

FILTRATIONS AND RECURSIONS FOR SCHUBERT MODULES

DAVID ANDERSON

ABSTRACT. Revisiting Kraśkiewicz and Pragacz’s construction of *Schubert modules*, we provide a new proof that their characters are equal to Schubert polynomials. The main innovation is a representation-theoretic interpretation of a recurrence relation for Schubert polynomials recently discovered by Nadeau, Spink, and Tewari. Along the way, we review several related constructions, and show that the Nadeau-Spink-Tewari recursion determines the characters of flagged Schur modules coming from a broader class of *translucent diagrams*.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Schur modules	4
2. Flagged Schur modules	12
3. Bergeron-Sottile operators	17
4. The kernel of $R_{k+1} \rightarrow R_k$	20
5. A recurrence relation	27
6. Examples and applications	31
Appendix A. Partial flags	34
References	37

INTRODUCTION

Schur functions appear in geometry as representatives for the cohomology classes of Schubert varieties in the Grassmannian, and in representation theory as the characters for irreducible GL_n -modules. They form a distinguished basis of the ring of symmetric polynomials, and are among the most-studied objects in algebraic combinatorics.

Schubert polynomials were introduced in the context of geometry, as canonical representatives for the cohomology classes of Schubert varieties in the complete flag variety. They form a

Date: August 29, 2024.

Partially supported by NSF CAREER DMS-1945212, and by a Simons-CRM scholarship.

distinguished basis for the ring of all polynomials, and they also have wonderful combinatorial properties, in many ways analogous to those of Schur polynomials.

A natural construction of modules having Schubert polynomials as their characters was found by Kraśkiewicz and Pragacz. This time the construction produces cyclic B -modules, where B is a Borel subgroup of upper (or lower) triangular matrices [KP₁, KP₂]. These B -modules were investigated rather extensively around 25 years ago by Magyar [M₁, M₂] and Reiner-Shimozono [RS]; in the decades that followed, they received intermittent attention (see, e.g., [W₁, W₂]). In the last few years, though, there seems to be renewed interest in these constructions: they have been revisited combinatorially, and some of the resulting formulas have been extended to Grothendieck polynomials (e.g., [MSS, MST, FG] and others).

On the other hand, Nadeau, Spink, and Tewari [NST₁, NST₂] have recently found a wonderful collection of identities arising from operators on the polynomial ring, including a remarkable one for Schubert polynomials:

$$(1) \quad \mathfrak{S}_w = R_1(\mathfrak{S}_w) + \sum_{k \in \text{Des}(w)} x_k \cdot R_{k+1}(\mathfrak{S}_{ws_k}).$$

The operators R_k act on polynomials by mapping $x_k \mapsto 0$ and $x_i \mapsto x_{i-1}$ for $i > k$. Nadeau, Spink, and Tewari call them *Bergeron-Sottile operators*, in reference to their connection with direct-sum embeddings of flag varieties [BS].

The results presented here are motivated by a desire to understand (1) as arising naturally from the representation theory of Kraśkiewicz-Pragacz's Schubert modules, here denoted $E_{\bullet}^{D(w)}$. The notation refers to a quotient flag $E_{\bullet} : E_n \twoheadrightarrow E_{n-1} \twoheadrightarrow \cdots \twoheadrightarrow E_1$, with $\dim E_i = i$, and to the Rothe diagram $D(w)$ of the permutation. In brief, we construct a functorial filtration

$$(2) \quad E_{\bullet}^{D(w)} = R_{n+1}E_{\bullet}^{D(w)} \twoheadrightarrow R_n E_{\bullet}^{D(w)} \twoheadrightarrow \cdots \twoheadrightarrow R_1 E_{\bullet}^{D(w)}$$

such that $R_{k+1}E_{\bullet}^{D(w)} \twoheadrightarrow R_k E_{\bullet}^{D(w)}$ is an isomorphism unless k is a (right) descent of w , in which case the homomorphism has kernel isomorphic to $\ker(E_k \twoheadrightarrow E_{k-1}) \otimes R_{k+1}E_{\bullet}^{D(ws_k)}$. This implies a formula in K-theory of B -modules:

$$(3) \quad [E_{\bullet}^{D(w)}] = [R_1 E_{\bullet}^{D(w)}] + \sum_{k \in \text{Des}(w)} [\ker(E_k \twoheadrightarrow E_{k-1})] \cdot [R_{k+1} E_{\bullet}^{D(ws_k)}].$$

Since (1) recursively determines the Schubert polynomials, (3) provides an independent proof that \mathfrak{S}_w is the character of $E_{\bullet}^{D(w)}$. The main ingredients—Lemmas 4.4 and 4.10—rely only on simple facts from classical invariant theory.

The construction of $E_{\bullet}^{D(w)}$ extends naturally to produce a B -module E_{\bullet}^D for any *diagram* D , meaning a finite subset of boxes in $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^2$ (usually displayed in matrix coordinates). As a byproduct of the discussion in §4 and §5, we find that a recursion analogous to that of (1) determines the characters of E_{\bullet}^D whenever D is *transparent* or *translucent* (Definitions 5.7 and 5.12). The recursive formula can be expressed as a sum over *reduced words* for such diagrams, for a suitable notion of reduced word (Corollary 5.10).

To my knowledge, the most thorough investigation of such modules and their characters was carried out by Reiner-Shimozono [RS], who obtained precise combinatorial formulas for the character of E_{\bullet}^D under the hypothesis that D is *%-avoiding*. Their methods involve a different recursion, coming from Magyar’s orthodontic poset. Examples in §5 show that the notions of translucent and %-avoiding are distinct, with neither encompassing the other, although both include Rothe diagrams of permutations.

The recursion (1) has many pleasant properties—it is strikingly easy to prove, and it is manifestly monomial-positive. On the other hand, being essentially equivalent to a sum over reduced words, it is not computationally efficient, and the same is true of our generalization to more general characters. (By contrast, Magyar’s orthodontic recursion is fast—but not obviously positive, as it involves divided difference operators.) For diagrams inside a 6×6 rectangle, however, experimentation is feasible. Julia code for computing characters is available at [A].

In the course of describing the setup, I take the opportunity to review the definitions and constructions of (flagged) Schur modules for general diagrams, reformulating some of these constructions according to the functorial definitions found in, e.g., [ABW] or [F, §8.1], and supplying several worked examples; these introductory sections (§§1–2) include an extended—but far from exhaustive—exposition of these constructions. One technical point is worth noting: as presented here, the flagged Schur module E_{\bullet}^D is naturally a pushout of the (unflagged) module E^D and a tensor product of flagged column modules TE_{\bullet}^D (Equation (10)). This lets us deploy a basic fact about pushouts to describe kernels of maps in the filtration (2) (Lemma 4.2).

The new ideas are introduced with the Bergeron-Sottile operators in §3, and the reader familiar with the relevant background is invited to start there. The main arguments are provided in §4, with Lemmas 4.2, 4.4, and 4.10. The main results appear in §5—see especially Theorem 5.5, which generalizes (1) to characters of modules coming from a broader class of diagrams—and §6 contains some further consequences and examples.

Acknowledgements. This project began when Philippe Nadeau and Vasu Tewari told me about (1) during the CAAC workshop in Montreal in January 2024. Meetings with Hunter Spink and Vasu Tewari at the Fields Institute in April 2024 provided further stimulation. I thank all

three of them for sharing ideas and a lively ongoing conversation. Thanks also to Hugh Dennin for helpful discussions, and Linus Setiabrata for comments on an earlier draft. I am grateful for the pleasant working environment provided by LACIM during a sabbatical visit to UQÀM in 2023–24.


This article is dedicated to Bill Fulton on his 85th birthday—it was from him that I first learned about Schur modules and their functorial construction, along with so much else about being a mathematician.

I. SCHUR MODULES


Let \mathbb{k} be a commutative ring. Examples we have in mind usually make \mathbb{k} a field, often of characteristic zero, but we will not require this in general.

Let E be a finitely generated \mathbb{k} -module. We will need some basic linear-algebraic constructions generalizing Schur functors, based on the version described by Fulton [F, §8.1]. At the same time, we introduce some notation which will be used throughout the paper.

Given a set of positive integers $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1 < \cdots < a_r\}$, we represent \mathbf{a} as a collection of r boxes stacked in a column, with a box present in rows a_1, \dots, a_r . Grayscale shading is used as a placeholder to mark an empty row. For added clarity, we often label the row numbers. (The row labeling will not be needed until we discuss flagged modules in the next section, and later it will be used to indicate the flagging conditions themselves.) For example, the set $\mathbf{a} = \{2, 3, 5\}$ is represented as follows:



A tuple of vectors in $E^{\times r}$ can be specified by placing them in the corresponding boxes. For example, (u, v, w) might be written as



1.1. *Column modules.* Our first construction is simply $\bigwedge^r E$, viewed as a quotient of $E^{\otimes r}$. But in preparation for what is to come, we phrase it as follows:

DEFINITION 1.1. The \mathbb{k} -module $E^{\mathbf{a}}$ is defined by the universal property

$$\text{Hom}(E^{\mathbf{a}}, M) = \left\{ \text{multilinear maps } \varphi: E^{\times r} \rightarrow M \mid \varphi(\dots, v, \dots, v \dots) = 0 \text{ for any } v \in E \right\}$$

For instance, with $\mathbf{a} = \{2, 3, 5\}$ as above, the relations defining $E^{\mathbf{a}}$ are

$$\varphi \left(\begin{array}{c} \blacksquare \\ \boxed{u} \\ \boxed{v} \\ \blacksquare \\ \boxed{w} \end{array} \right) = 0 \text{ whenever } u = v, u = w, \text{ or } v = w.$$

The module $E^{\mathbf{a}}$ depends only on r , not on \mathbf{a} , but the extra notation will be justified soon. Further abusing notation, we often write

$$\begin{array}{c} \blacksquare \\ \boxed{u} \\ \boxed{v} \\ \blacksquare \\ \boxed{w} \end{array}$$


to indicate $u \wedge v \wedge w$, the image of $u \otimes v \otimes w$ in $E^{\mathbf{a}}$.

When E is free, say with basis z_1, \dots, z_n , we simply record the index to indicate a basis vector in a box. The module $E^{\mathbf{a}}$ acquires a basis in the usual way, by writing


$$z_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} = z_{b_1} \wedge \dots \wedge z_{b_r}$$

for $b_1 < \dots < b_r$. These basis elements are depicted by labelling the boxes of \mathbf{a} . So, continuing our example with $\mathbf{a} = \{2, 3, 5\}$, if E is free of rank 5, the module $E^{\mathbf{a}}$ is free of rank 10, with basis

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \boxed{1} & \boxed{1} & \boxed{1} & \boxed{2} & \boxed{1} \\ \boxed{2} & \boxed{2} & \boxed{3} & \boxed{3} & \boxed{2} \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \boxed{3} & \boxed{4} & \boxed{4} & \boxed{4} & \boxed{5} \end{array}$$



1.2. *Diagrams and exchange relations.* A *diagram* is a tuple $D = [\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(m)}]$ of sets of positive integers. We represent a diagram $D = [\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(m)}]$ by placing the columns of boxes $\mathbf{a}^{(1)}$, $\mathbf{a}^{(2)}$, etc., alongside one another. For example, we depict the diagram $D = [\{2, 3\}, \{2, 3, 5\}, \{3\}]$ as follows:



Often we will consider a diagram D as a collection of boxes (i, j) , so that the boxes in column j form the set $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$. The meaning should be clear from context.

