Lazy approach to categories O, I.

0) Intro 1) Highest weight structure

0.1) BGG category U. Notation: Base field C G connected reductive group, of=Lie(G) $H \subseteq B \subseteq G$, Cartan & Borel. $\Lambda := Hom(H, \mathbb{C}^{\times})$

Def: Pick deb & view des element of b vie 5 = b. Of is the full subcategory in U(og)-mode consisting of all Ms.t. the action of 6 on Mgiven by X·m=Xm-<1, x7m integrates to a B-action.

Standard consequences: ·Weight decomposition: $M \in O_{\chi} \Rightarrow M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} M_{\chi}$ w. $M_{z} = \{ m \in M \mid xm = < \lambda + 1, x > m \neq x \in \beta \}; dim M_{x} < \infty$

 $\cdot \{\lambda \mid M_{\lambda} \neq 0\}$ is bounded from above with respect to the usual order: $\lambda_1 \in \lambda_2$ if $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \in Span_{\mathcal{R}_{20}}(positive roots)$. · Con form Verma module D, () = U(g) & C2+v & its simple quotient $L_{\lambda}(\lambda)$ so that $\Lambda \xrightarrow{\sim} Irr(O_{\lambda}), \lambda \xleftarrow{} L_{\lambda}(\lambda)$. • For $M \in \Lambda$ have $Q_{1} \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_{1+\mu} w = L_{1}(\lambda) \iff L_{\mu+1}(\lambda-\mu)$.

0.2)... and its siblings. Of is a "finite type" category (is "controlled" by the Hecke category associated to a subgroup of W, the Weyl group of G). It also has "affine" and, potentially, "double affine analogs to be briefly mentioned new and, hopefully, claborated later.

Affine world is inhabited by: · Lategories O over affine Lie algebras that exhibit 3 possible behaviors : "negative", "positive" and "critical" level. · Modular/quantum-at-a-root-of-1 categories O. Most of these (except the critical affine category) are directly controlled by the affine Hecke category.

There are also various geometric relatives of the above categories.

Double affine world: we haven't seen many categories living here but one of the families should be: quantum-at-a-voot-of-1-vational-level-affine categories () and their modular counterparts. Likely, there are many more but all of them (incl. quantum affine ones) are very complicated.

0.3) Coals & tools. Lategory O (& its siblings) split into direct sums of blocks. Our goal is to establish (derived) equivalences between blocks of Litterent categories O. The most basic & crucial tool here is highest weight structures to be discussed in the main part of the lecture.

1) Highest weight structures 1.1) Ceneral - and abstract - definition Let F be a field & C be an F-linear abelian category

Definition: The structure of a highest weight category w. finite poset on C is a finite poset, T, and a collection of standard objects $\Delta(\tau) \in C$, $\tau \in T$, satisfying the following: (HW1) dim_E Hom_e (D(T), M) < 00 + TEJ, MEC $(HW2) Hom_{e}(\Delta(T), \Delta(T')) \neq 0 \implies T \leq T'$ $(HW3) \mathbb{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} End_{\rho}(\Delta(\tau)) \neq \tau \in \mathcal{T}$ $(HW4) \neq M \in C, M \neq 0 \exists \tau \in T \text{ s.t. } Hom_{e}(\Delta(\tau), M) \neq 0.$ (HW5) ¥ T ∈ T] projective REC& R → Δ(T) s.t. Ker [P_ ->> D(t)] admits a finite filtration by D(t')'s w. $\mathcal{T}' > \mathcal{T}$

Exeruses:

1) A:= Ende (PZ) is finite & Home (PZ, •): C ~ A - Model. 2) Each $\Delta(\tau)$ has unique simple quotient, $L(\tau)$, and $\tau \mapsto L(\tau)$ is a bijection $\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow{\sim} Irr(\mathcal{C})$.

1.2) Example: infinitesimal blocks of O Of itself is not highest wt. in the sense of Sec 1.1 but is the infinite direct sum of such. Recall the Harish- Chandra isomorphism: $HC: \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{U}(\sigma_{f})) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{I}^{*}]^{(W, \cdot)}, \quad W \cdot \lambda = W(\lambda + p) - p$ so that $z \in Z(U(\sigma))$ acts on $\Delta_{\gamma}(\lambda)$ by $HC_{z}(\lambda+\lambda)$ Consider the equivalence relation ~, on A: 2,~, 2, if $\lambda_{1} + \gamma = W \cdot (\lambda_{1} + \gamma)$ We get the decomposition $Q_{1} = \bigoplus Q_{1,\Xi}$, where Ξ runs over the equivalence classes for ~. Exercise: Each O, is a highest weight category with standard objects $\Delta_{\lambda}(\lambda), \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$, and order restricted from \leq .

