $d\,e_{ij}$ as a dimension vector. For $p = j - i - 1$, we define a hyperkähler embedding

$$\phi_{i,j;d} \colon \mathbb{H}^p \longrightarrow M(d\,e_{ij})$$

$$\phi_{i,j;d}(a + \mathbf{j}b) = \left(0 \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\rightleftarrows}} \cdots \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\rightleftarrows}} 0 \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^d \underset{b_1}{\overset{a_1}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^d \underset{b_2}{\overset{a_2}{\rightleftarrows}} \cdots \underset{b_p}{\overset{a_p}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^d \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\rightleftarrows}} 0 \cdots \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\rightleftarrows}} 0\right)$$

with each map in the quiver being multiplication by the indicated scalar (the sets on both sides are empty if $p = -1$). This map is an isomorphism for $d = 1$, and in all cases is equivariant with



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

respect to the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$-action. Our construction will involve stacking the above embeddings on top of a quiver in $M(\mathbf{n})$.

Definition 6.6. A relation $S$ on $\{1,\dots,r-1\}$ is said to be *injective* if $S$ is the graph of an injective function, also denoted by $S$, from $\operatorname{dom} S = \{i \mid \exists j : (i,j) \in S\}$ to $\{1,\dots,r-1\}$.

We note that any subrelation of an injective relation is again injective.

Definition 6.7. Let $S$ be an injective subrelation of $\leqslant$ on $\{1,\dots,r-1\}$. Suppose $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^r_{\geqslant 0}$ are two ordered dimension vectors and there is a function $\delta\colon \operatorname{dom} S \to \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{d},$$

for $\mathbf{d} = \sum_{(i,j)\in S} \delta(i) e_{ij}$. Put $R = <_S = \{(i,j) \in S : i < j\}$ and $\ell = \sum_{(i,j)\in R} j - i - 1$.

The *augmentation map* is the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$-equivariant hyperkähler embedding

$$\phi_{S,\delta}\colon M(\mathbf{m}) \oplus \mathbb{H}^\ell \to M(\mathbf{n})$$

obtained by writing $\mathbb{H}^\ell = \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in R} M(e_{ij})$ and mapping

$$((\alpha,\beta), (a^{(i)} + \mathbf{j}b^{(i)})_{i\in \operatorname{dom} R}) \text{ to } (\alpha,\beta) \oplus 0 \oplus \bigoplus \phi_{i,S(i);\delta(i)}(a^{(i)} + \mathbf{j}b^{(i)}),$$

where $0 \in M(\sum_{(i,i)\in S} d(i) e_i)$.

Recall now that the hyperkähler modification [DS06] of a hyperkähler manifold $Y$ with a tri-Hamiltonian circle action is $Y_{\mathrm{mod}} = (Y \times \mathbb{H}) /\!\!/\!\!/ S^1$, where $S^1$ acts diagonally on $Y \times \mathbb{H}$ with respect to the given action on $Y$ and the inverse of the standard action on $\mathbb{H}$. This construction adjusts to other choices of weight for the circle action on $\mathbb{H}$. More generally if a torus $T^\ell$ acts on $Y$ with a hyperkähler moment map then we have a hyperkähler modification

$$\hat{Y} = (Y \times \mathbb{H}^\ell) /\!\!/\!\!/ T^\ell.$$

This is a hyperkähler space of the same dimension as $Y$ that contains a copy of the hyperkähler quotient $Y /\!\!/\!\!/ T^\ell$.

In the situation of Definition 6.7 above, suppose $S \subset S_1$, where $S_1$ is also an injective subrelation of $\leqslant$. Associated to $S_1$ we have the subgroup $H_{S_1} = H_{S_1}(\mathbf{m})$ of $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{m}) = \prod_{j=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{U}(m_j)$ from Definition 5.26. Put $Q_1 = M(\mathbf{m}) /\!\!/\!\!/ H_{S_1}$. Then there is an action of $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{m})$ on $M(\mathbf{m})$ and an induced action of $\tilde{T} = \tilde{H}(\mathbf{m})/H(\mathbf{m})$ on $Q_1$ since $H_{S_1}$ contains $H(\mathbf{m})$ as a normal subgroup.

Embed $T^\ell = \mathbb{R}^\ell/\mathbb{Z}^\ell$ into $\tilde{T}$ via $e_{(i,j);k} \mapsto e_{i+k,j}$ for $(i,j) \in S$ with $j > i$ and $k = 1,\dots,j-i$. We may now use the induced action of $T^\ell$ on $Q_1$ to construct a hyperkähler modification

$$\hat{Q}_1 = (Q_1 \times \mathbb{H}^\ell) /\!\!/\!\!/ T^\ell$$

and consider the open subset

$$\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}} = (Q_1^{\mathrm{hks}} \times (\mathbb{H}\backslash\{0\})^\ell) /\!\!/\!\!/ T^\ell. \tag{6.8}$$

Proposition 6.9. *Suppose $S_1$ is an injective subrelation of $\leqslant$ on $\{1,\dots,r-1\}$ with $S_1 = S \coprod S_2$, a disjoint union. Let $\mathbf{m}$, $\mathbf{n}$, $\delta$, $R = <_S$ and $\ell$ be as in Definition 6.7, with the additional assumption that $m_r = n = n_r$, and write $\phi_{S,\delta}$ for the resulting augmentation map.*

*Put $Q_1 = M(\mathbf{m}) /\!\!/\!\!/ H_{S_1}$ and $Q_2 = M(\mathbf{n}) /\!\!/\!\!/ H_{S_2}$, and let $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ be the open subset of the hyperkähler modification $\hat{Q}_1$ as in (6.8). Then the augmentation map $\phi_{S,\delta}$ induces an augmentation map*

$$\Phi_{S,\delta}\colon \hat{Q}_1 \to Q_2$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*of hyperkähler quotients which is* $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$*-equivariant and an embedding of the smooth manifold* $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$.

*Proof.* A point of $\hat{Q}_1$ is represented by $\mathbf{q} = ((\alpha, \beta), (a^{(i)} + \mathbf{j}b^{(i)})_{i \in \mathrm{dom}\, R})$ satisfying:

(i) the $H_{S_1}$-hyperkähler moment map equations

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i\alpha_i &= \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I, \\ \alpha_{i-1}\alpha_{i-1}^* - \beta_{i-1}^*\beta_{i-1} + \beta_i\beta_i^* - \alpha_i^*\alpha_i &= \lambda_i^{\mathbb{R}} I, \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, r-1$, and for some $(\lambda^{\mathbb{R}}, \lambda^{\mathbb{C}})$ satisfying $\sum_{k=i}^{j} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}} = 0 = \sum_{k=i}^{j} \lambda_k^{\mathbb{R}}$, for all $(i, j) \in S_1$;

(ii) the $T^\ell$-hyperkähler moment map equations

$$\begin{aligned} a_{k-i}^{(i)} b_{k-i}^{(i)} &= \lambda_k^{\mathbb{C}} + \lambda_{k+1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \cdots + \lambda_j^{\mathbb{C}}, \\ |a_{k-i}^{(i)}|^2 - |b_{k-i}^{(i)}|^2 &= \lambda_k^{\mathbb{R}} + \lambda_{k+1}^{\mathbb{R}} + \cdots + \lambda_j^{\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

for $(i, j) \in R$ and $i < k \leqslant j$.

The quiver $(\alpha', \beta') = \phi_{S,\delta}(\mathbf{q})$ satisfies the analogue of (6.10) with the same $(\lambda^{\mathbb{R}}, \lambda^{C})$. In particular, since $S_2 \subset S_1$, $(\alpha', \beta')$ satisfies the $H_{S_2}$-hyperkähler moment map equations. Furthermore $H_{S_1} \times T^\ell$ acts on $(\alpha', \beta')$ as a subgroup of $H_{S_2}$. We thus have a well-defined, and $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$-equivariant, map $\Phi_{S,\delta}$, as claimed.

For $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$, we can move our quiver via the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$ action so each $\alpha_i$ is injective, each $\beta_i$ is surjective and all $a_{k-i}^{(i)}$ and $b_{k-i}^{(i)}$ are non-zero. In this case, we can recover a point in $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ from the $H_{S_2}$-orbit of the quiver $(\alpha', \beta') = \phi_{S,\delta}(\mathbf{q}) \in M(\mathbf{n})$ by restricting maps in $(\alpha', \beta')$ to the images of compositions of other maps in $(\alpha', \beta')$, since the ambiguity in this process is exactly the action of $H_{S_1} \times T^\ell$, cf. Remark 5.24. Thus $\Phi_{S,\delta}$ is injective on $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$. □

*Remark* 6.11. We note that $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ determines $Q_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ as a hyperkähler manifold. Both spaces are the base of torus fibrations from a common total space contained in $M(\mathbf{m}) \times \mathbb{H}^\ell$. The projection to $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ is a Riemannian submersion, whereas that to $Q_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ is just projection on to the $M(\mathbf{m})$ components. The pull-backs of the two metrics differ by scalings along the quaternionic directions of the torus actions. A description of this in terms of the twist construction will appear in future work by the third author.

