

DUALITY IN DERIVED CATEGORY \mathcal{O}^∞

CEMILE KURKOGLU

ABSTRACT. Let \mathbf{G} be a split connected reductive group over a finite extension F of \mathbb{Q}_p , and let $\mathbf{T} \subset \mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{G}$ be a maximal split torus and a Borel subgroup, respectively. Denote by $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$ and $B = \mathbf{B}(F)$ their groups of F -valued points and by $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$ and $\mathfrak{b} = \text{Lie}(B)$ their Lie algebras. Let \mathcal{O}^∞ be the thick category \mathcal{O} for $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b})$, and denote by $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty \subset \mathcal{O}^\infty$ the full subcategory consisting of objects whose weights are in $X^*(\mathbf{T})$. Both are Serre subcategories of the category of all U -modules, where $U = U(\mathfrak{g})$. We show first that the functor $\mathbb{D}^{\mathfrak{g}} = \text{RHom}_U(-, U)$ preserves $D^b(U)_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}$, and we deduce from a result of Coulembier-Mazorchuk that the latter category is equivalent to $D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty)$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Overview of results and contents	1
1.2. Notations and conventions	2
2. Categories \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}^∞	3
2.1. Categories \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}_{alg}	3
2.2. Categories \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$	5
2.3. Blocks and \mathfrak{z} -blocks	8
3. Duality in the derived category of \mathcal{O}^∞	9
3.1. Ext-duals of induced modules	9
3.2. The functors $\text{Ext}_U^i(-, U)$ preserve \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$	11
3.3. Dualizing modules for universal enveloping algebras	12
3.4. The duality functors on $D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty)$ and $D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty)$	14
References	18

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Overview of results and contents.** Let F/\mathbb{Q}_p be a finite extension of the field \mathbb{Q}_p of p -adic numbers, and let \mathbf{G} be a connected split reductive group over F . We fix a Borel subgroup $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{G}$ and a maximal split torus $\mathbf{T} \subset \mathbf{B}$. Their Lie algebras we denote by gothic letters \mathfrak{g} , \mathfrak{b} , and \mathfrak{t} , respectively, and their groups of F -rational points by G , B , and T , respectively.

First we introduce the Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand category \mathcal{O} for the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b})$ (suitably defined for Lie algebras over a field which is not algebraically closed), its extension-closure \mathcal{O}^∞ , sometimes called the “thick” category \mathcal{O} , and the subcategories $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}} \subset \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty \subset \mathcal{O}^\infty$ consisting of modules M whose weights are *algebraic* for the torus \mathbf{T} , i.e., lie in the image of the canonical map $X^*(\mathbf{T}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathfrak{t}^*$. It is shown that \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ are Serre subcategories of the category of all $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules.

Then we study duality functors on derived categories related to the previous categories \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. To discuss those, denote by $D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod})$ (resp. $D_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod})$) the subcategory of the bounded derived category $D^b(U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod})$ consisting of complexes whose cohomology modules lie in \mathcal{O}^∞ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$). It is shown that these categories are invariant under the duality functor $M \rightsquigarrow \text{RHom}_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(M, U(\mathfrak{g}))$. Furthermore, a theorem by K. Coulembier and V. Mazorchuk says that the canonical functors

$$D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty) \longrightarrow D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod}), \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) \longrightarrow D_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod})$$

are equivalences of categories. We thus obtain involutive functors

$$\mathbb{D}^{\mathfrak{g}} : D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) \longrightarrow D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty), \quad \mathbb{D}_{\text{alg}}^{\mathfrak{g}} : D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) \longrightarrow D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty).$$

1.2. Notations and conventions. By F/\mathbb{Q}_p we denote a finite extension, occasionally called the “base field”, and by E/F another finite extension, called the “coefficient field”. The subscript “ E ” denotes the the base change to E , i.e., $W_E = W \otimes_F E$ for some F -vector space W .

We let \mathbf{G} denote a connected split reductive group over F , by $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{G}$ a Borel subgroup and by $\mathbf{T} \subset \mathbf{B}$ a maximal F -split torus, and write $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(\mathbf{G}) \supset \mathfrak{b} = \text{Lie}(\mathbf{B}) \supset \mathfrak{t} = \text{Lie}(\mathbf{T})$ for their Lie algebras.

We denote by $\Phi = \Phi(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$ the set of roots of \mathfrak{t} on \mathfrak{g} , and by \mathfrak{g}_α the root space corresponding to $\alpha \in \Phi$. As usual, Φ^+ denotes the set of roots determined by \mathfrak{b} , i.e., those α for which \mathfrak{g}_α is contained in \mathfrak{b} . We set $\mathfrak{t}_E^* = \text{Hom}_F(\mathfrak{t}, E)$, and we let $\Gamma = \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha$ be the integral cone generated by the positive roots. \mathfrak{t}_E^* carries a partial ordering $<$ defined by

$$\lambda < \mu \iff \mu - \lambda \in \Gamma.$$

Set $\rho = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} \alpha$ and define the dot-action of the Weyl group W of Φ by $w \cdot \lambda := w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$. The W -orbit of $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^*$ for the dot-action is denoted by $|\lambda|$.

If A is a ring (always associative and with unit element) then $A\text{-mod}$ denotes the category of all A -left-modules. Given a (cochain) complex

$$K^\bullet = (\dots \xrightarrow{d_K^{i-1}} K^i \xrightarrow{d_K^i} K^{i+1} \xrightarrow{d_K^{i+1}} \dots)$$

and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we let $K[n]$ be the complex $K[n]^i := K^{i+n}$ and with differential $d_{K[n]}^i = (-1)^n d_K^{i+n}$.

2. CATEGORIES \mathcal{O} AND \mathcal{O}^∞

2.1. **Categories \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}_{alg} .** The material in this section has appeared before in [OS15].

2.1.1. Diagonalizable, E -split, and algebraic modules. We recall some concepts about representations of \mathfrak{t}_E . Given an \mathfrak{t}_E -module (ϕ, M) and a weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^*$, we set

$$M_\lambda^i = \{m \in M \mid \forall h \in \mathfrak{t}_E : (\phi(h) - \lambda(h) \cdot \text{id})^i \cdot m = 0\}$$

and $M_\lambda^\infty = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} M_\lambda^i$. For M_λ^1 we write M_λ . Then M_λ is called the eigenspace of M for the weight λ , and M_λ^∞ is called the generalized eigenspace of M for the weight λ .

Definition 2.1.2. Let M be a \mathfrak{t}_E -module.

(i) M is called *diagonalizable* (over E) if

$$M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^*} M_\lambda.$$

(ii) M is called *E -split* if

$$M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^*} M_\lambda^\infty.$$

If M is E -split we set $\Pi(M) = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^* \mid M_\lambda^\infty \neq 0\}$ and call it the set of *weights* of M .

