

Title

D. Zack Garza

Tuesday 13th October, 2020

Contents

1 Friday, October 02

1

1 | Friday, October 02

Recall that *good filtration* is a chain $\{0\} \subseteq V_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq V$ satisfying $V = \cup V_i$ and $V_i/V_{i-1} \cong H^0(\lambda_i)$ for λ_i some weight of V .

Lemma 1.1(?).

Let V be a G -module and $\lambda \in X(T)_+$ with $\text{hom}_G(L(\lambda), V) \neq 0$. If $\text{hom}_G(L(\mu), V) = 0$ for any $\mu < \lambda$ and $\text{Ext}_G^1(V(\mu), V) = 0$ for all $\mu \in X(T)_+$, then V contains a submodule isomorphic to $H^0(\lambda)$.

That is, we have a lift of the following form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L(\lambda) & \hookrightarrow & V \\ \downarrow & \nearrow \exists & \\ H^0(\lambda) & & \end{array}$$

Theorem 1.0.1 (Cohomological Condition for Good Filtrations).

Let V be a G -module.

1. If V admits a good filtration, then the number of factors isomorphic to $H^0(\lambda)$, denoted $[V : H^0(\lambda)]$, is equal to $\dim \text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), V)$.

Analog of Jordan-Holder. Note that $H^0(\lambda)$ may not be irreducible, but changing the filtration can not change the number of composition factors.

2. Suppose $\text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), V) < \infty$, then TFAE:
 - V admits a good filtration.
 - $\text{Ext}_G^i(V(\lambda), V) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in X(T)_+$ and all $i > 0$.
 - $\text{Ext}_G^1(V(\lambda), V) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in X(T)_+$.

Much like measuring projectivity: can check all exts, or just the first.

Proof (Part a).

Suppose V has a good filtration. Idea: induct on the filtration.

Suppose $V = H^0(\lambda_1)$, then

$$[V : H^0(\mu)] = \begin{cases} 0 & \mu \neq \lambda_1 \\ 1 & \mu = \lambda_1 \end{cases} = \dim \text{hom}_G(V(\lambda_1), V),$$

since we know the dimensions of these hom spaces from a previous result.

Suppose now that we have

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(\mu_1) \rightarrow V H^0(\mu_2) \rightarrow 0.$$

Applying $F := \text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), \cdot)$, we find that Ext_G^1 vanishes. So this leads a SES, and the dimensions are thus additive. The result follows since F is additive. ■

Proof (Part b).

1 \implies 2: Use the fact that $\text{Ext}_G^i(V(\lambda), H^0(\mu)) = 0$ for all $i > 0$ and all μ .

2 \implies 3: Clear!

3 \implies 1: Choose a total ordering of weights $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots \in X(T)$ such that if $\lambda_i < \lambda_j$ then $i < j$. Since $V \neq 0$, there exists a dominant weight $\lambda \in X(T)_+$ such that $\text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), V) \neq 0$, so choose i minimally in this order to produce such a λ_i . Idea: use this to start a filtration.

Then $\text{hom}(L(\lambda_i), V) \neq 0$, and we have

$$V(\lambda_i) \twoheadrightarrow L(\lambda_i) \hookrightarrow V.$$

We know that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hom}_G(V(\mu), V) &= 0 \quad \forall \mu < \lambda_i \\ \text{hom}_G(L(\mu), V) &= 0 \quad \forall \mu < \lambda_i \\ \text{Ext}_G^1(L(\mu), V) &= 0 \quad \forall \mu \in X(T)_+ \text{ by assumption.} \end{aligned}$$

So the following map must be an injection, since there is no socle:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L(\lambda_i) & \hookrightarrow & V \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(\lambda_i) \end{array}$$

Set $V_1 = H^0(\lambda_i)$, so $V_1 \subseteq V$. We then have a SES

$$0 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V \rightarrow V/V_1 \rightarrow 0.$$

Applying $\text{hom}(V(\lambda), \cdot)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rightarrow \cancel{\text{Ext}_G^1(V(\lambda), V_1)} &\rightarrow \cancel{\text{Ext}_G^1(V(\lambda), V)} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}_G^1(V(\lambda), V/V_1)} \\ \rightarrow \cancel{\text{Ext}_G^2(V(\lambda), V_1)} &\rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