*Remark* 6.12. The image $\Phi_{S,\delta}(\hat{Q}_1) \subset Q_2$ determines the original data $\mathbf{m}$, $S$ and $d$ as follows.

Choose a point in the image represented by a quiver $(\alpha', \beta')$ of largest possible rank. Then $m_i = \mathrm{rank}\, \beta_i'\beta_{i+1}' \ldots \beta_{r-1}'$ and the corresponding quiver $(\alpha, \beta)$ obtained by restriction has $\alpha_i$ injective and $\beta_i$ surjective.

As $S$ is injective, the function $\delta$ is determined by its values on the range of $S$. We determine $S$ and $\delta$ recursively. Suppose we have found $S' \subset S$ and the corresponding values of $\delta$. Put $\mathbf{m}' = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{(i,j) \in S'} \delta(i) e_{ij}$. The largest element of the range of $S \backslash S'$ is the largest $j$ for which $m_j' < n_j$, and the corresponding value of $\delta$ is $n_j - m_j'$. Now $j = S(i)$, where $i - 1 < j$ is the largest index such that $\mathrm{rank}\, \beta_{i-1}'\beta_i' \ldots \beta_{j-1}'$ is strictly less than $(n_j - m_j') + \mathrm{rank}\, \beta_{i-1}\beta_i \ldots \beta_{j-1}$.

THEOREM 6.13. *Let* $\mathbf{n} = (n_1 < \cdots < n_r = n)$ *be strictly ordered and let* $M(\mathbf{n})$ *be the space of hyperkähler quiver diagrams (5.1).*

*Suppose* $S$ *is an injective subrelation of* $\leqslant$ *on* $\{1, \ldots, r-1\}$. *Let* $\delta \colon \mathrm{dom}\, S \to \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ *be a function such that* $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{d}$, $\mathbf{d} = \sum_{(i,j) \in S} \delta(i) e_{ij}$, *is an ordered dimension vector.*



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Put* $Q_S = M(\mathbf{m})/\!\!/\!\!/ H_S$. *Then*

$$Q_{(S,\delta)} = \Phi_{S,\delta}(\hat{Q}_S^{\mathrm{hks}})$$

*is a smooth hyperkähler manifold that is a locally closed subset of* $Q = M(\mathbf{n})/\!\!/\!\!/ H$.

*Furthermore,*

$$Q = \coprod_{S,\delta} Q_{(S,\delta)}$$

*is the disjoint union over all such choices of* $S$ *and* $\delta$.

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.9, $Q_{(S,\delta)}$ is a smooth hyperkähler manifold. It is open in its closure, which is just $\Phi_{S,\delta}(\hat{Q}_S)$. Remark 6.12 implies that $Q_{(S,\delta)} \cap Q_{(S',\delta')} = \varnothing$ if $(S,\delta) \neq (S',\delta')$. Finally it follows, from Proposition 5.27, that every quiver satisfying the hyperkähler moment map equations for $H$ lies in some $Q_{(S,\delta)}$. □

*Remark* 6.14. When $S$ is empty, so that $\delta$ is empty, we have $Q_{(S,\delta)} = Q^{\mathrm{hks}}$.

Let us now consider the full flag case when $r = n$ and $n_i = i$ for $i \leqslant n$, so that $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/ H$ is the universal hyperkähler implosion for $\mathrm{SU}(n)$. We specify $(S,\delta)$, by listing the elements of $S$, ordered by the first component, followed by the corresponding values of $\delta$.

When $n = 2$ there are two strata, $Q_{(\varnothing,\varnothing)} = Q^{\mathrm{hks}}$ and $Q_{(\{(1,1)\},1)}$ which consists of the zero quiver constructed as the direct sum of $0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^2$ and $0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows 0$.

When $n = 3$ the possible injective subrelations $S$ of $\leqslant$ on $\{1,2\}$ are $\varnothing$, the singletons $\{(1,1)\}$, $\{(2,2)\}$, $\{(1,2)\}$, and the subset $\{(1,1),(2,2)\}$. The strata are as follows:

(i) $Q_{(\varnothing,\varnothing)} = Q^{\mathrm{hks}}$;

(ii) $Q_{(\{(1,1)\},1)}$ with elements given by the direct sum of a hyperkähler stable quiver $0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^2 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^3$ and the zero quiver $0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows 0$;

(iii) $Q_{(\{(2,2)\},1)}$ with elements given by the direct sum of a hyperkähler stable quiver $0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^3$ and the zero quiver $0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows 0$;

(iv) $Q_{(\{(1,2)\},1)}$ with elements given by the direct sum of a hyperkähler stable quiver $0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^3$ and a quiver of the form $0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows 0$ where the maps $\mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}$ are isomorphisms;

(v) $Q_{(\{(1,1),(2,2)\},(1,1))}$ with elements given by the direct sum of a hyperkähler stable quiver $0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^3$ and the zero quivers $0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows 0$ and $0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows 0$;

(vi) $Q_{(\{(1,1),(2,2)\},(1,2))}$ which consists of the zero quiver constructed as the direct sum of $0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^3$ and the zero quivers $0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C} \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows 0$ and $0 \rightleftarrows 0 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{C}^2 \rightleftarrows 0$.

Corollary 6.15. $Q^{\mathrm{hks}}$ *is a dense open subset of* $Q$ *with complement of complex codimension at least* 2.

*Proof.* We observe using the complex equations that $\mathrm{rank}(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} - \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I) = \mathrm{rank}(\beta_i\alpha_i) < \min(\mathrm{rank}\,\alpha_i, \mathrm{rank}\,\beta_i)$, so if $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_i$ has rank less than $i$ then $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an eigenvalue of $\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}$.

Now, as the map $(\alpha,\beta) \mapsto \beta\alpha$ is a surjection from $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^j,\mathbb{C}^{j+1}) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{j+1},\mathbb{C}^j)$ onto $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^j,\mathbb{C}^j)$ for all $j$ we may vary the $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ arbitrarily at each stage (without changing $\alpha_j$, $\beta_j$ for $j < i$), and still stay within $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$. In particular, the $H_{\mathbb{C}}$-invariant function $\Phi_i := \det(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} - \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I)$ cannot vanish identically on a non-empty open set in $\mu_{\mathbb{C}} = 0$. The complement of $\Phi_i^{-1}(0)$ is now open and dense in the locus where $\mu_{\mathbb{C}} = 0$ for each $i$.

This implies that $Q^{\mathrm{hks}}$ is dense in $Q$; the complement is a union of strata of even complex dimension, and hence the codimension statement follows. □



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

## 7. The structure of the strata

We shall now take a closer look at the structure of the strata $Q_{(S,\delta)}$ appearing in the stratification of the quiver space $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/H$ with dimension vector $(n_1, \dots, n_r = n)$ given by Theorem 6.13. Recall that $Q_{(S,\delta)}$ is an open subset of a hyperkähler modification of a quotient of the form

$$M^{\mathrm{hks}}/\!\!/\!\!/H_S = (M^{\mathrm{hks}}/\!\!/\!\!/H)/\!\!/\!\!/T_S = Q^{\mathrm{hks}}/\!\!/\!\!/T_S$$

for a different dimension vector $(m_1, \dots, m_r)$ and a subtorus $T_S$ of $\tilde{T} = T^{r-1}$. Thus we shall first study the open stratum $Q^{\mathrm{hks}} = Q_{(\varnothing,\varnothing)} = M^{\mathrm{hks}}/\!\!/\!\!/H$ consisting of the hyperkähler stable quivers.

We first look at quivers

$$0 \underset{\beta_0}{\overset{\alpha_0}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_1} \underset{\beta_1}{\overset{\alpha_1}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_2} \underset{\beta_2}{\overset{\alpha_2}{\rightleftarrows}} \cdots \underset{\beta_{r-2}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-2}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_{r-1}} \underset{\beta_{r-1}}{\overset{\alpha_{r-1}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}^{n_r} = \mathbb{C}^n$$

satisfying the complex moment map equations

$$\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} = \beta_i\alpha_i + \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I_{n_i}$$

for $H$ where $0 = n_0 \leqslant n_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant n_r = n$ and all the $\beta_i$ are surjective. Lemma 5.30 shows that the $H_{\mathbb{C}}$-orbits of all such quivers are closed and hence represent points in $Q^{\mathrm{hks}}$ by Lemma 6.5.