For our purposes, nothing changes by re-ordering the columns of a diagram, or by adding or omitting empty columns, so we often do this without comment.

Given a diagram D , we will define a \mathbb{k} -module E^D by taking a certain quotient of the tensor product

$$TE^D = E^{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}} \otimes \dots \otimes E^{\mathbf{a}^{(m)}}.$$

The relations defining the quotient will be called the *D-exchange relations*. In a nutshell, these are all the linear relations among m -fold products of minors of a generic matrix, where the i -th minor is taken on rows $\mathbf{a}^{(i)}$.

To describe the D -exchange relations more precisely, first assume E is free on n generators, and choose a basis z_1, \dots, z_n . We consider $Z = \mathbb{k}^n \otimes E$ as a space of $n \times n$ matrices, with basis $z_{ij} := e_i \otimes z_j$, where e_1, \dots, e_n is the standard basis of \mathbb{k}^n . Let $\mathbb{k}[Z] = \text{Sym}^*(\mathbb{k}^n \otimes E)$ be the polynomial ring in variables z_{ij} . For sets $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1 < \dots < a_r\}$ and $\mathbf{b} = \{b_1 < \dots < b_r\}$, let $\Delta_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{k}[Z]$ be the minor of Z on rows \mathbf{a} and columns \mathbf{b} .

A *filling* of D is a function $\tau : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. A filling is *column-strict* if it is (strictly) increasing on columns: whenever (i, j) and (i', j) are in D , with $i < i'$, we have $\tau(i, j) < \tau(i', j)$. Restricting a column-strict filling τ to a column $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$, we get a set $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$. The module TE^D has a


basis indexed by column-strict fillings of D ,

$$z_\tau = z_{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes z_{\mathbf{a}^{(m)}, \mathbf{b}^{(m)}}.$$

Now we define a homomorphism $TE^D \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[Z]$ by

$$z_\tau \mapsto \Delta_\tau := \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(1)}} \cdots \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(m)}, \mathbf{b}^{(m)}}.$$

For example, if τ is the filling given by



then z_τ maps to

$$\Delta_\tau = \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{22} & z_{24} & z_{25} \\ z_{32} & z_{34} & z_{35} \\ z_{52} & z_{54} & z_{55} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{33}$$

The homomorphism $z_\tau \mapsto \Delta_\tau$ is injective if the sets $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ are pairwise disjoint, but in general there may be a kernel.

DEFINITION 1.2. Given a diagram D , the D -exchange relations are the elements of the kernel of the map $z_\tau \mapsto \Delta_\tau$.

We also use the term “ D -exchange relation” to refer to any equation implied by these relations.

If D consists of the two columns $\mathbf{a}^{(1)} = \mathbf{a}^{(2)} = \{1, \dots, r\}$, there are the two-column (quadratic) *Sylvester relations*: given a filling τ —that is, a pair of sets $\mathbf{b}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(2)}$ —select a box in the right-hand column, say in row i , with corresponding entry $b_i^{(2)}$. Then

$$(4) \quad \Delta_\tau = \sum_{\tau'} \Delta_{\tau'}$$

the sum over all ways of exchanging the selected entry on the right, $b_i^{(2)}$, with some entry on the left, $b_{i'}^{(1)}$. This is a special case of a more general identity due to Sylvester; see [F, §8.1, Lemma 2].

For example, there is a relation

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 5 & 1 \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 5 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline 5 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$(5) \quad = 0 - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 4 & 2 \\ \hline 5 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline 5 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

The same type of relation holds for any pair of identical sets of row-indices $\mathbf{a}^{(1)} = \mathbf{a}^{(2)}$, not necessarily top-justified ones. A similar relation holds whenever there is a containment $\mathbf{a}^{(1)} \supset \mathbf{a}^{(2)}$. For instance, we have

$$(6) \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & \square \\ \hline 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & \square \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & \square \\ \hline 3 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

More generally, arbitrary minors of Z can be expressed as maximal minors of an augmented matrix $\widehat{Z} = (Z \mid I)$, where I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. To specify columns of \widehat{Z} , we introduce a second alphabet $\{\widehat{1}, \widehat{2}, \dots\}$, so \widehat{i} indicates the i th column of the identity matrix (i.e., the $(n + i)$ th column of \widehat{Z}).

The classical relations for maximal minors imply corresponding relations for minors on any given set of rows. (See, e.g., [BCRV, §6].) For example, the minor $\Delta_{\{2,3,5\},\{1,2,5\}}(Z)$ is equal to $\Delta_{\{1,\dots,5\},\{\widehat{1},1,2,\widehat{4},5\}}(\widehat{Z})$, and this can be represented as

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \widehat{1} \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 2 \\ \hline \square & \widehat{4} \\ \hline 5 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \widehat{1} \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 2 \\ \hline \square & \widehat{4} \\ \hline 5 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} ,$$

corresponding to

$$\begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} & z_{25} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & z_{35} \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{55} \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} 1 & z_{11} & z_{12} & 0 & z_{15} \\ 0 & z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 & z_{25} \\ 0 & z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 & z_{35} \\ 0 & z_{41} & z_{42} & 1 & z_{45} \\ 0 & z_{51} & z_{52} & 0 & z_{55} \end{vmatrix}.$$

For example, we have a relation

$$(7) \quad \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \hat{1} \hat{1} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hat{4} \hat{4} \\ \hat{5} \hat{5} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{3} \hat{1} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & \hat{1} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hat{4} \hat{4} \\ \hat{5} \hat{5} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \hat{1} \hat{1} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{3} & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hat{4} \hat{4} \\ \hat{5} \hat{5} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \hat{1} \hat{1} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{3} & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hat{4} \hat{4} \\ \hat{5} \hat{5} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \hat{1} \hat{1} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & \hat{4} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{3} & \hat{4} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hat{5} \hat{5} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \hat{1} \hat{1} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & \hat{5} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hat{4} \hat{4} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{3} & \hat{5} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

$$= 0 + 0 + \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{3} & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} + 0 - \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & \hat{5} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathbf{3} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array},$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_{\{2,3\},\{1,2\}}(Z) \cdot \Delta_{\{2,3,5\},\{1,3,5\}}(Z) \\ &= \Delta_{\{2,3\},\{1,3\}}(Z) \cdot \Delta_{\{2,3,5\},\{1,2,5\}}(Z) - \Delta_{\{2,3,5\},\{1,2,3\}}(Z) \cdot \Delta_{\{2,3\},\{1,5\}}(Z), \end{aligned}$$

coming from the indicated relation for the maximal minors of \widehat{Z} . (In this example, the columns were nested, but the same construction evidently applies to any pair of columns \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' .)

REMARK 1.3. When D consists of a nested sequence of columns, so $\mathbf{a}^{(1)} \supseteq \mathbf{a}^{(2)} \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathbf{a}^{(m)}$, these two-column relations generate all the D -exchange relations. This is one of the fundamental theorems of classical invariant theory: the quadratic Plücker relations generate all relations among maximal minors of a generic matrix. (We may restrict to the submatrix of Z on rows $\mathbf{a}^{(1)}$, and re-order rows so all $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ are top-justified. Missing boxes in a column $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ may then be considered as filled by very large \hat{i} ; see [F, §8.1] or [BCRV, §6] for further details.)

REMARK 1.4. On the other hand, for general diagrams D , the exchange relations are poorly understood—not all relations come from quadratic ones. For instance, the cubic relation

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} = 0$$

is minimal, i.e., not a consequence of other relations. See [BCRV, §6.5, (6.8)].

Now we can define the \mathbb{k} -module E^D .

DEFINITION 1.5. Given a finitely generated \mathbb{k} -module E and a diagram D , the *Schur module* E^D is defined by the universal property

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E^D, M) = \left\{ \varphi: E^{\times D} \rightarrow M \left| \begin{array}{l} (1) \varphi \text{ is multilinear;} \\ (2) \varphi \text{ is alternating on columns; and} \\ (3) \varphi \text{ satisfies the } D\text{-exchange relations} \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

for any \mathbb{k} -module M .

We have constructed E^D in the case where E is free, as the submodule of $\mathbb{k}[Z]$ spanned by certain products of determinants. In general, let $F \twoheadrightarrow E$ be a presentation, so F is a finitely generated free module. We have surjections $TF^D \twoheadrightarrow TE^D$ and $TF^D \twoheadrightarrow F^D$, so we may construct E^D as the pushout, i.e., the universal (source) module fitting into the diagram

$$(9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} TF^D & \twoheadrightarrow & F^D \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ TE^D & \twoheadrightarrow & E^D. \end{array}$$

(The homomorphisms $F^D \rightarrow E^D$ and $TE^D \rightarrow E^D$ are also surjective, by general properties of pushouts.) The module E^D thus constructed satisfies the universal property of the definition: dualizing the pushout, $\mathrm{Hom}(E^D, M)$ is a pullback, which here means that

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E^D, M) = \mathrm{Hom}(F^D, M) \cap \mathrm{Hom}(TE^D, M)$$

as submodules of $\mathrm{Hom}(TF^D, M)$.

From the definitions, E^D only depends on D up to permutations of the rows and columns. That is, if D' is obtained from D by permuting some rows and columns, there is a canonical isomorphism $E^D \cong E^{D'}$.

EXAMPLE 1.6. There are no exchange relations across disjoint sets $\mathbf{a}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{a}^{(2)}$, because the corresponding determinants are taken in disjoint sets of variables. It follows that if $D = D' \cup D''$, with the columns in D' occupying disjoint rows from those in D'' , then $E^D = E^{D'} \otimes E^{D''}$.

EXAMPLE 1.7. If $D = \lambda$ is a Young diagram—that is, it consists of λ_i boxes in row i , with $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n > 0$ —then $E^D = E^\lambda$ is the classical Schur module: the construction is identical to the one given in [F, §8.1]. So the same is true whenever the rows and columns of D can be permuted to form a Young diagram.

EXAMPLE 1.8. When \mathbb{k} is a field of characteristic zero, so $E = \mathbb{k}^n$ is a vector space, E^D agrees with the module studied by Reiner and Shimozono [RS]. With some further restrictions on the diagram, it also agrees with the module introduced by Kraśkiewicz and Pragacz [KP1], which in turn is modelled on the construction studied in detail by Akin, Buchsbaum, and Weyman in the case $D = \lambda$ [ABW].

1.3. *Group actions.* Any homomorphism $E \rightarrow F$ determines a homomorphism $E^D \rightarrow F^D$. In particular, E^D is a $GL(E)$ -module. In the case where E is free, so E^D embeds in $\mathbb{k}[Z]$, this action is induced from the action on *entries* of the matrix $Z = (z_{ij})$, by

$$g \cdot (z_{ij}) = (g \cdot z_{ij}).$$

Recalling that $z_{ij} = e_i \otimes z_j$, so $g \cdot z_{ij} = e_i \otimes g \cdot z_j$, one sees that the span of products of determinants on rows specified by D , and all possible choices of columns, is preserved by this action.