For later use we note the following elementary

Lemma 2.1.3. *Given a \mathfrak{t}_E -module M such that $M_\lambda^\infty \neq 0$, then $M_\lambda^1 \neq 0$.*

Proof. Let $v \in M_\lambda^\infty$ be non-zero. Let h_1, \dots, h_ℓ be a basis of \mathfrak{t} . Choose $i_1 > 0$ maximal such that $v_1 := (\phi_M(h_1) - \lambda(h_1) \cdot \text{id})^{i_1-1} \cdot v \neq 0$. Note that $v_1 \in \ker(\phi_M(h_1) - \lambda(h_1) \cdot \text{id})$. Then choose $i_2 > 0$ maximal with the property that $v_2 := (\phi_M(h_2) - \lambda(h_2) \cdot \text{id})^{i_2-1} \cdot v_1 \neq 0$. Note that $v_2 \in \ker(\phi_M(h_1) - \lambda(h_1) \cdot \text{id}) \cap \ker(\phi_M(h_2) - \lambda(h_2) \cdot \text{id})$. We keep repeating this construction until we have found a non-zero $w := w_h \in M_\lambda^1$. \square

The group of algebraic characters $X^*(\mathbf{T}) = \text{Hom}_{\text{alg.gps}/F}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{G}_{m,F})$ embeds into \mathfrak{t}^* by the derivative $d : X^*(\mathbf{T}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$. We denote by $\mathfrak{t}_{\text{alg}}^*$ the image of d , and call the weights in $\mathfrak{t}_{\text{alg}}^*$ *algebraic* with respect to \mathbf{T} . A \mathfrak{t}_E -module M is called *algebraic* with respect to \mathbf{T} if it is E -split and $M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_{\text{alg}}^*} M_\lambda^\infty$.

As \mathbf{T} is fixed throughout this thesis, we often drop the qualifier “with respect to \mathbf{T} ”.

Definition 2.1.4. (i) Category \mathcal{O} for $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{t})$ and the coefficient field E is the full subcategory of $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$ consisting of modules M which satisfy the following properties:

- (1) M is finitely generated as a $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -module.

- (2) M is diagonalizable.
- (3) The action of \mathfrak{b}_E on M is locally finite, i.e., for every $m \in M$, the subspace $U(\mathfrak{b}_E).m \subset M$ is finite-dimensional over E .

(ii) Category \mathcal{O}_{alg} for $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathbf{T})$ and the coefficient field E is the full subcategory of \mathcal{O} consisting of modules M which are algebraic with respect to \mathbf{T} .

2.1.5. Properties of category \mathcal{O} . Category \mathcal{O} , as defined here for a split reductive Lie algebra over a field which is not algebraically closed, enjoys all the properties that category \mathcal{O} for a semisimple complex Lie algebra has. We only mention some of them here [Hum08, 1.1, 1.11]:

- (1) Every M in \mathcal{O} is noetherian and artinian (i.e., ascending chains of submodules are stationary, and descending chains of submodules are stationary). In particular every object in \mathcal{O} has finite length.
- (2) \mathcal{O} is closed under submodules, quotients, and finite direct sums.
- (3) \mathcal{O} is an abelian category.
- (4) If M in \mathcal{O} and L is finite dimensional, then $L \otimes M$ also lies in \mathcal{O} . Thus $M \rightsquigarrow L \otimes M$ defines an exact functor $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$.
- (5) If M in \mathcal{O} , then M is \mathfrak{z}_E -finite: for each $v \in M$, the span of $\{z \cdot v \mid z \in \mathfrak{z}_E\}$ is finite dimensional.
- (6) If M in \mathcal{O} , then M is finitely generated as a $U(\mathfrak{u}_{-E})$ -module.

2.1.6. Verma modules and simple modules. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E$ we denote by E_λ the one-dimensional module given by $\lambda : \mathfrak{t}_E \rightarrow \text{End}_E(E) = E$. Via the quotient morphism $\mathfrak{b}_E \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_E$ we consider E_λ also as a \mathfrak{b}_E -module, and thus as a $U(\mathfrak{b}_E)$ -module. The $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -module

$$M(\lambda) = U(\mathfrak{g}_E) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b}_E)} E_\lambda$$

is called the *Verma module* with highest weight λ . The vector $v_0 := 1 \otimes 1$ generates $M(\lambda)_\lambda$ as E -vector space and v_0 is a maximal vector in the sense that $\mathfrak{u}.v_0 = \{0\}$. The Verma module $M(\lambda)$ has following universal property: for any N in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -mod and any maximal vector $v \in N_\lambda$ there is a unique morphism $f : M(\lambda) \rightarrow N$ in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -mod such that $f(v_0) = v$. The module $M(\lambda)$ has a unique maximal submodule and therefore a unique simple quotient which we denote by $L(\lambda)$. Every simple object in \mathcal{O} is isomorphic to $L(\lambda)$ for a unique λ .

2.1.7. Category \mathcal{O} is not closed under extensions. For the very purpose of our paper, we would like to consider the subcategory $D_{\mathcal{O}}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod})$ of $D^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ consisting of complexes $M^\bullet = (M^n)_n$ whose cohomology groups are in category \mathcal{O} . If \mathcal{A} is an abelian

category and \mathcal{B} is a weak Serre subcategory, $D_{\mathcal{B}}^\star(\mathcal{A})$ is a strictly full¹ saturated² triangulated of $D^\star(\mathcal{A})$, where $\star \in \{\emptyset, -, +, b\}$ [Sta, 13.17.1]. But as the following example shows, \mathcal{O}_{alg} , and hence \mathcal{O} , is not stable under extensions in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$.

Example 2.1.8. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, F)$, and identify $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}_*$ with a scalar. Let $N = Fe_1 \oplus Fe_2$ be a 2-dimensional $U(\mathfrak{b})$ -module defined by letting x act as 0 and h act as $h.e_1 = \lambda e_1$ and $h.e_2 = e_1 + \lambda e_2$. The induced $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module $M := U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} N$ fits into an exact sequence which fails to split:

$$(2.1.8) \quad 0 \rightarrow M(\lambda) \rightarrow M \rightarrow M(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$$

2.1.9. Serre subcategories. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. Recall that a subcategory \mathcal{C} of an abelian category \mathcal{A} is called a *Serre subcategory* (resp. *weak Serre subcategory*) if it is non-empty, full, and if for any exact sequence

$$M_0 \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow M_2 \longrightarrow M_3 \longrightarrow M_4$$

in \mathcal{A} the object M_2 belongs to \mathcal{C} if both M_1 and M_3 (resp. if all of M_0, M_1, M_3, M_4) belong to \mathcal{C} [Sta, 12.10.1], [Wei94, Ex. 10.3.2]. A subcategory \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{A} is a Serre subcategory if and only if (i) it contains the zero object, (ii) is strictly full, and (iii) is stable under subobjects, quotients, and extensions [Sta, 12.10.2].

From the example 2.1.8 above, it follows that \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}_{alg} , are *not* weak Serre subcategories of $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$.

2.2. Categories \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. As category \mathcal{O} is not stable under extensions, we are led to consider the smallest strictly full abelian subcategory of $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$ which contains \mathcal{O} (resp. \mathcal{O}_{alg}) and is closed under extensions. We see from the example 2.1.8 that, in general, \mathfrak{t}_E acts no longer acts diagonalizable on modules in this subcategory.

Definition 2.2.1. (i) Category \mathcal{O}^∞ for $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{t})$ and the coefficient field E is the full subcategory of $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$ consisting of modules M which satisfy the following properties:

- (1) M is finitely generated as a $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -module.
- (2) M is E -split as a \mathfrak{t}_E -module.
- (3) The action of \mathfrak{b}_E on M is locally finite, i.e. for every $m \in M$, the subspace $U(\mathfrak{b}_E).m \subset M$ is finite-dimensional over E .

(ii) Category $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ for $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathbf{T})$ and the coefficient field E is the full subcategory of \mathcal{O}^∞ consisting of modules M which are algebraic with respect to \mathbf{T} .

¹A subcategory \mathcal{C} of a category \mathcal{A} is called *strictly full* if it is a full subcategory and contains all objects of \mathcal{A} which are isomorphic to objects of \mathcal{C} [Sta, 4.2.10].