As in the proof of Lemma 4.10 we may choose bases for the vector spaces $V_i = \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$ so that

$$\beta_i = (0_{n_i \times k_i} \mid I_{n_i \times n_i})$$

where $k_i = n_{i+1} - n_i$ is the dimension of the kernel of $\beta_i$. This amounts to using the action of $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \prod_{i=1}^r \mathrm{GL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$ to standardise the $\beta_i$, and we can replace $\mathrm{GL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$ with $\mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$ for each $i$ such that $n_{i-1} < n_i$, so that if the dimension vector is strictly ordered then it amounts to using the action of $H_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \prod_{i=1}^r \mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$.

Let us now assume we are in the strictly ordered case. As we saw in Lemma 4.10, when the dimension vector is strictly ordered the remaining freedom in the group action is the commutator of the parabolic group $P$ in $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ associated to the flag of dimensions $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r = n)$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$. In the particular case when $n_i = i$ for all $i$ (that is, all $k_i$ equal 1), this freedom is exactly the maximal unipotent group $N$, that is, the commutator subgroup of the Borel group $B$.

Now let us investigate what $X = \alpha_{r-1}\beta_{r-1}$ tells us when the dimension vector is strictly ordered once the $\beta_i$ have been standardised as above. With respect to bases chosen as above, the matrix of $\alpha_i\beta_i$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0_{k_i \times k_i} & D_{k_i \times n_i} \\ 0_{n_i \times k_i} & -\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I_{n_i} + \alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{7.1}$$

for some $D$.

Inductively it is now easy to show that $\alpha_i\beta_i$ has scalar blocks of size $k_j \times k_j$ $(j = i, i-1, \dots, 0)$ down the diagonal, where the scalars (from top left going down) are $0, -\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}, -(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \lambda_{i-1}^{\mathbb{C}}), \dots, -(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \cdots + \lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}})$.

In particular, $X = \alpha_{r-1}\beta_{r-1}$ lies in the annihilator of the Lie algebra of the commutator $[P, P]$ of the parabolic determined by the integers $k_j$. Again, in the case $n_i = i$ we have that $X$ lies in the Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{n}^\circ$. Notice also that the diagonal entries of $X$ are 0 ($k_{r-1}$ times), $-\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}}$ ($k_{r-2}$ times), $\dots$, $-(\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \cdots + \lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}})$ ($k_0 = n_1$ times).

Moreover any such $X$ comes from a solution to our equations, because we have that $X$ kills $\ker \beta_{r-1}$, and $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \beta_i\alpha_i$ kills $\ker \beta_{i-1}$ for $i < r - 1$.

Observe that for each $i$, knowledge of $\alpha_i\beta_i$ determines $\alpha_i$ (since $\beta_i$ is surjective and standardised), hence determines $\beta_i\alpha_i$ (since $\beta_i$ is standardised), and hence, together with knowledge of $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$, determines $\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1}$ by the equations.



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As we can read off the $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ by looking at the diagonal entries of $X$, we see that knowledge of $X$ determines all the $\alpha_i$ and hence the whole diagram.

In addition $X$ is determined by its trace-free part, as its leading entry $X_{11} = 0$. So, in summary, we have shown, in the strictly ordered case, that if the $\beta_i$ are surjective, they may be standardised (modulo $H_{\mathbb{C}}$) by an element of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$, unique up to an element of the commutator of the parabolic subgroup, and now the whole diagram is determined by $X$ (or its trace-free part) in the annihilator of the Lie algebra of this commutator. Moreover any such $X$ arises from such a diagram. We summarise our results as follows.

Proposition 7.2. *Consider a quiver diagram with strictly ordered dimension vector* $(n_1, \ldots, n_r = n)$. *Then the set of solutions to the complex moment map equations for* $H$ *with* $\beta_i$ *surjective, modulo the action of* $H_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$, *may be identified with*

$$\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times_{[P,P]} [\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$$

*where* $P$ *is the parabolic subgroup associated to the flag* $(n_1, \ldots, n_r = n)$, *and* $[\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$ *is the annihilator of the Lie algebra of the commutator subgroup of* $P$.

*In the special (full flag) case where* $n_i = i$ *for all* $i$, *we obtain the space*

$$\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$$

*where* $N$ *is a maximal unipotent subgroup of* $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ *and* $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{n}^\circ$ *is a Borel subalgebra.*

*Remark* 7.3. The space $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$ has also occurred in the work of Bielawski [Bie98a, Bie98b]. Proposition 7.2 and Lemma 5.30 show that $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$ naturally injects into the implosion $Q$.

We also have the following proposition.

Proposition 7.4. *Consider a quiver diagram with strictly ordered dimension vector* $(n_1, \ldots, n_r = n)$. *Then the set of solutions to the complex moment map equations for* $H$ *with* $\alpha_i$ *injective and* $\beta_i$ *surjective, modulo the action of* $H_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$, *may be identified with*

$$\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times_{[P,P]} [\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ_*$$

*where* $P$ *is the parabolic subgroup associated to the flag* $(n_1, \ldots, n_r = n)$, *and* $[\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ_*$ *is an open dense subset of* $[\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$. *Moreover* $[\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ_*$ *is contained in the complement of the union over all parabolic subgroups* $P'$ *strictly containing* $P$ *of the annihilator* $[\mathfrak{p}', \mathfrak{p}']^\circ$ *of the Lie algebra of the commutator subgroup of* $P'$.

*In the full flag case where* $n_i = i$ *for all* $i$, *we obtain a space*

$$\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}_*$$

*where* $N$ *is a maximal unipotent subgroup of* $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ *and* $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{n}^\circ$ *is a Borel subalgebra.*

*Proof.* The statement that $X$ has to lie in the complement of $[\mathfrak{p}', \mathfrak{p}']^\circ$ follows by an induction, using (7.1) and the given form of $\beta_i$. □

How does the argument which gave us Propositions 7.2 and 7.4 need to be modified if the dimension vector $(n_1, \ldots, n_r = n)$ is ordered but not strictly ordered? We may still choose bases for the vector spaces $V_i = \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$ so that

$$\beta_i = (0_{n_i \times k_i} \mid I_{n_i \times n_i})$$

where $k_i = n_{i+1} - n_i$ is the dimension of the kernel of $\beta_i$, but to do this we may need to use the action of a larger group than $H_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathrm{SL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$. It suffices to use the action



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) = (\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{GL}(n_i,\mathbb{C})) \times \mathrm{SL}(n_r,\mathbb{C})$, and then the remaining freedom is $P$ itself, embedded in $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ so that the projection of $g \in P$ in $\mathrm{GL}(n_i,\mathbb{C})$ is the bottom right-hand $n_i \times n_i$ block of $g$. Let

$$\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} = \tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}/H_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{GL}(n_i,\mathbb{C})/\mathrm{SL}(n_i,\mathbb{C}) = (\mathbb{C}^*)^{r-1}.$$

Once we have quotiented by the action of $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ we are using the residual action of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ to put the maps $\beta_i$ into standard form, and the remaining freedom is the action of $P$ embedded in $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ via the inclusion in $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ and the homomorphism

$$\chi = (\chi_1, \dots, \chi_{r-1})\colon P \to \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^{r-1}, \tag{7.5}$$

where $\chi_i\colon P \to \mathbb{C}^*$ is the character given by the determinant of the bottom right-hand block of size $n_i \times n_i$. Note that the kernel of $\chi$ is the commutator subgroup $[P,P]$ of $P$, but that $\chi$ is not surjective if $k_i = 0$ (i.e. if $n_{i+1} = n_i$) for some $i$.

The complex moment map equations

$$\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} = \beta_i\alpha_i + \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I_{n_i}$$

tell us that

$$\alpha_i = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i^{(1)} \\ \alpha_i^{(2)} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\alpha_i^{(1)}$ is $k_i \times n_i$ and $\alpha_i^{(2)}$ is $n_i \times n_i$ and

$$\alpha_{i+1}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}} I_{k_i \times k_i} & \alpha_i^{(1)} \\ 0_{n_i \times k_i} & \alpha_i^{(2)} - \lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}} I_{n_i \times n_i} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Inductively it follows that $\alpha_i^{(2)}$ has scalar blocks of size $k_j \times k_j$ (for $j = r-1, \dots, 0$) down the diagonal, where the scalars (from top left going down) are

$$-\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}, -(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \lambda_{i-1}^{\mathbb{C}}), \dots, -(\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \dots + \lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}}).$$

Furthermore the quiver is determined by knowledge of $\lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}}, \dots, \lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}}$ together with

$$X = \alpha_{r-1}\beta_{r-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{k_{r-1} \times k_{r-1}} & \alpha_{r-1}^{(1)} \\ 0_{n_{r-1} \times k_{r-1}} & \alpha_{r-1}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

which is block triangular with scalar blocks of size $k_j \times k_j$ ($j = r-1, \dots, 0$) down the diagonal, where the scalars are $0, -\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}}, -(\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \lambda_{r-2}^{\mathbb{C}}), \dots, -(\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \dots + \lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}})$. Note that we can only recover from $X$ those $\lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \dots + \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ for which $k_{i-1} > 0$; however from $\lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}}, \dots, \lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}}$ (which we can regard as determining an element of the dual of the Lie algebra of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$) and the off-diagonal blocks of $X$ (that is, the projection of $X$ to $\mathfrak{p}^\circ$) we can recover the quiver with $\beta_i$ in standardised form.

