

### Problem Set 3

February 1, 2007

In this problem set (and henceforth in the course), the following slight abuse of language will be made: if  $\rho : \pi_1(X, x_0) \rightarrow GL(E)$  is a representation of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$  on the vector space  $E$ , we will call  $E$  itself “the representation.” (Thus, “Let  $E$  be a representation of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$ ” means “Let  $E$  be a complex vector space, and suppose there is a representation  $\pi_1(X, x_0) \rightarrow GL(E)$  of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$  on  $E$ .”)

1. Let  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$ , and  $\mathcal{H}$  be sheaves of abelian groups on  $X$ . Prove that

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) \simeq \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}))$$

by using the corresponding facts for abelian groups.

2. Problem 2 of Problem Set 2 asked you to show that  $(j_!, j^{-1})$  is an adjoint pair, where  $j : U \hookrightarrow X$  is an open inclusion. State and prove a sheaf-Hom version of that theorem. (Note that it does not make sense to say  $\mathcal{H}om_X(j_! \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \simeq \mathcal{H}om_U(\mathcal{F}, j^{-1} \mathcal{G})$ .)
3. Show that there is an equivalence of categories

$$(\text{local systems on } X) \xrightarrow{\sim} (\text{representations of } \pi_1(X, x_0)).$$

In other words: In class, we have shown that there is a bijection between isomorphism classes of local systems and isomorphism classes of representations of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$ . Now, let  $E$  and  $F$  be representations of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  be the corresponding local systems on  $X$ . Given a morphism  $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , associate to it an equivariant linear transformation (also called an “intertwining operator”)  $S : E \rightarrow F$ . Conversely, given an equivariant linear transformation  $T : E \rightarrow F$ , construct an associated morphism  $\psi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ . Finally, show that the two assignments  $\phi \mapsto S$  and  $T \mapsto \psi$  are inverse to each other.

4. If  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  are local systems, show that  $\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  and  $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{F}$  are as well. What are their ranks in terms of  $\mathrm{rank} \mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathrm{rank} \mathcal{F}$ ? (The **rank** of a local system is the dimension of any of its stalks.)
5. In the setting of the previous problem, let  $E$  and  $F$  be the representations of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ . There is a natural way to regard the vector spaces  $\mathrm{Hom}(E, F)$  and  $E \otimes F$  as representations of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$  as well. (Ask me if you can’t figure out how yourself.) Show that the local systems corresponding to these representations are precisely  $\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  and  $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ .
6. Let  $E$  and  $F$  be two nonisomorphic irreducible representations of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$ . (A representation is **irreducible** if contains no nontrivial subspace that is stable under the action of  $\pi_1(X, x_0)$ .) Show that  $\mathrm{Hom}(E, F) = 0$ . (Note, however, that the sheaf  $\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  is not, in general, the zero sheaf.)