When \mathbb{k} is a field, and a maximal torus $T \subset GL(E)$ is chosen, the *character* of a $GL(E)$ -module M is the trace of the action restricted to T . This is an element of the representation ring of T , written

$$\text{char}_T(M) \in R(T).$$

We will generally fix a basis so that T consists of diagonal matrices, and for an element $t = \text{diag}(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, the character $x_i: T \rightarrow \mathbb{k}^*$ is defined by $x_i(t) = t_i$. This identifies $R(T)$ with $\mathbb{Z}[x_1^\pm, \dots, x_n^\pm]$, so $\text{char}_T(M)$ is a Laurent polynomial. (For the modules we consider, $\text{char}_T(M)$ will in fact be a polynomial.)

In the following examples, we assume \mathbb{k} is a field.

EXAMPLE 1.9. If D consists of a single box, then $E^D = E$ with its standard action of $GL(E)$. Concretely, in a basis z_1, \dots, z_n , suppose $t = \text{diag}(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$, so that $t \cdot z_j = t_j z_j$. Then for any row i , t acts on the row vector of Z by

$$t \cdot (z_{i,1} \mid z_{i,2} \mid \cdots \mid z_{i,n}) = (t_1 z_{i,1} \mid t_2 z_{i,2} \mid \cdots \mid t_n z_{i,n}).$$

The character of such a module is $\text{char}_T(E) = x_1 + \cdots + x_n$.

EXAMPLE 1.10. Suppose $D = [\mathbf{a}] = [\{1, 3\}]$ and E is 3-dimensional, with basis z_1, z_2, z_3 . Then $E^D = E^{\mathbf{a}} = \bigwedge^2 E$. We get a basis $\{z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}\}$ for $E^{\mathbf{a}}$, for $\mathbf{b} = \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}$. These map to the determinants

$$\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}} = \begin{vmatrix} z_{11} & z_{12} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix}, \quad \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}} = \begin{vmatrix} z_{11} & z_{13} \\ z_{31} & z_{33} \end{vmatrix}, \quad \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}} = \begin{vmatrix} z_{12} & z_{13} \\ z_{32} & z_{33} \end{vmatrix}.$$

For a diagonal element $t = \text{diag}(t_1, t_2, t_3)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t \cdot \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}} &= t_1 t_2 \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}, \\ t \cdot \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}} &= t_1 t_3 \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}, \\ t \cdot \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}} &= t_2 t_3 \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}}. \end{aligned}$$

So the character of this module is $\text{char}_T(E^a) = x_1 x_2 + x_1 x_3 + x_2 x_3$.

The lower-triangular element

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

acts by $g \cdot z_j = z_j + a z_{j+1}$ for $j = 1, 2$, and $g \cdot z_3 = z_3$. So

$$\begin{aligned} g \cdot \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}} &= \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}} + a \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}} + a^2 \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}}, \\ g \cdot \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}} &= \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}} + a \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}}, \\ g \cdot \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}} &= \Delta_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar calculations show that E^D is generated by $\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}$ as a B -module, where B is the subgroup of lower-triangular elements.

REMARK 1.II. The Schur modules considered here are dual to the *Weyl modules* often seen in the literature. Some authors consider $n \times n$ matrices $Y = (y_{ij})$, with GL_n acting on $\mathbb{k}[Y]$ by $g \cdot f(Y) = f(Yg^{-1})$, and define a Weyl module \mathcal{M}_D to be the subspace spanned by certain products of determinants. To recover Schur and Schubert polynomials, they study the *dual characters* of such Weyl modules. (See, e.g., [MI, MST].) The dual of a Weyl module is the double-dual of our Schur module, so their characters agree.

2. FLAGGED SCHUR MODULES

Let E be equipped with a quotient flag:

$$E_\bullet : E = E_n \twoheadrightarrow \cdots \twoheadrightarrow E_1 \twoheadrightarrow 0.$$

A morphism of flags $E_\bullet \rightarrow F_\bullet$ is just a collection of \mathbb{k} -linear maps $E_i \rightarrow F_i$ which commute with the quotient projections.

2.1. *Constructions and definitions.* The constructions of the previous section extend directly to flagged modules. Before giving the general version, we quickly go through the flagged analogues of the intermediate steps, E_\bullet^a and TE_\bullet^D .

First, we can define $E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}$ via an analogous universal property.

DEFINITION 2.1. The \mathbb{k} -module $E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}$ is defined by the universal property

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}, M) = \left\{ E^{\times r} \xrightarrow{\varphi} M \left| \begin{array}{l} \varphi \text{ is multilinear and alternating, and} \\ \varphi(v_1, \dots, v_r) = 0 \text{ if some } v_i \text{ lies in} \\ \text{the kernel of } E \rightarrow E_{a_i} \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

The flagging condition is equivalent to requiring that φ factor through a map $\prod_{i=1}^r E_{a_i} \rightarrow M$, so usually we will phrase it that way.

Recalling that $E^{\mathbf{a}}$ is a quotient of $E^{\otimes r}$, the module $E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}$ is constructed as the further quotient induced by $E \otimes E \otimes \dots \otimes E \rightarrow E_{a_1} \otimes E_{a_2} \otimes \dots \otimes E_{a_r}$. In other words, there is a pushout diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigotimes_{i=1}^r E & \twoheadrightarrow & E^{\mathbf{a}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bigotimes_{i=1}^r E_{a_i} & \twoheadrightarrow & E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}} \end{array}$$

We say a flag E_{\bullet} is *free* if E and each E_i are free modules. Suppose E_{\bullet} is free and $\mathrm{rk} E_i = i$. We can choose bases $z_{i,j}$ for E_i (with $1 \leq j \leq i$), so that the projection $E_i \rightarrow E_{i-1}$ is given by

$$z_{i,j} \mapsto \begin{cases} z_{i-1,j} & \text{if } j \leq i-1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

When such bases are chosen, we say E_{\bullet} is a *standard flag*.¹

Given a subset $\mathbf{b} = \{b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_r\}$, let us write

$$\mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a} \quad \text{if } b_i \leq a_i \text{ for all } i.$$

Then $E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}$ has a basis of elements


$$z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} := z_{a_1,b_1} \wedge \dots \wedge z_{a_r,b_r},$$

ranging over subsets $\mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a}$. (Our conventions make $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} = 0$ if $\mathbf{b} \not\leq \mathbf{a}$.)

As before, we will indicate basis elements by labelling diagrams, now requiring that labels in row i be no larger than i .

¹We will continue to assume $\mathrm{rk} E_i = i$ throughout the article. For remarks on the more general case where $\mathrm{rk} E_i = d_i$, see Appendix A.

EXAMPLE 2.2. For $\mathbf{a} = \{2, 3, 5\}$, the module $E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}$ has a basis consisting of the following seven elements:



Given a diagram $D = \{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(m)}\}$, the flagged tensor product module TE_{\bullet}^D is defined similarly to TE^D , by

$$TE_{\bullet}^D = E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}} \otimes E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}^{(2)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}^{(m)}}.$$

This has a basis consisting of tensors z_{τ} , also defined as before, but now τ ranges over *column-strict flagged fillings*, meaning an entry in row i can be at most i .

DEFINITION 2.3. Given a finitely generated flagged \mathbb{k} -module E_{\bullet} and a diagram D , the *flagged Schur module* E_{\bullet}^D is defined by the universal property

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E_{\bullet}^D, M) = \left\{ \prod_{(i,j) \in D} E_i \xrightarrow{\varphi} M \mid \begin{array}{l} (1) \varphi \text{ is multilinear;} \\ (2) \varphi \text{ is alternating on columns; and} \\ (3) \varphi \text{ satisfies the } D\text{-exchange relations} \end{array} \right\}$$

for any \mathbb{k} -module M . (The flagging condition appears in the requirement on the source of φ .)

Analogously to our construction of E^D as a quotient of $\bigotimes_{(i,j) \in D} E$ in $\mathfrak{S}\mathbb{I}$, the universal property constructs E_{\bullet}^D as a quotient of $\bigotimes_{(i,j) \in D} E_i$. In fact, we have another pushout diagram

$$(10) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \bigotimes_{(i,j) \in D} E & \twoheadrightarrow & TE^D & \twoheadrightarrow & E^D \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bigotimes_{(i,j) \in D} E_i & \twoheadrightarrow & TE_{\bullet}^D & \twoheadrightarrow & E_{\bullet}^D \end{array}$$

The D -exchange relations for flagged modules can also be obtained as the kernel of a map to a polynomial ring, just as we defined them for E^D . Let

$$\mathrm{Sym}^*(E_{\bullet}) = \mathrm{Sym}^*(E_1) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^*(E_2) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^*(E_n).$$

In case E_\bullet is free and standard, with compatible bases z_{ij} for E_i as above, this is a polynomial ring in variables

$$\begin{aligned} & z_{11}, \\ & z_{21}, z_{22}, \\ & \vdots \\ & z_{n1}, z_{n2}, \dots, z_{n,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $Z_\bullet = (z_{ij})_{i \geq j}$ be the $n \times n$ lower-triangular matrix of the form suggested above, so $\text{Sym}^*(E_\bullet) \cong \mathbb{k}[Z_\bullet]$. We have a homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} TE_\bullet^D &\rightarrow \mathbb{k}[Z_\bullet] \\ z_\tau &\rightarrow \Delta_\tau, \end{aligned}$$

completing the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} TE^D & \longrightarrow & E^D & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{k}[Z] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ TE_\bullet^D & \longrightarrow & E_\bullet^D & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{k}[Z_\bullet]. \end{array}$$

So in the free case, the homomorphism $E^D \rightarrow E_\bullet^D$ is induced by the map $\mathbb{k}[Z] \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[Z_\bullet]$ which sends $z_{ij} \mapsto 0$ for $j > i$.

2.2. Group actions. A homomorphism of flags $E_\bullet \rightarrow F_\bullet$ determines a homomorphism of flagged modules $E_\bullet^D \rightarrow F_\bullet^D$. In particular, E_\bullet^D is a representation of the Borel subgroup $B \subset GL(E)$ which preserves E_\bullet .

The construction of $\text{Sym}^*(E_\bullet)$ is also functorial, so a homomorphism $E_\bullet \rightarrow F_\bullet$ determines a homomorphism $\text{Sym}^*(E_\bullet) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^*(F_\bullet)$. When E_\bullet and F_\bullet are free, the homomorphism $E_\bullet^D \rightarrow F_\bullet^D$ is induced by this homomorphism of polynomial rings. In particular, the action of $g \in B$ on E_\bullet^D is induced from the action on entries of $Z_\bullet = (z_{ij})_{i \geq j}$, just as before. Our choice of basis identifies B with the Borel group of lower-triangular matrices.


Assuming \mathbb{k} is a field and a maximal torus $T \subset B$ is chosen, we will write

$$\mathfrak{S}_D = \text{char}_T(E_\bullet^D)$$

for the character. Our conventions make \mathfrak{S}_D a polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, not merely a Laurent polynomial.

In the following examples, we assume \mathbb{k} is a field.