*Remark* 7.6. Now let $S$ be an injective subrelation of $\leqslant$ on $\{1, \dots, r-1\}$. Let $T_S$ be the subtorus of $\tilde{T} = T^{r-1}$ as in Definition 5.26 and let $H_S = \phi^{-1}(T_S)$ be the corresponding subgroup of $\tilde{H}$ containing $H$. Then the complex moment map equations for $H_S$ are given by the complex moment map equations

$$\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} = \beta_i\alpha_i + \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I_{n_i}$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for $H$ together with the equations

$$\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \cdots + \lambda_j^{\mathbb{C}} = 0 \quad \text{for } (i,j) \in S,$$

which say that $(\lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}}, \ldots, \lambda_{r-1}^{\mathbb{C}}) \in \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}})^*$ lies in the annihilator of $\mathrm{Lie}(T_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$. Furthermore the residual action of $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}/H_{\mathbb{C}} = (T_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$ is given by its embedding as a subgroup of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and thus is a subgroup of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$.

Putting all this together gives us the following extension of Proposition 7.4. It is a generalisation, since when the dimension vector is strictly ordered then the homomorphism $\chi\colon P \to \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined at (7.5) above is surjective with kernel $[P,P]$, so that

$$(\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}))/P \cong \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})/[P,P].$$

Proposition 7.7. *Consider a quiver diagram with ordered dimension vector $(n_1, \ldots, n_r = n)$. Then the set of solutions to the complex moment map equations for $H$ with $\alpha_i$ injective and $\beta_i$ surjective, modulo the action of $H_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(n_i,\mathbb{C})$, may be identified with an open subset of the cotangent bundle to*

$$(\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}))/P,$$

*or equivalently with*

$$(\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})) \times_P (\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}})^* \oplus \mathfrak{p}^\circ)^*$$

*where $P$ is the parabolic subgroup associated to the flag $(n_1, \ldots, n_r = n)$. Here*

$$\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} = \tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}/H_{\mathbb{C}} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^{r-1}$$

*with $P$ acting on $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ by left multiplication and on $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ via the characters given by the determinants of the bottom right-hand blocks of size $n_i \times n_i$, and $(\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}})^* \oplus \mathfrak{p}^\circ)^*$ is an open dense subset of $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}})^* \oplus \mathfrak{p}^\circ$. Moreover the set of solutions to the complex moment map equations for $H_S = \phi^{-1}(T_S)$ (defined as in Definition 5.26) with $\alpha_i$ injective and $\beta_i$ surjective, modulo the action of $(H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}$, may be identified with an open subset of the cotangent bundle to*

$$\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})/(T_S)_{\mathbb{C}} \times P$$

*where $(T_S)_{\mathbb{C}} = (H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}/H_{\mathbb{C}}$ is a subgroup of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $(T_S)_{\mathbb{C}} \times P$ is embedded as a subgroup of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ via*

$$(t,g) \mapsto (t\chi(g), g)$$

*with $\chi\colon P \to \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ as defined at (7.5).*

*Remark* 7.8. An alternative argument notes that since the $\alpha_i$ are injective and the $\beta_i$ are surjective then $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_i$ are isomorphisms whenever $n_i = n_{i+1}$ and so we can contract the quiver as in Proposition 5.27 until we obtain a quiver of the same form but with strictly ordered dimension vector. For each such contraction the information lost is $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}$ and the difference between the actions of $\mathrm{GL}(V_{i+1})$ and $\mathrm{SL}(V_{i+1})$ is $\mathrm{GL}(V_{i+1})/\mathrm{SL}(V_{i+1}) \cong \mathbb{C}^*$, so we can use this point of view to deduce Proposition 7.7 from Proposition 7.4.

*Remark* 7.9. In fact for certain values of $\lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ we get restrictions on which parabolics can occur with a non-empty solution set in Proposition 7.7. More precisely, we observe that if $\lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}} = 0$, then the complex moment map equations imply $\alpha_{i+1}$ maps $\ker \beta_i$ into $\ker \beta_{i+1}$. If all $\beta_j$ are surjective and $\alpha_j$ are injective, this means that $k_i \leqslant k_{i+1}$. In particular, if all $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ are zero, then the $k_i$ form a *non-decreasing* partition of $n$. This is to be expected, as such partitions count the number of *unordered* partitions, that is, the strata of the nilpotent variety.



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Remark* 7.10. Now suppose that we are in the situation of Theorem 6.13. Recall that then the stratum $Q_{(S,\delta)}$ is the image of the hyperkähler embedding into $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/H$ defined in Proposition 6.9 with $S_1 = S$ and $S_2 = \varnothing$ of the hyperkähler modification $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ of $Q_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ as in (6.8).

Observe that $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}} = \hat{M}(\mathbf{m})^{\mathrm{hks}}/\!\!/\!\!/H_S$, where

$$\hat{M}(\mathbf{m})^{\mathrm{hks}} = (M(\mathbf{m})^{\mathrm{hks}} \times (\mathbb{H}\backslash\{0\})^\ell)/\!\!/\!\!/T^\ell. \tag{7.11}$$

Let $h = h_M - h_\ell$ be the hyperkähler moment map used in (7.11); this takes values in $\mathbb{R}^\ell \oplus \mathbb{C}^\ell$. We have that $\hat{M}(\mathbf{m})^{\mathrm{hks}} = (h^{\mathbb{C}})^{-1}(0)/\!\!/T_{\mathbb{C}}^\ell$. Put $M_0 = (h_M^{\mathbb{C}})^{-1}((\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\})^\ell)$. Now the $i$th component of $h_\ell^{\mathbb{C}}$ is just $a^{(i)} + \mathbf{j}b^{(i)} \mapsto a^{(i)}b^{(i)}$, so for $m \in M_0$, $h_M^{\mathbb{C}}(m) = h_\ell^{\mathbb{C}}((a^{(i)} + \mathbf{j}b^{(i)}))$ implies that each $a^{(i)}$ and $b^{(i)}$ is non-zero, and hence the $T_{\mathbb{C}}^\ell$ orbit through the point is closed. In particular, the holomorphic map $m \mapsto (m, h_M^{\mathbb{C}}(m) - \mathbf{j}\mathbf{1})$, $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, realises $M_0$ as an open subset of $h_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)/\!\!/T_{\mathbb{C}}^\ell = \hat{M}(\mathbf{m})^{\mathrm{hks}}$. This map is equivariant for both $H_S^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$, and so descends to a holomorphic map on an open dense set of $Q_1$ to $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$. Exploiting the action of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$, we can cover $\hat{Q}_1^{\mathrm{hks}}$ by such open sets.

Now note that if $m_{j+1} = m_j$ for some $j$, then, since $n_{j+1} > n_j$ there exists some $i \leqslant j$ such that $(i,j) \in S$. This implies that the homomorphism

$$(T_S)_{\mathbb{C}} \times P \to \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$$

given by $(t,g) \mapsto t\chi(g)$ is surjective, and its kernel is isomorphic to the subgroup

$$P_S = \{g \in P : \chi(g) \in (T_S)_{\mathbb{C}}\}$$

of $P$ containing $[P,P]$. Thus

$$\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})/(T_S)_{\mathbb{C}} \times P$$

can be identified with $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})/P_S$, and its cotangent bundle can be identified with

$$\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times_{P_S} \mathfrak{p}_S^\circ$$

where $\mathfrak{p}^\circ$ is the annihilator in the dual of the Lie algebra of $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{p}_S$ of $P_S$.

