

Problem Set 6

D. Zack Garza

Monday 4th May, 2020

Contents

1 Humphreys 5.3	1
2 Humphreys 7.2	1
2.1 Solution	1
3 Exercise p.108	3

1 Humphreys 5.3

Let λ be regular, antidominant, and integral, and suppose $M(\lambda)^n \neq 0$ but $M(\lambda)^{n+1} = 0$. In the Jantzen filtration of $M(w \cdot \lambda)$, show that $n = \ell_\lambda(w)$ where ℓ_λ is the length function of the system $(W_{[\lambda]}, \Delta_{[\lambda]})$. Thus there are $\ell(w) + 1$ nonzero layers in this filtration.

Use 0.3(2) to describe $\Phi_{w \cdot \lambda}^+$.

2 Humphreys 7.2

Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and show that T_λ^μ need not take Verma modules to Verma modules.

For example, let $\lambda = 1$ and $\mu = -3$.

2.1 Solution

Let $\lambda = 1$ and $\mu = -3$, noting that both are integral, μ is antidominant, and μ, λ are *compatible* as in the definition in 7.1. We can then consider

$$\nu := \mu - \lambda = -3 - 1 = -4,$$

and to compute the $\bar{\nu}$ that appears in the definition of T_λ^μ , we consider the (usual) W -orbit of ν . In $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$, we identify $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}$, $W = \{\text{id}, s_\alpha\}$, and $s_\alpha \lambda = -\lambda$ as reflection about 0. Thus the orbit is given by $W\nu = \{-4, 4\}$, which contains the unique dominant weight $\bar{\nu} = 4$. We thus have

$$T_1^{-3}(\cdot) = \text{pr}_{-3}(L(4) \otimes \text{pr}_1(\cdot)).$$

We use the fact that we always have an exact sequence of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow N(\lambda) \longrightarrow M(\lambda) \longrightarrow L(\lambda) \longrightarrow 0.$$

where in $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ we can identify $N(\lambda) = L(-\lambda - 2)$, thus we have

$$0 \longrightarrow L(-\lambda - 2) \longrightarrow M(\lambda) \longrightarrow L(\lambda) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here we can identify

$$\begin{aligned} L(-\lambda - 2) &= L(-1 - 2) \\ &= L(-3) \\ &= L(\mu) \\ &= M(\mu) \quad \text{since } \mu = -3 \text{ is integral and antidominant,} \end{aligned}$$

thus we can rewrite the exact sequence as

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M(\mu) & \longrightarrow & M(\lambda) & \longrightarrow & L(\lambda) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M(-3) & \longrightarrow & M(1) & \longrightarrow & L(1) & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

We know that the translation functor is exact, so applying T_λ^μ yields the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow T_1^{-3}M(-3) \longrightarrow T_1^{-3}M(1) \longrightarrow T_1^{-3}L(1) \longrightarrow 0$$

Since not *both* λ, μ are antidominant, we can not apply Theorem 7.6 to compute these, so we instead turn to the definition. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} T_1^{-3}L(1) &= \text{pr}_{-3}(L(4) \otimes \text{pr}_1(L(1))) \\ &= \text{pr}_{-3}(L(4) \otimes L(1)) \\ &= \text{pr}_{-3}(L(3) \oplus L(5)) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This follows from the fact that any module in $\mathcal{O}_{\chi_{-3}}$ has a composition series for which *all* of the composition factors have highest weight in $W_{[\lambda]} = \{\lambda, -\lambda - 2\} = \{1, -3\}$, but $L(3) \oplus L(5)$ has only composition factors with highest weight 3 or 5.

This forces an isomorphism $T_1^{-3}M(-3) \xrightarrow{\sim} T_1^{-3}M(1)$, so it suffices to show that either of these is not a Verma module.

This follows by considering

$$\begin{aligned} T_1^{-3}M(-3) &= \text{pr}_{-3}(L(4) \otimes \text{pr}_1 M(-3)) \\ &= \text{pr}_{-3}(L(4) \otimes M(-3)) \\ &= \text{pr}_{-3}(L(4) \otimes L(-3)) \\ &= \text{pr}_{-3}(L(1) \oplus L(3) \oplus L(5) \oplus L(7)) \end{aligned}$$

and noting that the resulting projection would have at least two distinct simple quotients, whereas every Verma module has a *unique* simple quotient.

3 Exercise p.108

- a. Work out the Jantzen filtration sections for $M(w_0 \cdot \lambda)$. List carefully any additional assumptions or facts needed to deduce $M(w_0 \cdot \lambda)^i$ uniquely.
- b. Continue #4.11 for the case of singular λ , e.g. $(\lambda + \rho, \widehat{\alpha}) = 1$. If you didn't deduce the structure of all $M(w \cdot \lambda)$ there, can you complete it now?
- c. Work out the non-integral case. (There are several different cases to consider.)