EXAMPLE 2.4. Building on Example 1.10, suppose $D = [\{1\}, \{1, 3\}]$ and E_\bullet is a standard flag. Then $TE_\bullet^D = E_\bullet^{\{1\}} \otimes E_\bullet^{\{1,3\}}$, and this has a basis consisting of the two elements $z_{\{1\},\{1\}} \otimes z_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}$ and $z_{\{1\},\{1\}} \otimes z_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}$, corresponding to the two column-strict flagged fillings of D :



These map to the polynomials

$$z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}} = z_{11} \begin{vmatrix} z_{11} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix}, \quad z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}} = z_{11} \begin{vmatrix} z_{11} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{33} \end{vmatrix}.$$

For a diagonal element $t = \text{diag}(t_1, t_2, t_3)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t \cdot (z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}) &= t_1^2 t_2 (z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}), \\ t \cdot (z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}) &= t_1^2 t_3 (z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}). \end{aligned}$$

Evidently there are no relations, so the map $TE_\bullet^D \rightarrow E_\bullet^D$ is an isomorphism, and the character of this module is

$$\mathfrak{S}_D = x_1^2 x_2 + x_1^2 x_3.$$

The lower-triangular element

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

acts by

$$\begin{aligned} g \cdot (z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}) &= z_{11} (\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}} + a\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}), \\ g \cdot (z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}) &= z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that E_\bullet^D is generated by $z_{11}\Delta_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}$ as a B -module.

EXAMPLE 2.5. Consider $D = [\{2, 3, 4\}, \{3\}]$. Then $TE_\bullet^D = E_\bullet^{\{2,3,4\}} \otimes E_\bullet^{\{3\}}$ is isomorphic to $\bigwedge^3 E_4 \otimes E_3$, so it is 12-dimensional. The module E_\bullet^D is a quotient of TE_\bullet^D , and there is one relation:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline \boxed{1} & \\ \hline \boxed{3} & \boxed{2} \\ \hline \boxed{4} & \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline \boxed{2} & \\ \hline \boxed{3} & \boxed{1} \\ \hline \boxed{4} & \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline \boxed{1} & \\ \hline \boxed{2} & \boxed{3} \\ \hline \boxed{4} & \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

So E_{\bullet}^D is 11-dimensional, with character

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{S}_D &= (x_1x_2x_3 + x_1x_2x_4 + x_1x_3x_4 + x_2x_3x_4)(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) - x_1x_2x_3x_4 \\
 &= x_1^2x_2x_3 + x_1^2x_2x_4 + x_1^2x_3x_4 + x_1x_2^2x_3 + x_1x_2^2x_4 + x_1x_2x_3^2 \\
 &\quad + 2x_1x_2x_3x_4 + x_1x_3^2x_4 + x_2^2x_3x_4 + x_2x_3^2x_4.
 \end{aligned}$$

3. BERGERON-SOTTILE OPERATORS

3.1. *Operators on indices and flags.* The *Bergeron-Sottile operator* R_k is defined on integer indices by

$$(II) \quad R_k(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i < k; \\ i - 1 & \text{if } i \geq k. \end{cases}$$

These satisfy the relations $R_k^2 = R_k R_{k+1}$. (They do not commute: for instance, $R_2^2(3) = R_2 R_3(3) = 1$, but $R_3 R_2(3) = 2$.) These operators were defined and studied by Nadeau, Spink and Tewari via their action on the polynomial ring $[NST_1, NST_2]$. To translate to their notation, let $\varpi_i = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_i$, and define an endomorphism of the polynomial ring by $R_k(\varpi_i) = \varpi_{R_k(i)}$. Written in terms of the x variables, R_k acts on polynomials by

$$(R_k f)(x_1, x_2, \dots) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 0, x_k, \dots).$$

That is, R_k acts on the polynomial ring by

$$R_k(x_i) = \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } i < k, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = k, \\ x_{i-1} & \text{if } i > k. \end{cases}$$

Given a flagged module E_{\bullet} , for any integer k , let $R_k E_{\bullet}$ be the flagged module defined by $(R_k E_{\bullet})_i = E_{R_k(i)}$. We often abbreviate the notation by writing $R_k E_i$ for the i th part of this flag, so

$$R_k E_i = \begin{cases} E_i & \text{if } i < k; \\ E_{i-1} & \text{if } i \geq k. \end{cases}$$

The maps of the flag $R_k E_\bullet$ are the ones induced from E_\bullet , but with $R_k E_k \rightarrow R_k E_{k-1}$ being the identity map on E_{k-1} .

We have surjections of flags $E_\bullet = R_{n+1} E_\bullet \rightarrow R_n E_\bullet \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow R_1 E_\bullet$, which expand as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & k+2 & & k+1 & & k & & k-1 & & \\
 R_{k+1} E_\bullet : & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & E_{k+1} & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & E_k & \xlongequal{\quad} & E_k & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & E_{k-1} & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdots \\
 \downarrow \pi_k & & & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & & & & \\
 R_k E_\bullet : & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & E_{k+1} & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & E_k & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & E_{k-1} & \xlongequal{\quad} & E_{k-1} & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdots
 \end{array}$$

The algebra of operators R_k acts oppositely on flags: we have $R_k^2 E_\bullet = R_{k+1} R_k E_\bullet$. For instance, $R_2^2 E_\bullet = R_2(R_2 E_\bullet)$ is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 4 & & 3 & & 2 & & 1 & & \\
 R_2^2 E_\bullet : & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & E_2 & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & E_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & E_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & E_1 & \longrightarrow & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdots
 \end{array}$$

which equals $R_3 R_2 E_\bullet$. (Writing out the definition, $(R_k R_\ell E_\bullet)_i = (R_\ell E_\bullet)_{R_k(i)} = E_{R_\ell R_k(i)}$.)

Assume E_\bullet is free and standard, so $\text{Sym}^*(E_\bullet) = \mathbb{k}[Z_\bullet] = \mathbb{k}[z_{ij}]_{i \geq j}$. Then the homomorphism $\text{Sym}^*(E_\bullet) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^*(R_k E_\bullet)$ is given by setting the diagonal entries $z_{ii} = 0$ for $i \geq k$. In particular, the homomorphism induced by $R_{k+1} E_\bullet \rightarrow R_k E_\bullet$ simply sets the entry z_{kk} to 0. It will be convenient to write Z_k for the lower triangular matrix of variables in $\text{Sym}^*(R_k E_\bullet)$. For example, with $k = 3$, the map $\text{Sym}^*(R_{k+1} E_\bullet) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^*(R_k E_\bullet)$ looks as follows:

$$\mathbb{k}[Z_4] \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[Z_3]$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
 z_{11} & & & \\
 z_{21} & z_{22} & & \\
 z_{31} & z_{32} & \mathbf{z_{33}} & \\
 z_{41} & z_{42} & z_{43} & 0 \\
 z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} & z_{54} & 0 \\
 \vdots & & & & \ddots
 \end{array} \right) \rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{cccc}
 z_{11} & & & \\
 z_{21} & z_{22} & & \\
 z_{31} & z_{32} & \mathbf{0} & \\
 z_{41} & z_{42} & z_{43} & 0 \\
 z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} & z_{54} & 0 \\
 \vdots & & & & \ddots
 \end{array} \right).$$

Additionally assuming \mathbb{k} is a field, so that $x_i = \text{char}_T(\ker(E_i \rightarrow E_{i-1}))$, we have $R_k(x_i) = \text{char}_T(R_k E_i \rightarrow R_k E_{i-1})$. (This property motivated the definition of $R_k E_\bullet$.)

3.2. *Action on single-column modules.* Assume E_\bullet is free and standard. For a diagram with a single column $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1 < \cdots < a_r\}$, we have a basis for $E_\bullet^\mathbf{a}$ consisting of $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ with $\mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a}$. Similarly, $R_k E_\bullet^\mathbf{a}$ has a basis consisting of those $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ such that $\mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a}$, and furthermore $b_i < a_i$ whenever $a_i \geq k$. This condition comes up frequently, so we introduce a shorthand for it:

DEFINITION 3.1. Write $\mathbf{b} \leq_k \mathbf{a}$ to mean $b_i \leq a_i$ for all i , and $b_i < a_i$ whenever $a_i \geq k$.

Under the projection $E_\bullet^\mathbf{a} \rightarrow R_k E_\bullet^\mathbf{a}$, the standard basis maps by

$$z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} \mapsto \begin{cases} z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} & \text{if } \mathbf{b} \leq_k \mathbf{a}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The same formula defines the map $R_{k+1} E_\bullet^\mathbf{a} \rightarrow R_k E_\bullet^\mathbf{a}$. It follows that the kernel of this map has a basis given by the nonzero $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ which map to 0 under the projection. Stated formally:

LEMMA 3.2. *Assume E_\bullet is free and standard, and let $N_k^\mathbf{a} = \ker(R_{k+1} E_\bullet^\mathbf{a} \rightarrow R_k E_\bullet^\mathbf{a})$. Then $N_k^\mathbf{a}$ is spanned by $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ such that $\mathbf{b} \leq_{k+1} \mathbf{a}$ and $a_i = b_i = k$ for some i . \square*

This is easily illustrated by considering $R_{k+1} E_\bullet^\mathbf{a}$ as a submodule of $\mathbb{k}[Z_{k+1}]$ via the embedding $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} \mapsto \Delta_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$. The point is that $\Delta_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ maps to zero whenever z_{kk} appears as a diagonal entry of the minor.

EXAMPLE 3.3. Consider $\mathbf{a} = \{2, 3, 5\}$, as in Example 2.2. A basis for $R_4 E_\bullet^\mathbf{a}$ is indexed by the column-strict flagged fillings \mathbf{b} whose entries in row 5 are at most 4:

1	■	■	■	■
2	□1	□1	□1	□2
3	□2	□2	□3	□3
4	■	■	■	■
5	□3	□4	□4	□4

Only the first two survive the projection to $\mathbb{R}_3 E_\bullet^a$. Identifying them with minors of Z_4 , these four polynomials map as

$$\begin{array}{l} \left| \begin{array}{ccc} z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & \mathbf{z}_{33} \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} \end{array} \right| \mapsto \left| \begin{array}{ccc} z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & \mathbf{0} \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} \end{array} \right|, \\ \left| \begin{array}{ccc} z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{54} \end{array} \right| \mapsto \left| \begin{array}{ccc} z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{54} \end{array} \right|, \\ \left| \begin{array}{ccc} z_{21} & 0 & 0 \\ z_{31} & \mathbf{z}_{33} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{53} & z_{54} \end{array} \right| \mapsto \left| \begin{array}{ccc} z_{21} & 0 & 0 \\ z_{31} & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{53} & z_{54} \end{array} \right| = 0, \\ \left| \begin{array}{ccc} z_{22} & 0 & 0 \\ z_{32} & \mathbf{z}_{33} & 0 \\ z_{52} & z_{53} & z_{54} \end{array} \right| \mapsto \left| \begin{array}{ccc} z_{22} & 0 & 0 \\ z_{32} & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ z_{52} & z_{53} & z_{54} \end{array} \right| = 0. \end{array}$$

3.3. *Action on tensor product modules.* Still assuming E is free and standard, the above considerations apply equally well to the tensor modules $TE_\bullet^D = E_\bullet^{a^{(1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes E_\bullet^{a^{(m)}}$. In particular, the module $T(\mathbb{R}_k E_\bullet)^D$ has a basis consisting of

$$z_\tau = z_{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes z_{\mathbf{a}^{(m)}, \mathbf{b}^{(m)}},$$

indexed by column-strict flagged fillings τ such that $\mathbf{b}^{(j)} \leq_k \mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ for all j . The natural extension of Lemma 3.2 follows from the single-column case:

LEMMA 3.4. *Assume E_\bullet is free and standard, and let $TN_k^D = \ker(T(\mathbb{R}_{k+1} E_\bullet)^D \rightarrow T(\mathbb{R}_k E_\bullet)^D)$. Then TN_k^D is spanned by $z_\tau = z_{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes z_{\mathbf{a}^{(m)}, \mathbf{b}^{(m)}}$ such that $\mathbf{b}^{(j)} \leq_{k+1} \mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ for all j , and $a_i^{(j)} = b_i^{(j)} = k$ for some i and some j . \square*

As before, the elements generating this kernel are precisely those z_τ which map to 0 under the projection. They can be interpreted as products of minors $\Delta_\tau = \prod_{j=1}^m \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}^{(j)}}$ such that some factor $\Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}^{(j)}}$ becomes zero when $z_{kk} = 0$.