Thus we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 7.12. *In the situation of Theorem 6.13 each stratum $Q_{(S,\delta)}$ of $Q$ is a union of open subsets, one for each element of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$, each of which can be identified with*

$$\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times_{P_S} (\mathfrak{p}_S)_*^\circ.$$

*Here $(\mathfrak{p}_S)_*^\circ$ is an open subset of the annihilator $(\mathfrak{p}_S)^\circ$ in $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}))^*$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{p}_S$ of a subgroup $P_S$ of the standard parabolic subgroup $P$ of $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ associated to the flag $\mathbb{C}^{m_1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \mathbb{C}^{m_r} = \mathbb{C}^n$ where*

$$m_k = k - d_k,$$

*$d_k$ being the $k$th component of $\mathbf{d} = \sum_{(i,j)\in S} \delta(i)e_{ij}$. More precisely, $P_S = \{g \in P : \chi(g) \in (T_S)_{\mathbb{C}}\}$ where $(T_S)_{\mathbb{C}} = (H_S)_{\mathbb{C}}/H_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the subgroup of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}} = \tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}}/H_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined as in Definition 5.26 and $\chi\colon P \to \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined at (7.5).*

COROLLARY 7.13. *In the case of a full flag, when $r = n$ and $n_j = j$ for $j = 0, \dots, n$, this description applies to each stratum $Q_{(S,\delta)}$ of the stratification described in Theorem 6.13 of the universal hyperkähler implosion $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/H$ for $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$.*

*Remark* 7.14. The space $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times_{P_S} \mathfrak{p}_S^\circ$ can be regarded as the complex-symplectic quotient of $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}} = K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$ by $P_S$, where $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$ and $[P,P] \leqslant P_S \leqslant P$. We may compare this, as in § 2,



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with symplectic implosion, where the universal implosion $(T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}} = K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N$ is stratified by the ordinary quotients of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by commutators of parabolics.

*Remark* 7.15. We have noted that for general compact $K$, the space $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_{[P,P]} [\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$ may be viewed as the cotangent bundle of $K_{\mathbb{C}}/[P, P]$. Now, from [GJS02] the latter quotient is just a Kähler stratum of the symplectic implosion $K_{\mathbb{C}}/\!\!/N$ (cf. Remark 7.14). A theorem of Feix [Fei01], now shows that there is a hyperkähler metric on some open neighbourhood of the zero section in the cotangent bundle $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_{[P,P]} [\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$. Proposition 7.2 gives us a hyperkähler structure on the full set $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_{[P,P]} [\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$ for $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$.

*Remark* 7.16. Note that in the full flag case the homomorphism $\chi\colon B \to \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined at (7.5) is surjective with kernel $N = [B, B]$ and thus allows us to identify $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ naturally with the maximal torus $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$.

We would also like to relate the quiver space $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/H$ in the full flag case to the non-reductive GIT quotient $(\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})/\!\!/N$, which as discussed in § 2 could be interpreted as a complex-symplectic quotient in the GIT sense of the cotangent bundle $T^* \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ by the maximal unipotent $N$.

Lemma 7.17. *When $r = n$ and $n_j = j$ for $j = 0, \ldots, n$ the complement in the variety defined by the complex moment map equations $\mu_{\mathbb{C}} = 0$ of the locus of full flag quivers with all $\alpha_i$ injective and $\beta_i$ surjective has complex codimension at least* 2.

*Proof.* As in the proof of Corollary 6.15, we observe that if some $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_i$ is of less than maximal rank, then the $H_{\mathbb{C}}$-invariant function $\Phi_i$ given by $\det(\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} - \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I)$ is zero; moreover we may vary the $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ arbitrarily at each stage (without changing $\alpha_j, \beta_j$ for $j < i$), and still stay within $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ since the map $(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto \beta\alpha$ is a surjection from $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^j, \mathbb{C}^{j+1}) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{j+1}, \mathbb{C}^j)$ onto $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^j, \mathbb{C}^j)$ for all $j$. In particular, the zero locus of $\Phi_i$ is a variety of codimension one. Furthermore, if this occurs for two indices $i$ and $j$, we can see in the same way that both $\Phi_i$ and $\Phi_j$ vanish, and this is a codimension two condition because $\Phi_j$ does not vanish identically on a non-empty open set in the zero locus of $\Phi_i$.

Similarly, if for some $i$ the rank of $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_i$ is less than $i - 1$, we deduce that $\Phi_i$ vanishes to order at least two, so we are in codimension two or higher.

So we just have to consider the situation where there is only one index $i$ where $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_i$ are of less than full rank, and for this index $(\mathrm{rank}\, \alpha_i, \mathrm{rank}\, \beta_i) = (i, i-1), (i-1, i)$ or $(i-1, i-1)$.

If $\beta_i$ is of maximal rank, we can put it in the standard form of Proposition 7.2, and now $\alpha_i$ is a $(i+1) \times i$ matrix such that the bottom $i \times i$ block is $\alpha_{i-1}\beta_{i-1} - \lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} I_{i\times i}$. The vanishing of $\Phi_i$ just says that the associated minor determinant is zero. The condition that $\alpha_i$ is of rank $i - 1$ means also that the other $i \times i$ minors must vanish, so we get a subvariety of codimension at least two in $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$. The case $(i-1, i)$ follows by dualising, and the third case $(i-1, i-1)$ proceeds by a similar calculation choosing a standard form for the rank $i - 1$ map $\beta_i$. □

Theorem 7.18. *The algebra of invariants $\mathcal{O}(\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})^N$ is finitely generated, and the hyperkähler quotient $Q = M/\!\!/\!\!/H$ of the space $M$ of full flag quivers by $H$ can be identified with the non-reductive GIT quotient*

$$(\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})/\!\!/N.$$

*Proof.* The set $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)^{\mathrm{surj}}$ of full flag quivers satisfying the complex equations and with all $\beta_i$ surjective is, by Lemma 7.17, an open set in $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ whose complement is of complex codimension



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at least two. Moreover, the proof of Proposition 7.2 shows that $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)^{\mathrm{surj}}$ may be identified with $(\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times H_{\mathbb{C}}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$.

Therefore the coordinate algebra $\mathcal{O}(\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0))^{H_{\mathbb{C}}}$ is isomorphic to

$$\mathcal{O}((\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times H_{\mathbb{C}}) \times_N \mathfrak{b})^{H_{\mathbb{C}}},$$

and hence to $\mathcal{O}(\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})^N$. As $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)$ is an affine variety and $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ is reductive, this algebra is finitely generated. Moreover

$$Q = \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0)/\!\!/H_{\mathbb{C}} = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}(\mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0))^{H_{\mathbb{C}}} = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}(\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})^N,$$

and the last space is by definition the non-reductive quotient $(\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})/\!\!/N$ (cf. the discussion in § 2), so the result follows. □

Together with the results of § 3, this means that the complex-symplectic quotients of the implosion will give the Kostant varieties $V_\chi$.

*Remark* 7.19. The symplectic implosion $(T^*K)_{\mathrm{impl}}$ has an action of $\mathbb{R}^*$ induced from multiplication in the fibres of $T^*K$. Similarly, we have a $\mathbb{C}^*$ action on $T^*K_{\mathbb{C}}$ given by $(g,\xi) \mapsto (g,\tau\xi)$. This action commutes with the right $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ action (2.1), and hence, for each $P_S$, preserves the property of being in the zero level set for the complex-symplectic action of $P_S$ and induces an action on the subsets $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times_{P_S} \mathfrak{p}_S^\circ$. Identifying these with the cotangent bundles of $K_{\mathbb{C}}/P_S$, this is just scaling in the fibre.

In fact, this extends to an action on the full implosion space $Q$, given by just scaling the $\beta_i$. Notice that this will also scale $X = \alpha_{n-1}\beta_{n-1}$, so will induce the scaling in the fibre of the cotangent bundles above. We can also view it as the action on $(\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})/\!\!/N$ induced by scaling the $\mathfrak{b}$ factor.

THEOREM 7.20. *The fixed points of the $\mathbb{C}^*$ action on the universal hyperkähler implosion $Q$ given by scaling the $\beta_i$ are represented by the quivers with $\beta_i = 0$ for each $i$. The fixed point set may therefore be identified, by the discussion in § 4, with the universal symplectic implosion for $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$.*

*Proof.* If $(\alpha,\beta)$ is fixed by the action, then for all $\tau \in \mathbb{C}^*$ there exists $g_\tau \in \mathrm{SL}$ with $g_\tau.(\alpha,\beta) = (\alpha,\tau\beta)$. Letting $\tau \to 0$, we see that $(\alpha,0)$ is in the closure of the SL-orbit of $(\alpha,\beta)$, and hence in the same orbit by our polystability condition. It now follows that $\beta = 0$. □

PROPOSITION 7.21. *If the universal hyperkähler implosion $Q$ for $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ is smooth, then so is the universal symplectic implosion for $\mathrm{SU}(n)$, and hence $n \leqslant 2$.*

*Proof.* We consider the action of the maximal compact subgroup $S^1$ of $\mathbb{C}^*$. If the hyperkähler implosion were smooth, then the fixed point set of this circle action would also be smooth. By general properties of reductive group actions, this set is also the fixed point set of the $\mathbb{C}^*$ action, which from above is just the universal symplectic implosion. The result now follows from [GJS02, § 6], which tells us that the universal symplectic implosion for $K$ is smooth if and only if the commutator $[K,K]$ is a product of copies of $\mathrm{SU}(2)$. □

*Remark* 7.22. We shall see in Example 8.5 that the universal hyperkähler implosion *is* smooth if $K = \mathrm{SU}(2)$.



