

## Inv. thy, HW 2 solutions

1) Let's show there are ~~no alg variety~~<sup>non-const</sup> morphisms  $G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ . Since  $G_1$  is conn'd we can assume  $G_1$  is conn'd. A morphism  $\varphi: G_1 \rightarrow G_2$  gives rise to  $\varphi^*: \mathbb{C}[G_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[G_1]$ . But  $\mathbb{C}[G_2] = \mathbb{C}[y_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, y_n^{\pm 1}]$  and  $\mathbb{C}[G_1] = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . The only invertible elements in the latter are constant. So  $\varphi^*(y_i) \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\varphi$  is constant.

Let's show there are no nontrivial alg. group homom's  $G_2 \xrightarrow{\varphi} G_1$ . Note that  $G_1$  contains no finite order elements so all finite order elem's in  $G_2$  go to 1. The connected component  $G_2^\circ$  is a torus, the finite order el'ts are dense there. So  $\varphi(G_2^\circ) = \{1\}$  and  $\varphi$  factors through  $G_2/G_2^\circ \rightarrow G_1$ . Again, since there are no finite order el'ts in  $G_1$ , this homomorphism is trivial.

2) Consider the action of  $H$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  by conjugation; it permutes the el'ts of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $H$  is connected, any permutation appearing in this way is trivial.

3) First, let us reduce to the case when  $x$  is nilpotent (in the Lie alg'e of a reductive alg'c group). Decompose  $x$  as  $x_s + x_n$ . We know that  $Z_G(x_s)$  is reductive &  $Z_G(x) = Z_G(x_s) \cap Z_G(x_n)$ . In other words,  $Z_G(x)$  coincides w/ the centralizer of  $x_n$  in  $Z_G(x_s)$ . We replace  $(G, x)$  w/  $(Z_G(x_s), x_n)$  and assume  $x$  is nilpotent.

Now let  $H$  be the centralizer of  $x$  in  $G$ , reductive by our assumption. We know that  $Z_G(H)$  is reductive. So we can replace  $G$  w/  $Z_G(H)^\circ$  and assume that the centralizer of  $x$  in  $G$  coincides w/ the center (and similarly in  $g$ ). The center consists of simple elements. But  $x$  lies in  $Z_G(x)$  and is nilpotent. So  $x=0$ , which implies the claim. □

Solution to extra-credit problem (HW 2)

Recall that the nilpotent orbits are in bijection with the conjugacy classes of  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples. So (a) means that if two orthogonal/symplectic rep's of  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$  are isomorphic, then there is an orthogonal/symplectic isomorphism. Let  $V$  be such a representation, and let  $U_n$  be the multiplicity space of the  $n+1$ -dimensional irrep  $V_n$  in  $V$  so that  $V = \bigoplus_n V_n \otimes U_n$ . It's easy to see that two different  $V_n \otimes U_n, V_m \otimes U_m$  are orthogonal and of course, any isomorphism  $V \rightarrow V$  preserves the decomp'  $V = \bigoplus_n V_n \otimes U_n$ . Now note that the tensor product of two spaces w/ orthogonal/symplectic forms carries a natural form that is orthogonal if both forms are ortho or both forms are symplc and is symplc if one of the forms is orthogonal and the other is symplectic. Note that  $V_n = S^n(\mathbb{C}^2)$  is orthogonal if  $n$  is even and is symplectic when  $n$  is odd. So  $U_n = \text{Hom}_G(V_n, V) = (V_n \otimes V)^G$  carries a natural non-degenerate form. If

(a)  $V, V_n$  are both orthogonal or both symplectic, then  $U_n$  is orthogonal

(b) If one of  $V_n, V$  is orthogonal and the other is symplc, then  $U_n$  is symplectic, hence even dimensional.

This implies (b). To prove (a), note that  $\text{Hom}_G(V_n \otimes U_n, V_n \otimes U_n) = \text{Hom}(U_n, U_n)$ . There is an isomorphism  $U_n \rightarrow U_n$  preserving the form, hence there's such an isomorphism in  $\text{Hom}_G(V_n \otimes U_n, V_n \otimes U_n)$ .

Let's prove (c). The  $O_n$ -orbit of an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{f})$  splits into two  $SO_n$ -orbits  $\Leftrightarrow$  the centralizer  $Z_{O_n}(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{f}) \subset SO_n$ . This centralizer is of the form  $\prod_n \{\mathbf{f} \pm \text{Id}_{V_n}\} \times G(U_n)$ , where  $G(U_n)$  is the group of the form preserving automorphisms of  $U_n$ . If  $V_n \neq 0$  for  $n+1$  odd, then  $\exists g \in G(U_n) = O(U_n)$  s.t.  $\det(-\text{Id}_{V_n} \otimes g) = -1 \Leftrightarrow Z_{O_n}(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{f}) \not\subset SO_n$ . But if  $V_n \neq 0 \Rightarrow n+1$  even  $\Rightarrow G(U_n) = Sp(U_n) \Rightarrow Z_{O_n}(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{f}) \subset SO_n$ . This proves (c).