In the next section, we compute the kernels of the maps $\mathbb{R}_{k+1} E_\bullet^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_k E_\bullet^D$.

4. THE KERNEL OF $\mathbb{R}_{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_k$

For the rest of the article, we assume E_\bullet is free and standard.

The general claim we need is a description of the kernel of the $R_{k+1} \rightarrow R_k$ projection for diagram modules E_{\bullet}^D , analogous to the ones we saw above for E_{\bullet}^a and TE_{\bullet}^D . Before stating it, we record a basic fact about pullbacks and pushouts.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Let \mathbb{k} be a commutative ring, and consider the following commutative diagram of \mathbb{k} -modules, in which the top row is right-exact and the bottom row is left-exact:*

$$(12) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B & \xrightarrow{g} & C & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \gamma \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & A' & \xrightarrow{f'} & B' & \xrightarrow{g'} & C' \end{array}$$

- (i) *If the left-hand square (involving A, A', B, B') is a pullback square, then γ is injective.*
- (ii) *If the right-hand square (involving B, B', C, C') is a pushout square, then α is surjective.*

The proof is an exercise in unwinding the definitions. The second statement of the proposition establishes the following:

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $N_k^D = \ker(R_{k+1}E_{\bullet}^D \rightarrow R_kE_{\bullet}^D)$, considered as a submodule of $\mathbb{k}[Z_{k+1}]$. Then N_k^D is generated by the products $\Delta_{\tau} = \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(1)}} \cdots \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(m)}, \mathbf{b}^{(m)}}$ which map to zero. That is, for some j and some i , we have $a_i^{(j)} = b_i^{(j)} = k$.*

Proof. From the definitions, we have a diagram

$$(13) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} TN_k^D & \longrightarrow & T(R_{k+1}E_{\bullet}^D) & \longrightarrow & T(R_kE_{\bullet}^D) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_k^D & \longrightarrow & R_{k+1}E_{\bullet}^D & \longrightarrow & R_kE_{\bullet}^D, \end{array}$$

in which the rows are exact, and the right-hand square is a push-out. It follows from the above proposition that α is surjective. Since TN_k^D is generated by the nonzero z_{τ} which map to zero in $T(R_{k+1}E_{\bullet}^D)$ (Lemma 3.4), and $\alpha(z_{\tau}) = \Delta_{\tau}$, the assertion is proved. \square

For the main theorems, we require two further facts, which follow from this lemma.


DEFINITION 4.3. A diagram D is said to be *k-full*² if whenever a box appears in row k , there is a box below it in row $k + 1$. That is, for each column $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ in D , either $k \notin \mathbf{a}^{(j)}$, or else $\{k, k + 1\} \subset \mathbf{a}^{(j)}$.

LEMMA 4.4. *If D is k-full then $R_{k+1}E_{\bullet}^D \rightarrow R_kE_{\bullet}^D$ is an isomorphism. (That is, $N_k^D = 0$.)*


²This is a variation on the notion of *i-free diagram*, used by Magyar [M1].

Proof. When D is k -full, having $a_i^{(j)} = k$ implies $a_{i+1}^{(j)} = k + 1$, and having $b_i^{(j)} = k$ implies $b_{i+1}^{(j)} \geq k + 1$. This violates the flagging condition for $R_{k+1}E_\bullet^D$, so the corresponding minor $\Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}^{(j)}}(Z_{k+1})$ was already zero, and Lemma 4.2 implies $N_k^D = 0$. \square

EXAMPLE 4.5. Let D be the following diagram:



This diagram is k -full for $k = 1$, $k = 2$, and $k = 4$, but not for $k = 3$ or $k = 5$. Consider $k = 2$, so the lemma asserts that $R_3E_\bullet^D \rightarrow R_2E_\bullet^D$ is an isomorphism. For $R_3E_\bullet^D$, we have a basis of Δ_τ as τ varies over the following four fillings:



The corresponding Δ_τ are:

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{31} \\ & \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{54} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{31} \\ & \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{32} \\ & \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & z_{22} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{54} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{32}. \end{aligned}$$

The map $R_3 \rightarrow R_2$ is given by $z_{22} \mapsto 0$, so these four polynomials map to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & \mathbf{0} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{31} \\
 & \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & \mathbf{0} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{54} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{31} \\
 & \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & \mathbf{0} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{32} \\
 & \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & \mathbf{0} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} \end{vmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{54} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{32}.
 \end{aligned}$$

So this map is indeed an isomorphism—but not the identity!

REMARK 4.6. Lemma 4.4 can be proved directly using standard monomial theory, which makes a pleasant exercise.


DEFINITION 4.7. A diagram D has a *descent* at k if, possibly after re-ordering columns, there is a column $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ such that

- $\mathbf{a}^{(j)} = \{a_1^{(j)} < \dots < a_r^{(j)} = k\}$, i.e., the last box in this column is in row k ;
- for $j' < j$, the columns $\mathbf{a}^{(j')}$ (i.e., to the left of $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$) are all k -full; and
- for $j' > j$, the columns $\mathbf{a}^{(j')}$ (i.e., to the right of $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$) all have $\mathbf{a}_{\leq k+1}^{(j')} \subseteq \mathbf{a}^{(j)}$, where $\mathbf{a}_{\leq k+1}$ is the subset $\mathbf{a} \cap \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, so in particular $k+1 \notin \mathbf{a}^{(j')}$.


If D has a descent at k , the witnessing column $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ is unique up to repetition. (That is, if both $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ and $\mathbf{a}^{(j')}$ are witnesses, then $\mathbf{a}^{(j)} = \mathbf{a}^{(j')}$ as sets.) By convention, we will choose the leftmost witnessing column for a descent. Following [FGRS], the box in position (k, j) is called a *border cell*.

Given a diagram D with a descent at k , let $s_k D$ be the diagram obtained by deleting the border cell (k, j) and then swapping rows k and $k+1$.

EXAMPLE 4.8. The diagram from Example 4.5 has descents at $k = 3$ and $k = 5$, with the border cells marked:



The corresponding diagrams s_3D and s_5D are shown below.



EXAMPLE 4.9. It can happen that k is a descent of s_kD . For instance, with $D = [\{1\}, \{2\}]$, we have $s_1D = [\{1\}]$ and $s_1s_1D = \emptyset$.

LEMMA 4.10. *If D has a descent at k , then*

$$N_k^D \cong K_k \otimes \mathbf{R}_{k+1} E_{\bullet}^{s_k D},$$

where $K_k = \ker(\mathbf{R}_{k+1} E_k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_k E_k) = \ker(E_k \rightarrow E_{k-1})$.

In our setting, K_k is the one-dimensional B -module with character x_k . To prove the lemma, we will use the classical quadratic straightening relations.

Proof. Suppose $\mathbf{a}^{(j)} = \{a_1^{(j)} < \dots < a_r^{(j)} = k\}$ is the column witnessing the descent, so for all $j' < j$, $\mathbf{a}^{(j')}$ is k -full, and for all $j' > j$, we have $\mathbf{a}_{\leq k+1}^{(j')} \subseteq \mathbf{a}^{(j)}$. Further re-ordering if necessary, we may assume that *all* of the k -full columns are to the left of $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$; that is, for every $j' \geq j$, we have $\mathbf{a}^{(j')} \cap \{k, k+1\} = \{k\}$.

We know that N_k^D is generated by the nonzero $\Delta_\tau(Z_{k+1})$ such that the filling τ puts an entry “ k ” in the k th row; that is, writing $\Delta_\tau = \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(1)}} \cdots \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(m)}, \mathbf{b}^{(m)}}$, we have $a_i^{(j')} = b_i^{(j')} = k$ for some i, j' . In our setting, such an entry can occur in a column $\mathbf{a}^{(j')}$ with $j' \geq j$, and only in these columns. (Placing a “ k ” in the k th row of a k -full column makes $\Delta_\tau(Z_{k+1}) = 0$.)

Claim. The Δ_τ such that $b_r^{(j)} = k$ suffice to generate N_k^D .

Specifically, suppose row k in column j' is filled by k , for some $j' > j$; that is, $a_i^{(j')} = b_i^{(j')} = k$. We will see that

$$(I4) \quad \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}^{(j)}} \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j')}, \mathbf{b}^{(j')}} = \sum_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}'} \pm \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}} \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j')}, \mathbf{b}'},$$

a sum over fillings \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}' such that \mathbf{b} places k in the k th row of the j th column; that is, $a_r^{(j)} = b_r = k$. If $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ already has k in this position, there is nothing to prove, so for the rest of the proof we assume $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ does not contain k . Together with the flagging condition, this implies all entries in $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ are strictly less than k .

Analogously to the situation explained in §I.2, we can represent any minor $\Delta_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(Z_{k+1})$ as a maximal minor of the augmented matrix $\widehat{Z}_{k+1} = (Z_{k+1} \mid I)$. Selecting the entry “ k ” in the k th row of the column $\mathbf{a}^{(j')}$, consider the Sylvester exchange relations

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}^{(j)}} \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j')}, \mathbf{b}^{(j')}} = \sum_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}'} \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}} \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j')}, \mathbf{b}'},$$

the sum over \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}' obtained by exchanging the entry in position (k, j') with an entry in position (i, j) (for all i). We describe the term $\Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}} \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j')}, \mathbf{b}'}$ by distinguishing three cases:

- (i) $i \notin \mathbf{a}^{(j)}$ and $i < k$. Since $\mathbf{a}^{(j)} \supseteq \mathbf{a}_{\leq k+1}^{(j')}$, this means $i \notin \mathbf{a}^{(j')}$, and that the corresponding entries of $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$ and $\mathbf{b}^{(j')}$ are both \widehat{i} . Upon performing the exchange, \mathbf{b}' has two copies of \widehat{i} , so the corresponding minor $\Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j')}, \mathbf{b}'}$ vanishes.
- (ii) $i \in \mathbf{a}^{(j)}$, so $i \leq k$. By assumption, all entries of $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$ are less than k . So after performing the exchange, \mathbf{b} has largest entry equal to k ; after re-arranging entries to increasing order (and possibly introducing a sign in the process), this must appear in the bottom row of $\mathbf{a}^{(j)}$, which is row k . So in this case, we obtain a term $\pm \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j)}, \mathbf{b}} \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j')}, \mathbf{b}'}$ of the desired form.
- (iii) $i > k$. Such an entry of $\mathbf{b}^{(j)}$ below row k is equal to \widehat{i} . After exchanging it with the entry k in row k of $\mathbf{b}^{(j')}$ to obtain \mathbf{b} , either we get a repeated \widehat{i} in \mathbf{b}' again (so the minor is zero), or else—after re-arranging to increasing order—the entries of $\mathbf{b}^{(j')}$ in rows $k+1$ through i get shifted up, so that \mathbf{b}' has an entry in row k , equal to the first entry below row k of $\mathbf{b}^{(j')}$. Since $\mathbf{b}^{(j')}$ had k in row k , all the entries below row k are strictly greater than k , meaning \mathbf{b}' has an entry $> k$ in row k . Therefore $\Delta_{\mathbf{a}^{(j')}, \mathbf{b}'}(Z_{k+1}) = 0$, by the flagging condition.

