# Category $\mathcal{O}$ , Problem Set 3

## D. Zack Garza

February 23, 2020

## **Contents**

	Humphreys 1.10         1.1 Solution	<b>1</b>
2	Humphreys 1.12           2.1 Solution	3
3	Humphreys 1.13	4

## 1 Humphreys 1.10

Prove that the transpose map  $\tau$  fixes  $Z(\mathfrak{g})$  pointwise.

Check that  $\tau$  commutes with the Harish-Chandra morphism  $\xi$  and use the fact that  $\xi$  is injective.

#### 1.1 Solution

We first note that after choosing a PBW basis for  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\tau$  is defined on  $\mathfrak{g}$  in the following way:

$$\tau: \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}$$

$$x_{\alpha} \mapsto y_{\alpha}$$

$$h_{\alpha} \mapsto h_{\alpha}$$

$$y_{\alpha} \mapsto x_{\alpha}$$

which lifts to an anti-involution  $\tau: U(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g})$  by extending linearly over PBW monomials. We can note that since  $\tau$  fixes  $\mathfrak{h}$  pointwise by definition, its lift also fixes  $U(\mathfrak{h})$  pointwise.

Using this basis, we can explicitly identify the Harish-Chandra morphism:

$$\prod_{i,j,k} x_i^{r_i} h_j^{s_j} y_k^{t_k} \mapsto \prod_j h_j^{s_j}.$$

### Proposition 1.1.

The following diagram commutes

$$Z(\mathfrak{g}) \xrightarrow{\xi} U(\mathfrak{h})$$

$$\downarrow^{\tau} \qquad \qquad \downarrow^{\tau}$$

$$Z(\mathfrak{g}) \xrightarrow{\xi} U(\mathfrak{h})$$

Proof.

We will show that for all  $z \in Z(\mathfrak{g})$ ,  $(\xi \circ \tau)(z) = (\tau \circ \xi)(z)$ . Expand z in a PBW basis as  $z = \prod_{i,j,k} x_i^{r_i} h_j^{s_j} y_k^{t_j}$ . We then make the following computations:

$$\begin{split} (\xi \circ \tau)(z) &= (\xi \circ \tau) \Biggl( \prod_{i,j,k} x_i^{r_i} h_j^{s_j} y_k^{t_j} \Biggr) \\ &= \xi \Biggl( \prod_{i,j,k} y_i^{r_i} h_j^{s_j} x_k^{t_j} \Biggr) \quad \text{since } \tau \text{ is an anti-homomorphism} \\ &= \prod_j h_j^{s_j} \end{split}$$

Similarly, we have

$$(\tau \circ \xi)(z) = \tau \left( \prod_{j} h_{j}^{s_{j}} \right)$$
$$= \prod_{j} h_{j}^{s_{j}}$$

where we note that the two resulting expressions are equal.

The above computation in fact shows that

$$(\xi \circ \tau)(z) = (\tau \circ \xi)(z) = \xi(z),$$

and using the injectivity of  $\xi$ , we have

$$(\xi \circ \tau)(z) = \xi(z)$$
  
 $\implies \tau(z) = z.$ 

## 2 Humphreys 1.12

Fix a central character  $\chi$  and let  $\{V^{(\lambda)}\}$  be a collection of modules in  $\mathcal{O}$  indexed by the weights  $\lambda$  for which  $\chi = \chi_{\lambda}$  satisfying

- 1. dim  $V^{(\lambda)} = 1$
- 2.  $\mu < \lambda$  for all weights  $\mu$  of  $V^{(\lambda)}$ .

Then the symbols  $[V^{(\lambda)}]$  form a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis for the Grothendieck group  $K(\mathcal{O}_{\chi})$ .

For example take  $V^{(\lambda)} = M(\lambda)$  or  $L(\lambda)$ .

## 2.1 Solution

Following a similar proof outlined here.

Fix a  $\lambda_0$  such that  $\chi = \chi_{\lambda_0}$  by Harish-Chandra's theorem, fix some order on the Weyl group  $W = \{w_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq |W| < \infty\}$ , and note that  $\chi_{\lambda_0} = \chi_{w \cdot \lambda_0}$  for each  $w \in W$ .

### Proposition 2.1.

The Verma modules  $\{L(w \cdot \lambda_0) \mid w \in W\}$  form a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis for  $\mathcal{O}_{\chi}$ .

Proof.

Write  $\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Z}} \left\{ [L(w_j \cdot \lambda_0)] \mid 1 \leq j \leq |W| \right\} \subset K(\mathcal{O}_{\chi}).$ 

**Spanning**: Let  $M \in \mathcal{O}_{\chi}$  be arbitrary, and consider  $[M] \in K(\mathcal{O}_{\chi})$ . By Humphreys Theorem 1.11, M has a finite composition series

$$M = M_1 > M_2 > \cdots > M_n$$

with simple quotients  $M^{i+1}/M^i \cong L(\lambda_i)$  for some  $\lambda_i \in \mathfrak{h}^{\vee}$ . By collecting terms, we can write

$$[M] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [L(\lambda_i)] = \sum_{i=1}^{n'} c_i [L(\lambda_i)] \in K(\mathcal{O}_{\chi}),$$

where each  $c_i$  is the multiplicity of  $L(\lambda_i)$  in the above composition series.

By definition,  $M \in \mathcal{O}_{\chi} \iff L(\lambda_i) \in \mathcal{O}_{\chi}$ , i.e. M is in this block precisely when all of its composition factors are. But this forces each  $L(\lambda_i) = L(w_j \cdot \lambda_0)$  for some j, and so we have

$$[M] = \sum_{i=j}^{n'} c_j [L(w_j \cdot \lambda_0)] \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Linear Independence: Define a family of maps

$$r_j: \mathcal{O}_\chi \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$$
  
 $M \mapsto \left| \left\{ M^{i+1}/M^i \mid M^{i+1}/M^i \cong L(w_j \cdot \lambda_0) \right\} \right|,$ 

i.e. the map that counts the multiplicity of  $L(w_j \cdot \lambda_0)$  appearing in any composition series of M for a fixed j.

This lifts to a group morphism  $r_j: K(\mathcal{O}_\chi) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$  which satisfies

$$r_j(L(w_i \cdot \lambda_0)) = \delta_{ij},$$

i.e. it takes the value 1 on the Verma modules in  $\mathcal{L}$  precisely when i=j and zero otherwise. Now suppose  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i[L(w_i \cdot \lambda_0)] = [0]$  in  $K(\mathcal{O}_{\chi})$ . For each fixed j, we can then apply the above group morphism to obtain

$$r_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^n a_i [L(w_i \cdot \lambda_0)] \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i r_j ([L(w_i \cdot \lambda_0)])$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^n a_i r_j \delta_{ij}$$
$$= a_i.$$

Since group morphisms preserve equalities and  $r_i([0]) = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , this forces  $a_i = 0$  for each j.

#### Proposition 2.2.

An arbitrary set of the stated form  $\mathcal{V} = \{V^{(\lambda_i)} \mid 1 \leq i < N < \infty\}$  is also a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $K(\mathcal{O}_{\chi})$ .

## 3 Humphreys 1.13

Suppose  $\lambda \notin \lambda$ , so the linkage class  $W \cdot \lambda$  is the disjoint union of its nonempty intersections of various cosets of  $\Lambda_r \in \mathfrak{h}^{\vee}$ .

Prove that each  $M \in \mathcal{O}_{\chi_{\lambda}}$  has a corresponding direct sum decomposition  $M = \bigoplus M_i$  in which all weights of  $M_i$  lie in a single coset.

Recall exercise 1.1b.