²Let \mathcal{D} be a pre-triangulated category. A full pre-triangulated subcategory \mathcal{D}' of \mathcal{D} is *saturated* if whenever $X \oplus Y$ is isomorphic to an object of \mathcal{D}' then both X and Y are isomorphic to objects of \mathcal{D}' [Sta, 13.6.1].

Remark 2.2.2. Category \mathcal{O}^∞ is sometimes called “thick category \mathcal{O} ”. It has been studied in several papers, for example [Soe85] and [CM15b].

Proposition 2.2.3. *Categories \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ are both abelian categories. Every object M in \mathcal{O}^∞ is noetherian (i.e., any ascending chain of submodules is stationary).*

Proof. As they are defined as full subcategories of the abelian category $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$, one only needs to check that these categories are closed under taking finite direct sums, kernels, and cokernels. This is straightforward to verify using the fact that $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ is noetherian (hence any submodule of a finitely generated module is finitely generated). This also implies the assertion about modules in \mathcal{O}^∞ being noetherian. \square

Lemma 2.2.4. *Let M be in \mathcal{O}^∞ .*

- (i) *For $\alpha \in \Phi$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ one has $x_\alpha M_\lambda^i \subset M_{\lambda+\alpha}^i$. In particular, $x_\alpha M_\lambda^\infty \subset M_{\lambda+\alpha}^\infty$.*
- (ii) *$\Pi(M)$ is contained in a finite union of sets of the form $\lambda - \Gamma$, where $\Gamma = \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha$.*
- (iii) *The generalized eigenspace M_λ^∞ is finite-dimensional over E for any weight $\lambda \in \Pi(M)$.*
- (iv) *The subspace $M^i := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Pi(M)} M_\lambda^i$ is a $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -submodule of M which belongs to \mathcal{O}^∞ . Moreover, M^1 is a submodule which lies in \mathcal{O} and which is non-zero if M is non-zero. There is $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$ such that $M = M^i$.*

Proof. (i) For $h \in \mathfrak{t}_E$ one has $hx_\alpha = \alpha(h)x_\alpha + x_\alpha h$, and hence

$$(h - (\lambda(h) + \alpha(h)) \cdot 1)x_\alpha = x_\alpha(h - \lambda(h) \cdot 1),$$

and thus $(h - (\lambda(h) + \alpha(h)) \cdot 1)^i x_\alpha = x_\alpha(h - \lambda(h) \cdot 1)^i$. This shows that

$$x_\alpha \cdot \ker \left((\phi_M(h) - \lambda(h) \cdot \text{id})^i \right) \subset \ker \left((\phi_M(h) - (\lambda + \alpha)(h) \cdot \text{id})^i \right).$$

(ii) Let M be generated by the elements m_1, \dots, m_n . Since $U(\mathfrak{b}_E).m_j$ is finite-dimensional

- (1) there is $i \gg 0$, and
- (2) there are finitely many $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$ in \mathfrak{t}_E^* , and
- (3) there are finite-dimensional subspaces $W_k \subset M_{\lambda_k}^i$, for $k = 1, \dots, n$

such that one has $U(\mathfrak{b}_E).m_j \subset \bigoplus_{k=1}^r W_k$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. By the PBW theorem we have, as E -vectors space, $U(\mathfrak{g}_E) = U(\mathfrak{u}_{-E}) \otimes_E U(\mathfrak{b}_E)$. By (i) we find that

$$(2.2.5) \quad M = \sum_{j=1}^n U(\mathfrak{g}_E).m_j \subset U(\mathfrak{u}_{-E}) \cdot \bigoplus_{k=1}^r W_k \subset \sum_{k=1}^r \sum_{\nu \in \lambda_k - \Gamma} (M_\nu^i \cap U(\mathfrak{u}_{-E}).W_k).$$

(iii) This follows from 2.2.5 together with the fact that for any $\mu \in \Lambda_r$ there are only finitely many $(m_1, \dots, m_t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^t$ such that $\mu = \sum_{j=1}^t m_j \beta_j$, where $\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t\} = \Phi^+$ and $t = |\Phi^+|$.

(iv) That M^i is a $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -submodule follows from (i). By 2.2.3, it lies in category \mathcal{O}^∞ . That M^1 lies in \mathcal{O} follows by definition. That M^1 is non-zero if M is non-zero follows from

2.1.3. The last assertion is a consequence of 2.2.5. Alternatively, one could argue that the sequence of submodules $M^1 \subset M^2 \subset M^3 \dots$ must be stationary as M is noetherian, by 2.2.3. \square

Proposition 2.2.6. (i) *Categories \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ are closed under extensions and are Serre subcategories of $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -mod.*

(ii) *A $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -module M belongs to \mathcal{O}^∞ if and only if there is a finite filtration $0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \dots \subset M_n = M$ such that all quotients M_k/M_{k-1} , $1 \leq k \leq n$, are in category \mathcal{O} .*

(iii) *A $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -module M belongs to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ if and only if there is a finite filtration $0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \dots \subset M_n = M$ such that all quotients M_k/M_{k-1} , $1 \leq k \leq n$, are in category \mathcal{O}_{alg} .*

(iv) *Simple objects in category \mathcal{O}^∞ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$) lie in \mathcal{O} (resp. \mathcal{O}_{alg}), and every object in \mathcal{O}^∞ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$) has finite length.*

Proof. (i) Suppose first that N, L belong to category \mathcal{O}^∞ , and that $0 \rightarrow N \hookrightarrow M \xrightarrow{\pi} L \rightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -mod. It is clear that M is then finitely generated. Let $W \subset M$ be a finite-dimensional \mathfrak{t}_E -stable subspace. We want to show that W is E -split in the sense of 2.1.2. Let \overline{E} be the algebraic closure of E . We use the fact that the induced action of $\mathfrak{t}_{\overline{E}}$ on $W_{\overline{E}} = W \otimes_E \overline{E}$ is \overline{E} -split, cf. [Jac79, II, sec. 4, Thm. 7]. So let $W_{\overline{E}} = W_{\overline{E}, \lambda_1}^\infty \oplus \dots \oplus W_{\overline{E}, \lambda_r}^\infty$ be a decomposition of $W_{\overline{E}}$ into simultaneous generalized eigenspaces, for pairwise different weights $\lambda_i : \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \overline{E}$. Note that the eigenvalues of $h \in \mathfrak{t}_E$ on $W_{\overline{E}}$ are thus $\lambda_1(h), \dots, \lambda_r(h)$ (not necessarily pairwise distinct). Then the eigenvalues of h on $W_{\overline{E}} \cap N_{\overline{E}}$ and the eigenvalues of h on $\pi(W_{\overline{E}})$ are also among $\lambda_1(h), \dots, \lambda_r(h)$. But the eigenvalues of h on any finite-dimensional h -stable subspace of $N_{\overline{E}}$ (resp. $L_{\overline{E}}$) are in E , as N (resp. L) is E -split. The linear forms $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$ are therefore E -valued and thus belong to \mathfrak{t}_E . As M is the union of its finite-dimensional \mathfrak{t}_E -stable subspaces, M is E -split.