To summarize: the only nonzero terms are those in the second case, and these are of the asserted form, so the claim is proved.

The claim shows that N_k^D is generated by Δ_τ having some factor divisible by z_{kk} . Pulling this factor out, we have

$$N_k^D = K_k \otimes R_{k+1} E_\bullet^{D'}$$


where $D' = D \setminus (k, j)$ is the diagram obtained by removing the border cell witnessing the descent at k . Under the operator R_{k+1} , the flagging conditions $R_{k+1} E_\bullet^{D'}$ treat rows k and $k+1$ identically, so they may be swapped. Performing the swap, we obtain $R_{k+1} E_\bullet^{D'} = R_{k+1} E_\bullet^{s_k D}$, completing the proof of the lemma. \square

EXAMPLE 4.11. Consider $\mathbf{a}^{(j)} = \{2, 3\}$ and $\mathbf{a}^{(j')} = \{2, 3, 5\}$, with $k = 3$, as in §1.2, (7). When the minors in the relation (7) are restricted to Z_4 , only one term survives on the right-hand side, and we have


$$\begin{aligned}
 (15) \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 3 \\ \hline & \\ \hline 5 & \\ \hline \end{array} &= \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 3 & \hat{1} \\ \hline 1 & \hat{1} \\ \hline 2 & \hat{1} \\ \hline \hat{4} & \hat{4} \\ \hline \hat{5} & \hat{5} \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \hat{1} & \hat{1} \\ \hline 3 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline \hat{4} & \hat{4} \\ \hline \hat{5} & \hat{5} \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \hat{1} & \hat{1} \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline \hat{4} & \hat{4} \\ \hline \hat{5} & \hat{5} \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \hat{1} & \hat{1} \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & \hat{4} \\ \hline 3 & \hat{4} \\ \hline \hat{5} & \hat{5} \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \hat{1} & \hat{1} \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & \hat{5} \\ \hline \hat{4} & \hat{4} \\ \hline 3 & \hat{5} \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 &= 0 + 0 + \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline & \\ \hline 5 & \\ \hline \end{array} + 0 + 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

The vanishing of the last term is an instance of Case (iii) examined in the above proof.

EXAMPLE 4.12. Continuing to examine the diagram from Example 4.8, consider the descent at $k = 3$.



Flagged column-strict fillings of D with $\mathbf{3}$ in the indicated border cell are evidently in bijection with flagged column-strict fillings of D' , the diagram obtained by removing the border cell from D . Furthermore, fillings of D' which respect the flagging condition for R_{k+1} are in evident bijection with those of $s_3 D$. The B -modules $R_4 E_\bullet^{D'}$ and $R_4 E_\bullet^{s_3 D}$ are isomorphic under the corresponding identification of minors. For instance, the fillings



correspond to products of minors

$$\Delta_{\tau'}(Z_4) = z_{22} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & 0 & 0 \\ z_{31} & z_{33} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{53} & z_{54} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{32}$$

and

$$\Delta_{s_3\tau}(Z_4) = z_{22} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} z_{21} & 0 & 0 \\ z_{41} & z_{43} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{53} & z_{54} \end{vmatrix} \cdot z_{42}$$

(In $\Delta_{s_3\tau}(Z_4)$, note that $z_{44} = 0$.)

5. A RECURRENCE RELATION

Now we come to the main theorem concerning characters of flagged diagram modules. We continue to assume E_\bullet is standard, and from now on, we also assume \mathbb{k} is a field. Given a diagram D and a flag E_\bullet , recall that $\mathfrak{S}_D = \text{char}_T(E_\bullet^D)$ is the corresponding character, and that our conventions ensure \mathfrak{S}_D is a polynomial in x_1, \dots, x_n .

The theorem requires a further condition on diagrams.


DEFINITION 5.1. A diagram D is *clear* if for every k , either D is k -full or D has a descent at k .

EXAMPLE 5.2. Given a permutation w , the Rothe diagram $D(w)$ consists of the boxes (i, j) such that $j < w(i)$ and $i < w^{-1}(j)$. (Writing the permutation matrix by placing dots in positions $(i, w(i))$, the boxes of $D(w)$ are those remaining after eliminating the boxes below and right of the dots.) Rothe diagrams of permutations are clear: for each k , either $w(k) > w(k + 1)$ (so k is a *descent* of w) or $w(k) < w(k + 1)$. In the latter case, $D(w)$ is readily seen to be k -full.

On the other hand, if k is a descent of w , then it is a descent of $D(w)$, witnessed by the border cell (k, j) where $j = w(k + 1)$ (cf. [FGRS, Definition 4.4]).

EXAMPLE 5.3. If D is clear, and D' is obtained by repeating or omitting some columns of D , then D' is also clear. In particular, for a permutation w , the diagram $m \cdot D(w)$ (obtained by repeating each column of the Rothe diagram m times) is clear. (Such diagrams are not always diagrams of permutations; for example, $2 \cdot D(2143)$ is not equal to $D(w)$ for any w .)

EXAMPLE 5.4. On the other hand, this imposes a nontrivial restriction—not every diagram is clear. The smallest non-example is the single-column diagram $D = [\{1, 3\}]$; it is neither 1-full nor has a descent at 1. A more interesting one is shown below; it is neither 3-full nor has a descent at 3.



(In the terminology of [RS], this diagram is not northwest, but it is $\%_0$ -avoiding.)

THEOREM 5.5. *Suppose D is a clear diagram. Then*

$$(I6) \quad \mathfrak{S}_D = R_1(\mathfrak{S}_D) + \sum_{k \in \text{Des}(D)} x_k \cdot R_{k+1}(\mathfrak{S}_{s_k D}),$$

where $\text{Des}(D)$ denotes the set of descents of the diagram D .

Proof. The R -operators produce a filtration of E_\bullet^D by quotients: assuming D has no boxes below row n , we have

$$E_\bullet^D = R_{n+1}E_\bullet^D \twoheadrightarrow R_n E_\bullet^D \twoheadrightarrow \cdots \twoheadrightarrow R_2 E_\bullet^D \twoheadrightarrow R_1 E_\bullet^D.$$

It follows that

$$(I7) \quad \mathfrak{S}_D = \text{char}_T(R_1 E_\bullet^D) + \sum_{k=1}^n \text{char}_T(\ker(R_{k+1} E_\bullet^D \twoheadrightarrow R_k E_\bullet^D)).$$

Since D is clear, it is k -full whenever k is not a descent; by Lemma 4.4, $\ker(R_{k+1} E_\bullet^D \twoheadrightarrow R_k E_\bullet^D) = 0$ in this case. So the RHS of (I7) ranges over $k \in \text{Des}(D)$.

When k is a descent, Lemma 4.10 says

$$\ker(R_{k+1} E_\bullet^D \twoheadrightarrow R_k E_\bullet^D) \cong \ker(R_{k+1} E_k \twoheadrightarrow R_k E_k) \otimes R_{k+1} E_\bullet^{s_k D},$$

and this has character $x_k \cdot R_{k+1} \mathfrak{S}_{s_k D}$, as claimed. \square

The formula of Theorem 5.5 can be rephrased as

$$(I8) \quad \mathfrak{S}_D = \frac{1}{1 - R_1} \sum_{k \in \text{Des}(D)} x_k \cdot R_{k+1}(\mathfrak{S}_{s_k D}),$$

cf. [NST₂, (3.1)]. This version expresses \mathfrak{S}_D in terms of lower-degree characters $\mathfrak{S}_{s_k D}$ on the right-hand side. (Since R_1 is a locally nilpotent operator, the action of $(1 - R_1)^{-1} = 1 + R_1 + R_1^2 + \dots$ involves only finitely many terms.)

REMARK 5.6. Comparing (16) with that of [NST₂, (3.1)], the indices of the operators R_k are shifted by one. As explained in [NST₂, Remark 3.6], the formulas agree when $D = D(w)$ is a Rothe diagram. In fact, Lemma 4.4 implies that whenever $s_k D$ is k -full, we have $R_{k+1} \mathfrak{S}_{s_k D} = R_k \mathfrak{S}_{s_k D}$, so the index shift does not change the formula in this case. For Rothe diagrams, $s_k D(w) = D(ws_k)$ is k -full whenever $k \in \text{Des}(w)$ —however, this fails for general D .

The formula (18) becomes a recurrence relation determining \mathfrak{S}_D under a further hypothesis.

DEFINITION 5.7. The set of *transparent* diagrams is defined inductively as follows:

- (base) The empty diagram $D = \emptyset$ is transparent.
- (step) A diagram D is transparent if D is clear and $s_k D$ is transparent for every $k \in \text{Des}(D)$.

COROLLARY 5.8. *If D is transparent, then the character \mathfrak{S}_D is determined by the recurrence relation (16) together with the fact that $\mathfrak{S}_\emptyset = 1$.*

Proof. On the RHS of (16), the term $R_1(\mathfrak{S}_D)$ involves fewer variables than \mathfrak{S}_D , and the terms $R_{k+1}(\mathfrak{S}_{s_k D})$ are of lower degree than \mathfrak{S}_D . So both can be assumed to be known, by induction on degree and number of variables. (Alternatively, one can use the reformulation (18) and induction only on degree.) \square

The recurrence relation implies a generalization of [NST₂, Theorem 1.1], giving a formula for the character of a transparent diagram D in terms of reduced words.

DEFINITION 5.9. Let ℓ be the number of boxes in D . We say (i_1, \dots, i_ℓ) is a *reduced word* for D if $s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell} D = \emptyset$. That is, there is a sequence of diagrams $D = D_\ell, \dots, D_1, D_0 = \emptyset$ such that $i_j \in \text{Des}(D_j)$ and $D_{j-1} = s_{i_j} D_j$.

We write $\text{Red}(D)$ for the set of all reduced words of D .

When $D = D(w)$ is the Rothe diagram of a permutation, a reduced word for D is the same as a reduced word for w .

COROLLARY 5.10. *Let D be a transparent diagram. Then*

$$(19) \quad \mathfrak{S}_D = \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in \text{Red}(D)} Z x_{i_\ell} R_{i_\ell+1} \cdots Z x_{i_1} R_{i_1+1}(1),$$

where $Z = 1/(1 - R_1)$.

REMARK 5.11. Compared with the formula of [NST2, Theorem 1.1], the above formula has the indices of the Bergeron-Sottile operators R_k shifted by one, for the reasons explained in Remark 5.6; as before, this leaves the formula unchanged when $D = D(w)$, but not in general.

In fact, the recurrence relation determines \mathfrak{S}_D for the slightly wider class of *translucent* diagrams.

