## KOSTANT'S WEIGHTING FACTOR IN MACDONALD'S IDENTITIES

By

Howard D. FEGAN and Stephen P. PETERSON

## I. Introduction

Macdonald's identities can be interpreted in terms of the fundamental solution,  $H(x, t)$ , of the heat equation on a compact Lie group G. In the notation of [2] this is

$$
H(a, t) = e^{-i\pi k t/12} \eta(t)^k.
$$
 (1.1)

Equation (1.1) can be obtained in two ways. One due to Kostant [3] and the other due to Van Asch [5]. The purpose of this paper is to point out that <sup>a</sup> key step in each of these derivations is in fact the same. This is done in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

THEOREM 1.1. Let  $P$  be the lattice of weights and  $P^{*}$  its dual. If  $\rho$  is half the sum of the positive roots,  $\lambda$  a dominant weight such that  $\lambda = s\rho-\rho+\mu$  for  $s\in W$ , the Weyl group,  $\sigma: t\rightarrow t^{*}$  the isomorphism induced by the Killing form, and  $\mu\!\in\!(1/2)\sigma P^{*}$ , then  $\chi_{\lambda}(a)$  = det s. For all other  $\lambda$ ,  $\chi_{\lambda}(a)=0$ , where a is an element "principal of type  $\rho"$ 

The derivation of Kostant involves rewriting Macdonald's original identities in terms of the highest weights of representations. In doing so the term  $\chi_{\lambda}(a)$ was introduced. Here  $\chi_{\lambda}(a)$  is the value of the character with highest weight  $\lambda$  on a special point a called "principal of type  $\rho$ ". It is clear from Kostant's work that  $\chi_{\lambda}(a)$  is either  $+1, -1,$  or 0.

Meanwhile, Van Asch [5] gave <sup>a</sup> direct proof of Macdonald's identities using the Poisson summation formula. Fegan, in [2], related this to the heat equation, <sup>a</sup> step involving writing <sup>a</sup> sum over <sup>a</sup> full lattice as <sup>a</sup> sum over the highest weights of representation. In both cases there is the need to reduce the sum over a lattice  $P$  to a sum over a sublattice. The point of this paper is to show that the changes of Kostant and Van Asch are essentially the same.

While the formula of Theorem 1.1 is essentially contained in [3] the proof

Received March 3, 1982. Revised June 15, 1982.