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

## 8. Geometry of the strata and torus reductions

Let us now further investigate the geometry of the strata described in Theorems 6.13 and 7.12 and consider some examples. We particularly focus on the stratification of the universal hyperkähler implosion $Q$ of $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$, where the original quiver is a full flag, that is, $r = n$ and $n_j = j$ for each $j$. Of course, the strata will involve quivers that are not necessarily of full flag type.

For the purposes of considering torus reductions of the implosion, we need to focus on the $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$-polystable locus, that is, the locus where the action of $\tilde{H}_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{GL}(n_i, \mathbb{C})$ on the quivers is polystable. (Recall from Remark 7.16 that in the full flag case we have a canonical identification of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ with the maximal torus $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$.) Using the results of §§ 5 and 7 we can relate these loci to open subsets of the cotangent bundles $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times_{P_S} \mathfrak{p}_S^\circ$ of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})/P_S$ where $[P, P] \leqslant P_S \leqslant P$ for suitable parabolics $P$.

In particular, we shall first take the parabolic $P$ to be the Borel subgroup $B$ with $P_S = [B, B] = N$, and look at the subset $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$ in the implosion, which as we have seen corresponds to full flag quivers with all $\beta_i$ surjective.

In order to analyse the $N$ action, let us write

$$\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} \mathfrak{k}_\alpha \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} \mathfrak{k}_{-\alpha},$$

where $\mathfrak{k}_\alpha$ are the root spaces and $\Delta_+$ the set of positive roots. So $[\mathfrak{k}_\alpha, \mathfrak{k}_\beta] \subset \mathfrak{k}_{\alpha+\beta}$, taking $\mathfrak{k}_0$ to be $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathfrak{k}_\gamma$ to be zero if $\gamma$ is not a root. Recall also that $\mathfrak{k}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{k}_\beta$ are Killing-orthogonal if $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$. We are using the pairing $(A, B) \mapsto \mathrm{tr}(AB)$ to identify $\mathfrak{k}$ and $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$ with their duals.

We can take

$$\mathfrak{n} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} \mathfrak{k}_\alpha$$

and

$$\mathfrak{n}^\circ = \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} \mathfrak{k}_\alpha.$$

Let $X_{(\alpha)}$ denote the component of $X$ in $\mathfrak{k}_\alpha$. So, if $n \in \mathfrak{n}$ and $X \in \mathfrak{n}^\circ = \mathfrak{b}$, then $[n, X]_{(\alpha)}$ is $[n_{(\alpha)}, X_{(0)}]$ plus terms $[n_{(\beta)}, X_{(\gamma)}]$ where $\beta + \gamma = \alpha$ and $\beta, \gamma > 0$. Moreover $[n_{(\alpha)}, X_{(0)}]$ is just $-\alpha(X_{(0)})n_{(\alpha)}$.

The adjoint action of $\exp(n) \in N$ on $X \in \mathfrak{k}_\alpha$ is

$$X \mapsto X + [n, X] + \text{terms in higher iterated brackets.}$$

So

$$(\exp(n)X)_{(0)} = X_{(0)}$$

and

$$(\exp(n)X)_{(\alpha)} = X_{(\alpha)} - \alpha(X_{(0)})n_{(\alpha)} + \cdots$$

where $\cdots$ denotes terms in $n_{(\beta)}, X_{(\gamma)}$ with $\beta$ (respectively $\gamma$) ranging over positive roots less than $\alpha$ (respectively 0 or positive roots less than $\alpha$).

This means that, provided $\alpha$ does not vanish on the Cartan component of $X$, we may work up inductively through the root spaces, starting with the lowest, finding $n_{(\alpha)}$ such that $(\exp(n)X)_{(\alpha)} = 0$. Moreover these $n_{(\alpha)}$ are uniquely determined.

So if $X_{(0)}$ lies in the complement of the union of the zero loci of the roots then the $N$-orbit through $X$ contains a unique element in the chosen Cartan algebra $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$. (See Example 8.7 for a concrete example in the SU(3) case.)



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We see that if the eigenvalues of $X \in \mathfrak{b}$ are all distinct, then the corresponding part of $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$ may be identified with $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$, where $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ is the complement of the union of the zero loci for the roots in $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$, that is, the set of diagonal matrices in $\mathfrak{sl}(n,\mathbb{C})$ with distinct entries. Note that in the setup of Proposition 7.2, this amounts to standardising the $\alpha_i$ so that the only non-zero entries are in position $(j+1, j)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, i$. The fact that the eigenvalues of $X$ are distinct now implies that all $\alpha_i$ are injective.

Proposition 8.1. *The implosion $Q$ contains $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ as an open dense subset.*

*Remark* 8.2. Notice that (for $K = \mathrm{SU}(n)$) $K_{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ is in this sense a complex-symplectic analogue of the product of $K$ with the interior of the Weyl chamber, which is the open stratum in the symplectic implosion of $T^*K$. However, in our case $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ is a proper subset of $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}_*$, and hence of the open hyperkähler stratum, because configurations with equal eigenvalues may occur in $Q^{\mathrm{hks}}$.

Let us now look at strata corresponding to more general parabolics. Our discussion of the diagonal entries of $X$ in Proposition 7.2 shows that the eigenvalue $\kappa_i$ of the trace-free part of $X$ occurs at least $k_{i-1}$ times ($i = 1, \ldots, r$ with the convention that $\kappa_r = 0$). We say 'at least' because if $\lambda_i^{\mathbb{C}} + \lambda_{i+1}^{\mathbb{C}} + \cdots \lambda_j^{\mathbb{C}}$ is zero for $i \leqslant j$, then $\kappa_i$ and $\kappa_{j+1}$ will be equal.

Hence, given a collection of eigenvalues $\kappa_j$ for $X$, the maximum value of $k_{i-1}$ compatible with this collection is the multiplicity of the corresponding $\kappa_i$.

*Example* 8.3. In particular, if the eigenvalues of $X$ are all distinct, then the $k_i$ are all 1 and we are in the full flag case where $n_i = i$ for all $i$. This means we are in $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$, which is open and dense in $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$.

Performing hyperkähler reduction by the maximal torus $T$ is equivalent to fixing the $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$-component of $\mathfrak{b}$, i.e. fixing $X_{(0)}$, and quotienting by $T_{\mathbb{C}}$. If we reduce at a level in $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$, then the above discussion shows the resulting space is the semisimple orbit $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})/T_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Now let us consider reduction at a level $X_{(0)}$ where a root vanishes. If $\alpha(X_{(0)}) \neq 0$, then as above we can set $(\exp(n)X)_{(\alpha)}$ to zero. That is, we can use the $N$ action to move $X$ into the subalgebra $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_1$, where

$$\mathfrak{n}_1 = \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in \Delta_+ \\ \alpha(X_{(0)})=0}} \mathfrak{k}_\alpha.$$

We have left a residual action of $N_1$, the unipotent group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{n}_1$.

*Example* 8.4. In particular, suppose $X$ has distinct eigenvalues $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s$ with multiplicities $m_1, \ldots, m_s$ and let us take the maximum possible $k_i$ compatible with this: that is, we take $r = s$ and $k_i = m_{i+1}$, $i = 0, \ldots, r-1$. Let $P$ denote the associated parabolic, whose commutator contains the maximal unipotent $N$. As we are concerned with the quotients of the strata by the full torus $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ we shall assume in the following discussion that $P_S = [P, P]$; this will not result in any loss of generality as regards the quotient, as $P_S$ is an extension of $[P, P]$ by a subtorus of $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

We can now use part of the $N$ action to kill the entries of $X$ in positions $(i, j)$ where $X_{ii} \neq X_{jj}$. However, our choice of $k_i$ means the other non-diagonal elements of $X$ are zero, as $X$ has to be in the annihilator $[\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$. The remaining part of $[P, P]$ that we have not used is just $\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(k_i,\mathbb{C})$.

So we obtain $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\sigma,m)} / \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathrm{SL}(k_i,\mathbb{C})$, where $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\sigma,m)}$ denotes the subset of $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$ satisfying the above equalities of eigenvalues. Hyperkähler reduction now fixes the diagonal



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

entries and quotients by $T_{\mathbb{C}}$, and hence we obtain the general semisimple orbit

$$\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{C})\Big/\mathrm{S}\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}\mathrm{GL}(k_i,\mathbb{C})\Big).$$

Thus we obtain the semisimple orbits (the closed stratum of the Kostant variety) by choosing the stratum where the $k_i$ are the maximum possible given the eigenvalues. The case of distinct eigenvalues, where all $k_i$ must be 1, gives the regular semisimple orbit as in the preceding example.