We also note that for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^*$ we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N_\lambda^\infty \rightarrow M_\lambda^\infty \rightarrow L_\lambda^\infty \rightarrow 0$. By 2.2.4, it follows that $\Pi(M) = \Pi(N) \cup \Pi(L)$ is contained in a finite union of sets of the form $\lambda - \Gamma$. Therefore, for any $\nu \in \Pi(M)$ we have that $(\nu + \Gamma) \cap \Pi(M)$ is finite. Now we have

$$U(\mathfrak{b}_E).M_\nu^\infty \subset \sum_{\nu \in (\nu + \Gamma) \cap \Pi(M)} M_\nu^\infty .$$

By 2.2.4, the generalized eigenspaces are finite-dimensional, which implies that $U(\mathfrak{b}_E).M_\nu^\infty$ is finite-dimensional. This completes the proof that \mathcal{O}^∞ is closed under extensions. That the same is true for $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ follows from the fact that $\Pi(M) = \Pi(N) \cup \Pi(L)$ when M is an extension of L by N .

It follows from the remark in 2.1.9 that both \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ are Serre subcategories of $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -mod.

(ii) and (iii) “ \Leftarrow ” For any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M_{i-1} \rightarrow M_i \rightarrow M_i/M_{i-1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Using part (i), it follows by induction on i and our assumption that M_i is in category \mathcal{O}^∞ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$). Hence $M = M_n$ belongs to category \mathcal{O}^∞ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$).

“ \Rightarrow ” Given M , we know from 2.2.4 that there is $i \gg 0$ such that $M = M^i$. Furthermore,

$$0 \subset M^1 \subset M^2 \subset \dots \subset M^i = M$$

is a filtration of M by submodules, and M^i/M^{i-1} lies in category \mathcal{O} (resp. \mathcal{O}_{alg}).

(iv) Let L be a simple module in \mathcal{O}^∞ . By 2.2.4, $L^1 = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Pi(L)} L_\lambda^1 \subset L$ is a non-zero submodule, and hence must be equal to L . By (iii) that every object in \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ possesses a finite filtration whose successive subquotients are in category \mathcal{O} . As objects in category \mathcal{O} have finite length, the same holds for objects in \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. \square

2.3. Blocks and \mathfrak{z} -blocks.

2.3.1. \mathfrak{z} -blocks³ of category \mathcal{O}^∞ . As we have recalled in 2.1.5, for every M in \mathcal{O} every element $m \in M$ is \mathfrak{z}_E -finite, i.e., annihilated by an ideal $J \subset \mathfrak{z}_E$ of finite codimension (i.e., $\dim_E(\mathfrak{z}_E/J) < \infty$). As M is finitely generated, it follows that M is annihilated by an ideal of finite codimension, $I \subset \mathfrak{z}_E$ say. By 2.2.6, this also holds for objects in \mathcal{O}^∞ .

Because \mathfrak{z}_E/I is an Artin ring, we can apply the decomposition of Artin rings into its local components: $\mathfrak{z}_E/I = \prod_{i=1}^r \mathfrak{z}_E/I_i$, where $\mathfrak{m}_i := \sqrt{I_i}$ is a maximal ideal. Then $\mathfrak{z}_E/I_i = (\mathfrak{z}_E/I)_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$ is the localization of \mathfrak{z}_E/I at \mathfrak{m}_i . It follows that

$$M = (\mathfrak{z}_E/I) \otimes_{\mathfrak{z}_E} M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r (\mathfrak{z}_E/I_i) \otimes_{\mathfrak{z}_E} M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r (\mathfrak{z}_E/I)_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \otimes_{\mathfrak{z}_E} M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r M_{\mathfrak{m}_i},$$

and every $M_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$ is a $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -submodule. Moreover, it follows from the condition that modules in \mathcal{O}^∞ are E -split that if \mathfrak{m} is a maximal ideal of \mathfrak{z}_E , then $M_{\mathfrak{m}} = 0$ unless $\mathfrak{z}_E/\mathfrak{m} = E$ (i.e., the canonical map $E \rightarrow \mathfrak{z}_E/\mathfrak{m}$ is an isomorphism). In that case the map $\mathfrak{z}_E \rightarrow \mathfrak{z}_E/\mathfrak{m} = E$ is of the form χ_λ , where $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^*$ and χ_λ denotes the character by which \mathfrak{z}_E acts on the Verma module $M(\lambda)$. One has $\chi_\lambda = \chi_\mu$ if and only if $|\lambda| = |\mu|$, cf. [KV95, 4.115]. Set $M_{|\lambda|} := M_{\ker(\chi_\lambda)}$ and write $\text{pr}_{|\lambda|} : M \rightarrow M_{|\lambda|}$ for the corresponding projection.

For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^*$ let $\mathcal{O}^\infty_{|\lambda|}$ be the full subcategory of \mathcal{O}^∞ consisting of modules M such that $M = M_{|\lambda|}$. Then every M in \mathcal{O}^∞ splits as $M = \bigoplus_{|\lambda|} M_{|\lambda|}$. We call $\mathcal{O}^\infty_{|\lambda|}$ a \mathfrak{z} -block. In

³We use the term “ \mathfrak{z} -block” here as we have not found a generally accepted name for those subcategories. In [Hum08, end of 1.13] it is said that those subcategories are sometimes also referred to as “blocks”, but in order to avoid confusion with blocks in the sense of the theory of abelian categories, we prefer not to call them blocks here.

general, it is not a block of this category. We obtain a decomposition $\mathcal{O}^\infty = \bigoplus_{|\lambda|} \mathcal{O}^\infty_{|\lambda|}$. Similarly, we have a decomposition

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty = \bigoplus_{|\lambda|, \lambda \text{ algebraic}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}, |\lambda|}^\infty .$$

We also define $\mathcal{O}_{|\lambda|}$ to be the subcategory of modules M such that $M = M_{|\lambda|}$, and call it a \mathfrak{z} -block of \mathcal{O} .

2.3.2. Blocks of category \mathcal{O} . If λ is integral, then $\mathcal{O}_{|\lambda|}$ is a block of category \mathcal{O} in the sense of the theory of abelian categories, cf. [Hum08, 1.13]. For general λ the subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{|\lambda|}$ splits further into subcategories \mathcal{O}_ν as follows. Given $\nu \in |\lambda|$ set $W_{[\nu]} = \{w \in W \mid w \cdot \nu - \nu \in \Lambda_r\}$ and consider the subcategory of modules M in \mathcal{O} which have the property that all irreducible subquotients are of the form $L(w \cdot \nu)$ with $w \in W_{[\nu]}$. Then \mathcal{O}_ν is a block of \mathcal{O} and

$$\mathcal{O}_{|\lambda|} = \bigoplus_{W/W_{[\lambda]}} \mathcal{O}_{w \cdot \lambda} ,$$

cf. [Hum08, 4.9]. For category \mathcal{O}^∞ one can define in an analogous way \mathcal{O}^∞_ν as the subcategory of modules M in \mathcal{O}^∞ which have the property that all irreducible subquotients are of the form $L(w \cdot \nu)$ with $w \in W_{[\nu]}$. While we have not tried to prove it, and it will not be relevant for our purposes later on, it seems natural to guess that these are the blocks of \mathcal{O}^∞ .

3. DUALITY IN THE DERIVED CATEGORY OF \mathcal{O}^∞

In this chapter we study the modules $\text{Ext}_{U(\mathfrak{g}_E)}^i(M, U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ for modules M in category \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. Our first result will be that these modules are again in \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$, respectively. We also consider the derived functor $\text{RHom}_{U(\mathfrak{g}_E)}(-, U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ on the derived category $D^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ and the subcategory $D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ of complexes of modules whose cohomology modules lie in \mathcal{O}^∞ .

