Problem Set One

D. Zack Garza

January 26, 2020

Contents

1	Humphreys 1.1 1.1 a	
2	Humphreys 1.3*	1
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_{μ} :	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:

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

Proof:

Noting that

- Ind^g_b C_λ = U(g) ⊗_{U(b)} C_λ,
 Res^g_b M is an identification of the g-module M has a b- module by restricting the action of g, consider the following two maps:

$$F: \hom_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} \mathbb{C}_{\lambda}, M) \to \hom_{U(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathbb{C}_{\lambda}, M)$$
$$\phi \mapsto (F\phi : z \mapsto \phi(1 \otimes z)),$$

and using the action of \mathfrak{g} on M,

$$G: \hom_{U(\mathfrak{b})}(\mathbb{C}_{\lambda}, M) \to \hom_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} \mathbb{C}_{\lambda}, M)$$
$$\psi \mapsto (G\psi : g \otimes v \mapsto g \curvearrowright \psi(v)).$$

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

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

$$b \curvearrowright F\phi(v) \coloneqq b \curvearrowright (z \mapsto \phi(1 \otimes z))(v)$$

$$\coloneqq b \curvearrowright \phi(1 \otimes v)$$

$$= \phi(b \curvearrowright (1 \otimes v)) \quad \text{since } \phi \text{ is } U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-linear and } b \in U(\mathfrak{g})$$

$$= \phi((b \curvearrowright 1) \otimes v) \quad \text{by the definition/construction of } M(\lambda) \text{ as a } U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-module.}$$

$$= \phi(1 \otimes (b \curvearrowright v)) \quad \text{since } \mathbb{C}_{\lambda} \text{ is a \mathfrak{b}-module and the tensor is over } U(\mathfrak{b})$$

$$\coloneqq (z \mapsto \phi(1 \otimes z))(b \curvearrowright v)$$

$$\coloneqq F\phi(b \curvearrowright v).$$

To see that G is well-defined, let $\psi: C_{\lambda} \to M$ be fixed; we will show that the set map $G\psi:$ $U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes C_{\lambda} \to M$ is $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -linear. Let $u \in U(\mathfrak{g})$, then

$$\begin{split} u \curvearrowright G \psi(g \otimes v) &\coloneqq u \curvearrowright (g \otimes v \mapsto g \curvearrowright \psi(v))(g \otimes v) \\ &\coloneqq u \curvearrowright (g \curvearrowright \psi(v)) \\ &= (ug) \curvearrowright \psi(v) \quad \text{since M is a \mathfrak{g}-module with a well-defined action.} \\ &\coloneqq (g \otimes v \mapsto g \curvearrowright \psi(v))(ug \otimes v) \\ &\coloneqq G \psi(ug \otimes v). \end{split}$$

To see that $GF := G \circ F$ is the identity, let ψ be defined as above, then,

$$\begin{split} FG\psi(z) &= F(g \otimes v \to g \curvearrowright \psi(v))(z) \\ &\coloneqq F(\lambda))(z) \quad \text{for notational convenience} \\ &= (v \mapsto \lambda(1 \otimes v))(z) \\ &= \lambda(1 \otimes z) \\ &\coloneqq 1 \curvearrowright \psi(z) \\ &= \psi(z). \end{split}$$