In general we have that each eigenvalue multiplicity $m_i$, $i=1,\dots,s$, is a sum of $k_j$, say $k_{i_1}+\cdots+k_{i_p}$. We can use part of the $[P,P]$ action to reduce $X$ to block-diagonal form where we have one block for each distinct eigenvalue $\sigma_i$. Moreover each block is upper triangular with diagonal entries all equal to the eigenvalue $\sigma_i$.

The remaining freedom in $[P,P]$ is now also block-diagonal: each block is the commutator of a parabolic $P_{\sigma_i}$ in $\mathrm{GL}(m_i,\mathbb{C})$. Let us write $P_{\sigma_i}$ as $U_{\sigma_i}L_{\sigma_i}$ where $U_{\sigma_i}$ is the unipotent radical of $P_{\sigma_i}$ and $L_{\sigma_i}$ is the corresponding Levi subgroup.

The condition that $X$ lies in $[\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{p}]^\circ$ means that, for each block, transposing and dualising, the non-scalar part of that block of $X$ actually lies in $\mathfrak{u}_{\sigma_i}$. The scalar part of the block is, of course, just $\sigma_i I_{m_i\times m_i}$.

The previous example is the case when $r=s$ and $k_i=m_{i+1}$, so we have one $k_i$ for each distinct eigenvalue. Now $P_{\sigma_i}=\mathrm{GL}(m_i,\mathbb{C})$ so the unipotent $U_{\sigma_i}$ is scalar and hence $X$ is scalar on each block. Moreover the remaining freedom in $[P,P]$ is just the product of the Levi subgroups $L_{\sigma_i}=\mathrm{SL}(k_{i-1},\mathbb{C})$, in agreement with the results of that example.

For some concrete low-dimensional examples consider the following.

*Example* 8.5. Let us take $K=\mathrm{SU}(2)$.

(i) The quivers we have to consider are now of the form

$$\mathbb{C}\ \underset{\beta}{\overset{\alpha}{\rightleftarrows}}\ \mathbb{C}^2$$

so we have $M=\mathbb{H}^2=\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C},\mathbb{C}^2)\oplus\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^2,\mathbb{C})$. In the terminology of § 5, the group $\tilde{H}$ is $\mathrm{U}(1)$ but its commutator $H$ and the associated complex group SL are the trivial groups $\mathrm{SU}(1)$ and $\mathrm{SL}(1,\mathbb{C})$. There is therefore no moment map equation and no stability condition for these groups, and the implosion $Q$ is just $\mathbb{H}^2$. We have a hyperkähler action of the torus $T=\mathrm{U}(1)$.

We can decompose the implosion into four subsets. The smallest one $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{bottom}}$ is when $\alpha,\beta$ are both zero, so $\mathbb{C}=\ker\alpha\oplus\mathrm{im}\,\beta$. At the other extreme, we let $\mathcal{S}_0$ be the set of quivers when $\alpha$ is injective and $\beta$ surjective, so again this direct sum condition holds. This subset is $(\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\})\times(\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\})$. We also have a subset $\mathcal{S}_1$ with $\beta$ surjective but $\alpha$ not injective (so zero), and a subset $\mathcal{S}_2$ with $\alpha$ injective and $\beta$ not surjective (so zero). Both these subsets are isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\}$.

We observe that $\mathcal{S}_0$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{bottom}}$ are sets of the form described in Proposition 7.4, corresponding to choosing the parabolic $P$ to be the Borel $B$ and the full group $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$, respectively. To see this, we can take the unipotent subgroup $N$ of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ to be the group of upper triangular matrices

$$N=\left\{\begin{pmatrix}1 & t\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}:t\in\mathbb{C}\right\}.$$



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We must consider $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{n}^\circ$, where

$$\mathfrak{n}^\circ = \mathfrak{b} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & -a \end{pmatrix} : a, b \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

Writing an element of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ as $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} q_{11} & q_{12} \\ q_{21} & q_{22} \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, the $N$ action is

$$\begin{aligned} q_{12} &\mapsto q_{12} - t q_{11} \\ q_{22} &\mapsto q_{22} - t q_{21} \\ b &\mapsto b - 2at \end{aligned}$$

while $q_{11}, q_{21}, a$ are invariant. Also $q_{11}q_{22} - q_{12}q_{21} = 1$.

According to the discussion in § 7, $\mathcal{S}_0$ will be just the open dense set $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}_*$ in $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$, where $X \in \mathfrak{b}$ is non-zero (that is, $a, b$ are not both zero).

If $a$ is non-zero then taking the $N$ quotient is equivalent to setting $b = 0$. We obtain a set $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times (\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\})$, which may be identified with $(\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\}) \times \mathbb{C} \times (\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\})$ (viewing the $\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\}$ factor as the first column of the matrix in $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$).

If $a$ is zero then the $N$ action on the $\mathfrak{b}$ factor is trivial, and we obtain $(\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})/N) \times \{X \in \mathfrak{b} : a = 0,\ b \neq 0\}$, which is just $(\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\}) \times (\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\})$. Identification of $(\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}))/N$ with $\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\}$ follows, for example, from the Iwasawa decomposition; this space is, of course, the open stratum of the symplectic implosion for $\mathrm{SU}(2)$.

The whole of $\mathcal{S}_0$, then, may be viewed as $(\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\})$ in accordance with the quiver picture. On the other hand $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{bottom}}$ has $X = 0$ so is just $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})/\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$, that is, a point, again agreeing with the quiver description above.

Note that if instead we took the whole of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times_N \mathfrak{b}$, rather than requiring $X \neq 0$, then we would obtain $(\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0\}) \times \mathbb{C}^2$. This, of course, corresponds to the union of the two sets $\mathcal{S}_0$ and $\mathcal{S}_1$, that is, quivers with $\beta$ surjective, in accordance with Proposition 7.2.

In terms of the hyperkähler stratification in § 6, the open stratum is the union $\mathbb{H}^2\backslash\{0\}$ of $\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$, which can also be viewed as the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{rotate}}$ sweep of $\mathcal{S}_0$. The closed stratum is just $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{bottom}}$, which is the origin. In the language of Proposition 6.9, the open stratum corresponds to taking $S$ empty, so there is no $\delta$, while the closed stratum corresponds to taking $S = \{(1,1)\}$ with $p = h = k = d_1 = 1$ and $0 = m_0 = m_1 < m_2 = 2$.

From the point of view of reductions by the torus $\mathrm{U}(1)$ the relevant sets are $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{bottom}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_0$ because these give the closed orbits for the complexified action on $\mathbb{H}^2$, in agreement with Proposition 5.20. The union of these strata can be viewed as the set of pairs $(z, w)$ in $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $z, w$ are both zero or both non-zero.

The hyperkähler quotient by $\mathrm{U}(1)$ gives us the hyperkähler structure on Kostant varieties of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ (i.e. the Eguchi–Hanson manifold or the nilpotent variety) as explained below.

(ii) It is also instructive, in the light of Theorem 7.18, to consider the GIT quotient $(\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})/\!\!/N$. Using the variables above, the invariant polynomials are generated by $q_{11}, q_{21}, a$ and $y_1 = 2q_{22}a - q_{21}b$, $y_2 = 2q_{12}a - q_{11}b$. We have the relation

$$q_{11}y_1 - q_{21}y_2 = 2a, \tag{8.6}$$

so $(\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{b})/\!\!/N$ is the affine hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^5$ with equation given by (8.6). Now projection onto $(q_{11}, q_{21}, y_1, y_2)$ gives an isomorphism with $\mathbb{C}^4 = \mathbb{H}^2$.

The $\mathbb{C}^*$-action of Remark 7.19 is just scaling of $a, b$, and hence of $a, y_1, y_2$. Its fixed-point set on $\mathbb{C}^4 = \mathbb{H}^2$ is just given by $y = 0$ and hence is a copy of $\mathbb{C}^2$, the symplectic implosion of $T^*\,\mathrm{SU}(2)$.



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ action is $q_{i1} \mapsto s^{-1}q_{i1}$, $q_{i2} \mapsto sq_{i2}$, $b \mapsto s^2 b$ while $a$ is invariant. So $y_i \mapsto sy_i$, and (8.6) is preserved.

Under the above identification with $\mathbb{C}^4$, the coordinates $q_{11}, q_{21}$ scale by $s^{-1}$ and $y_1, y_2$ by $s$. Note that the non-closed orbits for the $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ action are therefore those lying in $q_{11} = q_{12} = 0$ and $y_1 = y_2 = 0$, apart from the origin which is a closed point orbit.