DEFINITION 5.12. A diagram is *translucent*³ if it belongs to the following inductively defined set:

- (base) A diagram with a single (possibly empty) column $D = [\mathbf{a}]$ is translucent.
- (step) A diagram D with at least two columns is translucent if D is clear and $s_k D$ is translucent for every $k \in \text{Des}(D)$.


COROLLARY 5.13. *If D is translucent, then the character \mathfrak{S}_D is determined by the recurrence relation (16) together with the fact that*

$$(20) \quad \mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a}} x_{b_1} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_r},$$

where $\mathbf{b} = \{b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_r\}$.

(The recurrence can be repackaged into a sum over appropriately defined “reduced words” for translucent diagrams, as in Corollary 5.10, but the statement is less elegant and we leave it to the interested reader.)

EXAMPLE 5.14. The diagram D shown below, is translucent, but not transparent.



Using the recursion, one computes $\mathfrak{S}_D = x_1^3 x_2 + x_1^3 x_3 + x_1^2 x_2^2 + x_1^2 x_2 x_3$. (Alternatively, one can observe $D = D' \cup D''$, where $D' = [\{1, 3\}, \{1\}]$ and $D'' = [\{2\}]$ occupy disjoint rows, so $\mathfrak{S}_D = \mathfrak{S}_{D'} \cdot \mathfrak{S}_{D''} = (x_1^2 x_2 + x_1^2 x_3)(x_1 + x_2)$.)

REMARK 5.15. The diagram of the previous example is not %-avoiding, nor is any permutation of its columns. On the other hand, the diagram of Remark 1.4 is %-avoiding, but not translucent.

³A *clear* diagram is one which does not obstruct the recursive step (16); a *transparent* diagram is one for which the recursion passes all the way through to the base case $D = \emptyset$; a *translucent* diagram is not quite transparent, but lets through enough recursion to reach known base cases.

REMARK 5.16. As observed in Example 5.3, when D is clear, so is mD . Repeating columns does not preserve the properties of being transparent or translucent, however. For example $D = D(2\ 1\ 4\ 5\ 3)$ is transparent, but $2D$ is not even translucent.

REMARK 5.17. As operators on transparent diagrams, the s_k satisfy $s_k s_{k+1} s_k = s_{k+1} s_k s_{k+1}$ and $s_i s_j = s_j s_i$ when $|i - j| > 1$. So they determine an action of the braid monoid B_+ . In particular, one can perform commutations and braid moves on a reduced word for D to produce another reduced word. However, in contrast to the situation with reduced words for permutations, the commutation and braid moves do not connect every pair of reduced words for a diagram D . For instance, if $D = [\{1\}, \{2\}]$, its reduced words are $(1, 1)$ and $(1, 2)$.

6. EXAMPLES AND APPLICATIONS

6.1. *Schubert polynomials and Schubert modules.* The *Schubert polynomial* \mathfrak{S}_w associated to a permutation is usually defined via descending induction on the length of w ; see the next subsection. However, thanks to [NST₂, Theorem 1.1 and (3.1)], we have an alternative characterization via an increasing recursive formula: $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{id}} = 1$, and

$$(21) \quad \mathfrak{S}_w = R_1(\mathfrak{S}_w) + \sum_{k \in \text{Des}(w)} x_k \cdot R_{k+1}(\mathfrak{S}_{ws_k}).$$

For now, we may take this as a definition of \mathfrak{S}_w .

On the other hand, the Rothe diagram $D(w)$ of a permutation w is transparent, by induction on the length of w : As explained in Example 5.2, $D(w)$ is clear. And one checks that $s_k D(w) = D(ws_k)$ —this is the motivating case for the definition of $s_k D$ —so it is transparent by the inductive assumption. It follows that the characters $\mathfrak{S}_{D(w)}$ are characterized uniquely by an identical recursive formula (cf. (16) above):

$$(22) \quad \mathfrak{S}_{D(w)} = R_1(\mathfrak{S}_{D(w)}) + \sum_{k \in \text{Des}(D(w))} x_k \cdot R_{k+1}(\mathfrak{S}_{D(ws_k)}).$$

(As noted before, the descent sets of $D(w)$ and of w coincide— $\text{Des}(D(w)) = \text{Des}(w)$ —so this really is the same formula.) Thus we recover the theorem of Kraśkiewicz and Pragacz:

COROLLARY 6.1. *For a Rothe diagram $D(w)$, the character of the flagged module $E_{\bullet}^{D(w)}$ is equal to the Schubert polynomial \mathfrak{S}_w .*

EXAMPLE 6.2. The diagram $D = [\{2, 3\}, \{2, 3, 5\}, \{3\}]$ of our running example is equal to $D(1\ 4\ 6\ 2\ 5\ 3)$, with empty columns removed. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_D = \mathfrak{S}_{146253} = & x_1^3 x_2^2 x_3 + x_1^3 x_2^2 x_4 + x_1^3 x_2^2 x_5 + x_1^3 x_2 x_3^2 + x_1^3 x_2 x_3 x_4 + x_1^3 x_2 x_3 x_5 \\ & + x_1^3 x_3^2 x_4 + x_1^3 x_3^2 x_5 + x_1^2 x_2^3 x_3 + x_1^2 x_2^3 x_4 + x_1^2 x_2^3 x_5 + 2x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3^2 \\ & + 2x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3 x_4 + 2x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3 x_5 + x_1^2 x_2 x_3^3 + 2x_1^2 x_2 x_2^3 x_4 + 2x_1^2 x_2 x_2^3 x_5 \\ & + x_1^2 x_3^3 x_4 + x_1^2 x_3^3 x_5 + x_1 x_2^3 x_3^2 + x_1 x_2^3 x_3 x_4 + x_1 x_2^3 x_3 x_5 + x_1 x_2^2 x_3^3 \\ & + 2x_1 x_2^2 x_2^3 x_4 + 2x_1 x_2^2 x_2^3 x_5 + x_1 x_2 x_2^3 x_3^2 + x_1 x_2 x_2^3 x_3 x_4 + x_1 x_2 x_2^3 x_3 x_5 + x_2^3 x_3^2 x_4 \\ & + x_2^3 x_3^2 x_5 + x_2^2 x_3^3 x_4 + x_2^2 x_3^3 x_5. \end{aligned}$$

Adding up the coefficients, we find that $\dim E^\bullet = 38$.

6.2. *Divided difference operators.* Schubert polynomials are typically defined via a different recursion, but one which turns out to be closely related. The *divided difference operator* ∂_k is defined on polynomials by

$$\partial_k f = \frac{f - s_k f}{x_k - x_{k+1}} = \frac{f(\dots, x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots) - f(\dots, x_{k+1}, x_k, \dots)}{x_k - x_{k+1}}.$$

The Schubert polynomials \mathfrak{S}_w for $w \in S_n$ are then defined inductively by

$$\mathfrak{S}_{[n, n-1, \dots, 1]} = x_1^{n-1} x_2^{n-2} \cdots x_{n-1}$$

and

$$(23) \quad \partial_k \mathfrak{S}_w = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{S}_{ws_k} & \text{if } k \in \text{Des}(w); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As we have just seen, $\mathfrak{S}_D = \mathfrak{S}_w$ when $D = D(w)$ is the Rothe diagram of a permutation, so in this case we have

$$(24) \quad \partial_k \mathfrak{S}_D = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{S}_{s_k D} & \text{if } k \in \text{Des}(D); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The naive analogue of (24) is false for more general diagrams—it is easy to find small counterexamples, e.g., for $D = [\{1\}, \{2\}]$. It fails even for multiples of Rothe diagrams, $D = m \cdot D(w)$: for $w = [2, 1, 4, 5, 3]$ and $m = 2$, we have $\partial_1 \mathfrak{S}_D \neq \mathfrak{S}_{s_1 D}$.

On the other hand, consider the *trimming operator* T_k , introduced in [NST1] and defined by

$$\mathsf{T}_k f = \frac{R_{k+1}f - R_k f}{x_k}.$$

Lemmas 4.4 and 4.10 imply the following:

COROLLARY 6.3. *For any diagram D , we have*

$$\mathsf{T}_k \mathfrak{S}_D = \begin{cases} R_{k+1} \mathfrak{S}_{s_k D} & \text{if } k \in \text{Des}(D); \\ 0 & \text{if } D \text{ is } k\text{-full.} \end{cases}$$

When D is clear, the corollary gives a formula for $\mathsf{T}_k \mathfrak{S}_D$ for all k . Since $\mathsf{T}_k = R_k \partial_k = R_{k+1} \partial_k$ this says that (24) holds after applying R_{k+1} to both sides.

6.3. Graded algebras. Given a diagram D and a free \mathbb{k} -module E , consider the graded module

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{R}(D, E) = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} E^{mD}.$$

(Here, as before, mD is the diagram in which each column of D repeats m times.) This is a graded subalgebra of $\mathbb{k}[Z]$.

Similarly, given a flagged, free \mathbb{k} -module E_\bullet , we have

$$(26) \quad \mathcal{R}(D, E_\bullet) = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} E_\bullet^{mD},$$

a graded subalgebra of the polynomial ring $\mathbb{k}[Z_\bullet]$. The homomorphisms $R_{k+1} E_\bullet^{mD} \rightarrow R_k E_\bullet^{mD}$ determine graded ring homomorphisms

$$(27) \quad \mathcal{R}(D, E_\bullet) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(D, R_n E_\bullet) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(D, R_2 E_\bullet) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(D, R_1 E_\bullet).$$

COROLLARY 6.4. *If D is clear, the filtration (27) has associated graded*

$$\text{gr} \mathcal{R}(D, E_\bullet) = \mathcal{R}(D, R_1 E_\bullet) \oplus \bigoplus_{k \in \text{Des}(D)} K_k \otimes s_k \mathcal{R}(D, R_{k+1} E_\bullet),$$

where $K_k = \ker(E_{k+1} \rightarrow E_k)$ as above, and $s_k \mathcal{R}(D, E_\bullet) = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} E_\bullet^{s_k m D}$.

The algebra $\text{gr} \mathcal{R}(D, E_\bullet)$ retains its grading by m , and with respect to this grading, the ring $\mathcal{R}(D, R_1 E_\bullet)$ is a graded subalgebra (as well as a quotient). That is, passing to the associated graded produces a canonical section of the projection $\mathcal{R}(D, E_\bullet) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(D, R_1 E_\bullet)$.

The projective variety $\text{Proj } \mathcal{R}(D, R_k E_\bullet)$ can be identified with Magyar's *configuration variety*, and the above discussion determines a canonical degeneration. Describing these degenerations in greater detail should be an interesting project.

APPENDIX A. PARTIAL FLAGS

One can consider more general partial flags E_\bullet , where $\text{rk } E_i = d_i$ for some increasing sequence \mathbf{d} of integers, $0 = d_0 < d_1 < \cdots < d_n = N$. Here we will briefly review the changes required to accommodate this setup. As we will see, most of the constructions carry over easily, but the stronger results—for example, the simple characterization of \mathfrak{S}_D via the recursion (16)—do not.

A.1. *Flagged modules.* The constructions of E_\bullet^α , TE_\bullet^D , and E_\bullet^D go much as before.

Assume E_\bullet is free, with $\text{rk } E_i = d_i$, and fix bases $z_{i,j}$ for E_i so that the projection $E_i \rightarrow E_{i-1}$ is given by

$$z_{i,j} \mapsto \begin{cases} z_{i-1,j} & \text{if } j \leq d_{i-1}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This gives us the notion of a *standard flag*.

A basis for E_\bullet^α is provided by $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ for $\mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a}$ as before, but now we redefine this by

$$\mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a} \quad \text{if} \quad b_i \leq d_{a_i} \text{ for all } i.$$

A column-strict flagged filling τ of a diagram D is one where the entries in row i are bounded above by d_i . As before, TE_\bullet^D has a basis z_τ ranging over such fillings.

The D -exchange relations can be determined by mapping to a polynomial ring in variables

$$\begin{aligned} & z_{11}, z_{12}, \dots, z_{1,d_1}, \\ & z_{21}, z_{22}, \dots, z_{2,d_1}, \dots, z_{2,d_2}, \\ & \vdots \\ & z_{n1}, z_{n2}, \dots, z_{n,d_1}, \dots, z_{n,d_2}, \dots, z_{n,d_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $Z_\bullet = (z_{ij})_{d_i \leq j}$ be the $n \times d_n$ block lower-triangular matrix of the form suggested above. The homomorphism $TE_\bullet^D \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[Z_\bullet]$ is defined as before, and one has a pushout diagram analogous to that of (10).

Group actions are also as before, except now the group acting is the parabolic subgroup $P \subset GL(E)$ preserving E_\bullet . In our chosen basis, P is block lower-triangular, with block sizes $c_i = d_i - d_{i-1}$.

A.2. *Bergeron-Sottile operators.* From now on we assume \mathbb{k} is a field, and E_\bullet is standard. We use the same definition for operators on flags:

$$R_k^d E_i = \begin{cases} E_i & \text{if } i < k; \\ E_{i-1} & \text{if } i \geq k. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding action on polynomial rings is different:

$$R_k^d(x_i) = \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } i < d_k, \\ 0 & \text{if } d_k \leq i < d_{k+1}, \\ x_{i-c_{k+1}} & \text{if } i \geq d_{k+1}. \end{cases}$$

(Recall that $c_k = d_k - d_{k-1}$.) When the differences c_k are all equal, say $c_k = m$ for all m , we have $R_k^d = R_k^m$, cf. [NST₁, NST₂].

The analogous projections of polynomial rings $\mathbb{k}[Z_{k+1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[Z_k]$ set $z_{k,j} = 0$ for $d_{k-1} < j \leq d_k$. For instance, with $\mathbf{d} = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 7, \dots\}$ and $k = 3$, we have

$$(28) \quad \mathbb{k}[Z_4] \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[Z_3]$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_{11} \\ z_{21} & z_{22} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & \mathbf{z_{33}} & \mathbf{z_{34}} & \mathbf{z_{35}} \\ z_{41} & z_{42} & z_{43} & z_{44} & z_{45} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} & z_{54} & z_{55} & z_{56} & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} z_{11} \\ z_{21} & z_{22} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ z_{41} & z_{42} & z_{43} & z_{44} & z_{45} & 0 \\ z_{51} & z_{52} & z_{53} & z_{54} & z_{55} & z_{56} & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

We define $\mathbf{b} \leq_k \mathbf{a}$ analogously to before, to mean $b_i \leq d_{a_i}$ for all i , and $b_i \leq d_{a_i-1}$ whenever $a_i \geq k$. So $R_k^d E_\bullet^\mathbf{a}$ has a basis of $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ for $\mathbf{b} \leq_k \mathbf{a}$.

A.3. *Kernels of Bergeron-Sottile operators.* In our setting of partial flags indexed by \mathbf{d} , there are no simple analogues of the recursive formulas from §5. This is because the kernels computed in Lemma 4.4 and 4.10 become more complicated when $d_i \neq i$.

For single-column modules, the obvious analogue of Lemma 3.2 holds, for the same reason:

LEMMA A.1. *The kernel $N_k^\mathbf{a} = \ker(R_{k+1}^d E_\bullet^\mathbf{a} \rightarrow R_k^d E_\bullet^\mathbf{a})$ is generated by $z_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ such that $\mathbf{b} \leq_{k+1} \mathbf{a}$, and for some i we have $a_i = k$ and $d_{k-1} < b_i \leq d_k$. (That is, $\mathbf{b} \not\leq_k \mathbf{a}$.)*

Here we see the first contrast to the case $d_i = i$: the projection $R_{k+1}^d \rightarrow R_k^d$ need not be an isomorphism for k -full diagrams. Let $K_k = \ker(R_{k+1}^d E_k \rightarrow R_k^d E_k) = \ker(E_k \rightarrow E_{k-1})$.

LEMMA A.2. *Let $N_k^\mathbf{a} = \ker(R_{k+1}^d E_\bullet^\mathbf{a} \rightarrow R_k^d E_\bullet^\mathbf{a})$ as above.*

(i) If $k \notin \mathbf{a}$, then $N_k^{\mathbf{a}} = 0$, that is, $R_{k+1}^d E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}} \rightarrow R_k^d E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}$ is an isomorphism.

(ii) If $\mathbf{a} \supseteq \{k, k+1\}$, then

$$N_k^{\mathbf{a}} \cong \bigwedge^2 K_k \otimes R_{k+1}^d E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}'},$$

where $\mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{a} \setminus \{k, k+1\}$.

(iii) If $\mathbf{a} \cap \{k, k+1\} = \{k\}$, then

$$N_k^{\mathbf{a}} \cong K_k \otimes R_{k+1}^d E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}'},$$

where $\mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{a} \setminus \{k\}$.

These statements follow directly from the previous lemma. Note that cases (i) and (ii) comprise the possibilities for a k -full column; when case (ii) holds and $\dim K_k \geq 2$, $N_k^{\mathbf{a}}$ can be nonzero.

EXAMPLE A.3. Take $\mathbf{d} = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 7\}$ as in (28) above, and $\mathbf{a} = \{3, 4\}$, so for $k = 3$ we are in case (ii) of the lemma. The elements

$$z_{\{3,4\},\{3,4\}} = \begin{vmatrix} z_{33} & z_{34} \\ z_{43} & z_{43} \end{vmatrix}, \quad z_{\{3,4\},\{3,5\}} = \begin{vmatrix} z_{33} & z_{35} \\ z_{43} & z_{45} \end{vmatrix}, \quad z_{\{3,4\},\{4,5\}} = \begin{vmatrix} z_{34} & z_{35} \\ z_{44} & z_{45} \end{vmatrix}$$

are nonzero in $R_4 E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}$, and they all map to 0 under the map to $R_3 E_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}$.

Similarly, when k is a descent of a diagram D , the argument of Lemma 4.10 shows that N_k^D is isomorphic to the image of the homomorphism

$$(29) \quad K_k \otimes R_{k+1} E_{\bullet}^{s_k D} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[Z_{\bullet}]$$

given by multiplication, regarding both K_k as the span of $z_{k,j}$ for $d_{k-1} < j \leq d_k$, and $E_{\bullet}^{s_k D}$ as the span of appropriate products of determinants Δ_{τ} , so both are given as subspaces of $\mathbb{k}[Z_{\bullet}]$. When $\dim K_k \geq 2$, this multiplication map can have a kernel. This happens already in very simple cases.

EXAMPLE A.4. Consider the diagram $D = [\{1\}, \{1\}]$, and suppose $d_1 = 2$ and $d_2 = 3$, i.e., $\dim E_1 = 2$ and $\dim E_2 = 3$. Then $E_{\bullet}^D \cong \text{Sym}^2 E_1$. The diagram D has a descent at $k = 1$, and $R_1 E_1 = 0$, so

$$K_1 = E_1 \quad \text{and} \quad N_1^D = E_{\bullet}^D = \text{Sym}^2 E_1.$$

After erasing an empty column, $s_1 D = [\{2\}]$, so $E_{\bullet}^{s_1 D} = E_2$, and $R_2 E_2 = E_1$. So the map $K_1 \otimes R_2 E_{\bullet}^{s_1 D} \rightarrow N_1^D$ is the projection

$$E_1 \otimes E_1 \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2 E_1,$$

and not an isomorphism.

REFERENCES

- [ABW] K. Akin, D. Buchsbaum, and J. Weyman, “Schur functors and Schur complexes,” *Adv. Math.* **44** (1982), 207–277.
- [A] D. Anderson, “schubmods.jl”, Julia code for computing characters of Schubert modules, github.com/pseudoeffective/schubmods.
- [BS] N. Bergeron and F. Sottile, “Schubert polynomials, the Bruhat order, and the geometry of flag manifolds,” *Duke Math. J.* **95** (1998), 373–423.
- [BCRV] W. Bruns, A. Conca, C. Raicu, and M. Varbaro, *Determinants, Gröbner Bases, and Cohomology*, Springer 2022.
- [FG] N. J. Fan and P. L. Guo, “Upper bounds of Schubert polynomials,” *Sci. China Math.* **65** (2022), no. 6, 1319–1330.
- [FGRS] S. Fomin, C. Greene, V. Reiner, and M. Shimozono, “Balanced labellings and Schubert polynomials,” *European J. Combin.* **18** (1997), no. 4, 373–389.
- [F] W. Fulton, *Young Tableaux*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997.
- [KP₁] W. Kraśkiewicz and P. Pragacz, “Foncteurs de Schubert,” *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, **304** (1987), no. 9, 209–211.
- [KP₂] W. Kraśkiewicz and P. Pragacz, “Schubert functors and Schubert polynomials,” *Eur. J. Comb.* **25** (2004), no. 8, 1327–1344.
- [M₁] P. Magyar, “Schubert polynomials and Bott-Samelson varieties,” *Comment. Math. Helv.* **73** (1998), no. 4, 603–636.
- [M₂] P. Magyar, “Borel-Weil theorem for configuration varieties and Schur modules,” *Adv. Math.* **134** (1998), no. 2, 328–366.
- [MSS] K. Mészáros, L. Setiabrata, and A. St. Dizier, “An orthodontia formula for Grothendieck polynomials,” *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **375** (2022), 1281–1303.
- [MST] K. Mészáros, A. St. Dizier, and A. Tanjaya, “Principal specialization of dual characters of flagged Weyl modules,” *Electron. J. Combin.* **28** (2021), no.4, Paper No. 4.17, 12 pp.
- [NST₁] P. Nadeau, H. Spink, and V. Tewari, “Quasisymmetric divided differences,” preprint, [arXiv:2406.01510](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01510) (2024).
- [NST₂] P. Nadeau, H. Spink, and V. Tewari, “Schubert polynomial expansions revisited,” preprint, [arXiv:2407.02375](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.02375) (2024).
- [RS] V. Reiner and M. Shimozono, “Percentage-avoiding, northwest shapes and peelable tableaux,” *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **82** (1998), no.1, 1–73.
- [W₁] M. Watanabe, “An approach towards Schubert positivities of polynomials using Kraśkiewicz-Pragacz modules,” *Eur. J. Combin.* **58** (2016), 17–33.
- [W₂] M. Watanabe, “Kraśkiewicz-Pragacz modules and Pieri and dual Pieri rules for Schubert polynomials,” *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* **24** (2017), no. 2, 259–270.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OH 43210

Email address: `anderson.2804@math.osu.edu`