3.1. Ext-duals of induced modules.

3.1.1. Preliminaries on left-modules and right-modules. To simplify notation we will write from now on

$$\text{Ext}_U^i(M, U) \text{ instead of } \text{Ext}_{U(\mathfrak{g}_E)}^i(M, U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$$

and

$$\text{RHom}_U(-, U) \text{ instead of } \text{RHom}_{U(\mathfrak{g}_E)}(-, U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) .$$

If M is a left-module for $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$, then the dual space $M' = \text{Hom}_E(M, E)$ is naturally a *right- $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -module* via

$$(f.x)(m) = f(x.m)$$

for all $f \in M'$, $x \in \mathfrak{g}_E$, and $m \in M$. Using the anti-isomorphism $\iota : U(\mathfrak{g}_E) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ we can consider any $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -right-module N as a $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -left-module by setting

$$u.n := n.\iota(u) ,$$

for all $u \in U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ and $n \in N$. We write ${}_\ell N$ for this $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -left-module. If there is a chance that confusion may arise regarding left- or right-module structures, we will clarify which is meant. If $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}_E$ is a subalgebra and $\lambda : \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow E$ a linear form, then we write E_λ for the one-dimensional \mathfrak{h} -left-module given by $x.1 = \lambda(x)$. We identify the dual space E'_λ with E by the map $E'_\lambda \rightarrow E$, $f \mapsto f(1)$. If we do so, then $1.x = \lambda(x)$ is the formula for the natural \mathfrak{h} -right-module structure. In this case we also write E_λ for this \mathfrak{h} -right-module.

If not indicated otherwise, then we always consider \mathfrak{h} as a \mathfrak{h} -left-module via the adjoint action, i.e., $x.y := [x, y]$ for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{h}$. The dual space \mathfrak{h}' is then naturally a \mathfrak{h} -right-module, and so is any exterior power $\bigwedge^i \mathfrak{h}'$.

Theorem 3.1.2. *Let $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}_E$ be a subalgebra, and let W be a finite-dimensional \mathfrak{h} -module. Then there is an isomorphism in $D^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)^\circ)$*

$$\mathrm{RHom}_U(U \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{h})} W, U) \cong \left(W' \otimes_E \bigwedge^{\dim_F(\mathfrak{h})} \mathfrak{h}' \right) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{h})} U(\mathfrak{g}_E)[- \dim_F(\mathfrak{h})] .$$

In particular,

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i(U \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{h})} W, U) \cong \begin{cases} \left(W' \otimes_E \bigwedge^{\dim_F(\mathfrak{h})} \mathfrak{h}' \right) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{h})} U(\mathfrak{g}_E) & , \quad i = \dim_F(\mathfrak{h}) \\ 0 & , \quad i \neq \dim_F(\mathfrak{h}) \end{cases}$$

Proof. For the second formula see [Che99, p. 386]. The first formula follows from the second formula because a complex K^\bullet which has non-zero cohomology only in degree n is quasi-isomorphic to the complex $H^n(K^\bullet)[-n]$, where $H^n(K^\bullet)$ is the complex which has $H^n(K^\bullet)$ in degree zero and the zero module in all other degrees. \square

Corollary 3.1.3. *Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}_E^*$, let $M(\lambda) = U(\mathfrak{g}_E) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b}_E)} E_\lambda$ be the Verma module with highest weight λ . Then*

$$\mathrm{RHom}_U(M(\lambda), U) \cong \left(E_{\lambda+2\rho} \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b}_E)} U(\mathfrak{g}_E) \right) [- \dim_F(\mathfrak{b})] .$$

If we consider this $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -right-module as a $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -left-module, as explained in 3.1.1, then we have

$$(3.1.4) \quad {}_\ell \mathrm{RHom}_U(M(\lambda), U) \cong M(-\lambda - 2\rho)[- \dim_F(\mathfrak{b})] .$$

In particular, as $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -left-modules one has

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i(M(\lambda), U) \cong \begin{cases} M(-\lambda - 2\rho) & , \quad i = \dim_F(\mathfrak{b}) \\ 0 & , \quad i \neq \dim_F(\mathfrak{b}) . \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since $\bigwedge^{\dim_F(\mathfrak{b})} \mathfrak{b}$ is a one-dimensional representation, it factors through the map $\mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}/[\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{b}] \cong \mathfrak{t}$. Furthermore, because $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta \in \Phi^+} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ we have

$$\bigwedge^{\dim_F(\mathfrak{b})} \mathfrak{b} \cong \left(\bigwedge^{\dim_F(\mathfrak{t})} \mathfrak{t} \right) \otimes_E \bigotimes_{\beta \in \Phi^+} \mathfrak{g}_\beta,$$

as \mathfrak{t} -modules. This shows that this representation is equal to $E_{2\rho}$. It follows from this that the *right* \mathfrak{b} -module $\bigwedge^{\dim_F(\mathfrak{b})} \mathfrak{b}'$ is naturally isomorphic to $E_{2\rho}$ too, cf. 3.1.1. By the same reference, we have $E'_\lambda = E_\lambda$ as a $U(\mathfrak{b}_E)$ -right-module. Hence $E'_\lambda \otimes_E \bigwedge^{\dim_F(\mathfrak{b})} \mathfrak{b}'_E \cong E_\lambda \otimes_E E_{2\rho} = E_{\lambda+2\rho}$. It is straightforward to check that the map

$$U(\mathfrak{g}_E) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b}_E)} E_{-\lambda-2\rho} \longrightarrow \ell \left(E_{\lambda+2\rho} \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b}_E)} U(\mathfrak{g}_E) \right), \quad u \otimes c \mapsto c \otimes \iota(u),$$

for all $c \in E$ and $u \in U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ is well-defined and an isomorphism of $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -left-modules. \square

3.2. The functors $\text{Ext}_U^i(-, U)$ preserve \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$.

Proposition 3.2.1. (i) For all M in \mathcal{O}^∞ and all $i \geq 0$ the $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -module $\text{Ext}_U^i(M, U)$ is in \mathcal{O}^∞ too.

(ii) For all M in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$, and all $i \geq 0$ the $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -module $\text{Ext}_U^i(M, U)$ is in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ too.

(iii) $\text{Ext}_U^i(M, U) = 0$ for $i > \dim_F(\mathfrak{g})$.

Proof. (i) We prove this assertion in several steps.

Step 1: For modules possessing a standard filtration. Suppose M possesses a so-called standard filtration

$$(3.2.2) \quad 0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq M_n = M,$$

which means that every successive quotient M_i/M_{i-1} , $i = 1, \dots, n$, is isomorphic to a Verma module. We show the assertion by induction on n . The case $n = 1$ has already been dealt with in 3.1.3. Now suppose $n \geq 2$ and that the assertion is true for all modules possessing a standard filtration of length at most $n - 1$. Let M have a standard filtration of length n as in 3.2.2, and set $N = M_{n-1}$, $V = M/N$. Then V is isomorphic to a Verma module and we consider the long exact cohomology sequence

$$(3.2.3) \quad \dots \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_U^i(V, U) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_U^i(M, U) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_U^i(N, U) \longrightarrow \dots$$

The induction hypothesis implies that the modules $\text{Ext}_U^i(V, U)$ and $\text{Ext}_U^i(N, U)$ are in \mathcal{O}^∞ . By 2.2.6, the module $\text{Ext}_U^i(M, U)$ is in \mathcal{O}^∞ too.

Step 2: For modules in category \mathcal{O} . By [Hum08, 3.10], every projective module in \mathcal{O} has a standard filtration, hence the assertion is true for projective modules. By [BGG75, Thm. 6], every module M in \mathcal{O} has finite projective dimension $\text{pd}(M)$, i.e., there is an exact sequence

$$(3.2.4) \quad 0 \longrightarrow P_n \longrightarrow P_{n-1} \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow P_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

with $n = \text{pd}(M)$ and modules P_i which are projective in \mathcal{O} , and n is minimal with this property. We now prove the assertion in (i) by induction on $\text{pd}(M)$. If $\text{pd}(M) = 0$ then M is projective and there is nothing to show. Suppose $n > 0$ and the assertion is true for all modules of projective dimension at most $n - 1$. Let M be of projective dimension n and consider a resolution by projective modules in \mathcal{O} as in 3.2.4. Let N be the image of $P_1 \rightarrow P_0$ so that we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$. Note that $\text{pd}(N) \leq n - 1$. The long exact cohomology sequence

$$\dots \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_U^{i-1}(N, U) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_U^i(M, U) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_U^i(P_0, U) \longrightarrow \dots,$$

together with our induction hypothesis, implies then the assertion for M .

Step 3: For all modules in \mathcal{O}^∞ . By 2.2.6, every object in \mathcal{O}^∞ has finite length. We prove the assertion by induction on the length $\ell(M)$. If $\ell(M) = 1$ then M is simple and hence belongs to \mathcal{O} , again by 2.2.6, and the assertion is true for M . Let $n = \ell(M) > 1$ and assume the assertion is true for all modules of length at most $n - 1$. Choose a proper maximal submodule $N \subsetneq M$ and consider the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow L := M/N \rightarrow 0$. Applying the long exact cohomology sequence for $\text{Ext}_U^\bullet(-, U)$ to this sequence we conclude as in Step 1.

(ii) For category $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ we can prove the assertion by the same arguments as above. However, we need to check that all arguments used above apply within the setting of category $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. In Step 1 we have used the result 3.1.3. Note that if λ is algebraic, then so is $-\lambda - 2\rho$, since $2\rho \in \Lambda_r$. Hence $\text{Ext}_U^i(M(\lambda), U)$ is in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ if $M(\lambda)$ is in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ (which is equivalent to λ being algebraic). Furthermore, if M belongs to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ and possesses a standard filtration as in 3.2.2, then all submodules and all quotient modules (which are Verma modules) are in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$, and assertion (ii) is true for M . Now let M be in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ and consider a projective resolution of M as in 3.2.4. Without loss of generality we may assume that M belongs to a \mathfrak{z} -block $\mathcal{O}_{|\lambda|}^\infty$ of \mathcal{O}^∞ , as defined in 2.3.1. This implies that λ is algebraic. Then we apply the projection $\text{pr}_{|\lambda|}$ to the sequence 3.2.4. Note that $\text{pr}_{|\lambda|}$ is the same as the translation functor T_λ^λ of [Hum08, 7.1], which is exact and maps projective modules in \mathcal{O} to projective modules [Hum08, 7.1]. Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that all projective modules in 3.2.4 belong to $\mathcal{O}_{|\lambda|}^\infty$ and are hence in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. This shows that the arguments in Step 2 also apply to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. For Step 3 this is immediate, as $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ is an abelian category.

(iii) This follows from the Chevalley-Eilenberg resolution, cf. [Wei94, 7.7.4]. \square

3.3. Dualizing modules for universal enveloping algebras. We collect here some information about dualizing complexes and dualizing modules from the papers [YZ99, Yek00]. Then we consider in particular the case of such modules for universal enveloping algebras.

3.3.1. Generalities on dualizing complexes. Let k be a field and A, B, C unital associative k -algebras. We write B° for the opposite algebra. The category $B^\circ\text{-mod}$ of left

B° -modules is thus the same as the category of right B -modules. Given objects M in $D(A \otimes_k B^\circ\text{-mod})$ and N in $D(A \otimes_k C^\circ\text{-mod})$ with M bounded from above or N bounded from below, there is an object

$$\mathrm{RHom}_A(M, N) \text{ of } D(B \otimes_k C^\circ\text{-mod}) .$$

It is calculated by replacing M by an isomorphic complex in $D^-(A \otimes_k B^\circ\text{-mod})$ which consists of projective modules over A , or by replacing N by an isomorphic complex in $D^+(A \otimes_k B^\circ\text{-mod})$ which consists of injective modules over A . For modules M, N , viewed as complexes concentrated in degree zero, one has

$$H^q \mathrm{RHom}_A(M, N) = \mathrm{Ext}_A^q(M, N) .$$

A complex N in $D^+(A\text{-mod})$ is said to have *finite injective dimension* if there is $q_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for all M in $A\text{-mod}$ one has $\mathrm{Ext}^q(M, N) = 0$ for all $q \geq q_0$.

Definition 3.3.2. [YZ99, 1.1] Assume A and B are k -algebras, with A left noetherian and B right noetherian.

(i) A complex R in $D^b(A \otimes_k B^\circ\text{-mod})$ is called a *dualizing complex* if it satisfies the following three conditions:

- (1) R has finite injective dimension over A and B° .
- (2) R has finitely generated cohomology modules over A and B° .
- (3) The canonical morphisms

$$\begin{array}{lll} B \longrightarrow \mathrm{RHom}_A(R, R) & \text{in} & D(B \otimes_k B^\circ\text{-mod}) \\ A \longrightarrow \mathrm{RHom}_{B^\circ}(R, R) & \text{in} & D(A \otimes_k A^\circ\text{-mod}) \end{array}$$

are both isomorphisms.

(ii) Assume now $A = B$. A dualizing complex R in $D^b(A \otimes_k A^\circ\text{-mod})$ is called *rigid* if there is an isomorphism

$$R \longrightarrow \mathrm{RHom}_{A \otimes_k A^\circ}(A, R \otimes_k R)$$

in $D(A \otimes_k A^\circ\text{-mod})$. Such an isomorphism is called a *rigidifying isomorphism*. \square

In case $A = B$, we shall say that R is a dualizing complex over A . If a dualizing complex exists and is isomorphic to a module, considered as a complex concentrated in degree zero, we call it a *dualizing module*.

Remark 3.3.3. If R is a dualizing complex, then so is any shift $R[n]$. However, by [vdB97, 8.2], if a rigid dualizing complex exists, it is unique up to isomorphism.

Examples 3.3.4. It is straightforward to verify that k is a dualizing module for $A = k$. Dualizing complexes for schemes were introduced in [Har66, V]. As is shown there, \mathbb{Z} is a dualizing module for \mathbb{Z} . Moreover, if A is a commutative local Noetherian Gorenstein ring,

then A itself is a dualizing module for A [BH93, 3.3.7]. Any commutative k -algebra of essentially finite type has a dualizing complex [Sta, 47.15.11]. Examples of non-commutative algebras possessing a dualizing complex can be found in [Yek92, YZ99, Yek00, vdB97].

Given a dualizing complex R as in 3.3.2 we consider the functors

$$\mathbb{D} := \mathrm{RHom}_A(-, R) : D(A\text{-mod}) \longrightarrow D(B^\circ\text{-mod}) ,$$

$$\mathbb{D}^\circ := \mathrm{RHom}_{B^\circ}(-, R) : D(B^\circ\text{-mod}) \longrightarrow D(A\text{-mod}) .$$

Let A be a left noetherian k -algebra. Denote by $D_f(A\text{-mod})$ and $D_f^b(A\text{-mod})$ the triangulated subcategories of complexes whose cohomology modules are finitely generated.

Proposition 3.3.5. [YZ99, 1.3] *Let A, B be as in 3.3.2 and let R in $D(A \otimes_k B^\circ\text{-mod})$ be a dualizing complex.*

(i) *For any M in $D_f(A\text{-mod})$ one has $\mathbb{D}(M) \in D_f(B^\circ\text{-mod})$ and $M \cong \mathbb{D}^\circ(\mathbb{D}(M))$.*

(ii) *The functors \mathbb{D} and \mathbb{D}° determine a duality, i.e., an anti-equivalence, of triangulated categories between $D_f(A\text{-mod})$ and $D_f(B^\circ\text{-mod})$, restricting to a duality between $D_f^b(A\text{-mod})$ and $D_f^b(B^\circ\text{-mod})$.*

We now turn to the concrete case of the universal enveloping algebra.

Theorem 3.3.6. [Yek00, Thm. A] *Let \mathfrak{h} be a finite-dimensional Lie algebra \mathfrak{h} over E . Then*

$$\left(U(\mathfrak{h}) \otimes_E \bigwedge^{\dim_E(\mathfrak{h})} \mathfrak{h} \right) [\dim_E(\mathfrak{h})]$$

is a rigid dualizing complex for $U(\mathfrak{h})$. Here we consider $\bigwedge^{\dim_E(\mathfrak{h})} \mathfrak{h}$ as a left \mathfrak{h} -module with the trivial action and as a right \mathfrak{h} -module with the adjoint action.

Remark 3.3.7. When we apply 3.3.6 to the reductive Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_E , we find that $R = U(\mathfrak{g}_E)[\dim_F(\mathfrak{g})]$ is a dualizing module, because $\bigwedge^{\dim_F(\mathfrak{g})} \mathfrak{g}_E$ is the trivial one-dimensional representation. If W is a finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g}_E -module, it follows from 3.1.2 that

$$\mathrm{RHom}_U(W, U[\dim_F(\mathfrak{g})]) \cong W' ,$$

i.e., this duality functor maps finite-dimensional representations to finite-dimensional representations, considered as complexes concentrated in degree zero. While this is a nice property of this rigid dualizing complex, we in fact rather work with $R = U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ itself in the rest of this dissertation.

3.4. The duality functors on $D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty)$ and $D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{alg}}^\infty)$.

Proposition 3.4.1. (i) *$\mathrm{RHom}_U(-, U)$ preserves the subcategory $D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ and thus induces a (contravariant) functor*

$$(3.4.2) \quad \mathrm{RHom}_U(-, U) : D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) \longrightarrow D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$$

which is an anti-equivalence and an involution.

(ii) $\mathrm{RHom}_U(-, U)$ preserves the subcategory $D_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ and thus induces a (contravariant) functor

$$(3.4.3) \quad \mathrm{RHom}_U(-, U) : D_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) \longrightarrow D_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$$

which is an anti-equivalence and an involution.

Proof. This follows from 3.2.1 and 3.3.6, together with 3.3.3. \square

3.4.4. Motivation. In another paper, we will consider an exact functor $\check{\mathcal{F}} = \check{\mathcal{F}}_B^G : \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{alg}}^\infty \rightarrow D(G)\text{-mod}$, where $D(G)$ is the locally analytic distribution algebra of p -adic reductive group G with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . As this functor is exact, it gives rise to a functor $\check{\mathcal{F}} : D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{alg}}^\infty) \rightarrow D^b(D(G)\text{-mod})$. Our aim is to understand how this functor behaves when pre-composed with the duality functor in 3.4.3. Yet in order to make sense of this question, the duality functor must first be defined on $D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{alg}}^\infty)$. This is indeed possible by the result 3.4.9 below. We start with discussing some relevant concepts from [CM15b, sec. 2.2].

3.4.5. Extension full subcategories. Let \mathcal{B} be a full abelian subcategory of an abelian category \mathcal{A} , and we assume that the inclusion functor $\iota : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is exact. Because of this assumption, ι induces homomorphisms of extension groups

$$(3.4.6) \quad \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{B}}^i(M, N) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(M, N),$$

for any two objects M, N of \mathcal{B} and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The extension groups are here Yoneda Ext groups. These maps are in general neither injective nor surjective. \mathcal{B} is called *extension full* in \mathcal{A} if and only if 3.4.6 is an isomorphism for all objects M, N of \mathcal{B} and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. When $i = 0$ this map is always bijective, as \mathcal{B} was assumed to be full. If \mathcal{B} is a Serre subcategory (2.1.9), then the maps 3.4.6 for $i = 1$ are bijective. We continue with some useful results from [CM15a, CM15b].

Proposition 3.4.7. [CM15a, Prop. 5 in sec. 2.3] *Consider an associative algebra A , a full abelian subcategory \mathcal{A} in $A\text{-mod}$,⁴ and a full abelian subcategory \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} . Assume that these data satisfy the following conditions:*

- (i) \mathcal{B} is a Serre subcategory of $A\text{-mod}$.
- (ii) For every surjective morphism $\alpha : M \rightarrow N$, with M in \mathcal{A} and N in \mathcal{B} , there is a Q in \mathcal{B} and an injective morphism $\beta : Q \rightarrow M$ such that the composition $\alpha \circ \beta : Q \rightarrow N$ is surjective.

Then \mathcal{B} is extension full in \mathcal{A} .

⁴Note that we denote by $A\text{-mod}$ the category of all A -left-modules, whereas this category is denoted by $A\text{-Mod}$ in [CM15a].

Proposition 3.4.8. [CM15b, sec. 3, Prop. 8] *Let $\iota : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be the inclusion of an abelian full subcategory \mathcal{B} of an abelian category \mathcal{A} . We assume that ι is exact. Then \mathcal{B} is extension full in \mathcal{A} if and only if the functor*

$$D^b(\iota) : D^b(\mathcal{B}) \longrightarrow D^b(\mathcal{A})^5$$

induced by ι is fully faithful and triangulated (i.e., sends distinguished triangles to distinguished triangles).

Theorem 3.4.9. *The categories \mathcal{O}^∞ and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ are both extension full in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$. The canonical functors*

$$(3.4.10) \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty) \longrightarrow D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$$

$$(3.4.11) \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) \longrightarrow D_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$$

are equivalences of categories.

Proof. It is an easy consequence of 3.4.7 that $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}_{\text{fg}}$, the category of finitely generated $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ -modules, is extension full in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$ [CM15a, Cor. 6 (ii) in sec. 2.3]. And by [CM15b, Thm. 16 in sec. 5] the category \mathcal{O}^∞ is extension full in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}_{\text{fg}}$ (note that in [CM15b] the category $\mathfrak{g}\text{-mod}$ is the category of finitely generated $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules). Hence \mathcal{O}^∞ is extension full in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$.

Now we show that $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ is extension full in \mathcal{O}^∞ . We have already seen that $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ is a Serre subcategory of $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$ 2.2.6. Let $M \rightarrow N$ be a surjection in \mathcal{O}^∞ with N an object in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. We want to show that condition (ii) in 3.4.7 holds. It follows from the discussion in 2.3.1 that we may assume that N is contained in a \mathfrak{z} -block $\mathcal{O}^\infty_{|\lambda|}$ where λ is necessarily algebraic. Then $\text{pr}_{|\lambda|}(M) \rightarrow \text{pr}_{|\lambda|}(N) = N$ is still surjective, and $\text{pr}_{|\lambda|}(M)$ is in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$. By 3.4.7 we conclude that $\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty$ is extension full in \mathcal{O}^∞ , hence it is extension full in $U(\mathfrak{g}_E)\text{-mod}$.

By 3.4.8 the canonical functors

$$D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty) \longrightarrow D^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) \quad \text{and} \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) \longrightarrow D^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$$

are fully faithful. These functors factor through the full subcategories $D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ and $D_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$, respectively. We thus have to show that the functors

$$(3.4.12) \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty) \longrightarrow D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) \quad \text{and} \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) \longrightarrow D_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$$

are essentially surjective. To see this, we argue as Bernstein and Lunts in [BL95, 1.9.5, 1.9.4]. Given a complex M in $D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ we define $ca(M)$, the *cohomological amplitude*⁶

⁵Note that there is a typo in the statement of [CM15b, Prop. 8], where the target category is denoted by $\mathcal{C}^b(\mathcal{A})$ but $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ is meant there.

⁶We have not found in the literature a commonly accepted definition and use this only as an ad hoc definition for the purpose of this proof.

M , to be zero if $H^\bullet(M) = 0$ and to be $s - i + 1$ if M has non-vanishing cohomology, where $s = \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid H^i(M) \neq 0\}$ and $i = \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid H^i(M) \neq 0\}$. If $ca(M) \leq 1$ then M is obviously isomorphic to an object in the image of this functor. Let $n \geq 1$ and suppose that any object N with $ca(N) \leq n$ is in the image of this functor. Assume $ca(M) = n + 1$ and choose $i < j$ such that $H^i(M) \neq 0 \neq H^j(M)$. Using [Yek20, 7.3.10], we have objects $\text{smt}^{\leq i}(M)$ and $\text{smt}^{\geq i+1}(M)$ of $D^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$, the smart truncations of M , together with morphisms $e : \text{smt}^{\leq i}(M) \rightarrow M$ and $p : M \rightarrow \text{smt}^{\geq i+1}(M)$, such that

$$\forall k > i : H^k(\text{smt}^{\leq i}(M)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \forall k \leq i : H^k(e) : H^k(\text{smt}^{\leq i}(M)) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^k(M)$$

and

$$\forall k < i + 1 : H^k(\text{smt}^{\geq i+1}(M)) = 0 ,$$

$$\forall k \geq i + 1 : H^k(p) : H^k(\text{smt}^{\geq i+1}(M)) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^k(M) ,$$

which shows that these truncations belong to $D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$ (resp. $D_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$) if this is true for M . Furthermore, there is a distinguished triangle in $D^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E))$

$$\text{smt}^{\leq i}(M) \xrightarrow{e} M \xrightarrow{p} \text{smt}^{\geq i+1}(M) \xrightarrow{\theta} \text{smt}^{\leq i}(M)[1]$$

If we ‘turn’ this distinguished triangle twice we get the distinguished triangle

$$\text{smt}^{\geq i+1}(M) \xrightarrow{\theta} \text{smt}^{\leq i}(M)[1] \xrightarrow{-e[1]} M[1] \xrightarrow{-p[1]} \text{smt}^{\geq i+1}(M)[1]$$

Because the functors 3.4.12 are fully faithful, the essential images of these functors are strictly full triangulated subcategories. Since the objects $\text{smt}^{\leq i}(M)$ and $\text{smt}^{\geq i+1}(M)[1]$ belong to this subcategory (by induction, as their cohomological amplitude is at most n), and since θ comes from a morphism in $D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty)$ (resp. $D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty)$), the latter distinguished triangle belongs to this essential image, and this means that M is in the essential image. \square

3.4.13. *The duality functors on $D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty)$ and $D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty)$.* We now define the functors

$$(3.4.14) \quad \mathbb{D}^{\mathfrak{g}} : D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty) \longrightarrow D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{D}_{\text{alg}}^{\mathfrak{g}} : D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) \longrightarrow D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty)$$

by composing the functors in 3.4.2 (resp. 3.4.3) with the equivalences in 3.4.10 (resp. 3.4.11):

$$\mathbb{D}^{\mathfrak{g}} : D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty) \xrightarrow{\cong} D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) \xrightarrow{\text{RHom}_U(-, U)} D_{\mathcal{O}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) \xrightarrow{\cong} D^b(\mathcal{O}^\infty)$$

and

$$\mathbb{D}_{\text{alg}}^{\mathfrak{g}} : D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) \xrightarrow{\cong} D_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) \xrightarrow{\text{RHom}_U(-, U)} D_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty}^b(U(\mathfrak{g}_E)) \xrightarrow{\cong} D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\text{alg}}^\infty) .$$

REFERENCES

- [BGG75] I. N. Bernstein, I. M. Gelfand, and S. I. Gelfand. Differential operators on the base affine space and a study of \mathfrak{g} -modules. In *Lie groups and their representations (Proc. Summer School, Bolyai János Math. Soc., Budapest, 1971)*, pages 21–64. Halsted, New York, 1975.
- [BH93] Winfried Bruns and Jürgen Herzog. *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, volume 39 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [BL95] Joseph Bernstein and Valery Lunts. Localization for derived categories of (\mathfrak{g}, K) -modules. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 8(4):819–856, 1995.
- [Che99] Sophie Chemla. A duality property for complex Lie algebroids. *Math. Z.*, 232(2):367–388, 1999.
- [CM15a] Kevin Coulembier and Volodymyr Mazorchuk. Extension fullness of the categories of Gelfand-Zeitlin and Whittaker modules. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.*, 11:Paper 016, 17, 2015.
- [CM15b] Kevin Coulembier and Volodymyr Mazorchuk. Some homological properties of category \mathcal{O} . III. *Adv. Math.*, 283:204–231, 2015.
- [Har66] Robin Hartshorne. *Residues and duality*. Lecture notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck, given at Harvard 1963/64. With an appendix by P. Deligne. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 20. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1966.
- [Hum08] James E. Humphreys. *Representations of semisimple Lie algebras in the BGG category \mathcal{O}* , volume 94 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [Jac79] Nathan Jacobson. *Lie algebras*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1979. Republication of the 1962 original.
- [KV95] Anthony W. Knap and David A. Vogan, Jr. *Cohomological induction and unitary representations*, volume 45 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995.
- [OS15] S. Orlik and M. Strauch. On Jordan-Hölder series of some locally analytic representations. *Journal of the AMS*, 28(1):99–157, 2015.
- [Soe85] Wolfgang Soergel. Über den “Erweiterungs-Abschluß” der Kategorie \mathcal{O} in der Kategorie aller Moduln über einer halb-einfachen Liealgebra, 1985. Diplomarbeit im Fach Mathematik an der Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn.
- [Sta] The Stacks Project Authors. Stacks Project. <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>.
- [vdB97] Michel van den Bergh. Existence theorems for dualizing complexes over non-commutative graded and filtered rings. *J. Algebra*, 195(2):662–679, 1997.
- [Wei94] C. Weibel. *An introduction to homological algebra*, volume 38 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [Yek92] Amnon Yekutieli. Dualizing complexes over noncommutative graded algebras. *J. Algebra*, 153(1):41–84, 1992.
- [Yek00] Amnon Yekutieli. The rigid dualizing complex of a universal enveloping algebra. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 150(1):85–93, 2000.
- [Yek20] Amnon Yekutieli. *Derived categories*, volume 183 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020.
- [YZ99] Amnon Yekutieli and James J. Zhang. Rings with Auslander dualizing complexes. *J. Algebra*, 213(1):1–51, 1999.

DENISON UNIVERSITY, OH, U.S.A.

Email address: kurkoglu@denison.edu