

# Problem Set One

D. Zack Garza

January 26, 2020

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Humphreys 1.1</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	a . . . . .	1
1.2	b . . . . .	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Humphreys 1.3*</b>	<b>1</b>

## 1 Humphreys 1.1

### 1.1 a

If  $M \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $[\lambda] = \lambda + \Lambda_r$  is any coset of  $\mathfrak{h}^\vee / \Lambda_r$ , let  $M^{[\lambda]}$  be the sum of weight spaces  $M_\mu$  for which  $\mu \in [\lambda]$ .

**Proposition:**  $M^{[\lambda]}$  is a  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -submodule of  $M$

*Proof:*

Proposition:  $M$  is the direct sum of finitely many submodules of the form  $M^{[\lambda]}$ .

*Proof:*

### 1.2 b

**Proposition:** The weights of an indecomposable module  $M \in \mathcal{O}$  lie in a single coset of  $\mathfrak{h}^\vee / \Lambda_r$ .

## 2 Humphreys 1.3\*

**Proposition:** For any  $M \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $M(\lambda)$  satisfies the following property:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(M(\lambda), M) = \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}} \mathbb{C}_\lambda, M) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathbb{C}_\lambda, \mathrm{Res}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}} M).$$

*Proof:*

Noting that

- $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}} \mathbb{C}_{\lambda} = U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} \mathbb{C}_{\lambda}$ ,
- $\mathfrak{g}$ -morphisms can always be lifted to  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -morphisms,
- $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}} M$  is an identification of the  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $M$  as a  $\mathfrak{b}$ -module by restricting the action of  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,

consider the following two maps:

$$F : \text{hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} \mathbb{C}_{\lambda}, M) \rightarrow \text{hom}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbb{C}_{\lambda}, M)$$

$$\phi \mapsto (F\phi : v \mapsto \phi(1 \otimes v)),$$

and

$$G : \text{hom}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbb{C}_{\lambda}, M) \rightarrow \text{hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} \mathbb{C}_{\lambda}, M)$$

$$\psi \mapsto (G\psi : g \otimes v \mapsto g \cdot \psi(v)).$$

It suffices to show that these maps are well-defined and mutually inverse.

To see that  $F$  is well-defined, let  $\phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes \mathbb{C}_{\lambda} \rightarrow M$  be fixed; we will show that the set map  $F\phi : \mathbb{C}_{\lambda} \rightarrow M$  is  $\mathfrak{b}$ -linear.

- $F\phi(v + w) = \phi(1 \otimes (v + w)) = \phi((1 \otimes v) + (1 \otimes w)) = \phi(1 \otimes v) + \phi(1 \otimes w) = F\phi(v) + F\phi(w)$ .
- $(F\phi_1 + F\phi_2)(v) = (\phi_1 + \phi_2)(1 \otimes v) = \phi_1(1 \otimes v) + \phi_2(1 \otimes v) = F\phi_1(v) + F\phi_2(v)$ .