Corrections for W. Soergel: Langland's philosophy and Koszul duality, pp. 379–414 in the Proceedings of NATO ASI 2000 in Constanta of a conference on Algebra-Representation Theory, edited by Roggenkamp and Stefanescu, published by Kluwer (2001)

The argument on page 405 at the top needs fixing. This is still a fix on the quick. First we treat the case that $\mathcal{F} = i_{n!}\underline{B/B}$ is the skyscraper at the one-point cell. In this case the claim follows from the fact that $i_{n!}i_n^!\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ induces an injection on hypercohomology, which follows from the degeneration of the spectral sequence computing $\mathbb{H}^\bullet\mathcal{E}$. Then, for the general case, it will be sufficient to check the commutativity of the following diagrams, for $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}(G/P_s)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(G/B)$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(\pi^*\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\wr"] & \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{H}^\bullet\pi^*\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{H}^\bullet\mathcal{F}) \arrow[d] \\
\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}, \pi_*\mathcal{F}) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{H}^\bullet\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{H}^\bullet\pi_*\mathcal{F})
\end{tikzcd}$$

for the map on the right coming from $\mathcal{A} \to \pi_*\pi^*\mathcal{A}$, and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{F}, \pi^!\mathcal{A}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\wr"] & \mathrm{Hom}_C(\mathbb{H}^\bullet\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}^\bullet\pi^!\mathcal{A}) \arrow[d, "\wr"] \\
\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(\pi_!\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Hom}_{C^s}(\mathbb{H}^\bullet\pi_!\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}^\bullet\mathcal{A})
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here the point is to construct dually a canonical isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_{C^s}(C, \mathbb{H}^\bullet\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{H}^\bullet\pi^!\mathcal{A}$ and show that the resulting diagram will commute. With these diagrams, a non-injective case would lead to a noninjective case with $\mathcal{F}$ the skyscraper, which we have already shown to be impossible.

It now seems to me as if before 4.2.3 we should rather ask $\mathcal{M}^x = i_*\tau[\dim Y]$ and in 4.2.3 correspondingly $\hom_{\mathcal{D}}(L^x, M^x) \neq 0$. Furthermore it seems as if in 4.2.4 we should ask $\hom_{\mathcal{D}}(L_x, N_x) \neq 0$.