Figure 1: Cancellation in LES

Now iterate this process to obtain a chain $V_1 \subseteq V_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq V$, and set $V' := \cup_{i \geq 0} V_i$. Then $\dim \text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), V') = \dim \text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), V)$ since $\dim \text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), V) < \infty$. But then taking the SES

$$0 \rightarrow V' \rightarrow V \rightarrow V/V' \rightarrow 0$$

and applying $\text{Hom}(V(\lambda), \cdot)$, we have $\text{Hom}(V(\lambda), V/V') = 0$ and we get an isomorphism of homs. But then $\text{hom}(V(\lambda), V/V') = 0$ for all $\lambda \in X(T)_+$, forcing $V/V' = 0$ and $V = V'$. ■

Corollary 1.0.1(?).

Let $0 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow 0$ be a SES of G -modules with $\dim \text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), V_2) < \infty$ for all $\lambda \in X(T)_+$. If V_1, V have good filtrations, then V_2 also has a good filtration.

Note: this is likely difficult to prove without cohomology! But here we can apply the ext criterion.

Proof.

Let $\lambda \in X(T)_+$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \rightarrow \cancel{\text{Ext}_G^1(V(\lambda), V_1)} &\rightarrow \cancel{\text{Ext}_G^1(V(\lambda), V)} \rightarrow \text{Ext}_G^1(V(\lambda), V_2) \\ \rightarrow \cancel{\text{Ext}_G^2(V(\lambda), V_1)} &\rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

Figure 2: Image

For $\lambda \in X(T)_+$, let $I(\lambda)$ be the injective hull of $L(\lambda)$, so we have

$$0 \rightarrow L(\lambda) \hookrightarrow I(\lambda).$$

Theorem 1.0.2(?).

Let $\lambda \in X(T)_+$ and $I(\lambda)$ be the injective hull of $L(\lambda)$.

- a. $I(\lambda)$ has a good filtration.
- b. The multiplicity $[I(\lambda) : H^0(\mu)]$ is equal to $[H^0(\mu) : L(\lambda)]$, the composition factor multiplicity.

Brauer-Humphreys Reciprocity. Same idea as in category \mathcal{O} : multiplicity of Vermas equals multiplicity of irreducibles.

Proof (of a).

How to check that it has a good filtration? The cohomological criterion! So consider $\text{Ext}_G^1(V(\sigma), I(\lambda))$ for all $\sigma \in X(T)_+$. We want to show it's zero, but this follows because $I(\lambda)$ is injective. ■

Proof (of b).

By the previous result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [I(\lambda) : H^0(\mu)] &= \dim \text{hom}_G(V(\mu), I(\lambda)) \\ &= [V(\mu) : L(\lambda)]. \end{aligned}$$

Why does this second equality hold? The functor $\text{hom}_G(\cdot, I(\lambda))$ is exact, and $\text{hom}_G(L(\mu), I(\lambda)) = \delta_{\lambda, \mu}$. If $\lambda = \mu$ there's only one morphism, since $L(\lambda) \hookrightarrow I(\lambda)$ and $\text{Soc}_G I(\lambda) = L(\lambda)$. This means that they have the same character, $\text{char } H^0(\lambda) = \text{char } V(\lambda)$, and this implies that they have the same composition factors. ■

Theorem 1.0.3 (Cohomological Criterion for Weyl Filtrations).

Let V be a G -module.

- a. If V admits a Weyl filtration, then

$$[V : V(\lambda)] = \dim \text{hom}_G(V, H^0(\lambda))$$

- b. Suppose that $\dim \text{hom}_G(V(\lambda), H^0(\lambda)) < \infty$ for all $\lambda \in X(T)_+$. Then TFAE
 - V has a Weyl filtration.
 - $\text{Ext}_G^i(V, H^0(\lambda)) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in X(T)_+$ and $i > 0$.
 - $\text{Ext}_G^1(V, H^0(\lambda)) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in X(T)_+$.