1.3) Deformation Let R be a Northerian ring and Cp be an R-linear abelian category. Note that for MECR we get a right exact functor $M \otimes_{p} ?: R \cdot mod_{g} \rightarrow C_{p}$, we say that M is K-flat if this functor is exact.

One can generalize the definition of a highest weight category to lp: we require that $\Delta_R(\tau)$ are flat over R & modify (HW1) & (HW5) as follows: (HW1'): Home (A(T), M) is fin. generated over R. (HW5'): Ker [P2 ->> A(t)] is filtered by objects of the form Q^{t'} & A(t') for t'TT & Q^{t'} fin gen'd projective R-module. Exercise: End e (PP) is fin. genid projective R-module.

Main example: R: = C[["] completion at O. Let cbe the composition $h \hookrightarrow S(h) = C[h^*] \hookrightarrow R$. O, R is the full subcategory in U(og) & R - mode consisting of all M s.t. the action of 6 on M given by x·m=xm-(<v,x>+((x)) m integrates to a B-action.

We have the same properties as for O, , e.g. weight de composition M= @M, w. fin genid R-modules M, & weights bounded from above. We can form Verme modules

 $\Delta_{1, \mathcal{R}}(\lambda) = \mathcal{U}(\sigma_{\mathcal{I}}) \bigotimes_{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B})} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda+1}, \text{ where } \mathcal{R}_{\lambda+1} \simeq \mathcal{R} \text{ w. } \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{R} \text{ by}$ $x \mapsto ((x) + < \lambda + 1, x 7.$

Exercise: O, is identified w. the full subcategory in O, P consisting of all objects M where R acts via R ->> C.

Kemark: One can informally view Ras the algebra of functions on a tiny neighborhood around & Then One is a family of categories over this neighborhood whose fiber at a point of in the neighborhood is O, (note that strictly spearing Spec (R) only has one C-point).

We can extend the infinitesimal block decomposition for Of= Of to Of Let mcR denote the maximal ideal. Set O, R. Z = {MEO, R M/M*M is filtered by objects in O, HR}

Exercise 1) $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,R} = \bigoplus_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{R},\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathcal{R},\mathcal{Z}}$ 2) $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,R,\Xi}$ is highest weight w. standards $\Delta_{\lambda,R}(\lambda), \lambda \in \Xi$ \neq

1.4) (ategory of standardly filtered objects Def: An object in Cp is called standardly filtered it it admits a finite filtration by Qtop DR(C'), t'e T, where Q' is finitely generated projective R-module. The full subcategory of stand. filtered objects will be denoted by CR.

E.g. Dr(T) & PT from (HW5') are in CR.

The following claims require introducing "costandard" objects - the readers familiar with the notion could try to prove them.

Facts: 1) Every projective in C_R is in C_R^{Δ} 2) If $M, N \in C_R^{\Delta} \& \varphi: M \longrightarrow N$, then $\ker \varphi \in C_R^{\Delta}$.

The proof of the following corollary of these fact is left

as an <u>exercise</u>.

Corollary: For $M \in C_R^{\Delta}$ TFAE: a) M is projective 6) $Ext_{e_{R}}^{\prime}(M,N)=0 \forall N \in C_{R}^{\Delta}$ c) $E_{xt_{e_p}}(M, \Delta_{R}(\tau)) = 0 \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}.$

The importance of this corollary is as follows. We note that le is an "exact category" (an additive category with a good nation of short exact sequences). Fact 1 shows that the additive category of projectives CR-proj is contained in CR & Corollary allows to recover CR-proj Inside CR. And once we know CR-proj we can recover the abelian category CR.

1.5) What's next? Here's the "lazy approach" to understand the categories $Q_{1,\Xi}$ (the most interesting case is V=0). We will construct a "nice" right exact functor O, R, E - CR, where CR is an "easy" category that very roughly depends on "combina-

torics" of U, R. Z. We will see that V is acyclic on the standard objects & is fully feithful on Or, R. S. So we need to Lescribe N(One). It turns out that since N is "nice" it suffices to only describe the localizations of the categories & the functor at ht 1 prime ideals (which morally amounts to understanding the cases when I is generic on a root hyperplane). The resulting description of Or, R, E (and hence indirectly O, ;) is very implicit, yet it allows to prove equivalences between different such categories. Finally, what makes this approach "laty" is that one needs to know relatively little to get equivalences: essentially one needs to have a nice functor to a "combinatorial category" & to understand its localizations to neighborhoods of generic points on hyperplanes.