Now, it is well-known that the hyperkähler reduction of flat $\mathbb{H}^2$ by U(1) at the generic level gives the Eguchi–Hanson metric on the semisimple orbit of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. In terms of our variables, making the reduction is equivalent to fixing the value of $a$ (i.e. the value of the complex-symplectic moment map for $T_{\mathbb{C}}$), and then quotienting by $T_{\mathbb{C}}$. Taking as invariant polynomials on $\mathbb{C}^4$ the expressions $W = q_{11}y_1, Y = q_{11}y_2, Z = q_{21}y_1$ and $q_{21}y_2$ (which equals $W - 2a$), we obtain the affine surface $W(W - 2a) = YZ$, which is one of the complex structures for the Eguchi–Hanson structure. If we reduce $\mathbb{H}^2$ by U(1) at level 0, of course, we get the nilpotent variety $W^2 = YZ$ of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ with singularity at the origin.

*Example* 8.7. Let us take $K = \mathrm{SU}(3)$. From the quiver picture, we see the implosion is a hyperkähler quotient of $\mathbb{H}^8$ by SU(2); in fact it may be realised as the Swann bundle (with origin adjoined) of the quaternionic Kähler manifold $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_4(\mathbb{R}^8)$ of oriented 4-planes in $\mathbb{R}^8$. Note that this space is not smooth but has a conical singularity at the origin.

The $N$ action on $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{n}^\circ$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & r & s \\ 0 & 1 & t \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} : \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0 & d & e \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} a & b + r(d-a) & \begin{pmatrix} c+rt(a-d)-tb \\ +re+s(f-a) \end{pmatrix} \\ 0 & d & e + t(f-d) \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix}$$

where $a + d + f = 0$, of course.

Let us first take $a, d, f$ distinct, so we must be in the open stratum. As we are on the complement of the union of zero loci of the roots $a - d, d - f, f - a$, taking the quotient by $N$ is equivalent to setting $b = c = e = 0$. So we obtain, as in Proposition 8.1, a set which can be identified with $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$.

The hyperkähler reduction at such a level by the action of the maximal torus $T$ will be just the complex-symplectic quotient by the complex torus $T_{\mathbb{C}}$. This will be obtained by fixing the value of $(a, d, f)$ and then factoring out by $T_{\mathbb{C}}$, so we get $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C})/T_{\mathbb{C}}$ which is a semisimple orbit for $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C})$.

Now consider the case of eigenvalues $(a, a, -2a)$ with $a \neq 0$, i.e. when $a = d \neq f$. We can obtain this configuration by reducing at level $(\lambda_1^{\mathbb{C}}, \lambda_2^{\mathbb{C}}) = (3a, 0)$ in the stratum $Q_{(\{2,2\},1)}$, which has $k_0 = 1, k_1 = 0, k_2 = 2$, i.e. $n_1 = n_2 = 1, n_3 = 3$. So the parabolic $P$ consists of matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

As above, we see that each $N$-orbit contains an element $X \in \mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{C})$ with $c = e = 0$. Moreover $b = 0$ because $X$ must lie in $[\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}]^\circ$ (after suitable dual identifications), so again we get diagonal $X$. The remaining $[P, P]$ action is that of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \{1\}$, and the hyperkähler reduction is, as in Example 8.4, the non-regular semisimple orbit $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C})/\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}(1, \mathbb{C}))$: the closed stratum of the Kostant variety for $(a, a - 2a)$.

The level $(a, a, -2a)$ is also compatible with the stratum with $k_0 = k_1 = k_2 = 1$, and hence $n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2, n_3 = 3$: this is the open stratum. Now we can make $c = e = 0$ but $b$ may be non-zero, and the residual freedom in $N$ consists of block-diagonal matrices in $N$ of block size 2



https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and 1. This will be the open stratum of the Kostant variety for $(a, a, -2a)$, and, of course, is not semi-simple.

Finally, let us consider the level $(0, 0, 0)$. This is compatible (using Remark 7.9) with three strata:

(i) the open stratum with $k_0 = k_1 = k_2 = 1$;

(ii) the stratum with $k_0 = 0, k_1 = 1, k_2 = 2$;

(iii) the closed stratum with $k_0 = k_1 = 0, k_2 = 3$ corresponding to the point quiver.

On torus reduction, we will obtain the corresponding strata of the nilpotent variety: respectively, these are the regular stratum (minimum polynomial $x^3$), the subregular stratum (minimum polynomial $x^2$), and the zero element, i.e. the semisimple stratum.

Acknowledgements

The work of the second author was supported by a Senior Research Fellowship of the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (grant number GR/T016170/1) during much of this project. The third author is partially supported by the Danish Council for Independent Research, Natural Sciences. The first and third authors would like to thank the Banff International Research Station for its hospitality, during the final stages of this work, at the workshop, Geometric Structures on Manifolds.

References

Bie98a R. Bielawski, *Asymptotic metrics for $SU(N)$ monopoles with maximal symmetry breaking*, Comm. Math. Phys. **199** (1998), 297–325.

Bie98b R. Bielawski, *Monopoles and the Gibbons-Manton metric*, Comm. Math. Phys. **194** (1998), 297–321.

Biq96 O. Biquard, *Sur les équations de Nahm et la structure de Poisson des algèbres de Lie semi-simples complexes*, Math. Ann. **304** (1996), 253–276.

CG97 N. Chriss and V. Ginzburg, *Representation theory and complex geometry* (Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 1997).

DS96 A. Dancer and A. Swann, *Hyperkähler metrics associated to compact Lie groups*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **120** (1996), 61–69.

DS97 A. Dancer and A. Swann, *The geometry of singular quaternionic Kähler quotients*, Internat. J. Math. **8** (1997), 595–610.

DS06 A. Dancer and A. Swann, *Modifying hyperkähler manifolds with circle symmetry*, Asian J. Math. **10** (2006), 815–826.

DK07 B. Doran and F. Kirwan, *Towards non-reductive geometric invariant theory*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **3** (2007), 61–105.

Fei01 B. Feix, *Hyperkähler metrics on cotangent bundles*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **532** (2001), 33–46.

GJS02 V. Guillemin, L. Jeffrey and R. Sjamaar, *Symplectic implosion*, Transform. Groups **7** (2002), 155–184.

KN79 G. Kempf and L. Ness, *The length of vectors in representation spaces*, in *Algebraic geometry (Proc. summer meeting, Copenhagen, 1978)*, Lecture Notes in Mathmatics, vol. 732 (Springer, Berlin, 1979), 233–243.

Kir85 F. Kirwan, *Cohomology of quotients in symplectic and algebraic geometry* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1985).

KS96 P. Kobak and A. Swann, *Classical nilpotent orbits as hyperkähler quotients*, Internat. J. Math. **7** (1996), 193–210.

Kos63 B. Kostant, *Lie group representations on polynomial rings*, Amer. J. Math. **85** (1963), 327–404.

Kov96 A. Kovalev, *Nahm's equations and complex adjoint orbits*, Q. J. Math. **47** (1996), 41–58.

KP81 H. Kraft and C. Procesi, *Minimal singularities in $GL_n$*, Invent. Math. **62** (1981), 503–515.

Kro86 P. B. Kronheimer, *A hyperkähler structure on the cotangent bundle of a compact Lie group*, MSRI preprint (1986), eprint version arXiv:math/0409253 [math.DG].

Kro90a P. B. Kronheimer, *Instantons and the geometry of the nilpotent variety*, J. Differential Geom. **32** (1990), 473–490.

Kro90b P. B. Kronheimer, *A hyper-kählerian structure on coadjoint orbits of a semisimple complex group*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **42** (1990), 193–208.

MFK94 D. Mumford, J. Fogarty and F. Kirwan, *Geometric invariant theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 2. Folge, vol. 34 (Springer, Berlin, 1994).

Nak94 H. Nakajima, *Instantons on ALE spaces, quiver varieties and Kac-Moody algebras*, Duke Math. J. **76** (1994), 365–416.

SL91 R. Sjamaar and E. Lerman, *Stratified symplectic spaces and reduction*, Ann. of Math. (2) **134** (1991), 375–422.

Tho06 R. P. W. Thomas, *Notes on GIT and symplectic reduction for bundles and varieties*, Surveys in Differential Geometry, vol. 10 (International Press, Somerville, MA, 2006), 221–273.

Andrew Dancer dancer@maths.ox.ac.uk
Jesus College, Oxford, OX1 3DW, UK

Frances Kirwan kirwan@maths.ox.ac.uk
Balliol College, Oxford, OX1 3BJ, UK

Andrew Swann swann@imf.au.dk
Department of Mathematics, Aarhus University, Ny Munkegade 118, Bldg 1530,
DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

and

CP$^3$-Origins, Centre of Excellence for Cosmology and Particle Physics Phenomenology,
University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark