

Standard monomial theory and toric degenerations of Richardson varieties inside Grassmannians and flag varieties

Narasimha Chary Bonala, Oliver Clarke and Fatemeh Mohammadi

Abstract

We study toric degenerations of opposite Schubert and Richardson varieties inside degenerations of Grassmannians and flag varieties. These degenerations are parametrized by matching fields in the sense of Sturmfels and Zelevinsky [SZ93]. We construct so-called restricted matching field ideals whose generating sets are understood combinatorially through tableaux. We determine when these ideals are toric and coincide with Gröbner degenerations of Richardson varieties using the well established standard monomial theory for Grassmannians and flag varieties.

Keywords: Gröbner and toric degenerations, Grassmannians, flag varieties, semi-standard Young tableaux, Schubert varieties, Richardson varieties, standard monomial theory

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	3
3	Degenerations inside Grassmannians	11
4	Degenerations inside flag varieties	22
5	Standard monomial theory	35

1. Introduction

In this note we offer a new family of toric degenerations of Richardson varieties arising from Gröbner monomial degenerations of the Plücker ideal. This includes the well-studied diagonal and antidiagonal monomial degenerations as particular examples. We use combinatorial techniques and study permutations, semi-standard Young tableaux and standard monomial bases for Plücker ideals in order to construct these toric degenerations.

1.1 Background. The geometry of flag varieties heavily depends on the study of its Schubert varieties. For example, they provide an excellent way of understanding the multiplicative structure of the cohomology ring of the flag variety. In this context, it is essential to understand how Schubert varieties intersect in a general position. A Richardson variety in a flag variety is the intersection of a Schubert variety and an opposite Schubert variety.

In [Deo85] and [Ric92], the fundamental properties of these varieties are studied, including their irreducibility. On the other hand, degeneration techniques play a significant role in understanding a given algebraic variety in terms of well-studied algebraic varieties like toric varieties. It is desirable to extend the powerful machinery of toric varieties to a larger class of varieties by studying degenerations of a general variety to a toric variety. A toric degeneration of a variety X is a flat family $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$, where the special fiber (the fiber over zero) is a toric variety and all other fibers are isomorphic to X . In a toric degeneration, some of the algebraic invariants of X will be the same for all the fibers. Hence, we can do the computations on the toric fiber.

The study of toric degenerations of flag varieties was started in [GL96] by Gonciulea and Lakshmibai using standard monomial theory. In [KM05], Kogan and Miller obtained toric degenerations of flag varieties using geometric methods. Moreover, in [Cal02] Caldero constructed such toric degenerations using tools from representation theory. The article [FFL17] by Fang, Fourier and Littelmann contains more details on recent developments and provides an excellent overview of toric degenerations of flag varieties. We note that for Flag 4 and 5, toric degenerations obtained from Gröbner degeneration have been explicitly computed, see [BLMM17]. In [Kim15], the author studied the Gröbner degenerations of Richardson varieties inside the flag variety, where the special fiber is the toric variety of the Gelfand-Tsetlin polytope; this is a generalization of the results of [KM05]. In [MG08], Morier-Genoud obtained semi-toric degenerations of Richardson varieties by methods of Caldero in [Cal02], namely the Berenstein-Littelmann-Zelevinsky string parametrization of canonical basis [Lit98, BZ01].

1.2 Our contributions. We study toric degenerations of Grassmannians and flag varieties arising from combinatorial objects called block diagonal matching fields introduced in [MS19] and generalized in [CM20, CM19a]. Associated to each matching field is a weight vector that produces a one-parameter family, by Gröbner degeneration, where the special fiber is the initial ideal of the Plücker ideal. For Grassmannians and flag varieties, these initial ideals are called matching field ideals, whose generators can be understood combinatorially by tableaux. We use matching field ideals to study toric degenerations of various subvarieties of Grassmannians and flag varieties including Schubert, opposite Schubert and Richardson varieties. The defining ideals of these subvarieties are obtained from Plücker ideals by setting some particular variables to zero. Similarly, we define *restricted matching field ideals* associated to Schubert and Richardson varieties that are variants of matching field ideals obtained by setting the same collection of variables to zero. We aim to classify the toric, i.e. binomial and prime, restricted matching field ideals, which in this case is equivalent to showing that these ideals are monomial-free. We use techniques from standard monomial theory to construct monomial bases for restricted matching field ideals and initial ideals of Richardson varieties. We show that if a restricted matching field ideal is monomial-free then it is toric and coincides with the initial ideal of a Richardson, Schubert or opposite Schubert variety inside the Grassmannian or flag variety. Our results generalizes the previous results on Schubert varieties from [CM20, CM19b] and include, as a special case, the Gelfand-Tsetlin degeneration, also known as diagonal or antidiagonal Gröbner degeneration.

A similar approach has been taken in [Kim15], where the author describes the semi-toric degenerations of Richardson varieties in flag varieties, where each Richardson variety is degenerated to a union of toric varieties. We notice that the corresponding ideals of many such degenerations are either zero or contain monomials, hence their corresponding varieties are not toric. Hence, we aim to characterize nonzero monomial-free ideals. In particular, we explicitly describe degenerations of Schubert, opposite Schubert and Richardson varieties inside Grassmannians and flag varieties, and provide a complete characterization for permutations leading to zero or monomial-free ideals. For example, if the size of the index set in [Kim15, Corollary V.26] is one, then we obtain a toric degeneration corresponding to a unique face of the Gelfand-Tsetlin polytope. If the size of the index set is greater than one, our calculations show that some of these semi-toric degenerations are in fact toric. These cases arise when either the corresponding Schubert or opposite Schubert variety does not degenerate to a toric variety. We also remark that the degenerations in [Kim15] correspond to the antidiagonal Gröbner degenerations inside flag varieties, however we consider a one-parametric degenerations of Richardson varieties inside both Grassmannians and flag varieties which contain the diagonal case (which is isomorphic to the antidiagonal case) as a special case.

1.3 Outline of the paper. In Section 2 we fix our notation, and we recall the definitions of the main objects under study such as Grassmannians, flag, Schubert, opposite Schubert and Richardson varieties. Sections 3 and 4 contain our main results characterizing nonzero monomial-free *restricted matching field ideals*, see Definitions 3.2 and 4.1. In Figure 1 we provide a pictorial summary of some of our main results in which we show our inductive process to obtain zero and monomial-free ideals. In Table 1 we summarise our computational results, namely the number of zero, toric and non-toric ideals arising from our constructions. In Section 5.3 we perform calculations for Fl_3 and Fl_4 and compare our results to those in [Kim15]. In §5 we study monomial bases of Richardson varieties and prove that if the restricted matching field ideal is monomial-free then it coincides with the initial ideal of the Richardson variety, see Theorems 5.14, 5.19 and Corollary 5.15.

Acknowledgement. NC is supported by the SFB/TRR 191 “Symplectic structures in Geometry, Algebra and Dynamics”. He gratefully acknowledges support from the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in Bonn, and the EPSRC Fellowship EP/R023379/1 who supported his multiple visits to Bristol. OC was supported by EPSRC Doctoral Training Partnership (DTP) award EP/N509619/1. FM was partially supported by EPSRC Early Career Fellowship EP/R023379/1 and BOF Starting Grant from Ghent University. This project began during the “Workshop for Young Researchers” in Cologne. We would like to thank the organizers of the meeting, Lara Bossinger and Sara Lamboglia, and in particular Stephane Launois for supporting the authors visit via the EPSRC grant EP/R009279/1.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout we fix a field \mathbb{K} with $\text{char}(\mathbb{K}) = 0$. We are mainly interested in the case when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, the field of complex numbers. We let $[n]$ be the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and by S_n we

denote the symmetric group on $[n]$. A permutation $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is written $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ where $w_i = w(i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. We fix $w_0 := (n, n-1, \dots, 2, 1)$ for the longest product of adjacent transpositions in \mathcal{S}_n . The permutations of \mathcal{S}_n act naturally on the left of subsets of $[n]$. So, for each $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset [n]$, we have $w_0 I = \{n+1-i_1, \dots, n+1-i_k\}$ which is obtained by applying the permutation w_0 element-wise to I . We now recall the definitions of Grassmannian and flag varieties along with their Schubert, opposite Schubert and Richardson varieties.

2.1 Flag varieties. A full flag is a sequence of vector subspaces of \mathbb{K}^n :

$$\{0\} = V_0 \subset V_1 \subset \dots \subset V_{n-1} \subset V_n = \mathbb{K}^n$$

where $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(V_i) = i$. The set of all full flags is called the flag variety denoted by Fl_n , which is naturally embedded in a product of Grassmannians using the Plücker variables. Each point in the flag variety can be represented by an $n \times n$ matrix $X = (x_{i,j})$ whose first k rows span V_k . Each V_k corresponds to a point in the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(k, n)$. The ideal of Fl_n , denoted by I_n is the kernel of the polynomial map

$$\varphi_n : \mathbb{K}[P_J : \emptyset \neq J \subsetneq \{1, \dots, n\}] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[x_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq n-1, 1 \leq j \leq n]$$

sending each variable P_J to the determinant of the submatrix of X with row indices $1, \dots, |J|$ and column indices in J . We call the variables P_J of the ring Plücker variables and their images $\varphi_n(P_J)$ Plücker forms. For each $\alpha = (\alpha_J)_J$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\binom{n}{k}}$ we fix the notation \mathbf{P}^α denoting the monomial $\prod_J P_J^{\alpha_J}$. Similarly, we define the *Plücker ideal* of $\text{Gr}(k, n)$, denoted by $G_{k,n}$ as the kernel of the map φ_n restricted to the ring with variables P_J with $|J| = k$.

2.2 Schubert varieties. Let $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{K})$ be the group of complex $n \times n$ matrices with determinant 1, and let B be its subgroup consisting of upper triangular matrices. There is a natural transitive action of $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{K})$ on the flag variety Fl_n which identifies Fl_n with the set of left cosets $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{K})/B$, since B is the stabiliser of the standard flag $0 \subset \langle e_1 \rangle \subset \dots \subset \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle = \mathbb{K}^n$. Given a permutation $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$, we denote by σ_w the $n \times n$ permutation matrix with 1's in positions $(w(i), i)$ for all i . By the Bruhat decomposition, we can write the aforementioned set of cosets as $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{K})/B = \coprod_{w \in \mathcal{S}_n} B\sigma_w B/B$. Given a permutation w , its Schubert variety is

$$X_w = \overline{B\sigma_w B/B} \subseteq \text{Fl}_n$$

which is the Zariski closure of the corresponding cell $B\sigma_w B/B$ in the Bruhat decomposition. The ideal of X_w is obtained from I_n by setting P_I to zero for each $I \in S_w$ where

$$S_w = \{I : I \subset [n] \text{ with } I = (i_1, \dots, i_{|I|}) \not\leq (w_{\ell_1}, w_{\ell_2}, \dots, w_{\ell_{|I|}})\}$$

and $w_{\ell_1} < w_{\ell_2} < \dots < w_{\ell_{|I|}}$ is obtained by ordering the first $|I|$ entries of w . Note that $\{a_1 < \dots < a_m\} \leq \{b_1 < \dots < b_m\}$ means that $a_i \leq b_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. See Example 2.1.

Similarly, we can study the Schubert varieties inside $\text{Gr}(k, n)$. The permutations giving rise to distinct Schubert varieties in $\text{Gr}(k, n)$ are of the form $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ where $w_1 <$

$\dots < w_k, w_{k+1} < \dots < w_n$. Therefore, it is enough to record the permutations of S_n as $w = (w_1, \dots, w_k)$ which will be called a *Grassmannian permutation*. Suppose that w is a Grassmannian permutation, we define $S_{w,k} = S_w \cap \{I : |I| = k\}$. The elements in $S_{w,k}$ correspond to the variables which vanish in the ideal of the Schubert variety of the Grassmannian, see Definition 3.2.

2.3 Opposite Schubert varieties. Similar to the Schubert case, Fl_n can be decomposed as $\text{Fl}_n = \coprod_{v \in S_n} B^- \sigma_v B / B$ where B^- is subgroup of $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{K})$ of lower triangular matrices. For $v \in S_n$, we define its opposite Schubert variety as

$$X^v = \overline{B^- \sigma_v B / B} \subset \text{Fl}_n.$$

Let w_0 be the permutation $(n, n-1, \dots, 2, 1)$. As $B^- = \sigma_{w_0} B \sigma_{w_0}$, we can observe the opposite Schubert variety X^v is a translate $w_0 X_{w_0 v}$ of the Schubert variety $X_{w_0 v}$ in Fl_n .

2.4 Richardson varieties. Let $v, w \in S_n$. We denote the corresponding Schubert and opposite Schubert varieties by X_w and X^v respectively. Then the Richardson variety X_w^v is defined as $X_w \cap X^v$. We recall that $X_w^v \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $v \leq w$ (see for example [BL03]). We set

$$T_w^v = \{I : I \subset [n] \text{ with } (v_{k_1}, v_{k_2}, \dots, v_{k_{|I|}}) \leq I = (i_1, \dots, i_{|I|}) \leq (w_{\ell_1}, w_{\ell_2}, \dots, w_{\ell_{|I|}})\},$$

where $w_{\ell_1} < w_{\ell_2} < \dots < w_{\ell_{|I|}}$ and $v_{k_1} < v_{k_2} < \dots < v_{k_{|I|}}$ are obtained by ordering the first $|I|$ entries of v and w . The associated ideal of the Richardson variety X_w^v is

$$I(X_w^v) = (I_n + \langle P_I : I \in S_w^v \rangle) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \in T_w^v] = (I(X_w) + I(X^v)) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \in T_w^v],$$

where I_n is the Plücker ideal of Fl_n and $S_w^v = \{I : \emptyset \subset I \subset [n]\} \setminus T_w^v$. Similarly, the associated ideal of the Richardson variety X_w^v inside Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(k, n)$ is

$$(G_{k,n} + \langle P_I : I \in S_{w,k}^v \rangle) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \in T_{w,k}^v],$$

where $T_{w,k}^v = \{I \subseteq [n] : |I| = k\} \setminus S_{w,k}^v$. We now give an example of variables and refer the reader to [KL02, §3.4.] for more details.

Example 2.1. Let $n = 4$. Consider the permutations $v = (2314)$ and $w = (4231)$. The subsets of $[n]$ in T_w^v of size one are given by those entries that lie between $v_1 = 2$ and $w_1 = 4$, which are 2, 3 and 4. The subsets of size two are those that lie between $\{v_1, v_2\} = 23$ and $\{w_1, w_2\} = 24$ which are 23 and 24. The subsets of size three are those which lie between $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\} = 123$ and $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\} = 234$ which are all possible three-subsets. So the sets T_w^v and S_w^v are,

$$T_{(4231)}^{(2314)} = \{2, 3, 4, 23, 24, 123, 124, 134, 234\} \text{ and } S_{(4231)}^{(2314)} = \{1, 12, 13, 14, 34\}.$$

Note that $S_{(4231)}^{(2314)} = S^{(2314)} \cup S_{(4231)}$ where

$$S^{(2314)} = \{1, 12, 13, 14\} \text{ and } S_{(4231)} = \{34\}.$$

2.5 Matching fields. A matching field is a combinatorial object that encodes a weight vector for the ring $\mathbb{K}[P_J]$. These weight vectors are induced from a weight on the ring $\mathbb{K}[x_{i,j}]$, see Definition 2.2. The aim of this section is to define a particular family of matching fields called block diagonal matching fields. We will show that these matching fields give rise to toric degenerations of Richardson varieties inside Grassmannians and flag varieties.

A matching field also admits the data of a monomial map $\mathbb{K}[P_J] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[x_{i,j}]$ which takes each P_J to a term of the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J) = \det(X_J) \in \mathbb{K}[x_{i,j}]$. The ideal of the matching field is the kernel of this monomial map, which is a toric (prime binomial) ideal. Whenever a block diagonal matching field gives rise to a toric initial ideal, the corresponding toric ideal equals to the matching field ideal.

Definition 2.2. Given integers k, n and $0 \leq \ell \leq n$, we fix the $k \times n$ matrix M_ℓ with entries:

$$M_\ell(i, j) = \begin{cases} (i-1)(n-j+1) & \text{if } i \neq 2, \\ \ell - j + 1 & \text{if } i = 2, 1 \leq j \leq \ell, \\ n - j + \ell + 1 & \text{if } i = 2, \ell < j \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Let $X = (x_{i,j})$ be a $k \times n$ matrix of indeterminates. For each k -subset J of $[n]$, the initial term of the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J) \in \mathbb{K}[x_{i,j}]$ denoted by $\text{in}_{M_\ell}(P_J)$ is the sum of all terms in $\varphi_n(P_J)$ of the lowest weight, where the weight of a monomial \mathbf{m} is the sum of entries in M_ℓ corresponding to the variables in \mathbf{m} . We denote $M_\ell(\mathbf{m})$ for the weight of \mathbf{m} . We prove below that $\text{in}_{M_\ell}(P_J)$ is a monomial for each subset $J \subseteq [n]$. The weight of each variable $P_J \in \mathbb{K}[P_J]$ is defined as the weight of each term of $\text{in}_{M_\ell}(P_J)$ with respect to M_ℓ , and it is called *the weight induced by M_ℓ* . We denote \mathbf{w}_ℓ for the weight vector induced by M_ℓ .

Lemma 2.3. *Let $M = (m_{i,j})$ and $M' = (m'_{i,j})$ be $k \times n$ weight matrices. Suppose there exists $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $m_{i,j} = m'_{i,j}$ for all $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [n] \setminus p$. Suppose that there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $m'_{i,p} = m_{i,p} + c$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Then the initial terms of the Plücker forms are the same with respect to M and M' .*

Proof. Let J be a k -subset of $[n]$. If J does not contain p then the submatrices of M and M' with columns indexed by J coincide, hence the initial terms of the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J)$ with respect to M and M' are the same. On the other hand, if J contains p then consider each monomial \mathbf{x} in the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J)$. The monomial is squarefree and contains a unique variable of the form $x_{i,p}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Therefore $M'(\mathbf{x}) = M(\mathbf{x}) + c$. Therefore the initial term of $\varphi_n(P_J)$ is the same with respect to M and M' . \square

By the same method, one can prove an analogous result for weight matrices which differ by a constant in a particular row.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $M = M_0$ be the $k \times n$ weight matrix and $J = \{j_1 < \dots < j_k\} \subset [n]$ be a k -subset. Then the initial term $\text{in}_M(P_J)$ of the Plücker form is the leading diagonal term, in particular it is a monomial.*

Proof. We show that the leading diagonal term of the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J)$ is the initial term $\text{in}_M(P_J)$. We proceed by induction on k . If $k = 1$ then the result holds trivially. So assume $k > 1$. We have

$$\varphi_n(P_J) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}.$$

For each $\sigma \in S_k$ such that $x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}$ has minimum weight with respect to M , consider the value $\sigma(k) \in [k]$. Suppose $\sigma(k) = p$ for some $p \in [k]$. Then, by induction, we have that the leading term of the $\varphi_n(P_{J \setminus j_p})$ is the leading diagonal term. So $\sigma(1) = 1, \dots, \sigma(p-1) = p-1, \sigma(p) = p+1, \dots, \sigma(k-1) = k$ and $\sigma(k) = p$, therefore the weight of the monomial is

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (i-1)(n-j_i+1) + \sum_{i=p+1}^k (i-2)(n-j_i+1) + (k-1)(n-j_p+1) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k (i-1)(n-j_i+1) - \sum_{i=p+1}^k (n-j_i+1) + (k-p)(n-j_p+1) \\ &= M(x_{1,j_1} \cdots x_{k,j_k}) + \sum_{i=p+1}^k j_i - (k-p)j_p \end{aligned}$$

Note that $j_p < j_{p+1} < \dots < j_k$ and so $\sum_{i=p+1}^k j_i - (k-p)j_p > 0$. Therefore, if $\sigma(k) < k$ then the weight $M(x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}})$ is not minimum. Hence $\sigma(k) = k$ and we are done by induction. \square

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, $M = M_\ell$, the $k \times n$ weight matrix, and $J = \{j_1 < \dots < j_k\} \subset [n]$ be a k -subset. Suppose $k \geq 2$, then the initial term of the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J)$ is given by*

$$\text{in}_M(P_J) = \begin{cases} x_{1,j_1} x_{2,j_2} x_{3,j_3} \cdots x_{k,j_k} & \text{if } j_1 > \ell \text{ or } j_2 \leq \ell, \\ x_{1,j_2} x_{2,j_1} x_{3,j_3} \cdots x_{k,j_k} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular the leading term is a monomial.

Proof. Suppose that $j_1 > \ell$. By definition, the weight matrices M_ℓ and M_0 differ only in the second row. The entries of the second row are

$$\begin{aligned} (M_0) &: [n \ n-1 \ \dots \ 1], \\ (M_\ell) &: [\ell \ \ell-1 \ \dots \ 1 \ n \ n-1 \ \dots \ \ell+1]. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the submatrices of M_0 and M_ℓ consisting of the columns indexed by J . Since $j_1 > \ell$ the second row entries differ by exactly ℓ in each respective position. And so by the row-version of Lemma 2.3, the leading term of the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J)$ is the same with respect to M_0 and M_ℓ . By Proposition 2.4, the initial term is $\text{in}_M(P_J) = x_{1,j_1} x_{2,j_2} x_{3,j_3} \cdots x_{k,j_k}$.

Suppose that $j_1 \leq \ell$. We will prove the result by induction on k . For the case $k = 2$ we have

$$M_\ell = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \ell & \ell - 1 & \dots & 1 & n & n - 1 & \dots & \ell + 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If $j_1 > \ell$ or $j_2 \leq \ell$ then the leading term of the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J)$ is the leading diagonal term, i.e. $\text{in}_M(P_J) = x_{1,j_1}x_{2,j_2}$. Otherwise we have $j_1 \leq \ell$ and $j_2 > \ell$, and so the leading term of the Plücker form is the antidiagonal term, i.e. $\text{in}_M(P_J) = x_{1,j_2}x_{2,j_1}$.

Suppose $k > 2$. For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_k$ such that $x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}$ has minimum weight with respect to M_ℓ , consider the value $p = \sigma(k) \in [k]$. Let $J' = J \setminus j_p = \{j'_1 < j'_2 < \dots < j'_{k-1}\}$. There are two cases for J' , either $j'_2 \leq \ell$ or $j'_2 > \ell$.

Case 1. Assume $j'_2 \leq \ell$. By induction we have $\text{in}_M(P_{J'}) = x_{1,j'_1}x_{2,j'_2} \dots x_{k-1,j'_{k-1}}$. And so we have $\sigma(1) = 1, \dots, \sigma(p-1) = p-1, \sigma(p) = p+1, \dots, \sigma(k-1) = k, \sigma(k) = p$. Suppose by contradiction that $p \leq k-1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_\ell(x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}) - M_\ell(x_{1,j_1} \dots x_{k,j_k}) &= \sum_{i=p}^k \left(M_\ell(x_{i,j_{\sigma(i)}}) - M_\ell(x_{i,j_i}) \right) = \sum_{i=p}^k (i-1)(j_i - j_{\sigma(i)}) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=p}^{k-1} (i-1)(j_i - j_{i+1}) \right) + (k-1)(j_k - j_p) = \left(\sum_{i=p+1}^k j_i \right) + (p-k)j_p = \sum_{i=p+1}^k (j_i - j_p) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

But by assumption $x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}$ has minimum weight, a contradiction. And so we have $p = k$ hence $\text{in}_M(P_J) = x_{1,j_1}x_{2,j_2} \dots x_{k,j_k}$.

Case 2. Assume $j'_2 > \ell$. Either we have $j'_1 \leq \ell$ or $j'_1 > \ell$. In this case assume further that $j'_1 \leq \ell$, we will show that $j'_1 > \ell$ is impossible in Case 3. By induction we have $\text{in}_M(P_{J'}) = x_{1,j'_2}x_{2,j'_1}x_{3,j'_3} \dots x_{k-1,j'_{k-1}}$. Assume by contradiction that $k \neq p$. We proceed by taking cases on p , either $p = 1$, $p = 2$ or $3 \leq p \leq k-1$.

Case 2.1 Assume $p = 1$. So we have $\sigma(1) = 3, \sigma(2) = 2, \sigma(3) = 4, \dots, \sigma(k-1) = k, \sigma(k) = 1$. Since $j_p < j'_1 \leq \ell$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_\ell(x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}) - M_\ell(x_{1,j_1}x_{2,j_2} \dots x_{k,j_k}) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \left(M_\ell(x_{i,j_{\sigma(i)}}) - M_\ell(x_{i,j_i}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k (i-1)(j_i - j_{\sigma(i)}) = \left(\sum_{i=3}^{k-1} (i-1)(j_i - j_{i+1}) \right) + (k-1)(j_k - j_1) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=4}^k j_i \right) + 2j_3 - (k-1)j_1 = \left(\sum_{i=4}^k (j_i - j_1) \right) + 2(j_3 - j_1) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

But by assumption $x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}$ has minimum weight, a contradiction.

Case 2.2 Assume $p = 2$. So we have $\sigma(1) = 3, \sigma(2) = 1, \sigma(3) = 4, \dots, \sigma(k-1) = k, \sigma(k) =$

2. Since $j_p < j'_1 \leq \ell$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& M_\ell(x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}) - M_\ell(x_{1,j_1} x_{2,j_2} \dots x_{k,j_k}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \left(M_\ell(x_{i,j_{\sigma(i)}}) - M_\ell(x_{i,j_i}) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k (i-1)(j_i - j_{\sigma(i)}) = (2-1)(j_2 - j_1) + \left(\sum_{i=3}^{k-1} (i-1)(j_i - j_{i+1}) \right) + (k-1)(j_k - j_2) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=4}^k j_i \right) + 2j_3 - j_1 - (k-2)j_2 = \left(\sum_{i=4}^k (j_i - j_2) \right) + (j_3 - j_2) + (j_3 - j_1) > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

But by assumption $x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}$ has minimum weight, a contradiction.

Case 2.3 Assume $3 \leq p \leq k-1$. And so we have $\sigma(1) = 2, \sigma(2) = 1, \sigma(3) = 3, \dots, \sigma(p-1) = p-1, \sigma(p) = p+1, \dots, \sigma(k-1) = k, \sigma(k) = p$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& M_\ell(x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}) - M_\ell(x_{1,j_2} x_{2,j_1} x_{3,j_3} \dots x_{k,j_k}) = \sum_{i=3}^k \left(M_\ell(x_{i,j_{\sigma(i)}}) - M_\ell(x_{i,j_i}) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=p}^k (i-1)(j_i - j_{\sigma(i)}) = \left(\sum_{i=p}^{k-1} (i-1)(j_i - j_{i+1}) \right) + (k-1)(j_k - j_p) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=p+1}^k j_i \right) + (p-k)j_p = \sum_{i=p+1}^k (j_i - j_p) > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

But by assumption $x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}$ has minimum weight, a contradiction.

Case 3. Assume $j'_1, j'_2 > \ell$. By induction, we have $\text{in}_M(P_{J'}) = x_{1,j'_1} x_{2,j'_2} \dots x_{k-1,j'_{k-1}}$. Since $j_1 \leq \ell$ we must have $j'_1 = j_2, \dots, j'_{k-1} = j_k$ and so $\sigma(1) = 2, \sigma(2) = 3, \dots, \sigma(k-1) = k, \sigma(k) = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& M_\ell(x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}) - M_\ell(x_{1,j_2} x_{2,j_1} x_{3,j_3} \dots x_{k,j_k}) = \left(M_\ell(x_{2,j_{\sigma(2)}}) - M_\ell(x_{2,j_1}) \right) + \sum_{i=3}^k \left(M_\ell(x_{i,j_{\sigma(i)}}) - M_\ell(x_{i,j_i}) \right) \\
&= ((n - j_3 + \ell + 1) - (\ell - j_1 + 1)) + \sum_{i=3}^k (i-1)(j_i - j_{\sigma(i)}) = (j_1 - j_3) + n + \left(\sum_{i=3}^{k-1} (i-1)(j_i - j_{i+1}) \right) + (k-1)(j_k - j_1) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=3}^k j_i \right) + j_3 - (k-2)j_1 + n = \left(\sum_{i=3}^k (j_i - j_1) \right) + j_3 + n > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

But by assumption $x_{1,j_{\sigma(1)}} \dots x_{k,j_{\sigma(k)}}$ has minimum weight, a contradiction. And so if $j'_1 > \ell$ then we must have $j'_2 \leq \ell$. \square

Definition 2.6. Given integers k, n and $0 \leq \ell \leq n$, M_ℓ leads to a permutation for each subset $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset [n]$. More precisely, we think of I as being identified with the Plücker form

$\varphi_n(P_I)$ and we consider the set to be ordered by $I = \{i_1 < \dots < i_k\}$. Since $\text{in}_{M_\ell}(P_I)$ is a unique term in the corresponding minor of $X = (x_{i,j})$, we have $\text{in}_{M_\ell}(P_I) = x_{1,i_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots x_{k,i_{\sigma(k)}}$ for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_k$, which we call the permutation associated to M_ℓ . We represent the variable $\text{in}_{M_\ell}(P_I)$ as a $k \times 1$ tableau where the entry of $(j, 1)$ is $i_{\sigma(j)}$ for each $j \in [k]$. And so we can think of M_ℓ as inducing a new ordering on the elements of I which can be read from the tableau.

Remark 2.7. By Propositions 2.4 and 2.5 the initial term $\text{in}_{M_\ell}(P_J)$ is a monomial for each Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_J)$ where $J = \{j_1 < \dots < j_k\} \subset [n]$. Furthermore, these propositions give a precise description of the initial terms and the induced weight on the Plücker variable P_J as follows.

$$\mathbf{w}_\ell(P_J) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k = 1, \\ (n + \ell + 1 - j_2) + \sum_{i=3}^k (i-1)(n+1-j_i) & \text{if } k \geq 1 \text{ and } |J \cap \{1, \dots, \ell\}| = 0, \\ (\ell + 1 - j_1) + \sum_{i=3}^k (i-1)(n+1-j_i) & \text{if } k \geq 1 \text{ and } |J \cap \{1, \dots, \ell\}| = 1, \\ (\ell + 1 - j_2) + \sum_{i=3}^k (i-1)(n+1-j_i) & \text{if } |J \cap \{1, \dots, \ell\}| \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Propositions 2.4 and 2.5 show that the permutation given by M_ℓ and associated to J , which defines the matching field, is given by:

$$B_\ell(J) = \begin{cases} id & \text{if } k = 1 \text{ or } |J \cap \{1, \dots, \ell\}| \neq 1, \\ (12) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where (12) is the transposition interchanging 1 and 2. The functions B_ℓ are called 2-block diagonal matching fields in [MS19]. Note that $\ell = 0$ or n gives rise to the choice of the diagonal terms in each submatrix as in Example 2.8. Such matching fields are called *diagonal*. See, e.g. [SZ93, Example 1.3]. Given a block diagonal matching field B_ℓ we define $B_{\ell,1} = \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $B_{\ell,2} = \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$.

Example 2.8. Let $k = 3$, $n = 5$ and $\ell = 0$, so the matching field B_ℓ is the diagonal matching field, with $B_{\ell,1} = \emptyset$ and $B_{\ell,2} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. We have

$$M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 10 & 8 & 6 & 4 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ a weight matrix for } X = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} & x_{14} & x_{15} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} & x_{24} & x_{25} \\ x_{31} & x_{32} & x_{33} & x_{34} & x_{35} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The corresponding weight vector on $P_{123}, P_{124}, \dots, P_{345}$ is $\mathbf{w}_0 = (10, 8, 6, 7, 5, 4, 7, 5, 4, 4)$. Thus, for each $I = \{i < j < k\} \subseteq [5]$ we have that $\text{in}_{M_0}(P_I) = x_{1i}x_{2j}x_{3k}$. Therefore, the corresponding tableaux for P_I are:

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 2 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 3 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Note that each initial term $\text{in}_{M_0}(P_I)$ is the leading diagonal term of the Plücker form $\varphi_n(P_I)$. Let us consider a block diagonal matching field which is not diagonal.

Example 2.9. Let $k = 3$, $n = 5$ and $\ell = 3$. Then $B_{\ell,1} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $B_{\ell,2} = \{4, 5\}$ and

$$M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 2 & 1 & 5 & 4 \\ 10 & 8 & 6 & 4 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Comparing this matrix with M_0 , the weight matrix for the diagonal case, we see that the only differences are in the second row. The entries of the second row are obtained by permuting the entries in the second row of M_0 . The corresponding weight vector on the Plücker variables $P_{123}, P_{124}, \dots, P_{345}$ is

$$\mathbf{w}_2 = (8, 6, 4, 5, 3, 5, 5, 3, 4, 3).$$

For each $I = \{i, j, k\}$ we have the corresponding tableaux for P_I which are

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 4 \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 4 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 4 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

3. Degenerations inside Grassmannians

3.1 Gröbner degenerations induced by matching fields. In this section we introduce the main tool for studying Gröbner degenerations. These objects are called *restricted matching field ideals*, which are obtained from the toric initial ideals of the Grassmannian by setting some variables to zero. We begin by studying restricted matching field ideals and later, in Section 5, we show that these ideals coincide with initial ideals of Richardson varieties inside the Grassmannian.

Notation. Throughout this section we fix k, n, ℓ and the weight vector \mathbf{w}_ℓ , see Definition 2.7. We denote the initial ideal of $G_{k,n}$ with respect to \mathbf{w}_ℓ by $G_{k,n,\ell} := \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(G_{k,n})$. This is defined as the ideal generated by polynomials $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(f)$ for all polynomials $f \in G_{k,n}$, where

$$\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(f) = \sum_{\alpha_j \cdot \mathbf{w}_\ell = d} c_{\alpha_j} \mathbf{P}^{\alpha_j} \quad \text{for} \quad f = \sum_{i=1}^t c_{\alpha_i} \mathbf{P}^{\alpha_i} \quad \text{and} \quad d = \min\{\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_\ell : i = 1, \dots, t\}.$$

The ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}$ is introduced in [CM20]. In the following theorem we summarize some of its important properties. We refer to Section 4 of [CM20] for detailed proofs.

Theorem 3.1 (Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 4.7 in [CM20]).

(i) *The ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}$ is toric and it is equal to the kernel of the monomial map*

$$\phi_\ell: \mathbb{K}[P_I] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[x_{ij}] \quad \text{with} \quad P_I \mapsto \text{sgn}(B_\ell(I)) \text{in}_{M_\ell}(P_I). \quad (3.1)$$

Here M_ℓ is the matrix in Definition 2.2 and $\text{sgn}(-)$ denotes the standard sign function for permutations.

- (ii) The ideal $G_{k,n}$ has a quadratic Gröbner basis with respect to \mathbf{w}_ℓ . In particular, there exist quadratic polynomials g_1, \dots, g_s in $G_{k,n}$ such that

$$G_{k,n,\ell} = \langle \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(g_s) \rangle,$$

where s is the size of a quadratic minimal generating set of $G_{k,n}$.

The kernel of the monomial map (3.1) is the *matching field ideal* of the block diagonal matching field B_ℓ and, in this case, coincides with the initial ideal of the Grassmannian $G_{k,n,\ell}$. We recall that the ideal of the Richardson variety is $(G_{k,n} + \langle P_I : I \in S_{w,k}^v \rangle) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \in T_{w,k}^v]$. Replacing $G_{k,n}$ with a matching field ideal leads us to the construction of the restricted matching field ideal. Note that the ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is also quadratically generated since it is obtained from $G_{k,n,\ell}$ by setting some variables to zero. For an explicit construction of a quadratic generating set for $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ see Lemma 5.2.

Definition 3.2 (Restricted matching field ideal). Given a collection S of k -subsets of $[n]$, denote by T the collection of k -subsets of $[n]$ that are not in S . We define $G_{k,n,\ell}|_S = (G_{k,n,\ell} + \langle P_I : I \in S \rangle) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \in T]$.

It is useful to think of $G_{k,n,\ell}|_S$ as the ideal obtained from $G_{k,n,\ell}$ by setting the variables $\{P_I : I \in S\}$ to be zero. And so we say that the variable P_I *vanishes* in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_S$ if $I \in S$. Similarly we say that a polynomial or monomial $f \in \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \subseteq [n], |I| = k]$ vanishes in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_S$ if $f \in \langle P_I : I \in S \rangle$. The ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}|_S$ can be computed in Macaulay2 [GS] as an elimination ideal using the command `eliminate($G_{k,n,\ell} + \langle P_I : I \in S \rangle, \{P_I : I \in S\})$.`

Let $w = (w_1, \dots, w_k)$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ be two Grassmannian permutations with $v \leq w$. To simplify our notation through this note, we define the following ideals:

$$G_{k,n,\ell}|_w := G_{k,n,\ell}|_{S_{w,k}}, \quad G_{k,n,\ell}|^v := G_{k,n,\ell}|_{S_k^v} \quad \text{and} \quad G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v := G_{k,n,\ell}|_{S_{w,k}^v}. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that ideals in (3.2) are all generated in degree two, since they are obtained by setting some variables to zero in the ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}$ which is generated in degree two by Theorem 3.1. The proof of this claim is given in Lemma 5.2 in which we give an explicit generating set.

3.2 Richardson varieties. Here, we follow our notation in (3.2). First we show that the set of permutations leading to zero Richardson varieties is independent of ℓ . Then we use this to characterize all zero ideals of the form $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$.

Let us begin with an example which illustrates our techniques for manipulating tableaux in the following proofs.

Example 3.3. Following Example 2.9, let $k = 3$, $n = 5$ and $\ell = 3$. Let $v = (1, 3, 5, 2, 4)$ and $w = (2, 4, 5, 1, 3)$ be permutations and so we have

$$S_{w,k}^v = \{123, 124, 125, 134, 234, 345\}, \quad T_{w,k}^v = \{135, 145, 235, 245\}.$$

Consider the binomial relation $P_{135}P_{245} - P_{145}P_{235}$ in $G_{k,n,0}$. Since $135, 245, 145, 235 \in T_{w,k}^v$

we have that $P_{135}P_{245} - P_{145}P_{235} \in G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$. In tableau form, the relation is

$$P_{135}P_{245} - P_{145}P_{235} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 5 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 3 \\ \hline 5 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

However the tableaux above are not matching field tableaux for the matching field B_3 , moreover the binomial $P_{135}P_{245} - P_{145}P_{235}$ does not lie in the matching field ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}$. This is most easily seen shown by observing that the matching field tableaux representing $P_{135}P_{235}$ and $P_{145}P_{235}$ are not row-wise equal. Explicitly

$$P_{135}P_{245} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline 5 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} , \quad P_{145}P_{235} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 5 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

However, by permuting the entries in these tableaux we can obtain a binomial inside $G_{k,n,\ell}$ for which at least one of the terms does not vanish. In this case we have $P_{125}P_{345} - P_{135}P_{245} \in G_{k,n,\ell}$ and $P_{135}P_{245}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$. In tableau form we have

$$P_{125}P_{345} - P_{135}P_{245} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & 3 \\ \hline 5 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 2 \\ \hline 5 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

So $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is non-zero. In this case we have that $P_{125}P_{345}$ vanishes in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ and so $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ contains a monomial while it can be shown that $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ does not contain any monomials.

Proposition 3.4. *The ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is zero if and only if $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ is zero.*

Proof. We begin by showing that if $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ is nonzero then so is $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$. Suppose that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$ such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$. Now if we have that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$ then we are done. So let us assume that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is not a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$. In particular, if $B_\ell(I) = B_\ell(J)$ then it easily follows that $B_\ell(I) = B_\ell(J) = B_\ell(I') = B_\ell(J')$ and so $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'} \in G_{k,n,\ell}$. So we must have that $B_\ell(I) \neq B_\ell(J)$. So without loss of generality let us assume that $B_\ell(I) = id$ and $B_\ell(J) = (12)$. Since $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is not a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$, when written in tableau form, $P_I P_J$ and $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ are not row-wise equal. Since $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'} \in G_{k,n,0}$, all but the first two rows of $P_I P_J$ and $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ are row-wise equal. Therefore the first two rows of $P_I P_J$ and $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ different (even after permutation of the columns):

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I & J \\ \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline X & Y \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I' & J' \\ \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline j_2 & i_2 \\ \hline X' & Y' \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

Here X, Y, X', Y' represent the remaining parts of the tableaux. Since the first two rows are

different, we deduce that the entries i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 are distinct. There are two cases, either $i_1, i_2 \in B_{\ell,1}$ or $i_1, i_2 \in B_{\ell,2}$.

Case 1. Assume $i_1, i_2 \in B_{\ell,1}$. Let $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$ be the values i_1, i_2, j_1 written in ascending order. We define the sets $\tilde{I} = \{\alpha, \beta\} \cup Y$, $\tilde{J} = \{\gamma, j_2\} \cup Y$, $\tilde{I}' = \{\alpha, \gamma\} \cup Y$ and $\tilde{J}' = \{\beta, j_2\} \cup Y$. Consider the binomial $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$. In tableau form this binomial is

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \tilde{I} & \tilde{J} \\ \hline \alpha & j_2 \\ \hline \beta & \gamma \\ \hline Y & Y \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \tilde{I}' & \tilde{J}' \\ \hline \alpha & j_2 \\ \hline \gamma & \beta \\ \hline Y & Y \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Note that $\tilde{I}, \tilde{J}, \tilde{I}'$ and \tilde{J}' are well-defined as $i_1, i_2 \notin Y$. Since the two tableaux are row-wise equal we have that $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$. Since $i_1 < i_2$ and $j_1 < i_2$ we have that $i_2 = \gamma$ so $P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$. So we have shown that $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is nonzero.

Case 2. Assume $i_1, i_2 \in B_{\ell,2}$. Let $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$ be the values i_1, i_2, j_2 written in ascending order. Let $Z = X$ if $i_2 \geq j_2$, otherwise let $Z = Y$. We define the sets $\tilde{I} = \{\alpha, \gamma\} \cup Z$, $\tilde{J} = \{\beta, j_1\} \cup Z$, $\tilde{I}' = \{\beta, \gamma\} \cup Z$ and $\tilde{J}' = \{\alpha, j_1\} \cup Z$. The binomial $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is given by the tableaux

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \tilde{I} & \tilde{J} \\ \hline \alpha & \beta \\ \hline \gamma & j_1 \\ \hline Z & Z \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \tilde{I}' & \tilde{J}' \\ \hline \beta & \alpha \\ \hline \gamma & j_1 \\ \hline Z & Z \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Since the tableaux are row-wise equal we have $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$. If $i_1 = \alpha$ then $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$. Otherwise if $i_1 = \beta$ then $P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$. Note that we cannot have $i_1 = \gamma$ because $i_1 < i_2$. So we have shown that $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is nonzero.

For the converse we show that if $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is nonzero then $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ is nonzero. Let $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ be a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$ such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$. If $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$ then we are done. So we assume that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is not a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$. Therefore we have that $B_\ell(I) \neq B_\ell(J)$ and we may assume without loss of generality that $B_\ell(I) = id$ and $B_\ell(J) = (12)$. We also deduce that, written in tableau form, the first two rows of $P_I P_J$ and $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ are different (even after permutation of the columns)

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I & J \\ \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline i_2 & j_1 \\ \hline X & Y \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I' & J' \\ \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline j_1 & i_2 \\ \hline X' & Y' \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Where X, Y, X', Y' represent the remaining parts of the tableaux. Since the first two rows are different, we deduce that the entries i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 are distinct. There are two cases, either $i_1, i_2 \in B_{\ell,1}$ or $i_1, i_2 \in B_{\ell,2}$.

Case 1. Assume $i_1, i_2 \in B_{\ell,1}$. Let $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$ be the values i_1, i_2, j_1 written in ascending order. Let $Z = X$ if $i_2 \geq j_1$, otherwise let $Z = Y$. We define the sets $\tilde{I} = \{\alpha, \gamma\} \cup Z$,

$\tilde{J} = \{\beta, j_2\} \cup Z$, $\tilde{I}' = \{\beta, \gamma\} \cup Z$ and $\tilde{J}' = \{\alpha, j_2\} \cup Z$. The binomial $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is given by the tableaux

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \tilde{I} & \tilde{J} \\ \hline \alpha & \beta \\ \hline \gamma & j_2 \\ \hline Z & Z \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \tilde{I}' & \tilde{J}' \\ \hline \beta & \alpha \\ \hline \gamma & j_2 \\ \hline Z & Z \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Since the tableaux are row-wise equal, we have $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$. Since $i_1 < i_2$ and $i_1 < j_1$ we have that $i_1 = \alpha$ so $P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$. So we have shown that $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ is nonzero.

Case 2. Assume $i_1, i_2 \in B_{\ell,2}$. Let $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$ be the values i_1, i_2, j_2 written in ascending order. Define the sets $\tilde{I} = \{\alpha, \beta\} \cup X$, $\tilde{J} = \{j_1, \gamma\} \cup X$, $\tilde{I}' = \{\alpha, \gamma\} \cup X$ and $\tilde{J}' = \{j_1, \beta\} \cup X$. The binomial $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is given by the tableaux

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \tilde{I} & \tilde{J} \\ \hline \alpha & j_1 \\ \hline \beta & \gamma \\ \hline X & X \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \tilde{I}' & \tilde{J}' \\ \hline \alpha & j_1 \\ \hline \gamma & \beta \\ \hline X & X \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Since the tableaux are row-wise equal we have that $P_{\tilde{I}}P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$. Note that $B_{\ell}(J) = id$ so $j_2 < i_2$. Since $i_1 < i_2$ we have that $i_2 = \gamma$ so $P_{\tilde{I}'}P_{\tilde{J}'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$. So we have shown that $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ is nonzero. \square

We now prove our main result in this section which give a complete characterization of nonzero monomial-free ideals of Richardson varieties inside Grassmannians.

Theorem 3.5.

- (i) $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is monomial-free if and only if $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w$ and $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ are both monomial-free.
- (ii) $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ is zero if and only if at least one of the following holds:
 - There exists some i such that $v_i = w_i$ and $G_{k-1,n,0}|_{w'}^{v'}$ is zero where we define the permutations v', w' as $v' = (v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_k)$ and $w' = (w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}, w_{i+1}, \dots, w_k)$.
 - There exists some i such that $v = (i, i+1, \dots, i+k-1)$ and $w = (i+1, \dots, i+k)$.

Proof. (i). By definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v &= (G_{k,n,\ell} + \langle P_I : I \in S_{w,k}^v \rangle) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \notin S_{w,k}^v] \\ &= (G_{k,n,\ell} + \langle P_I : I \in S_{w,k} \rangle + \langle P_I : I \in S_k^v \rangle) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \notin S_{w,k}^v] \\ &= \left((G_{k,n,\ell} + \langle P_I : I \in S_{w,k} \rangle) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \notin S_{w,k}^v] \right) \\ &\quad + \left((G_{k,n,\ell} + \langle P_I : I \in S_k^v \rangle) \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \notin S_{w,k}^v] \right) \\ &= G_{k,n,\ell}|_w + G_{k,n,\ell}|^v \subseteq \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \notin S_{w,k}^v]. \end{aligned}$$

In the above we consider $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w$ and $G_{k,n,\ell}^v$ as ideals of the ring $\mathbb{K}[P_I : I \notin S_{w,k}^v]$ by inclusion of their generators. On the one hand if $G_{k,n,\ell}^v$ or $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w$ contain a monomial then the same monomial appears in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$. On the other hand suppose that $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ contains a monomial $P_I P_J$ then $v \leq I, J \leq w$. Also there exists I', J' such that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$ and either $I', J' \not\leq v$ or $I', J' \not\leq w$. If $I', J' \not\leq v$ then $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}^v$. If $I', J' \not\leq w$ then $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w$.

(ii). First suppose that there exists some i such that $v_i = w_i$ and $G_{k-1,n,0}|_{w'}^{v'} = 0$. Suppose by contradiction that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$, where $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$. By removing the i^{th} entry of I, J, I' and J' we obtain sets $\tilde{I}, \tilde{J}, \tilde{I}'$ and \tilde{J}' . Note that $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k-1,n,0}$. Also by assumption $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ does not vanish in $G_{k-1,n,0}|_{w'}^{v'}$ which is a contradiction. So $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v = 0$.

Suppose that, $v = (v_1, v_1 + 1, \dots, v_1 + k - 1)$ and $w = (v_1 + 1, v_1 + 2, \dots, v_1 + k)$. Suppose by contradiction that there is a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in $G_{k,n,0}$ such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$. Then we have that $i_1, j_1 \in \{v_1, v_1 + 1\}, \dots, i_k, j_k \in \{v_1 + k - 1, v_1 + k\}$. Since $I \neq J$ we may assume without loss of generality that there exists s such that $i_s < j_s$. Therefore we have $i_s = v_1 + s - 1$ and $j_s = v_1 + s$. This determines the following values of I : $i_1 = v_1, i_2 = v_1 + 1, \dots, i_s = v_s + s - 1$ and also determines the following values for J : $j_s = v_1 + s, j_{s+1} = v_1 + s + 1, \dots, j_k = v_1 + k$. We now focus on I' and J' . Without loss of generality we may assume that $i'_s = i_s = v_s + s - 1$ and $j'_s = j_s = v_1 + s$. Similarly these values determine the same values of I' and J' . Therefore I' and I are identical on the first $s + 1$ values and so J and J' are also identical on these values. Also J and J' are identical on the last $n - s$ values because $j'_s = v_1 + s$. Hence J and J' are identical and the binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is trivial.

For the converse take a pair of Grasmannian permutations v, w such that $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v = 0$. First let us assume there exists t such that $v_t = w_t$. We show that $G_{k-1,n,0}|_{w'}^{v'} = 0$ by contradiction. Let $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ be a binomial in $G_{k-1,n,0}$ such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $G_{k-1,n,0}|_{w'}^{v'}$. We have that $v_{t-1} < v_t < v_{t+1}$ and $w_{t-1} < w_t = v_t < w_{t+1}$. Since $P_I P_J$ does not vanish we have $i_{t-1}, j_{t-1} \leq w_{t-1} < w_t = v_t < v_{t+1} < i_t, j_t$. Therefore we may add v_t to each I, J, I' and J' to obtain $\tilde{I}, \tilde{J}, \tilde{I}'$ and \tilde{J}' . By construction $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ a binomial for $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ for which $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ does not vanish, a contradiction.

Now let us assume that for each t , we have $v_t < w_t$. Now we will show that v and w are of the desired form by contradiction. That is, we assume that there exists s such that either $v_{s+1} - v_s \geq 2$ or $w_{s+1} - w_s \geq 2$. We treat these as two separate cases.

Case 1. Let $v_{s+1} - v_s \geq 2$ for some s . Then let

$$I = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}, \quad J = \{v_1 + 1, \dots, v_k + 1\},$$

$$I' = \{v_1, \dots, v_s, v_{s+1} + 1, \dots, v_k + 1\} \text{ and } J' = \{v_1 + 1, \dots, v_s + 1, v_{s+1}, \dots, v_k\}.$$

Note that $v_s + 1 < v_{s+1}$ because $v_{s+1} - v_s \geq 2$. Since $v_t < w_t$ for each t therefore none of $P_I, P_J, P_{I'}$ and $P_{J'}$ vanish in $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$. By construction we have $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$ and so $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ is nonzero, a contradiction.

Case 2. Let $w_{s+1} - w_s \geq 2$ for some s . Then let

$$I = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}, \quad J = \{w_1 - 1, \dots, w_k - 1\},$$

$$I' = \{w_1, \dots, w_s, w_{s+1} - 1, \dots, w_k - 1\} \text{ and } J' = \{w_1 - 1, \dots, w_s - 1, w_{s+1}, \dots, w_k\}.$$

Note that $w_s < w_{s+1} - 1$ because $w_{s+1} - w_s \geq 2$. Since $v_t < w_t$ for each t therefore none of $P_I, P_J, P_{I'}$ and $P_{J'}$ vanish in $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$. By construction we have $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$ and so $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ is nonzero, a contradiction. \square

3.3 Schubert and opposite Schubert varieties. We first recall the characterization of nonzero monomial-free Schubert ideals from [CM20].

Lemma 3.6 (Theorem 5.7 in [CM20]).

(i) *The ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w$ contains a monomial if and only if:*

- $\ell \neq 0$
- $w_1 \in \{2, \dots, n - k\} \setminus \{\ell\}$, and
- $\{w_2, \dots, w_k\} \subseteq \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{w_1 + 1\}$

(ii) *The ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w$ is zero if and only if w belongs to the following set:*

$$Z_{k,n} = \{(1, 2, \dots, k - 1, i) : k \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{(1, \dots, \hat{i}, \dots, k, k + 1) : 1 \leq i \leq k - 1\}.$$

Remark 3.7. As a special example of pairs of permutations which satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.5(ii), we have that if $w \in Z_{k,n}$ or $w_0 v \in Z_{k,n}$ then $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is zero.

The proofs of many of the statements here rely on the following key but straightforward observation.

Lemma 3.8 (Key Lemma). *Fix $n > k$. Let $I, J \in \binom{[n]}{k}$. Then $I \leq J$ if and only if $w_0 I \geq w_0 J$.*

Before stating our main result, we first characterize which ideals are zero and which ideals contain monomials, which arise from the diagonal case when $\ell = 0$. We then extend this result to arbitrary ℓ in Theorem 3.11.

Lemma 3.9. *The ideal $G_{k,n,0}|^v$ is zero if and only if $w_0 v \in Z_{k,n}$. Moreover, if $\ell = 0$ or $\ell > n - k + 1$, then the ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ is either zero or it does not contain any monomial.*

Proof. For the first statement, $G_{k,n,0}|^v$ is nonzero if and only if there exists a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in $G_{k,n,0}$ such that $I, J \geq v$. By Lemma 3.8 $I, J \geq v$ if and only if $w_0 I, w_0 J \leq w_0 v$. Observe that $P_{w_0 I} P_{w_0 J} - P_{w_0 I'} P_{w_0 J'}$ is also a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$ and all binomials can be written in this form since $w_0^2 = id$. Therefore $G_{k,n,0}|^v$ is non-zero if and only if $G_{k,n,0}|_{w_0 v}$ is non-zero.

The second statement is a consequence of Lemma 3.6 and the bijection between binomials described above. If $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ contains a monomial $P_I P_J$ then there exists a binomial $P_I P_J -$

$P_{I'}P_{J'}$ in $G_{k,n,0}$ such that $I, J \geq v$ and $I', J' < v$. By Lemma 3.8, $w_0I, w_0J \leq w_0v$ and $w_0I', w_0J' > w_0v$. Since $P_{w_0I}P_{w_0J} - P_{w_0I'}P_{w_0J'}$ is also a binomial in $G_{k,n,0}$, therefore $P_{w_0I}P_{w_0J}$ is a monomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_{w_0v}$, which contradicts Lemma 3.6. \square

In the above proof of Lemma 3.9, if B_ℓ is the non-diagonal block diagonal matching field and $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in its corresponding initial ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}$ then it does not follow that $P_{w_0I} P_{w_0J} - P_{w_0I'} P_{w_0J'}$ is also a binomial. We illustrate this point with the following example.

Example 3.10. Consider $\text{Gr}(3, 6)$ with block diagonal matching field B_1 where $B_{1,1} = \{1\}$ and $B_{1,2} = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$. We describe the binomial through the following tableaux:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I & J \\ \hline 2 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 5 \\ \hline 5 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I' & J' \\ \hline 4 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & 5 \\ \hline 5 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

We apply w_0 to each set above to obtain the sets,

$$w_0I = \{2, 5, 6\}, w_0J = \{1, 2, 3\}, w_0I' = \{2, 3, 6\}, w_0J' = \{1, 2, 5\}.$$

We show that these sets do not give a binomial with respect to the matching field B_1 . Consider the position of 3 which appears only in w_0J and w_0I' . The true order of w_0J is $(2, 1, 3)$ and the true order of w_0I' is $(2, 3, 6)$. We see that the value 3 does not lie in the same position, hence the sets do not give rise to a binomial.

We note that it is also enough to show that $\mathbf{w}_\ell(w_0I) + \mathbf{w}_\ell(w_0J) \neq \mathbf{w}_\ell(w_0I') + \mathbf{w}_\ell(w_0J')$, however the above method considers only the true order of sets w_0J and w_0I' . In general, we will use the true orders of sets and their tableaux in our proofs because there may be many different weight vectors that induce the same matching field.

We are now able to prove our main result about opposite Schubert varieties in the Grassmannian which characterizes all permutations v for which $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ contains a monomial or is zero.

Theorem 3.11.

(i) *The ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ contains a monomial if and only if:*

- $1 \leq \ell \leq n - k + 1$
- $v_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$
- $v_2 \in \{v_1 + 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\ell + 1\}$

(ii) *The ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ is zero if and only if $w_0v \in Z_{k,n}$.*

Proof. (i) Suppose that $\ell \geq 1$ and $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ is nonzero. First assume that $\ell \leq n - k + 1$ and take $v = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ such that $v_1 \in B_{\ell,1}$ and $v_2 \in \{v_1 + 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\ell + 1\}$. We will show that $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ contains a monomial by taking cases on v_2 . Note that $v_2 \neq \ell + 1$.

Case 1. Let $v_2 \leq \ell$. Consider the following sets which we write in the true order according to the matching field. Let

$$I = \{\ell + 1, v_2 - 1, n - k + 3, n - k + 4, \dots, n - 1, n\}, \quad J = \{v_1, v_2, n - k + 3, n - k + 4, \dots, n - 1, n\},$$

$$I' = \{v_1, v_2 - 1, n - k + 3, n - k + 4, \dots, n - 1, n\} \text{ and } J' = \{\ell + 1, v_2, n - k + 3, n - k + 4, \dots, n - 1, n\}.$$

By construction we have that

$$P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$$

is a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$. We have that $I' \not\geq v$ hence $P_{I'}$ vanishes in $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$. However $I \geq v$ and $J \geq v$ hence $P_I P_J$ appears as a monomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$.

Case 2. Let $v_2 \geq \ell + 2$. We now prove that $v_2 + k - 1 \leq n$. Suppose by contradiction that $v_2 + k - 1 > n$ then it follows that $v_3 = v_2 + 1, v_4 = v_3 + 1, \dots, v_k = n$. Now we have that $w_0 v = (1, 2, \dots, k - 1, n - v_1 + 1) \in Z_{k,n}$. By Lemma 3.9, $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ is zero, a contradiction. Therefore $v_2 + k - 1 \leq n$. It follows that there exists $j \in \{2, \dots, k\}$ such that $v_j + 1 \leq n$ and $v_j + 1 \notin \{v_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \dots, v_k\}$.

Consider the following sets which we write in the true order according to the matching field. Let

$$I = \{v_2, v_1, v_3, \dots, v_k\}, \quad J = \{\ell + 1, v_2 + 1, v_3 + 1, \dots, v_{j-1} + 1, v_j + 1, v_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \dots, v_k\},$$

$$I' = \{\ell + 1, v_1, v_3, \dots, v_k\} \text{ and } J' = \{v_2, v_2 + 1, v_3 + 1, \dots, v_{j-1} + 1, v_j + 1, v_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \dots, v_k\}.$$

By construction we have that

$$P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$$

is a binomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}$. Since $v_2 \geq \ell + 2$, we have that $I' < v$ hence $P_{I'}$ vanishes in $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$. However $I \geq v$ and $J \geq v$ hence $P_I P_J$ appears as a monomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$.

For the converse we assume that $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ contains a monomial. If $\ell > n - k + 1$ or $\ell = 0$ then by Lemma 3.9 we have that $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ is monomial-free, a contradiction. So we may assume that $\ell \leq n - k + 1$. Suppose by contradiction that $v_1 \notin B_{\ell,1}$ then $v_1 \geq \ell + 1$. Suppose $P_I P_J$ is a monomial appearing in $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$. In particular P_I and P_J do not vanish so we have that $I, J \geq v$. We deduce that $I \cap B_{\ell,1} = \emptyset$ and $J \cap B_{\ell,1} = \emptyset$. Suppose that the monomial $P_I P_J$ is obtained from the binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in $\text{in}_{w_\ell}(G_{k,n})$. Then we have that $I' \cap B_{\ell,1} = \emptyset$ and $J' \cap B_{\ell,1} = \emptyset$. Therefore the true ordering on all indices I, I', J, J' is the diagonal order. It follows that the same monomial must appear in the ideal $G_{k,n,0}|^v$. However by Lemma 3.9, $G_{k,n,0}|^v$ is monomial-free, a contradiction. So we may assume that $v_1 \in B_{\ell,1}$.

It remains to show that if $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ contains a monomial then $v_2 \in \{v_1 + 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\ell + 1\}$. By the above argument, we may assume that $1 \leq \ell \leq n - k + 1$ and $v_1 \in B_{\ell,1}$.

Assume by contradiction that $v_2 \notin \{v_1 + 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\ell + 1\}$. Then there are two cases, either $v_2 = v_1 + 1$ or $v_2 = \ell + 1$.

Case 1. Let $v_2 = v_1 + 1$. Let $P_I P_J$ be a monomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee$ arising from a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in $G_{k,n,\ell}$ and write

$$I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad J = \{j_1 < \cdots < j_k\}.$$

By assumption we have $I, J \geq v$ so in particular $i_1, j_1 \geq v_1$ and $i_2, j_2 \geq v_2$. It is easy to see that $B_\ell(I) \neq B_\ell(J)$ otherwise it follows that $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee$. So without loss of generality, assume that $B_\ell(I) = id$ and $B_\ell(J) = (12)$. So, in tableau form, the binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I & J \\ \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline i_2 & j_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I' & J' \\ \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline j_1 & i_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Note, we must have the first two rows of these two tableaux are different, otherwise $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee$.

By assumption we have $i_2, j_2 \geq v_2$ hence $P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee$. Hence $P_{I'}$ must vanish. We take cases on $B_\ell(I')$.

Case 1.a. Let $B_\ell(I') = id$. Then we have $i_1 < j_1$. Since $P_{I'}$ vanishes, we must have $j_1 < v_2 = v_1 + 1$. Therefore $i_1 < v_1$, a contradiction.

Case 1.b. Let $B_\ell(I') = (12)$. Then we have $j_1 < i_1$. Since $P_{I'}$ vanishes we must have $i_1 < v_2 = v_1 + 1$, and so $j_1 < v_1$ which is a contradiction.

Case 2. Let $v_2 = \ell + 1$. Let $P_I P_J$ be a monomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee$ arising from a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in $\text{in}_{w_\ell}(G_{k,n})$ and write

$$I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad J = \{j_1 < \cdots < j_k\}.$$

By assumption we have $I, J \geq v$ so in particular $i_1, j_1 \geq v_1$ and $i_2, j_2 \geq v_2$. It is easy to see that $B_\ell(I) \neq B_\ell(J)$ otherwise it follows that $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee$. So without loss of generality, assume that $B_\ell(I) = id$ and $B_\ell(J) = (12)$. So, in tableau form, the binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I & J \\ \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline i_2 & j_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline I' & J' \\ \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline j_1 & i_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Note, we must have the first two rows of these two tableaux are different, otherwise $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee$. By assumption we have $i_2, j_2 \geq v_2 = \ell + 1$ hence $P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee$. Hence $P_{I'}$ must vanish. Since $j_1 \in B_{\ell,1}$, we must have $i_1 < v_2$. Since $B_\ell(I) = id$ and $i_2 \geq v_2 = \ell + 1 \in B_{\ell,2}$, we must have $i_1 \in B_{\ell,2}$. So $i_1 \geq \ell + 1$, a contradiction. And so we have shown that $v_2 \in \{v_1 + 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\ell + 1\}$. Therefore v satisfies all desired conditions.

(ii) Since $G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee = G_{k,n,\ell}^\vee|_{w_0}$ the statement follows from Proposition 3.4 and Lemma 3.9.

□




Figure 1: Depiction of the main results in Section 3. In particular we see the characterization of all pairs of permutations (v, w) for which $G_{k,n,\ell}^v|_w$ is zero, shown in red, and $G_{k,n,\ell}^v|_w$ contains monomials, shown in blue.

Remark 3.12. For general Grassmannians, there are other combinatorial constructions leading to toric degenerations such as plabic graphs, Newton–Okounkov bodies, and cluster algebras [RW19, BMC20]. We remark that all degenerations arising in this work can be realized as Gröbner degenerations, nevertheless, this is not true in general; See e.g. [KMS15] for an example of a toric degeneration which cannot be identified as a Gröbner degeneration.

Remark 3.13. We summarise the results of this section in Figure 1, which depicts the process by which one obtains pairs of permutations (v, w) whose corresponding ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}^v|_w$ is either zero or contains monomials.

4. Degenerations inside flag varieties

4.1 Gröbner degenerations. We first fix our notation throughout this section. Even though similar results hold for arbitrary ℓ , we only include results for the diagonal case as the general case requires enormous case studies and various technical arguments.

Fix n . We recall the definition of the matrix M_0 from Section 2.5 taking $k = n - 1$, that is $M_0(i, j) = (i - 1)(n - j + 1)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. We denote \mathbf{w} for the *weight vector* induced by M_0 on the Plücker variables and $F_n := \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(I_n)$ for its initial ideal.

Definition 4.1. Given a collection S of subsets of $[n]$ we denote $F_n|_S$ for the ideal obtained from F_n by setting the variables $\{P_I : I \in S\}$ to be zero. We say that the variable P_I vanishes in $F_n|_S$ if $I \in S$. In particular, to simplify our notation through this note, we define the following ideals for every pair of permutations v and w in S_n :

$$F_n|_w := F_n|_{S_w}, \quad F_n|^v := F_n|_{S^v} \quad \text{and} \quad F_n|_w^v := F_n|_{S_w^v}.$$

Theorem 4.2 (Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 4.13 in [CM19a]). *The ideal F_n is toric and it is equal to the ideal of the diagonal matching field, which is the kernel of the monomial map:*

$$\phi_0: \mathbb{K}[P_J] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[x_{ij}] \quad \text{with} \quad P_J \mapsto \text{in}_{M_0}(P_J). \quad (4.1)$$

Moreover, F_n is generated by quadratic binomials.

Similarly to the Grassmannian case, we note that since F_n is quadratically generated, we have that $F_n|_w^v$ is also quadratically generated. In Lemma 5.2, we give an explicit description of a canonical quadratic generating set.

Definition 4.3. We write Z_n^{op} and T_n^{op} for the set of permutations v in S_n for which $F_n|^v$ is zero and monomial-free respectively. We denote by N_n^{op} the collection of permutations $v \in S_n$ for which the ideal $F_n|^v$ contains at least one monomial. Note that such ideals are not toric. Similarly, we denote Z_n and T_n for the set of permutations w in S_n for which the ideal $F_n|_w$ is zero and monomial-free, respectively. For Richardson varieties, we define analogous sets:

- $T_n^R = \{(v, w) \in S_n \times S_n : F_n|_w^v \text{ has no monomial}\}$ and $Z_n^R = \{(v, w) \in S_n \times S_n : F_n|_w^v \text{ is zero}\}$.

4.2 Ascending, descending and compatible permutations. In order to classify the permutations which lie in T_n^R and Z_n^R it is important to define the following combinatorial properties and sets of permutations.

Definition 4.4. Let $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ be a permutation in S_n with $w_t = n$.

- We say w has the *ascending property* if $w_1 < w_2 < \dots < w_t = n$. We denote $S_n^<$ for the set of permutations with ascending property.
- We say w has the *descending property* if $n = w_t > w_{t+1} > \dots > w_n$. We denote $S_n^>$ for the set of permutations in S_n with descending property.

- Given $k \leq n$, we denote by $(w_1, \dots, w_k)\uparrow$ the ordered list whose elements are $\{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ taken in increasing order.
- We define $W_v := \{v s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_p} : \{i_1, \dots, i_p\} \subseteq I_v \text{ and } |i_a - i_b| > 1 \text{ for all } a, b \in \{i_1, \dots, i_p\}\}$, where $I_v := \{i \in [n-1] : v_{i+1} = v_i + 1\}$ and $s_i \in S_n$ is the transposition which swaps i and $i+1$.

Suppose that $w = (w_1, \dots, w_{n+1}) \in S_{n+1}$ is a permutation where $w_t = n+1$ for some $t \in [n+1]$. We denote $\underline{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}, w_{t+1}, \dots, w_n) \in S_n$.

We use the following simple but important observation in the proof of Theorem 4.17. We include it here as it follows easily from the definition and highlights an important relationship between S^v and $S^{\underline{v}}$ where v is a permutation with the ascending property.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose $v \in S_{n+1}$ has the ascending property and let $I \subset [n+1]$ be any subset with $n+1 \in I$. Then $I \geq v$ if and only if $I \setminus \{n+1\} \geq \underline{v}$.*

Proof. Since v has the ascending property we write $v_1 < v_2 < \cdots < v_r = n+1$ for some r . If $|I| \leq r$ then we have $i_1 \geq v_1, \dots, i_{|I|-1} \geq v_{|I|-1}$. Hence $I \setminus \{n+1\} \geq \underline{v}$. If $|I| > r$ then ordering the first $|I|$ elements of v and removing $n+1$ is the same as ordering the first $|I|-1$ elements of \underline{v} . It follows that $I \setminus \{n+1\} \geq \underline{v}$. The converse follows from a similar argument. \square

Definition 4.6. Let $v, w \in S_n$ with $n = v_t = w_{t'}$ and $n-1 = v_s = w_{s'}$. We say that v, w are *compatible* if $v \leq w$ and in the case that $t \neq t'$ the following conditions hold:

$$s' \leq t, \quad t' \leq s, \quad n = w_{t'} > w_{t'+1} > \cdots > w_t, \quad \text{and} \quad n = v_t > v_{t-1} > \cdots > v_{t'}.$$

Given a subset $Z \subseteq S_n \times S_n$ we define its *extension* as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Z} := & \{(v, w) \in S_{n+1} \times S_{n+1} : (\underline{v}, \underline{w}) \in Z \text{ and } v_t = w_t = n \text{ for some } t\} \\ & \cup \{(v, w) \in S_{n+1} \times S_{n+1} : (\underline{v}, \underline{w}) \in Z \text{ and } v, w \text{ are compatible}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Compatibility of a pair of permutations is important for characterizing $T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$ in terms of $T_n^R \cup Z_n^R$.

4.3 Richardson varieties.

Theorem 4.7. *With the notation above, we have:*

- (i) $Z_n^R = \{(v, w) : w \in W_v\}$,
- (ii) $T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R = \widehat{T}_n^R \cup \widehat{Z}_n^R$.

Proof. To prove (i) suppose that $w \in W_v$ and assume by contradiction that $F_n|_w^v$ is nonzero. So there exists a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in F_n such that $P_I P_J$ is nonzero in $F_n|_w^v$.

For each $1 \leq m \leq n$, let us consider for which sets I we have P_I is zero and $|I| = m$. If $m \in I_v$ then $\{v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_{m-1}\}$ and $w_m \in \{v_m, v_{m+1}\}$. So it follows that if $|I| = m$

and P_I is nonzero then I is either $\{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ or $\{v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, v_{m+1}\}$. On the other hand if $m \notin I_v$ then it follows that $\{v_1, \dots, v_m\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$. So if P_I is nonzero and $|I| = m$ then $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$.

Suppose $|I| = |J| = m$. By assumption the binomial is not trivial and so $I \neq J$. By the above argument, there are at most two different sets of size m whose corresponding variables do not vanish. So we must have $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ and $J = \{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$ and $\{v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_{m-1}\}$. Since $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial, it easily follows that either $I = I'$ and $J = J'$ or $I = J'$ and $J = I'$. In each case we have that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is zero, a contradiction.

If $m = |I| \neq |J|$ then without loss of generality assume that $|I| < |J|$. Suppose that $m \in I_v$ then since P_I is nonzero, we have that $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ or $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, v_{m+1}\}$. Since P_J is nonzero and $m+1 \notin I$, so we have that $J \supseteq \{v_1, \dots, v_{m+1}\} \supset I$. And so the binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is trivial, a contradiction. On the other hand, if $m \notin I_v$ then by a similar argument we have that $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$. And so $J \supset \{v_1, \dots, v_{|J|-1}\} \supseteq \{v_1, \dots, v_m\} = I$. Hence the binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is trivial, a contradiction.

For the converse, assume that $w \notin W_v$. By induction on n , we prove that $F_n|_w^v$ is nonzero. Note that for $n = 2$ the result holds trivially since all ideals $F_2|_w^v$ are zero. For the induction step we assume that $F_{n-1}|_{\underline{w}}^v$ is zero if and only if $\underline{w} \in W_{\underline{v}}$. Let $w_{t'} = n = v_t$. Note that since $v \leq w$, we have $t' \leq t$. In the next part of the proof we perform the following slight abuse of notation. Given a permutation α and a permutation $\beta \in W_\alpha$, we write I_α for the subset $\{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$ of $[n-1]$ such that $\alpha = \beta s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_r}$.

Case 1. Let $\underline{w} \in W_{\underline{v}}$.

Case 1.1. Let $t = t'$. Since $w \notin W_v$ and $\underline{w} \in W_{\underline{v}}$ it follows that $t-1 \in I_{\underline{v}}$ so $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}, n, v_{t-1}+1, \dots, v_n)$ and $w = (w_1, \dots, w_{t-2}, v_{t-1}+1, n, v_{t+1}, w_{t+2} \dots w_n)$. We also have that $\{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_{t-2}\}$. Now we define

$$I = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}, v_{t+1}, n\}, \quad J = (v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}, v_{t-1}),$$

$$I' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}, v_{t-1}, n\} \text{ and } J' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}, v_{t+1}\}.$$

Then $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_n . Since $v \leq I, J \leq w$, $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_w^v$ therefore $F_n|_w^v$ is a nonzero ideal.

Case 1.2. Let $t' < t$.

Case 1.2.1. Assume that $t-1 \in I_{\underline{v}}$ then we have

$$v = (v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}, n, v_{t-1}+1, \dots, v_n) \text{ and } w = (w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}, v_{t-1}+1, v_{t-1}, w_{t+2} \dots w_n).$$

Note that in this case we have $\{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}\} \setminus \{w_{t'}\}$. So in this case we define

$$I = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}, v_{t-1}, n\}, \quad J = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}, v_{t+1}\},$$

$$I' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}, v_{t+1}, n\} \text{ and } J' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t-2}, v_{t-1}\}.$$

We have that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_n . As $v \leq I, J \leq w$, $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_w^v$ and so $F_n|_w^v$ is a nonzero ideal.

Case 1.2.2. Assume that $t' - 1 \in I_{\underline{v}}$ then we have

$$v = (v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, v_{t'-1} + 1, \dots, v_n) \text{ and } w = (w_1, \dots, w_{t'-2}, v_{t'-1} + 1, n, v_{t'-1}, w_{t'+2} \dots w_n).$$

Note that we have $\{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-2}\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_{t'-2}\}$. So in this case we define

$$I = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-2}, v_{t'-1}, n\}, \quad J = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-2}, v_{t'-1} + 1\},$$

$$I' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-2}, v_{t'-1} + 1, n\}, \text{ and } J' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-2}, v_{t'-1}\}.$$

We have that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_n . As $v \leq I, J \leq w$, $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_w^v$ and hence $F_n|_w^v$ is a nonzero ideal.

Case 1.2.3. Assume that $t - 1 \notin I_{\underline{v}}$ and $t' - 1 \notin I_{\underline{v}}$. It follows that

$$\{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_{t'-1}\}, \quad \{v_{t'}, \dots, v_{t-1}\} = \{w_{t'+1}, \dots, w_t\}$$

$$\text{and } \{v_{t+1}, \dots, v_n\} = \{w_{t+1}, \dots, w_n\}.$$

By assumption we have that $w \notin W_{\underline{v}}$ so there exists $i \in \{t', t' + 1, \dots, t - 1\}$ such that $v_i + 1 < n - 1$. If $v_{t'} = n - 1$ then we note that $v_{t'+1} \leq n - 2$ and we define

$$I = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, n - 1, n\}, \quad J = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, n - 2\},$$

$$I' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, n - 2, n\}, \text{ and } J' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, n - 1\}.$$

Otherwise if $v_{t'} < n - 1$ we define

$$I = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, v_{t'}, n\}, \quad J = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, n - 1\},$$

$$I' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, n - 1, n\}, \text{ and } J' = \{v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1}, v_{t'}\}.$$

In both of the cases above we have that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_n and also $P_I P_J$ is nonzero in $F_n|_w^v$. So we have shown that $F_n|_w^v$ is a nonzero ideal.

Case 2. Assume that $\underline{w} \notin W_{\underline{v}}$. Then by induction we have $F_{n-1}|_{\underline{w}}^v$ is nonzero ideal. So, there is a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in F_{n-1} such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$. Without loss of generality we assume that $|I| = |I'|$ and $|J| = |J'|$. For each $L \in \{I, I', J, J'\}$ we now define $\tilde{L} \in \{\tilde{I}, \tilde{J}, \tilde{I}', \tilde{J}'\}$:

$$\tilde{L} = \begin{cases} L & \text{if } |L| < t', \\ L \cup \{n\} & \text{if } |L| \geq t'. \end{cases}$$

Then $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in F_n . Since $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$, we have $\underline{v} \leq I, J \leq \underline{w}$. Then $v \leq \tilde{I}, \tilde{J} \leq w$ and so $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ does not vanish in $F_n|_w^v$. Hence $F_n|_w^v$ is a nonzero ideal. This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) The proof of the second statement follows from a series of lemmas. Lemma 4.12 and Lemma 4.14 imply that $T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R \subseteq \widehat{T}_n^R \cup \widehat{Z}_n^R$. To prove the reverse, let $(v, w) \in \widehat{T}_n^R \cup \widehat{Z}_n^R$.

If $v_t = w_t = n + 1$ for some t , by Lemma 4.13, we see that $(v, w) \in T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$. Therefore assume that there is no t such that $v_t = w_t = n + 1$. If $(v, w) \notin T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$ then by Lemma 4.14, the pair (v, w) is not compatible, which is a contradiction. Hence, we conclude that $(v, w) \in T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$. \square

Remark 4.8. Note that Theorem 4.7 provides a complete characterization for the permutations which lead to zero or monomial-free Schubert and opposite Schubert ideals, as we have:

- $Z_n = \{w \in S_n : (id, w) \in Z_n^R\}$ and $T_n = \{w \in S_n : (id, w) \in T_n^R\}$,
- $Z_n^{op} = \{w \in S_n : (v, w_0) \in Z_n^R\}$ and $T_n^{op} = \{v \in S_n : (v, w_0) \in T_n^R\}$.

Example 4.9 (Example of Theorem 4.7). Consider the pair $((1, 3, 2), (2, 3, 1)) \in T_3^R$ which gives rise to a toric ideal. We find all pairs $(v, w) \in T_4^R$ such that $\underline{v} = (1, 3, 2)$ and $\underline{w} = (2, 3, 1)$. Firstly, if we have $4 = v_t = w_t$ for some t then we have the following pairs:

- $((1, 3, 2, 4), (2, 3, 1, 4))$,
- $((1, 3, 4, 2), (2, 3, 4, 1))$,
- $((1, 4, 3, 2), (2, 4, 3, 1))$,
- $((4, 1, 3, 2), (4, 2, 3, 1))$.

Secondly, for a compatible pair (v, w) such that $v_t = 4, w_{t'} = 4$, assume that $t \neq t'$. Since $v \leq w$ therefore $t > t'$. So we get the pair:

- $((1, 3, 4, 2), (2, 4, 3, 1))$.

We now proceed to prove the lemmas used in the proof of Theorem 4.7(ii).

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose $v \in T_n^{op}$, $w \in T_n$ and $v \leq w$ then $F_n|_w^v$ does not contain a monomial.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that there is a monomial $P_I P_J$ in $F_n|_w^v$. Let $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ be any binomial in F_n such that $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_w^v$. Then either $P_{I'}$ or $P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_w^v$. Also observe that since $w \in T_n$ and $P_I P_J$ does not vanish, we get that $P_{I'}$ and $P_{J'}$ do not vanish in $F_n|_w$. Hence we have $I' \leq w$ and $J' \leq w$. Similarly, as $v \in T_n^{op}$, we can see that $v \leq I'$ and $v \leq J'$. Thus we have $v \leq I' \leq w$ and $v \leq J' \leq w$. Hence $P_{I'}$ and $P_{J'}$ do not vanish in $F_n|_w^v$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that $F_n|_w^v$ does not contain a monomial. \square

Remark 4.11. Note that many pairs $(v, w) \in T_n^R$ do not arise as in Lemma 4.10. That is, we may have $v \notin T_n^{op}$ or $w \notin T_n$.

Lemma 4.12. *If $(v, w) \in T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$ and $\underline{v} \leq \underline{w}$, then $(\underline{v}, \underline{w}) \in T_n^R \cup Z_n^R$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(\underline{v}, \underline{w}) \notin T_n^R \cup Z_n^R$. Then there is monomial $P_I P_J$ in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$ which arises from the binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in F_n . Now we construct a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. Assume that $|I| = |I'| \geq |J| = |J'|$. Let $1 \leq t' \leq t \leq n+1$ such that $v_t = w_{t'} = n+1$. We take cases on t and t' .

Case 1. Assume that $t' > |I|$. Then $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . It is clear that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$ and $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. Hence $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$.

Case 2. If $|J| < t' \leq |I|$. Define

$$\tilde{I} = I \cup \{n+1\}, \tilde{J} = J, \tilde{I}' = I' \cup \{n+1\} \text{ and } \tilde{J}' = J'.$$

Then $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . Since $\underline{v} \leq I, J \leq \underline{w}$, then $v \leq \tilde{I}, \tilde{J} \leq w$. Since $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$, then one of the following holds:

- $\underline{v} \not\leq I'$ or $\underline{v} \not\leq J'$
- $\underline{w} \not\leq I'$ or $\underline{w} \not\leq J'$

Then by definition \tilde{I}' and \tilde{J}' we can easily see one of the following holds:

- $v \not\leq \tilde{I}'$ or $v \not\leq \tilde{J}'$
- $w \not\leq \tilde{I}'$ or $w \not\leq \tilde{J}'$

Hence $P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$ and so $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ is a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$.

Case 3. If $t' \leq |J|$. Define

$$\tilde{I} = I \cup \{n+1\}, \tilde{J} = J \cup \{n+1\}, \tilde{I}' = I' \cup \{n+1\} \text{ and } \tilde{J}' = J' \cup \{n+1\}.$$

Then $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . Since $\underline{v} \leq I, J \leq \underline{w}$, then $v \leq \tilde{I}, \tilde{J} \leq w$. By similar arguments as in Case 2, we can see that $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ is a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Let $(v, w) \notin T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$ such that $v_t = n+1 = w_{t'}$ for some t and $\underline{v} \leq \underline{w}$, then $(\underline{v}, \underline{w}) \notin T_n^R \cup Z_n^R$.*

Proof. Since $(v, w) \notin T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$, then there is a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in F_{n+1} such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$ and $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. Assume that $|I| = |I'| \geq |J| = |J'|$.

Case 1. If $n+1 \notin I \cup J$, then $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_n . We prove that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. Since $v \leq I$, we note that $n+1 \notin \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$. As $v_t = w_{t'}$ for some t , $n+1 \notin \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$. Then $\underline{v} \leq I$ and $I \leq \underline{w}$ and so P_I does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. Similarly we can see that P_J does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. Hence $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$.

Now we prove that $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. Without loss of generality assume that $P_{I'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^{\underline{v}}$. Then we have either $v \not\leq I'$ or $I' \not\leq w$. By above arguments, we have $n+1 \notin \{v_1, \dots, v_k, w_1, \dots, w_k\}$. Then we can see that $\underline{v} \not\leq I'$ or $I' \not\leq \underline{w}$.

Case 2. Assume that $n + 1 \in I \cup J$. Since $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} , if $|J| = 1$, then $J \neq \{n + 1\}$. For $L \in \{I, J, I', J'\}$, we define

$$\tilde{L} = \begin{cases} L \setminus \{n + 1\} & \text{if } n + 1 \in L, \\ L & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then it is easy to see that $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in F_n . First note that for any $u \in S_{n+1}$, we have that $\underline{u} \leq \tilde{L}$ if and only if $u \leq L$. Hence if $n + 1 \in I \cap J$, then $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ is a monomial in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$. Therefore we assume that $n + 1 \in I, I'$ and $n + 1 \notin J, J'$.

Since $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$ and $w_t = n + 1 = v_t$ for some t , by similar arguments as above we can see that $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$. Now we prove that $P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$. If $P_{I'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$, since $n + 1 \in I'$ then $P_{\tilde{I}'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$. Therefore assume that $P_{I'}$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$ and $P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$. Then we have either $v \not\leq J'$ or $J' \not\leq w$.

If $w_t = n + 1 = v_t$ with $t > |J'|$, we are done. Assume that $t \leq |J'|$. If $J' \not\leq w$, then $(j'_1 < \cdots < j'_{|J'|}) \not\leq (w_1, \dots, w_t = n + 1, \dots, w_{|J'|}) \uparrow$. Since $n + 1 \notin J'$, we have

$$(j'_1 < \cdots < j'_{|J'|-1}) \not\leq (w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}, w_{t+1}, \dots, w_{|J'|}) \uparrow.$$

Hence we have $\tilde{J}' = J' \not\leq \underline{w}$.

Finally assume that $v \not\leq J'$. Since $t \leq |J| = |J'|$ and $n + 1 \notin J$, we observe that $v \not\leq J$. Hence P_J vanishes in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$, which is a contradiction. Hence if $t \leq |J| = |J'|$, then $v \leq J'$. Therefore $P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a monomial in $F_n|_{\underline{w}}^v$. \square

For the following lemma, recall that for any pair of permutations $(v, w) \in S_{n+1} \times S_{n+1}$, we denote $v_t = w_{t'} = n + 1$ and $v_s = w_{s'} = n$.

Lemma 4.14. *Let $(v, w) \in T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$ such that $t' < t$ and $\underline{v} \leq \underline{w}$. Then v, w are compatible.*

Proof. Since $(v, w) \in T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$, by Lemma 4.12, then $(\underline{v}, \underline{w}) \in T_n^R \cup Z_n^R$. We prove that if $(v, w) \in S_{n+1} \times S_{n+1}$ is not compatible and $v < w$ then $(v, w) \notin T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$. Let $v_\ell = n - 1 = w_{\ell'}$.

Case 1. Assume that $t < s'$. Then we have $t' \leq t < s' \leq s$. Suppose that $s' = s$ and $\ell' > s$. Let

$$I = \{w_1, \dots, w_{s'}\} = \{i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{s'-2} < n < n + 1\}, \quad J = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_{s'-3} < n - 1\}.$$

Note that $\underline{v} \leq \underline{w}$ and $s = s' < \ell'$ therefore $i_{s'-2} < n - 1$. And so we have $v \leq I, J \leq w$. Let

$$I' = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_{s'-3} < n - 1 < n < n + 1\}, \quad J' = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_{s'-2}\}.$$

By construction it is clear that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . Since $n - 1 \notin \{w_1, \dots, w_{s'}\}$, it follows that $I' \not\leq w$. And so $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_{\underline{w}}^v$. So we may now assume that either $\ell' \leq s$ or $s' < s$. However if $s' < s$ then, by induction, we have $\ell' \leq s$. So we assume $\ell' \leq s$.

Case 1.1. Let $\ell' > s'$. Since $t' \leq t < s'$ and $t' \neq t$, we have $t' < s' - 1$. Take

$$I = (w_1, \dots, w_{s'})\uparrow, \quad J = \begin{cases} (w_1, \dots, w_{t'-1}, w_{\ell'})\uparrow & \text{if } t' > 1, \\ w_{\ell'} & \text{if } t' = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$I' = \begin{cases} (w_1, \dots, w_{t'-1}, w_{\ell'}, w_{t'}, w_{t'+2}, \dots, w_{s'})\uparrow & \text{if } t' > 1, \\ (w_{\ell'}, w_{t'}, w_{t'+2}, \dots, w_{s'})\uparrow & \text{if } t' = 1 \end{cases} \text{ and}$$

$$J' = \begin{cases} (w_1, \dots, w_{t'-1}, w_{t'+1})\uparrow & \text{if } t' > 1, \\ w_{t'+1} & \text{if } t' = 1. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . It is clear from the construction, we have $v \leq I, J \leq w$. Then $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_{n+1}|_w^v$. Since $I' \not\leq w$, then $P_{I'}$ vanishes in $F_{n+1}|_w^v$. Then $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_w^v$.

Case 1.2. Let $\ell' < s'$. Let $k = \max\{\ell', t\}$ and $v_r = \max\{v_i : 1 \leq i \leq k, i \neq t\}$. Now define

$$I = (v_1, \dots, v_k)\uparrow, \quad J = (v_1, \dots, v_{r-1}, v_{r+1}, \dots, v_{k-1}, n-1)\uparrow,$$

$$I' = (v_1, \dots, v_{r-1}, v_{r+1}, \dots, v_k, n-1)\uparrow \text{ and } J' = (v_1, \dots, v_{k-1})\uparrow$$

Consider the tableau for $P_I P_J$ and $P_{I'} P_{J'}$. Note that all rows are the same except for the $(k-1)^{th}$ row, and in this row we interchange $n-1$ and v_r . Since $k < s' \leq s$, $n-1 \notin I$ and $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . Clearly, $v \leq I, J \leq w$ and so $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_{n+1}|_w^v$. Since $k < s'$ and $n-1 \in I'$, we can see that $I' \not\leq w$. So $P_{I'}$ vanishes in $F_{n+1}|_w^v$.

Case 2. Assume that $t' > s$. Then we have $t \geq t' > s \geq s'$. Let $v_r = \max\{v_i : 1 \leq i \leq t', i \neq s\}$. We define

$$I = \begin{cases} (v_1, \dots, v_{s-1}, n, v_{s+1}, \dots, v_{t'})\uparrow & \text{if } s > 1, \\ (n, v_{s+1}, \dots, v_{t'})\uparrow & \text{if } s = 1, \end{cases} \quad J = (v_1, \dots, v_{t'-1})\uparrow,$$

$$I' = (v_1, \dots, v_{r-1}, v_{r+1}, \dots, v_{t'}, n)\uparrow \text{ and } J' = \begin{cases} (v_1, \dots, v_{s-1}, v_{s+1}, \dots, v_{t'-1}, v_r)\uparrow & \text{if } s > 1, \\ (v_{s+1}, \dots, v_{t'-1}, v_r)\uparrow & \text{if } s = 1. \end{cases}$$

Then $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . Since $n-1, n \notin J'$ and $t' > s$, we have $v \not\leq J'$ and $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_w^v$.

Case 3. Assume that there exists $t' \leq k < t$ such that $v_k > v_{k+1}$. We take

$$I = \begin{cases} (v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, v_{k+1}, n)\uparrow & \text{if } k > 1, \\ (v_{k+1}, n)\uparrow & \text{if } k = 1, \end{cases} \quad J = (v_1, \dots, v_k)\uparrow,$$

$$I' = \begin{cases} (v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, v_k, n)\uparrow & \text{if } k > 1, \\ (v_k, n)\uparrow & \text{if } k = 1, \end{cases} \text{ and } J' = (v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, v_{k+1})\uparrow.$$

Then $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . Since $v_{k+1} > v_k$, we have $v \leq I, J$ and $v \not\leq J'$. Now we show that $I \leq w$. Since $\underline{v} \leq \underline{w}$ and $v_{k+1} > v_k$, we have

$$(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k-1}, v_{k+1}) \uparrow \leq (w_1, \dots, w_{t'-1}, w_{t'+1}, \dots, w_k, w_{k+1}) \uparrow.$$

Then $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k-1}, v_{k+1}, n) \uparrow \leq (w_1, \dots, w_k, w_{k+1}) \uparrow$. Then we see that $P_I P_J$ is nonzero and $P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_w^v$. Hence $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_w^v$.

Case 4. Assume that there exists $t' < k \leq t$ such that $w_k < w_{k+1}$. In this case, we choose:

$$I = (w_1, \dots, w_k) \uparrow, \quad J = \begin{cases} (w_1, \dots, w_{t'-1}, w_{t'+1}, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_{k+1}) \uparrow & \text{if } t' > 1, \\ (w_2, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_{k+1}) \uparrow & \text{if } t' = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$I' = (w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_{k+1}) \uparrow \quad \text{and} \quad J' = \begin{cases} (w_1, \dots, w_{t'-1}, w_{t'+1}, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_k) \uparrow & \text{if } t' > 1, \\ (w_2, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_k) & \text{if } t' = 1. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is a binomial in F_{n+1} . Since $w_k < w_{k+1}$, we have $v \leq I \leq w$ and $J \leq w$. Now we show that $v \leq J$. Since $\underline{v} \leq \underline{w}$ and $w_{k+1} > w_k$, we have $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k-1}) \uparrow \leq (w_1, \dots, w_{t'-1}, w_{t'+1}, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_{k+1}) \uparrow$. Note that $P_I P_J$ is nonzero and $P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|_w^v$. Then $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $F_{n+1}|_w^v$.

Hence we conclude that if (v, w) is not compatible, then $(v, w) \notin T_{n+1}^R \cup Z_{n+1}^R$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 4.15. For each $3 \leq n \leq 6$ and $0 \leq \ell \leq n-1$ we calculate the number of pairs of permutations (v, w) such that $v < w$ and $F_{n,\ell}|_w^v$ is monomial-free, zero or contains a monomial. The results of these calculations are collected in Table 1. Here, $F_{n,\ell}|_w^v := \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I_n)|_{I \in S_w^v}$ is the ideal of the matching field B_ℓ whose corresponding weight vector is \mathbf{w}_ℓ and I_n is the Plücker ideal of the flag variety. Also for the Grassmannian case we calculate, for a given pair (n, k) , the number of triples (ℓ, v, w) for which $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is a toric ideal. These calculations are collected in Table 2.

4.4 Schubert and opposite Schubert varieties. We now focus on the Schubert and opposite Schubert varieties inside the flag variety. In each case, our goal is to give an explicit description of the permutations v and w for which $F_n|_w^v$ and $F_n|_w$ are monomial-free or zero. And for particular cases we note which of these ideals are principal. First we recall that F_n is a toric ideal by [CM19a, Corollary 4.13], in particular it is monomial free. We also recall following results from [CM19b] characterizing the permutations for which $F_n|_w$ is zero and contains no monomial respectively.

Theorem 4.16 (Schubert varieties, Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 5.5 in [CM19b]). *The ideal F_n is monomial-free. Moreover,*

- (i) $F_n|_w = 0$ if and only if $w \in Z_n$, where

n	ℓ	Toric	Zero	Non-toric
3	0	4	4	5
	1	4	4	5
	2	1	6	6
4	0	39	20	130
	1	38	20	131
	2	28	23	138
	3	22	24	143
5	0	343	114	3204
	1	329	114	3218
	2	269	125	3267
	3	228	125	3308
	4	255	133	3274
6	0	3066	750	93871
	1	2907	750	94030
	2	2490	796	94401
	3	2180	803	94704
	4	2318	818	94551
	5	2598	851	94238

Table 1: For each $3 \leq n \leq 6$ and $0 \leq \ell \leq n-1$, we give the number of pairs of permutations (v, w) for which $F_{n,\ell}|_w^v$ is either a toric ideal, a zero ideal or non-toric ideal.

$G_{k,n,\ell} _w^v$	k	
n	2	3
4	10	
5	49	71
6	151	902

$G_{k,n,\ell} ^v$	k	
n	2	3
4	6	
5	17	23
6	34	74

Table 2: For each $(k, n) \in \{(2, 4), (2, 5), (2, 6), (3, 5), (3, 6)\}$ we calculate the number of triples (ℓ, v, w) such that $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is toric. Similarly for the opposite Schubert varieties we calculate the number of pairs (v, ℓ) for which $G_{k,n,\ell}|^v$ is toric.

$$- Z_n = \{s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_p} \in S_n : |i_k - i_\ell| \geq 2, \text{ for all } k, \ell\}.$$

(ii) $T_n = A_1 \cup A_2$, where

$$- A_1 = \{w \in S_n : F_{n-1}|_{\underline{w}} = 0, w_n = n-2 \text{ and } \{w_{n-2}, w_{n-1}\} = \{n-1, n\}\},$$

$$- A_2 = \{w \in S_n : F_{n-1}|_{\underline{w}} \text{ is monomial-free, } \underline{w} \in S_{n-1}^{\geq} \text{ and if } w_s = n-1, w_t = n \text{ then } t \geq s-1\}.$$

We now state and prove the analogous result for opposite Schubert varieties.

Theorem 4.17 (Opposite Schubert varieties). *Following our notation in Definition 4.3:*

(i) $v \in Z_n^{op}$ if and only if $w_0 v \in Z_n$.

(ii) $T_n^{op} = A_1^{op} \cup A_2^{op}$, where

$$- A_1^{op} = \{v \in S_n : F_n|_v \neq 0, F_{n-1}|_v = 0, \text{ and } v \text{ has the ascending property}\}$$

– $A_2^{\text{op}} = \{v \in \mathcal{S}_n : F_{n-1}|^v \text{ has no monomial and } v \text{ has the ascending property}\}.$

Proof. To prove (i) first note that as the initial term of each Plücker variable is the diagonal term in its corresponding submatrix, every binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in F_n leads to the binomial $P_{w_0 I} P_{w_0 J} - P_{w_0 I'} P_{w_0 J'}$ in F_n . Now, note that if $F_n|^\nu$ is nonzero, then there is a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in F_n such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|^\nu$. Since $\nu \leq I, J$, we have that $w_0 I, w_0 J \leq w_0 \nu$. Hence $P_{w_0 I} P_{w_0 J}$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{w_0 \nu}$, and so $F_n|_{w_0 \nu}$ is nonzero.

Conversely, if $w_0 \nu \notin Z_n$ then $F_n|_{w_0 \nu}$ is nonzero. So there is a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in F_n such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|_{w_0 \nu}$. Since $I, J \leq w_0 \nu$, we have that $w_0(w_0 \nu) = \nu \leq w_0 I, w_0 J$. Hence $P_{w_0 I} P_{w_0 J}$ does not vanish in $F_n|^\nu$, and so $F_n|^\nu$ is nonzero.

(ii) First note that the classification of zero ideals in Theorem 4.17(i) shows that every permutation ν in A_1^{op} is either of the form $\nu = (n-2, n, n-1, \dots)$ or $\nu = (n-2, n-1, n, \dots)$. We partition A_1^{op} into

$$A_{1A}^{\text{op}} = \{\nu \in A_1^{\text{op}} : \nu_2 = n\} \text{ and } A_{1B}^{\text{op}} = \{\nu \in A_1^{\text{op}} : \nu_3 = n\}.$$

The proof of (ii) follows from a series of lemmas which we prove later. By Lemma 4.19 and Lemma 4.20 we have that $A_1^{\text{op}} \subset T_n^{\text{op}}$. By Lemma 4.22 we have $A_2^{\text{op}} \subset T_n^{\text{op}}$.

For the converse let $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in T_n^{\text{op}}$. By Lemma 4.18 we have that ν has the ascending property. Then by Lemma 4.21 we have that $\underline{\nu} \in T_{n-1}^{\text{op}}$ or $\underline{\nu} \in Z_{n-1}^{\text{op}}$. So $\nu \in A_2^{\text{op}}$ or $\nu \in A_1^{\text{op}}$ respectively by definition of A_1^{op} and A_2^{op} . \square

We now prove the lemmas used in the proof of Theorem 4.17(ii). Here we assume that F_n^ν is nonzero.

Lemma 4.18. *If $F_n|^\nu$ has no monomial, then ν has the ascending property.*

Proof. Suppose that ν does not have the ascending property. Then we choose the minimum index r such that $1 \leq r \leq t-2$ and $\nu_r > \nu_{r+1}$. To obtain a contradiction, we consider the following two cases on ν in which we find a monomial $P_I P_J$ in $F_n|^\nu$ arising from a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ in F_n .

Case 1. Let $\nu_{r+1} < \nu_1$. We choose

$$I = \{\nu_2, \nu_3, \dots, \nu_r, \nu_{r+1}, n\}, \quad J = \{\nu_1\},$$

$$I' = \{\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_r, n\} \text{ and } J' = \{\nu_{r+1}\}.$$

Case 2. Assume that there exists $1 \leq k \leq r-1$ such that $\nu_k < \nu_{r+1} < \nu_{k+1}$. We choose

$$I = \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k, \nu_{k+2}, \dots, \nu_r, \nu_{r+1}, n\}, \quad J = \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k, \nu_{k+1}\},$$

$$I' = \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_r, n\} \text{ and } J' = \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k, \nu_{r+1}\}.$$

In all the above cases, we have that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is nonzero in F_n . Since $\nu_1 < \nu_2 < \dots < \nu_r$, we have $\nu \leq I, J$ and $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|^\nu$. Also observe that $\nu \not\leq J'$ and so $P_{J'}$ vanishes in $F_n|^\nu$. Hence $P_I P_J$ is a monomial in $F_n|^\nu$, a contradiction. Therefore we conclude that ν has the ascending property. \square

Lemma 4.19. $F_n|^\nu$ is a principal toric ideal for each $\nu \in A_{1B}^{op}$. In particular, $A_{1B}^{op} \subset T_n^{op}$.

Proof. Let $\nu \in A_{1B}^{op}$ then we have $\nu = (n-2, n-1, n, \dots)$. First we note that $F_n|^\nu$ is nonzero because it contains the binomial $P_{n-1}P_{n-2,n} - P_{n-2}P_{n-1,n}$.

Now we show that the above binomial generates $F_n|^\nu$. Let $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ be a binomial in F_n such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|^\nu$. Assume $|I| \leq |J|$, we show by contradiction that $|I| = 1$ and $|J| = 2$. Since $|I| = |J| = 1$ is impossible there are three cases, either $|I|, |J| \geq 3$, $|I| \leq 2$ and $|J| \geq 3$ or $|I| = |J| = 2$.

Case 1. Let $|I|, |J| \geq 3$. Since $\nu_3 = n$ and $I, J \geq \nu$ therefore $n \in I$ and $n \in J$. It follows that

$$P_{I \setminus \{n\}} P_{J \setminus \{n\}} - P_{I' \setminus \{n\}} P_{J' \setminus \{n\}}$$

is a non-vanishing binomial $F_{n-1}|^\nu$, a contradiction since we assumed $\underline{\nu} \in Z_{n-1}^{op}$.

Case 2. Let $|I| \leq 2$ and $|J| \geq 3$. Since $J \geq \nu$, we have that $J = \{\dots, n-2, n-1, n\}$. Let us write $I = \{i_1, i_2\}$ where $i_1 < i_2$ if $|I| = 2$ and write $I = \{i_1\}$ if $|I| = 1$. Since $I \geq \nu$ we have $i_1 \geq n-2$ and $i_2 \geq n-1$. Observe that swapping any value in I with some value in J , either results in no change to I and J , or results in a repeated entry in J . Therefore $P_I P_J$ is not a term of any binomial in F_n , a contradiction.

Case 3. Let $|I| = |J| = 2$. Since $\nu_3 = n$, it follows that $I, J \geq \underline{\nu}$ hence $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_{n-1}|^\nu$. So $F_{n-1}|^\nu$ is nonzero, a contradiction.

So we have shown that $|I| = 1$ and $|J| = 2$. Let us write $I = \{i_1\}$ and $J = \{j_1, j_2\}$ where $j_1 < j_2$. Since $P_I P_J \neq P_{I'} P_{J'}$ it follows that i_1, j_1 and j_2 are distinct and $I' = \{j_1\}$ and $J' = \{i_1, j_2\}$. Since $I, J \geq \nu$ we must have $\{i_1, j_1, j_2\} = \{n-2, n-1, n\}$. So the binomial is $P_{n-1}P_{n-2,n} - P_{n-2}P_{n-1,n}$. In particular $F_n|^\nu$ is a principal toric ideal. \square

Lemma 4.20. $A_{1A}^{op} \subset T_n^{op}$.

Proof. Let $\nu \in A_{1A}^{op}$ then we have $\nu = (n-2, n, n-1, \dots)$. First we show that $F_n|^\nu$ is nonzero. Consider the binomial

$$P_{n-1}P_{n-2,n} - P_{n-2}P_{n-1,n}$$

The above binomial does not vanish in $F_n|^\nu$ hence the ideal is nonzero. We now show that $F_n|^\nu$ is principal. Let $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ be a binomial in F_n such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|^\nu$. Without loss of generality we assume $|I| \leq |J|$. We will show by contradiction that $|I| = 1$ and $|J| = 2$. Since $|I| = |J| = 1$ is impossible there are three cases, either $|I|, |J| \geq 3$, $|I| \leq 2$ and $|J| \geq 3$ or $|I| = |J| = 2$.

Case 1. Let $|I|, |J| \geq 3$. Since $\nu_2 = n$ and $I, J \geq \nu$ therefore $n \in I$ and $n \in J$. It follows that

$$P_{I \setminus \{n\}} P_{J \setminus \{n\}} - P_{I' \setminus \{n\}} P_{J' \setminus \{n\}}$$

is a binomial which does not vanish in $F_{n-1}|^\nu$, a contradiction since we assumed $\underline{\nu} \in Z_{n-1}^{op}$.

Case 2. Let $|I| \leq 2$ and $|J| \geq 3$. Since $J \geq \nu$, we have that $J = \{\dots, n-2, n-1, n\}$. Let us write $I = \{i_1, i_2\}$ where $i_1 < i_2$ if $|I| = 2$ and write $I = \{i_1\}$ if $|I| = 1$. Since $I \geq \nu$ we have $i_1 \geq n-2$ and $i_2 = n$. Observe that swapping any value in I with any value in J either results in no change to I and J or results in a repeated entry in J . Therefore $P_I P_J$ is not a term of any binomial in F_n , a contradiction.

Case 3. Let $|I| = |J| = 2$. Let us write $I = \{i_1, i_2\}$ and $J = \{j_1, j_2\}$ where $i_1 < i_2$ and $j_1 < j_2$. Since $I, J \geq v$ it follows that $i_2 = j_2 = n$. So we must have $n \in I'$ and $n \in J'$ and the polynomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'} = 0$ is zero, a contradiction.

We have shown that $|I| = 1$ and $|J| = 2$. Let us write $I = \{i_1\}$ and $J = \{j_1, j_2\}$ where $j_1 < j_2$. We must have no repeated values among i_1, j_1, j_2 otherwise the binomial is trivial. Since $I, J \geq v$ we must have $\{i_1, j_1, j_2\} = \{n-2, n-1, n\}$. It is now easy to see that $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ is exactly of the form described above. Since we are in the diagonal case, we have that both left and right hand side of the binomial do not vanish in $F_n|v$. So $F_n|v$ is generated by $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ and is a principal toric ideal. \square

Lemma 4.21. *If $\underline{v} \in N_{n-1}^{op}$ then $v \in N_n^{op}$.*

Proof. Let r be such that $v_r = n$. Let $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ be in F_{n-1} such that $P_I P_J$ does not vanish and $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ does vanish in $F_{n-1}|v$. We may assume, without loss of generality, $|I| = |I'|$ and $|J| = |J'|$. Define

$$\tilde{I} = \begin{cases} I & \text{if } |I| < r, \\ I \cup \{n\} & \text{if } |I| \geq r. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, we define \tilde{J}, \tilde{I}' and \tilde{J}' . By construction, for each $X \in \{I, J, I', J'\}$ we have $X \geq \underline{v}$ if and only if $\tilde{X} \geq v$. In particular $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ does not vanish in $F_n|v$ and $P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ does vanish. Also by construction we have that $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is a binomial in F_n . So we have shown $F_n|v$ contains the monomial $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$. \square

Lemma 4.22. $A_2^{op} \subset T_n^{op}$.

Proof. Suppose that $v \in A_2^{op}$ so we have $\underline{v} \in T_{n-1}^{op}$. By assumption v has the ascending property so we write $v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_r = n$ for some $r \in [n]$. Let $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$ be in F_n where $P_I P_J$ does not vanish in $F_n|v$. We will show that $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $F_n|v$. Without loss of generality we assume $|I| = |I'|$, $|J| = |J'|$.

Suppose that $n \in I, J$. We form the sets $\tilde{I}, \tilde{J}, \tilde{I}', \tilde{J}'$ by removing n , that is $\tilde{I} = I \setminus \{n\}$ and similarly for the other sets. It follows that $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is either zero or a binomial in F_{n-1} . By Lemma 4.5, $P_{\tilde{I}} P_{\tilde{J}}$ does not vanish in $F_{n-1}|v$. Since $F_{n-1}|v$ does not contain a monomial, $P_{\tilde{I}'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ does not vanish in $F_{n-1}|v$. So by Lemma 4.5, $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $F_n|v$.

Suppose that $n \notin I$ and $n \in J$. By assumption $I \geq v$ so we must have $|I| < r$. Since $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'} \in F_n$, it is straightforward to show that $n \in J'$. Since v and \underline{v} agree on the first $|I|$ entries, we have $I \geq \underline{v}$. As above, we define $\tilde{J} = J \setminus \{n\}$ and $\tilde{J}' = J' \setminus \{n\}$. By Lemma 4.5 we have $\tilde{J}' \geq \underline{v}$. We also have that $P_I P_{\tilde{J}} - P_{I'} P_{\tilde{J}'}$ is either zero or a binomial relation in F_{n-1} . Since $\underline{v} \in T_{n-1}^{op}$, we have that $I', \tilde{J}' \geq \underline{v}$. Since \underline{v} and v agree on the first $|I'|$ entries we have $I' \geq v$. By Lemma 4.5 we have $J' \geq v$. And so $P_{I'} P_{J'}$ does not vanish in $F_n|v$. The other cases follow similarly.

Finally, we must show that $F_n|v$ is nonzero. Since $F_{n-1}|v$ is nonzero, it contains a binomial $P_I P_J - P_{I'} P_{J'}$. By Lemma 4.5 we have that $P_{I \cup \{n\}} P_{J \cup \{n\}} - P_{I' \cup \{n\}} P_{J' \cup \{n\}}$ is a non-vanishing relation in $F_n|v$. Hence $F_n|v$ is nonzero. \square

5. Standard monomial theory

In this section we will study monomial bases of the ideals $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$, $F_n|_w^v$ and $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ for Richardson varieties inside the Grassmannian and flag variety. We will show that if $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is monomial-free then $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ and $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is a toric (prime binomial) ideal, assuming that $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ is quadratically generated. We will see that if $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is monomial-free then $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ is, in fact, quadratically generated. We prove this by showing that if $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is monomial-free then it is the kernel of a monomial map. Similarly for the flag variety.

It will be important to consider generating sets of the ideals $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ and $F_n|_w^v$. We construct quadratic generating sets for these ideals as follows.

Definition 5.1. Let $G \subset \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a collection of homogeneous quadratic polynomials and $S \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a collection of variables. We identify S with its characteristic vector, i.e. $S_i = 1$ if $x_i \in S$ otherwise $S_i = 0$. For each $g \in G$ we write $g = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} x^{\alpha}$ and define

$$\hat{g} = \sum_{S \cdot \alpha = 0} c_{\alpha} x^{\alpha}.$$

We define $G_S = \{\hat{g} : g \in G\}$ to be the collection of all such polynomials.

Lemma 5.2. Let $G \subseteq \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a set of homogeneous quadratics and $S \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ a subset of variables. Then $\langle G_S \rangle = \langle G \cup S \rangle \cap \mathbb{K}[\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \setminus S]$.

Proof. To show that $G_S \cup S$ and $G \cup S$ generate the same ideal, for each $g \in G$ we write $g = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} x^{\alpha}$, for some $c_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{K}$. We have that

$$g - \hat{g} = \sum_{S \cdot \alpha \geq 1} c_{\alpha} x^{\alpha}.$$

Each term appearing in the above sum is divisible by some variable in S , hence $\hat{g} \in \langle G \cup S \rangle$ and $g \in \langle G_S \cup S \rangle$.

For any polynomial $f \in \langle G \cup S \rangle \cap \mathbb{K}[\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \setminus S]$ we have $f = \sum_{g \in G} h_g g + \sum_{x_i \in S} h_i x_i$, for some $h_g, h_i \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. For each h_g we define \hat{h}_g similarly to \hat{g} and rewrite this polynomial as

$$f = \sum_{g \in G} \hat{h}_g \hat{g} + \left(\sum_{g \in G} (h_g g - \hat{h}_g \hat{g}) + \sum_{x_i \in S} h_i x_i \right).$$

Each monomial appearing in $\sum_{g \in G} \hat{h}_g \hat{g}$ is not divisible by any monomial in S . However each monomial appearing in the expressions $\sum_{g \in G} (h_g g - \hat{h}_g \hat{g})$ and $\sum_{x_i \in S} h_i x_i$ is divisible by some $x_i \in S$. Since $f \in \mathbb{K}[\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \setminus S]$ it follows that the bracketed expression above is zero and so $f = \sum_{g \in G} \hat{h}_g \hat{g} \in \langle G_S \rangle$. \square

5.1 Grassmannians. We begin by defining a new monomial map. The kernel of this monomial map will coincide with $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ when $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is monomial-free.

Definition 5.3 (Restricted monomial map). Fix $k \leq n$ and let $v \leq w$ be permutations in S_n . Let $R|_w^v = \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \subseteq [n], |I| = k, v \leq I \leq w]$ and $S = \mathbb{K}[x_{i,j} : i \in [n-1], j \in [n]]$ be polynomial rings. We define the map $\phi_\ell|_w^v : R|_w^v \rightarrow S$ to be the restriction of the monomial map ϕ_ℓ to the ring $R|_w^v$.

Notation. Fix $k \leq n$, $\ell \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ natural numbers and $v \leq w$ permutations. We use the following shorthand notation for ideals.

- $J_1 := G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$, the matching field ideal with $P_I = 0$ if $I \in S_w^v$.
- $J_2 := \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$, the initial ideal of the ideal of the Richardson variety X_w^v .
- $J_3 := \ker(\phi_\ell|_w^v)$, the kernel of the restricted monomial map.

The matching field ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}$ is quadratically generated and is the kernel of a monomial map by Theorem 3.1. We will show that a quadratic generating set of $G_{k,n,\ell}$ naturally gives rise to a quadratic generating set of $J_1 = G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$.

Lemma 5.4. *The ideals J_1 and J_3 coincide if and only if J_1 is monomial-free.*

Proof. Note that J_3 is the kernel of a monomial map and therefore does not contain any monomials. So, if J_1 contains a monomial then it is not equal to J_3 .

Suppose J_1 does not contain any monomials. Let G be a quadratic generating set for $G_{k,n,\ell}$ and let $S = \{P_I : I \in S_w^v\}$ be the collection of vanishing Plücker variables. By definition $J_1 = \langle G \cup S \rangle \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \notin S_w^v]$. So by Lemma 5.2 we have J_1 is generated by G_S . Since J_1 is monomial-free, we have that G_S does not contain any monomials. By Theorem 3.1, the ideal $G_{k,n,\ell}$ is the kernel of a monomial map ϕ_ℓ and by definition J_3 is the kernel of the restriction $\phi_\ell|_w^v$. Since all binomials $m_1 - m_2 \in G_S$ lie in $G_{k,n,\ell}$ and contain only the non-vanishing Plücker variables P_J for $J \notin S_w^v$, therefore $m_1 - m_2 \in J_3$. And so we have $J_1 \subseteq J_3$. Also, for any polynomial $f \in J_3$ we have that $f \in G_{k,n,\ell}$. Since f contains only the non-vanishing Plücker variables, therefore $f \in J_1$. \square

Lemma 5.5. $J_1 \subseteq J_2$.

Proof. Let G be a quadratic binomial generating set for $G_{k,n,\ell}$ and $S = \{P_I : I \in S_w^v\}$. Let $\hat{f} \in G_S \subset J_1$ be any polynomial. By the definition of G_S , there exists $f \in G$ such that \hat{f} is obtained from f by setting some variables to zero. Recall $G_{k,n,\ell} = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(G_{k,n})$, so there exists a polynomial $g \in G_{k,n}$ such that $f = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(g)$. Since the leading term of g is not set to zero in $I(X_w^v)$, it follows that $\hat{f} \in \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$. \square

Theorem 5.6. *If J_1 does not contain any monomials then the number of standard monomials in degree two of J_3 and $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ are equal.*

To prove this result we will show that there is a bijection between the semi-standard Young tableaux and a collection of standard monomials for J_3 of degree two. We define the following map.

Definition 5.7. Let T be a semi-standard Young tableau with two columns and k rows whose entries lie in $[n]$. For each $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ we define the map $\Gamma_\ell : T \mapsto T'$ where T' is a tableau whose columns are ordered according to the matching field B_ℓ . Suppose that the entries of the columns of T are $I = \{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k\}$ and $J = \{j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k\}$. Since T is in semi-standard form, we assume that $i_s \leq j_s$ for each $s \in [k]$. We define T' as the tableau whose columns are I' and J' as sets and are ordered by the matching field B_ℓ . The sets I' and J' are defined as follows.

- If $i_1, i_2, j_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, $j_2 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$ and $i_1 < j_1 < i_2$ then we define $I' = \{j_1 < i_2 < i_3 < \dots < i_k\}$ and $J' = \{i_1 < j_2 < j_3 < \dots < j_k\}$.
- If $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, $i_2, j_1, j_2 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$ and $j_1 < i_2 < j_2$ then we define $I' = \{j_1 < i_2 < i_3 < \dots < i_k\}$ and $J' = \{i_1 < j_2 < j_3 < \dots < j_k\}$
- Otherwise we define $I' = I$ and $J' = J$.

Lemma 5.8. Let T_1 and T_2 be semi-standard Young tableaux. If $\Gamma_\ell(T_1)$ and $\Gamma_\ell(T_2)$ are row-wise equal then T_1 and T_2 are equal.

Proof. We begin by noting that all rows except possibly the first two rows are of a tableau are fixed by Γ_ℓ . So it remains to show that if the first two rows of $\Gamma_\ell(T_1)$ and $\Gamma_\ell(T_2)$ are row-wise equal then so are the first two rows of T_1 and T_2 . We also note that Γ_ℓ preserves the entries of a tableau, thought of as a multi-set. Let us assume by contradiction that T_1 and T_2 are not row-wise equal. By the above facts we may assume without loss of generality that

$$T_1 = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad T_2 = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & i_2 \\ \hline j_1 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}$$

and $j_1 < i_2$. We proceed by taking cases on $s = |\{i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2\} \cap \{1, \dots, \ell\}|$.

Case 1. Assume $s = 0$ or 4 . It follows that Γ_ℓ fixes T_1 and T_2 . By row-wise equality of the second row of $\Gamma_\ell(T_1)$ and $\Gamma_\ell(T_2)$ we have that $j_1 = i_2$, a contradiction.

Case 2. Assume $s = 1$. It follows that $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $i_2, j_1, j_2 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$. Since $j_1 < i_2$ we have

$$\Gamma_\ell(T_1) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline j_1 & j_2 \\ \hline i_2 & i_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad \Gamma_\ell(T_2) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline j_1 & i_2 \\ \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

By row-wise equality of the second row, we have that $j_2 = i_2$. However in the tableau T_2 we have that $i_2 < j_2$, a contradiction.

Case 3. Assume $s = 2$. Since $j_1 < i_2$, it follows that $i_1, j_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $i_2, j_2 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$. And so we have

$$\Gamma_\ell(T_1) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad \Gamma_\ell(T_2) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & i_2 \\ \hline j_1 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

By row-wise equality of second row the tableau we have that $i_1 = j_2$, a contradiction since $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $j_2 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$.

Case 4. Assume that $s = 3$. It follows that $i_1, i_2, j_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $j_2 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$. And so we have

$$\Gamma_\ell(T_1) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline j_1 & j_2 \\ \hline i_2 & i_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad \Gamma_\ell(T_2) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline j_1 & i_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

By row-wise equality of the second row, we have that $i_1 = j_1$. However in T_2 , we have that $i_1 < j_1$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.9. *Let T be any tableau whose columns are valid for the block diagonal matching field B_ℓ . Then there exists a semi-standard Young tableau T' such that $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ and T are row-wise equal.*

Proof. Let T be the tableau with entries $\{i_1, i_2 < i_3 < \dots < i_k\}$ and $\{j_1, j_2 < j_3 < \dots < j_k\}$,

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline i_k & j_k \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $i_s \leq j_s$ for all $s \geq 3$. We proceed by taking cases on $s = |\{i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2\} \cap \{1, \dots, \ell\}|$.

Case 1. Assume $s = 0$ or 4 . We have that $i_1 < i_2$ and $j_1 < j_2$. So we may order the entries in row to obtain T' . Note that in this case Γ_ℓ fixes T' .

Case 2. Assume $s = 1$. Without loss of generality we assume $j_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$.

- If $j_1 > i_2$ then

$$\Gamma_\ell \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline j_2 & i_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

- If $j_1 \leq i_2$ then

$$\Gamma_\ell \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline j_2 & i_1 \\ \hline j_1 & i_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline j_1 & i_1 \\ \hline j_2 & i_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

The tableau on the right is row-wise equal to T .

Case 3. Assume $s = 2$.

- If $i_1, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ then Γ_ℓ fixes each column of T , which is a semi-standard Young tableau.

- If $i_2, j_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ then without loss of generality assume $i_2 \leq j_2$ and $i_1 \leq j_1$. We have

$$\Gamma_\ell \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Case 4. Assume $s = 3$. Without loss of generality we may assume $j_1 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$.

- If $j_2 < i_1$ then

$$\Gamma_\ell \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline j_2 & i_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Note that in this case we have $j_2 < i_1 < i_2$ and so the tableau on the left is a semi-standard Young tableau.

- If $j_2 \geq i_1$ then

$$\Gamma_\ell \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & j_2 \\ \hline i_2 & j_1 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Lemma 5.10. *Let $v \leq w$ be permutations. A semi-standard Young tableau T vanishes in $G_{k,n,0}|_w^v$ if and only if $\Gamma_\ell(T)$ vanishes in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$.*

Proof. Let I, J be the columns of T and I', J' be the columns of $\Gamma_\ell(T)$. The result follows from the fact that $\{\min(I), \min(J)\} = \{\min(I'), \min(J')\}$ and similarly for the second smallest of elements of I, J, I' and J' . \square

By the results of Kreiman and Lakshmibai, see [KL02], the semi-standard Young tableau for X_w^v are the tableaux such that each column I satisfies $v \leq I \leq w$.

Lemma 5.11. *If J_1 is monomial-free then the set*

$$\text{Im}(\Gamma_\ell)|_w^v = \{\Gamma_\ell(T) : T \text{ a two column semi-standard Young tableau for } X_w^v\}$$

is a monomial basis for J_3 in degree two.

Proof. We prove the contrapositive, i.e. if $\text{Im}(\Gamma_\ell)|_w^v$ is not a monomial basis for J_3 then J_1 contains a monomial. Let T be a matching field tableau for B_ℓ representing a monomial in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ which does not lie in the span of $\text{Im}(\Gamma_\ell)|_w^v$. Since $\text{Im}(\Gamma_\ell)$ is a basis for $G_{k,n,\ell}$, it follows that T is row-wise equal to $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ for some semi-standard Young tableau T' which vanishes in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$. We write I, J for the columns of T and I', J' for the columns of $\Gamma_\ell(T')$. Since T and $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ are row-wise equal we may assume that all their entries below the second row are

in semi-standard form. So we write

$$T = \begin{array}{c|c} I & J \\ \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline i_2 & j_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \end{array}, \quad \Gamma_\ell(T') = \begin{array}{c|c} I' & J' \\ \hline i_1 & j_1 \\ \hline j_2 & i_2 \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \end{array}.$$

Throughout the proof we write $v = \{v_1 < \dots < v_k\}$ and $w = \{w_1 < \dots < w_k\}$ for the Grassmannian permutations. We now take cases on $s = |\{i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2\} \cap \{1, \dots, \ell\}|$.

Case 1. Assume $s = 0$ or 4 . It follows that $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ is a semi-standard Young tableaux and so $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ does not vanish, a contradiction.

Case 2. Assume $s = 1$. Without loss of generality assume that $j_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and note that in this case we may possibly have that I' and J' are swapped in $\Gamma_\ell(T')$. Since T does not vanish we have $v \leq I, J \leq w$. So by ordering the entries of I, J in increasing order and comparing them with v and w , we have

$$v_1 \leq \{i_1, j_2\} \leq w_1, \quad v_2 \leq \{i_2, j_1\} \leq w_2.$$

Since $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ vanishes we must have that either I' or J' vanishes. Let us take cases.

Case 2.1 Assume $I' = \{i_1, j_2, \dots\}$ vanishes. We have

$$v_1 \leq j_2 \leq w_1, \quad i_1 \leq w_1 < w_2$$

and so $I' \leq w$. Since I' vanishes, we must have $I' \not\leq v$ and so $i_1 < v_2$. We have the following

- $v_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ because $v_1 \leq j_2$,
- $v_2 \in \{\ell + 2, \dots, n\}$ because $v_2 > i_1 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$.

By Theorems 3.5 and 3.11 we have that $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ contains a monomial.

Case 2.2 Assume $J' = \{j_1, i_2, \dots\}$ vanishes. We have

$$v_1 < v_2 \leq j_1, \quad v_2 \leq i_2 \leq w_2.$$

Therefore $J' \geq v$. Since J' vanishes we have $J' \not\leq w$ and so must have $j_1 > w_1$. We have the following

- $w_i \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$ for all $i \geq 2$ because $w_2 \geq i_2 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$,
- $w_2 \neq w_1 + 1$ because $w_1 < j_1 < i_2 \leq w_2$,
- $w_1 \leq n - k$ because $w_1 < j_1 = \min(J') \geq n - k + 1$,
- $w_1 \geq \ell + 1$ because $w_1 \geq i_1 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$.

And so by Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 we have that $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ contains a monomial.

Case 3. Assume $s = 2$. If $i_1, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ then $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ is not a valid tableau with respect to the matching field B_ℓ . It follows that $i_2, j_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. However it easily follows that $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ does not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^\nu$, a contradiction.

Case 4. Assume $s = 3$. Without loss of generality assume that $j_1 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$. Note that in this case we may possibly have that I' and J' are swapped in $\Gamma_\ell(T')$. Since T does not vanish we have $\nu \leq I, J \leq w$. So by ordering the entries of I, J in increasing order and comparing them with ν and w , we have

$$\nu_1 \leq \{i_1, j_2\} \leq w_1, \quad \nu_2 \leq \{i_2, j_1\} \leq w_2.$$

Since $\Gamma_\ell(T')$ vanishes we must have that either I' or J' vanishes. We proceed by taking cases.

Case 4.1 Assume that $I' = \{i_1, j_2, \dots\}$ vanishes. We have

$$\nu_1 \leq i_1 \leq w_1, \quad j_2 \leq w_1 < w_2$$

and so $I' \leq w$. Since I' vanishes we must have $I' \not\leq \nu$ and we deduce that $j_2 < \nu_2$. We have the following

- $\nu_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ because $\nu_1 \leq i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$,
- $\nu_2 > \nu_1 + 1$ because $\nu_1 \leq i_1 < j_2 < \nu_2$,
- $\nu_2 \neq \ell + 1$ because $\nu_2 \leq i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$.

By Theorems 3.5 and 3.11 we have that $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^\nu$ contains a monomial.

Case 4.2 Assume that $J' = \{j_1, i_2, \dots\}$ vanishes. We have

$$\nu_1 < \nu_2 \leq i_2, \quad \nu_2 \leq j_1 \leq w_2$$

and so $J' \geq \nu$. Since J' vanishes we must have $J' \not\leq w$ and we deduce that $i_2 > w_1$. We have the following

- $w_i \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$ for all $i \geq 2$ because $w_2 \geq j_1 \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, n\}$,
- $w_2 \neq w_1 + 1$ because $w_1 < i_2 < j_1 \leq w_2$,
- $w_1 \leq n - k$ because $w_1 < i_2 = \min(J') \geq n - k + 1$
- $w_1 \neq \ell$ because $w_1 < i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$,
- $w_1 \geq 2$ because, by column I' , we have $i_1 < j_2 \leq w_1$.

And so by Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 we have that $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^\nu$ contains a monomial. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.6. A collection of standard monomials for $G_{k,n,0}|_w^\nu$ in degree two is given by semi-standard Young tableaux T with two columns such that each column I satisfies $\nu \leq I \leq w$. By Lemma 5.10 we have that Γ_ℓ is a map from such semi-standard Young tableaux to matching field tableau for B_ℓ which do not vanish in $G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^\nu$. By Lemmas 5.8 and 5.11 we have that this map is a bijection. \square

Recall from Theorem 3.1 that the initial ideals $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(G_{k,n})$ are quadratically generated.

Conjecture 5.12. *If J_1 is monomial-free then J_2 is quadratically generated.*

Remark 5.13. We have calculated the initial ideals $J_2 = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ for all Richardson varieties of Grassmannians $G_{k,n}$ where $n \in \{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ and $k \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}$ using the software Macaulay2. We have observed that all such initial ideals are quadratically generated if $J_1 = G_{k,n,\ell}|_w^v$ is monomial-free.

Theorem 5.14. *Let $\ell = 0$. If J_1 is monomial-free then J_1, J_2 and J_3 coincide. In particular $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ is a toric ideal.*

Proof. Let $R = \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \subseteq [n], |I| = k, v \leq I \leq w]$ be the polynomial ring containing J_1, J_2 and J_3 . Suppose J_1 is monomial-free. By Lemma 5.4 we have that $J_1 = J_3$. By Lemma 5.5, we have $J_1 \subseteq J_2$. Let M be a collection of linearly independent monomials in R/J_2 , if M is linearly dependent in R/J_1 then we have $\sum_{m \in M} c_m m \in J_1 \subseteq J_2$ for some $c_m \in \mathbb{K}$. And so M is linearly dependent in J_2 , a contradiction. Hence for all $d \geq 1$, any collection of standard monomials for J_2 of degree d is linearly independent in $R/J_1 = R/J_3$. Since $J_2 = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ is an initial ideal of a homogeneous ideal, the number of standard monomials of degree d coincides with the number of standard monomials of degree d of $I(X_w^v)$. Recall that the semi-standard Young tableaux such that each column I satisfies $v \leq I \leq w$ with d -columns are in bijection with a collection of standard monomials of $I(X_w^v)$ of degree d .

Consider the case $\ell = 0$. Two monomials are equal in R/J_3 if and only if their corresponding tableaux are row-wise equal. Therefore, the semi-standard Young tableaux are in bijection with standard monomials for J_3 . And so we have $J_1 = J_2 = J_3$. \square

Corollary 5.15 (Corollary of Conjecture 5.12). *Suppose $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. If J_1 is monomial-free then J_1, J_2 and J_3 coincide. In particular $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_\ell}(I(X_w^v))$ is a toric ideal.*

Proof. Suppose that J_1 is monomial-free. By Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5, we have $J_1 = J_3 \subseteq J_2$. And so any collection of standard monomials of degree d for J_2 is linearly independent in R/J_3 . By Theorem 5.10 we have that J_2 and J_3 have the same number of standard monomials in degree 2. Since $J_3 \subseteq J_2$ it follows that $\text{Im}(\Gamma_\ell)$ is a collection of standard monomials for J_2 and J_3 . Suppose that Conjecture 5.12 holds, then we have that J_2 is generated in degree two. Since $J_1 = J_3$ is generated in degree two, it follows that J_1, J_2 and J_3 coincide. \square

5.2 Flag varieties. Fix n a natural number and $v \leq w$ permutations. Let $R = \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \subseteq [n], |I| \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, I \notin S_w^v]$ and $S = \mathbb{K}[x_{i,j} : i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}]$ be polynomial rings. We define the restricted monomial map $\phi_n|_w^v : R \rightarrow S$ for the flag variety analogously to the Grassmannian case. We use the following shorthand notation for ideals of R .

- $J_1 := F_n|_w^v$, the restricted matching field ideal.
- $J_2 := \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_0}(I(X_w^v))$, the initial ideal of the ideal of the Richardson variety.
- $J_3 := \ker(\phi|_w^v)$, the kernel of the restricted monomial map.

Remark 5.16. By [Kim15, Theorem V.14], there is collection of semi-standard Young tableaux T that form a monomial basis for the Richardson variety X_w^v which are called *standard tableaux*. The conditions for a semi-standard Young tableau to be standard implies that each column I of T satisfies $v \leq I \leq w$. Working directly from the combinatorial conditions, one can show that if $(v, w) \in T_n^R \cup Z_n^R$ then a tableau T is standard if and only if $v \leq I \leq w$ for each column I of T .

By Theorem 4.2, the matching field ideal F_n is quadratically generated and is the kernel of the monomial map ϕ_0 in (4.1). Hence, by a similar argument to the Grassmannian case we have the following results.

Lemma 5.17. *The ideals J_1 and J_3 coincide if and only if J_1 is monomial-free.*

Proof. Note that J_3 is the kernel of a monomial map and therefore does not contain any monomials. So, if J_1 contains a monomial then it is not equal to J_3 .

Suppose J_1 does not contain any monomials. Let G be a quadratic generating set for F_n and let $S = \{P_I : I \in S_w^v\}$ be the collection of vanishing Plücker variables. By definition $J_1 = \langle G \cup S \rangle \cap \mathbb{K}[P_I : I \notin S_w^v]$. So by Lemma 5.2 we have J_1 is generated by G_S . Since J_1 is monomial-free, we have that G_S does not contain any monomials. By Theorem 4.2, the ideal F_n is the kernel of a monomial map ϕ_0 and by definition J_3 is the kernel of the restriction $\phi_n|_w^v$. Since all binomials $m_1 - m_2 \in G_S$ lie in F_n and contain only the non-vanishing Plücker variables P_J for $J \notin S_w^v$, therefore $m_1 - m_2 \in J_3$. And so we have $J_1 \subseteq J_3$. Also, for any polynomial $f \in J_3$ we have that $f \in F_n$. Since f contains only the non-vanishing Plücker variables, therefore $f \in J_1$. \square

Lemma 5.18. $J_1 \subseteq J_2$.

Proof. Let G be a quadratic binomial generating set for F_n and $S = \{P_I : I \in S_w^v\}$. Let $\hat{f} \in G_S \subset J_1$ be any polynomial. By the definition of G_S , there exists $f \in G$ such that \hat{f} is obtained from f by setting some variables to zero. Recall $F_n = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_0}(I_n)$, so there exists a polynomial $g \in I_n$ such that $f = \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_0}(g)$. Since the leading term of g is not set to zero in $I(X_w^v)$, it follows that $\hat{f} \in \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_0}(I(X_w^v))$. \square

We write $SSYT_d(v, w)$ for the collection of semi-standard Young tableau T with columns I_1, \dots, I_d satisfying $v \leq I_j \leq w$ for each $j \in [d]$. We note that, in contrast to the Grassmannian, the monomials associated to the tableaux $SSYT_d(v, w)$ do not constitute a monomial basis for the Richardson variety X_w^v inside the flag variety.

Theorem 5.19. *If J_1 is monomial-free then J_1, J_2 and J_3 coincide. In particular $\text{in}_{\mathbf{w}_0}(I(X_w^v))$ is a toric ideal.*

Proof. Since J_1 is monomial-free, we have $J_1 = J_3$ by Lemma 5.17. By Lemma 5.18 we have $J_1 \subseteq J_2$. Let M be a collection of linearly independent monomials in R/J_2 , if M is linearly dependent in R/J_1 then we have $\sum_{m \in M} c_m m \in J_1 \subseteq J_2$ for some $c_m \in \mathbb{K}$. And so M is linearly dependent in J_2 , a contradiction. Hence for all $d \geq 1$, any collection of standard monomials for J_2 of degree d is linearly independent in $R/J_1 = R/J_3$. Since we are working with the

diagonal matching field, the monomials associated to $SSYT_d(v, w)$ form a monomial basis for J_1 in degree d . By Remark 5.16, the monomials associated to $SSYT_d(v, w)$ form a monomial basis for the Richardson variety X_w^v . Since $J_2 = \text{in}_{w_0}(I(X_w^v))$ is an initial ideal, any monomial basis for J_2 in degree d has size $|SSYT_d(v, w)|$. Therefore J_1 and J_2 have monomial bases of the same size in each degree. So $J_1 = J_2$. \square

5.3 Applications and further computations. In this section we provide some further applications of our results and compare them to the results in [Kim15]. In particular we give explicit calculations for Fl_3 and Fl_4 .

Let us begin by calculating the pairs of permutations (v, w) for which $F_n|_w^v$ is toric, non-toric and zero using a different weight matrix. For the weight matrix we use the same convention as Kim, so for $n = 3$ and $n = 4$ we use the weight matrices

$$M_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 6 & 3 & 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } M_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The leading term of any determinant $\phi_n(P_I)$ is the antidiagonal term. In [Kim15], the pairs of permutations (v, w) for which $F_n|_w^v$ is toric is parametrized by so-called *pipe dreams*. More precisely, each pair of reduced pipe dreams associated to (v, w) gives rise to a face of the Gelfand-Tsetlin polytope. The toric varieties associated to these faces give rise to the (possibly irreducible) components of X_w^v under the degeneration. Note that description in terms of pipe dreams cannot differentiate between toric and zero ideals and in some cases cannot determine whether the ideal is toric, non-toric or zero.

We calculate the ideals $F_n|_w^v$ for Fl_3 and obtain the following results for pairs of permutation (v, w) where $v < w$.

Toric	Non-toric	Zero
$((1,2,3),(3,1,2))$	$((1,2,3),(2,3,1))$	$((1,2,3),(1,3,2))$
$((1,2,3),(3,2,1))$	$((1,3,2),(2,3,1))$	$((1,2,3),(2,1,3))$
$((2,1,3),(3,1,2))$	$((1,3,2),(3,1,2))$	$((2,3,1),(3,2,1))$
$((2,1,3),(3,2,1))$	$((1,3,2),(3,2,1))$	$((3,1,2),(3,2,1))$
	$((2,1,3),(2,3,1))$	

In addition to the results of Kim, we note that we are also able to characterize those pairs of permutations for which the ideal of the corresponding Richardson variety is zero under the degeneration. In these calculations, similar to the diagonal case in Theorem 4.7, the pairs (v, w) for which $F_n|_w^v$ is zero satisfy: $w \in W_v$.

We perform the same calculation for Fl_4 and obtain the above complete list of toric and zero pairs of permutations. The symbol $*$ appears in the table beside pairs of permutations for which the description by pipe dreams does not determine whether the corresponding ideal is toric, non-toric or zero.

Remark 5.20. We note that our results determine pairs of permutations (v, w) for which the corresponding Richardson variety degenerates to a toric variety. As seen in the above

examples, it is not always possible to use pipe dreams, see [Kim15, Corollary V.26], to determine whether the Gelfand-Tsetlin degeneration gives rise to a toric degeneration of Richardson varieties. And so our results may be viewed as a strengthening of the previous results.

Toric		Zero
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (1, 4, 2, 3))$	$((2, 3, 1, 4), (4, 3, 1, 2))$	$((1, 2, 3, 4), (1, 2, 4, 3))$
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (1, 4, 3, 2))$	$((2, 3, 1, 4), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((1, 2, 3, 4), (1, 3, 2, 4)) *$
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (3, 1, 2, 4))$	$((2, 3, 4, 1), (4, 2, 3, 1)) *$	$((1, 2, 3, 4), (2, 1, 3, 4))$
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (3, 2, 1, 4))$	$((2, 3, 4, 1), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((1, 2, 3, 4), (2, 1, 4, 3))$
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (4, 1, 2, 3))$	$((3, 1, 2, 4), (4, 1, 2, 3))$	$((1, 2, 4, 3), (2, 1, 4, 3)) *$
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (4, 1, 3, 2))$	$((3, 1, 2, 4), (4, 1, 3, 2))$	$((1, 3, 4, 2), (1, 4, 3, 2)) *$
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (4, 2, 1, 3))$	$((3, 1, 2, 4), (4, 2, 1, 3))$	$((1, 4, 2, 3), (1, 4, 3, 2)) *$
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (4, 3, 1, 2))$	$((3, 1, 2, 4), (4, 3, 1, 2))$	$((2, 1, 3, 4), (2, 1, 4, 3))$
$((1, 2, 3, 4), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((3, 1, 2, 4), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((2, 3, 1, 4), (3, 2, 1, 4))$
$((1, 3, 2, 4), (1, 4, 2, 3)) *$	$((3, 1, 4, 2), (4, 1, 3, 2))$	$((2, 3, 4, 1), (2, 4, 3, 1)) *$
$((1, 3, 2, 4), (1, 4, 3, 2)) *$	$((3, 2, 1, 4), (4, 2, 1, 3))$	$((2, 3, 4, 1), (3, 2, 4, 1)) *$
$((2, 1, 3, 4), (3, 1, 2, 4))$	$((3, 2, 1, 4), (4, 3, 1, 2))$	$((3, 1, 2, 4), (3, 2, 1, 4))$
$((2, 1, 3, 4), (3, 2, 1, 4))$	$((3, 2, 1, 4), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((3, 4, 1, 2), (3, 4, 2, 1)) *$
$((2, 1, 3, 4), (4, 1, 2, 3))$	$((3, 2, 4, 1), (4, 2, 3, 1)) *$	$((3, 4, 1, 2), (4, 3, 1, 2))$
$((2, 1, 3, 4), (4, 1, 3, 2))$	$((3, 2, 4, 1), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((3, 4, 2, 1), (4, 3, 2, 1))$
$((2, 1, 3, 4), (4, 2, 1, 3))$	$((4, 1, 2, 3), (4, 3, 1, 2))$	$((4, 1, 2, 3), (4, 1, 3, 2))$
$((2, 1, 3, 4), (4, 3, 1, 2))$	$((4, 1, 2, 3), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((4, 1, 2, 3), (4, 2, 1, 3))$
$((2, 1, 3, 4), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((4, 2, 1, 3), (4, 3, 1, 2))$	$((4, 2, 3, 1), (4, 3, 2, 1)) *$
$((2, 3, 1, 4), (2, 4, 1, 3))$	$((4, 2, 1, 3), (4, 3, 2, 1))$	$((4, 3, 1, 2), (4, 3, 2, 1))$

5.4 Further connections. We proceed by comparing our results to previous results in the literature. We highlight possible connections to other areas and future research opportunities.

Remark 5.21. In [BL18], the authors study the degeneration of Schubert varieties inside the full flag variety. Their construction is built upon on the flat degeneration of the flag variety given by Feigin [Fei12] by restriction to its Schubert varieties. They give a number of sufficient conditions on the permutation $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ such that restriction of the degeneration to the Schubert variety $X(w)$ is reducible. Similarly to our methods, this is done by showing that the corresponding initial ideals contain monomials arising from certain Plücker relations.

Remark 5.22. Here we mention possible connections of our results to representation theory. The Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials play a key role in the representation theory of algebraic groups. The coefficients of these polynomials are closely related to the rank of intersection cohomology groups for Richardson varieties, see [Pro18, Theorem 4.3]. In the case of projective toric varieties, the rank of the intersection cohomology groups can be computed from the combinatorial data of the associated polytope P , namely in terms of the so-called h -functions of P , see [Sta87, Theorem 3.1] and [Fie91]. And so we leave the study of the polytopes associated to toric degenerations of Richardson varieties to future work however we will note some particularly relevant results regarding matching field polytopes. In [CHM20], the authors show that block diagonal matching field polytopes, which coincide with the toric polytope for toric degenerations of the Grassmannian via matching fields, are related to each other

by sequences of combinatorial mutations. Therefore one may naturally try to prove that the toric polytopes of toric degenerations of Richardson varieties are combinatorial mutations of faces of the Gelfand-Tsetlin polytope. In such a case, by the semi-continuity arguments, we obtain information about Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials from the toric degenerations of Richardson varieties.

Remark 5.23. Here we mention some application of our results and methods to further families of varieties. In our paper we use standard monomial theory for Schubert and Richardson varieties inside Grassmannians and flag varieties, i.e. the monomial basis given by semi-standard Young tableaux which is compatible with these subvarieties. The desingularizations of Schubert varieties are known as Bott-Samelson varieties and a standard monomial theory for these varieties is developed in [LLM02]. In [Bal13], the author develops standard monomial theory for desingularized Richardson varieties indexed by combinatorial objects called w_0 -standard tableaux. Similarly one can try to develop analogues for matching fields for these desingularized varieties and study their standard monomials with maps analogous to Γ_ℓ , see Definition 5.7.

References

References

- [Bal13] M. Balan. Standard monomial theory for desingularized Richardson varieties in the flag variety $GL(n)/B$. *Transformation Groups*, 18(2):329–359, 2013.
- [BL03] M. Brion and V. Lakshmibai. A geometric approach to standard monomial theory. *Representation Theory of the AMS*, 7(25):651–680, 2003.
- [BL18] L. Bossinger and M. Lanini. Following Schubert varieties under Feigin’s degeneration of the flag variety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04320*, 2018.
- [BLMM17] L. Bossinger, S. Lamboglia, K. Mincheva, and F. Mohammadi. Computing toric degenerations of flag varieties. In *Combinatorial algebraic geometry*, pages 247–281. Springer, 2017.
- [BMC20] L. Bossinger, F. Mohammadi, and A. Nájera Chávez. Families of Gröbner degenerations, Grassmannians and universal cluster algebras. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14972*, 2020.
- [BZ01] A. Berenstein and A. Zelevinsky. Tensor product multiplicities, canonical bases and totally positive varieties. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 143(1):77–128, 2001.
- [Cal02] P. Caldero. Toric degenerations of Schubert varieties. *Transformation Groups*, 7(1):51–60, 2002.
- [CHM20] O. Clarke, A. Higashitani, and F. Mohammadi. Combinatorial mutations and block diagonal polytopes. *In preparation*, 2020.

- [CM19a] O. Clarke and F. Mohammadi. Toric degenerations of flag varieties from matching field tableaux. *To appear in Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra, arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.07832*, 2019.
- [CM19b] O. Clarke and F. Mohammadi. Toric degenerations of Schubert varieties from matching field tableaux. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03215*, 2019.
- [CM20] O. Clarke and F. Mohammadi. Toric degenerations of Grassmannians and Schubert varieties from matching field tableaux. *Journal of Algebra*, 559:646–678, 2020.
- [Deo85] V.V. Deodhar. On some geometric aspects of Bruhat orderings. I. A finer decomposition of Bruhat cells. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 79(3):499–511, 1985.
- [Fei12] E. Feigin. \mathbb{G}_a^M degeneration of flag varieties. *Selecta Mathematica*, 18(3):513–537, 2012.
- [FFL17] X. Fang, G. Fourier, and P. Littelmann. On toric degenerations of flag varieties. *Representation Theory—Current Trends and Perspectives*, pages 187–232, 2017.
- [Fie91] K.H. Fieseler. Rational intersection cohomology of projective toric varieties. *J. reine angew. Math.*, 413:88–98, 1991.
- [GL96] N. Gonciulea and V. Lakshmibai. Degenerations of flag and Schubert varieties to toric varieties. *Transformation Groups*, 1(3):215–248, 1996.
- [GS] D. Grayson and M. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <https://faculty.math.illinois.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [Kim15] G. Kim. Richardson varieties in a toric degeneration of the flag variety. *Thesis (Ph.D.) - University of Michigan. 82 pp. ISBN: 978-1339-03949-7*, 2015.
- [KL02] V. Kreiman and V. Lakshmibai. Richardson varieties in the Grassmannian. *arXiv preprint math/0203278*, 2002.
- [KM05] M. Kogan and E. Miller. Toric degeneration of Schubert varieties and Gelfand-Tsetlin polytopes. *Advances in Mathematics*, 193(1):1–17, 2005.
- [KMS15] M. Kateri, F. Mohammadi, and B. Sturmfels. A family of quasisymmetry models. *Journal of Algebraic Statistics*, 6(1), 2015.
- [Lit98] P. Littelmann. Cones, crystals, and patterns. *Transformation groups*, 3(2):145–179, 1998.
- [LLM02] V. Lakshmibai, P. Littelmann, and P. Magyar. Standard monomial theory for Bott–Samelson varieties. *Compositio Mathematica*, 130(3):293–318, 2002.

- [MG08] S. Morier-Genoud. Geometric lifting of the canonical basis and semitoric degenerations of Richardson varieties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 360(1):215–235, 2008.
- [MS19] F. Mohammadi and K. Shaw. Toric degenerations of Grassmannians from matching fields. *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 2(6):1109–1124, 2019.
- [Pro18] N. Proudfoot. The algebraic geometry of Kazhdan–Lusztig–Stanley polynomials. *EMS Surveys in Mathematical Sciences*, 2018.
- [Ric92] R.W. Richardson. Intersections of double cosets in algebraic groups. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 3(1):69–77, 1992.
- [RW19] K. Rietsch and L. Williams. Newton–Okounkov bodies, cluster duality, and mirror symmetry for Grassmannians. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 168(18):3437–3527, 2019.
- [Sta87] R. Stanley. Generalized h-vectors, intersection cohomology of toric varieties, and related results, in commutative algebra and combinatorics. *Advanced Studies in Pure Math.*, 11:187–213, 1987.
- [SZ93] B. Sturmfels and A. Zelevinsky. Maximal minors and their leading terms. *Advances in Mathematics*, 98(1):65–112, 1993.

Authors’ addresses:

Narasimha Chary Bonala
 Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Fakultät für Mathematik, D-44780 Bochum, Germany
 E-mail address: `narasimha.bonala@rub.de`

Oliver Clarke
 University of Bristol, School of Mathematics, BS8 1TW, Bristol, UK
 E-mail address: `oliver.clarke@bristol.ac.uk`

Fatemeh Mohammadi
 Department of Mathematics: Algebra and Geometry, Ghent University, 9000 Ghent, Belgium
 Department of Mathematics and Statistics, UiT – The Arctic University of Norway, 9037 Tromsø, Norway
 E-mail address: `fatemeh.mohammadi@ugent.be`