

# Problem Set 2

D. Zack Garza

February 11, 2020

## Contents

1	Humphreys 1.5	1
2	Humphreys 1.9	2

## 1 Humphreys 1.5

**Proposition:** Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  and  $M(\lambda), M(\mu)$  Verma modules. Then  $M(\lambda) \otimes M(\mu)$  may not lie in  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Proof:**

Let  $M(\lambda), M(\mu)$  be arbitrary Verma modules with highest weight vectors  $v = 1 \otimes 1_\lambda, w = 1 \otimes 1_\mu$  respectively. We can then consider the weight of  $v \otimes w$  in  $N := M(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M(\mu)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} h \cdot (v \otimes w) &= h \cdot v \otimes w + v \otimes h \cdot w \\ &= \lambda(h)v \otimes w + v \otimes \mu(h)w \\ &= \lambda(h)(v \otimes w) + \mu(h)(v \otimes w) \\ &= (\lambda(h) + \mu(h))(v \otimes w). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , so  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* \cong \mathbb{C}$ , the claim is that it is possible for  $N$  to *not* be finitely-generated as a  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module.

Let  $\{y, h, x\}$  be the usual basis for  $\mathfrak{g}$ , for which  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  has the usual associated PBW basis. We can use the fact that  $\dim M(z) < \infty \iff z \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , so if we pick  $\mu, \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}$  we have weight space decompositions

$$\begin{aligned} M(\lambda) &= \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} M(\lambda)_{\lambda-2i} := \bigoplus_{\substack{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \\ \lambda_i := \lambda-2i}} M(\lambda)_{\lambda_i} \\ M(\mu) &= \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^+} M(\mu)_{\mu-2j} := \bigoplus_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \\ \mu_j := \mu-2j}} M(\mu)_{\mu_j} \end{aligned}$$

where we can explicitly identify  $\mathbb{C}$ -bases  $M(\lambda)_{\lambda_i} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \{y^i v_+\}$  and  $M(\mu)_{\mu_i} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \{y^i w_+\}$  where  $v_+, w_+$  are maximal weight vectors for  $M(\lambda), M(\mu)$  respectively.

By the initial observation, this yields a weight space decomposition for  $N$  given by

$$N = M(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M(\mu) = \bigoplus_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \left( \bigoplus_{\lambda_i + \mu_i = \nu} M(\lambda)_{\lambda_i} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M(\mu)_{\mu_i} \right) := \bigoplus_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^+} N_{\nu}.$$

Since each weight space  $N_{\nu} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \{y^i v_+ \otimes y^j w_+ \mid i + j = \nu\}$  has dimension  $p_2(\nu)$ , the (combinatorial) number of partitions of  $\nu$  into two parts. In particular,  $p_2(\nu)$  takes on arbitrarily large values, and thus  $N$  has weight spaces of arbitrarily large dimension.

Now suppose toward a contradiction that  $N$  is finitely generated as a  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, say by the  $n$  generators  $\{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$ . ■

## 2 Humphreys 1.9

**Proposition:** Let  $\psi : Z(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{h})$  be the twisted Harish-Chandra homomorphism. Then  $\psi$  is independent of the choice of a simple system in  $\Phi$ .

Hint: any simple system has the form  $w\Delta$  for some  $w \in W$ .

**Proof:**

For a given simple root system  $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell}\}$ , we can choose a PBW basis  $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$  for  $U(\mathfrak{h})$  to write

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : Z(\mathfrak{g}) &\xrightarrow{\xi} U(\mathfrak{h}) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{h}) = \mathbb{C}[\{h_i\}] = P(\mathfrak{h}^*) && \xrightarrow{\tau_{\rho}} \mathbb{C}[\{h_i\}] \\ z &\mapsto z = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} h_i^{t_i} && \mapsto \left( \lambda \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \lambda(h_i)^{t_i} \right) && \mapsto \psi(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (\lambda - \rho)(h_i)^{t_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The claim is that if an alternative simple root system  $\Delta = \{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{\ell}\}$  is chosen,  $\psi(z)$  does not change. Since there exists some  $w \in W$  such that  $w\alpha_i = \alpha'_i$  and we can write the Weyl vector as  $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell}$ .